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Ἐνυάλιος ἀνδρείφοντης,
Poetical code-switching between Hurrian and Greek
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Abstract: The paper first examines the occurrences of the theonym Ἐνυάλιος in Homer's Iliad, focusing on the formula Ἐνυάλιος ἀνδρείφοντης 'the manslaying god Enualios'. It has already been noticed that some parts of Hesiod's Theogony are highly reminiscent of Hurrian mythology. The paper goes one step further and proposes to etymologize the theonym En[w]alios itself as a Hurrian compound of the name eni 'god' with the verb aw- 'to kill, slay', which both exist in Hurrian. Two other compound theonyms En-hazizi and En-umašši show the same structure as Enuwalios.
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1. The issue of the cultural influence of Hurrian on Ancient Greek

Since cuneiform was deciphered and a number of original texts dealing with Anatolian mythology written in Hittite or Hurrian languages were published it is generally agreed that Hesiod's Theogony contains clearly intriguing and near certain parallels with religious documents of Hurrian origin, particularly with the Kingship in Heaven and the Song of Ullikummi. Unfortunately the untranslated Hurrian originals are severely damaged and reduced to fragments. In better shape are the translations in Hittite unearthed in Hatti homeland. We are thus forced to investigate Hurrian mythology through the filter of Hittite. Among the foremost and ground-breaking works on these issues a paper written by Güterbock as soon as 19461 comes in mind. It can be underlined that the three successive gods of the Greek Theogony: Ouranos, Kronos and Zeus correspond faithfully to the Hurrian pantheon: Anu, Kumarbi and Teššub. Analogies such as castration themes, fertilized stones, monsters to be fought, swallowed children, etc. are abundant in both mythological corpora. Of course these similarities of structural and thematic nature do not mean that Hesiod's Theogony is not a genuinely Greek composition. It is by far not a mere translation of Hurrian songs and it must definitely be read and understood within the cultural framework of Ancient Greece in the first place. Ancient Greeks perceived Zeus as an almighty and unsuperable god, in contrast with Teššub whose failure is possible in the Hurrian original but precluded in Hesiod's Theogony. Analogies are nevertheless pervasive.

2. The Ancient Greek theonym Ἐνυ[F]άλιος

The theonym Ἐνυάλιος is already attested in Mycenean Greek as reminded by Chantraine2 or Watkins3: (KN V 52) e-nu-wa-ri-jo. This kind of phonetics with digamma <F> [w] is confirmed by epigraphy: *[enuvalijo] and attested as late as the 7th century BCE in Argos.4

---

3 C. WATKINS, How to Kill a Dragon, 1995, Oxford University Press, p. 384.
The theonym Ἐνυάλιος occurs four times in Homer’s Iliad in association with the participle ἀνδρεί-φόντης ‘man-slaying’:

Iliad 2. 651
Μηριόνης τ’ ἀτάλαντος Ἐνυαλίῳ ἀνδρειφόντῃ
‘of Merion equal to Enualios [the] manslayer’

Iliad 7. 166, 8. 264, 17. 259
Μηριόνης ἀτάλαντος Ἐνυαλίῳ ἀνδρειφόντῃ
‘of Merion equal to Enualios [the] manslayer’

The formula Ἐνυαλιῳ ἀνδρέιϕοντῃ [dative Enualios manslaying] appears four times as second hemistich of verses. As noted by Watkins the formula is metrically incorrect and must be restored as follows: *[ἐνυάλιοι ἀνρ-φῶντα][5] with syllabic r. The participle *anr-ϕont- is attested in Mycenean Greek as a-no-go-ta, which stands for the phonetically archaic *a-nor-gwon-tas, and has an Old Indian equivalent nr-hantas, both being from *Hnor-gwont-es ‘man-slaying’, a compound of potentially Proto-Indo-European making and dating. In all cases it is attested since the Bronze Age and the mid-second millennium BCE, as Watkins rightly emphasizes.

3. Etymologizing the Ancient Greek theonym Ἐνυ[F]άλιος

Chantraine suggested that this theonym was “probablement préhellénique” [probably Pre-Hellenic]. Frisk was not more helpful: “Vorgriechischer Name mit unklarer Bildung und unbekannter Etymologie”[6] [Pre-Hellenic word with unclear formation and unknown etymology]. It can be noted that the masculine Ἐνυ[F]άλιος has a feminine equivalent Ἐνυώ. My proposal is to analyze both words as compounds of Hurrian eni ‘god’ and the verb uw-, ub- ‘to kill, slay’[8] attested in the Hurro-Hittite Bilingual of Boğazköy. For example Kbo 32 13 Vo I 15 reads <uí-wu,um nuú-bi GU-ri IM-ub-wa,> uwm nubi pedari Teššubwa ‘were slaughtered ten thousand pieces of cattle for Teššub’. Ἐνυό is based on the bare stem *en-uw- whereas Ἐνυ[F]άλιος has a suffixed stem *en-uw-al-. At first glance it would seem that Hurrian does not have such a compound in the available documents. But Laroche[9] lists a theonym left without translation: Ὠwalli, attested in Ugaritic script <uwln> and Cuneiform <dú-wa-al-li>. Apart from the absence of translation it must be noted that the reading proposed by the GLH is most probably false in light of Ἐνυ[F]άλιος. The sign AN = dingir ‘god’ cannot be a determinative and must be assigned a full lexical value: AN-uwali ‘god of slaying’. It is highly probable that the geminated ll results from an assimilated article -ni: *AN-uwal-ni. Theonyms that are compounds normally take the article[10]. Greek provides the meaning of this theonym while Hurrian accounts for its morphemic structure. Incidentally that *AN-uwal- is pronounced [enu(w)al] with initial [e] vindicates my proposal that Hurrian eni ‘god’ is the same word as AN, with Hurrianized phonetics and morphology[11]. Some forms listed by the GLH do not include the sign for ‘god’: AN = dingir ‘god’. It is therefore unclear whether they amount to the same word as AN-uwalli ‘god of slaying’.

---

5 C. WATKINS, op. cit, p. 384.
The way Watkins reconstructs vowel length is nevertheless a bit surprising. One would expect /a/ to be long.
6 P. CHANTRAINE, DELG, p. 352.
8 Left untranslated in E. LAROCHE, Glossaire de la langue hourrite (= Revue Hittite et Asianique, 34/35), Paris, 1980, p. 276-277. (= GLH)
9 E. LAROCHE, GLH, p. 291.
The formula Ἐνούκλος ἀνδρείφόντης is extremely interesting on several counts. It combines a Hurrian compound En(i)-uwali and a Greek compound *H₂ŋ-ul-g₂ont-. In addition eni ‘god’ corresponds to *H₂ŋ-ul ‘man’, and even more interestingly the Hurrian verb uwali and the Greek verb of Indo-European origin *g₂on- both mean ‘to kill, to slay’. This formula is therefore both a kind of pleonasm and a form of code-switching between Hurrian and Greek: ‘god of slaying [in Hurrian] man-slayer [in Greek]’.

4. Hurrian compounds with en- ‘god, lord’ as first morpheme

Several words in Hurrian involve a first morpheme en-, which has two origins: Sumerian an ‘god’ and en ‘lord, master’. Because Hurrian often does not clearly distinguish the phonemes a and e, especially when the vowel is followed by r, l or n, both loanwords have fused into en(i). A first compound involving en is endan ‘high priest.’ Originally endan was compared with Akkadian entu and Sumerian enitu ‘female priest’. This hypothesis has been dismissed. The modern interpretation is to analyze endan as a derivative of en- with the addition of -dan, which Wilhelm calls a nomen agentis suffix. A verbal interpretation of -dan naturally connects it with tan- ‘to do.’ Following this idea endan can be understood as meaning ‘god-doer’ ‘deifex’ on the model of pontifex, which provides a Latin parallel to this construction.12 In endan the morpheme en- obviously stands for ‘god’.

Another compound is eni-hazizi (KBo 2.9 iv 12, 18, 23). It is also attested in the Ugaritic alphabet, <i n h z z y> (RS.24.261 Ro 5), which Laroche correctly identifies with eni-hazizi.13 Hazizi is a loanword: from Akkadian hasisu ‘wisdom, intelligence’ as observed by Laroche.14 This compound means ‘god (or lord) of wisdom’ and appears in Akkadian as in ḪÈ EN ha-si₁₇-si₁₇ ‘Ēa, Lord of Wisdom’ (KBo 1.3 obv. 23). According to the sumerogram EN in this Akkadian compound eni should preferably be considered to mean ‘lord’, not ‘god’.

Another form with eni as first element is en-umašši in KBo 5.1 i 3 and <i n m t y> in RS.24.261 rev. 5. In contrast to eni-hazizi, Laroche did not provide any etymological analysis or parsing of en-umašši and considered the whole unsegmented form to be a (cultual) place.15 I have proposed to compare the second component with Akkadian umāššu ‘strength’.16 Hurrian en-umašši can be compared with Akkadian EN-umāšši ‘lord of strength.’ It can be noted that the traditional transliteration of EN as Akkadian bel is highly questionable in that kind of compounds. This transliteration seriously conflicts with two Hurrian words of Akkadian origin. It seems quite impossible to believe that Hurrian can have forms like eni-hazizi and en-umašši if the Akkadian words were **bēl-hazizi and **bēl-umāšši. Hurrian indicates that the Sumerogram EN is to be read [en-] not [bēl-] in Akkadian as well. From a philological point of view, it is noteworthy that en-umašši and eni-hazizi are used in the same line of RS 24.261 5 “Sacrifice to Astarte-Šauska”: [inmyt : ihzzy] in Laroche.17 These two Akkadian compounds are solidly bound by a religious, formulaic, and etymological solidarity. Other attempts at etymologizing en-umašši (from Hittite, for example) cannot be accepted: EN-umašši cannot be parsed as a Hittite or Luwian verb enuma- suffixed by a Hurrian abstract formative -šši.18 It can be further noted that the final -i of en-umašši and eni-hazizi stands for the Akkadian genitive and that the similarity with the Hurrian absolute is a chance coincidence.

5. Conclusion

The paper has described three Hurrian theonyms which are compounds: *en-hazizi* ‘god of intelligence’, *en-umašši* ‘god of force’ and *en-uwali*, originally of unknown meaning but which certainly means ‘god of slaying’ on account of the Greek borrowing Ἐνυάλιος. The Homeric formula Ἐνυάλιος ἀνδρεῖφόντης is an interesting instance of code-switching between Hurrian and Ancient Greek as shown above. And it can be noted that the components of this formula are as old as Mycenean Greek e-nu-wa-ri-jo a-no-qo-ta.

Ἐνυάλιος is a near transparent borrowing and Ancient Greek is phonetically faithful to the Hurrian original. This raises the issue of a direct flow of cultural influences of Hurrian people on Ancient Greece. Not only does Hesiod’s *Theogony* contain a number of Hurrian-looking features, but some words present in Ancient Greek are borrowed from Hurrian: Ἐνυάλιος stands for Hurrian *en(i)-uwali*. It can be further noted that the verb *uw-(al-)* is also attested with no suffix in the feminine counterpart of Ἐνω < *en-uw* and a Greek suffix -ό. The verb *uw-*, *ub-* is potentially attested in another Greek word ὑβρις, -ις (f.) ‘extreme unrestrained violence’, of unknown origin and potentially from Hurrian *uwari, ubri* ‘repeated slaying’ with a well-documented iterative suffix -ar. A word ú-wa-ri exists in Hurrian but its meaning is unknown. The regular case-marker for Hurrian Absolutive is final -i. Greek has three grammatical genders but Hurrian has none. It can be observed that *uwari* was transferred to the feminine declension -ις, -ι(δ)ος on account of its final -i.

Incidentally the existence of these borrowings of Hurrian origin raises issues as to how direct cultural and lexical interactions might have happened between Greece and Hurrian lands, located in eastern Anatolia.

---