FROM TEXT TO READING IN *ENŪMA ELIŠ*[1]

Johannes Haubold (Durham University)

Abstract

This article makes two main points. First, the transmitted text of *Enūma eliš* can be more reliably construed than has hitherto been assumed, provided we take seriously the spelling of the manuscripts and the rules of Akkadian grammar. If we do this, and that is my second point, we can also make progress at the level of interpretation. To illustrate these claims, I look at two passages that have caused difficulties to modern readers. In *Enūma eliš* I.1-10 we encounter some forms that seem *prima facie* to defy the normal rules of Akkadian grammar. Through careful analysis of spelling, syntax and poetic context I show that the text as it stands can in fact be securely construed. I then turn to a passage that the poet himself introduces as a masterpiece of verbal craft. In *Enūma eliš* II.61-70 the god Ea soothes the excited Anšar by reassuring him that he has the situation under control. I argue that existing translations misconstrue the personal pronoun *šâši* and consequently misinterpret the climactic final couplet of the speech. Clarifying the grammar of the passage enables us to establish not only what the text says, but also to appreciate it better.

Introduction

The last decade has seen important advances in scholarship on the Babylonian poem *Enūma eliš*. Three new editions, by Talon (2005), Kämmerer/Metzler (2012) and Lambert (2013), have collected the extant manuscripts and on that basis have established a much improved text. Some minor gaps remain,[2] but to all intents and purposes *Enūma eliš* has been restored. Now the task is to interpret it. Important inroads have already been made: Kämmerer/Metzler and Lambert have themselves contributed new insights into the language, themes, poetic structure, and compositional background of the poem.[3] Andrea Seri and Selena Wisnom have considered its complex intertextual relationships.[4] Eckart Frahm and Enrique Jiménez have studied commentaries and other forms of reception.[5] Scholars have also begun to develop ambitious readings of the text: the recent monograph of Gösta Gabriel is exemplary in this regard.[6] What remains surprisingly problematic is the meaning of the poem at the level of individual words and phrases.

Enūma eliš has had its fair share of recent translations.[7] At first sight, they render recognisably the same text, but on closer inspection the picture is less reassuring. The problem is not so much that the meaning of some Akkadian words still eludes us, though that is also true. At *Enūma eliš* I.129, for example, Wilfred Lambert leaves the verb form *im-ma-*

---

[2] Notably in Tablet V, where lacunae still remain in lines 23–48, 91–107, 139–50.

[3] Kämmerer/Metzler 2012: 1–79; Lambert 2013: 3–4 and 439–65; see also Seri 2006 and 2012, Gabriel 2014.

[4] Seri 2014, Wisnom 2014: 90–207; see also Katz 2011.

[5] Frahm and Jiménez 2015 (commentaries), Frahm 2010 (reception); see also Livingstone 1986 and Frahm 2011 on commentaries, Kämmerer/Metzler 2012: 36-49 on Ancient Near Eastern receptions, Haubold 2013: 146–53 on Berossos.

[6] Gabriel 2014.

[7] Among the more important are Dalley 2000, Foster 2005, Talon 2005, Kämmerer/Metzler 2012 and Lambert 2013; for further details, including earlier translations, see Kämmerer/Metzler 2012: 54-5.

as-ru-nim-ma untranslated because its meaning cannot currently be determined with any confidence.[8] Such gaps in our knowledge of the Akkadian lexicon are regrettable, but they are relatively rare and affect only specific passages.

Orthography and grammar pose more serious problems, as may be seen from the opening lines of *Enūma eliš* (I.1-10):

1 AabceeKx   *e-nu-ma e-liš   la na-bu-ú šá-ma-mu*
2 AabcdeeKM   *šap-liš am-ma-tum   šu-ma la zak-rat*
3 AabcdeeKMZ   *apsû-ma reš-tu-ú za-ru-šu-un*
4 AabcdeeKMxZz   *mu-um-mu ti-amat   mu-al-li-da-at gim-ri-šú-un*
5 AabcdeeKM   *mê*^meš*-šú-nu iš-te-niš i-ḫi-qu-ú-ma*
6 AabcdeejKMZz   *gi-pa-ra la ki-iṣ-ṣu-ru   ṣu-ṣa-a la še-ʾ-ú*
7 AabcdeejKM   *e-nu-ma ilāni   la šu-pu-u ma-na-ma*
8 AabcdjKM   *šu-ma la zuk-ku-ru   ši-ma-tú la ši-i-mu*
9 AabcdjKM   *ib-ba-nu-ú-ma ilāni qí-rib-šú-un*
10 AabcdjKM   ^d*laḫ-mu* ^d*la-ḫa-mu uš-ta-pu-ú   šu-mi iz-zak-ru*

1   When the heavens above did not exist,
2   And earth beneath had not come into being –
3   There was Apsû, the first in order, their begetter,
4   And demiurge Tiāmat, who gave birth to them all;
5   They had mingled their waters together
6   Before meadowland had coalesced and reed-bed was to be found –
7   When not one of the gods had been formed
8   Or had come into being, when no destinies had been decreed,
9   The gods were created within them;
10   Lahmu and Lahamu were formed and came into being.[9]

There has been much discussion of these lines, some of it focussing on semantics. What exactly is meant by *mu-um-mu ti-amat*, for example?[10] And what about *ṣu-ṣa-a la še-ʾ-ú*? Is this about "finding" reed-beds (*šeʾû*), as Lambert suggests, or perhaps rather about padding them (*šêʾu*)?[11] Important as these details are, most words in the passage are in fact perfectly clear. What is much less clear is how they fit together.

Despite much recent work, the syntax and grammar of *Enūma eliš* I.1-10 remain stubbornly elusive. How long does subordination continue after the opening conjunction *enūma*? How does line 6 fit in with the rest of the passage? How many sentences should we assume: one, two or perhaps four?[12] These questions matter, because depending on how we answer them we end up with very different accounts of how the universe developed from primordial stasis to the birth of the first gods. They also matter in a more general sense. Classical literary theory – in essence a branch of rhetoric – emphasised the trust that needs

---

[8] See Lambert's own comments *ad loc.* (2013: 471). Kämmerer/Metzler transliterate *im-maṣ-...* and suggest "richteten sich auf;" Talon gives "il formèrent un cercle;" *alii aliter*.

[9] Lambert's translation is quoted here as a starting point for discussion. As we shall see, some aspects of it are problematic.

[10] Frahm 2013 reviews older scholarship and argues persuasively for a meaning "creative spirit." which he compares with Biblical *rûaḥ*.

[11] Maul 2015: 22 agrees with Lambert in parsing *še-ʾ-ú* as a form of the verb *šeʾû,* "seek out, find." However, most recent scholars accept derivation from *šêʾu*, "pad:" see Held 1976: 233–36, Wilcke 1977: 167, Moran 1988, Streck 2014: 393, George 2016: 19, 132.

[12] One sentence: Lambert 2013: 29; two sentences: Dalley 2000: 233, Foster 2005: 439; four sentences: Wilcke 1977: 166–67.

building at the beginning of a text.[13] Today we no longer use terms like *captatio benevolentiae* to describe the relationship between the author and his/her audience, but the basic point still holds: the beginning of a text crucially shapes the relationship we form with it as readers. This is especially true in a cosmogony like *Enūma eliš*, where beginnings are themselves the main focus of attention.[14] If the start of the creation story is obscure or in some other way problematic, this is likely to put a serious strain on readers.

Today the signs of strain are unmistakable among readers of *Enūma eliš*. Kämmerer and Metzler, in one of the most detailed analyses to date, have spoken of the "Gordian Knot" of the opening lines, which they propose to cut by assuming that some ancient editor(s) tampered with the text.[15] This is an extreme measure, borne of the authors' frustration with a text that seems impossible to pin down. It is instructive to see how Kämmerer and Metzler reach this point of perplexity. For them, the main difficulty of *Enūma eliš* I.1-10 rests on the question of how we construe line 6: can the forms *gi-pa-ra* (6 MSS, var. *gi-pa-ru*) and *ṣu-ṣa-a* (4 MSS) be taken as nominatives (~ *gipāru*, *ṣuṣû*), as Lambert assumes in the translation reprinted above? Or are they accusatives (*gipāra*, *ṣuṣâ*), in which case should we take them as the objects of active/transitive statives *kiṣṣurū* and *šēʾū*? In answer to these questions, Kämmerer and Metzler claim that case endings in late Babylonian tend to be unreliable ("wenig aussagekräftig"), and that transitive statives are rare in late Babylonian – or rather, that they are rarely attested for certain ("selten sicher bezeugt").[16] The problem, in other words, cannot be solved with the normal methods of grammatical analysis.

Now, this conclusion has recently been challenged by Michael Streck, who insists that progress can be made.[17] Streck argues that the manuscripts of *Enūma eliš* do observe the old triptotic (or diptotic) system of declining nouns; and that the apparent accusatives in *Enūma eliš* I.6 must therefore be taken seriously:

> It is not true that the use of case endings in Akkadian texts of the first millennium is almost arbitrary. Rather, the case system gradually changes from the old triptotic system in the singular, first to a diptotic and later to a caseless system. The development can be summarized as follows: Singular: *-u, -i, -a > -u, -i, -u > -0*. Contracted vowels, however, are preserved and develop as follows: *-û, -î, -â > -û, -î, -û> -û, -û/î(?), -û*. Many manuscripts of *Enūma eliš* still have *-u, -i, -a* in the singular, others have *-u, -i, -u*. Already the first ten lines suffice to demonstrate this: Nominative *ammatum/abbatu* in l. 2, accusative *šuma* or *šumu* in l. 2, nominative *apsû* and *rēštû* in l. 3, nominative *mummu* in l. 4, accusative *šuma* in l. 8 and 10. Therefore, *gipāra* (manuscripts A, B, I, Y+, FF, TT) or *gipāru* (manuscript J), and *ṣuṣâ* (manuscripts A, B, I, J, Y+) are certainly accusatives and not nominatives.[18]

Streck argues that the text of *Enūma eliš* must be seen in the context of a gradual weakening of the Akkadian case system. According to him, the loss of short case endings has not yet fully taken hold in *Enūma eliš*, with "many" manuscripts retaining triptotic declension (*-u, -i, -a*), while "others" are diptotic (*-u, -i, -u*). He concludes that *gi-pa-ra* and *ṣu-ṣa-a* in I.6 must represent accusatives governed by active/transitive statives *kiṣṣurū* and *šēʾū*.

---

[13] For the problem of beginning in ancient rhetorical theory see Calboli Montefusco 1988, with further literature; for beginnings in Greek epic, see Wheeler 2002.

[14] For a brilliant discussion of beginnings in the canonical Greek cosmogony of Hesiod see Clay 2003: 49–72.

[15] Kämmerer/Metzler 2012: 61–64. They consider several scenarios, including secondary insertion of lines 5-6 and re-ordering of lines. Already West 1997: 187 had suggested a transposition of lines, though his scheme (1, 2, 7, 8, 3, 4, etc.) differs from that of Kämmerer/Metzler (1, 2, 6, 3, 4, etc.).

[16] Kämmerer/Metzler 2012: 61.

[17] Streck 2014.

[18] Streck 2014: 392–93.

Streck's suggestion has a strong intuitive appeal, but the evidence he adduces does not seem sufficient. Streck cites several instances of triptotic/diptotic declension in the manuscripts of *Enūma eliš* I.1-10, which, however, do not amount to a representative sample. The question remains how the loss of case endings affected the composition and transmission of the poem more generally. Moreover, there is the matter of the statives *ki-iṣ-ṣu-ru* and *še-ʾ-ú*, which Streck argues should be taken as active and transitive forms governing *gi-pa-ra* and *ṣu-ṣa-a.* In support of this thesis he draws attention to the active stative *dalḫūnimma ... karassa*, "they jarred her belly," in *Enūma eliš* I.23, which certainly confirms that active statives do occur in the poem. But once again we are left to wonder how often the poet employs this feature, and how the extant manuscripts cope with it.

In the first half of this article I test Streck's claim that *gi-pa-ra* and *ṣu-sa-a* in *Enūma eliš* I.6 are accusatives governed by active statives *kiṣṣurū* and *šēʾū*. I do so by compiling the relevant data from the poem itself and analysing it in view of poetic context, content and structure. In the course of this procedure, I want to test the more general hypothesis that we can trust the manuscripts of *Enūma eliš* to preserve a text that we can actually construe – not just in *Enūma eliš* I.6, and not even just in the opening ten lines of the poem, but throughout. In other words, it is the possibility of verifying syntactical relationships that interests me here: if we can make progress with phenomena such as noun declension and grammatical agreement, then we can hope to read the poem with a confidence, and an attention to detail, that has not so far seemed possible. The second half of this article then explores in greater depth the potential benefits of such an approach by focussing on a passage which the poet himself introduces as an outstanding piece of verbal craft: Ea's soothing speech to Anšar in Tablet II.61-70. Modern readers have struggled to appreciate the artistry of this speech, for similar reasons that have hampered their reading of *Enūma eliš* I.1-10. Here too I argue that we *can* trust the transmitted text to a greater extent than readers have felt able to do in the past. If we do, we gain a better appreciation of what the poet himself thought was most valuable about his art.

Building trust

Returning, then, to *Enūma eliš* I.6, let me begin with the question of how we should construe the statives *ki-iṣ-ṣu-ru* and *še-ʾ-ú*. Many scholars, including the most recent editor of the text, see them as agreeing with the nouns *gi-pa-ra* and *ṣu-ṣa-a*. However, there are at least two difficulties with this analysis. First, if we accept that line 6 no longer depends on *enūma* in the opening line,[19] *ki-iṣ-ṣu-ru* looks like a 3rd person plural masculine of the Gt stative of *kaṣāru* (*kiṣṣurū*) – which does not obviously agree with *gi-pa-ra*. Likewise, the form *še-ʾ-ú* would most naturally be parsed as the 3rd person plural masculine of the G stative of *šêʾu* (*šēʾū*),[20] which is again not in obvious agreement with the form *ṣu-ṣa-a*. One might argue that subordination to *enūma* in line 1 still applies and that *ki-iṣ-ṣu-ru* and *še-ʾ-ú* in fact represent singular forms (*kiṣṣur*, *šēʾi*) in the subordinative.[21] Indeed, one scribe writes *ki-iṣ-ṣu-ra* and another *še-ʾ-i*, suggesting that they perhaps had singulars in mind.[22] But that still leaves *gi-*

---

[19] Thus Lambert 2013: 29, Streck 2014: 391–92.
[20] For the derivation from *šêʾu*, 'pad', rather than *šeʾû*, 'seek', see the literature cited in n. 11.
[21] Thus Kämmerer/Metzler 2012: 68–69. It seems less likely that *ki-iṣ-ṣu-ru* represents singular + ventive *-u*, though George 2003: 441 notes that this is common enough in Late Babylonian MSS.
[22] Caution is required here, for *ki-iṣ-ṣu-ra* may be a mere slip (NB *gi-pa-<u>ra</u> la ki-iṣ-ṣu-<u>ra</u>*) and *še-ʾ-i* just conceivably an attempt to spell the 3rd person pl. masc. MSS from Babylonia occasionally use syllabic signs of the type consonant + *i* to represent verb-final *-ū* or even *-û*: see *Enūma eliš* II.17 (*la-[a]b-bi ~ labbū* in Lambert's MS b), III.77 (*te-bi-ni ~ tebûni* MS b), VI.69 (*pa-aḫ-ri ~ paḫrū* MS c). Writing a separate 'i' (as in *še-ʾ-i*) is perhaps a different matter. Moreover, the manuscript that has *še-ʾ-i* in I.6 comes from Assur (Lambert's K), so we might not expect *-i* to represent *-ū*. Still, the possibility should not be discarded out of hand; for examples of

pa-ra and *ṣu-ṣa-a*, two forms that look like accusatives (*gipāra*, *ṣuṣâ*), not nominatives, as Lambert's translation, for example, requires.

I have mentioned that Kämmerer and Metzler are sceptical about taking the endings of *gi-pa-ra* and *ṣu-ṣa-a* seriously. It is true that the manuscripts of Standard Babylonian literary texts can be capricious in their spelling, and final short vowels in particular tend to fluctuate.[23] In *Enūma eliš* we occasionally see spellings in *-a* for expected nominative singular: for example, several manuscripts offer *um-ma* in I.133 and II.19 for what looks ostensibly like a noun in the nominative (~ *ummu*).[24] However, such spellings are rare, and Streck is right to inist that most manuscripts do retain either the full triptotic case system (*-u*, *-i*, *-a*) or its pared-down diptotic form (*-u*, *-i*, *-u*). This is true even of short case endings,[25] but it becomes a firm rule with vowel stem nouns and adjectives. Appendix I to this article shows that they *always* exhibit at least diptotic case endings in the manuscripts of *Enūma eliš* and in the vast majority of cases retain the full triptotic inflection. In other words, the form *ṣu-ṣa-a* can *only* be accusative (~ *ṣuṣâ*).[26]

Two things follow. First, *ṣuṣâ* cannot agree with *še-ʾ-ú*, or indeed the variant reading *še-ʾ-i*: there simply is no way in Akkadian of construing such a thing. Secondly, the parallel form *gi-pa-ra* must also be accusative, and cannot therefore agree with *ki-iṣ-ṣu-ru* (or, for that matter, the variant *ki-iṣ-ṣu-ra*). It is perhaps possible in theory that *gi-pa-ra* and *ṣu-ṣa-a* fulfil different grammatical functions in the sentence (thus Kämmerer/Metzler), but the obvious parallelism of form and rhythm seems to me to exclude that possibility in practice: *gipāra* and *ṣuṣâ* must both be accusatives, which in turn suggests that we should at least consider Streck's suggestion that they serve as objects to active and transitive *kiṣṣurū* and *šēʾū*. Kämmerer/Metzler suggested that active statives are rare ("selten sicher bezeugt"), but Appendix II to this article shows that there is no dearth of them in *Enūma eliš*. Consider I.21-25, only some fifteen lines after the passage under discussion. I quote the text in Lambert's edition, and with his translation:

21 abef ffKM	*in-nen-du-ma at-ḫu-ú ilāni*^{meš-ni}
22 abf ffKMR	*e-šu-ú ti-amat-ma* *na-ṣir-šú-nu iš-tab-bu*
23 abf ffKMR	*dal-ḫu-nim-ma šá ti-amat ka-ras-sa*
24 abf ffKMR	*i-na šu-ʾ-a-ri šu-ʾ-du-ru* *qí-rib an-dúru-na*
25 abfKkMR	*la na-ši-ir apsû ri-gim-šu-un*

---

consonant + *i* to represent verb-final *-ū* in manuscripts from Kuyunjik see George 2003: 441 (*ṣal-li* for *ṣallū* in VI.180, *áš-bi* for *ašbū* in XI.126).

[23] George 2003: 437–42 documents the situation in the Kuyunjik MSS of SB *Gilgameš*; for *Enūma eliš* see the brief remarks in Lambert 2013: 12.

[24] One MS from Assur in I.133 and two from Babylonia in II.19.

[25] The only other clear exception that I have found, apart from *um-ma* for *ummu* (above, n. 24), is a Sultantepe MS which spells *nap-šu-ra e-né-na* in a context that requires nominatives (VI.131). Other examples are less certain: in I.53, the forms [^d*m*]*u-um-ma*, [^d*mu-u*]*m-ma* in two MSS from Assur and Kish are perhaps intended to make Mummuthe object of the sentence; I.59 *it-pe-šá* in one MS from Assur appears to have arisen from false analogy with preceding *uzna* and/or contamination with passages like *Enūma eliš* VII.117; II.127 *ga-áš-ra*, one MS from Assur, was probably understood as an accusative goverened by *ilsīma* (II.129); III.52 *kit-mu-ra*, in two MSS from Kuyunjik and Babylonia, is perhaps a misguided attempt to construe with the subsequent noun (NB *kit-mu-ra ma-ag-šá-ra* in the Kuyunjik MS); VI.114 *ba-ʾu-ú-la-a-ta* in one MS from Kish looks like the accusative object in a sentence that has been deliberately remodelled (NB *lu-ú hi-is-su-su* in the same MS; cf. n. 104 below); VI.117 *it-pe-šá* in one Assur MS seems intended to spell a stative with ventive ending (thus Kämmerer/Metzler) rather than an adjective in the nominative singular; VII.147 *a-ba* for expected *a-bu* in a Babylonian MS looks like another case of deliberate remodelling, turning *aba* into the object of *lišāḫiz* (NB *ma-ri-iš* for *ma-ri* in the same MS).

[26] See the conclusion reached in Appendix I: 'there is not a single certain case of a nominative in the status rectus that ends in *-a*'.

26 abfKklM   *ù ti-amat šu-qám-mu-mat i-na maḫrī-šu-un*

21   The divine brothers came together,
22   Their clamour got loud, throwing Tiāmat into a turmoil.
23   They jarred the nerves of Tiāmat,
24   And by their dancing they spread alarm in Anduruna.
25   Apsû did not diminish their clamour,
26   And Tiāmat was silent when confronted with them.

Lambert takes the statives *ešû*, *dalḫūnimma*, *šu'durū*, *našir* to be active and transitive. He must surely be right: these forms cannot be interpreted in any other way.[27] The *Enūma eliš* poet was evidently prepared to use active statives even in clusters of several at a time. At the very least we can say that he did not avoid them when they suited his plans. What he did avoid was faulty agreement between a stative and its noun, faulty, that is, by the standards of second millennium grammar. So, a feminine singular noun in *Enūma eliš* always takes a stative in *-at*; a feminine plural noun requires *-ā*, masculine plural calls for *-ū*. We know this because the manuscripts, which in many cases are much more recent than the poem itself, adhere to these rules with surprising stubbornness. Whether they be Babylonian or Assyrian, of reputable Kuyunjik stock or from disreputable Sultantepe: as may be seen from the data collected in Appendix II, the picture is remarkably consistent. Even if we allow for one or two exceptions, or near-exceptions,[28] the cumulative case is, I believe, overwhelming: the statives in I.6 must be masculine plural forms in agreement with a masculine plural subject, *Apsû* and *Tiāmat*.

They are also likely to be active. As we have seen, the poet of *Enūma eliš* is not shy to employ active/transitive statives. That he has been using passive ones earlier in the text (*nabû*, *zakrat*) should not overly concern us: in *Enūma eliš* I.159 ~ II.45, III.49, III.107 he switches from passive to active usage within a single line (*innanu Qingu šušqû leqû anūtu* = "When Qingu had been elevated [passive] and taken over [active] the Anuship"). In I.6 a switch to active statives is facilitated by the syntactic parallel with *mêšunu… ihiqqūma* in I.5,[29] and by the overall thrust of the passage. Apsû and Tiāmat, the poet seems to warn us, should not be regarded as creator figures, despite their role in bringing the gods into existence (*zārûšun*, *muallidat gimrīšun*). Pastureland (*gipāru*) and reed thickets (*ṣuṣû*) provided crucial resources in ancient Mesopotamia,[30] and reed in particular was celebrated as a divine gift, also in the context of creation accounts.[31] But Apsû and Tiāmat are not interested in that.

---

[27] Kämmerer/Metzler agree that the first three statives are active. Their interpretation of the fourth as passive is not plausible, in my view ("durch Apsû war ihr Geschrei nicht vermindert").

[28] Notably the variant *al-ka* for expected *al-ku* in II.14, III.18, 76. For discussion see below, n. 98.

[29] Both Kämmerer/Metzler (2012: 57) and Lambert (2013: 29) prefer the preterite *iḫīqū* to the present *iḫiqqū*; but the latter seems closer to the required sense (not a unique event but a continuous process) and is in fact what the scribe of MS K (from Assur) writes (*i-ḫi-iq-qu-ma*, adopted by Talon 2005); see George 2016: 12, n. 36.

[30] In *Erra* I.83 the *gipāru* is described as the "life of the land," presumably because of its importance for keeping livestock; for *gipāru* = "pasture" see *CAD s.v.* 3. Reed was used not just as animal fodder but also as raw material for writing equipment (the stylus), household goods (mats, baskets etc.) and in construction (huts, boats, etc.); see *RA s.v.* "Schilf" § 5.

[31] In KAR 59: 35, an Akkadian incantation, Ea is praised for producing "plenty" (*ḫegallu*) in the reed thicket (*ṣuṣû*); cf. K 2867, *Rückseite* 2-3 (Streck): Ea released the springs during the reign of Assurbanipal, and the reed thicket (*ṣuṣû*) grew dense (*elēpu* Št). In the Sumerian dispute between *Bird and Fish*, Enki "knits together" reed marshes after establishing human civilisation: ETCSL 5.3.5 l. 13. The bilingual incantation known as *The Founding of Eridu* describes Marduk's creation of reed (Lambert 2013: 372–73, ll. 25-26).

They are content to mix their waters together and leave the formation of the world to others.[32] We might then translate:

> "(Apsû and Tiāmat) mingled their waters together
>   but did not mat pastureland, nor pad reed thickets."

If this is correct, Apsû and Tiāmat appear already here as the problematic characters they later turn out to be: they care only about each other, and their own affairs. The alternative would be to take *kiṣṣurū* and *šē'ū* as passive statives with *gipāra* and *ṣuṣâ* as accusatives of respect. Buccellati, for example, translates: "ungirdled as to meadows, undefined as to marsh reeds".[33] A more elegant realization of the same idea has been proposed by George (2016: 12):

> "Though mingling their waters together
>   They were not matted with reedbed, nor padded with canebreak."

George's translation is grammatically unobjectionable, for the stative can indeed be construed in this way. Moreover, *kiṣṣurū* (Gt) with accusative can mean "they are girt with,"[34] and may thus point to descriptions of a person's attire as the model behind the line.[35] Taking the passage in this way is not without problems, however. If "they are girt" is a plausible way of describing Apsû and Tiāmat, "they are padded" seems less promising: according to *CAD s.v.*, the verb *šê'u* is primarily used of stuffing beds, chairs and other pieces of furniture. Granted, the details of the description are not to be taken too literally, but the composite image of two beings attired in pastureland (like a person?) and padded with reed thickets (like a piece of furniture?) does seem to ask rather a lot of the reader. Another difficulty concerns the progression of thought from *Enūma eliš* I.5 to I.6. George sees a concessive relationship ("though", *-ma*) between Apsû and Tiāmat mingling their waters and being matted/padded, but this strikes me as less natural than assuming that they do one thing continuously, i.e. mix their waters together (*iḫiqqū*), and in the process (*-ma*) fail to attend to other matters.

Whether we should take *kiṣṣurū* and *šē'ū* as active or passive in *Enūma eliš* I.6 is difficult to determine with absolute certainty. I have made the case for active statives, but I cannot exclude the alternative translation suggested by George. Future research will perhaps settle the issue. For now, what matters more than eliminating all possible alternatives (an ambition which cannot always be achieved) is that we eliminate those readings that are impossible by the grammatical standards of the *Enūma eliš* poet and those who transmitted his text. It is impossible, for example, to construe *gi-pa-ra* and/or *ṣu-ṣa-a* as nominatives with

---

[32] Rowton's stative of "sustained care in the performance of action" provides a positive template for their negative approach; see Rowton 1962: 252–57, especially p. 254 (*sidirtu kalû ki-iṣ-ṣu-ru nārū šu-te-šu-ru*). Ea founds his "cella" (*gipāru*) in I.77, perhaps in a deliberate echo of the "pastureland" (*gipāru*) that Apsû and Tiāmat fail to establish; see Gabriel 2014: 116, n. 30. The verb *kaṣāru*, "fashion," is part of Marduk's repertoire as a creator god (V.49, VI.5). Tiāmat and her hordes merely "fashion" strife (II.2, VI.24, 30).

[33] Buccellati 1990: 127–28.

[34] *CAD s.v.* 5b.

[35] As the anonymous reviewer of this article points out. For the common construction involving the stative and items of attire (in a broad sense) in the accusative see, e.g., *labiš melammī* in *Enūma eliš* I.103, *naḫlapta ... ḫalipma* in IV.57, *melammī ... apir* in IV.58. Statives referring to parts of the body follow a similar pattern. Note *zaqtūma šinnu/-a/-i* in I.135, II.21, III.25, 83; *patûni šaptī* in IV.53. The latter two phrases illustrate well the grammatical and semantic flexibility of this type of idiom: while *zaqtūma šinnu/-a/-i* suggests a state qualified by an adverbial accusative ("were sharp of fang"), *patûni šaptī* more naturally implies a verbal action with an object ("had their lips open").

the statives *ki-iṣ-ṣu-ru* and *še-'-u* in *Enūma eliš* I.6. We can say this with some confidence because the evidence confirms that this is not something that the poet and his scribes do.

Once that much is accepted, we may reconsider some of the other problems that have dogged the opening lines of *Enūma eliš*. For example, the collocation *ši-ma-tú la ši-i-mu* in I.8 cannot be taken to mean "no destinies had been decreed," as Lambert and several other recent translators suggest:[36] *ši-i-mu* is not a way of spelling feminine *šīmā* in *Enūma eliš*, and masculine *šīmū* cannot agree with feminine *šīmātu*: as Appendix II demonstrates, there are simply no parallels for this sort of thing.[37] More generally, we can apply the findings of the discussion to other passages in the poem, and to phenomena other than the declension of nouns or the use of the stative. As we shall see in the second half of this article, there is plenty of work still to be done along these lines – work of clarifying grammatical relationships and of building trust in the manuscripts of *Enūma eliš*.

All this is not to say, of course, that the manuscripts are always equally reliable. Ancient scribes were capable of misunderstandings and lapses of concentration.[38]They also deliberately changed the transmitted text: the opening of *Enūma eliš*, for example, generated a wealth of variant readings which may result in part from a wish to clarify or otherwise improve the received text. Much of this activity was aimed precisely at the statives that have caused modern readers such difficulty. Consider MS K's attempt to convert the statives in lines 1-2 from passive into active: that would seem to be the point of reading *zakrū* at the end of line 2. Conversely, some manuscripts appear to favour passive statives in line 6: I have already mentioned the variant readings *kiṣṣura* and *šē'i*.[39] Two scribes took issue with the Gt stative *kiṣṣurū*, and replaced it with the more familiar D-form *kuṣṣurū*. In lines 5 and 10, two manuscripts from Babylon and Assur (Lambert's MSS ee and M) introduce what look like further statives (*ḫīqū*, *šutāpû*): the former is a school text and commands little authority, the latter too may simply have slipped up – but given the context even trivial errors of this kind seem telling.

It is evident, then, that *Enūma eliš* attracted a range of interpretations already in antiquity. Still, the received text emerges clearly from the variety,[40] and its grammatical contours are neither uncertain nor vague. We are now able to attempt a revised translation of the opening lines of the poem:

1	When the heavens above had not yet been named,
2	and earth beneath had not been called a name,
3	Apsû, the first one, their begetter,[41]

---

[36] Lambert 2013: 51 ("no destinies had been decreed"), Foster 2005: 439 ("none destinies (had been) ordained"), Dalley 2000: 233 ("nor (were) destinies decreed"). As the anonymous reader of this article points out, it is possible that the spelling *ši-ma-tu* (with var. *-ta*) should be interpreted as a singular with epenthetic vowel. If so, this would further undermine any attempt to take it with *ši-i-mu* at the end of the line.

[37] The question arises of how we translate *ši-ma-tú la ši-i-mu* if the stative does *not* agree with the noun. Once again we are faced with the alternative between an active stative with accusative object and a passive one with adverbial accusative. Recent scholars tend to opt for the latter solution: "als (noch) keine Götter ... mit Schicksalen bestimmt waren" (Kämmerer/Metzler 2012: 110); "when the gods ... had not been given (their) destinies" (Streck 2014: 394); "sie waren mit Festsprechungen (noch) nicht bedacht" (Gabriel 2014: 252). Since it is not normally the gods who are fixed with fates in Mesopotamian thought, but the fates that are fixed by the gods, *ilāni šīmātu lā šīmū* ought to mean "the gods had not fixed the destinies," with *šīmū* yet again interpreted as an active/transitive stative. For *šīmtu* and associated activities in *Enūma eliš* see Gabriel 2014: 249–68.

[38] Worthington 2012, esp. pp. 68–70, on the "somnolent" scribe.

[39] Though again with the caveat that *ki-iṣ-ṣu-ra* may be a simple mistake (see *gi-pa-ra*) and *še-'-i* an attempt to spell the 3rd person masc. pl.; see above n. 22.

[40] *Pace* Kämmerer/Metzler 2012: 74–76. They are right that we do not have *the* text of *Enūma eliš*, but they seem to me to go too far in suggesting that "there are only *Enūma eliš*'s" (p. 74: "es gibt nur *Enūma elîš*e").

[41] Or: "There was Apsû, the first one, their begetter …" (existential clause).

4	and creative Tiāmat, who bore them all,
5	mingled their waters together
6	and did not knit togethermeadowland or pad reed thicket.[42]
7	When the gods had not yet emerged, none of them,
8	nor acquired their names, nor decreed the destinies,[43]
9	then gods were created within them:
10	Laḫmu and Laḫāmu appeared and were called by name.

If correct, this reading of *Enūma eliš* I.1-10 suggests a different emphasis from that of most current translations. The protagonists' actions (or lack thereof) stand out more starkly: Apsû and Tiāmat do not just mix their waters together (I.5) but also fail to get on with the business of creation (I.6). It seems to me that these points are worth considering in their own right, but the more important gain of my discussion lies arguably elsewhere: by restoring grammatical certainty at the beginning of *Enūma eliš*, we restore confidence in the text, and in our ability to read it closely. Basic rules of spelling and grammar do apply. If we establish what they are, we can be confident that we will grasp the meaning of the poem.

Ea's soothing words

So far I have emphasised the relationship between the modern reader and *Enūma eliš*, and the importance of building trust that the text can be reliably construed. I now turn to a passage where a careful analysis of spelling and grammar, in conjunction with a close reading of content and poetic structure, can, I believe, materially change our understanding of the text. We are in Tablet II of the epic: Tiāmat has created her monsters and Ea has brought news of her machinations to Anšar, the current champion of the gods. Anšar is appalled:

49 CDeGgJk	*iš-me-ma an-<šár> a-ma-tú ma-gal dal-ḫat*
50 CDegJk	*ù'-a iš-ta-si ša-pat-su it-taš-ka*
51 CDegJ	*ez-ze-et kab-ta-as-su la na-ḫat ka-ras-su*
52 CDegJ	*e-li ᵈé-a b[u]-uk-ri-šu šá-gi-ma-šú uš-taḫ-ḫa-aḫ*
53 CDeJg	*ma-ri šá te-e[g-ru]-ú tu-qun-tum*
54 CDegJ	*mi-im-mu-ú i-du-uk-ka [te]-pu-šu i-taš-ši at-ta*
55 CDegJ	*ta-'-i-ra-am-[m]a apsâ ta-na-ra*
56 CDgJ	*ù ti-amat šá tu-[š]a-gi-gu a-li ma-ḫír-šá*

49	Anšar heard; the matter was profoundly disturbing.
50	He cried "Woe!" and bit his lip.
51	His heart was in fury, his mind could not be calmed.
52	Over Ea his son his cry was faltering.
53	"My son, you who provoked the war.
54	Take responsibility for whatever you alone have done!
55	You set out and killed Apsû,
56	And as for Tiāmat, whom you made furious, where is her equal?"[44]

Anšar holds Ea responsible for Tiāmat's rebellion, and insists that he must set things right. In response, Ea soothes his grandfather and defends his own actions:

65 CgJ	*e-nim-me-e a-ta-mu-ka sur-riš nu-ḫa-am-ma*

---

[42] Or, less likely: "but were not matted with pastureland nor padded with reed thicket" (passive).

[43] Interpreting *šīmū* as an active stative. Alternatively: "nor had their destinies fixed" (passive).

[44] Text and trans. Lambert 2013: 66–67.

66 CgJ	*ki-i a-mat du-un-qu e-pu-šú šu-du-ud lib-bu-uk-ka*
67 CgJ	*la-am a-na-ku ap-sa-a a-na-ra-am-ma*
68 CgJ	*[m]a-an-na i-ta-mar-ma i-na-an-na an-na-a-ti*
69 CgJ	*la-am ur-ri-ḫa-am-ma ú-bal-lu-ú šu-a-ti*
70 CgJ	*lu-ú ša-a-ši uš-ḫal-li-qa mi-[n]a-am ba-ši-ma*

65	"I want to say something to you, calm down for a moment
66	And consider that I performed a helpful deed.
67	Before I killed Apsû
68	Who could have seen the present situation?
69	Before I quickly made an end of him,
70	What were the circumstances were I to destroy him?"[45]

Ea's argument evidently hits the mark, for Anšar is immediately appeased:

71 gJ	*iš-me-ma an-šár a-ma-tú i-ṭib el-[š]u*
72 gJ	*ip-šá-aḫ lib-ba-šú-ma a-na* ^d*é-a i-zak-[kà]r*
73 gJ	*ma-ri ep-še-ta-ka i-liš na-ṭ[a-a-m]a*

71	Anšar heard, the word pleased him
72	His heart relaxed to speak to Ea,
73	"My son, your deeds are fitting for a god ..."[46]

Ea has brought about a complete change of heart in Anšar: whereas the report of Tiāmat's revolt had been "utterly distressing" to him (*amātu magal dalḫat*),[47] Ea's speech has had a "pleasing" effect (II.71, *amātu iṭīb elšu*). Before the speech, Anšar was in a paroxysm of rage and fear (II.50, *u'a*), now he is at peace with himself (II.72, *ipšaḫ libbašūma*): *pašāḫu* is not just a generic term for describing contented gods throughout Akkadian epic, but more specifically acts as a powerful driver of the plot in *Enūma eliš*.[48] The effect of Ea's speech confirms the poet's own introduction of it as a triumph of rhetoric:

57 CDgJ	*a-ši-iš mi-il-ki ru-bé-e ta-šim-ti*
58 CDg	*ba-nu-ù né-me-qu ilu* ^d*nu-dím-mud*
59 CgJ	*a-ma-tu₄tap-šu-uḫ-tum sè-qar ta-né-ḫi*
60 CgJ	*an-šár a-ba-šu ṭa-bi-iš ip-pal*

57	The gatherer of counsel, the learned prince,
58	The creator of wisdom, the god Nudimmud
59	With soothing words and calming utterance
60	Gently answered [his] father Anšar.[49]

---

[45] Text and trans. Lambert *loc. cit.*: as will become apparent, Lambert's translation is problematic in some respects.

[46] Text and trans. Lambert *loc. cit.*

[47] For *dalāḫu* as a symptom of crisis and disturbance see also I.23, 108-109, 116, IV.48.

[48] Apsû cannot find rest (*pašāḫu*, I.38); is advised to find rest (*pašāḫu*, I.50); and is eventually put to rest against his will (*pašāḫu*, I.63). Ea, Anu and Marduk must put Tiāmat to rest (*pašāḫu*, II.77, 100, 102, 150). The gods are initially restless (I.110), but Marduk gives them rest (*pašāḫu*, VI.52 and 54; VI.8 and VII.10 *šunu lū pašḫū*; VI.12 *aššu tapšuḫti ša ilāni*; VI.26 *pašāḫiš tušbā*; VI.130 *šunu ippašḫū*; VI.136 *mušapšiḫu Igigî*); for discussion see Gabriel 2014, esp. pp. 120-125, 127-128, 132, 163-166, 202-203, 208.

[49] Text and trans. Lambert 2013: 66–67.

This is a stunning build-up, and Anšar's reaction confirms that Ea lives up to it. Notice particularly *ipšaḫ libbašūma* in II.72, which takes up *amāt tapšuḫti* in II.59; and *amātu iṭīb elšu* in II.71, which takes up *ṭābiš ippal* in II.60. If Mummu's speech in I.49-50 was introduced (and received) as a perverse discourse that further unhinges an already agitated ruler,[50] Ea's "soothing discourse" (*amāt tapšuḫti*) is clearly meant as a positive model for human speakers to emulate. *Enūma eliš* was always intended to be used in education, and we know that it was in fact extensively taught in school.[51] We can easily imagine a teacher pointing out the wisdom of Ea's speech and contrasting it with the folly of Mummu's. In an autocratic culture, as Assyria and Babylon were throughout the ancient reception of *Enūma eliš*, how to placate an angry superior must have been among the more important lessons the poet had to impart. But what exactly is so good about Ea's speech, and why is it so successful? Can we appreciate it as the rhetorical tour de force it supposedly is? Unfortunately, there have been problems.

Ea's speech is carefully structured: after four lines of address (II.61-64), there follow two lines that announce the central message (II.63-64). Four further lines round off the speech by defending Ea's previous actions (II.67-70). Each section thus contributes to the overall effect of soothing Anšar and vindicating Ea: the opening lines restore Anšar's sense of control, in a situation where he has been overwhelmed by adversity.[52] Ea then announces the substantive part of his speech in language that recalls the poet's own introduction. The focus is still on soothing his addressee,[53] but the emphasis has shifted, from Ea's current words to his previous actions. These too, he claims, were "good" (*amāt dunqi*).

That is a difficult case to make under the circumstances, and it calls for the full array of Ea's rhetorical tricks. A good example of his cunning is the fact that, having twice addressed Anšar as possessing "a wide heart" (*libbu rūqu*),[54] Ea appeals to Anšar's heart when offering a justification for his previous actions (II.66, *šudud libbukka* ~ "(that I did well) ... consider favourably in your heart"). Anšar "of the wide heart," it would seem, proves himself worthy of his epithet by endorsing Ea's view of events. This is effective rhetoric, by any standard. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said about lines 67-70, as currently understood. Ea there takes up Anšar's charge that his killing of Apsû (see II.55 *Apsâ tanāra*; II.67 *Apsâ anāramma*) had dreadful consequences. He counters this by pointing out that no-one could have foreseen what would happen next. So far so good, but this is hardly the case that Ea said he was going to make when he claimed that his actions were in fact beneficial. That point, it would seem, must emerge in the climactic final couplet of the speech. However, the meaning of that couplet is far from clear. This is how the first editors, Andrew George and Faruk Al-Rawi translated the lines (George/Al-Rawi 1990: 154):

"Before I myself with speed put an end to him,

---

[50] Note the poet's comments in I.48 (Mummu speaks like an enemy, *lā māgiru*) and 52 (Apsû is pleased "because he plotted evil," *aššu lemnēti ikpudu*).

[51] See the poet's own remarks on transmitting Marduk's fifty names in VII.145-148. For use of *Enūma eliš* in the scribal curriculum see Gesche 2001: 177–78; for the *Sitz im Leben* of the work more generally see Gabriel 2014: 29–106, who emphasises the role of the Marduk priests in Babylon.

[52] Ea twice addresses him as someone "who decrees destiny" and "who has the power to bring into being and to destroy." Anšar is faced with a situation where Tiāmat "creates everything" (I.133, etc.) and Qingu "fixes the destinies for the gods his sons" (I.160 etc.) – so to reassure him that he is in charge of destinies, creation and destruction is an effective rhetorical ploy on Ea's part.

[53] The injunction *nūḫamma* in II.65 takes up *siqar tanēḫi* in II.59 (which in turn echoes II.51, *lā nāḫat karassu*); *kī amāt dunqi ēpušu* in II.66 develops the idea of a 'good' speech in II.60 (*ṭābiš ippal*).

[54] *Enūma eliš* II.61, 63. Lambert's translation "deep mind" is preferable to Kämmerer/Metzler's "fernes Herz;" the point is not distance but mental capacity. Anšar shares this epithet only with Marduk at the height of his power: VII.118 and 155.

destroyed him indeed, what was there?"

It has been established that the end of line 69 reads *šuāti*, not *iāti*, as George and Al-Rawi thought (whence their translation "I myself")[55] – but the real problem with their translation lies arguably elsewhere: as a culmination to Ea's otherwise brilliant speech these lines seem curiously underwelming. Subsequent translators have understandably sought to enliven proceedings. Here is Lambert (2013: 67):

> "Before I quickly made an end of him
> What were the circumstanceswere I to destroy him?"

This is certainly more lively than George/Al-Rawi, but Ea did in fact destroy Apsû, so the question arises of why he now considers the circumstances "were he to destroy him."One possible answer might be that lines 69-70 still depend, however indirectly, on the question *manna ītamar* in line 68: "Who (fore)saw ... before I quickly made an end of him what were the circumstances were I to destroy him?" That resolves the immediate problem of Ea contradicting himself but it still seems longwinded, syntactically awkward and rhetorically weak. Construing the couplet in this way would overload the verb *ītamar* and compromise the parallel structure of lines 67 and 69. Moreover, it would do nothing to strengthen Ea's case, for the fact that it was he who killed Apsû was of course never in question.

Other translators have sought to avoid the charge of redundancy by introducing a different cast of characters. Here is how Stephanie Dalley understands the concluding couplet of Ea's speech (2000: 241):

> "Before I can rush up and extinguish him (Qingu)
> He will surely have destroyed me! Then what?"

Replacing Apsû with Qingu makes the end of Ea's speech seem less redundant. However, the sudden intrusion of another god is ill motivated and creates fresh grammatical difficulties: *urriḫamma* ought to be past tense, and *ušḫalliqa* cannot mean "he will have destroyed me." All in all, this solution seems no less problematic than Lambert's. Benjamin Foster suggests the following translation (2005: 448):

> "Ere I was the one who moved quickly to snuff out his life,
> I indeed, for it was I who destroyed him, [wh]at was occurring?"

Foster takes seriously the past tenses in lines 69-70, but like Lambert he struggles with the seemingly redundant first half of line 70. He reads that section as a parenthesis, with Ea insisting that he was the one to kill Apsû ("I indeed, for it was I ..."). Rhetorically, there seems no call for that, nor does the Akkadian text justify such a strong emphasis on the first person singular (*šâši* certainly does not mean "I"). Talon translates as follows (2005: 84):

> "avant que je ne me hâte pour l'anéantir par moi-même
> – car lui, je l'ai fait disparaître! – qu'est-ce qui existait?"

---

[55] For the correct reading see Lambert 2013: 66. Grammatical considerations confirm that Lambert's reading is correct, for *yāti* cannot be nominative in *Enūma eliš*; cf. III.14 (accusative object), 57 (after preposition, *ana yāti*), 72 (accusative object), V.26 (accusative object, in broken context), VII.140 (after preposition, *kīma yāti*). In the nominative, the poet consistently uses *anāku* (II.67 and *passim*).

Talon's translation of line 69 is still based on George/Al-Rawi's text that has since been superseded (*ú-bal-lu-ú-šu ia-ti* for correct *ú-bal-lu-ú šu-a-ti*). His rendering of line 70 seems closer to the Akkadian than either Dalley's or Foster's, but yields no better sense. Kämmerer/Metzler also read *ú-bal-lu-ú-šu ia-ti* in line 69 and arrive at a similar translation (2012: 163):

> "Bevor ich ihn meinerseits schnell auslöschte,
>   Ich ihn wahrlich vernichtete, was war (da)?"

This is again problematic, both as a translation and as a text. In sum, none of the existing translations of *Enūma eliš* II.69-70 are satisfactory. The main difficulty is grammatical: it just isn't clear how line 70 works. The grammatical problems are further compounded by the fact that existing translations do not make for a compelling climax to Ea's otherwise carefully crafted speech. Should we conclude that Babylonian readers thought this was good enough? And if we do, are we not in danger of conceding that what seemed excellent to the Babylonians falls well short of what we might consider so? For it should be remembered that Ea's speech in *Enūma eliš* II.61-70 really is framed by the poet as the best possible example of its kind.[56] The most brilliant speech by the most brilliantly clever god delivered in one of the most important texts of Babylonian literature – this is not the kind of context where we should have to put up with clunky grammar or stodgy phrasing. We might decide that the transmitted text is corrupt, but what we have before us does not *look* corrupt, and in any case, emendation can only be contemplated once we have exhausted all other possibilities. Let us then return to the text as we have it, and see if better sense cannot be gotten out of it.

Even without fully understanding the end of Ea's speech, we can still appreciate that it is crafted with extreme care. Line 69 echoes the language and thought of line 67: *lām* at the beginning of line 69 corresponds to *lām* at the beginning of 67; *uballû* ("I extinguished/finished," in the subordinative) takes up *anāramma* ("I killed"); *šuāti* refers back to *Apsâ*. The two couplets are not just similar, but meant to *look* similar – which suggests that we are invited to consider the differences between them.

The first thing to note here is a subtle shift in emphasis: *bullû* in Akkadian can mean "destroy," but it is not simply a synonym of *nâru*, "kill." Rather, its basic sense is "extinguish" (of fire, disease or fever) or "stop" (of attacks or quarrels); the *Enūma eliš* poet himself uses the verb of someone dealing with a developing crisis in IV.62 (of countering poison) and VII.45 (of meeting an enemy attack).[57] Our *uballû*, then, suggests a sense of urgency that was absent from line 67: Apsû was not just killed, but had to be stopped. The same sense of urgency shows in the verb *urriḫamma*, "I rushed." In combination, *urriḫamma* and *uballû* suggest that Apsû posed what modern pundits might call "a live threat."[58] The

---

[56] Lest it be objected that speech introductions in Akkadian epic tend to be formulaic and do not therefore carry any real significance, contrast how the poet frames other speeches in *Enūma eliš* (not always by way of a formal speech introduction): **I**.29-30, 33-36, 105-106, 109-112, 137-138, 151-152, 157-158, 159-160; **II**.9-10, 49-52, 71-72, 83-84, 95-96, 107-108, 127-130, 135-138, 153-154; **III**.1-2, 11-12, 13-14, 67-70, 125-126; **IV**.1-2, 19-20, 27-28, 29-30, 71-72, 75-76; **V**.13-14, 79, 87-88, 107-108, 111, 113-114, 117-118, 151-152; **VI**.1-4, 11-12, 17-20, 27-28, 45-48, 55-56, 70-71, 84-87, 95-101, 121-122, 157-158, 161-162; **VII**.137-138. As may be seen from these passages, the poet uses elaborate speech introductions elsewhere, especially in connection with Marduk (e.g. II.135-138, VI.17-20), but he never uses them to praise the speaker *qua* speaker in quite the way he does in II.57-60.

[57] The latter passage is particularly instructive: Marduk as Šazu-Suḫgirim "quashes" (*bullû*) any wicked enemy who "sets out" (*âru*) against him. Anšar had accused Ea of "setting out" to kill Apsû (*âru*, II.55). Ea, by contrast, implies that he was quashingan imminent attack (*bullû*, II.69).

[58] For similar sentiments, expressed in similar language, see Ea's second speech to Anšar, esp. II.95 (*lām qātīša ummidu ana muḫḫīni*) and Anšar's speech to Anu a few lines later (esp. II.99, *aruḫma*). By that point, it is Tiāmat who needs confronting urgently.

problem is not that Ea made a decision to go ahead and kill Apsû on the basis of limited intelligence, but rather that there was no time for deliberation, and no real choice: the threat that was Apsû *had* to be countered there and then.

Where does that leave us with line 70? The answer to that question rests in large measure on how we interpret the pronoun *šâši*. Modern translators generally take it to refer to Apsû, but grammatical considerations suggest otherwise. Historically, Akkadian had separate forms for the oblique cases of the masculine and feminine independent pronouns in the singular, (masc. *šuāti - šuāšim*; fem. *šiāti - šiāšim*) which, after contraction of the central vowels, became indistinguishable (*šâti - šâši*(*m*)).[59] By the later second millennium BCE, when *Enūma eliš* was probably composed,[60] distinct forms for the masculine and feminine pronoun had re-emerged.[61] The manuscripts of SB *Gilgameš* are remarkably consistent in using *šâši* for the 3rd person singular feminine and *šâšu* for the corresponding masculine form (Appendix III, Section 2). There is less opportunity for using feminine pronouns in *Enūma eliš*, but I believe a strong case can be made that here too *šuāšu/šâšu* is normally masculine; and that, where *šâši* is written, this *must* be interpreted as a feminine form.

I study relevant forms of the 3rd person singular pronoun in *Enūma eliš* in Section 1 of Appendix III. As may be seen from the analysis offered there, the masculine form in *Enūma eliš* is *šâšu/šuāšu*, in line with usage in SB *Gilgameš*. Twice we find *šuātu/-ti* instead. The scribes never write *ša-a-ši ~ šâši* for the masculine form.[62] They once do the opposite: in VI.36 we find *šâšu* (masc.) in several manuscripts, despite the fact that a feminine form is expected.[63] Perhaps the line is to be construed *ad sensum*, with preceding *amēlūtu* (fem.) ~ *amēlu* (masc.). Or perhaps the point is rather that the grammatical relationships are unproblematic in this case, so that the gender of the pronoun did not require clarification. In VI.94 the feminine form helps the reader establish that the person being enthroned is the Bow Star, *Qaštu*, not Marduk:[64] the scribe of a Kyunjik commentary writes [*šâš*]*i* while two Assyrian MSS offer *šuāša/šâša*.[65] The latter is a respectable alternative form of the feminine pronoun (cf. the variant in SB *Gilgameš* I.165) and the preferred way of spelling it in the *Descent of Ištar*.[66] What matters here is not whether the poet used *šâši* or *šâša* or both, but that he avoided *šâšu* where this had the potential of creating confusion. In VI.94 a recognizably feminine form certainly helped to clarify matters. In II.70 it was not just helpful but essential if a reference to anyone other than Apsû was intended.

And that, I argue, is why the poet wrote *šâši*, not *šâšu*: the form must be feminine, not masculine, and can *not* therefore refer to Apsû. The previous pronoun, which does refer to him, makes the point by contrast: as may be seen from Appendix III, the *Enūma eliš* poet

---

[59] *GAG* §41 f.

[60] The precise date of composition is still debated. Kämmerer/Metzler 2012: 16–21 argue for the Kassite period; Lambert 2013: 439–463 advocates a somewhat later date, under Nebuchadnezzar I.

[61] *GAG* §41 i lists *šuāti/šuātu/šātu* foraccusative and genitive; and *šuāšu/šâšu* (masculine) and *šuāši/šâši/šâša* (feminine) for the dative. However, in *Enūma eliš* (and SB *Gilgameš*) *šâšu/šuāšu* and *šâši/šâša/šuāša* are used for all oblique cases of the personal pronoun.

[62] At *Enūma eliš* I.148 Lambert reads the variant *ša-a-š*[*á*] in his manuscript b, from Babylonia, in a context where a masculine form is required. Kämmerer/Metzler read the same MS *ša-a-*[*šu*].

[63] Note also the possible variants *šâša*, *šâšun* in MSS from Uruk and Tell Haddad: see below, n. 145.

[64] One might argue that *ultēšibši* at the end of the line would have sufficed to clarify matters, but the author evidently felt the need to be clear from the start. *Pace* Lambert, *ultēšibši* must refer to the Bow Star ("he sat her down," with Dalley, Foster, Talon), not the throne ("he set it down").

[65] MSS H from Kuyunjik (*šuāša*) and M from Sultantepe (*šâša*). Another variant, *šá-a-šú ~ šâšu* (Lambert's MS h, Tell Haddad), is perhaps the result of a misunderstanding (i.e. construing with Marduk, not Qaštu), though a simple error is also possible: compare SB *Gilgameš* I.294, where the (Babylonian) variant reading *šâšu* is clearly inferior.

[66] *Descent* 75A and 126A B (Lapinkivi); cf. *Erra* II B.21.

does not normally treat *šuātu* as a personal pronoun but uses *šâšu* instead.[67] He breaks this rule on two occasions, in II.69 (of the defeated Apsû), and in IV.120 (again with reference to a defeated enemy of the gods, Qingu).[68] Whatever other connotations *šuātu* may carry in these contexts ("that one"?), it certainly has the effect of drawing a distinction with *šâši* in II.69-70, in a way that the regular form *šâšu* would not have done. There is Apsû, and there is somebody else – but who?

The obvious candidate is Tiāmat, who was the focus of Anšar's earlier speech (see II.56) and whom Ea has every reason to include in his. At first glance, it seems unlikely that she can be meant in II.70, for Ea did not of course kill Tiāmat, so *lū šâši ušḫalliqa* cannot mean "I did indeed kill her." But as Lambert's translation already implies ("were I to destroy"), the particle *lū* is used in Akkadian not just to make firm assertions but also to express a range of other nuances, including wishes, concessions and unreal clauses.[69] An impressive example of the latter may be found in SB *Gilgameš* VII.47-55 (George):

> *lu-u i-de* ^giš^*dalat*(ig) *ki-i an-nu-ú* [*gi-mil-k*]*i*? :
> KIMIN (= *lū īde dalat kī annû*) *du-muq-k*[*i*]
> *lu-ú áš-ši pa-a-šú lu-ú ak-ki*!(KU)-*sa k*[*a-a-ši*]
> *a-ma lu-ú ú-šar-ki-ba* [*a-n*]*a*é.babb[ar.ra]
> [*ana*] é.babbar.ra! *bīt*(é) ^d^*šá-maš lu ú-š*[*á-bi-lak-ki*? :]
> [*ina* (x) x] é.babbar.ra ^giš^*erēna*(eren) *lu-ú az-q*[*up*]
> [*ina*] *bābi*(ká)-*šú lu-u uš-zi-za an-za-*[*a ... :*]
> [...]x x *né-re-bi-ki lu-*[(*u*) x x]
> [*l*]*u-u am-*x[x (x)]x x[x] *šá āli*(uru) ^d^*šá-*[*maš*]

> Had I but known, O door, that this would be *your* [*reward*,]
>   had I but known, O door, that this would be your bounty,
> I would have picked up an axe, I would have cut you down
>   I would have shipped you by raft to E-babbara.
> [To E-babbara], the temple of Šamaš, I would have *brought* [you,]
>   I would have set [up] the cedar [*in the* ...] of E-babbarra.
> [At] its gate I would have stationed Anzû [...,]
>   [...] your entrance I would have [...]
> I would have ... [...] the city [...] Šamaš[70]

One may debate how best to translate each individual instance of *lū* in this rich and slightly lacunose passage. What seems clear is that Enkidu embarks on a sustained thought experiment: what might have been if (*lū*) he had known the future? Just so, I suggest that Ea in *Enūma eliš* invites Anšar to consider what might have been if (*lū*) he had killed Tiāmat – though in contrast with Enkidu he implies, not that things might have gone better, but that they might have gone considerably worse. We know, and have before us, the consequences of his killing Apsû (*inanna annâti* II.68). We can only speculate what would have happened had Ea not taken this course of action – hence the rhetorical question *mīnâ bašīma*, which is both suitably vague (we cannot strictly know what would have happened) and suitably ominous

---

[67] For a similar approach see SB *Gilgameš* (Appendix III, Section 2); the *Erra* poet, by contrast, routinely uses *šâšu* etc. as a demonstrative pronoun.

[68] Note also the variant reading *šuātu* (Assur) for *šâšu* at II.34, again of Qingu.

[69] *GAG* § 152f and 158c.

[70] The translationis taken from George 2003: 637.

(we can only imagine that it would have been worse) to make for an effective climax to Ea's speech.[71] A similar question is put to the assembled gods in *Erra* V.10-17 (Cagni):

> *ki-i a-gir ṣe-e-ni im-mer pa-ni ú-še-la ina pit-qi*
> *ki-i la za-qip ṣi-pa-ti a-na na-ka-si ul ú-ma-aq*
> *ki-i šá-lil māti ki-na u rag-gi ul ú-maš-ša-a ú-šam-qat*
> *ina pi-i lab-bi na-'i-r[i] ul ik-ki-mu šá-lam-tú*
> *ù a-šar iš-te-en ra-'i-bu šá-nu-ú ul i-ma-al-li[k-šú]*
> *<šá>la* ᵈ*i-šum a-lik maḫ-ri-ia mi-nu-ú ba-ši-ma*
> *a-li za-nin-ku-nu e-nu-ku-nu a-a-in-na*
> *a-li nin-da-bi-ku-nu e te-eṣ-ṣi-na qut-rin-na*

> Like a hired shepherd I drive out the ram from the flock.
> Like one who has never planted an orchard, I will not hesitate to cut it down.
> Like someone who plunders a country I hack down the good and the bad without discrimination.
> One cannot pull a carcass from the mouth of a roaring lion;
> and where one man runs riot another cannot offer [him] counsel.
> Without Išum who goes before me, what would be?
> Where would be your provisioner, where indeed your *ēnu* priest?
> Where your food offerings? You would no longer smell incense![72]

As Erra considers his own ferocious character he poses the question of what might be, *mīnû bašīma*, if it was left unchecked. We know that the *Erra* poet was in close dialogue with *Enūma eliš*,[73] and it is possible that his protagonist's speech in Tablet V was inspired directly by Ea's in *Enūma eliš* II. Certainly, the verbal echo is suggestive (*mīnâ bašīma~ mīnû bašīma*). However, what matters here is not direct borrowing, which is in any case hard to prove, but rather the fact that *mīnâ/û bašīma* can clearly mean what I have argued it ought to mean in *Enūma eliš*: "what would (now) be if a different course of action been taken?" The parallel confirms not only that Akkadian poets were capable of formulating sophisticated thought experiments, but also that their characters make rhetorical use of this conceit in just the way that I have argued happens in Ea's speech in *Enūma eliš* II. We are now ready to attempt a new translation of the concluding couplet:

> If (modal *lū*), before hastening to extinguish <u>him</u>
> I had destroyed <u>her</u>, what would (now) be?

We know from Tablet I of *Enūma eliš* that Apsû was highly dangerous before (*lām*) Ea defeated him; and we also know that Tiāmat was not dangerous *at that time*.[74] True, she *is* posing a greater threat now (*inanna*) than he did then, but that is only because, in the meantime, she has had reason to get angry and time to gather strength. How much more dangerous would Apsû have been had he been left unchallenged and/or further provoked by an attack on Tiāmat?[75] This is the argument we were promised in *Enūma eliš* II.66: Ea did not

---

[71] We may contrast Enkidu's much more confident prediction in SB *Gilgameš* VI.156: *u kâši lū akšudkīma kī šâšūma lū ēpuški* – "You too, if (*lū*) I had caught you, I would (*lū*) have treated you just like it!."
[72] My own translation, with generous help from the anonymous reader for this journal.
[73] Wisnom 2014: 233–40.
[74] She defended the gods *against* Apsû in I.41-46.
[75] Appealing to the listener's imagination by posing a rhetorical question is among the oldest of all known rhetorical techniques. In classical antiquity, it was much discussed in rhetorical treatises (e.g., Quint. *Inst.* 9.2.6-

just act in good faith but actually did what was best in the circumstances (*kī amāt dunqi ēpušu šudud libbukka*). In order to persuade Anšar that he acted in the gods' best interests, as we know he succeeds in doing from Anšar's response,[76] he insists that there were only two options: kill Apsû immediately and deal with the consequences; or kill Tiāmat (first) and face a potentially much worse scenario. The use of temporal markers (*lām*) to take us back to the moment when Apsû was plotting to destroy the gods; the urgent nature of that threat (*urriḫamma uballû*); the stark alternative between "him" (*šuāti*) and "her" (*šâši*); and the vaguely menacing tone of the concluding question – all this seems calculated to make the point that, given the circumstances, killing Apsû was indeed an *amāt dunqi*. That, it seems to me, *is* sound rhetoric, especially as it allows Ea to smuggle in an answer to Anšar's initial question: who is to confront Tiāmat?[77] As the one who disposed of Apsû in the nick of time, Ea himself is ideally placed to do the same with her.

Ea's peroration is rhetorical rather than strictly logical, and remains vague on certain key points. He does not commit to saying what would have happened had he not killed Apsû, and he does not even name Tiāmat. Instead, he focuses on refuting Anšar's claim that he needlessly killed Apsû and thus created a problem that was entirely of his own making.[78] Ea concedes that the situation which has arisen is not ideal, but Anšar should ask himself what the alternative would have been (*mīnâ bašīma*). I started this section by pointing out that Ea's speech is framed by the poet himself as the ultimate feat of rhetoric in a society where hierarchies are fixed and power differentials real, and threatening: his is the first, and finest, example of a subordinate's 'soothing discourse' to his irate master, the cosmic blueprint, as it were, for scores of other such speeches in real time. If my interpretation is correct, then its concluding lines contribute to making it such a powerful model for humans to emulate: with efficiency and discretion Ea absolves himself, deals with Tiāmat and puts Anšar back in charge by allowing him to embrace the reality that is before him. Direct and engaging, yet at the same time cunningly oblique, these lines make for a fitting climax to a brilliant speech.

Conclusion

I began this article by reflecting on the sense of frustration that can take hold of modern readers of *Enūma eliš*: we do now have the text, but our hope that it will speak to us is often thwarted. In response to this impasse, I have argued two main points. First, the transmitted text of *Enūma eliš* does allow reliable judgments about how it should be construed, provided we take the time to collect and review the relevant data. This concerns individual passages such as *Enūma eliš* I.1-10 but also entire grammatical phenomena such as the stative which, depending on context, may express a range of temporal relationships and be read as either active or passive. I have argued that the spelling of the manuscripts (and of the poet in as much as we can reconstruct it) is overall reasonably consistent, and that the rules of Akkadian grammar still apply: if we apply them with confidence and rigour, we are likely to arrive at a more satisfactory reading of the text.

My reading of *Enūma eliš* I.1-10 did not suggest a startlingly new interpretation of those lines. However, and that was my second point, real progress can be made at the level of interpretation, too. To illustrate this claim, I looked at a passage that the poet himself

---

11). Babylonian literature lacked a meta-discourse, but texts like SB *Gilgameš* confirm that the practice was highly developed (e.g., SB *Gilg.* X.120-125 ~ 220-225). The poet of *Enūma eliš* does not portray Ea as its inventor (for an earlier instance see *Enūma eliš* I.45), but certainly as its most effective exponent.

[76] See II.73 ~ 75 *epšētūka iliš naṭâma*.

[77] See II.56. That Ea fails to make any impact in *Enūma eliš* II.81-94 is an exquisite irony at the level of plot. At another level, Ea's defeat against Tiāmat enables the poet to introduce as cosmogonic fact an important distinction in Babylonian society, between rhetorical prowess as the province of the wise counsellor (represented here by Ea) and military prowess as the prerogative of the king (here Marduk).

[78] *Enūma eliš* II.53-56; in II.55 (*ša tegrû tuqunta*) Anšar alleged that it was Ea who initiated the hostilities.

introduces as a masterpiece of verbal craft, the speech that Ea makes in *Enūma eliš* II.61-70 to soothe the excited Anšar. Nowhere else in the text is the effective use of language advertised with quite so much eagerness. So far, the poet's own enthusiasm, and that of the character Anšar within the text, has not been shared by modern readers. I argued that existing translations misconstrue the personal pronoun *šâši* and consequently misunderstand the climactic final couplet of the speech. The result falls short of the rhetorical brilliance that the poet himself promises us. Clarifying the grammar of the passage enables us not only to establish what the text actually says but also to appreciate it better.

Appendix I – The declension of vowel-stem nouns and adjectives in *Enūma eliš*

Appendix I lists vowel-stem adjectives and nouns in the nominative and accusative singular.[79] MS spellings have been compiled from the edition of Kämmerer/Metzler, with additional readings from Lambert. Numbers in brackets indicate how often a spelling is attested (1, 2, 3, etc.). The conventions for spelling vowel-stem nouns and adjectives are broadly shared by all known MSS; I have therefore indicated the provenance of readings only where there are significant divergences.

Nominative singular:
ayyû II.143 *a-a-ú* (2); ***annû*** VII.54 *an-nu-ú* (3); ***Apsû*** I.3 abzu-*ú* (1), abzu-*um-ma* (1), I.25 abzu-*ú* (1), *ap-sú-ú* (1), I.51 *ap-su/sù-ú* (2), I.117 *ap-su-ú* (2); ***banû*** VI.131 *ba-nu-ú* (4);[80] ***šubšû*** II.62, 64 *šub-šu-ú* (2);[81] ***bānû*** II.145, 147 *ba-nu-ú/u* (9), VI.133 *ba-nu-šu/šú-nu* (2); ***geštû*** VI.148 *ge-eš/geš-ṭu/ṭú-ú/u* (5); ***maḫrû*** VI.21, VII.145, 157 *maḫ/ma-aḫ-ru-u/-ú* (12); ***nebû*** VI.127 *né/na-bu-ú/u* (3); ***rēmēnû*** VII.30 *re-mé/me-nu-ú* (4); ***rēštû*** I.3 *reš-tu-ú* (6); ***šanû*** VI.89, VII.88 *šá-nu-ú/u* (7); ***šaqû*** VII.82 *šá-qu-ú* (2); ***zārû*** I.3 *za-ru-šu-un* (5).

Accusative singular:
agâ I.67 *a-ga-šú* (3), I.108 *a-ga-(a-)am-ma* (6), V.94 *a-ga-a* (1); ***annâ*** V.131 *an-na-a* (2); ***Apsâ*** I.47 *ap-sa-a* (2), I.65 abzu-*am* (1), *ap-sa-a* (2), *ap-sù-ú* (1),[82] I.69 abzu-*am* (2), *ap-sa-[a]* (1), I.76 *ap-su-ú* (1),[83] I.113 *ap-sa-a* (1), II.55 *ap-sa-a* (1), II.67 *ap-sa-a* (1); ***inimmâ*** VI.22 *i-nim-ma-a/'a* (5); ***katrâ*** VII.110 *kàt-ra-šú/šu-un* (3); ***lalâ*** V.89 *la-la-šu* (1); ***lullâ*** A VI.6, 7 *lul-la-a* (1), *lú-u₁₈-lu-a* (7); ***lullâ*** B IV.72 *lul-la-a* (4); ***meḫâ*** I.107 *me-ḫa-a* (3), IV.45 *me-ḫa-a* (4), *me-ḫu-ú* (1);[84] ***palâ*** (IV.29); bala-*a* (3); ***qabâ*** V.131 *qa-ba-a-šú* (1); ***rabâ*** IV.49 gal-*a* (2) *ra-ba-a-am* (1), IV.75 gal-*a* (2) ***ṣuṣâ*** I.6 *ṣu-ṣa-a/'a* (5); ***šubarrâ*** VI.49 *šu-bar/ba-ra-(a-)ni/nu* (4); ***tâ*** IV.61 *ta-a* (2), I.153, II.39, III.43, 101 *ta-a-ka/ak* (10), VI.111 *ta-a-/ti-'a-a-ši-na* (4), I.62, IV.91 *ta-a-šu/-šú* (10).

Doubtful or problematic:
agâ V.17 *a-ga-a* (2);[85] ***banû*** IV.22 *ba-nu-ú/u* (3);[86] ***pâ-/pā-/pī-***[87] IV.100 *pa-a-ša/šá* (3), VII.33 *pa(-a)-ši-na* (4),[88] I.35, III.1, V.117 *pa-a-šu/šú* (12), V.108, VI.47 *pa-a-šu-nu* (5), II.134 *pi-[i-ka]* (1), IV.97 *pi-i-ša/šá* (4).[89]

---

[79] I only include forms that have a bearing on the argument: e.g. abzu-*ú* but not abzu in I.3. Lacunae in the text are not generally indicated, except where they affect the argument.

[80] Infinitive used as a noun.

[81] Infinitive used as a noun.

[82] MS a (Lambert), from Kish.

[83] MS s (Lambert), a Babylonian exercise tablet.

[84] MS c (Lambert), from Babylonia.

[85] Both Kämmerer/Metzler 2012: 17 and Lambert 2013: 98 parse the form as a nominative singular in agreement with a stative *mašla* which they restore at the end of the line (only *-la* is preserved). However, this reconstruction seems difficult to defend in grammatical terms and does not appear to yield the required sense in a context where Marduk gives instructions to Sîn: "You shall be brilliant" (*nabâta* V.16), "stand in opposition!"

Summary:

The manuscripts of *Enūma eliš* spell and decline vowel-stem nouns and adjectives according to the rules of second-millennium grammar. There is not a single certain case of a nominative in the status rectus that ends in *-a*. *a-ga-a* in V.17 has sometimes been interpreted as a nominative singular, but the context is broken and restoration against the normal rules of grammar and orthography seems perilous. Occasionally, scribes from Babylonia spell accusatives with final *-û* in accordance with the historical development of the language: see *ap-su/sù-ú* (accusative) in I.65 (Kish) and 76 (Babylonian exercise tablet), against a large majority of MSS that follow triptotic declension here and elsewhere (*ap-sa-a*, abzu-*a*, etc.); also *me-ḫu-ú* (accusative) in IV.45 (regular Babylonian tablet), against four MSS that have *me-ḫa-a* here and another three in I.107. The infinitives *abātu u ba-nu-ú* in IV.22 (Sippar, Assur, Sultantepe) are probably best construed as nominatives with *liktūnū*.

Bound forms too are remarkably consistent in following triptotic declension (e.g. *za-ru-šu-un* in I.3, *a-ga-šú* in I.108). The main exceptions concern the noun *pû*, 'mouth'; cf *pāšina* = nominative in VII.33, spelled *pa-ši-na* in a Kuyunjik MS but *pa-a-ši-na* in three Babylonian witnesses (after *ta-a-šu,* accusative); also *pīka*, *pīša* = accusative in II.134 (*pi-[i-ka]*, 1 MS from Assur) and IV.97 (*pi-i-ša/šá*, 2 MSS from Kuyunjik, 2 from Sultantepe).

Appendix II – Statives in *Enūma eliš*

Appendix II lists statives in *Enūma eliš* under three headings: 1. active/transitive forms (A/T); 2. passive/intransitive forms (P/T); 3. doubtful or problematic forms. Statives are in bold type (**dal-ḫu-nim-ma**); nouns in agreement are underlined (<u>ilāni</u>); grammatical objects in active/transitive constructions are marked with a dotted underline (<u>karassa</u>). Significant variants are listed in the footnotes, with numbers indicating multiple attestations (2, 3, etc.). Their provenance is recorded in so far as it is known; for details see Lambert 2013 and Kämmerer/Metzler 2012. One note of caution should be added: active/transitive and passive/intransitive are modern grammatical categories, which Babylonian readers are not likely to have recognized as meaningful. Indeed, the boundaries between the two groups are often fluid.[90] I have split the sample along these lines to counter the erroneous impression that active/transitive use of the stative is non-existent or rare in *Enūma eliš*. Readers may disagree with how some forms are classified, but I trust the overall picture will not be misleading.

(*lū šutamḫurāta* V.18), "diminish!" (*šutakṣibamma* V.20), "go back!" (*bini arkāniš* V.20), "draw near!" (*šutaqribma* V.21), "stand in conjunction!" (*lū šutamḫurāta* V.22), "rival!" (*lū šanâta* V.22), "follow its path!" (*ba'i uruḫša* V.23), "render judgment!" (*dīna dīna* V.24).

[86] Thus three MSS from Sippar, Assur and Sultantepe: the likely construction is nominative with *liktūnū* rather than accusative with *qibi*.

[87] The forms of *pû*, "mouth," pose particular problems that cannot be fully explored here. In *Enūma elîš* the noun occurs only in bound form, and almost exclusively in the accusative and genitive. There is a strong tendency to associate 'a' with the accusative and 'i' with the genitive, as if in triptotic declension (*pâ-*, *pî-*, cf. *GAG* § 65 i). However, we occasionally encounter forms in the nominative (*pāšina*) and accusative (*pīka*, *pīša*) that do not follow the triptotic system. What the scribes thought they were copying is difficult to determine: non-triptotic *pā-* (and very occasionally *pī-*) throughout? Triptotic *pâ-*, *pî-* as default, with occasional deviations?

[88] One MS from Kuyunjik has *pa-ši-na*, which appears to represent non-triptotic *pāšina* (nominative). The three Babylonian MSS vulgarise to triptotic-looking *pa-a-ši-na*, perhaps under the influence of preceding *ta-a-šu*.

[89] The forms *pi-[i-ka]* at II.134 (one MS, from Assur) and *pi-i-ša/šá* at IV.97 (four MSS, two from Kuyunjik, two from Sultantepe) are in the accusative and must therefore be read *pīka*, *pīša* (non-triptotic).

[90] This is particularly evident with stative constructions that involve a piece of attire or part of the body in the accusative; see above, n. 35.

Active/transitive

ilāni ... aḏīršu **aḫ-zu** VII.4; (_ilāni_) **dal-ḫu-nim-ma** _karassa_ I.23; _ilāni ... _ **en-du** _ṭubqāti_ IV.113; (_ilāni_) **e-šu-ú** _Tiāmat_ I.22; **ka-pid** _libbakīma dekê ananta_ IV.78; _gipāra lā_ **ki-iṣ-ṣu-ru** (sc. _Apsû, Tiāmat_) I.6;[91] (_erbet naṣmadū_) _ṣapāna_ **lam-du** IV.54;[92] (_innanu_) _Qingu ..._ **le-qu-ú** _enūtu_ I.159, II.45, III.49, III.107; **šite''â** _mu-da-ta_ (sc. _Kakka_) III.5; **nap-lu-su** _šunu šâšu_ VI.132; _šinnāšunu_ **na-šá-a** _imta_ IV.53; _ṭubbāti eliš_ **na-šá-ti-ma** (sc. _Tiāmat_) IV.77; **na-ši-ir** _Apsû rigimšun_ I.25; (_ilāni_) _šēreṣṣu_ **na-šu-ú** IV.114; (_ilāni_) **na-šu-ú** _tamḫārī/-a_ I.131, II.17, III.21, III.79;[93] _šu-nu šâšu ..._ **pal-su**-_šú_ VII.127; _lū_ **rit-ku-su** _šunu kakkīki_ IV.85; (_Nēberu_) **ṣa-bit** _kunsaggî_ VII.127; (_Apsû, Tiāmat_) _ṣuṣâ lā_ **še-'-ú** I.6;[94] (_Tiāmat_) _lā_ **še-ma-ta** _amātka_ II.10;[95] (_ilāni_) _šīmātu lā_ **ši-i-mu** I.8;[96] (_Tiāmat_) _puḫru_ **ši-it-ku-na-at-ma** II.12, III.16, III.74; (_ilāni_) _ukkinna_ **šit-ku-nu-ma** I.132, II.18, III.22, III.80; (_erbet šārū_) **šu-ud-lu-ḫu** _karšakīma_ I.116;[97] (_ilāni_) **šu-'-du-ru** _qereb Anduruna_ I.24; _ša_ **tak-lu**-_ka_ IV.17; (_Marūtuk_) _šammi imta bullî_ **ta-me-eḫ** IV.62; _Nēberu nēberēt šamê ..._ **ta-me-eḫ-ma** VII.124; **zi-za-ma** _salmāt qaqqadi ilāni_ VI.119.

Passive/Intransitive

(_ilāni_) _i-da-a-ša_ **al-ku** II.14, III.18, 76;[98] (_Marūtuk_) _melammī ..._ **a-pi-ir** IV.58;[99] _iṣu_ **a-rik** VI.89; **áš-ba-ti** I.118 (sc. _Tiāmat_); (_Marūtuk_) **a-tar** I.92; _Anšar Kišar ..._ **at-ru** I.12; (_banû abātu_ etc.) _lū_ **ba-ši-ma** _nannuššu_ VI.132; _mī[n]â_ **ba-ši-ma** II.70; _Anunnaki mala_ **ba-šu-u** V.86; _ilāni mala_ **ba-šu-[ú]** V.106; _ša bulluṭu_ **ba-šu-ú** _ittīšu_ VII.30; _šubšû u ḫulluqu_ **ba-šu-u** _ittīšu_ II.62, 64; _ša anni u gillati maharšu_ **ba-'-ú** VII.156; _amātu ..._ **dal-ḫat** II.49; **dal-ḫat** _Tiāmatma_ I.109; _emūq(u) sinništi ... lū_ **dun-nu-na** II.92, 116;[100] _Tiāmat ..._ **dun-nu-na-at-ma** II.88, 112; (_ilāni_) **e-gu-ú** III.137; _lā_ **e-na-at** _qibīssu_ VII.151; (_amēlū_?) _lū_ **en-du** _dulli ilānīma_ VI.8;[101] **e-ši** _malakšu_ IV.67; (_Meršakušu_) **e-zi-iz** VI.137; **ez-ze-et** _kabta[a]ssu_ II.51; (_ilāni_) **ez-**

---

[91] An interpretation as P/I seems possible, but less likely: see above p. ****. The isolated variant _ki-iṣ-ṣu-ra_ (Kuyunjik) may be a trivial slip (NB _gi-pa-ra la ki-iṣ-ṣu-ra_ and cf. [_gi-pa-_]_ru la ki-iṣ-ṣu-ru_ in MS K, from Assur), or else result from speculation about the syntax and meaning of the line. Two further variants, _ku(-uṣ)-ṣu/ṣú-ru_, suggest that it may have been subject to deliberate alteration; for discussion see above, pp. ***-***.

[92] Var. _lam_-NA (Sultantepe); cf. _sa-pa-na_.

[93] Across the four passages where the phrase occurs the manuscripts are split between _tam-ḫa-ri_ (5 MSS, from Assur, Kuyunjik and Babylonia), _tam-ḫa-ra_ (5 MSS, all from Babylonia), and _tam-ḫa-ru_ (3 MSS from Babylonia and Sultantepe). The spread and quality of the witnesses argues in favour of _tam-ḫa-ri_, which at first sight may suggest the expression _nāš tamḫāri_, 'bearers of battle' (thus _CAD s.v. tamḫāru_ b). _CAD s.v. našû_ A 2c 2' confirms that phrases of this type can very occasionally be spelled with final -_u_, but much more common are _na-áš bilti_, _na-ši bilti_, etc. (sg. and pl.). That, and the immediate context (statives!), suggests that _na-šu-ú tam-ḫa-ri/-a/-u_ is better taken as A/T stative _našû_ with object _tam-ḫa-ri/-a/-u_; for this use of _našû_ in the stative see Rowton 1962: 244. The form _tam-ḫa-ri_ in the Kuyunjik MSS may then be interpreted either as a way of spelling the accusative singular (as often in the Kuyunjik MSS of _Gilgameš_, see George 2003: 439) or as the plural _tamḫārī_ (for a rare example where this is certain cf. _bēlet taḫāzi/-ī kalîšunu tamḫārī_ in the _Great Prayer to Ishtar_, NB version, _STC_ II Plate LXXVII line 30, Reiner and Güterbock 1967: 260).

[94] Var. _še-'-i_ (Assur); an interpretation as P/I seems possible, but less likely: see above p. ****.

[95] _še-ma-ta ~ šemât_, CV-CV for CVC or sandhi spelling.

[96] An interpretation as P/I seems possible: see above, n. 37.

[97] Var. _šu-ud-luḫ_ (Sultantepe). The form _šu-ud-lu-ḫu_ may be better analysed as an infinitive with consecutive or final meaning (thus Lambert, Kämmerer/Metzler).

[98] The variant _al-ka_ is attested a total of four times across the three passages (twice in II.14, once in III.18, once in III.76), against six MSS that have grammatically correct _al-ku_. Both forms are found in MSS from Babylonia _and_ Assyria, including Kuyunjik. This almost even split in the tradition is unusual for _Enūma eliš_ and may have something to do with competing considerations of grammar and orthography on the one hand (favouring _al-ku_) and sound on the other (favouring _al-ka_, after multiple 'a'-sounds earlier in the line: _ṭab-na-a i-da-ša_ _al-ka_).

[99] For the construction of the stative with a piece of attire in the accusative see above, n. 35.

[100] Ventive.

[101] Context (cf. VI.34, 36) and variants suggest that _endū_ is a P/I stative agreeing _ad sensum_ with a plural subject (_amēlū_?), rather than A/T agreeing with _ilāni_.

zu I.130, II.16, III.20, 78; **gap-ša** *emūqāša* II.87; **gap-ša** *emūqāšu* II.98, II.111; **gap-ša** *têrētūša* I.145, II.31, III.35, 93; (*Marūtuk*) **ga-šir** I.88; (*Nudimmud*) **gu-uš-šu-ur** I.19; (*Marūtuk*) *naḫlapta ...* **ḫa-lip-ma** IV.57;[102] *Damki[na] ...* **ḫar-šas-šu** I.84;[103] (*Nudimmud*) **ḫa-sis** I.18; *ba'ulātu lū* **ḫi-is-su-sa** VI.114;[104] **ḫu-um-mu-ra** *īnātūni* I.121;[105] (*Mari-utu*) *šaqîš* **it-bur** I.103; (*Tiāmat, Marūtuk*) *šašmiš* **it-lu-pu** IV.94; *attāma* **kab-ta-ta** IV.3; *Marūtuk* **kab-ta-ta** IV.5; *Asaralim ša ina bīt milki* **kab-tu** VII.3;[106] (*ilāni*) **ka-lu-ú** *kišukkiš* IV.114; **ka-mi-il** *libbašūma* II.126; *pulḫātu ... elīšu* **kám-ra** I.104; (*ilāni*) **kap-du** I.130, II.16, III.20, 78; (*isu*) *lū* **ka-šid** VI.89; **ki-na-at** *amāssu* VII.151; **ki-na-at** *sīt pîka* IV.9; (*ilāni*) *lū* **kub-bu-tu-ma** VI.10; **kūn** *ašrukka* IV.12; *Mummu ... dalāpiš* **ku-ú-ru** I.66;[107] *šaptāšunu* **ku-ut-tu-ma-ma** II.122; (*Tiāmat*) **la-ab-bat** II.12, III.16, 74; (*Mari-utu*) **la-biš** *melammī* I.103;[108] (*ilāni*) **lab-bu** I.131, II.17, III.21, 79;[109] **la-a-'iṭ** *karassu* VI.138; **lam-da-ma** *... minâtūšu* I.93; (*ilāni*) **la-mu-ú** IV.110; *Tiāmat ...* **ma-la-ta** *adīru* II.87, 111;[110] (*ilāni*) **ma-lu-ú** *dumāmu* IV.113; *epšetuš lū* **maš-lat** VI.122;[111] *ša ana dunnīšu ... šanû lā* **m[aš]-l[u]** VII.88; (*Meršakušu*) **muš-tal** VI.137; **na-ba-a-ta** V.16 (sc. *Nannaru*); *lā* **na-bu-ú** *šamāmū* I.1; *ša* **na-bu-ú** *zikiršu* VI.51; (*ilāni*) *sapāriš* **na-du-ma** IV.112; *lā* **na-ḫat** *karassu* II.51; *mīnâ* **nak-ra** III.127;[112] *lā* **na-ši-ir** *tukkaša* II.89, 113; *epšētūka iliš* **na-ṭ[a-a-m]a** II.73; (*minâtūšu*) *ḫasāsiš lā* **na-ṭa-a** I.94; *šipru šū lā* **na-ṭu-ú** *ḫasāsiš* VI.37; (*ilāni*) **na-zar-bu-bu** I.131, II.17, III.21, 79; **nu-uk-ku-la** *minâtūšu* I.93;[113] (*qaštu*) **nu-uk-ku-lat** VI.84; (*mušmaḫḫū*) *lā* **pa-du-u** *atta'u/-a/-i* I.135, II.21, III.25, 83; (*Igigi*) *...* **paḫ-ru** VI.69;[114] **pa-aḫ-ru-ma** *Igigi* II.121, V.85; **paḫ-ru-nim-ma** *ilāni* I.127; (*Nudimmud*) **pal-ka** *uznu* I.18;[115] (*Irugga*) *ša ... ḫasīsa* **pal-ku** VII.104;[116] *šū lū* **pa-qid** VII.123; *šunu lū* **pa-áš-ḫu** VI.8, VII.10; (*minâtūšu*) *amāriš* **pa-áš-qa** I.94; (*erbet naṣmadī*) **pa-tu-ni** *šaptī* IV.53;[117] (*Nudimmud*) *emūqān* **pu-un-gul** I.18; (*Tiāmat, Marūtuk*) **qit-ru-bu** *taḫāziš* IV.94; **ra-pa-aš** *karassu* VII.155;[118] **ra-pa-áš** *libbašu* VI.138; *ušaṣlilma apsâ* **re-ḫi** *šittu* I.65;[119] **ru-u-qu** (*vel sim.*) *libbašu* VII.155;[120] (*Meršakušu*) **sa-bu-us** VI.137; (*ilāni*) *lā* **sa-ki-pu** I.130, II.16, III.20, 78; **sa-pi-iḫ** *tēmašūma* IV.68; **si-ḫa-ti** *epšessu* IV.68;[121]

---

[102] For the construction of the stative with a piece of attire in the accusative see above, n. 35.

[103] The form is difficult to place on a spectrum from A/T to P/I.

[104] The var. *ba-'-ú-la-a-ta lu-ú ḫi-is-su-su* (Kish) may result from a misinterpretation of the Gt stative as effectively a form of the D-stem (~ *lū ḫussusū*, 'let them remind'), perhaps driven by a a concern with what was perceived to be the wrong relationship between gods and worshippers; for Gt statives corrected to D see above n. 91 and the discussion on pp. ***-***.

[105] Var. *ḫu-um-mu-ru* (Bab. exercise tablet) – a trivial error.

[106] Var. *kab-ti*. There seems to be disagreement between Lambert and Kämmerer/Metzler where this reading originates.

[107] The form *ku-ú-ru* is slightly obscure (D stative of *kâru*, 'be dazed'?).

[108] For the construction of the stative with a piece of attire in the accusative see above, n. 35.

[109] Var. *la-[a]b-bi* in II.17 (Babylonian); for *-i* representing *-ū* or *-û* in Babylonian tablets see above, n. 22.

[110] *ma-la-ta* ~ *malât*, CV-CV for CVC or sandhi spelling.

[111] Var. *maš-la* (Assur); for discussion see below, n. 128.

[112] Ventive; for the agreement with *mīnâ* (singular) cf. *mī[n]â ba-ši-ma* in II.70.

[113] Var. *lam-da-a-[...]+[-u]k-ku-lu* MS a (Kish); *-lu* is not read by Kämmerer/Metzler. If Lambert's reading is correct, this would be a curious departure both from the majority text (two witnesses from Assur) and from standard orthography and grammar.

[114] Var. *pa-aḫ-ri* (Uruk); for *-i* representing *-ū* or *-û* in Babylonian manuscripts of *Enūma eliš* see above, n. 22.

[115] Var. *pal-ku* (Babylonian); *palka* is 3rd pers. sg. with ventive *-a*.

[116] Var. *pal-ki* (Assur).

[117] The form *šaptī* is oblique of the bodily dual; for the construction of the stative with parts of the body see above, n. 35.

[118] *karassu* is accusative of respect; cf. *palka uznu* (I.18) etc. For the construction of the stative with parts of the body see above, n. 35.

[119] The parallel with the previous line suggests P/I with change of subject.

[120] Var. *ru-ú-qa* (Babylonian). The three MSS that have '*-u*' are from Kuyunjik (*ru-u-qu*), Sultantepe (*ru-qú*) and Babylonia (*ru-ú-qu*).

[121] *si-ḫa-ti* ~ *seḫât*, CV-CV for CVC or sandhi spelling.

(*Apsû*) *ṣa-lil* I.64; *lā ṣa-al-la-ku* I.38; *lū ṣal-la-at* I.50;[122] *lū ṣa-an-da-at* *ummatki* IV.85; *šūt* *pulḫāti ṣa-'-nu* IV.115; *ṣa-ri-ir* *nīš īnīšu* I.87; (*Lugaldurmaḫ*) *ša ... ṣi-ru* VII.96; *šū lū šal-ma* VII.150;[123] *šam-ḫat* *nabnīssu* I.87; *Pagalguenna ... ša šá-qa-a emūqāšu* VII.93, 101; (*kussû*) *... ša ina ilāni ša-qa(-a)-ta* VI.93;[124] *lū ša-qá-ta amātka* IV.15;[125] *tukkaša* *še-ba-am-ma* II.89, 113; *ilāni lū šu-'-du-ru* VI.142; *abī lā šuk-tu-mat piti šaptuk* II.139;[126] *Anšar lā šuk-tu-mat piti šaptuk* II.141;[127] *alkassunu lū šum-ru-ṣa-at-ma* I.46; **šu-un-na-at** *ilūss[u]* I.91; *alkatuš lū* **šu-pa-a-tu** VI.122;[128] *lā šu-up-šu-ḫa-ku* I.38; **šup-šu-ḫa-at** I.50;[129] *ilāni lā šu-pu-u* I.7; *Tiāmat* **šu-qám-mu-mat** I.26; **šur-ba-ta-ma** I.155, II.41, III.45, 103 (sc. Qingu); (*Lugaldurmaḫ*) *ša ...* **šur-bu-u** VII.96; (*Pagalguenna*) *ša ...* **šur-bu-u** VII.94; *lū* **šu-uš-qu-ma** *māru mutīr gimillīni* VI.105;[130] (*Marūtuk*) **šu-uš-qu** I.92;[131] (*innanu*) *Qingu* **šu-uš-qu-ú** I.159, II.45, III.49, 107; (*Tutu*) *lū* **šu-uš-qu-ú-ma** VII.13; (*Nannaru*) *lū* **šu-tam-ḫu-rat** V.22;[132] *mešrētušu* **šu-ut-tu-ḫa** I.100; (*Marūtuk*) *ilitta* **šu-tur** I.100;[133] (*Marūtuk*) **šu-tur** *... lānšu* I.99;[134] *enūssu lū* **šu-tu-rat** VI.106; *qibītuššu* (sic) *lū* **šu-tu-rat** VI.104;[135] *Asaralim ša ...* **šu-tu-ru** *milikšu* VII.3; *bēlum ... ša* **šu-tu-ru** VII.102; (*Meršakušu*) **ṭ[a]-a-ár** VI.137; *lū* **te-bu-ú** VII.12;[136] (*šārū*) **ti-bu-ú** IV.48; (*ilāni*) **ti-bu-ni/te-bu-ni/te-bu-ú-ni** I.129, II.15, III.18, 77;[137] *lā ṭa-bat* *alkassunu* I.28; (*Tiāmat*) **ug-gu-gat** I.43, IV.60; **uṭ-ṭu-lat** *šittašu* I.88; *ammatum šuma lā* **zak-rat** I.2;[138] (*mušmaḫḫū*) **zaq-tu-ma** *šinnu/-a/-i* I.135, II.21, III.25, 83; (*ilāni*) *lū* **zi-zu** VI.10; (*ilāni*) *šuma lā* **zuk-ku-ru** I.8.

Doubtful or problematic

agâ **[maš]-la(?)** V.17;[139] *ilāni la* **šup-šu-ḫa/hu(?)** *i-zab-bi-lu šá-ri-ša* I.110;[140] **šu-šub** V.103;[141] *lū* **šu-tam-ḫu-rat** V.18.[142]

---

[122] *ṣallāta*, sc. Apsû.

[123] Ventive.

[124] Thus two MSS from Kuyunjik (*ša-qa-a-ta*) and Tell Haddad (*ša-qa-ta*); *ša-qa(-a)-ta* ~ *šaqât(a)*, 3rd pers. sg. fem. (CV-CV for CVC?). The variant (deliberate 'correction'?) *ša-qa-at*, from Sultantepe, seems less good in terms of metre.

[125] *ša-qá-ta* ~ *šaqât*, CV-CV for CVC or sandhi spelling.

[126] Most likely *šuk-tu-mat* ~ *šuktumāta* (2nd pers. sg. masc.), with accusative *šaptuk*, construed *apo koinou* (Kämmerer/Metzler 2012: 79) with *piti*; cf. (*erbet naṣmadī*) *pa-tu-ni šaptī* in IV.53, with discussion in nn. 35 and 118. *šuk-tu-mat* ~ *šuktumat* (3rd pers. sg. fem.) in agreement with *šaptuk* seems less likely but is perhaps not impossible.

[127] See previous note.

[128] Var. *šu-pa-a-ti* (Tell Haddad). The scribe of MS A (Lambert), from Assur, apparently understood *al-ka<-ka?>-tuš* here and *ep-še-tuš* later in the line as plurals. Accordingly, he uses plural forms of the stative with both: *šu-pa-a* and *maš-la*. MS b (Lambert), from Kish, also has plural in the first half of the line (*al-ka-tuš ... šu-pa-a₄*) but is broken in the second, so we cannot tell whether it was equally consistent. The plural forms may be inspired by a wish to match the plurality of Marduk's fifty names, which were introduced in the previous line. Achieving this (in a manner of speaking) by leaving out just two signs from the received text perhaps proved irresistible to some scribes.

[129] *šupšuḫāta*, sc. Apsû.

[130] Var. *šu-uš-qí-m[a]* (Kish).

[131] Var. *šu-uš-qí* (Assur).

[132] *šutamḫurāta*.

[133] Grammatical agreement is unproblematic if we assume that *šūtur* refers to Marduk and *ilitta* is an accusative of respect; cf. SB *Gilg.* I.105-6, 230-1, etc.

[134] *lānšu* is accusative of respect; see previous note.

[135] The four extant MSS, from Assur, Sultantepe, Kisch and Tell Haddad all transmit the form *qibītuššu* (*qí-bi-tuš/tu-uš-šú/šu*) for expected *qibītuš* (II.123) or *qibīssu* (V.110 and VII.151).

[136] The subject is an unspecified plurality, perhaps the gods (*ilāni*).

[137] Var. *te-bi-ni* (Babylonian) in III.77. For *-i* representing *-ū* or *-û* in Babylonian manuscripts see n. 22.

[138] Var. *zak-ru* (Assur): perhaps a deliberate attempt to convert lines 1-2 from P/I into A/T? For discussion see above, pp. ***-***.

[139] By the normal rules of orthography and grammar *a-ga-a* ought not to be a nominative in agreement with a 3rd sg. stative *mašla* (see above, n. 85).

Summary:

Active-transitive statives are common in *Enūma eliš* and freely alternate with passive-intransitive ones. Grammatical agreement is carefully observed even by late and otherwise inferior manuscripts: *Marūtuk šu-tur*, *enūssu šu-tu-rat*, *Anšar Kišar at-ru*, *gap-ša têrētūša*, etc. In the few exceptional cases where apparently ungrammatical variants establish themselves in the MSS tradition (notably *al-ka* alongside expected *al-ku* in II.14, III.18, 76) this appears to be motivated by contextual factors such as sound (*t̠ab-na-a i-da-ša al-ka*).

Appendix III – Independent personal pronouns

Appendix III is designed to clarify the gender of *šâši* in *Enūma eliš* II.70. It lists instances of the 3ʳᵈ person singular independent pronoun in the oblique cases, divided by grammatical gender.[143] I also append instances of the demonstrative pronoun *šuātu*. Because numbers are small, I have complemented the analysis of *Enūma eliš* (Section 1) with data from SB *Gilgameš* (Section 2). Numbers in brackets indicate how often a form is transmitted, with alternative spellings for the same grammatical form given as + 1, + 2, etc. Readings are compiled from Kämmerer/Metzler 2012, with additional readings from Lambert 2013 (*Enūma eliš*); and from Andrew George's score transliteration of SB *Gilgameš* published online at https://www.soas.ac.uk/nme/research/gilgamesh/standard/. Significant variants are cited in the footnotes, with provenance where known. Majority readings are provenanced only where relevant to the argument. The right-hand column provides rudimentary grammatical analysis. I have used the following abbreviations:

acc. ob. – Pronoun serves as accusative object in the sentence.
attr. acc. ob. – Pronoun serves as attribute to an accusative object.
dat. ob. – Pronoun serves as dative object in the sentence.
prep. dat. – Pronoun is in the dative after preposition.
prep. gen. – Pronoun is in the genitive after preposition.

Section 1: *Enūma eliš*
Masculine (šâšu)

I.54 (*Mummu*) *unaššaq **ša-a-šu*** (sc. Apsû)	acc. ob. (2)
I.148, II.34, III.96 (*Tiāmat*) ***šá-a-šú*** (sc. Qingu) *ušrabbīšu/-iš*	acc. ob. (2 + 1)[144]
II.10 (*Ea*) *mimmû Tiāmat ikpudu ušannâ ana **šá-a-šú*** (sc. Anšar)	prep. dat. (1)
IV.134 *igisê šulmāni ušābilū šunu ana **šá-a-šu*** (sc. Marduk)	prep. dat. (1 + 2)

---

[140] A difficult line, which has been interpreted in many different ways: e.g. Bottéro 1993: 609 ("Et ses dieux, sens relâche, supportaient les coups-de-vent (?)"); Streck 1995: 50 ("Die Götter wurden ohne Rast wie im Wind (?) umhergetragen (?)"); Dalley 2000: 236 ("The gods, unable to rest, had to suffer ..." [*sic*]); Foster 2005: 443 ("the gods, finding no rest, bore the brunt of each wind"), with note on p. 485 ("translation uncertain"); Talon 2005: 81 ("et sans lui laisser de repos [les dieux] portaient contre elle les vents"); Kämmerer/Metzler 2012: 137 ("Die Götter wurden rastlos umhergetragen im Wind"), Lambert 2013: 57 "The gods took no rest, they ..." [*sic*]. Pending detailed investigation, it does not seem advisable to draw any conclusions about the grammatical status of *šup-šu-ḫa*, much less to speculate about (faulty) agreement of a stative *šupšuḫa/-ā* with the noun *ilāni*. (To complicate things even further, Lambert has detected a variant *šup-šu-ˈḫuˋ* (~ stative *šupšuḫū*?) in MS a, from Kish, which seems difficult to confirm on the basis of his own drawing; see Lambert 2013: 538, Plate 4.)

[141] Broken context.

[142] Normalize *šutamḫurāta* and construe with Nannaru (thus Lambert) or *šutamḫurat* in agreement with *šapattu* (Kämmerer/Metzler)?

[143] I have only considered passages where enough of the pronoun can be read to determine its gender, i.e. including such cases as [*šá*]-*šú*-[*ma*] or *ša-š*[*u-m*]*a* but excluding *šá*-[*šu*]-*ma*.

[144] At I.148 Lambert reads *ša-a-š*[*á*] in his MS b from Babylonia; Kämmerer/Metzler read the same MS *ša-a-*[*šu*]. At II.34 Lambert's MS G, from Assur, reads *šu-a-tú*.

V.112 *šu-a-šú* (sc. Marduk) *tiklāšu*   dat. ob. (1)

V.114 *šu-a-šú* (sc. Marduk) *izzakrū*   dat. ob. (1)

VI.36 *dulli ša ilāni īmidūni **šá-a-šú*** (sc. *amēlūtu/amēlu?*)   acc. ob. (2 + 1)[145]

VI.64 *ana Anim Ellil Ea u **šá-a-šú*** (sc. Marduk) *ukinnū šubtu*   prep. dat. (1 + 2)

VI.132 *lū naplusū šunu **šá-a-šu*** (sc. Marduk)   acc. ob. (2 + 1)[146]

VI.136 ***šá-a-šu**-ma litta''idāšu* (sc. Marduk)   acc. ob. (1 + 2)[147]

VII.14 *mamman ... **šu-a-šu*** (sc. Marduk) *lā um[daššalš]u*   acc. ob. (1 + 2)

VII.114 *ela **šá-a-šú*** (sc. Marduk)   prep. gen. (1 + 3)

VII.125 *li-qé-'u-šú **šá-a-šu*** (*Nēberu*)   acc. ob. (1 + 2)

VII.127 *šunu **ša-a-šu*** (sc. *Nēberu*) *lū palsūšu*   acc. ob. (2 + 1)

Feminine (šâši/šâša)

II.70 *lū **ša-a-ši** ušḫalliqa*   acc. ob. (1)[148]

VI.94 *ina puḫur ilāni**šu-a-šá** ultešibši*   acc. ob. (1 + 1)[149]

Demonstrative pronoun (šuātu)

I.98 *īnā kīma **šu-a-tu/-tú/-ti*** ("like that") *ibarrâ gimrēti*   prep. gen. (4)

I.146 ~ II.32, III.36, III.94*kīma **šu-a-tu** etc.* ("like that") *uštabši*   prep. gen. (7)

II.5 *išmēma Ea amātu **šu-a-ti/-tì/-tum*** ("that," fem.)   acc. ob. (3)

II.69 *lām ... uballû **šu-a-ti*** ("that one"?, masc.)   acc. ob. (1)

IV.120 *itti uggê **šu-a-ˈta**ˈ imnīšu* ("that one"?, masc.)   acc. ob. (1)

Section 2: SB *Gilgameš*

Masculine (šâšu)

I.114 ***šá-a-šú** uštamḫiršu*   acc. ob. (1 + 1)

I.161 etc. (23 passages in total) *ana **šá-šu-ma** izakkara*   prep. dat.[150]

I.235 *amur **šá-a-šú***   acc. ob. (1)

III.57 ~ III.75 [*š*]***á-a-šú** ana maṣṣarāti ... piq[iss]u*   acc. ob. (1 + 1)

V.97 (as in George 2003: 606) *nikaššas[s]u **šá-a-šú***   acc. ob. (1)

V.301 (as in George and Al-Rawi 2014: 82) *erēni **šá-a-šu** ub-ba-lu*   attr. acc. ob. (1)

VI.156 *kī **šá-šu-ma** lū ēpuški*   prep. gen. (3)

X.70 ~ X.147, X.247 *anāku ul kī **š**]á(-a)-šu-ma(-a)*   prep. gen. (5)

---

[145] There are two possible variants, *ša-a-ša* (Uruk) and *šá-šu-u[n]* (Tell Haddad). The former is read by Lambert but not Kämmerer/Metzler, who give *ša-a-šu* instead. The tablet that preserves this reading is lost, a photograph printed in Kämmerer/Metzler 2012: Plate XXXXIII does little to clarify matters. *šá-šu-u[n]* (plural) is Kämmerer/Metzler's reading of MS j (Lambert), whereas Lambert reads the same MS *šá-šu-ˈú*ˈ. Kämmerer/Metzler's reading is likely to be correct: Al-Rawi's copy, on which Lambert's text is based, appears to favour *šá-šu-u[n]*, see Al-Rawi and Black 1994: 136. Moreover, *šá-šu-u[n]* seems inherently more plausible in a mansucript that otherwise spells the independent pronoun *šá-a-šú* (VI.64, 94, 132), or *šá-šu* (VI.136, 138), but never *šá-šu-ú*. We may note, too, that *šá-šu-u[n]* is a perfectly normal variant of *šá/ša-a-šu-un* found in *Enūma eliš* III.12 (two MSS from Kuyunjik and Babylonia), whereas *šá-šu-ú* occurs nowhere else in the MSS of *Enūma eliš*.

[146] Var. *ana šá-a-šú* (Tell Haddad).

[147] Var. *ana ša-a-šu-ma* (Kish).

[148] The reading *ša-a-ši* is found in MS g (Lambert), from Sippar, the only extant witness.

[149] *šu-a-šá* is the reading of MS H (Lambert), from Kuyunjik. Varr. *šá-a-šá* (Sultantepe); *ša-a-š]i* (Commentary X (Lambert), from Kuyunjik); *šá-a-šú* (Tell Haddad). The latter may have arisen from a misunderstanding of the line (construing with Marduk?), or it may be a simple error.

[150] The full list, excluding passages that are too broken to be significant, is as follows: **I**.161, 206, **II**.188, 230b, **X**.25, 78, 112, 155, 173, 207, 212, 219, 249, 266, **XI**.1, 8, 215, 231, 242, 273, 278, 294, 322. Throughout these passages one finds plenty of minor variations in spelling (e.g. *ša-šu*, *šá-šú*, *ša-a-šu*, *šá-a-šú*, etc.), but none that are grammatically significant (e.g. *šá-a-ši*, *šá-a-šá* for expected masculine *vel sim.*).

XI.285 *šumma šamma* **šá-a-šú** *ikaššadā qātāk*[*a*]   attr. acc. ob. (1)

Feminine (šâši)
I.144 ~ I.165 *iṭeḫḫ*[*â ana* **š**]**á-a-ši**   prep. dat. (2)[151]
I.215 etc. (9 passages in total) *ana* **šá-ši-ma** *izakkara*   prep. dat.[152]
XI.31 **šá-a-ši** *ṣullilši*   acc. ob. (2)
XI.60 **šá-a-ši** *ēṣirši*   acc. ob. (2)

Demonstrative pronoun (šuātu)
IX.196 *in*]*aṭṭa*[*lšu* **š**]**u-a-tum**   acc. ob. (1)

Summary:

The manuscripts of *Enūma eliš* use independent personal pronouns much like those of SB *Gilgameš*, i.e. they use *šâšu* for the masculine and *šâši* (or *šâša*) for the feminine of the third person singular oblique. Very occasionally, inferior MSS from Babylonia have the wrong gender: *šâšu* for *šâši/šâša* in *Enūma eliš* VI.94 and *Gilgameš* I.294, perhaps *šâša* for *šâšu* in *Enūma eliš* I.148(?). However, *šâši* is never used as a masculine form.

Bibliography

Al-Rawi, F. N. H. and J. A. Black
1994   A New Manuscript of *Enūma Eliš*, Tablet VI. *JCS* 46: 131–39.
Bottéro, J. and S. N. Kramer
1993   *Lorsque les dieux faisaient l'homme*, 2nd ed. Paris: Gallimard.
Buccellati, G.
1990   On Poetry – Theirs and Ours. Pp. 105–34 in *Lingering over Words: Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Literature in Honor of William L. Moran*, ed. Tz. Abush, J. Huehnergard and P. Steinkeller. HSS 37. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
Calboli Montefusco, L.
1988   *Exordium, narratio, epilogus. Studi sulla retorica greca e romana delle parti del discorso*. Bologna: CLUEB.
Clay, J. Strauss
2003   *Hesiod's Cosmos*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Dalley, S.
2000   *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, The Flood, Gilgamesh and Others*, revised ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Foster, B. R.
2005   *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature*, 3rd ed. Bethesda: CDL.
Frahm, E.
2010   Counter-texts, Commentaries and Adaptations: Politically Motivated Responses to the Babylonian Epic of Creation in Mesopotamia, the Biblical World, and Elsewhere. *Orient* 45: 2–33.
2011   *Babylonian and Assyrian Text Commentaries: Origins of Interpretation*. GMTR 5. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
2013   Creation and the Divine Spirit in Babel and Bible: Reflections on *mummu* in *Enūma eliš* I 4 and *rûaḥ* in Genesis 1:2. Pp. 97–116 in *Literature as Politics, Politics as Literature: Essays on the Ancient Near East in Honor of Peter Machinist*, ed. D. S. Vanderhooft and A. Winitzer. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

---

[151] Var. *šá-a-šá* at I.165 (Kuyunjik).
[152] The full list of passages is as follows: **I**.215, 275, 294, **III**.23, **X**.19, 29, 72, **XI**.212, 219.

Frahm E. and E. Jiménez

2015 Myth, Ritual and Interpretation: The Commentary on *Enūma eliš* I-VII and a Commentary on Elamite Month Names. *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel* 3: 293–343.

Gabriel, G.

2014 *Enūma eliš – Weg zu einer globalen Weltordnung: Pragmatik, Struktur und Semantik des babylonischen "Lieds auf Marduk."* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

George, A. R.

2003 *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic. Introduction, Critical Edition and Cuneiform Texts*Oxford: Oxford University Press.

2016 Die Kosmogonie des alten Mesopotamien. Pp. 7–25, 132–33, 140 in *Anfang & Ende: vormoderne Szenarien von Weltenstehung und Weltuntergang*, ed. M. Gindhart and T. Pommerening, Darmstadt: Phillip von Zabern. Quoted from the original English text of the article posted at http://eprints.soas.ac.uk/22858/1/CosmogonyEng.pdf.

George A. R. and F. N. H. Al-Rawi,

1990 Tablets from the Sippar Library, II. Tablet II of the Babylonian Creation Epic. *Iraq* 52: 149–57.

1996 Tablets from the Sippar Library VI. Atra-ḫasīs. *Iraq* 58: 147–90.

2014 Back to the Cedar Forest: The Beginning and End of Tablet V of the Standard Babylonian *Epic of Gilgamesh*,"*JCS* 66: 69–90.

Gesche, P. D.

2001 *Schulunterricht in Babylonian im ersten Jahrtausend v. Chr.* AOAT 275. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Haubold, J.

2013 *Greece and Mesopotamia: Dialogues in Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2013.

Kämmerer, T. R and K. A. Metzler

2012 *Das babylonische Weltschöpfungsepos Enūma elîš*. AOAT 375. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2012.

Katz, D.

2011 Reconstructing Babylon: Recycling Mythological Traditions Toward a New Theology in *Babylon.* Pp. 123-34 in *Wissenskultur im Orient und Okzident*, ed. E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, M. van Ess and J. Marzahn. Topoi 1. Berlin: de Gruyter 2011.

Lambert, W. G.

2013 *Babylonian Creation Myths*. MC 16. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Livingstone, A.

1986 *Mystical and Mythological Explanatory Works of Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Maul, S.

2015 Kosmologie und Kosmogonie in der antiken Literatur: das sog. babylonische Weltschöpfungsepos *Enūma eliš*. Pp. 15–37 in *Cosmologies et cosmogonies dans la littérature antique*, ed. M. Erler, T. Fuhrer and P. Derron. Geneva: Fondation Hardt.

Moran, W. L.

1988 *Enūma elîš* I 1–8. *Nouvelles assyriologiques brèves et utilitaires* 21: 15–16.

Reiner, E. and H. G. Güterbock

1967 The Great Prayer to Ishtar and its Two Versions from Boğăzköy. *JCS* 21: 255–66.

Rowton, M. B.

1962 The use of the permansive in classic Babylonian. *JNES* 21: 233–303.

Seri, A.

2006 The Fifty Names of Marduk in "Enūma eliš." *JAOS* 126: 507–19.

2012 The Role of Creation in "Enūma eliš." *JANER* 12: 4–29.

2014 Borrowings to Create Anew: Intertextuality in the Babylonian "Poem of Creation" ("Enūma eliš"). *JAOS* 134: 89–106.

Streck, M. P.

1995 ittašab ibakki "weinend setzte er sich:" iparras für die Vergangenheit in der akkadischen Epik, *OrNS* 64: 33–91.

2014 The Beginning of the Babylonian Epic of Creation. Pp. 391-96 in *"Vom Leben umfangen." Ägypten, das Alte Testament und das Gespräch der Religionen. Gedenkschrift für Manfred Görg*, ed. S. J. Wimmer and G. Gafus. Ägypten und Altes Testament 80. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Talon, P.

2005 *The Standard Babylonian Creation Myth Enūma eliš*. SAACT 4. Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project.

West, M. L.

1997 Akkadian Poetry: Metre and Performance. *Iraq* 59: 175–87.

Wheeler, G.

2002 Sing, Muse ...: The Introit from Homer to Apollonius. *Classical Quarterly* 53: 33–49.

Wilcke, C.

1977 Die Anfänge der akkadischen Epen. *ZA* 67: 153–216.

Wisnom, M. S.

2014. Intertextuality in Babylonian Narrative Poetry: Anzû, Enūma Elish, and Erra and Ishum, D.Phil. Thesis Oxford.

Worthington, M.

2012 *Principles of Akkadian Textual Criticism*. SANER 1. Berlin: De Gruyter.