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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. Threenew 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, 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 newinsights into the language, themes, poetic structure, and compositional background of the poem. Andrea Seri and Selena Wisnom have considered its complex intertextual relationships. Eckart Frahm and Enrique Jiménez have studied commentaries and other forms of reception. Scholars have also begun to develop ambitious readings of the text: the recent monograph of Gösta Gabriel is exemplary in this regard. 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. 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-
as-ru-nim-ma untranslated because its meaning cannot currently be determined with any confidence. 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 Enûma eliš (I.1-10):

1 AabceeKx  e-nu-ma e-liš  la na-bu-ú šá-ma-mu
2 AabcedeKM  šap-liš am-ma-tum  šu-ma la zak-rat
3 AabcedeKMXZ  apsū-ma reš-tu-ú za-ru-šu-un
5 AabcedeKM  meš-šú-nu iš-te-niš i-ḥi-qu-ú-ma
6 AabcedeKMXZ  gi-pa-ra la ki-iš-su-ru  šu-şa-a la še'-ú
7 AabcedeKMXZ  e-nu-ma ilâni  la šu-pu-u ma-na-ma
8 AabcdjKM  šu-ma la zuk-ku-ru  ši-ma-tû la ši-i-mu
9 AabcdjKM  ib-ba-nu-ú-ma ilâni qî-rib-šû-un
10 AabcdjKM  dîlah-mu dî-la-ḥa-mu uš-ta-pu-ú  šu-mi iz-zak-ru

1 When the heavens above did not exist,
   And earth beneath had not come into being –
3 There was Apsû, the first in order, their begetter,
4 And demiurge Tiâmât, 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 Lhamu 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 šu-şa-a la še’-ú? Is this about “finding” reed-beds (šē ‘ū), as Lambert suggests, or perhaps rather about padding them (šē ‘ū)?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 Enûma eliš I.1-10 remain stubbornly elusive. How long does subordination continue after the opening conjunction enûma? 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

---

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 ṛiṭḥ.
building at the beginning of a text. 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 cosmology like *Enûma eliš*, where beginnings are themselves the main focus of attention. 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 *Enûma 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. 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 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 *Enûma 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 (*gipāra*, *ṣusā*), as Lamberts assumes in the translation reprinted above? Or are they accusatives (*gipāra*, *ṣusā*), in which case should we take them as the objects of active/transitive statives *kiṣṣurā* and *šeʾū*? 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”). 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. Streck argues that the manuscripts of *Enûma eliš* do observe the old triptotic (or diptotic) system of declining nouns; and that the apparent accusatives in *Enûma 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 > -O. Contracted vowels, however, are preserved and develop as follows: -u, -i, -a > -ū, -i, -ā > -ū, -ū-market (c), -ū. Many manuscripts of *Enûma eliš* still have -u, -i, -a in the singular, others have -u, -i, -a. Already the first ten lines suffice to demonstrate this: Nominative *ammatum/abbatu* in l. 1, accusative *šuma* or *šummu* in l. 2, nominative *apsa* and *rēštū* 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 *ṣusā* (manuscripts A, B, I, J, Y+) are certainly accusatives and not nominatives.

Streck argues that the text of *Enûma 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 *Enûma 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 *kiṣṣurā* and *šeʾū*.

---

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.
Streck’s suggestion has a strong intuitive appeal, but the evidence he adduces does not seem sufficient. Streck cites several instances of triptic/diptyc declension in the manuscripts of *Enûma ešîš* 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-*š-*u*-ra and še-* ‘-ū, which Streck argues should be taken as active and transitive forms governing *gi-*pa-ra and šu-*sa-a. In support of this thesis he draws attention to the active stative *dailûnimma* ... karassa, “they jarred her belly,” in *Enûma ešîš* 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 šu-*sa-a in *Enûma ešîš* I.6 are accusatives governed by active statives kiššurū and še-* ‘-ū. 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 *Enûma ešîš* to preserve a text that we can actually construe – not just in *Enûma ešîš* 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 *Enûma ešîš* 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 *Enûma ešîš* I.6, let me begin with the question of how we should construe the statives *ki-*š-*u*-ra and še-* ‘-ū. Many scholars, including the most recent editor of the text, see them as agreeing with the nouns *gi-*pa-ra and šu-*sa-a. However, there are at least two difficulties with this analysis. First, if we accept that line 6 no longer depends on *enûma* in the opening line,19 *ki-*š-*u*-ra looks like a 3rd person plural masculine of the Gt stative of kašāru (kiššurū) – which does not obviously agree with *gi-*pa-ra. Likewise, the form še-* ‘-ū would most naturally be parsed as the 3rd person plural masculine of the G stative of šē’u (šē’ū),20 which is again not in obvious agreement with the form šu-*sa-a. One might argue that subordination to *enûma* in line 1 still applies and that *ki-*š-*u*-ra and še-* ‘-ū in fact represent singular forms (kišsur, šē’i) in the subordinative.21 Indeed, one scribe writes *ki-*š-*u*-ra and another še-* ‘-i, suggesting that they perhaps had singualrs in mind.22 But that still leaves *gi-

---

20 For the derivation from šē’u, ‘pad’, rather than še’u, ‘seek’, see the literature cited in n. 11.
21 Thus Käümmer/Metzler 2012: 68–69. It seems less likely that *ki-*š-*u*-ra 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-*š-*u*-ra may be a mere slip (NB *gi-*pa-ra la *ki-*š-*u*-ra) and še-* ‘-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 -u or even -ū: see *Enûma ešîš* III.17 (la-[a]bbi ~ labbû in Lambert’s MS b), III.77 (te-bi-ni ~ tebabû MS b), VI.69 (pa-ah-ri ~ pahrû MS c). Writing a separate ‘i’ (as in še-* ‘-i) is perhaps a different matter. Moreover, the manuscript that has še-* ‘-i in 1.6 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 šu-ša-a, two forms that look like accusatives (gipāra, šusā), 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 šu-ša-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. In *Enûma 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). However, such spellings are rare, and Streck is right to insist that most manuscripts do retain either the full tripptic case system (-u, -i, -a) or its pared-down diptotic form (-u, -i, -u). This is true even of short case endings, 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 *Enûma eliš* and in the vast majority of cases retain the full tripptic inflection. In other words, the form šu-ša-a can only be accusative (~ šusā).

Two things follow. First, šusā cannot agree with še-’ú, or indeed the variant reading še-’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-is-šu-ru (or, for that matter, the variant ki-is-šu-ra). It is perhaps possible in theory that gi-pa-ra and šu-ša-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 šusā 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 kisšūrī and šē ū. 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 *Enûma 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 abf ffKM in-nen-du-ma at-ḫu-ú ilāni
22 abf ffKM ešu-ú ti-amat-ma
23 abf ffKM na-šir-šú-nu iš-tab-bu
24 abf ffKM ša ti-amat ka-ras-sa
25 abfKkMR i-na šu-’ir šu-’du-ra
26 abfKkMR qi-rib an-dāru-na
27 abfKkMR la na-ši-ir apsā rī-gim-šu-un

consonant + i to represent verb-final -ū in manuscripts from Kuyunjik see George 2003: 441 (šal-li for šallā in VI.180, āš-bi for asbiā in XI.126).

23 George 2003: 437–42 documents the situation in the Kuyunjik MSS of SB Gilgames; for *Enûma 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-nē-na in a context that requires nominatives (VI.131). Other examples are less certain: in I.53, the forms [m]u-um-ma, [m]a-[m]a in two MSS from Assur and Kish are perhaps intended to make Mummuthe object of the sentence; I.59 it-pe-sā in one MS from Assur appears to have arisen from false analogy with preceding agga and/or contamination with passages like *Enûma eliš* VII.117; II.127 ga-ās-ra, one MS from Assur, was probably understood as an accusative governed by išīma (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 ki-it-mu-rā ma-ag-sā-rā in the Kuyunjik MS); VI.114 ba-ru-dā-la-a-ta in one MS from Kish looks like the accusative object in a sentence that has been deliberately remodelled (NB lu-ū hi-is-su-su in the same MS; cf. n. 104 below); VI.117 it-pe-sā in one Assur MS seems intended to spell a static 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 lišāḫīc (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’.
The divine brothers came together,
Their clamour got loud, throwing Tiāmat into a turmoil.
They jarred the nerves of Tiāmat,
And by their dancing they spread alarm in Anduruna.
Apsû did not diminish their clamour,
And Tiāmat was silent when confronted with them.

Lambert takes the statives esū, dalḥūnimma, šu’durū, našir to be active and transitive. He must surely be right: these forms cannot be interpreted in any other way. The Enûma 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 faultless agreement between a stative and its noun, faulty, that is, by the standards of second millennium grammar. So, a feminine singular noun in Enûma eliš always takes a stative in -at; a feminine plural noun requires -ā, masculine plural calls for -û. 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, 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 Enûma 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 Enûma eliš I.159 ~ II.45, III.49, III.107 he switches from passive to active usage within a single line (innamu Qingu šušqû leqû anûtu = “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 mēšunu ... ihiqqûma in I.5, 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 (zārāšûn, muallidat gimrīšun). Pastureland (gipāru) and reed thickets (ṣuṣût) provided crucial resources in ancient Mesopotamia, and reed in particular was celebrated as a divine gift, also in the context of creation accounts. 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 iḥiqū to the present ihiqqû; 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-ḥi-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” (ḥegalla) in the reed thicket (ṣuṣût); cf. K 2867, Rückseite 2-3 (Streck): Ea released the springs during the reign of Assurbanipal, and the reed thicket (ṣuṣût) grew dense (elēpu Št). In the Sumerian dispute between Bird and Fish, Enki “knits together” reed marshes after establishing human civilization: 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, II. 25-26).
They are content to mix their waters together and leave the formation of the world to others.\footnote{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 (\textit{sidirtu kulä ki-igi-şu-ru nárru šu-te-šu-ru}). Ea founds his “cella” (\textit{gipāra}) in I.77, perhaps in a deliberate echo of the “pastureland” (\textit{gipāra}) that Apsû and Tiāmat fail to establish; see Gabriel 2014: 116, n. 30. The verb \textit{kāšャa}, “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).} We might then translate:

\begin{quote}
“(Apsû and Tiāmat) mingled their waters together
but did not mat pastureland, nor pad reed thickets.”
\end{quote}

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 \textit{kḫšuru} and \textit{šē’u} as passive statives with \textit{gipāra} and \textit{ṣuṣu} as accusatives of respect. Buccellati, for example, translates: “ungirdled as to meadows, undefined as to marsh reeds”.\footnote{Buccellati 1990: 5b.} A more elegant realization of the same idea has been proposed by George (2016: 12):

\begin{quote}
“Though mingling their waters together
They were not matted with reedbed, nor padded with canebreak.”
\end{quote}

George’s translation is grammatically unobjectionable, for the stative can indeed be construed in this way. Moreover, \textit{kḫšuru} (\textit{Gt}) with accusative can mean “they are girt with,”\footnote{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., \textit{labiş melammī} in \textit{Enûma eliš} I.103, \textit{naḫlipta ... šalipma} in IV.57, \textit{melammī ... apir} in IV.58. Statives referring to parts of the body follow a similar pattern. Note \textit{zaqûma šinnu/-a/-i} in I.135, II.21, III.25, 83; \textit{patûni šapṭi} in IV.53. The latter two phrases illustrate well the grammatical and semantic flexibility of this type of idiom: while \textit{zaqûma šinnu/-a/-i} suggests a state qualified by an adverbial accusative (“were sharp of fang”), \textit{patûni šapṭi} more naturally implies a verbal action with an object (“had their lips open”).} and may thus point to descriptions of a person’s attire as the model behind the line.\footnote{\textit{CAD} s.v.} 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 \textit{CAD} s.v., the verb \textit{šē’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 less natural than assuming that they do one thing continuously, i.e. mix their waters together (\textit{iḫiqqū}), and in the process (-\textit{ma}) fail to attend to other matters.

Whether we should take \textit{kḫšuru} and \textit{šē’u} as active or passive in \textit{Enûma 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 \textit{Enûma eliš} poet and those who transmitted his text. It is impossible, for example, to construe \textit{gị-pa-ra} and/or \textit{ṣu-ṣa-a} as nominatives with...
the statives ki-is-šu-ru and še-ʾi-u in Enûma elîš 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 Enûma elîš. 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 Enûma elîš, and masculine šīmū cannot agree with feminine šīmātū: 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 Enûma elîš.

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 Enûma elîš, 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 zakrû at the end of line 2. Conversely, some manuscripts appear to favour passive statives in line 6: I have already mentioned the variant readings kîṣṣura and šēʾi. 39 Two scribes took issue with the Gt stative kîṣṣurû, and replaced it with the more familiar D-form kusṣurû. In lines 5 and 10, two manuscripts from Babylon and Assur (Lambert’s MSS ee and M) introduce what look like further statives (ḫiḡū, 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 Enûma elîš 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,

---

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-tû 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 Göttter ... mit Schickssalen bestimmt waren” (Kämmner/Metzler 2012: 110); “when the gods ... had not been given (their) destinies” (Streek 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, ilâni šīmātû lâ šīmû ought to mean “the gods had not fixed the destinies,” with šīmû yet again interpreted as an active/transitive stative. For šīmû and associated activities in Enûma elîš see Gabriel 2014: 249–68.

38 Worthington 2012, esp. pp. 68–70, on the “somnolent” scribe.

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

40 Pace Kämmner/Metzler 2012: 74–76. They are right that we do not have the text of Enûma elîš, but they seem to me to go too far in suggesting that “there are only Enûma elîš’s” (p. 74: “es gibt nur Enûma elîše”).

41 Or: “There was Apsû, the first one, their begetter ...” (existential clause).
and creative Tiāmat, who bore them all,
ingled their waters together
and did not knit together meadowland or pad reed thicket.\textsuperscript{42}
When the gods had not yet emerged, none of them,
nor acquired their names, nor decreed the destinies,\textsuperscript{43}
then gods were created within them:
Laḫmu and Laḫamu 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.

\textbf{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:

\begin{verbatim}
49 CDeGJk  `iš-me-ma an-<šár>  a-ma-tú ma-gal dal-ḫat
50 CDeGJk  `u-ta iš-ta-ti ša-pat-su it-taš-ka
51 CDeGj  ez-ze-et ku-ba-as-su la na-ḫat ka-ras-su
52 CDeGj  e-li ̀é-a b[u]-uk-ri-šu šá-gi-ma-šu uš-taḫ-ḫa-ă̂h
53 CDeGj  ma-ri ša te-e[r-g]-ru-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 CDeGj  `u ti-amat ša tu-[š]a-gi-gu a-li ma-ḥir-ša

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?\textsuperscript{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:

\begin{verbatim}
65 CgJ  e-nim-me-e a-ta-mu-ka sur-riš nu-ḫa-am-ka
\end{verbatim}
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{42} Or, less likely: “but were not matted with pastureland nor padded with reed thicket” (passive).
\textsuperscript{43} Interpreting šīmû as an active stative. Alternatively: “nor had their destinies fixed” (passive).
\textsuperscript{44} Text and trans. Lambert 2013: 66–67.
Anšar was in a paroxysm
pašā
: as will become apparent, Lambert’s translation is problematic
pašā
pašā
rans. Lambert
49
see Gabriel 2014
VI.12
are initially restless (I.110), but Marduk gives them rest (II.72, ipšaḫ libbašūma): pašāhu
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 Enûma elîš. The effect of Ea’s speech
confirms the poet’s own introduction of it as a triumph of rhetoric:

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

“... My son, your deeds are fitting
for a god ...”

Ea has brought about a complete change of heart in Anšar: whereas the report of
Tiâmat’s revolt had been “utterly distressing” to him (amātu magal dalḥat), 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): pašāhu
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 Enûma elîš. The effect of Ea’s speech
confirms the poet’s own introduction of it as a triumph of rhetoric:

57 CDgJ
58 CDg
59 CGJ
60 CGJ

aši-iš mi-il-ki
ba-nu-û né-me-qu
a-ma-tu₃at-šu-ul-tum
an-šār a-ba-šu

ru-bé-e ta-šim-ti
ihu₄nu-dim-mud
sē-qaṭ ta-né-hi
ṭa-bi-iṣ ip-pal

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

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 dalḥat as a symptom of crisis and disturbance see also I.23, 108-109, 116, IV.48.
48 Apsû cannot find rest (pašāhu, I.38); is advised to find rest (pašāhu, I.50); and is eventually put to rest against
his will (pašāhu, I.63). Ea, Anu and Marduk must put Tiâmat to rest (pašāhu, II.77, 100, 102, 150). The gods
are initially restless (I.110), but Marduk gives them rest (pašāhu, VI.52 and 54; VI.8 and VII.10 šunu lû pašḫu;
VI.12 aššu tapšuḫtu ša ilâni; VI.126 pašaḫu tuṣḫa; VI.130 šunu ippaḫu; VI.136 mušapšuḫu Igiḫi); for discussion
This is a stunning build-up, and Anšar’s reaction confirms that Ea lives up to it. Notice particularly ipšā libbašuma in II.72, which takes up amāt tapšušti in II.59; and amātu itib ēlu in II.71, which takes up tābīs 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 tapšušti) 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 Apsû tanāra; II.67 Apsû 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 nāhama in II.65 takes up siqar tanēhi in II.59 (which in turn echoes II.51, lā nāḥat karassu); ki amāt dunqi ēpušu in II.66 develops the idea of a “good” speech in II.60 (tābīs 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 underwhelming. 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 (šāši 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 Enûma 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, war das (da)？”

This is again problematic, both as a translation and as a text. In sum, none of the existing translations of Enûma elîš 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 Enûma elîš 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: lâm at the beginning of line 69 corresponds to lâm at the beginning of 67; uballû (“I extinguished/finished,” in the subordinative) takes up anāramma (“I killed”); šuātī refers back to Apsû. 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 Enûma elîš 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 urrihamma, “I rushed.” In combination, urrihamma and uballû suggest that Apsû posed what modern pundits might call “a live threat.”\(^{58}\)

---

\(^{56}\) 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 Enûma elîš (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-Suhgirim “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 quashing an imminent attack (bullû, II.69).

\(^{58}\) For similar sentiments, expressed in similar language, see Ea’s second speech to Anšar, esp. II.95 (lâm qâṭša unmiidu ana maḫḫûni) and Anšar’s speech to Anu a few lines later (esp. II.99, arûmû). By that point, it is Tiâmat 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. šuāši / šuāši; fem. šīāš / šīāši) which, after contraction of the central vowels, became indistinguishable (šāši / šāši(m)). By the later second millennium BCE, when Enûma eliš was probably composed, distinct forms for the masculine and feminine pronoun had re-emerged. 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 Enûma eliš, but I believe a strong case can be made that here too ṣuāšulšâšu 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 Enûma eliš in Section 1 of Appendix III. As may be seen from the analysis offered there, the masculine form in Enûma eliš is šâšulšâšu, in line with usage in SB Gilgameš. Twice we find šuāšu-ši instead. The scribes never write ša-a-ši ~ šâši for the masculine form. They once do the opposite: in VI.36 we find šâšu (masc.) in several manuscripts, despite the fact that a feminine form is expected. Perhaps the line is to be construed ad sensum, with preceding amēlūtu (fem.) ~ amēlūtu (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. The scribal commentary writes [šâši] while two Assyrian MSS offer ūašša/šašša. 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. What matters here is not whether the poet used šâši or šâšu 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 Enûma 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 lists šuāši/šuāšu/šâši for accusative and genitive; and šuāššu/šâša (masculine) and šuāššı̂/šâšı̂/šâsha (feminine) for the dative. However, in Enûma eliš (and SB Gilgameš) šuāšu/šuāšu and šâši/šaša/šušša are used for all oblique cases of the personal pronoun.
62 At Enûma eliš I.148 Lambert reads the variant ša-a-š[i] in his manuscript b, from Babylonia, in a context where a masculine form is required. Kämmerer/Metzler read the same MS ša-a-š[i].
63 Note also the possible variants šaša, šašun 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 (šušša) and M from Sultantepe (šâša). Another variant, šâ-a-ši ~ 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 šāšu instead. He breaks this rule on two occasions, in II.69 (of the defeated Apsū), and in IV.120 (again with reference to a defeated enemy of the gods, Qingu). Whatever other connotations šuātu may carry in these contexts (“that one”), it certainly has the effect of drawing a distinction with šāši in II.69-70, in a way that the regular form šāšu would not have done. There is Apsū, 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 šāši ušhalliqa 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. An impressive example of the latter may be found in SB Gilgameš VII.47-55 (George):

```
lu-u i-de งิš dalat(ig) ki-i an-nu-ú [gi-mil-k]i? :
KIMIN (= lū īde dalat kī annû) du-muq-k[i]
lu-ū āš-ši pa-a-šū lu-ū ak-ki!(KU)-sa k[a-a-ši]
a-ma lu-ū ú-šār-ki-ba [a-n]aē.babb[ar.ra]
[ana] ē.babbar.ra! ბუ(t) Īša-maš lu ú-šā-ši-lak-ki? :
[ina] ē.babbar.ra งิš erēna(eren) lu-ū az-q(up)
[ina] bābī(kā)-sū lu-u uš-ziz-za an-za-[a ... :
[...] x x nē-še-bi ki lu-[u] x x
[l]u-u am-x[ x (x)] x x šā āli(uru) Īš-ša-[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-babbar.
[To E-babbar], 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 Anzū […]
    […] your entrance I would have […]
I would have … […] the city […] Šamaš

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 Apsū (inanna annâti II.68). We can only speculate what would have happened had Ea not taken this course of action – hence the rhetorical question mēnā bašima, 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 šāšu etc. as a demonstrative pronoun.
68 Note also the variant reading šāatu (Assur) for šāšu at II.34, again of Qingu.
69 GAG § 152f and 158c.
70 The translation is 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 se-e-ni im-mer pa-ni ú-še-la ina pit-qi
ki-i la za-qip ši-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 pī-i lab-bi na-’i-r[i] ul ik-ki-mu šá-lam-tū
ù a-šar is-te-en ra-’i-bu šá-nu-ú ul i-ma-al-li[k-šū]
<sá>la 4i-išum a-liš mah-ri-ia mi-nu-tú 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-eš-ši-ná 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 plungers 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, mīnū 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 (mīnā bašīma- mīnū bašīma). However, what matters here is not direct borrowing, which is in any case hard to prove, but rather the fact that mīnā/ū 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 him
I had destroyed her, 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 kāši lū akšudkīma kī šāšūma lā 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.
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 (urrīḫamma uballû); the stark alternative between “him” (šuāti) and “her” (šāši); 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 (mīnā 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 Enûma 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 Enûma 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 Enûma 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 Enûma 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 Gilgamesh confirm that the practice was highly developed (e.g., SB Gilg. X.120-125 ~ 220-225). The poet of Enûma eliš does not portray Ea as its inventor (for an earlier instance see Enûma eliš I.45), but certainly as its most effective exponent.

76 See II.75 ~ 75 epšētika iliš našāma.

77 See II.56. That Ea fails to make any impact in Enûma 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 Enûma eliš II.53-56; in II.55 (ša tegrā tuqunta) Anšar alleged that it was Ea who initiated the hostilities.
introduces as a masterpiece of verbal craft, the speech that Ea makes in *Enûma 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 šaši 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 *Enûma eliš***

Appendix I lists vowel-stem adjectives and nouns in the nominative and accusative singular. 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:**

*ayay* 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-sû-ú (1), I.51 ap-sa/sû-ú (2), I.117 ap-su-ú (2); *banû* VI.131 ba-nu-ú (4); *šubû* II.62, 64 šub-šu-ú (2); *banû* II.145, 147 ba-nu-ú (9), VI.133 ba-nu-šu/su-nu (2); *gešû* VI.148 ge-es/geš-tu/ú-ú (5); *mahû* VII.82 re-mé/me-nu-ú (4); *rebû* I.3 reš-tu-ú (6); *šanû* VI.89, VII.88 ša-nu-ú (7); *ṣaqû* VII.82 ša-qu-ú (2); *zûrû* I.3 za-ru-šu-un (5).

**Accusative singular:**

*aqû* I.67 a-ga-šû (3), I.108 a-ga-(a)-am-ma (6), V.94 a-ga-a (1); *annû* V.131 an-na-a (2); *Apsû* I.47 ap-sa-a (2), I.65 abzu-am (1), ap-sa-a (2), ap-sû-ú (1); *šubû* II.127 nêtu-bu-ú (3); *rebû* I.61 lal-lu-a (1); *lûlûl* B IV.72 lù-lu-a (4); *meḫû* I.107 me-ḫa-a (3), IV.45 me-ha-a (1), me-ḫu-ú (1); *šûnu* III.59 ba-ba-šu-un (1); *rabû* IV.49 gal-a (2) ra-ba-a-am (1), IV.75 gal-a (2) šuša lù-sha-a/a-á (5); *šabarû* VI.49 šu-bar/ba-ra/-(a)-ni/nu (4); *tû* IV.61 ta-a (2), I.153, II.39, III.43, 101 ta-a-ka/ak (10), VI.111 ta-/-ti-‘a-aši-na (4), I.62, IV.91 ta-a-shu/-šu (10).

**Doubtful or problematic:**

*aqû* V.17 a-ga-a (2); *banû* IV.22 ba-nu-ú (3); *pâ/-pâ/-pâ* IV.100 pa-a-šaša (3), VII.33 pa-(a)-ši-na (4); *I.35, III.1, V.117 pa-a-šuši (12), V.108, VI.47 pa-a-šu-nu (5), II.134 pi-[i-ka](1), IV.97 pi-i-šaša (4).

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 mašša 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 Sin: “You shall be brilliant” (*nabûta* V.16), “stand in opposition!”
Summary:

The manuscripts of Enûma 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/sû-û (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-hu-û (accusative) in IV.45 (regular Babylonian tablet), against four MSS that have me-ḫa-û here and another three in I.107. The infinitives abātu u ba-nu-û in IV.22 (Sippar, Assur, Sultantepe) are probably best construed as nominatives with liktûnû.

Bound forms too are remarkably consistent in following triptotic declension (e.g. za-ru-šu-un in I.3, a-ga-šû in I.108). The main exceptions concern the noun pû, ‘mouth’; cf pâšina = 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 piḳa, piša = accusative in II.134 (pi-[i-ka], 1 MS from Assur) and IV.97 (pi-i-ša/sâ, 2 MSS from Kuyunjik, 2 from Sultantepe).

Appendix II – Statices in Enûma eliš

Appendix II lists statives in Enûma 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-nîm-ma); nouns in agreement are underlined (ilâni); grammatical objects in active/transitive constructions are marked with a dotted underline (karassa). 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 Kämmener/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. 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 Enûma eliš. Readers may disagree with how some forms are classified, but I trust the overall picture will not be misleading.


86 Thus three MSS from Sippar, Assur and Sultantepe: the likely construction is nominative with liktûnû rather than accusative with qibî.
87 The forms of pû, “mouth,” pose particular problems that cannot be fully explored here. In Enûma eliš 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-, pi-, cf. GAG § 65 i). However, we occasionally encounter forms in the nominative (pāšina) and accusative (piḳa, piša) that do not follow the triptotic system. What the scribes thought they were copying is difficult to determine: non-triptotic pâ- (and very occasionally pi-) throughout? Triptotic pû-, pi- as default, with occasional deviations?
88 One MS from Kuyunjik has pa-ši-na, which appears to represent non-triptotic pâšina (nominative). The three Babylonian MSS vulgarize 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/sâ at IV.97 (four MSS, two from Kuyunjik, two from Sultantepe) are in the accusative and must therefore be read piḳa, piša (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

ilānī ... adīruḫ aḫ-zu VII.14; (ilānī) dal-ḫu-nim-ma karassa I.23; ilānī ... en-du tubqāti IV.113;
(ilānī) e-šu-ḫu Tiāmat I.22; ka-pid lakkakima dekā ananta IV.78; gipāra lā ki-iš-šu-ru (sc. Apsû, Tiāmat) I.6.91 (erbet nasmādī) sapāna lam-du IV.54;92 (innanu) Qintu ... le-šu-Ḫ enūtu I.159, II.45, III.49, III.107; šile ... ma-da-ta (sc. Kakka) III.5; nap-šu ... šu-šu VI.132; šinnāšu na-ša-a imta IV.53; ābbātī elīš na-šā-ša-ḫa (sc. Tiāmat) IV.77; na-ši-ir Apsû rigimšu I.25; (ilānī) šeressu na-šu-ḫu IV.114; (ilānī) na-šu-ḫu tamhārīl-a I.131, II.17, III.21, III.79; šu-Šu ... šu-ša-tu VII.127; lū ri-tu-šu šunu kakkāki IV.85; (Nēberu) ša-bit kunsaggī VII.127; (Apsû, Tiāmat) sušā lā še*-šu I.6;94 (Tiāmat) lā še-ma-ta amākša II.10.95 (ilānī) šīmātu lā ši-imu I.8;96 (Tiāmat) puhru ši-it-ku-na-at-ma II.12, III.16, III.74; (ilānī) ukkinma šī-ku-nu-ma I.132, II.18, III.22, III.80; (erbet šārī) šu-ud-lu-ḫu karsakīma I.116;97 (ilānī) šu-*du-ru gērēb Anduruṣa I.24; ša tak-lu-ka IV.17; (Marūtuk) šanmi imta bullī ta-me-ēḫ IV.62; Nēberu nēberēt ... ta-me-ēḫ-ma VII.124; zi-za-ma šalūm qaqqadi ilānī VI.119.

Passive/Intransitive

(ilānī) i-da-aša al-ku II.14, III.18, 76;98 (Marūtuk) melammī ... a-pi-ir IV.58;99 šu a-rīk VI.89; aš-ša-ti I.118 (sc. Tiāmat); (Marūtuk) a-tar I.92; Anšar Kišar ... at-rū I.12; (banū abātu etc.) lā ba-si-ša-ma nansūlu I.132; mēnīlā ba-šī-ma II.70; Anunnaki mala ba-šu-u V.86; ilānī mala ba-šu-[ā] V.106; ša bullutu ba-šu-ḫu ittīšu VII.30; šabāšu ... hulugušu ba-šu-ḫu ittīšu II.62, 64; ša ... u ... māḫarasu ba-*u VII.156; amātu ... da-hat II.49; da-hat Tiāmatma I.109; emaḫ(u) simīštī ... lū du-nu-ナ II.92, 116;100 Tiāmat ... dun-nu-na-at-ma II.88, 112; (ilānī) e-šu VI.133; lā na-at gībēšu VII.151; (amēlā?) lū en-du dullī ilānīma VI.8,101 e-šī malakšu IV.67; (Mešaškušu) e-zi-īz VI.137; ez-e-ēt kabta[a]ssu I.51; (ilānī) ez-

---

91 An interpretation as P/I seems possible, but less likely; see above p. ****. The isolated variant ki-iš-su-ra (Kuyunjik) may be a trivial slip (NB gi-pa-ra la ki-iš-su-ra and cf. [gi-pa-ru] la ki-iš-su-ra in MS K, from Assur), or else result from speculation about the syntax and meaning of the line. Two further variants, ku-us-su/sa-su-ra, 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-ha-ri (5 MSS, from Assur, Kuyunjik and Babylonia), tam-ha-ra (5 MSS, all from Babylonia), and tam-ha-ru (3 MSS from Babylonia and Sultantepe). The spread and quality of the witnesses argues in favour of tam-ha-ri, which at first sight may suggest the expression nāš tamhārī, ‘bearers of battle’ (thus CAD s.v. tamhāru b). CAD s.v. našā A 2c 2 confirms that phrases of this type can very occasionally be spelled with final -ar, but much more common are na-aš bilti, naši-bilti etc. (sg. and pl.). That, and the immediate context (statives!), suggests that na-ša-um tam-ha-rīl-al-u is better taken as A/T stative našū with object tam-ha-rīl-al-ur; for this use of našū in the stative see Rowton 1962: 244. The form tam-ha-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 Gilgamesh, see George 2003: 439) or as the plural tamhārī (for a rare example where this is certain cf. bélet taḫāzi-kā kilišumu tamhārī in the Great Prayer to Ishtar, NB version, STC II Plate LXVII 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 ~ šemāt, CV-CV for CVC or sandhi spelling.
96 An interpretation as P/I seems possible: see above, n. 37.
97 Var. šu-ud-lu-ḫu (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 I.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 Enûma 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: tab-na-a i-da-ša-kā-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 endī is a P/I stative agreeing ad sensum with a plural subject (amēlā?), rather than A/T agreeing with ilānī.
zu I.130, II.16, III.20, 78; gap-ša emūgāša II.87; gap-ša emūgāšu II.98, II.111; gap-ša tērētēša I.145, II.31, III.35, 93; (Marātuk) ga-šir I.88; (Nudimmud) gu-uš-šu-ur I.19; (Marātuk) nahlapta ... ha-li̱p-ma IV.57;102 Danm[a]ta ... har-šaš-šu I.84;103 (Nudimmud) ha-sis I.18; ha-šu-ša li̱ hi-i̱š-su-su I.114;104 hu-um-mu-ra ū-nātimu I.121;105 (Mari-utu) šaqūš it-bur I.103; (Tiāmat, Marātuk) šašmiši it-lu-ru IV.94; attāma kab-ta-ta IV.3; Marātuk kab-ta-ta IV.5; Aṣaralim ša ina bit milki kab-tu VII.3;106 (ilāni) ka-lu-ú kisūkkiš IV.114; ka-mi-il libāšāša I.126; pulīdatu ... elīṣu kām-ra I.104; (ilāni) kap-du I.130, II.16, III.20, 78; (išu) lu ka-sīš VI.89; ki-na-at aššu VII.151; ki-na-at šišt pīka IV.9; (ilāni) lu ku-bu-tu-ma VI.10; kūn āṣuṣuка IV.12; Mummu ... dālapiši ku-ú-ru I.66;107 šapāšuṇu ku-ut-tu-ma-ma II.122; (Tiāmat) la-ab-baš II.12, III.16, 74; (Mari-utu) la-biš melāmmu I.103;108 (ilāni) lab-bu I.131, II.17, III.21, 79,109 la-a-'iš karassu VI.138; lam-da-ma ... minātišu I.93; (ilāni) lam-mu-ú IV.110; Tiāmat ... ma-lā-ta adīrū II.87, 111,110 (ilāni) ma-lu-ú dumāmu IV.113; epšetuš lu maš-lat VI.122;111 ša ana dumnušu ... šanū lu ma[a]-l[u] VII.88; (Mersakusu) muš-taš VI.137; na-ba-a-ta V.16 (sc. Nannaru); lā na-bu-ú šašmušu I.1; ša na-bu-ú zikīruš VI.51; (ilāni) šapariš na-du-ma IV.112; lā na-hat karassu II.51; minā nak-ra III.127;112 lā na-ši-ir tukkaša I.89, 113; epšētaka iliš na-ša-ma-[š]a VII.73; (minātišu) hašasiš lā na-ša-a I.94; šipru šu lā na-šu-ú hašasiš VI.37; (ilāni) na-zar-bu-bu I.131, II.17, III.21, 79; nu-uk-ša minātišu I.93;113 (gaštu) nu-uk-ša-la VI.84; (mušmahih) lā pu-du-u atta 'u/a'-i I.135, II.21, III.25, 83; (lagi) ... paḥ-ru VI.69;114 pa-ab-ru-ma īgī II.121, V.85; paḥ-ru-nim-ma ilāni I.127; (Nudimmud) pal-ka uznu I.18;115 (Irugga) ša ... hašiša pal-ku VII.104;116 šu lā pa-qid VII.123; šumu ši pa-dāš-šu VI.8, VII.10; (minātišu) amāriš pa-dāša I.94; (eret našmad) pa-tu-ni šapāti IV.53;117 (Nudimmud) emūgān pu-un-gul I.18; (Tiāmat, Marātuk) qit-ru-bu taḫāšiš IV.94; ra-pa-šaš karassu VII.155;118 ra-pa-šī sabuša VI.138; ušasšlama apsā re-ḥi šittu I.65;119 ru-u-qu (vel sim.) libbaša VII.155;120 (Mersakusu) sa-bu-šu VII.137; (ilāni) lā sa-ki-pu I.130, II.16, III.20, 78; sa-pi-ih tēmašuš VI.68; si-ḥa-ṭi epšessu VI.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-'a-la-a-ta lu-ú hi-is-su-su (Kish) may result from a misinterpretation of the Gt stative as effectively a form of the stem ("lu hussuša, 'let them remind'), perhaps driven by a concern with what was perceived to be the wrong relationship between gods and worshippers; for Gt statives correctly placed see above n. 91 and the discussion on pp. *** ***.
105 Var. hu-um-mu-ru (Bab. exercise tablet) — a trivial error.
106 Var. kab-tu. 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 kārū, '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]bi in II.17 (Babylonian); for -i representing -i or -ā in Babylonian tablets see above, n. 22.
110 ma-la-ta ~ malāt, CV-CV for CRCV or sandhi spelling.
111 Var. maš-la (Assur); for discussion see below, n. 128.
112 Ventive; for the agreement with minā (singular) cf. mi[n]ā ba-ši-ma in II.70.
113 Var. lam-da-a-[...]ra-tu-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-ab-ri (Uruk); for -i representing -i or -ā in Babylonian manuscripts of Enûma elishe see above, n. 22.
115 Var. pal-ku (Babylonian); palka is 3rd pers. sg. with ventive -a.
116 Var. pa-ki (Assur). The form šapti is oblique of the bodily dual; for the construction of the stative with parts of the body see above, n. 35.
117 karassu is accusative of respect; cf. palka uzn (I.18) etc. For the construction of the stative with parts of the body see above, n. 35.
118 The parallel with the previous line suggests P/I with change of subject.
119 Var. ru-ū-qa (Babylonian). The three MSS that have -ʻu- are from Kuyunjik (ru-ū-qa), Sultantepe (ru-ū-qa), and BABYLONIA (ru-ū-qa).
120 si-ḥa-ṭi ~ sehāt, CV-CV for CRCV or sandhi spelling.
Doubtful or problematic


gəgə [məš]-la(?) V.17; 139  iliənə la šu-šu-ḫa-hu(?) i-zab-bi-lu ša-ri-ša I.110; 140 šu-šub V.103; 141 lù šu-tam-ḫu-rat V.18.
Summary:

Active-transitive statives are common in Enûma eliš and freely alternate with passive-intransitive ones. Grammatical agreement is carefully observed even by late and otherwise inferior manuscripts: Marûtuk šu-tur, enîssu šu-tu-rat, Anšar Kišar at-ru, gap-ša térētuša, etc. In the few exceptional cases where apparently ungrammatical variants establish themselves in the MSS tradition (notably al-ka alongside expected al-ku in I.I4, III.18, 76) this appears to be motivated by contextual factors such as sound (tab-na-a i-dq-ša al-ka).

Appendix III – Independent personal pronouns

Appendix III is designed to clarify the gender of šâši in Enûma eliš II.70. It lists instances of the 3rd person singular independent pronoun in the oblique cases, divided by grammatical gender. I aloud I also append instances of the demonstrative pronoun šââtu. Because numbers are small, I have complemented the analysis of Enûma 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 (Enûma 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: Enûma eliš

Masculine (šâšu)

I.54 (Mummu) unâššaq ša-a-šu (sc. Apsû) acc. ob. (2)
I.148, II.34, III.96 (Tiāmat) ša-a-šu (sc. Qingu) ušrabbâšu-l-iš acc. ob. (2 + 1)144
II.10 (Ea) mimmu Tiāmat ikpudu ušannâ ana šá-a-šû (sc. Anšar) prep. dat. (1)
IV.134 igisâ šulmâni ušâbîlû šunu ana ša-a-šu (sc. Marduk) prep. dat. (1 + 2)

143 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] portaiten 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-ša, much less to speculate about (faulty) agreement of a stative šupša-ḫu- with the noun ilâni. (To complicate things even further, Lambert has detected a variant šup-šu-ḫu- with the noun ilâni in MS a, from Kish, which seems difficult to confirm on the basis of his own drawing; see Lambert 2013: 538, Plate 4.)

144 Broken context.

145 Normalize šutamiḫurâta and construe with Nannaru (thus Lambert) or šutamiḫurat in agreement with šapattu (Kämmerer/Metzler)?

146 I have only considered passages where enough of the pronoun can be read to determine its gender, i.e. including such cases as šâšu-[ma] or ša-ša-[ma] but excluding ša-[ša]-ma-a.

147 At I.148 Lambert reads ša-a-š[a] in his MS b from Babylonia; Kämmerer/Metzler read the same MS ša-a-[ša]. 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) iżaḵru—
dat. ob. (1)

VI.36 dūli ša ilāmi imīduši ša-a-šú (sc. amēlûtu/amēlu?)
acc. ob. (2 + 1)145

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

VI.132 lā nāplussu šunu ša-a-šú (sc. Marduk)
acc. ob. (2 + 1)146

VI.136 ša-ašu-ša mīta全国人大, idāšu (sc. Marduk)
acc. ob. (1 + 2)

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

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

VII.125 li-qe-šu ša-a-šú (Nēberu)
acc. ob. (1 + 2)

VII.127 šunu ša-a-šú (sc. Nēberu) lū pālsušu
acc. ob. (2 + 1)

Feminine (šaši/šaša)
III.70 lū ša-a-ši ušhaliqa
acc. ob. (1)148

VI.94 ina puljr ilānišu-a-ša ultēšibši
acc. ob. (1 + 1)149

Demonstrative pronoun (šuatu)
I.98 inā kīma šu-a-tu-tū-ti (“like that”) ibarrā girmēti
prep. gen. (4)

I.146 – II.32, III.36, III.94 kīma šu-a-tu etc. (“like that”) uštābši
prep. gen. (7)

II.5 išmēma Ea amātu šu-a-ti-ti-tum (“that,” fem.)
acc. ob. (3)

II.69 lām ... uballū šu-a-ti (“that one”?, masc.)
acc. ob. (1)

IV.120 iti uggē šu-a-ša imnišu (“that one”?, masc.)
acc. ob. (1)

Section 2: SB Gilgameš

Masculine (šašu)

I.114 ša-ašū uštābšišu
acc. ob. (1 + 1)

I.161 etc. (23 passages in total) ana ša-šu-ma iżakkara
prep. dat.150

I.235 amur ša-a-šū
acc. ob. (1)

III.57 ~ III.75 ša-a-ša ana maṣṣṣarāṭi ... piq[iss]u
acc. ob. (1 + 1)

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

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

VI.156 kī ša-šu-ma lū āpuški
prep. gen. (3)

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

145 There are two possible variants, ša-a-ša (Uruk) and ša-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 XXXIII does little to clarify matters. ša-šu-u[n] (plural) is Kämmerer/Metzler’s reading of MS j (Lambert), whereas Lambert reads the same MS ša-šu-“a”. Kämmerer/Metzler’s reading is likely to be correct: Al-Rawi’s copy, on which Lambert’s text is based, appears to favour ša-šu-u[n], see Al-Rawi and Black 1994: 136. Moreover, ša-šu-u[n] seems inherently more plausible in a manuscript that otherwise spells the independent pronoun ša-a-šū (VI.64, 94, 132), or ša-šu (VI.136, 138), but never ša-aš-ū. We may note, too, that ša-šu-u[n] is a perfectly normal variant of šašu-a-šu-un found in Enûma elīš III.12 (two MSS from Kuyunjik and Babylonia), whereas ša-šu-ū occurs nowhere else in the MSS of Enûma elīš.

146 Var. ana ša-a-šu (Tell Haddad).

147 Var. ana ša-šu-ma (Kish).

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

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

149 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-aš, ša-a-šu, ša-a-šu, ša-a-šu, etc.), but none that are grammatically significant (e.g. ša-a-ši, ša-a-ša for expected masculine vel sim.).
XI.285 šumma šamma šá-a-šú ikašadā qāṭāk[a] attr. acc. ob. (1)

Feminine (šâši)
I.144 – I.165 īteh[ā ana š]á-a-ši prep. dat. (2)
I.215 etc. (9 passages in total) ana šá-ši-ma izakkara prep. dat. (2)
XI.31 šá-a-ši šullilši acc. ob. (2)
XI.60 šá-a-ši ēširši acc. ob. (2)

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

Summary:
The manuscripts of Enûma 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 šâšišâša in Enûma eliš VI.94 and Gilgameš I.294, perhaps šâša for šâšu in Enûma eliš I.148(?). However, šâši is never used as a masculine form.
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