

Spectacle of Enquiry:
The Violent and Macabre in Herodotus'
Histories

Liam Thomas Ahern (SID: 307164101)

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of
Arts, Honours in Ancient History and Classical Greek

2011

(TOTAL: 19,454 WORDS)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank the entire Honours cohort of Classics and Ancient History, who have all contributed to this thesis in so many different ways, either through their comments and suggestions, or simply through stimulating discussion in class. This thesis would be far from its current state if not for them. I also thank my family and my girlfriend, whose lively dinner table debates both roused my argumentative abilities and humbled my often reckless confidence. I thank those with whom I shared weekly drinks at Manning Bar and daily coffees at Toby's. But beyond all others I thank my supervisor Dr. Julia Kindt, whose advice, encouragement and admonitions moved this thesis from a string of convoluted ideas into a well structured argument. I am indebted to her for giving me confidence in my work and helping me realise a thesis of which I am now proud. Without our meetings, which always ran well over time, I cannot imagine having written even a small fraction of this thesis.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements ii
Abstract iv
Introduction 1
Chapter One: The Historiographical Gaze 7
Chapter Two: This Thing of Darkness 22
Conclusion 40
Bibliography 42

ABSTRACT

This thesis endeavours to explain the role of graphic violence in Herodotus' *Histories*. It attempts to look past explanatory models of othering that categorise acts of violence as manifestations of the *other* and deeds of transgression. Instead it presents an alternative model that considers Herodotus in the context of his intellectual and cultural milieu. In enquiring into the *role* of violence, it examines episodes in context and considers their meaning in regards to Herodotus' broader historiographical project. It also explores the intense dialogue that can be found between Herodotus' work and other arenas of violence, either past literary works, contemporaneous thinkers or cultural institutions. It argues that the style of Herodotean violence was influenced by his exposure to practices such as philosophical and medical dissection and forensic torture. It argues that the rhetorical language of violence as an integral part of investigation strongly influenced not only Herodotus' representation of violence and the body but also his narratological use of these scenes. It ultimately claims that both the style and rhetorical position of Herodotean violence is a manifestation of the historian's critical enquiry.

INTRODUCTION

Otanes' father Sisamnes had been put to death by Cambyses: he was one of the royal judges, and as a punishment for receiving a bribe and so diverting justice Cambyses had him flayed. His skin was peeled back and cut into strips, and these were stretched across the seat of a chair on which he sat in court. Cambyses then appointed his son to be judge in his place, and told him not to forget what his chair was made of.

(Hdt. 5.25)

This passage sees Sisamnes introduced to Herodotus' narrative only to disappear again in an explosion of extreme and graphic violence within the same sentence. That this brief digression on Otanes' genealogy makes up the entirety of Sisamnes' presence in the *Histories* does not seem to have diminished the potency of this character. Gerard David's 15th Century series of paintings, *The Judgement of Cambyses* and *The Flaying of Sisamnes*, attest to the lasting power of this gruesome image.¹ Thomas Preston's seminal Elizabethan play, *King Cambyses*, also continued to explore this character and the macabre horror of his downfall so vividly recounted by Herodotus.² Perhaps this scene has resonated so strongly due to its almost poetic moral lesson, as a corrupt judge is literally transformed into the seat of justice by an unforgettable show of punishment and retribution. Indeed, Herodotus' text goes deeper than this, for just as Sisamnes' skin is peeled back to reveal the corruption inside, so too does the audience get to see inside Otanes, his background, his relationship to Cambyses and justice. And just as Otanes' is given this chair, a token by which he may be reminded of the horror of bribery, neither will the audience forget Otanes' history, this scene of gore seared onto the narrative, a gruesome flare of rhetoric.

Such scenes of extreme and graphic violence litter Herodotus' narrative of the Persian wars, gruesome deaths punctuated by a miscellany of the macabre. The flaying of Sisamnes is just one in a menagerie of episodes, carried out in highly varied situations, perpetrated and received by just as diverse a range of characters. The Scythians feed a butchered child to

¹ Whilst David did not draw these images directly from Herodotus' description, having access only to later Latin accounts of this scene (see Miegroet (1988) who claims that it was far more likely that David drew upon, the medieval *Gesta Romanorum* and Valerius Maximus' *Facta et dicta memorabilia* (vi. 3) and cites various other media such as glasswork and medals similarly employing this image in this period), the dissemination of this story can nevertheless be traced directly back to Herodotus' original telling.

² Generally considered the 'first Elizabethan play', Preston focuses upon the irony of a cruel, savage and mad king carrying out fair and wise justice through the very same brutality by which he is labeled mad, for an introduction and notes on the text see Craik (1974, vii–xxii; 60–104).

Spectacle of Enquiry

Cyaxares, king of Media (1.73); Xerxes mutilates Masistes' wife, cutting off her breasts, nose, ears and lips (9.112); Pheretima impales the men of Barca and sets their bodies upon the city walls, before cutting off the breasts of their wives and displaying these too (4.202). Even so, this rising tide of blood never completely inundates the *Histories*, with these descriptions of cruel torture, savage executions and self-mutilation often forming nothing more than a sidenote as the story progresses, ensuring that the work is not one *about* violence, but instead a work that *contains* violence. Is this brutality simply literary flavour for the narrative? And if so, what are we to make of the purpose of this flavour? What are we to make of Herodotus' sustained interest in the gruesome and the macabre? And what of the *form* and *style* of this violence?

Surely its ubiquitous nature within the text hints at an answer to these questions, surely its continual presence announces itself as having a role, relevant, perhaps even pivotal, to Herodotus' historiographical method. But within these questions is a far more immediate question, a question that must be answered to give other answers meaning, a deceptively simple question: What *is* violence? What is it to Herodotus?

The English word 'violence' is abstract, broad and complex, but like Latin *violentia* (from *vīs*), it is roughly equivalent to (although stemming from phonetically close but entirely distinct Proto-Indo-European roots) Greek βιαίότης (from βία).³ The conceptual spectra of both English and Greek terms are surprisingly similar, from physical force, to the metaphorical violence of the mind or of an argument and euphemistic legal connotations that suggest rape or sexual misconduct.⁴ However, the narrow definition provided by the *Oxford English Dictionary* of 'the exercise of physical force so as to inflict injury on, or cause damage to, persons or property' corresponds quite neatly to the normative usage of Greek βιαίότης. This thesis will adopt this more restricted conceptualisation, although it will certainly not entirely ignore its broader connotations.⁵ However, the purpose of this thesis is not to simply hunt down, label and categorise cases of βιαίότης in the *Histories*, and indeed, in a work primarily about war, this would be not only unmanageable but meaningless.

³ Whilst βία can be traced back to Proto-Indo-European root *g^weyə-, Latin *vīs* is etymologically derived from root *weyə-, the source of the less common Greek ἰς (strength or force). Nonetheless, *vīs* was treated as the direct Latin equivalent of βία during the Roman period (see, for example, Cass. Dio 37. 31 and *LSJ* q.v. βία, entry II) 4.) and held a similar significance, unmatched by ἰς, regardless of actual etymology.

⁴ See both *LSJ* q.v. βία which cites examples of violence on a metaphorical level (eg. οὐκ ἔστι βίη φρεσίν II.3.45.) and its legal uses to refer to rape, at least in Athens, (βίαις δίκη Sch.Pl.R.464e), and also *Oxford English Dictionary*, in which entries on 'violence, n.' range from the highly metaphoric to legal jargon to straight forward physical force.

⁵ *Oxford English Dictionary* (2nd edition 1989) q.v. 'violence, n.' entry 1a.

Introduction

As such, this thesis looks strictly at graphic violence. Graphic in the fullest sense of the literary term, explicit and vivid, descriptive and often extreme and excessive. That is to say, only passages which describe the method and form of violence will be considered. It is for this reason, its descriptive and vivid quality, that Herodotus' interest in the macabre more generally will also be analysed, such as non-violent cannablism, odd or exploratory treatments of dead bodies and medical amputation. Consequently, simple death on the battle field or straightforward murder will not be included, the unadulterated verb ἀποκτείνειν is not sufficient to be classified as *graphic* violence. This clearly puts the emphasis upon excessive or unusual violence and cruelty. That is not to say strictly transgressive violence, as one may be tempted to equate it with, but instead on acts of cruelty beyond the expected cultural practice. Undue brutality, however, is a culturally problematic area to explore, and requires us to encounter the conceptual boundaries of violence in ancient Greek culture.⁶

The unwarranted killing of children, for instance, is easily recognisable as both extreme and excessive in its use of force and violence even in the ancient world, whilst the murder or punishment of slaves and animals may not have seemed as horrific and undeserved as they do to a modern audience. Conversely, violence against religious property, such as statues and other icons, although perhaps only considered horrific on a metaphoric level to a contemporary audience, would have certainly represented a more real and immediate form of violence for Herodotus' readers. Similarly, violence against, or even amongst, animals is given another level of meaning due to ritual sacrifice, a practice so pivotally 'violent' in the religious landscape of ancient Greece.⁷ Ultimately the conceptualisation of violence in the Greek cultural landscape is difficult to navigate with any certainty since it is fundamentally impossible to exhaustively locate the precise boundaries of violent acts and non-violent acts, permissible objects of violence and non-permissible objects and excessive cruelty and non-excessive cruelty. As such, this thesis addresses this imperfect system by primarily considering human violence, whilst continuing to give weight to the impact of these more culturally complex arenas of violence.

Until recently, however, Herodotean violence had only been used as evidence of the historian's roots in the Homeric tradition, reading any brutality of the work almost exclusively

⁶ Consider Whitehead's statement on the importance of cultural analysis in approaching the meaning of violence that "understanding not simply the cultural context of violence, as if that were to understand violence itself, but also violence as cultural performance" (2002, 64).

⁷ See Girard 1972.

against this context.⁸ Such an interpretation of Herodotus' use of violence is not invalid, for there clearly are many strong Homeric resonances within these acts of brutality, but equally, this one-eyed view of the complexities of violence will never be able to access the entirety of its purpose.

Francois Hartog's claim that the violent acts found within the *Histories* are a manifestation of Herodotus' orientalisising outlook appears as the first significant attempt to holistically explain the purpose of violence in this work.⁹ And indeed it is this view that the limited literature on the subject has been unable to shake.¹⁰ Hartog claims that mutilation and brutality are representations of the other: acts of foreign savagery in the eyes of the author. He reaches this conclusion not by a broad survey of all instances of violence in Herodotus' work, but rather by exploring how far specific instances of violence stray from the assumed 'Greek normative cultural practice'. In arguing that violence represents a form of ethnographic characterisation, Hartog is able to claim that Greek acts of *barbaric* violence are instances of these characters transgressing normative practice. This argument is quite compelling, although somewhat circular, and has consequently guided most subsequent scholarship on the issue. However, such structuralist transgressionism fails to give a satisfactory explanation of the specifics of Herodotean violence. That is to say, as a formula it can often yield trivial answers to complex questions.

More recently, Robert Rollinger has completed a study dedicated solely to violence in Herodotus.¹¹ This study, unlike Hartog's piecemeal approach that made up only one part of a broader argument, surveys the entirety of the *Histories* for each instance of violence. However, like Hartog, he begins with a focus upon geographic and ethnographic boundaries, determining that statistically, there is a clear distinction in the volume of violent acts carried out by Greek versus non-Greeks and in Europe versus Asia. He then concedes that this evidence is meaningless without considering Herodotus' assessment of each instance and proceeds to explore the historian's judgement of each case. He ultimately argues that violence is not determined by ethnicity or geography as much as it is by political system, claiming

⁸ As early as the eighteenth century Pierre-Henri Larcher saw in Herodotus' account of the Athenian women attacking a lone man with the brooches of their dresses (5.87) a reference to Athena's words in the *Iliad* (5.422-5) (1802, 60-1), and claims that in expressions of death Herodotus is a *grand imitateur* of Homer (347); Leonhard Schmitz, in his nineteenth century commentary on the *Histories*, considered it sufficient to simply reference the fight over Patroclus' corpse as an explanation of the battle for Leonidas' body (7.225) (1855, 376).

⁹ Hartog 1988, *passim*, esp. 112-72

¹⁰ Boedeker 2003; Darbo-Peschanski 1988; Desmond 2004; Strid 2006; Rollinger 2004: These works make up the entirety of significant studies on violence in Herodotus.

¹¹ Rollinger 2004

Introduction

from his variously indexed statistics that Herodotus uses violence as a means to both characterise and criticise autocracy.

Ultimately Rollinger's approach, being vastly similar to the methodology employed by Hartog, merely shifts its focus from geographic and ethnographic boundaries to those of political systems. But whilst this approach has its merits, namely in establishing rhetorical order to violence as a device for characterisation, it equally presents a number of insurmountable problems. The primary issue is clearly that it arbitrarily applies an existing conclusion as an explanatory model instead of deducing an explanation from the evidence itself. This approach also does not contextualise violence beyond Herodotus' work. For whilst one may claim that the use of torture by Persian kings is consistent with the othering of violence, Herodotus was also entirely familiar with torture as an Athenian legal procedure, questioning the ability of torture to trace distinct cultural or political lines. In this way, whilst the other may feature as an important component in the historian's use of violence, it is surely detrimental to employ it as a starting point.

Instead, paying particular attention to the *style* in which violence is presented, this thesis looks at the idiosyncratic nature of Herodotean violence. In enquiring into the *role* of violence, it examines episodes in context and considers their meaning in regards to Herodotus' broader historiographical project. It also explores the intense dialogue that can be found between Herodotus' work and other arenas of violence, either past literary works, contemporaneous thinkers or cultural institutions. These will help give some nuance to specific tropes of violence and, more importantly, give meaning to the style in which these episodes are presented. Overall, this thesis endeavours to take some emphasis off violence as a tool for characterisation and place it upon its role in the *spectacle* of Herodotus' critical enquiry.

This thesis, therefore, considers first Herodotus' conceptualisation of violence and its evolution from an earlier Greek model. This first chapter especially explores how Herodotus either rejects or adapts the model of violence found in the Homeric texts. In doing so it probes further into questions on the style of Herodotean violence and look particularly at its relationship to *pathos*. This chapter takes these two related concepts, the style of violence and the *pathos* associated with it, and examines their relationship both to broader socio-political themes and rhetorical techniques in the text. As such, by investigating the microdynamics of violence, the first chapter of this thesis ultimately assesses the pathetic value of these graphic scenes.

Spectacle of Enquiry

Then, having explored the way in which Herodotus looks at violence, the second chapter of this thesis explores the relationship between violence and critical enquiry. It examines Herodotus' relationship to contemporary intellectual movements, such as philosophy and the Hippocratic corpus, and from this establishes links between violence, apodeictic display and critical enquiry more broadly. Proceeding to excavate the specific way in which Herodotus employs violence as a part of his display of enquiry, this last chapter demonstrates that these graphic descriptions form a fundamental rhetorical and investigative role in his historiographical method. This first chapter, then, links Herodotean violence back to his opening statement (that his work is an ἱστορίας ἀπόδειξις, a display of enquiry) arguing that violence within this work is a display of his enquiry, a spectacle of his investigation.

Overall, this thesis demonstrates that the extreme violence found in the *Histories* is actually a manifestation of Herodotus' investigative method. Moreover (and more importantly), it endeavours to expose the complexities of this position. For if it is established that violence forms a part of *apodeixis*, then a number of outcomes must be explored: Is his overall investigative strategy being played out over the bodies of the work's various victims? Or does this violence simply occur at the apex of his investigation, serving as memorable and spectacular proof? And indeed, at some level there must be some metaphorical and allegorical interchange between the violence perpetrated on the bodies of his characters and the violence of positivism, but ultimately it is in looking at the violence in Herodotus as what it truly is, a bloody spectacle, that it gains its most meaning.

CHAPTER ONE: THE HISTORIOGRAPHICAL GAZE

The Violent and The Pathetic in Herodotus

Ἐνθ' ἔβαλ' Ἀνθεμίωνος υἷον Τελαμώνιος Αἴας
ἠΐθεον θαλερὸν Σιμοεΐσιον, ὃν ποτε μήτηρ
Ἰδηθεν κατιούσα παρ' ὄχθησιν Σιμόεντος
γείνατ', ἐπεὶ ῥα τοκεύσιν ἄμ' ἔσπετο μῆλα ιδέσθαι·
τοῦνεκά μιν κάλεον Σιμοεΐσιον· οὐδὲ τοκεῦσι
θρέπτρα φίλοις ἀπέδωκε, μινυρθάδιος δέ οἱ αἰὼν
ἔπλεθ' ὑπ' Αἴαντος μεγαθύμου δουρὶ δαμέντι.
πρῶτον γάρ μιν ἰόντα βάλε στήθος παρὰ μαζὸν
δεξιόν· ἀντικρὺ δὲ δι' ὤμου χάλκεον ἔγχος
ἦλθεν· ὃ δ' ἐν κονίησι χαμαὶ πέσεν αἰγείρος ὡς
ἢ ῥά τ' ἐν εἰαμενῇ ἔλεος μεγάλοιο πεφύκει
λείη, ἀτὰρ τέ οἱ ὄζοι ἐπ' ἀκροτάτῃ πεφύασι·
τὴν μὲν θ' ἀρματοπηγὸς ἀνήρ αἰθῶνι σιδήρῳ
ἐξέταμ', ὄφρα ἵτυν κάμψῃ περικαλλεῖ δίφρῳ·
ἢ μὲν τ' ἀζομένη κείται ποταμοῖο παρ' ὄχθας.
τοῖον ἄρ' Ἀνθεμίδην Σιμοεΐσιον ἐξενάριξεν
Αἴας διογενῆς...

(*Iliad*. 4.473-89)

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 ἀποκοπεῖς πελέκει πίπτει, τοῦτο δὲ ἄλλοι Ἀθηναίων πολλοὶ τε καὶ ὀνομαστοί.

(Hdt. 6.114)

We have, then, two battle scenes, recounted deaths brought before the waiting ears of an audience: beneath the walls of Troy, Homer looks upon the young warrior Simoeisius, his chest pierced through by the javelin of the great-hearted Ajax, he lies lifeless upon the dry earth; so too, upon the beach of Marathon, does Herodotus' gaze come upon Cynegirus who falls dead, his hand cut off as he grasps the stern of a Persian ship. These moments, highlighted against the backdrop of immense and devastating wars, provide graphic, visual insights to the blood and violence of these conflicts. At times, the violence of the Homeric epic even seems to spill over into Herodotus' narrative, such as upon the corpse of Leonidas, battled over and desecrated in a flourish of *kleos* (7.255).¹² But whilst Homer informed so much of the *Histories*, these two scenes are separated by far more than the Aegean.

¹² cf. *Il.* 17.274-87. See Munson who argues that Herodotus' use of the term *kleos* (7.220.2; 7.220.4), a word used only rarely throughout the *Histories* "is almost a technical term in the poetic tradition for the glory of heroes, especially in death", demonstrating a very close link to Homeric battle in the historian's

When Simoeisius is struck down, the implications stretch far beyond the moment of his destruction. At the very point of his introduction and the cast of Ajax' spear, we leave the falling corpse of Anthemion's son (Ἄνθεμίωνος υἱὸν) to journey with his mother along the banks of the river Simoeis, his namesake, flowing from idyllic Ida to the tranquil pastoral scene where she will give birth. But as his grandparents and their rural flock stand as spectators to this peaceful birth, it is interrupted by the violence of Ajax' javelin, which, reverberating through Simoeisius' sternum, shatters the pastoral serenity of this scene and strikes at even his lineage. The brutality of his death, his leaking blood, spills off the battlefield granting grief and sorrow to his parents and ancestors and tragic significance to the moment of his birth. His sun-parched corpse, again identified by his patronym (Ἄνθεμίδης) heralds the pain of his father and the, now eternal, separation from his mother. This genealogy that buffers this act of brutality clearly adds a sense of bitter *pathos* to the scene.¹³ In pinpointing the precise, anatomical location of his wounding (ιόντα στήθος παρὰ μαζὸν δεξιόν) the poet establishes an epicenter of grief, from which the violence radiates beyond Simoeisius' body, through time and place, giving this corporeal moment transcended meaning.¹⁴ This exact, distinctive image not only increases the immense empathy of the scene, but also grants it a bloody poignancy.

Given the epithet of a blooming sapling (ἠΐθεον θαλερόν), images of youth and fertility saturate this scene. Named after the river, he is soon compared to a poplar which has grown smooth in a great marshland (αἴγειρος ὡς ἥ ῥά τ' ἐν εἰαμενῇ ἔλεος μέγαλοιο πεφύκει λείῃ). The flowing stream at his birth and vigour of soft youth come together in this fledgling tree which should one day grow thick and strong.¹⁵ The moisture and vitality of this simile is soon subverted as a chatioteer bends it to his will, and throws it down to dry upon a river bank.

conceptualisation of this scene (1993, 53). Consider also the death of Masistes, the fight over his corpse and wonder at his beauty, seemingly carrying a heavy Homeric perspective (9.22-3), cf. Aly (1921, 274-5).

¹³ Although, also consider Plato and Demosthenes who both claim that pity for the weak is a particularly Athenian trait (*Men.* 294e; *Dem.* 24.171).

¹⁴ Indeed, the anatomical precision with which Homer continuously describes wounding has given rise to theories which claim the poet had some connection to the medical profession, or was perhaps a surgeon himself (see Grmek 1983, 38-9). On the transcended meaning of death and wounding see Holmes who states that "one may say that death and dying are simply what heroic epic is about, the same way one might claim that the wounds of the *Iliad* are only exercises in demonstrating the warrior's ability to overcome his flesh" (2007, 80).

¹⁵ Shorey on the innate *pathos* of this simile and Matthew Arnold's translation: "Did Homer consciously feel the pathos that Arnold's imitation makes explicit to us? *For very young he seemed tenderly reared/ Like some young cypress, tall and dark and straight.* Are we to think with Mure of the resemblance of the slender youth with his plumed helmet to a Lombardy poplar, trimmed to the leafy top, or shall we say, with Madame Dacier that the poplar that grows by the water is chosen because Simoeisius was born by a river? Is ὡς more frequently used in comparisons that turn on a single precise point, and is τοῖον the mark of a broader or more elaborated simile? It is perhaps wiser not to dogmatize. Again, however Homer may have felt ἰάνθη, *Iliad* xxiii. 599, he did not by φρίσσουσιν ἄρουρα intend Arnold's *A shiver runs through the deep corn for joy*" (1922, 248).

As Simoeisus' young body hits the dry dusty earth (κονίησι χαμαί), Ajax has done more than simply kill a foe, he has subverted the natural order of life, destroyed a boy in his prime: this is a bitter loss of potential. This scene is above all steeped in *pathos* and *kleos*, poignant and memorable. Metaphor lifts the significance of this scene far above a simple death on the battlefield.¹⁶

In the grips of Darius' famed invasion at Marathon, Herodotus, likewise, focuses in upon the death of Cynegeirus. Pulling three names from a list of ninety-two, he pauses his narrative for a moment to paint exact detail to one death against the backdrop of a larger battle. This dramatic spotlight upon the minute intricacies of war recalls the previous Homeric description.¹⁷ However, as we look upon the wound to Simoeisus' sternum and Cynegeirus' severed hand, these points of content soon reveal themselves to be nothing other than surface similarities. For whilst there is some focus on *kleos* (eg. ἀνήρ γενόμενος ἀγαθός; ἄλλοι Ἀθηναίων ὀνομαστοί), it scarcely reflects the immense emotive and idiosyncratic language of Simoeisus' death.¹⁸ Similarly one may note that the fathers' names of the three fallen Athenians are given, however, their unemphatic attributive positions, falling directly after their names, should inform us that these are simply used as patronymic identifiers. Indeed, the historian could have easily stressed Cynegeirus' familial connections through his brother, the poet Aeschylus.¹⁹ Nonetheless, this passage still gives us a vivid description of the precise mode of death, beginning with his attempt to grab the stern of the ship (ἐπιλαμβανόμενος τῶν ἀφλάστων νεός) bringing his hand to the audience's attention before severing it with an axe (τὴν χεῖρα ἀποκοπεῖς πελέκει). The hand balances the two participle phrases, putting dramatic focus on this part of his body. Whilst the severed hand takes center stage, the perpetrator, presumably a Persian soldier, remains obscure, unlike the towering Ajax whose unique and immense violence dominates Simoeisus' death scene. We may, however, consider Cynegeirus' striving as instilling some subjectivity and, therefore, empathy to the scene, but this is far from the overwrought metaphorical implications found in Homer. Indeed, Herodotus' version of this story goes little towards reflecting the immense patriotism and emotion given to this scene elsewhere. The contemporary Stoa Poecile in Athens, for instance,

¹⁶ This is Simoeisus' first, and obviously final, appearance in the poem, however, as shown, his death does not simply occur in a vacuum. The hero is given both a genealogy and a memorable, idiosyncratic death. The *Iliad*, in fact, introduces previously unknown warriors over a hundred times, giving them unique qualities, before having them fall victim to a spectacular and memorable death. For more on the subjective quality of death in Homer and its relationship to the reporting of death in Herodotus see Boedeker (2003) and Darbo-Peschanski (1988).

¹⁷ For Herodotus' own exposure to the violence of battle see Tritle (2006, 209–10) and Lintott (1982).

¹⁸ On the unique violence of each death scene in the *Iliad* see Morrison's appendix (1999, 143–4).

¹⁹ Suid. q.v. Κυναίγειρος.

portrayed Cynegirus' attempt in spectacular fashion, setting him amongst other Athenian heroes.²⁰ Justin's late Roman telling also seems to point to other alternative versions of the story:

Cynegiri quoque, militis Atheniensis, gloria magnis scriptorum laudibus celebrata est, qui, post proelii innumeras caedes, cum fugientes hostes ad naves egisset, onustam nauem dextra manu tenuit nec prius dimisit quam manum amitteret; tunc quoque amputata dextera, nauem sinistra comprehendit, quam et ipsam cum amisisset, ad postremum morsu nauem detinuit. Tantam in eo uirtutem fuisse, ut non tot caedibus fatigatus, non duabus manibus amissis uictus, truncus ad postremum et ueluti rabida fera dentibus dimicauerit. (Justin 2.9.16-9)

Here, grabbing the ship successively with his right hand, then his left, then even his teeth, his spirit (*uirtutis*) and determination (*non fatigatus; non uictus*) are highlighted as the key aspects of this story.²¹ Claimed to be sourced from earlier historians, this testimony suggests that Cynegirus had been long celebrated for his valour.²² In comparison, Herodotus' version is empty, his eye looks simply to the severing of the hand, not the man himself. In this way, although the historian is interested in the mechanics of violence, he abandons the pathetic superstructure that pervades Homeric brutality.²³

It is, therefore, the *style* of Herodotean violence that so distinguishes it from the previous Homeric model. It is corporeal, prosaic, stripped of the hyper-meaning attached to Simoeisius' death.²⁴ The historian looks neither for the metaphorical nor the pathetic but to the mechanics of violence and its macabre outcomes. Whilst Ajax' spear brings light and relief to the features of Simoeisius, Cynegirus fades into the background, subordinate to the act itself.

²⁰ The Stoa Poecile, described most thoroughly by Pausanias (1.15.3), is variously credited to Panaenus, Micon or Polygnotus, nevertheless, this still puts its composition at some point in the middle of the 5th century BCE. Lucian, in the second century CE, still associates the Poecile with Cynegirus, demonstrating that this story has retained much currency in Athens and political sentiment: πρὸς δὲ τῇ Ποικίλῃ ἀνδριάντα ἰδὼν τὴν χεῖρα ἀποκεκομμένον, ὄψῃ ἔφη Ἀθηναῖος εἰκόνι χαλκῇ τετιμηκέναι τὸν Κυνέγειρον (*Demonax* 53).

²¹ See also Suidas who similarly embellishes Herodotus' story by having both his hands cut off successively: Κυναίγειρος, Ἀθηναῖος, Εὐφορίωνος, Αἰσχύλου δὲ ἀδελφός, τῆς στρατηγίδος ἐπέλαβετο νηὸς τῶν Περσῶν ἤδη φευγούσης καὶ τὴν δεξιὰν ἀποκοπεῖς ἐπέβαλε τὴν ἀριστεράν, ἧς καὶ αὐτῆς ἀποκοπέεισσις ἐτελεύτα πεσῶν.

²² Since Justin describes his work as an epitome of Pompeius Trogus' *Historiae philippicae et totius mundi origines et terrae situs*, we can assume this story was current in Rome, and already described by multiple historians by the time of Augustus. Valerius Maximus, also, states that the Greeks sung Cynegirus' praises and advertised this deed so that it may never be forgotten (3.2.22).

²³ Not only can we see *pathos* as a key element in the *Iliad*, but, similarly, the *Odyssey* can be analysed in much the same way. For even in the blinding of Polyphemus (Hom. *Od.* 9.371-412), a monster for whom sympathy should barely extend, there is still a focus on cries of pain and mentions of his father. Also see the murder of the maids (Hom. *Od.* 22.465-72). On spectacle and the resultant authority in the *Odyssey* see Olson (1995, 1-23).

²⁴ See Griffin who also argues that objects are often given far more meaning beyond their physical form, stating, for instance, that "the way in which meals are described has a symbolic rather than nutritious interest" (1983, *passim* esp. 19, 104-43).

Cynegeirus' death, however, is in some ways atypical of Herodotean violence. Acts of violence in the *Histories* vastly occur off the battlefield, often with anonymous victims, as the murder of an unnamed Athenian illustrates:²⁵

πιθομένας δὲ τὰς γυναῖκας τῶν ἐπ' Αἴγιναν στρατευσαμένων ἀνδρῶν, δεινόν τι ποιησαμένας κείνον μόνον ἔξ ἀπάντων σωθῆναι, πέριξ τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦτον λαβούσας καὶ κεντεούσας τῆσι περόνησι τῶν ἱματίων εἰρωτᾶν ἐκάστην αὐτέων ὄκου εἶη ὁ ἔωυτῆς ἀνήρ. Καὶ τοῦτον μὲν οὕτω διαφθαρήναι, Ἀθηναίοισι δὲ ἔτι τοῦ πάθεος δεινότερόν τι δόξαι εἶναι τὸ τῶν γυναικῶν ἔργον. (5.87)

Here the grief of the women and horror of the Athenian is more than evident, however, Herodotus reports this moment with sober detachment, all characters remain faceless, carrying no names or history. And although there is some hint of allusion, with the man appearing as an Orpheus or Dionysus type figure, this is not deeply explored, as in the previous Homeric case of Simoeisus, or carried through to any significance in the scene. We do not hear his family history or even his cries of pain, we are simply positioned to see the women gather round and thrust their brooches into his flesh (κεντεούσας τῆσι περόνησι τῶν ἱματίων). It is only after this that Herodotus reveals the purpose of this story:

Ἄλλω μὲν δὴ οὐκ ἔχειν ὅτεω ζημιώσωσι τὰς γυναῖκας, τὴν δὲ ἐσθῆτα μετέβαλον αὐτέων ἐς τὴν Ἰάδα· ἐφόρεον γὰρ δὴ πρὸ τοῦ αἰ τῶν Ἀθηναίων γυναῖκες ἐσθῆτα Δωρίδα, τῆ Κορινθίῃ παραπλησιωτάτην· μετέβαλον ὧν ἐς τὸν λίνεον κιθῶνα, ἵνα δὴ περόνησι μὴ χρέωνται. Ἔστι δὲ ἀληθείᾳ λόγῳ χρεωμένοισι οὐκ Ἰὰς αὕτη ἢ ἐσθῆς τὸ παλαιὸν ἀλλὰ Κάειρα, ἐπεὶ ἢ γε Ἑλληνικῆ ἐσθῆς πᾶσα ἢ ἀρχαίη τῶν γυναικῶν ἢ αὕτη ἢ τὴν νῦν Δωρίδα καλέομεν. (5.87-8)

He uses this act of violence not as a spectacle of *pathos* or battle, as in Homer, but to trace the aetiology of clothing. His interest in this scene of violence lies not with the pain or distress of either the victim or the assailant but rather in the role of the brooches as they penetrate the victim's *body*. His eyes see the torn flesh as marks not of pain or sorrow, he does not look upon this gruesome act as significant to the parties involved, but instead to the objects involved.²⁶ It is Ajax' spear, not Simoeisus, nor his parents, nor the river, his flowing namesake, that Herodotus looks to. His concern is objective and immediate, he spends more time tracing the history of brooches and clothing than any personage within the scene. So, whilst Herodotus' violence is not entirely devoid of *pathos*, his conceptualisation of the pathetic function of violence is clearly radically different to that of Homer.

A sixty line elegiac inscription found in Halicarnassus, written in the second century BCE, lists amongst the city's most acclaimed literary figures 'Herodotus, the prose Homer of

²⁵ The deaths of Artybius (and his horse) (5.111-2), Cynegeirus (6.114), Masistes (and his horse) (9.22) and Callicrates (9.72) make up the entirety of deaths in battle for which details are provided.

²⁶ Consider also Psametticus cutting out the tongues of women in order to raise two boys in silence (2.3), here Herodotus similarly thinks not of the victims but rather the plausibility of the experiment.

historiography' (Ἡρόδοτον τόν πεζόν ἐν ἱστορίαισιν Ὅμηρον: line 43).²⁷ Like Homer, his text is littered with blood and gore, the violence of both works is ubiquitous and pervasive. But whilst the *Iliad* focuses upon the *pathos* of the event, granting each character a memorable death, the brutality of the *Histories* is unadorned, not typically elevated beyond the scene, it is πεζός, prosaic.²⁸

Indeed, Herodotus' very vocabulary of violence reflects this overall shift in the conceptualisation of the violent and gory. For example, Herodotus uses the term λώβη, to denote a specific act of violence, that is, mutilation. However, this same term used in the Homeric texts is far more multifaceted and far more complex. Achilles cries that Agememnon could not persuade his heart until he pays back all the heart-grieving *outrage* (πρίν γ' ἀπὸ πᾶσαν ἐμὸν δόμεναι θυμαλγέα λώβην *Il.* 9.387).²⁹ Thersites similarly abuses Agememnon stating that if Achilles were not so forgiving, this would have been his last piece of *insolence* (ἦ γὰρ ἂν Ἀτρεΐδῃ νῦν ὕστατα λωβήσατο *Il.* 2.242). Penelope warns Telemachus that upon him would fall shame and *disgrace* among men (σοί κ' αἰσχος λώβη τε μετ' ἀνθρώποισι πέλοιτο *Od.* 18.225). It need not imply violence, but when it does, it refers not only to the act itself, but also the social and cultural consequences that stretch beyond its immediate action. Donna Wilson, in fact, argues that one's λώβη may be passed on from father to son, as in the case when Agememnon demands Antimachus' sons, Peisandros and Hippolochus, to pay back the λώβη of their father:³⁰

...ἀγγελίην ἐλθόντα σὺν ἀντιθέῳ Ὀδυσῆϊ
αὐθι κατακτείνει μηδ' ἐξέμεν ἄψ ἐς Ἀχαιοὺς
νῦν μὲν δὴ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀεικέα τίσετε λώβην.
(*Il.* 11. 142)

²⁷ Isager (1998) points out that Herodotus is listed first before Andron, fourth century BCE author of the *Syngenetika*, a prose work treating the genealogical relationships between Greek cities, and Panyassis, either Herodotus' nephew or uncle, who composed an epic work, the *Herakleia*. Whilst the text continues with other literary figures, this initial combination of three seems standard, found in at least one other Hellenistic epigram (*IG XII 1*, 145, see also *SEG 36 no.* 975), perhaps positioning Herodotus as a master of both epic content and prose style. Lloyd-Jones expands on this stating that 'it is unlikely that this poet was the first author to call Herodotus the prose Homer' (1999, 16).

²⁸ On the use of πεζός cf. Quintilian (10.81) who states that the style of Plato is worthy of Homer (quis dubitet Platonem esse praecipuum siue acumine disserendi siue eloquendi facultate diuina quadam et Homericam?) and that it rises beyond its prosaic form (multum enim supra prorsam orationem et quam pedestrem Graeci uocant surgit).

²⁹ The precise meaning of λώβη in the *Iliad* has been a matter of some debate, this example, in which Achilles demands this act be paid back, has been the epicenter of much of this argument. Parry, for instance, argued that Achilles is here using λώβη incorrectly, arguing that it is an abstract concept which cannot be simply 'paid back', and thus represents the hero as out of control, even in language (1956, 5–6). Reeve, similarly argues that paying back λώβη is a "logical absurdity" (1973, 195). Claus, however, has also argued that Achilles use of λώβη represents its use in a more concrete, quasi-legal sense (1975, 24). Nonetheless, the term still refers to the social superstructure that surrounds such acts.

³⁰ Wilson 1999, 140–1

Here, λώβη clearly refers far beyond the immediate event of Antimachus' exhortations to murder Menelaus, but instead denotes the entire symbolic superstructure around *violent* and insulting acts. This language does not describe any specific act of *graphic* violence, though it may refer to one, but rather elevates the meaning of violence beyond the corporeal, probes its results and deepens its meaning.³¹

As such, when Herodotus employs this term to refer exclusively to the act of mutilation, there has been dramatic change in the meaning of this term. For instance, he describes Zopyrus, one of Darius' generals, mutilating his own face in order to gain a military advantage:

Ἐνθαῦτα ἐν ἐλαφρῷ ποιησάμενος ἑωυτὸν λωβᾶται λώβην ἀνήγεστον· ἀποταμῶν γὰρ ἑωυτοῦ τὴν ῥίνα καὶ τὰ ὄτα καὶ τὴν κόμην κακῶς περικείρας καὶ μαστιγώσας ἦλθε παρὰ Δαρεῖον. (3.154)

Here the act is described generally as λωβᾶται λώβην, before referring to the specific acts of cutting off his nose (ἀποταμῶν γὰρ ἑωυτοῦ τὴν ῥίνα) and ears (καὶ τὰ ὄτα), cropping his hair badly (τὴν κόμην κακῶς) and scourging himself (μαστιγώσας). The term has lost its symbolic and pathetic connotations, λώβη here refers only to the act of mutilation and not the social consequences that surround it.³² This is, in part, due both to semantic changes over time and to differences in compositional dialects, indeed it is not uncommon for words to change quite radically outside of an epic register.

However, roughly contemporaneously with Herodotus we find tragedians using the term to denote both shame and mutilation (eg. S. *Aj.* 181 cf. 1392).³³ Conversely Plato uses it to describe teachers *mistreating* their pupils (*Pr.* 318b), whilst it is also used of doing damage to religious objects (Thuc. 6.27; and later, in the fourth or third centuries BCE: *IG.* 3.1417). As such, beyond Herodotus this language refers not only to the act of mutilation, but also to its outrageousness: λώβη transgresses and offends, it operates on the extra-corporeal. Indeed, Josephus' comment in the first century CE refers to those infected with leprosy as 'diseased as to their bodies (οἱ τὰ σώματα λελωβημένοι *Ap.* 1.253)', seemingly pointing to the continual use of the term to consider social consequences and not simply an act of violence. Whilst Galen's second century CE comment that "a man must not give up trying to make himself

³¹ Other early texts similarly use λώβη with an attached sense of social outrage: Hesiod speaks of avenging a father's evil *outrage* (πατρός κε κακὴν τεισαίμεθα λώβη *Theog.* 165); Semonides states that the wife that seems most restrained is the most *treacherous* of all (αὕτη μέγιστα τυγχάνει λωβωμένη fr. 7.109).

³² The verb λωβάομαι is similarly used simply of Cleomenes self-mutilation (6.75).

³³ It is perhaps interesting that Sophocles, a poet with whom Herodotus was in direct communication, should use this term so variably between its heightened aspect and its simple corporeal meaning within a single text.

better even if, at the age of fifty, he should see that his soul has *suffered damage* which is not incurable but which has been left uncorrected (οὐ μὴν ἀφίσταται χρῆ τοῦ βελτίω ποιεῖν ἑαυτόν, εἰ καὶ πεντηκοντούτης τις ὢν αἴσθοιτο τὴν ψυχὴν λελωβημένος οὐκ ἀνίατον οὐδ' ἀνεπανόρθωτον λώβην 14.757)" continues to demonstrate the enduring focus of λώβη beyond the body well past the time of Herodotus.

The historian's language omits the elevation of violence so important to Homer. His descriptions are dry, focusing on the *mode* of violence rather than its consequences or implications. Sataspes is simply impaled (ἀνασκολπίζειν) (4.43); the people of Amathus sever the head of Onesilus and hang it upon the gates without any elevation of language (τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτάμνειν) (5.114); Cambyses buries twelve Persians alive, head downwards (ζῶοντας ἐπὶ κεφαλὴν κατορύσσειν) (3.35). These scenes are vivid, providing precise details as to the manner of violence, but the vocabulary is unadorned, it is simple and corporeal. Indeed, whilst the *mode* of violence is described, the exact moment of death is vastly ignored: black night does not cover the eyes of Sataspes (τὸν δὲ κατ' ὀφθαλμῶν ἐπεβεννὴ νύξ ἐκάλυψεν *Il.* 5.659); Onesilus' knees are not unbound (εἶθαρ δ' ὑπὸ γούνατ' ἔλυσε *Il.* 13.412); ill-named fate does not shroud the Persian nobles (πρόσθεν γάρ μιν μοῖρα δυσώμενος ἀμφεκάλυψεν *Il.* 12.116); nor does any soul depart from its corpse (ψυχὴ δ' ἐκ ρεθέων παμμένη Ἄϊδόσδε βεβήκει *Il.* 16.856).³⁴ The language of Herodotean violence is literal and grounded, he soberly reports acts of brutality without emotive display.

In this way, we can ultimately see Herodotus' shift away from the Homeric model of violence not simply in their respective conceptualisations of violence, but also in the way the texts approach the body. Homeric violence is concerned with the social and personal superstructure that surrounds it. Violence heralds an exploration of character. The poet looks upon the body as an arena for both *kleos* and shame, a symbol of sorrow or insult to family, of fear or exhortation to fellow warriors.³⁵ Peneleus thrusts his spear below Ilioneus' brow, when it emerges, from its tip hangs the fallen warrior's eye (ἔτι δ' ὄβριμον ἔγχος ἦεν ἐν ὀφθαλμῷ). He lifts it high, like the head of a poppy (ὃ δὲ φῆ κώδειαν ἀνασχών), and displays it to the Trojans, boasting and mocking them (14.489-507). He tells his victim's father and mother to weep (εἰπέμεναί μοι Τρῶες ἀγανοῦ Ἴλιονῆος πατρὶ φίλῳ καὶ μητρὶ γοήμεναι ἐν μεγάροισιν), for whom he was the only child, aiming his comment at their very

³⁴ Morrison points out that the language of death in Homer "is highly metaphorical, including such images as night, darkness, loosening, covering, taking and pouring. Seldom is the straightforward verb ἀποθνήσκω used" (1999, 131).

³⁵ On the significance of violence and *kleos* on a heroic corpse see Vernant (1991).

home.³⁶ The gaze of this dangling eye falls far beyond the gouged out body of its owner, it looks upon the fear of its trembling audience (τοὺς δ' ἄρα πάντα ὑπὸ τρόμος ἔλλαβε γυῖα, πάπτηνεν δὲ ἕκαστος ὄπη φύγοι αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον) and casts itself to the weeping halls of Phorbas. So too does Tyrtaeus look upon the violated body with such intent:

τοὺς δὲ παλαιότερους, ὧν οὐκέτι γούνατ' ἐλαφρά,
 μὴ καταλείποντες φεύγετε, τοὺς γεραιούς.
 αἰσχρὸν γὰρ δὴ τοῦτο, μετὰ προμάχοισι πεσόντα
 κείσθαι πρόσθε νέων ἄνδρα παλαιότερον,
 ἤδη λευκὸν ἔχοντα κάρη πολιόν τε γένειον,
 θυμὸν ἀποπνεῖοντ' ἄλκιμον ἐν κονίῃ,
 αἱματόεντ' αἰδοῖα φίλαισ' ἐν χερσὶν ἔχοντα
 αἰσχρὰ τὰ γ' ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ νεμεσητὸν ἰδεῖν,
 καὶ χροῖα γυμνωθέντα· νέοισι δὲ πάντ' ἐπέοικεν,
 ὄφρ' ἐρατῆς ἥβης ἀγλαὸν ἄνθος ἔχη,
 ἀνδράσι μὲν θηητὸς ἰδεῖν, ἐρατὸς δὲ γυναιξὶ
 ζωὸς ἐὼν, καλὸς δ' ἐν προμάχοισι πεσών.
 (Tyrt. Frag. 7.21-30)

As the aged warrior falls, clutching his bloodied genitals (αἱματόεντ' αἰδοῖα φίλαισ' ἐν χερσὶν ἔχοντα), this wound to his white haired body brings shame and disgrace.³⁷ Breathing out his life-giving soul on the dusty ground (θυμὸν ἀποπνεῖοντ' ἄλκιμον ἐν κονίῃ), his withered corpse and naked skin testify to his ugly fame. Whilst for the young man, the beauty of his form as he falls (καλὸς δ' ἐν προμάχοισι πεσών) brings admiration (ἀνδράσι μὲν θηητὸς ἰδεῖν). Violence to the body, bloody and graphic, is essential to the heroic or shameful death, it is extracorporeal, concerned with the victim, not their body.³⁸ As the assailant looks upon his victim we understand the horror and pleasure of this violence, and as the victim looks upon his assailant we understand his pain and coming *kleos*.³⁹

³⁶ cf. Hector's penetrative threats that Achilles' body will 'incorporate' his spear (ὡς δὴ μιν σφ' ἐν χροῖ παῖν κομίσατο *Il.* 22.286) and that his spear will bite Ajax' delicate body (αἶ κε ταλάσσης μείναι ἐμὸν δόρυ μακρόν, ὅ τοι χροῖα λαιριόεντα ἴδ' ἀψεί 13.829-31). These taunts transform the bodies of his victims, instill effeminacy and, therefore, shame.

³⁷ cf. Barton (2002) who provides a Roman perspective on gazing and shame.

³⁸ Tsagalis 2004, 13-5

³⁹ In looking at the graphic violence of horror films, for instance, Clover, in her seminal work *Men, Women and Chainsaws*, introduces two interrelated gazes, those of the *assaultive gaze* and the *reactive gaze* (1993, 166-230). Such gazes, defined by the way in which the spectator is positioned as the subject of graphic violence, are clearly culturally specific and defined by the medium in which they are manifest, however, the relationship between audience, victim and assailant in Homeric epic, in many ways, is similar to that present in horror. Whilst the focus of Clover's analysis is gender, her argument that through the interplay of assaultive and reactive gazing the spectator is given a greater understanding of his or her role in the violence on screen is equally applicable to the *Iliad*, in which assailants often look upon their victims before killing or maiming them just as the audience also looks, before the narrator gives an externalised account of gore. Indeed these assailants often become the object of another's assaultive gaze before being harmed themselves, forging a confronting matrix of perspective, audience and violence.

Herodotus, however, is rarely concerned with the experience of either assailant or victim. Vastly, victims of violence in the *Histories* remain silent, whilst Herodotus betrays no sentiment towards them. As the case of an Aeginetan prisoner demonstrates:

Ἐπακοσίους γὰρ δὴ τοῦ δήμου ζωγήσαντες ἐξήγον ὡς ἀπολέοντες, εἷς δέ τις τούτων ἐκφυγὼν τὰ δεσμὰ καταφεύγει πρὸς πρόθυρα Δήμητρος Θεσμοφόρου, ἐπιλαβόμενος δὲ τῶν ἐπισπαστήρων εἶχετο· οἱ δὲ ἐπέτε μιν ἀποσπάσαι οὐκ οἴοι τε ἀπέλκοντες ἐγίνοντο, ἀποκόψαντες αὐτοῦ τὰς χεῖρας ἤγον οὕτω, αἱ χεῖρες δὲ ἐκείναι ἐμπεφυκυῖαι ἦσαν τοῖσι ἐπισπαστήρσι. Ταῦτα μὲν νυν σφέας αὐτοὺς οἱ Αἰγινήται ἐργάσαντο. (6.91)

Herodotus spares no words of sympathy as this anonymous Aeginetan's hands are cut off, neither his cries of pain nor anguish are found in the text.⁴⁰ Herodotus is not interested in the subjective experience of violence. Indeed, his perspective is revealing, for his focus continues to fall upon the hands after they have been cut off (αἱ χεῖρες δὲ ἐκείναι ἐμπεφυκυῖαι ἦσαν τοῖσι ἐπισπαστήρσι). This is the image with which Herodotus chooses to finish his description of the event before moving on. The fate of the man remains unknown after he is dragged away from his amputated body parts. The historian's focus falls not upon the person of the victim, but rather the body of the victim.

This macabre gaze pervades the violence of the *Histories*, it searches out the body and its parts, it looks for bones and organs.⁴¹ It examines the mechanics of violence and its physical remnants. It looks upon the cooked limbs of Harpagus' son (1.119) and Hegesistratus' severed foot (9.37) with a sober curiosity. It seeks out Persian and Egyptian skulls (3.12) and the intricacies of mummification (2.86-7). It privileges the precise, corporeal and visual over motivation, character and consequence. The Aeginetan's hands, Herodotus' miscellany of body parts take centre-stage in his drama of blood.

In investigating when Herodotus reports the specifics of death, Ove Strid argues that "Herodotus is interested in deaths and circumstances of deaths, if they are extraordinary in some way". She observes that Herodotus only reports a victim's perspective when the extraordinary element of the violence directly involves the victim's sentiments.⁴² Herodotus is interested in the mechanics of violence and the way in which they play out over the human

⁴⁰ Lateiner similarly observes that Herodotus is only drawn to scenes of pity in rare circumstances, however, he only definitively locates instances of characters expressing pity, rather than any externalised rhetoric of pity (2005, 72–80).

⁴¹ Herodotus' conceptualization of the body, in many ways, resembles Foucault's dehumanizing *clinical gaze* in which the body of the patient is separated from the person of the patient (1972, passim esp. 107–23). Such a conceptualization clearly privileges the mechanics and visual effects of violence over its subjective aspects such as pain and social consequences, however, the *Histories* is not entirely 'medical' in its treatment of the human body with the circumstances around a violent act often personalizing the victim to some extent.

⁴² Strid 2006, 403

The Historiographical Gaze

body due to their marvellous nature.⁴³ His eye searches out the wondrous with objective curiosity, disregarding the victims beyond their bodies.⁴⁴ Violence, in and of itself, does not connect the audience to the experience of the victim or assailant, is not designed to evoke a pathetic reaction.

In this way the rhetorical power of Herodotean violence must take an objective, corporeal shape. Without emotive value or pathetic authority, the ability for the violent or the macabre to connect with an audience's values or worldview is limited. As such, Francois Hartog's analysis of Scythian violence is somewhat problematic. He begins:

La question posée sera donc la suivante: Quelle place le discours d'Hérodote fait-il à la mort de l'autre? Quelle pertinence a cette figure si l'on prend comme exemple privilégié les funérailles des rois scythes?

La mort est signe d'altérité et elle intervient, dans le grand partage, toujours recommencé, entre le même et l'autre: elle est opérateur de différence; soit: "Dis-moi comment tu meurs et je te dirai qui tu es." Mais elle est aussi, là même où elle intervient comme discriminant, rubrique et objet de classification.⁴⁵

Hartog continues his analysis:

Mais l'écart le plus grand s'inscrit dans les actions accomplies sur les tombes. Les Scythes étranglent (*apopnigei*) une concubine, l'échanson, un palefrenier, un cuisinier, un valet, porteur de messages, des chevaux, bref l'entourage normal d'un roi barbare. L'étranglement est, en premier lieu, une pratique non grecque d'exécution, ou de meurtre: se marque donc une différence. Mais en plus, en Scythie, étrangler est le mode normal de sacrifier. L'action qu'accomplissent les Scythes sur la tombe de leur roi est donc un sacrifice: étrangler ces personnes correspond, dans la cité, à la prescription de Solon interdisant de sacrifier un bœuf aux morts, ou à celle de Iulis stipulant que "pour le sacrifice, on se conformera à l'usage des ancêtres". La distance entre les deux pratiques se trouve alors maximale: à l'interdiction du sacrifice du bœuf, répond un sacrifice humain. Il faut remonter jusqu'à l'épopée, c'est-à-dire vers un passé lointain, pour retrouver un sacrifice humain sur un bûcher; c'est, bien sur, Achille, qui sacrifie (mais en les égorgeant) douze Troyens en l'honneur de Patrocle, à quoi il ajoute quatre caavales et deux chiens familiaux.⁴⁶

The Scythian stranglers, the Scythian performs human sacrifice, they transgress the laws of Solon, they subvert the stipulation of Iulis. For Hartog, to strangle a concubine, a cupbearer, a cook, a groom, a messenger and horses before the king's tomb substitutes man for Solon's ox. To strangle casts the Scythians far beyond the Greek world, it subverts the heroic, it casts them to the realm of the human sacrificers. The method of their violence offends, it marks itself as impossibly Greek, delineates itself as foreign. But Hartog here ignores the Herodotean component in violence, his reading is generic. He considers only the *form* of violence and not the *style* with which it is invested.

⁴³ This wondrous, *thaumatic* gaze pervades not Herodotus' descriptions of violence, but his entire work (1.0).

⁴⁴ See also Gray 1995, 195–202

⁴⁵ Hartog 1980, 148–9

⁴⁶ Hartog 1980, 163

Spectacle of Enquiry

Herodotus further describes these funeral rites (4.72): taking fifty of the king's best remaining servants and fifty of the finest horses, the Scythians strangle them (ἀποπνίξωσι) before gutting their bodies (ἐξελόντες αὐτῶν τὴν κοιλίην καὶ καθήραντες), stuffing them with chaff (ἐμπιπλάσι ἀχύρων) and stitching them back up (συρράπτουσι). He describes that they cut a number of wheels in half and fix them in pairs, rim-downwards, to stakes driven into the ground, two stakes to each half wheel. Then, driving thick poles lengthwise through the horses, tail to neck, they mount them upon these wheels (ἔπειτα τῶν ἵππων κατὰ τὰ μήκεια ξύλα παχέα διελάσαντες μέχρι τῶν τραχήλων ἀναβιβάζουσι αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὰς ἀψίδας): the front of the wheels holds the shoulders, the rear supports the thighs and belly (τῶν δὲ αἱ μὲν πρότεραι ἀψίδες ὑπέχουσι τοὺς ὄμους τῶν ἵππων, αἱ δὲ ὀπισθε παρὰ τοὺς μηροὺς τὰς γαστέρας ὑπολαμβάνουσι) with their legs hanging down (σκέλεα δὲ ἀμφοτέρω κατακρέμαται μετέωρα). He tells us that the bodies of the men are treated similarly: straight poles are driven along the spine through the neck (νεκροῦ ἐκάστου παρὰ τὴν ἄκανθαν ξύλον ὀρθὸν διελάσωσι μέχρι τοῦ τραχήλου) before these are attached to the horses (κάτωθεν [δὲ] ὑπερέχει τοῦ ξύλου τούτου τὸ ἐς τόρμον πηγνύουσι τοῦ ἐτέρου ξύλου τοῦ διὰ τοῦ ἵπου). He describes the intricacies of the ritual with a dry unimpassioned eye for precision. He is concerned with the method, the shape, the visual façade of the gory act. Hartog sees in this an inversion of nomadism and the mutability of the Scythian tomb, the spinning wheels and galloping horses made still by this decaying monument. His *other* only gives meaning to the type, the trope of violence, it explores its place in the Greek cultural matrix. But it fails to address the *style* of violence, the role of the macabre in Herodotus' own work, the idiosyncratic nature of his brutality. The blood of the *Histories* does not drip with outrage at the actions of the Scythians, it does not throw them to the edge of the earth with emotive language. In looking at the funeral rites of the Scythian kings and the rhetoric of otherness contained within, Hartog strains the power of Herodotus' macabre gaze.

Again with the Tauri, Herodotus describes the sacrifice of shipwrecked Greek sailors with a dry detachment. He recounts the method:

Θύουσι μὲν τῇ Παρθένῳ τοὺς τε ναυηγοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἂν λάβωσι Ἑλλήνων ἐπαναχθέντες τρόπῳ τοιῷδε· καταρξάμενοι ῥοπάλῳ παίουσι τὴν κεφαλὴν. Οἱ μὲν δὴ λέγουσι ὡς τὸ σῶμα ἀπὸ τοῦ κρημοῦ ὠθέουσι κάτω (ἐπὶ γὰρ κρημοῦ ἴδρῦται τὸ ἰρόν), τὴν δὲ κεφαλὴν ἀνασταυροῦσι· οἱ δὲ κατὰ μὲν τὴν κεφαλὴν ὁμολογέουσι, τὸ μέντοι σῶμα οὐκ ὠθέεσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ κρημοῦ λέγουσι ἀλλὰ γῆ κρύπτεσθαι. Τὴν δὲ δαίμονα ταύτην τῇ θύουσι λέγουσι αὐτοὶ Ταῦροι Ἰφιγένειαν τὴν Ἀγαμέμνονος εἶναι. Πολεμίους δὲ ἄνδρας τοὺς ἂν χειρώσωνται ποιεῦσι τάδε· ἀποταμῶν [ἕκαστος] κεφαλὴν ἀποφέρεται ἐς τὰ οἰκία, ἔπειτα ἐπὶ ξύλου μεγάλου ἀναπέρας ἰστῶ ὑπὲρ τῆς

The Historiographical Gaze

οικήης ὑπερέχουσαν πολλόν, μάλιστα δὲ ὑπὲρ τῆς καπνοδόκης. Φασὶ δὲ τούτους φυλάκους τῆς οικήης πάσης ὑπεραιωρέεσθαι. (4.103)

He is concerned with describing the exact process (τρόπος), the order of brutal acts and the final results.⁴⁷ He debates on how the body is dealt with after the head is removed and gives the final location of each body part. He does not spare words of sympathy for the Greek sailors or words of reproach and disgust towards the violent Tauri. There is no rhetoric of outrage in Herodotus' description, the violence of the *other* is not distinguished from the Greek self.

Indeed, Hartog's division between the violent barbarian and the passive Greek encounters much difficulty in the ubiquitous cruelty of Greek tyrants in the *Histories*. However, in attempting to solve this, Robert Rollinger commits much the same error. He argues that "acts of human violence are part of a broader ideology", that "this ideology is one of demarcation separating not so much cultures, i.e. East and West but, rather, 'political systems', i.e. autocracy and freedom".⁴⁸ He reads upon each act of violence a moralising assessment by the historian, he sees deeds of brutality repugnant for Herodotus, except when such actions are performed for the sake of freedom. His analysis on the social background of perpetrators of excessive violence reveals that "an above average number of autocrats are found to be committing acts of violence". Supposedly demonstrating that "Otanés' denunciation of one man rule quite probably reflects the attitude of Herodotus himself". But Herodotus' does not invest these displays of brutality with the emotive or pathetic capital for such a rhetorical aim. This violence cannot comment on the autocratic, it cannot pass ethical judgement. When Lycidas is stoned (9.5), Herodotus does not describe this as an "act of barbarian cruelty".⁴⁹ When the Scythian's drink human blood Herodotus does not lay a *charge de monstreaux* nor recount a shocking *aberration*.⁵⁰ In this way, the rhetorical position of violence is unlikely to be directly connected to any socio-political themes.

As such, when throughout the *Histories* Herodotus has various figures proclaim staunch views against both war and violence and at times goes as far as to even employ his direct authorial voice to push similar views, his words do not carry into his descriptions of the

⁴⁷ On archeological evidence of Taurian practices see Minns (1913, 101-3). See also Bilde (2003) for Herodotus' cultural perception of the Taurians.

⁴⁸ Rollinger (2004, 143): his analysis of Persian executions and torture techniques in the sixth and fifth centuries BCE does much to show that the specifics of Herodotean violence were often reasonably historically accurate (for a detailed study of contemporary Persian techniques of execution see Jacobs (2009)). However, this does not imply that Herodotean violence *characterizes* in its style, but rather, that the historian was fastidious in reporting the exact details of violent acts.

⁴⁹ Rollinger 2004, 137

⁵⁰ Hartog 1980, 132-3

violent acts themselves. Croesus' famous words to Cyrus, after he had almost been burned alive, that no-one would choose war over peace, since in peace sons bury fathers but in war fathers bury sons (Οὐδείς γὰρ οὕτω ἀνόητός ἐστι ὅστις πόλεμον πρὸ εἰρήνης αἰρέεται· ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῇ οἱ παῖδες τοὺς πατέρας θάπτουσι, ἐν δὲ τῷ οἱ πατέρες τοὺς παῖδας 1.87) are emblematic of Herodotus' continual rhetoric against the horrors of war. However, graphic violence, similarly pervasive throughout the text, is rarely directly connected to any of these views, and in no cases is such a relationship explicitly exploited. His macabre eye is not contaminated by any socio-political agenda.

Most strikingly, we find that deaths in battle are reported with a sober detachment, he rarely mentions the specifics of death, rather simply stating that casualties occurred. Statements on the miseries of war occur some distance from the front lines of battle. As James Romm observes “when his Greeks and Persians fight, he keeps a respectful distance from the cut-and-thrust action of the front lines”.⁵¹ We are not attached to the experience of war, nor even their bloody consequences.

Indeed, when Herodotus reports the Persian attack on Cyprus, he begins with an account of Onesilus' opportunistic usurpation of his brother's throne, however, he fast digresses onto the curious method of attack of the horse of the Persian commander, Artybius. He has Onesilus' Carian armour beater state “Artybius' horse rears, and savages with his teeth and hooves anyone he comes on, now think a moment and tell me which of the two – Artybius or his horse – you would prefer watch for a chance of striking”. When he goes on to report the battle, he begins with an account of the death of this horse:

Ὡς προσεφέρετο πρὸς τὸν Ὀνήσιλον ὁ Ἀρτύβιος ἐπὶ τοῦ ἵππου κατήμενος, ὁ Ὀνήσιλος κατὰ συνεθήκατο τῷ ὑπασπιστῇ παίει προσφερόμενον αὐτὸν τὸν Ἀρτύβιον· ἐπιβάλλοντος δὲ τοῦ ἵππου τοὺς πόδας ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ Ὀνησίλου ἀσπίδα, ἐνθαῦτα ὁ Κάρδρεπάνω πλήξας ἀπαράσσει τοῦ ἵππου τοὺς πόδας· Ἀρτύβιος μὲν δὴ ὁ στρατηγὸς τῶν Περσέων ὁμοῦ τῷ ἵππῳ πίπτει αὐτοῦ ταύτη. (5.112)

Here, unusually, Herodotus puts his audience directly into the specific mechanics of battle. A comprehensive and precise account of violence is given, the swing of Onesilus, the rearing of the horse and the strike of the Carian. However, it is only the *wondrous*, rather than sentimental, death of the horse that is represented. As he goes on it becomes even clearer that graphic violence is irrelevant to the miseries of battle in the *Histories*:

Γενομένων δὲ τούτων κατυπέρτεροι ἦσαν οἱ Πέρσαι τῶν Κυπρίων. Τετραμμένου δὲ τοῦ στρατοπέδου ἄλλοι τε ἔπεσον πολλοὶ καὶ δὴ καὶ Ὀνήσιλός τε ὁ Χέρσιος, ὅς περ τὴν Κυπρίων ἀπόστασιν ἔπηξε, καὶ ὁ Σολίων βασιλεὺς Ἀριστόκυπρος ὁ Φιλοκύπρου,

⁵¹ Romm 1998, 149

The Historiographical Gaze

Φιλοκύπρου δὲ τούτου τὸν Σόλων ὁ Ἀθηναῖος ἀπικόμενος ἐς Κύπρον ἐν ἔπεσι αἶνεσε
τυράννων μάλιστα. (5.113)

Whilst, Artybius' horse was given a spectacular and memorable death, many others are simply reported as having died (ἄλλοι τε ἔπεσον πολλοὶ). Onesilus and Aristocyprus are given specific histories, taking shape as symbols of Cypriot freedom, history and valour, and yet the precise details of their deaths go unreported.⁵² As such, it would seem that the graphic aspect of Herodotean violence has little to do with an anti-war sentiment, it is not concerned with presenting the experience of war or ethical problems.

The style of Herodotean violence does not easily evoke *pathos*, it is vastly detached from experience and is concerned primarily with the precise mechanics of the act. The *Histories* looks upon the bodies of its various victims with little concern for the subjective experience of violence. Although much of the text takes its cue from the Homeric epics, the graphic violence of the *Histories* does not echo the hyper-pathetic and metaphorically infused violence of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. This Homeric model serves largely as a counter-example, with deaths in battle typically ignored and the focus on familial pain and sorrow abandoned for a perspective that favours looking at how violent acts affect the body. Such a shift in focus does not entirely preclude Herodotus passing ethical judgement on acts of violence, however, it does limit its rhetorical value in conjuring political and moral sentiment.

⁵² Both Boedeker (2003, 20) and Strid (2006, 403) discuss this scene. Boedeker argues that Herodotus here is interested in “good planning and bravery – and in preserving the social hierarchy – but not in the experience of death from Artybios’ point of view”. In response Strid states that the story is primarily about the Carian’s advice to his master and how he makes good on his promise, linking it to Herodotus’ interest in the extraordinary. Nonetheless, the story is concerned on the *extraordinary* figures of Onesilus and Artybius, yet the battle is only concerned with the extraordinary violence committed on the horse.

CHAPTER TWO: THIS THING OF DARKNESS

Critical Enquiry and The Macabre

Michel Foucault begins his history of prisons and social control, *Surveiller et Punir*, with a description of the torture and death of Damians the regicide. He quotes Bouton, an officer on watch, in giving the exact, gory details of the ordeal. A crowd, gathered round by the proclamation of Louis XV on January 5th 1757, watched as his skin was burnt with boiling sulphur. A pair of pincers then twisted his flesh and tore it roughly from his breast, arms and legs, producing small round wounds and into which hot wax was poured. His limbs were then tied to four horses in order to tear him into four pieces. However, after some time it became clear that the horses would not manage this task, and so two more horses were brought in. When this too was unsuccessful his tendons were cut at his joints. After a number of subsequent attempts, and some more hacking at his exposed and bloodied joints, the exhausted horses were arranged to pull his limbs off one at a time. The pieces of his still twitching body were then piled up and burnt in accordance with the decree. Bouton finishes his account by stating that the hacked apart flesh and trunk of his body took about four hours to burn down to ash.⁵³

Foucault here chronicles a punishment carried out over the body, a visual spectacle to be measured against the hidden regimented punishment of the prison. It is Damians' body that becomes the subject of his trial. It inquires into his crimes by mapping them out over his flesh. His crimes and his body are pulled apart, exposed and explored publically, for all to see.

Indeed, Foucault has continually demonstrated a relationship between the subject of enquiry, power and violence. The very act of enquiry into an object is an act of violence 'it forces, it bends, it breaks on the wheel, it destroys'.⁵⁴ Enquiry looks upon the body of its subject as something that must be twisted and dissected against its will, something that must be forcibly opened up and laid bare.

Similarly, outside the Persian palace, Herodotus recounts, on the streets of Susa, a crowd was summoned to hear Prexaspes proclaim the legitimacy of Smerdis' birth, but instead he

⁵³ Foucault 1975, 10–2

⁵⁴ Foucault 1982, 14

This Thing of Darkness

traces the genealogy of Cyrus, laying bare the history of Persian rule, and revealing Smerdis to be an imposter, a Magus masquerading as a king (3.75). Aware of his impending punishment he throws his own body to the streets below and dies. He offers his body as proof of his claim, a token of truth to the mob. But this is just the beginning of the day's revelations. Soon Darius and his fellow conspirators will enter the palace, the insides of which are hidden from the waiting crowd. There they will plunge their daggers into the waiting Magi and subsequently emerge, running out into the street, shouting and making a great noise, carrying the freshly decapitated heads of the usurpers. They will show these to their fellow citizens, and just as Prexaspes did, reveal to them the inner workings of the shrouded citadel and the lies of the Magi, they will tell of their investigation and the how they killed the traitors.

Herodotus goes further than this, telling us that upon hearing this the people ran out into the street murdering every Magus they could find. He informs us that this day became an important festival, the Magophonia, on which, in remembrance of this day, Persians spill the blood of any Magus they come across.

Like the torture of Damians, Herodotus' work is a display of enquiry (ἱστορίας ἀπόδεξις), it looks upon its subject, the Persian invasion of Greece, and forcibly dissects it. He peels back its skin to uncover its origin, its cause. He opens it up for his waiting crowd, the audience of his display, with various tools of investigation, challenging popular conception and exposing its bloody insides, its battles, its politics, its leaders. Herodotus presents not only his conclusions but also the process of his investigation.

The *Histories*, however, was far from the only display of enquiry being performed in the fifth century BCE. The medical writers and sophists similarly presented to their audiences the manner of their enquiries. Their writings displayed their tools and guided their readers through their techniques as they exposed the inner workings of their subject. So too is there evidence of live performance. There was Gorgias, for instance, who would open up and explore rhetoric before throngs of spectators. Or Socrates, who would expose the nature of things through conversation in public arenas, such as the agora.

Plutarch, for example, provides us with a revealing anecdote on the methods of Anaxagoras' philosophy. In explaining the rise to power of Pericles, he describes an incident involving the philosopher, his tutor:

λέγεται δέ ποτε κριού μονόκερω κεφαλὴν ἐξ ἀγροῦ τῷ Περικλεῖ κομισθῆναι, καὶ Λάμπωνα μὲν τὸν μάντιν, ὡς εἶδε τὸ κέρας ἰσχυρὸν καὶ στερεὸν ἐκ μέσου τοῦ μετώπου πεφυκός, εἰπεῖν ὅτι δυεῖν οὐσῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει δυναστειῶν, τῆς Θουκυδίδου καὶ Περικλέους, εἰς ἓνα περιστήσεται τὸ κράτος παρ' ᾧ γένοιτο τὸ σημεῖον· τὸν δ' Ἀναξαγόραν τοῦ κρανίου διακοπέντος ἐπιδειξάι τὸν ἐγκέφαλον οὐ πεπληρωκότα τὴν

Spectacle of Enquiry

βάσιν, ἀλλ' ὄξυν ὡσπερ ῥὸν ἐκ τοῦ παντὸς ἀγγείου συνωλισθηκότα κατὰ τὸν τόπον ἐκείνον ὅθεν ἡ ρίζα τοῦ κέρατος εἶχε τὴν ἀρχήν. καὶ τότε μὲν θαυμασθῆναι τὸν Ἀναξαγόραν ὑπὸ τῶν παρόντων... (Plut. *Per.* 6.2-3)

Here Anaxagoras performs a public dissection to the amazement of his onlookers (θαυμασθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν παρόντων), an *apodeixis* of his scientific enquiry. He takes an observed phenomenon, the abnormal horn of a ram, dissects it, and uses this bloody act to demonstrate the origin of the phenomenon. That such an act was scientific and critical is brought to the forefront by the presence of Lampon, a mantic, a man who had in his prophetic arsenal the practice of *haruspicy*, a religious practice that resembled (or rather was resembled by) dissection, but was devoid of scientific intrigue. Here it is the philosopher, not the prophet who cuts open the beast. He plainly shows all around that which he discovers inside, his proof requires no special religious knowledge, only the ability to see for oneself, *autopsy*.⁵⁵

Indeed, such a technique of investigation can be aligned almost directly with a number of examples in Herodotus' examination of animals. Such as his proof on the bile causing nature of a certain Scythian grass:

τοῖσι δὲ κτήνεσι ἡ ποίη <ή> ἀναφυομένη ἐν τῇ Σκυθικῇ ἐστὶ ἐπιχλωτάτη πασέων ποιέων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν· ἀνοιγομένοισι δὲ τοῖσι κτήνεσι ἐστὶ σταθμῶσασθαι ὅτι τοῦτο οὕτω ἔχει. (4.58)

Here the historian recommends dissection as a means by which to prove his assertion. Such a task is mathematical (σταθμῶσθαι) and looks for visual, tangible evidence (ἐπίχλωτος).⁵⁶ Likewise, he approaches the biology of hares, lions and snakes:

ταῦτα μὲν πάντα πολύγωνα πεποίηκε, ἵνα μὴ ἐπιλίπη κατεσθιόμενα, ὅσα δὲ σχέτλια καὶ ἀνηρά, ὀλιγόγωνα. Τοῦτο μὲν, ὅτι ὁ λαγὸς ὑπὸ παντὸς θηρεύεται θηρίου καὶ ὄρνιθος καὶ ἀνθρώπου, οὕτω δὴ τι πολύγονόν ἐστι· ἐπικνίσκονται μόνον πάντων θηρίων, καὶ τὸ μὲν δασὺ τῶν τέκνων ἐν τῇ γαστρὶ, τὸ δὲ ψιλόν, τὸ δὲ ἄρτι ἐν τῇσι μήτρησι πλάσσεται, τὸ δὲ ἀναιρέεται. Τοῦτο μὲν δὴ τοιοῦτό ἐστι, ἡ δὲ δὴ λέαινα, ἐὼν ἰσχυρότατον καὶ θρασύτατον, ἅπαξ ἐν τῷ βίῳ τίκει ἐν· τίκτουσα γὰρ συνεκβάλλει τῷ τέκνῳ τὰς μήτρας. Τὸ δὲ αἷτιον τοῦτου τόδε ἐστὶ· ἐπεὰν ὁ σκύμνος ἐν τῇ μητρὶ ἐὼν ἄρχηται διακινεόμενος, ὁ δὲ ἔχων ὄνυχας θηρίων πολλὸν πάντων ὄξυτάτους ἀμύσσει τὰς μήτρας, αὐξόμενός τε δὴ πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἐπικνέεται καταγράφων· πέλας τε δὴ ὁ τόκος ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ παράπαν λείπεται αὐτέων ὑγιᾶς οὐδέν. Ὡς δὲ καὶ αἱ ἔχιδναί τε καὶ οἱ ἐν Ἀραβίοισι ὑπόπεροι ὄφεις εἰ ἐγίνοντο ὡς ἡ φύσις αὐτοῖσι ὑπάρχει, οὐκ ἂν ἦν βιώσιμα ἀνθρώποισι· νῦν δὲ ἐπεὰν θορνύωνται κατὰ ζεύγεα καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ ἢ ὁ ἔρσην τῇ ἐκποίησι, ἀπιεμένου αὐτοῦ τὴν γονὴν ἢ θήλεα ἄπτεται τῆς δειρῆς καὶ ἐμφῦσα οὐκ ἀνιεῖ πρὶν ἂν διαφάγη. Ὁ μὲν δὴ ἔρσην ἀποθνήσκει τρόπῳ τῷ εἰρημένῳ, ἡ δὲ θήλεα τίσιν τοιήνδε ἀποτίνει τῷ ἔρσην· τῷ γονεῖ τιμωρέοντα ἔτι ἐν τῇ γαστρὶ ἐόντα τὰ τέκνα

⁵⁵ Craik argues that the knowledge of the lymphatic system found in the Hippocratic *On Glands* was most likely a byproduct of haruspicy, with the treatise giving weight to the parts for which particular attention was granted in sacrifice (2009, 36). Nonetheless, haruspicy was in many ways a counter point to dissection, opening forth the body of animals but hiding its own procedure, basing its conclusions upon guarded knowledge.

⁵⁶ cf. Hippoc. *Aer.* 10; Arist. *Hist. An.* 497b17, 531a16; Theophrastus *Hist. Plant.* IX 17.4 who states that the animals of the Pontus do not have bile by cause of eating absinth.

This Thing of Darkness

διεσθίει τὴν μητέρα, διαφαγόντα δὲ τὴν νηδὺν αὐτῆς οὕτω τὴν ἔκδυσιν ποιέεται.
(3.108-9)

This passage similarly uses the language of dissection, with the insides of animals brought forcefully to the outside in order to investigate the origins of phenomena. Herodotus traces the fecundity (πολυγονία) of hares to their wombs, in which he uncovers the cause and mechanics of such an attribute: superfetation (ἐπικυίσκεσθαι). He visually reveals this to his audience, describing the appearance of the inside of a hare's womb. His description cuts his subject open to expose fetuses at different stages of growth, some with fur (τὸ μὲν δασὺ), some with none (τὸ δὲ ψιλόν), some only beginning to grow (τὸ δὲ ἄρτι πλάσσεται), others just conceived (τὸ δὲ ἀναιρέεται). So too does he locate the cause of few offspring (ὀλιγογονία) in lions to inside the womb of the lioness.⁵⁷ For the very process of birth brings the womb violently to the outside, showing itself plainly to have been torn apart by the sharp, savage claws of the cub, which it once held. And also with snakes, whose violent conception is answered by a violent birth as the offspring chew their way out, which, again, opens up the womb of the female, revealing its bloodied insides and the cause of the snake's ὀλιγογονία.⁵⁸

Beyond Anaxagoras, other thinkers in Herodotus' contemporary intellectual world were certainly employing the dissection of animals as a tool of both enquiry and display.⁵⁹ Hippocrates, for instance, recommends dissection as a means of proof in locating the origin of epilepsy:

ἦν διακόψης τὴν κεφαλὴν, εὐρήσεις τὸν ἐγκέφαλον ὑγρὸν ἔοντα καὶ ὕδρωπος περιπλεων καὶ κακὸν ὄζοντα, καὶ ἐν τούτῳ δηλονότι γνώση ὅτι οὐχ ὁ θεὸς τὸ σῶμα λυμαίνεται, ἀλλ' ἡ νοῦσος. (Hippoc. *Morb. Sac.* 11.10-3)

⁵⁷ It is evident that these concepts, πολυγονία and ὀλιγογονία, were matters of topical discussion in this period. Plato has Protagoras similarly argue that divine providence organised the relative fertility of prey and predators for the continuance of all species (καὶ τοῖς μὲν ὀλιγογονίαν προσήψε, τοῖς δ' ἀναλισκομένοις ὑπὸ τούτων πολυγονίαν, σωτηρίαν τῷ γένει πορίζων Plat. *Prt.* 321b5-6). See also Arist. *De. Gen. Anim.* IV 733a.

⁵⁸ Such a focus on the seed and the womb, in fact, superficially echoes Anaxagorean philosophy. Indeed, the language of Plutarch's passage would seem to demonstrate that Anaxagoras' concerns in practicing dissection reflected his philosophical interests, describing the ram's brain, the source of its condition, as an egg (ὥσπερ ᾠδόν) and the horn's base as a root extending from it (ῥίζα). Furthermore, the timeline of events even allows Herodotus to have observed Anaxagoras' scientific spectacle, perhaps influencing his own conceptualisation of dissection, emphasising its role in locating the cause through observation, and also a focus on performance and display. However, unfortunately, such a comparison is not without issue: The first problem is that of transmission, for Plutarch's account is the only reference to this event. This is compounded by the fact that whilst Anaxagoras was intensely concerned with seeds and origins, the surviving corpus does not demonstrate a thorough interest in dissection. Secondly, there is the matter that Plutarch's description cannot be accurate. As Philip Stadter observes "An animal so deformed would not have lived long enough to grow its "strong, solid" horn, nor is there in fact any relation between the horn and the skull (much less the brain)" (1989, 89). And indeed, the story fits almost too perfectly with Plutarch's thematic discussion of Pericles' life. However, this said, there is no reason to doubt that this story at least reflects actual Anaxagorean methods.

⁵⁹ For Herodotus' relationship with the medical authors see Thomas (2002, 28–74), who focuses especially upon Herodotus' ethnographic analysis, see also her extension upon this argument which sees the historian engaging in contemporary debate even more closely (2006, 60–75).

Going on to extrapolate his results from goats to conclusions regarding human epilepsy, Hippocrates uses dissection to give weight to his arguments. Like Herodotus, his text provides dissection as a recommendation, placing the greatest emphasis upon *autopsy*, in all senses of the word. Readers are invited to perform dissection for themselves, placing value on the visual, gaining authority from the procedure, not simply the conclusions.⁶⁰

Indeed, there is some evidence to suggest that the Hippocratic physicians even went so far as to perform human dissection as early as the fifth century BCE.⁶¹ Alcmaeon of Croton, similarly, may have been dissecting human remains in Sicily prior to Herodotus' composition of the *Histories*, whilst Empedoclean medical theory seems to have equally required at least some exploration of human cadavers.⁶² Nonetheless, Herodotus was certainly operating at a time in which interest in dissection as a means of both scientific enquiry and performative display was forming.⁶³ In Egypt, he dwells upon the practice of mummification, describing the three different methods in anatomical and technical detail (2.86-7). He describes the removal of the brain and the rinsing of the skull (Πρώτα μὲν σκολιῶ σιδήρῳ διὰ τῶν μυξωτήρων ἐξάγουσι τὸν ἐγκέφαλον, τὰ μὲν αὐτοῦ οὕτω ἐξάγοντες, τὰ δὲ ἐγγέοντες φάρμακα), the removal of the organs from the abdomen and how it is scraped clean (Μετὰ δὲ λίθῳ αἰθιοπικῶ ὀξεῖ παρασχίσαντες παρὰ τὴν λαπάρην ἐξ ὧν εἶλον τὴν κοιλίην πᾶσαν, ἐκκαθήραντες δὲ αὐτὴν καὶ διηθήσαντες οἴνῳ φοινικίῳ αὐτίς διηθέουσι θυμῆμασι τετριμμένοις), in each case focusing on both the process and the tools used. He records the exact number of days required to dissolve the flesh, stomach and intestines (Ταῦτα δὲ ποιήσαντες ταριχεύουσι λίτρῳ κρύψαντες ἡμέρας ἑβδομήκοντα), and how this mixture is poured out from the skin and bones (ἢ δὲ ἔχει τοσαύτην δύναμιν ὥστε ἅμα ἐωυτῇ τὴν νηδὺν καὶ τὰ σπλάγχνα κατατετηκότα ἐξάγει· τὰς δὲ σάρκας τὸ λίτρον κατατῆγει, καὶ δὴ λείπεται τοῦ νεκροῦ τὸ δέσμα μόνον καὶ τὰ ὀστέα). He presents a

⁶⁰ On the epideictic nature of the Hippocratic treatises see Agarwalla (2010) and Craik (2010).

⁶¹ Edelstein (1967, 255) argues that all the Hippocratic physicians gained their knowledge of anatomy “from chance observation and from animal dissection”, however, seems to entirely ignore a number of passages that directly refer to human dissection: *On Joints*, for example, recommends probing the shoulder socket of a cadver in order to determine the natural position of the bones (46), whilst *On Diseases I* refers to puss visible only by opening the tubercle of the lung (19). Similarly, other Hippocratic treatises display anatomical knowledge that most likely required the use of human dissection (*De Loc. Hom. 2; De Carn. 17*).

⁶² The somewhat ambiguous hints of human dissection can be read in Chalcidius *Commentary on Plato's 'Timaeus'* (Wrobel 279ff. *D.K.*24A10) which states that Alcmaeon was the first to dare to approach the excision of the eye (primus exsectionem [oculi] adgredi est ausus). Aristotle, similarly, preserves an Empedoclean verse on the composition of the eye: ὡς δὲ τότ' ἐν μήνιξι ἐεργμένον ὠγύγιον πῦρ/ λεπτήσιν τ' ὀθόνησι λοχεύσατο κύκλωπα κούρηγ-/ <αῖ> χοράνησι διάντα τετρήατο θεσπεσίησιν-/ αἰ δ' ὕδατος μὲν βένθος ἀπείστεγον ἀμφιναέντος/ πῦρ δ' ἔξω διέσκον, ὅσον ταναώτερον ἦεν (437b29ff.).

⁶³ For a full list of the physiological queries being investigated at this time see Longrigg (2002, 54–7).

recipe for mummification, a technical manual, both vivid and precise.⁶⁴ He explores the human body with the style and tools of scientific dissection. A practice based on taking external observed phenomena and explaining them through a bloody exploration of internal mechanics.

In this way, Herodotus' broader historiographical methodology quite closely reflects the concerns and practices of early medical and philosophical dissection.⁶⁵ Dissection takes as its starting point an observed phenomenon, for the medical writers a disease or anatomical feature, for the philosophers a natural force or anomaly.⁶⁶ Through dissection such phenomena are opened up and explored, their origins exposed to be seen by the audience. Dissection is a spectacle, visible and self-evident in its conclusions. So too does Herodotus begin with external observation before exposing his subjects' internal mechanics. His proem promises to uncover the cause, the origin, the truth, of the well-known, much mythologised Persian war.⁶⁷ He presents competing interpretations on natural occurrences, such as the flooding of the Nile or the extent of Egypt, before disproving them with his own measurements and observations, revealing openly his techniques and sources (2.19-34). Like the dissector he places the greatest value on ὄψις and causation.⁶⁸ He continually imposes himself upon his subject to uncover its origin, its purpose, its meaning.

⁶⁴ Indeed this section is directly preceded by a description of Egyptian medical practice, which Herodotus reports as treating each part of the body separately (2.84), demonstrating an interest not only in medical theory, as represented by the Hippocratic writings, but also the specifics of medical practice.

⁶⁵ On the pervasive impact of the Hippocratic texts, especially on works concerning human suffering, see Kosak (2004). On the rhetoric of medical and philosophical texts more broadly see van der Eijk (1997, *passim* esp. 93-99).

⁶⁶ Indeed Aëtius records Pythagoras as first describing the project of philosophers as *ἱστορία περὶ φύσεως* (I 3, 8 *D.K.*58B15).

⁶⁷ Herodotus, in fact, emphasises discovering the cause above all else: *τά τε ἄλλα καὶ δι' ἣν αἰτίην ἐπολέμησαν ἀλλήλοισι* (1.0).

⁶⁸ 2.99.1; 2.123.1; 2.147.1; 2.154.4, these passages contain the most explicit description of how Herodotus gathered and processed his sources. He ranks ὄψις, ἀκοή and γνώμη in decreasing effectiveness as techniques of investigation. Although somewhat tangential to this paper, whether or not this system delineated throughout book 2 is meant to be applied to the work as a whole is somewhat controversial, for instance, Marincola claims that "one problem of discerning Herodotus' method arises from the polymorphous nature of the material he includes. When, for example, he states in Book II (99.1) that his narrative will be based on *opsis*, *akoē*, and *gnōmē*, does he mean this is simply for Book II, or for this part of Book II, or is this construed by the reader as valid for the entire work? We have no way of knowing. My own opinion is that it is not to be seen as universal (which is why it is stated here), and this hierarchy would indeed serve little purpose in the later narrative of a war and its battles, or indeed in the early history of Lydia or Persia" (Marincola 2001, 36). However, Herodotus' consistent use of ring composition (see *inter alia* Immerwahr 1966) and recurrence of key themes certainly implies some methodological unity. Indeed even this terminology can be seen echoed throughout the work (for ὄψις, see: 1.131.1; 1.140.1-2; 3.1.5: for ἀκοή, see: 1.95.1; 1.133.2; 3.105.2; 7.12.1: γνώμη appears throughout the work in terms such as *δοκέω*). As such, we should certainly read his exposition of investigative methods as applying to the entire work. On how this investigative system is slightly altered the further Herodotus moves away from Greece see Lateiner (1989, pp. 101 ff.).

When his narrative reaches the relationship between the two Spartan kings at the time of the conflict between Athens and Aegina, Demaratus and Cleomenes, Herodotus endeavours to explain the origin of this phenomenon, that is, dual kingship in Sparta. He records first the Spartan account in which Argeia, wife of Spartan king Aristomachus, gives birth to twin boys, but refuses to reveal which son is the elder. The story itself puts focus on observation (ὄψις), with the Spartans learning the true nature of the children's birth by paying attention to the order in which their mother washed and fed them. Herodotus then proceeds to discuss the genealogy of the Spartan kings, providing two versions which equally trace their ancestry to Egyptian chieftains. He continues on to “mention points which no other writer has touched upon (τὰ δὲ ἄλλοι οὐ κατελάβοντο, τούτων μνήμην ποιήσομαι 6.55)”, describing the customs, responsibilities and prerogatives of the Spartan kings. Such an exploration comes to its first climax in the deposition of Demaratus, whose lineage is brought into question, and revealed to be an imposter. It is only after Herodotus' exposition of Spartan genealogy that Demaratus' lineage can be properly exposed, his deposition real and tangible evidence of the *Histories'* investigation. With Herodotus' dissection of Spartan history and custom, Demaratus can be shown to be false, one who has the external visage of a king, but not the internal nature.

However, following this, Herodotus leads his investigation into Sparta to a far more dramatic and charged moment, the spectacularly gory suicide of Cleomenes:

Κλεομένης δὲ παραλαβὼν τὸν σίδηρον ἄρχετο ἐκ τῶν κνημέων ἐωστὸν λωβώμενος· ἐπιτάμων γὰρ κατὰ μῆκος τὰς σάρκας προέβαινε ἐκ τῶν κνημέων ἐς τοὺς μηρούς, ἐκ δὲ τῶν μηρῶν ἔς τε τὰ ἰσχία καὶ τὰς λαπάρας, ἐς ὃ ἐς τὴν γαστέρα ἀπῆκετο καὶ ταύτην καταχορδεύων ἀπέθανε τρόπῳ τοιούτῳ. (6.75)

One of Herodotus' most detailed, anatomically focused descriptions of death, Cleomenes' body parts explode forth from the narrative. It confronts us with a spectacular display of madness and the truly gruesome. The focus on piece-by-piece, progressive vivisection seems to be, at least partially, influenced by an interest in medical and forensic dissection. Like his dissection of animals before, he brings to the forefront the real, tangible and bloodied insides of his subject. His pain is kept distant from the reader, and Herodotus records no final words.

The historian is now interested in the mechanics of this death and the pieces of his body, the person of Cleomenes fades into the background as his flesh is cut away. But more interesting is its position in the investigative narrative of Spartan kingship. This graphic explosion of blood and flesh occurs not simply at a dramatic high point, but also at an

investigative end point, death of a Spartan king appearing at the apex of Herodotus' discussion of Spartan kingship.⁶⁹

He has been dissecting and exploring the customs and history of Spartan diarchy and it is at this point that Cleomenes' graphic death is described. In this way, it is possible to see a brief synecdoche between Cleomenes and the practice of Spartan kingship as a whole.⁷⁰ So just as the flesh of the king is taken apart and exposed to Herodotus' audience, so too are the customs, prerogatives and responsibilities of all Spartan kings.⁷¹ The purposes, origins and history of this practice are investigated over Cleomenes' blood stained body. Herodotus' investigative strategy makes its way over Cleomenes just as it does any other subject, pulling away its external façade strip by strip, revealing its internal mechanics. This is not to say, however, that Cleomenes is a purposeful metaphorical representation of Spartan kingship, but rather, that this description presents itself as the most effective display of enquiry. Herodotus' investigation into Sparta can be most spectacularly shown by this graphic mutilation.

This interest in taking apart the human body, therefore, is not only an indication of his acquaintance with the dissection found in contemporary medical and philosophical texts, but is also fundamentally enmeshed with his overall analytic scheme. His investigation of the human body often reflects his investigation into related customs or histories, for example, like the body of Cleomenes, Cambyses digs up Amasis' corpse, exposing it to a whole manner of desecration, coinciding both with the Persian king's and Herodotus' probing of Egypt (3.16). Like Anaxagoras' ram, these kings are dissected, their insides brought violently into view, their true natures explored plainly and visibly for in audience.⁷² Indeed, both these accounts spur a deeper investigation into the bodies of their subjects. In the case of Amasis, Herodotus

⁶⁹ On the importance of Herodotus' discussion of Spartan kingship to his broader analysis of political systems see Munson (1993, 40–4).

⁷⁰ On the conflation between the body and other objects of enquiry cf. Benardete's analysis of Herodotus' crocodile and hippopotamus: "the monstrous character of both these amphibious animals, the double look they have— the hippopotamus with the hooves of a bull and the mane, tail, and voice of a horse but the size of the largest bull, and the crocodile with the eyes and tusks of a boar but otherwise like lizards, shows how difficult Herodotus sees his task to be of uniting the disproportion between the ultimate causes of Egypt (its land and river) and their results, the customs and beliefs of the Egyptians. The disproportion exists in the animals themselves. The crocodile's scaly, unbreakable skin, which is the product of its power of growth, resembles Egypt itself, with its permanent, unchanging appearance that the moving power of the Nile has effected (cf. III.12; 16.2). Indeed, Herodotus himself underlies the resemblance. The Ionians, in calling them crocodiles because of their likeness to their native lizards, do what Herodotus did in comparing the action of the Nile to that of their other rivers in Ionia, "to compare the small with the large" (10.1). Egypt and the crocodile have both become large from the very smallest of beginnings" (1969, 55).

⁷¹ The self-reflexive aspect of this suicide perhaps allows us to see Cleomenes as both dissector and dissected, investigation brought back upon itself, a maddening cycle that closes itself off, that hides and muddies its results for the outside observer. cf. Zopyrus' self-mutilation that allows him to deceive others, uninvestigated by the enemy (3.154–5).

⁷² cf. Christ 1994, 167–202

presents an Egyptian story by which the desecrated body is not that of their king, but another man of similar stature. The historian, however, imposes upon the investigation and lays much doubt upon the story. Amasis' body has been prodded and plucked and burnt, revealed and examined through the very unholiness of Cambyses' act, laid bare for the audience. Cleomenes, also, is investigated further, the cause of his madness questioned (6.75-84). Herodotus provides multiple accounts, firstly he gives the opinion of the majority of Greeks, that his madness was divine punishment for corrupting the Pythia at Delphi. He goes on to give the opinion of the Athenians, that it is was for devastating the sacred land of Demeter and Persephone, then the Argives, that it came after cutting Argive fugitives to pieces on holy ground, before setting fire to the grove. The final explanation, provided by the Spartans, argues that he went mad after acquiring the custom of drinking unmixed wine from the Scythians.⁷³ Herodotus provides the full context behind each of these stories, before stating that his opinion rests upon the first conclusion. Like Cleomenes' body, he takes the external appearance of a number of opinions before exploring their inner workings and internal logic in order to expose his own judgement on the matter.

Blood and body parts continue to reflect his overall investigative methodology as the narrative progresses. He continues to look upon body parts as distinct from historical characters, he only rarely uses the body to explore pain and emotion, instead usually employing these as an investigative canvas over which to examine custom, history and the natural world. The bleeding flesh of an unnamed Athenian exposes the history of brooches and traces the origin of Athenian dress (5.87); the unjust blinding of the shepherd Evenius brings into relief the root of Deiphonus' prophetic power (9.92-5); the decapitated head of the Scythian king Scylas excavates and reveals the importance of tradition to the Scythian people (4.80). Indeed, Herodotus' interest in the left-over parts of violence, severed limbs, ears, noses, tongues, breasts and lips, reflects analytic frameworks found throughout fifth century critical enquiry. The objective divisibility of subjects can be found in philosophical ideas, Plato's technique of *diairesis*, or Leucippus' developing atomic theory, for instance, and medical writers, who continually prefer to pinpoint the cause of a disease to a localised area or defined trigger rather than holistically treat the patient.⁷⁴

⁷³ Whilst Hartog's argument that "boire le vin pur est le fait d'un sauvage et represente une transgression" is certainly true, Cleomenes does not imbibe the violence of the Scythians: in keeping with Hartog's argument of *forms* of violence, Cleomenes' suicide echoes a Greek sacrifice (with its focus on the thighs) far more than any Scythian practice (1980, 182-3).

⁷⁴ Indeed Plato appears to adopt, or at least appropriate, the Empedoclean four-element theory and apply it to the classification of diseases (*Tim.* 81-4). For more on the medical approach to specific body parts see Longrigg (2002, 26-103).

The emerging practice of medical amputation most clearly demonstrates this analytic mindset. Hippocrates' *On Joints*, for example, proposes the amputation of limbs in cases of extreme gangrene (Χρῆ δὲ, ὅσα ἂν κατωτέρω τοῦ σώματος τῶν ὀρίων τοῦ μελασμοῦ ἔη, ταῦτα, ὅταν ἤδη πάμπαν τεθνήκη καὶ ἀναλγέα ἔη, ἀφαιρέειν κατὰ τὸ ἄρθρον, προμηθεόμενον ὅπως μὴ τιτρώσκη 69.14-7), excising that tissue which has been observed to be affected by the disease. Such a practice requires the limb to be separated and examined distinctly from the remainder of the body.

In this way, the various stray body parts that litter the *Histories* are intrinsically related to Herodotus' overall scheme of enquiry. He continually deals with regions, events and customs by delineating a part from the whole. His proem looks east to the massive, unwieldy continents of Asia and Africa, however, his narrative breaks it down into discrete units. He deals with Lydia, Egypt, Libya, India, each on their own terms, separated from the whole, with each of their features, customs, geography, history, dealt with by discrete explanatory units.⁷⁵ He takes this to its full degree in his discussion of Scythian headhunting:

Τὰ δ' ἐς πόλεμον ἔχοντα ὠδέ σφι διάκειται. Ἐπεὰν τὸν πρῶτον ἄνδρα καταβάλῃ ἀνήρ Σκύθης, τοῦ αἵματος ἐμπίνει. Ὅσους δ' ἂν φονεύσῃ ἐν τῇ μάχῃ, τούτων τὰς κεφαλὰς ἀποφέρει τῷ βασιλεῖ· ἀπενείκας μὲν γὰρ κεφαλὴν τῆς λήϊης μεταλαμβάνει τὴν ἂν λάβωσι, μὴ ἐνείκας δὲ οὐ. Ἀποδείρει δὲ αὐτὴν τρόπῳ τοιῷδε· περιταμῶν κύκλῳ περὶ τὰ ὦτα καὶ λαβόμενος τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐκσεῖει, μετὰ δὲ σαρκίσας βοῶς πλευρῇ δέψει τῆσι χερσί, ὀργάσας δὲ αὐτὸ ἅτε χειρώμακτρον ἔκτηται, ἐκ δὲ τῶν χαλινῶν τοῦ ἵππου τὸν αὐτὸς ἐλαύνει, ἐκ τούτου ἐξάπτει καὶ ἀγάλλεται. (4.64)

He goes on:

Ταῦτα μὲν δὴ οὕτω σφι νενόμισται. Αὐτὰς δὲ τὰς κεφαλὰς, οὔτι πάντων ἀλλὰ τῶν ἐχθίστων, ποιεῦσι τάδε. Ἀποπρίσας [ἕκαστος] πᾶν τὸ ἐνερθε τῶν ὀφρύων ἐκκαθαίρει· καὶ ἦν μὲν ἦ πένης, ὁ δὲ ἔξωθεν ὠμοβοέην μούνην περιτείνας οὕτω χρᾶται, ἦν δὲ [ἦ] πλούσιος, τὴν μὲν ὠμοβοέην περιτείνει, ἔσωθεν δὲ καταχρυσώσας οὕτω χρᾶται <ἅτε> ποτηρίῳ. (4.65)

With this exploration, Herodotus looks at the intricacies of severed heads. With a brief mention of their mode of acquisition, the historian quickly forgets about the victims and moves promptly onto tracing the transformation from decapitated head to drinking vessel. He is concerned with the intricacies of the methods used to scrape out the flesh and remove the

⁷⁵ cf. the late Hippocratic treatise *On Sevens* which compares the seven parts of the earth to the seven parts of the human body (11). It sees in the Bosphorus a resemblance to the feet, in the Hellespont, the legs, in Egypt, the belly, in the Black Sea, the lower intestine, in Ionia, that which is located *inter viscera et praecordia*, in the Corinthian Isthmus, the neck and in the Peloponnesus (*magnarum animarum habitationem*), the head. Whilst this text, which only survives in a Latin translation, takes its comparison to an extreme, it does reflect Herodotus' scheme of treating his various historical objects, be they geographic, cultural or else, in the same manner as he approaches the human body. On how analogies between the body and the cosmos are present not only in this text, but represent a long Hippocratic, and generally medical, tradition see le Blay (2005, 251–70). Concerning *On Sevens* see also Mazzarino (1947, 65ff.).

skin. He discusses with anatomical precision where the bone is cut, and how the raw skull is furnished with hide and gilded. He follows the severed head, not the grief that surrounds the victim or its fallen body, he uses it as evidence of a Scythian custom, a custom severed from Persian, Egyptian or Indian practice, with its own intricacies, origins and evidence. Herodotus is building Asia piece by piece, severing part from the whole.

Herodotus looks upon body parts with an anatomical and wondrous gaze just as he looks upon his historical subjects: customs, events, people, geographical areas, he is concerned with their inner workings, their specific origins and their wonders. He explores the missing hands of statues, supposedly representing slaves, whose hands were cut off by Mycerinus' spiteful wife (2.131). These missing hands are proof of Mycerinus' shameful act, violating his daughter. These missing hands trace back the history of Egypt's kings, explain its statues and monuments and its present politics. However, Herodotus turns this on its head. He sees on the floor, below the statues, the fallen hands, evidence of an untrustworthy source. He beholds the severed bodies of his work's victims with an inquisitive eye.

Indeed, Herodotus' conceptualisation of the human body as an arena of critical enquiry is more culturally enshrined than simply in the works of the philosophers and medical writers. The human body had been the subject of forensic violence, perhaps long before the advent of performative scientific dissection and medical investigation. Aristotle records the forensic use of torture, in a political context, as early as 514 BCE on Aristogeiton at the hands of the tyrant Hippias (Arist. *Ath.* 18.1-5).⁷⁶ Likewise, Antiphon, contemporaneously to Herodotus, mentions it as a well-established practice in Athenian legal proceedings.⁷⁷ He provides us with a compelling example, which demonstrates the cultural link between critical enquiry, torture and truth:

καὶ ἰέναι ἐκέλευον λαβόντα μάρτυρας ὁπόσους βούλοιο ἐπὶ τοὺς παραγενομένους, λέγων αὐτῷ ὄνόματι ἕκαστον, τούτους ἐρωτᾶν καὶ ἐλέγχειν, τοὺς μὲν ἐλευθέρους ὡς χρῆ τοὺς ἐλευθέρους, οἱ σφῶν <αὐτῶν> ἔνεκα καὶ τοῦ δικαίου ἔφραζον ἂν τάληθῆ καὶ τὰ γινόμενα, τοὺς δὲ δούλους, εἰ μὲν αὐτῷ ἐρωτῶντι τάληθῆ δοκοῖεν λέγειν, εἰ δὲ μὴ, ἔτοιμος ἢ ἐκδιδόναι βασανίζειν τοὺς τε ἑμαυτοῦ πάντας, καὶ εἴ τινος τῶν ἀλλοτρίων κελεύει, ὡμολόγουν πείσας τὸν δεσπότην παραδώσειν αὐτῷ βασανίζειν τρόπον ὁποῖον βούλοιο. (Antiph. 6.23)

⁷⁶ An emotionally charged scene, under torture, Aristogeiton feigns willingness to give up the names of his fellow conspirators, asking for Hippias' handshake as a guarantee. When Hippias complies and offers his hand, Aristogeiton taunts him for shaking the hand of his brother's murderer. The word used here is ἀκίσειν, however, the concurrent questioning makes it clear that this is forensic, not punitive, torture.

⁷⁷ Gagarin draws a distinction between evidentiary (two-party) torture and judicial (one-party) torture: he states that evidentiary torture always resulted from a challenge, whilst judicial torture was carried out by either this victim, his representative or a public official (1996, 3–4). Ultimately both forms of torture referred to here are investigative and not punitive.

Here, the bodies of slaves are presented as tokens of truth, assurances against the speaker's deceit. Their untortured speech is only accepted as a matter of opinion, as a matter that must find consensus (τάληθῆ δοκοῖεν λέγειν), whilst their testimony under torture guarantees objective truth. Later, Lysias shows such an opinion to an even greater extent:

καὶ ἐπεβούλευον μὲν αὐτῷ, οὕτω δὲ ἦλθον ἀπαράσκευος, ὥστε μήτε φίλους μήτε οἰκέτας μήτε ἄλλον ἄνθρωπον παρακαλέσαι μηδένα, εἰ μὴ τοῦτό γε τὸ παιδίον, ὃ ἐπικουρήσαι μὲν μοι οὐκ ἂν ἐδύνατο, μηνῦσαι δὲ ἱκανὸν ἦν βασανιζόμενον, εἴ τι ἐγὼ ἐξημάρτανον; (Lys. 3. 33)

In this case, it is the very torturability of the slave's body that provides insurance against any wrongdoing of the speaker. The violence of torture extracts objective truth. Indeed its perceived relationship with truth is often promoted as one of necessity:

Ὅρω δὲ καὶ ὑμᾶς καὶ περὶ τῶν ἰδίων καὶ περὶ τῶν δημοσίων οὐδὲν πιστότερον οὐδ' ἀληθέστερον βασάνου νομίζοντας, καὶ μάρτυρας μὲν ἡγουμένους οἷόν τ' εἶναι καὶ τῶν μὴ παραγενομένων παρασκευάσασθαι, τὰς δὲ βασάνους φανερώς ἐπιδεικνύναι ὁπότεροι τάληθῆ λέγουσιν. (Isoc. 17.54)

Ἵμεῖς μὲν τοίνυν καὶ ἰδία καὶ δημοσία βάσανον ἀκριβέστατον ἔλεγχον νομίζετε· καὶ ὁπότεν δούλοι καὶ ἐλεύθεροι παραγέωνται καὶ δέη εὐρεθῆναι τι τῶν ζητούμενων, οὐ χρήσθε ταῖς τῶν ἐλευθέρων μαρτυρίαις, ἀλλὰ τοὺς δούλους βασανίζοντες, οὕτω ζητεῖτε εὐρεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν τῶν γεγενημένων. Εἰκότως, ὧ ἄνδρες· σύνιστε γὰρ ὅτι τῶν μὲν μαρτυρησάντων ἤδη τινὲς ἔδοξαν οὐ τάληθῆ μαρτυρήσαι, τῶν δὲ βασανισθέντων οὐδένας πώποτε ἐξηλέγχθησαν ὡς οὐκ ἀληθῆ ἐκ τῶν βασάνων εἰπόντες. (Is. 8.12)⁷⁸

In this way torture views the body not only as an object that *can* be manipulated, but one that *must* be manipulated in order to discover truth. Information cannot flow out willingly; it must be violently taken if it is to be considered legitimate.⁷⁹ We find Herodotus, then, operating in a context in which controlled forensic violence is being used as a standard form of enquiry upon the human body.

Indeed, like Herodotus' *apodexis* and Anaxagoras' dissection, torture was, ideally, performative, viewed not as a matter of questioning (ἐλέγχειν) but rather *autopsy*.⁸⁰ An anecdote provided by Antiphon demonstrates the importance placed upon transparency:

⁷⁸ cf. D. 30.37: Ἵμεῖς τοίνυν καὶ ἰδία καὶ δημοσία βάσανον ἀκριβεστάτην πασῶν <πίστων> νομίζετε, καὶ ὅπου ἂν δούλοι καὶ ἐλεύθεροι παραγέωνται, δέη δ' εὐρεθῆναι τὸ ζητούμενον, οὐ χρήσθε ταῖς τῶν ἐλευθέρων μαρτυρίαις, ἀλλὰ τοὺς δούλους βασανίζοντες, οὕτω ζητεῖτε τὴν ἀλήθειαν εὐρεῖν. εἰκότως, ὧ ἄνδρες δικασταί· τῶν μὲν γὰρ μαρτυρησάντων ἤδη τινὲς οὐ τάληθῆ μαρτυρήσαι ἔδοξαν· τῶν δὲ βασανισθέντων οὐδένας πώποτ' ἐξηλέγχθησαν, ὡς οὐκ ἀληθῆ τὰ ἐκ τῆς βασάνου εἶπον. The language here clearly directly echoes Isaeus. This is either due to their relationship as master and pupil (Plut. *Dem.* 5), or it may reflect a very standardised rhetoric concerning truth and the use of torture. Either way, it demonstrates the persistent opinion that torture was both a legitimate and powerful form of objective enquiry.

⁷⁹ Consider also Isoc. 17.11-7 in which the speaker claims that if the slave present were to be tortured the case would be cleared up instantaneously, but refuses to verbally interrogate him.

⁸⁰ cf. duBois' argument concerning the conceptualization of torture and its relationship to Platonic philosophy: "The Socratic debate in its search for the truth seems somehow to shade, in the practice of the

Spectacle of Enquiry

Οἶμαι δ' ὑμᾶς ἐπίστασθαι τοῦτο, ὅτι ἐφ' οἷς ἂν τὸ πλεῖστον μέρος τῆς βασάνου, πρὸς τούτων εἰσὶν οἱ βασανιζόμενοι λέγειν ὅ τι ἂν ἐκείνοις μέλλωσι χαριεῖσθαι· ἐν τούτῳ γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐστὶν ἡ ὠφέλεια, ἄλλως τε κὰν μὴ παρόντες τυγχάνωσιν ὧν ἂν καταπεύδωνται. Εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἐγὼ ἐκέλευον αὐτὸν στρεβλοῦν ὡς οὐ τάληθῆ λέγοντα, ἴσως ἂν ἐν αὐτῷ τούτῳ ἀπετρέπετο μηδὲν κατ' ἐμοῦ καταπεύδεσθαι· νῦν δὲ αὐτοὶ ἦσαν καὶ βασανιστὰ καὶ ἐπιτιμητὰ τῶν σφίσιν αὐτοῖς συμφερόντων. (Antiph. 5.32)

Torture is only valid when open and exposed. It is subverted when performed behind closed-doors.⁸¹ The display of torture is intrinsic to its value, the information it extracts gains its authority from its self-evident nature: both parties must observe the twisted and prodded body pour forth its truths.⁸²

In this way the rhetoric of torture is deeply embedded in the language of critical enquiry. Its focus on display, enquiry and truth closely echoes the concerns of Herodotus' critical project. Like Athenian forensic torture, the violence of Herodotus' narrative plays out over the bodies of his various victims with an inquisitive eye, pursuing proof. When Xerxes brands Leontiades and the Thebans after the battle of Thermopylae, their searing and marked flesh is self-evident, visual proof of their Medising, their trial as traitors to Greece carried out over their skin (7.233).⁸³ So too when Xerxes surveys the corpses on the battlefield and cuts off Leonidas' head, skewering it upon a stake, does Herodotus show the intensity of the Persian king's anger against his Spartan counterpart, mapping this outrage over his body, wrenching it to pieces, putting up on display (7.238). Herodotus looks to the human body as a theatre of proof, its manipulated and misshapen pieces clear and manifest evidence of his enquiries. He submits these disfigured bodies to his audience, his *dicasts*, to support his claims: he has tested and tried his histories upon the bodies of his characters.

To torture was to test, its very vocabulary entangled with the world of critical enquiry. The βάσανος, the touchstone, the standard Greek term for torture, in its simplest form denoted a 'dark coloured stone on which pure gold, when rubbed, leaves a peculiar mark'.⁸⁴ This touchstone, which visibly exposed the metal's true nature, was self-evident and inquisitive. In the sixth century BCE, it came to metaphorically imply a test or trial more generally, however, by the fifth century BCE, its use to denote torture was deeply embedded in

elegkhos, into something resembling an interrogation, perhaps even, given the Greek legal practices, interrogation under torture" (1991, 112–3).

⁸¹ Indeed, it is when slaves are humanized, offered freedom, approached as subjective, thinking individuals that torture breaks down (Antiph. 5.31). It is only as objects, impartial and corporeal, that they can yield truth through violence.

⁸² For a full explanation of the laws associated with the testimony of slaves and the conditions of torture in such cases see MacDowell (1978, 245–7).

⁸³ On the poetics of branding see duBois' discussion of the tattooed slave (5.35) by whose scalp Histaeus communicates with Aristagoras (2003, 3–4).

⁸⁴ *LSJ* q.v. βάσανος

Athenian legal language.⁸⁵ Thucydides' claim, then, that people accept stories about the past in an *untested* manner (οἱ γὰρ ἄνθρωποι τὰς ἀκοὰς τῶν προγεγενημένων, καὶ ἦν ἐπυχώρια σφίσις ἦ, ὁμοίως ἀβασανίστως παρ' ἀλλήλων δέχονται 1.20) sees critical enquiry taking on this rich term as part of its own self-reflexive analysis.⁸⁶ Similarly, Hippocrates uses the term to simply denote *scientific investigation* ("Ὀκως δὲ χρῆ ἕκαστα τῶν προειρημένων σκοπέειν καὶ βασανίζειν, ἐγὼ φράσω σαφέως *Aer.* 3), whilst Herodotus himself uses it both for *rigorous questioning* (1.116) and *inquisitive torture* (8.110).⁸⁷ In this way, the language used to describe critical enquiry was already deeply associated with objective violence, demonstrating a conceptual link between the methods and aims of both practices.⁸⁸

It is in this way then that when Cambyses reveals that the very Smerdis who sits upon the throne of Persia is a Magus and not his brother, those around him listening to the revelation do not believe him, they hear only his untrusted word. As such, Otanes' subsequent investigation is played out not over Cambyses' testimony, but rather the body of Smerdis. For since his daughter's reports reveal a palace shrouded in darkness and an unseen king, he decides to confirm his suspicions with a tactile order:

Νῦν ὦν ποιήσον τάδε· ἐπεὰν σοὶ συνεύδῃ καὶ μάθῃς αὐτὸν κατυπνωμένον, ἄφασον αὐτοῦ τὰ ὦτα. Καὶ ἦν μὲν φαίνεται ἔχων ὦτα, νόμιζε σεωυτὴν Σμέρδι τῷ Κύρου συνοικέειν, ἦν δὲ μὴ ἔχων, σὺ δὲ τῷ μάγῳ Σμέρδι. (3.69)

Like gold upon the touchstone, she rubs her hands around his misshapen head, she feels the absence of his ears, cut off as a punishment for an unnamed crime. It is the mutilated body that proves his suspicions, the mark of violence that swears to Smerdis' identity.⁸⁹

So just as the mark of the touchstone reveals the deceitful metal and the egg-shaped brain of Anaxagoras' ram swears to the cause of its horn, so too do the bloodied and twisted bodies

⁸⁵ Theognis demonstrates the use of the term to imply testing in a simile with gold: Οὐδέν' ὁμοῖον ἐμοὶ δύναμαι διζήμενος εὐρεῖν/ πιστὸν ἑταῖρον, ὅτῳ μὴ τις ἔνεστι δόλος/ ἐς βάσανον δ' ἐλθὼν παρατρίβομαι ὥστε μολύβδῳ/ χρυσός, ὑπερτερῆς δ' ἄμμιν ἔνεστι λόγος (1.415-8). On the metaphor of testing gold and its connection to a changing aristocracy in the sixth century BCE see duBois (1991, 9–11). Its association with physical suffering later became the normative use, such as the *agony* of battle (ἡ κατὰ τὸ ἔργον βάσανος S.E. M. 6.24) or the tortures of disease (ποικίλιας νόσοις καὶ βασάνοις *Ev. Matt.* 4.24).

⁸⁶ It is perhaps interesting that this passage continues on to refer to the assassination of Hipparchus by Aristogeiton, whose subsequent torture was a story with much currency by the time of Aristotle (*Ath.* 18.1-5), a story also told, supposedly incorrectly, but Herodotus. As such, it is possible to read Thucydides' use of this term as quite loaded, playing with the entire panoply of meaning for βάσανος.

⁸⁷ Consider Austin's claim that words are always accompanied by "trailing clouds of etymology" (1961).

⁸⁸ Similarly, if we consider critical enquiry as a body invested with the symbolic power of investigation, a holder of truth περὶ φύσεως, we may imagine a constant interchange between violence and enquiry, an indelible relationship of power that permeates the authority of knowledge in the fifth century BCE (cf. Bourdieu 1998, *passim* esp. 102ff.).

⁸⁹ For more on the relationship between the macabre and identification cf. Zopyrus' self-mutilation (3.154-5).

of the *Histories* lend weight to Herodotus' enquiries. As the brain flows forth from the ram's opened skull those present are given a gruesome token of proof, Anaxagoras' violent *epideictic* dissection assures the rhetorical power of his proof. Unlike Lampon, he does not speak forth his theory concerning the cause of the horn, but rather he offers his audience this violence as assurance of his authority.

Herodotus continues to display these left-overs of violence, these signifiers of enquiry with fascination and intrigue. It is the bloody and macabre that draws his eye. Xerxes invites his soldiers to tour the battlefield of Thermopylae and look upon the scattered corpses, to look upon the morbid evidence of his greatness (8.24-5).⁹⁰ The body of the Scythian king is cut open, cleaned out and stuffed, as each town looks upon it they cut a piece of their ears, gash their foreheads and noses and pierce their hands with arrows (4.71). The Spartans look upon Hegistratus' foot, which he cut off himself in order to escape, still lying in the stocks, a manifest sign of his bravery (9.37). Herodotus himself looks upon the skulls of the Egyptians and Persians with scientific interest. He observes that the Egyptian skulls are far thicker than those of the Persians (3.12). His explanation looks at this abject phenomenon with scientific wonder, reflecting both arguments put forward in *Airs, Waters, Places* and his own interest in custom, he posits that since Egyptians shave their heads, the hot sun thickens the bone of their skulls and offers the skulls of other battles to corroborate.⁹¹ He looks upon these human remains with a forensic interest that pervades his conceptualisation of the human body. These body parts, these explosions of blood and violence become *aides memoires* to enquiry, rhetorical objects in his historiography.

It is upon the tortured, twisted head of Smerdis, then, that Otanes builds his case, an orator presenting a bent and prodded slave. He gathers the conspirators around these severed ears, now resolute in the coming assassination. So when they enter the shrouded citadel they are able to see the usurpation for themselves, the Magus sitting upon the throne, his brother whispering in his ear:

Ἀποκτείναντες δὲ τοὺς μάγους καὶ ἀποταμόντες αὐτῶν τὰς κεφαλὰς τοὺς μὲν
τρωματίας ἐωυτῶν αὐτοῦ λείπουσι καὶ ἀδυνασίης εἴνεκεν καὶ φυλακῆς τῆς
ἀκροπόλιος, οἱ δὲ πέντε αὐτῶν ἔχοντες τῶν μάγων τὰς κεφαλὰς ἔθεον ἔξω, βοῆ τε καὶ
πατάγῃ χρωόμενοι, καὶ Πέρσας τοὺς ἄλλους ἐπεκαλέοντο ἐξηγεόμενοι τε τὸ πρῆγμα
καὶ δεικνύντες τὰς κεφαλὰς· (3.79)

⁹⁰ The soldiers walk like tourists amongst the semblance of a battlefield, an artificial gravesite, however, the bodies swear against these lies, act as proof of their own rearranged existence (cf. Das 2000, 222).

⁹¹ Thomas 2002, 31–2

Darius holds forth the mutilated head of the Magus and exposes it to the light before the waiting crowd. Darius has split open the ram's head and revealed, performed his investigation before an audience. He holds in his hands the marked touchstone, presents the tortured slave.

But with these bloody tokens, the still dripping head of Smerdis, the continuing tradition of murdering Magi each year, so too does Herodotus hold forth proof of his own investigations. The violence illuminates his enquiry, the heads become tokens that ensure the truth of his assertions. With the decapitated head Herodotus indisputably locates the origin of Darius' rise to power. He presents an *apodeixis* of his enquiry, the violent and macabre as a demonstration of his investigative method, valuing autopsy and origins.

Indeed, earlier when Prexaspes reports to Cambyses that the Persians say he is too fond of wine and now mad (Νῦν ἄρα μέ φασι Πέρσαι οἴνω προσκείμενον παραφρονέειν καὶ οὐκ εἶναι νοήμονα), he responds by shooting his son with an arrow:

διατείναντα τὸ τόξον βαλεῖν τὸν παῖδα, περόντος δὲ τοῦ παιδὸς ἀνασχίζειν αὐτὸν κελεύειν καὶ σκέπασθαι τὸ βλήμα· ὡς δὲ ἐν τῇ καρδίῃ εὐρεθῆναι ἐνεόντα τὸν οἰστόν, εἰπεῖν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα τοῦ παιδὸς γελάσαντα καὶ περιχαρέα γενόμενον· «Πρήξασπες, ὡς μὲν ἐγὼ τε οὐ μαίνομαι Πέρσαι τε παραφρονέουσι, δηλὰ τοι γέγονε· νῦν δέ μοι εἶπέ, τίνα εἶδες ἤδη πάντων ἀνθρώπων οὔτω ἐπίσκοπα τοξεύοντα; (3.35)

Cutting open his chest, examining his heart, Cambyses claims to have proven his sanity with this horrific spectacle. But it is instead Herodotus who, with ironic flare, presents this pierced heart as proof, a demonstration of Cambyses' madness and the origin of Prexaspes' grudge. Like the Arabs who spill the blood of their palms as assurance of their pledge (3.8) or the Carians who cut their foreheads as a mark of their foreignness (2.61), he gives us the boy's blood as a reminder of his enquiry, presents it to his audience as proof.

He tells an extended narrative in which Rhampsinitus, an Egyptian king, attempts to discover the identity of the thief of his treasury (2.121). He first tells of the foresight and bravery of the thief's brother, who orders him to cut off his head when caught in a trap so that his identity will remain hidden. The king responds by hanging this headless corpse upon the wall to reveal the thief through signs of grief or mourning. Exhorted by his mother to recover this desecrated body, the thief gets the guards drunk, takes the corpse and shaves the guards' cheeks. Then, when Rhampsinitus lays a trap, with his daughter posing as a prostitute, the thief mocks the king by revealing himself as the perpetrator, but escapes by offering her a severed arm to grab instead of his own. Herodotus then concludes this story with Rhampsinitus offering the thief a full pardon and his daughter's hand in marriage. The story demonstrates the value that the Egyptians place on cunning through a battle of wits between the king and the thief. This battle is played out over a headless corpse and severed limbs,

body parts used as weapons to both expose and hide true identities. And indeed Herodotus' own arsenal of epideictic techniques is inscribed upon these abject pieces: shock, wonder and memorability. The wondrous morbidity of the scene spectacularly demonstrates an Egyptian trait, the shocking images of the corpses impress this investigation upon his audience.

It is the memorability of the macabre, the graphic, visual and spectacular nature of violence that allows it to highlight Herodotus' investigations.⁹² The arresting visual displays bring the narrative and investigations to the forefront. Like the twisted body of the slave, the enquiries undergo such varied forms of violence that highlight and explore individual investigative units. As Otanes sits upon his judicial chair, constructed from his father's flayed skin (5.25), it is the cruel and unusual, the shocking and idiosyncratic that captivates and mesmerises. Violence is ultimately rhetorically coupled with investigation.⁹³

So when Pythius, a Lydian subject of Xerxes, requests for the eldest of his five sons to be released from service from the Great King's army, he is answered by a cruel and blood thirsty act:

Ὡς δὲ ταῦτα ὑπεκρίνατο, αὐτίκα ἐκέλευε τοῖσι προσετέτακτο ταῦτα πρήσσειν τῶν Πυθίου παίδων ἐξευρόντας τὸν πρεσβύτατον μέσον διαταμείν, διαταμόντας δὲ τὰ ἡμίτομα διαθείνειν τὸ μὲν ἐπὶ δεξιὰ τῆς ὁδοῦ, τὸ δ' ἐπ' ἀριστερά, καὶ ταύτη διεξιέναι τὸν στρατόν. Ποιησάντων δὲ τούτων τούτο, μετὰ ταῦτα διεξίηκε ὁ στρατός. (7.39)

Previously, Pythius' loyalty and generosity had been rewarded with an immense amount of Persian gold, but here his fear and impudence is punished with acute brutality and ironic severity. But this body, its tragically wrenched apart pieces, are not imprinted with the sorrow of a grieving father or the murderous character of the Persian king, instead they herald Herodotus' description of the army. He records its composition and its arrangement. He recounts that first to walk through the body were the men with the gear and the pack animals (πρώτοι μὲν οἱ σκευοφόροι τε καὶ τὰ ὑποζύγια), behind these the host of troops (στρατὸς παντοίων ἐθνέων ἀναμίξ, οὐ διακεκριμένοι). After these, a thousand horsemen and

⁹² Consider Gray and Oliver's exploration of catastrophe and memory that argues that memory and violent catastrophe often share the same cultural space (2004, 3–4). The relationship between trauma, violence and memory has been studied for some time (see, for example, Bower 1981): on the significance given to the memory of violent acts and traumatic experiences see van der Kolk and van der Hart (1995).

⁹³ This thesis has been unable to address the complexities of violence in tragedy, its complex relationship with Herodotus' work or the *Histories'* appropriation of such concepts of brutality. Ultimately the violence of tragedy is fundamentally different to Herodotus' use of the macabre. The violence of tragedy is invisible, unseen, and whilst often hinted at or reported, drama puts the grief and sorrow of characters centre stage and marginalises the act itself. The human body is continually explored by tragedy, however, it is the abstract (sorrow, pain, desire) that usually subjugates and not the physical (for a full analysis of the complexities of the human body in tragedy see Cawthorn (2008) who puts much emphasis on sorrow and identity; see also Holmes (2008) and Segal (1990)). Nonetheless, the violence of tragedy still may be similarly influenced by concepts of critical enquiry, Euripides' *Bacchae*, for instance, is primarily concerned with the theme of investigation and ends with the investigator, Pentheus, torn apart, *quasi* dissected.

spearman (Προηγέοντο μὲν δὴ ἰππῶται χίλιοι ἐκ Περσέων πάντων ἀπολελεγμένοι μετὰ δὲ αἰχμοφόροι χίλιοι, καὶ οὗτοι ἐκ πάντων ἀπολελεγμένοι) pass through the young man's split remains. He tells us of the ten sacred horses, their attributes and etymology (Μετὰ δὲ ἰοῖ Νησαῖοι καλεόμενοι ἵπποι δέκα, κεκοσμημένοι ὡς κάλλιστα. Νησαῖοι δὲ καλέονται ἵπποι ἐπὶ τοῦδε· ἔστι πεδῖον μέγα τῆς Μηδικῆς τῷ οὐνομά ἐστι Νήσαιον· τοὺς ὧν δὴ ἵππους τοὺς μεγάλους φέρει τὸ πεδῖον τοῦτο), and the chariot of Zeus, drawn by eight white horses (Ὅπισθε δὲ τούτων τῶν δέκα ἵππων ἄρμα Διὸς ἰρὸν ἐπετέτακτο, τὸ ἵπποι μὲν εἶλκον λευκοὶ ὀκτώ, ὄπισθε δὲ αὐτῶν τῶν ἵππων εἶπετο πεζῆ ἠνίοχος ἐχόμενος τῶν χαλινῶν· οὐδεὶς γάρ δὴ ἐπὶ τοῦτον τὸν θρόνον ἀνθρώπων ἐπιβαίνει). And finally, he describes how the king himself crossed this bloody threshold, this marker by which Herodotus records the army (Τούτου δὲ ὄπισθε αὐτὸς Ξέρξης ἐπ' ἄρματος ἵππων Νησαίων· παρεβέβηκε δὲ οἱ ἠνίοχος τῷ οὐνομα ἦν Πατιράμφης Ὅτάνεω παῖς, ἀνδρὸς Πέρσεω 7.40). It is the two halves of this gruesome body from which the historian launches into his investigation of the army, it brings light to his investigation, it lends shocking credence to his descriptions and numbers. The macabre march highlights and pinpoints a moment, explores the intricacies of Xerxes' forces. Indeed, as Persia rolls in gory waves across Asia, Africa and Europe, violence is the great illuminator of the *Histories*, exposing its subject with a graphically macabre eye.

Enquiry demanded blood, it demanded the cruel and unusual, it demanded the visual, the transparent, the graphic. Critical enquiry looked upon the macabre as a theatre of truth. When Anaxagoras splits open the skull of the ram his authority comes from witness and wonder. So too does Darius holding forth the severed head, presenting it to the Persian crowd: Herodotus uses these abject spectacles as proof of his investigation. His interest in the macabre is ultimately a manifestation of his critical enquiry, a product of his cultural and intellectual milieu, a result of his investigative strategies. He navigates the authority of truth across the topography of the body and presents his anatomy of Asia and Africa through a tour of limbs and organs. His enquiry, like the trial of Damians, is continually inscribed upon the bodies of his work's various victims.

CONCLUSION

Gerard David's painting, *The Flaying of Sisamnes*, shows the corrupt judge, Herodotus' short lived character, laid forth upon a bench, now a cadaver inspected by a crowd of curious onlookers as its skin is sliced apart and peeled back. Those performing the punishment do so with measured precision, cutting fine, straight lines, keeping the skin, and what lies underneath, intact. David's flashes of colour uncover the red tendons and muscles of this lifeless corpse. Under David's brush, Cambyses' demonstration of justice looks more like a demonstration of Renaissance anatomy, a medical seminar. His painting captures the burgeoning interest in the human body, its parts, its functions.

It is from these roots that Rembrandt's *The Anatomy Lesson of Doctor Nicolaes Tulp* emerged. Its scene, almost identical to David's earlier work, shows a body laid out upon a bench, its arm split open and examined before a crowd of waiting spectators. The doctor carefully lifts a bunched group of sinews and muscle into clearer view. He looks out towards his audience, beckoning them to view this carefully, examine the intricate detail of the forearm, its complex lines, its deep red web of tendons.⁹⁴ And like his watching students, this group of stone-faced surgeons, we too look upon the doctor's dissection with a macabre interest.

But the macabre lies not in the doctor's scalpel, instead it dwells within the artist's brush and the spectators' eyes. It is not in dissecting that the macabre manifests, it is in its representation, it is in gazing upon the opened corpse. It is not Hippocrates, the doctor, who cuts, burns and tortures the body, but Herodotus, the historian, who records, displays and looks upon these procedures, the mutilated remains and blood stained tools, that brings the macabre into relief.⁹⁵

Rembrandt looks not upon the identity of the doctor's dissected corpse, the convicted, executed criminal Aris Kindt, he presents his scene not as an act of justice, sees his body not as an arena of pity or horror, but of medical investigation and anatomical interest. Herodotus, likewise looking upon the human body with such a *macabre regard*, presents not the pain,

⁹⁴ On the popularity of the 'anatomical theatre' and anatomical artworks in the Renaissance see Ingham (2008, 76–7).

⁹⁵ οἱ γοῦν ἰατροὶ τέμνοντες, καίοντες, πάντη βασανίζοντες κακῶς τοὺς ἀρρωστούντας, ἐπαιτέονται μηδὲν ἄξιοι μισθὸν λαμβάνειν παρὰ τῶν ἀρρωστούντων, ταῦτ' ἐργαζόμενοι, τὰ ἀγαθὰ καὶ τὰς νόσους (Heraclit. *Fr.* 58): on the use of βασανίζειν and the complex emendations made to this fragment see Kirk (2010, 88–90).

Conclusion

pity or grief of his work's victims, but the raw mechanics of their deaths, the varied forms of their violence. His theatre of objective enquiry plays out over their severed limbs and twisted flesh.

In this way, Herodotus' project is derived from his context, his cultural milieu, his interaction with the philosophical and medical writers. He was in full conversation with his intellectual world. However, he was also doing something unique, exploring the macabre, probing the literary, rhetorical and investigative products of violence. He looks upon the body as he tears it apart with curiosity and invites his audience to gaze with him upon its remains.

In the gruesome descriptions of the *Histories* it is spectacle, then, that takes prime of place. Not spectacle that asks upon whom such violence is committed, but in what way: a spectacle of violence that enquires into its subject with objective interest.

It is therefore fitting that his narrative ends with Artayctes hung up, crucified, nailed to a plank by the Athenians on the spit of land where Xerxes built his bridge (9.120-3). He watches as his son is stoned to death before his eyes. Upon his dying body are inscribed Herodotus' investigations. His nailed up flesh evokes so many punishments throughout the work, it looks upon the mercilessness of the Athenian crowd, it recalls the cruelty of Asian kings, his crucifixion enquires into the practices, the customs of Greeks and Persians, their similarities, their differences.⁹⁶ So too does this gruesome scene look to the geography of the narrative, this body hanging upon this pivotal location, this origin of transgression, this beginning of war. And indeed even history is explored over his body as its wasting form recalls and demonstrates the words of Cyrus, spoken to the Persians so long ago.

Herodotus' violence reflects his style and overall narrative scheme. It is both a manifestation of and rhetorically enmeshed with his investigative method. The *Histories*, his enquiries, are inscribed upon the mutilated head of the Magus. They shine forth from *l'eclat des supplices*.⁹⁷ They are hung upon Artayctes' crucifixion. They are presented upon the *spectacle of the scaffold*.

⁹⁶ Desmond 2004, 37 ff.

⁹⁷ Foucault 1975, 36

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agarwalla, P. 2010. "Training Showmanship: Rhetoric in Greek Medical Education of the Fifth and Fourth centuries BC" in *Hippocrates and Medical Education: Selected Papers Read at the XIIth International Hippocrates Colloquium, Universiteit Leiden, 24-26 August 2005*, ed. M. Horstmanshoff and C. Tilburg, Leiden: Brill. 73-85.
- Althoff, J. 1993. "Herodot und die Griechische Medizin" *Antike Naturwissenschaft und ihre Rezeption* 3: 1–16.
- Aly, W. 1921. *Volksmärchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen eine Untersuchung über die Volkstümlichen Elemente der altergriechischen Prosaerzählung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Austin, J. L. 1961. "A Plea For Excuses" in *Philosophical Papers*, ed. J. O. Urmson and G. J. Warnock, Oxford: Clarendon Press. 123-52.
- Avelar, I. 2004. *The Letter of Violence Essays On Narrative, Ethics, and Politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Beazley, J. D. 1911. *Herodotus at the Zoo*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Benardete, S. 1969. *Herodotean Inquiries*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Berno, F. R. 2004. "Un Truncus, Molti Re: Priamo, Agamennone, Pompeo (Virgilio, Seneca, Lucano)" *Maia* 56 (1): 79–84.
- Bichler, R. 1996. Wahrnehmung und Vorstellung fremder Kultur. Griechen und Orient in archaischer und frühklassischer Zeit. In *Die Begegnung mit dem Fremden. Wertungen und Wirkungen in Hochkulturen vom Altertum bis zur Gegenwart*, ed. M. Schuster, 51-74. Colloquium Rauricum 4. Stuttgart: Teubner.
- Bilde, P. G. 2003. "Wandering Images: From Taurian (and Chersonesean) Parthenos to (Artemis) Tauropolos and (Artemis) Persike" in *The Cauldron of Ariantas. Studies Presented to AN Scegllov on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*, ed. J. M. Hoijte, V. F. Stolba, and P. G. Bilde, Aarhus: Aarhus University Press. 165–83.
- le Blay, F. 2005. "Microcosm and macrocosm : the Dual Direction of Analogy in Hippocratic Thought and the Meteorological Tradition" in *Hippocrates in Context: Papers Read at the XIth International Hippocrates Colloquium, University of Newcastle upon Tyne, 27-31 August 2002*, ed. P. J. van der Eijk., Leiden: Brill. 251-70
- Boedeker, D. 2003. "Pedestrian Fatalities: The Prosaics of Death in Herodotus" in *Herodotus and His World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest*, ed. P. Derow and R. Parker, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 3-16.
- Bourdieu, P. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Basil Blackwell.
- — —. 1998. *Practical reason: On the Theory of Action*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bower, G.H. 1981. "Mood and Memory" *American Psychologist* 36 (2): 129-48.
- Brandenburg, D. 1976. *Medizinisches bei Herodot: e. Literaturhistor. Studie zur Antiken Heilkunde*. Berlin: Hessling.
- Cairns, D.L. 2001. "Affronts and Quarrels in the Iliad" in *Oxford Readings in Homer's Iliad*, by D.L. Cairns, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 155-67.

Bibliography

- Cawthorn, Katrina. 2008. *Becoming Female: the Male Body in Greek Tragedy*. London: Duckworth.
- Christ, M. R. 1994. "Herodotean Kings and Historical Inquiry" *CIAnt*: 167–202.
- Claus, D. B. 1975. "Aidos in the Language of Achilles" *TAPhA* 105: 13–28.
- Clover, C. J. 1993. *Men, Women, and Chainsaws: Gender in the Modern Horror Film*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Cox, A. 2011. "Outrageous Fortune?: Agamemnon, Payback, and Achilles' "Heart-Rending λῶβη" in Iliad 9" Research Seminar: April 7, Department of Classics and Ancient History, University of Sydney.
- Craik, E. 2010. "The Teaching of Surgery" in *Hippocrates and Medical Education: Selected Papers Read at the XIIth International Hippocrates Colloquium, Universiteit Leiden, 24-26 August 2005*, ed. M. Horstmanshoff and C. Tilburg, Leiden: Brill. 223-33.
- — —. 2009. *The Hippocratic Treatise On glands*. Leiden: Brill.
- Craik, T. W. 1974. *Minor Elizabethan Tragedies*. London: J.M. Dent.
- Darbo-Peschanski, C. 1988. "La Vie des Morts: Representation et Fonctions de la Mort et des Morts Dans les Histoires d'Hérodote" *AION* 10: 41-51.
- Das, V. 2000. "The Act Of Witnessing: Violence, Poisonous Knowledge, and Subjectivity" in *Violence and Subjectivity*, ed. V. Das, Berkeley: University of California Press. 205-25.
- Desmond, W. 2004. "Punishments and the Conclusion of Herodotus' *Histories*" *GRBS* 44 (1): 19-40.
- Dewald, C. "Reading the World: The Interpretation of Objects in Herodotus' Histories" in *Nomodeiktēs: Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Oswald*, ed. M. Rosen and J. Farrell, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 55-70.
- Diller, H. 1932. "ΟΨΙΣ ΤΩΝ ΑΔΗΛΩΝ ΤΑ ΦΑΙΝΟΜΕΝΑ" *Hermes* 67 (1): 14–42.
- Dirckx, J. H. 1987. "The Language of Hippocrates" *The American Journal of Dermatopathology* 9 (2): 144-8.
- DuBois, P. 1991. *Torture and Truth*. New York: Routledge.
- — —. 2003. *Slaves and Other Objects*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- van der Eijk, P. J. 1997. "Towards a Rhetoric of Ancient Scientific Discourse: Some Formal Characteristics of Greek Medical and Philosophical Texts" in *Grammar as Interpretation: Greek Literature in its Linguistic Contexts*, ed. E. J. Bakker, Leiden: Brill. 77–129.
- Foucault, M. 1969. *L'Archéologie du Savoir*. Paris: Gallimard
- — —. 1972. *Naissance de la Clinique: une Archéologie du Regard Médical*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- — —. 1975. *Surveiller et Punir: Naissance de la Prison*. Paris: Gallimard.
- — —. 1982. "The Subject and Power" *Critical Inquiry* 8 (4): 777-95.
- Friedrich, W. 2003. *Wounding and Death in the Iliad: Homeric Techniques of Description*. London: Duckworth.

Spectacle of Enquiry

- Gagarin, M. 1996. "The Torture of Slaves in Athenian Law" *CPh* 91 (1): 1–18.
- Gammie, J. G. 1986. "Herodotus on Kings and Tyrants: Objective Historiography or Conventional Portraiture?" *JNES* 45 (3): 171–95.
- Gill, C. 1984. "The Ethos/Pathos Distinction in Rhetorical And Literary Criticism" *CQ* 34 (01): 149-66.
- Girard, R. 1972. *La Violence et le Sacré*. Paris: B. Grasset.
- Gray, P., and K. Oliver. 2004. *The Memory of Catastrophe*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Gray, V. 1995. "Herodotus and the Rhetoric of Otherness" *AJPh* 116 (2): 185–211.
- . 1996. "Herodotus and Images of Tyranny: The Tyrants of Corinth" *AJPh* 117 (3): 361–89.
- Griffin, J. 1983. *Homer on Life and Death*. Cambridge: Clarendon Press.
- Grmek, M. D. 1983. *Les Maladies à l'Aube de la Civilisation Occidentale: Recherches sur la Réalité Pathologique dans le Monde Grec Préhistorique, Archaique, et Classique*. Médecine et Sociétés. Paris: Payot.
- Hall, E. 2007. "Subjects, Selves, and Survivors" *Helios* 34 (2): 125-59.
- Hartog, F. 1980. *Le Miroir d'Hérodote: Essai sur la Representation de l'Autre*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Headlam, J. W. 1894. "Slave Torture in Athens" *CR* 8 (04): 136–7.
- Henkelman, W. 1999. "Zopyros en Sokrates. Een Fysiognomische Ontmoeting" *Lampas*: 128-48.
- Holmes, B. 2008. "Euripides' Heracles in the Flesh" *ClAnt* 27 (2): 231-81.
- Hüppauf, B. 1997. "Emptying the Gaze: Framing Violence through the Viewfinder" *New German Critique* (72): 3-44.
- Immerwahr, H. R. 1966. *Form and Thought in Herodotus*. Chapel Hill: Western Reserve University Press.
- Ingham, K. 2008. "The Anatomy Lesson of Professor Moxham" in *Anatomy Live: Performance and the Operating Theatre*, ed. M. Bleeker, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. 75-92.
- Isager, S. 1998. "The Pride of Halikarnassos. Editio princeps of an inscription from Salmakis" *ZPE* 123: 1–23.
- Jantzen, G. 2004. *Foundations of violence*. New York: Routledge.
- Jung, E. G. 2005. "On the Origin of Flaying in Assyria" *Aktuelle Dermatologie* 31 (5): 244-246.
- Kirk, G. S. 2010. *Heraclitus: The Cosmic Fragments*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- van der Kolk, B., and O. van der Hart. 1995. "The Intrusive Past: The Flexibility of Memory and the Engraving of Trauma" in *Trauma: Explorations in Memory*, ed. C. Caruth, 158-83. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bibliography

- Kosak, J. C. 2004. *Heroic Measures: Hippocratic Medicine in the Making of Euripidean Tragedy*. Studies in ancient medicine v. 30. Leiden: Brill.
- Larcher, P. 1802. *Histoire d'Hérodote: Traduite du Grec, avec des Remarques Historiques et Critiques, un Essai sur la Chronologie d'Hérodote, et une Table Géographique*. Paris: G. Debure l'Aîné.
- Lasserre, F., and P. Mudry, eds. 1983. *Formes de Pensée dans la Collection Hippocratique. Acts du IVe. Colloque Internationale Hippocratique. Lausanne 1981*. Vol. 26. Geneva: Droz.
- Lateiner, D. 1985. "Limit, Propriety, and Transgression in the Histories of Herodotus" in *The Greek Historians: Literature and History. Papers Presented to AE Raubitschek*, ed. M. H. Jameson, Saratoga: Anma Libri. 87–100.
- — —. 2005. "The Pitiers and the Pitied in Herodotus and Thucydides" in *Pity and Power in Ancient Athens*, ed. Rachel Hall Sternberg. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 67–97
- Leigh, M. 1997. *Lucan: Spectacle and Engagement*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lieber, E. 1991. "Herodotus and The Hippocratic Airs, Waters, Places on Eunuch– Natural and Divine" in *Actes du XXXIIe Congrès International d'Histoire de la Médecine, Anvers, 3-7 Septembre 1990*, Bruxelles: Societas Belgica Historiae Medicinae. 169-73.
- Lincoln, B. 2007. *Religion, Empire, and Torture: The Case of Achaemenian Persia: With a Postscript on Abu Ghraib*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lintott, A. W. 1982. *Violence, Civil Strife, and Revolution in the Classical City, 750-330 B.C.* New York: Routledge.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 1999. "The Pride of Halicarnassus" *ZPE* 124: 1–14.
- Lloyd, G. E. R. 1975. "The Role of Medicine in the Development of Early Greek Science" *Lampas*: 327-33.
- Lock, M. 2000. "The Quest for Human Organs and the Violence of Zeal" in *Violence and Subjectivity*, ed. V. Das, Berkeley: University of California Press. 271-295.
- Longrigg, J. 2002. *Greek Rational Medicine: Philosophy and Medicine from Alcmaeon to the Alexandrians*. New York: Routledge.
- Lovatt, H. 2011. "Monumentality and the Epic Gaze" Research Seminar July 25, Department of Classics and Ancient History, University of Sydney.
- MacDowell, D. M. 1978. *The Law in Classical Athens*. Aspects of Greek and Roman life. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Marincola, J. 2006. "Herodotus and the Poetry of the Past" in *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, ed. C. Dewald and J. Marincola, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 13-28.
- — —. 2001. *Greek historians*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mazzarino, S. 1947. *Fra Oriente E Occidente: Ricerche Di Storia Greca Arcaica*. Pensiero storico. Firenze: La Nuova Italia.
- Minns, E. H. 1913. *Scythians and Greeks: A Survey of Ancient History and Archaeology on the North Coast of the Euxine from the Danube to the Caucasus*. Cambridge University Press.

Spectacle of Enquiry

- Mirhady, D. C. 1996. "Torture and Rhetoric in Athens" *JHS* 116: 119-31.
- Mohanty, J. 1993. "The Status of the Subject in Foucault" in *Foucault and the Critique of Institutions*, ed. J. D. Caputo and M. Yount, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press. 27-40.
- Morrison, J. V. 1999. "Homeric Darkness: Patterns and Manipulation of Death Scenes in the 'Iliad'." *Hermes* 127 (2): 129-44.
- Munson, R. V. 2001. *Telling Wonders: Ethnographic and Political Discourse in the Work of Herodotus*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- — —. 1993. "Three Aspects of Spartan Kingship in Herodotus" in *Nomodeiktēs: Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald*, ed. R. M. Rosen and J. Farrell, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 39-54.
- Olson, S. E. 1995. *Blood and Iron: Stories and Storytelling in Homer's Odyssey*. Leiden: Brill.
- Pelling, C. 1997. "East is East and West is West—Or Are They? National Stereotypes in Herodotus." *Histos* 1: 75–104.
- — —. 2006. "Homer and Herodotus" in *Epic Interactions*, ed. M. Clark, B. Currie, and R. O. A. M. Lyne, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 75-105.
- Perdicoyianni-Paleologou, H. 2009. "The Vocabulary of Madness from Homer to Hippocrates" *History of Psychiatry* 20 (3): 311-39.
- Peters, E. 1996. *Torture*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Pouncey, P. R. 1980. *The Necessities of War: A Study of Thucydides' Pessimism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Prioreschi, P. 1996. *A History of Medicine: Greek Medicine*. Omaha: Horatius Press.
- Reeve, M. D. 1973. "The Language of Achilles" *CQ* 23 (2): 193–5.
- Rollinger, R. 2004. "Herodotus, Human Violence and the Ancient Near East" in *The World of Herodotus: Proceedings of an International Conference Held at the Foundation Anastasios G. Leventis, Nicosia, September 18-21, 2003 and Organized by the Foundation Anastasios G. Leventis*, ed. Vassos Karageorghis, Nicosia: The Foundation Anastasios G. Leventis. 121-50.
- Schneider, M. A. 1996. "Sacredness, Status and Bodily Violation" *Body & Society* 2 (4): 75-92.
- Segal, C. 1990. "Violence and the Other: Greek, Female, and Barbarian in Euripides' Hecuba" *TAPhA* 120: 109-31.
- Shapiro, S. O. 1994. "Learning through Suffering: Human Wisdom in Herodotus" *CJ* 89 (4): 349-55.
- — —. 1922b. "The Logic of the Homeric Simile" *CPh* 17 (3): 240-59.
- von Staden, H. 1992. "The Discovery of the Body: Human Dissection and its Cultural Contexts in Ancient Greece" *The Yale Journal of Biology and Medicine* 65 (3): 223-41.
- Strid, O. 2006. "Voiceless Victims, Memorable Deaths in Herodotus" *CQ*: 393-403.
- Thomas, R. 2002. *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science and the Art of Persuasion*. Cambridge University Press.

Bibliography

- . 2006. "The Intellectual Milieu of Herodotus" In *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, ed. Carolyn Dewald and John Marincola, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 60-75.
- Todd, S. C. 1993. *The Shape of Athenian Law*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Tritle, L. 2006. "Warfare in Herodotus" in *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*. ed. J. Marincola and C. Dewald, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 209-23.
- Tsagalis, C.C. 2004. "The Poetics of Sorrow: Thetis' Lament in 'Iliad' 18.52-64" *QUCC* 76 (1): 9-32.
- Vermeule, E. 1979. *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Vernant, J. P. 1991. "A "Beautiful Death" and the Disfigured Corpse in Homeric Epic" in *Mortals and Immortals: Collected Essays*, ed. Froma Zeitlin, New Jersey: Princeton University Press. 50-74.
- Walcot, P. 1978. "Herodotus on Rape" *Arethusa* 11 (2): 137-48.
- Whitehead, N. 2002. "On the Poetics of Violence" in *Violence*, ed. N. Whitehead. Oxford: James Currey Ltd. 4-24
- de Wied, M., D. Zillmann, and V. Ordman. 1995. "The Role of Empathic Distress in the Enjoyment of Cinematic Tragedy" *Poetics* 23 (1-2): 91-106.
- Wilson, D. 1999. "Symbolic Violence in 'Iliad' Book 9" *CW* 93 (2): 131-47.