The Performance of a Sumerian Wedding Song (CT 58, 12)

by Sam Mirelman and Walther Sallaberger – München

A close examination of the Old Babylonian Sumerian song CT 58, 12, in terms of its graphic arrangement and its literary patterns, leads to a better understanding of its performance: male and female singers participate, soloists and choir alternate, and vocables feature prominently besides the Sumerian text. The song can be situated within the marriage ceremony.

Introduction

The Old Babylonian Sumerian text CT 58, 12 (BM 85206) is remarkable, firstly for the extensive use of ‘unintelligibles’ or ‘vocables’, secondly for its graphic arrangement and thirdly for the repeated indication ṇeš-ge-ṇa2. As the alternation between phrases in Emesal and the main dialect of Sumerian makes clear, we are dealing with a dialogue between male and female partners. The divine names locate the text in the context of the Inana-Dumuzi corpus of Sumerian literature.

The tablet BM 85206 is part of the 99-4-15 collection at the British Museum, which was acquired from the Paris dealer I. Elias Gejou, and thus its provenance cannot be determined (Sigrist e.a. 1996, ix and 248). The upper part of the tablet (width ca. 10.5 cm, length ca. 11.5 cm) is preserved, with perhaps half of it missing. The format of the tablet is unusual, since it is wider than the standard Old Babylonian imgida. Furthermore, its surface is not covered by a fine slip and is not carefully smoothed, as it normally appears with Old Babylonian literary and school texts. As Steve Tinney remarks (personal communication), this coarse finish may relate to the practical use of texts; furthermore, Tinney compares it to a Nippur group of hymns known in single exemplars, which may represent texts prepared for performance.

---

1 We thank Steve Tinney for these observations on the format of CT 58, 12, which are based on his intimate knowledge of the typology of Old Babylonian tablets.
The text was copied by Alster, and some lines were transliterated in the preface (Alster/Geller 1990, 12). The greater part of the reverse was transliterated by Volk (1994, 189 note 71), who added some notes on the ‘vocables’. A short description of the text as “Wechselgesang über Inanna und Amā’ušumgal‘anna” was given by Fritz (2003, 157f.), and Shehata (2009, 357–360) discusses the text in the context of music in the Old Babylonian period.

The transliteration is based on a set of photographs and repeated collations of the original. The values for Sumerian are based on Attinger *apud* Mittermayer (2006).

In the transliteration below, various kinds of text are distinguished as follows:

- main dialect Sumerian is in Roman Type (e.g. nam-nin)
- Emesal dialect Sumerian is in bold type (e.g. mu-lu)
- vocables (see below) in italics (e.g. e-ia el-lu)
- the performative instruction *neš-ge-ŋal₂* is underlined

Reading based on collations that deviate from the handcopy of B. Alster are indicated by asterisks (*).
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BM 85206, obv.

13 [………]-mu* men saṅ-ṇa₂ al-u₃-du₂ ia-amⁿ ma*-mu*¹
14 [………]
15 [mu-lu a-la]-lu in-gur  ° ...  °* a-a-a
15a  Ṝeš-ge-ṇa₁

E 16 [x-x-ṇ]a₂* ki suku₅ dub-ba-bi u₃ men saṅ-ṇa₂ al-ⁱu₃-du₂
16a       Ṝeš-ge-ṇa₂
17 [………]-ʳ mu*¹ men saṅ-ṇa₂ al-u₃-du₂ ia-am-ma-mu
18 [………]
19 [mu-lu a-la-lu in]-gur  ° ...  °* a-a-a
19a       Ṝeš-ge-ṇa₂

F 20 [………] lil₂?-la₂ KA [x x] ŠGi* x x₁ mi-ni-i[b?]…-ri*-[(o)]
21 [……………………………………………………………………………]-ri-i[a?] […]
BM 85206, rev.

Rev.

[...]

G’

[..........................] de₂* -e

1a’

[.................. nẹš-ge-ŋa]₂*?

H’ 2’

[nin?] tza*-e* u₄*-de₃* a*-ba* in*-na₃*-ri*-ri* ia-am-ma-mu

3’

[........]

4’

[mu-lu a-la-lu in]- r gur\(^1\) ° ...........° a-a-a

4a’

nẹš-ge-ŋaḷ₂

I’ 5’

[.........] x unuk⁻¹-ra ušbar(UR₂[NUN?]*) - e mu-un-šum₂* [(...)]

5a’

nẹš*-ge*-ŋaḷ₂*

6’

[... za] t[::-] u₄*-de₃ a-ba in-na-ri-ri ia-am-ma-mu

7’

[..................]

8’

[mu-lu a]- l₃*-lu in-gur ° ...........° a-a-a

8a’

nẹš-ge-ŋaḷ₂
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J’ 9’  ušbar(UR₂×U₂)  ṅnu₅⁴ ṣa-an-sumun₂-na-ra  kaš*-še₃  ga-an-na-sur  ṅeš-ge-ŋal₂
9a’  ṅeš-ge-ŋal₂
10’  ḫinana  za-e  u₄-de₃  a-ba  in-na-ri-ri  ia-am-ma-mu
11’  e-e₄-a
12’  mu₄-lu  a-la₄-lu  in-gur°  ..........  ṃ-a₄-a
12a’  ṅeš-ge-ŋal₂

K’ 13’  e-rib-ba-ŋnu₁₀  ṭmu₄-tin-an-na-ra  kuru₁₃*-še₃  ga-an-na-du₈  ṅeš-ge-ŋal₂
13a’  ṅeš-ge-ŋal₂
14’  ḫin-in₂₄  za-e  u₄-de₃  a-ba  in-na-ri-ri  ia-am-ma-mu
15’  e-e₄-a
16’  mu₄-lu  a-la₄-lu  in-gur°  ..........  ṃ-a₄-a
16a’  ṅeš-ge-ŋal₂

L’ 17’  ṭmu₄-ud-na-ŋnu₁₀  ṭušumgal-an-na-ra  amaš*-še₃  ga-an-na-ir-ir  ṅeš-ge-ŋal₂
17a’  ṅeš-ge-ŋal₂
18’  in-nin  za-e  u₄-de₃  de₄  a-ba  in-na-ri-ri  ia-am-ma-mu
19’  e-e₄-a
20’  mu₄-‘₄lu’  a-la₄-lu  in-gur°  ..........  ṃ-a₄-a
20a’  ṅeš-ge-ŋal₂

lower edge
M’ 21’  [(x) ṭa-am-ma  u₅-li-li-a  [x(x)]  ṭx-ta?]  […]
22’  […]  x  x  nin  ṭe?  ṭx  […]
23’  […]  x  li*  li*  […]  x  […]
24’  mu*₄-lu*  a-la₄*-lu  in*-gur*  […]

left edge
undeciphered traces

Translation
The translation indicates male and female voice, but does not note the term ṅeš-ge-ŋal₂ “Response” (see the discussion below).

A  (m.) [Innin] has encircled (her head) with the diadem, u₄ … ladyship a …
  [eya ell]u  (m.) a ladyship, ladyship eyammamu [e]ya-a  ṃ-a₄-a

B  (m.) Holy Inana has encircled (her head) with the diadem, u₄ ladyship e ladyship a
eeya ellu  (m.) a ladyship, ladyship eyammamu
e-eya-a  ṃ-a₄-a
(f.) The man has returned the alalu-cheers!

C  (m.) ‘Divine Heroic …’ has encircled (her head) with the diadem, u₄ ladyship e ladyship a
eya ellu  (m.) a ladyship, ladyship eyammamu
e-[e]ya-a  ṃ-a₄-a
(f.) The man has returned the *alalu*-cheers!

D (m.) [...], where the diadem encircled (her head), $u_3$ she was born with a crown on her head!

[..]-*mu* (m.) She was born with a crown on her head! *yammamu*

[..]

(f.) The man has returned the *alalu*-cheers!

E (m.) [...], where the diadem encircled (her head), $u_3$ she was born with a crown on her head!

[..]-*mu* (m.) She was born with a crown on her head! *yammamu*

[..]

(f.) The man has returned the *alalu*-cheers!

F [...]

G’ [...] ...

H’ (m.) [*Lady*], you, today! Who will direct something to him? *yammamu*

[..]

(f.) [The man has] returned [the *alalu*-cheers!]

I’ (m.) To [the …] of Uruk, the in-law has given it.

(m.) [...], you, today! Who will direct something to her? *yammamu*

[..]

(f.) [The man has] returned the *alalu*-cheers!

J’ (f.) For my mother-in-law Ninsumun? (m.) For beer, I will brew for her!

(m.) Inana, you, today! Who (but I) will direct something to her? *yammamu*

*e-eya-a* $\ldots$ *a-a-a*

(f.) The man has returned the *alalu*-cheers!

K’ (f.) For my sister-in-law Geštinana? (m.) For the granary, I will make heaps for her!

(m.) Ninegal, you, today! Who (but I) will direct something to her? *yammamu*

*e-eya-a* $\ldots$ *a-a-a*

(f.) The man has returned the *alalu*-cheers!

L’ (f.) For my husband Ušumgal-ana? (m.) For the sheepfold, I will bring him (sheep)!

(m.) Innin, you, today! Who (but I) will direct something to him? *yammamu*

*e-eya-a* $\ldots$ *a-a-a*

(f.) The man has returned the *alalu*-cheers!
M’ […] yamma ulili […]
[...] lady […]
[...] lili […]
(f.) The man has returned the alalu-cheers!

Philological notes

1 ff.: Alster (1990, 12) reads muš₂ (accepted by Fritz 2003, 158 n.636), but the sign is clearly muš₂, read suku₅ (traditionally suḫ), a “diadem”; on this see recently Steinkeller (1998, 92–95), who describes it as “a type of band”, “an object of considerable importance and value, which was worn over the head.” The verb is dub/dab₆ “to encircle, surround”; the prefix chain nam- instead of na-an- (the ergatives require a transitive construction) was already discussed by Fritz (2003, 158 n.636). suku₅ dub “to encircle (the head) with a diadem” is an expression for the beautiful coiffure of the bride Inana; see in this regard the discussion by Sefati (1998, 143, on Inana-Dumuzi C, see below; 317), who translates the phrase more freely as “to comb” (Sefati reads muš₂ instead of suku₅/suḫ).

1: The restoration [in]-nin is inspired by sequences such as the beginning of Inana and Šukaletuda (p.c. Pascal Attinger).

7 etc.: a-la-lu describes the joyful exclamations uttered by the men in response to the women; cf. PSD A/I, 100–101 (calling it a song or an exclamation). In CT 58, 15/16 the men coming to Inana sing the alalu.

8: drxA¹-ur-sañ-e poses difficulties. The first signs look like AN Tur, but an epithet dumu ur-sañ is not known as a divine name. As an epithet of Inana, dumu ur-sañ appears in the OB version of Uru’amairabi (Volk 1989, 35 CT 42 48:3 and and parallels; cf. CLAM p. 557f.) dumu ur-sañ dumu-ul-li₄-[la₂-men₃ ] “I am the heroic child of Mullil (Enlil)”; for the first millennium version see Volk 1989, 136 on Tablet XX 15.

11: gur is clear on the tablet, although Alster/Geller (1990, 12) claim that this line “has in-du, and this is the correct reading, although in rev. 4, 5, and 6 the sign looks like gur”.

12: One could think of a restoration like [x sañ-ñ]a₂ … “the X of the head(, which was encircled by the diadem)”. Here, the diadem is likened to the “crown” (men).

20: If the sign ri is correctly identified, this could point to a connection with the continuation of the text on the reverse.
Rev. 2’, 6’, 10’, 14’, and 18’: The gloss di in rev. 18’ points to a reading $u_{4}\text{-}d_{e\,3}$ (“on the day”, > “today”(?)) instead of the more frequently used $u_{4}\text{-}n_{e}$ (“this day” > “today”).

Rev. 5’ and 9’: In 5’, the inscribed nun/û of ušbar is not visible because of the worn surface, in 9’ one is inclined to see $u_{R\,2\times u_{2}} = ušbar_{7}$. On the variation of the writings for the Sumerian words for the parents-in-law see Wilcke (1985, 235–238).

Rev. 9’, 13’, 17’: Whereas the first halves of these lines are clearly in Emesal, the cohortative prefix ga- indicates main dialect for the latter parts. This results in a strange combination with the (incorrectly used) Emesal verb ir in 17’. Together with the performative instruction $n^\text{eš-ge-}n_{al\,2}$ (see below) we take the use of ga- and the verb šum$_{2}$ in the preceding section (line 5’, instead of Emesal ze$_{2}\text{-}e_{N_{3}}$) as markers of main dialect. It may be noted, however, that the cohortative prefix ga-may appear very rarely in Emesal context in Old Babylonian; see Lugale 383 (van Dijk 1983, I 99, II 109f.) OB ga-an-ši-ŋen // SB da-ši-in-ŋen (// lullik).

Rev. 13’: erib, the Sumerian term for the sister of the husband, was treated by Wilcke (1987); this is the relationship of Geštinana, Dumuzi’s sister, to Inana, his bride.

The Vocables

The song CT 58, 12 features an unparalleled wealth of ‘unintelligibles’ or ‘vocables’, i.e. sonic expressions without semantic meaning. These are marked as italics in the transliteration. They include simple vocals (a, e, u$_{4}$, u$_{3}$), sequences of vowels (a-a-a) and syllable sequences (eya, yammmamu, ellu, ulili). Such ‘nonsense syllables’ are sometimes called ‘vocables’ in musicological literature (see Nettl 1993, 114), a term that is adopted here. Vocables appear here and there in Sumerian literary texts (see below), but never to the extent of our song. However, we would not conclude that CT 58, 12 is a completely unique text in this regard. More probably, vocables were written out in this instance, whereas normally they may have been added only in performance.

The Old Babylonian vocables include vowels as well as syllable sequences, which differentiates them from Late Babylonian performative notations of vowels or vowel sequences (Mirelman 2010). Furthermore, the Late Babylonian vowels add information regarding the musical performance of the text, like a musical notation. In our Old Babylonian example, the vocables can be compared to the commonly attested usage
of exclamations of joy and lament, from a-la-la to u₃-u₇-a, in literary texts (see Edzard 2003, 167–170).

The scribe of CT 58, 12 has observed the following rules in the notation of the vocables: The glide /ya/ is indicated by the ia sign (note e-ia, ia-am-...), so a-a-a should probably not be regarded as *ayaya v.s. (thus Volk 1994, 189 n.69), but as a repeated vowel (a`a`a) or as notation for an elongated single vowel (aaah). The reduplication of vowels is a relevant feature, since the text differentiates between e-ia and e-e-ia-a (1.5–6, 9–10), the latter standing for e`eya`a or eeyaa. It cannot be excluded, however, that our text uses the ia sign only between different vowels and that sequences of identical vowels were pronounced as ayaya (a-a-a) or eye (e-e), e-e-ia-a thus representing eyeyaya.

Furthermore, the doubling of consonants is indicated (el-lu, ia-am-ma-... against u₃-li-li and -ma-mu).

Finally, u₄ and u₃ are differentiated, which may point to two vowels, perhaps o and u, although the differentiation is between u₄/u and u₂ in the lexical list Proto-Aa (Westenholz 1991) and both u₃ and u₄ seem to represent /o/ (Lieberman 1979, 25).

Simple vowels: a, e, u₄, u₃

Simple vowels appear as exclamations within the text of main dialect Sumerian only on the obverse and only in the second half of the line or its repetition, exactly the sections marked as nesketal (see below). Regarding the vowels, it is interesting to compare the evidence of the Late Babylonian performative notations (see Mirelman 2010): The vowel /a/ is the most widely attested, probably representing the middle pitch-range and high amplitude, /e/ is second in popularity, suggesting a middle-upper pitch-range and relatively high amplitude; the rarely attested /u/ stands for the low pitch-range and low amplitude. /i/ is known from the LB texts but it does not appear in our text as simple vowel or in vowel(-glide) sequences.

The sequence a-a-a always appears at the same point in every stanza, namely at the very right of the penultimate line. It immediately precedes the female repetitive phrase mu-lu a-la-lu in-gur „The man has returned the alalu-cheers!” Should alalu thus refer to this a-a-a alone, or to the complete neskental-response (e.g. line 2, 6, 10: a nam-nin nam-nin e ia-am-ma-mu, a-a-a)? As noted above, a-a-a can stand for a repeated or an elongated vowel a.
Vowel-glide sequences: e-e-ia-a, e-ia

The short eya is combined with ellu on the obverse, the long e-eya-a appears both on the obverse and the reverse. On the obverse, the pair eya ellu, e-eya-a is opposed to the single nam-nin-line in the main dialect, on the reverse e-e-ia-a is written very close to the Emesal phrase mu-lu a-la-lu in-gur; this suggests that eya ellu and e-eya-a belong to the female speech. We know of no other instances of the glide e-ia (eya) as an exclamation outside of this text. The alleged exclamation ya in i₃-a lúm-lúm (Gilgameš and Ḫuwawa B 1 and parallels) has been interpreted as “oil-glistening one” by Marchesi (2000).

Multi-syllable vocables: el-lu, u₃-li-li, ia-am-ma-mu

For ellu, and other exclamations based on /l/, see Krecher (1966, 148 n. 433); Civil (1976, 90) specifically on e-el-lu as an exclamation to incite the ploughing oxen; Attinger (1993, 559); Römer (2001, 225 n. 184); and Edzard (2003, 167).

In our text, eya ellu obviously belongs to the female part (see above on eya). Similarly, ellu ellu-lines occur in Emesal context in CT 58 14, a song which is also related to the Dumuzi-Inana topic; and Inana repeatedly uses ellu in the “Manchester Tammuz” (lines 49, 55, 73, 75(?), and 189; Alster 1992).

The context for ulili is not well preserved (1, 21’, 23’?), where it appears together with yamma. On ulili see Römer (2001, 225 n. 184) and note the equation munus-ù-li-li = zammirtu “female singer” (Lu III = MSL 12, 124 ii 16).

Exclamations around the consonant [l] are a world-wide phenomenon, and Edzard l.c. refers i.a. to Greek alala, Hebrew hallelülā, and, most importantly, to the ululation of the Middle East, a high-pitched vocalisation produced with an oscillating tongue from the women (and sometimes men) at emotional high points, typically at marriage ceremonies (Jacobs 2007, 489f.).

In every stanza, yammamu is attached to the end of the speech in the main dialect, and is thus a ‘male’ exclamation in our text. For similar exclamations in Old Babylonian Sumerian lamentations cf. Kramer (1987, 82) line 344: i-am₃-ma e-la-lu, closing a lament addressed to Inana; Cohen (1988, 83) f+182: i-a-am-ma (context unclear); see also the similar exclam-

---

2 This distribution excludes the reading e-i-ia—a proposed by Volk (1994, 189), who based his interpretation on the distribution of the signs on the reverse.
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mation in Kramer (1985, 120) lines 23, 24: \(a-u_3-am_3-ma, al-li-li-am_3-ma\) in a section praising Enlil.

Emesal and Main Dialect as Features of the Dialogue

The tablet is divided in various sections (here numbered A to F and G' to M'). The decisive clue for understanding the song's structure is provided by the sequence of phrases in Emesal (ES) and in the Main Dialect (MD) of Sumerian within each section. This clearly indicates that the text represents a dialogue between male and female participants.

The key words for the Main Dialect are: \(nin\) (instead of ES \(ga-\text{s}a-an\)), \(nam\) (vs. ES \(na-\text{an}_2\)), \(inan\) (ES \(ga-\text{s}a-an-an-na\)), \(\text{\textcircled{S}}um_2\) (ES \(ze_2-\text{en}_3\)), cohortative \(ga-\) (ES \(da-, \text{de}_3\)-).

Emesal words are \(mu-\text{lu}\) (MD \(lu_2\)), \(ga-\text{s}a-an\) (MD \(nin\)), \(mutil-an-na\) (MD \(\text{\textcircled{N}}e\text{\textcircled{S}}tin-an-na\)); \(mu-ud-na\) (MD \(\text{\textcircled{N}}e\text{\textcircled{S}}dana\)); for the problem of the verb \(ir\) (MD \(tum_2/\text{de}_6\)) see above on line 17'.

The use of pronouns underlines the distinction between male and female speech on the reverse. Inanna and other goddesses are addressed in the second person (\(za-e/ze_4-e\)) (in Rev. 2', 6', 10', 14', and 18'). On the other hand, the goddess speaks of “my husband” in Rev. 17'.

Graphic arrangement

Previous commentators have already noted the exceptional graphic arrangement of this text. Here we list the most important features:

The first line of each section starts at the left margin of the tablet, thus marking clearly the division of the text. Within the sections, lines often do not proceed uniformly from left to right. In some cases on the obverse, half lines to the left correspond to a single half line to the right (see ll. 5–6, 9–10, etc.). The vocable \(a-a-a\) and the performative instruction \(\text{\textcircled{N}}e\text{\textcircled{S}}-ge-\text{\textcircled{N}}a\text{\textcircled{L}}_2\) are placed in specific positions in the right half of each section. Collation of the tablet has revealed many erasures throughout the text, specifically above every instance of a section's last \(\text{\textcircled{N}}e\text{\textcircled{S}}-ge-\text{\textcircled{N}}a\text{\textcircled{L}}_2\). This implies that the graphic displacement of the text is significant. In section D one is inclined to see erased traces of a final \(\lambda\), so probably the vocable \(a-a-a\) was erased and later rewritten to the right of these erasures and of the \(\text{\textcircled{N}}e\text{\textcircled{S}}-ge-\text{\textcircled{N}}a\text{\textcircled{L}}_2\) notation. The reason behind this correction becomes clear from section A. In this single instance, a third \(\text{\textcircled{N}}e\text{\textcircled{S}}-ge-\text{\textcircled{N}}a\text{\textcircled{L}}_2\) is written directly underneath \(a-a-a\).
Throughout the text, the performative indication $\text{nes-ge-nal}_2$ is written exactly below the beginning of the half lines to the right: On the obverse below the second part of the first line and below the second half line to the right; on the reverse it is written below the second part of both phrases.

This arrangement, roughly indicated in the transliteration given above, can be estimated from the illustration on these page. This transliteration, indicating the exact spot of each sign on the tablet, was created with a photographic background image on the program Adobe Photoshop.
In our text, the performative instruction $\text{nēs-ge-nal}_2$ marks the right half of the principal lines of each section. This unique use of the term $\text{nēs-ge-nal}_2$, so well known from Old Babylonian Sumerian literary texts, demands further consideration.

The Akkadian translation of $\text{nēs-ge}$ as $\text{meher zamāri}$ “answer/response of singing” has resulted in the standard translation as “antiphone”. The relevant lexical entries stem from the first millennium:

$$\text{GIŠ gi-ēš-gal}_2 = \text{MIN (mi-ḥir) za-ma-ri Erimḫuš II 239 (MSL 17, 39)}$$
$$\text{mu-g[i-ma-al]} = \text{nēs-gi-gal}_2 = \text{me-ēh-ru Emesal Voc. III 58 (MSL 4, 32)}$$
\[\text{nes}-\text{gi}^{(4)} - \eta a_{2}\] = \text{MIN} (\text{mi}-\text{ihr}-\text{rum}) \; \text{\textit{sha}}_{2} \; \text{za-ma-ri} \; \text{Nabnitu XVI} \; 33 \\
\text{(MSL 16, 142)}

In OB lexical lists, \text{nes}-\text{gi}^{(4)} - \eta a_{2} is only attested in OB Proto-Lu 612, 843 (MSL 12, 66 and 64).

The description of Hartmann (1960, 239–244) is still generally accepted: \text{nes}-\text{ge}^{(4)} - \eta a_{2} is used as a subscript for sections of one to four lines, usually set off from the rest of text by horizontal lines. The term always refers to a preceding section, marked as ki-ru-gu_{2}, sa \text{gid}_{2}-da, sa-\text{nar-ra} or once as “Lament (er_{2}-\text{sa}_{3}-ne-\text{sa}_{4}) of a man’s god” (Gordon 1960, 150). This can be expressed either as \text{nes-ge-} \eta a_{2}-bi-(im), “(it is) its \text{nesgenal}”, or as \text{nes-ge-} \eta a_{2} ki-ru-gu_{2}-da-kam (etc.) “it is the \eta. of a kirugu (etc.)”. A similar usage is found in OB Akkadian literary texts.\text{nes-ge-} \eta a_{2}-bi occurs in one OB Balān composition (CT 42, 15, pl. 28 ii 8; CLAM 194: a+38), but it is not attested in LB Emesal literary texts, where instead the Akkadian translation me\text{hr}u is found (see Mirelman 2010). CT 58, 12 is the only attestation in a literary text, where the term is not qualified.

The literal meaning of the term is obscure. Wilcke (1975, 260) suggests “Holz zurückkehren(?) (oder: zur[?] Erde[?]) lassen”, thus possibly indicating the absence of musical accompaniment. This interpretation implies that \text{nes} “wood” can be used as general term for “musical instrument” or short for \text{nes-gu}_{3}-\text{di}. However, we know of no place where \text{nes} is used alone as referring to musical instruments. Two post-OB references point in other directions. Examentext A line 8 (Sjöberg 1975, 140f. and 151 f.) equates \text{nes} \text{ge}_{4} with Akkadian \text{apâlu} “to answer”, but subsequently the text uses the standard verb \text{ge}_{4} as Sumerian equivalent of \text{apâlu} (lines 9 to 11). Is \text{nes} thus related to an element \text{nes} which appears in \text{nes-} \text{tuku} “to hear” (related to \text{nes-} \text{stu} “ear”) or in \text{nesgem} “sign”? For the latter possibility, the late unorthographic writing \text{nesgem-} \eta a_{2}-\text{bi} // \text{mihi}[r-sȫ] (KAR 100 ii 10, bilingual hymn to Gula and Ištar) is suggestive.

\text{nes-} \eta a_{2} passages are typically general statements, which comment and summarize the single statements of the preceding text. They may be compared to the fixed part in the refrain sections of Emesal songs.

---

3 In Agušaya (Groneberg 1997, 55–93): \text{nes-ge}^{(4)} - \eta a_{2}-\text{bi} (passim), Hymn to Ištar (RA 22, 171: 60, see Groneberg 1999, 169–171, translating \text{nes-ge-} \eta a_{2} as “Zusammenfassung”, “Quintessenz” on p. 171 fn. 7); Hymn to Nanaya (ZA 44, 34). The Akkadian equivalent \text{mehrum} appears in a literary catalogue of late Old Babylonian or Kassite date (Finkel 1988) after 5 \text{irtum} songs, two incipits are called \text{mehrum}; Kilmer (1992, 109) suggests this is the antiphon of the five song incipits (or strophes according to Groneberg 2003, 58) listed above it.
Hartmann (1960, 243f.) correctly notes that \( \text{nēš-ge}_1 \text{N}_{\text{a}2} \) has to refer to the musical performance of the text and suggests that the \( \text{nēš-ge}_1 \text{N}_{\text{a}2} \) sections were sung by a second singer or a choir. Instead of the term “Antiphon”, which has a complicated history, we prefer to use the neutral musicological terms “Call” and “Response”. In this respect, the first opening part is the Call, the second the Response, whether it is a literal response or not.

The Call and Response-pattern identified by Hartmann corresponds well with CT 58, 12. Here, phrases marked as \( \text{nēš-ge}_1 \text{N}_{\text{a}2} \) never start a section, but are always following an initial phrase. Furthermore, the \( \text{nēš-ge}_1 \text{N}_{\text{a}2} \) phrases appear first as verbatim repetitions in the manner of a refrain: \( u_4 / a \text{ nam-nin} \ldots \) in sections A, B, C, \( m\text{en saŋ-n}_2 \ldots \) in D and E, \( a-ba \text{ in-na-ri-ri} \text{ in H'} \text{ to L'}; \) secondly, they start expressions of a similar structure (OBJECT-še \( \text{g}_3 \text{ a-an-na-VERB} \) in J' to L'. Finally, as noted above, the vocable \( a-a-a \) can also be considered a nēšgēnaŋal.

To sum up, \( \text{nēš-ge}_1 \text{N}_{\text{a}2} \) phrases appear as constant refrains or as the completion of a sentence. Whereas the \( \text{nēš-ge}_1 \text{N}_{\text{a}2} \) phrase itself is always in the Main Dialect, it may respond to either Main Dialect or Emesal phrases. The term \( \text{nēš-ge}_1 \text{N}_{\text{a}2} \) thus does not refer to the dialogue between Dumuzi and Inana (or their human representatives). The first half-line shows more variation, although also some repetition is apparent here, a wide-spread feature of Sumerian literature. In general, passages marked as \( \text{nēš-ge}_1 \text{N}_{\text{a}2} \) are Responses, which were most probably performed by a choir. However, it remains unknown if the enigmatic term \( \text{nēš-ge}_1 \text{N}_{\text{a}2} \) refers to the literary-musical pattern ‘Response’, to the choir as performer,\(^4\) or to another-musical aspect of the performance.

---

\(^4\) A few references concerning choral performance in Early Mesopotamia may suffice here: The OB Mari ritual for the Balaŋ uru’ama’irabi involves a group of musicians (šiṭru), nārum and kalām singers (Ziegler 2007, 14 and 55–64); kalāšunu izammarū “they all/their kalā lamentation singers sing” in an OB Emesal text (BE 30, 12 i 24; cf. e.g. Krecher 1966, 118); gala-ze \( \text{e}_3 = \text{ašú “solo(?)} \) performer/kalā”, gala keš \( \text{e}_3 - \text{da} = \text{min (}= \text{kala?/ašú?)} \) kisrī “kalā/performer of the group/chorus” (Lu IV 172f., MSL 12, 134); PBS 1/1 11 iv 84 x-me-ēs-\( \text{e}_2 \) bi \( \text{s}_1 - \text{k}-\text{bi-ne “they are..., their (music) makings in harmony} “/ ii 52 ša rigimšunu istēniš šutē[m] “(those) whose voices are together brought into accord” (translation by Westenholz 2005, 366) and other passages in the same text (Westenholz 2005); cf. also Alster (1985); Ambos (2006–2008, 501f. “Solo-Sänger und Chor-Sänger”).
The performance

The preceding considerations lead to a reconstruction of the performance of the text of CT 58, 12. It is reasonable to suggest that the first, more variable half-lines were performed by a male soloist or a female voice, whereas the second half-lines were sung by a (male) choir (\(\eta\)e\(\acute{s}\)-g\(e\)-\(\eta\)a\(\acute{l}\)_2, Response). This means that at least three ‘parties’ performed the song of CT 58, 12: a male soloist and his choir, and a female voice.

A more detailed reconstruction of the performing parts must begin with the reverse. In I’ to L’ each section’s first line shows the sequence of a female Call and a male Response, i.e. a male choir (see commentary on lines 9’, 13’, and 17’). The second line (lines 2’, 6’, 10’, 14’, 18’) is a male Call and Response sequence, the latter ending in -yammamu. Although written separately, the vocable sequence a-a-a must be a choral Response (according to section A) which follows e-eya-a. e-eya-a was probably sung by the female part because of the close proximity to the phrase mu-lu a-lu-lu in-gur (see already above). The female phrase mu-lu a-la-lu in-gur concludes each section. This results in the following reconstructed sequence (example J’):

- **female voice:** u\(\acute{s}\)bar\(\_\) (\(\exists\)ur\(\_\)\(\exists\)u\?\) - f\(\eta\)u\(\_\) \(\tilde{\eta}\)a\-an\-sum\_\(\exists\)na\-ra
  („For my mother-in-law Ninsumun“)
- **male choir:** ka\(\acute{s}\)-\(\acute{s}\)e\(\_\) ga\-an\-na\-sur („For beer, I will brew for her!“)
- **male soloist:** d\(\tilde{\eta}\)an\_\(\tilde{\eta}\)a\-e \(\exists\)u\(\_\)\(\exists\)e\(\_\) \(\tilde{\eta}\)a\-rei\(\_\) “Inana, you, today!”
- **male choir:** a-ba in\-na\-ri\-ri yammamu („Who (but I) will direct something to her? yammamu“)
- **female voice:** e-eya-a
- **male choir:** a-a-a
- **female voice:** mu-lu a-la-lu in-gur („The man has returned the alalu-chores!“)

Applying this pattern to the obverse, we obtain the following structure. In A to C, a male soloist’s Call is followed by a male choral Response in the first line. Since e-eya-a is clearly female on the reverse, we regard the same sequence as female on the obverse; furthermore, the graphic arrangement indicates that the vocable sequence eya ellu belongs to the female voice (see above on ellu in the Manchester Tammuz). Considering the top to bottom and left to right sequence of writing, we propose the following reconstruction (example section B):

- **male soloist:** f\(\tilde{\eta}\)ku\(\_\) \(\tilde{\eta}\)a\-ke\(\_\) su\(\_\)ku\_\(\exists\) nam\-dub („Holy Inana has encircled (her head) with the diadem“)
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male choir: $u_4$ nam-nin e nam-nin a (“$u_4$ ladyship e ladyship a”)
female voice: eya ellu
male choir: a nam-nin nam-nin e yammamu (“a ladyship, ladyship e yammamu”)
female voice: e-eya-a
male choir: a-a-a
female voice: mu-llu a-la-llu in-gur (“The man has returned the alalu-cheers!”)

This reconstruction is informed by the distribution of dialects, the position of the performative indication $\eta e s-ge-\eta a l_2$ and the text’s graphic arrangement. Now we understand how the scribe of CT 58, 12 left important clues for the performance of this song, e.g. by placing eya ellu and e-eya-a close to each other on the ‘female side’ of the tablet. The possibility must not be excluded that some female vocables were sung simultaneously with the male choir parts, or that female and male vocables resounded together, but the available evidence does not point in this direction.

The ceremonial context

The main protagonists of the song CT 58, 12 are Inana and Dumuzi. In the first part of the song (obverse), the male soloist and the choir praise Inana’s beauty. In the second part, the men proclaim that they will provide food, namely beer (rev. 9’), barley for bread (rev. 13’) and meat from the sheepfold (rev. 17’). The food is destined for the new relatives of Inana, her mother-in-law Ninsumun, her sister-in-law Geštinana, and her husband Dumuzi himself.

Our song relates to a specific moment within the larger context of the marriage of Inana and Dumuzi. In the text called “Dumuzi’s wedding” (Dumuzi-Inana C, Sefati 1998, 286–300; Fritz 2003, 75–78) various men, called paranymphs (libirsi, i 21) and including Dumuzi himself, bestow food-stuffs to Inana. Her mother, an expert in ilu-songs (i-lu-zu, ii 3) explains that he will be like a relative. Inana bathes and dresses up to receive Dumuzi. Similarly, in Dumuzi-Inana C (Sefati 1998, 132–150), Inana presents herself as having bathed and dressed, and finally being adorned by a diadem and jewels (cf. above on CT 58, 12: 1ff.). At the appearance of her ‘brother’, Dumuzi according to Sefati’s interpretation, the “musicians” (nar-e-ne) start their performance (DI C 28). Inana wishes that her bridegroom may provide her with animals.

Both Wilcke (1985, 274–279) and Greengus (1990) have pointed to the central role of a ceremonial meal in the context of marriage. The “bride-
wealth” consists of foodstuffs destined for the meal of the bride’s and the 
bridegroom’s families. There, the bridegroom does not appear alone; he is 
accompanied by his paranymphs, a group of young male companions 
(Malul 1989).

The song CT 58, 12 fits this context precisely: The bride Inana has 
dressed up, and appears at the door, where she is praised by the men. 
They, on their side, provide food for the communal meal. The group of 
men, the male choir who sings the ηες̱-ге̱-ṇα12 passages of our recon-
struction, can be identified with the paranymphs of the marriage cer-
emony. This is the right moment for singing and music, as it is referred to 
in Dumuzi-Inana C. Thus, the song preserved on the tablet CT 58, 12 was 
performed at a wedding ceremony: a female voice, representing the bride 
and (probably) her female companions, alternates with the male choir of 
the paranymphs, including the bridegroom. The male soloist addresses 
Inana and her attractive appearance, although there is no indication that 
the male soloist represented the bridegroom Dumuzi.

The reference to the mythological marriage of Dumuzi and Inana, the 
musical performance by men and women, and the correlation with mar-
riage procedures in Early Mesopotamia all point to the actual use of this 
song in a wedding ceremony. The bride and the bridegroom are presented 
as the divine bridal couple Inana and Dumuzi. Similarly, in ancient Greek 
结婚 songs, the names of the bride and groom are sometimes replaced 
by the names of gods, especially Zeus and Hera (Hague 1983, esp. 134). 
Furthermore, the physical features of the tablet (see Introduction) would 
point towards its practical use in performance.

The indicator ηες̱-ге̱-ṇα12, the notation of the vocables and the 
graphic arrangement have allowed for a detailed reconstruction of the 
manner by which such a wedding song was performed. This singular text 
may thus serve as an example for the performance practice of other Su-
merian songs, especially those concerned with Dumuzi and Inana.
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