M. N. Kazanskaya
Institute for Linguistic Studies, RAS / St. Petersburg State University,
St. Petersburg, Russia. subura@mail.ru

TMESIS OF ADVERBS IN EARLY EPIC POETRY

The article studies a group of prefixed adverbs that appear in tmesis in archaic epic poetry: διαμπερές "right through, piercing through", διάνδιχα "in two, in half, in twain", and ἐξονομακλήδην "by name, calling by name". While adverbial tmesis is mentioned in grammars of ancient Greek and in works on tmesis in early poetry, the examples have not been treated in detail. In this article the tmetic usages of adverbs in Homer and Hesiod are studied one by one, and compared to non-tmetic usages of the same adverb. It is shown that adverbial tmesis is limited to a single syntactic construction with the adverb occupying the initial position in the phrase in a complex paratactic sentence, its preverb separated by the particle δέ, and that the motive for the tmesis of the adverb is primarily stylistic (emphasis, σχῆμα ἀπὸ κοινοῦ).

Keywords: tmesis, adverbial tmesis, διαμπερές, διάνδιχα, διάτριχα, ἐξονομακλήδην, emphasis, Homeric Greek, epic poetry.

М. Н. Казанская
Институт лингвистических исследований РАН
Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет. subura@mail.ru

Тмесис наречий в ранней эпической поэзии

В статье исследуется группа приставочных наречий, которые используются в тмесисе (с отделением приставки) в архаической эпической поэзии: διαμπερές 'насквозь', διάνδιχα 'надвое', ἐξονομακλήδην 'по имени'. Хотя тмесис наречий упоминается в грамматиках древнегреческого языка и в работах, посвященных тмесису в ранней поэзии, эти примеры ранее подробно не исследовались. В статье разбираются пассажи из Гомера и Гесиода, в которых наречие стоит в тмесисе, в сравнении со слитным (бестмесисным) их употреблением. Показывается, что использование наречного тмесиса ограничено единственной синтаксической конструкцией (с вынесением наречия в начало простого предложения в составе сложносочиненного, с частицей δέ), и что оно мотивировано стилистически (эмфаза, конструкция ἀπὸ κοινοῦ).

Ключевые слова: тмесис, тмесис наречий, διαμπερές, διάνδιχα, διάτριχα, ἐξονομακλήδην, эмфаза, гомеровский греческий, эпическая поэзия.

Works on tmesis in Archaic poetry, apart from the habitual tmesis of the prefixed verb (separation of the prefix from its verb) associated with Homeric style, mention, as a curiosity, several examples of tmesis of adverbs. This separation of the preverb seems to be attested in the case of only three adverbs, διαμπερές "right through, piercing through", διάνδιχα "in two, in half, in twain", and ἐξονομακλήδην "by name, calling by name"[1]. In modern studies, the phenomenon is mentioned briefly, but never examined in detail nor explained: Jacob Wackernagel in his *Lectures on Syntax* and Raphael Kühner in his *Ausführliche Grammatik* comments briefly on the artificiality of such division of the adverb[2]; E. Schwyzer explains it as imitation of tmesis of verbs (in the case of διαμπερές)[3]. However, these examples deserve attention as we find nothing strictly comparable in later ages[4], and they do seem to shed an interesting light on the development and perception of tmesis in early epic poetry. This article analyses the occurrences of διαμπερές, διάνδιχα and ἐξονομακλήδην in tmesis, and compares them with non-tmetic usage. The aim is to establish the reasons behind the development of the tmesis of adverbs, and to assess whether this usage is primarily prompted by linguistic (syntactic) or stylistic reasons.

[1] Wackernagel (1928: II, 171) and Schwyzer, Debrunner (1988: 426) mention only διαμπερές which occurs three times; Kühner, Gerth (1898: II.1, 530 § 445), followed by Hainsworth (1993: 268, *ad Il*. 11, 377) and Priestley (2009: 119 n. 7), mention both διαμπερές and ἐξονομακλήδην. The adverb διάνδιχα is omitted in these lists (Schwyzer 1953: 598 n. 5, speaking of διὰ δ' ἄνδιχα, avoids the word "tmesis").

[2] Wackernagel (2009: 613 = 1928: II, 171): "Homeric διὰ δ' ἀμπερές, which occurs only three times (*Il*. 11, 377; 17, 309; *Od*. 21, 422), can hardly be anything but an artificial splitting of διαμπερές ('right through, throughout')".

[3] Schwyzer, Debrunner (1988: 449 n. 5): „[Tmesis διὰ δ' ἀμπερές] der verbalen nachgeahmt ist".

[4] Later formations such as ἐγγεταυθί (Aristoph. *Thesm*. 646) and ἐνμεντευθενί (Metagenes fr. 6, 5 PCG) are very different; see Wackernagel (2009: 613–614 = 1928: II, 172) and Willi (2003: 250). Obviously, we do not take into account tmetic usages of epic adverbs in later literature, as they are imitations of Homeric style (e. g., Theocr. *Id*. 25, 256 discussed below).

διαμπερές

The best attested tmesis of adverb concerns διαμπερές which is fairly frequent in the epic language [5], occurring, among other contexts, in the verse-end formula διαμπερὲς ἤματα πάντα # (*Od.* 4, 209; *hHymn. Apoll.* 485; *hHymn.Aphr.* 209; cf. its mid-verse variant ἤματα πάντα διαμπερές — *Il.* 16, 499; *hHymn.Aphr.* 248). The adverb διαμπερές belongs to later epic formations[6], and invariably appears with an apocope of the second preverb ἀνα- which is dictated by metrical reasons (the non-syncopated form *διαναπερές is impossible to use in a hexameter due to the sequence of four short vowels in open syllables[7]). Its inner form was transparent, and epic poets clearly connected the root to the family of πέρα, πεῖραρ, etc., as may be seen in the following passage from the *Odyssey* describing Odysseus' shelter for the night, as he reaches the land of Phaeacians

> τοὺς μὲν ἄρ' οὔτ' ἀνέμων διάη μένος ὑγρὸν ἀέντων,
> οὔτε ποτ' ἠέλιος φαέθων ἀκτῖσιν ἔβαλλεν,
> οὔτ' ὄμβρος περάασκε διαμπερές,
> "no force of winds, blowing damply, could blow through them, nor the shining sun touch them with its rays, nor the rain drench them through and through" (Od. 5, 478–480)[8].

From the point of view of semantics, the usage of διαμπερές is fluid, ranging from the sense "throughout, i. e., right through, right to the end" to "throughout, i. e., continuously, without pause" and "forever, without end"[9]. While in the absolute majority of cases,

---

[5] *Il.* — 20x, *Od.* — 16x; Hes. *Theog.* — 1x, *Op.* — 1x; *hHom.Herm.* — 2x; *hHom.Aphr.* — 3x; *hHom. Apoll.* — 1x; *hHom.Dem.* — 1x.
[6] Thus, Schmitt (1967: 232, § 477). Cf. Schwyzer, Debrunner (1988: 449) note that διαμπερές (together with διαμπάξ, διαμφαδές) is of verbal origin, comparing it to ἀμπείραντες in *Il.* 2, 426; consequently, its tmesis may be analyzed as an extension or imitation of tmesis of the corresponding verb (cf. above).
[7] It should be noted that the non-syncopated form *διαναπερές is not attested in Greek at all. Likewise, its close synonym with the same preverb διαμπάξ "right through, though and through", appears only in the syncopated form (never *διαναπάξ). Cf. Schwyzer, Debrunner (1988: 449).
[8] These lines are repeated, to describe a boar's lair, with the only modification of τοὺς to τήν later in the *Odyssey* (19, 440–442).
[9] *LSJ* (1996: 404, s.v. διαμπερές): "I. of place, through and though, right through"; "2. abs. without break, continuously; "II. of time, throughtout, forever". R. Schmitt notes that, from the point of view of semantics and

διαμπερές appears in a non-tmetic form, in three cases the first preverb is separated from the adverb by the particle δέ. Significantly, all three passages describe the trajectory of an arrow or a spear, twice in the context of fatal wounding (i. e., the shaft pierces a limb straight through) once, in the context of Odysseus' masterful shot through the row of axes[10]. Thus, Hector, aiming at Aiax, kills Schedios in his stead, his spear going through Schedios' collarbone, and the tip coming out at his shoulder:

> τὸν βάλ' ὑπὸ κληῖδα μέσην· διὰ δ' ἀμπερὲς ἄκρη
> αἰχμὴ χαλκείη παρὰ νείατον ὦμον ἀνέσχε·
> δούπησεν δὲ πεσών, ἀράβησε δὲ τεύχε' ἐπ' αὐτῷ,
> "[Hector] hit him under the collar bone in its midpart: straight through, the tip of the bronze spear went up to the outer part of his shoulder: and he fell with a thud, and his armour clanged on him" (Il. 17, 309–311).

And similarly, Paris wounds Diomedes, his shaft piercing Diomedes' foot and sticking into the ground:

> καὶ βάλεν, οὐδ' ἄρα μιν ἅλιον βέλος ἔκφυγε χειρός,
> ταρσὸν δεξιτεροῖο ποδός· διὰ δ' ἀμπερὲς ἰὸς
> ἐν γαίῃ κατέπηκτο…,
> "and he shot, and the arrow did not escape from his hand in vain, hitting [Diomedes'] right foot: and the arrow, [piercing] right though, stuck in the ground" (Il. 11, 377–378).

It is worth noting that in other comparable contexts involving a wound, διαμπερές is non-tmetic. The effect is very evident, as may be seen from comparison of *Il.* 17, 309–311 with the killing of Tleptolemos, which is very similar in regard to the wound and its description:

> […] ὃ μὲν βάλεν αὐχένα μέσσον
> Σαρπηδών, αἰχμὴ δὲ διαμπερὲς ἦλθ' ἀλεγεινή·
> τὸν δὲ κατ' ὀφθαλμῶν ἐρεβεννὴ νὺξ ἐκάλυψε,

---

word-formation, the verbal root of the adverb must have been originally use in the active sense and was later reinterpreted in the passive sense: "Man hat ein ursprünglich intendiertes und in Homer, *E* 112 gerade noch greifbares 'er zog das scharfe Geschoß, das sich durch und durch hineinbohrende, heraus' als 'er zog das scharfe Geschoß ganz und gar wieder heraus' mißdeutet" (Schmitt 1967: 232, § 476).

[10] It is probable that διαμπερές was originally used in the context of warfare, of shafts and spears (cf. Schmitt 1967: 232, § 476, citing W. Luther).

"Sarpedon hit him square on the throat, and the lethal spear went right through: and the dark night covered his eyes" (Il. 5, 657–659).

The poet feels no need to emphasize additionally διαμπερές by tmetic usage (although there would have been no metrical difference, had he used διὰ δ' ἀμπερές instead of δὲ διαμπερές in this line, as both scan ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡): practically any wound to the neck, especially by a flying spear, would involve the neck being pierced (cf. Il. 13, 547). A minor point to note is that, in the case of the two tmetic uses (at Il. 17, 309–311 and 11, 377–378), διὰ δ' ἀμπερές is placed closer to the end of the line (the word-ending coincides with the end of the fifth foot), while, as was noticed by R. Schmitt, the non-tmetic διαμπερές is standardly used before the bucolic diaeresis (i. e., ending at the end of the fourth foot)[11]. The stylistic effect is that in the case of διὰ δ' ἀμπερές the phrase necessarily runs over into the next hexameter, mirroring the sense of "going right through".

And finally, the same tmesis occurs in the trial of the bow as Odysseus, still disguised as a beggar, strings the bow and shoots the arrow straight through the axes:

[…] πελέκεων δ' οὐκ ἤμβροτε πάντων
πρώτης στειλειῆς, διὰ δ' ἀμπερὲς ἦλθε θύραζε
ἰὸς χαλκοβαρής,
"and he did not miss the edge of the hole in a single axe, starting from the first, but the bronze-laden shaft went right through and out" (Od. 21, 421–423).

This is a less typical usage of διὰ δ' ἀμπερές, simply because shooting an arrow accurately through a row of axes[12] is a rare and extraordinary feat. It is clear that it must have been extremely hard, although not absolutely infeasible[13]. The poet emphasizes the fact

---

[11] Schmitt (1967: 231, § 476): "immer vor bukolischer Dihairesis", and later (1967: 232, n. 1363a): "Das Wort διαμπερές füllt den Versteil zwischen der τομή κατὰ τρίτον τροχαῖον und der bukolischen Dihairesis. Das kann auf Herkunft aus einer älteren Stufe hexametrischer Dichtung deuten".

[12] The exact details of how the contest was set have been much discussed: see M. Fernández-Galiano in the introduction to the commentary on Odyssey 21 for a thorough discussion of the theories that have been proposed (Russo, Fernández-Galiano, Heubeck 1992: 140–147, with further bibliography). I follow Fernández-Galiano's interpretation of the ἄεθλον, and his discussion of πρώτης στειλειῆς has influenced my translation of the passage above (Od. 21, 421–423).

[13] Cf. Russo, Fernández-Galiano, Heubeck (1992: 141).

that the arrow went straight through twelve axes, hence the unusual
(and slightly pleonastic) expression πελέκεων δ’ οὐκ ἤμβροτε
πάντων πρώτης στειλειῆς. He also seems to highlight insistingly the
importance of διά for the whole scene, introducing it in several other
verbal tmeses in connection to the contest: as Telemachus is
preparing the equipment, he digs up a trench so as to have a place to
set the row of axes, and then aligning and fixing them in the dug-up
earth (πελέκεας στῆσεν, διὰ τάφρον ὀρύξας πᾶσι μιὰν μακρήν “he
set the axes, digging up a ditch, one long ditch for them all”, *Od*. 21,
120–121); and later, Eurymachus expresses his apprehensions about
letting Odysseus, still in disguise, touch the bow, fearing that people
will say that a beggar has managed to shoot through the targets
(ἀλλ’ ἄλλός τις πτωχὸς ἀνὴρ… ῥηϊδίως ἐτάνυσσε βιόν, διὰ δ’ ἧκε
σιδήρου, “but some other beggar… easily strung the bow, and shot
straight through the ironware”, *Od*. 21, 327–328). The adverbial
tmesis διὰ δ’ ἀμπερές, as it occurs in the description of Odysseus’
actual shot in v. 422, is thus prepared well in advance. With regard
to the tmesis of the adverb, M. Fernández-Galiano notes that it may
have been prompted by διαμπερές being a cognate of πείρω[14]. I
would argue, however, that the tmesis places the spotlight on the
preverb διά which would otherwise have been much less emphatic
in a non-tmetic διαμπερές, where it is only one of two preverbs. Cf.
also examples below, where the preverb appears to be semantically
connected not only to the adverb, but also to the verb: here διά could
go well with the verb ἦλθε, so it is worth considering the possibility
that it is used ἀπὸ κοινοῦ.

διάνδιχα

The adverb διάνδιχα “in two, in twain” is constructed with two
adverbs, δια- and apocopated ἀνα- (most of them in the formula
διάνδιχα μερμήριξεν)[15]. This adverb occurs quite regularly in

---

[14] “The unusual tmesis of an adverb may here be explained by its
derivation from the verb πείρω, ‘pierce’, but this explanation will not do
for the other two occurrences” (Russo, Fernández-Galiano, Heubeck 1992:
203, on *Od*. 21, 422). I am not sure I understand the reasons behind the
second part of this statement.

[15] Schwyzer, Debrunner (1988: 448–449) remark on the fact that δια- did
not originally have an adverbial usage, and that its form and usage shows
that it was primarily a preverb: cf. “Die Grundbedeutung ‚entzwei, aus-
einander, zer-‘ ist im Lateinischen und Gotischen fast rein erhalten, im
Griechischen nur im präverbialen Gebrauch“. However, when speaking of
διάνδιχα they interpret its appearance before adverbs as adverbial: “Als

Homeric poems, but never in a tmesis. There is, however, one instance of tmetic usage[16] in the beginning of Hesiod's *Work and Days*, as the poet speaks of the two kinds of Eris:

> Οὐκ ἄρα μοῦνον ἔην Ἐρίδων γένος, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπὶ γαῖαν
> εἰσὶ δύω· τὴν μέν κεν ἐπαινήσειε νοήσας,
> ἣ δ᾽ ἐπιμωμητή· διὰ δ᾽ ἄνδιχα θυμὸν ἔχουσιν,
> "There was not only one kind of Eris, but there are two of them on
> this earth: the first <Eris>, if one gave it thought, one would praise,
> the other deserves blame: their disposition is absolutely opposite
> (lit. their spirit is divided in two)" (Hes. *Op*. 11–13).

Hesiod seems to be reworking here the expression διάνδιχα μερμήριξεν that was used in earlier epic poetry to describe the state of a person who (often under the influence of another person's words) is torn between two opposite courses of action (or impulses)[17]. Thus, as Deiphobus deliberates advancing alone or calling a fellow Trojan to his aid:

> ὣς φάτο, Δηΐφοβος δὲ διάνδιχα μερμήριξεν
> ἤ τινά που Τρώων ἑταρίσσαιτο μεγαθύμων
> ἂψ ἀναχωρήσας, ἦ πειρήσαιτο καὶ οἶος,
> "thus he spoke, and Deiphobus pondered two courses of action,
> whether he, turning back, should take one of the great hearted
> Trojans as companion, or should he try [to confront Idomeneus] on
> his own" (*Il*. 13, 455–457).

It was already noticed by Aristarchus that after διάνδιχα μερμήριξεν sometimes only one possible course of action is described, while the other (as its direct opposite) is implied: thus, in *Il*. 8, 167–168 the presence of διάνδιχα prompted the introduction of a line listing the alternatives (168a), and Aristarchus argued that it should be excluded as an interpolation[18]. Most interestingly, he also

---

[16] Adverb (was nach obigem nicht ursprünglich ist) vor Adverbia: hom. διάνδιχα 'zweigeteilt' = hom. ἄνδιχα" (Schwyzer, Debrunner 1988: 449, 2.b.6).

[16] West (1978: 143, *ad* Hes. *Op*. 13) is loathe to call this construction a tmesis, putting the term in hyphens.

[17] On expression to describe the moment of deciding between two courses of action, see Arend (1933: 108–113); more specifically on the verb μερμηρίζειν, see Bravi (2014).

[18] […] Τυδεΐδης δὲ διάνδιχα μερμήριξεν / ἵππους τε στρέψαι καὶ ἐναντίβιον μαχέσασθαι "Son of Tydeus pondered two <opposite> courses of action, whether he should turn around his steeds and fight against them (*scil*. or

used this argument in commenting the scene in *Iliad* 1, as Achilles is debating how to respond to Agamemnon's offense (*Il*. 1, 189–192): Aristarchus argued that the use of the formula διάνδιχα μερμήριξεν in v. 189 did not require that keeping peace (the alternative to attacking Agamemnon) be spelled out, and that in fact in v. 192 should be athetized as it weakens the depiction of Achilles' wrath[19]. The way that διάνδιχα μερμήριξεν corresponds to the choice the character is faced with suggests that διάνδιχα, over time, developed a stronger usage than the original "in two", as reflected in the tendency to appear in the case of two radically opposed choices.

When speaking of the dispositions of the two Eris, Hesiod took as his starting point δίχα θυμὸν ἔχοντες "divided in two in their spirit" (*Il*. 20, 32) of the gods, part of whom were fighting on the side of the Trojans, and part on the side of the Achaeans. However, he chose to reinforce it by replacing δίχα with the stronger διάνδιχα[20]: the adverb manifestly preserves the sense of "absolutely separated, having nothing in common" that it had in the expression διάνδιχα μερμήριξεν, but is now applied to the disposition of two distinct deities (the good Eris and the bad Eris). Once again, the separation διὰ δ' ἄνδιχα is not necessary from the metrical point of view, as it is equivalent to δὲ διάνδιχα in *Il*. 13, 455 (see above), and a rearrangement of word order (to accommodate the placement of δέ) would have sufficed. Instead, Hesiod places διὰ δ' ἄνδιχα at the beginning of the syntactic unit right after the colon, with the particle dividing the adverb in two and thus additionally highlighting semantics of "cardinally opposite" that διάνδιχα already had in Homer. This usage was neatly replicated by Theocritus in *Idyll* 25, as Heracles tells of the killing of the Nemean lion, how he first knocked the beast unconscious with his club which broke in two from the blow, and then throttled him to death:

> τῇ δ' ἑτέρῃ ῥόπαλον κόρσης ὕπερ αὖον ἀείρας
> ἤλασα κὰκ κεφαλῆς, διὰ δ' ἄνδιχα τρηχὺν ἔαξα
> αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ λασίοιο καρήατος ἀγριέλαιον

---

not)" (*Il*. 8, 167–168). See Kirk (1990: 310–311, *ad Il*. 8, 167–168) on the fallacy of this reasoning.

[19] This can be deduced from the short scholium to v. 192: ὅτι ἐκλύεται τὰ τῆς ὀργῆς· διὸ ἀθετεῖται "as the depiction of the wrath is weakened: for this reason, it is athetized" (schol. A *in Il*. 1, 192, Aristonicus; cf. schol. bT *in Il*. 1, 189–193 where the line is qualified as περισσός "superfluous"); see Schironi (2018: 715).

[20] See Schwyzer (1953: 598, V.d.β) on this derivation.

θηρὸς ἀμαιμακέτοιο,
"and raising with my other hand my seasoned club over my head, I brought it down on his head; and clean in two pieces I broke the tough olive on the shaggy head of that invincible beast" (Theocr. Id. 25, 255–258).

It is also important to mention the adverb διάτριχα that is cited as a parallel to διάνδιχα, and which also once appears in tmesis[21]. There are two apparent attestations of διάτριχα in Homer, both times accompanying the passive aorist participle of the verb κοσμέω:

οἳ Ῥόδον ἀμφενέμοντο διὰ τρίχα κοσμηθέντες
Λίνδον Ἰηλυσόν τε καὶ ἀργινόεντα Κάμειρον,
"[…] they, who inhabited Rhodos, arranged in three parts, Lindos, Ialousos and the shining Kameiros" (Il. 2, 655–656).

αὐτίκα καμπύλα τόξα καὶ αἰγανέας δολιχαύλους
εἱλόμεθ᾽ ἐκ νηῶν, διὰ δὲ τρίχα κοσμηθέντες
βάλλομεν…
"and at once we took the curved bows and hunting spears from the ships, and arranged in groups of three, we start shooting…" (Od. 9, 156–158).

In both cases διὰ τρίχα appears as two words (although the reading διάτριχα is attested as a variant for *Il*. 2, 655–656, and in the scholia vetera)[22], which raises the question of whether διά pertains to τρίχα or to κοσμηθέντες (as tmesis of διακοσμέω[23]). The adverb διάτριχα (as a single word) does appear, however, in the *Homeric hymn to Demeter*, in the description of the division of the Universe between Zeus, Poseidon and Hades: ἀμφὶ δὲ τιμὴν / ἔλλαχεν ὡς τὰ πρῶτα διάτριχα δασμὸς ἐτύχθη (*hHom. Dem.* 85–86). I would tentatively argue that the expression διακοσμηθέντες τρίχα (with the

---

[21] See West (1976: 143, *ad* Hes. *Op*. 13) who cites διὰ δὲ τρίχα (*Od*. 9, 157) as a parallel to διὰ δ᾽ ἄνδιχα.

[22] See the apparatus criticus *ad loc*. in West's edition (West 2006: 76); the D scholia read διάτριχα κοσμηθέντες: τριχῶς διαταχθέντες "triply-arranged" (van Thiel 2014: 134).

[23] Thus, Schwyzer, Debrunner (1988: 449): „Aber B 655 ι 157 wird besser διά mit κοσμηθέντες verbunden". Schwyzer's attempt of explaining διὰ δ᾽ ἄνδιχα as a tmesis of διέχω (Schwyzer 1953: 598 n.4: „δι(ά) gehörte ursprünglich zum Verb (so διὰ δ᾽ ἄνδιχα θυμὸν ἔχουσιν Hes. E. 13)") is much less plausible, as the verb διέχω in early epic poetry is used exclusively of shafts piercing an object: see B. Mader, s.v. ἔχω II.5 in *LfgrE* 1955–2010: II, col. 848: „hindurchdringen, -fahren (so daß es herausragt)".

verb in tmesis) might have been reinterpreted in later epic poetry of the archaic period as διάτριχα to match διάνδιχα, and this interpretation was accepted by some of ancient scholars for *Il*. 2, 655 (hence the *varia lectio*); it probably also influenced Apollonius of Rhodes imitating *Il*. 2, 655 in his *Argonautica*:

> οὐ γὰρ ὁμηγερέες μίαν ἄμ πόλιν, ἀλλ᾽ ἀνὰ γαῖαν
> κεκριμέναι κατὰ φῦλα διάτριχα ναιετάασκον…
> "for they (scil. the Amazons) did not gather in one city, but lived scattered across the earth in tribes, divided into three parts" (Apoll. Rhod. 2, 996–997).

ἐξονομακλήδην

The adverb ἐξονομακλήδην "by name"[24] appears in three passages in Homer, as a person calls out to one or multiple addressees (in two cases, in scenes of utter desperation); P. Chantraine astutely notices that in none of these passages is the name actually given[25]. Thus, as Charybdis snatches Odysseus' companions, they cry for help: […] ἐμὲ δὲ φθέγγοντο καλεῦντες / ἐξονομακλήδην, "and they cried for me, calling me by name…" (*Od*. 12, 249–250; the adverb, which is placed in enjambement, is printed as a single word both by P. von der Mühll and M. L. West). It is less evident, how the adverb should be printed in the following passage from the *Iliad*:

> πάντας δ᾽ ἐλλιτάνευε κυλινδόμενος κατὰ κόπρον,
> ἐξ ὀνομακλήδην ὀνομάζων ἄνδρα ἕκαστον,
> "and [Priam] pleaded with them all, rolling in the filth, naming every man by name" (*Il*. 22, 414–415).

---

[24] The parts of this composite adverb are easily recognizable, but the exact formation is not evident: P. Chantraine reconstructs the syntagm at its basis as ὄνομα καλεῖν, with preverb ἐξ- highlighting the thoroughness of the address (*DELG*: 803, s.v. ὄνομα: « ἐξ- 'complètement' comme dans ἐξονομάζω, p.-ê. 'en appellant de tous ses noms (nom du père, etc.) »; H. Fränkel (1925: 2–3) reconstructed ἐξ as part of the initial syntagm, ἐξ ὀνόματος καλεῖν. While Chantraine's reconstruction appears much more plausible, I would like to point out that the use of ἐξονομακλήδην in *Od*. 12, 250 and *Il*. 22, 415, in a context of intense distress, speak against the idea of full (formal) address, with patronymic: it seems better to understand ἐξ- as indicator of the tone of voice ("crying out", cf. the use of ἐξονομῆναι in the sense "to say or mention out loud", in *Od*. 6, 66; *hHom.Aphr*. 252).

[25] *DELG*: 803, s.v. ὄνομα: «on observe que dans tous les exemples jamais les noms ne sont donnés ensuite».

Th. W. Allen and M. L. West separate ἐξ ὀνομακλήδην, printing it as two words, and the manuscript tradition in this point is divided (with some ms. giving ἐξ ὀνομακλήδην, while other ms. and the scholia read ἐξονομακλήδην) [26]. If the form is indeed ἐξ ὀνομακλήδην, there is reason to wonder whether ἐξ belongs with the adverb or with the participle ὀνομάζων, i. e., if we are in fact dealing with a tmesis of ἐξονομάζω.

And finally, as in *Odyssey* 4 Menelas reminisces in Helen's presence how she came out to the Trojan horse and called the hiding Greeks, naming each of them separately by his name, the adverb certainly appears as two words, with δέ separating ἐξ from the adverb:

> τρὶς δὲ περίστειξας κοῖλον λόχον ἀμφαφόωσα,
> ἐκ δ' ὀνομακλήδην Δαναῶν ὀνόμαζες ἀρίστους…
> "and thrice did you go around the hollow ambush, feeling it <by hand>, and you were naming the best of the Greeks, calling them out by name…"·(*Od*. 4, 278–279)

This passage is different in that Helen's calling the Greeks was not a sign of desperation, but a ruse. Once again in this construction (which is metrically identical to ἐξ ὀνομακλήδην in *Il*. 22, 415) it is difficult to establish, whether ἐκ pertains to ὀνομακλήδην or to ὀνόμαζες, and I would argue that this deliberate on the part of the poet: placed at the beginning of the line (in a sort of "hyperbaton") ἐκ belongs ἀπὸ κοινοῦ with both, binding the members of this *figura etymologica* even closer together[27].

Conclusions

The study of the contexts in which prefixed adverbs appear in tmesis in early epic poetry allow us to formulate certain principles regarding this peculiar phenomenon. While none of these examples are strictly necessary from the metrical point of view, it is important to note that they are limited to a single syntactic construction: the

---

[26] See the apparatus criticus in West's edition (1998–2000: 287). For the reading of the scholia, see Erbse 1969–1977: V, 344, *ad loc*.); for the D scholia, see van Thiel (2014: 577).

[27] Other *figurae etymologicae* on the same root include, e. g., γενεὴν ὀνομάκλυτον ἐξονομάζων (*hHom.Herm*. 59), Εὔβοιαν δὲ βοός μιν ἐπώνυμον ὠνόμασε Ζεύς (Hes. fr. 296, 3 Merkelbach, West). Unfortunately, there are not many thorough syntactical and stylistic studies of the ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction in Greek (see recently Massimilla 2016: esp. 173–174, with references to earlier scholarship).

adverb in tmesis is placed at the beginning of a phrase in a complex sentence, in mild opposition to the previous phrase, and the prefix divided from the main part of the adverb by the particle δέ. Within this construction δέ occupies the expected second position in the syntactic unit, whereas the preverb is highlighted by its initial position in the unit, as well as by the separation. All other details are specific to each adverb in particular. The best attested tmesis of adverb is διὰ δ' ἀμπερές (*Il*. 11, 378; 17, 309; *Od*. 21, 422): its connection to the verb πείρω could explain the extension of the verbal tmesis to the adverb. In a number of examples, the tmesis seems to be stylistically motivated, as the preverb may belong semantically not only with the adverb, but also with the verb, i. e., it is used ἀπὸ κοινοῦ: this is evident in ἐκ δ' ὀνομακλήδην… ὀνόμαζες (*Od*. 4, 279; cf. *Il*. 22, 415), but also in διὰ δ' ἀμπερὲς ἦλθε (*Od*. 21, 422), where it would be natural to think of the verb διέρχομαι, were it not for the fact that the non-prefixed *ἀμπερές is never used adverbially (only ἀμπερέως appears as a gloss in Hesychius, α 3781). I would suggest that such ἀπὸ κοινοῦ constructions, where the preverb separated by δέ could be taken both with the adverb and the verb that is placed behind it, played an important role in the development of this untypical class of tmesis in early epic. Finally, the tmesis of διάνδιχα into διὰ δ' ἄνδιχα in Hes. *Op*. 13 primarily seeks to emphasize the semantics of preverb διά (as highlighting the fact that the two Eris have nothing in common), and is analogical to διὰ δ' ἀμπερές. This tmesis probably influenced the reinterpretation of the verbal tmesis διὰ τρίχα κοσμηθέντες and the "invention" of the adverb διάτριχα (as analogical to διάνδιχα).

References

Arend, W. 1933: *Die typischen Scenen bei Homer*. Berlin: Weidmann.

Bravi, M. 2014: Note di psicologia e linguistica omerica I: μερμηρίζειν dall' *Iliade* all'*Odissea*. *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 106, 13–32.

DELG — Chantraine P. 1968–1977: *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque : histoire des mots*. Vol. I–IV. Paris: Klincksieck.

Denniston, J. D. 1954: *The Greek Particles*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Erbse, H. 1969–1977: *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem* / ed. H. Erbse. Vol. I–VII. Berolini: W. de Gruyter.

Fraenkel, H. 1925: Griechische Wörter. *Glotta* 14, 1–13.

Gow, A. S. F. 1952: *Theocritus, edited with a Translation and Commentary*. Vol. I–II. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hainsworth, B. 1993: *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. III: *Books 9–12*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kirk, G. S. 1990: *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. II: *Books 5–8*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kühner, R., Gerth, B. 1898: *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. Teil II: *Satzlehre*. Hannover, Leipzig: Hahnsche Buchhandlung.

LfgrE — *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* / begründet von Br. Snell. Bd. 1–IV. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955–2010.

LSJ — Liddell H. G. Scott, R. 1996: *A Greek-English Lexicon, revised and augmented by H. G. Jones, with the assistance of R. McKenzie and the cooperation of many scholars*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Massimilla, G. 2016: The ἀπὸ κοινοῦ of the Prepositions as a Feature of Epigrammatic Style. In: E. Sistakou, A. Rengakos (eds.) *Dialect, Diction, and Style in Greek Literary and Inscribed Epigram* (*Trends in Classics* 43). Berlin, Boston: de Gruyter, 173–191.

Priestley, J. 2009: Tmesis in Herodotus. *Glotta* 85, 118–178.

Russo, J., Fernández-Galiano, M., Heubeck, A. 1992: *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*. Vol. III: *Books XVII–XXIV*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Schironi, Fr. 2018: *The Best of the Grammarians: Aristarchus of Samothrace on the Iliad*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Schmitt, R. 1967: *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Schwyzer, E. 1953: *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik*. Bd. I: *Allgemeiner Teil, Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*. 2. Aufl. München: C.H. Beck.

Schwyzer, E., Debrunner, A. 1988: *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik*. Bd. II: *Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*. 5. Aufl. München: C.H. Beck.

van Thiel, H. 2014: *Scholia D in Iliadem: proekdosis aucta et correctior*. Köln.

Wackernagel, J. 1926–1928: *Vorlesungen über Syntax, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch*. Bd. I–II. Basel: Birkhäuser.

Wackernagel, J. 2009: *Lectures on Syntax, with Special Reference to Greek, Latin, and Germanic* / ed. with notes and bibliography by D. Langslow. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

West, M. L. 1978: *Hesiod: Works and Days, edited with Prolegomena and Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

West, M. L. 1998–2000: *Homeri Ilias*. Vol. I–II. Munich, Leipzig: K.G. Saur.

West, M. L. 2017: *Homerus Odyssea*. Berlin, Boston: de Gruyter.

Willi, A. 2003: *The Languages of Aristophanes: Aspects of Variation in Classical Greek*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.