ἔτος and ἐνιαυτός in Homeric Formulae

By R. S. P. Beekes, Leiden

Under this title C. J. Emlyn — Jones wrote an article in the 45th issue of this journal, (1967) 156—61. The author tried to find an original difference in meaning between the two words ,,in the light of the work done by Milman Parry''. The conclusion was that there was no such difference, or in any case that it could not be found in this way. This result is to my mind due to a wrong premise and to a wrong application of the 'formulaic method'. The wrong premise is stated when Liddell and Scott's division of the uses of ἐνιαυτός into two groups, a distinctive one and one in which it is equivalent to ἔτος, is dismissed (spec. p. 157 n. 8). I think that the supposition that there was an *original* difference which later disappeared is a perfectly possible one. The method used is not that of Parry at all. In fact it is shown that the words do sometimes occur in the same environments and from this it is concluded that they cover the same ground. The author may indeed be accused of the same thing for which he blames his predecessors: that it is unmethodical to base a conclusion merely upon a selection of the contexts in which these words occur. The study of formulae has given us a method, however delicate, of distinguishing between young and old; and in the present case we must look for the oldest meaning of the word. Since either our understanding of ἐνιαυτός or — which is worse — our confidence in the analysis of formulae might be endangered, I may evaluate the facts again here as I think this should be done.

For studying Homeric formulae[1]) it is of course necessary to present the facts first. Since this is not done in the earlier article and since the method itself is the first object of these pages, the facts may be given here in full. I shall start with ἔτος. The facts are arranged first according to the frequency of the forms, then systematically for each form. A separate treatment of the Iliad and the Odyssey did not appear useful.

---

[1]) One of the most recent and best books on the subject is by A. Hoekstra, *Homeric Modifications of Formulaic Prototypes* (Amsterdam, 1965). It should not, however, be used as a first introduction; for that purpose one might use the relevant parts of G. S. Kirk, *The Songs of Homer* (Cambridge, 1962), spec. pp. 59—68, or A. Lesky's article in *RE* Suppl. XI (1967) s. v. Homeros II.

ἔτος

-ος	β 107 τ 152 ω 142	ἀλλ' ὅτε τέτρατον ἦλθεν ἔτος καὶ ἐπήλυθον ὧραι
	η 261 ξ 287	„ „ δὴ ὀγδοόν μοι ἐπιπλόμενον ἔτος ἦλθεν
	α 16	„ „ „ ἔτος ἦλθε περιπλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν
	β 89	ἤδη γὰρ τρίτον ἐστὶν ἔτος, τάχα δ'εἶσι τέταρτον
	Ω 765	„ „ νῦν μοι τόδ' ἐεικοστὸν ἔτος ἐστὶν
	τ 222	εἰπέμεν· ἤδη γάρ οἱ „ „ „
	ω 309	αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσῆι τόδε δὴ πέμπτον „ „
	ω 288	πόστον δὴ ἔτος ἐστίν, ὅτε ξείνισσας ἐκεῖνον
-ει	π 206 τ 484 φ 208 ω 322	ἤλυθον εἰκοστῷ ἔτει ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν
	ψ 102 ψ 170	ἔλθοι ἐεικοστῷ „ „ „ „
	δ 82	ἠγαγόμην ἐν νηυσὶ καὶ ὀγδοάτῳ ἔτει ἦλθον
-εος	λ 295 ξ 294	ἂψ περιτελλομένου ἔτεος καὶ ἐπήλυθον ὧραι
-εα	Β 328	ὣς ἡμεῖς τοσσαῦτ' ἔτεα πτολεμίξομεν αὖθι
-εων	Λ 691	τῶν προτέρων ἐτέων, κατὰ δ' ἔκταθεν ὅσσοι ἄριστοι

What conclusions can be drawn from this? We have 22 instances in all, three in the Iliad, 19 in the Odyssey. Though it is difficult to give an exact definition of a 'formula', in practice there are no great problems. All groups of words that occur more than once must be considered as 'formulae', provided only that the group is not too insignificant: nobody can reasonably consider ὅ γ' as a formula; some uncertainty thus remains, but we are not concerned with it here. On the other hand, a group of words found only once in Homer may well be the only instance of a formula that has come down to us. It is clear that there must be special reasons for assuming this[2]).

---

[2]) On this problem see Hoekstra, *Modifications* (see note 1), p. 12ff· Accepting his line of reasoning we might restate Parry's definition as follows: "A formula is a not too small or too insignificant group of words which is or was regularly employed in a fixed place in the verse at the beginning and at the end coinciding with a caesura or a pause."

There is no such reason for ἔτεα and ἐτέων (in B 328 there was no Ϝ, so in any case this verse is not very old), which must therefore be left out of consideration here. The formula with ἔτεος cannot be old, since one would then expect a genitive in -οιο with the participle. Though there is enough uncertainty about the history of these genitive endings, I never saw any reason for assuming that -ου is old in epic tradition. It may be recalled here that we are looking for the oldest meanings of the words studied, so that only the oldest formulae are of interest. As to ἔτει, Hoekstra, *Modifications*, p. 52, demonstrated that the formula found in π 206 etc. originally had a 3 p. sg.: ἦλυϑε. In *The Development of the PIE Laryngeals in Greek*, p. 61, I tried to show that the verse then read: ἦλυϑ᾽ ἐϜῑκοστῷ Ϝέτει ῾Ϝὴν πατρίδα γαῖαν. If this is correct we have the same formula here as in ψ 102. 170. (If this should not be accepted, it would not change the present argument very much, for we would then simply have to write (ἐ)εικοστῷ Ϝέτει; only the above reconstruction would show the great antiquity of the verse and so of this use of ἔτος.) For δ 82 there is no reason to assume a formula, and it is improbable that it ever was one, because it does not coincide with a caesura (unless καὶ belonged to that formula, which I doubt), and it is not old because ἔτει is disyllabic. The situation with ἔτος is not very clear. There seem to be two formulae: ἀλλ᾽ ὅτε (δή) + ordinal + ἦλϑε (and, of course, ἔτος), and another: ordinal + ἐστίν. The formula in η 261 is probably a clumsy variant of a formula with another numeral, because of the metrical difficulty (cf. δ 82, where this numeral also occurs in a recent verse)[3]; ἐπιπλόμενον against περι- (in λ 295 and with ἐνιαυτός) too is antitraditional. To sum up, we can say that we find formulae only for ἔτει and ἔτος, the first of which is probably very old, and which all have a numeral.

Let us now consider ἐνιαυτός.

-ον	T	32	ἥν περ γὰρ κεῖταί γε τελεσφόρον εἰς ἐνιαυτόν			
	δ	86	τρὶς γὰρ τίκτει μῆλα	,,	,,	,,
	χ	467	ἔνϑα μὲν ἤματα πάντα	,,	,,	,,
	ξ	292	ἔνϑα παρ᾽ αὐτῷ μεῖνα	,,	,,	,,
	ο	232	ὅς οἱ χρήματα πολλὰ	,,	,,	,,

---

[3]) Bentley's ὀγδόατόν cannot be accepted, since it would not explain how it came to be replaced by ὀγδόον. In general we should not emend away difficulties rather than evaluate them.

	Φ 444	παρ Διὸς ἐλθόντες θητεύσαμεν εἰς ἐνιαυτόν
	δ 526	χρυσοῦ δοιὰ τάλαντα· φύλασσε δ᾽ ὅ γ᾽ ἐνιαυτόν
	δ 595	καὶ γάρ κ᾽ εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν ἐγὼ παρὰ σοί γ᾽ ἀνεχοίμην
	λ 356	εἴ με καὶ „ „ ἀνώγοιτ᾽ αὐτόθι μίμνειν
	ξ 196	ῥηιδίως κεν ἔπειτα καὶ εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν ἅπαντα
	ο 455	οἱ δ᾽ ἐνιαυτὸν ἅπαντα παρ᾽ ἡμῖν αὖθι μένοντες
	α 288	ἤ τ᾽ ἂν τρυχόμενός περ ἔτι τλαίης ἐνιαυτόν
	β 219	„ „ „ „ „ „ τλαίην „
-ῳ	M 15	πέρθετο δὲ Πριάμοιο πόλιν δεκάτῳ ἐνιαυτῷ
	π 18	ἐλθόντ᾽ ἐξ ἀπίης γαίης „ „
	γ 391	οἴνου ἡδυπότοιο, τὸν ἑνδεκάτῳ „
	β 175	ἄγνωστον πάντεσσιν ἐεικοστῷ „
	ϱ 327	αὐτίκ᾽ ἰδόντ᾽ Ὀδυσῆα „ „
-ους	Θ 404 }	
	Θ 418 }	οὐδέ κεν ἐς δεκάτους περιτελλομένους ἐνιαυτούς
	Ψ 833	ἕξει μιν καὶ πέντε περιπλομένους „
-ων	B 551	κοῦροι Ἀθηναίων, περιτελλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν
	α 16	ἀλλ᾽ ὅτε δὴ ἔτος ἦλθε περιπλομένων „
-ος	B 295	ἡμῖν δ᾽ εἴνατός ἐστι περιτροπέων ἐνιαυτός
	κ 469	ἀλλ᾽ ὅτε δή ῥ᾽ ἐνιαυτὸς ἔην, περὶ δ᾽ ἔτραπον ὧραι
-ου	λ 248	χαῖρε, γύναι, φιλότητι. περιπλομένου δ᾽ ἐνιαυτοῦ
-οι	B 134	ἐννέα δὴ βεβάασι Διὸς μεγάλου ἐνιαυτοί

27 cases, 9 in the Iliad, 18 in the Odyssey. For ἐνιαυτοί, ἐνιαυτοῦ and ἐνιαυτός there is no indication of a formula; ἐνιαυτοί stand quite alone, having no adjunct, ἐνιαυτοῦ has the younger ending -ου, in κ 469 ἐνιαυτός stands alone, in B 295 περιτροπέων seems a variant for περιτελλόμενος (-πλόμενος) which will not fit the metre when placed before ἐνιαυτός. The forms ἐνιαυτῶν, -ούς are formulae, all at the end of the verse, preceded by the (Middle) participle of περι-τελλ-/ -πλ-. Of the cases with the dative, γ 391 will be a variant of δεκάτῳ ἐνιαυτῷ; it cannot be an old formula since it does not follow a caesura. The other dative cases are formulae. Most frequent (13 out of 27) is the accusative, displaying τελεσφόρον εἰς ἐνιαυτόν five times at the end of the verse, εἰς ἐνιαυτόν twice at the end, twice the same before the trochaic caesura, once the same followed by ἅπαντα in final position (which does not follow a caesura, unless καὶ is taken with it), once ἐνιαυτὸν ἅπαντα non-final, and two cases without adjunct. It looks as if εἰς ἐνιαυτόν was taken from its original place (with τελεσφόρον) and varied (by adding ἅπαντα).

Now if we are going to look for the original meaning of the two words in the formulaic systems found, we see that the only case of identical use is that with a numeral. When we then note that ἔτος has in *all* its formulaic uses a numeral and ἐνιαυτός does not, and further that -ῷ ἐνιαυτῷ is suspected of having hiatus (though I am not sure of this) whilst -ῳ ϝέτεϊ does not, it seems probable that ἐνιαυτός here encroached upon the field of ἔτος. Of course this cannot be regarded as certain in this phase. We shall therefore look at the other formulae.

The most important fact we see is, to my mind, that with ἐνιαυτός the preposition εἰς is firmly embedded in tradition, while it is never found with ἔτος. I consider this sufficient evidence that the old interpretation that ἐνιαυτός is 'the year-day', 'the day on which a year-cycle is completed' is right, because only in this way can the use of εἰς be understood. This is confirmed by the adjective τελεσφόρος and the participles of περι-τελλ-/-πλ-. Both words, τέλος and the verb, are derived from the same PIE root $*k^uel$-, meaning something like 'to turn (round)'. So τέλος probably originally meant 'the turning point'[4]), for which compare its derivative τέλσον[5]). Both epithets therefore confirm the meaning 'the turning point in the year-cycle' for ἐνιαυτός. When we now look back at the cases with a dative and a numeral, our supposition that ἐνιαυτός here encroached upon the field of ἔτος is confirmed: 'in the n'th year' must be expressed by a word for 'the period of a year, of twelve months', which is ἔτος, not ἐνιαυτός.

It must be stated here that almost every step in the argumentation with these formulae is a matter of probability only, so that mistakes are far from excluded (if only because of the limited material we have). In the present case, however, we have decisive evidence from elsewhere (see e. g. Bechtel, *Lexilogus zu Homer*, p. 125), which shows that our interpretation is not too far from the truth[6]).

Note on τέλος.

Entirely unacceptable to me is the thesis of Holwerda, *Mnemosyne* 16 (1963) 338—63, who proposes for τέλος the meaning 'librae iugum'

---

[4]) See the note at the end.

[5]) For this word see my *Development*, App. 2.

[6]) Curious is the expression τετελεσμένον εἰς ἐνιαυτόν (fin.) Hes. *Th.* 795, *Op.* 561. It is apparently a variant of τελεσφόρον εἰς ἐνιαυτόν to follow the penthemimeres, but τετελεσμένον shows that ἐνιαυτός lost its original meaning: ἐνιαυτός (in its original sense) *brings* completion, it cannot *be completed* (with the passive one would have expected ἔτος).

(the article is written in Latin). In Glotta 43 (1965) 38—61 Ph. Ambrose analysed the meaning of τελεῖν and τέλος in Homer, I think correctly. His conclusion was that all the forms derive from the root *kʷel- 'to turn'. I would like to make a few remarks on his interpretation.

On λ 352 δωτίνην τελέσω Ambrose states (p. 46) that "the gift which Alcinous promises to Odysseus is the pompē". To my mind it is clear that a distinction is here continuously made between the πομπή and the gifts. Here there is a reference to λ 339f., where Arete suggests that the Phaeacian kings should give more δῶρα. Rightly therefore Ameis-Hentze note on τελέσω: „vollzogen habe, sofern er auch die Geschenke der andern βασιλῆες in Empfang nimmt." In other words, the δωτίνη must be *completed* first.

In Φ 450 μισθοῖο τέλος the author holds that "telos is a point in time; it signals the termination of a previously existing activity; it brings an issue or result". This is not quite right, to my mind. *Τέλος* is a point in time only inasmuch as it indicates the moment of completion or fulfilment, and the *result* of the work is in this case the Wall of Troy, not the reward for building it. The solution is given in Φ 457 μισθοῦ χωόμενοι, τὸν ὑποστὰς οὐκ ἐτέλεσσεν: Laomedon did not fulfil his *promise*. After all, wages are always promised only until they are paid. Ambrose rejects a meaning 'fulfilment' here "for there never was any payment or fulfilment of the wage." I do not think this is a real obstacle. It is quite conceivable to say "but when time was bringing the fulfilment of the wages, Laomedon refused it".

As for 'the military τέλος' I must say that I am not convinved by the interpretation given. Specially in the formula (δόρπον ἔπειθ' εἵλοντο) κατὰ στρατὸν ἐν τελέεσσι H 380 ~ Λ 730 ~ Σ 298 it would appear that the word originally had a local meaning. It should then be understood as 'the end of the camp' or 'the fulfilment of a specifically desired arrangement of troops in a particular place and for a particular purpose'. I may stress that the expression is an old formula, κατὰ στρατὸν ἐν τελέεσσι following the trochaeic caesura, ἐν τελέεσσι following the bucolic caesura. An easier interpretation would be 'dwelling-place', derived directly from the meaning 'to turn'. The meaning 'to dwell' is well known from cognate words, e. g. Lat. *colo*. The meaning 'military unit, squadron' would then show the same development as στρατός 'camp > army' (see my *Development*, Appendix 3, for a criticism of Strunk's interpretation of this word).