TMESIS IN HERODOTUS[1]

By JESSICA PRIESTLEY, Cambridge

Introduction

Tmesis, one of many ways that H[erodotus] models himself on Homer.

In their 2002 Cambridge commentary on book nine of the Histories, Michael Flower and John Marincola made this cursory remark.[2] Tmesis occurs a total of thirty-three times in the *Histories*;[3] yet discussions of Herodotean usage have been scattered, brief and, often, not particularly informative.

Tmesis in Greek is a device associated with poetry.[4] In the Homeric poems it is so common that it used to be thought it reflected the natural spoken language of the times.[5] More recently, from the evidence of the Linear B tablets, it has been argued that "tmesis was a poetic feature equally remote from spoken language in the seventh and in the fourth centuries B.C."[6] The usefulness of tmesis in poetry is plain: it affords

---

[1] The original version of this paper was written as a Master's dissertation in 2005 at the University of Auckland, under the supervision of Vivienne Gray. I wish to thank her for her encouragement and guidance as the dissertation took shape. I am also grateful for the financial assistance of the University's Faculty of Arts Master's Scholarship, which enabled me to carry out this research.

[2] Flower & Marincola (2002), 108, commenting on 9.5.3. Similarly, Smyth §1652: "Hdt. uses tmesis frequently in imitation of the Epic".

[3] A comprehensive list of references is given by Aly (1969) 268–9. I exclude from this count the last three examples of Aly's first class: see n. 13.

[4] See, for example, Willi (2003), 250: "The separation of a preverb from the verbal stem ('tmesis') is commonly regarded as poetic".

[5] E.g. Kühner-Gerth, §445.1. Against this view, see Morpurgo Davies (1985), 86–9.

[6] Morpurgo Davies (1985), 87. The tablets suggest that the fusion of preverb and verb had already taken place in Mycenaean Greek. See also Horrocks (1981), 148–63, and Duhoux (1998).

poets greater flexibility while working within the constraints of metre. From post-Homeric to Classical times it is found in all forms of poetry. Kühner-Gerth identify various functions, including emphasis, vividness, elevation of tone, decoration, and parody.[7]

In prose, tmesis is rarely seen.[8] But it should not therefore be equated automatically with Homer, nor necessarily even with poetry. Other possibilities exist. There are cases of tmesis in the Hippocratics, which may indicate that tmesis was a standard feature of technical Ionian prose. Trimeter passages in Aristophanes suggest that tmesis could be used colloquially for emphasis.[9] Another piece of the puzzle to bear in mind is the logographic tradition, almost entirely lost, that influenced Herodotus' work.

This study seeks to improve our understanding of Herodotean tmesis by examining the contexts in which it occurs and discussing the possible effect and narrative function of the device in each instance. Tmetic examples outside of Herodotus are discussed when it is thought that they might enhance our understanding of his usage, but by and large the focus remains specifically on the cases within the *Histories*. This approach seems justified given that Herodotus is, as Morpurgo Davies remarks, "obviously a case *sui generis*".[10]

---

[7] On tmesis generally, see Goodwin §1222.2, Smyth §1650–3. For a fuller discussion, with numerous examples, see Kühner-Gerth §445. As well as tmesis of verbs, tmesis of the adverbs διαμπερές and ἐξονομακλήδην is found in Homer (K-G 445.1) and of ἐνταυθί in Aristophanes (Willi, 250).

[8] See Kühner-Gerth §445.13. Most of the examples in Attic prose involve ποιεῖν and πάσχειν, which may reflect a colloquial use: ξὺν κακῶς ποιεῖν (Thuc. 3.13), ἀντ' εὖ ποιεῖν (Xen. *An.* 5.5.21, Plato, *Gorgias* 520e), ἀντ' εὖ πεποίηκεν, σὺν εὖ πεπονθότων, (Dem. 20.64, 8.65). There is a poetic use in Plato: ξύμ μοι λάβεσθε (*Phaedr.* 237a). For references to its use in the Hippocratics, see following section on type 1.

[9] Wackernagel (1928), 173; Morpurgo Davies (1985), 88; Willi (2003), 250. Tmesis can also be used for colloquial emphasis in English: e.g. 'abso-bloody-lutely' is popular presently, and in Edwardian times 'abso-bally-lutely' was current (OED suppl. I). Cf. also 'Jee-crawling-hova' in Harper Lee's *To Kill a Mockingbird* (ch. 14).

[10] Morpurgo Davies (1985), 109 n. 28.

It will become clear during the course of this study that not all cases of tmesis are created equal. Wolf Aly collated the examples of Herodotean tmesis and classified them as follows: [11]

1) The division of the preposition and verb by ὦν (οὖν);

2) Tmesis due to anaphora of paired phrases (e.g. κατὰ μὲν φαγεῖν...κατὰ δὲ...);

3) 'Genuine' (*echte*) tmesis. This consists of all examples that do not fall into either of the first two classes. [12]

These divisions have been adopted for the purposes of this study. I refer to the three classes of tmesis simply as 'type 1', 'type 2', and 'type 3', and each type is discussed separately in the following pages.

Type 1 Tmesis

There are eighteen instances of 'type 1' tmesis in Herodotus. [13] Type 1 tmesis is where the preposition is separated from the rest of the verb by the particle ὦν (οὖν). This type of tmesis has received a reasonable amount of attention, in contrast to the other types. It even earns a mention in Liddell and Scott's lexicon. [14]

Outside Herodotus, tmesis with ὦν (οὖν) is found in the following places:

---

[11] Aly (1969) 268-9. See also n. 3, above.

[12] The label 'genuine' which Aly gave to the third class is unhelpful, since it falsely implies that the other examples are in some way *not* true cases of tmesis.

[13] 1.194.4; 2.39.2, 40.2, 47.1, 47.3, 70.2, 85.1, 86.4, 87.2, 87.3, 88, 96.2, 122.3, 172.3; 3.82.4; 4.60.2, 196.2; 7.10ε. Aly counts twenty-one instances because, for reasons of *Satzmelodie* (i.e. the overall intonation and structure of the sentence), he includes in his count οὐκ ὦν ἔπειθον (3.137.4, 138.3) and οὐκ ὦν ἔπνευσαν (2.20.2). I exclude these since they are not examples of tmesis.

[14] LSJ s.v. οὖν II.

1) Hipponax, fr. 78.19 (West): ἀπ' ὦν ἐδέψατ'...

2) Epicharmus, fr. 35.6 (Kaibel): κἄπ'ὦν ἠχθόμαν ...; fr. 124.3 (Kaibel): καὶ γλυκύν γ' ἐπ' ὦν ἐπίομες οἶνον.

3) Some of the Hippocratic works: *de Morbis* I (but only in manuscript θ) 14, 15, 18, 19, 21, 22, 30; *de Morb.* II 50; *Nat. Mul.* 11 (manuscript θ only).

4) Aristophanes, Frogs 1047: ὥστε γε καὐτόν σε κατ' οὖν ἔβαλεν.

5) Dorieus (possibly early 3rd century)[15] *ap.* Athen. 413A: ὃν γὰρ ἐπόμπευσεν βοῦν ἄζυγον, εἰς κρέα τόνδε | κόψας πάντα κατ'οὖν μοῦνος ἐδαίσατό νιν.

6) Herodas: κατ' οὖν λήσεις [γηρᾶσα][16] (1.37), πάξ· μήτε προσθῇς μήτ' ἀπ' οὖν ἕλης μηδέν (7.114).

7) Callimachus: *Hy.* 6.75 (ἀπ' ὦν ἀρνήσατο μάτηρ), fr. 64.5 Pf. (κ]ατ' οὖν ἤρειψεν), fr. 384.5 Pf. (νεῖον ἀπ' οὖν μέμβλωκεν).

8) Nicander, *Alexipharmaca* 561: ἀπ' οὖν νόσφισσε.

9) Strato, *A. P.* 12.226: κατ' οὖν ἐδάμασσεν.

It should be noted that tmesis with οὖν is not found in Homer. The closest epic parallel is the single example of tmesis with δ'οὖν at *Iliad* 19.94: κατὰ δ'οὖν ἕτερόν γ'ἐπέδησεν, and even this example is unusual since the particle combination δ'οὖν is found nowhere else in early epic.[17] There is, then, no reason to think that Herodotus uses type 1 tmesis with a view to sounding Homeric.

---

[15] See Pauly.
[16] On γηρᾶσα, see Headlam (1922), 32–3.
[17] Edwards (1991), 248–9. The line was athetised by Aristarchus.

Earlier Commentators' Views on Type 1

Discussions of type 1 tmesis have not always been in agreement. Following is a survey of what earlier commentators have said about it.

Stein is, so far as I am aware, the earliest commentator on type 1, and his remarks have been regarded as so authoritative that he is even quoted in Kühner-Gerth's tome on grammar:

> "Dieser Tmesis mit sperrendem ὦν bedient sich Herodot, wahrscheinlich in Nachahmung eines populären Gebrauches, durchgängig mit dem empirischen Aorist, bei Schilderung von Sitten und Gebräuchen, um eine Handlung als energisch und lebhaft oder als plötzlich, unverzüglich, eilfertig darzustellen".[18]

This explanation requires at least one qualification: this form of tmesis is not found in conjunction with the empiric aorist in every single instance (*durchgängig*) in the *Histories*. The exception is 2.172, where the aorist simply describes a single event in the past, namely Amasis' destruction of the golden footbath to make a statue of a god. Later in this paper, each of the examples in Herodotus will be discussed in detail, to help assess whether Stein is correct in his assessment of why tmesis with ὦν is used in the *Histories*.

The next important comments come from Aly, who, with remarkable assurance, asserts that:

> "Die Tmesis vom Typus δι᾽ ὦν ἐφθάρησαν lebte in der Umgangssprache der 2. Hälfte des 5. Jhdts. weder in Ionien noch in Attika. Sie ist also ein literarisches Residuum".[19]

How he can be certain about the details of colloquial Attic and Ionic he does not explain. He comments that, judging from the range of authors in which it is found, the phenomenon is not to be explained by dialect. He then draws attention to the very

---

[18] Stein (1883), vol. 1, p. 219 (comment on 1.194). Quoted by Kühner-Gerth II.i, p. 537 n. 1.

[19] Aly (1969), 268.

interesting distribution of the examples in Herodotus: of the eighteen instances, thirteen (72%) occur in Book 2,[20] and all except one occur in the first half of the *Histories*. He speculates:

> "Fast ist man geneigt, an den Mann zu denken, der materiell der Führer gerade durch das II. Buch war, an Hekataios, der diese künstlerisch, wie gesagt, in der überwiegenden Mehrzahl der Fälle bei Hdt nichts bedeutende Eigenheit hervorgerufen haben könnte".[21]

Presumably this is what Aly is alluding to when he calls type 1 tmesis a 'literary residuum'. Due to the concentration of examples early on, Aly makes the (rather bizarre) comment that Herodotus 'breaks free' of the mannerism, saying that the one example from the second half of the *Histories* is different in meaning from all the others, bar the example at 3.82.4.[22]

Wackernagel rightly takes issue with Aly's comment about Herodotus 'breaking free' of the mannerism.[23] Having cited other authors who used it, he concludes that the basis of this type of tmesis might be understood when the 'dark origin' of the particle ὦν (οὖν) is established.[24] He then adds the observation that for other types of tmesis, the earliest examples coincide with when a preverb stands at the beginning of its clause, but that this is not the case for this type of tmesis.[25]

Denniston notes that Kühner associates the usage with popular speech. Judging from his comment on the one Aristophanic example (below), it seems that Denniston agrees with

---

[20] Or, according to Aly's criteria, fourteen out of twenty-one (67%): see n. 13.

[21] Aly (1969), 268.

[22] Aly (1969), 268: "Folglich hat sich Hdt von dieser Manier freigemacht, sie bedeutet VII 10 etwas anderes, als an den anderen Stellen. Vergleichbar ist nur III 82".

[23] Wackernagel (1928), 173.

[24] Wackernagel (1928), 174: "Worauf diese eigentümliche Art von Tmesis beruht, wird man dann vielleicht verstehen, wenn die jetzt noch völlig dunkle Herkunft der Partikel ὦν (οὖν) erschlossen ist".

[25] Wackernagel (1928), 174.

Kühner/Stein[26] on this point. He remarks, as do most of the commentators, on the fact that type 1 tmesis is almost always found in conjunction with the aorist indicative. This aorist normally does not refer to the past, but tends to be of the type referred to variously as 'empiric' or 'gnomic'.[27] (Compare also Semonides' use of a simple verb in the gnomic aorist together with οὖν, which Lloyd-Jones connects with the 'Ionic' type 1 tmesis.[28]) Denniston also notes that type 1 tmesis is used mainly in apodoses,[29] although not in the earliest examples of the mannerism, and concludes: "It may therefore derive from Homeric οὖν referring to something foreshadowed, 'accordingly'."[30] Lloyd-Jones and Hopkinson are both unconvinced by this last comment of Denniston's, and remark that a source in popular speech seems more likely.[31]

There are fairly strong indicators that tmesis with οὖν is to be explained by dialect. Most of the examples we have are Ionic: those from Herodotus, Hippocrates, Hipponax, Herodas. But, as Hopkinson has pointed out, it looks as if it was also genuinely Doric: as well as the example from Callimachus' *Hymn* 6, there are those from Epicharmus. In Attic there is only the example from Aristophanes' *Frogs*,[32] about which Denniston has made the comment: "I have little doubt that there is an intentional

---

[26] A number of modern commentators seem unaware that "Kühner's" comment is in fact a quote from Stein (e.g. Lloyd-Jones (1975), 74).

[27] 'Empiric': Stein, Kühner-Gerth, Bechtel. 'Gnomic': Wackernagel, Denniston, Hopkinson. All but one of the eighteen Herodotean cases involve empiric/gnomic aorists (the exception being 2.172.3).

[28] Sem. 7.45: ἔστερξεν ὧν ἅπαντα κἀπονήσατο. Lloyd-Jones (1975), 74.

[29] In Herodotus all the cases are apodotic except four. The exceptions are 2.88, 2.96.2, 2.172.3, 4.60.2. Note that Denniston (1954), 429, misses 4.60.2 and wrongly categorises 2.88 as apodotic.

[30] Denniston (1954), 429–30.

[31] Lloyd-Jones (1975), 74; Hopkinson (1984), 141.

[32] Cf. Archippus, fr. 35 I 886 (Kock): κατὰ μὲν οὖν ἔφαγε κἀπεβρυξέ τις. Most commentators, rightly, do not count this as an example of 'type 1' tmesis: the insertion of the particle combination μὲν οὖν cannot be compared with the insertion of οὖν alone.

Ionism (or Dorism) here, and that Aristophanes is parodying some one, probably Euripides himself".[33]

One question to consider, which unfortunately is unlikely ever to be resolved, is Aly's speculation about whether the use of type 1 tmesis in Herodotus might be a trace of Hecataeus' influence. Is there any overlap between where type 1 tmesis is found and passages which we have reason to believe were influenced by Hecataeus?[34] Example 6 (below), on crocodile hunting, is a passage which Porphyry claims was influenced by Hecataeus.[35] Example 12 (below), which describes Egyptian cargo boats, is another passage which may have been influenced by Hecataeus.[36]

It is also worth considering the validity of Stein's comment on the purpose of Herodotus' use of tmesis with οὖν: "...um eine Handlung als energisch und lebhaft oder als plötzlich, unverzüglich, eilfertig darzustellen".[37] From the discussion of the individual examples below it should become clear that a sense of suddenness and immediacy is indeed often present.

Finally, Denniston sees "... 'actuality' or 'essentiality' as the root meaning of the particle"[38] and although he is not making this remark specifically about the connective use that οὖν has in the examples with which we are concerned, it nevertheless is a

---

[33] Denniston (1954), 430. Euripides uses tmesis frequently. However, there are no extant examples of type 1 tmesis in his plays. K. Dover (1993), 323, does not discuss Denniston's comment. It is possible that Euripides' actual speech is being parodied. Willi (2003), 157–97 (see esp. 165, 9), notes that in Aristophanes Euripides and his associates are feminised, even to the extent of having their way of speech referred to as λαλιά, a negative term which is otherwise used by Aristophanes only in reference to the speech of women. In addition he argues that there is good reason to think that women and the intellectual élite at Athens attached prestige to a linguistically innovative, Ionic-influenced form of Attic Greek.

[34] For a useful discussion of Hecataeus' influence on Herodotus, see Lloyd (1976), I 127–39.

[35] Porphyry, *FGrH* I, fr. 324. But see the comment in Lloyd (1976), I 128, that Porphyry is oversimplifying in at least the case of the phoenix.

[36] Lloyd (1976), 133–4. Note Lloyd's sensible comments on the difficulties of drawing such inferences.

[37] Stein (1883), vol. 1, p. 219 (comment on 1.194).

[38] Denniston (1954), 416.

useful remark to bear in mind. As is discussed below, οὖν often seems to be used in the Herodotean examples to emphasise the actuality or truth of something that might for one reason or another seem unexpected, amazing, or unbelievable: 'they do X – *really* they do!'

The Herodotean Examples of Type 1 Tmesis

All eighteen examples of type 1 tmesis in Herodotus are given below, along with a brief explanation of the context in each case. In each case the use of type 1 tmesis is discussed in light of the comments made above.

Often there are multiple examples of type 1 tmesis clustered closely together:

- examples 2 and 3 (customs relating to sacrifice),
- examples 4 and 5 (beliefs and customs relating to pigs),
- examples 7–11 (customs relating to mourning and mummification of the dead).

Another point of interest is that some verbs are found in tmesis with ὦν on more than one occasion, and even more interestingly, the surrounding context is sometimes similar also. Compare:

- example 3 (κοιλίην μὲν κείνην πᾶσαν ἐξ ὦν εἷλον) and example 8 (ἐξ ὦν εἷλον τὴν κοιλίην πᾶσαν),
- example 6 (πηλῷ κατ᾽ ὦν ἔπλασε αὐτοῦ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς) and example 7 (κατ᾽ ὦν ἐπλάσατο τὴν κεφαλὴν πηλῷ ἢ καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον),
- examples 2 (ἀπ᾽ ὦν ἔδοντο), 10 and 11 (ἀπ᾽ ὦν ἔδωκαν).

1) At 1.194 Herodotus describes what he regards as the most amazing thing in Assyria (τὸ δὲ ἁπάντων θῶμα μέγιστόν μοι ἐστι τῶν ταύτῃ...) after Babylon itself. He describes the boats which were made in Armenia to transport goods down-river to Babylon: they were round, their frames made of willow over which watertight skins were stretched, and the insides were lined with straw. As well as the goods and men to paddle, they would carry donkeys. Having

arrived in Babylon, the goods, the boat frames and the straw would be sold off and the men returned to Armenia with the skins, which the donkeys carried. The reason, Herodotus tells us, is that the current was too strong for the boats to sail back up the river.

ἐπεὰν ὦν ἀπίκωνται πλέοντες ἐς τὴν Βαβυλῶνα καὶ
διαθέωνται τὸν φόρτον, νομέας μὲν τοῦ πλοίου καὶ
τὴν καλάμην πᾶσαν ἀπ᾽ ὦν ἐκήρυξαν, τὰς δὲ διφθέρας
ἐπισάξαντες ἐπὶ τοὺς ὄνους ἀπελαύνουσι ἐς τοὺς
Ἀρμενίους. ἀνὰ τὸν ποταμὸν γὰρ δὴ οὐκ οἷά τέ ἐστι
πλέειν οὐδενὶ τρόπῳ ὑπὸ τάχεος τοῦ ποταμοῦ.

(1.194.4–5)

Herodotus devotes quite a bit of space to this story, and it seems that what he finds 'amazing' is not only the round shape of the boats but the way that they were used. The use of tmesis draws attention to a point that Herodotus knew his audience would also find amazing. When they arrived in Babylon, the traders auction off (ἀπ᾽ ὦν ἐκήρυξαν) not just their goods but the boat parts as well! That Herodotus' audience would have been surprised by this part of the narrative is confirmed by the fact that in the very next sentence he feels the need to give an explanation (…γάρ…) for the behaviour. The sense of immediacy to which Stein refers is perhaps also there. Compare Schwyzer, who translates: "schlagen sie *gleich* los"[39] (my emphasis).

2) At 2.39 Herodotus describes the way in which bulls in Egypt are sacrificed. Wine is sprinkled on the victim, the deity is invoked, and then the animal's throat is cut. Then they cut off the head, skin the body, and call down curses on the victim's head. They then try to sell the head to any resident Greeks, or they throw the head into the river. The intention of the curses is to divert evil from the worshippers or from Egypt as a whole.

σῶμα μὲν δὴ τοῦ κτήνεος δείρουσι, κεφαλῇ δὲ κείνῃ πολλὰ
καταρησάμενοι φέρουσι, τοῖσι μὲν ἂν ἦ ἀγορὴ καὶ Ἕλληνές
σφι ἔωσι ἐπιδήμιοι ἔμποροι, οἱ δὲ φέροντες ἐς τὴν ἀγορὴν

---

[39] Schwyzer (1950), II 284.

ἀπ' ὧν ἔδοντο, τοῖσι δὲ ἂν μὴ παρέωσι "Ελληνες, οἱ δ'
ἐκβάλλουσι ἐς τὸν ποταμόν.

(2.39.2)

Again tmesis seems to be used to mark a matter of custom
that Herodotus' Greek audience would have found surprising.
The head of the animal, which has been cut off and cursed, is
taken to the market place to be sold off (ἀπ' ὧν ἔδοντο) to any
resident Greek merchants! Probably what was most unexpected
in this action was the idea of selling something that had been
cursed. The selling of a part of a sacrificial victim would per-
haps also have struck a Greek audience as rash or surprising,
given their custom of sacrificial feasting and the burning of any
inedible remains.[40] In Greek inscriptions there is often the stip-
ulation οὐ φορά: no part of the victim is to leave the sanctuary.[41]

For the verb, compare examples 10 and 11.

3) At 2.40 Herodotus describes the way entrails are removed from the
victim sacrificed at the most important festival in Egypt for the
most important goddess (that is, Isis). They skin the bull, offer
prayers, and remove the intestines[42] but leave the rest of the
innards and fat on the body. Then they cut off the legs, tail-bone,
shoulders and neck. The remainder of the bull's body they fill with
purified loaves, honey, raisins, figs, frankincense, myrrh, and other
perfumed spices. All of this they burn while pouring large quanti-
ties of oil over it. The remains are served up as a meal.

ἐπεὰν ἀποδείρωσι τὸν βοῦν, κατευξάμενοι κοιλίην μὲν κείνην
πᾶσαν ἐξ ὧν εἷλον, σπλάγχνα δὲ αὐτοῦ λείπουσι ἐν τῷ
σώματι καὶ τὴν πιμελήν, σκέλεα δὲ ἀποτάμνουσι καὶ τὴν

---

[40] For a description of animal sacrifice in Greece, see W. Burkert (1985),
55–9.

[41] For examples, see Burkert (1985), 369 n. 15. Cf. Hermary et al. (2005),
119.

[42] κοιλίην...κείνην πᾶσαν. It seems unlikely that LSJ are right to read
κεινήν (= κενήν) instead of κείνην (see LSJ κοιλία I,3). How and Wells
(1912) understand κείνην as bracchylogy for τὴν κείνου (i.e. 'of the bull'):
the same construction is found in the section only just preceding (2.39.2:
κεφαλῇ...κείνη).

ὀσφὺν ἄκρην καὶ τοὺς ὤμους τε καὶ τὸν τράχηλον. ταῦτα
δὲ ποιήσαντες τὸ ἄλλο σῶμα τοῦ βοὸς πιμπλᾶσι ἄρτων
καθαρῶν καὶ μέλιτος καὶ ἀσταφίδος καὶ σύκων καὶ λιβανωτοῦ
καὶ σμύρνης καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θυωμάτων, πλήσαντες δὲ τούτων
καταγίζουσι, ἔλαιον ἄφθονον καταχέοντες.
προνηστεύσαντες δὲ θύουσι, καιομένων δὲ τῶν ἱρῶν τύπτονται
πάντες· ἐπεὰν δὲ ἀποτύψωνται, δαῖτα προτίθενται τὰ ἐλίποντο
τῶν ἱρῶν.

(2.40.2–4)

Does the tmesis colour the passage in any particular way?
Many of the other examples seem to support the idea that
Herodotus uses type 1 tmesis to mark a particular detail of the
narrative that he expects his Greek audience will find surprising.
How alien would the sacrificial practices described here have
seemed to his audience? Lloyd remarks, it would be "astonish-
ing" to a Greek to leave the σπλάγχνα (heart, lungs, liver,
kidneys) inside the body since Greek custom was to eat them.[43]
It is possible, then, that more of the passage is coloured than just
the clause in which the tmesis actually occurs. But is there
something that a Greek would have seen as remarkable in the
statement κοιλίην...κείνην πᾶσαν ἐξ ὧν εἷλον...?

There are conflicting traditions about which parts of sacrifi-
cial victims were eaten, and which parts were consecrated to the
gods.[44] According to Homer and Pausanias, the thighs of the
victims were burnt.[45] But it is the meanness of the portion for
the gods that is evidenced by the ruse of Prometheus in Hesiod
and a passage from Menander's *Dyskolos*.[46] Hermary *et al.*

---

[43] Lloyd (1976), II 179. See also Hermary *et al.* (2005), 125–9, for the
evidence relating to the parts that were eaten. In Herodotus, see 6.67–8,
where Demaratus offers an ox to Zeus and it is clear that the σπλάγχνα are
not among the parts offered to the god since Demaratus gives them to his
mother.

[44] For a full discussion of our knowledge of Greek sacrifice, see Hermary
et al. (2005).

[45] Pausanias 1.24.2.

[46] Menander, *Dyskolos* 447-53: Cnemon scoffs at the 'piety' shown to the
gods in sacrifice, pointing out that all they get are incense and cake, and the
tail-bone and gall-bladder because humans cannot eat them, whereas the
human participants get all the rest.

argue that pictorial evidence from the classical period supports the latter tradition (that the portions for the gods were the undesirable parts) since it is nearly always the sacrum of the victim which is shown being destroyed on the altar.[47]

To Herodotus' Greek audience, then, the extravagance of what was burnt in the offering to Isis would have been amazing: the delicacies stuffed into the body of the bull, as well as the large amounts of olive oil poured over it. The point of the first part of the narrative seems to be that the portions saved for the participants are not the desirable ones: for instance, among the list of parts that are *not* consecrated to Isis is the tail-bone (τὴν ὀσφὺν ἄκρην), one of the very things which is offered by the Greeks, according to the *Dyskolos* passage. Perhaps, then, despite the evidence of Hesiod,[48] the stomachs of bulls were not usually kept for the feast by the Greeks, and Herodotus, as in so many of the other examples, is using type 1 tmesis here to highlight this particular point of difference. Either way, the tmesis at the very least seems to alert the audience that the rest of the details about the sacrifice will astonish them.

For this verb, compare example 8.

4) Herodotus talks about the Egyptian belief that pigs are unclean. He describes how people cleanse themselves in the river if they touch one, how swineherds do not enter sanctuaries, and how swineherds must intermarry.

ὗν δὲ Αἰγύπτιοι μιαρὸν ἥγηνται θηρίον εἶναι· καὶ τοῦτο μέν, ἤν τις ψαύσῃ αὐτῶν παριὼν ὑός, αὐτοῖσι τοῖσι ἱματίοισι ἀπ' ὧν ἔβαψε ἑωυτὸν βὰς ἐς τὸν ποταμόν, τοῦτο δὲ οἱ συβῶται ἐόντες Αἰγύπτιοι ἐγγενέες ἐς ἱρὸν οὐδὲν τῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἐσέρχονται μοῦνοι πάντων, οὐδέ σφι ἐκδίδοσθαι οὐδεὶς θυγατέρα ἐθέλει οὐδ' ἄγεσθαι ἐξ αὐτων, ἀλλ' ἐκδίδονταί τε οἱ συβῶται καὶ ἄγονται ἐξ ἀλλήλων.   (2.47.1)

---

[47] Hermary *et al.* (2005), 119.
[48] *Theogony* 535-57 suggests that ox stomachs were included in the human portions, but that they were undesirable: the stomach is used by Prometheus to conceal the tastier pieces of the ox in his attempt to trick Zeus.

Here there is an element of surprise in the action that is carried out: they do not merely wash themselves after touching a pig, but dunk themselves (ἀπ' ὦν ἔβαψε) in the river, clothes and all. In addition, this example seems to convey the sense of immediacy to which Stein referred. Purification is carried out promptly, without delay.

5) Herodotus describes the manner in which pigs are sacrificed to Selene: the tip of the tail, the spleen, and the omentum are lumped together, covered with all the fat from the belly region, and then burnt on the fire. The rest of the meat is eaten on that day, the day of the full moon. On any other day they would not eat it.

θυσίη δὲ ἥδε τῶν ὑῶν τῇ Σελήνῃ ποιέεται· ἐπεὰν θύσῃ, τὴν οὐρὴν ἄκρην καὶ τὸν σπλῆνα καὶ τὸν ἐπίπλοον συνθεὶς ὁμοῦ κατ' ὦν ἐκάλυψε πάσῃ τοῦ κτήνεος τῇ πιμελῇ τῇ περὶ τὴν νηδὺν γινομένῃ καὶ ἔπειτα καταγίζει πυρί· τὰ δὲ ἄλλα [κρέα] σιτέονται ἐν τῇ πανσελήνῳ ἐν τῇ ἂν τὰ ἱρὰ θύωσι, ἐν ἄλλῃ δὲ ἡμέρῃ οὐκ ἂν ἔτι γευσαίατο.

(2.47.3)

As in example 3, our limited knowledge of the details of Greek sacrifice makes it difficult to be certain about the effect of this passage. Is there something surprising in the description of the sacrifice? In some ways it sounds very much like Greek practice: the best flesh is saved for the feast. Even the act of 'hiding' the other pieces with fat is reminiscent of Prometheus' ruse:

τῷ μὲν γὰρ σάρκας τε καὶ ἔγκατα πίονα δημῷ
ἐν ῥινῷ κατέθηκε, καλύψας γαστρὶ βοείῃ·
τοῖς δ' αὖτ' ὀστέα λευκὰ βοὸς δολίῃ ἐπὶ τέχνῃ
εὐθετίσας κατέθηκε καλύψας ἀργέτι δημῷ.

Theogony, 538–41.

Possibly the omentum and the spleen were among the parts designated by the term σπλάγχνα, in which case a Greek would have been surprised that they were burnt (see discussion on example 3). Perhaps it was contrary to Greek practice to burn *all*

the fat from the belly region: in the *Theogony* passage both gods
and mortals receive some of the fat. In example 3 Herodotus
mentions all the fat of the bull being burnt in the same section of
the narrative as he mentions features of the sacrifice that look
likely to have been un-Greek. Alternatively, the fact that the
Egyptians would *ever* sacrifice and eat an animal that they
normally regarded as impure might well have struck a Greek
audience as odd. Herodotus' concluding remark that on any
other day the flesh would not be eaten suggests that he finds it a
surprising custom. Any one of these reasons might lie behind the
use of tmesis here.

6) Herodotus comments that crocodiles are hunted in all sorts of
   different ways, but he proceeds to describe only the method that he
   thinks most worth describing (ἀξιωτάτη ἀπηγήσιος). The hunter
   has a live pig on the bank whose squeals attract the crocodile, but
   uses just the backbone of a pig to snare it. When the crocodile has
   been hauled to land, its eyes are smeared with mud to help
   overpower it.

   ἐπεὰν δὲ ἐξελκυσθῇ ἐς γῆν, πρῶτον ἀπάντων ὁ θηρευτὴς
   πηλῷ κατ' ὦν ἔπλασε αὐτοῦ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς· τοῦτο δὲ
   ποιήσας κάρτα εὐπετέως τὰ λοιπὰ χειροῦται, μὴ δὲ ποιήσας
   τοῦτο σὺν πόνῳ.

                                                              (2.70.2)

The tmesis seems to convey both a sense of immediacy and
surprise. The immediacy of action is stressed by the phrase
πρῶτον ἀπάντων. As well, the hunter's actions go against all
expectations that an attempt would be made to kill the creature
immediately it reached the land and the tmesis suggests that
Herodotus anticipates his audience will be surprised: 'he smears
its eyes with mud – really he does!' Evidence that there is an
element of surprise here is Herodotus' announcement at the
beginning that he is only going to tell the story most worth
telling: Herodotus enjoys the remarkable, and knows that his
audience will too. Finally, as in example 1, he feels obliged to
explain the practice (τοῦτο δὲ ποιήσας κάρτα εὐπετέως τὰ

λοιπὰ χειροῦται...), which suggests that it was not something with which his audience would have been familiar.

For the verb, compare example 7.

7) Herodotus begins his discussion of the mourning and burial of the dead in Egypt. When a man of standing dies the women of the household smear mud on their heads or faces, then leave the corpse in the house while they go about the city, bare-breasted, beating their chests.

θρῆνοι δὲ καὶ ταφαί σφεων εἰσὶ αἵδε· τοῖσι ἂν ἀπογένηται
ἐκ τῶν οἰκίων ἄνθρωπος τοῦ τις καὶ λόγος ᾖ, τὸ θῆλυ γένος
πᾶν τὸ ἐκ τῶν οἰκίων τούτων κατ' ὦν ἐπλάσατο τὴν κεφαλὴν
πηλῷ ἢ καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον, κἄπειτα ἐν τοῖσι οἰκίοισι λιποῦσαι
τὸν νεκρὸν αὐταὶ ἀνὰ τὴν πόλιν στρωφώμεναι τύπτονται
ὑπεζωμέναι καὶ φαίνουσαι τοὺς μαζούς, σὺν δέ σφι αἱ προσ-
ήκουσαι πᾶσαι.

(2.85.1)

From the context it seems that the tmesis conveys a sense of immediacy here. As Lloyd remarks: "It is important to notice that the custom described by H. is intended to apply to the time immediately following death (λιποῦσαι τὸν νεκρόν)...".[49] In addition a Greek audience would no doubt have been taken aback by the practice of smearing the head and face with mud as a sign of mourning. Extravagant signs of mourning were restricted at Athens by Solon's legislation, and at Sparta they were said to have been forbidden for private persons by Lycurgus.[50] They were associated with barbarism (cf. 8.99, 9.24) or heroic times (cf. Il. 18.23 ff.): Herodotus connects the Spartan customs for their kings with practices in Asia, and Xenophon says they were honoured "not as humans, but as heroes".[51] The law quoted by Pseudo-Demosthenes, ascribed to Solon, places restrictions on the number of participants at the prothesis,

---

[49] Lloyd (1976), II 351.
[50] Plutarch, Sol. 12.8, Lyc. 27.1–4, Apophth. Lac. 18 p. 238d.
[51] Hdt. 6.58; Xen. Hell. 3.3.1.

forbids the lacerating of flesh, and stipulates that the *prothesis* should be carried out indoors.[52] Solon was also said to have ruled that the *ekphora* must take place before sunrise.[53] Halting at street corners was forbidden,[54] the number of women allowed to attend was restricted,[55] and it is possible that the number of flautists was limited to ten.[56] It seems, then, that the point of this passage is to draw attention to the 'barbaric' extravagance of Egyptian mourning. The smearing of mud on the head and face as a sign of mourning is not attested anywhere at any time in Greek custom, and tmesis highlights what would have been, from the Greek perspective, astonishing.[57]

For the verb, compare example 6.

8) Herodotus is describing the best method of mummification for corpses. After the brain has been extracted, the body is cut open, the intestines are removed, and the insides are cleaned and rinsed with wine and crushed spices.

μετὰ δὲ λίθῳ Αἰθιοπικῷ ὀξέϊ παρασχίσαντες παρὰ τὴν λαπάρην ἐξ ὧν εἶλον τὴν κοιλίην πᾶσαν, ἐκκαθήραντες δὲ αὐτὴν καὶ διηθήσαντες οἴνῳ φοινικηΐῳ αὖτις διηθέουσι θυμιήμασι τετριμμένοισι.

(2.86.4)

Here tmesis is being used to emphasise something that Herodotus' audience would have found strange in Egyptian custom – namely the removal of innards from the *human* corpse. This was of course quite at odds with Classical Greek practice after a person died: the eyes and mouth were closed, and the body was washed and clothed.[58] The majority of Herodotus' audience would probably have been aware of the Egyptian

---

[52] Ps.-Dem. 43.62.
[53] Ps.-Dem. 43.62.
[54] Cf. Sokolowski, F. (1969), 77C, 15ff.
[55] Ps.-Dem. 43.62.
[56] Cicero, *Laws* 2.59.
[57] For a detailed treatment of Greek funerary practice, see Garland (1985), 21–37.
[58] For the details, see Garland (1985), 23–6.

practice of mummification, but it is doubtful that they would all have known the finer details of the procedure. Again, then, tmesis seems to be marking a point of the narrative that would have astonished Herodotus' audience.

As well as example 3, compare also example 9 (ἐν ὦν ἔπλησαν ...τὴν κοιλίην).

9) Herodotus goes on to describe the second best mummification method for corpses. Syringes filled with juniper[59] oil are used to douche the insides of the corpse. After a few days the oil is allowed to drain out.

ἐπεὰν [τοὺς] κλυστῆρας πλήσωνται τοῦ ἀπὸ κέδρου ἀλείφατος γινομένου, ἐν ὦν ἔπλησαν τοῦ νεκροῦ τὴν κοιλίην, οὔτε ἀναταμόντες αὐτὸν, οὔτε ἐξελόντες τὴν νηδύν, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἕδρην ἐσηθήσαντες καὶ ἐπιλαβόντες τὸ κλύσμα τῆς ὀπίσω ὁδοῦ ταριχεύουσι τὰς προκειμένας ἡμέρας, τῇ δὲ τελευταίῃ ἐξιεῖσι ἐκ τῆς κοιλίης τὴν κεδρίην τὴν ἐσῆκαν πρότερον.

(2.87.2)

Again, as in the previous example, tmesis is drawing attention to what in Greek eyes would have been strange treatment of a corpse. Emphasis is also placed on there being no need to incise the corpse and remove the intestines (...οὔτε... οὔτε...). This may indicate that this second method of mummifycation was even less well-known among educated Greeks than the first.

10) The description of the second method of mummification continues. Herodotus claims that the effect of the oil is to dissolve the guts and intestines, so that they are drawn off with the oil. Meanwhile, the natron dissolves the flesh, so that only the skin and bone of the corpse is left. They then return the corpse, Herodotus says, without doing anything more to it.

---

[59] κέδρος probably does not refer to the cedar: see Lloyd (1976), II 364.

ἐπεὰν δὲ ταῦτα ποιήσωσι, ἀπ' ὦν ἔδωκαν οὕτω τὸν νεκρόν,
οὐδὲν ἔτι πρηγματευθέντες.

(2.87.3)

There is clearly an element of surprise in this example. Even
Lloyd protests: "Surely it was bandaged at the very least".[60] But
not according to Herodotus' account. Indeed, Herodotus is quite
firm on this point: the body is returned in this state (οὕτω),
without anything further (οὐδὲν ἔτι) being done to it. From
archaeology we know that poorer members of Egyptian society
would often be buried in their everyday clothes rather than
bandages.[61]

For the verb, compare examples 2 and 11.

11) The final (cheapest) method of embalming is described very
    briefly. The entrails are cleaned out with myrrh, the corpse is
    preserved for the seventy day period and is then returned to be
    taken away.

    συρμαίῃ διηθήσαντες τὴν κοιλίην ταριχεύουσι τὰς ἑβδομήκοντα
    ἡμέρας καὶ ἔπειτα ἀπ' ὦν ἔδωκαν ἀποφέρεσθαι.

(2.88)

Tmesis is being used here for the same reasons as in example 10.

For the verb, compare examples 2 and 10.

This is one of only four Herodotean examples where type 1
tmesis is not apodotic. The others are 2.96.2 (example 12),
2.172.3 (example 14) and 4.60.2 (example 16).

12) Herodotus describes the Egyptian cargo boats (*bareis*), beginning
    with how they are made. His comments include the observation
    that the boats lack any internal framework (νομεῦσι) and that the

---

[60] Lloyd (1976), II 365.
[61] See Grajetzki (2003), *passim*. The very poorest members of society
would not even be mummified.

seams (ἀρμονίας) are reinforced with papyrus ropes (or caulked with papyrus)[62] from the inside.

νομεῦσι δὲ οὐδὲν χρέωνται· ἔσωθεν δὲ τὰς ἀρμονίας ἐν ὦν ἐπάκτωσαν τῇ βύβλῳ.

(2.96.2)

While some of the details of this passage are controversial, it is agreed that "96.1–3 consists of a series of implicit contrasts with Greek practice".[63] Here Herodotus remarks first on the absence of internal frameworks in the *bareis*, which Greek ships certainly had.[64] His next remark has been interpreted in two different ways: it could refer to a custom of using papyrus lashings to reinforce the boats,[65] or it could mean that the boats were caulked with papyrus.[66] Whatever the interpretation, a Greek audience would have been surprised: the contrast is either with the practice of using lashings, which were not a feature of Greek shipbuilding,[67] or with the caulking from within with papyrus, since the Greek practice was to caulk from the outside with pitch and wax.[68] Once again tmesis with ὦν marks a surprising detail of the narrative.

This is one of only four Herodotean examples where type 1 tmesis is not apodotic. The others are 2.88 (example 11), 2.172.3 (example 14) and 4.60.2 (example 16).

13) Herodotus tells the story of Rhampsinitus' descent into the Underworld and gives an account of the ritual that, according to the Egyptian priests (ἔφασαν), was a reflection of the story. Rhampsinitus was said to have gone down to the Underworld and played dice with (συγκυβεύειν) Demeter (i.e. Isis). He won and lost some

---

[62] The interpretation of this passage is controversial. See in particular Lloyd (1979), and Haldane and Shelmerdine (1990).
[63] Lloyd (1979), 47. Haldane and Shelmerdine (1990) agree: 536–7.
[64] Lloyd (1979), 46–7.
[65] So Haldane and Shelmerdine (1990).
[66] So Lloyd (1979).
[67] Haldane and Shelmerdine (1990), 537.
[68] Morrison and Williams (1968), 279–80.

games, and then returned from the Underworld with a golden hand-kerchief (χειρόμακτρον χρύσεον) she had given him.

Of the festival Herodotus firstly says that it is still celebrated in Egypt in his time, but he sounds a little sceptical about whether it is based on the story. He says that on a single day the priests weave a robe (φᾶρος). One of them is blindfolded and taken with the robe out onto the street that leads to the sanctuary of Demeter and is then left there. The blindfolded priest was then supposedly escorted by two wolves to the sanctuary, some twenty stades out of the city, and later brought back again to the same spot by the wolves.

ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς 'Ραμψινίτου καταβάσιος, ὡς πάλιν ἀπίκετο, ὁρτὴν δὴ ἀνάγειν Αἰγυπτίους ἔφασαν, τὴν καὶ ἐγὼ οἶδα ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἐπιτελέοντας αὐτούς· οὐ μέντοι εἴ γε διὰ ταῦτα ὀρτάζουσι ἔχω λέγειν. φᾶρος δὲ αὐτημερὸν ἐξυφήναντες οἱ ἱρέες κατ' ὧν ἔδησαν ἑνὸς αὐτῶν μίτρῃ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, ἀγαγόντες δέ μιν ἔχοντα τὸ φᾶρος ἐς ὁδὸν φέρουσαν ἐς [ἱρὸν] Δήμητρος αὐτοὶ ἀπαλλάσσονται ὀπίσω. τὸν δὲ ἱρέα τοῦτον καταδεδε-μένον τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς λέγουσι ὑπὸ δύο λύκων ἄγεσθαι ἐς τὸ ἱρὸν τῆς Δήμητρος ἀπέχον τῆς πόλιος εἴκοσι σταδίους, καὶ αὖτις ὀπίσω ἐκ τοῦ ἱροῦ ἀπάγειν μιν τοὺς λύκους ἐς τὠυτὸ χωρίον.
    Τοῖσι μέν νυν ὑπ' Αἰγυπτίων λεγομένοισι χράσθω ὅτεῳ τὰ τοιαῦτα πιθανά ἐστι· ἐμοὶ δὲ παρὰ πάντα [τὸν] λόγον ὑπόκειται ὅτι τὰ λεγόμενα ὑπ' ἑκάστων ἀκοῇ γράφω.
(2.122.2-123.1)

Herodotus does not express scepticism about the actual story of Rhampsinitus' descent, but about whether the festival is celebrated because of the story. The details of the festival as Herodotus tells them cannot easily be connected to the story of Rhampsinitus. Rather than labouring this point, Herodotus describes the story in a way that subtly draws attention to some of the points of variance. The blindfolding of the priest is an unexpected detail if there was meant to be some connection between the festival and the story, and by using tmesis with ὧν at this point Herodotus communicates to his audience that, given the Egyptian claim, they should find its presence in the ritual surprising. The important tangible memento of Rhampsi-

nitus' journey, the golden handkerchief, is also absent from the festival: there is no mention of anything golden and Herodotus' careful use of different terminology for the pieces of material used in the festival (φᾶρος and μίτρη instead of χειρόμακτρον) is another way that he distances the ritual from the myth. The wolves are the other obvious point of difference. Lloyd goes to some lengths in his commentary to try to explain the festival, and on his explanation there is indeed, as Herodotus seems to be suggesting, no close link with the story of Rhampsinitus.[69]

The tmesis coincides with the blindfolding of the priest. This is in itself a surprising point in the narrative (as explained above), but what is particularly incredible is yet to come: blindfolded, the priest is said to be led to the temple, twenty stades from the city, by two wolves (and then back again)! Tmesis is one way that Herodotus highlights the detail of the narrative that makes the story an amazing one. He repeats this detail, confirming its importance in the narrative (τὸν δὲ ἰρέα τοῦτον καταδεδεμένον τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς...). The shift to indirect discourse in this sentence and the intrusion of the word λέγουσι signals to the audience that the story is moving from that which Herodotus himself can confirm (...ἐγὼ οἶδα...) to the testimony of his sources. Source citations can be interpreted in various ways.[70] In the case of Xenophon's *Hellenica and Anabasis*, Gray has argued that "the major function of citations is to validate content that the reader might find too great to be

---

[69] Lloyd (1976), III 55–9. At 58: "The blindfolded priest embodies Horus *Mhnty-n-irty*, i.e. Osiris, the dead king, who is conducted to Isis as the agent of rebirth. The priest, on his return, has then had his sight restored, though H. omits to make this point, i.e. he has become Horus *Mhnty-irty*, the embodiment of living and triumphant kingship." At 55–6, Lloyd attempts to make some connection: "If this [i.e. *the Egyptian claim that the myth and ritual are linked*] is correct, the link between the two will be that the Tale of Rhampsinitus' descent is an example of a common category of folk-tale, viz. the faded myth, and was formed by demythologizing and expanding upon the myth which constituted the conceptual framework of the *hortē* ritual".

[70] In particular they can be used to verify information or to distance the author from information. For more on Herodotus' sources, see S. Hornblower (2002).

believed".[71] Here, the citation seems to *mark* content that the reader might find incredible, but not necessarily to *validate* it. The signs are that Herodotus disbelieved the story: at 2.123 he makes the well-known remark that he is simply a scribe recording what he is told, and seems to distance himself from the idea that the Egyptian stories are plausible (πιθανά). Could there even be a hint of irony in this particular citation? The juxtaposition of ὀφθαλμοὺς with λέγουσι is striking, and is perhaps designed to highlight the *lack* of eye-witnesses for this part of the story. Either way, Herodotus' use of both type 1 tmesis and citation place this story firmly in the realm of the 'wondrous', which is precisely his reason for telling it.

14) Herodotus tells the story of how Amasis, when he became king of Egypt, was initially not well-liked because he came from an undistinguished house. So Amasis decided on a clever way to win esteem. He had a golden footbath made into a statue, and when his Egyptian subjects began worshipping it he told them what he had done. He explained to them that he and the footbath were alike in the sense that even though he had previously been a commoner, now that he was their king he should be honoured and respected.

μετὰ δὲ σοφίῃ αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἄμασις, οὐκ ἀγνωμοσύνῃ προσηγά-
γετο. ἦν οἱ ἄλλα τε ἀγαθὰ μυρία, ἐν δὲ καὶ ποδανιπτὴρ χρύ-
σεος, ἐν τῷ αὐτός τε ὁ Ἄμασις καὶ οἱ δαιτυμόνες οἱ πάντες
τοὺς πόδας ἑκάστοτε ἐναπενίζοντο· τοῦτον κατ' ὦν κόψας
ἄγαλμα δαίμονος ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐποιήσατο καὶ ἵδρυσε τῆς
πόλιος ὅκου ἦν ἐπιτηδεότατον.

                                                          (2.172.2–3)

This is the single example from Herodotus where type 1 tmesis is used in conjunction with an aorist that is not gnomic or empiric. It is also the only Herodotean example where the indicative form of the verb is not used. Nevertheless, the tmesis seems to fulfil a function similar to that seen in many of the other examples of type 1.

---

[71] V. Gray (2003), 116.

Once again, tmesis is used at the very point of the narrative that the audience would have been surprised and shocked by: Amasis has his golden footbath broken up to be made into a statue of a god. This is surprising on three levels.

Firstly, breaking up a valuable object made of gold is shocking behaviour. Compare Cyrus promising in the *Hellenica* to fund the Peloponnesian fleet: he voices his commitment to the cause through a crescendo of promises which culminate in him saying that, if necessary, he will break up the gold and silver throne on which he sits.[72] Cyrus' intention is to convince Lysander of his zeal by amazing him at the lengths to which he would be prepared to go. To break up a throne is shocking, and especially so if it is made of gold and silver.

Secondly, it is shocking that Amasis would dare to have a footbath, of all things, made into so sacred an object as a statue of a god.

Thirdly, at this moment of the narrative, we have no inkling as to why he decides to do this. We do not discover the reason until the explanation which Amasis himself gave to the Egyptians is reported. For an explanation following the surprising behaviour, compare examples 1 and 6.

This is one of only four Herodotean examples where type 1 tmesis is not apodotic. The others are 2.88 (example 11), 2.96.2 (example 12) and 4.60.2 (example 16).

15) In the debate on the constitutions following the murder of the Magi Otanes argues for democracy (3.80), Megabyxus for oligarchy (3.81), and Darius for monarchy (3.82). In his speech Darius claims that the best form of oligarchy and the best form of democracy will both lead to monarchy. He adds that it was a monarch (Cyrus the Great) who gave the Persians freedom and that since they had been well-served by monarchy, the tradition should not be abandoned. Below is his argument about how democracy leads to monarchy. He says that baseness in a democracy is inevitable, but that rather than feuds there are strong friendships between the base people: they put their heads together to be base at the public

---

[72] Xenophon, *Hellenica* 1.5.3.

expense. This continues until a champion of the people emerges and puts a stop to it. This person wins popular admiration and becomes monarch, which proves that monarchy is best.

δήμου τε αὖ ἄρχοντος ἀδύνατα μὴ οὐ κακότητα ἐγγίνεσθαι·
κακότητος τοίνυν ἐγγινομένης ἐς τὰ κοινὰ ἔχθεα μὲν οὐκ
ἐγγίνεται τοῖσι κακοῖσι, φιλίαι δὲ ἰσχυραί· οἱ γὰρ κακοῦντες
τὰ κοινὰ συγκύψαντες ποιεῦσι. τοῦτο δὲ τοιοῦτο γίνεται ἐς
ὃ ἂν προστάς τις τοῦ δήμου τοὺς τοιούτους παύσῃ· ἐκ δὲ
αὐτῶν θωμάζεται οὗτος δὴ ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου, θωμαζόμενος δὲ
ἀν᾽ ὧν ἐφάνη μούναρχος ἐών· καὶ ἐν τούτῳ δηλοῖ καὶ οὗτος
ὡς ἡ μουναρχίη κράτιστον.

(3.82.4)

What sense is conveyed by the tmesis here? One possibility is immediacy. Christopher Pelling, in his important article on the constitutional debate, translates to convey this sense: "then that figure wins popular admiration, and as a result he *soon* emerges as monarch himself" (my italics).[73] But are there other possibilities? I think it significant that the tmesis occurs in a sentence where there is such emphasis on wonder or admiration (θωμάζεται…θωμαζόμενος). As many of the other examples show, type 1 tmesis often seems to be used when something surprising or astonishing (i.e. a θῶμα) is being described. Here too a θῶμα is being described.

It is interesting to consider the different levels of audience in this example: if it is correct to interpret the tmesis as a way of marking the emergence of the monarch as a θῶμα, then the next question is 'a θῶμα according to whom?' Clearly it is a θῶμα from the perspective of the demos of Darius' example: θωμάζεται οὗτος δὴ ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου.

It could be argued that the tmesis also marks something that Darius' audience, Otanes and Megabyxus, would find surprising. Pelling makes the point that what initially looks puzzling – "the strangely positive tinge given to this harmony of popular leaders" – is turned completely on its head as part of Darius'

---

[73] Pelling (2002), 144.

rhetorical strategy, which is "to stress that even when such leadership takes its most positive form, it *still* generates tyranny".[74] Darius' argument relies on a 'twist-ending', and the tmesis may function in part as a marker for Otanes and Megabyxus of this surprising, and crucially important, twist.

Is there another level of audience surprise or wonder? Once again, on the basis of Pelling's discussion, it seems fair to say that perhaps there is. Pelling points out that while much of Darius' argument may have seemed persuasive to the internal Persian audience, its effect on the external Greek audience would have been quite different.[75] Although there exist sentiments such as Plato's, that tyranny tends to emerge from democracy,[76] and that the best constitution can develop out of tyranny,[77] Pelling argues that nevertheless "Darius' argument would seem far less self-evidently valid in the Greek world than in the Persian".[78] Therefore it is conceivable that Herodotus is consciously employing type 1 tmesis to mark a moment of the narrative that he knows his immediate audience will find surprising, because the argumentation is so 'un-Greek'.

16) Herodotus describes the way that the Scythians conduct sacrifices. The victim stands with its front legs tied together. The person performing the sacrifice stands behind and tugs on the rope, which fells the animal. While it is falling, he invokes the relevant deity. He then wraps a noose around the victim's neck and inserts a stick into the noose which he twists, thus choking the victim. There is no fire, consecration, or libation. After the victim has been throttled and skinned, the meat is cooked.

τὸ μὲν ἱρήιον αὐτὸ ἐμπεποδισμένον τοὺς ἐμπροσθίους
πόδας ἔστηκε, ὁ δὲ θύων ὄπισθε τοῦ κτήνεος ἑστεὼς
σπάσας τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ στρόφου καταβάλλει μιν, πίπτον-
τος δὲ τοῦ ἱρηίου ἐπικαλέει τὸν θεὸν τῷ ἂν θύῃ καὶ

---

[74] Pelling (2002), 145 n. 67.
[75] Pelling (2002), 145 n. 67, 146-7.
[76] e.g. *Republic* 562a7-8, 565c9, 565d1, 575d5.
[77] *Laws* 710d-e.
[78] Pelling (2002), 147. See also 147 n. 76.

ἔπειτα βρόχῳ περὶ ὦν ἔβαλε τὸν αὐχένα, σκυταλίδα δὲ
ἐμβαλὼν περιάγει καὶ ἀποπνίγει, οὔτε πῦρ ἀνακαύσας
οὔτε καταρξάμενος οὔτ' ἐπισπείσας.

(4.60.1–2)

Once again, as in examples 2, 3 and 5, type 1 tmesis occurs
here in a description of 'barbarian' sacrificial custom. The
tmesis is used specifically in connection with the way that the
victim is killed: a noose is put around its neck (βρόχῳ περὶ ὦν
ἔβαλε τὸν αὐχένα). The method of execution is clearly very
different from Greek practice. Tmesis emphasises this (again,
highlighting a point in the narrative by which a Greek audience
would have been surprised), as do the negatives, which intro-
duce important points of contrast between Greek and Scythian
custom: fire, consecration, and libation are all missing from this
ritual (...οὔτε...οὔτε...οὔτ'...).

This is one of only four Herodotean examples where type 1
tmesis is not apodotic. The others are 2.88 (example 11), 2.96.2
(example 12) and 2.172.3 (example 14).

17) In his excursus on Libya (4.168-99) Herodotus includes a story
　　about a system of silent bartering between the Carthaginians and
　　the natives of the Libyan land beyond the Pillars of Hercules. The
　　Carthaginians would first unload their cargo on the beach, and then
　　withdraw to their ships, using a smoky fire as a signal to the
　　natives. The natives, having seen the smoke, would come forward
　　and inspect the goods. They would leave some gold on the ground
　　for the goods and then withdraw. The Carthaginians would look to
　　see if they thought the gold sufficient payment, taking it if it was,
　　but withdrawing again to the ships if it was not, to give the natives
　　the opportunity to add more gold. The Carthaginians say that
　　neither side cheats the other.

τοὺς δὲ Καρχηδονίους ἐκβάντας σκέπτεσθαι, καὶ ἢν μὲν
φαίνηταί σφι ἄξιος ὁ χρυσὸς τῶν φορτίων, ἀνελόμενοι ἀπαλ-
λάσσονται, ἢν δὲ μὴ ἄξιος, ἐσβάντες ὀπίσω ἐς τὰ πλοῖα
κατέαται, οἱ δὲ προσελθόντες ἄλλον πρὸς ὦν ἔθηκαν χρυσόν,
ἐς οὗ ἂν πείθωσι. ἀδικέειν δὲ οὐδετέρους· οὔτε γὰρ αὐτοὺς
τοῦ χρυσοῦ ἅπτεσθαι πρὶν ἄν σφι ἀπισωθῇ τῇ ἀξίῃ τῶν φορ-

τίων, οὖτ᾽ ἐκείνους τῶν φορτίων ἄπτεσθαι πρότερον ἢ αὐτοὶ
τὸ χρυσίον λάβωσι.

(4.196.2–3)

The story is remarkable for the displays of good faith shown by either side. Type 1 tmesis here draws attention to the act of the natives adding more gold (πρὸς ὦν ἔθηκαν) to the original amount put down. This of course highlights the amazing extent of the mutual trust: on the one hand, they add gold to the total rather than snatching off with the goods and the gold already there, and on the other hand, they are so trusting that they are willing to add to the sum out of which they could potentially be cheated. As in some of the other examples, negatives are used as well to spell out just how amazing the custom is: neither side cheats by either touching the gold or touching the goods until the deal is made (...οὐδετέρους· οὔτε...οὔτ...).

18) After his conquest of Egypt, Xerxes summons the leading Persians to a meeting. He announces his plans to invade Greece, and then invites discussion on the matter (7.8). Mardonius responds first, and speaks in favour of the expedition (7.9). Artabanus speaks next, voicing his opposition to the plan (7.10). Artabanus is an example of the wise advisor whose advice is not heeded. His speech contains numerous pieces of proverbial wisdom, including the sentiment that the divine likes to chastise all that is excessive: thus even a large force can be destroyed, undeservedly, by a small force if the god, in envy, sends panic or thunder.

φιλέει γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τὰ ὑπερέχοντα πάντα κολούειν. οὕτω δὲ
καὶ στρατὸς πολλὸς ὑπὸ ὀλίγου διαφθείρεται κατὰ τοιόνδε·
ἐπεάν σφι ὁ θεὸς φθονήσας φόβον ἐμβάλῃ ἢ βροντήν, δι᾽ ὦν
ἐφθάρησαν ἀναξίως ἑωυτῶν. οὐ γὰρ ἐᾷ φρονέειν μέγα ὁ θεὸς ἄ
λλον ἢ ἑωυτόν.

(7.10ε)

This is the only example of type 1 tmesis in the latter half of the *Histories*. There is probably a sense of immediacy conveyed by the tmesis: ἐπεάν...ὦν... ('when...then at once...'). As well, there seems to be the element of surprise that has been present in so many of the other examples. There is of course the

expectation that a larger force will usually beat a smaller one, and Artabanus endorses this expectation with the words ἀναξίως ἑωυτῶν: in the normal course of events a large force should not be destroyed at the hands of a smaller one. As in examples 1, 6 and 14, an explanation for the unexpected outcome follows (...γάρ...): the god does not allow anyone other than himself to feel pride.

Type 1: Conclusions

Type 1 tmesis seems to be a feature of Ionic and Doric dialect. Some of the examples we have of it are found in written renditions of speech, which supports the suggestion that it was used colloquially. However, its prevalence in the Hippocratics and in narrative descriptions of foreign customs in Herodotus demonstrates that it was also a feature of prose writing, and may reflect a wider use in technical discussions.

As Stein declared in the late nineteenth century, type 1 tmesis often lends a sense of suddenness or immediacy to an action. However, in Herodotus at least, this is not its only function. Herodotus tends to use type 1 tmesis to mark out things that his audience would in all likelihood have found unexpected, amazing, or unbelievable. It is not possible to demonstrate this conclusively in *every* instance, but when all the examples are considered cumulatively, the case looks strong indeed.

Importantly, then, type 1 tmesis is one of a range of narrative devices that Herodotus had at his disposal to highlight the 'wondrous', a central theme of the *Histories* as set out in the preface.[79] This narrative function helps to account for the frequency of type 1 in descriptions of foreign customs and habits, and thus for its otherwise remarkable prevalence in book two. Such subject matter was especially likely to strike Herodotus' audience with wonder and amazement.

---

[79] On Herodotus' interest in 'wonders', see, for instance, Lateiner (1989), 14, and Thomas (2000), 138–9.

Type 2 Tmesis

There are eight instances of 'type 2' tmesis in Herodotus.[80]
This is the type where the compound verb is cut by μέν, and
then the preposition only is repeated in the corresponding δέ
clause. To illustrate: ...κατὰ μὲν φαγεῖν τοὺς φαρετρεῶνας
αὐτῶν, κατὰ δὲ τὰ τόξα... (2.141.5).

In terms of formal structure, this looks like an epic
mannerism. Detlev Fehling has observed that there is only a
single example in epic of a compound verb repeated in a μέν/ῥα
and δέ clause where tmesis is *not* used:[81]

...ἠώς τοι προφέρει μὲν ὁδοῦ, προφέρει δε καὶ ἔργου... .
(Hesiod, *Works and Days* 579).

Fehling regards the mannerism as a natural feature of epic
language, related to other types of anaphora:

"In der epischen Sprache ergibt sich die Form ganz natürlich aus
der allgemein noch lockeren Verbindung zwischen Präposition und
Verb, und die Verhältnisse sind grundsätzlich nicht anders als bei
Anapher anderer Bestimmungen des Verbs, z. B. Objekten, Adver-
bien u. a."[82]

However, it has to be said that although type 2 tmesis 'looks'
epic, such a description does not take us very far in under-
standing the mannerism in the *Histories*. Herodotus is not an
epic poet, so the way *he* uses the device should be considered.
What are the characteric features of the mannerism in Herodo-
tus? How similar in form really is Herodotus' mannerism to that
found in epic? Does Herodotus wish to 'sound' epic when he
uses the device, or does it fulfil some other narrative function?

---

[80] 2.141.5; 3.36.2, 126.2; 5.81.3; 6.114; 8.33, 89.1; 9.5.3.
[81] Fehling (1969), 194. For examples of the mannerism in epic and
elsewhere, see Fehling, 194–7, 'Anapher mit Präposition, als Kompositions-
glied und sonst'.
[82] Fehling (1969), 194.

The discussion below begins to answer some of these questions, although inevitably further questions arise along the way.

Characteristic Features of Type 2 Tmesis in Herodotus

Two features of type 2 tmesis are particularly noteworthy. Firstly, in every single instance the verb is in the aorist. The aorists are not gnomic/empiric, as was usually the case for type 1 tmesis, but simply express a single action in the past. Secondly, and perhaps more significantly, all of the verbs can be classified as 'verbs of death or destruction': κατά...φαγεῖν (devoured), ἀπὸ...ὤλεσας (destroyed), κατά...ἔκτεινε (killed), κατά...ἔσυραν (ravaged), κατά...ἔκαυσαν (burnt down), ἀπο ...ἔθανε (died), κατά...ἔλευσαν (stoned to death). The related meanings of the verbs suggest that type 2 tmesis may well fulfil a particular narrative function.

Importantly, the mannerism is not simply a stylistic 'tick' to be explained by anaphora of a compound. There are two examples in the *Histories* that prove this to be the case:

ὡς δὲ συνελέχθη μὲν χρῆμα πολλὸν νεῶν, συνελέχθη δὲ καὶ πεζὸς στρατὸς πολλός... .

(6.43.4)

...ἀνῆγον μὲν τὸ ἀπ' ἑσπέρης κέρας κυκλούμενοι πρὸς τὴν Σαλαμῖνα, ἀνῆγον δὲ οἱ ἀμφὶ τὴν Κέον τε καὶ τὴν Κυνόσουραν τεταγμένοι... .

(8.76.1)

It should also be remembered that in most of the examples of type 2 tmesis Herodotus could, if he chose, have used the simple instead of the compound form of the verb (thus avoiding tmesis). A thorough study of Herodotus' use of anaphora would probably enhance our understanding of how he uses type 2 tmesis. However, since the decision to use tmesis is independent of the decision to use anaphora, it seems worth considering type 2 tmesis as a narrative device in its own right.

Type 2 Tmesis in Herodotus: 'Epic' to what Degree?

There are some clear differences between Herodotus and Homer in the form of this 'epic' mannerism. In Homer the overwhelming majority of examples of the mannerism involve local prepositions.[83] For example:

ἐν μὲν γαῖαν ἔτευξ', ἐν δ' οὐρανόν, ἐν δὲ θάλασσαν... .
(*Iliad* 18.483)

But this is not always the case. Consider:

...σὺν ῥ' ἔβαλον ῥινούς, σὺν δ' ἔγχεα καὶ μένε' ἀνδρῶν... .
(*Iliad* 4.447)

Nevertheless, examples such as *Iliad* 4.447 are very rare. Herodotus by contrast does *not* use type 2 tmesis with local prepositions. Fehling says one can therefore speak of 'hyper-epicism' in Herodotus.[84]

Another important respect in which the Herodotean mannerism differs from the Homeric is in the verbs used. The verbs κατασύρω and καταλεύω occur nowhere in Homer, nor even do their simple forms σύρω and λεύω. The verb ἀποθνήσκω is uncommon in Homer (καταθνήσκω is the preferred form): it occurs only four times, and then never in the aorist as in Herodotus, but only in the perfect and present.[85] In the case of κατακαίω, although it is found in Homer, he consistently uses a different form of the aorist from Herodotus. Moreover, in Homer the verb is used only in the context of cremation and ritual feasting after a sacrifice, never in the sense of burning something down as in Herodotus.[86] So of the eight examples of type 2 tmesis, only three involve verbs for which Homer provides parallels in both form and meaning: κατά...φαγεῖν, ἀπό...

---

[83] Fehling (1969), 194.
[84] Fehling (1969), 194.
[85] *Il.* 22.432 σεῦ ἀποτεθνηῶτος; *Od.* 11.424 ἀποθνήσκων περὶ φασγάνῳ, 12.392 βόες ἀποτέθνασαν, 21.33 κάλλιπ' ἀποθνήσκων.
[86] See Ebeling (1963).

ὤλεσας, and κατά...ἔκτεινε. This suggests that it would be imprudent to conclude too hastily that Herodotus is trying to sound Homeric when he uses type 2 tmesis.

Another point of difference is that while Herodotus formally is very strict in his use of type 2 tmesis, Homer is very free. In Herodotus, the pattern is a μέν clause with the verb in tmesis, and then a repetition of the preposition at the beginning of the δέ clause.[87] A parallel for this in Homer is *Iliad* 23.798–9:

αὐτὰρ Πηλεΐδης κατὰ μὲν δολιχόσκιον ἔγχος
θῆκ' ἐς ἀγῶνα φέρων, κατὰ δ' ἀσπίδα καὶ τρυφάλειαν... .

But sometimes, as for instance at *Iliad* 23.886–8, the verb in the first clause does not stand in tmesis, and the preposition is repeated in the subsequent μέν and δέ clauses:

...καὶ ῥ' ἥμονες ἄνδρες ἀνέσταν,
ἂν μὲν ἄρ' Ἀτρεΐδης εὐρὺ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων,
ἂν δ' ἄρα Μηριόνης θεράπων ἐὺς Ἰδομενῆος.

Sometimes the verb is not found in the very first clause, as at *Iliad* 18.535:

ἐν δ' Ἔρις, ἐν δὲ Κυδοιμὸς ὁμίλεον, ἐν δ' ὀλοὴ Κήρ... .

Sometimes a simple verb is used in the first clause but a preposition follows in the subsequent clauses, as if the verb was a compound. This occurs, for example, at *Iliad* 3.268:[88]

ὤρνυτο δ' αὐτίκ' ἔπειτα ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων,
ἂν δ' Ὀδυσσεύς... .

---

[87] 6.114, where there is only tmesis in the δέ clause, is an exception. If the manuscript reading ἀπὸ δὲ ὤλεσας at 3.36.3 is correct (it is rejected by the OCT editor), then that is another exception.
[88] Other examples of this are to be found at *Iliad* 5.480f., 23.754f., 24.232ff.

Given this variety in Homer, one might expect to see more variety in Herodotus' own employment of the device if his primary aim was to sound Homeric.

The final point of difference that should be highlighted is an obvious one, but also an important one. The mannerism is very common in Homer, but very rare in Herodotus. This makes it all the more striking when it *does* occur in the *Histories*. What is its effect? Each of the examples from the *Histories* is discussed below.

Examples of Type 2 Tmesis in Herodotus

Type 2 tmesis in Herodotus is a listing technique for destruct-tion and in most cases it coincides with an important moment in the narrative. In two or three cases, in lists of dead, it seems to give a passage some epic colouring.

Important Narrative Moments

19) Sethos, the Egyptian king and priest of Hephaestus, finds himself in trouble when the country is invaded by an army of Arabians and Assyrians. Earlier, he had offended the Egyptian warrior class and because of this they refuse to help him. In desperation, Sethos goes to the temple and explains the situation to the god. He falls asleep and the god, coming to him in a dream, tells him not to worry and promises him assistance if he faces the enemy. Sethos trusts the dream and enlists all the Egyptians he can to help him. The force establishes its position at Pelusium and the opposing army arrives. Herodotus tells how at night, a swarm of field-mice eats through the enemy's quivers, bows and shield straps. The next day, without their weapons, the enemy flees, suffering many casualties.
The tmesis occurs at the point where Herodotus tells how the field-mice ate through the enemy equipment:

ἐνθαῦτα ἀπικομένοισι τοῖσι ἐναντίοισι [αὐτοῖσι] ἐπιχυθέντας νυκτὸς μῦς ἀρουραίους κατὰ μὲν φαγεῖν τοὺς φαρετρεῶνας αὐτῶν, κατὰ δὲ τὰ τόξα, πρὸς δὲ τῶν ἀσπίδων τὰ ὄχανα, ὥστε τῇ ὑστεραίῃ φευγόντων σφέων γυμνῶν [ἀνόπλων] πεσεῖν πολλούς.   (2.141.5)

This is of course the climax of the *logos*; the assistance which the god promised Sethos is revealed to be the field-mice. Tmesis is being used to highlight the most important moment in the story – the destruction by the mice of the enemy's weaponry. Clearly the clause beginning with πρὸς δέ is every bit as important as the ones beginning κατὰ μέν...κατὰ δέ: the clauses create a list of the items destroyed. The tmetic clauses list the instruments of offence, which are then complemented and contrasted by the defensive instruments in the clause beginning πρὸς δέ. The use of tmesis in the first clause alerts the audience right from the very beginning of the list that this is an important narrative moment. The method of listing has a much more impressive ring to it than would be the case if Herodotus had simply used two conjunctive καίs. There is a forcefulness of expression in κατὰ μέν...κατὰ δέ...πρὸς δέ... and the audience is left with the feeling that the god's promise has been well and truly fulfilled.

20) The next example occurs at 3.36. This is in the account of Cambyses' madness. Croesus rebukes Cambyses for his senseless killings, warning that if he continues the Persians will rise up against him. The advice was well-intentioned, as Herodotus remarks, but Cambyses berates Croesus for daring to give him advice. He accuses Croesus of bringing about his own downfall as well as Cyrus' through incompetence. He then says that he has been waiting for an excuse to attack Croesus for a long time and makes to shoot him with his bow and arrows, but Croesus escapes from the room.

This time the tmesis is in Cambyses' address to Croesus:

Σὺ καὶ ἐμοὶ τολμᾷς συμβουλεύειν, ὃς χρηστῶς μὲν τὴν σεωυτοῦ πατρίδα ἐπετρόπευσας, εὖ δὲ τῷ πατρὶ τῷ 'μῷ συνεβούλευσας, κελεύων αὐτὸν Ἀράξην ποταμὸν διαβάντα ἰέναι ἐπὶ Μασσαγέτας βουλομένων ἐκείνων διαβαίνειν ἐς τὴν ἡμετέρην, καὶ ἀπὸ μὲν σεωυτὸν ὤλεσας τῆς σεωυτοῦ πατρί- δος κακῶς προστάς, ἀπὸ δὲ [ὤλεσας] Κῦρον πειθόμενόν σοι· ἀλλ' οὔτι χαίρων, ἐπεί τοι καὶ πάλαι ἐς σὲ προφάσιός τευ ἐδεόμην ἐπιλαβέσθαι.

(3.36.3)

Again tmesis occurs at a climactic point. Sarcastically, Cambyses speaks of how well Croesus ruled his own country and advised his father. he reason for the sarcasm is revealed when Cambyses says that Croesus brought about his own ruin as well as Cyrus', an indictment to which tmesis and anaphora lend a full crushing force. Tmesis draws attention to the verb, giving it extra weight, and obviously the repetition of ἀπό adds strength to the statement as well. The construction of course not only draws attention to the verb, but to everything within the μέν and δέ clauses. By saying that Croesus ruined himself by ruling his own land badly and ruined Cyrus, who had trusted him, Cambyses implies that it would be sheer folly if he himself were to trust Croesus' advice on how to rule. The anaphora sets up a contrast between Croesus, who destroyed himself as a ruler (προστάς), and Cyrus, who was destroyed by trusting/obeying (πειθόμενον) him.

A noteworthy feature of this example is that it is not just μέν that cuts the verb, but μὲν σεωυτόν. If it were not for the μὲν ...δέ construction, this first clause would read simply: ἀπο σεωυτὸν ὤλεσας. This is in fact a particular form of type 3 tmesis that will be discussed later in this paper, namely a verb in direct speech that is cut by a personal pronoun (see 'type 3A'). It will be shown that in such cases the tone of the address tends to be accusatory, which is clearly the case here too.

21) Herodotus begins his story of how the Polycrates' avenging spirits (Πολυκράτεος τίσιες) caught up with Oroetes. The vengeance is carried out on Darius' orders (3.127–8), because "he wished to punish Oroetes for all his crimes, and in particular [for his crime against] Mitrobates and his son" (3.127). These crimes are outlined by Herodotus immediately beforehand, at 3.126: he murdered Mitrobates and his son, and committed other acts of hybris, such as killing a messenger (*angaros*) sent by Darius.

ὁ δὲ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ταραχῇ κατὰ μὲν ἔκτεινε Μιτροβάτεα τὸν ἐκ Δασκυλείου ὕπαρχον, ὅς οἱ ὠνείδισε τὰ ἐς Πολυκράτεα ἔχοντα, κατὰ δὲ τοῦ Μιτροβάτεω τὸν παῖδα Κρανάσπην,

ἄνδρας ἐν Πέρσῃσι δοκίμους, ἄλλα τε ἐξύβρισε παντοῖα καί
τινα καὶ ἀγγαρήιον Δαρείου ἐλθόντα παρ' αὐτόν, ὡς οὐ πρὸς
ἡδονήν οἱ ἦν τὰ ἀγγελλόμενα, κτείνει μιν ὀπίσω κομιζόμενον
ἄνδρας οἱ ὑπείσας κατ' ὁδόν, ἀποκτείνας δέ μιν ἠφάνισε
αὐτῷ ἵππῳ.

(3.126.2)

Anaphora pairs Mitrobates and his son together, as one would
expect since they are related and share the same fate; the killing
of the messenger sent by Darius is separated from the other two
(κατὰ μὲν ἔκτεινε Μιτροβάτεα...κατὰ δε τοῦ Μιτροβάτεω
τὸν παῖδα...κτείνει μιν). Why does Herodotus choose to use
the compound verb κατακτείνω in tmesis, rather than just the
simple form of the verb?[89] The reason is revealed at 3.127,
where Herodotus says that it was *especially* (μάλιστα) due to
these killings that Darius wished to punish Oroetes. Tmesis is
used to draw attention to an event important to the subsequent
development of the narrative: the killings are what finally led to
Oroetes being brought to justice, thus avenging Polycrates'
death. In addition, κατά strengthens the force of the verb
ἔκτεινε. This gives more weight to the hybris of the crime (as
does the detail that these men were δοκίμους), and so
contributes to the portrayal of Oroetes as thoroughly hybristic
(ἐξύβρισε).

As in example 19, there are additional elements to the list
beyond those in the tmetic clauses. The structure of the list is:
κατὰ μὲν ἔκτεινε...κατὰ δε...ἄλλα τε ἐξύβρισε...καί... . The
latter elements contrast the first two: they are introduced by
ἄλλα, and clearly there is a marked contrast in the rank of the
messenger and the rank of Mitrobates and his son.

As well as functioning as a narrative marker that introduces a
list of destruction, tmesis may add epic colouring to this
particular example. Like epic heroes, Mitrobates and his son are

---

[89] Cf. 3.36.1: σὺ δὲ κτείνεις μὲν ἄνδρας σεωυτοῦ πολιήτας ἐπ' οὐδεμιῆ
αἰτίῃ ἀξιοχρέῳ ἑλών, κτείνεις δὲ παῖδας.

of high status, and they are also related which adds to the pathetic effect: compare the slaying of the two sons of Antenor and the twin sons of Diocles in the *Iliad*.[90] There is pathos, too, in the 'anecdotal' detail about the manner in which Darius' messenger is killed. The passage is reminiscent of Homeric lists of war-dead (on which see further below). Also giving the passage an epic ring is the repetition of the name Mitrobates, initially in the accusative and subsequently in the genitive: this mannerism is fairly common in epic but rare elsewhere in early Greek literature.[91] However, there is no obvious reason *why* Herodotus would wish to sound 'epic' at this point, and perhaps what we regard as 'epic', a Greek audience might simply have regarded as 'emphatic'. Whether or not it is correct to detect epic colouring here, the fact remains that tmesis marks an important moment in the narrative.

22) Herodotus tells how the Thebans sent a delegation to Aegina to ask for help against Athens. The Aeginetans respond by launching an 'unannounced war' against Athens. They send warships to ravage the port of Phaleron and many of the other coastal demes while the Athenians are attacking the Boeotians:

Αἰγινῆται δὲ εὐδαιμονίῃ τε μεγάλῃ ἐπαρθέντες καὶ ἔχθρης παλαιῆς ἀναμνησθέντες ἐχούσης ἐς ᾿Αθηναίους, τότε Θηβαίων δεηθέντων πόλεμον ἀκήρυκτον ᾿Αθηναίοισι ἐπέφερον. ἐπικειμένων γὰρ αὐτῶν Βοιωτοῖσι ἐπιπλώσαντες μακρῇσι νηυσὶ ἐς τὴν ᾿Αττικὴν κατὰ μὲν ἔσυραν Φάληρον, κατὰ δὲ τῆς ἄλλης παραλίης πολλοὺς δήμους, ποιεῦντες δὲ ταῦτα μεγάλως ᾿Αθηναίους ἐσίνοντο.

(5.81.2–3)

Herodotus says that the Aeginetans were "raised up by great good-fortune" (εὐδαιμονίῃ...μεγάλῃ ἐπαρθέντες). Harry Avery has examined the use of ἐπαίρω in Herodotus, and concludes that it is used in a pregnant sense, borrowed from tragedy, that

---

[90] *Iliad* 11.241–7, 5.539ff.
[91] See further Fehling (1969), 139: 'Πρίαμος Πριάμοιο τε παῖδες und Ähnliches'.

has various connotations but most importantly conveys the sense "to raise one up to a very high state, but with the further implication that such an elevation is certain to be followed, indeed must be followed, by a precipitous and disastrous fall".[92]

Later comments confirm that Herodotus regarded the sackings as unjust acts of hybris:

οἱ δὲ Αἰγινῆται, πρὶν τῶν πρότερον ἀδικημάτων δοῦναι δίκας τῶν ἐς Ἀθηναίους ὕβρισαν Θηβαίοισι χαριζόμενοι, ἐποίησαν τοιόνδε...

(6.87)

He also uses the terms ἀδικίου (5.89.2) and ἀνάρσια (5.89.3) in reference to the Aeginetan actions.

As in the previous example, then, tmesis draws attention to hybristic acts of destruction. Anaphora brings additional force to the construction. Once again there is a contrast, this time between the μέν and the δέ clause: the places attacked are Phaleron and many *other* coastal demes (τῆς ἄλλης παραλίης).

23) On the march of Xerxes' land force down through Greece the Thessalians, who were ancient enemies of the Phocians, acted as guides to the Persians between Trachis and Phocis (8.31). The Persian army overran Phocis. They cut things down and put everything, settlements and temples, to the torch, and gang-raped a group of women.

οἱ δὲ βάρβαροι τὴν χώρην πᾶσαν ἐπέδραμον τὴν Φωκίδα· Θεσσαλοὶ γὰρ οὕτω ἦγον τὸν στρατόν· ὁκόσα δὲ ἐπέσχον, πάντα ἐπέφλεγον καὶ ἔκειρον, καὶ ἐς τὰς πόλις ἐνιέντες πῦρ καὶ ἐς τὰ ἱρά.
πορευόμενοι γὰρ ταύτῃ παρὰ τὸν Κηφισὸν ποταμὸν ἐδηίουν πάντα, καὶ κατὰ μὲν ἔκαυσαν Δρυμὸν πόλιν, κατὰ δὲ Χαράδραν καὶ Ἔρωχον καὶ Τεθρώνιον καὶ Ἀμφίκαιαν καὶ Νέωνα

---

[92] Avery (1979), 2. The word is used fifteen times by Herodotus at 1.87.3, 90.3, 90.4, 204.2, 212.2; 2.162.3; 4.130; 5.81.2, 91.2; 6.132; 7.9.γ1, 10.η1, 18.4, 38.1; 9.49.1. Only at 2.162.3 is it used without 'poetic' resonance, where it takes the meaning 'raise up' in a literal rather than a figurative sense. This instance is also distinctive for being the only intransitive use of the verb in Herodotus.

καὶ Πεδιέας καὶ Τριτέας καὶ Ἐλάτειαν καὶ Ὑάμπολιν καὶ
Παραποταμίους καὶ Ἄβας, ἔνθα ἦν ἱρὸν Ἀπόλλωνος πλούσιον,
θησαυροῖσί τε καὶ ἀναθήμασι πολλοῖσι κατεσκευασμένον· ἦν
δὲ καὶ τότε καὶ νῦν ἔστι χρηστήριον αὐτόθι· καὶ τοῦτο τὸ
ἱρὸν συλήσαντες ἐνέπρησαν. καὶ τινας διώκοντες εἷλον τῶν
Φωκέων πρὸς τοῖσι ὄρεσι, καὶ γυναῖκάς τινας διέφθειραν
μισγόμενοι ὑπὸ πλήθεος. Παραποταμίους δὲ παραμειβόμενοι
οἱ βάρβαροι ἀπίκοντο ἐς Πανοπέας.

(8.32–33)

Tmesis with anaphora is once again used to begin a list of
destruction, this time a *very* long and striking catalogue. The
μέν and δέ clauses bring elegance to the list's arrangement,
although the balance between Drymus and the other cities is
obviously contrived; Drymus has no special significance, being
mentioned nowhere else by Herodotus. Was it only a sense of
artistry that led Herodotus to use anaphora with tmesis here, or
does the stylistic device serve some other purpose too?

At 8.27 Herodotus reveals that the Thessalians were ancient
enemies of the Phocians and that a recent defeat at Phocian
hands had made them particularly angry. A few years prior the
Thessalians and their allies had invaded Phocis, but by means of
a clever trick the Phocians had managed to rout them and take
possession of four thousand bodies and shields. Half the shields
were dedicated at Abae, half at Delphi, and a group of huge
statues was dedicated at both sanctuaries as well.

Herodotus says that the Thessalians took it upon themselves
to guide the Persians through Phocis (8.31). He reiterates this
just before beginning the long list of towns sacked: οἱ δὲ
βάρβαροι τὴν χώρην πᾶσαν ἐπέδραμον τὴν Φωκίδα· Θεσσα-
λοὶ γὰρ οὕτω ἦγον τὸν στρατόν. The devastation of Phocis,
then, is very clearly presented as an act of vengeance by the
Thessalians, not simply as an act of aggression by the Persians.
The use of tmesis once again alerts the audience to an important
narrative moment: this is the resolution of the story of
Thessalian-Phocian hostilities that was begun at 8.27.

In addition to tmesis, the attention given to Abae in the list
makes it clear that the acts should be interpreted as vengeance

rather than simply aggression. From the geography of the places mentioned,[93] it looks likely that Herodotus is listing the places in the order that they were sacked, except for the final two in the list. The geography of the area indicates that the next place to attack after Hyampolis would have been Abae, and then after that Parapotamioi. That Abae was indeed attacked before Parapotamioi is confirmed by the statement beginning 8.33: Παραποταμίους δὲ παραμειβόμενοι οἱ βάρβαροι ἀπίκοντο ἐς Πανοπέας. Herodotus reverses the order of attack for the last two places in his list. Why? Abae was a sanctuary, which made its sacking is all the more outrageous. But this is not the only reason that Herodotus positions it last in the list and elaborates on its destruction.

Abae was a place of significance in the context of Thessalian-Phocian hostilities. The elaboration that at Abae there was a rich sanctuary of Apollo with treasures and many votive offerings (...καὶ Ἄβας, ἔνθα ἦν ἱρὸν Ἀπόλλωνος πλούσιον, θησαυροῖσί τε καὶ ἀναθήμασι πολλοῖσι κατεσκευασμένον...) is not merely descriptive. It reminds us of the two thousand shields and the statues that Herodotus said the Phocians themselves had dedicated only a few years previously (8.27). Herodotus does not explicitly link the two; he is too subtle for that and perhaps too reverential to suggest that the sacking of a temple might somehow be justified. But he has clearly worked his material to suggest that there was an element of mirroring or balance between the act of Thessalian vengeance and the original Phocian 'crime'.[94]

---

[93] On the place-names, see How and Wells (1912), ad loc. 'Drymus' is Drymaea, and 'Amphicaea' is Amphiclea. The locations of Pedieёs and Triteae are unknown.

[94] Elsewhere in Herodotus the act of vengeance mirrors the crime even more perfectly. Consider for instance the revenge of the eunuch Hermotimus, who forces the man who castrated him, Panionius, to castrate his own sons and then has them castrate Panionius (8.105–6), and also how Cambyses was himself fatally wounded in the very spot where he had wounded the Apis bull (3.64). More generally, on the importance of reciprocal and 'equalizing' actions in the *Histories*, see Gould (1989), 42–7, and Lateiner (1989), 193–6.

24) While Mardonius was at Athens, he sent Murichides, a Helles-
pontine, to Salamis with a message to try to persuade the Athenians
to come to terms. The message was delivered to the Council, and
an Athenian called Lycides argued in support of the proposals.
Considering this a terrible thing,[95] the Athenians stoned Lycides to
death, and the Athenian women went to his house, where they
stoned his wife and children to death as well.

ὁ μὲν δὴ ταύτην τὴν γνώμην ἀπεφαίνετο, εἴτε δὴ δεδεγμένος
χρήματα παρὰ Μαρδονίου, εἴτε καὶ ταῦτά οἱ ἐάνδανε· Ἀθη-
ναῖοι δὲ αὐτίκα δεινὸν ποιησάμενοι, οἵ τε ἐκ τῆς βουλῆς
καὶ οἱ ἔξωθεν, ὡς ἐπύθοντο, περιστάντες Λυκίδην κατέλευσαν
βάλλοντες, τὸν δὲ Ἑλλησπόντιον [Μουρυχίδην] ἀπέπεμψαν
ἀσινέα. γενομένου δὲ θορύβου ἐν τῇ Σαλαμῖνι περὶ τὸν Λυ-
κίδην, πυνθάνονται τὸ γινόμενον αἱ γυναῖκες τῶν Ἀθηναίων,
διακελευσαμένη δὲ γυνὴ γυναικὶ καὶ παραλαβοῦσα ἐπὶ τὴν
Λυκίδεω οἰκίην ἤισαν αὐτοκελέες, καὶ κατὰ μὲν ἔλευσαν
αὐτοῦ τὴν γυναῖκα, κατὰ δὲ τὰ τέκνα.

(9.5.2–3)

The use of tmesis here brings more emphasis to the stoning of
Lycides' wife and children than to the stoning of Lycides
himself. This is presumably due to the unusual nature of the
incident. The spontaneous violence of the Athenian women
would have been a surprising contravention of their usual
behaviour,[96] and Herodotus underscores this through his use of
martial language: διακελευσαμένη δὲ γυνὴ γυναικὶ καὶ παρα-
λαβοῦσα.[97] By emphasising the feminine in a martial context
(not just by the side-by-side repetition γυνὴ γυναικί but by the
decision to use feminine participles rather than the non-gender
specific indicative forms of the verbs), Herodotus highlights

---

[95] On δεινὸν ποιησάμενοι, see Flower and Marincola (2002), 108.

[96] Cf. Hdt. 5.87, where the Athenian women turn on the sole survivor of
the men sent to Aegina and stab him with their brooch-pins. On this occasion
Herodotus comments that the Athenians regarded this act as something more
dreadful (δεινότερόν τι) than the disaster on Aegina itself.

[97] Flower and Marincola (2002), 108: "'woman giving the order to
woman and taking her along': military language is used here for the women's
'expedition' to the house of Lycides".

their irregular behaviour. The use of tmesis, it would seem, adds to the effect.[98]

Epic Colouring? The War-Dead

There are two other examples of type 2 tmesis in the *Histories* that do not appear to operate in the same way as the ones discussed thus far. Both of these involve the same verb: ἀποθνῄσκω. Of all the thirty-three cases of tmesis in Herodotus, only in these two (as well as perhaps in example 21, above) does tmesis appear to lend epic colouring to the narrative. Tmesis with anaphora is one of the ways that Herodotus lists the dead in a battle, and he only uses it to list men of standing. The mannerism seems to lend some of the grandeur of epic to the narrative. It is not the only way Herodotus lists war-dead, however, and there is no obvious reason why he uses it in some places but not in others.

25) In his description of the Battle of Salamis (8.84–96), Herodotus relates how many important men from the enemy forces died, including one of Xerxes' brothers, and how comparatively few Greeks lost their lives because, unlike the Persians, they were capable of swimming to safety:

> ἐν δὲ τῷ πόνῳ τούτῳ ἀπὸ μὲν ἔθανε ὁ στρατηγὸς Ἀριαβίγνης ὁ Δαρείου, Ξέρξεω ἐὼν ἀδελφεός, ἀπὸ δὲ ἄλλοι πολλοί τε καὶ ὀνομαστοὶ Περσέων καὶ Μήδων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συμμάχων, ὀλίγοι δέ τινες καὶ Ἑλλήνων· ἅτε γὰρ νέειν ἐπιστάμενοι, τοῖσι αἱ νέες διεφθείροντο, οἱ μὴ ἐν χειρῶν νόμῳ ἀπολλύμενοι ἐς τὴν Σαλαμῖνα διένεον.
>
> (8.89.1)

---

[98] The incident is echoed at the end of the histories when Artayctes, the Persian governer, is punished by the Athenians by being nailed to a plank on the shore of the Hellespont and having his son stoned to death before his eyes (9.120). Herodotus passes judgement on neither incident, leaving us uncertain as to how to interpret them insofar as his characterization of the Athenians is concerned.

Once again tmesis with anaphora begins a list of destruction. As in several of the other examples, the list continues beyond the μέν and δέ clauses: ἀπὸ μέν...ἀπὸ δὲ...ὀλίγοι δε... . The few deaths on the Greek side contrast the deaths of the many great men from among the Persians and their allies. An explanation follows to explain the unexpected disparity between the sides (ἅτε γὰρ νέειν ἐπιστάμενοι...).

One senses that tmesis adds a certain grandeur or importance to the enemy deaths. Certainly they are important men who died. On the one hand there is Ariabignes, who is described as *strategos*, son of Darius, and brother of Xerxes; he is important in not one but three ways. And on the other hand there are the πολλοί τε καὶ ὀνομαστοί of the Persians, Medes, and other allies.

For comparison's sake, consider the following passage from the *Iliad*:

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ μὲν Τρώων θάνον ὅσσοι ἄριστοι,
πολλοὶ δ' Ἀργείων οἱ μὲν δάμεν, οἱ δ' ἐλίποντο...
<div align="right">(Iliad 12.13–14)</div>

The sequence κατὰ μέν...θάνον... πολλοὶ δ'... in the Iliad is remarkably similar to the sequence ἀπὸ μὲν ἔθανε...ἀπο δὲ...ὀλίγοι δέ... . As in Herodotus, attention is also given here to the calibre of the enemy (Trojan) dead. In Homer, many (πολλοὶ δ') of the Argives die, whereas in Herodotus there are only a few (ὀλίγοι δέ) Greek deaths.

26) The second example involving the verb ἀποθνῄσκω is found during the account of the Battle of Marathon:

καὶ τοῦτο μὲν ἐν τούτῳ τῷ πόνῳ ὁ πολέμαρχος [Καλλίμαχος] διαφθείρεται, ἀνὴρ γενόμενος ἀγαθός, ἀπὸ δ' ἔθανε τῶν στρατηγῶν Στησίλεως ὁ Θρασύλεω· τοῦτο δὲ Κυνέγειρος ὁ Εὐφορίωνος ἐνθαῦτα ἐπιλαμβανόμενος τῶν ἀφλάστων νεός, τὴν χεῖρα ἀποκοπεὶς πελέκει πίπτει, τοῦτο δὲ ἄλλοι Ἀθηναίων πολλοί τε καὶ ὀνομαστοί.
<div align="right">(6.114)</div>

In this example there is no tmesis in the μέν clause but, as
Stein and Aly say, ἀπὸ δ' ἔθανε is to be understood as an
anacoluthic second half of a pair.[99] Herodotus does not have
ἀπὸ μὲν ἔθανε because he chose to begin the list with
τοῦτο μέν (which is balanced by ...τοῦτο δὲ...τοῦτο δὲ...); it
would sound clumsy to have τοῦτο μέν...ἀπὸ μὲν ἔθανε
within the same clause. Tmesis with anaphora is just one of the
ways Herodotus can begin a list of the dead; like any good
narrator, he has other devices at his disposal.

As in the previous example, there is a sense of epic grandeur
in this list of war-dead. Once again it is men of standing who are
listed among the dead: a polemarch, who is described as an
ἀνὴρ...ἀγαθός; a *strategos*; Cynegeiros, whose manner of death
is described; and finally 'many other Athenians of note'. The
use of tmesis seems to be just one of the ways of lending an epic
colouring to the list of the dead.

Lists of the Dead in Homer and Herodotus

There are similarities between Herodotus' lists of the dead
and those found in Homer.[100] The use of tmesis in examples 25

---

[99] Stein, *ad loc.*; Aly (1969), 268.
[100] On Homeric lists of dead Charles Beye (1964), 345, comments: "In
form each battle list seems to be a thing apart from the general dramatic
narrative, often introduced in a way seemingly so consciously artificial as to
set the passage very definitely off to itself." The same could be said of
Herodotus (see, for instance, 6.114, 7.224, 8.89). Beye notes that in Homeric
lists of battle dead, as well as 'basic information' (the names of the slain and
slayer) and 'contextual information' (the manner of death), 'anecdotes' will
often be added (358). Herodotus presents his lists in similar ways. Some
names are always given. His statement after the Battle of Thermopylae recog-
nises that this is the norm and it is interesting that on that particular occasion
Herodotus decides to reject the convention of the list (7.224). Contextual
information about the manner of death is sometimes given, as in the case of
Cynegeiros (6.114). Sometimes 'anecdotal' information is included too.
Usually this concerns the social position of the dead man (e.g. 7.224, 8.89.1).
The dead are not all on one side and Herodotus, like Homer, recognises this
in his lists, accounting for the dead on both sides regardless of the outcome of
the battle. Both also allude to the large numbers of dead, even though the lists
themselves may actually be quite short. For instance, Herodotus seems fond of

and 26 may contribute to a presentation perhaps designed to suggest that the dead of the Persian Wars rank in importance alongside the heroes of epic. But there are differences too. One is that these two examples involve the verb ἀποθνῄσκω, which in Homer is very uncommon and is found nowhere in the aorist. Details like this are important. Although there seem to be similarities, Herodotus is not trying to model his lists precisely on Homer's. Perhaps this is symptomatic of a wider programme: the *Histories* have been seen as "a conscious attempt to present the history of the Persian Wars as the history of a *new* Trojan War won by a *new* race of heroes".[101]

Type 2: Conclusions

Herodotus' use of type 2 tmesis does not have neat parallels in Homer. The linguistic differences suggest that Herodotus' primary aim in using the device may not always have been to sound Homeric.

Herodotus uses the device as a listing technique for destruction. The relationship between the elements of the list varies. Sometimes tmesis binds the first two elements of the list together and the other elements are contrasted. Sometimes the elements in the μέν and δέ clause are contrasted. Sometimes, as in the long list of Phocian cities, there is no contrast at all.

In most cases the list coincides with an important moment in the narrative: the destruction by the mice of the weaponry; Cambyses' furious indictment of Croesus' incompetence; the hybristic killing of Mitrobates and his son by Oroetes; the hybristic sacking of the Athenian coastal demes by Aegina; the Thessa-

---

the phrase ἄλλοι τε πολλοὶ καὶ ὀνομαστοί (or some variation on it), and Homer will sometimes introduce a list with the question ἔνθα τίνα πρῶτον, τίνα δ᾽ ὕστατον ἐξενάριξε; A difference is that Homer tends to throw in names that are otherwise unknown: "literary cannon-fodder, faceless supernumeraries, so to speak" (Beye, 358). Herodotus is content to name only a few.

[101] O. Murray (1988), 463 (my italics). For more on the relationship between epic and Herodotus, see Boedeker (2002).

lian vengeance, through the Persians, on Phocis; and the highly irregular actions of the Athenian women in stoning the wife and children of Lycides to death.

In two cases, type 2 tmesis is used in a list of war-dead. In these contexts Herodotus seems to be striving to recreate some of the grandeur of epic. Using type 2 tmesis is just one of a number of his methods for doing so.

Type 3 Tmesis

In the *Histories* there are seven examples of type 3 tmesis, the type which Aly refers to as 'genuine' (*echte*) tmesis. The examples are simply all those which do not fall into either of the first two classes. The description 'genuine' is unhelpful as it falsely implies that the other examples are in some way *not* true cases of tmesis.

Within the examples of type 3 tmesis, there appear to be two further subtypes. These will be referred to here as 'type 3A' and 'type 3B'.

There are five examples of type 3B. All involve the same verb (ἀναδραμεῖν), which in every instance is cut by τε. These examples will be discussed in the latter part of this section.

The remaining two examples of type 3 (κατά με ἐφάρμαξας and μετά δὴ βουλεύεαι) are classed as type 3A, which is discussed below. In addition, example 21 above is an example of type 3A (as well as type 2).

Type 3A

27) Herodotus tells of the friendship between Amasis and the Cyreneans, and of how he married Ladice, a woman from an eminent Cyrenean family.When Amasis comes to have intercourse with Ladice, he repeatedly finds himself impotent, even though this does not happen with his other wives. Amasis accuses Ladice of drugging him and threatens her with a terrible death:

ἐπείτε δὲ πολλὸν τοῦτο ἐγίνετο, εἶπε ὁ Ἄμασις πρὸς τὴν
Λαδίκην ταύτην καλεομένην· Ὦ γύναι, κατά με ἐφάρμαξας,
καὶ ἔστι τοι οὐδεμία μηχανὴ μὴ οὐκ ἀπολωλέναι κάκιστα
γυναικῶν πασέων.

(2.181.3)

28) Xerxes decides to invade Greece. A council meeting is held at
which he announces his intentions and the matter is debated. That
night, however, Xerxes begins to have doubts and decides that the
expedition is, after all, not in his best interests. But as he sleeps a
figure comes to him and warns against this change of heart:

δεδογμένων δέ οἱ αὖτις τούτων κατύπνωσε, καὶ δή κου ἐν
τῇ νυκτὶ εἶδε ὄψιν τοιήνδε, ὡς λέγεται ὑπὸ Περσέων· ἐδόκεε
ὁ Ξέρξης ἄνδρα οἱ ἐπιστάντα μέγαν τε καὶ εὐειδέα εἰπεῖν·
Μετὰ δὴ βουλεύεαι, ὦ Πέρσα, στράτευμα μὴ ἄγειν ἐπὶ τὴν
Ἑλλάδα, προείπας ἁλίζειν Πέρσῃσι στρατόν; οὔτε ὦν μετα-
βουλευόμενος ποιέεις εὖ, οὔτε ὁ συγγνωσόμενός τοι πάρα·
ἀλλ' ὥσπερ τῆς ἡμέρης ἐβουλεύσαο ποιέειν, ταύτην ἴθι τῶν
ὁδῶν.   (7.12.1–2)

There are similarities in the contexts of these two uses of
tmesis that may help to explain the effect. Both examples are
found in direct speech. Both examples involve a verb in the
second person, are found at the beginning of an address, and are
used in conjunction with apostrophe (ὦ γύναι, ὦ Πέρσα). The
first example is obviously meant to be accusatory in tone:
Amasis is accusing his own wife of drugging him. The second
example too seems to be accusatory: although it is addressed in
the form of a question, the dream-figure knows the answer, and
is merely asking it to make clear his knowledge of and displeas-
ure at Xerxes' change of heart.

For the latter example it is also important to consider the
nuance of the particle δή. Often δή conveys a sense of irony,
scorn, or indignation.[102] The dream-figure's question looks
rather like the series of 'indignant questions' with δή which

---

[102] Denniston (1954), 229–36.

Denniston cites.[103] There is an alternative or even additional shade of meaning possible. Denniston comments:

> "The emphasis conveyed by δή with verbs is for the most part pathetic in tone, and it is peculiarly at home in the great crises of drama, above all at moments when death or ruin is present or imminent, though its use is not confined to such moments."[104]

The sequence of visitations by the dream-figure is highly dramatic, and in addition marks a moment of crisis for Xerxes and indeed for Graeco-Persian relations: should the invasion go ahead? Herodotus' audience knows this, and so too does the dream-figure. The dream's tone communicates to Xerxes (and to Herodotus' audience) the gravity of his situation and the importance of his decision. As well as being indignant, the tone seems to be threatening: the placement of δή suggests that by changing his mind Xerxes will *make* his death or ruin imminent. If this reading is correct, then the words …οὔτε ὧν μεταβουλευόμενος ποιέεις εὖ, οὔτε ὁ συγγνωσόμενός τοι πάρα… are to be under-stood as a reiteration of and elaboration on this opening threat.[105]

Both of the above examples occur in addresses with a hostile tone.[106] It would be useful to look at parallels outside of Herodotus to see whether this sort of tmesis is used in similar contexts by other authors. However, there is the problem of deciding exactly how to define 'this sort of tmesis' when we only have two Herodotean examples.

---

[103] Denniston (1954), 236.

[104] Denniston (1954), 214.

[105] Cf. Van Ophuijsen and Stork (1999), 183, who simply take δή to mean 'clearly'.

[106] The term of address which the dream-figure uses may also contribute to the hostility of tone: rather than the polite and deferential ὦ Βασιλεῦ, or even his name ὦ Ξέρξης, the generic and undistinguished ὦ Πέρσα is used. This term of address is unusual, occurring on only one other occasion in the *Histories*, in the message from the Scythian king Idanthyrsus to Darius (4.127). There ὦ Πέρσα might contribute to the tone of hostility and contempt, but since Idanthyrsus is explaining that he is not running from Darius, but practising the normal Scythian nomadic lifestyle, its function is perhaps rather to draw attention to cultural differences.

The example of μετὰ δὴ βουλεύεαι is particularly problematic: I am aware of no other examples of tmesis where the verb is cut by δή and by δή only.[107] However, in the case of κατά με ἐφάρμαξας other authors do provide similar examples. The characteristics that I have looked for are:

i. the tmesis is found in direct speech;
ii. the verb is cut by one word only, and that word is a personal pronoun.

Using these criteria I have found five parallel examples. The interesting thing about these examples is that they too are all used in a context that suggests a hostile tone.

Consider first Sophocles' *Philoctetes*. Philoctetes briefly becomes delirious and Neoptolemus, fearing that he will fall over the edge of a cliff,[108] restrains him. Philoctetes begs to be let go and says that Neoptolemus will kill him. Neoptolemus sees that Philoctetes has now returned to his senses and agrees to let him go:

NE. τί παραφρονεῖς αὖ; τί τὸν ἄνω λεύσσεις κύκλον;
ΦΙ. μέθες μέθες με.
NE.   ποῖ μεθῶ;
ΦΙ.   μέθες ποτέ.
NE. οὔ φημ᾽ ἐάσειν.
ΦΙ.   ἀπό μ᾽ ὀλεῖς, ἢν προσθίγῃς.
NE. καὶ δὴ μεθίημ᾽, εἴ τι δὴ πλέον φρονεῖς.

(Philoctetes 815–8)

The tmesis coincides with Philoctetes' accusation, that by restraining him Neoptolemus will kill him. In Herodotus too, tmesis concided with the accusations made by Amasis and the dream-figure.

---

[107] Denniston (1954), 229, cites only this instance.
[108] See Webster (1970), 814f., on the dramatic location of this scene.

The second parallel comes from Aristophanes' *Acharnians*. The chorus has entered, looking for Dicaeopolis. They find him and threaten to stone him to death for brokering a peace:

NE. σὲ μὲν οὖν καταλεύσομεν, ὦ μιαρὰ κεφαλή.
ΔΙ. ἀντὶ ποίας αἰτίας, ὦχαρνέων γεραίτατοι;
NE. τοῦτ' ἐρωτᾷς; ἀναί-
     σχυντος εἶ καὶ βδελυρός,
          ὦ προδότα τῆς πατρίδος,
     ὅστις ἡμῶν μόνος
          σπεισάμενος εἶτα δύνα-
     σαι πρὸς ἔμ' ἀποβλέπειν.
ΔΙ. ἀντὶ δ' ὧν ἐσπεισάμην ἀκούσατ', ἀλλ' ἀκούσατε.
NE. σοῦ γ' ἀκούσωμεν; ἀπολεῖ· κατά σε χώσομεν τοῖς
     λίθοις.
ΔΙ. μηδαμῶς πρὶν ἄν γ' ἀκούσητ'· ἀλλ' ἀνάσχεσθ', ὦγαθοί.
                                   (*Acharnians* 285–96)

In this case, the tmesis does not coincide with an accusation but with a threat. In Herodotus the dream-figure's address also seems to be threatening in its tone.

The third example is also Aristophanic, this time from *Wealth*. Chremylus, on the advice of the Delphic oracle, has brought home with him the first man he encountered on leaving the sanctuary. Chremylus and his slave Cario ask the 'man' (who is in fact the god Wealth) who he is. Wealth responds rudely to both of them. As a result Cario and Chremylus grow angry:

XP. οὔ τοι μὰ τὴν Δήμητρα χαιρήσεις ἔτι.
KA. εἰ μὴ φράσεις γάρ, ἀπό σ' ὀλῶ κακὸν κακῶς.
ΠΛ. ὦ τᾶν, ἀπαλλάχθητον ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.
                                   (*Wealth* 64–6)

Once again, tmesis coincides with a threat: Cario abuses Wealth (κακόν) and says he will kill him in a dreadful way (ἀπό σ' ὀλῶ... κακῶς) if he does not speak.

The next example is later, coming from the *Anacreontea*. The poet is awoken in the middle of the night by Eros banging on the door. The poet reproaches him for scattering his dreams:

μεσονυκτίοις ποτ' ὥραις,
στρέφετ' ἦμος Ἄρκτος ἤδη
κατὰ χεῖρα τὴν Βοώτου,
μερόπων δὲ φῦλα πάντα
κέαται κόπῳ δαμέντα,
τότ' Ἔρως ἐπισταθείς μευ
θυρέων ἔκοπτ' ὀχῆας.
'τίς' ἔφην 'θύρας ἀράσσει,
κατά μευ σχίσας ὀνείρους;'

<div align="right">(Anacreontea 33.1–9 [West])</div>

Here tmesis coincides with an angry accusation, just as is it did in the case of Amasis' address to his wife.

Finally there is a fragment of Hipponax which is found in Tzetzes' commentary on the *Iliad* (12th century AD):

ὑπερβατόν. ἔστι δὲ καὶ τοῦτο Ἰωνικόν, ὥς φησι καὶ Ἱππῶναξ·
"ἀπό σ' ὀλέσειεν Ἄρτεμις." – "σὲ δὲ κὠπόλλων."

<div align="right">(Exeg. Il. A 25, p. 83.25 Hermann;
Hipponax, fr. 25 West)</div>

Although the context is unclear, the tone appears to be hostile (or perhaps mock-hostile): the first speaker is cursing the second.

Tzetzes calls the tmesis 'hyperbaton' and says it is an Ionic practice. Perhaps it was more prevalent in Ionia, but the examples above are evidence that this particular form of tmesis was current in Attic Greek too. Three of the examples involve the same verb, ἀπόλλυμι, once in an accusation, once in a threat, and once in a curse. This is the same verb that was found in example 20 above (an example of type 2 and 3A tmesis combined): ἀπὸ μὲν σεωυτὸν ὤλεσας. The evidence strongly

suggests that at least in the case of this verb, we are seeing an Attic-Ionic colloquialism.[109]

Is it purely coincidence that for all these examples of tmesis, where the verb is cut by a personal pronoun (and only by that), the tone of the address is hostile? More examples might make the situation clearer. Also unresolved is whether μετὰ δὴ βουλεύεαι is a related category of tmesis. The similarities in context and in tone between examples 27 and 28 suggest that there is some relationship. However, with the limited data available, it is difficult to be sure which characteristics of 'type 3A' are defining, and which are merely incidental.

Type 3B

The final five examples of tmesis in Herodotus are all of the form ἀνά τε ἔδραμε/ἔδραμον. In early Greek literature this mannerism seems to be peculiarly 'Herodotean' (although in the scholia to the *Commentaria in Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam* it is given as an example of an Ionism).[110] In narrative, the only extant examples outside Herodotus are in Appian (2nd century AD) and Eunapius (4th century AD).[111] Aly points to *Iliad* 5.599 as well,[112] but in the course of this discussion it will be explained that that example is in fact not a precise parallel.

It is more usual than not for Herodotus to use ἀναδραμεῖν in tmesis. There are only three occasions in the *Histories* where the verb ἀναδραμεῖν occurs *without* tmesis.[113] Is he striving for any

---

[109] Similarly, Willi (2003), 250: "The tone of some of the Aristophanic examples (and the frequency with ἀπόλλυμι) suggests that tmesis was a means of colloquial intensification."

[110] *Scholia Londinensia on Dionysius Thrax*, vol.i.iii, p. 468, lines 39–40 (Uhlig).

[111] Appianus, *Civil War* 1.13.110, 2.5.33; Eunapius, *Lives of the Sophists* 4.1.2.

[112] Aly (1969), 269. The Homeric example is quoted by Apollonius Sophista (30.16) and Eustathius (*Comm. ad Homeri Iliadem*, 585.26–28, Van der Valk, v. 2, p. 155).

[113] ...Κροῖσος δὲ ἀναδραμὼν ἔθεε ἔξω... (3.36.4); ἐν ταύτῃσι τῇσι

particular effect when he does use ἀνά τε ἔδραμε/ἔδραμον? Or does its very frequency indicate that any striking impact it may once have had has been lost through overuse?

Three times in the *Histories* ἀνά τε ἔδραμε/ἔδραμον is used of people in a literal sense ('leapt up', 'jumped up and ran'), and twice it is used of cities in a metaphorical sense, derived from the verb's use in relation to plant growth ('shot up'). All the examples are set out below. Discussion of them is left until the end.

29) The first example is found in the story about the 'conspiracy of the seven'. The Persians involved in the conspiracy enter the palace and kill the eunuchs who try to stop them from going to the Magi. The Magi, who at the time were discussing the consequences of Prexaspes' actions (he had revealed to the Persians the true identity of the Magus Smerdis), see the eunuchs in uproar, leap up and, when they realise what is happening, turn to defend themselves:

οἱ δὲ μάγοι ἔτυχον ἀμφότεροι τηνικαῦτα ἐόντες [τε] ἔσω καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ Πρηξάσπεος γενόμενα ἐν βουλῇ ἔχοντες. ἐπεὶ ὦν εἶδον τοὺς εὐνούχους τεθορυβημένους τε καὶ βοῶντας, ἀνά τε ἔδραμον πάλιν ἀμφότεροι, καὶ ὡς ἔμαθον τὸ ποιεύμενον, πρὸς ἀλκὴν ἐτράποντο.   (3.78.1)

30) The second use in relation to human action is found much later, on the second occasion that the dream-figure visits Xerxes before the invasion of Greece. The dream warns Xerxes that, unless he carries out the invasion, he will quickly fall from prominence. Xerxes, terrified by this dream, leaps out of bed and sends for Artabanus, whom he will use to test the dream's divinity:

Ξέρξης μὲν περιδεὴς γενόμενος τῇ ὄψι ἀνά τε ἔδραμε ἐκ τῆς κοίτης καὶ πέμπει ἄγγελον [ἐπὶ] Ἀρτάβανον καλέοντα.
                                                      (7.15.1)

προσόδοισι τῆς μάχης λέγεται βασιλέα θηεύμενον τρὶς ἀναδραμεῖν ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου, δείσαντα περὶ τῇ στρατιῇ (7.212.1); ...δευτέρη δὲ ἡμέρη ἀπὸ τῆς ἐμπρήσιος Ἀθηναίων οἱ θύειν ὑπὸ βασιλέος κελευόμενοι ὡς ἀνέβησαν ἐς τὸ ἱρόν, ὥρων βλαστὸν ἐκ τοῦ στελέχεος ὅσον πηχυαῖον ἀναδεδραμηκότα (8.55).

31) The third example is during the battle of Thermopylae, when the
Persians are coming along the mountain path. The Phocians per-
ceive their presence and leap up to fight:

ἔμαθον δὲ σφέας οἱ Φωκέες ὧδε ἀναβεβηκότας· ἀναβαίνοντες
γὰρ ἐλάνθανον οἱ Πέρσαι τὸ ὄρος πᾶν ἐὸν δρυῶν ἐπίπλεον.
ἦν μὲν δὴ νηνεμίη, ψόφου δὲ γινομένου πολλοῦ, ὡς οἰκὸς ἦν
φύλλων ὑποκεχυμένων ὑπὸ τοῖσι ποσί, ἀνά τε ἔδραμον οἱ
Φωκέες καὶ ἐνέδυνον τὰ ὅπλα, καὶ αὐτίκα οἱ βάρβαροι παρῆ-
σαν.

(7.218.1)

32) The next example is where Herodotus describes how Sparta flour-
ished after the reforms of Lycurgus:

οὕτω μὲν μεταβαλόντες εὐνομήθησαν, τῷ δὲ Λυκούργῳ
τελευτήσαντι ἱρὸν εἰσάμενοι σέβονται μεγάλως. οἶα δὲ
ἔν τε χώρῃ ἀγαθῇ καὶ πλήθεϊ οὐκ ὀλίγων ἀνδρῶν, ἀνά
τε ἔδραμον αὐτίκα καὶ εὐθενήθησαν.

(1.66.1)

33) The final example is found in the description of how Syracuse
flourished under Gelon:

ὁ δὲ ἐπείτε παρέλαβε τὰς Συρηκούσας, Γέλης μὲν ἐπικρα-
τέων λόγον ἐλάσσω ἐποιέετο, ἐπιτρέψας αὐτὴν Ἱέρωνι ἀδελ-
φεῷ ἑωυτοῦ, ὁ δὲ τὰς Συρηκούσας ἐκράτυνε, καὶ ἦσάν οἱ
πάντα αἱ Συρήκουσαι. αἱ δὲ παραυτίκα ἀνά τ' ἔδραμον καὶ
ἔβλαστον.

(7.156.1–2)

The first thing to observe is that where type 3B tmesis is
used, the τε is conjunctive, *always* beginning a τε... καὶ con-
struction. This is an important difference from the example that
Aly cites in Homer, where τε stands alone, loosely connecting
the clause to the preceding one in 'adjunctive' rather than 'con-
junctive' manner.[114] The construction is not τ'...τε since the τε

---

[114] On the adjunctive nature of τε, see LSJ, A, and Denniston (1954),
497–503. Herodotus in places uses τε on its own to mean 'too, also': e.g.
πρὸς δὴ ὦν ἐμοί τε δοκέει (1.58). See LSJ, B II for further examples and
for possible instances of this usage in Sophocles and Thucydides.

of line 600 also operates adjunctively rather than conjunctively (lines 597–9 are a simile):

ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἀνὴρ ἀπάλαμνος, ἰὼν πολέος πεδίοιο,
στήῃ ἐπ' ὠκυρόῳ ποταμῷ ἅλαδε προρέοντι,
ἀφρῷ μορμύροντα ἰδών, ἀνά τ' ἔδραμ' ὀπίσσω,
ὣς τότε Τυδείδης ἀνεχάζετο, εἶπέ τε λαῷ·

(*Iliad* 5.597–600)

Importantly, the three cases in Herodotus where ἀναδραμεῖν is not found in tmesis do *not* contain a τε...καί construction.[115] James Adams has shown that, in classical Latin, there are occasions where the nominative personal pronouns *ego* and *tu* are not used for emphasis or contrast, but are instead simply 'generated' by certain structural conditions.[116] The tmesis of ἀνά τε ἔδραμον/ἔδραμε looks like a parallel case: tmesis arises *if and only if* the verb ἀναδραμεῖν is used in combination with a τε...καί construction.[117]

In examples 29-31, where ἀνά τε ἔδραμον/ἔδραμε is used in relation to human actions, the scenes are ones of tension and excitement: the Magi and the Phocians leap to their feet, in danger after being caught off-guard, and Xerxes leaps out of bed

---

[115] See n. 113.

[116] J. N. Adams (1999).

[117] For one of the examples of ἀναδραμεῖν without tmesis (3.36.4), Herodotus could have used a τε...καί construction without any significant change in meaning, yet he chose not to. The context is the account of how Croesus advises Cambyses to show some restraint, in response to which Cambyses grows angry and tries to kill him. Croesus escapes. Instead of Κροῖσος δὲ ἀναδραμὼν ἔθεε ἔξω, Herodotus could have written: Κροῖσος δὲ ἀνα τε ἔδραμε καὶ ἔθεε ἔξω. The use of the participle and finite verb combination ἀναδραμὼν ἔθεε, rather than two finite verbs in a τε...καί construction, seems to be a deliberate departure by Herodotus from his usual mannerism. However, this departure makes sense when the context is considered. Using a τε...καί construction would create a sense of delay by focussing on each of the actions separately. The brevity of the phrase Κροῖσος δε ἀναδραμὼν ἔθεε ἔξω mirrors the swiftness of the exit described. Croesus escapes successfully with his life. In contrast, in examples 29 and 31, where τε... καί constructions *are* used, the Magi do not escape and the Phocians fail to hold back the Persians. Delays can be costly. For general remarks on the differences between using an aorist participle with an indicative verb and using two indicative verbs, see M. Buijs (2005), 24–37.

after awaking from a terrifying and threatening dream. The τε...καί constructions contribute to the suspense that maintains audience interest as the stories unfold, rather like the English construction 'first...then...'. In each case the καί introduces a new element which further increases the suspense.[118]

In examples 32 and 33, where ἀνά τε ἔδραμον is used in relation to cities, the effect is different. The scenes are not tense ones, and τε does not create suspense. In both cases the second element introduced by καί adds to the image of health that ἀνά τε ἔδραμον, 'shot up' (like a plant), suggests: Sparta shot up at once and flourished (καὶ εὐθενήθησαν) and Syracuse shot up and grew (καὶ ἔβλαστον). The τε...καί construction is being used for emphasis, much like the English construction 'both... and...'.

The frequency with which ἀνά τε ἔδραμον/ἔδραμε occurs in the *Histories* and the regularity of the structural conditions in which it is found strongly suggest that we are seeing an example of an inherited linguistic structure. The run of short syllables (ἀνά τε) *may* contribute to the sense of agitation in examples 29–31, and this agitation could *perhaps* translate into a sense of vibrancy in example 32 (τε is elided in 33). However, the formulaic nature of ἀνά τε ἔδραμον/ἔδραμε makes it seem likely that the tmesis itself has little, if any, narrative function. The effectiveness of the structure seems to lie in the strong, rapid action of the verb and in the suspense or emphasis created by the τε...καί construction.

Type 3: Conclusions

Tmesis of type 3A includes the two examples that do not fall into any of the other classes (κατά με ἐφάρμαξας and μετά

---

[118] The Magi turn to fight (καὶ...πρὸς ἀλκὴν ἐτράποντο): will they be successful? Xerxes sends a messenger to fetch Artabanus (καὶ πέμπει ἄγγελον [ἐπὶ] Ἀρτάβανον καλέοντα): why does he do something as unexpected as this? The Phocians begin arming (notice the imperfect) and the Persians are at once upon them (καὶ ἐνέδυνον τὰ ὅπλα, καὶ αὐτίκα οἱ βάρβαροι παρῆσαν): how will the Phocians survive this sticky situation?

δὴ βουλεύεαι). These look to be related, but because the number of examples is so low, it is not possible to state with absolute certainty what the defining characteristics of this class are. Parallels outside Herodotus suggest that the function of the tmesis κατά με ἐφάρμαξας is to contribute to the hostile tone of Amasis' address. In the case of μετὰ δὴ βουλεύεαι, the particle δή suggests a hostile and threatening tone, and if μετὰ δη βουλεύεαι indeed belongs in the same category of tmesis as κατά με ἐφάρμαξας, then the effect of the tmesis is to intensify this tone.

The tmesis seen in ἀνά τε ἔδραμον/ἔδραμε (type 3B) is common in Herodotus, and occurs if and only if the verb ἀναδραμεῖν is used in combination with a τε...καὶ construction. The frequency of type 3B and the regularity of the structural conditions in which it is found strongly suggest that this is an inherited linguistic structure. Any effect that the tmesis may once have had was probably no longer felt. Any emphasis is due not to tmesis, but to the forceful action of the verb and to the suspense or emphasis created by the τε...καί construction.

Conclusion

Our appreciation of the complexities and subtleties of Herodotus' narrative has improved remarkably in recent years. Even close study of individual words can be fruitful. The preceding pages have shown that in the overwhelming majority of cases in the *Histories*, tmesis has a discernable narrative function.

Herodotus uses type 1 to lend a sense of suddenness or immediacy to an action, as well as to mark out aspects of his narrative that his audience would have found unexpected, amazing, or unbelievable. Type 2 is a listing technique for destruction. In most cases the list coincides with an important moment in the narrative, such as acts of hybris or revenge. In the context of war-dead lists, it seems to be one of a number of ways in which Herodotus gives his lists an epic colouring. Type 3A is used in

speech for words of accusation. It contributes to the overall hostile tone of an address.

In the case of type 3B, tmesis has no obvious narrative function. The frequency of type 3B and the regularity of the structural conditions in which it is found strongly suggest that it is an inherited linguistic structure. We can only speculate on the wider context of the mannerism: perhaps it was an Ionism; perhaps it was a feature of spoken Greek; perhaps it was used by the logographers.

There must of course be a 'wider context' for all the types of tmesis seen in Herodotus. Our knowledge of where and how the different types were used will always be imperfect. What does seem clear is this: Herodotus uses tmesis in some contexts deliberately, for a particular effect; but in other contexts only incidentally, as a kind of linguistic 'consort' to another narrative device. The same is no doubt true of various linguistic structures in *all* authors, and is a useful point to bear in mind when analysing any text.

The purpose of this study has been to improve our understanding of the contexts in which Herodotus uses tmesis in his narrative and his reasons for doing so. In the process, it has become abundantly clear that while tmesis, more often than not, is used for 'emphasis', the kind of emphasis can vary greatly. Further attempts to classify different types of tmesis and to investigate the functions of these types could prove useful for the study of other authors. Such studies might also help to refine some of the conclusions reached here.

Bibliography

Adams, J. N. (1999): 'Nominative Personal Pronouns and Some Patterns of Speech in Republican and Augustan Poetry', in Adams and Mayer (1999), 97–133.

Adams, J. N., and R. G. Mayer (1999): *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*. Oxford.

Aly, W. (1969): *Volksmärchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen²*. Göttingen.

Avery, H. C. (1979): 'A Poetic Word in Herodotus', *Hermes* 107, 1–9.

Bakker, E. J., I. J. F. de Jong, and H. van Wees (eds.) (2002): *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*. Leiden.

Bechtel, F. (1963): *Griechische Dialekte²*. Berlin.

Beye, Ch. R. (1964): 'Homeric Battle Narrative and Catalogues', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 68, 345–73.

Boardman, J., N. G. L. Hammond, D. M. Lewis, and M. Ostwald (eds.) (1988): *The Cambridge Ancient History²*. Cambridge.

Boedeker, D. (2002): 'Epic Heritage and Mythical Patterns in Herodotus', in Bakker, de Jong, and van Wees (eds.) (2002), 97–116.

Buijs, M. (2005): *Clause Combining in Ancient Greek Narrative Discourse*. Leiden.

Burkert, W. (1985): *Greek Religion*, translated from the German by J. Raffan. Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Denniston, J. D. (1954): *The Greek Particles²*. Oxford.

Dover, K. (1993): *Aristophanes. Frogs*. Oxford.

Duhoux, Y. (1998) : 'Autour de la tmèse grecque. Situation dialectale à l'époque mycénienne; datation de l'épopée', in Isebaert and Lebrun (1998), 71–80.

Ebeling, H. (1963): *Lexicon Homericum*. Hildesheim.

Edwards, M. (1991): *The Iliad. A Commentary, vol. v. Books 17–20*. Cambridge.

Fehling, D. (1969): *Die Wiederholungsfiguren und ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen vor Gorgias*. Berlin.

Flower, M. A., and J. Marincola (2002): *Herodotus. Histories Book IX*, Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge.

Garland, R. (1985): *The Greek Way of Death*. London.

Gould, John (1989): *Herodotus*. London.

Grajetzki, W. (2003): *Burial Customs in Ancient Egypt: Life in Death for Rich and Poor*. London.

Gray, V. (2003): 'Interventions and Citations in Xenophon, *Hellenica and Anabasis*', *Classical Quarterly* 53, 111–23.

Haldane, Ch. W., and C. W. Shelmerdine (1990): 'Herodotus 2.96.1-2 Again', *Classical Quarterly* 40, 535–9.

Headlam, W. (1922): *Herodas. The Mimes and Fragments*. Cambridge.

Hermary, A., and M. Leguilloux, in collaboration with V. Chankowski and A. Petropoulou (2005): 'Sacrifices. Les sacrifices dans le monde grec', *Thesaurus Cultus et Rituum*, vol. 1, 59–134. Los Angeles.

Hopkinson, N. (1984): *Callimachus. Hymn to Demeter*. Cambridge.

Hornblower, S. (2002): 'Herodotus and his Sources of Information', in Bakker, de Jong, and van Wees (eds.) (2002), 373–86.

Horrocks, G. C. (1981): *Space and Time in Homer. Prepositional and Adverbial Particles in the Greek Epic*. New York.

How, W. W., and J. Wells (1912, 1928): *A Commentary on Herodotus*[2]. Oxford.

Isebaert, L., and R. Lebrun (1998): *Quaestiones Homericae*. (Louvain & Namur).

Kühner, R., and B. Gerth (1898–1904): *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. Hannover.

Lateiner, D. (1989): *The Historical Method of Herodotus*. Toronto.

Lloyd, A. B. (1976): *Herodotus. Book II*, 3 volumes. Leiden.

–   (1979): 'Herodotus 2.96.1–2', *Classical Quarterly* 29, 45–8.

Lloyd-Jones, H. (1975): *Females of the Species. Semonides on Women*. London.

Liddell, H. G., and R. Scott, revised by Sir H. Stuart Jones (1940): *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford.

Morpurgo Davies, A. and Y. Duhoux (eds.) (1985): *Linear B: a 1984 survey*. Louvain-la-Neuve.

Morpurgo Davies, A. (1985): 'Mycenaean and Greek Language', in Morpurgo Davies and Y. Duhoux (1985), 75–125.

Morrison and Williams (1968): *Greek Oared Ships*. London.

Murray, O. (1988): 'The Ionian Revolt', in Boardman *et al.* (1988), vol. 4, 461–90.

Pauly, A. F. von, H. Cancik, and H. Schneider (1996–2003): *Der Neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*. Stuttgart.

Pelling, Ch. (2002): 'Speech and Action: Herodotus' Debate on the Constitutions', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 48, 123–58.

Sokolowski, F. (1969): *Lois Sacrées des Cités Greques*. Paris.

Stein, H. (1877-89): *Herodotus*. Berlin.

Schwyzer, E. (1950): *Griechische Grammatik*[2]. Munich.

Talbert, R. J.A. (ed.) (2000): *Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World*. Princeton.

Thomas, R. (2000): *Herodotus in Context*. Cambridge.

van Ophuijsen, J., and P. Stork (1999): *Linguistics into Interpretation. Speeches of War in Herodotus VII 5 & 8–18*. Leiden, Boston, Cologne.

Wackernagel, J. (1928): *Vorlesungen über Syntax*[2]. Basel.

Willi, A. (2003): *The Languages of Aristophanes*. Oxford.