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## PREFACE

Rare indeed is the Sumerian literary composition whose contents can be reconstructed with reasonable completeness. Of the numerous Sumerian epics and myths, hymns and lamentations, proverbs and "wisdom" texts that have come down to us on tablets dating from the early post-Sumerian period-the period covering the dynasties of Isin, Larsa, and Babylon I-the great majority are in such a state of incompleteness that, although large portions of the compositions can at times be pieced together from the various duplicating fragments, it is impossible to obtain a clear and satisfactory picture of their contents as a whole. It is no exaggeration to state that for the serious translator of the unilingual literary material, beset as he is by difficulties ubiquitous and treacherous-difficulties which have already been set forth in $A S$ No. 10this unfortunate fact amounts to a tragedy, for it robs him of an all-important control against slipping into a biased attitude in his interpretation of the individual passages. It is therefore with a feeling akin to elation that the writer presents to the Assyriologist and to the general student and historian of the culture of the Near East this transliteration and translation of a composition best entitled Lamentation over the Destruction of Ur. For, barring a word here and a phrase there, this lamentation, consisting of eleven songs and 436 lines, which was both composed and inscribed some time during the Isin-LarsaBabylon I period (as yet we lack criteria for more exact dating), is practically complete. Moreover, while, obviously enough, only too doubtful in spots, the translation as a whole is reasonably certain and relatively free from obscurities.

The manuscript of the Lamentation over the Destruction of Ur, based on the published texts then available, was completed early in 1937. In June of that year, however, with the aid of a fellowship award of the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, I left for Istanbul to study and copy a part of the collection of Sumerian "literary" texts from Nippur in its Museum of the Ancient Orient. Among the approximately 170 tablets which I copied were the fairly well preserved Ni 2780 and the fragments $\mathrm{Ni} 3166,2401,4024$, and 2911 (see Pls. I-IV), all duplicates of our lamentation. Upon returning to the United States in June, 1939, I went to Philadelphia and collated the copies of all the texts belonging to our composition which had been published in $M B I$, $P B S \mathrm{X} 2, P B S \mathrm{X} 4$, and $P B S$ XIII with the originals in the University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania. In January, 1940, I returned to
the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago and devoted several months to a thorough revising of the first manuscript with the aid of the collations and the new material. The revised study was completed in May, 1940.

May I take this opportunity of expressing my most profound gratitude to the Ministry of Education of the Turkish Republic, to the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, to Mr. Horace H. F. Jayne, director of the University Museum, and to Professor John A. Wilson, director of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago; it is their generous attitude that made possible this study and its publication. To the Editorial Office of the Oriental Institute I am indebted for numerous useful and practical suggestions. Very special thanks are due to Mrs. Ruth S. Brookens, a member of the editorial staff and former student, who devoted much time and effort to the checking of the huge list of variants with the published texts. The resulting accuracy will be gratefully appreciated by all Sumerologists who may have occasion to make use of it.

S. N. Kramer

Chicago
June 1940
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## INTRODUCTION

## STRUCTURE AND CONTENTS

With the exception of one tablet whose provenance is uncertain, ${ }^{\text {a }}$ all the tablets used in reconstructing this lamentation belong to the so-called Nippur "literary" material excavated by the University of Pennsylvania some forty years ago and now located in the University Museum at Philadelphia and in the Museum of the Ancient Orient at Istanbul. As stated in the Preface, the lamentation consists of 436 lines, divided into eleven "songs." ${ }^{\text {" }}$ These are of uneven length (the shortest consists of nine lines, the longest of seventy-four) and are separated from one another by means of "antiphons" consisting of one or two lines.

For some reason as yet unknown, perhaps because it was to be recited by the kalu, the first "song" is written in the eme-sal dialect. Beginning "He has abandoned his stable, his sheepfold (has been delivered) to the wind," it
${ }^{a}$ Cf., however, nn. 716a and 800a. The tablet is AO 6446 of the Louvre collection, our text A; it was published as TRS II, No. 40. It is interesting to note in this connection that although large parts of the composition had been published as early as 1918 and 1919, and although a considerable amount of additional material has appeared since, notably in $S T V C$, the contents would have remained difficult to interpret and relatively obscure were it not for the publication of AO 6446.

[^0]repeats the second half of this line as a sort of refraind in each of the remaining lines, which list the more important cities and temples of Sumer together with the deities who have abandoned them, as follows:
Enlil has abandoned Nippur, and Ninlil has abandoned the Kiur;
Ninmab has abandoned Keš;
Ninisinna has abandoned the Egalmab;
Inanna has abandoned Uruk;
Nanna has abandoned Ur and the Ekišsirgal, and Ningal has abandoned her Enunkug; Enki has abandoned Eridu, and Nin. . . . has abandoned Larak;
S̃ara has abandoned the Emah, and Usabarra has abandoned Umma;
Bau has abandoned Urukug and the Bagara(?), and Abbau has abandoned the Maguenna;
The lamassu has abandoned the E-sil-sirsir;
Mother Gatumdug has abandoned Lagaš;
Ningula has abandoned Sirara;
Dumuziabzu has abandoned Kiniršag;
Ninmar has abandoned the Guabba.
Like the first "song," the second too is written in the e me-sal dialect. Beginning with a plea directed to Ur to "set up a bitter lament as her lament," the first part of the "song" continues with several variations on the theme of Ur and her lament. The plea to "set up a bitter lament" is then directed to other centers of Sumer, namely to Nippur, Lagaš, Isin, Uruk, and Eridu. ${ }^{\circ}$ Toward the close, however, the "song" returns once more to Ur and, in words spoken directly to the city, bewails its destruction, the loss of its people, and the transformation of its "decrees" to "inimical decrees."

The third "song" informs us that Ningal, Nanna's wife, moved by Ur's bitter lament, approached her husband and, determined to give him no rest and to arouse him to the fate of her city and house, wept bitterly before him: Day and night she is pursued by bitter lamenting in her land and city, and although she has made numerous efforts to halt its destruction, she has not

[^1]e Cf. comment on 11. 48-62.
succeeded in saving Ur from its cruel fate. The Ekišširgal has caved in like a garden hut; it has become exposed to wind and rain like a tent. Her house and city have been torn down like a sheepfold; her possessions have been dissipated.

In the fourth "song" Ningal continues her lament before Nanna, describing her efforts in behalf of her city and bemoaning their futility: It was Anu and Enlil who had ordered Ur to be destroyed and its people to be killed. And when she, Ningal, wept before them and pleaded that Ur should not be destroyed and that its people should not perish, they denied her plea. Anu and Enlil have ordered the destruction of Ur and the death of its people, and they are not wont to change their commands.

One might perhaps have expected the fifth "song" to contain Nanna's response to his wife's lament. Instead, it describes in detail what seems to be an overwhelming affliction which overtook Ur in the form of a devastating "storm." Beginning with the statement that after he had carried off from Sumer the "good storm," the "storm of overflow," Enlil called against the land the "storm," much of the remainder of the "song" concerns itself with describing this "storm":g It is an "evil storm," a "storm that annihilates the land," "the great storm of heaven," an "afflicting storm," a "destructive storm," etc. This "storm," moreover, is aided and abetted by other destructive elemental forces called by Enlil against Ur, such as "the evil winds," "fire," darkness, and unbearable heat.

The sixth "song" too, in its first three lines, speaks of a "storm" which had been directed against Ur and Sumer and had turned them into ruins. It is not unlikely, however, that the word "storm" is here used figuratively, for practically the entire remainder of the "song" treats of the calamities that befell Ur as a result of her defeat in battle: The people of Sumer lay prostrate on the walls of their cities, and their dead bodies filled the gates. In their streets and boulevards they were ruthlessly attacked and laid low. Those who had been killed by the enemies' weapons lay unburied and untended; those who escaped were prostrated by the "storm." In Ur weak and strong alike perished through famine. Parents who did not leave their houses were overcome by fire, suckling babes were carried off by the waters, and the breasts of the nursing mothers were pried open. Judgment and counsel perished in the

[^2]land. Parents abandoned their children, husbands their wives, and all their possessions were scattered about. Gone is Ningal, its lady; she has departed like a flying bird. Lofty Ekišsirgal is "devoured" by the ax; the Sutians and the Elamites break it up with the pickax and turn it into ruins. Ningal cries: "Alas for my city, alas for my house." Ur is destroyed, and its people are dispersed.

In the seventh "song" Ningal again takes up the lament for her destroyed city: ${ }^{\text {h }}$ Anu has cursed her city, and Enlil has turned inimical to her house and hurled fire upon him who comes from below and upon him who comes from above. The inside of the city and its outside have been destroyed. In the rivers of her city dust has gathered; sparkling waters flow not. There is no grain in her fields; gone is the fieldworker. Her palm groves and vineyards have brought forth the mountain thorn. Her possessions have been carried off to the lower lands and the upper lands; scattered about lie her precious metal, stone, and lapis lazuli. Her ornaments of precious metal and stone adorn the bodies of those who "know" not precious metal and stone. Her sons and daughters have been carried off into captivity; she is no longer queen of Ur. Her city and house have been destroyed, and strange cities and strange houses have been erected in their place. Woe is her; Ur is destroyed, and its people are dead. Where, then, shall she sit down, and where shall she stand up? Woe is her; her house is a stable torn down, her cows are dispersed, the weapon has fallen on her ewes. She has gone forth from the city and found no rest; she has gone forth from the house and found no dwelling-place. She is a stranger in a strange city; curses and abuse are heaped upon her. She approaches her lord (Nanna?) for the sake of his house and city which have been destroyed and weeps bitterly before him. Woe is her; "O fate of my city," she will say, "bitter is the fate of my city." "O my house which has been destroyed," she will say, "bitter is the fate of my house." Like a fallen ox she will lie down beside the ruins of her city and her house and will not rise up. Bitter is the destruction of her house and her city, attacked without cause.

Beginning with the words "O queen, make thy heart like water; thou, how dost thou live!'" and repeating this and parallel phrases as a persistent refrain, the eighth "song" proceeds to enumerate in direct address to Ningal the misfortunes that have befallen her, but concludes with words of comfort and consolation. Her city has been destroyed, and her house has perished. Her city has become a strange city; her house has become a house of tears and has been given over to the pickax. She is no longer queen of her

[^3]people; these have been led to slaughter or carried off into exile. Her city has been made into ruins, her house into pasture land. Ur, the shrine, has been given over to the wind. Its pašišu walks not in radiance, its ênu dwells not in the giparru; no lustrations are made for her. Her mahhu dresses not in linen, her ênu proceeds not joyfully to the giparru. The black-headed people, whose appearance has been transformed, celebrate not her feasts, play no music for her, pour no libations. Her song has turned to weeping and her music to lamentation. The fat of her ox is not prepared for her, nor the milk of her sheep; the fisherman brings not her fish, nor the bird-hunter her birds. Her rivers and roads are overgrown with weeds. Her city seeks a place before her and weeps; her house stretches out its hands and like a human being cries her "Where, pray?" May she, Ningal, return like an ox to her stable, like a sheep to her fold, like a young child to her chamber. May Anu utter her ahulappu; ${ }^{\text {i }}$ may Enlil decree her (favorable) fate, may he return Ur ${ }^{\mathbf{j}}$ to its place for Ningal to exercise her queenship.

The ninth and tenth "songs" together contain a plea to Nanna not to permit the "storm" to overwhelm Ur and the black-headed people. Beginning with the statement: "Alas, all the storms have flooded the land together," they continue with a description of the "storms" and their destructive deeds, upon which follows a prayer to Nanna. The great "storm" of heaven, the ever roaring "storm," has sated the land with affliction. The "storm" which destroys cities and houses, stables and sheepfolds, has stretched out its hand over the holy pars $\hat{u}$, has cut off the light of the land, has banned the light of the black-headed people. The "storm" which "knows" neither mother nor father, sister nor brother, weak nor strong, the "storm" on whose account wife and child are forsaken, has caused the light to perish in the land and has sated it with evil and affliction. Let not Nanna allow this "storm" to become established near the city, let it not cast down the black-headed people. Like the great gate of night may the door be closed on it; may it be entirely destroyed. Let it not be given a place in the "numbering," and may its record hang by a nail outside the house of Enlil.

The last "song," which unfortunately is not as well preserved as the others, consists of a prayer to Nanna to restore Ur and the black-headed people to their original and favored position. The first three lines of the "song" are more or less unintelligible in their present state. Starting with the fourth line the

[^4]"song" continues: May the black-headed people who have been cast away prostrate themselves (once again) before him (Nanna); may the city which has been made into ruins (once again) "set up a wail" (i.e., utter prayers etc.) before him. May the city which has been restored step forth gloriously before him, and like a bright star may it proceed before him; let it not be destroyed. Following six broken and rather obscure lines, the "song" concludes: May Nanna gaze with steadfast eye upon its (i.e., Ur's) man of offerings. May every evil heart of its people be pure before Nanna, whose penetrating gaze overwhelms every heart, and may the hearts of those who dwell in the land be good before him. The lament ends with the line: "O Nanna, thy city which has been returned to its place exalts thee."

## THE SYSTEM OF TRANSLITERATION

Recent studies in Sumerian phonetics by Poebel and myself ${ }^{1}$ have shown that the customary transliteration of a large number of Sumerian signs is erroneous and misleading, being the result of a misconception of the Sumerian system of orthography. Since, however, the time is not yet ripe for a thorough and scientific overhauling of the Sumerian system of transliteration, and since piecemeal efforts in that direction would only tend to intensify the prevailing confusion, the writer, in transliterating the following lamentation, deems it best to follow the more or less established usage. Thus:

1. In the case of signs representing roots that end in a consonant and may have either the long or the short value (e.g. the signs for pa(d), "to call," du(g), "good," etc., which may be read either pàd, dùg, etc. or pà, $d u_{10}$, etc.) the transliteration uses the longer value in spite of the fact that the shorter is scientifically the more correct. ${ }^{m}$ Only in cases such as $u(d)$, "day," and s a ( g ), "heart," where the shorter value has become more or less standard, is that value used in our transliteration, although the inconsistency in transliterating the signs for $p a(d)$ and $d u(g)$ as $p$ àd and d ùg while giving those for $u(d)$ and $\mathrm{s} \mathrm{a}(\mathrm{g})$ as $\mathrm{u}_{4}$ and s à is only too patent. ${ }^{\text {n }}$
2. The signs bi and Ni (when used for the possessive pronouns or when representing the syllable resulting from the combination of a final $b$ or $n$ with the vowel $e$ of an immediately following grammatical element), the sign GI,
${ }^{1}$ Cf. $A S$ Nos. 2 and 8, also Kramer in Archiv orientálni VIII (1936) 18-33.
${ }^{\mathrm{m}} \mathrm{Cf}$. Archiv orientälni VIII 19 ff .
${ }^{n}$ The sign for the root $k e s x(d)$ is transliterated as $k e s s$ when not followed by a grammatical element beginning with a vowel. When so followed, it is transliterated as $\mathrm{k} 6 \check{s}$ if the orthography combines the final $d$ with the vowel of the grammatical element; where the orthography fails to do so, it is transliterated as k esd.
and the signs RI and ur (when representing the syllable resulting from the combination of a final $r$ or $l$ with the vowel $e$ of an immediately following grammatical element) are to be read be, ne, ge, re, and le respectively, not $\mathrm{bi}, \mathrm{ni}, \mathrm{gi}, \mathrm{ri}$, and li. ${ }^{\circ}$ In the present transliteration, however, it is the latter values which are used, in conformity with established usage.
3. The final consonant in such words as sag, "head," ág, "to measure," nag , "to drink," s è g , "to rain," although actually a nasalized $g$ (when combined with the vowel $a$ of a following grammatical element, therefore, the resulting syllable is written with the sign $G \dot{A}$, not with $G A$ ), is transliterated as an ordinary $g$, although it would be more correctly transliterated as $n g$ or $\tilde{g}$. On the other hand, in spite of the fact that the final consonant in the Sumerian words for "to pacify" and "to seek" is exactly the same as that in the words listed above (when combined with the vowel $a$ of a following grammatical element, its resulting syllable too is written with the sign $G \hat{A}$ ), these words are transliterated, in conformity with customary usage, as $\mathrm{h} u \mathrm{n}$ and kin , not, as might have been expected, hug or kig nor, as is more correct, $\mathrm{hu} \tilde{\mathrm{g}}$ and $\mathrm{ki} \tilde{\mathrm{g}}$.
4. The preceding three paragraphs deal with transliterations which follow the more or less accepted usage for practical reasons, in spite of the fact that from a purely scientific point of view they are recognized to be unjustified and even though there is good reason to hope that in the not too distant future the situation will be remedied. If we now turn to the problems involved in the transliteration of the voiced and voiceless consonants, such as $b$ and $p, d$ and $t, g$ and $k$, and of the sibilants $\check{s}$ and $s$, we find ourselves almost completely at sea and practically without any point of reference whatever. For not only is the matter complicated by the fact that the systems of orthography in the various Sumerian and post-Sumerian periods underwent considerable modification, but there is also the added difficulty that the pronunciation of a consonant may have depended upon the nature of the consonants (and vowels?) preceding and following. In the present study the transliteration of such consonants follows the more or less customary usage, although in many cases the reading is merely assumed and may turn out to be unfounded.

A special problem in the transliteration of our lamentation is presented by the inconsistent orthography that is met with in the eme-sal passages. Thus we find the signs en (ll. 137 and 139), ezen (l. 117), gÁL (ll. 133 and 152; cf. also nn. 100 and 350), Gar (ll. 32, 33, 37, etc.), IGI (ll. 277 and 301), Lú (ll. 90, 132, 275, etc.), Níg (ll. 130, 133, 165), and Nin (ll. 5, 6, 11, 138, 316) instead of, and at times alongside of, the expected $u m u n, i z i m, m a l$,

[^5]mar, ibi, mulu, ag, and gasan.p In this study these signs are transliterated in small capitals in order to indicate our uncertainty as to the readings intended by the scribe. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

## THE VARIANTS

As mentioned above, our lamentation was composed and inscribed during the early post-Sumerian period when Sumerian was primarily used as a literary language only. The principles governing the orthography, phonetics, and grammar of the Sumerian of this period not only differed considerably from those prevalent during the classical period but themselves varied with time and place. Indeed, as the manifold variants in our lamentation-based as it is on tablets which with one possible exception were excavated at Nippur (cf. p. 1)-make evident, different scribal practices prevailed even in the same city. ${ }^{r}$ Comparatively little progress has been made as yet in determining the principles which guided the early post-Sumerian scribal schools in inscribing literary compositions. ${ }^{3}$ The following classified list of variants, ${ }^{t}$ together with similar lists in future translations, will lay the groundwork for a thorough study and, it is hoped, for some satisfactory solution of the problems involved.

## A. ORTHOGRAPHIC VARIANTS ${ }^{4}$

1. Use of variant signs: bur and bứr (422a), Du and dù (344), EN and ÈN (40c), GAR and Kar (232), GAR and Kàr (351), gig and Gig (115), GIr ${ }_{5}$ and $\mathrm{GIR}_{7}$ (443a), GUR and Kúr (280a), iв and íb (58, 130, 146, 295, 301k, 551, 632, $646,676)$, IR and $\mathrm{IR}_{10}(374,378)$, LA and LÁ (432), MA and MÀ (411), MÚŠ and
[^6]MÙŠ ( 12,631 ), NIN and NIN $_{\mathbf{x}}(=$ SAL +KU ) ( 656 a ), SA and SÁ ( 620 ), SUR and SÙr (242a), ȘI and ZI $(245,292)$, ŠA and ŠA ( $25,26 \mathrm{~b}$ ), TIL and Tìm (515), TƯM and TÙM (345), ÙR and UR4 (215). ${ }^{v}$
2. Writing of a syllable consisting of consonant-vowel-consonant with one sign and with two: -mèn and -me-en (613), -mun and $-\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{un}$ (242), -píl and -pi-el (354), -rum and -ru-um (161).
3. Ideographic and phonetic writing: ${ }^{\text {gisistukul.an and } \mathrm{mi-tum}}$ (260). ${ }^{\text {w }}$
4. Single and double writing of a consonant: the $b$ of -bi $(133,679)$, the $m$ of the thematic particles im(m) i- and im (m) a- (95, 98, 156, 169; cf. also 127), the $n$ of the ending -en $(474,477)$, the $n$ of the infix -n a$(64,454)$, the $b$ in $-\mathrm{sib}-(5,7)$, the syllables $g u l-\mathrm{an}-\mathrm{a}$ as $\mathrm{gul-1a-na}$ and gul-an-na (38a).
5. "Full" and "simple" writing of a vowel:
a) The vowel $a$ : - gar-ra-a-and-gar-ra-(69), gig-ga-a and gig-ga (40a, 447), - lá-a and -lá (91), -lagasa ${ }^{k i}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{ke} \mathrm{e}_{4}$ and -lagasa ${ }^{k i}-\mathrm{ke}_{4}$ (18), LUL-la-a and LUL-la (482), ma-a-ra and ma-ra (85), -sirarà ${ }^{k i}-a$ and sirara ${ }^{k i}(24)$, uru-si-baki-a and uru-si-ba (44a).
b) The vowel $e$ : -e-en and -en (543), - láe-eš and - lá-es (179, 264), LUL-e-eš and lul-eš (131), me-e and me (299, 300, 301, 429), -tab-e-ešand -tab-eš (118); cf. -rix -en-na-and-ri-na-(474).
c) The vowel $i$ : $-\mathrm{zi}-\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{zi}$ and $-\mathrm{zi}-\mathrm{zi}$ (425).
d) The vowel $u$ : $-\mathrm{zu}-\mathrm{ne}$ and $-\mathrm{zu}-\mathrm{u}-\mathrm{ne}$ (385).
6. Combination and noncombination of the final consonant of a root with the immediately following vowel of a grammatical element:
a) When the vowel involved is $a$ : -gul-1a and -gul-àm (186), $-\mathrm{kúr}-\mathrm{ra}$ and -k úr-àm (187), -nag-gáand -nag-a (266), šèg-gá and šèg-a (135).
b) When the vowel involved is $e$ : an-ni and an-e (157, 171), ir-ri and ír-e (50, 57, 129), - líl-li and-líl-e (158a, 181a, 320), sug-gi(?) and sug(!)-e (142), -tab-bi-eš and -tab-eš or -tab-e-eš

[^7](118), -til-li and -til-e (170), -til-li and -til-en (511), -til-li-en and -til-en (515). ${ }^{\text {y }}$
7. Omission and writing of determinative: dingir (2, 49, 109, 431, 438), gis (602), ki (27b, 29, 38b, 43a, 44a, 56, 293, 305, 633), mušen (363?), $\mathrm{t} \mathrm{u}_{15}$ (208), túg (254), uzu (243).
8. Variation in position of determinative: $\mathrm{ki}(5,7,25)$, $\mathrm{k} u$ Š (585).
9. Eme-sal variants in eme-ku passages: $\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{s} \mathrm{i}$ - and udu-(597), ka-na-ág and kalam (549), mu-ul-líl and en-líl (196), naam and nam (214), $\mathrm{nu}-\mathrm{nuz}$ and munus (301i, 308, 516).

## b. phonetic variants

1. Interchange of the vowels $a$ and $e$ :
a) Where neither vowel is combined with the preceding consonant: gisa $1-\mathrm{a}$ and sisal-e (294, 540), -bal-a and -bal-e (211), šèg-a and šèg-e (135), $\mathrm{me}-\mathrm{a}$ and $\mathrm{me}-\mathrm{e}(428,429)$.
b) Where the vowel $a$, but not the vowel $e$, is combined with the preceding consonant: - ág-gá and -ág-e (568), -gal-la and-gal-e (292a), -gíg-ga and -gíg-e (210), ir-ra and ir-e (129), kešda and $\mathrm{kes} d-\mathrm{e}$ (660), šèg-gáand šèg-e (135), -til-la and -til-e (59, 216, 521).
c) Where both vowels are combined with the preceding consonant: - ba and -biy ${ }^{\text {y }}$ (19, 23, 26a, 69, 87a, 91, 132, 159, 174, and passim), -d è - and -d a - (101, 243a, 441, 620), -d è and -d a (62, 63, 151, 176, 302), -d è and - dam (183, 441), -ga and -gi (479), -ke $\mathrm{e}_{4}$ and -ka (15), $-\mathrm{ke} \mathrm{e}_{4}$ and -kam(342), -na and-ni $\mathrm{i}^{y}(56,194,197,278,279,282 \mathrm{a}, 305,581$ ), ir-ra and ír-riy (40b, 129, 533), -kúr-ra and -kúr-ri (530), má-gur ra and má-gurs-ri (602), ra and ri (647), sá and si (620).
2. Interchange of the vowels $a$ and $u: ~ h a-r i-e s t a n d h a-r i-i s-$ $t u m(257),-k u d-d a$ and $-k u d-d u(654), m a-d a-a n d m u-d a-$ (118), ma-ra-and mu-ra-(667), -ma-ni-and -mu-ni- (91a), $-\mathrm{mà}$ and $-\mathrm{mu}(82,91,93,138,328,428,456,469,472 \mathrm{a}),-\mathrm{za}$ and -zu ( $538,544,574,583,603,618,672$ ).
3. Interchange of the vowels $e$ and $i$ : $\mathrm{im}-\mathrm{me}$ - and $\mathrm{im}-\mathrm{mi}$ - (149).aa
4. Interchange of the vowels $e$ and $u$ : $-\mathrm{h} u \mathrm{n}-\mathrm{e}$ and $-\mathrm{bun-un}$ (684).
$y$ The vowels transliterated as $i$ in $-n i,-r i,-1 i$, and $-b i$ are really $e ; c f . p p .6 f$.
: For inconsistencies in the orthography of the eme-sal passages cf. pp. 7 f .
${ }^{\text {as }}$ Cf. perhaps also $h a-r i-e s-t a$ and $h a-r i-i s t u m$.
5. Contracted and uncontracted writing of vowels: $b a-$ and $b a-e-$ (192, 620), mu - and $\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{e}-(479,681),-\mathrm{na}$ and $-\mathrm{ni}-\mathrm{a}$ (282a), za and za-e $(509,513)$; cf. also e- and ì-e- $(554,560,566)$, ì-bí-šègim and ì-bí-šè a-gim (553, 559; cf. also 565), za-gim and za-e $\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{gim}$ (510, 513 and 514).
6. Writing of pronominal element $n$ as $n$ and $m$ :
a) In the infix -n-ši - ( $86,98,99$ ).
b) Before the verbal roots $\mathrm{d} \mathrm{ug}_{4}{ }^{\mathrm{ab}}(326,329 \mathrm{~b}, 368,383,421)$, g ul (303), and til $(246,261)$.
7. Interchange of pronominal $n$ and $b$ :
a) In infixes: no examples.
b) Before the verbal roots bal (321), $\mathrm{du}_{8}$ (121b), dúb (127), $\mathrm{dug}_{4}$ (653), gar (217a), ir or ir $\mathrm{r}_{10}(374,378$ ), Ne (285a), tab (61), and ús (112).
8. Omission and writing of pronominal $n$ :
a) In the infixes - ( $\mathrm{n}-) \mathrm{d} \mathrm{a}-(61,118,158,165$, and passim), - ( $\mathrm{n}-)$ ši (690).
b) Before the verbal roots ág (192), bir (379), Du (333), d ù (398, 407), du $\mathrm{u}_{8}(84,121 \mathrm{~b}, 276)$, díb (666), dúb (657), du-bu-ul (270), du g ${ }_{4}$ (326), dúr (165, 598), GÁL or GAR (136), gar (227, 230, 232, 236, $537,671 \mathrm{~b}$; cf. also 89,411 , and 569), g ul (327a, 400, 518, 658), g ur (173), kar (189a), k u b $_{6}$ - am (674), kúr ( $187,486,591,642$ ), mú ( 355,358 , 605), Ne (149, 203), ra (252), sír (141), š es (426), šub (434), tab (118, 203), tar (318), tu(r) (593, 595), túm (123, 596, 667), and tuš (543).
c) Substitution of -e - for pronominal - $\mathrm{n}-($ (or $-\mathrm{b}-$ ) (222, 222b, 521, 544).
d) Substitution of -a - for pronominal $-\mathrm{n}-$ (326).
9. Omission and writing of pronominal $b$ :
a) In infixes: no examples.
b) Before the verbal roots a g (95), GÁL (163), $\mathrm{g} \mathrm{i}_{4}(96,490)$, tag (671a), t úm (92), and zi (107).
10. Omission and writing of second person singular pronominal element:
a) In the infix - (e -) da ( $46 \mathrm{~b}, 46 \mathrm{c}$ ).
b) Before the verbal root $i$ (691b).

[^8]11. Interchange of consonants:
a) $l$ and $n$ : lú - and $\mathrm{nu}-(306,616)$.
b) $d$ and $t:-\mathrm{d}$ a and -t a (177, 231, 280, 580).
12. Omission and writing of final consonant:
a) $l$ : -ma-and -ma-al- (71), -ti and -til (564).
b) $m$ : -a and -a m ( $37,44 \mathrm{~b}, 46 \mathrm{~b}, 47 \mathrm{a}, 49,52,84,111,122,134$, and passim) ; cf. also - da and -d a m (181, 209, 228a, 298, 473, 536), - d è and - dam (183, 441), - ka and -kam (15), -ke $\mathrm{k}_{4}$ and -kam (15, 342), $\mathrm{ha}-\mathrm{ri}-\mathrm{es}-\mathrm{ta}$ and $\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{ri} \mathrm{i}$ štum (257).
c) $n$ : In the ending -en ( $46,87,404,405,479,511,515,545$; cf. also 81 , 684); cf. also the variants $\mathrm{d} \grave{\mathrm{u}}-\mathrm{mu}$ and $\mathrm{d} \dot{\mathrm{u}}-\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{u}$ ( $508,512,522,527$, 535, 556).
d) $\mathrm{r}: \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{s} \mathrm{e}-\mathrm{ir}$ and $\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{s} \mathrm{e}(35,36 \mathrm{~b}), \mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{un}-\mathrm{g} \mathrm{a}$ and $\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{un}-\mathrm{k}$ à r (370).
13. Omission and writing of syllable: $a-d a-a l$ and $a-d a-a l-1 a m$ (496), ga-ša-an-na and ga-ša-an-an-na (3a).
14. Insertion and omission of seemingly inorganic $n$ : $\mathbf{i}-\mathrm{me}-\mathrm{na}-\mathrm{k} \mathrm{e}_{4}-\mathrm{e}$ s and $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{me}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{ke}_{4}-\mathrm{ex}$ (116).
15. Omission and writing of intervocalic $m$ (331).

## C. GRammatical variants

1. Interchange of grammatical particles:
a) Thematic particles: ba-and bí (217a, 355), ba-and i- (671a), ba- and imma- (or (im) ma-) (136, 141, 322, 329, 555), ba- and mu - (130, 222, 222b, 243b, 301d, 624; cf. also 407, 411), ba-e-and mu(46), i - and $\mathrm{mu} \mathrm{u}^{\text {ac }}$ (333, 336, 338a, 490b, 571 ; cf. also 645), immi- and bí (127), immi- and imma- (or (im)ma-) (95, 127), (im) maand bí-(127), im-ma-andmi-ni-in-(236), ammi-(immi-) and $\mathrm{mu}-$ (288) ; cf. also $\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{ra}-\mathrm{mu}-$ and $\mathrm{la}-\mathrm{ba}-(596,598)$.
b) Thematic particle and infix: ba-ra- and mu-da- (before the root zi) (107).
c) Miscellaneous: the possessive pronouns -mu and -na (121), -zu and - bi (481, 502); cf. also -mu and -à m (486); the infixes - da-and -r a - (668); the postpositions - d a and -e (191), -t a and -šè (371, 375, 665); cf. also the variants for -m èn (108, 301a, 430a, 432a, 436, 439a, 441, 446,450 ).
${ }^{a c}$ Cf. also the variants d ù $-\mathrm{m} u$ and d ù $-\mathrm{a} \mathrm{m}(508,512,535,556,563)$.
2. Omission and writing of grammatical particles:
a) Asseverative hu-(ba-) (123, 325, 386, 591).
b) Infixes: - na- (105, 155, 288, perhaps also 684), -(n-) da- (118, $173,197,386),-n i \operatorname{l}(1 \mathrm{~b}, 33,294 \mathrm{a}, 366,571,576,624)$, -ra-(671a).
c) Postpositions: - a (4, 17, 30a, 60, 68?, 76, 93a, 94b, 97a, 108a, 140, 162, $188 \mathrm{a}, 205,273,281,301 \mathrm{j}, 353,414,419,435,439,447 \mathrm{a}, 489,544,612,622,626$, $636,638,656 \mathrm{e}$ ), - da (552), -e (32; cf. also 6a), - gim (525, 553, 565), -k a (476), -r (a) $(456,683)$, -šè (or -e s) $(120,240,634,637)$.
d) Possessive pronouns: -mu(140, 301b, 399, 428, 456, 473, 489, 497; ef. also 91 ), $-\mathrm{zu}(35,38)$; for $-(\mathrm{a}) \mathrm{n}$ i cf. n .10 ; for -bi cf. nn. 291, 524, 526.
e) Enclitic pronoun: - à m (31, 112, 122, 267), -me-en (614).
3. Interchange of verbal forms whose grammatical construction varies (or at least seems to vary):
a) Preterit and future ( $81,86,95,98,102,112,118,123,153,243$ c, 380, 584, 586, 658).
b) Singular and plural (112, 118, 123, 243c, 247, 259, 274, 584, 586).
c) Second and third person (474).
d) Substantivized form of verb (followed by enclitic -men) and unsubstantivized form (617).
4. Reduplication and nonreduplication of root: $\mathrm{d} u$ (359), $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{u}}$ (571), dul (222), gub (269), kalag (275), nag (266), Ne (201), TUŠ (449).

## d. miscellaneous variants

1. Omission of refrain, entirely or in part (1d, $6,21,41 \mathrm{~b}, 44,67,214 \mathrm{a}, 296$, 458).
2. Omission of line or lines (9, 39a, 41a, 51, 92a, 96, 194a, 195, 197b, 198a, $323,393,396 b, 627,638,663,673,677,678,684,687,691 b, 692$; cf. also 13).
3. Use of variant lines ( $39,143,232 \mathrm{a}, 393,428,429,656 \mathrm{c}, 678,681,684$ ).
4. Variation in order or position of lines (41a, 94a, 96, 97c, 147, 195, 237, $255,560,656,678,684)$.
5. Omission and writing of words not absolutely essential to the meaning of the complex involved: é (532), è š (301c, 485), gal (193, 438a), hul andhul-a ( 66,457 ), ki (before city names) $(3,20)$, lú $(367,490)$, me-e (466), na-ám (466), $\mathrm{u}_{4}$ (656b), $\mathrm{u}_{4}-\mathrm{da}$ (193a), uk ù (before $\mathrm{sag}-\mathrm{g}$ íg) (114), z i (38b); cf. also nn. 77 and 675.
6. Use of words or phrases that are to some extent synonymous: ad-d a and $\mathrm{ab}-\mathrm{ba}$ (272), di(g) (nasalized $g$ ) and $\mathrm{Du}(\mathrm{n})(372,375), \mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{u}} \mathrm{g}_{4}$ and di (106), gabar and naqad (334), GÁL and Gar (136), gal-gal and gig-ga (310, 315), gul and tab (651), bun and šed $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{x}}(160,175)$, $\mathrm{ka}-\mathrm{ta}-\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{a}$ and $\mathrm{du}_{4}-\mathrm{ga} \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{a}$ (182), kud and kúr (486), láand ag (255), lá and gál (268), lá and si-ig (661), mi-ni-ib-bi and $\mathrm{im}-\mathrm{me}$ (311, 316), $\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{lu}$ and uk ù (301e) sì and šub (324).
7. Use of words, phrases, and grammatical particles whose meanings are more or less parallel: - a and -gim (343), g a n a mand mdu (330), gis s búr-ra and ${ }^{\text {gisg }} \mathrm{g}-\mathrm{um}$ (250), im-te-a and dal-1a(282, 283), ninmu and ki-sikil (628), $\mathrm{nu}-\mathrm{nuz-zi}$ and ga-ša-an (409), urú and é (396a, 406, 410, 420, 457, 461, 463, 505), urú and ka-na-ág (93, 97), urú and mu-1u (388, 415); cf. also nn. 237, 242b, 246b, 288, 301f, 358a, 444, 499, 520 (also 531, 554, 560, 566), 599, 601.
8. Use of pronoun and the substantive complex to which it refers ( 54,188 , $225,304,507,644)$.
9. Variants not readily analyzable ${ }^{\text {ad }}$ ( $1 \mathrm{~h}, 3 \mathrm{~b}, 7,8,13,14,20,34 \mathrm{a}, 43 \mathrm{~b}, 70$, 88a, 90, 140, 148, 167, 176a, 179, 180, 197a, 200, 202, 204, 212, 216, 217, 218a, 218b, 229, 236a, 239, 253, 255, 258, 262, 273, 280a, 280b, 283a, 299, 300, 301, $333,335,337 \mathrm{a}, 338,339,344,351,357,365,366,401,405 \mathrm{a}, 409,424,443,445$, $464,470,473,484,534,539,567,577,581,582,594,601,614,623,649,656 d$, $669,670,686,691)$.

## THE TEXTS

The texts on which the reconstruction of our lamentation is based are as follows: ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| A | TRS II, No. 40 | G | STVC, No. 18 | N | MBI, No. 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aa | Ni 2780 | $\mathrm{H}^{\text {af }}$ | PBS X, 4, No. 11 | Na | Ni 2401 |
| B | SRT, No. 45 | I | STVC, No. 22 | Nb | Ni 4024 |
| C | STVC, No. 17 | J | STVC, No. 20 | Ne | Ni 2911 |
| D | PBS XIII, No. 20 | K | STVC, No. 23 | 0 | STVC, No. 33 |
| Da | Ni 3166 | L | PBS X 2, No. 10 | P | SRT', No. 32 |
| E | STVC, No. 19 | La | $V A S X$, No. 171 |  |  |
| F | STVC, No. 21 | M | STVC, No. 24 |  |  |

ad It is highly probable that not a few of these variants actually involve scribal errors.
${ }^{\text {es }}$ Cf. also Kramer in $J A O S$ LIV (1934) 413-15; the list of duplicates there outlined is to be emended as shown here.
${ }^{\text {af }}$ An examination of the originals of H and C revealed that they actually join and that they are therefore part of the same text.

The lines they contain are:

| Text | Lines | Text | Lines | Text | Lines |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A i-vi | 1-436 | D iv | 158-89 | H vii | 297-322 |
| Aa i | 1-37 | Ji | 166-73 | Na obv. | 298-311 |
| Bi | 10-27 | E iv | 168-84 | N ii | 299-334 |
| Ci | 16-49 | K ii | 194-207 | K v | 304-10 |
| Di | 24-33 | H v | 198-248 | E vii | 312-24 |
| Da obv. i | 36-63 | Aav | 198-224 | C iv | 324-51 |
| Aa ii | 47-72 | I obv. ii | 204-7 | Na rev. | 328-31 |
| E ii | 60-67 | L obv. | 208-16 | I rev. iii | 331-34 |
| C ii | 66-96 | J ii | 211-17 ${ }^{\text {ag }}$ | N iii | 335-65 |
| F obv. | 71-85 | La obv. and rev. | 219-47 | H viii | 337-60 |
| D ii | 75-80 | Ev | 220-29 | Nb obv. | 341?-42 |
| Aa iii | 90-116 | Aa vi | 231-54 | E viii | 349-62 |
| G i | 95-102 | K iii | 238-49 | Nb rev. | 357-59 |
| H iii | 97-149 | L rev. | 253-54 | C v | 361-91 |
| D iii | 102-35 | M obv. | 254-74 | N iv | 368-97 |
| F rev. | 105-22 | I rev. i | 254-55 | Da rev. ii | 400-410 |
| E iii | 108-33 | H vi | 255-84 | C vi | 406-31? |
| C iii | 122-45 | Ni | 259-98 | Ne rev. | 411-22 |
| H iv | 150-97 | K iv | 269-77 | 0 | 415?-27 |
| G ii | 152-59 | Evi | 276-84 | P | 430-36 |
| Aa iv | 153-86 | M rev. | 283-98 | B vi | 433-36 |
| I obv. i | 156-60 | I rev. ii | 295-98 | Da left edge | 434?-35 |

${ }^{\text {as }}$ Perhaps 218 is more correct; cf. n. 241a.

## TRANSLITERATION ${ }^{1}$

11a $t \stackrel{u}{u}-r a-n[a]$
$[a] m-e^{1 c} t u \mathbf{r}-r a-n a$
$\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{m u} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{n}-\mathbf{k} \mathbf{u} r-k \mathbf{u}-$ $r a-k e_{4}$
${ }^{d} m u-u l-1 i ́ l-l i \quad A B-e-$ nibru $u^{k i}-a$
5 dam-a-ni-dNIN-1il-1i

$\mathbf{k i}-[\mathbf{u} r]-\mathbf{r a}$
$g a-[\underset{S}{a} a]-a n^{1 e}-k e{\underset{S}{s i}}_{k i}-k e_{4}$
$g a-s a-a n-m a b-e^{n}$
e-bilg ke ski $-a^{1 h}$
$m u-1 u-i-s i-i n^{k i}$ $n a-k e_{4}$
$10 \quad g a^{2}-5 a-a n-i-s i-i n^{k i}$.
 $m a h-a$
$N I N-k i^{3}-u n u g^{k i}-g a-k e_{4}$
$g a^{2}-s a-a n^{3 x}-n a c e b i$ unug ${ }^{k i}-g a-a^{3 b}$
dnannauríki-ma
${ }^{d}$ zuen-e $\quad e^{3 c}-k i s ̌-s ̌ i r_{5}-$ gál-la ${ }^{4}$
${ }^{1}$ The Sumerian is transliterated in letterspaced roman, Akkadian words (including those borrowed from Sumerian) in italics. In the translation italics serve a further use, that of indicating doubtful passages.
${ }^{1 a}$ In $A$ the superscription ${ }^{d} n i d a b a$
$m$ ùs $m i-n i^{1 b}-i n-g a \quad a m a s-a-$ na líl-e
mùšmi-ni-in-ga amas-ana 1il- $\mathrm{e}^{\text {ld }}$
mùšmi-ni-in-ga amaš-ana 1il-e
mùs mi-ni-in-ga amašana Iíl-e
$m$ ùs mi-ni-in-ga amastana 1il-e
mùs mi-ni-in-ga amastana líl-e
[mùš] mi-ni-in-ga amaš-ana 1il-e
$m[u \check{s} m i-n i]-i n-g a \quad a m a s ̌-a-$ na líl-e
mù $\mathrm{S} \quad[\mathrm{mi}-\mathrm{ni}-\mathrm{i}] \mathrm{n}-\mathrm{ga}$ amars-ana líl-e
$m$ ùs mi-ni-in-ga a[ma]s-ana líl-e
mus mi-ni-in-ga [amaš]-ana 1il-e
mù mi-ni-in-ga amas-ana [líl]-e
mùs mi-ni-in-ga amaš-an a [líl]-e
$m$ ùs $m i-n i-i n-g a \quad a m[a s-a-$ na] 1íl-e
$\mathrm{dh} \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{n} \mathrm{i}$ precedes this line; in Aa the superscription reads [d] idaba.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& { }^{{ }^{1 b}} \text { Aa omits - } \mathrm{ni}-. \\
& { }^{{ }^{10}} \text { So Aa; A: - e (!). }
\end{aligned}
$$

${ }^{\text {Id }}$ In Aa the refrain is omitted in this line

## AND TRANSLATION

1 He has abandoned hi[s] stable, his sheepfold (has been delivered) to the wind;
The wild ox has abandoned his stable, his sheepfold (has been delivered) to the wind.
The lord of all the lands has abandoned (his stable), his sheepfold (has been delivered) to the wind;
Enlil has abandoned . . . . Nippur, his sheepfold (has been delivered) to the wind.
5 His wife Ninlil has abandoned (her stable), her sheepfold (has been delivered) to the wind;
Ninlil has abandoned their house Ki[ur], her sheepfold (has been delivered) to the wind.
The qu[ee]n of Keš has [ab]andoned (her stable), her sheepfold (has been delivered) to the wind;
Ninmah has [aba]ndoned their house Keš, her sheepfold (has been delivered) to the wind.
The lady of Isin has a[ban]doned (her stable), her sheepfold (has been delivered) to the wind;
10 Ninisinna has abandoned the shrine Egalmah, her sh[ee]pfold (has been delivered) to the wind.

The queen of Uruk has abandoned (her stable), her [sheepfold] (has been delivered) to the wind;
Inanna has abandoned their house Uruk, her sheepfold (has been delivered) to the [wind].
Nanna has abandoned Ur, his sheepfold (has been delivered) to the [wind];
Sin has abandoned Ekišširgal, [his] sheep[fold] (has been delivered) to the wind.

```
and in all the following lines of the first song
except the last.
    \({ }^{10} \mathrm{Aa}\) : NIN- (for ga-ša-an-).
    \({ }^{14}\) So Aa; A: - e (!).
    \({ }^{1}\) So \(\mathrm{Aa} ; \mathrm{A}:-\mathrm{bi}(!)\).
    \({ }^{\text {lh }} \mathrm{Aa}:-\mathrm{k} \mathrm{e}_{4}\) (for -a ).
```

```
            \({ }^{2}\) In B the determinative dingir pre-
cedes.
    \({ }^{3}\) B omits -ki-.
    \({ }^{3 s}\) Aa inserts - an-between -an-and
-na.
    \({ }^{3 b} A a:-k e_{4}(\) for \(-\mathrm{ga} a \mathrm{a}\) ).
    \({ }^{30} \mathrm{~B}: 仑(1) . \quad\) So Aa; A omits - la.
```
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$$
\begin{aligned}
& d a m-a-n i g a^{2}-s ̌ a- \\
& \quad a n-g a l-e \\
& \text { ga } a^{2}-s ̌ a-a n-g a l-e \\
& \text { én n } u n^{4}-k u g-g a-n a
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
a m-u r u ́-s i-b a^{k i}-k e_{4}^{5}
$$

$d_{a m-a n-k i-k e e^{68}}$ é-bi urú-ṣi-ba ${ }^{k i}-\mathrm{ke}_{4}{ }^{7}$
$g a-s ̌ a-a n-{ }^{8} \ldots \ldots$.
é-ba la-ra-a gki $-a$
20 dšara é-mab-a $a^{10}$
${ }^{d} u_{4}-s a b a r^{11}-r a \quad e ́-b i$ ummaki-a
dba-ú urú-kug-ga
kug-ba-gara(?)
$a m a_{5}-n a^{13}$
$d u m u-a-n i{ }^{d} a b-b a-\mathbf{n}^{14}$

25 dab-ba-ú ma(!)gú(!) -en-na-k $a^{15}$
dama-é-kug ${ }^{16}-\mathrm{ke}_{4}$
dama-e é-sil-sír-sír-ra ${ }^{17}$
um-ma-lagasa ${ }^{k i}-\mathrm{ke}_{4}^{18}$
${ }^{d} m a-s ̦ i-s ̧ i-b i^{18 a}$ é-bi $i^{19}$ lagas a ${ }^{k i}-a^{20}$

4 A: -nun(!) - .
${ }^{5}$ So $\mathrm{Aa} ; \mathrm{B}$ and C insert -ib-after - $\mathrm{s} \mathrm{i}-$; in C the determinative k i precedes -ba-.
${ }^{6} \mathrm{C}$ omits the rest of the refrain.
${ }^{6 s}$ B omits -ke .
${ }^{7}$ So Aa. C inserts -ib-after -si-, places the determinative $k i$ before $-\mathrm{ba}-$, and omits -ked. Does $A$ read dam-
$m$ ù š mi-ni-in-ga $a^{6} \quad \mathrm{ma}$ š-ana líl-e
m ùs $[\mathrm{mi}]-\mathrm{ni}-[\mathrm{in}-\mathrm{ga}$ amaš-a]na líl-e
mùš [mi]-ni[-in-ga amaš-a]na líl-e
mùs mi-ni-in-ga $a^{6}$ maš-ana líl-e
mùs $\mathrm{s}^{6} \mathrm{mi}-\mathrm{ni}-\mathrm{in}-\mathrm{ga}$ amastana líl-e
mùs mi-ni-in-ga amašana lil-e ${ }^{9}$
mùšmi-ni-in-ga $\quad$ amaš-ana lil-e
mùs $\mathrm{s}^{6} \mathrm{minni}-\mathrm{in}-\mathrm{ga}$ amaš-ana lil-e
$\mathrm{mu} \mathrm{s}^{12} \mathrm{mi}-\mathrm{ni}-\mathrm{in}-\mathrm{g} \mathrm{a}^{6}$ amaš-ana lil-e
mù sin mi-ni-in-ga ${ }^{6}$ amaš-ana líl-e
mùs mi-ni-in-ga $a^{6}$ amaš-ana líl-e
mùs mi-ni-in-gab amaš-ana líl-e
mùs mi-ni-in-ga $a^{6} m a s ̌-a-$ na lil-e
$m$ ùs mi-ni-in-ga $a^{6} m a \check{s}-a-$ na líl-e
mùšmi-ni-in-ga amaš-ana líl- $\mathrm{e}^{21}$
an-ki-[ked $] \quad$ - $-[b i] \quad u r u ́(!)-s i(!)-$ i $b^{k i}-\mathrm{ke}_{4}$ ?
${ }^{8}$ Below and to the right of ga-sa-an A seems to have a small en, which may have been followed by one or more additional signs.
${ }^{9}$ Entire line omitted in Aa, B, and C.
${ }^{10} \mathrm{C}$ adds - na , 'his."
${ }^{11}$ In A the sign ralam is probably miscopied for 1 š.

15 His wife Ningal has aban[doned] (her stable), her [sheepfold] (has been delivered) to the wind;
Ningal has aban[doned] her Enunkug, her [sheepfold] (has been delivered) to the wind.
The wild ox of Eridu has abandoned (his stable), his sheepfold (has been delivered) to the wind;
Enki has abandoned their house Eridu, his sheepfold (has been delivered) to the wind.
Nin. . . . has abandoned their house Larak, her sheepfold (has been delivered) to the wind.
20 Šara has abandoned the Emah, his sheepfold (has been delivered) to the wind;
Usaharra has abandoned their house Umma, her sheepfold (has been delivered) to the wind.
Bau has abandoned Urukug, her sheepfold (has been delivered) to the wind;
The holy Bagara, her chamber, she has abandoned, her sheepfold (has been delivered) to the wind.
Her son Abbau has abandoned (his stable), his sheepfold (has been delivered) to the wind;
25 Abbau has abandoned the Maguenna, his sheepfold (has been delivered) to the wind.
The lamassu of the holy temple has abandoned (his stable), his sheepfold (has been delivered) to the wind;
The lamassu has abandoned E-sil-sirsir, his sheepfold (has been delivered) to the wind.
The mother of Lagaš has abandoned (her stable), her sheepfold (has been delivered) to the wind;
Masişib has abandoned their house Lagaš, her sheepfold (has been delivered) to the wind.
${ }^{12} \mathrm{~B}: ~ m u ́ s ̌$.
${ }^{13}$ In A an illegible gloss(?) follows.
${ }^{14} \mathrm{D}$ : ${ }^{\mathrm{d}} \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{u}$; so actually on original.
${ }^{15} A a$ and $B$ have $-k e_{4} ; D$ seems to have - kam.
${ }^{16}$ In $B$ the sign $E$ is probably miscopied for kug.
${ }^{17}$ So C; A: -ra(!) ; Aa omits -ra.
${ }^{18}$ So Aa. A seems to have d a ma(!?)instead of $u m-m a-$; is some miscopy involved? C adds -a - before $-\mathrm{k} \mathrm{e}_{4}$.

[^9]$30 \mathrm{mu}-1 \mathrm{u}-\mathrm{nin} \mathrm{a}^{\mathrm{ki}}-\mathrm{ke}_{4}$
\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { é-bi }{ }^{23} \text { sirarà }{ }^{\text {ki }}{ }^{24} \\
& m u^{24 a}-l u-k i-n i r-s ̌ a ̀-~ \\
& \mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{ke}_{4}{ }^{25} \\
& { }^{d} d u m u-z i-a b z u \\
& \mathrm{ke}_{4}{ }^{27 \mathrm{~b}}
\end{aligned}
$$
\]

$m$ ùs mi-ni-in-ga $a^{6} m a s ̌-a-$ na lile
mùs mi-ni-in-ga amaš-ana lil- $\mathrm{e}^{21}$
mùšmi-ni-in-ga $a^{6} m a s ̌-a-$ na líl-e ba-ni(!)-in(!)-GAR ${ }^{26}$
mùs $\mathrm{s}^{6} \mathrm{mi}-\mathrm{ni}-\mathrm{in}-\mathrm{ga}$ amaš-ana líl-e ba-ni(!)-in(!)$\operatorname{GAR}(!)^{27}$
mùs mi-ni-in-gáamaš-a-
na lil-e
 èš-gú-ab-ba-ke ${ }^{29} \quad$ na líl-e
$k i-s ̌ u b-g u ́-a \check{s}-a-k a m^{30}$
amaš-a-na líl-e ba-ni-in-GAR i-si-išbi mu-un[ k ú] š - ù
 $\mathrm{nu}-\mathrm{ni}(?)^{33}$ - UL
iz - gid ${ }^{34 \mathrm{an}}$-GÁL-bi-im
40 urú $a-s ̌ e-i r-g i g^{35}-g a \quad a-s ̌ e-i r-z u \quad$ GAR-ra
a-še-ir ${ }^{36 b}-z u-g i g-g a^{37}$ urúa-še-ir-zu ${ }^{38}$ GAR-ra
urú-zi-gul-1a $a^{38 a}-n a \operatorname{a}-$ še-ir-bi gig-ga $a^{37}$
urifi ${ }^{38 \mathrm{~b}}-\mathrm{gul-l} \mathrm{a}^{38 \mathrm{a}}-\mathrm{na}$ a-še-ir-bi gig-ga $\mathrm{a}^{39}$
a-še-ir-zu-gig-ga urú a-še-ir-zu GAR-ra $a^{39 a}$
$45 \mathrm{urf}^{\mathrm{ki}}-\mathrm{gul-la}-\mathrm{na} \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{še}-\mathrm{ir}-\mathrm{bi} \mathrm{gig}-\mathrm{ga}$
${ }^{22}$ So Aa. In $A$ is mu miscopied for $g A$ ?
${ }^{23}$ So Aa and B; A: -b a .
${ }^{24}$ So $\mathrm{Aa} ; \mathrm{C}$ : siraraki-a. A: $\mathrm{O}_{4}(!), \mathrm{MA}(!) \cdot \mathrm{UNO}(!)^{\text {ki }} ;$ it seems to omit the postposition.
${ }^{24 \mathrm{a}} \mathrm{So} \mathrm{Aa}$; in A , if no miscopy is involved, the traces do not point to the restoration of the sign as mu.
${ }^{25} \mathrm{Aa}:-\mathrm{ki}-\mathrm{nir}-\mathrm{s} \mathrm{a}-[\mathrm{b}] \mathrm{a}^{\mathrm{ki}}-\mathrm{ke} \mathrm{e}_{4} ; \mathrm{C}$ : $[k i-n i] r-s ̌ a(!)^{k i}-b a-k e_{4}(!)$.
${ }^{26}$ This verbal form in A is written in smaller script, approximately in the center of the line, in the lower part of the blank space between the first half of the line and its refrain.
${ }^{268}$ So Aa; A: d(9) umu(1)-ziabzu(!) é-ba.
${ }^{26 \mathrm{~b}} \mathrm{Aa}$ : -ša-.
${ }^{27}$ Written in A in smaller script under the signs zi and zU of the complex ${ }^{\mathrm{d}} \mathrm{d} \mathrm{umu}$ -z]i-abzu.
${ }^{27 \mathrm{~A}} \mathrm{~A}: \mathrm{mu}(\mathrm{l})-\mathrm{lu}(\mathrm{l})$.
${ }^{27 b} A a:-b a^{k i}-k e 4$.
${ }^{28} \mathrm{~A}$ : - mar (!).
${ }^{29} \mathrm{Aa}$ inserts the determinative ki after -ba-. Does C read è š-ga-ab-bakina, "her shrine Guabba"?

$$
{ }^{30} \mathrm{C}:-\mathrm{a}(!)-\mathrm{k} \text { a m } \mathrm{m}(!) .
$$

30 The lady of Nina has abandoned (her stable), her sheepfold (has been delivered) to the wind;
Ningula has abandoned their house Sirara, her sheepfold (has been delivered) to the wind.
The lord of Kiniršag has abandoned (his stable), his sheepfold has been delivered to the wind;
Dumuziabzu has abandoned their house Kiniršag, his sheepfold has been delivered to the wind.

The lady of Guabba has abandoned (her stable), her sheepfold (has been delivered) to the wind;
35 Ninmar has abandoned the shrine Guabba, her sheepfold (has been delivered) to the wind.
The first song.
His sheepfold has been delivered to the wind, he makes [grie]vous its wail;
The cow of . . . . without ${ }^{34}$ a stable . . . . .
Its antiphon.
40 O city, a bitter ${ }^{36}$ lament ${ }^{36 a}$ set up as thy lament;
Thy lament which is bitter-O city, set up thy lament.
His righteous city which has been destroyed-bitter is its lament;
His Ur which has been destroyed-bitter is its lament.
Thy lament which is bitter-0 city, set up thy lament;
45 His Ur which has been destroyed--bitter is its lament.
${ }^{30 \mathrm{a}} \mathrm{C}$ adds -ra.
${ }^{31} C$ omits $-1 a$-à $m$.
${ }^{32} \mathbf{C}$ adds -e.
${ }^{33} \mathrm{C}$ omits.
${ }^{34}$ More literally: "there not being."
${ }^{34 \mathrm{a}}$ Da omits - $\mathrm{g} \mathrm{i}_{4}-$; scribal error?
${ }^{35} \mathrm{C}$ : - gig(!) -. Da omits -ir-and inserts - zu-before -gig-.
${ }^{36}$ More literally: "painful."
${ }^{36 a} \mathrm{Da}: ~ " O$ city, thy lament which is bitter."
${ }^{36 \mathrm{~b}}$ Da omits -ir-.

```
    * C adds - 2 m.
    38}\textrm{C}\mathrm{ omits -zu.
    38a Da: -an- (for -1a-).
    38b Da omits determinative and adds
-zi-, "righteous."
    39 Instead of ll. 43-45 C has only two
lines:
.........ki(?) a-še-ir-gig-ga
    a-še-ir-zu GAR-ra
...., a bitter lament set up as thy lament;
[uri(?)]ki a-še-ir-gig-ga
[O Ur,] a bitter lament (set up as thy
    lament).
    39a}\textrm{Da}\mathrm{ omits ll. 44-45.
```

```
\(46 \quad a-s ̌ e-i r^{36 b}-z u-g i g-g a^{37} g a-s ̌ a-a n-z u-m u-l u-i ́ r-r i\)
        èn-šè mu-un-kúšù
```



```
        šè mu-un-kús -ù
    še-ib-uríri-ma
    é-kiš-ši \(r_{5}(!)-g\) ál(!)
    50 ès šé -nun-kug
    ki-ùr ki-gal
    è š - nibruki URÚ(? \()^{42}\)
    še-ib-é-kur-ra
    mà-giš-šú-a
    a-še-ir-gig-ga a-še-ir-zu
        GAR- \(\mathrm{a}^{41_{a}}\)
    a-še-ir-gig-ga a-še-ir-zu
        GAR-ra
    a-še-ir-gig-ga a-še-ir-zu
        GAR-r a
    \(a-s ̌ e-i r-g i g-g a^{41 b} a-s ̌ e-i r^{36 b}-\)
        zu GAR-ra
    a-še-ir-gig-ga a-še-ir-zu
        GAR-r
    \(a-s ̌ e-i r-g i g-g a^{41 b} a-s ̌ e-i r^{36 b}-\)
        zu GAR-ra
    \(a-s ̌ e-i r-g i g-g a^{41 b} a-s ̌ e-i r-z u\)
        GAR-ra
    \(55 \mathrm{ub}-\mathrm{s} u-\mathrm{kin} \mathrm{n}_{5}-\mathrm{na}\)
    \(\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{š} \mathrm{e}-\mathrm{ir}-\mathrm{gig}-\mathrm{g} \mathrm{a}^{41 \mathrm{~b}} \mathrm{a}-\) še-ir\({ }^{36 \mathrm{~b}}-\)
        zu GAR-ra
    še (!) - ib (!) - urúa -kug-
        ga.... \({ }^{43}\)
    é-sil-sír-sír-ra
    \(\mathrm{ma}(!)-\mathrm{gu}-\mathrm{en}-\mathrm{na}\)
\(a-s ̌ e-i r-g i g-g a \quad a-s ̌ e-i r-z u\)
        GAR-r a
    še-ib-i-si-in \(n^{k i 4 a}-n a\)
60 è š-é-gal \({ }^{43 \mathrm{~b}}-\mathrm{m}\) a b
    GAR-r a
\(a-s ̌ e-i r-g i g-g a^{41 b 44} a-s ̌ e-i r-\)
    zu GAR-ra
    še-ib-ki-unugki-ga \(\quad a-s ̌ e-i r-g i g-g a^{44} a-s ̌ e-i r-z u\)
    GAR-r a
```

${ }^{40}$ More literally: "thy lord, him of tears."
${ }^{40 \mathrm{a}} \mathrm{Da}$ adds -a.
${ }^{406} \mathrm{Da}:-\mathrm{r}[\mathrm{a}]$ (for -ri).
${ }^{400} \mathrm{Da}$ : en-(for è̀n-).
${ }^{4}$ More literally: "Nanna, him of tears."
${ }^{41 \mathrm{a}}$ In Aa the order of the temples ad- Note too that 11.52 and 60 of our text are
dressed is quite different from that in our text, which is based on A:

| = A | $\mathrm{A}_{2}=$ |  | $\mathrm{Aa}=\mathrm{A}$ |  | $\mathrm{Aa}^{2}=\mathrm{A}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ii 253 | ii 6 | 48 | ii 9 | 61 | ii 12 | 59 |
| 351 | 7 | 49 | 10 | 56 | 13 | 57 |
| 54 | 8 | 58 | 11 | 62 | 14 | 50 |

46 Thy lament which is bitter-how long will it grieve thy weeping lord? ${ }^{40}$ Thy lament which is bitter-how long will it grieve the weeping Nanna? ${ }^{41}$

O thou brickwork of Ur, a bitter lament set up as thy lament;
O Ekišsirgal, a bitter lament set up as thy lament;
50 O thou shrine Enunkug, a bitter lament set up as thy lament.

O thou Kiur, thou kigallu, a bitter lament set up as thy lament;
O thou shrine of Nippur . . . . , a bitter lament set up as thy lament;
O thou brickwork of the Ekur, a bitter lament set up as thy lament.
O Magiššua, a bitter lament set up as thy lament;
55 O ubšukinnakku, a bitter lament set up as thy lament.
O thou brickwork of Urukug, a bitter lament set up as thy lament;
O E-sil-sirsir, a bitter lament set up as thy lament;
O Maguenna, a bitter lament set up as thy lament.
O thou brickwork of Isin, a bitter lament set up as thy lament;
60 O thou shrine Egalmah, a bitter lament set up as thy lament.
O thou brickwork of Uruk, a bitter lament set up as thy lament.
omitted altogether in Aa. In Da too the order varies:

| $\mathrm{Da}=\mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{Da}=\mathrm{A}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| i 11 | 53 | i 14 | 54 |
| 12 | 51 | 15 | 59 |
| 13 | 55 | 16 | 60 |

The remainder of Da is destroyed. Note that Da as well as Aa omitsl. 52 at least of our text.
${ }^{41 \mathrm{~b}} \mathrm{Da}$ seems to omit this complex.
42 If, as the copy clearly reads, the sign is actually URÚ, its position is difficult to explain.
${ }^{43}$ An illegible gloss?
${ }^{43 a}$ Da omits determinative.
${ }^{43 \mathrm{~b}}$ Da omits - gal-.
${ }^{44} \mathrm{E}$ omits the rest of the refrain.

62

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { še-ib-urú }-s \text { i }- \\
{[b a]^{k i 44_{\mathrm{a}}}-\mathrm{a}}
\end{gathered}
$$

$$
a-\text { še-ir-gig-ga } a^{44} a-s ̌ e-i r-z u
$$

GAR- ra
$a-s ̌ e-i r-z u-g i g-g a^{44 b} \quad g a-s ̌ a-a n-z u-m u-l u-i ́ r-r i$
èn-šè mu-un-kúš- ù ${ }^{45}$
$a-s ̌ e-i r-z u-g i g-g a^{44 b}{ }^{d} n a n n a-m u-1 u-i ́ r-r i ~ e ̀ n-s ̌ e ̀ ~$ mu-un-kús -ù
65 urú mu-zu ì-gál za-e mu-da-gul-en ${ }^{46}$
urú bàd-zu ì-il ka-na-ág ${ }^{46 \mathrm{a}}-\mathrm{zu}$ ba ${ }^{46 \mathrm{~b}}-\mathrm{da}$-til
urú-mu ganam4-zi-gm sila4-zu ba-e-da-tar.
uríki ùz-zi-GIM máš-zu ba- ${ }^{46 \mathrm{c}}-\mathrm{da}$-til
urú marza-zu-ní-me-1ám-kúr-ra ${ }^{46 d}$
70 me-zu me-kúr-ra šu-bal ba-ni-ib-ag $a-$ še-ir-zu-gig-ga ${ }^{47 a}$ ga-ša-an-zu-mu-lu $u^{48}-i ́ r-r i$ èn-šè mu-un-kúš-ù
 $\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{un}-\mathrm{k}$ ús - ù
ki-sub-gú-min-kam-ma $a^{49}$
[urú-zi-gul-la]-na a-še-ir-bi gig-ga ${ }^{51}$
75 uríki-gul-la-na a-še-ir-bi gig-ga ${ }^{52}$
i $z^{53}-\mathrm{g} \mathrm{i}_{4}$ - GÁL-bi-i m ${ }^{54}$
nin-lú-é-bul-a-ta $a^{55}$ urú(!) $-\mathrm{ni}^{56}$ ír-ri ${ }^{57} \mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{an}-\mathrm{di}-\mathrm{ni}-$ ib (! $)^{58}-\mathrm{gar}^{58 \mathrm{a}}$
$d_{n} a n n a-1$ ú-kalam-ba-an-da-til-1 $a^{59}$
urim ${ }^{k i}-e$ a-nir-ra ${ }^{60}$ bar ba-da-an-tab $b^{61}$

${ }^{\mathrm{d}} \mathrm{nin}-\mathrm{gal}-[\mathrm{e}$ nin(?) kalam]-ma(!)-ni-šè ù-nu-KU-KU$d \mathrm{e}^{63}$

44a Aa omits determinative and -a.
${ }^{44 \mathrm{~b}} \mathrm{Aa}$ adds -à m .
${ }^{45} \mathrm{E}:-\mathrm{u}(!)$. Note that this and the following line are each written in two lines on E .
${ }^{46} \mathrm{E}:-\mathrm{gul}(\mathrm{l})-\mathrm{e}$; Aa: ba-e-da-gul-e.
${ }^{46 \mathrm{a}} \mathrm{Aa}:$ Kalam(!)-(for $\mathrm{ka}-\mathrm{na}-\mathrm{a} \mathrm{g}-$ ).
${ }^{46 \mathrm{~b}} \mathrm{Aa}$ adds -e -
${ }^{466}$ Aa omits - e - .
${ }^{46 d} \mathrm{C}$ adds - [à m$]$.
${ }^{47}$ More literally perhaps: "the dread and the overawing splendor of (i.e., the splendor which overawes) the enemy."
${ }^{47 \mathrm{a}} \mathrm{Aa}$ and C add - à m .
${ }^{48} \mathrm{C}$ : -Iu-(not -da-).
${ }^{49} \mathrm{Aa}, \mathrm{C}$, and F add - à m. Note that, probably as the result of a scribal error, Aa omits the following an sign.
${ }^{50} \mathrm{~F}$ : - e (instead of -ri).

62 O thou brickwork of Erid[u], a bitter lament set up as thy lament.

Thy lament which is bitter-how long will it grieve thy weeping lord? ${ }^{40}$
Thy lament which is bitter-how long will it grieve the weeping Nanna? ${ }^{41}$
65 O thou city of name, thou hast been destroyed;
$O$ thou city of high walls, thy land has perished.
O my city, like an innocent ewe thy lamb has been torn away from thee;
$O$ Ur, like an innocent goat thy kid has perished.
O city, thy parş $\hat{u}$, the dread and awe of the enemy, ${ }^{47}$
70 Thy decrees-unto inimical decrees they have been transformed.
Thy lament which is bitter-how long will it grieve thy weeping lord? ${ }^{40}$
Thy lament which is bitter—how long will it grieve the weeping Nanna? ${ }^{41}$
The second song.
His [righteous city] which [has been destroyed]-bitter is its lament;
75 His Ur which has been destroyed-bitter is its lament. Its antiphon.

Because of the lord, whose house has been attacked, his city was given over to tears;
Because of Nanna, whose land had perished, Ur intensified its lament.
80 The righteous "lady," because of his city to grieve the lord, Ningal, because of his [land] to give no rest to [the lord],

```
\({ }^{51}\) Line omitted in C and F.
\({ }^{52} \mathrm{C}\) and F add - àm. Note that the preceding signs in \(F\) are miscopied for gig-ga-.
\({ }^{53}\) D: iz (!) - .
\({ }^{54} \mathrm{~F}:\left[i z-g i_{4}-G A ́\right] L-k i-s ̌ u b-g u ́-\)
da-kam.
\({ }^{55}\) In A the remnant of the sign is not that of a TA; miscopied?
\({ }^{56}\) So C; A: - na (for - ni ) ; D: uru \(\mathrm{u}^{\mathrm{ki}}\) ni.
```

```
    57 F: ír-e.
    58 F: -ibl-.
    58. Two lines in C and F.
    59 So F; A: - e (for-1 a).
    *0 So C and F; A omits - ra.
    61F:ba-an-da-ab-tab.
    62C: kúš-ù(!)-da.
    63 So F; A and C: - da (for - d è); in A
the sign preceding - d a is KU (not BA).
```

82 e-[ne(?)]-ra nam-urú-na mu-un $n^{64}-n a-t e$ ír-gig ìšes - še $_{8}$
nin-ra nam-é-hul ${ }^{66-a-n a ~ m u-u n-n a-t e i ́ r-g i g ~ i ̀-~}$ š $\mathrm{e}_{8}-\mathrm{s} \mathrm{e}_{8}$
[nam(?)-uru(?)-hul(?)]-a-na mu-un-na-te ír-gig ì -še ${ }_{8}-$ š $_{8}{ }^{67}$
85 [nam(?)-é(?)]-hul-a-na mu-un-na-te a-nir-gig-ga-bi im-da-ra-da-gá-gá
munus-e..........-a-ni balag-ír-ra-ki ${ }^{68}$ al-gar-$\mathrm{ra}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{b} \mathrm{a}^{69}$
i-1u-ma(?)-si-ga tur-tur-bi níte-na mi-ni-ibbi
$\left[u_{4}\right]^{70}-m a^{71}-m a-a l-1 a$ i-si-iš-bi ma-lá-1á
$u_{4}-\mathrm{da} \mathrm{na}$-ám-bi-šè ${ }^{73}$ súr (?)-súr (? $)^{74}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{dè}$
90 Lú-nu-nuz-mèn $u_{4}{ }^{76}-\mathrm{ma}^{71}-\mathrm{ma}$-al-la i-si-iš-bi ma-1á-1 á ${ }^{77}$
$u_{4}{ }^{76}-m a^{71}-m a-a l-1 a i-s i-i s-b i \quad m a-1 a-1 a^{\prime}$
$u_{4}-\mathrm{da}(!) \quad \mathrm{u}_{4}{ }^{78}-\mathrm{gig}-\mathrm{ga} \mathrm{ma}-\mathrm{ra} \mathrm{ma}(!)-\mathrm{ma}-\mathrm{al}-\mathrm{la}$
me-e $u_{4}$-bi-šè sag-PA ${ }^{80}$ LLAGAB hé-en-ši-ag-[an] ${ }^{81}$
$u_{4}-d a$ á-bi-šè ba-ra-ba-ra-è (!)-en
 ga i-bí ba-ra-bí-in-du $u_{8}-a^{84}$
mi-šè $a-$ še-ir-gig ma-ra $a^{85} m a-m a-a l-l a$
me-e mi-bi-šè sag-pA-LagAB bé-en-š $[i-a g]-a n^{86}$ mi á-bi-[šè $]$ ba-ra-ba-ra-è-e[n] ${ }^{87}$
$u_{4}$ urú -GIM-gul-1a-ba ní-bi ${ }^{87 a}$ ba-ma $a^{88}-1$ á-lá
100 $\ldots-b i-s ̌ e ̀ k i-n a ́-m i-u ̀ n a^{88 a}-m a ̀ k i(!)-n a ́-m i(!)-$ ù (!) -na-mà LUL ba-ra-ma(!) $)^{89}-\mathrm{mar}^{90}$
${ }^{64} \mathrm{~F}$ omits $-\mathrm{un}-$.
${ }^{65}$ More literally: "painful tears she sheds."
${ }^{66}$ C: omits -hul-.
${ }^{67} \mathrm{C}$ omits refrain.
${ }^{68} \mathrm{C}:-\mathrm{ki}-\mathrm{a}$.
${ }^{69}$ C: -gar-ra-bi.
${ }^{70}$ Thus is A to be restored; cf. l. 91. C: $u_{4}-d a$.
${ }^{11} \mathrm{C}$ inserts - al -
${ }^{72}$ I.e., the wail because of it?
${ }^{73} \mathrm{C}$ : -bi(!) -šè (!).
${ }^{74}$ In C sag-sag- is a miscopy; the original probably has súr-súr-.
${ }^{75}$ Literally: "The storm-because of it."
${ }^{76} \mathrm{C}: \mathrm{u}_{4}$-da.
${ }^{77} \mathrm{C}$ omits last half of line.
${ }^{78} \mathrm{C}: \mathrm{u}_{4}(\mathrm{I})-$.

82 Unto him for the sake of his city approached-bitterly she weeps, ${ }^{65}$
Unto the lord for the sake of his house which had been attacked ap-proached-bitterly she weeps. ${ }^{65}$
[For the sake] of his [city which had been attacked] she approached himbitterly she weeps; ${ }^{65}$
85 [For the sake] of his [house] which had been attacked she approached him -its bitter lament she sets before him.
The "lady". . . .
A . . . . wail tremblingly in fear utters:
"The storm ever breaking forth-its wail ${ }^{72}$ has filled me full.
Raging about because of the storm, ${ }^{75}$
90 Me , the 'lady,' the storm ever breaking forth-its wail ${ }^{72}$ has filled me full.
The storm ever breaking forth-its wail ${ }^{72}$ has filled me full.
During the day a bitter ${ }^{78 a}$ storm ${ }^{79}$ having been raised unto me, I, although for that day I tremble-
To the day's aid verily I went not forth.
95 Because of its affliction I saw not one good day during my rule, one good day during my rule.
At night a bitter lament having been raised unto me,
I, although for that night I tremble-
To the night's aid verily I went not forth.
Like (that of) a city, the terror of the destruction of the day verily has filled me full.
100 Because of its . . . . in my sleeping-place of the night, in my sleepingplace of the night verily there is no peace ${ }^{90 \mathrm{a}}$ for me;

```
    78a More literally: "painful," "afflicting."
    \({ }^{79}\) I.e., "howl"?
    \({ }^{80}\) A: \(\mathrm{PA}(!)\).
    \({ }^{81} C\) omits - an.
    \({ }^{82} \mathrm{Aa}\) and C: -mu .
    \({ }^{83} \mathrm{C}: \mathrm{u}_{4}(!)\), not un.
    \({ }^{84}\) So C. A probably omits -in-; G:
- àm (for -a).
    \({ }^{85}\) C: ma-a-ra.
```

        \({ }^{86} \mathrm{G}, \mathrm{H}\), and probably Aa: hé-im-
    ši-ag.
ši-ag.
${ }^{87} \mathrm{G}$ and H omit -en.
${ }^{37 \mathrm{a}} \mathrm{Aa}$ : -ba (for -bi).
${ }^{88} \mathrm{H}$ : - ma(!) - .
${ }^{88}$ Aa omits - n a-; scribal error.
${ }^{89} \mathrm{Aa}$ inserts -an-.
${ }^{90}$ In Aa the traces do not point to the
restoration of MAR.
${ }^{90 \mathrm{a}}$ More literally: "peace has not been
made to exist for me."
$101 \mathrm{u}_{4}$-TUR-bi-šè ki-ná-mà mu-us-lá-a-bi ki-ná-mà GIš- $1[a ́-a-b i]^{91} n u-s ̌ i-i n-g a-m a^{91 a}-n i-i b^{92}-t u ́ m^{92 a}$
$\mathrm{ka}-\mathrm{na}$-ág-m $\mathrm{a}^{93} \quad[\mathrm{a}(?)-$ še (? $\left.)-\mathrm{ir}(?)\right]-\mathrm{gi} \mathrm{g}^{93 \mathrm{a}}$ ba-ma(!)a ${ }^{94}-1 a-k e_{4}-$ es $^{94_{a}}$
áb-amar-ra ${ }^{94 b}$-gim NAM $k i \quad s ̌ u b e ́ i m-m a-a g-a n^{95}$
$k a-n a-a ́ g-m u n i(?)$ šu-a ba-ra-mu-da-ab-gi4(!) ${ }^{96}$

mušen-an-na-gIm á-dúb bé-en-ši-ag-ann
me-e urú-mu-šè hé-en ${ }^{99}$-ši-dal-dal-en
urú-muki-ma-al $l^{100}-b a \operatorname{hé}-e n-g a \operatorname{mu}-d a(!)^{101}-g u l$ urfíki-ná-bi-a bé-en-ga mu-da ${ }^{101}-t i l-e^{102}$
110 šu-u $u_{4}-d a \quad a n-t a \quad b a-m a-a l^{104}-1 a-k e_{4}-e \check{s}$
KA bu-mu-dúbedin(!)-na- $u_{4}(!)-g i_{4}-a m e-e h e ́-i m-$ $\mathrm{ma}(!)-\mathrm{na}^{105}-\mathrm{Dr}^{106}$
$u_{4}-d a \operatorname{daba}-b i \quad b a-r a-m u-d a-z i^{107}$
$n u-n u z-m e ̀ n^{108}$ é -nun-kug ${ }^{108 a}-$ é-na-áam-109ga-ša(!) -

$$
a n-n a-m u
$$


115 ir a-še-ir-ra ki ba-ma-ab-ús-e ${ }^{112}$
é - ki - Hur-ša $\mathrm{g}_{5}-\mathrm{gi}^{114}-\mathrm{sag}-\mathrm{g} \mathrm{íg}^{115}-\mathrm{ga}-\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{me}-\mathrm{n} \mathrm{a}^{116}-\mathrm{k} \mathrm{e}_{4}-\mathrm{es}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { EZEN }^{117}-\mathrm{bi}-\mathrm{ta} \text { ib(!)-ba(!) } \mathrm{su}(!)-\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{ug}-\mathrm{ga} \text { bé-en-ga } \\
& m u-t a b-t a b-b i^{118} \\
& u_{4}-\text { TUR-bi-š é }{ }^{120} \text { é -mu-ki-ša } \mathrm{g}_{5}-\mathrm{ga}
\end{aligned}
$$

${ }^{91}$ For the preceding four complexes Aa reads ki-ná giš-lá-a-ba ki-ná$m u$ GIš-1 á-a-[ba]; G reads $[k i-n]$ á mu-us(!)-1ába ki-ná mu-us-1a-ba.
${ }^{\text {91a }} \mathrm{Aa}:-\mathrm{mu}$ - (for $-\mathrm{ma}-$ ).
${ }^{22}$ G probably omits -ib-.
${ }^{92 a}$ In Aa this line is followed by a line omitted in the other texts: [ka]-na-ag-mu-ta Im-subme-e ba-ra-ba-da-ag, "My land verily I forsook not." Cf. 1. 144.
${ }^{\text {92b }}$ More literally: "been allowed to enter for me."
${ }^{93}$ D: ur ú - mu, "in(!) my city."
${ }^{93 a} \mathrm{Aa}$ adds -g a.
${ }^{94} \mathrm{Aa}$ and H: -GÁL- (for -ma-al-).
${ }^{94 a}$ The corresponding line in Aa is iii 16.
${ }^{94}$ Aa omits -ra-.
${ }^{95} \mathrm{Aa}: \quad \mathrm{b}$ é-mi-ib-ag; H: -im-mi-ag.
${ }^{96} \mathrm{H}:-\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{da}-\mathrm{gi} \mathrm{i}_{4}$. In D and H this line seems to precede the line corresponding to 102 of our text. Aa omits this line altogether.
${ }^{97} \mathrm{D}: \mathrm{ka}-\mathrm{na}-\mathrm{a} \mathrm{g}-$ (for urú ).
${ }^{97 a} \mathrm{~F}$ and H add -g a.
${ }^{97 b} \mathrm{Aa}, \mathrm{F}$, and H : -GÅL- (for -ma-al-).
${ }^{97 \mathrm{c}}$ The corresponding line in Aa is iii 14.

101 Nor, verily, because of its affiction, has the quiet of my sleeping-place, the quiet of my sleeping-place been allowed me. ${ }^{92 \mathrm{~b}}$
Although, because in my land a bitter [lament] has broken forth,
I like a cow to its calf . . . . ,
My land was not delivered of fear.
105 Although, because in my city a bitter wail has broken forth, I like a bird of heaven flap (my) wings
(And) to my city I fly,
My city on its foundation in grief was destroyed;
Ur on its base in grief perishes. ${ }^{103}$
110 Although, because the hand of the storm has appeared above, I screamed and cried to it, 'Return, O storm, to the plain,'

The storm's breast verily rose not to depart.
Me, the 'lady,' in the Enunkug, my house of 'ladyship,'
For whose rule long days had not been granted me,
115 Verily weeping and lamentation follow. ${ }^{113}$
As for the house which used to be the place where was soothed the spirit of the black-headed people,
Instead of its feasts wrath, distress, (and) grief multiply. ${ }^{119}$
Because of its affliction in my house, the good place,

```
    98 Aa: bé-mi-{ib-ag]; F and H:
bé-im-ši-ag.
    99 Aa, F, and H: -im-(for -en-).
    100 D: -GÁL- (for -ma-al-).
    101 F: -dèe.
    102 F and H omit - e.
    103 F and G: "perished."
    104 E, F, and H: -GÁL- (for -ma-al-).
    105 F and H omit -na-.
    106 F and H: -dug4 (for -DI).
    107 E:-da-ab-zi; H: ba-ra-ba-
ra-zi.
    108 D: munus-e.
    108a E inserts -g a-.
```

    \({ }^{109}\) Finserts the determinative dingir. \(\quad{ }^{120}\) E omits -s è .
    \({ }^{110} \mathrm{D}: \mathrm{u}_{4}(!)\).
    \({ }^{111} \mathrm{~F}\) : - a (for-àm).
    \({ }^{112}\) F: -ús-àm; H: -ma-an-ús-
    eš.
${ }^{113} \mathrm{~F}$ and H : "followed."
${ }^{14} \mathrm{E}$ inserts uk ù.
${ }^{115}$ So E, F, and H. A seems to have
-gig-.
${ }^{116} \mathrm{~F}$ and H : -a-(for -na-).
${ }^{117}$ E: $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{zi}$-èm-.
${ }^{118} \mathrm{E}$ : mu-un-da-tab-tab-e-
eš; F: ma-da-an-tab-tab-bi-
eš; H: mu-da-tab-tab-es.
${ }^{119} \mathrm{E}, \mathrm{F}$, and H : "multiplied."

119 ézi-bul-a-mu ${ }^{121}-\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{b} 1^{121 a}-\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{ra}-\mathrm{b} 1^{121 b}-\mathrm{d} \mathrm{u}_{8}-\mathrm{a} \mathrm{m}^{122}$
120 HUR-bAD-a $a-s ̌ e-i r-a ́ g-g i g-g a$
a-še-ir-ág-gig-ga mu-ni-túm-túm-mu-u sin
é-Lứ-zi-dè-ba-ab-GAR-ra-m u ${ }^{125}$
gi-sig ${ }^{126}-k i r i-$ GIm bar-ba hé-bí-in-dúb ${ }^{127}$
é-kǐs-ši $r_{5}-\mathrm{g}$ allé-nam $\mathrm{m}^{128}-1 \mathrm{ugal}-1 \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{mu}$
125 é-zi-é-ír-ra ${ }^{129}-b a-a n-d i-n i-i b-G A R-r a-m u^{130}$

ba-la-ba-bi-a ${ }^{133}$ ba-ma(!)-ni-in-GAR-ri-ess à m ${ }^{134}$
za-lam-gar-éki-ebur-sír-ra-Grm
é-ki-ebur-sír-ra-GIM tu $\mathrm{l}_{15}$ - s èg-a $\mathrm{a}^{135}$ ba-ba-an-GAR ${ }^{136}$
130 urfíki ${ }^{137}$-ama $a_{5}$-NIG-dirig-mu ${ }^{138}$
é-uru ${ }^{139}-s i-g a-m u-u n-s i ́ r-s i ́ r-r a-m u^{140}$
amaš-LÚ-sipad-da-GIM ha(!)-ba-an-sír-sír ${ }^{141}$
Níg-GA-urú -GÁL-GÁL-la-mu sUg-gi (? $)^{142}$ hu-mu-da-ab$\mathrm{ku}^{143}$
ki-šub-gú - e ${ }_{5}^{5}-\mathrm{kam}-\mathrm{ma}^{145}$
135 uríki ír-ri ba-an-di-ni-ib ${ }^{146}$-GAR
iz -g $\mathrm{i}_{4}$-GÁL-bi-im
$u_{4}$-ba $u_{4}$-dè EN ba-sìg-sìg-ga-b a ${ }^{147}$
NIN-da urú-ni ba-an-da-gul-la-ba ${ }^{148}$ $u_{4}$-ba $u_{4}$-dè EN ba-dím-dím-ma-ba
140 urú-mu gul-gul-l[u-ba] im-mi-in ${ }^{149}$-NE-eš-a-ba uríki gul-gul-1[u]-ba im-mi-in ${ }^{149}$-NE-eš-a-ba

${ }^{121}$ E: - na-(for -mu-) ; scribal error?
121a $F$ : -IGI- (for -i-bí-).
${ }^{121 b} \mathbf{F}$ inserts -ib-; Hinserts - in-.
${ }^{122} \mathrm{E}$ : -a (for -a m ) ; H omits -à m .
Lines 118-19 form one line in F and H .
${ }^{123} \mathrm{D}: \mathrm{bu}-\mathrm{mu}-$; E: hu-mu-ni-
in-túm-túm-mu; Fomits-us; H adds - in-after - ni-.
${ }^{124} \mathrm{D}$ adds "verily"; E : "verily are brought"; F: "are brought."
${ }^{125}$ E omits -ab-; E and H: - mar(for -gar-).
${ }^{126} \mathrm{D}: \mathrm{sig}(!)$.
${ }^{127} \mathrm{D}: ~ h a-m a-d u ̛ b ; E:$ bé-im-mi-ib-dúb.
${ }^{128} \mathrm{H}$ : nam (!).
${ }^{129} \mathrm{D}: \mathrm{Ir} \mathrm{e}$; E: $\mathrm{fr} \mathrm{r} \boldsymbol{\mathrm { ri }}$.
${ }^{130} \mathrm{D}:-\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{di}-\mathrm{ni}-i \mathrm{~b}-\mathrm{GAR}-\mathrm{ra}-\mathrm{mu}$.
${ }^{131} \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{D}$, and E: LuL-e-e e .
${ }^{132} \mathrm{D}, \mathrm{E}$, and H: - ba.
${ }^{133} \mathrm{D}: \mathrm{b} a-1 \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{ab}-\mathrm{bi}-\mathrm{a}$.
${ }^{134} \mathrm{E}:-\mathrm{a}$ (for - à m).
${ }^{135} \mathrm{D}$ and $\mathrm{H}:-\mathrm{e}$ (for-a); $\mathrm{E}:-\mathrm{g}$ á.
${ }^{136} \mathrm{D}:$ h a-ma-GÁL; H omits -an-.
${ }^{137} \mathrm{H}: ~[\mathrm{ur} \text { 亿 }]^{\mathrm{ki}(!)}$.

119 My attacked righteous house upon which verily I had not cast (my) eye, 120 . . . . laments that are bitter, Laments that are bitter were brought. ${ }^{124}$
My house founded by a righteous man
Like a garden hut verily on its side has caved in.
The Ekišširgal, my royal house,
125 The righteous house, my house which has been given over to tears, Whose building, falsely, whose perishing, truly,
Has been established for me as its lot and share,
Like a tent, the house where the crops have been
Like the house where the crops have been . . . . , to wind and rain verily has been exposed.
130 Ur, my extra large chamber,
My smitten house and city which have been torn down,
Like the sheepfold of a shepherd verily has been torn down;
My possessions which had accumulated in the city verily have been dissipated." ${ }^{144}$
The third song.
135 Ur has been given over to tears.
Its antiphon.
"On that day, after the lord had been overcome by the storm, After, in spite of the 'lady,' her city had been destroyed;
On that day, after the lord had been overwhelmed by the storm,
140 After they had commanded the utter destruction of my city; ;150
After they had commanded the utter destruction of Ur, ${ }^{150 \mathrm{a}}$
After they had ordered that its people be killed-

```
    \({ }^{138} \mathrm{H}\) : -m à (for -mu ).
    \({ }^{139}\) D seems to read -uru-.
    \({ }^{140} \mathrm{D}, \mathrm{E}\), and \(\mathrm{H}:-\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{un-sir-sír}-\)
sir.
    \({ }^{141} \mathrm{E}\) and \(\mathrm{H}:-\mathrm{ma}\) - (for - ba-) ; D, E ,
and H omit -an-.
    \({ }^{142} \mathrm{D}\) : sug(1)-e.
    \({ }^{143}\) So A and D; E and \(H\) have a variant
reading for the line:............. -
sag(?)-si-ga-ba šu-pi-el-la
ba-ab-dug4. Cf. 1. 239.
    \({ }^{144} \mathrm{E}\) and H : ". . . . on its . . . . a defiling
hand was placed."
```

${ }^{145} \mathrm{D}$ and H add - à m.
${ }^{146} \mathrm{D}:$ - 1 b -.
${ }^{147}$ In H the positions of the lines corresponding to 137 and 139 are interchanged.
${ }^{148} \mathrm{H}$ : - gul-e.
${ }^{149} \mathrm{H}:-\mathrm{me}$ - (for -mi-in-).
${ }^{150}$ More literally: "Of my city [its] utter destruction."
${ }^{150 a}$ More literally: "Of Ur its utter destruction."
${ }^{151} \mathrm{C}$ : - d è .
${ }^{152} \mathrm{H}:-\mathrm{f} \mathrm{g}$ (!).
$143 u_{4}-b a \operatorname{me-e} u r u-m u-s ̌ e ̀ ~ G A ́-l a \quad b a-r a-b a-r a-d a g(!)$ $k a-n a-a ́ g-m u-t a \quad i m-s ̌ u b$ me-e ba-ra-ba-da-ag-en $n^{153}$


urú-mu nam-ba-gul-lu hé-me-ne-dug ${ }_{4}$
uriki nam-ba-gul-lu be ${ }^{156}-m e-n e-d u g_{4}$
$u k u ̀-b i n a m-b a-t i l-e ~ h e^{156}-m e-n e-d u g_{4}$
150 $a n-e^{157} \quad e-n e-e ̀ m-b i \quad b a-r a-m u^{158}-d a-g u r$
 $m u-u n-h u n^{160}$
mìn-kam-ma-šè pu-úh-ru-um ${ }^{161 k i}$ sag-ki-a $a^{162} \quad$ bad $\mathrm{a}^{163}$-GÁL-I $a$
$d_{a-n u n-n a ~ e-n e-e ̀ m-K A-k e ́ s ~}{ }^{164}-d a-b i \quad b a-a n-d a-d u ́ r-$ ru-Ne-es - à m ${ }^{165}$
úr hétim-ma-BU-BU $\mathfrak{a}(!)^{166}$ bé-im-ma-lálá
155 an-ra $a-i-b i ́-m a ̀ m e-e ~ b e ́ i m-m a-n a-d e ~ e^{167}$ ${ }^{d} m u-u l-1 i l-r a \operatorname{nímu}$ ša-ne-ša4 ${ }^{168}$ h é-im-ma-ag urú-mu nam-ba-gul-lu héreme-ne-dug uríki nam-ba-gul-lu be ${ }^{169}-m e-n e-d u g_{4}$ $u k u ̀-b i n a m-b a-t i l-e^{170} \quad$ b $e^{169}-m e-n e-d u g_{4}$ $a n-e^{171} \quad e-n e-e ̀ m-b i \quad b a^{172}-r a-m u-d a^{173}-g u r$
 $m u-u n-h u n^{175}$
urú-mugul-gul-lu-ba $\mathfrak{a}^{166}-\mathrm{bi}$ hécim-ma(!)-an-áge s
uríki gul-gul-lu(!)-ba áabibi bé-im-ma(!)-an-áges
ukù-bi ug $\mathrm{g}_{5}-\mathrm{gi}-\mathrm{d}^{176}$ na-ám-ba $\mathrm{a}^{159}$ ba-ba-an-tar-ries
${ }^{163} \mathrm{H}$ omits -en.
${ }^{1539} \mathrm{H}$ : "forsook."
${ }^{154} \mathrm{H}$ : - de (!).
${ }^{155} \mathrm{H}$ inserts - na - before - ag.
${ }^{256} \mathrm{H}$ inserts - im -.
${ }^{157} \mathrm{H}:-\mathrm{ni}$ (for -e).
${ }^{158} \mathrm{H}$ inserts - un-.
${ }^{1682} \mathrm{H}:-\mathrm{e}$ (for -l i).
${ }^{150} \mathrm{H}:-\mathrm{bi}($ for-ba).
${ }^{160} \mathrm{H}$ : $\quad b a-r a-b i-i n-s ̌ e d x$ (i.e., mUslan.di).
${ }^{161} \mathrm{H}$ : - rum.
${ }^{162} \mathrm{H}$ omits -a.
${ }^{163} \mathrm{H}$ inserts - ab -.

143 On that day verily I abandoned not my city;
My land verily I forsake ${ }^{153 \mathrm{~s}}$ not.
145 To Anu the water of my eye verily I poured;
To Enlil I in person verily made supplication.
'Let not my city be destroyed,' verily I said unto them;
'Let not Ur be destroyed,' verily I said unto them;
'Let not its people perish,' verily I said unto them.
150 Verily Anu turned not to this word;
Verily Enlil with its 'It is good; so be it' soothed not my heart.
For the second time, when the council had . . . .ed
(And) the Anunnaki . . . . had seated themselves,
The legs verily I . . . .ed, the arms verily I stretched out.
155 To Anu the water of my eye verily I poured;
To Enlil I in person verily made supplication.
'Let not my city be destroyed,' verily I said unto them;
'Let not Ur be destroyed,' verily I said unto them;
'Let not its people perish,' verily I said unto them.
160 Verily Anu turned not to this word;
Verily Enlil with its 'It is good; so be it' soothed not my heart.
The utter destruction of my city ${ }^{150}$ verily they ordered,
The utter destruction of $\mathrm{Ur}^{150_{a}}$ verily they ordered;
That its people be killed, as its fate verily they decreed.

[^10]me-e Níg-KA-mu(!) $)^{176 a}$ mu-ne-sim-ma-gIm me-e urú-mu-ta $a^{177}$ hé-en-ga ${ }^{178} \mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{da}-\mathrm{l} \mathrm{á}^{-\mathrm{e}^{179}-\mathrm{es}}$ uríki-mu ma-da hé-en-ga ${ }^{178}$ mu-da-lá-e-es ${ }^{180}$ an-ni dugatga-ni 甘UR $n u-k u ́ r-r u-d a m^{181}$
 $e-d$ è $^{83}$
$k i-s ̌ u b-g u ́-l i m m u-k a m-m a^{184}$
urún ${ }^{185}-n i$ ba-an-da-gul-la $a^{186}$ me-ni ba-an-kúrra ${ }^{187}$
iz-gis -GÁL-bi-i m ${ }^{188}$
den-líl-li $u_{4}-d$ è gù-ba- ukù-e še-a-an-ša4 an-dé
$u_{4}-h e ́-g$ ál-la $a^{188 a}$ kalam-da $a^{189} u k u ̀-e ~ s ̌ e-a-a n-s ̌ a_{4}$ $b a-d a-a n^{189 a}-k a r$
175
\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& u_{4}-d \text { ùg ki-en-gi-da } a^{190} \quad u k u ̀-e \text { še-a-an-ša } a_{4} \\
& \text { ba-da-an-kar } \\
& u_{4}(!)-h u l-g a ́ l-d a^{191} \quad a^{166} \quad u k u ̀-e s ̌ e-a-a n-s ̌ a_{4} \\
& \text { ba-e-d } a^{192}-\mathbf{a} g \\
& k i n(!)-g a l^{193}-u_{4}-d a-u_{4}-d a^{193 a}-g u b-b a \quad s ̌ u-n i^{194} \\
& \text { im-ma-an-sim } \\
& u_{4}-k \text { alam-til-til-e } \\
& \text { gù-ba-an-dé } \\
& t u_{15}-h u l-t u_{15}-h u l-e \\
& u k u ̀(!)-e \text { še-a-an- } \\
& \text { gù-ba-an-dé }
\end{aligned}
$$
\]

ni-in-tu-ri(!) ${ }^{197 \mathrm{a}}$
${ }^{176 a}$ In Aa -me-en seems to follow -mu .
${ }^{177} \mathrm{H}:-\mathrm{da}$.
${ }^{178} \mathrm{H}:-\mathrm{ga}$ (!).
${ }^{179} \mathrm{H}$ omits -e-. In $D$ the verbal form seems to end in -en.
${ }^{180}$ In D the verbal form seems to end in -en.
${ }^{181} \mathrm{~J}:-\mathrm{da}$.
${ }^{181 a} \mathrm{H}$ and $\mathrm{J}:-\mathrm{e}$ (for -li ).
${ }^{182} \mathrm{Aa}$ and J: ka-ta-è-a-ni.
${ }^{183} \mathrm{H}:-\mathrm{dam}$.
${ }^{184} \mathrm{Aa}, \mathrm{H}$, and J add - a m .
${ }^{185}$ E seems to read uru-.
${ }^{186} \mathrm{H}: \mathrm{b} \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{da} \mathrm{a}$ gul-àm.
${ }^{187} \mathrm{H}: \mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{da}-\mathrm{k}$ úr-àm; Aa and J: ba-an-da-kúr-ra.
${ }^{188} \mathrm{D}$ and $\mathrm{J}: ~ i z-g \mathrm{i}_{4}$-GÁL-ki-šub-gú-da-kam.

188a Aa seems to omit-1a.
${ }^{189}$ So H; A: - bi (?).

165 Me like one who had given them my .... -
Me because of my city they filled with grief;
My Ur because of me they filled with grief.
Anu changes not his command;
Enlil alters not the command which he had issued."
170 The fourth song.
Her city has been destroyed; her decrees have become inimical.
Its antiphon.
Enlil called to the storm, The people groan.
The storm of overflow he carried off The people groan. from the land;
175 The good storm he carried off from The people groan. Sumer.
To the evil storm he gave (his) order; The people groan.
The great work set aside for each storm he gave into his hand.
To the storm that annihilates the The people groan.
land he called;
To all the evil winds he called. The people groan.
180 Enlil brings Gibil to his aid;
${ }^{1889} \mathrm{Aa}:-\mathrm{an}-\mathrm{da}-($ for $-\mathrm{da} \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{an}-$ ).
${ }^{190} \mathrm{So} \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{A}:-\mathrm{ra}$ (?).
${ }^{191} \mathrm{Aa}$ and H : -e (for -da).
${ }^{192} \mathrm{Aa}$ omits -e-; Aa, E, and H insert -an-.
${ }^{193}$ E omits-gal-.
${ }^{193 a}$ Aa omits $-\mathrm{u}_{4}-\mathrm{da}$-.
${ }^{194} \mathrm{H}$ : - na (for -ni).
${ }^{1044}$ Entire line omitted in Aa.
${ }^{195}$ Entire line omitted in H . In Aa this line follows the one corresponding to 1.180
of our text. In $E$ it follows the one corresponding to 1.181 of our text.
${ }^{196} \mathrm{Aa}, \mathrm{E}$, and H: den-lil-li. In H en- is probably written over erased $m u-$ ul-.
$197 \mathrm{E}:-\mathrm{ni}$; H: - na (!).
${ }^{197 \mathrm{a}}$ In A the verbal form is preceded by the end of a sign which may be restored as na. Does it belong to the preceding complex át ab-a-na? Note that there seems to be plenty of room for the -a-n a in the first (i.e., upper) part of the line.
$181 u_{4}-g a l-a n-n a-k e_{4} g$ ù-ba- $u k u ̀-e$ še-a-an-ša4 ${ }^{197 b}$ an-dé
$u_{4}$-gal-e an-ta g ù ${ }^{198}$ im- ukù-e še-a-an-ša4 ${ }_{4}{ }^{198 a}$ me
$u_{4}$-kalam-til-til-e ${ }^{199}$ ki-a ukù-e še-a-an-ša4 ${ }^{198 a}$ $\mathrm{ur}_{5}$ im-ša4

185 gis̊má (!) -urú-ke $\mathrm{c}_{4}$ sag-gaz ì-ag-e ur-bi i-kú-e an-na úr-ba? mu-un- ukù-e še-a-an-ša4 nigin
$u_{4}-\mathrm{da}$ igi-ba izi(?)
$u k u ̀-e$ še-a-an-ša4 $\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{un}-\mathrm{NE}^{201}$
$u_{4}$-mir-mir-e-da ${ }^{202}$ NE-Mr-edin-na bar ba-da-an ${ }^{203}-$ $t a b-t a b$
AN.NE-bar Šèg(? $)^{204}-11-i l-1 a-? ~ i z i(?) i m-m a-a n^{203}$ -NE-NE
190 an-ne-GÁN $u_{4}-z a l a g-g a^{205}-e ̀-a-b i u_{4}-d u ̀ g-d a \quad b a-d a-$ $a n-t a b$
kalam-ma $u_{4}-z a l a g-g a l a-b a-a n-e ̀ m u l-u s a n n_{x}{ }^{206}-$ gim ba-zal
 $\mathrm{da}-\mathrm{an}-\mathrm{ta} \mathrm{b}^{208 \mathrm{a}}$
sika-NE-NE-da ${ }^{209}$ sabar (?) ukù-e še-a-an-ša4 $i m-d a-t a b-t a b$
sag-gig-gaid tu $u_{15}-t u_{15} \quad u k u ̀-e s ̌ e-a-a n-s a_{4}$ ba-an-ri
195
ki-en-gi giš-búr-ra i-bal-e 211
$u k u ̀ n-e$ še-a-an-ša $a_{4}$
 $u_{4}-\mathrm{gig}$ ir-ri nam $\mathrm{m}^{214}-\mathrm{nu}-\mathrm{tar}$-riria
${ }^{197 b}$ Entire line omitted in Aa.
198 In H the signs Ni and is are miscopied; they are not on the original.

198a Entire line omitted in Aa and E.
${ }^{199}$ In H the $\mathrm{K} \sigma G(?)$ is miscopied; it is not on the original, where the entire line seems to be written over an erasure.
${ }^{200}$ So H. In A and Aa the sign ku(?) is inserted between $a$ - and -mab-.
${ }^{2003}$ More literally: "On the boats of the city an attack it makes."
${ }^{201} \mathrm{H}$ : -NE-NE.
${ }^{202} \mathrm{H}: \mathrm{u}_{4}-\mathrm{U}_{4}$-RI (instead of $\mathrm{u}_{4}-\mathrm{mir}-$ mir-e-da).
${ }^{203}$ D omits - an-.
${ }^{204}$ In H the sign ne is inserted.
${ }^{204 \mathrm{~A}} \mathrm{H}$ : "rain-and storm-bearing."
${ }^{205} \mathrm{H}$ omits -g a-.

181 To the great storm of heaven he The people groan. called.
The great storm howls above;

The land-annibilating storm roars The people groan. below.
The evil wind like the rushing torrent cannot be restrained;
185 The boats of the city it attacks ${ }^{2002}$ (and) devours.
At the base of heaven it made the The people groan. . . . . whirl,
In front of the storm it made fire burn; The people groan.

At the side of the battling storms it intensified the tumult,
In the rain ${ }^{204 \mathrm{a}}$-bearing . . . . of the day it made fire burn.

190 The bright light sent forth by the day, the good light, $\mathrm{it}^{205 \mathrm{5a}}$ withheld;
In the land $\mathrm{it}^{206 a}$ sent not forth bright light, like a twilight star it shone.
The night during the celebration of its feasts and banquets was overwhelmed by the South Wind;
At the side of their ${ }^{209 \mathrm{a}}$ cups dust was The people groan. piled high;
Over the black-headed people the The people groan. winds swept.
195 Sumer is broken up by the gišburru; The people groan.
Upon the land $\mathrm{it}^{213}$ makes . . . . (and) devours it.
The afflicting storm by tears is not adjured;
${ }^{205 a}$ I.e., the evil wind.
${ }^{206}$ I.e., AN.DUR.
${ }^{206 a}$ I.e., the day.
${ }^{207}$ I.e., musLan.dr.
${ }^{208} \mathrm{H}$ inserts the determinative $t u_{15}$.
${ }^{208 a} \mathrm{H}:-\mathrm{t}$ ab (!).
${ }^{209} \mathrm{H}:-\mathrm{d}$ a m.
${ }^{200 a}$ Does "their" refer to the "black-
headed people" of the following line?
${ }^{210} \mathrm{H}:-\mathrm{e}$ (for -ga).
${ }^{211}$ So $H$ and $K$; $A$ seems to have $-a$
(for -e). In $H$ the sign AN which precedes $\mathbf{i}-\mathrm{b} a \mathrm{l}$-e is probably a miscopy.
${ }^{212} \mathrm{~K}$ seems to omit -e -
213 I.e., the gišburru.
${ }^{214} \mathrm{~K}: ~ \mathrm{na}$ a $\mathbf{a}_{\mathrm{m}}$.
${ }^{214 a} \mathrm{~K}$ adds the refrain.

$u_{4}$ a-ma-ru-gim urú i-gul-gul-e
$u_{4}$-kalam-til-til-e ${ }^{216}$ urú-a me $\mathrm{m}^{217}$ bí-íb-gar ${ }^{217 a}$

$u_{4}-\mathrm{NE}-\mathrm{gim}$ NE-a ${ }^{219}$ ukù-e $\mathrm{su}^{220}$ bífíb-gar ${ }^{221}$

uríi-ma túg-gim ba-e-dul ${ }^{222}$ gad $d^{222 a}-g i m b a(!)-e^{222 b}-$ búr
$205 \mathrm{ki}-\mathrm{s} u \mathrm{~b}-\mathrm{g}$ ú-iá-kam-ma $\mathrm{a}^{223}$
$u_{4}-u g-a^{224} \quad a l-d u_{7}-d u_{7} \quad u k u ̀-e s ̌ e-a-a n-s a_{4}$
iz-gi $\mathrm{i}_{4}$-GÁLL-bi-i $\mathrm{m}^{225}$
$\mathrm{u}_{4}-\mathrm{ba} \quad \mathrm{u}_{4} \quad \mathrm{ur} \hat{u}^{226}-\mathrm{da} \quad \mathrm{ba}^{226 \mathrm{a}}-\mathrm{d} \mathrm{a}^{227}-\mathrm{gar}(!) \mathrm{ur} \mathrm{u}^{228}-\mathrm{bi}$ dul(!) $-\mathrm{dul}(!)-\mathrm{da}{ }^{228 \mathrm{a}}$
$a-a-{ }^{d} n a n n a \quad u r$ un $^{288 b}-b i^{229} \quad u k u ̀-e s ̌ e-a-a n-s ̌ a_{4}$ $d u l-d u l-d a b a-d a^{230}-g a r$
$210 u_{4}$-ba $u_{4}$ kalam-ta ${ }^{231}$ ba- ukù-e še-a-an-ša ${ }_{4}{ }^{232 a}$ $\mathrm{da}-\mathrm{ga} \mathrm{r}^{232}$
$u k u ̀-b i^{233}$ sika-kud-da-nu-me-a bar-ba ba-e-si
bàd-ba ${ }^{234}$ gú gìr ${ }^{235}$ im- $\quad u k u ̀-e ~ s ̌ e-a-a n-s ̌ a_{4}$ $\mathrm{ma}^{236}-\mathrm{gar}-\mathrm{gar}$
k $\mathrm{a}^{236 a}-\mathrm{gal}(\mathrm{l})-\mathrm{mab}-\mathrm{gìr}-\mathrm{gal}-\mathrm{la}-\mathrm{ba}$ LỨ+BAD im-mi-in-gar-gar ${ }^{237}$
${ }^{215} \mathrm{~K}$ : -ùr-ùr-.
${ }^{2150}$ More literally: "makes the land tremble again and again."
${ }^{216} \mathrm{Aa}:-\mathrm{la}$ (for -e); K: -la-ba (for -e) .
${ }^{217}$ So Aa and K; A omits.
${ }^{217 \mathrm{a}}$ So K (and probably Aa); A: ba-an-gar.
${ }^{218} \mathrm{H}:-\mathrm{u}(!)-$.
${ }^{218 a}$ So Aa (and probably A); K adds -eš.
${ }^{218 \mathrm{~b}}$ So K; A: - (for -e s ).
${ }^{219}$ So $A a$ and $K$; $A:-a$ ( 1 ?).
${ }^{220}$ So $A a$ and K; A: so(!).
${ }^{222} \mathrm{So} \mathrm{K} ; \mathrm{A}:-\mathrm{ma}$ (?) (for -gar).
${ }^{222} \mathrm{Aa}$ and $\mathrm{K}: \mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{un}$ - (for ba-e-);
H seems to repeat the root.
${ }^{222 a} \mathrm{H}$ and K : $\operatorname{gad}(\mathrm{l})-$.
${ }^{222 b} \mathrm{Aa}: m u-\mathrm{un}-($ for $\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{e}-$ ).
${ }^{223} \mathrm{Aa}, \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{I}$, and K add -à m .
${ }^{224} \mathrm{Aa}$ and H : - ${ }^{2} \mathrm{~m}$ (for -a).
 da-kam.
${ }^{226} \mathrm{H}$ and L seem to have uru-.
${ }^{226 a}$ Aa inserts -an-.
${ }^{227} \mathrm{H}$ and L insert - an-.
${ }^{228} \mathrm{Aa}$ and H seem to have uru-.
${ }^{2288} \mathrm{Aa}$ : - dam (for -da).
${ }^{228 \mathrm{~b}} \mathrm{Aa}$ : uru-.
${ }^{229} \mathrm{H}$ and L: - ni .

198 The destructive storm makes the land tremble and quake; ;215s Like the storm of the flood it destroys the cities.
200 The land-annihilating storm set up (its) decrees in the city; The all-destroying storm came doing evil;
Like a . . . it placed the . . . . upon the people.
The evil, afflicting storm, the command of Enlil, the storm unceasingly undermining the land
Covered Ur like a garment, enveloped it like linen.
205 The fifth song.
The raging storm has attacked un- The people groan. ceasingly.
Its antiphon.
On that day the (good) storm was carried off from the city; that city into ruins,
O Father Nanna, that city into ruins The people groan. was made.
210 On that day the (good) storm was The people groan. carried off from the land;
Its people without a potsherd filled its sides;
On its walls they lay prostrate. The people groan.
In its lofty gates where they were wont to promenade ${ }^{238}$ dead bodieswere lying about;
${ }^{230} \mathrm{Aa}$ and L insert - an-.
${ }^{231} \mathrm{~L}:-\mathrm{d}$ a .
${ }^{232} \mathrm{H}: \mathrm{b} a-\mathrm{da}-\mathrm{an}-\mathrm{kar}(!)$; L: ba-
$d a-a n-k a r$.
${ }^{232 a}$ Instead of this line Aa has the follow-

## ing two lines:

$u_{4}-b a \quad u_{4} \quad u r u-d a \quad b a-a[n-d] a-$ gar uru-bi dul-dul-dam
On that day the (good) storm was carried off from the city, that city (was made) into ruins;
$\mathbf{u}_{4}-\mathrm{d} \mathbf{u} \mathrm{g} \quad \mathrm{ki}-\mathrm{en}-\mathrm{gi} \mathrm{i} \mathrm{da} \quad \mathrm{b} a-\mathrm{da}-$ an-kar ukù-e še-a-an-ša4
The good storm was carried off from Sumer. The people groan.

[^11]```
sila-dagal-ezem-ma \({ }^{239}-d u\)-a-ba sag-bal-e(! ?) - es \({ }^{240} b a-a b-g a r\)
```

e-sír-e-sír-gìr-gál-la-ba Ĺ̛bad im-ma-an-gargar
ki-ešemen-kalam-ma-gál-la-ba ukù zar ${ }^{241}-r i-e s ̌$ bí-in-du ${ }_{8}{ }^{241 \mathrm{a}}$
ù-mun ${ }^{242}-\mathrm{kalam}-\mathrm{ma}-\mathrm{ke}_{4}$ urudu-an-na-gim mùLsur ${ }^{242 a}$ ba-gar-gar ${ }^{242 b}$
 $\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{an} \mathrm{n}^{243 \mathrm{~b}}-\mathrm{zal}-\mathrm{li}-\mathrm{e} \mathrm{s}^{243 \mathrm{c}}$
 $\mathrm{la}-\mathrm{ba}(!)-\mathrm{ab}-\mathrm{dul} \mathrm{l}$ es (? $)^{247}$
220
$m a s ̌ a^{249}-g i s ̌-b u ́ r-r a^{250}-d i ́ b-b a-g i m k a s a h a r-r a$ bí-in-us
 in-lá-e-e š ${ }^{255}$
$\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{gi} \mathrm{i}_{4}-\mathrm{in}-\mathrm{zu} \mathrm{u}^{256} \mathrm{ki}-\mathrm{ha} \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{ri}-\mathrm{i} \mathrm{s}-\mathrm{t} \mathrm{um}^{257}-\mathrm{ama} \mathrm{m}-\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{k} \mathrm{a}^{258}$ BAD-bi-a mu-un-s $a_{4}$-e š $^{259}$
lú-mi-tum $\mathrm{m}^{260}-\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{i} \mathrm{n}^{261}-\mathrm{til}-\mathrm{la}-\mathrm{bi} \mathrm{i}^{262}$ Š $\mathrm{u}^{263}$-NE ba-ra-bi-in-1á-e-e ša $^{264}$
lúka ${ }^{265}-\mathrm{nag}(!)-\mathrm{ga}(!)^{266}-\mathrm{nu}(!)-\mathrm{me}-\mathrm{es}-\mathrm{a} \mathrm{m}^{267} \mathrm{~g}$ úzagga bí-in-lá-e-e sis
${ }^{\text {gist }}$ tukul-e-gub-b $a^{269}$ gistukul-e in-gaz
lú-kar-ra-bi $u_{4}$ im-ma- ukù-e še-a-an-ša4 a $n^{270}-\mathrm{DU}-\mathrm{bu}-\mathrm{ul}$
${ }^{239} \mathrm{H}:-\mathrm{gim}$-(for -ma-).
${ }^{240} \mathrm{~L}$ omits -es.
${ }^{241} \mathrm{H}$ : zar (!) -
${ }^{24 a_{a}} \mathrm{Aa}: \mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{an}-\mathrm{d} \mathrm{u}_{8}$. Is this line omitted in J , or is a variant line arrangement involved?
${ }^{242} \mathrm{~J}: \mathrm{u}-\mathrm{m} \mathbf{u}-\mathrm{u} \mathrm{n}$-.
${ }^{242 a} \mathrm{Aa}$ : -sùr.
${ }^{242 b} \mathrm{Aa}: ~ \mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{ni}-\mathrm{in}-\mathrm{DU}-\mathrm{es}$.
${ }^{243} \mathrm{H}$ omits the determinative.
${ }^{243 \mathrm{a}} \mathrm{Aa}$ : - dè - (for - da - ).

${ }^{243 c}$ Aa omits - e . .
${ }^{244} \mathrm{H}$ : urudu(!).
${ }^{245} \mathrm{H}$ and $\mathrm{La}:-\mathrm{zi}$-.
${ }^{248} \mathrm{Aa}, \mathrm{H}$, and La: - im-(for -in-).
${ }^{244 \mathrm{a}} \mathrm{Aa}$ : - ba.
${ }^{256 \mathrm{~b}} \mathrm{Aa}: \mathrm{t}$ úg-ugu (for sag-Tứ).
${ }^{247}$ So H; A seems to omit -eš.
${ }^{248}$ More literally:" they did not put the helmet as a cover over themselves."
${ }^{240}$ So E and H; A: maš.nitag. ${ }^{250} \mathrm{SoH}$; A seems to read ${ }^{\text {sidigu }} \mathrm{g}-\mathrm{um}-$. ${ }^{251}$ More literally: "bordered on," "touched."
${ }^{252} \mathrm{E}$ and La omit - un-.
${ }^{253}$ So E and H ; in A -a follows.

214 In its boulevards where the feasts were celebrated they were viciously attacked.
215 In all its streets where they were wont to promenade ${ }^{238}$ dead bodies were lying about;
In its places where the festivities of the land took place the people were ruthlessly laid low.
The blood of the land like bronze and lead.... ;
Its dead bodies, like fat put to the flame, of themselves melted away.
Its men who were brought to an end by the ax did not cover themselves with the helmet; ${ }^{248}$
220 Like a gazelle held fast by the gišburru, (their) mouths bit ${ }^{251}$ the dust.
Its men who were struck down by the spear did not fasten about them the . . . . ;
Lo, (as) in the place where their mother labored they lay stricken in their blood.
Its men who were brought to an end by the battle mace did not fasten about them the . . . . ;
Like men who cannot drink strong drink, they drooped neck over shoulder.
225 Who was stationed near the weapons The people groan. by the weapons was killed;
Who escaped them by the storm was The people groan. prostrated.
${ }^{254} \mathrm{E}$ and H omit the determinative.
${ }^{255}$ E omits - 1 á-e-; H: -ag-eš (for
-1á-e-ess). In Aa, E, H, and La the
lines corresponding to 221 and 223 are
interchanged.
${ }^{256} \mathrm{H}:-\mathrm{zu}$ (!).
${ }^{257} \mathrm{Aa}:-\mathrm{ta}$ (for -tum); E and La:
${ }^{258}$ So Aa, E, and H; A seems to have
$-b i-g i m(?)(f o r-b a-k a)$.
${ }^{259}$ So E and H ; A seems to omit -es.
${ }^{280} \mathrm{Aa}, \mathrm{E}, \mathrm{H}$, and La: -gis ${ }^{\text {TUKUL.AN- (for }}$
-mi-tum-).
${ }^{261} \mathrm{Aa}, \mathrm{E}, \mathrm{H}$, and La: - im-(for -in-).

```
    262 Aa: -g im, E: -ba, and H: -ri
(for - b i) ; La: - 1a(!) - ba.
    263 H: šu (!) - .
    264 Aa, E, and H omit -e-. Cf. also n.
255.
    265 So H; A: -kurun(?)-.
    266 La: -a (for -ga); E: - nag-
nag-a(for-nag-gá).
    267 So H;A seems to omit - àm ; Aa, E,
and La: - a (for -àm).
    268 H: -gál-eš(for - 1á-e-es).
    269 So H (and probably E and La); A:
gis(!)tukul(!)-e-gub-gub.
    270 E, H, and La omit - an-.
```

uríki-ma si-ga-kalag-ga-bi šà-gar-ra im-til ${ }^{271}$ um-ma-ab-ba ${ }^{272}-$ é-ta-nu-è- $a^{273}$ izi mu-ni-in(!) -si-sìki-es
$d u_{13}-d_{13}-1 a ́-u ́ r-a m a(!)-b a-k a-n a ́(!)-a k u a-g i m a$ ba-an-túm-mu-u ${ }^{2}{ }^{274}$
230
 $d a-a n^{276}-d^{0}$
dim-ma-kalam-ma ú(!) - ukù-e še-a-an-ša4 gu im-ma-an-dé
galga-kalam-ma $\operatorname{sug}^{277}-\mathrm{gi}_{4}$ ukù-e se-a-an-ša4 $b a-a b-k u(!?)$
ama dumu-na $a^{278}$ igi-ni $i^{279}$ ukù-e še-a-an-ša4 ba-ra- $\grave{e}^{279 a}$
ad-da dumu-ni-ta ${ }^{280} \quad$ ukù-e še-a-an-ša4 ba-da-an-gur ${ }^{280 a}$
235 urú-a dam ba-šub dumu ba-šub níg-ga ba-birbir
sag-gig ki-sag-gál-la-ka ${ }^{280 b}$ im-me bílab $b_{4}-\mathrm{e}^{281}$
nin-bi mušen-dal-la $a^{282}-\mathrm{gim}$ urú (!)-na $\mathrm{a}^{282 a}$ ba-ra-è
d(!)nin(!)-gal-e mušen-dal-la $a^{283}$-gim urú (!) -na ${ }^{282 a}$ $\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{ra}$-è
níg-ga ${ }^{283 \mathrm{a}}-\mathrm{k}$ alam-ma-gar-gar-ra-ba su-pi(!)-e[1]-láabab-dug4
240 amas (! $)^{284}-k a l a m-m a-s ̌ a ́ r-s ̌ a ́ r-r a-b a i z i 85 i m-m a-~$ $\mathrm{ab}^{285 a}-\mathrm{NE}-\mathrm{NE}^{286}$
íd(!) ${ }^{286 n}-b a{ }^{d}$ gibil-lú-sikil-la $a^{287}$ kin(!) àm-mi-in$d$ ù - d un $^{288}$
${ }^{271} \mathrm{H}:-\mathrm{til}$ (!).
${ }^{271 a}$ More literally: "Of Ur."
${ }^{272} \mathrm{E}$ and La: - $\mathrm{ad}-\mathrm{da}$ - (for -ab- $-\mathrm{n}[\mathrm{a}]$.
ba-).
${ }^{273} \mathrm{La}$ seems to have - $\mathrm{e}_{11}$ - (for -è-); E, H, and La omit -a .
${ }^{274} \mathrm{H}$ omits -mu-uš.
${ }^{275} \mathrm{H}$ omits one kalag.
${ }^{276} \mathrm{H}$ : - an-da-(for -da-an-).
${ }^{277} \mathrm{H}$ : sua(!)-

$$
\begin{aligned}
& { }^{278} \mathrm{Aa} \text { and } \mathrm{H}:-\mathrm{ni}(\text { for }-\mathrm{na}) \text {. } \\
& { }^{279} \mathrm{So} \text { Aa and } \mathrm{H} \text {; in A the traces point to } \\
& \mathrm{n}[\mathrm{a}] \text {. } \\
& { }^{279 \mathrm{a}} \mathrm{La} \text { seems to repeat this line; prob- } \\
& \text { ably scribal error. }
\end{aligned}
$$

```
280}\textrm{H}:-\textrm{da}(for -ta)
```

${ }^{280} \mathrm{Aa}$ : - k úr (!) (for-an-gur).
${ }^{280 b}$ So Aa and $\mathrm{La} ; \mathrm{A}:-\mathrm{gim}$.
${ }^{281}$ So Aa and H ; A adds - a .

227 Ur-271a its weak and (its) strong perished through hunger;
Mothers and fathers who did not leave (their) houses were overcome by fire;
The young lying on their mothers' bosoms like fish were carried off by the waters;
230 The nursing mothers-pried open were their breasts.
The judgment of the land perished; The people groan.
The counsel of the land was dissi- The people groan. pated.
The mother left her daughter; The people groan.
The father turned away from his son. The people groan.
235 In the city the wife was abandoned, the child was abandoned, the possessions were scattered about;
The black-headed people wherever they laid their heads . . . . were carried off.
Its lady like a flying bird ${ }^{282 b}$ departed from her city;
Ningal like a flying bird ${ }^{282 b}$ departed from her city.
On all its possessions which had been accumulated in the land a defiling hand was placed.
240 In all its storehouses which abounded in the land fires were kindled;
At its rivers Gibil, the purified, relentlessly did (his) work.
${ }^{282} \mathrm{Aa}$ and La: -im-te-a-(for -dal-1a-).
${ }^{2823} \mathrm{Aa}$ and La: -ni; H: -ni-a.
${ }^{282 b}$ Var.: "like a bird in flight."
${ }^{283} \mathrm{Aa}, \mathrm{H}$, and La: -Im-te-a- (for -dal-1a-).
${ }^{288 a}$ The traces in Aa do not point to a restoration nig-ga-.
${ }^{284} \mathrm{So} \mathrm{K}$; fr is miscopied. Is A also to be so corrected?
${ }^{285} \mathrm{H}$ : KA, probably miscopied; the tablet is now broken altogether at this point.
${ }^{285 a} \mathrm{Aa}$ and K: - an - (for - a b-).
${ }^{286} \mathrm{So} \mathrm{Aa}$ and H; A: -KA-KA (for -NE-NE), probably miscopied.
${ }^{286 \mathrm{a}} \mathrm{K}$ : $\mathrm{I} \mathrm{d}(\mathrm{l})-$.
${ }^{287} \mathrm{H}:-\mathrm{sikil}(!)-\mathrm{la}(!)$.
${ }^{288} \mathrm{H}:[\mathrm{mu}(?)]-\mathrm{un}-\mathrm{d}$ ù -d ù; K:
$m u-n a-a n-[d u ̀-d u ̀] ; A a: \ldots-a n-$ tuk-tuk-ki.

242 hur (!) -sag-sukud(!)-d $u^{289}-$ šu $-n u-t e-g a ́-e^{290} \quad$ é $-k i s ̌-$ ši $r_{5}-g$ ál-la
 i-kú(!)-e
 an-ag-e(!)-es
 bal-e-ne
urúa ${ }^{297}$ dul-dul-dam ${ }^{298} \quad u k u ̀-e ~ s ̌ e-a-a n-s ̌ a 4^{296}$ $m u-u n-g a ́-g a ́-n e$
nin-bi a urú-mu im-me-e-a-a $\mathrm{s}^{299}$ a étmu im-me-e-a-a $\mathbf{s}^{300}$
$d_{n i n-g a l-e ~ a ~ u r u ́-m u i m-m e-e-a-a ~}^{\text {s }}{ }^{301}$ a étmuim-me-e-a-a $\check{s}^{301}$
Lứ-nu-nuz-mè $n^{301 a}$ ù (!) -urú $-\mathrm{m}^{301 b}-\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{da}-\mathrm{gul}$ ù-é$m u^{301 b}-m u-d a-g u l$
 bir ${ }^{3019}$
$k i-s ̌ u b-g u ́-a ̀ s ̌ k a m-m a^{301 h}$
tùr-ra-na amaš-a-na munus ${ }^{301 i}-\mathrm{e}$ inim-gig-ga ${ }^{301 j}$ mi-ni-íb $b^{301 k}-b i$
$252 a$ urú $u_{4}-\mathrm{da}^{302}$ à $\mathrm{m}^{303}-\mathrm{gul}(!)-\mathrm{e}$
iz-git $\mathrm{i}_{4}$ GÁL-bi-i m ${ }^{304}$
ama-dnin-gal urú-na ${ }^{305} \mathrm{nu}^{306}$-erím-gim ${ }^{307}$ bar-ta $\mathrm{ba}(!)-\mathrm{da}-\mathrm{gub}$
255 lú-munus ${ }^{308}-\mathrm{e}$ ír- $\mathrm{e}^{309}-\mathrm{hu} u \mathrm{l}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{na}$ gal-gal ${ }^{310}-\mathrm{bi}$ mini(!) - ib(!) -bisil
${ }^{289} \mathrm{~K}:-\mathrm{d} \mathbf{u}$ - (written over erasure).
${ }^{290} \mathrm{H}:-\mathrm{g} \mathbf{a}(!)-\mathrm{e}(!)$.
${ }^{291}$ So H, K, and La; A and Aa probably -dè (for -ba).
${ }^{202} \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{K}$, La, and probably Aa: - zi-
(for -sic).
${ }^{292 a}$ Aa probably - I a (for -e).
${ }^{293} \mathrm{Aa}$ omits determinative.
${ }^{294} \mathrm{Aa}, \mathrm{H}$, and La: - a (for -e).
${ }^{294 a}$ Aa omits -ni-.
${ }^{295} \mathrm{Aa}, \mathrm{H}$, and $\mathrm{La}:-\mathrm{ib}$-.
${ }^{296} \mathrm{Aa}, \mathrm{H}$, and La omit refrain.
${ }^{297} \mathrm{H}$ and K seem to have uru .
${ }^{298} \mathrm{H}$ : - da (for - dam).
${ }^{299}$ Aa omits -e-a-aš. $H$ reads after -mu im(not un)-me(not im)-a (!)a s.
${ }^{300}$ Aa omits -e-a-ǎs. H omits -e-; last sign in complex is AŠ (not AN).
${ }^{301}$ Aa omits - e-a-a ${ }^{2} ; H$ omits -e-.
${ }^{301 \mathrm{a}} \mathrm{Aa}$ : -e (for -mèn).
${ }^{301 b}$ So Aa; A seems to omit $-\mathrm{mu}-$.
${ }^{301 \mathrm{c}} \mathrm{Aa}$ inserts è š-.

242 The lofty unapproachable mountain, the Ekišširgal-
Its righteous house by large axes is devoured;
The Sutians and the Elamites, the destroyers, made (of) it thirty shekels.
245 The righteous house they break up The people groan. with the pickax;
The city they make into ruins. The people groan.
Its lady cries: "Alas for my city," cries: "Alas for my house";

Ningal cries: "Alas for my city," cries: "Alas for my house.

As for me, the lady, my city has been destroyed, my house too has been destroyed;
250 O Nanna, Ur has been destroyed, its people have been dispersed. ${ }^{301 \mathrm{~g}}$
The sixth song.
In her stable, in her sheepfold the lady utters bitter words:
$252 a$ "The city is being destroyed by the storm."
Its antiphon.

Mother Ningal in her city like an enemy stood aside.
255 The lady loudly ${ }^{312}$ utters there the wail for ${ }^{313}$ her attacked house;

```
    301d Aa: mu-(for ba-).
    301e Aa: mu-1u-(for ukù-).
    301f Aa: ba-u gs-ga-eš.
    301g Aa: "have been killed."
    301h Aa adds -à m.
    301i Aa: nu-nuz-.
    301j Aa omits -ga.
    301k Aa: - i b - .
    302 L (and perhaps Aa): - d è .
    303 Or is the reading a-an-? Aa: an-
(for àm-).
```

```
    \({ }^{304} \mathrm{~L}: \mathrm{iz}-\mathrm{g} \mathrm{i}_{4}\)-GÁL-ki-šub-gú-da-
    kam.
    \({ }^{305} \mathrm{Aa}:\) uru-ni; M: uru(?)-ni;
    L: uruki n a.
    \({ }^{306} \mathrm{M}\) : [1] \(\mathrm{u}^{-}\)(for nu u ).
    \({ }^{307} \mathrm{~L}:-\mathrm{gim}(!)\).
    \({ }^{308} \mathrm{M}:-\mathrm{nu}-\mathrm{nuz}\) - (for \(-\mathrm{munus}-\) ).
    \({ }^{309}\) M: -色(!)-.
    \({ }^{310} \mathrm{M}\) : gig-ga-(for gal-gal-).
    \({ }^{311} \mathrm{H}\) (and probably M): im-me (for
mi-ni-ib-bi).
    \({ }^{312} \mathrm{M}\) : "bitterly."
    \({ }^{313}\) More literally: "of."
```

egíri ${ }^{314}$ èš-uríki-hul-a-na gi[g-ga-bi] ${ }^{315}$ im-me $e^{316}$ an-e urú-mu na-ám ba-ba-da-an ${ }^{318-t a r ~ u r u ~} u^{319}-$ $m u b u-m u-d a-g u l$
 ha-ba $a^{322}-r a$
$\operatorname{sig}(!)-t a-d i(!)-m a(!) \quad i z i \quad h a-b a(!)-n i(!)-i n(!)-$
sub (!) a urú-mu bu-mu-da-gul ${ }^{323}$
 ul ba-ba-ni-in-šub ${ }^{324}$
urú-bar-ra urú-bar bu $u^{325}-m u-d a-a n-g u l$ a $u r u ́-$ mu ga -à $\mathrm{m}^{326}-\mathrm{du}_{4}$
urú-šà-ba urú-šà-ab b $u^{325}-m u-d a-a n^{327 a}-g u l a t e-~$ $\mathrm{mu} \mathrm{ga}-\mathrm{àm} \mathrm{~m}^{326}-\mathrm{dug}_{4}$
 $\mathrm{ga}-\mathrm{a} \mathrm{m}^{329_{a}}-\mathrm{du} \mathrm{g}_{4}$
é-urú-šà-ba-mu ba-ba ${ }^{329}-\mathrm{gul-gul} a \operatorname{é-muga-}$ à $\mathrm{m}^{329 \mathrm{~b}}-\mathrm{dug}_{4}$
265 urú-mu ganam4 ${ }^{330-z i-\operatorname{Grm}(!) b a-r a-a l^{33 t}-L U ~ s i p a d-z i-~}$ bi ${ }^{332} \mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{ra}-\mathrm{DU}^{333}$
 ba-ra-Du ${ }^{335}$
gud-mu tùr-bi-a ba-ra-an ${ }^{336}-$ sub mu-lu $u^{337}-b i \quad b a-$ ra-DU ${ }^{337 \mathrm{a}}$
 bi ba ${ }^{340}-\mathrm{ra}-\mathrm{DU}$
${ }^{314}$ So M; A: -ri (!).
${ }^{315} \mathrm{M}$ : gal-gal-bi (for gig-gabi).
${ }^{316} \mathrm{H}: \mathrm{mi}-\mathrm{ni}-\mathrm{ib}-\mathrm{bi}$ (for $\mathrm{im}-\mathrm{me}$ ).
${ }^{317} \mathrm{M}$ : "loudly."
${ }^{318} \mathrm{M}$ omits -an-.
${ }^{319}$ So M (the only text extant at this point).
${ }^{320} \mathrm{H}:-\mathrm{e}$ (for -li ).
${ }^{322} \mathrm{M}$ : - ib - (for $-\mathrm{in}-$ ).
${ }^{322}$ So M; H: -ma-.
${ }^{323} \mathrm{Ll}$. 259-60 omitted in M.
${ }^{324} \mathrm{H}$ : - sì (for -šub).
${ }^{325} \mathrm{M}$ omits hu-.
${ }^{326} \mathrm{Or}$ is the reading -a~an-? H omits-a-; Nomits-an-.
${ }^{327} \mathrm{M}$ omits "verily."
${ }^{327 a} \mathrm{~N}$ omits - an -.
${ }^{328}$ The traces in $M$ point to -ma (for -mu ).
${ }^{329} \mathrm{H}:-\mathrm{ma}$ - (for -ba-).
${ }^{3209} \mathrm{~N}$ too has - $\mathrm{it} \mathrm{m}-$; H broken.
${ }^{329 \mathrm{~b}} \mathrm{~N}$ too has -àm-; H:-an-.

256 The princess in Ur, her attacked shrine, bitterly ${ }^{317}$ cries: "Verily Anu has cursed my city, my city verily has been destroyed;

Verily Enlil has turned inimical to my house, by the pickax verily it has been torn up.
Upon him who comes from below verily he hurled fire-alas, my city verily has been destroyed;
260 Enlil upon him who comes from above verily hurled the flame.
Outside the city, the outside of the city verily ${ }^{327}$ has been destroyed'alas for my city' I will say;
Inside the city, the inside of the city verily ${ }^{327}$ has been destroyed-'alas for my house' I will say.
My houses of the outside of the city verily have been destroyed-'alas for my city' I will say;
My houses of the inside of the city verily have been destroyed-'alas for my house' I will say.
265 My city like an innocent ewe ${ }^{333 a}$ has not been . . . .ed, gone is its trustworthy shepherd;
Ur like an innocent ewe ${ }^{335_{3}}$ has not been . . . .ed, gone is its shepherd boy.
My ox in its stable has not been . . . .ed, gone is its herdsman;
My sheep in its fold has not been . . . .ed, gone is its shepherd boy.

```
    \mp@subsup{}{}{300}M:udu-(for ganam4-).
    s31 M and probably H}\mathrm{ and N: -ma-
(for-al-).
    832N: sipad(!)-zi(!)-bi.
    \mp@subsup{}{}{333}Nomits-ra-; M:[ba-ra-mu]-
un-D[0].
    3339 M: "sheep."
    33b}\textrm{M}:\hat{\textrm{u}}\textrm{z
    334 N: na(!)-qad(!)-bi.
    *35 On the original of N there seems to
be a sign between ba and du; the writing
is so crowded, however, that it is difficult to
recognize what the scribe intended by it.
```

```
    335a M: "goat."
```

    335a M: "goat."
    \({ }^{336} \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{M}\), and probably \(\mathrm{N}:-\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{un}-\)
    \({ }^{336} \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{M}\), and probably \(\mathrm{N}:-\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{un}-\)
    (for -an-).
(for -an-).
${ }^{387} \mathrm{M}:-1 \mathrm{u}(!)-$.
${ }^{387} \mathrm{M}:-1 \mathrm{u}(!)-$.
${ }^{3372} \mathrm{~N}$ omits - ra -.
${ }^{3372} \mathrm{~N}$ omits - ra -.
${ }^{338} \mathrm{M}$ has the sign $\mathbf{L U}$ between - a and
${ }^{338} \mathrm{M}$ has the sign $\mathbf{L U}$ between - a and
ba-.
ba-.
${ }^{338 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{H}$ : - mu-un-(for $-\mathrm{an}-$ ).
${ }^{338 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{H}$ : - mu-un-(for $-\mathrm{an}-$ ).
${ }^{339} \mathrm{~A}$ seems to have a sign between - s u b
${ }^{339} \mathrm{~A}$ seems to have a sign between - s u b
and $\mathrm{na}-$.
and $\mathrm{na}-$.
${ }^{340} \mathrm{H}:$ b a (!) - .

```
    \({ }^{340} \mathrm{H}:\) b a (!) - .
```

269 id (1) ${ }^{341}-u r u ́ d i a ̀(!)-\mathrm{ke}_{4}{ }^{342}$ sahar ha-ba-nigin é-LUL$a^{343}$ ba-ba-an-du $u^{344}$
270 šà-ba $a-z a l-1 i \quad b a-r a-m u-u n-t u ́ m{ }^{345} m u-u n-t a r-b i$ ba-ra-DU ${ }^{346}$
 gar ${ }^{351}-\mathrm{bi}$ ba-ra-Du
gán $n^{348}-\mathrm{mu} \mathrm{g}_{\text {án }} \mathrm{n}^{348}-\mathrm{gis} a l(!)-\mathrm{e}^{352}-\mathrm{ri}^{353}$ - GIM mul-gán $\mathrm{n}^{348}-$ pil (! $)^{354}$ ha-ba-an-m un $^{355}$
 raha-ba-an-mún ${ }^{358}$
edin-ka-zal-kaš(? $)^{358}-\mathrm{d} \mathbf{u}-\mathrm{d} \mathrm{u}^{359}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{mu} \mathrm{GIR}_{4}(!)-\mathrm{GIM}^{360}$ ba-ba-fUR-HUR ${ }^{361}$
$275 \mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{un}-\mathrm{ga}-\mathrm{mu} \mathrm{bur}_{4}{ }^{\text {musen }}{ }^{363}-\mathrm{dug} \mathrm{gd}^{364}-\mathrm{zi}-\mathrm{ga}-\mathrm{Gm}^{364 \mathrm{a}}$ RI-RI$\mathrm{bi}^{365}$ ha-ba-ni-zi $\mathrm{i}^{366} \mathrm{mu}^{367}-\mathrm{un}-\mathrm{ga}-\mathrm{mu}$ ga-àm-du $\mathrm{g}_{4}{ }^{368}$ $\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{un}-\mathrm{ga}^{370}-\mathrm{mu} \operatorname{sig}-\mathrm{ta}^{371}-\mathrm{DU}-\mathrm{ni}^{372}$ sig(!)-šè (! $)^{373} \mathrm{ha}-$ $\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{an}-\mathrm{ir} \mathrm{r}_{10}{ }^{374} \quad \mathrm{mu} u^{367}-\mathrm{un}-\mathrm{ga} \mathrm{a}^{370}-\mathrm{mu} \quad \mathrm{ga}-\mathrm{a} \mathrm{m}-\mathrm{du} \mathrm{g}_{4}{ }^{368}$ $m u-u n-\mathrm{ga}^{370}-\mathrm{mu}$ IGI-nim(!)-ta-DU-ni $\mathrm{i}^{375} \quad$ IGI $^{376}-\mathrm{nim}(!)-$ $\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{e}}{ }^{377} \mathrm{ha}-\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{an}-\mathrm{ir} \mathrm{r}_{10}{ }^{378} \mathrm{~m} \mathrm{u}^{367}-\mathrm{un}-\mathrm{g} \mathrm{a}^{370}-\mathrm{mu} \mathrm{ga}-\mathrm{a} m-$ $\mathrm{dug}_{4}{ }^{368}$
 $m u^{367}-u n-g^{370}-m u \quad g a-a ̀ m-d u g_{4}{ }^{368}$
gil ${ }^{381}-s a-m u \quad s U G^{381 a}-g i_{4} \quad$ bu-mu-da-ab-kúan $u^{382} \quad \mathrm{~m}^{367}-$ $\mathrm{un}-\mathrm{ga} \mathrm{a}^{370}-\mathrm{mu} \quad \mathrm{ga}-\mathrm{a} \mathrm{m}^{383}-\mathrm{du}_{\mathrm{g}}$
${ }^{3 n} \mathrm{H}: \mathrm{id}(!)-(n o t k i-)$.
${ }^{322}$ M: -kam (for -ke4).
${ }^{343}$ So M. Does A read $\{\hat{e}-\mathrm{Luj}] \mathrm{l}-\mathrm{gim}$ ?
${ }^{344} \mathrm{H}$ and M : - dù ; N: ba-ba-NI (so on original).
${ }_{345} \mathrm{~N}$ : -t ùm.
${ }^{340} \mathrm{~N}: \mathrm{ba}(!)-\mathrm{ra}(!)-\mathrm{du}$.
${ }^{47}$ Literally: "have been brought."
${ }^{348}$ So rather than é-.
${ }^{249} \mathrm{H}$ : še (!).
${ }^{350} \mathrm{M}: \mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{ra}$ (!) -GÁL.
${ }^{351} \mathrm{M}$ : -kàr- (for -gar-); N omits this syllable altogether.
${ }^{351 a}$ More literally: "has been made to be."
${ }_{352} \mathrm{M}$ : -e (!) -.
${ }^{353} \mathrm{H}$ and N insert -a-.
${ }^{354}$ M:-pi-el (for -pil).
${ }^{335} \mathrm{H}$ and N omit -an-; $M$ probably be-bi-in-mú.
${ }^{356}$ So H. Despite the copy, A probably had the same text.


${ }^{358} \mathrm{~N}: \mathrm{ba}(!)-\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{mú}$.

${ }^{359}$ Second dù in A only; all extant duplicates omit.
${ }^{360} \mathrm{~N}:-\operatorname{GIM}(!)$.

${ }^{352} \mathrm{~K}$ and N : "oil."
${ }^{363} \mathrm{~N}$ : bur $\mathrm{r}_{4}$ (!)muSen(!) - (RI for Ho actually on the original). Does A omit the determinative?

269 In the rivers of my city dust has gathered, into . . . . verily they have been made;
270 In their midst no sparkling waters flow, ${ }^{347}$ gone is its river-worker.
In the fields of the city there is ${ }^{351 \mathrm{a}}$ no grain, gone is its fieldworker;
My fields verily like fields torn $u p$ by the pickax have brought forth.....
My palm groves and vineyards that abounded with honey and wine verily have brought forth the mountain thorn;
My plain where kazallu and strong drink ${ }^{352}$ were prepared verily like an oven has become parched.
275 My possessions like heavy locusts on the move verily .... have been carried off-'O my possessions ${ }^{369}$ I will say;
My possessions verily he who came from the lower lands to the lower lands has carried off-'O my possessions ${ }^{369}$ I will say;
My possessions verily he who came from the upper lands to the upper lands has carried off-'O my possessions'369 I will say.

Verily my (precious) metal, stone, and lapis lazuli have been scattered about ${ }^{380}$-' O my possessions ${ }^{369} \mathrm{I}$ will say;
My treasure verily . . . . has been dissipated-'O my possessions ${ }^{3669}$ I will say.
${ }^{364} \mathrm{H}:-\mathrm{dugud}(!)-$.
${ }^{3645}$ Unlike the copy, the original of H has room for -GIM (following - $\mathrm{ga}_{\mathrm{a}}$-).
${ }^{365} \mathrm{H}: \mathrm{r}[\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{RI}]-\mathrm{da}($ ? $) ; \mathrm{K}: \quad[\mathrm{R}]$-RI-e bi; N: [RI-RI]-dè (?).
${ }^{366} \mathrm{H}: \mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{ba-ab-i}[\mathrm{r}](?) ; \mathrm{N}: \mathrm{ba}-$ ba-ni(!?)-ir(!?).
${ }^{367}$ So all extant duplicates except A, which inserts ut́ before mu-un-ga.
${ }^{368} \mathrm{H}$ : - a n - for - a m - (or is the latter to be read -a-an-?). N probably gaà $\mathrm{m}-\mathrm{dug}_{4}$; the writing is very crowded on the original and certainty is impossible.
${ }^{369} \mathrm{~A}$ : "O my men and possessions."
${ }^{370} \mathrm{E}$ : - k à r -.
${ }^{371} \mathrm{H}$ : [sigl-sìe-; N: [sig]-ta(!)-.
${ }^{372} \mathrm{H}$ and N : - di(!) -mà (for-du-ni).

```
    373 N: sigg(!)-šè(!).
    \mp@subsup{}{}{34}H: -ab-ir (for -an-iri0); K:
    -ab-(for -an-);N: ba(!)-ba(!)-
    ab(!)-ir(!).
    375 E: i-bí[nim-t]a-di-m à; H:
    [i-bi-nim-s]è(!)-di-mà. In N
    -di-ma is omitted on the original.
    378}\textrm{E},\textrm{H},\mathrm{ and N: i-bi-.
    377 E: - ̌ è (!).
    378 E: -ab-ir (for -an-ir m).
    379 H omits -an-.
    380 E and N add -ri.
    380a E and N: "are scattered about."
    381 H: gil(!) -.
    881a}\mathrm{ So E and H in spite of copy.
    382 H: -kú(!).
    *83 H: -an- (for -àm-); cf. n. 368.
```

$280 \mathrm{kug}-\mathrm{mu} \mathrm{Lf}^{384}-\mathrm{kug}-\mathrm{nu}-\mathrm{zu} u^{385}-\mathrm{ne} \mathrm{s} u-\mathrm{bi}$ ba-ba-da$a b-s i$
$z a-m u f^{384}-z a-n u-z u^{385}-n e g u ́(!)-b i b a-b a-d a-a b-$ si
bur $r_{5}-m u s ̌ e n-m u s ̌ e n-m u$ bu-mu-da(!?)-dal-dal ${ }^{386}$ a $u r u ́-m u g a-a ̀ m-d u g_{4}$
 $\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{lu}{ }^{388}-\mathrm{mu} \quad \mathrm{ga}-\mathrm{a} \mathrm{m}-\mathrm{dug}_{4}{ }^{389}$
me-li-e-a gitin-mu urú-kúr-ra ${ }^{391}$ šu-še-ir-kúr ba-ba-an-díb
285
$\ldots . . \ldots . .$. e ${ }^{393}$
[me-li-e-a urú-mu]-nu-me-a me-e ga-ša-an-bi $\mathrm{n} \mathbf{u}-\mathrm{m}$ è $\mathrm{n}^{393}$

UB-\&AR-ra é-mu ba-ba-dù-a urú-mu ba-ba-gul$1 a^{394}$
$n u-n u z-z i-m e ̀ n(!) u r u ́-m u-t a u r u ́ t u ́ r h a-b a-r a-$ dù -d ù $-\mathbf{a}^{396}$
290 UB- HAR-ra urú-mu ha-ba-dù-a $e^{396 a}-m u \quad$ ba-ba-ab-gul-1 $\mathrm{a}^{396 \mathrm{~b}}$
$g a-s ̌ a-a n-g a l-m e ̀ n ~[e ́]^{397 b}-m u-t a ~ e ́-k u ́ r ~ b a-b a-r a-~$ dù -d ù $-\mathbf{a}^{398}$
me-li-e-a urú mu-da-gul ù é ${ }^{399} \mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{da}-\mathrm{gu} \mathrm{l}^{399 \mathrm{a}}$
 $\mathrm{ug}_{5}(!?)-\mathrm{ga}-\mathrm{e} \mathrm{s}^{401}$
$m e-l i-e-a \quad m e-a-t u s ̌-u ̀-d \grave{e n}^{403}-e^{404} m e-a-g u b-b u-$ dè $-e^{405}$
${ }^{384} \mathrm{E}$ : mu-lu-(for $\mathrm{L} \mathrm{O}_{-}$).
${ }^{385} \mathrm{E}$ and H insert - ù-.
${ }^{386}$ E omits bu-and - da-.
${ }^{387}$ E omits "verily."
${ }^{388} \mathrm{E}$ and H : urú- (for $\mathrm{mu}-1 \mathrm{u}-$ ).
${ }^{389} \mathrm{~N}$ probably $\mathrm{ga}(!)-\mathrm{a} \mathrm{m}(\mathrm{l})-\mathrm{du} \mathrm{g}_{4}$.
${ }^{390} \mathrm{E}$ and H: "city" (for "men").
${ }^{391} \mathrm{M}:$ urú (!) - ; N probably urú (!) -kúr(!)-ra.
${ }^{392}$ More literally: "have taken hold of."
${ }^{393} \mathrm{Ll} .285-87$ are omitted in M and N, which substitute for them the following line
(not found in A): šul(?)-mu edin-ki$\mathrm{nu}($ ! $)-\mathrm{zu}(!)-\mathrm{na}$-misal-mu-un BU $b a-b a-a n-a g$. Note that in $M$ the sign KU has been omitted in the copy.
${ }^{394} \mathrm{~N}$ probably -gul(!)-1a(!).
${ }^{395}$ L.e., "I, the righteous lady, whose $\ldots$..."; the complex nu-nuz-zi-mèn of the following line is to be supplied.
${ }^{396} \mathrm{M}$ : - à m (for - a ).
${ }^{3968}$ A: urú- (for é-) ; beginning of line is lost.

280 My (precious) metal verily they who know not (precious) metal have fastened about their hands;
My (precious) stone verily they who know not (precious) stone have fastened about their necks.
Verily ${ }^{387}$ all my birds and winged creatures have flown away-'alas for my city' I will say;
My daughters and sons verily . . . . have been carried off-'alas for my men ${ }^{390}$ I will say.
Woe is me, my daughters verily in a strange city carry ${ }^{392}$ strange banners;
285 With . . . . verily the young men and young women have been fastened.
[Woe is me, my city] which no longer exists-I am not its queen;
[O Nanna,] Ur which no longer exists-I am not its mistress.
I whose ${ }^{395}$ house verily has been made into ruins, whose city verily has been destroyed,
I, the righteous lady, in place of whose city verily strange cities have been built,
290 I whose ${ }^{397}$ city verily has been made into ruins, whose house ${ }^{397 a}$ verily has been destroyed,
I, Ningal, in place of whose house verily strange houses have been built-

Woe is me, the city has been destroyed, the house too has been destroyed; O Nanna, the shrine Ur has been destroyed, its people are dead. ${ }^{402}$

Woe is me, where shall I sit me down, where shall I stand up?

[^12]${ }^{399} \mathrm{M}$ seems to add -mu .
${ }^{399 a}$ In N this line is written as two lines.
${ }^{400} \mathrm{M}$ omits -an-.
${ }^{401}$ So M; A: ba-an-........ In N this line is written as two lines; the verbal form ends in -ri.
${ }^{402}$ More literally: "have died."
${ }^{403} \mathrm{M}$ : - de (!) - .
${ }^{404} \mathrm{M}$ and N omit -e n .
${ }^{405} \mathrm{M}$ and N omit -en. Note that in N the line is written as two lines.
 d è ${ }^{407 a}$
ga-ša-an-gal-mè $n^{409}$ é-mu-ta $e^{410}-k u ́ r b a-r a-m a-~$ $\mathrm{ma}-\mathrm{d} \mathrm{e}^{411}$
ki-bi-ta-edin-ta-bad-du $u^{414}-b i$ a $u \dot{u}^{415}-m u \quad g a-a ̀ m-$ $\mathrm{dug}_{4}{ }^{416}$
urú-mu-uríri-ta-bad $\mathrm{d}^{418}-\mathrm{d}^{419}-\mathrm{bi}$ a $\mathrm{e}^{420}-\mathrm{mu}$ ga-à $\mathrm{m}^{421}-$ $\mathrm{dug} \mathrm{g}_{4}$
l[ú(?)]......-ni únumún-bur ${ }^{422 a}$-GIM $^{423}$ šu mu-ni-in-dúb-dúb
$$
300
$$
gaba-ni ?-kug-ga-àm $\mathrm{m}^{423 a}$ ì-sìg-gi a urú-mu im-me ${ }^{424}$
 še8 ${ }_{8}{ }^{427}$
[me-li-e-a urú-mu-ta] urútkúr ba-ra-dù (!) - ù d ${ }^{428}$
ga-[ša-an-gal-mèn é-mu-t]a é-kúr ba-ra-ma-$\mathrm{ma}-\mathrm{d} \mathrm{e}^{429}$
me-li-e-a étùr-sír-ra-mèn áb-sig $\mathrm{g}_{11}-\mathrm{dug}_{4}-\mathrm{ga}^{430}-$ $m$ è $\mathrm{n}^{430_{\mathrm{a}}}$
ga-ša $a^{431}-a n-g a l-m e ̀ n ~ n a-q a d(!)-p i-e l-l a a^{432}-$ GIM $^{432 a}$ gis(!)tukul ganam $\mathrm{m}_{4}-\mathrm{ma}^{433}$ bí i $^{434}-$ šub
me-li-e-a urú-ta-è- $\mathrm{a}^{435}-\mathrm{m}$ èn m - nu - dúb-bu-mè $\mathrm{n}^{436}$

405a I omits -a.
${ }^{406} \mathrm{I}$ and M : é- (for urú-).
${ }^{407}$ I and M: ma-ra-an- (for ba-ra-).

407a $N$ : - dù (!) - ù (!) - dè (!).
${ }^{408}$ I and M: "house."
${ }^{409}$ In M - an - seems to be in the wrong position (so actually on original) unless it originally read dga-ša-an(!); cf., however, $M$ rev. 9 , where the determinative is not written. I: nu-nuz-zi-mèn (for ga-sta-an-gal-mèn).
${ }^{410} \mathrm{I}$ and M : urúr-.
4tI and M: ma- (for $\mathrm{ba}_{\mathrm{a}-\text { ) ; }} \mathrm{I}$ in-serts-an-after-ra-; I and M:-mà-mà- (for -ma-ma-); N: -mà (!) mà(!) $-\mathrm{dè}(!)$.
${ }^{412}$ I: "the lady" (for "Ningal").
${ }^{413} \mathrm{I}$ and M : "city."
${ }^{414} \mathrm{I}$ inserts -a-.
${ }^{415} \mathrm{I}$ and M : mu-lu- (for urú-).
${ }^{416} \mathrm{Or}$ is the reading $-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{an}-$ (instead of

- àm-)?
${ }^{417}$ I and M: "people" (for "city").
${ }^{418} \mathrm{H}$ : -bad (!) -.
${ }^{419} \mathrm{M}$ inserts $-\mathrm{a}-$.
${ }^{420} \mathrm{M}$ and Na : urú- (for é).
${ }^{221} \mathrm{H}$ : - an- (for -àm-).
${ }^{422} \mathrm{M}$ and Na : "city."
${ }^{\text {422a }} \mathrm{So} \mathrm{Na} ; \mathrm{H}$ : -búr-.
${ }^{423} \mathrm{SoH}$ and $\mathrm{Na} ; \mathrm{A}:-\operatorname{-im}(!?)$.
${ }^{423 \mathrm{a}} \mathrm{Na}$ omits - a m .

295 Woe is me, in place of my city a strange city ${ }^{408}$ is being built;
I, Ningal ${ }^{412}$-in place of my house a strange house ${ }^{413}$ is being erected.
Upon its removal from its place, from the plain, 'alas for my city' ${ }^{117}$ I will say;
Upon its removal from my city, Ur, 'alas for my house'422 I will say.
The . . . . tore his [hair] like the . . . . reed;

300 His chest, the pure . . . . , he strikes; 'alas for my city' he cries. His eyes are flooded with tears; bitterly he weeps.
[Woe is me, in place of my city] a strange city is being built;
[I, Ningal-in place of my house] a strange house is being erected.

Woe is $m e$, I am one whose house is a stable torn down, I am one whose cows have been dispersed;
305 I, Ningal-like an unworthy shepherd the weapon has fallen on (my) ewes.
Woe is me, I am one who has gone forth from the city, I am one who has found no rest; ${ }^{437}$
${ }^{424} \mathrm{~N}: ~ i \mathrm{~m}(!)-\mathrm{me}(!)$; $\mathrm{Na}: ~ g a-\mathrm{a} \mathrm{m}-$ $\mathrm{dug}_{4}$ (for $\mathrm{im}-\mathrm{me}$ ).

425 So H and Na. N reads - $\mathrm{zi}-\mathrm{zi}-\mathrm{zi}$; A reads -zi(!)-zi(!) but is preceded by a break which may have contained one more -zi-.
${ }^{426} \mathrm{H}$ : in - (for ì).
${ }^{427} \mathrm{~N}:-\mathrm{š} \mathrm{e}_{8}(!)-\mathrm{s} \mathrm{e}_{8}(!)$.
${ }^{428} \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{N}$, and Na have a variant line: me-li-e-a urúmu(N: mà)-nu-me-a me-e (N: -a) ga-sa-an-bi (H: NIN(?)-bi; N: ga(!)-sa-anbi(!)) nu(N: nu(!))-mèn. Cf. l. 286.
${ }^{429} \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{N}$, and Na have a variant line: dnannauriki-nu-me-a me-e (N: -a ; Na omits -e) $\mathrm{mu}-1 \mathrm{u}-\mathrm{bi} \mathrm{nu}-$ mèn. Cf.l. 287.
${ }^{430} \mathrm{H}:-\mathrm{si} \mathrm{g}_{11}(!)-\mathrm{du} \mathrm{g}_{4}(!)-\mathrm{ga}(!)-$.
${ }^{430 \mathrm{Na}} \mathrm{Na}:-\mathrm{mu}$ (for -m è n ).
${ }^{431} \mathrm{H}: \mathrm{d}(!) \mathrm{g} a(!)-\mathrm{š} \mathrm{a}(!)-; \mathrm{N}: \mathrm{dg}_{\mathrm{a}}(!)-$
${ }^{432} \mathrm{H}:-\mathrm{pi}(!)-\mathrm{el}(!)-\mathrm{Ia}-(\operatorname{sic}!$ without accent); $\mathrm{N}:-\mathrm{la}$ - (so on original; copy omits).
${ }^{432 \mathrm{a}} \mathrm{N}:-\mathrm{m}$ è n (for -GIM).
${ }_{433} \mathrm{~N}:-\mathrm{ma}$ (!).
${ }^{434} \mathrm{~K}$ and Na insert - in-.
${ }^{435} \mathrm{~K}$ and Na omit -a-.
${ }^{436} \mathrm{H}: \operatorname{Im}(!)-\mathrm{n} u-d u ́ b(!)-; K, N$, and Na : - dè (for -mèn) ; in $N-d$ è is written over an erasure.
${ }^{437} \mathrm{~K}, \mathrm{~N}$, and Na : "I find no rest."
$307 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{a}^{438}-\mathrm{ša}-\mathrm{an}-\mathrm{ga} \mathrm{l}^{438 \mathrm{a}}-\mathrm{m}$ èn é -ta-è - $\mathrm{a}^{439}-\mathrm{mè} \mathrm{n}^{439 \mathrm{a}} \mathrm{k} \mathrm{i}^{440}-$ $\mathrm{t} u \check{\mathrm{~s}}-\mathrm{nu} \mathrm{u}-\mathrm{pàd} \mathrm{~d}-\mathrm{da}-\mathrm{m}$ è $\mathrm{n}^{441}$
 m è $\mathrm{n}^{446}$
é-u $r_{5}-u r_{5}-r a-a ́ g-g i g-g a-a^{447} \quad$ sag-a(!) tuš-a(!) $)^{447 a-}$ $\mathrm{ma}-\mathrm{ab}-$ ú $^{448}-\mathrm{e}$
310 é-urin ra mu-lu-tuš-bi-TUŠ- $\mathrm{a}^{449}-\mathrm{KA}-\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{ne}-\mathrm{e} \mathrm{m}-\mathrm{nu}-$ dirig-mèn ${ }^{450}$
 $\mathrm{s}_{8} \mathrm{e}^{455}$
NIN-ra $\mathrm{a}^{456}$ nam-é-hul-a-n $\mathrm{a}^{457} \quad \mathrm{mu}^{454}-\mathrm{na}-\mathrm{te}$ ír-gig ì $-\mathrm{še}_{8}-\mathrm{š}_{8}{ }^{458}$

nam-ur $\dot{u}^{463}-\mathrm{hul-a} \mathrm{a}^{464}-\mathrm{na} \mathrm{m}^{454}-\mathrm{na}-\mathrm{te}$ ír-gig i-š $\mathrm{e}_{8}-$ š $\mathrm{e}_{8}$
$315 \mathrm{me}-\mathrm{li}-\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{a}$ na-ám $\mathrm{m}^{466}-\mathrm{ur}$ ú-mu ga-à $\mathrm{m}^{383}-\mathrm{du}_{4} \mathrm{na}-$ ám-urú-mu gig-ga-à $\mathrm{m}^{467}$
NIN-mèn é-gul-la-mu $u^{469}$ ga-à $\mathrm{m}^{383}-\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{C}}^{\mathrm{g}} \mathrm{g}_{4} \mathrm{na} \mathrm{a}$ ám-é-mu gig-ga-à $\mathrm{m}^{467}$
Še (!) -ib(!) -uríki-m $a^{470}-a-d u g_{4}-g a-m u \quad a-b i-g i_{4}^{471}-a^{472}-$ mu
é-zi-mu $u^{472 a}$ uru-dul-dul-dam $m^{473}-b a-m a r-r i-n a-m u^{474}$
${ }^{438}$ In H and N dingir precedes.
${ }_{438 \mathrm{a}} \mathrm{N}$ and Na omit -gal-.
${ }^{439} \mathrm{~K}$ and Na omit $-\mathrm{a}-$; N : - $\mathrm{a}(!)-$.
${ }^{4330 \mathrm{a}} \mathrm{K}$ : -dè (for -mèn).
${ }^{440} \mathrm{H}$ : ki(l) -.
${ }^{411} \mathrm{H}$ : - dè - (for -da-) ; K: -dèdè, $\mathrm{N}:-\mathrm{d}$ è -dam, and Na : - dè (for - da-mèn).
${ }^{4 s} \mathrm{~K}, \mathrm{~N}$, and Na : "I find no dwellingplace."
${ }^{443} \mathrm{H}$ omits -in-.
${ }^{443 \mathrm{Na}} \mathrm{Na}$ gir $\mathrm{F}_{7}$ (for $\mathrm{gir}_{5}$-).
${ }_{44}$ Instead of -urú-kúr-ra-K reads -uru (sic! no accent) $-1 \mathrm{u}^{1}-1 \mathrm{u}_{6}$ ka (sic! NE is miscopied) - . Na reads uru (sic! no accent)-lú-ka-.
${ }^{46} \mathrm{H}$ : -sag(!)-11(!)-; Na:-gim(for -ill-).
${ }^{446} \mathrm{~N}:-\mathrm{tu} \mathrm{S}(!)-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{ni}$ (so on original).
${ }^{446 a}$ I.e., as a beggar?
${ }^{447} \mathrm{H}$ omits -a ; K, N, and Na: -à m (for -a ).
${ }^{447 \mathrm{a}} \mathrm{Na}$ omits -a-.
${ }^{448} \mathrm{H}$ : -ús (!) -.
${ }^{449} \mathrm{H}:-$ TUŠ-TOŠ- a - (for -TUS̆- a -) ; N: -тTš(!) - a - .
${ }^{450} \mathrm{H}$ : -mu (for -mèn).
${ }^{451}$ More literally perhaps: "I am not one who multiplies words."
${ }^{4519} \mathrm{H}: \mathrm{ki}(!)-$.
${ }^{452} \mathrm{H}$ : nam (!) -.
${ }^{453} \mathrm{~N}$ : -na (!).
${ }^{454} \mathrm{H}$ inserts -un-.

307 I, Ningal-I am one who has gone forth from the house, I am one who has found no dwelling-place. ${ }^{42}$
Lo, I am a stranger sitting with raised head ${ }^{46 \mathrm{a}}$ in a strange city;
Curses and abuse press upon me, head and limb;
310 (Against) the curse of those who inhabit its dwelling-places $I$ (dare) not speak out. ${ }^{451}$
In that place for the sake of his city I approached him-bitterly I weep;
To the lord for the sake of his house ${ }^{459}$ which had been attacked ${ }^{460}$ I approached-bitterly I weep.
For the sake of his house ${ }^{462}$ which had been attacked I approached himbitterly I weep;
For the sake of his city ${ }^{465}$ which had been attacked I approached himbitterly I weep.
315 Woe is me, ' O fate of my city,' ${ }^{468} \mathrm{I}$ will say, 'bitter ${ }^{468 \mathrm{~s}}$ is the fate of my city';
I, the queen-'O my house which has been destroyed,' I will say, 'bitter ${ }^{468 a}$ is the fate of my house.'
O my brickwork of Ur which has been torn down, which has been wrecked.
O my righteous house, my city which has been made into ruins,
${ }^{455} \mathrm{~N}: 1 \mathrm{r}-\mathrm{gig}(!) \mathrm{l}(!)-\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{e}_{8}(!)-\mathrm{S} \mathrm{e}_{8}(!)$.
${ }^{466} \mathrm{So} \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{E}$ and $\mathrm{N}:-\mathrm{mu}$ (for -ra) ; A:
-mà (?).
${ }^{457} \mathrm{E}$ : - urú- (for -é-) ; H omits
-hul-a-; N: -ć(!)-na(!).
${ }^{458} \mathrm{E}, \mathrm{H}$, and N omit refrain.
${ }^{469}$ E: "city."
${ }^{460} \mathrm{H}$ and N omit "which had been attacked."
${ }^{461} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{urú}$ - (for -é-).
${ }^{462} \mathrm{H}$ : "city."
${ }^{463} \mathrm{H}$ : -é- (for -urú-) ; N :

- urú (!) - .
${ }^{464} \mathrm{~N}$ omits -a-(so actually on original).
${ }^{465} \mathrm{H}$ : "house."

```
    486 So E, H, and N; A: me-e (for
na-ám-).
    467 E and N omit -àm.
    *68 A: "I-'O my city.""
    468a More literally: "painful."
    469 So E and N; A and H: -m à (for
    -mu).
    470 N omits - ma -.
    471 N: - gi4(!)-.
    472 So E, H, and N. A omits - a- ; mis-
copied?
    472a}A: -m à (!?) (for -mu).
    473}\mathrm{ So E and N; H: urú-mu-dul-
dul-da; A: urú-gim-dul-dul-
da(!?).
    474 So E; A: -GAR- (for - m ar -); H in-
serts - en- after -ri-; N: -ra- (for
-ri-na-).
```

 nam
320 gud-šub-ba-GIM in-gar-zu ${ }^{478}-t a \quad$ ba-ra-mu-da-zi-gi-en ${ }^{479}$
me-li-e-a(! $)^{480}$ dù-a-zu(! ? $)^{481}$ LuL-l $a^{482}$ gul-la-zu gig-ga-àm ${ }^{483}$
$\mathrm{nu}(!)^{484}-\mathrm{nuz}-\mathrm{mèn} \mathrm{ur}^{\text {ki }}-\mathrm{e} \mathrm{e}^{485}-\mathrm{nindaba}$-bi-im-ma-an-kud-da-mu ${ }^{486}$
é -nun-kug-é-gibil-gibil ${ }^{488}-1 a-m u^{489} \quad$ la-la-bi $i^{489 a}-$ n $u^{490}-\mathrm{gi}_{4}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{mu}$
$u r \hat{u}^{490 a}-\mathrm{I}^{490 b}-d$ ù-a-la-ba-GAR ${ }^{491}-r a-m u \quad t a-a-a s ̌-$ hul-a-mu

$a-d a-a l^{496}-u_{4}-b u l-g i g-g a-d u g_{4}-g^{497} \quad a-b a^{498} \quad$ la-ba-ri-gub(? $)^{499}$
uríni-ma-édzuen-na-mu $\mathbf{u}^{501}$ gul-la-zu $u^{502}$ gig-ga ${ }^{503}$ $\mathrm{ki}-\mathrm{s} u \mathrm{~b}-\mathrm{g}$ ú-imin-kam-ma $\mathrm{a}^{504}$
a $e^{505}-m u$ a é-mu
330
iz-g $i_{4}-G A ́ L-b i-i m^{507}$
nin šà-zu(!) a(!)-gim dù -mu $u^{508} z a-e^{509} a-$ gim $^{510}$ ìtill-en $n^{511}$ $d_{n}$ in-gal šà-zu a-gim(!) dù-mu $u^{512} \quad$ za- $e^{513} \quad a^{514}-g i m$ ìtil-en ${ }^{515}$
${ }^{475} \mathrm{E}$ probably búr(!) - ; written over erasure.
${ }^{476} \mathrm{~N}$ omits -ka .
${ }^{477} \mathrm{E}, \mathrm{H}$, and N : - ù - (for -un-).
${ }^{478} \mathrm{~N}:-\mathrm{zu}(!)-$.
${ }^{479} \mathrm{H}$ inserts -e-before -da- and reads-ga (for -gi-en); Nomits-en.
${ }^{480} \mathrm{~N}: \mathrm{me}-\mathrm{li}(!)-\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{a}(\mathrm{l})$.
${ }^{481} \mathrm{~N}$ : -bip written over erasure.
${ }^{482} \mathrm{H}$ adds -àm; N adds - a .
${ }^{483} \mathrm{~N}$ omits -àm.
${ }^{484}$ In E the line seems to begin with
$\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{a}$ [nna].
${ }^{485} \mathrm{In} \mathrm{N}$-è š - precedes -uriki-.
${ }^{486} \mathrm{H}$ : -kur-ra-àm (for $-\mathrm{kud}-$ da-mu); N: -im(!)-ma(!)-kúr(!)-$\mathrm{ra}(\mathrm{l})-\mathrm{mu}(!)$.
${ }^{487} \mathrm{H}$ and N : "have been estranged."
${ }^{488}$ So N ; A: -gibil(!)-gibil(!).
${ }^{489}$ So $N ; A$ omits $-1 a-m u$.
${ }^{489 \mathrm{a}}$ So N;A: [b]i(!).
${ }^{490}$ So N. In A -Lut precedes and -ubfollows - nu-.
${ }^{490 \mathrm{a}} \mathrm{N}$ : uru-.
490b N : -mu - (for -i-).
${ }^{491} \mathrm{~N}$ : -mar-.
${ }^{492}$ More literally perhaps: "which is no longer considered as having been built."
${ }^{493}$ More literally: "my why attacked (city)."

319 In the debris of thy righteous house which has been destroyed I lay me down alongside of thee;
320 Like a fallen ox from thy wall I do not rise up.
Woe is me, untrustworthy was thy building, bitter ${ }^{468 \mathrm{a}}$ is thy destruction.
O Ur, my, the lady's, shrine whose offerings have been cut off, ${ }^{487}$
O Enunkug, my house of burnt offerings whose bounty is no longer satisfying,
O my city which exists no longer, ${ }^{492}$ my (city) attacked without cause, ${ }^{493}$

325 O my (city) attacked and destroyed, ${ }^{495}$ my (city) attacked without cause, ${ }^{493}$
The strength of the protecting word uttered against the evil, bitter storm stood not by thee; ${ }^{500}$
O my house of Sin in Ur, bitter is thy destruction."
The seventh song.
"Alas for my house, ${ }^{506}$ alas for my house."
330 Its antiphon.

O queen, make thy heart like water; thou, how dost thou live!
O Ningal, make thy heart like water; thou, how dost thou live!

| $\text { ba }(!)-\mathrm{g} u \mathrm{l}-\text {. }$ | da-kam. |
| :---: | :---: |
| ${ }^{495}$ More literally: "destroyed and attacked." | ${ }^{508} \mathrm{C}$ : - àm (for -mu ); I adds - un ter -mu ; $\mathrm{N}: ~ n i n(!)$ šà(!) -zu (!) |
| ${ }^{496} \mathrm{~N}$ adds -1 am |  |
| ${ }^{497} \mathrm{~N}$ adds | ${ }^{509}$ I omits |
| 498 | ${ }^{510}$ In N the sign ba is miscopied |
| ${ }^{499} \mathrm{~N}$ probably -ra-è (for-ri-gub). | $m$ (i.e., the contracted form of $z$ |
| ${ }^{500} \mathrm{~N}$ : "did not come forth for thee." | a-) gim). |
| ${ }^{501}$ So N. A seems to have -k a (for | ${ }^{511} \mathrm{I}: \mathrm{i}-\mathrm{till-li-en} ; \mathrm{N}: \mathbf{i}-\mathrm{t}$ |
| mu) ; miscopied? | : -àm (for |
| ${ }^{502} \mathrm{~N}$ : - b i | ter -mu; N: ${ }^{\text {d }}$ in $\mathrm{m}-\mathrm{gal}(!)$ Š |
| ${ }^{503}$ N | $u$ (!) $a-g i m d u$ (!) - mu-un. |
| 4 N : -imin (!)-kam | ${ }^{513} \mathrm{~N}$ omits - e |
| ${ }^{605} \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{N}$, and Na: urú- (for é-) | ${ }^{514} \mathrm{~N}$ omits a |
| ${ }^{506} \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{N}$, and Na : "city | ${ }^{615} \mathrm{I}$ : i l -til-1i- |

$n u(!)-n u z^{566}-z i-1$ ú-ur ${ }^{517}-b a-a n-d a^{518}-g u l-l a \quad i-b i ́-$ Šè-gim ì-e-à m $\mathrm{m}^{519}-\mathrm{m} \mathrm{u}^{520}$
${ }^{d}$ nin-gal-1úkalam-ba-an-da-til-la $a^{521}$ šà-zu $a-g i m \quad d u ̀-m u^{522}$
335
$u_{4}{ }^{523}-u r u ́-z u-i m-m a-g u l-l a-b a^{524} \quad i \quad-b i ́-s \grave{c}^{525}-g i m$ ìe-è $\mathrm{m}^{519}-\mathrm{m} \hat{u}^{520}$
 $\mathrm{du}-\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{u} \mathrm{n}^{527}$
urún ${ }^{528}-\mathrm{zu}$ urún ${ }^{529}-\mathrm{k}$ úr-ri ${ }^{530}$ ba-ab-gar ì-bí-šè (!) ì - e-à m ${ }^{519}-\mathrm{m}$ ún $^{531}$
é-zu $e^{532}-i ́ r-r i^{533} \quad b a-a n(!)-d i-n i^{534}-i b-g a r ~ s ̌ a ̀-z u$ $a-g i m \quad d u ̀-m u^{535}$
urús ${ }^{529}-\mathrm{dul}-\mathrm{dul}-\mathrm{d} \mathrm{a}^{536}-\mathrm{b} a-\mathrm{a} \mathrm{n}^{537}-\mathrm{g}$ ar-ra-zu $\mathrm{u}^{538}$ mušenbi nu-mèn
 $1 a-b a-t u s ̌-n^{543}$
$u k u ̀-k i-l u l-l a-b a-a b(!)-l a b_{4}-a-z u^{544} \quad n i n-b i-e ́ s$ la-ba(!) -tu-ri-en $n^{545}$
ír-zu(!) ír-kúr-ra(! $)^{546}$ ba-ab-gar ka-na(!)-ágzu nu-še $e_{8}-\mathrm{se}_{8}$
ír-šà-ne-ša4-nu-tuku-à $m^{547}$ kur-kur im $m^{577_{a}}-m a-$ an-tus
ka-na-áag ${ }^{549}-\mathrm{zu}$ NÍG-KA-dirig ${ }^{550}-\mathrm{gim}$ KA šu ba-nii $b^{551}-\mathrm{d}$ if (?)
${ }^{516} \mathrm{C}$ : munus-; $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{munus}(!)$-.
${ }^{517} \mathrm{C}:-\mathrm{uru}$ (!).-
${ }^{518}$ I: -da-an-(for -an-da-); N omits -an-.
${ }^{519} \mathrm{Or}$ is the reading -a-an-?
${ }^{520}$ So N. A is broken; for its probable restoration ef. nn. 531 and 554.
${ }^{521}$ So I; A: -e (for -la) ; N: -lú(!) -kalam-ba-e-da(!)-til-la.
${ }^{522} \mathrm{I}$ adds $-[\mathrm{u}] \mathrm{n}$; $\mathrm{N}: ~$ šì $-\mathrm{zu}(\mathrm{l}) \mathrm{a}-$ gim dù (!) $-\mathrm{mu}(!)-[u n]$.
${ }^{523} \mathrm{~N}: \mathrm{u}_{4}(!)-$.
${ }^{524} \mathrm{~N}$ omits - ba .
${ }^{525} \mathrm{~N}$ : -šè (!) . N (original and copy) omits -gim.
${ }^{526} \mathrm{~N}$ omits - ba.
${ }^{527}$ So N. A is broken, but it no doubt omitted the final -un.
${ }^{528} \mathrm{C}$ and $\mathrm{N}: ~ \mathrm{uru}$-.
${ }^{529} \mathrm{~N}: ~ u r u-$.
${ }^{530} \mathrm{~N}$ : - ra (for-ri).
${ }^{531}$ So $N$; A probably bi-àm (or -a-an?)-[NE- $u n]$.
${ }^{532} \mathrm{~N}$ omits é -
${ }^{533} \mathrm{C}$ : - ra (for -ri).
${ }^{534} \mathrm{~N}:-\mathrm{ni}-\mathrm{di}$ - (for -di-ni-); so actually on original.
${ }^{535} \mathrm{H}$ : - àm (for -mu ) ; N adds - un .

333 O thou righteous lady whose city has been destroyed, now how dost thou exist!
O thou Ningal whose land has perished, make thy heart like water!
335 After thy city had been destroyed, now how dost thou exist!
After thy house had been destroyed, make thy heart like water!
Thy city has become a strange city; now how dost thou exist!
Thy house has become a house of tears; make thy heart like water!
Thy city which has been made into ruins-thou art not its mistress . . . . ;

340 Thy righteous house which has been given over to the pickax-thou dost not dwell as its dweller.
Thy people who have been led to slaughter--thou enterest not as their queen.
Thy tears have become strange tears, thy land weeps not;
Without "tears of supplication" it ${ }^{548}$ inhabits foreign lands;
Thy land like one who has multiplied . . . shuts tight its mouth. ${ }^{551 a}$

```
    \({ }^{536}\) E: - dam-(for -da-). responds to this line, it seems to have a vari-
    \({ }^{537} \mathrm{C}\) and N omit -an-.
    \({ }^{538} \mathrm{H}\) and N : -za (for -zu ).
    \({ }^{539} \mathrm{SoC}\) and \(\mathrm{N} ; \mathrm{A}:-\mathrm{zu}\) - (for-zi-).
    \({ }^{540} \mathrm{~N}:-\mathrm{a}\) - (for \(-\mathrm{e}-\) ).
    \({ }^{541} \mathrm{~N}\) : - ba(!) -.
    \({ }^{511_{s}} \mathrm{C}: \mathrm{tus}(!)\)-.
    \({ }^{542} \mathrm{~N}\) : -bi (!) - és (!).
    \({ }^{543} \mathrm{H}\) inserts -e-before -en; N :
la(!)-ba(!)-an(!)-tuš(!)-e-en.
    \({ }^{544} \mathrm{C}\) : - e- (for -ab-) ; Nomits - a-;
H and N : - za (for -zu ).
    \({ }^{545} \mathrm{~N}\) omits -en. If Nb obv. i cor- hand on the mouth."
```

responds to this line, it seems to have a variant reading ending in -mu .
${ }^{546} \mathrm{~N}: \operatorname{ir}(!)-\mathrm{zu}$ ír (!) $-\mathrm{kúr}(!)-\mathrm{ra}$.
${ }^{547} \mathrm{So} \mathrm{C} ; \mathrm{A} ;-\mathrm{t} \mathbf{u k u}(!?)$-àm (!?) ; N: - ${ }^{2}$ (for - àm).
${ }^{547 \mathrm{a}} \mathrm{H}$ : im (!) - .
${ }^{548}$ I.e., "(the people of) thy land."
${ }^{549} \mathrm{~N}:-\mathrm{ag}(\mathrm{l})-$; C: kalam- (for ka-na-ág-).
${ }^{550}$ So C and N. A: - si- (for -dirig-) ; miscopied?
${ }^{651} \mathrm{~N}:-\mathrm{i} b-$.
${ }^{5514}$ More literally perhaps: "presses the hand on the mouth."
$345 \mathrm{ur} \dot{u}^{528}-\mathrm{zu}(!) \mathrm{d} u \mathrm{l}(!)-\mathrm{dul}(!)-\mathrm{d} \mathrm{a}^{552} \quad \mathrm{im}-\mathrm{ma}-\mathrm{an}-\mathrm{gar}$ ì (!) -bí (!) -šè (!) -gi m ${ }^{553} \quad \mathrm{i}-\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{a} \mathrm{m}^{519}-\mathrm{m} \mathrm{u}^{554}$
é-zu šà-BU-ga ba $a^{555}-a n-d u ̀ ~ s ̌ a ̀-z u \quad a-g i m ~ d u ̀-m u u^{556}$
 ì - e-à $\mathrm{m}^{519}-\mathrm{m} \hat{u}^{560}$
gutug-bi hi-li-a $\mathbf{a}^{561} \quad b a^{562}-r a-m u-u n-D U ~ s ̌ a ̀-z u$ $a-g i m \quad d u ̀-m u-u n^{563}$
en-bi gi $\mathrm{i}_{6}$-par-ra ba-ra-mu-un-ti ${ }^{564} \quad$ [i]-bí(!)šè (!) - $\mathrm{gim}^{565}$ ì - e-à $\mathrm{m}^{519}-\mathrm{m}$ ún $^{566}$
350 ? -bi $i^{567}$ lú-šu-luh-e-ki-ág-e ${ }^{568}$ šu-luh nu-mura(!) $-\mathrm{an}^{569}-\mathrm{ga}-\mathrm{g} \mathrm{a}^{570}$
$a-a-d n a n n a m e-z u \quad Q A-k u g-g a \quad s u \quad n-m u-r a-n i-$ $\mathrm{in}-\mathrm{du}_{\mathrm{u}^{571}}$
lú $-\mathrm{mah} \mathrm{h}^{572}-\mathrm{zu} \quad \mathrm{gi}-\mathrm{g} \mathrm{u}^{573}-\mathrm{na}-\mathrm{kug}-\mathrm{z} \mathrm{u}^{574} \quad$ s̀ ${ }^{575}-\mathrm{qad} \quad \mathrm{la}-$ $b a-a n^{576}-1 a ́$
en-zi-šà-bi(!)-li-a-pàd-da-zu $u^{577}$ é $-k i$ š-šir $r_{5}-\mathrm{g}$ álla -à m $\mathrm{m}^{578}$
 in-d i$] \mathrm{b}-\mathrm{d}[\mathrm{i}] \mathrm{b}-\mathrm{b} \mathrm{i}$
355
$a-\mathrm{FU}^{582}-$ é-izim(!)-ma-za $\mathrm{a}^{583}$ izim nu-mu-ni-in-dùge ${ }^{554}$
 $m u-r a-a n-t u k u-u s^{586}$
$u k u ̀-s a g-g i ́ g-g a \quad i z i m-m a-z u^{587}$ a la-ba-an-tu $u_{5}$ $t u_{5}-n e^{588}$
${ }_{52} \mathrm{~N}$ probably omits -da.
${ }^{563} \mathrm{~N}$ omits -gim (so original). C inserts a-after -šè; its word division is therefore i-bíšè a-gim.
${ }^{554}$ So original of $\mathrm{N} ; \mathrm{H}$ omits $\mathrm{i}-$; A probably bí-àm (or-a-an?)-NE-un.
${ }^{555} \mathrm{C}$ : im-ma- (for ba-).
${ }^{556} \mathrm{H}$ : - à m (for -mu ) ; N adds - un .
${ }^{657} \mathrm{~N}$ : - è st (!).
${ }^{658} \mathrm{~N}: 111(!)-$.
${ }^{559}$ For C's variant ef. n. 553.
${ }^{660}$ So original of N . H omits i-. In A the first halves of 11.347 f . are interchanged: 347. gut[ug(!)]-b[i] hi-l[i-a ba-ra-

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { mu-un]-DO[i-b]í-šè (!)-gim } \\
& \text { bi-àm (or -a-an?)-NE-un. }
\end{aligned}
$$

348. uriki-èš $[$ lfl-eim-ma]-an(!)gar(!) šà-zua-gim dù$\mathrm{mu}(!)$.
${ }^{561} \mathrm{~N}: ~ b i(!)-1 \mathrm{i}(1)-\mathrm{a}(!)$.
${ }^{562} \mathrm{~N}$ : ba(l)-.
${ }^{563}$ So N ; H: -̀̀m (for $-\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{un}$ ); for A cf. n. 560 .
${ }^{564} \mathrm{~N}$ : -til (for - ti ).
${ }^{565} \mathrm{~N}$ omits -gim; E: -šè (!)-egim.
${ }^{666} \mathrm{So} \mathrm{N} ; \mathrm{H}$ omits 1-; A: [b] 1 - à m (or -a-an? )-NE-un.
${ }^{567} \mathrm{~N}$ seems to have -ga for -bi .

345 Thy city has been made into ruins; now how dost thou exist!
Thy house has been made into a pasture; make thy heart like water!
Ur, the shrine, has been given over to the wind; now how dost thou exist!
Its pašišu verily walks not in radiance; make thy heart like water!
Its ênu verily dwells not in the giparru; now how dost thou exist!
350 Its . . . . who cherishes lustrations makes no lustrations for thee;
Father Nanna-thy decrees in the holy . . . . he perfected not for thee.
Thy mahbu in thy holy gigun $\hat{u}$ dressed not in linen;
Thy righteous ênu chosen ${ }^{579}$ in radiance, in the Ekišširgal,

From the shrine to the giparru proceeds not joyfully.

355 In the a - -gu , thy house of feasts, they celebrated not the feasts;

On the uppu and al̂ that which brings joy to the heart, . . . .-music, they played not for thee.
Thy black-headed people during thy feasts make no libations; ${ }^{583}$

```
    568 H: -gá (for -e). }\quad\mp@subsup{}{}{580}\textrm{E}:-\textrm{da}\mathrm{ (for -ta). In N the line
    \mp@subsup{}{}{569}N
    570 N: -gá-ga(!).
    s71 Nomits - mu-; H: -an-du7 (!) -
du7 (!).
    572 So E; A: -mab (!) -.
    573 I.e., -UNU-.
    [74 So E; A: g [i-g] ux -na-[k]ug-
zu(!); H: -za (for -zu).
    575 N: šà (!) -.
    \mp@subsup{}{}{576}}\textrm{H}\mathrm{ probably -ni-in-(for -an-).
    s77N: -na (for -zu).
    678 N omits -àm.
    579 More literally: "called to the heart."
```

${ }^{581}$ So E . In A the traces seem to point to

```
seems to begin with še-ib.
```

seems to begin with še-ib.
-ni (for ${ }^{-n a}$ ); N probably -da (for
-ni (for ${ }^{-n a}$ ); N probably -da (for
-na).
-na).
${ }^{582}$ E: a - ù (?) - a - (for a -ho-).
${ }^{582}$ E: a - ù (?) - a - (for a -ho-).
${ }^{683} \mathrm{E}$ : -zu (for -za ).
${ }^{683} \mathrm{E}$ : -zu (for -za ).
${ }^{584} \mathrm{H}$ : -gi (for -er).
${ }^{584} \mathrm{H}$ : -gi (for -er).
${ }^{586}$ So E; A perhaps ub-kuš(!)á-1á-e (!).
${ }^{586}$ So E; A perhaps ub-kuš(!)á-1á-e (!).
${ }_{586} \mathrm{H}$ omits - u s.
${ }_{586} \mathrm{H}$ omits - u s.
${ }^{587}$ So E; A: ukù (!) -sag(l)-gig(!) -
${ }^{587}$ So E; A: ukù (!) -sag(l)-gig(!) -
gaizim(!)-ma(!)-zu(!).
gaizim(!)-ma(!)-zu(!).
${ }^{588} \mathrm{H}:-\left[\mathrm{t} \mathrm{u}_{5}\right]-\mathrm{t} \mathrm{u}_{5}(!)-\mathrm{ne}$.
${ }^{588} \mathrm{H}:-\left[\mathrm{t} \mathrm{u}_{5}\right]-\mathrm{t} \mathrm{u}_{5}(!)-\mathrm{ne}$.
${ }^{589}$ More literally: "pour no water."

```
    \({ }^{589}\) More literally: "pour no water."
```

$358 \mathrm{gu}-\mathrm{gim} \mathrm{mu}$-sír-ra nam-ha-ba-ni-in-tar ${ }^{590}$ SIG7.ALAM-bi ha-ba-an-kúr ${ }^{591}$
li-du-zu ${ }^{592}$ ír-ra ba-e-da-an-tu ${ }^{593}$ èn-tukum-s $e^{594}-$ SAR
360 NAR.bALAG-zu a-nir-ra ba-e-da-an-tu $u^{595}$ èn-tukum-s ${ }^{594}-$ SAR
$g \mathrm{gd}_{\mathrm{d}} \mathrm{zu}$ tùr-bi-a ba-ra-mu-un-túm $\mathrm{m}^{596}$ ià (!)-bi nu-mu-ra-ag-e
$e-s i^{597}-z u \quad a m a s ̌(!)-b i-a \quad b a-r a-m u-u n-d u ́ r-r u^{598}$ ga-bi $n u-m u-r a-s u-B U-e^{599}$
ià -gù $r^{600}-r u-z u \quad$ tùr-ta $n u-m u-r a-t u ́ m ~ e ̀ n-~$ tukum-šè-sAR
ga-gùr-ru-zu amaš-ta nu-mu-ra-túm èn-tukum-šè -SAR
365 ŠU.HA kua-gùr-ru-zu hul-gál-e ba-an-díb (? $)^{601}$ è $n-t u k u m-s ̌ e ̀-s A R$
mušen-dù mušen-gùr-ru-zu Gír-gír-e im-Du
íd (!) - má $-\mathrm{gur}_{8}-\mathrm{r} \mathrm{i}^{602}-\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{ab}-\mathrm{d} u_{7}(!)-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{za} \mathrm{a}^{603}$ šà $-\mathrm{ba} \quad \quad^{\text {?sAR }}$ $b a-m$ ú
 kur-ra ba-mún ${ }^{605}$
ñin-mu urú-zu ama(?)-bi(?)-gim(?) NAM(?) ir $\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{e}-[\mathrm{ski}(?)]-\mathrm{s}_{8}-\mathrm{š}_{8}{ }^{606}$
 e (!) -ši (!)-KIN-Kin
é-zu $u^{608}$ lú-níg-ú-gu-dè-a-gim šu mu-e-ši-ša-ša
 nin-mu é -ta-è- $a^{612}$ bé $-m e-e n^{613}$ urú (!)-ta ba-raè - me-en $n^{614}$
${ }^{590}$ So E; A: gu(!)-gim(!) mu(!)-$\operatorname{sir}(!)-\mathrm{ra}(!?)$ nam(!)-[ba]-ba(!)-ni-i[n(!)-tar]; N: nam(!)-[ba]-ba-ni(!)-in(!)-tar(!).
${ }^{591}$ So E; A seems to omit ha-; Nomits -an-.
${ }^{592}$ So $\mathrm{E} ; \mathrm{A}:-\mathrm{zu}$ (!?) or -za (!?).
${ }^{593}$ So E; A: ba-e(!)-da(!)-a[n$t u] ; N:-d a(!)-t u(!)$.
${ }_{64} \mathrm{~N}$ : -šè (!) - ; Nb: -šu.gar.tur.?.Lé -.
${ }^{695} \mathrm{~N}: \mathrm{ba}(!)-\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{da}-\mathrm{tu}(!)$.
${ }^{696} \mathrm{~N}: 1 \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{ba}$ - (for $\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{ra}-\mathrm{mu}$ -un-).
${ }^{597} \mathrm{C}: \mathbf{u d u}$ - (for e-şi-).
${ }^{698}$ So C; A adds -un(!) ; N: Ia(!) $b a(!)-d u(!)-r u(!)-u n(!)$.
${ }^{599} \mathrm{~N}: \mathrm{nu}(!)-\mathrm{mu}(!)-\mathrm{ra}(!)-\mathrm{ag}-\mathrm{e}$.
${ }^{599 \mathrm{a}}$ So N ; the variant must have some parallel meaning.

358 Like . . . . verily dirt has been decreed for them; verily their appearance has changed.
Thy song has been turned into weeping . . . . ;
360 Thy . . . -music has been turned into lamentation . . . . .
Thy ox verily has not been brought into its stable, its fat is not prepared for thee;
Thy sheep verily stays not in its fold, its milk is not prepared ${ }^{599 \mathrm{a}}$ for thee.
Thy . . . fat from the stable has not been brought for thee . . . . ;
Thy . . . . milk from the sheepfold has not been brought for thee $\qquad$

365 Thy fisherman and . . . . fish were overtaken by misfortune . . . . ;
Thy bird-hunter and . . . . birds . . . . .
Thy river which had been made fit for the makurru-boats-in its midst the . . . .-plant grows; ${ }^{604}$
On thy road which had been prepared for the chariots the mountain thorn grows. ${ }^{604}$
O my queen, thy city like $a \ldots$. . . mother weeps before thee;
370 Ur like the child of a street which has been destroyed seeks a place before thee.
Thy house like a man who has lost everything stretches out the hands to thee;
Thy brickwork of the righteous house like a human being cries thy "Where, pray?"
O my queen, verily thou art one who has departed from the house; thou art one who has departed from the city.

```
    600 N: i à (!) - gùr (!) -.
    *08 C: e(!)-zu(!).
    601 N seems to have -DU (for -an-
    *09 So C; A: - Ked (for -zu) ; mis-
díb(?)).
    602 C: - 8'ismám-gure-ra-.
    *03 C: - zu (for -z a).
    604 More literally: "has sprouted."
    605 N: b a (!) - a n - múa(!).
    606 So N; C: -šes(!)-še (!).
    607N: - lam(!) - ma(!) -.
    copied?
    810 C: - a - (for - àm-).
    611 N: - zu(!).
    612 C omits - a.
    \mp@subsup{}{}{613}\textrm{N}: -mèn (for -me-en).
    614 C omits - è - ; N: b a (!) - ra(!)-
è (!).
```

374 èn (!)-šè-àm urúaris-za n $u^{616}$-erím-gim bar-ta ba-$\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{da}-\mathrm{g} u \mathrm{~b}^{617}$
ama- ${ }^{\mathrm{d}} \mathrm{nin}-\mathrm{gal} \mathrm{uru}^{615}-\mathrm{za}^{618} \mathrm{nu}^{616}-\mathrm{erim}-\mathrm{gim} \mathrm{m}^{619}$ gabaza ba-e-da-s a ${ }^{620}$
nin-uru $u^{621}-n i-k i-a ́ g-h e ́-m e-e n-n a^{622} \quad$ urú-zu $\ldots \ldots{ }^{623} \mathrm{mu}(!)-\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{tag} \mathrm{g}^{624}$
[ama-dnin-gal-ukù-ni-ki-ág $\left.{ }^{625}-b e ́\right]-m e-e n-n a^{626}$ ukù-zu ....... mu-e-tag ${ }^{627}$
ama-dnin-gal gud-gim tùr-zu-še udu-gim amas-zu-šè
gud-gim tùr-u $u_{4}-b i-t a-z u-s ̌ e ̀ u d u-g i m ~ a m a ̌ ̌-~$ zu-šè
380 dumu-ban-da-gim amas-zu-šè ki-sikil ${ }^{628}$ é-zu-šè ${ }^{629}$ an-lugal-dingir-ri-e-ne-ke $\cos _{4}{ }^{631}-\mathrm{a} m-z u \quad$ hé-im-me
${ }^{d} e n-1 i l-1 u g a l-k u r-k u r-r a-k e_{4}$ nam-zu bé-íb-tar$r i^{632}$
 nin-bi ag-a ${ }^{636}$
urf ${ }^{k i}$ ki-bi-še ${ }^{637}$ ba-ra-ab-gi $i_{4}-\mathrm{gi}_{4} \quad \mathrm{nam}-\mathrm{nin}-\mathrm{bi}$ ag - $a^{638}$
$385 \mathrm{ki}-$ šub-gú(!) -ussu ${ }^{639}-\mathrm{k}$ am-ma $\mathrm{a}^{640}$
$m e-m u \quad m^{641}-d a-a n^{642}-k u ́ r-r a^{643}$
iz-gi $\mathrm{i}_{4}$-GÁL-bi-i m ${ }^{644}$
e(?) $\quad u_{4}-d e ̀-u_{4}-d e ̀ \quad k a l a m \quad u r-a \quad m i{ }^{645}-n i-i b^{646}-r i^{647}$
$u_{4}-g a l-a n-n a-k e_{4} \quad u_{4}-g u ̀ d u ́ b-d u ́ b-b i$
${ }^{615} \mathrm{C}$ : uru-; miscopied?
${ }^{616} \mathrm{C}$ : lú- (for nu-).
${ }^{617}$ So C and probably $\mathrm{N} ; \mathrm{A}:$ ba-gub-bi-me-en.
${ }^{6179} \mathrm{~A}$ : "wilt thou be one who stands ....?"
${ }^{618} \mathrm{C}$ : -zu (for -za ).
${ }^{619} \mathrm{~N}$ : -g im (!), apparently written over an erased d
${ }^{620} \mathrm{C}$ : -dè-sa (for -da-sa); N : [b] a-da-si.
${ }^{620 a}$ More literally: "match thy breast."
${ }^{621}$ Sic! without accent in C, the only text extant for this part of the line.

```
    \({ }^{622} \mathrm{C}:-\mathrm{na}\) (!); N omits - na .
    \({ }^{623} \mathrm{~N}\) : zag-arš(?)-Ne(?) (for urú-
zu ........).
    \({ }^{624} \mathrm{So} \mathrm{N}\) and perhaps A; C: ba-e-ni-
tag.
    \({ }^{625}\) Restoration uncertain.
    \({ }^{626}\) So N; A omits -na.
    \({ }^{627} \mathrm{C}\) omits entire line.
    \({ }^{628} \mathrm{C}\) : nin-mu (for ki-sikil).
    \({ }^{620} \mathrm{C}\) perhaps é(!)-[zu]-še .
    \({ }^{630} \mathrm{C}\) : "O my queen."
    \({ }^{631} \mathrm{C}\) : múş.
    \({ }^{632}\) C: -ib-; N: -ib (!)-tar (!)-ri.
    \({ }^{633} \mathrm{C}\) omits determinative.
```

374 How long, pray, wilt thou stand aside ${ }^{617 \mathrm{7}}$ in thy city like an enemy?
375 O Mother Ningal, (how long) wilt thou hurl challenges ${ }^{60 \mathrm{a}}$ in thy city like an enemy?
Although thou art a queen beloved of her city, thy city . . . . thou hast abandoned;
[Although] thou art [Mother Ningal beloved of her people], thy people . . . . thou hast abandoned.
O Mother Ningal, like an ox to thy stable, like a sheep to thy fold!

Like an ox to thy stable of former days, like a sheep to thy fold!
380 Like a young child to thy chamber, 0 maid, ${ }^{630}$ to thy house! May Anu, the king of the gods, utter thy abulappu; May Enlil, the king of all the lands, decree thy (favorable) fate.

May he return thy city to its place for thee; exercise its queenship!

May he return Ur to its place for thee; exercise its queenship!
385 The eighth song.
My decrees have become inimical.
Its antiphon.

Alas, all the storms together have flooded the land.
The great storm of heaven, the ever roaring storm,
${ }^{634} \mathrm{C}$ and N omit -šè.
${ }^{635} \mathrm{~N}:-\mathrm{gi} \mathrm{i}_{4}(!)-\mathrm{g} \mathrm{i}_{4}(!)$.
${ }^{636} \mathrm{~N}: \mathrm{nam}(\mathrm{l})-\mathrm{nin}-\mathrm{bi}(!) \cdot \mathrm{ag}$.
${ }^{637} \mathrm{~N}$ and probably C omit -šè .
${ }^{638} \mathrm{~N}$ omits -a. In C and N this line is preceded by
nibruki ki-bi ba-ra-ab-gis-gi4 nam-nin-biag-a
May he return Nippur to its place for thee; exercise its queenship!
and is followed by
i-si-inki ki-bi ba-ra-ab-gi4-gi4 nam-nin-biag-a

```
May he return Isin to its place for thee;
    exercise its queenship!
In both lines Nomits the -a of ag-a.
    \mp@subsup{}{}{68}\textrm{InC-ussu(!)}\mathrm{ - seems to be written}
over an erased NAM on the original.
    640 C and N add -am.
    641 N: mu(!) - .
    842 C and N omit -an-.
    \mp@subsup{}{}{643}\textrm{C}\mathrm{ adds -àm.}
    \mp@subsup{}{}{644}}\textrm{C}\mathrm{ and N: [iz-gi_ ] -GÁL-ki-šub-
gú-da-kam.
    \mp@subsup{}{}{645}\textrm{N}: i - (for mi-).
    *46 C: -ib-.
    647 C and N: -ra (for -ri).
```

$390 \quad u_{4}$-gig kalam-ma ${ }^{648} \quad \mathrm{ba}^{649}-\mathrm{zal}-\mathrm{la}-\mathrm{RI}^{650}$

$u_{4}-t u ̀ r-g u l-g u l-e \quad u_{4}-a m a s-g u l-g u l-e^{651}$
garza-kug-ga šu bí-íb-lá-a-Ri ${ }^{650}$
galga-níg-arattaki 652 šu-pi-el-láaim-mi-in $n^{653}$ -$\mathrm{du}_{4}-\mathrm{ga}-\mathrm{RI}^{650}$
$395 \quad u_{4}-k a l a m-m a-n i ́ g-d u ̀ g(!?) \quad i m-m i-i n-k u d-d a(!)^{654}-$ $\mathrm{RI}^{650}$
$u_{4}-\mathrm{sag}$-gíg-ga á bí-íb-1á-a-RI ${ }^{650}$
ki-šub-gú-ilimmu-kam-ma $a^{655}$
$\mathrm{u}_{4}-\mathrm{ki}-$ ?-igi(?)-ba ur ?-gál-1a-RI $\mathrm{I}^{650}$
iz - $\mathrm{g} \mathrm{i}_{4}$-GÁL-bi-im
$400 \quad u_{4}-a m a-n u-z u-\mathrm{RI}^{650} \quad u_{4}-a-a-n u-z u-\mathrm{RI}^{650}$
$u_{4}-d a m-n u-z u-R^{650} \quad u_{4}-s ̌ e s ̌-n u-z u-R^{650656}$
$u_{4}-n i n_{x}{ }^{656 a}-n u-z u-R^{650} \quad u_{4}-s ̌ e s ̌-n u-z u-R^{650}$
$\mathrm{u}_{4}-\mathrm{uk}$ ú (!) $-\mathrm{nu} \mathrm{u}-\mathrm{zu}-\mathrm{RI}^{650} \quad \mathrm{u}_{4}-\mathrm{ma}-\mathrm{gal}-\mathrm{nu}-\mathrm{zu}-\mathrm{RI}^{650}$
$u_{4}-d a m-I M-s ̌ u b-b a \quad d u m u^{656 b}-I M-s ̌ u b-b a-R I^{650}$
$405 \quad u_{4}-\mathrm{d}$ è $u_{4}-\mathrm{kalam}-\mathrm{ma}$ ú-gu-bí-íb(!?)-dé-a-RI $\mathrm{m}^{650}$
$u_{4}-\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{ul}-\mathrm{gig}-\mathrm{dug}_{4}-\mathrm{ga} \quad \mathrm{im}-\mathrm{mi}-\mathrm{in}-\mathrm{zal}-\mathrm{la}-[\mathrm{RI}]^{650}{ }^{656 \mathrm{c}}$
$a-a-d n a n n a \quad u_{4}-b i \quad u r u ́-z u^{656 d}-t a \quad k i n a m-b a-g a ́-$ gá
ukù-sag-gíg-zu igi-zu nam-bí-íb-dus
$u_{4}-b i \quad i m i-a n-t a-s ̌ e ̀ g-g a^{656 e}-g i m \quad k i \ldots n a m-$ ba-gur-ru
410 níg-zi-gál-an-ki sag-gíg im-ma-an $n^{657}-\mathrm{d}$ úb (?) -ba(?)-RI
${ }^{648}$ Original of N too badly damaged for collation.
${ }^{649} \mathrm{~N}: \mathrm{u}_{4}$ - (for $\mathrm{ba}-$ ).
${ }^{650}$ The sign transliterated as RI is assumed to indicate that l. 388 is to be repeated as a refrain.
${ }^{651} \mathrm{~N}:-\mathrm{amas}(!)-\mathrm{tab}-\mathrm{tab}-\mathrm{e}$.
${ }^{652}$ In N this ends the first part of 1. 394, which is broken into two parts.
${ }^{653} \mathrm{~N}:-\mathrm{i} \mathrm{b}-$.
${ }^{654} \mathrm{~N}:-\mathrm{kud}(!)-\mathrm{du}=$.

390 Which sated the land with affliction; ${ }^{650}$
The storm which destroys cities, the storm which destroys houses;
The storm which destroys stables, the storm which destroys sheepfolds; Which stretched out (its) hand over the holy parsu, ${ }^{650}$
Which placed a defiling hand on the weighty counsel; ;50
395 Which cut off the light of the land, the good, ${ }^{650}$
Which banned the light of the black-headed people. (Alas, all the storms together have flooded the land.) ${ }^{650}$
The ninth song.
The storm which
Its antiphon.
400 The storm which knows not the mother, ${ }^{650}$ the storm which knows not the father, ${ }^{\text {, } 50}$
The storm which knows not the wife, ${ }^{650}$ the storm which knows not the child, ${ }^{650}$
The storm which knows not the sister, ${ }^{650}$ the storm which knows not the brother, ${ }^{650}$
The storm which knows not the weak, ${ }^{650}$ the storm which knows not the strong, ${ }^{650}$
The storm on whose account the wife is forsaken, on whose account the child is forsaken, ${ }^{650}$
405 The storm which caused the light to perish in the land, ${ }^{650}$
Which sated it with evil and affliction--650
O Father Nanna, let not that storm establish itself near thy city!
Let it not cast down thy black-headed people before thee!
Let not that storm like rain pouring down from heaven turn . . . . !
410 (The storm) which overwhelmed the living creatures of heaven and earth, the black-headed people-

[^13]$411 u_{4}$-ba dù-a-bi bé-im-ma-an-gul ${ }^{658}$ $k a ́-g a l-g i_{6}-u$-na-gim ${ }^{\text {gisigig }}$ bé-bíin-kéš-da $a^{660}$ $u_{4}-b i \quad$ sitim (?)-ma na-an-ni-gágá

$415 \mathrm{ki}-\mathrm{s} u \mathrm{~b}-\mathrm{gu}-\mathrm{u}-\mathrm{kam}-\mathrm{m} \mathrm{a}^{662}$
$u_{4}-\mathrm{Ul}_{-} \mathrm{u}_{4}-\mathrm{k}$ úr-ra- $\mathrm{u}_{4}-\mathrm{da}-\mathrm{egir}-\mathrm{bi}-\mathrm{š}$ è (?)
iz-gid $\mathrm{i}_{4}$ GÁL-bi-i m ${ }^{663}$
$\mathrm{u}_{4}-\mathrm{ul}-\mathrm{kalam}(?)-\mathrm{k} \mathrm{i}^{664}-\mathrm{gar} \mathrm{ra} \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{ta}(?)^{665}$
${ }^{d}$ nanna lú-gu-na-gir-zu-mu-un-díb-ba $a^{666}$
420
ír-é-si-ga-bi ma-ra-an-túm $\mathrm{m}^{667}$ igi-zu(!)-šè (!) tuku-a-bi
sag-gíg-ba-ra $a^{668}-s ̌ u b-b u(!)-u s ̌-a^{669}-z a^{670} \quad k A \quad s ̌ u^{671}$ $b a-r a-a b^{671 a}-t a g(!)-g i-n e$
urúdul-dul-da-ba $a^{671 b}-g a r-r a-z a^{672}$ i-si-is
hu-mu-ra-gágá
${ }^{d} n a n n a \quad u r u ́-k i-b i-g i_{4}-a-z a \quad k u ́ n-e ̀ ~ b a-r a-a b-~$ ag- $\mathrm{e}^{673}$
mul-kug-gim nam-mu-un $\mathrm{n}^{674}-\mathrm{k} \mathrm{u}_{6}(!)-\mathrm{lam}(!)-e(!)$ igi(!)-zu-še ${ }^{675}$ héé-bí-íb $b^{676}-d i ́ b-b i^{677}$
425

[lú (?) -SISKUR]-SISKUR-ra-ke ${ }_{4}$ a-ra-zu mu-ra-ab ${ }^{679}-\mathrm{bi}$ . - [kal]am-ma-me-en .....................-zu im-mi-in-dug $\mathrm{g}_{4}-\mathrm{ga}$-?
 $e-d u_{8}{ }^{681}$
dingir (?) -................ bi $i^{683}$ šà ha-ba-an-na-hun- $\mathrm{e}^{684}$
${ }^{658} \mathrm{C}$ omits -an- and adds - lu .
${ }^{659}$ More literally: "Of that storm may its entirety be destroyed."
${ }^{660} \mathrm{C}$ : - e (for - da ).
${ }^{661} \mathrm{C}$ : -si-ig (for -la ).
${ }^{862} \mathrm{C}$ adds - a [ m ].
${ }^{663}$ Entire line omitted in Ne and 0.
${ }^{684} \mathrm{O}$ : - ki (!) - .
${ }^{665} \mathrm{C}$ and O : - se è (?) (for -ta ).
${ }^{666} \mathrm{O}$ omits -un- and has -bi for -ba.
${ }^{667} \mathrm{C}$, Nc , and O : mu- (for ma-);
Oomits -an-.
${ }^{668} \mathrm{C}$ : -da- (for -ra-).
${ }^{669} \mathrm{Nc}$ : -da-(for -uš-a-).
${ }^{670} \mathrm{C}$ and Nc :-bi (for-za); O:-ba.
${ }^{671}$ So O; A omits šu.
${ }^{671 a} 0$ : $-b a-($ for $-\mathrm{ra}-\mathrm{ab}$-).
${ }^{\text {onb }} \mathrm{Nc}$ inserts -an -.
${ }^{672} \mathrm{C}$ : -zu (for -za ).
${ }^{673}$ Entire line omitted in C and O .
${ }^{675} 0$ omits - $u n-$.

411 May that storm be entirely destroyed! ${ }^{659}$
Like the great gate of night may the door be closed on it!
Let not that storm be given a place in the numbering!
May its record hang by a nail outside the house of Enlil!
415 The tenth song.
Unto distant days, other days, future days.
Its antiphon.

From distant days, when the land was founded, O Nanna, the . . . who have taken thy path
420 Have brought unto thee their tears of the smitten house; before thee is their cry!
May thy black-headed people who have been cast away prostrate themselves unto thee!
May thy city which has been made into ruins set up a wail unto thee!
O Nanna, may thy city which has been returned to its place step forth gloriously before thee!
Like a bright star let it not be destroyed; may it proceed before thee!
425 . . . . man shall . . . . ;
[The man] of [offer]ings shall utter prayers unto thee.
. . . . who art . . . . of the [lan]d,
Undo the sins of its . . . . ! ! ${ }^{682}$
430 May the heart of its . . . . be soothed! ${ }^{685}$
${ }^{675}$ Entire complex omitted in 0.
${ }^{675} \mathrm{O}$ : - i b -.
671 Entire line omitted in C.
${ }^{678}$ This line seems to be omitted in $C$ and
O. In these two texts the line corresponding to 424 is followed by that corresponding to 429.
${ }^{679} 0$ omits - $\mathrm{ab}-$.
${ }^{680} \mathrm{C}:-\mathrm{ga}(!)-\mathrm{ni}(!)$.
${ }^{681} \mathrm{O}$ omits -e-. For the position of this line in C and O cf. n. 678.
${ }^{682}$ More literally: "Of its . . . . undo his sins."
${ }^{683} \mathrm{P}$ adds -ir.
${ }^{684}$ In P the verbal form may have read $b a-b a-a n-h u n-u n$. In $C$ the line corresponding to 430 probably follows two other lines of text which seem not to be found in either $A$ or $P$ but to replace 11 . 428 f .:
......................................
tù m-da
$-\mathrm{ga}(?)-\mathrm{a}$ (?).
${ }^{685}$ More literally: "Of its . . . . may the heart be soothed for him."
 ù $-\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{s} \mathrm{i}-\mathrm{bar}{ }^{687}$
${ }^{d} n a n n a i g i-d u_{8}-a-b a r-r a-z u-s ̌ a ̀-s ̌ u-n i g i n-s u ̀-~$ ga-àm
lú-l $u_{6}{ }^{688}-b i \quad s ̌ a ̀-h u l-d u ̀-a-b i^{689}$ hyé-im-m $a^{690}-$ ši-$\mathrm{kug}-\mathrm{gi}$
šà-kalam-ma-ma-gál-la-ke $4^{691}$ hé (!) -im-ma $a^{690}$. ši -d ùg (! ?) $-\mathrm{e}^{691 \mathrm{a}}$
435 dnanna $u[r] u ́-k i-b i-g i_{4}(!)-a-z a \quad m e-t e s ̌ a ́ r(?)$ mu-e-i-i ${ }^{691 b}$
$\mathrm{ki}-\check{s} u \mathrm{~b}-\mathrm{g} \mathbf{u}^{\prime}-\mathrm{u}-\mathrm{di} \check{s}-\mathrm{k} a \mathrm{~m}-\mathrm{m} \mathrm{a}^{692}$
${ }^{686}$ So P; A seems to read -zu (for ${ }^{691} \mathrm{Da}:-\mathrm{zu}, \mathrm{P}:-\mathrm{za}$ (for $-\mathrm{ke} \mathrm{e}_{4}$ ). -zi).
${ }^{687}$ In $P$ and probably $C$ this line is preceded by a line of text not found in $A$ :
dingir-lú-ba-ke4 nig(?)-šà-gar mu-ra-an-túm
The god of its man has brought thee that
for which the heart longs.
${ }^{688}$ B: $-1 \mathrm{u}_{6}(!)-$.
${ }^{889}$ P: - ba(! ?).
${ }^{690} \mathbf{P}$ inserts -an-.
${ }^{691 a} \mathrm{Da}:$ bé-im(!?)-ši(?)-
dùg (?) - e .
${ }^{\text {691b }} \mathrm{Da}$ omits -e-. This line is preceded in Da by two lines which seem to be inserted in that text only:

1. ....-bi be-im-da bi-in-kuub
2.....-e bé-gál-kalam-ma [hu(?)]-mu-un-gá-gá-ne May the . . . . establish the prosperity of the land.

431 Upon its man of offerings, who is standing, gaze with steadfast eye!

O Nanna, thou whose penetrating gaze overwhelms every heart,

May every evil heart of its people be pure before thee!
May the hearts of those who dwell in the land be good before thee!
435 O Nanna, thy city which has been returned to its place exalts thee.
The eleventh song.
${ }^{692}$ In A I. 436 is separated by means of a double rule from a following line:
ilimmu-bi-im
Its nine.
The significance of this notation is obscure. It is separated from the first two lines of the colophon by a double rule. The colophon reads
sitim-bi gistimin-u-iámu-

> bi-im

Its count: 435 is (the number of) its lines.
su-a-bil-dsumugan
The hand of Abil-Sumugan
itu-dul-kug $u_{4}-u-\bar{a} s-k a m$ The month of Tišrê, the sixteenth day,
......
If the number 435 is not merely an error on the part of the scribe, it is not clear just which line is not to be counted; is it the last? In Aa the colophon reads
[mu-šitim-bi] eš-šu-šinimin(?)
[The number of the lines] (is) 220(?).
....-ra-na
The number 220 , if the copy is correct, is difficult to explain, since Aa actually has 254 lines.

## COMMENTARY

Line 1.-The compound $\mathrm{my} \mathrm{x}^{693}-\mathrm{g}$ a is the eme-sAL ${ }^{694}$ equivalent of m ù s - $t$ ú m , Akkadian napark $\hat{u} .{ }^{695}$ Whatever the literal meanings of the two components may be, it is quite certain that $m$ ù $s$ is a substantive used as direct object of the verbal root ga ( $=\mathrm{tu} \mathrm{m}$ in the eme-Kण). The locative infix -ni- in mi-ni-in-ga ${ }^{696}$ recapitulates the postposition -a of turr-ra-na. A literal translation of the verbal form would therefore read: "he . . . .ed the . . . . in it (i.e., in his stable)."

In the second half of the line, as the translation "his sheepfold (has been delivered) to the wind" indicates, the -e of líl-e is a locative postposition recapitulated by the -ni- of ba-ni-in-GAR; this verbal form was omitted by the scribe because of lack of space. ${ }^{697}$ Note that instead of $\mathrm{amars}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{na}$ one might have expected amaša-ni. ${ }^{698}$

[^14]${ }^{696}$ For the change of mu - to mi - under the influence of the following -ni - cf. GSG §§ 568 f .
${ }^{687}$ The same holds true of all the other lines that comprise the first $k i-s ̌ u b-g$ ú except 11. 32 and 33 ; cf. comment on these two lines, also the text of 1.37. Note too that, governed by the space at his disposal, the scribe of C not only omits $\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{ni} \mathrm{i}-\mathrm{n}$-aAR but in the large majority of instances fails to write the two preceding complexes amass-a-na 1if-e. Indeed, in at least three cases he writes only mus, the first word of the refrain, and in at least two cases he even omits mus. Only in the last line of the $k i-s ̌ u b-g u ́$ does he write as much of the refrain as $A$, omitting only $b a-n i-i n$-Gar. The scribe of Aa, on the other hand, made it a rule to omit the entire refrain, beginning with m ùs ; he writes it only in the first and last lines, and even in these two cases omits $b a-n i-i n-$ Gar.
${ }^{698}$ In all likelihood the -n a of $\mathrm{a} \mathrm{mar}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{na}$ is merely a variant for -ni ; cf, the comment on 1.19 and especially the variants listed on $p$. 10 , where will be found the instances

Lines 3-6.-For the eme-sal writings $u \mathrm{mun}$ (1.3) and ${ }^{d} \mathrm{mu} 11 \mathrm{il}$ (l. 4) and the unexpected eme-kU writing NiN for gas an (ll. 5 and 6) cf. n. 694. The -a at the end of 1.4 , like those at the ends of 11.6 ( $-\mathrm{ra}(-\mathrm{a})$ ), $8,10,12,13,14,16(\mathrm{n}(\mathrm{i}-)$ a), etc., is the locative postposition corresponding to the - a of t ùr-ra-n(i-)a in l. 1. In l. 6, if the translation "their" for the -bi of é -bi is correct, does it refer to the people of Sumer?

Lines $9-10$. -Note that in 11. 9, 30, and 34 mulu refers to a female deity and in 1.32 to a male deity. The translation assumes that mulu is used in these four cases more or less as a synonym for $u m u n$ and gas an.

Lines 11-12.-For the writing nin- instead of the expected gasancf. n. 694.

The genitive complex ga-ša-an-na (<gašan-an-a(k)), since it is the subject of two transitive verbal forms, might have been expected to be followed by the syllable $-\mathrm{ke}_{4}$, which represents the combination of the $k$ of the genitive particle with the subject element -e; cf. ll. $7,9,10$, etc. and especially dga-ša-an-mab-e (l. 8), dzuen-e (l. 14), and ${ }^{\mathrm{d} g} \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{ša} \mathrm{a} \mathrm{n}-\mathrm{gal}-\mathrm{e}$ (ll. 15-16). ${ }^{69}$ Similarly the syllable $-\mathrm{ke}_{4}$ might have been expected to follow ${ }^{d} \mathrm{~d} u \mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{zi}-\mathrm{abzu}$ (l. 33). ${ }^{700}$

Line 14.-If the -gál of é-kiš-ši $r_{5}-\mathrm{g}$ ál is to be equated with the Akkadian bašu, there is the possibility that we have here another example of an eme-ku writing for an expected eme-sal writing (i.e., -gál for -ma-al). ${ }^{701}$

Line 18.-The name dam-an-ki ${ }^{702}$ does not mean "the wild ox of heaven and earth," as a synthetic and superficial analysis might suggest, but in all likelihood a m-an-is simply a variant pronunciation of $u m u n$, the eme-sal form of en (<ewen=emen). The final $-k e_{4}$ of
in which $e$ and $a$ interchange both when standing by themselves and when combined with the preceding consonant, as in -bi (i.e., -be ) and $-\mathrm{ba},-\mathrm{de}$ and -da , etc. In the case of amas $-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{na}$, moreover, the pronunciation and writing of -ni as -na may have been due at least in part to the preceding three $a$-vowels of a mas s-a-as well as to the -na of $\mathrm{t} \mathbf{u} \mathrm{r}-\mathrm{ra}-\mathrm{na}$.
 (l. 21), and the other deities whose names end in a vowel, the latter absorbs the subject element. Note therefore that the name $\mathrm{d}_{4}-\mathrm{s} a \mathrm{ba} \mathrm{r}-\mathrm{ra}$ is probably not to be analyzed as a genitive complex (with some such translation as "the day of dust" or "the dust storm"), since it is not followed by $-\mathrm{ke}_{4}$.
${ }^{700}$ Note that in 1.18 the syllable $-\mathrm{ke}_{4}$ of $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{m}-\mathrm{an}-\mathrm{ki}-\mathrm{ke}_{4}$ is omitted in one of the duplicates.
${ }^{701}$ Cf. n. 694.
${ }^{702}$ For the omission of the subject element in B cf. comment on 1.12 and n. 700.
urú-si-baki-ke $e_{4}$ is grammatically unjustified; cf. 1. 33 for another instance of the same phenomenon.

Line 19.-The goddess of Larak is usually designated as ${ }^{\mathrm{d} g} \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{s} \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{an}$ -as-te; the traces in A, however, point to a different reading. Note that in this line as well as in 11.31 and 33 A writes - b a for the expected - bi ; the duplicates, on the other hand, write - $b i$ in all the extant cases. It must be borne in mind that the sign bI, which is usually transliterated as $\mathbf{b i}$, actually represents the syllable be (cf. $A S$ No. $8, \mathrm{pp} .3 \mathrm{ff}$.) and that the difference in the pronunciation of the signs BA and BI was by no means as wide as the customary transcription for the sign BI might lead one to conclude (cf. also n. 698).

Line 21.-If, as is not improbable, ${ }^{d} \mathrm{u}_{4}-\mathrm{s}$ ahar-ra ${ }^{703}$ is merely a phonetic variant of $\mathrm{d} i \mathrm{sh}$ hara, our text would indicate that this deity had her main cult center in Umma.

Lines 24-25.-There is little doubt that $\mathrm{da}_{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{b}-\mathrm{b} \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{u}$ is merely an orthographic variant for $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{b}-\mathrm{u}$, the deity mentioned immediately after $\mathrm{db} a-$ ú in, for example, $S B H$, p. 134, l. 37, p. 137, 1. 47, and p. 140, 1. 91, and $B L$, No. 101 obv. ii $5 .{ }^{704}$ The $\mathrm{ma}-\mathrm{g}$ ú-en-na(-k) is mentioned in connection wth Lagaš in VAS II, No. 2 iv 16, and BL, No. 175 obv. 26. ${ }^{705}$ That a $\mathrm{ma}-\mathrm{g}$ ú-en-na existed in other temples is indicated by $S R T$, No. 1 iii 7 .

Line 26.-Instead of $-\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{kug}-\mathrm{ke}_{4}$ one might have expected -é-$\mathrm{kug}-\mathrm{ga}-\mathrm{ke}_{4}$. Does é-kug refer to the ésil-sír-sír-ra of l. 27?

Line 27.-To judge from Gudea Statue E vi 16, the name of the temple was é-sil-sír-sír. In our present passage the final -a may of course be the locative postposition. ${ }^{706}$ From the writing of the name in 1.57 of our text, ${ }^{706 a}$ however, we may conclude that our scribe actually intended the name to be read é-sil-sír-sir-ra, with a final -a. ${ }^{707}$

Lines 28-29.-The eme-sal reading for šir.bur.la ${ }^{\mathrm{ki}}$ is lagasa; cf. VAS II, No. 2 iv 14, and $C T$ XV, Pl. 22:3 and 25. That, the name ended in a vowel in the eme-KU dialect is indicated by the fact that the following
${ }^{703}$ For comment on the grammatical construction of this name cf. n. 699.
${ }^{701}$ Note the identification of $d_{a b} u$ as well as ${ }^{d_{n}}$ ingirsu with ${ }^{d_{n}} \operatorname{inurta}$ in IIR $57 c, \mathrm{ll} .72 \mathrm{ff}$. Cf. also SLT, No. 118:4ff., where $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{in}-\mathrm{g} \mathrm{fr}-\mathrm{su},{ }^{\mathrm{d} b} \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{u}$, and $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{b}-\mathrm{u}$ appear in the order indicated.
${ }^{705}$ In the latter text gal - at the beginning of the complex is no doubt miscopied for ma-.
${ }^{706}$ The complex is parallel to $\mathrm{t} u \mathrm{r}-\mathrm{ra} \mathrm{a}$ a; cf. comment on l. 1.
${ }^{706 a}$ Cf. also [e-sil-sir]-sir-ra, VAS II, No. 2 iv 15.
${ }^{707}$ Grammatically, therefore, the complex reads é -sil-sir-sir-a (-a).
genitive particle regularly appears as -k (not -ak ). In the syllabary material published to date the name is treated as ending in a final $\check{s}$, and if, as is not improbable, this was the labially characterized $\check{s}$, the following vowel was $u$ rather than $a$; i.e., in the eme-ku dialect the name was pronounced lagašu rather than lagasa. ${ }^{708}$ In $1.29 \mathrm{~d}_{\mathrm{m}} \mathrm{m}-\mathrm{si} \mathrm{i}-\mathrm{si} \mathrm{i}-\mathrm{bi}$ is the eme-sal form of ${ }^{d} g a ́-t u ̀ m-d u ̀ g-g i \quad$ (grammatically ${ }^{d} g a t u m d u g-$ e) ; the eme-ku syllables $g$ á, $t u ̀ m$, and $d u ̀ g$ correspond to the eme-sal syllables ma , si, and sib respectively. The equation (eme-KU) $\mathrm{tu}(\mathrm{m})=(\mathrm{eme-sAL})$ ṣi may seem strange at first glance; it is an example of the consonantal changes described in GSG §§68-70.

Lines $30-31$.-For the translation of $\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{lu}$ here and in 1.32 cf . comment on 1l. 9-10.

Lines 32-33.-For ki-nir-šà as the name of the cult center of ${ }^{d} d u m u z i a b z u$ in the environs of Lagaš cf. ddumu-zi-abzu.... $\mathrm{ki}-\mathrm{nir}-\mathrm{s}^{\mathrm{ki}}-\mathrm{ba}^{709} \ldots$ (PBS X 4, No. 6 obv. 19) and the line following, where the name reads $k i-n i r-s \grave{a}^{k i} .{ }^{710}$ For the grammatically unjustified final $-\mathrm{ke}_{4}$ cf. comment on l. 18.

The reason why the scribe wrote $\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{ni}-\mathrm{in}$-GAR (if the reading is correct) in these particular two lines and not in any of the other lines of the first $\mathrm{ki}-\mathrm{s} u \mathrm{~b}-\mathrm{g}$ ú is not quite clear. For the writing -GAR instead of the expected -mar cf. comment on ll. 3-6 and n. 694.

For the omission of $-\mathrm{ke}_{4}$ after ${ }^{d} \mathrm{~d}_{\mathrm{u}} \mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{zi}-\mathrm{abzu}$ cf. comment on 1. 12.

Lines 34-35.-For the translation of $\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{lu}$ cf. comment on ll. 9-10. In l. 35 note that the KI of $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{g}}^{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{s} \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{an}-\mathrm{mar} \mathrm{r}^{\mathrm{ki}}-\mathrm{ke} \mathrm{e}_{4}$ is treated as a determinative, i.e., the goddess' name is ${ }^{d_{n}} \mathrm{in}$ (gašan in the eme-sal dialect) -mar, not $d_{n i n-m a r-k i ; ~ c f . ~}^{d n i n-m a r i}{ }^{d_{n}}-r a-k e_{4}$ in PBS X 4, No. 6:9. ${ }^{710 \mathrm{a}}$ In l. 35 - k a might have been expected instead of $-\mathrm{ke}_{4}$ in èš-gú-ab-ba-ke ; cf. ma(!) -gú (!) -en-na-ka (l. 25) and comment on ll. 1 and 3-6.

Line 36.-The analysis of the complex ki-šub-gú (d) (Akkadian šêru) still remains obscure.
${ }^{708}$ In DPr, Nos. 41, 42, and 43, all of which are quoted by Deimel (ŠL, p. 147) in support of a reading lagasa in the eme-ku dialect, the sign copied as -sa is actually -k e.
${ }^{709}$ So; not, as might have been expected, with -šà - .
${ }^{710}$ Note that in A and Aa the determinative is placed after - b a - and not, as might have been expected, after -šà-
${ }^{710 a}$ Cf., however, Thureau-Dangin, La chronologie des dynasties de Sumer et d'Accad (Paris, 1918) p. 27; the reduplicated KI in the example there cited is very probably nothing more than a scribal error.

Line 37 .-For the writing -gar in ba-ni-in-gar cf. n. 694.
The translation assumes that mu-un-kúš-ù represents the grammatical $m u-n-k u$ sw-e, ${ }^{711}$ i.e., the third person singular present-future of the causative form of the root. For an analysis of the meaning of the root see comment on 11. 80-81.

Line 38.-As things now stand it would be futile to attempt a fuller translation of the line. For the writing -GÁL- instead of -ma-al-in nu-cíL-la-àm cf. n. 694.

Line 39.-While the reading of $\operatorname{GIS}-\mathrm{g} \mathrm{i}_{4}-$ as $\mathrm{iz}-\mathrm{gi}_{4}-72$ is now established by the variant $\mathrm{izki}(\mathrm{m})-(K A R$, No. 100 ii 10$)$, the reading of the following -GÁL is still uncertain.

Line 40.-To judge from the fact that anir (eme-sal: a ser), when used alongside of ir ("weeping"), regularly follows the latter, we may conclude that anir denotes a severer form of lamentation. ${ }^{713}$ In our case the translation "lament" seems to suit the sense; whether it represents the exact equivalent of a šer is not certain, however,
Since this second $\mathrm{ki}-\mathrm{sub}-\mathrm{gu}$, like the first, is written in the emesal dialect (cf. the writings a šer [ll. $40,41,42$, etc.], šeb [ll. 48, 53,59 , etc.], kanag [1.66], gasan [1. 71], and mulu [1.72] for the emeku forms anir, siga, kalam, nin, and lú respectively), one might have expected the writing mar-ra for GAR-ra $\mathrm{a}^{714}$ in this line as well as in 11. 41, 44, and 48-62.

Note that gig-ga in ll. 40, 48, 49, etc. is an intransitive participle used as an ordinary adjective; the $\mathrm{gig}-\mathrm{ga}$ of $11.41,44,46$, etc., as the variant $\mathrm{gig}-\mathrm{ga}-\mathrm{a} \mathrm{m}$ indicates, is used predicatively.

Lines 42-48.-The complexes urú-zi-gul-la-na and uriki-gul-la-na are anticipatory genitives; a more literal translation would therefore read: "Of his righteous city . . . .," "Of his Ur . . . . ."
Lines $46-47$.-As shown by the following line, where $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{n}}$ ann a takes its place, the word ga-sa-an-(1.46) is to be translated not "queen" but "lord." The complex $-\mathrm{mu-lu-1r} \mathrm{r} \mathrm{r}^{715}$ is assumed to be a genitive con-

[^15]struction with change of the vowel of the genitive particle $-\mathrm{a}(\mathrm{k})$ from $a$ to $e .^{716}$ For the verbal form $\mathrm{mu-un-k}$ ús -u cf. comment on l. 37. It may of course be taken as a passive; the translation of the two lines would then read:

Thy lament which is bitter-how long will thy weeping lord be grieved (by it)?
Thy lament which is bitter-how long will the weeping Nanna be grieved (by it)?
Lines 48-62.-The cities of Sumer called upon to utter a bitter lament are Ur ${ }^{716 a}$ (ll. 48-50), Nippur (ll. 51-55), Lagaš (ll. 56-58), Isin (ll. 59-60), Uruk (1. 61), and Eridu (1. 62). Omitted for some unknown reason are Keš, Larak, and Umma, although these are listed in the first $k i-s ̌ u b-g$ ú alongside of the others as "abandoned" and "given over to the wind."

For the -g ál of é-kiš-šir $\mathrm{r}_{5}$-gál (1.49) cf. comment on 1.14.
In 1.50 ès š-é-nun-kug refers to Ningal's shrine in Ur.
If 1.51 goes with the preceding three lines, the ki - u r is part of the temple complex of the Ekišsirgal at Ur. If, however, it goes with the following four lines, the $\mathrm{ki}-\mathrm{u} \mathrm{r}$ is part of the temple complex of the Ekur at Nippur. The latter seems the more likely, for in the Sumerian texts published to date the $\mathrm{ki}-\mathbf{u} \mathrm{r}$ is regularly mentioned in connection with Nippur. ${ }^{717}$ It is not altogether impossible, however, that every important temple had its $k i-u ̀ r$.

In l. 52 the sign urú seems on the surface to be altogether meaningless.
In $1.54 \mathrm{ma}-\mathrm{g}$ i $\mathrm{s}-\mathrm{s} \dot{\mathrm{u}}-\mathrm{a}$ is a shrine of Ninlil at Nippur; cf. e.g. TRS I, No. 9 vi 32 and 40; ibid. No. $48: 28$; ibid. No. 65:28; PBS I 1, No. 11:86; and (especially for the reading of the signs involved) BIN II, No. 24:28 and No. 25:28 (cf. also the photographs of No. 24 on Pl. LXV). Note that it seems to be written ba-giš-šú-a in VAS II, No. 25 i 7; for the interchange of $g, m$, and $b$ in the pronunciation of the sign $G A(c f . G S G \S 75$.

Lines 65-68.-Note that in the Sumerian idiom mu-zuivgal, "thy name exists," and bàd-zui-il(?), "thy walls have been raised high," are treated as independent clauses. The infix -da-in mu-da-gulen (l. 65) and ba-da-til (1.66) seems to qualify the meanings of the roots gul and til; whether the translations "destroy" and "perish" render the exact meanings of these two roots when preceded by the infix
${ }^{716}$ For a parallel phenomenon cf. n. 698. Whether the consonant $r$ influenced the change is a matter for future investigation.
${ }^{116 a}$ Note that A , on which our text is based, gives Ur first place, but Aa and Da , both from Nippur, give Nippur first place. This fact tends to indicate that the provenance of the Louvre tablet AO 6446 ( $=$ our A) is Ur; cf. also n. 800a.
${ }^{717}$ Cf. $S R T$, No. 13:23; HAV, No. 3:25; SEM, No. 77 obv. ii 3-4; etc.
-da - must remain as yet undecided. ${ }^{718}$ On the other hand, the infixed -e-da-in ba-e-da-TAR (1.67) and ba-e-da-til (ll. 66 and 68) is no doubt to be translated "from thee," ${ }^{719}$ although in the case of $\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{e}-$ da-til the English equivalent of -e-da- is difficult to express.

In 11. 67-68 is gim to be read -dím? Cf. comment on l. 40.
Lines 69-70.-A more definitive translation of the synonyms marza and me is as yet impossible.

The locative infix -ni-, "upon it," is used regularly with the compounds su-bal, "to turn the hand (upon something)," and šu-bal-ag, "to do the hand-turning (upon something)." However, it is problematical whether our scribe considered $\mathrm{me}-\mathrm{zu}$, for example, to be a locative complex rather than the (logical) direct object (grammatical subject in our case).

Lines 77-79.-Although the general sense of the passage seems reasonably clear, the correctness of the translation is by no means certain. In ba -an-di-ni-ib-gar (l. 77) the infix -di- ( $<-\mathrm{da}$ - under the influence of the following -ni-) qualifies the meaning of the root gar. Whether the translation "was given over" for the verbal form is correct, however, must remain undecided. ${ }^{720}$

In 1. 78 one might have expected the postposition -ta after -ba-anda $a^{721}-t i l-1 a$.

In l. 79 the postposition - e after $u \mathrm{rim}^{\mathrm{ki}},,^{722}$ if the translation is correct, is the subject element.

The translation "to intensify" for the compound bar-tab (cf. also 1.188) is a reasonable guess based on the sense of the context. For the complex preceding the verbal form the reading $\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{nir}-\mathrm{ra}$ of C and F rather than $a-n i r$ of $A$ was chosen, under the assumption that the $b a r$ of $b a r-$ tab is the direct object and that the preceding a-nir is related dimensionally to the verbal root. Nevertheless, it is to be noted that the locative

[^16]postposition -a of a-nir-ra is not recapitulated in the verbal form $\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{da}^{723}-\mathrm{an}-\mathrm{tab}$, although the postposition -e of $\mathrm{ir-ri}$ (l.77) is taken up again by the $-n i$ of the following verbal form. ${ }^{724}$

Lines $80-81$.-The use of the future infinitives k úš- $\mathrm{u}-\mathrm{d}$ è and $\mathrm{u}-$ $\mathrm{nu}-\mathrm{KU}-\mathrm{KU}-\mathrm{d} \mathrm{e}^{725}$ as parallels would indicate that at least one of the meanings of the root $\mathrm{k} \mathrm{u} \mathrm{š} \mathrm{w}{ }^{726}$ is "to be grieved," "to be harassed," "to be wearied (by some persistent action or state)," etc.; the causative form of the root would therefore mean "to grieve," "to harass," "to make weary," etc. Cf. also Kramer in RA XXXVI (1939) 73 (comment on ll. 214-17).

Lines 82-84.-For an analysis of the compound verb ir-š $e_{8}-\mathrm{s}_{8}$ see AS No. 10, pp. 18 f .

Line 85.-The verbal form im-da-ra-da-gágá, if the reading is correct, is unusual and difficult to analyze.

Lines 86-87.-As matters now stand, the meaning of the various complexes of 1.86 is too uncertain for any attempt at a translation of the line. Thus, if the word division proves correct, is balag-1r-ra-ki a musical instrument used in accompaniment to the lament, or is it the musical chant accompanying the lament? ${ }^{727}$ Is al-g ar of the following complex a variant writing
 gar-ra-a-ba a verbal form ending in the postposition -a-ba, "after"?

In 1.87 the translation assumes that $\mathrm{tur}-\mathrm{tur}-\mathrm{bi}$ is to be equated with the Akkadian rabbiš; there is some possibility, however, that i-1u-m a (?) -si-ga-tur-tur-bi forms a single complex, to be translated "its(?) . . . . wail." As things now stand, it is not clear just what complex is recapitulated by the infix -ni- of the following verbal form.

Lines 88-91.—Does "the storm," if this translation of $\mathrm{u}_{4}{ }^{729}$ is correct,

[^17]actually refer to an attack by the elements, ${ }^{730}$ or does it refer figuratively to the destructive forces that overwhelmed Ur and Sumer?

In ll. 88, 90, and $91-\mathrm{ma}-\mathrm{ma}-\mathrm{al}-1 \mathrm{a}$ is the reduplicated intransitive participle (in the form $x-x-a)^{731}$ of the root mal ( $=\mathrm{g}$ al in emeKU). ${ }^{732}$

In ma-lá-lá (Il. 88, 90, and 91) ma-represents m(u-2-) a-, a combination of the thematic particle mu with the dative infix of the first person. ${ }^{733}$ A more literal translation of $\mathrm{ma}-1 \mathrm{a}-1$ á may therefore be: "was directed repeatedly against me."

In l. $89 \mathrm{su} \mathrm{r}(?)-\mathrm{su} \mathrm{r}(?)-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{d}$ è seems to consist of the reduplicated infinitive (in the form $x-x-a$ ), ${ }^{733 a}$ the first person possessive pronoun, and the postposition - d è, i.e., the regular Sumerian construction approximating our temporal clause. ${ }^{734}$ However, since the reading of the first two signs is not quite certain and since the logical connection with the line following is not altogether clear, the translation is very doubtful.

In $\mathrm{L} \mathrm{U}_{-} \mathrm{nu} \mathrm{u}-\mathrm{nuz}-\mathrm{m}$ èn (1. 90) the $\mathrm{Lu}^{-735}$ seems, at least on the surface, to be used as a kind of relative pronoun. ${ }^{736}$ The same seems to be true of Lú-nu-nuz-mèn, "as for me, the lady" (1.249), and lú-munuse, ${ }^{737}$ "the lady" (1.255).

Lines 92-101.-The verbal form ma-ma-al-la (ll. 92 and 96) seems on the surface to correspond exactly to the $-m a-m a-a l-1 a$ of 11.88 , 90 , and $91 .{ }^{738}$ Actually, however, it is a quite different form, probably to be analyzed as $m\left(u^{-}-\right) a-m a l-a$, i.e., a verbal form consisting of the thematic particle $\mathrm{mu}-$, the dative infix of the first person $-3-a-{ }^{739}$ the root -mal- ( $=-\mathrm{ga} \mathrm{a}^{-}$- in eme-ku), and the substantivizing particle -a.
${ }^{730}$ Cf. e.g. 11.173 ff .
${ }^{731}$ Cf. GSG § 146. Note that, while $\mathbf{C}$ writes the final $l$ of the first -mal-, A fails to do so.
${ }^{732} \mathrm{Ll} .88-169$ are written in the eme-sAL dialect, since they contain the direct speech of Ningal.
${ }^{733} \mathrm{Cf} . G S G \S 563 . \quad{ }^{733 \mathrm{~s}} \mathrm{Cf} . G S G \S 146 . \quad{ }^{734} \mathrm{Cf} . G S G \S 703$.
${ }^{735}$ One might have expected mu-1u- for $\mathrm{m} f$-, since the passage is written in the eme -sal dialect (cf. nn. 732 and 694).
${ }^{735} \mathrm{Cf}$. GSG $\S 274$ for examples from the late post-Sumerian period.
${ }^{737}$ The - e is the subject element.
${ }^{738}$ Note that while for the latter Cread -ma-al-ma-al-1a, the extant traces seem to indicate that for the former (i.e., for the $\mathrm{ma}-\mathrm{ma}-\mathrm{al}-1 \mathrm{a}$ of 1 l .92 and 96) C too read ma-ma-al-1a, not ma-al-ma-al-la.
${ }^{739}$ It recapitulates the preceding $\mathrm{ma}-\mathrm{ra}$. For the contraction of $\mathrm{m}\left(\mathrm{u}-{ }^{\circ}-\mathrm{A} \mathrm{a}-\right.$ to m a - see GSG § 563 .

In héen-ši-ag-an (ll. 93 and 97), as this verbal form is written in A, note the change of the $m$ of the infix $-m-s ̌ i-(<-b-s ̌ i-)^{740}$ to $n$, probably under the influence of the following sibilant, which is in part dental; in the variant h é-im-ši-ag of G and H this change has not taken place or at least is not indicated in the orthography. Note too that, while hé -en-ši-ag-an of $A$ is clearly the present tense of the verb, the variant $h e-i m-s i-a g$, at least on the surface, seems to be a preterit. It is not altogether impossible, however, that the sign ag is in this case to be read aga and that the variant, read as $h e-i m-s i-a g a$, would represent the grammatical form $\mathrm{he}-\mathrm{b}-\mathrm{s} \mathrm{i}-\mathrm{ag} \mathrm{a}(-\mathrm{e}(\mathrm{n})) .^{741}$ Indeed the final -an of what has been read above as $h e ́-e n-s i-a g-a n$ points to a similar conclusion, since only so can the change of the $e$ of - en to $a^{742}$ be explained. ${ }^{743}$

In $\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{ra}-\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{ra}-\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{en}$ (ll. 94 and 98) the first $\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{ra}$ - is the emphatic negative particle, ${ }^{744}$ while the -ba-ra-following consists of the thematic particle $b a-$ and the infix - ( $\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{)} \mathrm{r} \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{used}$ with verbs of separation. ${ }^{745}$

The meaning of $u_{4}$-TUR- bi-(l. 95) as "affliction" rather than the more obvious "young days," i.e., "days of youth," is a guess based on the context. For other examples of the complex cf. VAS II, No. 2 iv 43-44, and U 9364 ( $R A$ XXX [1933] 127 ff .) obv. 27. Because of the uncertain meaning of several of the signs, the translation of the remainder of the line is doubtful and obscure. ${ }^{746}$

For the reading mi- (not $\mathrm{gi}_{6}-$ ) in 1. 96, which is part of an emesaL passage, cf. GSG §75. Note that a-še-ir-gig seems to parallel
${ }^{750} \mathrm{Cf}$. $G S G$ § 503.
${ }^{741}$ For the absorption of the $e$ of -en by the preceding vowel of the root see GSG $\S 466$; for the amissibility of the final $n$ see GSG $\S \S 479 \mathrm{ff}$. and the list of phonetic variants, § $12 c$ on our p. 12.
${ }^{742}$ I.e., -aga -(e) $\mathrm{n}>-\mathrm{agan}$, which is written $-\mathrm{AG}(=\mathrm{aga})-\mathrm{an}$. The change can hardly be due, as a superficial examination might suggest, to the initial $a$ of the root ag , since in Sumerian retrogressive assimilation is the rule. Thus 1.106 has the verbal form bé-en-si-ag-an, while l. 107 has a verbal form bé-en-si-dal-dalen (not-dal-dal-an). However, $A$ is by no means consistent in writing the $e$ of a grammatical particle following the root written with the sign ag as $a$; of. -ag-en (1. 144) and -AG-e (1. 423). For other problems concerning the reading of the root written with the sign ag cf. $A S$ No. 8, pp. 28 f.
${ }^{743}$ As matters now stand with this passage (II. 92-101) it must be admitted that, although the translation of the individual complexes seems more or less justified, the resulting connected translation is quite obscure and lends itself to numerous interpretations, none of which is altogether satisfactory.
${ }^{744} \mathrm{Cf} . G S G \S 638 . \quad{ }^{245} \mathrm{Cf} . G S G$ § 497.
${ }^{46}$ Cf. 11. 118-19, which together parallel 1.95 to some extent.
$u_{4}-\mathrm{gig}-\mathrm{g}$ a ( 1.92 ); the reason for using the long form of the adjective in the one case and the short form in the other is not apparent.

In l. 100 the transliteration of the first sign of $-\mathrm{MI}-\mathrm{u}-\mathrm{n}$ a as mi (not $g \mathrm{i}_{6}$ ) is based on the assumption that it represents mi, "night"; cf. comment on 1. 96. The meaning attributed to Lut is merely a guess based on the context. Note that it seems to be parallel to mu-us-1a-a-bi (1.101), the eme-sal form for gisk-lá, and that this latter seems to have the meaning "quiet" in the phrase gisclá-ki-na-da-na, "in the quiet of his sleeping-place" (CT XVI, Pl. 45, 1. 116). Admittedly, however, giss-lá also has the altogether opposite meaning "strife"; at least on the surface, however, this meaning does not seem to suit the context. In ba-rama (!) - mar the translation assumes that ma - is grammatically m (u$\left.{ }^{\prime}-\right) a-$, i.e., the thematic particle $m u$ - followed by the dative infix of the first person; cf. n. 733.

Lines 102-4.-For the postposition - akess (1. 102) cf. GSG§ 339.
In l. 103 note that the sign NAM seems to follow -Gmi ${ }^{746 a}$ for another possible example cf. l. 369. Whatever the meaning of the compound ki su-ag turns out to be, the probability is that šu is the direct object of the root, while ki is related dimensionally to the latter; hence the use of the prefix im-ma- (variant im-mi-). ${ }^{747}$

In l. 104, if the word division and translation are correct, the verb is su-a-gi4, "to hand over," "to deliver." Is the infix -da- in ba-$\mathrm{ra}-\mathrm{mu} \mathrm{d} \mathrm{d}-\mathrm{ab}-\mathrm{g} \mathrm{i}_{4}$ to be translated "from it" (i.e., "from fear")? Note too that the verbal form might have been expected to recapitulate the locative complex šu-a.

Lines 105-9.-The translation "wail" for DU-lum (l. 105) is no more than a guess based on the context. For - akes cf. comment on l. 102. For -Gim (l. 106) cf. n. 746a. For an analysis of bé-en-ši-ag-an cf. comment on 1. 93 ; cf. ibid. for the change (in A only) of the $m$ of the infix $-m-$ ši- ( $<-\mathrm{b}-\mathrm{s} \mathrm{i}-)$ to $n$.

In 1. 109 note that A uses the present tense of the verb, although it uses the preterit in the parallel form of 1.108 ; cf. the list of grammatical variants, § $3 a$ on p. 13.

Line 110.-For - akeš cf. comment on 1. 102.
Line 114.-Or should bal-ba be translated: "in whose...."? Cf.
${ }^{746 a}$ Is -gim here to be read - dim? Cf. n. 732 and comment on l. 40.
347 For a statement concerning the problems involved in the reading of the root written with the sign AGef. comment on bé-en-si-ag-an (l.93) and n. 742.

1. 95. For the change of the negative particle $n u-$ to $n a-$ before $m a--^{748}$ cf. GSG § 630.

Lines $116-17$.-Is -ša $g_{5}-\mathrm{g} \mathrm{i}$ - (1. 116) the present-future active participle ( $<\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{Ka}}^{5} \mathrm{~g}_{5}-\mathrm{e}(\mathrm{d})$ ), ${ }^{749}$ or is it simply a variant for -ša $\mathrm{g}_{5}-\mathrm{ga}$-? In $-\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{me}-\mathrm{na}-\mathrm{ke}_{4}-\mathrm{es}$ ( A and E ) note the seemingly unjustifiable $n$; the regular form is $-\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{me}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{k} \mathrm{e}_{4}-\mathrm{e}$ š ( F and H ).

For the variants ezen and ìzi-èm (l. 117) cf. n. 732 and comment on 1. 40.

Lines 118-21.-For $u_{4}$-TUR- bi-(1.118) cf. comment on 1. 95. Note that the "in" in 1.118 translates the locative postposition which should have followed the second of the two appositional complexes beginning with é(ll. 118 and 119) but has been omitted since the latter ends with the enclitic - àm..$^{750}$ The correctness of the translation is indicated by the locative infix $-n i-$ of $m u-n i-t u ́ m-t u ́ m-m u-u s ̌$ (l. 121).

HUR-bad-a (l. 120) no doubt has a meaning paralleling to some extent that of a-še-ir which follows; cf. PBS X 4, No. 1 i 20 , where it is preceded by ír, a-nir, and šà-sig (=Akkadian zurub libbi). ${ }^{751}$

Lines 122-23.-For -LÚ- (instead of the expected $\mathrm{mu}-1 \mathrm{u}$ ) in 11.122 and $132 \mathrm{cf}$. n. 735. For -GAR- (instead of mar ) in ll. 122, 125, 127, 129, and $135 \mathrm{cf} . \mathrm{nn} .732$ and 694 . For the writing -gim in 1l. 123, 128-29, and 132 cf. n. 746 a .

Lines 124-29.-The translation assumes that in ll. 126 f ., which seem to contain a clause descriptive of the Ekišsirgal (cf. l. 124), the complexes luleš and zi-dè-es modify ha-ma-ni-in-GAR-ri-ešàm and that $d u$ plural verbal form. ${ }^{752}$

Lines 130-33.-If the reading and translation of 1. 130 should prove cor-
${ }^{768}$ From m (u-כ-) a; cf. GSG § 563.
${ }^{749}$ A more literal translation would then be: "As for the house which used to be the heart-soothing place of the black-headed people."
${ }^{760}$ The enclitic -àm cannot be followed by a postposition.
${ }^{751}$ The sign gur of gUR-bad-a is there miscopied as hr; for the correct reading ef. SRT, No. $40: 8$.
${ }^{752}$ It is not impossible that 1.126 merely contains a parenthetical statement and should be translated: "untrustworthily its building, trustworthily (i.e., long enduring?) its destruction." Note, however, that in this case one might perhaps have expected lul- àm (or LuL-a) and zid-am (or zid-a) instead of lul-eš and zid-eš; cf. l. 321 . Moreover, what in that case would be the plural subject of $\mathrm{ha} \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{ma} \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{ni}-\mathrm{in}$-GAr-ri-eš-àm?
rect, Níg of -Níg-dirig- is used as a kind of relative pronoun, ${ }^{753}$ while dirig is the short form, i.e., that without the following -a, of the intransitive verbal adjective. ${ }^{754}$ In l. 133 one might perhaps have expected $\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{un}-\mathrm{ga}$ - (for NíG-GA-) and -ma-al- (for -GÁL-). ${ }^{755}$

The translation of 1.131 as well as its exact relationship to the lines preceding and following is quite uncertain. Moreover, there is the added complication of the variant -mu-un-sír-sír-sir (D, E, and H), a reading which, as matters now stand, is inexplicable. ${ }^{756}$

The sign gi of sug-gi (l. 133) may be a miscopy for $\mathrm{GI}_{4}$; cf. 1.232, where all the extant texts including A have the sign Gr 4 . For the meaning of sug$\mathrm{g} \mathrm{i}_{4}-\mathrm{k}$ ú cf. comment on l. 232.

Line 195.-For ba-an-di-ni-ib-GAR of. comment on l. 77.
Lines 187-46.-To whom do the words en (ll. 137 and 139) and NIN (l. 138) refer? They can hardly refer to Nanna and Ningal, since Ningal herself is speaking, ${ }^{757}$ unless one is to assume that in 1.138 alone she speaks of herself in the third person. ${ }^{758}$ For the postposition - a b a cf. AS No. 10, p. 31. In l. 139 the translation "overwhelm" for the reduplicated root d i m is a guess based on the context. ${ }^{759}$ Cf., however, the passage $u_{4}-u r u$ u $b-$ dím-dím-ma-ba ba-si-si-ga-[ba], "after the cities had been overwhelmed, after they had been laid low," ${ }^{759 a}$ where the root dím again parallels the root si (g).
${ }^{753} \mathrm{Cf}$. also the comment on Lú of L ̛́-nu-nuz-mèn (l. 90). Note, however, if Nig is the relative pronoun, that one might have expected the eme-sal form ag.
${ }^{754}$ GSG § 687. For another example of Níg-dirig(?) see VAS X, No. 197 iii 15, where the meaning is uncertain. In $S R T$, No. 3 iii $13-14$, however, we find a Nío-dirig-ga (i.e., the long form of the adjective), for which the meaning "which is extra large in quantity" seems suitable.
${ }^{755} \mathrm{Cf} . \mathrm{nn} .732$ and 694.
${ }^{756}$ Just what may be involved in the tripling of the root is uncertain; cf. comment on 1. 301.
${ }^{767}$ An added difficulty, therefore, is the fact that the eme-sal forms umun and ga san might have been expected instead of EN and NIN.
${ }^{758}$ Note too that, if the translation of 1.138 is correct, it is difficult to reconcile its statement that Ur had already been destroyed with Ningal's plea to Anu and Enlil (Il. 147-49), which implies that Ur has not yet been destroyed.
${ }^{759}$ Note the reduplication of the roots sig (1.137) and dim (l. 139); the translations "overcome" and "overwhelm" probably render not merely the meanings of the respective roots but also the repeated action implied by their reduplication.
${ }^{7599_{\mathrm{a}}} S R T$, No. 2 obv. 1. This fragment is an extract from a composition consisting of close to 300 lines which laments a calamity that befell Agade during the reign of Naram-Sin; the first line of the fragment (i.e., the line quoted above) corresponds to approximately 1.90 of the composition. It is a misunderstanding (obviously very justifiable in this case) of the

In im-mi-in-NE-esta-ba (ll. 140f.) the translation "command" for the root represented by NE is based on the assumption that the meaning of the latter might be expected to parallel to some extent that of the compound á —ág of l. 142. Is it possible that Ne should be read $n e$ and that the latter represents a combination of the pronominal element $n$ with the root e, ${ }^{760}$ "to speak," just as, for example, the verb be, 761 "to speak," resulted from the combination of the pronominal element $b$ - and the same root e? Note, however, that, no matter what the reading of NE in this case may be, its object seems to be related to it dimensionally, although in the English rendering it is best treated as a direct object; hence the - b a (not-bi) of gul-gul-lu-ba, and hence also the dimensionally characterized thematic prefix $i m-m i$ in $i m-m i-i n-N E-e s-a-b a .{ }^{762}$

In l. 143 the compound $G A \in-1 a-d$ ag (direct object[?] and verbal root) is, as the translation indicates, to be equated with the Akkadian naparku. The compound im-šub-ag (1. 144), to judge from the context, has a similar meaning. ${ }^{763}$ In the verbal form $b a-r a-b a-d a-a g-e n$ note the -en, not-an, and cf. comment on bé-en-ši-ag-an (l. 93) and n .742.

Lines $147-49$.-In be -me-ne-dug 4 the bé-me- is probably for the grammatical be-im-ma; the $a$ of -imma- has become $e$ under the influence of the following long open $e$ of the dative plural infix -ne-. ${ }^{764}$

Lines 150-51.-In $b a-r a-b i ́ i n-s e d x$, the variant for $b a-r a-$ $m u-u n-h u n$ (l. 151), note that the root šed $d_{x}$ is preceded by the dimensionally characterized thematic prefix bí. A more literal translation of the verbal form would therefore read: "he did not . . . . it (i.e., my heart) upon it (i.e., its 'It is good')."

Lines 152-54.-The uncertainty in regard to the meanings of sag-$\mathrm{ki}-\mathrm{a}$ (l. 152) and e-ne-èm-KA-kés-da-bi (l. 153) makes a fuller translation of these two lines inadvisable. For the -GÁL- of ba-da-GÁLla (l. 152) cf. comment on l. 133. In ba-an-da-dúr-ru-ne-ešà $m$ (l. 153) the reading of the sign Ne as $n e$, which at least on the surface

[^18]seems unquestionably correct, presents some difficulty, for the syllable ne resulting from the combination of the final $n$ of a verbal root with the initial $e$ of a following grammatical particle is regularly written with the sign NI. ${ }^{765}$

In l. 154 úr hé-im-ma-BU-BU, to judge from the context, may describe some gesture of supplication, such as falling on the knees.

Lines 155-61.-Cf. 11. 145-51.
Lines 165-67.-For another example of Nig-ka (l. 165) see 1. 344. If the translation of ll. 166 f . should prove correct, the complexes me-e and $u r i^{k i}-\mathrm{mu}$ are related dimensionally to the verbal form, while béen-ga is the direct object of the latter. A more literal translation would therefore read perhaps: "At me . . . they directed grief; at my Ur . . . . they directed grief."

Lines 168-69.-In $\mathrm{nu}-\mathrm{ku} \mathrm{r}-\mathrm{ru}-\mathrm{dam}$ (variant -da) and nu -bal-e-dè (variant -dam) ${ }^{766}$ we may have the form lal-ed-am which frequently takes the place of the finite future; cf. GSG § 689.

Line 171.-As the variant readings in H indicate, the final - a of the two verbal forms stands for the enclitic -à $m$. The exact force of the latter in this case is not clear.

Line 179.-For the reading, meaning, and grammatical analysis of se-$a-a n-s a_{4}$ cf. Poebel in $Z A$ XXXVII (1928) 268 f . The refrain is frequently omitted in this and the following $k i-s ̌ u b-g u$. Usually, though by no means in all cases, this seems to be due to lack of space. ${ }^{767}$

Lines 184-91.-Just what is involved in the insertion of KU between aand -mah (1. 184) in the variants (cf. n . 200) is obscure. Perhaps KU is to be read $k u$ and $a-k u$ may therefore be another writing for $a-g a$ and a-mi-a ( $=a g \hat{u}$ ); cf. also perhaps $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{a}}-\mathrm{KU}$.

For comment on the compound $\mathrm{ur}-\mathrm{k}$ ú (l. 185) see $A S$ No. 10, p. 40. For the construction of the complex Ne-mr-e din-na(l. 188) cf. n. 724.


For an-ne ${ }^{768}-\mathrm{GAAN}$ (l. 190) (opposite $\mathrm{g} \mathrm{i}_{6}-\mathrm{u}-\mathrm{n}$ a) cf. $S R T$, No. 1 iv 1, No. 6 iii 26, and No. 7 obv. 37 (duplicate of preceding). Cf. also VAS X, No. 200:3, where an-ne-GÁN is used as the opposite of gi. $\mathrm{i}_{6}{ }^{769}$
${ }^{765}$ Cf. $A S$ No. 8, p. $5 . \quad{ }^{765}$ Cf. n. 725.
${ }^{767}$ Thus in lines such as 184-85 lack of space was undoubtedly the guiding motive. In lines such as 197-200, however, there seems to be sufficient space for the refrain, which is omitted nevertheless.
${ }^{768}$ For the reading of the first two signs cf. the hitherto unintelligible e-ne-gán (Gudea Cyl. xi 27) used opposite $g \mathrm{i}_{6}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{na}$ (cf. also $\mathrm{gi}_{6}-\mathrm{an} \mathrm{n}-\mathrm{na}$, ibid. xviii 8), a dialectal variant of $\mathrm{g} \mathrm{i}_{6}-\mathrm{u}-\mathrm{n}$ a of the preceding sentence.
${ }^{709}$ In this passage, if the complex is actually to be read $g i_{6}-a n-n e-q A ́ N-b$ a with the meaning "during day and night," the sign GÁN should represent a word ending in $b$.

Is mul in l .191 to be treated as a determinative, and should the translation of mulu s a $n_{x}-\mathrm{gim}$ read "like twilight"?

Line 192.-For $\mathrm{ka-zal}$ cf. also comment on l. 274. For the reading $1 u_{6}$ for GÀL in the combination lú Gìl $^{\text {lu }}$ cf. Falkenstein in OLZ XXXVI (1933) 302 f .; it seems not unlikely therefore that the word for "South Wind" too should be read $\mathrm{l} \mathrm{u}_{6}^{\text {lu }}$.

Lines 195-96.-For the gis - b ur-ra as an instrument used in the hunting of gazelles see 1.220. For the translation of i-bal-e cf. 1. 245. For $\mathbf{u r}$ - k ú cf. comment on l. 185.

Lines 201-2.-In 1. 201 the addition of -e s to the first complex (cf. n. 218a) seems inexplicable; note too that the variant -e for -ess (cf. n. $218 b)$ is not usual. In l. 202 the reading and meaning of the sign Ne in the first two complexes offers too many possibilities for a reasonably safe translation. As the $u r{ }^{1 k i}-\mathrm{ma}$ of l .204 indicates, the object of the verb dul , katâmu, "to cover," is expressed as a locative (not accusative) in the Sumerian idiom. The $b a-e$ of $b a-e-d u l$ and $b a-e-b u r$ is merely a variant for $\mathrm{ba}-{ }^{770}$

Lines 208-10.-The translation assumes that the root represented by the sign gar in ba-da-gar is actually kar; cf. the variant -kar for -gar in l. 210 and especially the two-line variant in Aa for 1. 210, where
 gi-da ba-da-an-kar.

Line 211.-Even if the meaning ascribed to each complex by the translation should prove correct, which is not very likely, the meaning of the line as a whole remains ambiguous. Note too that, if the $-\mathrm{b} a \operatorname{of} \mathrm{bar}-\mathrm{b}$ a represents grammatically $b(i-) a$, the complex is related dimensionally to the verbal form and is not, as the English rendering may suggest, a direct object.

Line 212.-If the translation of $\mathrm{gu} \mathrm{gi} \mathrm{r}-\mathrm{gar}$ as "to lie prostrate" should prove correct, what is the grammatical analysis of this compound?

Lines 214-16.-If the translation of 1.214 is correct, the -ma-following -ezem- seems unnecessary. ${ }^{770 a}$ The complexes sag-bal-e (!?)eš ba-ab-gar (l.214) parallel zar-ri-ešbí-in-du (1.216) in meaning, although the particular meaning intended for the root $d u_{8}$ in this combination must remain uncertain. ${ }^{771}$ In 1.216 the reading e šemen is ascribed to the signs e.ne.di (not ki.e.ne.di), for, in spite of the fact that
${ }^{770}$ Cf. $A S$ No. 10, p. 56, n. 117.
${ }^{770 a}$ Note too the variant -gim- (so actually on original), which seems quite inexplicable.
${ }^{771}$ For another example of $\mathrm{zarrex}-\mathrm{d} \mathrm{u}_{8}$ see VASII, No. 12 v 6.

BM syllabary 82-8-16, 1 gives the reading ešemen for Ki.E.Ne.di, evidence from such texts as VAS II, No. 79 (cf. its bilingual duplicate S $526^{772}$ ), ll. 20 f., seems to point to the conclusion that the signs e.ne.dI alone (i.e., without a preceding KI) are to be read ešemen. $\mathrm{m}^{773}$

Line 220.-For the gišburra-weapon see also l. 195.
Lines 221-22.-The translation "spear" rather than "long bow" seems more suitable to the context. For another instance where ${ }^{\text {tag }_{\text {gig-LÁ }} \text { is found in con- }}$ nection with ${ }^{\text {gisg }} \mathrm{g} \mathrm{d}-\mathrm{d}$ a see $S R T$, No. 1 ii 21 and 23 . For $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{gi} \mathrm{i}_{4}-\mathrm{in}-\mathrm{zu}$ (l. 222) see also l. 308. The word baristum is an Akkadian loan word usually translated as "woman in labor." In our case, however, if the reading and translation of the line should prove correct, the meaning "labor" seems more suitable.

Lines 225-26.-Instead of $\mathrm{u}_{4}$ one might have expected $\mathrm{u}_{4}-\mathrm{d}$ è (grammatically ud-e) in l. 226, since it seems to parallel the second sis̆t ukul-e of 1.225 .

Line 230.-The reading of šu. kalag when equated with Akkadian kirimmu is given in the syllabaries as LI- $\mathrm{r} u$; whether the transliteration šu-$\mathrm{kalag}-\mathrm{kalag}-\mathrm{ga}-\mathrm{b} \mathrm{i}^{774}$ is correct, therefore, must remain uncertain. What, moreover, is the reading and meaning of sudralag in the compound šu. Kalag- $\mathrm{du}_{8}$, "to pry open"?

Lines 231-32.-Although an analysis of the meaning and construction of the component parts of the compound sUG-gi4-kú is as yet impossible, its meaning "to dissipate" is relatively certain. For in the parallel passage PBSX2, No. 5 rev. 8: dím-ma $\mathrm{a}^{775}-\mathrm{ni}$ bé-sùh galga-a-ni hé-bir-ri, "May his judgment be confounded; may his counsel be dissipated," as well as in ll. 278-79 of our text, the compound sug-gi4 -k ú parallels the root bir. ${ }^{775}$

Line 233.-If the translation is correct, dumu-na is an anticipatory genitive. Note that the postposition - ta might have been expected after igi-ni; cf. comment on ll. 237 f.
${ }^{772}$ Published in Samuel Alden Smith, Miscellaneous Assyrian Texts of the British Museum (Leipzig, 1887) Pl. 24.
${ }^{773}$ For another example of this phenomenon cf. in BM syllabary $82-8-16,1$ (ibid. Pls. 25-26) the reading izi with the meaning $i s$ stum for the signs $\mathrm{KI} . \mathrm{NE}$.

[^19]Line 236.-The final - a which the variant $A$ has at the end of the verbal form seems to be unjustified.

Lines 237-98.-If the translation of the verbal form is correct, one might have expected $-\mathrm{ni}-\mathrm{ta}$ instead of -na in the complex $u r u-n a ;$ cf. also comment on 1. 233. Note too that the postposition -e in $d_{n} n_{n}$ -gal-e (l. 238) seems quite unjustified, since Ningal is the subject of an intransitive verbal form. The sign mm of the variant -rm-te-a- (for -dal-la-; cf. n. 283) is usually read ni. Note, however, the variant me-da (CT XV, Pl. 25:7 = K 41 [Society of Biblical Archaeology, Proceedings XVII (1895) Pls. I-II] obv. ii $10=B L$, No. 71:30), which seems to represent (i) mit (e-) a .

Line 240.-As a collation of the original of K shows, the first sign is actually PISAN+SAL (not, as might perhaps have been expected, PISAN + ERIN).

Lines 242-44.-The complex é-zi-ba (l. 243) is an anticipatory genitive taken up again by the -bi of ur-bi; the preceding appositional complex é-kiš-šir $r_{5}-\mathrm{g}$ al-la seems also to be an anticipatory genitive. Indeed it is not impossible that even in the first appositional clause, bur -sag-sukud-du-šu-nu-te-gáe, the final -e actually represents the genitive -a $(k) .{ }^{776}$

For $\mathbf{u r - k}$ ú cf. comment on 1. 185.
Instead of the -ma of $1 \hat{u}-\mathrm{k}_{6}-1 \mathrm{am}-\mathrm{ma}$ (1. 244) one might have expected -e or -me , since the complex is the subject of a transitive verbal form.

For $u$ šù -gín-ag (literally perhaps: "to make thirty shekels [of somethingl," with a meaning approximating "to hold in light esteem," "to treat with contempt") cf. $A S$ No. 10, pp. 59 f.

Lines 247-48.-The sign AŠ at the end of each of the four clauses that constitute these two lines should, if the reading is a š, represent the contracted form of the postposition -š è . At least on the surface, however, a translation such as "to" or "for" seems out of place here.

Line 249.-For the Lú of $\mathrm{L} \tilde{U}_{-} \mathrm{nu} \mathrm{u}-\mathrm{nuz}-\mathrm{m}$ èn cf. comment on l. 90. For ù - . . . ù - cf. GSG § 411.

Lines 254-56.-The exact logical connection between l. 255 and the passage following is not quite clear. In l. 256 note that one might perhaps have expected a word such as anir, parallel to the ir of l. 255; a-nir-ès -uríki-hul-a-na would then correspond to the ir-e-bul-a-na of the preceding line.

[^20]Lines 259-60,-For the translation of $-\mathrm{di}-\mathrm{m}$ à as "who comes" cf. ll. 276 f ., where it is found as a variant of -DU- ni.

Lines 265-66.-For the reading of -Gm, in these two lines as well as in Il. 272, 274-75, 299, 305, and 320, cf. n. 746a. ${ }^{777}$

Line 267.-For mulu =utullu cf. e.g. A. T. Clay, Babylonian Records in the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan, Part IV (New York, 1923) No. 9:46.

Line 271.-For mu-un-gar (variant mu-un-kàr) as the emeSal form of engar cf. Thureau-Dangin in $R A$ XXXIII (1936) 111. For another mu-un-kàr (variant mu-un-ga), the eme-sal form of n íg-ga(r), ${ }^{777 a}$ cf. ll. 275 ff .

Line 272.-The ri of gisal-e-ri- seems to be the same root as the ra of ha-ba-ra in 1. 258.

Line 274.-To judge from the fact that $\mathrm{ka}-\mathrm{z}$ al here seems to parallel $k$ as, it may be the name of a plant or plant product utilized perhaps for its exhilarating effect. ${ }^{778}$

Lines 275-82.-For mu-un-g a cf. comment on 1. 271. In 1l. 275-81 and 287 note the writing L $G$ in A (cf. n. 367) instead of the expected mulu and similarly in 1.277 the writing igr in A for the expected ibi (so written in $\mathrm{E}, \mathrm{H}$, and N ); for the problems involved cf. nn. 777 and 694. For the compound sug-gi $\mathrm{i}_{4}$ - k ú (1.279) cf. comment on ll. 231-32.

Lines 283-85.-Is $\mathrm{gi}_{4}$-in (ll. 283 f .) the reading (at least in emesal) for the ideogram dumu.sal? For me-li-e-a (1. 284) cf. ThureauDangin in RA XXXIII 109. In the numerous instances in our text where this word is found, a meaning such as "woe is me" seems to fit the context. Note that, if the translation of 1.284 is correct, one might have expected a plural instead of a singular verbal form. In 1.285 is $g \mathrm{i}_{4}$ the same word as $\mathrm{gi}_{4}$-in (ll. 283 f .)?

Lines 286-87.-For the restoration of these two lines cf. the variants of 11. 302 f . The line which M and N substitute for ll . 285-87 presents too many difficulties in reading and meaning for a reasonably adequate attempt at translation. It may be worth noting, however, that there is some possibility that Bu (to be read s ùs) - $\mathbf{a g}$ is to be equated with the Akkadian $p u s{ }_{\mathrm{s}}$ šûư̌u.

Lines 288-93.-If the translation "into ruins" for Ub-łAR- ra (ll. 288 and
${ }^{777}$ Ll. 257-327, which contain the direct speech of Ningal, are written in the emesal dialect.
${ }^{777 a}$ Note that the Akkadian makkuru is derived from the eme-sal form of the Sumerian word.
${ }^{778}$ Cf. also $P B S$ X 4, No. 10 rev. i 11, where the same problem arises.
290) should prove correct, perhaps the reading of the complex is ár-àrra. In $\mathrm{ba} \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{ra}-\mathrm{d} \mathrm{u}-\mathrm{d} \mathbf{u}-\mathrm{a}$ (ll. 289 and 291) the infix -ra-, "out," "away," etc., recapitulates the -ta of urú-mu-ta and é$\mathrm{m} u-\mathrm{ta}$. The translation assumes that the reduplication of the root indicates the plurality of the subject. Cf. 11. 295 and 302, where, under what seem to be quite parallel circumstances, the unreduplicated root is used. For $\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{ug}_{5}(!?)-\mathrm{ga}-\mathrm{e}$ s of l . 293 the variant in N may read [ba-bir-bir]-ri; cf. l. 250.

Lines 295-96.-If the reading of the last sign in ba-ra-d ù-ù-dè and $\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{ra}-\mathrm{ma}-\mathrm{ma}-\mathrm{d}$ è and the translation of these two verbal forms should prove correct, they are to be analyzed as third singular present-future passives. ${ }^{779}$ It is not impossible, of course, that the final sign of each is to be read ne (instead of $d$ è) ; the resulting $b a-r a-d u ̀-u-n e ~ a n d ~$ $b a-r a-m a-m a-n e$ would of course represent third plural presentfuture active forms. What, however, would be the subject in that case?

In the second half of each of the lines $I$ and $M$ seem to have é where urú is expected and urú where é is expected. Just what is involved in these variant readings is not clear.

Lines 297-301.-For the possibility that the root bad should be more accurately transcribed as badw cf. n. 711. Note that the translation of the first parts of $11.297-98$ is based on a rather synthetic analysis which is far from satisfactory; especially far from reassuring is the translation "from its (Ur's?) place" for $\mathrm{ki}-\mathrm{bi}-\mathrm{ta}$. The -bi of $-\mathrm{bad}-\mathrm{du} \mathrm{u}-\mathrm{bi}$ of 1.298 seems to refer to the "house"; does the - bi of the same complex in the preceding line refer to the "house" or to Ur? As for the relationship between the first halves of $11.297-98$ (the second halves are merely refrains) and ll. 299-301, it seems best to assume that, while the former are treated asindependent complexes in Sumerian, they are best rendered in English as circumstantial subordinate clauses followed by the main and co-ordinate clauses in ll. 299-301. Thus, if all these assumptions prove correct, the sense of the passage freely rendered would be: When Ur and its "house" were moved from Sumer (since the people were forced into exile) the . . . . (identity of the individual obscure) tore his hair, struck his chest, and wept bitterly.

For the writing IGI in 1.301 instead of the expected $i-b i$ cf. comment on l. 277. If, as is not unlikely, the writing-zi-i- in mi-ni-ib-zi-$\mathrm{zi}-\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{zi}$ is merely a variant form for zi , we have here what seems to be another example of the tripling of the root. ${ }^{780}$
${ }^{779}$ I.e., in accordance with post-Sumerian system Aa; cf. Poebel in $A J S L$ L (1934) 170.
${ }^{780}$ Cf. comment on 1. 131.

Lines 802-8.-Cf. comment on 11. 295 f.
Lines 308-10.-Just what is intended by the variants uru-1u-lu ${ }_{6}{ }^{781}$ ka and uru-lú-ka, "in the city of man" (for urú-kur-ra; cf. n. 444), is obscure. For the translation of é-ur $r_{5}-r a$ as "curses," a translation merely guessed at from the context, cf. perhaps the following passage with its variant é-ùr-ra:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ki-il-ki-NE-ent-éama-ugu-mà-ka é-ùrtra-bi-me-en } \\
& \text { "I, the hierodule-in my city I am an enemy, in my streets I am a stranger; } \\
& \text { The place of creation, the house of my mother, the begetter-I am its accursed." }{ }^{782}
\end{aligned}
$$

Lines 311-14.-Just exactly what is intended by $\mathrm{ki}-\mathrm{ba}$ (1. 311) is not clear. Instead of $\mathrm{n} \mathrm{a} \mathrm{m}-$ (ll. 311-14) and NIN (ll. 312 and 316) one might have expected the eme-sal forms na -ám- (cf. ll. 315f.) and g ašan; for the problem involved cf. nn. 777 and 694.

Lines 315-16. -If the complexes na-ám-urúmu and na-ámé -mu have been correctly translated, the last syllable might have been expected to read mà ( $<\mathrm{m}\left(\mathrm{u}_{-}\right) \mathrm{a}(\mathrm{k})$ ) instead of mu .

Lines 317-20.-In 1. 318 -ba-mar-ri-na-represents grammatically $b a-m a r-e n-a$, i.e., the relative form of the second person singular permansive of the passive, and its more literal translation reads: "thou which hast been made (into ruins)."

For the infix -e-d è - (l. 319), "alongside of thee," cf. $A S$ No. 10, pp. 20-22.

Line 321.-Cf. the contents of 1. 126.
Lines 322-27.-If the translation "attacked and destroyed" for $b a-$ gul-in-ga-ba-bul-a-(l. 325) is correct, we have here another case of "inverted" word order in Sumerian. ${ }^{783}$

For other examples of the word a dal (a m) (l. 326) see SEM, No. 73:4, and PBS X 4, No. 3 ii 32; in the latter case it is the object of $\mathrm{dug}_{4}$, "to speak. ${ }^{\text {, }} 84$ Perhaps it refers to some favorable divine command, directed in

[^21]our case against the evil wind. For the dative infix - (e) - ri (instead of - (e) - r a) cf. Kramer in RA XXXIV (1937) 122.

Lines 331-82.-The translation assumes that the first a-gim in each line ${ }^{785}$ is not to be equated in our case with the exclamatory $k \hat{\imath}$, "how," but that it is a complex consisting of a, "water," and gim, "like," ${ }^{88}$ also that the verbal form $d u ̀ m u$ (variants $d u ̀ m u-u n$ and $d u-a ̀ m)^{787}$ is an imperative. It must be admitted, however, that the figure of speech seems rather forced and that some other interpretation of the line is not impossible. ${ }^{788}$

In A note the unusual division of the grammatical i-til-e (n) into the syllables $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{til}$-en instead of the more usual $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{ti} \mathrm{l}$ len as well as the rather unusual writing of the syllable -til- with the sign Tr .

Line 339. ${ }^{789}$-The second sign in the adverb $\mathbf{i}$-NE- e $^{790}$ (Akkadian inanna) is to be read bi (not dè or ne) ; cf. the variants igi-és and i-NE-é š (PBS X 4, No. 1 ii 18, and STVC, No. 66 i 16).

To judge from the fact that i-e-àm-mú seems to be parallel to i-til-en of the preceding line, it may represent grammatically i-mú-(-e (n)), ${ }^{791}$ i.e., the second person singular permansive of the intransitive. As the doubling of the $m$ indicates, the stress was on the syllable preceding -m u, and the seemingly pleonastic $\overline{\mathrm{i}}-\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{a} \mathrm{m}$ for $\overline{\mathrm{i}}-\mathrm{m}$ may represent an attempt to approximate the actual pronunciation demanded by the rhythm of the line. ${ }^{792}$

Line 338.-The translation of the first half of this line is justified if, as
${ }^{785}$ Cf. also ll. 334, 336, 338, 346, and 348.
${ }^{780}$ Note that $S B H$, No. 83 rev . $19-20$, reads

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { šà-zu a-gim dù-.... } \\
& \text { lib-ka ki-ma me(!?)-e(! ?).... . }
\end{aligned}
$$

The traces in the copy, however, do not point to the restoration me-e. In SBH, No. 67 rev. 16 ff ., on the other hand, the $\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{gim}$ of $\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{gim} \mathrm{du}-\mathrm{mu}(?)$ is translated by $k i-i$.
${ }^{787} \mathrm{D}$ ù $-\mathrm{a} \mathrm{m}<\mathrm{d} \mathbf{u}-\mathrm{a} b<\mathrm{d}$ ù $-\mathrm{i} b$ ?
${ }^{788} \mathrm{Cf}$. for example the words $\check{s}$ à-zu $\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{gim} \mathrm{t}$ úm-mu-un, addressed by the gatekeeper of the nether world to Inanna, which seem to be best translated: "How has thy heart led thee (on the road to the nether world)?" See Kramer in RA XXXIV 104, 1. 83.
${ }^{789}$ Cf. also ll. 335, 337, 345, 347, and 349.
${ }^{790}$ The last sign may also be read -šè. In our case the reading -šè was chosen, since there are some strong indications that $\bar{i}-b i-s ̌ e ̀-g i m$ is actually a contraction
 Ke (!)-e-gim in E(n. 565).
${ }^{791}$ Note that in $A$ the variant reading ends in -un (<-en).
${ }^{792}$ For another example of seemingly pleonastic writing cf. Kramer in $R A$ XXXIV 117.
seems not unreasonable, it is parallel to the first half of the preceding line. Note, however, that, if the translation is correct, the infixes -di-niseem superfluous. ${ }^{793}$ It is not impossible that $N$, which omits the second é, has the preferable reading and that the translation should read: "Thy house has been given over to tears."

Line 389.-For a possible analysis of musen as a compound whose second component šen is a substantive corresponding to the eme-kU n in cf. Poebel in ZA XXXVIII (1929) 85 ff .

Line 343.-For the probability that ír-šà-ne-ša4 is a genitive construction (the loan word in Akkadian should therefore read iršanešakku) ef. Langdon in $R A$ XXXIII 195 f .

Line 344.-For another example of níg.ka cf. l. 165.
Line 346. -For another example of šà-Bu-g a ba-an-d ù cf. PBS X 4 , No. 6 rev. 40 , where the sign šì is probably to be restored. The translation of šà-BU-ga as "pasture" is suggested by the equation šà-sù-ga= mêrânu in SBH, No. 60 obv. 9-10.

Line 348.-For hi-li-a cf. Kramer in RA XXXIV 119. ${ }^{794}$
Line 350.-It is not impossible that the first two signs read uzùga, "in the shrine." As the postposition -e after šu-lub shows, the compound ki-ág takes not a direct object but one that is dimensionally related to it.

Line 352.-For šà-q a d-l'á see also SRT, No. 44 obv. ii 2.
Lines $355-57 .-F o r$ a $-\mathrm{HU}^{795}$ (1. 355) as part of the temple complex cf. $S B H$, No. 9 obv. 55 and No. 10 obv. 56. Note that the logical subject of $\mathrm{nu}-\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{ni}-\mathrm{in}-\mathrm{du} \mathrm{g}-\mathrm{es}$ and $\mathrm{nu}-\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{ra}-\mathrm{an}-\mathrm{tuku} \mathrm{u}$ š seems
 nar.balag- $\mathrm{a}^{796}$ to be explained?

Lines 859-60.-In $\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{da} \mathrm{a} \mathrm{a} \mathrm{n}-\mathrm{t} \mathrm{u}$ the translation assumes that $\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{e}$ - is merely a variant for $\mathrm{ba}{ }^{-797}$ and that in the meaning "to turn (something) into (something)" the root $\mathrm{t} u$ is preceded by the infix - ( $\mathrm{n}-$ )
${ }^{793}$ Has the scribe been confused by the usual expression 1 r-ri ba-an-di-ni-ib-gar (cf. 11.77, 125, and 135)?
${ }^{794}$ For the reading li of the sign min bi-LI-a cf. Thureau-Dangin, Rituels accadiens (Paris, 1921) p. 94, n. 3. In my "Inanna's Descent" study this note was unfortunately overlooked.
${ }^{795}$ Note, however, that E seems to have an entirely different reading.
796 That nar.balag denotes a certain kind of music or song rather than a musical instrument seems to be indicated by 11.359 f ., where it is parallel to $\mathrm{li}-\mathrm{du}$.
${ }^{797}$ Cf. $A S$ No. 10, p. 56, n. 117.
da; cf. comment on 11.374 f . In è $\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{tukum}-\mathrm{s}$ è -SAR, è $\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{S}$ è may be identical with the interrogative pronoun èn-šè, "till when."

Line 362.-If the compound $\mathrm{s} u-\mathrm{BU}$ is involved in $\mathrm{nu}-\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{ra}-$ su-bu-e the expected form would read šu nu-mu-ra-Bu-e.

Lines 365-66.-The general implication of these two lines, obviously enough, is that Ningal was not presented with her fish and bird offerings. The correctness of the grammatical analysis of the two lines assumed by the translation is of course by no means certain.

Lines 369-72.-For another example of NAM (if the reading proves correct) following Gim see l. 103.

If in 1.370 , as the translation assumes, Ur is the subject, it might have been expected to read urim${ }^{k i}-e$. As for the verbal form, it is not unlikely that the root $k$ in belongs to that class of verbs which forms the present-future by reduplication of the root and dropping of the final consonant if the root ended in one; -KIN-KIN is therefore probably to be read $-\mathrm{ki}-\mathrm{ki}$.

In 1. 371 the translation "to stretch" for the root ša is merely a guess based on the context.

Lines 373-75.-In 1. 373 one might have expected the substantivizing particle -a- before -me-en in $b a-r a-e ̀-m e-e n$. In $b a-e-d a-$ $\mathrm{gub} \mathrm{b}^{798}$ (1. 374) and $\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{da} \mathrm{s}$ - $\mathrm{a}^{(1.375)}$ the translation, which is by no means certain, assumes that $\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{e}$ - is merely a variant writing for ba-; i.e., it does not treat - e-da-as a dimensional infix with some such meaning as "against thee" or "from thee." Note too that, if the translation "wilt thou stand aside" is correct, $\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{da}-\mathrm{gub}$ is a present-future, and grammatically the last two syllables might therefore have been expected to read $-\mathrm{gub}-\mathrm{e}(\mathrm{n}),{ }^{799}$ which would usually be written as $-\mathrm{gub-bi}-$ en (or $-\mathrm{gub-bi}$ ) or $-\mathrm{gub-bu}-\mathrm{un}$ (or $-\mathrm{gub}-\mathrm{bu}$ )..$^{800}$

Lines $376-77$.-It is very strange that $A$ has $b e ́-m e-e n-n a ~ i n ~$ 1. 376 and $\mathrm{be}-\mathrm{me}-\mathrm{en}$ in 1. 377, while in N the reverse seems to be the case. Since the two lines seem to be quite parallel in construction and the substantivized form seems to be the more correct, the reading béme-en-na has been preferred in the transliteration.
${ }^{798}$ This reading was chosen as the preferable one because it seems to be parallel with $b a-e-d a-s a$ of the line following. A, on the other hand, reads $b a-g u b-b i-m e-$ en, "(How long) wilt thou be one who stands aside?" Is the $i$ (really $e$; cf. AS No. 8, pp. 3 f .) of $-\mathrm{bi}-\mathrm{a}$ variant of the expected substantivizing -a-?
${ }^{799}$ I.e., according to post-Sumerian system A; cf. Poebel in $A J S L$ L 170.
800 Is it possible that qub has here the value gubu ? The problem does not arise in the case of $b a-e-d a-s a$, since the root there ends in a vowel and -sa may represent grammatically -sa(-e(n)).

Lines 378-84.-Lines 378-80 seem to be without predicate. Is one perhaps to understand an exclamatory word or phrase such as "Back!" or "Return!" with each of the six parallel phrases that constitute the three lines? Or are the verbal forms in 11.381 f . to be brought into some relationship with each of the six phrases, despite the fact that on the surface at least this does not seem readily feasible?

In ll. 383 f ., if the translation "may he return" for $\mathrm{ba}-\mathrm{ra}-\mathrm{ab}-\mathrm{gi} \mathrm{i}_{4}$ $\mathrm{g} \mathrm{i}_{4}$ proves correct, Enlil is the subject (not Anu and Enlil). ${ }^{800 a}$

Lines $388-414$.-In l. 388 the meaning "alas" for e (?) is a guess only. For $\mathrm{ur}-\mathrm{a}=$ mithariš cf. $S B H$, No. $71 \mathrm{obv} .16-17$, and note that the duplicate $B E$ XXIX, No. 2:19, has the variant ur-bi.

As n. 650 indicates, the translation assumes that the sign transliterated as RI (ll. 390 ff .) is actually a "ditto" or "repetition" sign, i.e., a sign which indicates that some preceding line or phrase which has more or less the character of a refrain is to be inserted in the position indicated; cf. e.g. the "ditto" sign in AO $4331+4335$ (G. Cros, Mission française de Chaldée. Nouvelles fouilles de Tello [Paris, 1910-14] p. 206). ${ }^{801}$

In 1. 390, if the translation is correct, the verbal form might have been expected to begin with the thematic particle im-mi- or bi- instead of ba-; cf. 1. 406. The postposition -e at the end of each complex in ll. $391-92$ is the subject element. In I. 398 the word division is very uncertain.

A more literal translation of the eight parallel complexes that constitute 11. 400-403 would read "the mother-not-knowing storm, the father-notknowing storm," etc. For the reading of the sign sal+пu (1. 402) as nin $n_{x}$ (i.e., the same pronunciation as that for the sign $S A L+T$ ÚG, "queen") cf. the variants dumu-ni-na-ka (VASII, No. 94:16) and dumu-sal+ $\mathrm{KU}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{k}$ a (ibid. No. 95:16). That the sign in the last quotation is really sal+ku, "sister," and not sal+túg is proved by the line that follows, which reads dumu-si-sa-ka in No. 94 and dumu-šes-a-ka in No. 95. For $\mathrm{Im}-\mathrm{s}$ ub-ba (1. 404), which seems to be a complex whose second

[^22]part is a passive participle, cf. 1. 144.802 In 1. 406 the exact meaning and force of the passive participle $-\mathrm{du} \mathrm{g}_{4}-\mathrm{g}$ a, which seems to be used pleonastically in $u_{4}-\mathrm{bul-gig}-\mathrm{dug}_{4}-\mathrm{ga}$, is still uncertain. In l. 408, if the translation is correct, one might have expected the postposition -še following $\mathrm{igi-zu}$. There is the possibility, of course, that the verb is to be taken as the compound $\mathrm{igi}-\mathrm{du} \mathrm{u}_{8}$; if so, however, the meaning of the line escapes me. In l. 410 should the translation read: ". . . . the living creatures of heaven and earth and the black-headed people"? For a thought similar to that expressed in 1.413 cf . Job 3:6.

Lines 416-20.-The translations of 11. 416 and 418 are quite doubtful. In addition to the fact that the reading of several of the signs is uncertain, there may be at least some possibility that $u_{4}$ - ul has a meaning such as "the attacking storm" and that $u_{4}-\mathrm{k}$ úr-ra has a meaning such as "inimical storm." Moreover, l. 416 seems to be without a predicate. Is it possible that the -šè (?) at the end of this line relates it dimensionally to ma-ra-an-túm of 1.420 in the same way that the - ta (?) at the end of 1. 418 seems to relate that line to this verbal form?

Line 423.-For some of the problems connected with the reading of the root written with the sign AG cf. comment on ll. 93 and 97 and n. 742.

Lines $427-35$.-Because of their broken state it is futile to attempt to reconstruct the interrelations of ll. 427-29. The - bi of ll. 429-31 and 433 is treated in the translation as the possessive pronoun referring to kalam of l. 427. In l. 435 the -za at the end of the complex ur $\mathfrak{u}-\ldots$ - z a is treated in the translation as a variant of -zu . The -e- of $\mathrm{mu}-\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{i}$ seems to be the accusative singular of the second person; cf. AS No. 10, p. 30.
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[^0]:    b The term "song," which attempts to translate the as yet inexplicable Sumerian complex $\mathbf{k i - s ̌ u b - g u ́ ( d ) , ~ i s ~ o b v i o u s l y ~ v a g u e ~ a n d ~ u n s a t i s f a c t o r y . ~ A t ~ p r e s e n t ~ n o t h i n g ~ m o r e ~}$ definite can be added, however, since we know practically nothing concerning the background of the recitation of the composition. Thus we have no idea of the occasion on which it was recited, although obviously the conclusion may not be unwarranted that it took place on a day set aside to mark the anniversary of the destruction of Ur. Moreover, we can make only more or less obvious guesses in answer to such questions as who did the reciting, who uttered the "antiphon," and whether the recitation, which was no doubt musically intoned, was accompanied by musical instruments.

    - Like the term "song" discussed in the preceding note, the term "antiphon," which attempts to translate the Sumerian complex $i z-g i_{4}$-GÁt, is, and for the present must remain, rather indefinite. An examination of the contents of the ten "antiphons" in our lamentation fails to reveal any uniform principle guiding their selection. In two instances (the second and third "antiphons") the "antiphon" merely repeats verbatim, or with very slight modification, one of the more effective lines in the preceding song. In four instances (the fourth, fifth, seventh, and eighth "antiphons") it contains a statement which, in a sense, might be said to sum up the situation as described in the preceding song. In two cases (the first and sixth "antiphons") it expands an important statement in the preceding song. In the case of the ninth and tenth "antiphons" the meaning is too doubtful to warrant any analysis.

[^1]:    ${ }^{d}$ In addition to the use of parallelism in all its manifold modifications for obtaining its poetic effects, the lamentation utilizes the following two varieties of repetition:

    1. Complete and continued repetition of a phrase, which as far as the effect is concerned may well be compared to the continuous and monotonous beating of a drum. Cf. for example the phrases "his (or her) sheepfold has been delivered to the wind," repeated thirty-five consecutive times in the first "song"; "a bitter lament set up as thy lament," repeated fifteen times in the second "song"; and "the people groan," repeated at least twenty-six times in the fifth and sixth "songs."
    2. The couplet typical of all Sumerian poetry, in which the second line repeats word for word the contents of the first line except that it actually names the person, deity, place, etc. (usually the subject, though not always) that the first line has merely hinted at by the use of a pronoun or some descriptive complex.
[^2]:    It is not altogether impossible, though it seems quite improbable, that the word "storm" is used figuratively and refers to the destruction of Ur by the Sutians and the Elamites (cf. 1. 244). It is to be noted, however, that of the thirty-two lines in this "song" only two (ll. 195 f.) seem to refer to destructive forces other than the elements.

    * For the refrain "the people groan," which echoes all through the fifth and sixth "songs," cf. note $d$ and comment on 1. 173.

[^3]:    ${ }^{\mathrm{h}}$ The lament seems to be in the form of a soliloquy; at least no mention is made of any deity to whom it may have been directed.

[^4]:    ${ }^{\text {i Perhaps " }}$ "nough!" (i.e., of suffering and punishment).
    ${ }^{j}$ Also Nippur and Isin according to the variants.
    k The contents of the two "songs" seem to present an organic whole, and at least on the surface there seems to be little reason for the division into two.

[^5]:    ${ }^{\circ}$ Cf. $A S$ No. 8, pp. 3 ff.

[^6]:    $p$ Note also the varied writings $n a m$ and $n a-a m$ in the eme-sal lines 311-16.
    4 Similarly the postposition -GIM is written in small capitals in the eme-sal passages (ll. 67-68, 103, 123, etc.), since it is uncertain whether it should be read - dimor-gim.
    $r$ Whether the time element enters here must at present remain uncertain. It is to be noted, however, that even in the same tablet the orthography is not always consistent; cf. for example the inconsistent writings é-bi and é-ba (see comment on l. 19), an-e and an-ni (A 150 and 168).

    - By far the most important work in this field has been accomplished by Poebel, whose conclusions are to be found in various sections of his GSG and in his study "The tenses of the intransitive verb in Sumerian," $A J S L$ L (1934) 143-70. Several of the orthographic and phonetic principles prevalent at this period have been examined and clarified by the present writer in $A S$ Nos. 8 and 10.
    ${ }^{t}$ The classification of the variants as orthographic, phonetic, and grammatical is based on a more or less obvious analysis of the variations involved. A more profound insight into the problem and its intricacies may reveal that some of the orthographic variants actually belong to the phonetic group, or that some of the phonetic variants actually involve grammatical differences, or that certain of the grammatical variants would be better classed as phonetic.
    u The numbers in parentheses refer to the notes.

[^7]:    $\checkmark$ In the case of the variant URU for und there is always the possibility that the former is miscopied for the latter or is the result of an unintentional seribal lapse.
    w Cf. perhaps also maš.nitay and mašda (249).
    = More correctly transliterated as -re-; cf. p. 7.

[^8]:    ${ }^{a b}$ Unless the reading of the verbal form is $g a-a-a n-d u g_{4}$, in which case we have another example of "full" and "simple" writing of a vowel.

[^9]:    ${ }^{18 a}$ So Aa. Does A read ${ }^{d} \mathrm{ma}$ (!) $-\mathrm{s} \mathrm{i}-$ si (!)-ib(!)? Note that in $C$ too the traces do not point to bi as the last sign of the complex. In D, however, what precedes e-bi is not the sign ni but the end of the sign BI.

    ```
    \({ }^{19}\) So Aa and C; A: -ba.
    \({ }^{20} \mathrm{C}\) and D: ki-lagasaki-a; Aa:
    \(-\mathrm{k}_{4}\) (for - a ).
    \({ }^{21} \mathrm{C}\) omits entire refrain.
    ```

[^10]:    ${ }^{164}$ The signs resembling ra and gUr in H are miscopied for kéš.
    ${ }^{165} \mathrm{H}$ : ba-da-an-dúr-ru-NE-eša.
    ${ }^{106} \mathrm{H}:$ a (!) ; copy reads da.
    ${ }^{167} \mathrm{H}$ : -KA.
    ${ }^{168} \mathrm{H}$ : KV-NE; a miscopy for šà-ne${ }_{s} a_{4}$ may be involved.
    ${ }^{169} \mathrm{H}$ and I insert - im -.
    ${ }^{170} \mathrm{I}$ : - 1 i (for -e).
    ${ }^{171} \mathrm{Aa}$ and H : -ni (for -e).
    ${ }^{172}$ I: ba (!).
    ${ }^{173} \mathrm{H}$ and $\mathrm{I}:-\mathrm{u} \mathrm{n}$ - (for $-\mathrm{da}-$ ).
    ${ }^{174} \mathrm{D}$ and $\mathrm{H}:-\mathrm{bi}$ (for -ba).
    ${ }^{175} \mathrm{D}$ and H : ba-ra-bi-in-sedx (i.e., muslan.di).
    ${ }^{178} \mathrm{Aa}$ and H : - dè .

[^11]:    ${ }^{233}$ So Aa and L. In A there seems to be an erasure between -bi and sika-.

    $$
    { }^{234} \mathrm{~J}:-\mathrm{b} i(!)
    $$

    $$
    { }^{235} \mathrm{~L}: \operatorname{gir}(!)
    $$

    $$
    { }^{236} \mathrm{~L} \text { inserts -an-before }-\mathrm{gar}-\mathrm{Aa}:
    $$

    $$
    m i-n i-i n-(\text { for } i m-m a-)
    $$

    $$
    { }^{236 a} \mathrm{~J}: \text { é - (for } \mathrm{k} \text { á). }
    $$

    ${ }^{237}$ So Aa. A and L: a im-ma-anBAD (for im-mi-in-gar-gar). Note that in $A$ a and $J$ the positions of this and the preceding line are interchanged.
    ${ }^{238}$ More literally: "where the promenading took place."

[^12]:    ${ }^{396 \mathrm{~b}} \mathrm{~N}$ probably omits this and the following line.
    ${ }^{397}$ I.e., "I, Ningal, whose . . . ."; the complex ga-sa-an-gal-mèn of the following line is to be supplied.

    397a A: "city."
    ${ }^{397 b}$ The original of $M$, the only text preserved at this point, actually has urú ; cf. comment on ll. 295 f .
    ${ }^{338} \mathrm{M}$ inserts -an-after -ra- and reads -à $m$ for -a.

[^13]:    ${ }^{655} \mathrm{~N}$ adds -à m .
    ${ }^{656}$ In Da the positions of 11.401 and 402 are interchanged.
    ${ }^{658} \mathrm{Da}$ : - n in- (for -ninx-).
    ${ }^{666} \mathrm{Da}$ adds $\mathrm{u}_{4}$ - before dumu-.
    ${ }^{\text {bs5c }} \mathrm{Da}$ has a variant line: $\mathrm{u}_{4}-[\mathrm{b} u \mathrm{l}]$ -

[^14]:    ${ }^{693}$ The reading mus for the signs mùs and mớs in the compound mur-túm is assured by the variant muš; cf. $P B S X 2$, No. 14 rev. 21 ( $=S T V C$, No. 72 obv .11 ); TRS I, No. 34 ii $44(!)$; SRT, No. $36: 35$; etc.

    694 The entire first $k i-s ̌ u b-g$ ú is written in the eme-sal dialect; cf. the writings umun (l.3), dmullil (l.4), gašan (ll. 7, 8, 10, 12, 16, 19, 31, 35), mulu (ll.9, 30, 34), urusibibi (ll. 17, 18), damanki (l.18), dmassiṣib(1.29) for the eme-ku en, ${ }^{d} e_{n l i l}, n i n, ~ l u ́, ~ e r i d u(g){ }^{k i}$, ${ }^{d} e n k i$, and ${ }^{d} g$ atumdug. Note, however, the writings Nin instead of gas an (ll. 5, 6, 11), dumu instead of tumu (ll. 24 and 33), and -gar instead of - mar in ba-ni-in-GAR (ll. 32 and 33). For the problem involved in these irregular writings cf. discussion on pp. 7 f .
    ${ }^{605}$ Cf. V R Pl. 11, col. a, 11. 14-15. Note that in 1.14 the duplicate has the correct variant Du in the eme-ku space and that in 1.15 the sign Nam of musinam-ba-an-NAM$m a$ in the $e m e-\kappa u$ space has to be read $d u(m)$, as for instance in the word nam- $q u$ of the Semitic space of 1.18 .

[^15]:    ${ }^{n 1}$ For similar possibilities, e.g., that the root transliterated as bad (Akkadian nis $\hat{\text { a }}$ ) should be more accurately transcribed as badw, see $G S G \S 474$ and $A S$ No. $10, \mathrm{pp} .31 \mathrm{f}$.
    ${ }^{712}$ It is not impossible, therefore, that the Sumerian word usually transliterated as $\mathrm{g} i \mathrm{~s}-\mathrm{bur}$ is actually to be read $\mathrm{iz}-\mathrm{ur}_{5}$, whence the Akkadian uşurtu.
    ${ }^{713}$ Cf. GSG § 127.
    ${ }^{14}$ Cf. n. 694.
    ${ }^{715}$ More correctly the last syllable should be read -re. The sign ar could be read either $r i$ or $r e$ at this period, although in the classical period it had the reading $r i$ only; cf . $A S$ No. 8, pp. 6 and 25.

[^16]:    718 It is to be noted that in numerous instances in our text, though by no means in all, the roots g ul and til are preceded by the infix - da-; cf. e.g. 11. 78, 108-9, 171, 250, and 261 with ll. 147-49. The problem involved must await a future investigation.
    ${ }^{719}$ For the problem involved in the pronunciation of the dentals in the postpositions usually transliterated as -da and -ta cf. p. 7.
    ${ }^{720}$ The infixed form of the verb is used consistently in this expression; cf. $11.125,135$, and 338.
    ${ }^{721}$ For the use of - da - with the root til cf. comment on 11. 65-68.
    ${ }^{722}$ Note that, although the complex is regularly written uri (= SEš. und $) \mathbf{k i}-\mathrm{ma}$ when followed by the vowel $a$ of a grammatical particle, when followed by the vowel $e$ of a grammatical particle, as in our case, the scribe chose the writing urim ( $=$ šišu.unu $)^{k i}$ - e rather than uriki-me.

[^17]:    ${ }^{723}$ The infix - d a may recapitulate the -ta which according to the sense might have been expected to follow -ba-an-da-til-la of l. 78; cf. comment on that line. A more literal translation of the verbal form may therefore be: "intensified because of him" (i.e., because of Nanna, whose land had perished).
    ${ }^{724}$ Note too that in 1.188 the complex ne-mi-edin-na, which parallels the a-nir$r$ a of 1.79 , can be taken as a locative complex only if it does not represent a genitive construction.
    ${ }^{725}$ Note the variant writings for the final vowel. A writes it as $e$ in k ús-ù-dè but as $a$ in $\mathrm{u}-\mathrm{nu} \mathrm{KU}-\mathrm{kU}-\mathrm{d}$ a, while C writes $a$ and F writes $e$ in both cases.
    ${ }^{726}$ For this reading of the root cf. comment on l. 37.
    ${ }^{727}$ Or does it refer to the individual uttering the $\mathrm{balag}-\mathrm{i} \mathrm{r}-\mathrm{ra}$ ?
    ${ }^{728}$ If so, however, the -a - between -ra- and -ba seems difficult to explain.
    ${ }^{729}$ The reading $u_{4}$ - of A seems preferable to $u_{4}-d a$ of $C$, since the final $a$ of $u_{4}$ da seems unjustified.

[^18]:    meaning of this line that led Chiera to describe it as "a fragment of an ancient story of the creation of the world, which has later been dedicated to the king ${ }^{d} \mathrm{Naram}^{2} \mathrm{~d} \operatorname{Sin}$ " (ibid. p. 12).
    ${ }^{760}$ Note, however, that at least in the eme-ku orthography one might have expected the resulting syllable $n e$ to be written with the sign Ni; cf. comment on 1. 153.
    ${ }^{761}$ Written with the sign bi, which is to be read be; cf. $A S$ No. 8, pp. 3 f .
    ${ }^{762}$ The subject of this plural verbal form is, of course, Anu and Enlil (cf. ll. 145 f.).
    ${ }^{763}$ Cf. also l. $404 . \quad{ }^{764}$ Cf. $A S$ No. 2, pp. 15 f., and $A S$ No. 8, p. 5.

[^19]:    ${ }^{774}$ The -bi is the collective form of the third person possessive pronoun and refers to $u \mathrm{mmeda}$.
    ${ }^{775}$ It is not impossible that dimma is the Akkadian têmu, just as galga (emesal malga ) is the Akkadian milku.
    ${ }^{775 \mathrm{~s}} \mathrm{Cf}$. also the comment on 1.133.

[^20]:    ${ }^{776}$ Note too that the variant ézi-d è for $6-z i-b a(c f . ~ n . ~ 291) ~ c a n ~ b e s t ~ b e ~ e x-~$ plained as representing the anticipatory genitive $\begin{gathered}\text { e-zid-a } \\ \text { (k) }\end{gathered}$.

[^21]:    ${ }^{781}$ For the reading $1 u_{6}$ for ${ }^{6}$ àl cf. comment on l. 192.
    ${ }^{782} \mathrm{CT}$ XV, Pl. 8, 11. 1-2 (=A) $=$ ibid. Pl. 24, 11. 9-10 $(=\mathrm{B})=$ VAS II, No. 25 viii 56-57 $(=\mathrm{C})=B L$, No. 177 rev. $7-8(=\mathrm{D})$. The passage presents some interesting variants: a B, C, and D omit entire phrase; ${ }^{\text {b }}$ B, C, and D: ur-ri- (for uri-) ; ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C}$, and D:
     $\mathrm{ki}-\mathrm{NE}-\mathrm{en}$ gives us the eme-sal rendering of the word represented by the ideogram
    
    ${ }^{783} \mathrm{Cf} . G S G \S 100$.
    ${ }^{78}$ What, if any, is the relationship between our word and the adalam which is a synonym of ibis (Akkadian inanna)?

[^22]:    ${ }^{800 a}$ The fact that $A$ (provenance unknown) mentions Ur alone in the restoration prayer, while $\mathbf{C}$ and N both from Nippur) add Nippur and Isin to Ur , again leads to the conclusion that A's provenance is Ur; cf. n. 716a.
    ${ }^{801}$ Cf. Poebel in ZA XXXVII 169 ff . Note that if this suggestion should prove correct it would solve the problem of the hitherto inexplicable -RI in such passages as VAS II, No. 12 i 1-5; ibid. No. 25 i 5-15, ii 48 ff., and iv 49 ff ; $S B H$, No. $14: 1,3,38$, 40 , and 42 ; $i 6 i d$. No. 82 rev. 2-6; 29615 ( $=C T$ XV, Pls. 7-8) ll. 6-12; perhaps, too, VAS II, No. 32 rev. 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, and 14; ibid. No. 33 (left column); 29623 (CT XV, Pls. 12-13) I. 24 (=IV R 28, No. 4 rev. 4-5); "Gilgamesh and the Buluppu-Tree" (reconstructed text in $A S$ No. 10, pp. 2 ff .) 1. 51 .

[^23]:    ${ }^{802}$ Note that the relationship between $u_{4}$ - and the complexes - $\mathrm{dam-rm-šub-ba}$ and $d u m u-i m-s ̌ u b-b a$, which the translation renders by the phrase "on account of," is not expressed in Sumerian; cf. GSG § 719.

