# ADDITIONAL MATERIAL TO «INANNA'S DESCENT TO THE NETHER WORLD * 

Par S. N. KRAMER

In a recent issue of this journal ${ }^{1}$ I published a study entitled Innana's Descent to the Nether World : The Sumerian Version of "Istar's Descent». It gave in transliterated form the text of the Sumerian myth dealing with Inanna's descent to the nether world as reconstructed from eight published Nippur tablets, together with a translation and commentary. Very briefly sketched, the contents of the myth run as follows :

Inanna had forsaken heaven and earth in order to descend to the nether world. Fearing an attempt at her life during her visit, she instructs Ninšubur, her messenger, to go to the Ekur in Nippur and plead with Enlil to «stand by » his mistress. If Enlil refuses, he is to go to the Ekišsirgal in Ur and present the same plea to Nanna. If Nanna refuses, he is to go to Eridu and plead before Enki. And the latter who «knows» the «food of life» and the «water of life» will surely «make his daughter to live ». Inanna then descends to the nether world, where, after her queenly robes and ornaments had been removed, she was attacked and (probably) crucified. Thereupon Ninšubur set out to make his rounds to the gods. Both Enlil and Nanna refuse their help. Enki, however, "stands by " Inanna and brings her back to life. Inanna then reascends to the earth, accompanied by the denizens of the nether world.

As the reader will recollect, the text broke off with Ninšubur's plea before Enki. When it began again, it described the very last steps in the process of Inanna's revival. The resulting lacuna was rather exasperating. The missing text contained not only Enki's answer to Ninšubur, but also the details of his plan for restoring Inanna to
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life. With the publication of Ni. 4200 and Ni. $2762^{1}$, at least part of this gap is filled, as follows :

When Enki heard what Inanna had done he was much distressed, and immediately set to work to bring her back to life. He fashioned the kurgarrû and kalaturru. To the former he entrusted the «food of life» and to the latter, the «water of life». He then gave them detailed instructions which they were to follow in the process of reviving Inanna. Unfortunately, because of a seriously damaged text, only the last step in the process is reasonably clear. The kurgarrû and the kalaturru are to sprinkle the food of life and the water of life upon Inanna, whereupon she will arise.

## Transliteration and Translation ${ }^{2}$

## 213. a-a- ${ }^{\mathrm{d}} \mathrm{en}-\mathrm{k}[\mathrm{i}]{ }^{\mathrm{d}}$ nin-šubur-ra-ke ${ }_{4}$ mu-un-na-ni-ib- $\mathrm{gi}_{4}$ - $\mathrm{gi}_{4}$ <br> Father Enk[i] unto Ninšubur answers :

冗14. dumu-mu a-[n]a bí-in-ag mà-e mu-un-kúš-ù
" Wh[a]t now has my daughter done! I am grieved,
915. "inanna-ke ${ }_{4}$ [a-na] bí-in-ag mà-e mu-un-kúš-ù
[What] now has Inanna done! I am grieved,
¿16. nin-kur-kur-r[a-ke ${ }_{4}$ ] a-na bí-in-ag mà-e mu-un-kúš-ù
What now has the queen [of] all the lands done! I am grieved,
217. nu-u ${ }_{8}$-gíg-[a]n-na-ke $4_{4}$ a-na bí-in-ag mà-e mu-un-kúš-ù What now has the hierodule of [he]aven done! I am grieved».


#### Abstract

1. Ni. 4200 (to be cited as $G$ ', cf. list of texts used in reconstructing the myth, ibid., p. 98) is a single column lablet with a fairly well preserved obverse and a poorly preserved reverse. Its first six lines duplicate 11. 207-212 of the reconstructed text. The contents of the remainder of the tablet, therefore, fill in part of the gap between 1. 212 and $l$. $x 1$ of the reconstructed text (cf. ibid., p. 112). Ni. 2762 (to be cited as $G^{\prime \prime}$ ) is a fragment consisting of the extreme right end of a single column tablet. On both its obverse and reverse, therefore it contains only the ends of lines. As the copy shows, moreover, even these ends are so poorly preserved that they are largely illegible. The importance of $G$ " lies primarily in the fact that it indicates that the number of lines broken between the last line of the obverse of $G^{\prime}$ and the first line of its reverse is three.

Both tablets belong to the Nippur "literary» collection of the Museum of the Ancient Orient of Istanbul. I copied them together with over one hundred and sixty additional numbers (mostly very fragmentary in character) during a prolonged stay in Istanbul made possible by the generosity of the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation. The Minister of Education of the Turkish Republic generously granted the permission for the work, and the volume of texts will appear as a publication under the auspices of the Museum of the Ancient Orient of Istanbul. While the contents are not sensational in character, they will prove invaluable for the gradual and patient piecing together of a large number of Sumerian literary compositions. For its help in making this material available to scholars, not only Sumerologists the world over, but all students of the ancient Near East will be ever grateful to the Republic of Turkey and to the Ministry of Education, its representative in this matter.


$\because$. For the line numeration, cf. RA XXXIV, p. 112.

```
218. ?-?-ni mu-sír ba-ra-an-DU kur-gar-ra ba-an-dim
................he brought forth dirt (and) fashioned the kurgarrù,
219. ?-dirig(?)-?-ma-na mu-sír ba-ra-an-DU ga[la-tur ba-an-dim] he brought forth dirt (and) [fashioned the]ka[laturru].
```

220. kur-gar-ra ú-nam-ti-la ba-an-

To the kurgarru he [entrusted] the food of life,
221. kala-tur-ra a-nam-ti-la ba-an-

To the kalaturru he [entrusted] the water of life.
2.22. [a-a]-den-ki kala-tur-kur-gar-ra gù mu-u[n-na-dé-e]
[Father] Enki sa[ys] to the kalaturru and the kurgarrû :
ٌ23. .......... an-ṣi-en GİR-kur-TÚG ná-ba-an-ṣ[i-en]
".......................... lay
224. .................................................... . [d]è̀-en-ṣi-e[n]

2ข5. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . $\left[\right.$ [e]nn-ṣi-en ${ }^{1}$.

227. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . - ra-àm ${ }^{2}$
228.
229.
230. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . - ni

Her

:3®. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . -ni
Her
233.
$[d u] g_{4}(?)-g a-n[a-a] b-s i_{i}-n^{4}$
Direct unto her

1. Here begins $\mathrm{G}^{\prime \prime}$.
2. Here ends the obverse of $G$ '.
3. Here probably begins the reverse of $G$ '.
4. In $G^{\prime \prime}$ the corresponding line seems to end in -e§.
```
234.
```





```
237.
    . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .)-ta[r](?)-r[i](?)-en-[s]i-en
238.
    . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .šub(?)-bi(?)-en-ṣi-en
    Sprinkle
239.
    . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . -ab-ṣi-en
240. a-a ........-[n]a(?) kug(?)-e-dè šu nam-ba-bu-i-en-ṣi-en
    Tp purify the ............., do not
241. a-?-tu(?) ......-na(?) kug-e-dè šu nam-ba-bu-i-en-ṣi-en
    Tp purify the ............., do not
242. uzu-níg-....[fi]ska[k]-ta-lá-a [n]i-me-[l]ám(!) dug4-ga-na-ab-și-en4
    Upon the flesh ...... fastened with nai[ls] direct for her the [fear]fulness of the
        me[l]ammû
243. DIŠ-àm ú-[n]am-ti-la DIŠ-àm a-nam-ti-la ugu-n[a š]ub-bu-dè-en-şi-en
    ....the food of [l]ife, .... the water of life, sprinkle upon he[r]
244. a[ina]nna ha-ba-gub
    Verily [Ina]nna shall arise.
```


## Commentary

$G^{\prime}$ obv. ll. 1-6. - As stated in note 2, these lines correspond to ll. 207-12 of the text of the myth as reconstructed in RA XXXIV p. 98 ff . The following points are to be noted: (1). In G' obv. 2 ( $=1.208$ of the r. t. ${ }^{5}$ ), the traces of the sign preceding -zu do not point to its restoration as MU (of the expected tu-mu-zu). Did the scribe write the eme-KU dumu instead of the expected eme-SAL tu-mu? (2). In G' obv. 4

[^1]
( $=1.210$ of the r. t.), the sign MA is omitted after ZADIM ; cf. correction to CSRT No. 53, note 19. (3). In G' obv. 5 ( $=1.211$ of the r. t.) the traces of the sign preceding NAGAR do not point to its restoration as NAM. Note the variant -dar-ri(for -dar-e). (4). As G' obv. 6 shows, the interrogation marks following KI and SIKIL in l. 2 P 2 (also in 11. 47, 56, 64, 185, and 199) of the r. t. are no longer necessary. Note the variant ga-ša-an-an-na(for ga-ša-an-na).

Line 213. - The sign $\mathrm{KE}_{4}$ following "nin-šubur-ra should have followed the subject complex a-a ${ }^{a}$ en-ki.

Lines 214-17. - The "now " of the translation attempts to render the circumstantial nuance intended by the prefix bí in bí-in-ag. The verbal form mu-un-kúš-ù is assumed to represent the grammatical mu-n-kuš-e $(n)^{1}$, i. e. the first person present passive ${ }^{2}$. For the meaning of the root kuš as "to grieve », « to trouble», cf. the parallel use of kúš-ù-dè and ù-nu-KU-KU-dè in the Lamentation over the Destruction of $\boldsymbol{U r}^{\boldsymbol{3}}$. In the same composition ${ }^{4}$, cf. also the passage :
a-še-ir-zu-gig-ga ga-ša-an-zu-mu-lu-ír-ri èn-šè mu-un-kúš-ù
Thy lament which is bitter, how long will it grieve thy weeping lord!
a-še-ir-zu-gig-ga dnanna-mu-lu-ír-ri èn-šè mu-un-kúš-ù
Thy lament which is bitter, how long will it grieve the weeping Nanna!
Lines 218-19. - Both the reading and meaning of the first complex in each of these lines are uncertain. In translating ba-ra-an-DU as « he brought forth », -rais assumed to be the infix of separation ${ }^{5}$. Kalaturru is assumed to be the Semitic equivalent of gala-tur despite the lack of syllabary corroboration.

Lines 220-1. - The -ra of gala-tur-ra is the dative postposition. In the parallel complex kur-gar-ra, the dative postposition is omitted because the complex ends in -ra.

Line 222. - Instead of a-a-den-ki, one would have expected a-a-den-ki-ke ${ }_{4}$ for the first complex, the subject element was erroneously omitted by the scribe. The kurgarrû follows the kalaturru in this line since he was created first and hence is the more important ${ }^{6}$. For the omission of the dative postposition -ra after kur-gar-ra, cf. comment to ll. 220-1.

Lines 223-39. -- As the plural imperative endings -an-ṣi-en, en-și-en, and -ṣi-en indicate, these lines contain Enki's instructions to the kurgarrû and kalaturru.

[^2]4. TRS 40, 11. 46-7, 63-4, 71-2.

־. C.f. GSG \$ 497.
f. For this idiomatic word order, cl. GSG $\$ 1: R$.

Note that I. 223 contains two commands. In 1.233 does the infix -na- refer to Inanna or Ereškigal? In l. 235, -dè- is probably a variant form of the infix -da-, cf. AS 10 , p. 58. For the preceding -e-, cf. perhaps ibid., p. 56. In l. 238, if the reading šub-bi-en-și-en is correct, it is the imperative counterpart of bi-in-šub-bu-uš1, " they sprinkled $n$.

Lines 240-1. - The meaning of these two lines which, except for the initial complexes, seem to read exactly alike, is quite obscure. Note that nam-ba-bu-i-en-si-en is the negated form of the optative used as a prohibitory command ${ }^{2}$.

Line 242. - This line contains the command whose execution is described in l. x5 of the r. t . The latter therefore can now be corrected to read :
[u]zu-nig. ... gisikak-ta-lá(!)-a ní-me-lám m[u(?)-na-ab-dug ${ }_{4}$-gi-eš]
Upon the flesh ......fastened with nails [they directed for her] the fearfulness of the melammu.

Line 243. - This line contains the command whose execution is described in 1 . x 6 of the r . t .; the second half of that line was therefore restored and read correctly by me at the time. Note that G' has the variant DIŠ-àm for DIŠ. Is it possible that it should be read gés-àm, and that the translation of the line should read : "Sixty times the food of life. sixty times the water of life they sprinkled upon her ?" Note that instead of šub-bu-dè-en-ṣi-en, one might have expected the form to read šub-bí-en-și-en. this being the imperative counterpart of the bí-in-šub-bu-uš of 1 . x6 of the $r$. $t$.

Line 244. - This line is to be compared with x 7 of the r . t . ; the latter is therefore to be corrected to read :ainanna ba-gub, «Inanna arose »3.

G"rev. ll. 1-22. - These lines correspond to ll. 11.x9-x31 of the r. t. As will be seen from the following detailed list of correspondences, however, the two texts show quite a number of variations. Thus : G' rev. ll. 1-5 correspond to $11 . \mathrm{x} 9-\mathrm{x}-13$ of the r. t. ; 11. 6-7 correspond to $11 . \mathrm{x} 17-\mathrm{x} 18^{4}$; $11.8-10$ correspond to $11 . \mathrm{x} 21-\mathrm{x} 23 ; 1.11$ is omitted in the r. t. ; ll. 12-13 correspond to $\mathrm{x} 24-\mathrm{x} 25$; ll. $14-15$ are omitted in the

1. Cf. 1. $\times 6$ of the r. $t$.
2. Cf. GSG $\S 670$.
3. This line marks the end of the passage containing Enki's directions to the kurgarru and the kalaturru; it begins with 1.223 and consists of 22 lines. The execution of these commands is no doubt described in the passage immediately following l. 244, which ends with 1 . $x 7$ of the $r$. $t$. If, therefore, this latter contained the same number of lines as the former passage, $i$. e. 22, the break between 1.244 and $x l$ of the $r$. $t$. would consist of 15 lines. It is to be noted, however, that the lines preceding $x 5$ of the $r . t$. do not seem to correspond to those preceding 1.242 , and it is not impossible, therefore, that the passage describing the execution of Enki's commands contained some additional material. All in all, however, it is hardly likely that the gap between 1.244 and xl consisted of much more than about 20 lines.
4. The verbal form in xis of the $r$. t. can now be restored, therefore, to read mu-un-lii.

r. t. ; l. 16 corresponds to $1 . x 14 ; 1.17$ corresponds to $11 . \mathrm{x} 15-\mathrm{x} 16^{1} ; \mathrm{ll} .18-22$ correspond to ll. x27-x31. Note that G" omits ll. x19-x20 and l. x26 of the r. t.
5. Note that the sign in $G^{\prime}$ rev. 17, corresponding to the last sign of $\mathrm{xl5}$ seems to be KA. If this is correct, the last sign in x 15 is actually to be read $-\mathrm{ke}_{4}$ (as in the copy) and not -gim as I suggested. Lines xl 14 and $\mathrm{xl5}$ do not, therefore, seem to be parallel in construction, and their sense is even more obscure than before.

## Corrections to CSRT No. 53

CSRT No. 53 is a copy of Ni. 368, the upper half of a four column tablet located in the Museum of the Ancient Orient of Istanbul, which had already been copied by Langdon and published as No. 33 of BE XXXI ${ }^{1}$. As is quite obvious from a comparison of the two copies, the CSRT copy is a marked improvement on its predecessor. The fragment, however, has been recently baked and cleaned in the newly installed laboratory of the museum, and, as the accompanying photographs show, not a few of the signs which were illegible at the time Langdon and Chiera prepared their copies, can now be read. As a consequence, numerous miscopies can now be corrected. The following is a line by line list of these corrections, based on a careful collation of the original :

> col. i

Line 1. The broken space at the very top of the tablet is indicated in the copy as consisting of a single line. Actually, however, it consists of two lines ${ }^{2}$.

Lines 3-5. The last sign at the end of each of these lines is $\mathrm{E}_{11}\left(\right.$ not KA) ${ }^{3}$. Note that the lines are a good deal more legible now than the copy indicates ${ }^{4}$.

Lines 6-12. These lines are now seen to read as follows :
6. [unugki-ga é-an]-na mu-un-šub
7. [bàd-tibira ${ }^{\text {ki }}$ é-M]UŠ-kalam-ma mu-un-šub ${ }^{5}$
8. [zabalam ${ }^{k 16}$ ]-a gi-gu ${ }_{15}{ }^{\text {ki }}{ }^{-n a^{7}}$ mu-un-šub ${ }^{8}$

1. Together with CBS 9800 which is the lower half of the very same tablet, it forms text $A$ of the reconstructed myth \& Inanna's Descent to the Nether World ;, cf. RA XXXIV, p. 93 ff . For the list of texts utilized to reconstruct the myth, cf. ibid., p. 98, note 1.
2. Chiera's line numeration of column i should therefore be advanced by one. In order to avoid confusing the reader, however, I have retained Chiera's numbering. Note that in the transliteration of the r. $t$. ( $=$ reconstructed text), the line numeration is correct.
3. Cf. the comment to lines 4-6 of the $r$. $t$. where this correction has been anticipated.
4. The new readings, however, add nothing in the way of variants to the $r$. $t$.
5. Line 8 of the $r$. $t$. is therefore to be so corrected.
6. In the r. $t$. I transliterated the name of the city by writing the component signs in capitals, since in spite of the suggestions made by various scholars, the reading of the name still seemed uncertain. In a recent examination of VS II, however, I came upon the phonetic spelling of the name in a passage which, as far as I know, has hitherto remained unnoted. In the eme-SAL text VS II No. 48, the first part of 1.7 reads : za-ba-la gi-gúna. Zabala is here the name of the city and Giguna is the name of its temple, just as in the first part of the preceding line which reads : ù-nu-ka e-ia-na, Uruk is the name of the city and Eanna, the name of its temple. The name of the city is also written as za-ba-la in VS II No. 3, col. ii, ll. 21 and 22. As the syllabary reading za-ba-lam indicates, however, the name actually ended with an $m$. As in the case of Urim and Larsam, this final $m$ was dropped when not followed by a grammatical element beginning with a vowel.
7. In $D$, as a collation of the original shows, the KI of gi-gu ${ }_{15}-\mathrm{KI}$ is a miscopy for NA, cf. the comment to 1. 8 of the $r$. t. where this possibility was suggested.
8. Line 9 of the r.t. is therefore to be so corrected. The Edilmun of Ur is not mentioned in any of

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 9. [adaba }{ }^{k i} \text { ] é-šar-ra mu-un-šub }{ }^{1} \\
& \text { 10. nibruki-a bara-tuš-gar-ra }{ }^{2} \text { mu-un-šub } \\
& \text { 11. } \text { kiši }^{k 1} \text {-a h }[\text { ur-sag-kalam }]-m a ~ m u-u n-s ̌ u b ~ \\
& \text { 12. a-ga-dè }{ }^{k 1} \text { é-U[L-maš] }{ }^{k 13} \text { mu-un-šub }{ }^{4}
\end{aligned}
$$

Line 19. Between TUR and GÚ, the sign LA is to be inserted ${ }^{5}$.
Line 22. Preceding the verb ba-an-BU, the complex gaba-?-na is now legible ${ }^{6}$.
Line 23. The line reads : túg-nam-nin-túg-nam-nin-a bar-ra-na ba-an-dul ${ }^{7}$.
Line 24. Between E and HE, one, or perhaps two signs are broken away ${ }^{8}$.
Line 26. Following SUUBUR, the sign RA is now legible. The latter is followed by an illegible sign which is in turn followed by the sign $\mathrm{A}^{9}$.

Line 32. The first two signs read $u_{4}-\mathrm{da}^{10}$.
col. ii

Line 5. The eighth sign is ZADIM ${ }^{11}$.
Line 6. The sign following NAGAR is RA(not LA) ${ }^{12}$.
the duplicates. The reasons that induced me to reconstruct the first part of 1.9 of the r . t . as [uriki-ma é-dilmun]na (cf. comment to ll. 7-13 and especially RAXXXIV, p. 117, note 1) were, as the collation of the original shows, invalid.

1. Note 1 of RA XXXIV, p. 117 is therefore to be modified accordingly.
2. The Nippur temple which Inanna forsook is not Duranki, as $I$ had assumed in accordance with VS $\mathbf{X}$ No. 199 ,col. iii, l. 31, but Baratušgarra. Note that line 13 of $B$ can now be seen to confirm this reading, the first part of this line is to be restored as : nibru ${ }^{k 1}$ [a(?) bara]-tuš-ga[r-r]a.
3. Unless some miscopy is involved, $B$ reads é-UL-mastila. This variant was erroneously omitted in my list of variants to the $r$. $t$.
4. The list of temples forsaken by Inanna is therefore exactly alike in $A$ and $B$, the two texts differ only in the order in which the cities are listed. In $B$ the order is as follows: 1. Uruk (so also A); 2. Zabalam (no. 3 in B); 3. Adab (no. 4 in A) ; 4. Agade (no. 7 in A); 5 . Kiš (no. 6 in A); 6. Badtibira (no. 2 in A); 7. Nippur (no. 5 in A).
5. A therefore agrees with $C$ and D, cf. RA XXXIV, p. 100 , note 1 . If the copy is correct, B omits LÁ
6. L. 23 (also l. 109) of the r. t. should therefore be corrected to read :
tu-di-tum-lú-gá-nu-gá-nu gaba-?-na ba-an-BU
7. L. 24 (also 1. 111) of the r. t. is therefore to be corrected accordingly. For the omission of -a after the first túg-nam-nin-, cf. RA XXXIV, p. 100, note 8. The correct reading of the last sign as DUL (not GUL) renders the line intelligible : With garments of ladyship she covered her body (more literally : «Garments of ladyship she arranged upon her body »).
8. Cf. RA XXXIV, p. 100, note 12.
9. Line 27 of the $r$. $t$. should therefore be corrected to read :
sukkal-a-ni dga-ša-an-šubur-ra ?-a-na i-im-DU.
10. Line 33 of the $r$. $t$. should therefore be corrected to read :
$u_{4}$-da kur-šè gin-na-mu-dè, "On the day that I go the nether world. *
11. L. 62 (also 11. 45, 54, 183, 197, and 210) of the r. t. should therefore be corrected accordingly. Zadim "the (precious) stone worker » would seem to parallel nagar, "the wood worker " of the line following; it is to be noted, however, that the latter is part of the abstract substantive nam-nagar. Note that $B$ omits the sign MA after ZADIM ; this variant was erroneously omitted in the list of variants to the r. $t$.
12. Cf. l. 63 of the r . t . where the correct reading was anticipated.


Line 8. The three signs following UŠ are GIŠ(as in the copy), TÚG(not TUKUL), MA(not BA) ${ }^{1}$.

Line 14. Between $\mathrm{DUG}_{4}$ and MU insert GA(omitted in the copy). Between MU and LA there are only two signs ; the first is illegible (but certainly not UN and hardly GÚ) ; the second is $\check{S} \AA\left(\right.$ not ZU) ${ }^{2}$.

Line 17. The second sign is GAL(not GAL) ${ }^{3}$.
Line 19. Between Ú and MU insert AŠ(omitted in the copy) ${ }^{4}$.

## col. iii

Line 11. The first three signs read tu-di-tum, the traces in the copy are entirely misleading ${ }^{5}$.

Line 19. This line, completely illegible, was erroneously omitted in the transliteration of the reconstructed text where it should have followed $1.160^{6}$.

Line 22. The first part of the line reads; ${ }^{\text {a }} \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{nun}-\mathrm{na}^{7}$.
col. iv

Line 2. The last five signs read : al mu(?)-ni-ib-dug ${ }_{4}{ }^{8}$.
Lines 3-12. These lines which correspond to lines 191-200 of the reconstructed text, are now much more legible ; the new readings bear out completely the restorations there made.

1. I. 65 of the r. t. should therefore be corrected to read :
a-a-dam-an-ki-ù-mu-un-mu-uš-giśtúg-ma-al-la-ke ${ }_{4}(?)$.
The translation of the line as it now reads is difficult. Is muš (i.e.-mu-uš-) the eme-SAL for the ges of gestug. And what is -ma-al-?
2. L. 71 of the r. t . should therefore be corrected to read:

The word division is still uncertain and the translation remains difficult.
3. The first part of $\mathbf{l} .74$ of the r. t. should therefore be corrected to read : e-gal-kur-ra-ka, "In the palace of the nether world $\geqslant$.
4. Cf. l. 76 of the r. t . where the correct reading was anticipated.
5. L. 152 of the r. t. should be corrected to read :
tu-di-tum-[lú-gá-nu-gá-nu gaba-?-na lú ba-da-an-şi-ir].
(i. note 14 .
6. In order to retain the line numeration intact, however, this line will be referred to as 160 a.
7. Line 162 of the $r$. $t$. should therefore be corrected to read :
da-nun-na ................... IN NE $\qquad$
8. L. 190 of the r. t. should therefore be corrected to read :
[a-ba-àm ki(?)-bi(?)] . . . . . . . . . . . . al mu(?)-ni-ib-dug ${ }_{4}$.
For the restoration of the first part of the line, ef. corrections to col. iv, 1.16 and note 32.

Line 13. The line reads : . . . . . . . . . al . . . . . . . . al bí(not KA)-in-dug ${ }_{4}{ }^{1}$.
Line 14. The line reads : dinanna AN . . . . . . al bi(?)-in(?)-?-? al . . . . . . . ${ }^{2}$
Line 15. Between RA and AL insert ME(omitted in the copy). Following AL, the signs ME and AL are now legible ${ }^{3}$.

Line 16. The second sign is probably $\mathrm{BA}^{4}$.
Line 18. The fifth sign is $\hat{E}\left(\right.$ not $\left.\mathrm{KE}_{4}\right)$. Instead of AN-šà-ga-ra as in the copy, the original reads : ${ }^{d} \mathrm{en}$-ki-ga-še ${ }^{5}$.

Line 19. The sign IGI(omitted in the copy) begins the line. The last two signs are $\check{S K}_{\mathbf{q}}, \check{S K}_{8}\left(\right.$ not KA, KA) ${ }^{6}$.

1. L. 201 of the r. $t$. should therefore be corrected to read :
[AN] ...... al [bi(?)-in(?)-?-?] al bi-in-dug ${ }_{4}$.
The signs in brackets are restored from the line following under the assumption that except for the introductory dinanna, the latter is an exact repitition of the former. Note that 1.187 of the $r$. $t$. should therefore be corrected to read :
[AN ..... al bi(?)-in(?)-?-? al bí-in-dug ${ }_{4}$ ].
2. L. 202 of the $r$. $t$. should therefore be corrected to read :
dinanna AN ...... al bi(?)-in(?)-?-? al [bi-in-dug ${ }_{4}$ ].
For restoration of the last three signs, cf. note 29 . Note that 1.188 of the $r$. $t$. should therefore be corrected to read :
[dinanna AN ...... al bi(?)-in(?)-?-? al bi-in-dug] ${ }_{4}$.
3. L. 203 of the r. t. should therefore be corrected to read :
me-kur-ra me-al-me-al . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . [bi-in-dug ${ }_{4}$ ].
Note that l. 189 of the r. t. should therefore be corrected to read :
[me-kur-ra me-al-me-al] . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . bi-in-dug ${ }_{4}$.
4. L. 204 of the r. t. should therefore be corrected to read :
a-ba-àm $\mathbf{k i}(?)$-bi(?) . . . . . . . . . . . . [al mu-ni-ib-dug ${ }_{4}$ ].
Fior the restoration of the last part of the line, cf. corrections to col. iv, l. 2 and note 28.
5. Cf. l. 206 of the r. t. where all the corrections were anticipated.
f. Cf. l. 207 of the r. t. where all the corrections were anticipated.

[^0]:    1. Cf. RA X IV, p. 93 ff.
[^1]:    1. This transliteration of 1.235 assumes that $G^{\prime}$ rev. 1.5 consists of two parts and that it corresponds to G" obv. 1. 11 .
    2. G' rev. 1. 7 is assumed to correspond to G'" obv. l. 12.
    3. This transliteration of 1.237 assumes that $G^{\prime}$ rev. l. 7 consists of two parts and that it corresponds to G" obv. 1. 13.
    4. Here ends obverse of $G$ ".
    5. Abbreviation for "reconstructed text».
[^2]:    1. Note that kuš is one of the roots whose labial $\xi$ causes the $e$ of such endings as -en, -e, -eš, etc. to appear as $u$; cf. GSG § 470.
    2. The same grammatical form mu-n-kuš-e(n) may, of course, also be translated «(she) grieved me»; i. e. it may be analyzed as mu-n-kuš, the third person singular preterite active and -en, the first person accusative pronominal element.
    3. Cf. TRS 40 (the basic text for the reconstruction of the composition) 11. 80-1. The entire text of the lamentation, based on all the then extant material, together with a translation and detailed commentary was prepared by me before leaving for Istanbul. In the Museum of the Ancient Orient I located several additional fragments which help to fill in some of the relatively few lacunae in the reconstructed text of the composition. The completed study will appear in the near future.
