ENJAMBMENT AND BINDING
IN HOMERIC HEXAMETER

MATTHEW CLARK

I. INTRODUCTION

Pʀᴇᴠɪᴏᴜs sᴛᴜᴅɪᴇs of enjambment in Homeric verse have posed a variety of questions, such as: What are the types of Homeric enjambment? Do the differences between Homer's practice and that of later poets help to demonstrate that the Homeric epics were oral compositions? What is the relationship between enjambment and sentence structure? And recently the methods of discourse analysis have been used to call into question the very status of enjambment in Homeric verse.[1]

In this paper I will investigate the larger lexical context of enjambed single words and short phrases. In particular I will be interested to see what role such runover words and phrases play within the Homeric system of formulas. My argument requires a few technical terms. The enjambed word or short phrase I will call a *runover*. The word or words just before the runover I will call the *dux*, and the word or words just after the runover I will call the *comes*; the fundamental concept of this study is *binding*, which is simply the probability that two words will occur together.

The following publications I will refer to by author's name and, where necessary, date of publication: S. E. Bassett, "The So-Called Emphatic Position of the Runover Word in the Homeric Hexameter," *TAPA* 57 (1926) 116–148; M. W. Edwards, "Homeric Craftsmanship," *TAPA* 97 (1966) 115–179; C. Higbie, *Measure and Music: Enjambe-ment and Sentence Structure in the Iliad* (Oxford 1990); G. S. Kirk, "Studies in Some Technical Aspects of Homeric Style II," *YCS* 20 (1966) 105–151; A. B. Lord, *The Singer of Tales* (New York 1974); A. B. Lord, *Epic Singers and Oral Tradition* (Ithaca, N.Y. 1991); M. Parry, "The Distinctive Character of Enjambment in Homeric Verse," *TAPA* 60 (1929) 200–220 (= Adam Parry [ed.], *The Making of Homeric Verse* [Oxford 1987] 251–265); M. Parry, "Whole Formulaic Verses in Greek and Southslavic Heroic Song," *TAPA* 64 (1933) 179–197 (= Adam Parry [ed.], *The Making of Homeric Verse* [Oxford 1987] 376–390).

[1] I will deal briefly with typology and sentence structure in section VII below. Al-though I do not have the space here to discuss the very interesting work of Egbert J. Bakker ("Homeric Discourse and Enjambment: A Cognitive Approach," *TAPA* 120 [1990] 1–21), I believe that his application of discourse analysis to Homeric verse can be incorporated into a theory which still allows for enjambment. And perhaps it is worth stating, if only in a footnote, that the present discussion seems to make good sense in the context of an oral poetics.

```
                        < ........................_____dux_____|
|_____runover_____| |_____comes_____...............>
```

With these terms, four different sorts of runovers may be distinguished: *free*, *pendant*, *embedded*, and *orphan*.[2] I will briefly define free and pendant runovers, and then I will discuss in some detail embedded and orphan runovers.

A free runover is bound neither to any particular *dux* nor to any particular *comes*.[3] Consider, for example, the runover λευκοί, which occurs just twice in the epics:

1.   ἐν δέ οἱ ὀμφαλοὶ ἦσαν ἐείκοσι κασσιτέροιο
            λευκοί, ἐν δὲ μέσοισιν ἔην μέλανος κυάνοιο.   *Il.* 11.34–35

            οἵ οἱ ἔσαν προπάροιθε θυράων ὑψηλάων
            λευκοί, ἀποστίλβοντες ἀλείφατος·   *Od.* 3.407–408

Clearly this runover is not bound to any particular *dux* or *comes*; it is therefore *free*. Degrees of freedom vary. The runover νήπιος occurs in the epics eleven times:[4]

2.   ἤματι κείνῳ / νήπιος, οὐδὲ τὰ ᾔδη ἅ ῥα   *Il.* 2.37–38
            ἠΰτε κούρη / νήπιος, οὐδέ τί οἱ τό γ' ...   *Il.* 2.872–873
            θοῇσι / νήπιος, οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔμελλε ...   *Il.* 12.112–113
            ἀάσθη / νήπιος· εἰ δὲ ἔπος ...   *Il.* 16.685–686
            Αἰνείαο / νήπιος, οὐδ' ἐνόησε ...   *Il.* 20.263–264
            ἑκάτοιο / νήπιος, οὐδέ τί οἱ χραισμήσει ...   *Il.* 20.295–296
            ἐλεήσας, / νήπιος, οὐδὲ τὸ ᾔδη ὃ οὐ ...   *Il.* 20.465–466
            ἐξακέσαιτο, / νήπιος, οὐδὲ τὸ ᾔδη ὃ οὐ ...   *Od.* 3.145–146
            ἐπὶ νηός, / νήπιος, οὔτε πόνων ...   *Od.* 4.817–818
            ἡγήσαιτο / νήπιος, οὐ μὲν γάρ ...   *Od.* 6.300–301
            ἐπὶ μαζῷ / νήπιος, ὅς που ...   *Od.* 11.448–449

[2]The term *runover* I adopt from Bassett; the idea of *binding* is present in Parry (1929); the terms *dux* and *comes* I derive from the analysis of fugues, but with no suggestion that the hexameter is fugal; *orphan* was suggested by the typographers' term; the terms *free*, *pendant*, and *embedded* are self-explanatory.

[3]I mean, of course, not bound in the texts as we have them; throughout this study I use the OCT text for the sake of simplicity, not because I believe that it preserves the very words of the poet. Since I am interested in describing a general technical process, the use of a different text with the addition or subtraction of an example or two would make little difference.

[4]Edwards treats νήπιος (141–142) and χάλκεον (143–144) mostly in terms of Bassett's claim that runovers are not emphatic by position; he does consider the words following the runover, but as individual cases only, not systematically. He notes that νήπιος is "often followed by a clause introduced by οὐδέ or ... a relative clause"; Carolyn Higbie has pointed out to me that the runover χάλκεον is frequently followed by a relative clause. In this paper I have restricted my attention to (nearly) exact verbal repetitions, but another stage of investigation could include patterning of this type.

It is clear that there is no bond between this runover and any particular *dux*; although there is a strong tendency for the *comes* to begin with a negative, the repetition does not really go any further. The runover χάλκεον, however, occurs ten times in seven different environments,[5] so it is slightly less free than νήπιος.

A *pendant* runover is regularly associated with a particular *dux*, but not with a particular *comes*. The runover ὡς ἑνός occurs twice in the epics, with the same whole line *dux* on both occasions, but with different *comites*:

3.   τῶν πάντων οὐ τόσσον ὀδύρομαι ἀχνύμενός περ
            ὡς ἑνός, οὗ μ' ἄχος ὀξὺ κατοίσεται Ἄϊδος εἴσω, ...

                                                            Il. 22.424–425

            τῶν πάντων οὐ τόσσον ὀδύρομαι ἀχνύμενός περ
            ὡς ἑνός, ὅς τέ μοι ὕπνον ἀπεχθαίρει καὶ ἐδωδήν, ...

                                                            Od. 4.104–105

Again there are differences of degree. The runover name Ἀργείην Ἑλένην occurs three times in the *Iliad*, always with the same whole line *dux*, but with two different *comites*:

4.   κὰδ δέ κεν εὐχωλὴν Πριάμῳ καὶ Τρωσὶ λίποιεν
            Ἀργείην Ἑλένην, ἧς εἵνεκα πολλοὶ Ἀχαιῶν ...   *Il.* 2.160–161

            κὰδ δέ κεν εὐχωλὴν Πριάμῳ καὶ Τρωσὶ λίποιτε
            Ἀργείην Ἑλένην, ἧς εἵνεκα πολλοὶ Ἀχαιῶν ...   *Il.* 2.176–177

            κὰδ δέ κεν εὐχωλὴν Πριάμῳ καὶ Τρωσὶ λίποιμεν
            Ἀργείην Ἑλένην· σεό δ' ὀστέα πύσει ἄρουρα ...   *Il.* 4.173–174

II. EMBEDDED RUNOVERS

In his article "The Distinctive Character of Enjambment in Homeric Verse," Milman Parry notes that the reader of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* (the argument would apply only more strongly for the original audience) gradually forms "what may be called a *sense of the formula*. Meeting over and over the same group of words expressing the same idea, he comes to look on this group of words as a whole which has a fixed end" (258). Thus, Parry argues, the reader's response to *Il.* 5.16 is conditioned by his memory[6] of *Il.* 5.66 and *Il.* 17.49 = *Il.* 22.327 = *Od.* 22.16:

---

[5] *Il.* 3.335 = *Il.* 16.135 = *Il.* 19.372; *Il.* 13.440; *Il.* 15.127; *Il.* 18.371; *Il.* 22.286, *Il.* 23.561; *Od.* 5.235 almost = *Od.* 22.80.

[6] In our text, *Il.* 5.16, with the enjambment, precedes any of the passages without enjambment, so the response of the reader might lead to the reverse expectation, the expectation of an enjambment where it does not occur. Parry, no doubt, would have argued that the listener's total experience of oral epic, rather than the experience of just this text in this order, is what determines the expectation. Even so, one might prefer to say that the listener or reader learns to expect that the enjambment may or may not occur.

5.   Τυδείδεω δ' ὑπὲρ ὦμον ἀριστερὸν ἦλυθ' ἀκωκή
              ἔγχεος.   *Il.* 5.16–17

                          ἡ δὲ διαπρὸ
              ἀντικρὺ κατὰ κύστιν ὑπ' ὀστέον ἦλυθ' ἀκωκή·   *Il.* 5.67

              ἀντικρὺ δ' ἁπαλοῖο δι' αὐχένος ἦλυθ' ἀκωκή.
                                    Il. 17.49 = *Il.* 22.327 = *Od.* 22.16

Parry argues that because the formula ἦλυθ' ἀκωκή in *Il.* 5.67 and *Il.* 17.49 forms the end of the sentence or clause, the reader tends "to close the thought in [5.]16 also at the verse end"; ἔγχεος, then, is only loosely bound to the preceding line—Parry describes it as a word without much weight, almost colorless: it "marks a rest during which the mind lingers on the already finished thought of the foregoing verse . . . . [T]he mind, going from formula to formula, has closed the circle of the idea with ἀκωκή, and has placed ἔγχεος next to it, but outside of this circle" (258).[7] Thus the runover ἔγχεος is a metrical filler.

But more can be said. A free runover, such as λευκοί in example 1 above, may be simply a filler, with no bond to any particular lexical context; if we extend the citation of example 5, however, we find that the runover ἔγχεος is bound to a particular context, both *dux* and *comes*:

6.   οἱ δ' ὅτε δὴ σχεδὸν ἦσαν ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισιν ἰόντες
              Φηγεύς ῥα πρότερος προΐει δολιχόσκιον ἔγχος·
              Τυδείδεω δ' ὑπὲρ ὦμον ἀριστερὸν ἦλυθ' ἀκωκή
              ἔγχεος, οὐδ' ἔβαλ' αὐτόν· ὁ δ' ὕστερος ὄρνυτο χαλκῷ
              Τυδείδης· τοῦ δ' οὐχ ἅλιον βέλος ἔκφυγε χειρός,
              ἀλλ' ἔβαλε στῆθος μεταμάζιον, ὦσε δ' ἀφ' ἵππων.   *Il.* 5.14–19

              Ἔνθ' αὖ Σαρπηδὼν μὲν ἀπήμβροτε δουρὶ φαεινῷ,
              Πατρόκλου δ' ὑπὲρ ὦμον ἀριστερὸν ἦλυθ' ἀκωκή
              ἔγχεος, οὐδ' ἔβαλ' αὐτόν· ὁ δ' ὕστερος ὄρνυτο χαλκῷ
              Πάτροκλος· τοῦ δ' οὐχ ἅλιον βέλος ἔκφυγε χειρός,
              ἀλλ' ἔβαλ' ἔνθ' ἄρα τε φρένες ἔρχαται ἀμφ' ἁδινὸν κῆρ.
                                                              Il. 16.477–481

The formulas in these lines bind in various ways. We have noted that ἦλυθ' ἀκωκή can occur without ἔγχεος; furthermore, ἔγχεος can occur without ἦλυθ' ἀκωκή (*Il.* 13.409–410; *Il.* 13.443–444; *Il.* 16.612–613; *Il.* 17.528–529)—neither, then, is bound to the other; οὐδ' ἔβαλ' αὐτόν, however, only occurs

---

[7]Bassett had already discussed *Il.* 5.17 and *Il.* 22.367, as well as the runover word ἔγχος in *Il.* 3.360 (= *Il.* 7.254). He notes (130) that the runovers, although unemphatic, have various functions, both rhythmic and grammatical. Edwards is less inclined than Bassett to see all runovers as metrical fillers. Some of the runovers I discuss seem to be fillers, others seem merely unemphatic, and still others seem necessary and even emphatic, as I will note below.

following ἔγχεος, and may therefore be said to be bound to it. In order to understand the conditions and function of runovers, therefore, we must examine not only what precedes the enjambment, but also what follows. Previous investigations of runover enjambment have generally neglected the words following the runover.

The present case, however, requires more comment. As it happens, the three-word *dux* ἀριστερὸν ἤλυθ' ἀκωκή is always bound to the runover ἔγχεος; furthermore, the three-word *dux* plus runover ἤλυθ' ἀκωκή / ἔγχεος is always bound to the *comes* οὐδ' ἔβαλ' αὐτόν—but these slightly more complex relationships are only the result of the (near) identity of the two passages *Il.* 5.16–19 and *Il.* 16.477–481.

Albert B. Lord has discussed such passages (which he calls "blocks of lines," but which I will call "formulaic molecules") in some detail, first in *The Singer of Tales* (58):[8]

There are ... larger groups of lines which the singer is accustomed to use often, and through habit they are always found together. The repetition of these groups is sometimes word-for-word exact, sometimes not. Often enough the order of the lines is different. But these clusters of formulas or of lines, which are frequently associated together and are recurrent, also mark one of the characteristic signs of oral style.

He continues the discussion more extensively in *Epic Singers and the Oral Tradition* (75), particularly in the chapter "Homer as an Oral-Traditional Poet" (72–103). Lord notes the presence in both South Slavic epic and Homeric epic of "the repeated gnomic type of line or couplet":

By the "couplet" in this case I mean two lines that are always (or almost always) found together .... The repeated couplets do not have to be gnomic in content, but may express any oft-repeated idea that can be expressed in two lines. Indeed the couplet is frequently expanded by a line or two. The main thing is that there be a more or less stable block of lines that is frequently repeated and plays an important role in oral-traditional composition.

Such formulaic molecules, which are fairly common in Homeric epic, may tend to protect a runover—here, both ἔγχεος and the proper name in the following line—simply because the presence of the runover allows the molecule to continue. Runovers within molecules may be termed *embedded*. The function of ἔγχεος, then, is to be part of the molecule, and in particular, to provide a metrical introduction for the phrase οὐδ' ἔβαλ' αὐτόν. Once the

---

[8] Lord's term *block of lines* may (unintentionally) tend to suggest that the repetitions are monolithic and unvarying, whereas they can be quite flexible; furthermore, they may be less than two full lines long; my term avoids these problems, and also indicates that the larger units are made of of smaller formulaic elements.

performer gets going in this particular molecule, the runover and *comes* naturally follow.[9]

III. ORPHAN RUNOVERS

So far I have been discussing runovers which are bound to *dux* and *comes* within a formulaic molecule. Many such runovers occur, and I will have occasion to discuss more as my argument proceeds. But another situation may arise: a runover word or short phrase can be tightly bound to a particular *comes* but not tightly bound to a particular *dux*.

In the passages cited in example 6, the runover occurred twice along with the same *dux* and the same *comes*. In example 7, however, the runover occurs three times with the same *comes*, but with three different *duces*:

7.   Αἶαν, δεῦρο, πέπον, περὶ Πατρόκλοιο θανόντος
σπεύσομεν, αἴ κε νέκυν περ Αχιλλῆϊ προφέρωμεν
<u>γυμνόν</u>· ἀτὰρ τά γε τεύχε' ἔχει κορυθαίολος Ἕκτωρ.

                                              Il. 17.120–122

       ἀλλὰ σύ γ' αἶψ' Ἀχιλῆϊ θέων ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν
εἰπεῖν, αἴ κε τάχιστα νέκυν ἐπὶ νῆα σαώσῃ
<u>γυμνόν</u>· ἀτὰρ τά γε τεύχε' ἔχει κορυθαίολος Ἕκτωρ.

                                              Il. 17.691–693

       κεῖται Πάτροκλος, νέκυος δὲ δὴ ἀμφιμάχονται
<u>γυμνοῦ</u>· ἀτὰρ τά γε τεύχε' ἔχει κορυθαίολος Ἕκτωρ.

                                                Il. 18.20–21

It is clear, therefore, that there is no attested bond between the runover γυμνόν/οῦ and any *dux*—it is, so to speak, an *orphan*, dependent on no *dux*—but there is a bond between the runover and the *comes*. Furthermore, the runover and the *dux* occur within the same unit of syntax, while the runover and the *comes* are in different clauses, and have no grammatical relationship; nonetheless they co-occur. Lines of this sort are in effect

---

[9]Further investigation shows that line final ἀκωκή/ῇ occur in a fairly large number of environments: *Il.* 5.15–16; *Il.* 16.477–478; *Il.* 5.66–67; *Il.* 17.48–49 = *Il.* 22.326–327 = *Od.* 22.15–16; *Il.* 10.372–373; *Il.* 16.322; *Il.* 17.294–295; *Il.* 20.259–260; *Il.* 11.252–253; *Il.* 23.820–821; *Od.* 19.452–453; *Il.* 13.250–251. Although ἀκωκή/ῇ does occur in some formulas (including a whole line formula and the formulaic molecule we have been discussing), it is clear that it is not very restricted—that is, it can occur with various enjambments, or without any enjambment. The runover ἔγχεος, however, is restricted to only three environments. (1) It occurs in the two twin passages already cited (*Il.* 5.16–17 and *Il.* 16.478–479). (2) It also occurs embedded in another molecule which is found in two forms: *Il.* 16.610–613 = *Il.* 17.526–529 and *Il.* 13.443–444. (3) And it also occurs in a singleton passage at *Il.* 13.409–410. Thus we find a variety of binding conditions: the *dux* ἀκωκή is not tightly bound to any context but occurs freely; the runover ἔγχεος is more restricted, occurring in only three contexts; and the *comes* οὐδ' ἔβαλ' αὐτόν is completely bound to the enjambment ἔγχεος.

whole line formulas, but the boundaries of the line do not coincide with
the boundaries of the grammar. Nonetheless, orphan runovers are fairly
common in the epics.[10]

IV.   REPETITION

Runovers in general function to provide metrical variety, to fill in the
space at the beginning of the line, to give emphasis. But embedded and
orphan runovers (unlike free runovers) have additional functions within the
Homeric system of formulas. The formular systems which I discuss in the
paper all involve extensive lexical repetitions. One may expect a certain
semantic repetition as well, but what counts as semantic repetition varies
a good deal from situation to situation.

In one type, a particular character may use the same words on different
occasions to make the same statement.[11] Here, for example, are two situa-
tions in which Hera is addressing Zeus, making a claim for her own divine
status; she uses a formulaic molecule including an embedded runover:

8.   καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ θεός εἰμι, γένος δέ μοι ἔνθεν ὅθεν σοί,
                καί με πρεσβυτάτην τέκετο Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης,
                ἀμφότερον γενεῇ τε καὶ οὕνεκα σὴ παράκοιτις
                κέκλημαι, σὺ δὲ πᾶσι μετ' ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνάσσεις.   Il. 4.58–61

                πῶς δὴ ἔγωγ', ἥ φημι θεάων ἔμμεν ἀρίστη,
                ἀμφότερον γενεῇ τε καὶ οὕνεκα σὴ παράκοιτις
                κέκλημαι, σὺ δὲ πᾶσι μετ' ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνάσσεις,
                οὐκ ὄφελον Τρώεσσι κοτεσσαμένη κακὰ ῥάψαι;   Il. 18.364–367

Sometimes one character has occasion to repeat the words of another.[12]
This sort of repetition can occur if the two characters simply have the same
thing to say: in the first of the following passages Odysseus is rebuked by
Melantho, and in the second by Eurymachos:[13]

---

[10]Parry (1933) discusses only those whole line formulas which are also complete sen-
tences, and this bias has continued in later analysis; see, for example, Kirk 121 ff. on
"Whole-sentence verses".

[11]In addition to the passages quoted here, see for example Il. 18.54–63 and Il. 18.436–
443, both spoken by Thetis—the first time as she laments with the Nereids, the second
as she asks Hephaistos for aid.

[12]George Calhoun ("Homeric Repetitions," [Berkeley, Calif. 1933, University of Cal-
ifornia Publications in Classical Philology 12] 1–25) distinguishes repetitions which are
part of the technique of oral formulaic composition from repetitions which are a matter
of general poetic art (18–19); but the technique of embedded and orphan runovers is
common to all sorts of repetition in Homer, without distinction.

[13]In addition to these passages, note: μηδέ τι θυμῷ / ταρβεῖ Od. 7.50–51; οὐδὲ τι θυμῷ |
ταρβεῖ οὐδέ φοβεῖται Il. 21.574–575; κυδάλιμον κῆρ | ταρβεῖ οὐδὲ φοβεῖται Il. 12.45–46; οὔτε
τι λίην | ταρβεῖ Il. 13.283; Τυδεὺς | ταρβεῖ Il. 4.387–388.

9.   ἀλλ' ἐνθάδε πόλλ' ἀγορεύεις,
θαρσαλέως πολλοῖσι μετ' ἀνδράσιν, οὐδέ τι θυμῷ
ταρβεῖς· ἦ ῥα' σε οἶνος ἔχει φρένας, ἤ νύ τοι αἰεὶ
τοιοῦτος νόος ἐστίν, ὃ καὶ μεταμώνια βάζεις.
ἦ ἀλύεις ὅτι Ἶρον ἐνίκησας τὸν ἀλήτην;   Od. 18.329–333

ἆ δείλ', ἦ τάχα τοι τελέω κακόν, οἳ' ἀγορεύεις,
θαρσαλέως πολλοῖσι μετ' ἀνδράσιν, οὐδέ τι θυμῷ
ταρβεῖς· ἦ ῥα' σε οἶνος ἔχει φρένας, ἤ νύ τοι αἰεὶ
τοιοῦτος νόος ἐστίν, ὃ καὶ μεταμώνια βάζεις.
ἦ ἀλύεις ὅτι Ἶρον ἐνίκησας τὸν ἀλήτην;   Od. 18.389–393

Another type occurs when a message is repeated; in Book 2 of the *Iliad*, Zeus sends a message to the sleeping Agamemnon (*Il.* 2.11–16); the message is delivered in nearly the identical words (*Il.* 2.28–33); and then Agamemnon repeats the message to the Greek leaders (*Il.* 2.65–70):

10.   θωρῆξαί ἑ κέλευε κάρη κομόωντας Ἀχαιοὺς
πανσυδίῃ· νῦν γάρ κεν ἕλοι πόλιν εὐρυάγυιαν
Τρώων· οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἀμφὶς Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες
ἀθάνατοι φράζονται· ἐπέγναμψεν γὰρ ἅπαντας
Ἥρη λισσομένη, Τρώεσσι δὲ κήδε' ἐφῆπται.   *Il.* 2.11–15

θωρῆξαί σε κέλευσε κάρη κομόωντας Ἀχαιοὺς
πανσυδίῃ· νῦν γάρ κεν ἕλοις πόλιν εὐρυάγυιαν
Τρώων· οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἀμφὶς Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες
ἀθάνατοι φράζονται· ἐπέγναμψεν γὰρ ἅπαντας
Ἥρη λισσομένη, Τρώεσσι δὲ κήδε' ἐφῆπται
ἐκ Διός· ἀλλὰ σὺ σῇσιν ἔχε φρεσί, μηδέ σε λήθη ....
                                                Il. 2.28–33

θωρῆξαί σε κέλευσε κάρη κομόωντας Ἀχαιοὺς
πανσυδίῃ· νῦν γάρ κεν ἕλοις πόλιν εὐρυάγυιαν
Τρώων· οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἀμφὶς Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες
ἀθάνατοι φράζονται· ἐπέγναμψεν γὰρ ἅπαντας
Ἥρη λισσομένη, Τρώεσσι δὲ κήδε' ἐφῆπται
ἐκ Διός· ἀλλὰ σὺ σῇσιν ἔχε φρεσίν· ὣς ὃ μὲν εἰπὼν ....
                                                Il. 2.65–70

Orphan runovers can be created when a passage is repeated not quite in the same words. In Book 1 of the *Iliad*, Achilles has been insulted by Agamemnon, and he is considering a violent reaction:

11.   ἧος ὁ ταῦθ' ὥρμαινε κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν,
ἕλκετο δ' ἐκ κολεοῖο μέγα ξίφος, ἦλθε δ' Ἀθήνη
οὐρανόθεν· πρὸ γὰρ ἧκε θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη
ἄμφω ὁμῶς θυμῷ φιλέουσά τε κηδομένη τε.   *Il.* 1.193–196

When Athena tells Achilles that she has come to persuade him not to use force, she repeats the two line molecule, with the change necessary to con-

vert it into the first-person; in the process the runover has been orphaned
of its first *dux*, but it remains bound to its *comes*:[14]

12.   ἦλθον ἐγὼ παύσουσα τὸ σὸν μένος, αἴ κε πίθηαι,
        οὐρανόθεν· πρὸ δέ μ' ἧκε θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη
        ἄμφω ὁμῶς θυμῷ φιλέουσά τε κηδομένη τε.   *Il.* 1.207–209

Any repeated situations, such as battle scenes in the *Iliad*, are likely to
include repeated molecules with repeated runovers, sometimes, as here, in
the narrator's voice:

13.   Οἱ δ' ὅτε δή ῥ' ἐς χῶρον ἕνα ξυνιόντες ἵκοντο
        σύν ῥ' ἔβαλον ῥινούς, σὺν δ' ἔγχεα καὶ μένε' ἀνδρῶν
        χαλκεοθωρήκων· ἀτὰρ ἀσπίδες ὀμφαλόεσσαι
        ἔπληντ' ἀλλήλῃσι, πολὺς δ' ὀρυμαγδὸς ὀρώρει.
        ἔνθα δ' ἅμ' οἰμωγή τε καὶ εὐχωλὴ πέλεν ἀνδρῶν
        ὀλλύντων τε καὶ ὀλλυμένων, ῥέε δ' αἵματι γαῖα.
                                    Il. 4.446–451; *Il.* 8.60–65

In this molecule, as in some others,[15] there are multiple runovers; it may
be that the method of composing in molecules makes it easy for the poet
to form phrases which cross the line boundaries. In the following passages,
πίμπλαντ' is embedded, while ἀχνύμενος is an orphan:[16]

14.   τοῖσι δ' ἀνέστη
        ἥρως Ἀτρείδης εὐρὺ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων
        ἀχνύμενος· μένεος δὲ μέγα φρένες ἀμφὶ μέλαιναι
        πίμπλαντ', ὄσσε δέ οἱ πυρὶ λαμπετόωντι ἐΐκτην·   *Il.* 1.101–104

        τοῖσιν δ' Ἀντίνοος μετέφη, Εὐπείθεος υἱός,
        ἀχνύμενος· μένεος δὲ μέγα φρένες ἀμφὶ μέλαιναι
        πίμπλαντ', ὄσσε δέ οἱ πυρὶ λαμπετόωντι ἐΐκτην·   *Od.* 4.660–662

Repeated battle scenes provide occasion for orphan runovers, just as
they did for embedded runovers: αἰχμὴ χαλκείη occurs embedded twice in a
couplet molecule:[17]

---

[14]The word οὐρανόθεν does occur elsewhere, but not as a single word enjambment.
It occurs four times in the phrase οὐρανόθεν καταβάς / καταβᾶσα (*Il.* 11.184; *Il.* 17.545;
Od. 6.281; *Od.* 20.31); it also occurs in the phrase οὐρανόθεν πεδίον δέ (*Il.* 23.189) and in
the phrase οὐρανόθεν προὔφαινε (*Od.* 9.145). If we take all cases of line initial οὐρανόθεν,
we would have to say that it occurs in several different environments, but the one-word
enjambment by itself is completely bound to one particular environment.

[15]Compare, e.g., example 10 above; also *Il.* 18.54–62 almost = *Il.* 18.436–443.

[16]We also find πίμπλαντο in a two-word orphan enjambment at *Od.* 10.247–248 and
Od. 20.348–349; and ἀχνύμενος is found as a runover with a different *dux* and *comes* at
Il. 23.137.

[17]In addition to these examples, the phrase also occurs in two singleton passages,
Il. 20.474 and *Il.* 20.480; it also occurs not as a runover at *Il.* 5.282; *Il.* 12.183; *Il.* 16.118;
and *Il.* 17.310.

15.   ἐν δὲ μετώπῳ πῆξε, πέρησε δ' ἄρ' ὀστέον εἴσω
            αἰχμὴ χαλκείη· τὸν δὲ σκότος ὄσσε κάλυψεν

                                        Il. 4.460–461; *Il.* 6.10–11

but then again as an orphan, with the same *comes* but a different *dux*:

16.   ἡ δ' ἑτέροιο διὰ κροτάφοιο πέρησεν
            αἰχμὴ χαλκείη· τὸν δὲ σκότος ὄσσε κάλυψεν,   *Il.* 4.502–503

It also occurs in another molecule:

17.   ἔνθ' Ἕκτώρ εἰσῆλθε Διΐ φίλος, ἐν δ' ἄρα χειρὶ
            ἔγχος ἔχ' ἐνδεκάπηχυ· πάροιθε δὲ λάμπετο δουρὸς
            αἰχμὴ χαλκείη, περὶ δὲ χρύσεος θέε πόρκης.   *Il.* 6.318–320

            τόν ῥ' Ἕκτωρ ἀγόρευε Διΐ φίλος, ἐν δ' ἄρα χειρὶ
            ἔγχος ἔχ' ἐνδεκάπηχυ· πάροιθε δὲ λάμπετο δουρὸς
            αἰχμὴ χαλκείη, περὶ δὲ χρύσεος θέε πόρκης,   *Il.* 8.493–495

Similar situations naturally call forth similar phrasings, which may then produce or protect embedded and orphan runovers. The similarities may be great (a messenger repeats a message, Hera twice defends her status, and so on) or less great, so long as the occasion for the same words arises. For example, at *Iliad* 1.571 ff. Hephaistos appeals for peace on Olympus:

18.   ἦ δὴ λοίγια ἔργα τάδ' ἔσσεται οὐδ' ἔτ' ἀνεκτά
            εἰ δὴ σφὼ ἕνεκα θνητῶν ἐριδαίνετον ὧδε,
            ἐν δὲ θεοῖσι κολῳὸν ἐλαύνετον· οὐδέ τι δαιτὸς
            ἐσθλῆς ἔσσεται ἦδος, ἐπεὶ τὰ χερείονα νικᾷ.   *Il.* 1.573–576

But in *Od.* 18 the peace of a very different banquet is threatened:

19.   νῦν δὲ περὶ πτωχῶν ἐριδαίνομεν, οὐδέ τι δαιτὸς
            ἐσθλῆς ἔσσεται ἦδος, ἐπεὶ τὰ χερείονα νικᾷ.   *Od.* 18.403–404

In the following passage, from the catalogue of the ships, Podarkes is compared to his older brother Protesilaos; in the next passage the disguised Odysseus is telling Penelope his story:

20.   Ἰφίκλου υἱὸς πολυμήλου Φυλακίδαο
            αὐτοκασίγνητος μεγαθύμου Πρωτεσιλάου
            ὁπλότερος γενεῇ· ὁ δ' ἅμα πρότερος καὶ ἀρείων
            ἥρως Πρωτεσίλαος ἀρήϊος·   *Il.* 2.705–708

                        ἐμοὶ δ' ὄνομα κλυτὸν Αἴθων,
            ὁπλότερος γενεῇ· ὁ δ' ἅμα πρότερος καὶ ἀρείων.

                                                 Od. 19.183–184

All of these examples raise an important issue: when repeated runover words are in question, one must ask which unit is the unit of repetition—the runover, or the context in which the runover occurs. Consider, for example,

the following molecule, which occurs at *Il.* 5.506–511 and also at *Il.* 15.263–268:

21.   ὡς δ᾽ ὅτε τις στατὸς ἵππος, ἀκοστήσας ἐπὶ φάτνῃ,
             δεσμὸν ἀπορρήξας θείῃ πεδίοιο κροαίνων,
             εἰωθὼς λούεσθαι ἐϋρρεῖος ποταμοῖο,
             κυδιόων· ὑψοῦ δὲ κάρη ἔχει, ἀμφὶ δὲ χαῖται
             <u>ὤμοις ἀΐσσονται</u>· ὁ δ᾽ ἀγλαΐηφι πεποιθώς,
             ῥίμφα ἑ γοῦνα φέρει μετά τ᾽ ἤθεα καὶ νομὸν ἵππων.

Here the relevant repetition is not the enjambed κυδιόων or ὤμοις ἀΐσσονται, but the repetition of the simile as a molecule, which incidentally protects the two enjambments. If such a passage is in some sense available to the performing poet more or less as a unit, he would not then have to be composing the runovers anew on each occasion. Perhaps, therefore, the process of composing in molecules increases the statistical occurrence of runovers without increasing the difficulty of composing in performance.

V.   RUNOVERS IN TYPE-SCENES

The examination of runovers in repeated passages must necessarily consider their behavior in type-scenes, which constitute one of the most important kinds of repetition in the Homeric epics. In this section I will examine runovers in arming type-scenes, but there are many other type-scenes which would do as well.[18]

The arming passages are (A) *Il.* 3.324–339; (B) *Il.* 11.15–46; (C) *Il.* 15.478–483; (D) *Il.* 16.130–154; (E) *Il.* 19.349–395; and (F) *Od.* 22.116–125.[19] In order to save space I will cite the first of these passages in full and then only specific lines from the other passages for comparison. The reader may find it useful to consult the text of the other passages.

22.   Ὣς ἄρ᾽ ἔφαν, πάλλεν δὲ μέγας κορυθαίολος Ἕκτωρ
             ἂψ ὁρόων· Πάριος δὲ θοῶς ἐκ κλῆρος ὄρουσεν.
             οἱ μὲν ἔπειθ᾽ ἵζοντο κατὰ στίχας, ἧχι ἑκάστῳ
             ἵπποι ἀερσίποδες καὶ ποικίλα τεύχεα κεῖτο·
             αὐτὰρ ὅ γ᾽ ἀμφ᾽ ὤμοισιν ἐδύσετο τεύχεα καλὰ
             δῖος Ἀλέξανδρος, Ἑλένης πόσις ἠϋκόμοιο.
             κνημῖδας μὲν πρῶτα περὶ κνήμῃσιν ἔθηκε
             καλάς, ἀργυρέοισιν ἐπισφυρίοις ἀραρυίας·
             δεύτερον αὖ θώρηκα περὶ στήθεσσιν ἔδυνεν
             οἷο κασιγνήτοιο Λυκάονος· ἥρμοσε δ᾽ αὐτῷ.
             ἀμφὶ δ᾽ ἄρ ὤμοισιν βάλετο ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον

---

[18]For example, the type-scene of sacrifice/feasting (*Il.* 1.458–468 and related passages) includes a number of repeated runovers, both embedded and orphan.

[19]For a discussion of these passages from a different point of view, see James I. Armstrong, "The Arming Motif in the *Iliad*," *AJP* 79 (1958) 337–354.

χάλκεον, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα σάκος μέγα τε στιβαρόν τε·
κρατὶ δ' ἐπ' ἰφθίμῳ κυνέην εὔτυκτον ἔθηκεν
ἵππουριν· δεινὸν δὲ λόφος καθύπερθεν ἔνευεν·
εἵλετο δ' ἄλκιμον ἔγχος, ὅ οἱ παλάμηφιν ἀρήρει.
ὣς δ' αὔτως Μενέλαος ἀρήϊος ἔντε ἔδυνεν.   *Il.* 3.324–339

The runover δῖος 'Αλέξανδρος at *Il.* 3.329 perhaps does not fit any of my categories, since it is probably better to consider it part of a whole line naming formula rather than as a runover.[20] The name occurs in this position—beginning with the third syllable of the line—seven times in the *Iliad*:

23.   αὐτὰρ 'Αλέξανδρος καὶ ἀρηΐφιλος Μενέλαος   *Il.* 3.136
         αὐτὰρ 'Αλέξανδρος καὶ ἀρηΐφιλος Μενέλαος   *Il.* 3.253
         δῖος 'Αλέξανδρος, 'Ελένης πόσις ἠϋκόμοιο   *Il.* 3.329
         δῖος 'Αλέξανδρος, 'Ελένης πόσις ἠϋκόμοιο   *Il.* 7.355
         δῖος 'Αλέξανδρος, 'Ελένης πόσις ἠϋκόμοιο   *Il.* 8.82
         αὐτὰρ 'Αλέξανδρος, 'Ελένης πόσις ἠϋκόμοιο   *Il.* 11.369
         εἰ μὴ 'Αλέξανδρος, 'Ελένης πόσις ἠϋκόμοιο   *Il.* 11.505

These seem to be formulaic variants; each occasion, however, has a different *dux*. The *dux* in the passage in question, τεύχεα καλά, occurs as a line-ending ten times in the epics in various environments.[21] Thus the whole line formula acts somewhat like an orphan runover inserted into the type-scene.

The form καλάς, enjambed at *Il.* 3.331, occurs only seven times in the epics; of these, five are line initial, and of these five, four occur in exactly this three line molecule, from κνημῖδας to ἔδυνεν, in four of the passages under consideration here: *Il.* 3.331; *Il.* 11.18; *Il.* 16.132; and *Il.* 19.370. (The other occurrence is at *Il.* 18.491.) Thus καλάς is an embedded runover.

The form χάλκεον (which I mentioned briefly above, in section I), a runover at *Il.* 3.335 = *Il.* 16.135 = *Il.* 19.372, occurs elsewhere with various *comites*, but the *comes* here occurs only with this runover, and the two together always follow the same line, so we have a formulaic molecule with an embedded runover, although the runover itself has some freedom of occurrence. The passage at *Il.* 19.372 shows an interesting variation:

24.   ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' ὤμοισιν βάλετο ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον
         χάλκεον, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα σάκος μέγα τε στιβαρόν τε
         εἵλετο, ...

---

[20]This example bears some similarity to the set of runovers in which ἐϋπλόκαμος is the second word: *Od.* 5.57–58; *Od.* 7.40–41; *Od.* 7.245–246; *Od.* 7.254–255; *Od.* 10.135–136; *Od.* 11.78 = *Od.* 12.149–150; *Od.* 12.448–449; *Od.* 20.79–80.

[21]*Il.* 7.103 and *Od.* 23.365 are particularly similar to the line here; *Il.* 5.621 = *Il.* 13.510 in a molecule; the other cases are *Il.* 11.110; *Il.* 11.247; *Il.* 17.130; and *Od.* 22.114.

In the other cases, the line χάλκεον, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα σάκος μέγα τε στιβαρόν τε is end stopped, but here the main verb εἵλετο (which is a runover only here) has been enjambed.

The form ἵππουριν, a runover at *Il.* 3.337, occurs just six times in the epics. One of these (*Il.* 6.495) is in a rather different situation, at the end of Hector's conversation with Andromache. The other five instances are all in the arming scenes under consideration: *Il.* 3.337; *Il.* 11.42; *Il.* 15.481; *Il.* 16.138; and *Od.* 22.124. It occurs always with the same *comes*, but with two different *duces*. It is therefore an orphan runover, created by the deployment of the formulas around it.

The three-word runover phrase βριθὺ μέγα στιβαρόν (*Il.* 16.141) occurs six times in the epics, always as a runover, in various environments (but always coming shortly after the word ἔγχος, which sometimes is the *dux*, and which regularly seems to be the semantic trigger):

25.   ἔγχος δ' οὐχ ἔλετ' οἶον ἀμύμονος Αἰακίδαο
            βριθὺ μέγα στιβαρόν· τὸ μὲν οὐ δύνατ' ἄλλος Ἀχαιῶν
            πάλλειν, ...   *Il.* 16.140–141

            ἐκ δ' ἄρα σύρριγος πατρώϊον ἐσπάσατ' ἔγχος
            βριθὺ μέγα στιβαρόν· τὸ μὲν οὐ δύνατ' ἄλλος Ἀχαιῶν
            πάλλειν, ...   *Il.* 19.387–388

            ἐς δ' ὄχεα φλόγεα ποσὶ βήσετο, λάζετο δ' ἔγχος
            βριθὺ μέγα στιβαρόν, τῷ δάμνησι στίχας ἀνδρῶν
            ἡρώων. οἷσίν τε κοτέσσεται ὀβριμοπάτρη.   *Il.* 5.745–747

            ἐς δ' ὄχεα φλόγεα ποσὶ βήσετο, λάζετο δ' ἔγχος
            βριθὺ μέγα στιβαρόν, τῷ δάμνησι στίχας ἀνδρῶν
            ἡρώων. τοῖσίν τε κοτέσσεται ὀβριμοπάτρη.   *Il.* 8.389–391

            εἵλετο δ' ἄλκιμον ἔγχος, ἀκαχμένον ὀξέϊ χαλκῷ
            βριθὺ μέγα στιβαρόν, τῷ δάμνησι στίχας ἀνδρῶν
            ἡρώων. τοῖσίν τε κοτέσσεται ὀβριμοπάτρη.   *Od.* 1.99–101

            πᾶν δέ οἱ ἐν χείρεσσιν ἄγη δολιχόσκιον ἔγχος
            βριθὺ μέγα στιβαρόν κεκορυθμένον· αὐτὰρ ἀπ' ὤμων
            ἀσπὶς σὺν τελαμῶνι χαμαὶ πέσε τερμιόεσσα.   *Il.* 16.801–803

The runover πάλλειν (*Il.* 16.142 and *Il.* 19.389) occurs in just these two passages, embedded in a molecule.

VI. APPLICATIONS

I believe that examining the behavior of runovers has a value in itself, as part of Homeric metrical and syntactic technique. But in addition there may be special applications to specific problems. In this section I touch briefly on three areas which may be illuminated by considering runovers.

A. The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*: As the examples given above demonstrate, many enjambment formulas are identical in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Sometimes, however, the two poems can have different practices. In the next example we have a single runover which takes four different *duces*; in the *Iliad* it has one *comes* (times 2), and in the *Odyssey* it has a different *comes* (times 2):

26.   αἵ τε κατὰ σταθμὸν ποιμνήϊον ἠλάσκουσιν
         ὥρῃ ἐν εἰαρινῇ ὅτε τε γλάγος ἄγγεα δεύει   *Il.* 2.470–471

         σταθμῷ ἔνι βρομέωσι περιγλαγέας κατὰ πέλλας
         ὥρῃ ἐν εἰαρινῇ, ὅτε τε γλάγος ἄγγεα δεύει.   *Il.* 16.642–645

         Εὐρύμαχ', εἰ γὰρ νῶϊν ἔρις ἔργοιο γένοιτο
         ὥρῃ ἐν εἰαρινῇ, ὅτε τ' ἤματα μακρὰ πέλονται   *Od.* 18.366–367

         τὰς μέν τ' αἰόλος οἶστρος ἐφορμηθεὶς ἐδόνησεν
         ὥρῃ ἐν εἰαρινῇ, ὅτε τ' ἤματα μακρὰ πέλονται   *Od.* 22.300–301

The first, second and, fourth of these occur in similes, but not the third, which is spoken by Odysseus.[24]

This is not a lone instance of different practice in the two poems. For example, μαψιδίως is embedded in a couplet which occurs twice in the *Iliad*; on the first occasion Dione is comforting her daughter Aphrodite, who has been attacked by Diomedes; on the second occasion, Zeus is comforting Artemis, who has been attacked by Hera:

27.   τίς νύ σε τοιάδ' ἔρεξε φίλον τέκος Οὐρανιώνων
         μαψιδίως, ὡς εἴ τι κακὸν ῥέζουσαν ἐνωπῇ;
                         Il. 5.373–374; *Il.* 21.509–510

But μαψιδίως also occurs in a five-line molecule which appears twice in the *Odyssey*; on the first occasion, Telemachos is addressing the assembly in Ithaca; on the second occasion, Penelope is telling Eumaeus to summon the still-disguised Odysseus:[23]

28.   οἱ δ' εἰς ἡμέτερον πωλεύμενοι ἤματα πάντα
         βοῦς ἱερεύοντες καὶ ὄϊς καὶ πίονας αἶγας
         εἰλαπινάζουσιν πίνουσί τε αἴθοπα οἶνον
         μαψιδίως· τὰ δὲ πολλὰ κατάνεται. οὐ γὰρ ἔπ' ἀνήρ,
         οἷος Ὀδυσσεὺς ἔσκεν, ἀρὴν ἀπο οἴκου ἀμῦναι.
                          Od. 2.55–59; *Od.* 17.534–538

The runover λαῶν occurs twice in a molecule in the *Iliad*, twice in a different molecule in the *Odyssey*:

[24]Gregory Nagy suggests that the effect of the third passage (*Od.* 18.366–367) is to move the outer narrative into the narrative level of the similes.

[23]As an enjambment μαψιδίως also occurs in a singleton passage at *Od.* 17.450; and the word also occurs twice in longer enjambments, at *Od.* 7.310 and *Od.* 14.365.

29.   εὗρε Λυκάονος υἱὸν ἀμύνονά τε κρατερόν τε
       ἑσταότ'· ἀμφὶ δέ μιν κρατεραὶ στίχες ἀσπιστάων
       <u>λαῶν</u>, οἵ οἱ ἕποντο ἀπ' Αἰσήποιο ῥοάων·
       ἀγχοῦ δ' ἱσταμένη ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·   *Il.* 4.89–92

       παπταίνων ἥρωα Μαχάονα· τὸν δ' ἐνόησεν
       ἑσταότ'· ἀμφὶ δέ μιν κρατεραὶ στίχες ἀσπιστάων
       <u>λαῶν</u>, οἵ οἱ ἕποντο Τρίκης ἐξ ἱπποβότοιο·
       ἀγχοῦ δ' ἱσταμένη ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·   *Il.* 4.200–203

       ἀλλ' αἰεὶ χαλεπός τ' εἴη καὶ αἴσυλα ῥέζοι,
       ὡς οὔ τις μέμνηται Ὀδυσσῆος θείοιο
       <u>λαῶν</u>, οἷσιν ἄνασσε, πατὴρ δ' ὣς ἤπιος ἦεν.
                            Od. 2.232–234; *Od.* 5.10–12

These examples are only suggestive; if, however, the two poems show different practices in a fair number of instances which seem to have no particular semantic motivation, the argument that the two poems derive from slightly different formulaic systems may be strengthened.

B. Textual Issues: A number of runovers occur in passages which have been questioned. Consider, for example, the runover καλοῦ δαιδαλέου, which occurs four times in the epics:

30.   τὴν μὲν ἔπειτα καθεῖσεν ἐπὶ θρόνου ἀργυροήλου
       <u>καλοῦ δαιδαλέου</u>· ὑπὸ δὲ θρῆνυς ποσὶν ἦεν.   *Il.* 18.389–390

       ὡς ἀπ' Ἀχιλλῆος σάκεος σέλας αἰθέρ' ἵκανε
       <u>καλοῦ δαιδαλέου</u>· περὶ δὲ τρυφάλειαν ἀείρας   *Il.* 19.379–380

       εἷσε δέ μ' εἰσαγαγοῦσα ἐπὶ θρόνου ἀργυροήλου
       <u>καλοῦ δαιδαλέου</u>· ὑπὸ δὲ θρῆνυς ποσὶν ἦεν.
                         Od. 10.314–315; *Od.* 10.366–367

Note also

31.   αὐτὴν δ' ἐς θρόνον εἷσεν ἄγων, ὑπὸ λῖτα πετάσσας,
       <u>καλὸν δαιδάλεον</u>· ὑπὸ δὲ θρῆνυς ποσὶν ἦεν.   *Od.* 1.130–131

Allen prints all of these as cited, but *Od.* 10.315 was omitted in some manuscripts.[24] Another similar instance Allen treats differently; the orphan runover τερπόμενοι is found twice in the *Odyssey*:

32.   γείτονες ἠδὲ ἔται Μενελάου κυδαλίμοιο,
       <u>τερπόμενοι</u>· μετὰ δέ σφιν ἐμέλπετο θεῖος ἀοιδὸς
       φορμίζων·   *Od.* 4.16–18

       μῆρα δὲ κήαντες δαίνυντ' ἐρικυδέα δαῖτα
       <u>τερπόμενοι</u>· μετὰ δέ σφιν ἐμέλπετο θεῖος ἀοιδός,
       Δημόδοκος,   *Od.* 13.26–28

[24] See also *Il.* 14.240; *Od.* 4.136; *Od.* 19.57.

In the *Iliad* we find

33.   πολλὸς δ' ἱμερόεντα χορὸν περιίσταθ' ὅμιλος
             τερπόμενοι· [μετὰ δέ σφιν ἐμέλπετο θεῖος ἀοιδὸς
             φορμίζων·] δοιὼ δὲ κυβιστητῆρε ...   *Il.* 18.603–605

Allen's OCT text omits the clause in brackets, noting that it was condemned by Aristarchus. If it is in fact an interpolation, the interpolator was completely conversant with Homeric technique.[25]

C. A Problem Passage: The runover τυτθόν occurs twice in the *Odyssey* embedded in a molecule:[26]

34.   κὰδ δ' ἔβαλεν προπάροιθε νεὸς κυανοπρῴροιο
             τυτθόν, ἐδεύησεν δ' οἰήϊον ἄκρον ἱκέσθαι.
             ἐκλύσθη δὲ θάλασσα κατερχομένης ὑπὸ πέτρης.   *Od.* 9.482–484

             κὰδ δ' ἔβαλε μετόπισθε νεὸς κυανοπρῴροιο
             τυτθόν, ἐδεύησεν δ' οἰήϊον ἄκρον ἱκέσθαι.
             ἐκλύσθη δὲ θάλασσα κατερχομένης ὑπὸ πέτρης.   *Od.* 9.539–541

Od. 9.483 has attracted some attention from commentators; W. B. Stanford, for example, remarks in his note to the line that it is absurd, and he suggests that it is an interpolation from *Od.* 9.540. But this sort of molecule, protecting an embedded enjambment, is typical of the style of the poems. If this passage is a problem, it is a problem which occurs not on its own, but within a technical system. To relate the passage to the system may not solve the problem, but it may explain in a larger sense how it came about.

VII.   TYPOLOGY AND RUNOVERS

The fundamental distinction between types of enjambment is found in Parry ([1929] 253):[27]

Broadly there are three ways in which the sense at the end of one verse can stand to that at the beginning of another. First, the verse end can fall at the end of a sentence and the new verse begin a new sentence. In this case there is

---

[25]For other disputed passages with runovers note *Il.* 18.155 and 18.176; also *Il.* 11.704–705 and *Od.* 9.41–42.

[26]The word occurs three times in the *Iliad* as a runover not in this block (*Il.* 10.345; *Il.* 13.185 and *Il.* 17.306—these two pendant from a whole line formula); it also occurs in a two-word enjambment at *Il.* 16.302; *Il.* 21.604; and *Il.* 24.170.

[27]Parry's distinction of unperiodic and necessary enjambment is not the same as Bassett's distinction of emphatic and unemphatic runovers. First, although all runovers are enjambed, many enjambed verses do not have runovers, which extend only as far as one or a few words into the line; second, a runover can be emphatic but not necessary, or necessary but not emphatic. Parry's scheme has been modified in various ways by later analysts, but his basic division remains fundamental; see, for example, Kirk 108; also Higbie 29.

no enjambement. Second, the verse can end with a word group in such a way that the sentence, at the verse end, already gives a complete thought, although it goes on in the next verse, adding free ideas by new word groups. To this type of enjambement we may apply [the] term *unperiodic*. Third, the verse end can fall at the end of a word group where there is not yet a whole thought, or it can fall in the middle of a word group; in both of these cases enjambement is *necessary*.

Parry (254) calculated the percentages of the types of enjambment over what he felt were representative sections of the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, the *Argonautica*, and the *Aeneid*, and came to the conclusion that the style of enjambment in the Homeric epics is an index of orality.[28]

For the purposes of the following discussion, I will use Higbie's modification of Parry's basic distinction between unperiodic and necessary enjambment.[29] (I will not, however, offer any calculations; the sample I have collected is too small to be statistically useful.) Higbie's scheme has four types, with two types subdivided: (1a) adding internal and (1b) adding external, (2a) clausal internal and (2b) clausal external, (3) necessary, and (4) violent. Higbie's adding enjambment is equivalent to Parry's unperiodic enjambment, and Parry's necessary enjambment includes Higbie's clausal, necessary, and violent. In Higbie's system, if the break at the verse end divides one clause from another, then the enjambment is external; but if the break at the verse end divides elements within a clause, then the enjambment is internal. Rather than give a complete account of Higbie's system at once, I will further specify each type as I deal with it.

Consider, for example, the passages I have given above as example 6, *Il.* 5.14–19 and *Il.* 16.477–481, with the phrase ἤλυθ' ἀκωκή | ἔγχεος over the line break. This was one of Parry's examples of unperiodic enjambment, or, in Higbie's terminology, adding; adding enjambment occurs when a line which could be grammatically complete is nonetheless continued in the next line. Here, as Parry demonstrated, other passages in the *Iliad* demonstrate that ἤλυθ' ἀκωκή alone, without the defining genitive ἔγχεος, can stand alone. This passage, furthermore, is adding internal, since a clause of the first line is expanded; if a new clause had been started, then the enjambment would have been adding external.

Examples of adding internal embedded and orphan runovers are common, as one would expect, since adding enjambment is common in the epics. Consider, for example, the passages cited in example 7 (*Il.* 17.120–122, *Il.* 17.691–693, and *Il.* 18.20–21) where νέκυν (or νέκυος) in the leading line is followed by γυμνόν (or γυμνοῦ) in the following line. Here the noun could

---

[28]Since Parry, different analysts have arrived at different calculations (see Kirk 118), but the fundamental point of Parry's study seems untouched by these modifications.

[29]See Kirk 108 for a somewhat different modification; Higbie, Chap. 1 (4–19) is a recent account of the development of enjambement studies since Bassett and Parry. Higbie outlines her system in Chap. 2 (28–65).

certainly stand without the adjective. The passages cited in example 11, *Il.* 1.194–196 and *Il.* 1.207–209, have an adverb over the line break: ἦλθε δ' Ἀθήνη / οὐρανόθεν and ἦλθον ἐγὼ ... | οὐρανόθεν.

Adding external enjambment, where the grammar of the leading line is complete, but is continued by a new clause, occurs frequently in the epics, but it is not really relevant to our discussion, since runovers, strictly speaking, should be internal. Embedded and orphan runovers are interesting precisely because the runover and the *dux* are within the same clause, while the runover and the *comes* are not.

In the type which Higbie calls clausal enjambment, the end of the first line creates an expectation that more will follow in the next; in adding enjambment there is no such expectation. The expectation "can either be due to the order of the clauses—in clausal enjambment the dependent clause precedes the independent—or because some element in the first clause, a particle or word, sets up an expectation for the second clause." (Higbie 41) Again, the continuation may be internal—within a clause of the first line— or external. As an example of clausal internal enjambment, Higbie cites (among other passages) *Il.* 12.213–214: οὔτ' ἐνὶ βουλῇ | οὔτε ποτ' ἐν πολέμῳ ..., where the correlative negative in the leading line creates the expectation of a continuation. When a dependent clause precedes an independent clause, the resulting enjambment is clausal external, as in *Il.* 16.705–706:

> ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ τὸ τέταρτον ἐπέσσυτο δαίμονι ἶσος,
> δεινὰ δ' ὁμοκλήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα.

Whereas adding internal embedded and orphan runovers are common, I believe there is no instance of clausal internal runover in the passages I have cited. Clausal internal enjambment is rare in the epics (Higbie counts only 29 instances for the *Iliad*), so if there are any cases which are embedded or orphan, my sample may simply have missed them. There is among my examples one instance of clausal external enjambment embedded in a molecule, example 13, *Il.* 4.446–451 and *Il.* 8.60–65:

> Οἱ δ' ὅτε δή ῥ' ἐς χῶρον ἕνα ξυνιόντες ἵκοντο
> σύν ῥ' ἔβαλον ῥινούς, σὺν δ' ἔγχεα καὶ μένε' ἀνδρῶν
> χαλκεοθωρήκων· ἀτὰρ ἀσπίδες ὀμφαλόεσσαι
> ἔπληντ' ἀλλήλῃσι, πολὺς δ' ὀρυμαγδὸς ὀρώρει.
> ἔνθα δ' ἅμ' οἰμωγή τε καὶ εὐχωλὴ πέλεν ἀνδρῶν
> ὀλλύντων τε καὶ ὀλλυμένων, ῥέε δ' αἵματι γαῖα.

Here ὅτε in the first line creates the expectation of a continuation, and the second line begins with the clausal external σύν ῥ' ἔβαλον ῥινούς; but external enjambment is, again, of no particular interest in this discussion. In this passage the enjambed phrases ἀνδρῶν | χαλκεοθωρήκων and ἀνδρῶν | ὀλλύντων τε καὶ ὀλλυμένων are adding internal, but the phrase ἀτὰρ

ἀσπίδες ὀμφαλόεσσαι | ἔπληντ' ἀλλήλῃσι is an instance of necessary enjambment.

In necessary enjambment, some essential grammatical component of a clause (Subject, Verb, or Object) is delayed until after the break at the end of the verse. Consider the passages cited in example 8:

καὶ γάρ ἐγὼ θεός εἰμι, γένος δέ μοι ἔνθεν ὅθεν σοί,
καί με πρεσβυτάτην τέκετο Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης,
ἀμφότερον γενεῇ τε καὶ οὕνεκα σὴ παράκοιτις
κέκλημαι, σὺ δὲ πᾶσι μετ' ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνάσσεις.   Il. 4.58–61

πῶς δὴ ἔγωγ', ἥ φημι θεάων ἔμμεν ἀρίστη,
ἀμφότερον γενεῇ τε καὶ οὕνεκα σὴ παράκοιτις
κέκλημαι, σὺ δὲ πᾶσι μετ' ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνάσσεις,
οὐκ ὄφελον Τρώεσσι κοτεσσαμένη κακὰ ῥάψαι;   Il. 18.364–367

Here the words οὕνεκα σὴ παράκοιτις could not end the line because the grammar is incomplete—a main verb, κέκλημαι, is needed; the enjambment is therefore necessary. Necessary enjambment has schemes such as Subject | Verb (+ Object); Subject + Object | Verb; Object | Verb (+ Subject); and Verb (+ Subject) | Object (Higbie 48).

Necessary runover enjambment of the verb is well represented in the examples I have cited; for instance (among others), in example 9 (Od. 18.329–333 and Od. 18.389–393), οὐδέ τι θυμῷ / ταρβεῖς; in example 13 (Il. 4.446–451, Il. 8.60–65), ἀτὰρ ἀσπίδες ὀμφαλόεσσαι | ἔπληντ' ἀλλήλῃσι; in example 14 (Il. 1.101–104, Od. 4.660–662): μένεος δὲ μέγα φρένες ἀμφὶ μέλαιναι | πίμπλαντ'; example 21 (Il. 5.506–511, Il. 15.263–268): ἀμφὶ δὲ χαῖται | ὤμοις ἀίσσονται. All of these examples show necessary verbal runovers embedded in a molecule, but orphan necessary runovers are not impossible. Consider the following examples:

35.   τῇ σ' ὀίω κατανεῦσαι ἐτήτυμον ὡς Ἀχιλῆα
        τιμήσῃς, ὀλέσῃς δὲ πολέας ἐπὶ νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν.   Il. 1.558–559

        ἀλλ' ὅ γε μερμήριζε κατὰ φρένα ὡς Ἀχιλῆα
        τιμήσῃ, ὀλέσῃ δὲ πολέας ἐπι νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν.   Il. 2.3–4

In the examples I have cited, for the most part, the *dux* extends over a whole line; in the passages of example 35 the *dux* extends only from the bucolic diaeresis.[30] In the first two passages of the next example, the dux has been pared down to a single word, and in the third passage, the runover has been completely orphaned:

36.   ἦ γάρ μ' Ἀτρεΐδης εὐρὺ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων
        ἠτίμησεν· ἑλὼν γὰρ ἔχει γέρας αὐτὸς ἀπούρας.   Il. 1.355–356

[30] Another example of a runover verb with a short *dux*: οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε | ἤντησ' οὐδὲ ἴδον· περὶ δ' ἄλλων φασὶ γενέσθαι. (Il. 4.374–375 and Od. 4.200–201).

ἀτάρ μιν νῦν γε ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων
ἠτίμησεν· ἐλὼν γὰρ ἔχει γέρας αὐτὸς ἀπούρας.   *Il.* 1.506–507

ὃς καὶ νῦν Ἀχιλῆα ἕο μέγ' ἀμείνονα φῶτα
ἠτίμησεν· ἐλὼν γὰρ ἔχει γέρας αὐτὸς ἀπούρας.   *Il.* 2.239–240

Violent enjambments are of three types: (1) the separation of clause-introductory material; (2) the separation of an epithet and a noun; (3) the separation of preposition and object (Higbie 51–57). Violent enjambments are rare; there are none in my sample, and I do not expect to come across any.

VIII. CONCLUSION

In this paper I have demonstrated that runovers in Homeric verse can be understood only if both the words preceding the runover (the *dux*) and also those following (the *comes*) are taken into account. The four types of runover (free, pendant, embedded, and orphan) must be distinguished, since they play different roles in the formulaic system. Both embedded and orphan runovers are bound to words with which they have no grammatical relationship. Furthermore, the process of composing in molecules increases the statistical occurrence of embedded runovers without increasing the difficulty of composing in performance; the relevant repetition is not so much the repetition of the particular enjambment, but the repetition of the molecule, which in turn protects the enjambment. On the other hand, the strong formulaic bond between an orphan runover and its *comes* demonstrates the strength of the tendency to compose in whole lines, even when there is a break in syntax. Runovers will be found primarily among adding internal and necessary enjambments.

Analysis of particular cases may help to illuminate particular problems, such as those touched on in section VI, and further study may reveal other interesting cases, but the primary value of the approach must be the description of a fundamental technique of Homeric verse composition. Further study should collect more cases, and should compare Homeric practice with that in other dactylic verse, particularly Hesiod. In addition, it would be interesting to investigate in the same terms what might be thought of as the inverse runover: sentences beginning at the bucolic diaeresis.

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
HARVARD UNIVERSITY
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138