THE SUMERIAN VERB l u g_x (LUL)[*]

Piotr Steinkeller

1.   In *Altorientalischen Notizen*, 9-17 (1980), p.6[1], J. Bauer discussed the verbal form e-d a-LUL, which occurs in the passage (1 animal) PN ÁB.KU-d a e-d a-LUL, "(one animal) ...s with PN, the shepherd" (VAS 14 26 iii 2-4, 62 ii 4-6; *Nikolski* 1 219 iii 1-4 - all Pre-Sargonic, Lagaš). Having noted that e-d a-LUL stands in a complementary distribution to the forms e-d a-t i, "he/she lives with (somebody)", and e-d a-s e_{11} (SIG_7), "they live with (somebody)", in similar contexts, Bauer proposed to see in LUL a suppletive root of the verb "to live". Since t i is used with the singular subject of the class of persons, while s e_{11} is employed with a plural subject regardless of class[2], LUL would be reserved specifically for the singular subject of the class of animals. The resulting paradigm would be as follows:

	Class of Persons	Class of Animals
Sg.	t i-(1)	LUL
Pl.	s e_{11}	s e_{11}

Further, Bauer considered the possibility of connecting LUL with the OB and later verb l u-(g), Akk. *uzuzzu, rabāṣu*, while cautioning that this interpretation would necessarily require LUL to have the value l u g_x, for which he could find no evidence.

The objective of this note is to present data in support of both Bauer's hypotheses, and also, to discuss the range of values of LUL in 3rd mil. texts.

2.   Bauer's suggestion that the use of LUL is limited to the singular

subject of the class of animals is corroborated by a recently published Sar-
gonic tablet, which reads: 1 á b-m á ḫ PN ÁB.KU-d a ì-d a-LUL 1 ANŠE.NI
TA.LIBIR g i š PN$_2$ d u b-s a r-d a ì-d a-LUL (B.R. Foster, *Umma in the
Sargonic Period*, Hamden, Conn., 1982, pl. 32 no. 54:1-7). Yet another Sar-
gonic example of this usage of LUL is found in MAD 4 33:6, cited below un-
der (2).

    Likewise, it can be demonstrated that LUL does in fact have the read-
ing l u g$_x$ (or rather l u k$_x$, as the texts seem to indicate) in 3rd mil.
sources, thereby adding strength to Bauer's proposal that LUL is to be co-
nnected with the verb l u-(g). The evidence for this reading is as follows:

    (1) the Ur III personal name Ḫ a-b a-1 u$_5$-k e$_4$ (standard spelling;
see, e.g., *Nikolski* 2 436: 4; MVN 3 268:20), written also:

        (a) Ḫ a-b a-1 u$_5$-g e (NRVN 1 99:3; NATN 267:9)

        (b) Ḫ a-b a-1 u$_5$-e (*N.Y. Public Library* 276:12 - case; tablet,
             line 11, has Ḫ a-b a-1 u$_5$-k e$_4$)

        (c) Ḫ a(!)-b a-1 u-g e (NRVN 1 88:3)

        (d) [Ḫ] a-b a-1 u-g e$_{18}$ (NRVN 1 155:3)

The comparison of these variant spellings shows quite clearly, I think,that
the name is to be analyzed /ḫ a-b a-1 u G-e/, "May-he-..." (for the meaning
of LUL in this name, see below), a construction parallel to Ḫ a-b a-z i-g e
/ḫ a-b a-z i g-e/[3] and Ḫ a-b a-š a g$_5$-g e /ḫ a-b a-š a g-e/[4]. The same ver
bal root may also be suspected in the names Ḫ a-1 u$_5$-1 u$_5$[5], N a-b a-1 u$_5$[6],
and N a-1 u$_5$[7].

    (2) the passage 1 m á š u r u-a e-1 u$_5$-k a-à m /e-1 u G-a m/ D i n
g i r-r a-n a-š è e-TÚM, "one kid, pasturing/remaining in the town, he took
for Dingirana" (MAD 4 33:5-7, Sargonic)[8].

    (3) the passage p i r i g m u š-ḫ u š a b š a g$_4$-g a 1 u$_5$-g a,
"the lion, the *mušḫuššu*-dragon which lives in the midst of the sea" (L 1036,
unpublished Ur III incantation, courtesy of M.Civil)[9].

    (4) perhaps also the Pre-Sargonic personal name LUL.KA (TMH 5 124 iv 1,
159 v 10; OSP 1 122 ii 5), assuming that it is to be read L u$_5$-k a /1 u G-

-a/, and not N a r-k a /n a r-a k-a (m)/ or K a$_5$$^{k\ a\ 10}$.

In view of the use of -k a and -k e$_4$ as the complements of l u$_5$ in
(2) and (1), and possibly also in (4), until now documented only for the gen
itive element -a k and the verb a k, "to do"[11], it is tempting to specul-
ate that the final consonant of our verb was likewise /k/[12]. Especially per-
suasive for this interpretation is the consistent use of -k e$_4$ in the name
Ḫ a-b a-l u$_5$-k e$_4$, the spellings with -g e and -g e$_{18}$ being exceptional
and limited to the Ur III texts from Nippur, which abound in phonetic and un
orthographic writings.

Unfortunately, this hypothesis is weakened by the occurrence of -g a
in (3), as well as by the fact that l u-(g), the presumed variant of /l u G/,
is complemented not by -k a and -k e$_4$ but by -g a and -g e (see be-
low for the examples). It cannot be excluded, however, that the pronunciation
/l u g/ is a later development; this development may have taken place as
early as the Ur III period (as suggested by (3) and the variant spellings
with -g e and -g e$_{18}$ cited under (1)), though it was fully realized in
writting only in Old Babylonian times.

Nevertheless, since the evidence in hand is too slim and too ambiguous
to permit an outright conclusion, for the purpose of this note it will be
sufficient to assume that LUL has the reading l u g$_x$, leaving the question
of the final consonant for a future investigation.

So far, extant lexical sources fail to produce any unambiguous evidence
for the reading l u g$_x$ of LUL. It should be noted, however, that Proto-Ea
582 (= MSL 14, p.55) has the value z u l u g (or z u l u k)[13], of which
l u g$_x$ could be a derivative.

Turning now to the question of the relationship between l u g$_x$ and
l u-(g), we may begin by examining the semantic range of the latter verb.The
most extensive information on the meanings of l u-(g) comes from an Aa-
-type syllabary of the Old Babylonian date, where LU (glossed l u-ú) is
equated with *dešûm, re'ûm, uzuzzum, rabāsum, duššûm, balālum, mâdum, ṣalālum,*
and *kamārum* (MSL 14, p.141 lines 40-48). Another Aa-type syllabary, also dat

ing to the Old Babylonian period, translates LU by *re'ûm*, *dešûm*, *uzuzzum*, *itaktumum* (Ntn of *katāmu*), *rabāṣum*, and *mekûm* (MSL 14, p. 123 lines 282-87). These two listings combined suggest that the basic meanings of l u-(g) are:

(1) "to live (of an animal), to pasture" (intransitive)[14], "to herd/pasture animals, to take care of animals" (transitive), covering *rabāṣu*, *ṣalā lu*, *uzuzzu*, and *re'û*;

(2) "to be numerous/abundant" (intransitive), "to make numerous/abundant", also "to heap up" (transitive), covering *mâdu*, *dešû*, *duššû*, and *kamā ru*.

Since the translations *balālu*, "to mix", and *itaktumu*, "to be completely covered", cannot be accommodated under either (1) or (2), we can speculate that when used in these two meanings the sign is to be read l u and interpreted as a graphic variant of l ù, standing for both *balālu*[15] and *itaktumu*[16]. The case of *mekû*, "to be negligent (?)", is unclear.

That the verb is to be read l u g when having meaning (1) is assured by the lexical entry l u-u g LU = *man-za-zu šá* GUD u UDU (Ea I 191 = MSL 14, p. 186). Further, see the following examples from literary texts:

(a) k u_6 p ú-a l u g-g a-g i n_7, "like fish living in a pond", "Ur Lamentation 2" line 296 (UET 6 131:6).

(b) k u_6 a-n í g i n-n a l u g-g a-g i n_7, "like fish living in a pool", "Ur Lamentation 2" line 412 (UET 6 132:52).

(c) k u_6 a m u n l u g-g a-g i n_7, "like fish living in the brackish water" (JAOS,103 [1983], 71 line 11).

(d) m u š e n-e z a g d i š-à m i m-m a-d a(-a n)-l u g-g a = *iṣ--ṣu-ru a-di iš-ten i-z[i-iz/zu]*, "the bird, who lived alone", "Lugalbanda" line 68 (cf. also line 69) (C. Wilcke, *Lugalbanda*, p. 98)[17].

(e) n u n s a g-m a ḫ k u r š a g_4-g a l u g-g a, "the prince, the ... standing/living in the midst of the mountains" (A. Sjöberg: StOr, 46, p. 302 line 7).

(f) n u-é r i m-l á^{mušen} a b-t a g i-d ù-a b a-r a-à m-d a-l u g--g a-à m, "the ...-bird must live/sit (neither) in a window (nor) in a reed

hut", "Nanše and the Birds" iv 27' (courtesy of Civil).

(g) [š a g$_4$-b a (?) š e g$_9$ š e g$_{\bar{9}}$b a]r m i-n i-i n-l u-u g = *a-tu-du* *šap-pa-ri iz-za-az ina*(!) *libbi*(!)-*šú*, "the wild ram, the mountain ram lives/ stands there/in its midst" (CT 13 37:30)[18].

(h) [....] ⌜x⌝ u m a ḫ m a ḫ k u$_6$ m u š e n m i-n i(-i n)-l u(- u g), "the fish and the bird lived in the [.... of(?)] the great marsh", "Bird and Fish" line 14 (PBS 10/2 21:14 = UET 6 38:14).

(i) l u-u g-g e (in broken context) (ISET 1, p.73 Ni. 4369 rev. 28).

In view of the standard l u-a, "numerous"[19], and because of such ex- amples as n í g i m(-d a)-l u-l u-u n /-l u-l u-e n/, "you will make things numerous" ("Instructions of Šuruppak" lines 134, 181 = B. Alster, *Instructions of Suruppak*, pp. 40, 44) and g u d a l-l u-l u-u n, "you make oxen numer- ous" ("Proverbs, Collection Five" 5.27 = E.I. Gordon: JCS, 12 [1958], 16), we can assume that the reading of (2) is simply l u. Accordingly, it appears that what we have here is two homonyms, l u g, "to live (of an animal), to herd, to pasture", and l u, "to be/make numerous", grouped under one sign[20].

Turning now to the verb l u g$_x$, we can see that in the examples of the forms e/ì-d a-l u g$_x$, e-l u g$_x$-k a-à m, and l u g$_x$-g a cited earlier (see pp. 3-4), its meaning agrees precisely with that of l u g. The sense of the name Ḫ a-b a-l u g$_x$-k e$_4$ cannot be gauged with the same confidence; but, if we are correct that the reading of the verb "to be/make numerous" is l u, then the translation "May-he-pasture/take-care-of" would seem fairly certain.

Since l u g$_x$ is attested exclusively in 3rd mil. texts, whereas l u g is not documented before Old Babylonian times, it appears that LUL was the original grapheme of the verb in question. We can speculate that the trans- fer of the value /l u g/ from LUL to LU took place in the Old Babylonian pe- riod, possibly due to the semantic association between l u g$_x$, "to herd, to pasture", and u d u (also l u), "sheep". The question whether l u, "to be/ make numerous", was originally expressed by LU or by LUL remains unclear[21].

The only inconsistency that seems to exist between the (intransitive) uses of l u g$_x$ and l u g is that, while the former is reserved for the

singular subject, the latter can be employed with a plural subject as well (as in the example (h) cited earlier). However, since we have indications that by the Old Babylonian period many of the Old Sumerian suppletive roots lost their original function and acquired the status of "regular" verbs[22], it is possible that the same explanation also applies to l u g[23].

3.   As we have already touched upon the question of the readings of LUL, it might be useful to examine this issue in greater detail. According to Proto-Ea 578-582a (= MSL 14, pp. 54-55), the values of LUL are l u l, k a$_5$, p a ḫ, l i b, z u l u g, and n a r. Aa VII/4:118-137 (*ibid.*, pp. 468-‑469) adds l u$_5$, plus the rare š e$_{11}$, š a t a m, d u g a, and k ú š u m. Of all these values, only l u l, l u$_5$, l i b, n a r, and k a$_5$ are assured in 3rd mil. texts. To be added to this list are the values l u g$_x$ and l u b, neither of which is attested lexically.

3.1.   l u$_5$

The value l u$_5$ is commonly thought to be an abbreviation of l u l. This position is best evidenced in the (fairly) standard Sumerological pra-ctice of transliterating LUL as l u l whenever the reading of the sign is not manifestly l u$_5$. However, the fact that LUL can also be read l u g$_x$, as well as l u b, makes it clear that l u$_5$ is a short value of the sign, whose relationship to l u l, l u g$_x$, and l u b is the same as that of z i to z i d, z ì g, and z i r$_x$[24], or that of t u to t u d and t u r$_5$, to give just two examples. This, of course, does not preclude the possibility that l u$_5$ may actually derive from one of the long values, though there is no way of determining which value it could have been.

The value l u$_5$ is frequent in 3rd mil. texts, where it is used, as far as I was able to ascertain, always as a syllabogram. In fact, l u$_5$ ap-pears to have been the usual syllabic value of LUL before the Old Babylonian period. Among the examples of the syllabic l u$_5$ we can list:

(1) the noun p i-l u$_5$-d a, "practices, (ritual) obligations" (e.g., *Sollberger Corpus* Ukg. 4 vii 26 = 5 vii 9), a loan-word from *bēlūtu*[25].

(2) the noun k a(-a l)-l u$_5$ (a type of bowl) (DP 75 vi 4: k a-a l-

-l u$_5$ ^{giš}t a ș k a r i n; BIN 8 388 ii 1: k a-l u$_5$ ^{giš}t a s k a r i n;
both Pre-Sargonic, Lagaš), a loan-word from *kallu*, "bowl (made of clay or
wood)" (see CAD K, 83).

(3) the gloss l u$_5$-m a-a m$_6$/l a m-a m/ of l á m (NE) in a Pre-Sar-
gonic school exercise from Lagaš (*Bibl. Mesop.* 3 29 iv 4)[26].

(4) the Ebla GN Gáb-lu$_5$-ul^{ki}/Gáb-lu-ul^{ki} (see MEE 2, 359).

(5) the Ebla GN Lu$_5$-a-tum^{ki} (see A.Archi: SEb, 4 [1981], 1) / Lu-a-
-tum^{ki} (see MEE 2, 359).

(6) the GN Làl-lu$_5$-ur$_4^{ki}$/La-lú-ru$_{12}^{ki}$ of the Abu Salabikh-Ebla Geogra-
phical List line 61 (= MEE 3, 232).

(7) the GN Ì-làl-lu$_5^{ki}$/Ì-la-lu^{ki}/Ì-làl-lu^{ki} of the Abu Salabikh-Ebla
Geographical List line 206 (= *ibid.*, 236).

(8) the PN Ba-lu$_5$-lu$_5$/Ba-lu-lu of the Abu Salabikh-Ebla Names and Pro-
fessions List line 134 (= Archi: SEb 4, 184).

(9) the Sargonic PN Ip-lu$_5$-zi-DINGIR /*iplus-ilum*/, "The-god-has-looked-
-upon" (HSS 10 188 iii 21), also written Ip-lu-us-DINGIR (MVN 3 108 rev. 11)
and Ip-lu-zi-DINGIR (AS 17 21:3, 22:3; A.Westenholz, ECTJ no. 51:2; *Acta Su-
merologica*, 4 [1982], 45-46 no. 14 ii 11, iv 1).

(10) the Sargonic nisbe Gáb-lu$_5$-lí-um /*gablulīum*/ (OIP 14 81:2), deriv-
ing from the GN Gáb-lu$_5$/lu-ul^{ki}, cited under (4).

(11) the Sargonic spelling *ga-lu$_5$-ma* /*kaluma*/, "all" (PBS 5 36 rev. ii
13).

(12) the Sargonic month name Ḫa-lu$_5$-ut (see MAD 1, 234).

(13) the syllabic spelling ú-l u$_5$-š i-e for the usual u l u š i n,
"emmer-beer" (Gudea Cyl. B vii 2)[27].

(14) the Ur III item ḫ a l-l u$_5$ z a b a r (BIN 5 2:34), probably a
loan-word from *ḫallu* (a container) (see CAD Ḫ, 45b under *ḫallu* B).

For other examples of the syllabic l u$_5$, coming from Sargonic and Ur
III personal names, see MAD 2², p. 95[28].

3.2.   l u l

The value l u l is well documented in the 3rd mil. texts written in

Sumerian, its usage being strictly logographic. In literary texts: see, e.g.,
1⌈u l n a-g u r$_5$-g u r$_5$⌉ (OIP 99 256 iv 5) = ⌈1 u⌉1 ⌈n a⌉-g u r$_5$-g u r$_5$
(OIP 99, p. 58 iii 1'), "do not spit out lies" (ED version of the "Instruct-
ions of Šuruppak", corresponding to l u l n a m-g u r$_5$-g u r$_5$ in line 41
of the OB version); g u d l u l n a-ḫ u n(?) (OIP 99 256 v 2) = ⌈g⌉u d
1⌈u l n⌉a b-⌈s a$_{10}$(?)-s a$_{10}$(?)⌉ (OIP 99, p. 58 iii 8'), "do not ⌈hire(?)/
buy (?)⌉ a treacherous ox" (ED version of the "Instructions of Šuruppak",
corresponding to g u d 1⌈u l-l⌉a n a-a b-s a$_{10}$-s a$_{10}$ in line 218 of the OB
version). In personal names: see e.g., E n-n í g-l u l-l a (e.g., RTC 81:14),
N í g-l u l-l i (WF 31 iv 4), L u l-l a (see Limet, *Anthroponymie*, 481),
^{d}N a n n a-l u l-l a (see *ibid*., 500), K i-l u l-l a (see *ibid*., 444), and
Š e š-k i-l u l-l a (see *ibid*., 530), where n í g-l u l-l a, l u l-l a, and
k i-l u l-l a are to be connected with *sartu*, *sarru*, and *šagaštu* respectively.

The syllabic l u l is thought to appear in 1) the month name Za-LUL[29],
2) the Akkadian personal names I-LUL-DINGIR (see MAD 3, 40), Ib-LUL-I1/DIN-
GIR (see *ibid*., 96), Id-LUL-DINGIR, Da-ad-LUL-tum (see *ibid*., 109), Iš-LUL-
-I1/DINGIR, Da-áš-LUL-tum (see *ibid*., 271), and Da-áš-LUL-^{d}A-a (CT 50 79:4),
and 3) the literary passage *ad*-LUL ⌈UD(?)⌉ *a-da-la-li*-[...] (AfO, 25 ⌈1974-
-1977⌉, 98 obv. ii' 2'). In none of these examples, however, is the reading
l u l completely certain, the alternative readings being possible in all
instances[30]. Therefore, until the unequivocal evidence is produced, the use
of the syllabic l u l in 3rd mil. texts must remain in doubt.

3.3.   l i b

Attested syllabically in the GN I-lib^{ki} (BE 1 pls. VI-VII iii 8', rev.
ii 7', Sargonic). The same toponym is spelled Ì-li-bí^{ki}/I1-íb^{ki} in the Abu
Salabikh-Ebla Geographical List line 270 (= MEE 3, 239), and Ì-lib^{ki}, I-li-
-ib^{ki}, or E-li-ib in Old Babylonian texts (see B. Groneberg, RGTC 3, 71; MSL
11, 102 line 178).

3.4.   l u g$_x$

Attested logographically only. See under 2.

3.5. l u b

Although the value l u b is not preserved in lexical texts[31], its use in Sumerian is assured by the entry a l-l u-u b-b a = *al-lu-tum* (MDP 27 45 rev. 2), which establishes the reading a l-l u b for a l-LUL = *alluttu*, "crab"[32]. In this example, l u b apparently serves as a syllabogram. For the early occurrences of a l-l u b, see k u n a l-l u b, "crab's tail", in an Ur III incantation (ArOr 17/2, 1949, pls. III-IV lines 5, 20), and possibly also the metal object ŠEN-a l-l u b (Gudea Statue B v 42; BIN 5 1:1; YOS 4 246 i 11, ii 32, vi 136), which could be either a container (š e n) or an axe (d u r$_{10}$).

3.6. n a r

Attested logographically in the occupation n a r, "singer" (*passim* in 3rd mil. texts). The possibility that n a r occurs as a syllabogram in the personal name Na-LUL, as suggested by Gelb, MAD 2^2, p. 95, is highly doubtful.

3.7. k a$_5$

Attested logographically only. See, e.g., the personal name Ka$_5$^{a}, "Mr. Fox" (e.g. MAD 4 157:3, 166:6).

3.8.

In summary: 1) l u g$_x$ and k a$_5$ are attested only logographically; 2) l u$_5$, l u b, and l i b are attested only syllabically; 3) l u l and n a r are certain only as logograms; their syllabic use remains in doubt.

	Sumerian		Akkadian
	Log.	Syl.	Syl.
l u$_5$	-	+	+
l u l	+	-	+ (?)
l i b	-	-	+
l u g$_x$	+	-	-
l u b	-	+	-
n a r	+	-	+ (?)
k a$_5$	+	-	-

Values of LUL in 3rd Mil. Texts

I wish to thank Miguel Civil and William L. Moran for their most useful comments and suggestions. It goes without saying that responsibility for the final product rests solely with the author.

1) Published by the author.

2) See Steinkeller: Or, 48 (1979), 55. For the examples of s e$_{11}$ with the plural subject of the class of animals, see: (several animals) PN s i p a d-d a e-d a-s e$_{11}$ (VAS 14 8 i 1-ii 4); (several animals) PN a g a--ú s a g r i g-d a a n-d a-s e$_{11}$-à m (*Bibl. Mesop.* 3 18 iii 1-4); (several animals) PN e-d a-s e$_{11}$ (MAD 4 19:9-12, 75:7-14);(several animals) PN (s i p a d)-d a ì-d a-s e$_{11}$ (MAD 4 20:5-8, 29:15-19, 30:7-10; 38:1--12, 52:1-8, 76 ii 7-iii 3, 135:1-7, 146:5-7, 148:1-7).

3) See H. Limet, *Anthroponymie*, 427.

4) See *ibid.*, 427.

5) See *ibid.*, 428.

6) See *ibid.*, 495.

7) See *ibid.*, 496; note that N a-l u$_5$-l a of CT 10 16 i 9, cited there, is to be corrected to K i-l u l-l a.

8) Against Foster, *Umma in the Sargonic Period*, 67, who translates the same lines: "1 kid, he placed in custody in the city; he placed (it) at the very command of his (personal) god", I assume that D i n g i r-r a-n a is a personal name, to be analyzed as /d i n g i r-a n i-a k/, "The-one-of-his-god". The usual spelling of this name is the contracted D i n g i r-n a (e.g., BIN 8 141:8, 10). For similar constructions, cf. D i n g i r-r a/d i n g i r--a k/, "The-one-of-the-god" (see Limet, *op. cit.*, 395, and note also the spelling D i n g i r-r a-k e$_4$ [with agentive] in SACT 2 147:5) and D i n g i r--g á/d i n g i r-m u a k/, "The-one-of-my-god" (e.g. MAD 5 59:17').

9) Cf. m u š-ḫ u š a-a b-b a = *muš-ḫuš tam-ti* in Angim 139 (J.S. Cooper, AnOr, 52, p. 80 [misprinted as a-a-b a]).

10) Further evidence for the reading l u g$_x$ of LUL may be sought in the divine epithet / priestly title a m a-LUL. The fact that this word found its way into Akkadian under the forms *amaluktu, maluktu, maruktu,* and *amalūtu* (see CAD A/2 , 1-2), suggests that its pronunciation was /a m a--l u g/. This interpretation seems to find support in the personal name Ama-lu$_5$-gu (*Nikolski* 2 19 i 1), which very likely represents a variant spelling of a m a-LUL. [In this connection, note the Pre-Sargonic and Sargonic noun l u$_5$-g u (meaning uncertain), which occurs both independently and as part of the compound verb l u$_5$-g u ... a k (see, most recently, F.Pomponio: WO, 13 [1982], 95-96). The possibility that this word is a verbal noun of l u g$_x$ (LUL) with the assimilated final vowel /l u g -a > l u g u/, certainly needs to be considered, but it does not seem

very likely.]

11) See, most recently, M.A. Powell in *Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East: Studies in Honour of I.M. Diakonoff*, ed. by. M.A. Dandamayev et al., Warminster 1982, 318.

12) In accordance with the conventional phonemic transcription of Sumerian.

13) See also Aa VII/4:135 (= MSL 14, 469), Nabnitu XXI 250 (= MSL 16, 199), and Nigga bil. B 185 (see Civil: JAOS, 103 [1983], 63b).

14) Cf. Civil's translation "to live in its natural habitat, said of an animal" : JNES, 31 (1972), 386b.

15) See CAD B, 39-40, lexical section of *balālu*.

16) See [l ù]-l ù = *i-ta-ak-tu-mu* (MSL 9, 96, line 206).

17) For the reconstruction of the Akkadian verb, see Civil: JNES, 31 (1972), 386b.

18) For the reading of this passage, see W. von Soden: StOr, 46, 331.

19) For the examples, see J. van Dijk, SGL 2, 61-62; W. Heimpel, *Tierbilder*, 218-19.

20) For a suggestion that l u g and l u are two separate verbs, see already von Soden: StOr, 46, 331.

21) A clear instance of this usage of LU is found in Gudea Cyl. B xii 13-15: g a b a-g a b a m a š a n š e l u-a-b a e d i n k i-á g ^{d}N i n--g í r-s u-k a-k e$_4$ n í g-k u d n u-a k-d a, "in order that the weanlings of the numerous flock be not diminished in the beloved steppe of Ningirsu" (cf. A. Falkenstein, GSGL 2, 9). On the other hand, one notes the existence of LUL.AŠ (to be read l u$_5$-a š ?), "very much, greatly" (e.g. UET 6 2:5; JAOS, 88 [1968], 82 line 12), corresponding to the Akkadian *mādiš*, *danniš* (see CAD M/1, 17, lexical section of *mādu*), which could preserve the sense "to be/make numerous" of LUL. This issue is still further complicated by the fact that there are also examples where the sign LÚ is used, as in a l-l ú, "are numerous" (*Barton MBI* 1 iii 1', 2', 3', 4', 5'; courtesy of Civil).

22) See Steinkeller: Or, 48, 62 n. 16, for the roots /e r e/ and l a ḫ$_4$; further, note the Ur III examples of the singular roots g i n, g u b, and t u š employed with a plural subject, cited *ibid.*, 61 n. 13, which indicate that the process by which suppletive roots lost their distinctive character and were eventually leveled with "regular" verbs had already began in Ur III times.

23) Sjöberg: StOr, 46, 312, assumed that in the above-cited example (e) l u g refers to the "prince" (n u n), that is, a noun of the class of

persons . This, of course, would be against the rule posited by Bauer
that the intransitive l u g$_x$/l u g can be used only of the class of
animals. However, this difficulty can be removed, if one assumes that
the subject of l u g in this passage is s a g-m a ḫ, which, whatever
its exact meaning, must be either an animated object or an animal.

24) Attested in z i r$_x$, "to break, to destroy, to obliterate, etc." (Akka-
   dian *pasāsu*), "to be troubled" (Akkadian *ašāšu*). Though this verb (or
   verbs) is usually written z i-i r, spellings without -i r are also
   extant, as in s í g-m u g z i r$_x$-r a, "damaged wool combings" (VAS 14
   146 i 1).

25) See Powell: ZA, 62 (1972), 210 n. 128.

26) See Civil: BO, 40 (1983), (in press).

27) Cf. Falkenstein, GSGL 1, 31.

28) Cf. also the Pre-Sargonic feminine names A-n a-m u-g u-l u$_5$ (e.g., VAS 14
   124 i 2), U r u-n a-a-n a-g u-l u$_5$ (e.g., HSS 3 23 iii 18), and N i n-r a-a-
   -n a-g u-l u$_5$ (e.g., HSS 3 23 iii 5), also the Ur III name G u-l u$_5$ (see
   Limet, *op. cit.*, 425), where g u-l u$_5$ could conceivably be related to
   /g u l u d/ (a variant of g a l a m ?), found in n í g-g u-l u-d a, Ak-
   kadian *nikiltu* (see CAD N/2, 220).

29) Attested at Ebla (see Pettinato: OA, 16 [1977], 275), Pre-Sargonic Mari
   (see D. Charpin: RA, 76 [1982], 5), and Sargonic Gasur (see MAD 1, 234).

30) (1) The explanation of Za-LUL as Za-lul /salūl/ was primarily based on
   the existence of the cognate Za-líl-tum (see MAD 3, 234; CAD Ṣ, 72a).
   However, since it has recently been demonstrated that the latter month
   name is to be read Za-'à-tum (see Pettinato: OA, 16, 275), the inter-
   pretation of Za-LUL is no longer certain.
   (2) Though the reading l u l is admissible in the case of Id-LUL-Il
   and Da-ad-LUL-tum (with MAD 3, 109), because *dalālu* yields a good sense
   for these names, the readings Id-lip- and Da-ad-lip- (to be connected
   with *dalāpu*, "to be or stay awake, to work ceaselessly, to keep (some-
   one) awake") are equally possible. Given that *alālu*, "to shout", is not
   attested in G-stem (see CAD A/1, 331 under *alalu B), the interpretation
   of I-LUL-DINGIR as /īlul-ilum/ (see MAD 3, 40) is open to question. Read,
   perhaps, I-lip- and connect with *elēpu*, "to send forth shoots, to lenght-
   en, to stretch (arm, hand, etc.)". For Iš-LUL-Il/DINGIR, Da-áš-LUL(-tum),
   and Da-áš-LUL-$_d$A-a, which MAD 3, 271, and AHw, 1142, place under *šalālu*,
   "to carry away", one might consider the reading l u p, since *šalāpu,*
   "to pull out, to extract (as in birth ?)", would give a better meaning
   than *šalālu*. The name Ib-LUL-Il/DINGIR has been identified with either
   balālu, "to mix" (MAD 3, 96; AHw, 98a) or *palālu* (Edzard, ARET 2, 107).
   However, neither of these hypotheses is very convincing, for *balālu* fails

to yield any good sense, whereas *palālu* is difficult to accept on gram-
matical grounds (the expected form is **iplil*, see AHw, 813b). An altern-
ative solution would be to read this name Ip-lu$_5$-Il/DINGIR and to inter-
pret it as an abbreviated spelling of the name ^{5}Iplus-ilum, cited above
under (9). (In this connection, note that Ib-LUL-Il/DINGIR is limited to
Pre-Sargonic and Early Sargonic sources, while Iplus-ilum is found only
in Classical Sargonic texts!). For similar abbreviations in 3rd mil. mat
erial, see: (a) I-ku/gu- for Ikūn- (both before C and V; see MAD 3, 138);
(b) I-ti- for Iddin- (both before C and V; see MAD 3, 198-99); for those
who might still prefer to interpret I-ti- as Idī-, "My-arm/strength", we
should note the variant spellings I-din-DINGIR (NATN 481:5) and I-ti-
-[DINGIR] (*ibid.*, seal), and I-din-É-a (NATN 918 rev. 1) and I-ti-É-a
(*ibid.*, seal); (c) Iš-ku- for Iškun- (see MAD 3, 268); (d) Ku-ru- for
Kurub- (cf. the examples cited *ibid.*, 149 under KR' ? and 150 under
karābum); (e) I-mi- for Īmid- (cf. the examples cit$_x$ed *ibid.*, 44 under
amājum and *amādum*); (f) perhaps also I-zi- for Īṣid- (cf. the examples
of I-zi-, *ibid.*, 70, with the name ^{d}EN.ZU-e-zé-id, *ibid.*, same page).
(3) The passage from AfO, 25, p. 98 obv. ii' 2', was read by Westenholz,
ibid., p. 98, *ad-lul* UTU *a-da-la-li-*[*im*]?, "I praised Šamaš(?) highly".
This interpretation, however, is highly questionable, considering the
absence of a divine determinative before ⌜UD(?)⌝ and the grammatical dif
ficulties presented by *a-da-la-li-*[...]. Further, it should be noted
that, as copied, the sign ⌜UD(?)⌝ seems to form a ligature with LUL;
this suggests that it belongs to the preceding word, perhaps as a gloss.

31) They do, however, record the value l i b (e. g., Proto-Ea 581; Aa
VII / 4:121; S^a 230), to which l u b is obviously related. For the
syllabic l u p in Akkadian texts, see Von Soden and Röllig, *Syllabar*,
p. 39, 207.

32) Note also g i š-é r i n-l u b-b i = *qab-lu-u*, *lub-bu*, MIN *šá zi-ba-ni-*
-*ti* (Hh. VI 110-112), and the related terms discussed in MSL 9, 27.

ADDENDUM to p. 10 under 3.: to be added to the 3rd mil. values of LUL is

p a ḫ; this value is used syllabically in the Sumerian word p a-p a ḫ,

"cella" (Akk. *papāḫum*), which already occurs in a Late Sargonic/Early Ur III

house-plan from Lagaš (RTC 145).