

Princeton/Stanford Working Papers in Classics

The Epic Adventures of an Unknown Particle

Version 1.0

July 2007

Joshua T. Katz

Princeton University

Abstract: This paper, a mini-“*Autour de ‘ταρ épique’*,” is above all a contribution to the study of Homeric formulas and compositional technique. I give an overview and expand our understanding of the under-appreciated Homeric particle ταρ (*tar*), whose Cuneiform Luvian cognate Calvert Watkins discovered over a decade ago and whose essential Greek-ness M. L. West accepts in his Teubner edition of the *Iliad*; demonstrate on linguistic and stylistic grounds that ταρ is part of the conjunction αὐτάρ (*autár*) but not of the semantically similar near-look-alike ἀτάρ (*atár*); and explain why this unstressed and almost unknown monosyllable is of unexpectedly wide interest, being not just a bit of Homeric and Indo-European linguistic trivia, but an important rhetorical device in the description of ancient Greek ritual.

© Joshua T. Katz. [jtkatz@princeton.edu](mailto:jtkatz@princeton.edu)

This paper achieved its current form in the early months of 2007. It will be published (more or less as is, I hope) in *Greek and Latin from an Indo-European Perspective* (Cambridge Philological Society Supplementary Volume 32), edited by Coulter George, Matthew McCullagh, Benedicte Nielsen, Antonia Ruppel, and Olga Tribulato.

\*\*\*

In a paper delivered at a conference in Heidelberg in 1996 on the editing of texts,<sup>\*</sup> M. L. West took on the *Iliad*, and the version of his talk published in the proceedings two years later concludes with what he calls a ‘provisional specimen of [his forthcoming] edition, so that the reader may get an idea of how it will look and what it will offer in comparison with existing editions’.<sup>1</sup> West’s opinion at the time was that *Il.* 1.8 should be read,<sup>2</sup>

τίς τ’ ἄρ σφωε θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι;  
τ’αρ 1, τ’ἄρ vel τ’ἄρ Ω\*: τάρ ApD Hdn A [...]

This is hardly surprising, for it is just how the first question in Greek literature appears in other standard editions.<sup>3</sup> However, by the time West came to publish his Teubner text, he had reconsidered the relative weight of the material already recorded in the preliminary apparatus and, following Apollonius Dyscolus, Herodian, and Venetus A, ended up printing the verse very slightly differently<sup>4</sup>:

τίς τάρ σφωε θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι;  
τάρ ApD Hdn A: τ’αρ 1, τ’ἄρ vel τ’ἄρ [Plut.] Z Ω\* [...]

---

\* This paper has had plenty of adventures of its own, with versions presented at the 128th Annual Meeting of the American Philological Association (New York, December 1996) and at UCLA (January 2006), as well as at the conference at Cambridge (July 2005) whose proceedings are collected here. A full list of thanks would be long, but I must mention the patient editors, the gracious Fondation Hardt, and Prof. Michael Haslam, whose critical engagement after the talk in Los Angeles will remain forever memorable. Considerations of space have forced me to leave off much material, but it is high time to deal in some way with this tar baby: a first draft, written in January 1994, is cited in Katz (1994[1995]) as ‘forthcoming’ and in Watkins (1995) 151 n. 27 as ‘Katz 1994’—and now, embarrassingly many years later, on the occasion of his 75th birthday, I dedicate it to Calvert Watkins, to whom I have so often posed the question, “Μέντορ, πῶς τὰρ ἴω ...;” (*Od.* 3.22).

<sup>1</sup> West (1998a) 107.

<sup>2</sup> West (1998a) 109.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. D. B. Monro and T. W. Allen’s 1920 <sup>3</sup>*OCT* and H. van Thiel’s 1996 Weidmann. Note, though, that the *OCT* does not make any mention of ‘TAP’ in the apparatus.

<sup>4</sup> West (1998b) 4.

My goals here are to defend as fully as possible West's particular change of mind, to show that I am not wasting time over what is in effect a matter of an apostrophe, and to demonstrate something of the excitement of hunting for particles.<sup>5</sup>

Can there really be a word in the opening lines of Homer that the vast majority of classicists have never seen? The question comes close to sounding preposterous, but it cannot be denied that this is the consequence of accepting West's final choice of a unitary particle  $\tau\alpha\rho$ . Rather than turn directly to this odd would-be form, though, let me start with a couple of only very slightly longer, but entirely familiar, words:  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho$  and  $\acute{\alpha}\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho$ . Despite their small size, insubstantial meaning, and generally unexciting aspect, these two conjunctions have much to tell us about Greek and Indo-European historical linguistics and about Homeric diction. I begin by considering their formal etymologies, using both the evidence of epic and recently re-evaluated linguistic facts to argue against the assertion that  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho$  and  $\acute{\alpha}\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho$  are somehow derivable one from the other. After a brief synopsis of what is already known about  $\tau\alpha\rho$ , I then demonstrate that the evidence of Homeric formulas strongly supports the contention that  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho$ , but not  $\acute{\alpha}\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho$ , conceals the particle that West now champions, a claim that allows us to view in a new light certain other words and phrases in both Greek and Luvian (the language that may well have been spoken by the Greeks' adversaries in the Trojan War<sup>6</sup>). Finally, I turn to a matter of wider literary and cultural interest and show that  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho$ , far from being a mere narrative vehicle, is an important and archaic element in its own right.

Although  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho$  has received considerable attention since the middle of the 20th century, mostly because it is taken to be a mainstay of so-called 'Achaean' style, few scholars have understood its morphological composition or the nature of its relationship—or, perhaps better put, non-relationship—to  $\acute{\alpha}\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho$ . At first glance, it would seem to be true that  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho$  and  $\acute{\alpha}\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho$ , which certainly do sound very much alike and which the handbooks are loath to distinguish, are semantically basically equivalent, and this is indeed the opinion of those grammarians, ancient and modern, who have looked long and hard at the matter: for example, the scholia to Dionysius Thrax speak of Οὔτοι οἱ δύο σύνδεσμοι, ἰσοδυναμοῦντες τῷ δέ (*Gramm. Gr.* III, 62,33 Hilgard *ad Ars gramm.* 89,2 Uhlig), while LSJ begins the lemma s.v.  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho$  with the words, 'Conj. =  $\acute{\alpha}\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho$  (Ep. and Cypr. [...]) [...] *but, besides, moreover*', and the one s.v.  $\acute{\alpha}\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho$  with 'Ep. also  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho$  (q.v.) [...] Conj., *but, nevertheless*'.<sup>7</sup> Still, the very notion that they could be essentially the same is deeply suspicious, whether  $\acute{\alpha}\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho$  should somehow have given rise to  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho$ <sup>8</sup> or vice versa.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>5</sup> For reasons that will become clear, not all my citations from Homer (or even just from the *Iliad*, for which see now West (1998b-2000)) come from any single edition—or from any existing edition at all.

<sup>6</sup> The literature on this question is growing fast: Bryce (2006) 117-22, with notes on 202, has the latest general discussion.

<sup>7</sup> Compare also Monro (1891) 308, Schwyzler and Debrunner (1950) 556 and 559, Denniston (1954) 51 and 55, and (most thoroughly) *LfrgE* s.vv.  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho$  (R. von Bennekom—W. Beck) and  $\acute{\alpha}\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho$  (K. Alpers).

<sup>8</sup> Richard Schneider writes of A.D., *Conj.* 254,5, 'Apollonio igitur persuasum est,  $\acute{\alpha}\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho$  esse nativam formam, ex ea  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho$  per passionem ortam' (*Gramm. Gr.* I/2, 254).

<sup>9</sup> Thus Düntzer (1863) 7 and Risch (1958) 92; I owe both references to Dunkel (1988) 54 n. 5.

Modern etymological opinion holds that αὐτάρ and ἄτάρ are partly the same and partly different, specifically that their first syllables are historically distinct but that the final -αρ has in both cases the same origin. I have very little to say about ἄτάρ except that there is no reason to object to the *communis opinio* that this conjunction is composed of two originally separate particles, the first cognate with Lat. *at* ‘but’, etc. (< PIE *\*at(i)* (*vel sim.*)) and the second equivalent to the still self-standing ‘evidential’ particle ἄρ(α), ῥα in Greek.<sup>10</sup> As for its use, I have been unable to uncover any hitherto unrecognized and interesting nuances.

The same is not true of αὐτάρ. This conjunction is usually said to be the conflation of αὔτ(ε) ‘again; on the other hand’<sup>11</sup> (< PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>(e)u-te* (*vel sim.*); cf. e.g. Lat. *aut* ‘or’ and also *autem* ‘but’)<sup>12</sup> and the same particle ἄρ(α) invoked for ἄτάρ. This is formally acceptable and would perhaps go some way toward explaining the assumed semantic near-identity of αὐτάρ and ἄτάρ—not that an account of meaning would seem terribly consequential for words of this kind, especially when they are synchronically so similar and therefore *a priori* likely to have influenced each other, whatever their deep histories may be. However, it turns out that there are strong philological objections to this etymology, including one that guarantees—this is a strong word, and I use it advisedly—that αὐτάρ and ἄτάρ have nothing to do with each other in terms of historical morphology. But before looking at these objections, I should point out that other scholars have already noted or claimed that there are some semantic, metrical, and stylistic differences between αὐτάρ and ἄτάρ. While I see no reason to follow George E. Dunkel in his assessment of αὐτάρ as once having meant only ‘and’ and ἄτάρ only ‘but’,<sup>13</sup> C. J. Ruijgh and others rightly maintain that the two conjunctions display non-obvious prosodic differences and are characteristic of different styles or dialects. Unfortunately, I do not know why the final syllable of αὐτάρ is never *in longo*,<sup>14</sup> but the claim that there are stylistic distinctions between

---

<sup>10</sup> I have no opinion on whether *\*at(i)* should actually be reconstructed as *\*h<sub>2</sub>et(i)*; this and related etymological questions (see Dunkel (1988) 56-7) have in any case no bearing on the matter under consideration here. As for PIE *\*r* (*vel sim.*), I see no reason to follow Dunkel (1988) 55 in setting up two Proto-Indo-European particles, one for ἄρ(α), ῥα (possibly with a second laryngeal: *\*h<sub>2</sub>(e)r-*) and another for Lith. *iř* ‘and’, the Old Irish verbal particle *ro-*, and the second syllable of αὐτάρ and ἄτάρ; again, however, the issue has no immediate relevance. The most detailed account of the preform of ἄρ(α), etc. is Peters (1986) 380-2, who proposes ‘*\*h<sub>1</sub>r-a*’.

<sup>11</sup> Ruijgh (1971) 716 prefers the first element to be *\*αὔτι* (cf. αὔτις ‘again’).

<sup>12</sup> George E. Dunkel and Jared S. Klein been arguing for years about the form and function of αὔ ‘again; on the other hand’, αὔτε, and the like and about their cognates elsewhere in Indo-European. Most relevant for the present purposes is Klein’s study of αὔ in Homer (Klein (1988)), though I am more inclined than Klein to believe that αὔ and Skt. *u* ‘and’ go back to PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>(e)u* rather than *\*(a)u* and that αὔτε is cognate with Skt. *utá* ‘and’ rather than Go. *-(u)h* ‘and’. Nothing here depends on this, though.

<sup>13</sup> See Dunkel (1988) 55.

<sup>14</sup> See the summary in *LfrgE* s.vv. αὐτάρ and ἄτάρ (esp. col. 1567) for details and references. For a brief account of the difference in hiatus before the two conjunctions, see Crespo (1977) 58-9.

αὐτάρ and ἀτάρ is obviously correct—whether or not one wants to call the former ‘Achaean’ and the latter Ionic—for the one is highly formulaic while the other is not.<sup>15</sup>

Let me now consider a Homeric formula with αὐτάρ and return to my claim in the previous paragraph. How is it that we can be sure that αὐτάρ is not to be analyzed as αὐτ(ε) + ἄρ(α) and that it and ἀτάρ are not in the first instance to be examined as a pair? Take the following formula, discussed by none other than Milman Parry: verse-initial #αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ ῥ’ [⚭ — √]<sub>verb</sub> ||, as in #αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ ῥ’ εὕξαντο ... (*Il.* 1.458 = 2.421 = *Od.* 3.447 ~ 12.359).<sup>16</sup> This schema shows up eighteen times in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and there are many more examples in archaic epic that likewise have some form of the particle ἄρ(α), ῥ(α) somewhere after, but still in the same clause as, αὐτάρ.<sup>17</sup> To be sure, particle doubling is not out of the question, but it is a rare phenomenon at all stages of Greek (as well as in related languages); the significant exception is γάρ ῥ(α) (already in Homer: *Il.* 1.113+), on the assumption, which I grant is very likely correct, that γάρ is a very early univerbation of γε and ἄρ(α).<sup>18</sup> This means that if αὐτάρ does contain ἄρ(α), then formulaic #αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ ῥ’ is morpho-syntactically unusual—and, to make matters worse, whereas Homer’s use of ῥ(α) after γάρ is wholly non-formulaic and certainly just a metrical convenience with no deep history, the same cannot by any stretch of the imagination be said about #αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ ῥ’, for formulas are generally repositories of archaism, and the further back in time we decided to go, the more obvious the supposed particle doubling in the phrase would be.

Now, one might still not wish to put so much stress on this little ῥ’ were it not for a second striking fact, which deals the deathblow to the assumption that αὐτάρ contains ἄρ(α). In short, whereas there are plenty of examples of αὐτάρ (...) ἄρ(α), ῥ(α), *there is not a single clause in all of Homer that contains both ἀτάρ and either ἄρ(α) or ῥ(α)*. What we have, then, is a perfect example of complementary distribution, one that leads us to the following two conclusions: (1) αὐτάρ probably does not conceal the particle \*r, as is generally assumed, and it is therefore not to be segmented as \*αὐτ-άρ; and (2) ἀτάρ, by contrast, does indeed conceal this very particle (ἀτ-άρ).<sup>19</sup> Since it is thus nearly certain that αὐτάρ is to be separated from its

<sup>15</sup> See above all Ruijgh (1957) 29-55, with reference to Parry; on the function of ἀτάρ ‘to loosen the strict formulaic structure by means of enjambement’, see Hoekstra (1965) 108-10 (quotation at 109). Note also that αὐτάρ, which is far more common in Homer (and Hesiod) than ἀτάρ, is largely confined to epic—with the significant exception of Cyprian inscriptions (for quick summaries of the Cyprian evidence, see Egetmeyer (1992) s.v. *a-u-ta-re* and Hintze (1993) s.v. *a-u-ta-ra*).

<sup>16</sup> See notably Parry (1930) 85-6 (= (1971) 275-6).

<sup>17</sup> Other formulas with #αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ ῥ(α) include ... ἐπὶ νῆα κατήλυθον ἠδὲ θάλασσαν (*Od.* 2.407+); note also #αὐτάρ ἄρα Ζεὺς δῶκε διακτόρῳ Ἀργεῖφόντη (*Il.* 2.103), the unique case (though cf. also *h.Merc.* 69) of directly juxtaposed #αὐτάρ ἄρα (compare Schwyzler and Debrunner (1950) 559). Among the numerous other instances of αὐτάρ ... ἄρ(α), ῥ(α) is #αὐτάρ ὁ βῆ ῥ’ (*Il.* 5.849+).

<sup>18</sup> On γάρ ῥ(α) and (in later Greek also) γάρ ἄρα, see e.g. Denniston (1954) 56. Note also the collocation γάρ ... γ(ε) (cf. e.g. *Od.* 9.5, 11.450).

<sup>19</sup> To forestall the idea that the absence of \*αὐτάρ τε from Homer (of course, since αὐτάρ is never *in longo*; see above in the text, with fn. 14) might suggest that αὐτάρ conceals (αὐτ-)τε

superficially similar counterpart ἄτάρ, we need to take a fresh look at what αὐτάρ is and how it functions. After an excursus on its morphology, I attempt to demonstrate that an examination of αὐτάρ-clauses that goes beyond their purely formal characteristics and looks at them in larger poetic terms can actually make this little word sparkle.

Since philological evidence dictates against the standard segmentation of αὐτάρ as \*αὐτ-άρ and since there is no reason to reject the connection between the initial diphthong and the adverbial particle αῦ, an obvious goal is to find an element ταρ. Until a few years ago, this would have been quite a difficult business: the ancients knew of the existence of a particle ταρ—for example, Herodian reads it in *Il.* 1.65 and 93 (these verses are discussed below; on ταρ in the former, Herodian specifically states that it is an enclitic particle and that, since it is unitary and does not contain the conjunction τε, it should not be written with an apostrophe, i.e. as τ' ἄρ(΄)) and his father, Apollonius Dyscolus, sees it in fact in αὐτάρ (*Conj.* 241,8-9 and 254,2-21)—but modern scholars have so neglected it that, although it earns a brief lemma in both LSJ and Chantraine's etymological dictionary,<sup>20</sup> no less a scholar than Günter Neumann could write that 'ein griechisches Wort \*ταρ gibt es nicht'.<sup>21</sup> Nor is it to be found anywhere in the main text of either *OCT* of Homer, where the editors invariably convert the sequence τ-α-ρ into τ' ἄρ(΄) (cf. *Il.* 1.8, with which this paper began).<sup>22</sup> However, in his 1995 book *How to kill a dragon: aspects of Indo-European poetics*, Calvert Watkins, invoking Wackernagel (among others), breathed new life into the particle ταρ, demonstrating in a convincing fashion that it makes a perfect equation with the Cuneiform Luvian locatival, and likewise enclitic, particle *-tar*, with both going back to the same Proto-Indo-European etymon \*t<sub>ɹ</sub> (i.e. \*-t<sub>ɹ</sub>), the 'pronominal stem [\*t-] with adverbial ending as in Vedic *tar-hi*, Gothic *þar* (\*tor), English *there* (\*tēr)'.<sup>23</sup> Although

---

after all, I note that ἄτάρ τε is nearly entirely absent as well, found only in *Il.* 4.484; see Ruijgh (1971) 714-18.

<sup>20</sup> By including a cross-reference to the lemma for τε, Chantraine (1999) s.v. implies that ταρ is a collocation of τ(ε) plus ἄρ(α), though there is in fact no mention of ταρ s.v. τε; compare also Vendryes (1945) 90 and 106-7, who considers as well the competing possibility that ταρ would contain τοι rather than τε. Frisk (1960-1972) ignores ταρ completely.

<sup>21</sup> Neumann (1987) 116 (= (1994) 445).

<sup>22</sup> Aside now from West (1998b-2000), few editions of Homer in current use in the English-speaking world ever print the particle ταρ in the main text; note, however, that it shows up in W. Leaf's 1900-1902<sup>2</sup> Macmillan, T. W. Allen's 1931 Oxford, and P. Mazon's 1937-1938 Budé editions of the *Iliad* in some (but never all) of the possible instances defined in the next paragraph in the text as 'Type I'. The classic modern accounts of ταρ are Lehrs (1837) 131-2, La Roche (1866) 359-60, and Cobet (1876) 315-23; compare also e.g. Monro (1891) 304 plus 402 (but he does not understand its morphology).

<sup>23</sup> Watkins (1995) 150-1, with quotation at 151 n. 28; see also Watkins (1997) 618 and (2000) 10 n. 13. A small potential difficulty that Watkins does not mention is that CLuv. *-tar* is consistently written with only one *-t-* (cf. also its probable cognate in Lycian and Milyan, *-de*, not *\*-te*; see Melchert (2004) s.vv.) and might therefore rather be said to come from something like \*d<sup>(h)</sup>t<sub>ɹ</sub>. However, Anatolian particles may be expected to have both lenited and unlenited variants depending on where they sit in the particle chain, and *-tar* is frequently found in what would historically be a leniting environment (see Melchert (1993) s.v.). To judge from our (limited) evidence, the lenited variant would seem in this case to have been generalized.

there had been a number of observations about the Luvian particle and its etymology in the decades before, none had brought in the Greek.<sup>24</sup> Watkins's idea has been widely applauded (except by Gregory Nagy; see fn. 37),<sup>25</sup> and it is almost certainly on account of this Greco-Luvian connection, explicitly acknowledged in his *Iliad*'s 'Praefatio', that West now opts for ταρ ('[e]pici carminis peculiare [...], perantiquum') in *Il.* 1.8 and, as we shall see, elsewhere.<sup>26</sup>

Proposing equations between particles is a dangerous business, but the connection between the Greek and the Luvian is assured by the fact that each of the two basic constructions in Homer with ταρ that Watkins identifies has either an equivalent or a near-parallel in the Luvian corpus. The first, which I call 'Type I', has the structure #Interrogative (PIE *\*k<sup>w</sup>i/o-*) + *\*tr*: it is reflected in Homer's basically verse-initial collocation (see below, with fn. 39) of a 'wh-word' (τίς, τί, πῶς, etc.) plus ταρ (cf. *Il.* 1.8 #τίς τάρ σφωε θεῶν ...;) and in what is both synchronically and diachronically exactly the same schema, with the same meaning, in Cuneiform Luvian, #ku-(i-)iš=tar.<sup>27</sup> The Greek construction is quite common,<sup>28</sup> and Watkins rightly comments that it 'strains credulity' to believe, with J. D. Denniston, that 'τε after interrogative is always followed by ἄρ(α)'.<sup>29</sup> Note that the Greek questions are 'sentence- and

<sup>24</sup> See e.g. Josephson (1976) 174, with n. 46, and Joseph (1981) 93 n. 2.

<sup>25</sup> It is explicitly noted in at least two reviews: Dunkel (1997) 418 and Schlerath (2000) 46. For positive assessments elsewhere, see Martin (2000) 56-7, Pulleyn (2000) 123, and Melchert (2004) s.v. Lyc. -de; see also Latacz (2002) 2.23, 53, and 71 and Huys and T. Schmidt (2005) 213-14, as well as the newly published (and cautious) *LfrgE* lemma s.v. ταρ (M. Schmidt). (Some of these scholars mistakenly cite the Greek particle as 'τάρ' although it is inherently accentless: the acute in the *Paradebeispiel*, *Il.* 1.8, comes from the following word, σφωε, which is likewise enclitic.)

<sup>26</sup> West (1998b) XXIX, with reference to Watkins in n. 52; compare also West in Latacz (2002) 1.XIV.

<sup>27</sup> The Luvian is attested thus three times, in the same phrase: see Melchert (1993) s.v. -tar for the textual references.

<sup>28</sup> The full list follows (though perhaps γάρ should be read for ταρ in some verses; see fn. 41): τίς ταρ in *Il.* 1.8, 2.761, 3.226, 17.475, 18.182 and *Od.* 4.443, 10.383, 501, 14.115, 17.382; τί ταρ in *Il.* 12.409, 18.6 and *Od.* 23.264; τίπτε ταρ in *Il.* 11.656 and *Od.* 13.417; πῶς ταρ in *Il.* 1.123, 10.61, 424, 11.838, 18.188 and *Od.* 3.22 (*bis*), 10.337, 16.70, 19.325 (also in *h.Ap.* 19 = 207; see now West (2003) 72 and 86); πῆ ταρ in *Il.* 13.307 and *Od.* 15.509; and possibly ποίη ταρ in *Od.* 16.222. All but two of the fourteen ταρ-questions in the *Iliad* are asked by Greeks (exceptions: 3.226, 12.409).

<sup>29</sup> Watkins (1995) 150, with reference to Denniston (1954) 533-4. The recognition of ταρ as a unitary particle forces us to re-examine certain cases of 'τε épique' (see the very fair presentation of interrogative plus τ' ἄρ(α)/ταρ in Ruijgh (1971) 57-8 and esp. 804-9) and a would-be cognate use of ca 'and' in the *Rigveda* (see Klein (1985) 114-15, with 120-1 n. 9, and *passim*) and also of ἄρ(α), ῥ(α), especially (for reasons that will become clear) in such combinations as δ' ἄρ(α)/δ' ἄρ' ἔπειτ(α) (see Visser (1987) 91-3; some of the work on ἄρ(α), ῥ(α) by Egbert J. Bakker is now conveniently collected in Bakker (2005); see General Index s.v. 'particles: ara' (p. 195), esp. p. 12 n. 32 (from an article, written with F. Fabbricotti, originally published in 1991)). It also forces us to reconsider certain standard views of Homeric particle order (see e.g. Wills

frequently episode-initial<sup>30</sup> and that CLuv. *#kuiš=tar* begins a ritual speech. Likewise verse-initial is *#εἶ ταρ* in *Il.* 1.65, a structural variant of Type I about which Watkins says nothing: Achilles' *#εἶ ταρ ὁ γ' εὐχολῆς ἐπιμέμφεται εἴθ' [v.l. ἦδ']*; see fn. 31] *ἐκατόμβης*. It is this verse that brings out the strongest ancient claims of a Homeric particle *ταρ*, and one good reason to trust Herodian's authority may be that not accepting *\*#εἴτ' ἄρ' (OCT, etc.)* goes some way toward eliminating from epic the collocation *εἴτ(ε) ... εἴτ(ε)*.<sup>31</sup> As for the nearby verse *Il.* 1.93, *#οὔτ' ἄρ' ὁ γ' εὐχολῆς ἐπιμέμφεται οὔθ' ἐκατόμβης*, with apparent *οὔτ(ε) ... οὔτ(ε)* (a perfectly common construction), it may be that—even if we do read *#εἶ ταρ [... εἴθ']* in 1.65—Calchas' repetition of Achilles' words should be understood not as *\*#οὔ ταρ [... οὔθ']*, but rather (*pace* Herodian) as an instance of what I call 'unetymological *ταρ*', a kind of play on the particle that, as we shall see, Homer appears very much to enjoy.<sup>32</sup>

The other major construction that Watkins discusses, which I call 'Type II', has the following structure: *#Verb of emotion + \*t<sub>r</sub>*. More precisely, the verse-initial verb has, in addition to its semantic restriction, a very specific morphological and metrical make-up—a third-person singular aorist active indicative of the shape — plus the ending *-εν*—and is, furthermore, invariably followed by not just *ταρ*, but also *ἔπειτα*, as in *Il.* 3.398 *#θάμβησέν ταρ ἔπειτα*. Watkins compares this schema to a Cuneiform Luvian phrase that has what is for Anatolian very peculiar morpho-syntax, namely a clause-initial verb: *#ma-am-ma-an-na=tar* 'Regard with favor!'<sup>33</sup> The other verbs that participate most clearly in the Greek formula *#— -έν ταρ ἔπειτα* are *ρίγησεν (Il.* 4.148 = 11.254<sup>34</sup>), *ζῆμωξεν (Il.* 10.522 = 23.178 = 24.591, 15.397 = *Od.* 13.198), *κώκυσεν (Il.* 18.37, 24.703), and *γῆθησεν (Od.* 13.353 = 21.414), and Watkins writes, 'The semantic unity of all these verbs, "shuddered", "wailed", "shrieked", "was awestruck", as well as their morphological and phrasal rigidity, would suggest that they are ultimately all variants or developments of a single formula. Only in the *Odyssey* with *γῆθησέν ταρ ἔπειτα* (13.353 etc.) "rejoiced" do we find the [+horror] overtones replaced by [+joy].'<sup>35</sup> In view of the semantics of CLuv. *mammanna=tar*, as well as the relatively small amount of evidence (especially in the *Odyssey*), the implication that '[+joy]' is an inner-Greek development is at least uncertain. But this is a small matter: the Greco-Anatolian comparison seems to me persuasive. However, quite unlike with Type I, West does not take over Type II *ταρ* (neither does M. Schmidt in *LfrgE*), perhaps because he believes that this use of *ταρ* is not synchronically viable in Greek (?) or perhaps simply because the connection between the Greek and Luvian phrases is not flawless, unlike the equation *#τίς ταρ = #kuiš=tar*. Nevertheless, I

---

(1993) 80) and perhaps to think again about the much-debated etymology of *τίπτε* (almost the entire underpinnings of the analysis of Lillo (1992) get knocked away).

<sup>30</sup> Watkins (1995) 150.

<sup>31</sup> It is otherwise attested in Homer only in *Il.* 2.349 (with a *varia lectio*: see e.g. Chantraine (1953) 293), 12.239-40 and *Od.* 3.90-1 (the last two unnoticed by Chantraine); the paucity of examples runs counter to the implication of Denniston (1954) 505. Herodian (followed by West (1998b) 8 and some others) reads the 'second' *εἴθ'* in *Il.* 1.65 as *ἦδ'*.

<sup>32</sup> West (1998b) 8 and 10 prints *#εἶ ταρ* but *#οὔτ' ἄρ'* (followed, however, by *οὔδ'*). For the sequence *οὐ τάρ πω* in *Il.* 7.433, see the apparatus in West (1998b) 223.

<sup>33</sup> The phrase is attested twice: see Melchert (1993) s.vv. *māmmanna-* and *-tar*.

<sup>34</sup> But see van Thiel (1997) 29-30.

<sup>35</sup> Watkins (1995) 151.

hope in this paper to provide reasons why future editors and critics of Homer ought to accept it. Whatever the case may be, Watkins is probably correct to see in the Greek and Luvian deployments of PIE *\*t̥* a Western Anatolianism, that is to say, an ‘areal feature common to both languages at the geographical point of their contact’.<sup>36</sup>

Let us return to αὐτάρ. Now that ταρ has been properly introduced, we may consider whether there is further inner-Homeric evidence to back up the conclusion that αὐτάρ, but not ἄτάρ, conceals this particle.<sup>37</sup> Certainly αὐτάρ and ταρ have at least two general features in common: both are highly formulaic (whereas ἄτάρ is not) and both are characteristic of epic (whereas ἄτάρ has a far broader distribution over time, space, and genre).<sup>38</sup> Furthermore, αὐτάρ and ταρ share a narrative function, to the exclusion of ἄτάρ. Consider again Type I ταρ. It is notable that collocations of interrogative plus ταρ are not only always verse-initial or immediately following a verse-initial (extra-sentential) vocative,<sup>39</sup> but almost always at the beginning of a speech as well, invariably in the *Iliad* (with the interesting quasi-exceptions of 1.8 and 2.761<sup>40</sup>) and usually in the *Odyssey*.<sup>41</sup> These synchronic pragmatic facts, coupled with the

---

<sup>36</sup> Watkins (1995) 151. A phrase in Vedic prose that Watkins does not point out, *kim tarhi*, literally ‘What then?’ (~ Gk. \*τί ταρ-χι), could conceivably be a *tertium comparationis* for Type I, but I believe it is more likely to be an independent collocation of inherited material. Cardona (1998) argues that *kim tarhi* actually means ‘but, however, on the other hand’, which is all the more interesting in view of the morphology of αὐ-τάρ.

<sup>37</sup> As noted above in the text, Gregory Nagy has not been enthusiastic about ταρ. In his review of West (1998b), Nagy (2004) 73-4 (~ Nagy (2000)) sets aside the Luvian evidence and rejects the Watkins/West/Katz view of this particle (he, like some others, cites my 1996 APA abstract, ‘Αὐτάρ, ἄτάρ, ταρ: the poetics of a particle in Homer’, though mistakenly dating it to 1998). While Nagy (2004) 74 (also Nagy (2000)) complains that ‘there are problems with West’s application of linguistics in the process of rewriting the received text of the *Iliad*’, Nagy’s wording in the section at issue is extremely sloppy: it is impossible to tell for sure, for example, whether he accepts any synchronic instances of ταρ—I expect he does, but it is not clear where, why, or how—and, if indeed he does accept some, what he thinks they reflect diachronically. I regret that considerations of space have made it impossible for me to include here, as I did on the handout for the Cambridge conference, an annotated version of Nagy’s entire discussion; still, anyone who reads it closely will see that it is filled with non sequiturs and rhetoric designed to make the reader feel unwarranted doubt.

<sup>38</sup> Why αὐτάρ is generally oxytone is unclear; one might have expected αὐ̄ + ταρ to give αὐ̄ταρ (see for this *LfrgE* s.v. αὐτάρ (col. 1567)). Perhaps the accentuation is analogical on ἄτάρ (however this is to be explained)?

<sup>39</sup> The only exception is not a real exception: in *Od.* 3.22, there are two speech-opening πῶς ταρ-questions.

<sup>40</sup> Here #τίς ταρ is not part of a speech by a Greek or Trojan hero but is rather one of the rare moments in which ‘Homer’ himself makes an appearance, asking a question and invoking the Muses (cf. also πῶς τάρ σ’ ὑμνήσω ...; in the *Hymn to Apollo*; see fn. 28). The fact that these two ‘rhapsodic questions’ (thus Race (1992) 21 and *passim*) are so central to the *Iliad* suggests that we take ταρ very seriously: 1.8—in effect another opener after the mention of the central theme, μῆνις, in 1.1—asks who of the gods set Achilles and Agamemnon against each other and

etymological comparison of CLuv. *-tar* and Eng. *there*, suggest that ‘Who on earth?’, ‘What in the world?’, and the like may be appropriate English translations.<sup>42</sup> Now, like *ταρ*, *αὐτάρ* is a scene-changer as well, frequently found at the beginning of episodes and even, for what it is worth, whole books (2x *Il.*, 6x *Od.*)<sup>43</sup>; by contrast, *ἄτάρ* has in general a somewhat different narrative function, namely to cast a new light or give a second perspective on a scene that is in the process of being described (compare fn. 62).

Still more striking is one formal similarity between Type II *ταρ* and *αὐτάρ*, and it is from this that we can be sure that *αὐτάρ*—but, again, not *ἄτάρ*—conceals the particle. As already noted, every example of #[-- -έν]<sub>Verb of emotion</sub> *ταρ* is followed immediately by *ἔπειτα*, a syntagma that is obviously related to a formula we have already looked at for another reason, namely #*αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ ῥ’*. In other words, not only is the little word *ῥ(α)* in this formula interesting for telling us what *αὐτάρ* *is not*, but the other smallish word, *ἐπεὶ*, is interesting for confirming for us what *αὐτάρ* *is*. In fact, while there are sporadic instances of *ἐπ-* in *ἄτάρ*-clauses, those with *αὐτάρ*—both the verse-initial set discussed by Parry (#*αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ*, #*αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ ῥ’*, #*αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ δὴ*, and #*αὐτάρ ἐπήν*)<sup>44</sup> and even those that are not strictly formulaic—extraordinarily frequently contain this element (in the form of the conjunctions *ἐπεὶ* and *ἐπήν*, the adverb *ἔπειτα*, the preposition *ἐπί*, and the preverb *ἐπι-*)<sup>45</sup>; quite a number of *αὐτάρ*-clauses even contain two examples of *ἐπ-* (e.g. formulaic #*αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ ῥ’ ἐπὶ νῆα κατήλυθον*; see fn.

---

thereby brought on Achilles’ wrath; and 2.761, which immediately follows the Catalogue of Ships and sounds like yet another beginning, asks who is the best of the Achaeans.

<sup>41</sup> It is scarcely a problem that the *Odyssey* differs slightly from the *Iliad* in the placement of this construction within the narrative (compare above in the text on what Watkins believes to be a shift in the use of Type II *ταρ* in the *Odyssey*, where it is also less frequent). However, it could be that some of the ‘aberrant’ instances are actually to be read with *γάρ*, which is an extremely common particle after interrogatives in later Greek (compare Denniston (1954) 81-6), not to mention a recognized variant of *ταρ/τ’ ἄρ(’)* throughout Homer (see e.g. *LfggE* s.v. *ταρ*).

<sup>42</sup> The ancients understood *ταρ* as a synonym of *δὴ* ‘in fact’: the most interesting testimony is *POxy.* 2405.(v.)180 (J. W. B. Barns) *ad Il.* 1.123. Martin (2000) 56-7, with n. 33, suggests that Nestor’s #*τίπτε ταρ ...*; in *Il.* 11.656 and perhaps other *ταρ*-questions in the *Iliad* are meant to ‘sound old, as though coming from a different generation’ (57).

<sup>43</sup> Note as a curiosity that in the *Odyssey*, Books 19, 20, and 22 all begin #*αὐτάρ ὁ ...* EPITHET Ὀδυσσεύς, while Book 21 starts with an example of ‘unetymological *ταρ*’: #*τῆ δ’ ἄρ’ ἐπὶ φρεσὶ ...* EPITHET Ἀθήνη. Similarly, Books 11, 12, and 14 begin #*αὐτάρ* (*ἐπεὶ (ῥ’ ἐπὶ νῆα)*), while Book 13 has *δ’ ἄρα πάντες* in its first verse (compare fn. 69).

<sup>44</sup> See the reference in fn. 16.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. also *Il.* 1.65 #*εἴ ταρ ... ἐπι-μέμφεται*, discussed above in the text.

17).<sup>46</sup> Why exactly (-)ταρ and ἐπ- have such a close relationship is unclear, but each is originally locatival (cf. CLuv. *-tar*) and would seem therefore to reinforce the other.<sup>47</sup>

This brings me to two small points of linguistic interest, the one an inner-Greek matter, the other a possible third Greco-Luvian comparandum. First, it is usually acknowledged that ὄπ- (cf. e.g. ὀπίσ(σ)ω and ὀπιπέω) is etymologically related to ἐπ-, with the former showing the *o*-grade of the root noun (see fn. 47) and the latter the *e*-grade (cf. Myc. *o-pi(-) ~ e-pi(-)*).<sup>48</sup> Occasionally, however, this view is called into question, in recent decades notably by Dunkel, who argues on semantic grounds that the forms in ὄπ- belong rather with ἄπό.<sup>49</sup> I am not convinced by Dunkel's proposal, which does not strike me as obvious semantically and is anyway difficult from a phonological standpoint, but a new (if not in itself clinching) reason to believe that ἐπ- and ὄπ- do in fact belong together comes not from Indo-European historical and comparative linguistics, but rather from Homeric poetics: alongside αὐτάρ ἔπειτα# (*Il.* 3.273+)—the formula appears verse-finally as well (compare fn. 46)—we also find αὐτάρ ὀπισθε(ν)# (*5x Il.*, *2x Od.*).

As for the second point, we can go beyond Watkins's comparisons of #τίς ταρ with #kuiš=*tar* and #θάμβησέν ταρ ἔπειτα and the like with #mammanna=*tar* and note that there may be yet another such quasi-equation between Greek and Cuneiform Luvian, one involving αὐτάρ. Since the Luvian preverb *āppa* 'back, again' reflects PIE \**h<sub>1</sub>op-* and is therefore cognate with Gk. ἐπ-/ὄπ-,<sup>50</sup> the following passage, which, as it happens, begins a section of a ritual, holds particular interest: #*pā=tar āppa zaštanz(a) aštummantanz(a)=ta atuwalaḥiti niš dādduwar* (*KUB IX 31 Ro. ii 25-6*), whose translation is something like, 'But do not come back with evil to these gates!'<sup>51</sup> Without going into the admittedly problematic syntactic details, I simply note that clause/section-initial #*pā=tar āppa*, with the contrastive or adversative particle *pā-* 'but' (cf. Gk. αὖ), looks to be *mutatis mutandis* the same as Homer's verse-initial #αὐ-τάρ ἐπ-.<sup>52</sup>

Let me move away now from the Indo-European perspective and return to Homer. Possibly the most interesting point about αὐτάρ and its formulaic usage remains to be made, namely what verbs appear in clauses introduced by the conjunction. Although the idea may

<sup>46</sup> Note also e.g. *Il.* 4.442-3 αὐτάρ ἔπειτα / οὐρανῶ ἐστήριξε κάρη καὶ ἐπὶ χθονὶ βαίνει. Well beyond the scope of the present work is a general survey of αὖ and its allied formations, though I note that αὐτίκα 'forthwith', too, is a scene-changer (see Erren (1970)) and is used formulaically with ἐπ- in such collocations as #αὐτίκ' ἔπειτα (*Il.* 1.583+).

<sup>47</sup> It is widely believed that ἐπί is the old locative of a root-noun \**h<sub>1</sub>ep-* of not entirely clear meaning (and ἐπεί is probably originally a locative as well); see e.g. Katz (1994[1995]) 157-8 and *passim*, with references. The latest word on ἐπί in Homer is Fritz (2005) 104-91.

<sup>48</sup> The clearest exposition is Morpurgo Davies (1983); see also Hamp (1981).

<sup>49</sup> See e.g. Dunkel (1982/83).

<sup>50</sup> *Pace* Hamp (1981) 42-3 and Dunkel (1982/83) 71, 84-5, and *passim*. See Melchert (forthcoming) for an additional piece of evidence in favor of the derivation.

<sup>51</sup> Compare Morpurgo Davies (1987) 218.

<sup>52</sup> However, since *āppa* is a preverb and goes with the verb *dādduwar* (2pl. pres. mid. of *tā-* 'step, arrive'), there is a syntactic break between *-tar* and *āppa*, unlike between formulaic (-)ταρ and ἐπ-. In any case, the Luvian phrase is peculiar in containing two locatival particles, both *-tar* and *-(t)ta*, and in having the second of these in the middle of the sentence rather than in Wackernagel position; for possible Hittite comparanda, see Neu (1993).

sound far-fetched that there are observable patterns, it is not on the face of it absurd: after all, since the epic particle *ταρ*, in Type II constructions, serves to emphasize a definable class of verbs, why should something similar not hold true also for the epic conjunction *αὐτάρ*? While there do not seem to be interesting patterns with *ἀτάρ*, this is not at all the case with *αὐτάρ*, which—to generalize—frequently introduces clauses with three kinds of verbs: (1) verbs of motion (*βαίνω*, *ικνέομαι*, etc.) and (2) verbs of giving (*δίδωμι*, *νέμω*, etc.), for both of which a connection with a ‘spatial’ (etymologically locatival) particle is understandable,<sup>53</sup> but also (3) verbs of intense emotion and mental activity, in which the function of *-ταρ* is not obvious. In particular, there are a tremendous number of *αὐτάρ*-clauses, including many of the rigidly formulaic ones, that describe what French Hellenists refer to as ‘the cuisine of sacrifice’, that is to say, are concerned with emotionally charged rites and ritual feasting: prayer, sacrifice, libation, eating, and drinking. Note that this is a coherent semantic field, at least from the point of view of Ancient Greece.<sup>54</sup>

A way to show in short order why this is interesting is to take just the one smallish set of formulas, assembled and discussed by Parry (and already referred to above; see fnn. 16 and 44), in which verse-initial *#αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ*, *#αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ ῥ’*, *#αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ δὴ*, and *#αὐτάρ ἐπὶν* are followed immediately by a verb that ends at the trochaic caesura, like *εὔξαντο*. Parry examined the formal characteristics of these clause-openers, of course, but he did not consider the nature of the verbs that appear in them. In fact, he missed something important. All five verbs that fill the slot in the most basic of these variations, *#αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ [ — — ]<sub>Verb</sub> ||*, have to do with cuisine and/or sacrifice<sup>55</sup>:

(1) *δείπνησε* ‘feasted’, in a twice-attested formula: *Od.* 5.95 = 14.111 *#αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ δείπνησε καὶ ἤραρε θυμὸν ἐδωδῆ*, the first on Calypso’s isle (cf. *#αὐτάρ ὁ πῖνε καὶ ἤσθε* in the preceding verse), the second of Odysseus’ meal with Eumaeus;

(2) *παύσαντο* ‘ceased [from preparing the feast]’, in a thrice-attested formula: *Il.* 1.467 = 2.430 = 7.319 *#αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ παύσαντο πόνου τετύκοντό τε δαῖτα* (the next word each time is *#δαίνυτ’*)<sup>56</sup>;

(3) *κατέπαυσα* ‘stopped [the wrath of the gods through ritual offerings]’: *Od.* 4.583 *#αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ κατέπαυσα θεῶν χόλον αἰὲν ἐόντων* (the preceding verse refers to hecatombs and the following one begins with a verb of pouring: *#χεῦ’ Ἀγαμέμνονι τύμβον*); and

(4) *τάρπημεν* and (5) *τάρπησαν* ‘enjoyed [food and drink]’, in a twice-attested formula: *Il.* 11.780 ~ *Od.* 5.201 *#αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ τάρπημεν/τάρπησαν ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτῆτος*<sup>57</sup> (the

<sup>53</sup> By ‘spatial’ I mean locatival plus (presumably secondarily) directional: cf. e.g. the use of *there* in English to indicate direction to (instead of moribund *thither*) as well as place at. I am grateful to Antonia Ruppel for forcing me to clarify this point.

<sup>54</sup> See most notably the essays in Detienne and Vernant (1979).

<sup>55</sup> Compare Reece (1993) 24.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. also *Od.* 16.478(-9) = 24.384.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. the very common formula *#αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο* (*Il.* 1.469+).

other three instances of #αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τάρπησαν are not directly in a ritual context, but *Od.* 4.47 is followed immediately by bathing and anointing with oil (48 λούσαντο#, 49 λούσαν καὶ χρίσαν ἐλαίω#) and *Od.* 10.181 by the washing of hands and feasting (182 #χεῖρας νιψάμενοι τεύχοντ' ἔρικυδέα δαῖτα); *Il.* 24.633 is somewhat different).<sup>58</sup>

Evidently #αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ is sending a semantic signal—and that seems remarkable.

A look at one of the other variations—one discussed in depth more recently than Parry, and from the point of view of meaning as much as formula—will reinforce my point. Among the verbs that pertain to the intersection of ritual and dining and that follow #αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' are ὄμοσεν/ὄμοσαν (*Il.* 14.280 = *Od.* 2.378 = 10.346 ~ 12.304 = 15.438 = 18.59 #αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' ὄμοσέν/ὄμοσάν τε τελεῦτησέν/τελεῦτησάν τε τὸν ὄρκον), ὤπτησε and ἔχευε (*Il.* 9.215 #αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' ὤπτησε καὶ εἰν ἐλεοῖσιν ἔχευε; see the next paragraph, as well as fn. 66), and εὔξαντο. The last of these is the verb of sacral prayer *par excellence*: #αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' εὔξαντο καὶ οὐλοχύτας προβάλοντο (*Il.* 1.458 = 2.421 = *Od.* 3.447) and #αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' εὔξαντο καὶ ἔσφαξαν καὶ ἔδειραν (*Od.* 12.359; cf. *Il.* 1.459 = 2.422, right after the preceding formula); note also #αὐτὰρ ἐπὶ σπέισης τε καὶ εὔξεαι (*Od.* 3.45).<sup>59</sup> We can therefore go beyond the verb in discussions of the powerful language of ritual and, expanding on a point Leonard Charles Muellner makes in his excellent treatment of εὔχομαι in Homer,<sup>60</sup> consider the status of (-)ταρ as a 'sacral particle'. Summarizing the characteristics of ritual narrative as seen in *Il.* 1.458-68 (a passage I examine in detail below), Muellner writes,<sup>61</sup>

[I]t is possible that εὔχομαι in A 458 means nothing more than, e.g., 'spoke loudly, made a loud speech'. This, too, would be appropriate to the context of flaying cattle and casting barley. But against it is the restriction of the only rigorous formula in this section [on prayers]

# αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' εὔξαντο ||

to sacral contexts exclusively. The rule holds again: an εὔχομαι formula designed for sacral contexts is not used in secular contexts. If there is something intrinsically sacral about εὔξαντο—for *there is nothing sacral about αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ'*—then this rule makes sense.

Muellner's assumption seems reasonable enough, but in fact forms of εὔχομαι show up five times after #αὐτὰρ ἐπ- *precisely because there is something sacral* and presumably old about the co-occurrence of this verb and the particle (-)ταρ.

<sup>58</sup> *Pace* Parry (1930) 85 (= (1971) 276), *Il.* 11.780 is the only instance of τάρπημεν and there are four of τάρπησαν, not three.

<sup>59</sup> 'Unetymological ταρ' is found in #εὐχόμενος δ' ἄρα εἶπεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε (*Od.* 7.330 (cf. also *Il.* 16.513, 19.257); note εἶπ-, ἐπ-, ἐφ- in alternating syllables (cf. *Il.* 3.398, with 'real' ταρ)) and #εὐξάμενος δ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα (*Od.* 24.521).

<sup>60</sup> Muellner (1976).

<sup>61</sup> Muellner (1976) 32-3 (quotation at 33; footnote omitted and italics added).

It is thus possible to speak of the poetics of a particle, and I conclude by illustrating the points I have been making with reference to more than single Homeric verses; as already hinted, multiple instances of (-)ταρ often appear in the same ritual scene. Take, for example, *Il.* 9.205-24: a proper analysis of the diction is impossible here, but note that four begin #αὐτάρ (206, 212, 215, 222; the last three have #αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ (ῥ')); that each of the first three refers to the next step in Patroclus' ritual preparations; and that the final one is the feast-ending formula #αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο (see fn. 57).<sup>62</sup>

The most spectacular example of (-)ταρ-clustering comes in *Il.* 1.457-71, a passage about which G. S. Kirk in his Cambridge commentary writes the following<sup>63</sup>:

This description of animal sacrifice is a 'typical scene' with many standard verses. The language is fluent and clear with a number of technical ritual terms; it is not noticeably archaic, except conceivably in the rarity of integral enjambment (only at 462/3) and the regularity of verse-pattern (although there are rising threefolds at 464 and 466). This is the fullest description in the *Iliad* of this fundamental ritual act (Agamemnon's sacrifice and prayer for victory at 2.410ff. being similar but lacking some details), only surpassed by Nestor's elaborate sacrifice on the sea-shore near Pulos at *Od.* 4.321ff.

But this ritual type scene is rather more interesting (and presumably archaic) than Kirk and others make out, showing as it does a remarkable combination of Indo-European poetic inheritance and Homeric technique. Especially remarkable is the interplay between 'real' examples of (-)ταρ and instances in which its sound and context are evoked (what I have been calling 'unetymological ταρ')<sup>64</sup>:

- ἽΩς ἔφατ' εὐχόμενος, τοῦ δ' ἔκλυε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων.  
αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' εὐξαντο καὶ οὐλοχύτας προβάλντο,  
 αὐέρυσαν μὲν πρῶτα καὶ ἔσφαξαν καὶ ἔδειραν,  
 460 μηρούς τ' ἐξέταμον κατὰ τε κνίση ἐκάλυψαν  
 δίπτυχα ποιήσαντες, ἐπ' αὐτῶν δ' ὠμοθέτησαν·  
 καῖε δ' ἐπὶ σχίζης ὁ γέρων, ἐπὶ δ' αἶθοπα οἶνον  
 λείβε· νέοι δὲ παρ' αὐτὸν ἔχον πεμπώβολα χερσίν.  
αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ μῆρ' ἐκάη καὶ σπλάγχχν' ἐπάσαντο,  
 465 μίστυλλον τ' ἄρα τᾶλλα καὶ ἀμφ' ὀβελοῖσιν ἔπειραν,  
 ὦπτησάν τε περιφραδέως, ἐρύσαντό τε πάντα.  
αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ παύσαντο πόνου τετύκοντό τε δαῖτα,  
 δαίνυντ', οὐδέ τι θυμὸς ἐδεύετο δαιτὸς εἴσης.  
αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο,  
 470 κοῦροι μὲν κρητῆρας ἐπεστέψαντο ποτοῖο,

<sup>62</sup> Cf. *Il.* 24.621-34. Note that Achilles' (surprisingly) subordinate rôle is introduced with ἀτάρ rather than αὐτάρ: ἀτάρ κρέα νεῖμεν Ἀχιλλεύς# (*Il.* 9.217 (= 24.626)), where ἀτάρ stands in for δέ (it follows on the μὲν-clause about Patroclus in the previous verse, 9.216 (but 24.625 is in this respect interestingly different)).

<sup>63</sup> Kirk (1985) 100-1.

<sup>64</sup> I quote from the *OCT*, except 464, which comes from West (1998b) 30 (also van Thiel) and is the only place in the passage where there is a difference of (small) consequence to my argument: the *OCT* prints μῆρε κᾶη and (N.B.) σπλάγχχνα πάσαντο.

νώμησαν δ' ἄρα πᾶσιν ἐπαρξάμενοι δεπᾶεσσιν·

In these fifteen verses, all of which are formulaic<sup>65</sup> and a number of which we have already had occasion to inspect, almost every stage of sacrifice and feasting is signaled by a real case of (-)ταρ (458, 464, 467, 469); twice Homer adds an unetymological one (465, 471). First there is prayer (458 #αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ'), then ritual slaughter. This is followed by libations and the burning and tasting of various parts (464 #αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ... ἐπάσαντο), an activity whose ritual significance is stressed by the following verse, 465, which begins #μίστυλλον τ' ἄρα (this clearly plays on Type II ταρ, as in fact do all eight Homeric verses with #μίστυλλον) and ends with a verb, ἔπειραν, whose first syllable—just like the first syllable of the verb directly above it, in a verse with 'real' -ταρ—is *non-preverbal* ἐπ-.<sup>66</sup> Afterwards, the men finish their ritual preparations and themselves feast (467 #αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ). Then they are full, no longer interested in food and drink (469 #αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ), but the *kouroi* still pour liquids, in a verse that is an even more extraordinary play on Type II ταρ than 465: 471 #νώμησαν δ' ἄρα πᾶσιν ἐπαρξάμενοι δεπᾶεσσιν opens with a trisyllabic verb of the shape -- -Vv followed immediately by something almost like ταρ and then again by something almost like -επ- (δ' ἄρα π-)<sup>67</sup>; continues with a real instance of the preverb ἐπ- (ἐπαρξάμενοι)<sup>68</sup>; and is finally capped with yet another -επ- (δεπᾶεσσιν).<sup>69</sup> The abundance of inherited and unetymological (-)ταρ's emphasizes the sacral nature of the actions and, indeed, of the particle itself.<sup>70</sup> By pointing this out, I hope in a small and unexpected way to have added to our knowledge of not just classical and Indo-European linguistics, but also the rhetoric of ritual and religion in the ancient world.

This paper, a mini-*'Autour de "ταρ épique"'*, has argued that alongside Types I and II ταρ (#Interrogative + \*t<sub>l</sub> and #Verb of emotion + \*t<sub>l</sub>) there is also third type, (#)Adversative +

<sup>65</sup> For a convenient presentation, see now Pavese and Boschetti (2003) 26-7.

<sup>66</sup> The following verse, 466, which contains two instances of the phonetic sequence -ε π-, likewise begins #[-- -Vv]<sub>Verb</sub>—and the verb is ὤπτησαν (cf. #αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' ὤπτησε in *Il.* 9.215, cited above in the text).

<sup>67</sup> Note also the 'near miss' right before, in *Il.* 1.449: #χερνίψαντο δ' ἔπειτα καὶ οὐλοχύτας ἀνέλοντο.

<sup>68</sup> The construction may help explain the reason for the preverb ἐπ- in the ritual verb ἐπάρχομαι, whose form and precise meaning vis-à-vis ἀπάρχομαι have been the subject of speculation; see now Pulleyn (2000) 240-1.

<sup>69</sup> Homer a number of times has #[-- -Vv]<sub>Verb</sub> (e.g. #τέτρηεν (*Od.* 5.247) and #βόμβησαν (*Od.* 12.204)) followed by δ'/τ' ἄρα and a form of παντ- (and, when the verb is #νώμησVv, always ἐπ- as well); the perceptual difference between e.g. #νώμησαν δ' ἄρα πᾶσιν ἐπ- and \*#νώμησάν ταρ ἅπασι ἐπ- is very small. Among the more striking examples of #[-- -Vv]<sub>Verb</sub> δ' ἄρ' (...) ἐπ- are *Il.* 1.46, 17.84 and *Od.* 15.134, 21.389 (and cf. also *Il.* 7.482).

<sup>70</sup> A real account of 'unetymological ταρ' and its effects would be a paper in itself, but I cannot resist calling attention to a remarkable run in *Odyssey* 22: #Εὐρυάδην δ' ἄρα (267), #Πείσανδρον δ' ἄρ' ἔπεφνε ... ἐπιβουκόλος (268), and #τοὶ δ' ἄρ' ἐπήϊξαν (271), as well as #οἱ μὲν ἔπειθ' ἅμα πάντες (269). Homer likes the formula #[—  $\approx$  x]<sub>Personal name (nom. or acc.)</sub> δ' ἄρα (... ἐπ-)/δ' ἄρ' ἐπ-, especially when the name ends in -Vv (in this book alone, cf. also 277, 285, 365).

\**tr*, which is likewise reflected in Greek, as formulaic (#)αὐ-τάρ, and perhaps also in CLuv. #*pā=tar*. I have tried to show by means of the smallest of examples—an unstressed particle that is very nearly unknown—why classicists can only benefit from having a linguistic perspective and, conversely, why Indo-Europeanists should be sure to read Homer and not merely cull examples from isolated paragraphs in grammatical handbooks. Even a monosyllable is entitled to some epic adventures.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bakker, E. J. (2005) *Pointing at the past: from formula to performance in Homeric poetics*, Washington, D.C.
- Bryce, T. (2006) *The Trojans and their neighbours*, London.
- Cardona, G. (1998) ‘On *kim tarhi* in the Mahābhāṣya’, in J. Jasanoff, H. C. Melchert, and L. Oliver (eds.) *Mīr Curad: studies in honor of Calvert Watkins*, Innsbruck, 63-73.
- Chantraine, P. (1953) *Grammaire homérique*, vol. 2 (*Syntaxe*), Paris.
- (1999) *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots* (new edn.), Paris.
- Cobet, C. G. (1876) *Miscellanea critica quibus continentur observationes criticae in scriptores Graecos praesertim Homerum et Demosthenem*, Leiden.
- Crespo, E. (1977) *Elementos antiguos y modernos en la prosodia homérica*, Salamanca.
- Denniston, J. D. (1954) *The Greek particles* (2nd edn.), Oxford.
- Detienne, M. and J.-P. Vernant (1979) *La Cuisine du sacrifice en pays grec*, Paris [English version: *The cuisine of sacrifice among the Greeks*, trans. by P. Wissing, Chicago, 1989].
- Dunkel, G. E. (1982/83) ‘Πρόσσω καὶ ὀπίσσω’, *KZ* 96, 66-87.
- (1988) ‘Indogermanisch \**át*, vedisch *átha*’, *HS* 101, 53-78.
- (1997) Review of Watkins (1995), *CJ* 92, 417-22.
- Düntzer, H. (1863) ‘Zur homerischen wortforschung’, *KZ* 12, 1-26.
- Egetmeyer, M. (1992) *Wörterbuch zu den Inschriften im kyprischen Syllabar*, Berlin.
- Erren, M. (1970) ‘Αὐτικά “sogleich” als Signal der einsetzenden Handlung in Ilias und Odyssee’, *Poetica* 3, 24-58.
- Frisk, H. (1960-1972) *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 3 vols., Heidelberg.
- Fritz, M. A. (2005) *Die trikasuellen Lokalpartikeln bei Homer: Syntax und Semantik*, Göttingen.
- Hamp, E. P. (1981) ‘Indo-European \*(*H*)*op-*’, *MSS* 40, 39-60.
- Hintze, A. (1993) *A lexicon to the Cyprian syllabic inscriptions*, Hamburg.
- Hoekstra, A. (1965) *Homeric modifications of formulaic prototypes: studies in the development of Greek epic diction*, Amsterdam (= *Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, afd. Letterkunde*, N.R. 71/1).
- Huys, M. and T. Schmidt (2005) ‘A Toronto ostrakon with a list of monosyllables (2718 Pack<sup>2</sup>): re-edition with commentary’, *ZPE* 152, 209-17.
- Joseph, B. D. (1981) ‘Hittite *iwar*, *wa(r)* and Sanskrit *iva*’, *KZ* 95, 93-8.
- Josephson, F. (1976, publ. 1977) ‘On the function of the Gothic preverb *ga-*’, *IF* 81, 152-75.
- Katz, J. T. (1994[1995]) ‘Homeric formula and the Tocharian word for “year”: a transferred epithet’, *Glotta* 72, 151-68.
- Kirk, G. S. (1985) *The Iliad: A Commentary*, vol. 1, Cambridge.

- Klein, J. S. (1985) 'The origin and syntax of the Rigvedic construction *yá- (...) ká/i/ú- ca*', *MSS* 44 (*Festgabe für Karl Hoffmann, Teil I*), 105-21.
- (1988) 'Homeric Greek αὔ: a synchronic, diachronic, and comparative study', *HS* 101, 249-88.
- La Roche, J. (1866) *Die homerische Textkritik im Alterthum*, Leipzig.
- Latacz, J. (2002) *Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar*, vol. 1 (*Erster Gesang (A)*): fasc. 1 with M. L. West, fasc. 2 with R. Nünlist and M. Stoevesandt; 2nd edn.), Munich.
- Lehrs, K. (1837) *Quaestiones epicae*, Königsberg.
- Lillo, A. (1992) 'Zu griechisch τίπτει', *Glotta* 70, 15-19.
- Martin, R. (2000) 'Wrapping Homer up: cohesion, discourse, and deviation in the *Iliad*', in A. Sharrock and H. Morales (eds.) *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman textual relations*, Oxford, 43-65.
- Melchert, H. C. (1993) *Cuneiform Luvian lexicon*, Chapel Hill.
- (2004) *A dictionary of the Lycian language*, Ann Arbor.
- (forthcoming) 'Hittite *hi*-verbs from adverbs', to appear (see <<http://www.unc.edu/~melchert/krakow.pdf>>).
- Monro, D. B. (1891) *A grammar of the Homeric dialect* (2nd edn.), Oxford.
- Morpurgo Davies, A. (1983) 'Mycenaean and Greek prepositions: *o-pi*, *e-pi* etc.', in A. Heubeck and G. Neumann (eds.) *Res Mycenaeae: Akten des VII. Internationalen Mykenologischen Colloquiums in Nürnberg vom 6.-10. April 1981*, Göttingen, 287-310.
- (1987) "'To put" and "to stand" in the Luwian languages', in C. Watkins (ed.) *Studies in memory of Warren Cowgill (1929-1985): papers from the Fourth East Coast Indo-European Conference, Cornell University, June 6-9, 1985*, Berlin, 205-28.
- Muellner, L. C. (1976) *The meaning of Homeric εὔχομαι through its formulas*, Innsbruck.
- Nagy, G. (2000) Review of West (1998b), *BMCR* 2000.09.12.
- (2004) *Homer's text and language*, Urbana, Ill.
- Neu, E. (1993) 'Zu den hethitischen Ortspartikeln', *Linguistica* 33 (*Bojan Čop septuagenario in honorem oblata*), 137-52.
- Neumann, G. (1987) 'Beiträge zum Kyprischen IX', *Kadmos* 26, 113-19.
- (1994) *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*, ed. by E. Badali, H. Nowicki, and S. Zeilfelder, Innsbruck.
- Parry, M. (1930) 'Studies in the epic technique of oral verse-making. I. Homer and Homeric style', *HSCP* 41, 73-147.
- (1971) *The making of Homeric verse: the collected papers of Milman Parry*, ed. by A. Parry, Oxford.
- Pavese, C. O. and F. Boschetti (2003) *A complete formular analysis of the Homeric poems*, vol. 2 (*Formular edition: text and apparatus—Homeri Ilias*), Amsterdam.
- Peters, M. (1986) 'Probleme mit anlautenden Laryngalen', *Sprache* 32 (*Festgabe für Manfred Mayrhofer*), 365-83.
- Pulleyn, S. (2000) *Homer: Iliad Book One*, Oxford.
- Race, W. H. (1992) 'How Greek poems begin', *YCS* 29, 13-38.
- Reece, S. (1993) *The stranger's welcome: oral theory and the aesthetics of the Homeric hospitality scene*, Ann Arbor.
- Risch, E. (1958) Review of Ruijgh (1957), *Gnomon* 30, 90-4.
- Ruijgh, C. J. (1957) *L'Élément achéen dans la langue épique*, Assen.
- (1971) *Autour de "τε épique": études sur la syntaxe grecque*, Amsterdam.

- Schlerath, B. (2000) Review of Watkins (1995), *Kratylos* 45, 36-46.
- Schwyzler, E. and A. Debrunner (1950) *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik*, vol. 2 (*Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*), Munich.
- van Thiel, H. (1997) 'Der Homertext in Alexandria', *ZPE* 115, 13-36.
- Vendryes, J. (1945) *Traité d'accentuation grecque* (new printing), Paris.
- Visser, E. (1987) *Homerische Versifikationstechnik: Versuch einer Rekonstruktion*, Frankfurt am Mein.
- Watkins, C. (1995) *How to kill a dragon: aspects of Indo-European poetics*, New York.
- (1997) 'Delbrück and the syntax of Hittite and Luvian: predictive power', in E. Crespo and J. L. García Ramón (eds.) *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy: actas del Coloquio de la Indogermanische Gesellschaft, Madrid, 21-24 de septiembre de 1994*, Madrid—Wiesbaden, 611-30.
- (2000, publ. 2001) 'A distant Anatolian echo in Pindar: the origin of the aegis again', *HSCP* 100, 1-14.
- West, M. L. (1998a) 'The textual criticism and editing of Homer', in G. W. Most (ed.) *Editing texts/Texte edieren*, Göttingen, 94-110.
- (1998b-2000), *Homeri Ilias*, 2 vols, Stuttgart (vol. 1) and Munich (vol. 2).
- (2003) *Homeric hymns, Homeric apocrypha, Lives of Homer*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Wills, J. (1993) 'Homeric particle order', *HS* 106, 61-81.