# SOME REFLECTIONS ABOUT THE VERBS $/ \mathrm{DU}_{3} /$, /TU/, /DIM $/$ / AND /AK/ IN THE SUMERIAN INSCRIPTIONS OF GUDEAS STATUES 


#### Abstract

In its internal structure every language contains a great deal of information. Important linguistic data may be revealed by studying such information. In a language like Sumerian, which has no other related language with which to draw parallels, this method of study turns out to be absolutely essential. The study of the actants and circumstants of «making» verbs such as $/ \mathbf{d u}_{3} /, / \mathbf{t u} /, / \mathbf{d i m}_{2} /$ and $/ \mathbf{a k} /$, in a context of representative texts such as the inscriptions on Gudea's monuments, can provide us with fundamental information about the basic meaning of these verbs.
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Resumen: Todas las lenguas poseen en su estructura interna una gran capacidad de información susceptible de ser investigada y proporcionarnos datos de notable relevancia lingüística. Si esto es cierto en una lengua que cuenta con el apoyo de otras lenguas con ella emparentadas, el método del estudio interno en una lengua como el Sumerio resulta decisivo, al no tener junto a él ningún representante lingüísticamente emparentable. El estudio de los actantes y circunstantes de los verbos que significan «hacer», concretamente $\mathbf{d u}_{3}, \mathbf{t u}, \mathbf{d i m}_{2} y$ ak en un grupo de textos tan representativos como las inscripciones de las estatuas de Gudea de Lagash pueden suministrarnos una información cabal sobre el significado básico de estos verbos.
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In its internal structure every language contains a great deal of information and important linguistic data may be revealed by means of a patient analysis labour. In fact, it is studying a language «from the inside» which can provide us with a mine of information about it on various levels. If this is true of languages which are closely related to others, it is doubly so when the language in question bears no relation whatsoever to any other.

As far as we know, such is the case with Sumerian: Although no other language is related to it directly, there are many translations of it into Akkadian and, lexically speaking, a good deal of documentation exists in the latter tongue, which may compensate for the deficiency mentioned above. Nevertheless, one should draw a clear distinction between a language which is simply related and another, which, without belonging to the same group - the case of Akkadian and Sumerian-, provides us with the type of data referred to. My aim in this paper is very simple: to apply the internal method of lexical analysis to a reduced yet significant number of verbs meaning «to make», which are to be found on the Lagas statues of Gudea.

I should like to add to the textual limits, easily justified for reasons of space, that the corpus selective criteria are due, on the one hand, to the fact of being texts dated in a time in which Sumerian
was very surely still spoken ${ }^{1}$ and the other to, given the ritual and stereotyped character of these texts, that, in the same way of other old languages, in many aspects provides us with the knowledge of a language state previous to the time in which they are dated ${ }^{2}$.

In our corpus we have selected four verbs of «to make», namely, /du $\mathbf{3}_{3}$, /tu/, /dim $\mathbf{d}_{2}$ and /ak/ widely documented, and we have analysed all the constructions in which they appear in detail, trying to isolate their relevant semes and establishing the possible oppositions amongst them to obtain the «basic meaning» and, when necessary, "the secondary meaning» of each one of them.

A key question in the analysis of these verbs is the actant complements, their nature, their disposition, their accidental characteristics, the metaphoric use and the peculiarities of syntactic construction.

## $\mathrm{du}_{3}$

This verb goes into two actants, one of them in Ergative and represented in our texts by an animate being, and the other in Absolutive functioning as a complement and offering a varying range of inanimated terms.

Type I: /du $\mathbf{u}_{3}$ / with the meaning of «to build».
In the texts we have studied we can see as complements of this meaning names of building, usually temples. So, for example, we read: $\mathbf{e}_{2}$-ninnu-anzu-babbar ${ }_{2}$-ra-ni / mu-na-du $\mathbf{3}_{3}$ (B 5:15-16) «His Eninnu-bright-Bird built him» ${ }^{3}$. The complement is represented by the generic term $\mathbf{e}_{2}$ thirtyfour times and for the specific denomination of the building, in our case names of temples, a total number of thirty-five cases ${ }^{4}$ :
${ }^{1}$ Ur III had to mark the end of the spoken language. Cf. J.S.Cooper «Sumerian and Akkadian in Summer and Akkad» OrNs 42, 1973, pp. 239-246. For the different points of view adopted about this problem it can be consulted the work of F. Rudolf Krauss, Sumerer und Akkader. Ein Probleme der altmesopotamischen Geschichte. Amsterdam-Leiden 1970, p. 86 ff. In opinion of Sth. Libermann in The Sumerians Loandword in Old Babylonian, I, Prolegomena and Evidence. Missoula 1977, pp. 20-21, still in the Old Babylonian people went on speaking Sumerian in isolated nucleus although they were getting smaller gradually. Cf. lately about this problem Th. Jacobsen «Sumerian Grammar today», JAOS 108, 1988, pp. 123-125.
${ }^{2}$ It gives impression that this phenomenon constitues a typological character of the Antiquity monumental inscriptions. It is curious to see how in the Latin funeral inscriptions, votive or monumental of the first century BC. and even posterior, we see a state of the language that belongs to three or four years before in anthroponyms and other terms.
${ }^{3}$ The examples corresponding to the Gudea Statues are named according to the corpus of H. Steible, Die Neusumerischen Bau- und Weihinschriften, Stuttgart 1982 I, pp. 154-255 and for the examples corresponding to the Old Sumerian we take as reference H. Steible-H. Behrens, Die Altsumerischen Bau- und Weihinschriften I-II. Wiesbaden 1983.
${ }^{4}$ A 1: 8-9 ( ${ }^{\text {d }}$ ninhur-saĝ[ra])..gu ${ }_{3}$-de $\mathbf{2}_{2}$-a...-ke ${ }_{4} \mathbf{e}_{2}$ uru-giir ${ }_{2}$-su ${ }^{\text {ki-ka-ni mu-na-du }}$; A 3: 7-4 (nintu...ke ${ }_{4}$ $\mathrm{gu}_{3}-\mathrm{de}_{2}-\mathrm{a} \mathrm{lu}_{2} \mathrm{e}_{2} \mathrm{du}_{3}$-a-ka nam-ti-la-ni mu-su $;$ B 4: 6 saĝ-ur-saŠ-e mu-na-du ${ }_{3}$ ("they build [the building]»); B 4 : 7-9 $\mathbf{e}_{2}{ }^{\text {d }}$ nin- $\hat{g i r}_{2}$-su-ka eridu ${ }^{\text {ki }}$-gim ki sikil-la bi ${ }_{2}$ du $_{3}$; B 5: 21-22 $\mathbf{u}_{4} \mathbf{e}_{2}{ }^{\text {d }}$ nin- ${ }^{\text {gir }}{ }_{2}$-su-ka mu-du ${ }_{3}$-a; B 6 : 77-7: 1-3 $\mathbf{e}_{2}$ ur $_{5}$-gim dim ${ }_{2}$-ma ensi ${ }_{2}$ Aš-e ${ }^{\text {d }}$ nin-ĝir ${ }_{2}$-sura mu-na-du $\mathbf{3}_{3}$ B 7: $4 \mathbf{e}_{2}$ ur-gim $\operatorname{dim}_{2}$-ma (B6;77)... na-mu-du ${ }_{3}$; B $^{2}$ : 14-16 lugal-mu $e_{2}$-a-ni mu-na-du ${ }_{3}$; C 3: 18-19 gu $_{3}$-de ${ }_{2}$-a lu $\mathbf{e}_{2}$ - du $_{3}$-a-ka....nam-ti-la-ni...; D 3: 17-4: 1 e $\mathbf{e}_{2}$ uru-kug-ga-ka-ni mu-na-du ${ }_{3}$; D 5: 5-6 $\mathrm{gu}_{3}-\mathrm{de}_{2}$-a lu $\mathrm{e}_{2} \mathrm{e}_{2} \mathrm{du}_{3}$-a-ra; E 4: 1-2 ki dadag-ga-a $\mathrm{e}_{2}$ mu-na-du $;$ E 7: 16-20 $e_{2}$ gibil gu -de $_{2}$-a ensi ${ }_{2}$ lagaški ${ }_{-2}$ lu $_{2}$ e-du ${ }_{3}$-a-ke ${ }_{4}$; E 9: $3 \mathbf{u}_{4}-$ du $_{11}(=S A G)$ gaba $\mathbf{i}_{3}-$ du $_{3}$ (it is understood $\mathbf{e}_{2}$ ); E 9: 6-8 alan $l \mathbf{u}_{2} \mathbf{e}_{2}$ dba-ba ${ }_{6}$ mu-du $\mathbf{u}_{3}$-akam; F 2: 6-7 uru-kug-ga ki dadag-ga-a $e_{2}$ mu-na-du ${ }_{3}$;
 mu-na-du $\mathbf{3}_{3}$ a; G 5: 8-12 dba-ba ${ }_{6}$ nin-a-ni $\mathbf{e}_{2}$ ki-ag $\hat{g}_{2}$-ni $\mathbf{e}_{2}$-TAR-sir -sir $_{2}$ mu-na-du ${ }_{3}$-a (in this case $\mathbf{e}_{2}$ is apposition of $\mathbf{e}_{2}$-TAR-sir ${ }_{2}$-sir ${ }_{2}$ ); G 6: 14-18 $\mathbf{e}_{2}$ gibil gu $\mathbf{g u}_{3}-$ de $_{2}$ a ensi ${ }_{2}$ lagas ${ }^{\text {ki }}\left[\mathbf{l u}_{2} \mathrm{e}_{2}\right]$-du $\mathbf{3}_{3}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{ke}_{4} ; \mathrm{H} 2: 1-4 \mathbf{u}_{4} \mathrm{e}_{2}$-TAR-sir ${ }_{2}$ $\operatorname{sir}_{2} \mathrm{e}_{2} \mathbf{k i}-\hat{\mathrm{g}}_{2}-\mathrm{ni}^{2} \mathrm{e}_{2} \mathrm{he}_{2}-\mathrm{du}_{7}$ uru-kug-ga mu-na-du -a ( $\mathrm{e}_{2}$ as an apposition of $\mathbf{e}_{2}$-TAR-sir ${ }_{2}$-sir ${ }_{2}$ ); I 3: 4-6 dingir galgal lagaški-ke -ne $_{4} \mathrm{e}_{2}$-ne-ne mu-ne-du $\mathbf{3}_{3}$; I 3: 9-10 $\mathrm{e}_{2}$ gir $_{2^{-}}$ su $^{\text {ki-ka-ni mu-na-du }}$; I 5: 3-6 gu $3_{3}-$ de $_{2}$-alu $\mathbf{e}_{2}$ edu ${ }_{3}$-a-ka nam-ti-il mu-na-sum; $M$ (right shoulder) $1-6 \mathbf{g u}_{3}-\mathrm{de}_{2}-\mathbf{a}$ ensi ${ }_{2}$ lagaš ${ }^{\text {ki }}{ }^{l} u_{2} \mathrm{e}_{2}{ }^{\text {d }}$ nin- ${ }^{\text {gisis-zi-da }} \mathbf{u}_{3} \mathrm{e}_{2}{ }^{\text {d }}$ geŝtin-an-na-ka mu-du $\mathbf{3}^{-a} ;$ M 2: 1-6 nin-a-ni gu $\mathbf{3}_{3}-\mathrm{de}_{2}-$ a ensi $_{2}$ lagas $^{\text {ki }}-\mathrm{ke}_{4}$

$$
\mathbf{e}_{2}-\text { ninnu }^{5}, \mathbf{e}_{2} \text {-an-na }{ }^{6}, \mathbf{e}_{2}-\text { PA } \mathbf{e}_{2} \text {-ub-imin }{ }^{7}, \mathbf{e}_{2} \text {-TAR-sir }{ }_{2} \text {-sir }{ }_{2}{ }^{8}, \mathbf{e}_{2} \text {-sirara }{ }_{6}{ }^{9} \text { and gi-gun }{ }_{4}^{10}
$$

In two cases we find $/ \mathbf{d u}_{3} /$ without any explicit Absolutive complement, but with the previous
 brought ebory and he used it for the construction» and in B 6: 53...55-56 esir $\mathbf{2}_{2}$ - $\mathbf{g u}_{2} / \ldots / \mathbf{k i}^{3} \mathbf{s a}_{2} \mathbf{e}_{2}$ -
 that we are dealing with a secondary meaning that has as its point of departure the meaning of / du $\mathbf{I}^{I}$ / type.

Type II $/ \mathbf{d u}_{3} /$ with the meaning of «to hoist», «to grasp», «to plant».
In our documentation we find four examples in which the Absolutive complement is represented by a kind of weapon, the šar ${ }_{2}$-ur ${ }_{3}$, the šar $\mathbf{r}_{2}$-ur ${ }_{3}{ }^{\text {urudu }}$ KAK-igi-imin, the ${ }^{[\text {[ur]udu }}$ KAK(.) ŠEN and the ${ }^{\text {urudu }}$ KAK(.) ŠEN-al-LUL: šar ${ }_{2}$-ur ${ }_{3}$ a-maru me ${ }_{3}$-ka-ni / mu-na-du $\mathbf{3}_{3}$ (B 5:37-38) «His (weapon) šarur, 'his torrent of fight' he grasped for him (Ningirsu)»; šar ${ }_{2}$-gaz ${ }^{\text {urudu }}$ kak-igi-imin / mu-na-du ${ }_{\text {lur }}$ (B 5:39-40) «The (weapon) šargaz seven eyed copper nailed he grasped for him (Ningirsu)»; udu KAK(.)ŠEN-da-ka-ni / mu-na-du (B 5: 41-42) «His (weapon) kakšenda he grasped for him»; ${ }^{\text {[ur]udu }}$ KAK(.) ŠEN-al-LUL-ni / mu-na-du ${ }_{3}$ (B 5: 43-44) «His (weapon) kakšenallul he grasped for him».
$\mathbf{e}_{2} \hat{\text { gir }}_{2}$-su ${ }^{\text {ki-ka-ni mu-na-du }} \mathbf{3}_{3} ;$ N 1-6 $=\mathrm{M}$ (right shoulder) 1-6; N 2: 1-3: $1=\mathrm{M} 2: 1-6$; O (right shoulder) 1-6 $=$ M 2: 1-6: O 2: 1-15 gu $_{3}-$ de $_{2}$-a ensi ${ }_{2}$ lagaški- $\mathbf{k e}_{4} \mathbf{e}_{2} \hat{\text { gir }}_{2}-$ su ${ }^{\text {ki}}-k a-n i$ mu-na-du ${ }_{3}$.
${ }^{5} \mathrm{~A}$ (on the shoulder) $\left(\mathbf{g u}_{3}-\mathbf{d e}_{2}\right.$-a...) $\mathbf{l u}_{2}-\mathbf{e}_{2}$-ninnu ${ }^{\text {d }}$ nin- $\hat{g i r}_{2}$-su-ka in-du ${ }_{3}$-a; B 1: 3_..-6-7 alan gu ${ }_{3}$-de $3_{3}$-a... $l_{u_{2}} \mathrm{e}_{2}$-ninnu in-du $\mathbf{3}_{3}$-a-ke $\mathrm{e}_{4} \ldots$; В 5: 15-16 $\mathrm{e}_{2}$-ninnuanzu $^{\text {musen }}$-babbar ${ }_{2}$-ra-ni mu-na-du $\mathbf{3}_{3}$; В 6: 73-75 $\mathbf{u}_{4}$ $\mathbf{e}_{2}$-ninnu ${ }^{\text {d }}$ nin- gir $_{2}$-su-ra mu-na-du ${ }_{3}$-a; B 7: 26-28 $\mathbf{u}_{4}$ $\mathbf{e}_{2}$-ninnu $e_{2}$ ki-a $\hat{g}_{2}$-ga ${ }_{2}$-ni mu-na-du $\mathbf{3}_{3}$ a; B 7: 61-8: 1-5
 in-du ${ }_{3}$ a; B 8: 31-34 $\mathbf{e}_{2}$-ninnu ${ }^{d}$ nin- $\hat{g}^{2} r_{2}$-su lugal-mu
 in-du ${ }_{3}$-a; D 2: 7-8 $\mathbf{e}_{2}$-ninnu-anzu ${ }_{2}{ }^{\text {musisen-babbar }}$-ra-ni
 ninnu ${ }^{\text {d nin }}$-gir ${ }_{2}$-su-ka e $e_{2}$-PA $e_{2}$-ub-imin mu-du ${ }_{3}$-a; E 2 : 9-13 ni $\hat{g}_{2} \mathbf{e}_{2}$-ninnu $\mathbf{e}_{2} \mathbf{k i}-\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{2}$-ni ${ }^{\text {d }}$ nin- $\hat{g i r i r}_{2}$-su lugal-a-ni mu-na-du ${ }_{3}$-a-gim; E 6: 8-12 $\mathbf{u}_{4}{ }^{\text {d }}$ nin- $\hat{g i r i r}_{2}$-su lugal-a-ni $\mathbf{e}_{2} \mathbf{k i}-\hat{g}_{2}$-ni $e_{2}$-ninnu mu-na-du $u_{3}$-a; F $1: 8-11 \mathrm{lu}_{2} \ldots \mathrm{e}_{2}-$ ninnu-anzu ${ }_{2}{ }^{\text {musen }}$-babbar $_{2}{ }^{{ }^{\text {d }} \text { nin- }}{ }^{\text {gir }}{ }_{2}$-su-ka mu-du ${ }_{3}$-a;
 $\hat{\mathrm{g} i r}_{2}$-su-ka in-du $\mathbf{3}_{3}$-a; I 2: 11-13 $\mathbf{e}_{2}$-ninnu-anzu ${ }_{2}{ }^{\text {musisen }}$ babbar $_{2}$-ra-ni $e_{2}$-PA $e_{2}$-ub-imin-na-ni mu-na-du $u_{3}$-a; $P$ 2: 12-14 ( $\mathbf{u}_{4} \ldots \mathrm{gu}_{3}$-de $\left.\mathrm{e}_{2}-\mathrm{a}\right) \ldots \mathrm{e}_{2}$-ninnu-anzu ${ }_{2}{ }^{\text {musen }}$ babbar $_{2}$-ra-ni $e_{2}$-PA $e_{2}$-ub-imin-na-ni mu-na-du ${ }_{3}$-a;
 in-du ${ }_{3}$-a; R 1: 8-2: 1 [ $\left.\mathbf{u}_{4}\right] \mathbf{e}_{2}$-ninnu [ ${ }^{d} \mathbf{n i ]}$ n- ĝir $_{2}$-su-ka in-du - a-ta; W 5'-6' $\mathbf{e}_{2}$-ninnu- anzu $_{2}$-babbar ${ }_{2}$-ra-ni m[u]-na-[du $\mathbf{3}_{3}$.
${ }^{6} \mathrm{C}$ 1: 2-6 $\ldots \mathrm{gu}_{3}-$ de $_{2}$-a ensi ${ }_{2}$ lagaš ${ }^{\text {ki }} l_{u_{2}} e_{2}$-an-na in-du ${ }_{3}$-a-kam; C 3: 11-13 $\mathrm{e}_{2}$ ki-ag $\hat{g}_{2}$ - $\mathrm{ga}_{2}$-ni $\mathrm{e}_{2}$-an-na ša ${ }_{3}$ $\hat{\text { gir }}{ }_{2}$-su ${ }^{\text {ki-ka mu-na-ni-du }}$.

7 D 2: 11-12 $\mathbf{e}_{2}$-PA en $\mathbf{e}_{2}$-ub-imin-na-ni mu-na-du $\mathbf{x}_{3}$; 1: 11-17 gu $_{3}$-de ${ }_{2}$-a ensi ${ }_{2}$ lagaški $\mathrm{lu}_{2} \mathrm{e}_{2}$-ninnu ${ }^{\text {d nin- }{ }^{3} \mathrm{gir}_{2} \text { - }}$ su-ka $e_{2}$-PA $e_{2}$-ub-imin mu-du - a; G 1: 13-18 $e_{2}$-PA $e_{2}$-ub-imin $e_{2}$-PA saĝ-bi-še $e_{3} e_{3}$-a ${ }^{\text {d }}$ nin- $\hat{g}^{2} r_{2}$-su-ke $e_{4}$ namdu $_{10}$ [tar]-ra; I 2: 11-13 $\mathbf{e}_{2}$-ninnu-anzu ${ }_{2}{ }^{\text {musen }}$-babbar ${ }_{2}$ -ra-ni $\mathrm{e}_{2}$-PA $\mathrm{e}_{2}$-ub-imin-na-ni mu-na-du $\mathbf{u}_{3}$-a; P 2: 12-14 $\left(\mathbf{u}_{4} \ldots \mathrm{gu}_{3}-\right.$ de $\left._{2}-\mathrm{a}\right) \ldots \mathrm{e}_{2}$-ninnu- $\mathrm{anzu}_{2}{ }^{\text {muŝen }}$-babbar ${ }_{2}$-ra-ni $\mathbf{e}_{2}$-PA $\mathbf{e}_{2}$-ub-imin-na-ni mu-na-du $u_{3}$ a.
${ }^{8}$ E 2: 14-20 u $\mathbf{u}_{4}{ }^{\text {d }}$ ba-ba ${ }_{6}$ dumu an-na nin uru-kugga nin-a-ni $e_{2}$-TAR-sir ${ }_{2}$-sir ${ }_{2} e_{2}$ ki-a $\hat{g}_{2}$-ni mu-na-du ${ }_{3}$-a; E 6: 13-17 ( $\mathbf{u}_{4} \ldots$...) dba-ba ${ }_{6}$ nin-a-ni $e_{2}$ ki-ag $\hat{g}_{2}$-ni $e_{2}$-TARRsir $_{2}$-sir ${ }_{2}$ mu-na-du $\mathbf{3}_{3}$ a; G 5: 8-12 dba-ba ${ }_{6}$ nin-a-ni $\mathbf{e}_{2}$ ki-a $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{2}$-ni $\mathbf{e}_{2}$-TAR-sir ${ }_{2}$-sir ${ }_{2}$ mu-na-du $\mathbf{3}_{3}$-a; H 2: 1-4 $\mathbf{u}_{4}$ $e_{2}-$ TAR-sir ${ }_{2}$-sir ${ }_{2} e_{2}$ ki-ag $\hat{g}_{2}$-ni $e_{2}$ be $_{2}-$ du $_{7}$ uru-kug-ga mu-na-du $u_{3}$-a.
${ }^{9}$ I 3: 1-3 $\mathbf{e}_{2}$-sirara ${ }_{6}$ kur $\mathbf{e}_{2}$-ta il $\mathbf{l}_{2}$-la-ni mu-na-du ${ }_{3}$; P 3: 2-4 $e_{2}$-sirara ${ }_{6}$ kur $e_{2}$-ta il $_{2}$-la-ni mu-na-du ${ }_{3}$; U (right shoulder) 4-6 (gu $\left.\mathbf{u}_{3}-\mathbf{d e}_{2}-\mathbf{a} . ..\right) 1\left[\mathbf{u}_{2} \mathbf{e}_{2}-\right.$ sira $] \mathbf{r}\left[\mathrm{a}_{6}\right]\left[\mathrm{e}_{2}\right]-$ $\left.{ }^{\text {d nan [še?] [ }} \mathbf{m}\right] \mathbf{u}-\mathrm{du}_{3}$-a.
${ }^{10} \mathrm{~B} 5: 18-20$ ša $_{3}$-ba gi-gun ${ }_{4} \mathbf{k i} \mathbf{a g}_{2}$-ni šim-eren-
 šim ${ }^{\text {tísis }}$-eren-na mu-na-ni-du $3_{3} ; U^{3} 2: 2^{\prime}-4^{\prime}$ gi- $\left[g \operatorname{lgn}_{4}\right]$ ki $\mathbf{a g}_{2}$-ni šim-eren-na mu-na-ni-du ${ }_{3}$.
${ }_{11}$ givesi would be the elliptic object. In this case we could understand that ebory wood would be used as an element of construction, and so the basic meaning of / $\mathbf{d u}_{3} /$ could still be considered «to place upwards (in a way of balks)».
${ }^{12}$ The elliptic object would be esir $_{2}-$ gu $_{2}$, pitch used in the construction of the Eninnu plinth. For more details look up H.Steible, Die Neusumerischen Bau- und Weihinschriften, Stuttgart 1991, II, p. 26, note 72.

As far as $/ \mathbf{d u}_{3} \mathrm{I} /$ is concerned we must conclude that, as these are names of weapons, it could hardly mean «to build», but describes the raising, the holding aloft, brandishing of the weapon, and so it must be translated as «to hoist» or «to grasp»" ${ }^{13}$.

Definitively, while in $/ \mathbf{d} \mathbf{u}_{3} /$ the complement was not a pre-existent element, in the case we are going to consider now, we see it is something that exists previously, and it must be translated into «to hoist, to hold aloft, to brandish» or «to grasp». The only nuance which is common to both of them is the feature of the «vertical position from down to up» inherent in the verbal process. A meaning very close to the one we are considering is that which we find, when the Absolutive complement is represented by words like «vegetable garden» as well as «garden» or «trees» where /du ${ }_{3}$ / would be rendered as «to plant» ${ }^{14}$. Actually the idea is «to grow» what we planted previously, growth that obviously is revealed in a slow and gradual movement upwards, something like the french élever «to breed (animals) or in latin submittere «to breed» with complements like vitulos or «to enlarge» if its complement is, for example, prata.

The texts of the Gudea statues do not offer any example of this meaning. Nevertheless, in the epigraphic documentation of Old Sumerian we can see some very interesting cases like kiri $_{6}$ - $\mathbf{e}_{2}$-ša $\mathbf{a}_{3}$ ga mu-na-du ${ }_{3}$ (Entemena 42, 4: 2-3) «The garden of the Eša (to Ningirsu) he planted» as well as the description of year's name for Gudea of Lagash» cronology: mu ghiš-šar $\mathbf{z}_{2}$ - $\mathbf{u r}_{3}$-raba-du $\mathbf{H}_{3}$-a «The year in which the tree destined to the weapon šarur was planted» ${ }^{15}$.

Type III /du $\mathbf{3}_{3}$ / to pile up», «to heap up».
There is in our documentation a case, which has been the object of discussion for some special-
 the following translation: «Their ships loaded up with wood they transport to Lagaš» ${ }^{16}$. Actually it refers to ships loaded up with wood that the countries Magan, Meluhha, Gubi and Dilmun put at Gudea's disposition.

We see that what is expressed by $/ \mathbf{d u}_{3} /$ is heaping, the piling up of wooden blocks on the cargo ship. Once again we see that generic meaning that goes continuously with the verb, the heaping of something in the vertical sense from a limit.

There are some other cases that do not appear in the documentation with which we are dealing, but they are testified in the Old Sumerian royal inscriptions. They are texts in which the verb $/ \mathbf{d u}_{3} /$

[^0]to Lagaš their ships loaded up with wood'. This meaning had already been noticed by F.Th. Dangin in his book Die sumerischen und akkadischen Königsinschriften, Leipzig 1907, pp. 78-79, where we can read in his translation «Schiffe (beladen) mit Hölzern aller Art kamen nach Lagas». A. Falkenstein in Die Inschriften Gudeas von Lagaš. I Einleitung, Roma 1966, p. 47 refering to the text in the note 3, translates: «Schiffe brachten ihm Hölzer aller Art nach Lagas» (possibly having in mind Dangin's translation). For M. Lambert-J. R. Tournay «Les statues D, G, E, et H de Gudéa (Textes concernant la déese Bau )", $R A 46,1952$, p. 79 translates ma ${ }_{2}$ giš$\mathbf{d u}_{\mathbf{3}}$-a-bi into «les bateaux -trains de bois—" although he makes the following observation : $\mathbf{m a}_{2}$ - $\hat{\mathrm{g}} \mathbf{i s}-\mathbf{d u}_{3}-\mathbf{a}$, textuel.: «barque faite de bois», paraît signifier train de bois». H.Steible in Die Neusumerischen Bau- und Weibinschriften, Stuttgart 1991, II, p. 43, note 7 translates into «Schiff(e) mit Bauholz».
has two types of complement in Absolutive and they are of great interest. I refer to a) poleonyms ${ }^{17}$, b) names of waterways and watering words in general.
 mu-na-du ${ }_{3}{ }^{\text {d nanše }}$ NINA $^{k i}$ mu-na-du $\mathbf{3}_{\mathbf{3}}$ «He built Girsu for Ningirsu, he built NINA for Nanše». It is the use of type $/ \mathbf{d u}_{3} \mathrm{I} /$ with the meaning of «to build», as well as «to raise» where the sumerian speaker refered to these locations as the addition of buildings that formed them as opposed to the very extensive and institutional simple meaning that implied the «foundation» and for which the Sumerian used the composed verb ki--gar.

As far as the second type is concerned, some problems of interpretation arise, because obviously a waterway or a watering work implies a construction work but in a sense of the «vertical» direction completly opposite to the one we have claimed for $/ \mathbf{d u}_{3} /$ up to now. In other words, the buildings are raised from their foundations, and the waterways are excavated. Let us take some examples: e da$\mathbf{s a}\left[\mathbf{l a}_{4}-\right]$ mar-tu mu-du $\mathbf{3}_{3}$ (Urnanshe 40, 2: 1-3) «Dasalamartu excavated the ditch» ${ }^{18}$. Nevertheless, there is a substantial number of examples that could shed some light on this apparent contradition. In the epigraphic royal documentation of Eannatum, Entemena and Uruinimgina we can see numerous cases in which this type of construction goes with the complement $\mathbf{s i g}_{4}-\mathbf{B A} \cdot \mathbf{A R}_{2}$ «bricks", what could explain this apparent contradition. So we read kisal daĝal-la-na $\mathbf{p u}_{\mathbf{2}} \boldsymbol{\operatorname { s i g }}_{4}-\mathbf{B A}^{2} \cdot \mathbf{A R}_{\mathbf{2}}$-ra mu-na-ni-du ${ }_{3}$ (Eannatum 22, 3: 2-4) «In his wide court he build a well of bricks». In this case I do not think $/ \mathbf{d u}_{3} /$ has the meaning of «to excavate» but it is likely to mean «to raise» as the verbal process indicated by $/ \mathbf{d u}_{3} /$ started off once the excavation had taken place, as is indicated by the complement $\boldsymbol{s i g}_{4}-\mathbf{B A} . \mathbf{A R}_{2}$ refering to the brick courses that constitued their walls, brick courses that were built upwards from the base ${ }^{19}$. Nevertheless, there are cases in which this complement does not appear. In this way eda-sa-[la $\left.\mathbf{a}_{4}-\right]$ mar-t $[\mathbf{u}] \mathbf{~ m u}-\mathbf{d u}_{3}$ (Urnanshe 40, 2: 1-3) «Dasalamartu dag?/ made? a ditch» as well as ŠUB-lugal-ke ${ }_{4}$ saĝ-GANA ${ }_{2}$-ga-na-ka pu $\mathbf{2}_{2}$-ni $\mathbf{i}_{3}$ - du $_{3}$ (Uruinimgina 4, 7: 17-19 = 5, 6: 37-7: 2) «The ŠUB-lugal dag? / made? his well in the narrow part of his fields». In direct opposition to these two cases they are more numerous, as we have just seen, those that present the complement $\boldsymbol{s i g}_{4}-\mathbf{B A}_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{A R}_{2}$, what leads us to believe it is a derived use of verb $/ \mathbf{d u}_{3} \mathrm{I} /$ and its complement or that in the begining the relevant characteristic of $/ \mathbf{d u}_{3} /$ was the one of «vertical position», the direction being unimportant, something like the Latin term altum that can be expressed as «tall» as well as «deep».

This could explain that in Old Sumerian some cases of $/ \mathbf{d u}_{3} /$ could be translated as «to dig». Anyway this meaning must have fallen into disuse early because of the pressure of other more concrete

[^1]na-ka mu-na-[ni]-du ${ }_{3}$ (Entemena 35, 6: 2-5) «He dag the Lumma(gimdu) waterway dicht of Gu'edenna...»; $\hat{g} i s ̌->k e s_{2}-D U-\left[x(?)^{d} n\right] i n-\left[h u r \int-s a \hat{g}-\hat{g}_{2}\left[(\ldots) \quad\right.\right.$ sig $\left.{ }_{4}\right]-B A$. $\mathbf{A R}_{2}$-ra mu-ni-du $\mathbf{3}_{\mathbf{3}}$ (Entemena I 33, 5: 8-11) «He dag the ditch.....of brick»; [ĝišs->keš ${ }_{2}$-DU]-i $\mathbf{i}_{7}$-NINA ${ }^{k i}$-du mu-na-du 2 Šar $_{2}\left[\right.$-gal] sig ${ }_{4}-$ BA.AR $_{2}$-ra 1820 gur-saĝĝal ${ }_{2}$ ENGUR mu-na-ni-du 3 (Uruinimgina $7,1^{\prime}: 1^{\prime}-2^{\prime}$ : $5^{\prime}$ ) «He dag the waterway ditch that leads to Nina. Made of 43200 bricks for him with capaciousness of 1820 gur-saĝ-ĝal»; kisal daĝal-la-na pu $\mathbf{p i g}_{4}$-BA.AR ${ }_{2}$-ra mu-na-ni-du ${ }_{3}$ (Eannatum 22,3: 2-4) «He built a well made of bricks for him in his wide court»; $\mathbf{p u}_{2} \boldsymbol{s}\left[\mathbf{i g}_{4}\right]-\mathbf{B A}^{2} . \mathbf{A R}_{2}$-ra mu-na-ni-du ${ }_{3}$ (Eannatum I 33, 5: 2-3) «He built a well made of bricks for him».
verbs such as $/ \mathbf{b a}-\mathbf{a l} /{ }^{20}$, as well as the composed forms already created for this purpose such as $/ \mathbf{e}--$ $\mathbf{a k} /{ }^{21}$ «make a pit», $/ \mathbf{a} / \mathbf{i}_{7}-$-dun $/{ }^{22}$ «dig a waterway» or $/ \mathbf{i}_{7}-$-al $/ 23$ «build a waterway with the hoe».

So we see how $/ \mathbf{d u}_{3} /$ can go with complements in Absolutive of different nature such as:
a) Buildings, towns, waterways and watering works ${ }^{24}$ with the meaning of «to raise» as well as «to build» = /du ${ }_{3} \mathrm{II} /$.
b) Gardens, vegetable gardens, trees ${ }^{25}$ with the meaning of «to plant» as well as weapons with the meaning of «to hoist, to brandish, to grasp» = /du $\mathbf{u}_{3} \mathrm{II} /$.
c) What can be piled up with the meaning of «to pile up» $=/ \mathbf{d u}_{3} \mathrm{III} /$.

The common seme that holds all these meanings, as we have already seen, is the one of "to dispose something vertically upwards from a limit» ${ }^{26}$.

Evidently this limit would be the foundation in the construction of a building, the ground in the plantation of trees, the hands in the brandishing of a weapon or the boarding of a ship on which the load is piled up. The concrete meaning depends on the nature of the complement. But in all the meanings, the basic meaning of the verb keeps inalterable, it is, «to dispose something vertically upwards from a limit». The language, taking determined meanings quite usual as point of start, can favour some values already precise. This is what has happened with $/ \mathbf{d u}_{3} \mathrm{I} /$ in the meaning of «to build» in the examples that we have presented without an explicit complement Absolutive and where it only appeared the materials of construction or some evidences seemingly contradictory like the case of the use / $\mathbf{d} \mathbf{u}_{3} /$ with $\mathbf{e}$ «ditch» where the vertical disposition's direction is downwards and not upwards.

[^2]$\operatorname{saman}_{3}$ (= BU.Š E.ŠE $\mathbf{E}_{3}!$ NUN) mu-dun (Urnanshe 51, 5: 10-11). dun was translated by Akkadians into herû. See $A H w 341$ and $C A D 175$.

23 d nanše (.....) $\mathbf{i}_{7}$-NINA ${ }^{\text {ki-du-a (.....) al mu-na- }}$ $\mathbf{d u} \mathbf{u}_{3}$ (Uruinimgina 1, 3: $4^{\prime}-7^{\prime}$ ) «He dag the waterway that leads to NINA with the hoe...for Nanše»; ( $\mathbf{i}_{7}$ )- $\mathbf{p a}_{5}$ $\mathrm{d}_{\text {saman }_{3}-\mathrm{KAS}_{4} . \mathrm{DU} \text { al mu-na-du }}^{3}$ (Uruinimgina 6, 5 : $6^{\prime}-7^{\prime}$; Uruinimgina $8,3^{\prime}: 5^{\prime}-6^{\prime}$ ) «He built (the waterway) PasamanKAS.DU with the hoe»'; $\mathbf{i}_{7}$-TUR $\hat{g i r}_{2}$-su ${ }^{\mathbf{k i}}$ $\mathbf{i}_{3}$-tuku-a ${ }^{\text {d }}{ }^{\text {nin- }}$ gir $_{2}$-su-ra al mu-na-du $\mathbf{3}_{3}$ (Uruinimgina 4, 12: 30-33) «he built the little waterway that Girsu has for Ningirsu with the hoe».
${ }^{24}$ In the Gudea of Lagaš statues documentation we only have testified examples of buildings.

25 No testified in the Gudea of Lagaš statues but very abundant in the royal inscriptions of the OS.
${ }^{26}$ With exception of some cases we have already exposed, of the construction $/ \mathbf{e}-\mathbf{d u}_{3} /$ of the OS . in a quite reduced number of evidences in which the usual complement $\boldsymbol{s i g}_{4}-\mathbf{B A} . \mathbf{A R}_{2}$ did not appear. For these cases, if it is not secondary use from the more extense construction with $\boldsymbol{s i g}_{4}-\mathbf{B A} . \mathbf{A R}_{2}$ or $\mathbf{d u}_{3}$ with the meaning already secondary of «to build», we might think that in a beginning the seme of «vertical position» was nodirectional, it means, understood in height as well as in depth. Lately it would specialize in the sense of «from down to up" in front of the competence of verbs like / ba-al/ and /dun/ that could express the sense «from up to down».

## $/ \mathbf{t u} /{ }^{27}$

We know that the basic meaning of /tu/ is «to give birth to». Nevertheless, what is really surprising is the appearence in the documentation, which we are studying, of some irregular meanings, limited to the semantic nature of the complement and to a determined syntactic construction. In this way there are seven cases in which $/ \mathbf{t u} /$ appears with complement Absolutive and always the same term, namely, alan «statue»: alan-na-ni / mu-tu (M 2:7-3: 1) «He made his statue» ${ }^{28}$. We shall name this type / tu I/ to distinguish it from another one whose construction is characterized by a double complement. Thus this verb takes the Absolutive to designate the material that will be used for transformation into a statue, this last term appears in the Directive case with the ending -še ${ }_{3}$.

Again we find here the meaning of «to make», but with the pecualiarity that, as the material is indicated and its result appears in Directive case, the characteristic seme of this meaning will be the idea of «transformation». As in the case of /tu I/, also in this new meaning that we shall name /tu II/, the result of verbal process remains limited to the lexical term alan «statue». A example-type of the eight cases represented in the Gudea statues inscriptions might be ${ }^{\text {na4 }}$ esi im-ta- $\mathbf{e}_{11}$ alan-na-ni-še ${ }_{3}$ mu-tu (A: 3: 1-3): «He brought diorit stone and he transformed it into his statue» ${ }^{29}$.

We see the generic meaning of «to build» in /tu I/ as there is no pre-existent element which is capable of being transformed, but there is a material ${ }^{30}$ that is transformed into a statue in /tu II/. It is possible that this second meaning has its origin in syntactical constructions such as ${ }^{\mathbf{d}} \mathbf{b a - b a} \mathbf{a}_{6} \ldots$. uru-inim-gi-na nam-sipa-še ${ }_{3}$ mu-tu (Uruinimgina 51: 1-2) «Baba engendered Uruinimgina for the shepherdness»; but in the construction that we are studying the Absolutive complement is an inanimate element.

When it refers to god's statues the common noun alan does not appear, but the god's name alone is given: ${ }^{\text {d nanše }} \mathbf{n i n} \mathbf{u r u}_{\mathbf{1 6}} \mathbf{~ m u - t u}$ (Urnanshe 25, 2: 2-3) «He made (the statue of) Nanše, powerful mistress». The fact that the term «statue» is the only inanimate element capable of appearing as a complement of $/ \mathbf{t u} /$ may be due to a peculiar valuation of the sumerian spirit according to which an identification between the sculpted representation and the engenderable, between statue and what it represented was being established. That is the reason for the exclusiveness of the alan term's use as a complement of $/ \mathbf{t u} /{ }^{31}$.

$$
/ \operatorname{dim}_{2} /
$$

This verb shows its meaning diaphanously by means of its complements» nature. It has a double complementation: a) With Absolutive, b) With Absolutive to express the material and Directive with -še ${ }_{3}$ to designate the result of a verbal process.

[^3]mu-tu. Identical form we see in C 3: 15-17; H 2: 6-8; K 2': $1^{\prime}-5^{\prime}$ and the variant B 7: 11-13 ${ }^{\text {na4 }}$ esi im-ta-e ${ }_{11}$ alan-na-še $\mathbf{3}_{\mathbf{3}}$ mu-tu and with the same form in $\mathrm{D} 4: 16-5$ : 1; E 8: 18-20; G 3: 2-4; Z 1: $2^{\prime}-5^{\prime}$.
${ }^{30}$ In the Gudea statues inscriptions it is always ${ }^{\text {na4 }}$ esi «diorit».

31 This identification is evident in the construction of /tu I/ with complement in Absolutive of god's name without the mediation of the name alan or similar.

For the first type, we have documentary evidence of eight cases in the Gudea of Lagaš statues texts, and in all of them, the complement of the verb is characterized by being an object that expressed the result of craftsmanship. In this way we read in A 2:3-4 ${ }^{\text {gisis }} \mathbf{d u r}_{2}$ - gar mah nam-nin-ka-ni


Works that require skilled craftsmanship, in many cases of great precision, such as caskets ${ }^{33}$, chairs ${ }^{34}$, musical instruments ${ }^{35}$ and other objects of similar nature ${ }^{36}$ are the terms that work as Ab solutive complement of this verb.

Another type of construction is the one we have already mentioned and it consisted of using the Absolutive to indicate the material and the Directive to express the result of an elaboration process. In the documentation we are studying we have found six cases in which the final product is also characterized by indicating objects similar to the ones we have just seen in the previous construction. It is about objects that have been elaborated by craftsmanship. In this way we read in B 5: 45-47 ${ }^{\text {gेiseren-bi } / \mathbf{i g - g a l - s ̌ e ~}}{ }_{3}$ / mu-na- dim $_{2}$ «He modelled cedar wood into big doors». The material, the cedar, is elaborated until it is transformed into large doors. The result of this process can be translated into products of similar characteristics, such as steles ${ }^{37}$, representations of animals: B 6: 15....17-18 nu $\mathbf{n d}_{11}$-gal lagab-bi-a / ...... / ur pad-da-še ${ }_{3} / \mathbf{m u}$-na-dim $\mathbf{D}_{2}-\operatorname{dim}_{2}$ «He modelled alabaster into blocks ......... like destructive lions» ${ }^{38}$, and weapons: B 6: 23....24-25 urudu.... I šita $\mathbf{2}_{\mathbf{2}}$ ub-e nu- $\mathrm{IL}_{\mathbf{2}}$-še $\mathbf{3}_{\mathbf{3}} / \mathbf{m u}$-na- dim $_{2}$ «He modelled copper into a weapon šita, that no region can resist»" ${ }^{39}$.

What characterizes the verb in both constructions is its use to express a craft and artistic elaboration, either marking only the result in which case the Absolutive is used, or indicating the transformation of a material into a crafted product in which case it takes Absolutive and Directive.

So, the characteristic that we could define as «craft elaboration» would be the essential seme of this verb. Now we can understand why men, as beings created by divinity, have the name of nig ${ }_{2}-$
${ }_{32}$ Identical text in E 4: 3-5.
${ }^{33}$ Like this in A 2: 1-2; E 4: 8-9; F 2: 8-9 with identical text: DUB.ŠEN-kug-ga-ni mu-na-dim ${ }_{2}$. «He made his pure casket for him».
${ }^{34}$ Like this in A 2: 3-4 with identical text: ${ }^{\text {gis }} \mathbf{d u r}_{2}{ }^{-}$ gar mah nam-nin-ka-ni mu-na-dim ${ }_{2}$
${ }^{35}$ E 4: 12-13 balaĝ nin an-da gal-di mu-na-dim 2 «He made a harp (which name is) The lady who is lofty with $A n$ '».
${ }^{36}$ Similarly in the royal inscriptions of the OS. we can see that the complement are weapons: šar- $\mathrm{i}_{3}$ lum ma GIIDRI.MA. [TUKUL (?)] [....] DI[m $\mathrm{m}_{2} \ldots$. ] ${ }^{\mathrm{d}} \mathbf{I}[\mathbf{N}]$ ANNA SAĜ.RIG ${ }_{9}$ (=kab.BU) (AnHaf. 4, 1-5) «šarilumna elaborated (this) big mace(?) (as a) weapon and he gave it to Inanna» as well as receptacles. In this way bur-sum-gaz mu-na-dim $\mathbf{d}_{2}$ (Entemena I 18: 12-13) «He elaborated (this) mortar»; nigin-kug-
 mu-na-dim $\mathbf{2}^{\text {(Entemena 34: 15-16) «He elaborated }}$ (this) receptacle-Nigin, made of pure silver....»; ${ }^{\text {d }}$ nanše nin-uru ${ }_{16}$-ra $\quad \mathbf{e}_{2}$-an-na-tum ${ }_{2}$-me mu-na-dim ${ }_{2}$-ma $\mathbf{l u}_{2}$ na-ab-dab $\mathbf{5}_{5}$ - (Eannatum 62 IV 2: 2' $\mathbf{2}^{\prime}$ ) «(This mortar) that Eannatum had elaborated for Nanše, the pure lady, must be taken by nobody». We can also see
clay nails as crafted objects, like KIB mu-dim $\mathbf{2}_{2}-\operatorname{dim}_{2}$ (Entemena I 10, 2: 6) or chariots like ${ }^{\text {gेišgigir...mu-na- }}$ $\operatorname{dim}_{2}$ (Entemena 35, 4: 9-5:1). In the documentation, which we are studying, it can be testified B 6: 77-7: 1-3 $\mathbf{e}_{2} \mathbf{u r}_{5}$-gim dim -ma ensi $_{2}$ Ab-e ${ }^{\text {d }}$ nin-g $\hat{g i r}_{2}$-su-ra mu-na-du $\mathbf{3}^{\text {«No ensi }}$ has raised a temple built like this for Ningirsu» ; D 3: 3-5 ma $\mathbf{m a r}_{2}$ - kur $_{8} \mathbf{k i}$-a $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{2}-\hat{\mathrm{ga}}_{2}$-ni kar-nun-ta- $\mathbf{e}_{3}$-a mu-na-dim ${ }_{2}$ «He made The Karnunta'ea, his loved ship".
${ }^{37}$ B 6: 7...-9-10 ${ }^{\text {na4 na-gal,,,,,na-ru }}{ }_{2}$-a-še ${ }_{3}$ mu-dim ${ }_{2}$ «He modeled big stones Na like steles».

38 We could quote too B 6:47...-49-50 ĝis ba-lu$\mathbf{u b}_{2} \ldots .$. mušen-šar $_{2}-$ ur $_{8}$-še ${ }_{3}$ mu-na-dim ${ }_{2}$ «He modeled ilex wood .....like bird šarun.
${ }^{39}$ Cf. also B 6: 29...-31-32 lagab-nir ${ }_{3}$...šita ur ur-saĝ- $^{\text {- }}$ 3-še $\mathbf{3}_{3} \mathbf{m u - n a - d i m}{ }_{2}$ «He modeled nir blocks like weapon sita with three heads of lion». Other objects are also to be found in the OS. documentation. Like this igi-erenbabbar $_{2}$ mu-na-dim ${ }_{2}$ nam-ti-la-ni-še ${ }_{3} e_{2}$-a mu-na-DU (Entemena 27: 16-19) «He made the shining cedar gate and he set it in the temple for his life»; URUxA.A. ${ }^{\text {ki }}$-ta mu-na-ta-e ${ }_{11}$ ŠITA $_{2}$. UR $_{3}$ - -se $_{3}$ mu-na-dim ${ }_{2}$ (Entemena 76 , a) $5-7$ «He brought (this stone) from URUxA.A. and he transformed it into ŠITA.UR».
$\operatorname{dim}_{2}$ - $\operatorname{dim}_{2}$-ma, as a work modeled by the gods in the Sumerian Flood ${ }^{40}$ or in the text corresponding to the Gilgamesh» epic cycle entitled «Gilgamesh death» ${ }^{41}$.

In a metaphorical way we could pass from a craft elaboration characterized by a manual process of what is elaborated to an intellectual conception that is useful for expressing the elaboration of the mind, namely, what is thought and planned intellectually. This could give us an explanation to the fact that the sumerian term sidim «architect» uses the same sign as $/ \mathrm{dim}_{2} /$, or the meaning we find in / $\mathbf{d i m}_{2} /$ as «law, disposition» in a passage of «Gilgamesh and Huwawa» when Enkidu declares openly to Gilgamesh that it is necessary to cause Utu to know the enterprise planned by Gilgamesh of going into the country of cedars, as the laws by which this country is governed are the competence of $\mathrm{Utu}^{42}$.

As far as form is concerned the construction of /tu/ we saw previously and /dim $/$ are similar. Nevertheless, while /tu I/ and /tu II/ are a secondary use of the basic meaning of /tu/ «to give birth to» and it appears exclusively with the term alan «statue» as complement, the verb / $\mathrm{dim}_{2}$ / has «to elaborate something hand-made» as basic meaning and it can take as complement all those terms which might be made by hand, the term alan among them.

## /ak/

/ak/ is the most generic verb in the semantic field of «action»; so much so that it is formed as the neutralized term in the different oppositions in which it can appear in front of the others verbs of «to make». In the documentation we are studying, we have found eleven cases that we could distribute in the following way:
a) With the generic meaning of «to make».
b) Neutralized use of $/ \mathbf{a k} /$ in front of $/ \operatorname{dim}_{2} /+-$ še $_{3}$.
c) As an auxiliar verb.

In the first case its use is very frequent. It can take any kind of complements, whatever its semantic category is. When the diverse verbal features of the semantic field of «to make» by which is established the exclusive opposition between these verbs and /ak/ characterized this latter as a nonmarked term of the opposition, do not operate, then the non-marked term of the opposition can be used instead of the others. This is what happens with the verb/ak/.

With the generic meaning of «to make» we have the following examples: B 6: 66 nam-ra-AK-bi «His booty made / done»; B 6: 66...-76 nam-ra-AK-bi / ... /gi $\mathbf{g i}_{16}$-sa im-mi-AK «He made his booty everlasting»; B 8: $24 \mathbf{l u}_{2} \mathbf{l u}_{2}$ si-sa $\mathbf{s e}_{2}$-ra ni $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{2}$-NE.RU-AK-gim «Like (to) a man who has done wrong to a righteous man»; E 5: 3 ni $\hat{\mathrm{g}}_{2}-\mathrm{MI}_{2}$-us $\mathbf{u s}_{2}$-sa $\mathbf{A K}_{\mathbf{2}}$ AK-da «The wedding presents to give»; G 2: 1-7 ni $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{2}{ }^{-}$

[^4]for this text N.S.Kramer, «The death of Gilgameš», $B A-$ SOR 94, 1944, pp. 7 y 9. Cf. also G.Pettinato, La saga di Gilgameš, Milano 19934, p. 342.
${ }_{42}$ Cf. lines 10-12: dutu šul dutu he ${ }_{2}$-me-da-an-zu / kur-ra $\operatorname{dim}_{2}$-ma-bi ${ }^{\text {d }}$ utu-kam he ${ }_{2}$-me-da-an-zu / kur gíserin-ku ${ }_{5}$ dim $_{2}$-ma-bi šul dutu-kam dutu «Let us inform Utu, the young Utu. The laws of the cedars country belong to Utu, let us inform him! The laws of the cedars country belong to Utu. Let us inform him!».
 AK-ke ${ }_{4}$ «Ningirsu gives the wedding presents that make Baba's heart feel happy, An's daughter, his loved wife'; G 3: $7 \mathbf{n i g}_{2}-\mathrm{MI}_{2}-\mathbf{u s}_{\mathbf{2}}$ - $\mathbf{s a}_{2}$ AK-da «Wedding presents to give'; I 4: 3-4 y P 4: 4-5 igi X-la / na-ab-AK-ke ${ }_{4}$ "That an eye ....does not do».

As we see, the complements are very different. There is an extensive range that goes from the most concrete concepts to the most abstract ones ${ }^{43}$. We also find it used with the same construction as / $\operatorname{dim}_{2} /+$ Absolutive and Directive in two cases: B 5: 35 ad-še $\mathbf{3}_{\mathbf{3}}$ mu-AK-AK «He transformed into trunks». The complement in Absolutive appears some lines before; it refers particularly to iُiseren «cedars» in the lines 29, 31 and ${ }_{\text {gis }}$ taskarin «box» of line 33 . These trees will be transformed into trunks.
 transformed junipers, very big (common) pines, plane trees, mountain trees into trunks». If we look carefully at these examples and we compare them with the ones corresponding to $/ \mathrm{dim}_{2} /$, we see inmediatly that in the examples of /ak/, the result of the verbal process is not an artistic elaboration but a simple transformation that does not require any manual skill. Here it is clearly made evident the part of the neutralized term /ak/ which does not have the relevant seme of / $\mathrm{dim}_{2} /$, that we defined previously as «craft elaboration», and that constitutes the positive feature of the opposition with regard to this feature's absence in /ak/. But what is really remarkable in /ak/ is that it can even move to the semantic field of «the giving» and then it can be used instead of /sum/ or similar verbs, as we
 an-na / dam ki-a $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{2}$-ni / mu-na-ta-AK-ke ${ }_{4}$ "Ningirsu gives wedding presents that make Baba's heart feel happy, An's daughter, his loved wife» or in E 5: $3 \mathbf{n i n} \hat{\mathbf{g}}_{2}-\mathbf{M I}_{2}-\mathbf{u s}_{\mathbf{2}}$-sa $\mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{A K}$-da «Wedding presents to make / give».

We are possibly dealing with proportional oppositions where the terms of an opposition given by virtue of the parallelism with another opposition's term, can be used by this last one shaping itself into a new semantic field ${ }^{44}$.

The meaning of /ak/ as an generic verb of «action» is also made evident in its use as an element of the periphrastic construction with any other verb. In this way in B 7: 24-8: $1 \mathbf{h e}_{2}$ - $\mathrm{gal}_{2}$-bi / pa $\mathbf{e}_{3}$ AK-da «To make visible his wealth». In this kind of construction, as is known, it shares its use with the verb / $\mathbf{d u g}_{4} /$.

Once we have considered in detail the study of these verbs in the documentation of Gudea of Lagaš statues, we can establish the following succint conclusions:

1) $/ \mathbf{d u}_{3} /$ is characterized by a seme that we could define as «to dispose something in vertical position down to up from a limit, from a fixed point». The complement in Absolutive will indicate what kind of vertical disposition it is. Thus we would have the meaning of «to raise», «to build» with buildings, towns, waterways and other kinds of construction works. Proceeding, the verb / du $\mathbf{u}_{3}$ / could assume the secondary meaning of «to use a determined material in the construction». If what is disposed in vertical position are trees, vegetable gardens or gardens, we will be dealing with a new contextual meaning, namely, «to plant». When the complements are weapons, it is obvious that it

[^5]$\mathbf{u r i}_{2}{ }^{\text {ki}}-\mathbf{n}[\mathrm{a}]$ nam-lugal mu-ak-ke ${ }_{4}$ (Lugalkiginnedudu 2: 4-14) «When Enlil ... had linked the sovereignty en with the royalty for him, it allows him to practice the sovereignty in Uruk and the royalty in Ur»; ni $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_{2} \mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{2}}$-zi-še $\mathbf{3}_{3}$ nuak (Uruinimgina 14, 2': $6^{\prime}$ ) «I did nothing violently».
${ }^{44}$ Cf. for this kind of oppositions B. García Hernández, Semántica estructural y lexemática del verbo, Reus 1980, p. 35.
is not its manufacture which is in question, but the context suggests the meaning of "to hoist", "to brandish», «to keep raised». Finally, in some case we have also observed the meaning of «to pile up», «to heap up» refering to objects capable of being set one on top of the other.
2) We know that the basic meaning of /tu/ is «to give forth to». Nevertheless, we must translate it as «to make», «to build» in some cases. The texts we have studied, present two different syntactic constructions. One of them is characterized by using only the complement in Absolutive, and this is the one we have called /tu I/; and another that uses the Absolutive to indicate the material and the Directive to express the result, the one we have called /tu II/. Whatever the construction used, what is really remarkable is the exclusivity of this verb's use with only one word to express the complement, namely, alan «statue». We have found no other term as result of this verb's process in its meaning of «to make» and this is possibly due to the sumerian conception of identifying what is engenderable, men or gods, with the objects that represented it, namely, its sculptoric representations.
3) / $\operatorname{dim}_{2}$ / has as its essential seme the idea of «to elaborate something by handicraft». It has two syntactic constructions that are identical to $/ \mathbf{t u} /$. But the complement that designates the final product from the elaboration of $/ \mathbf{d i m}_{2} /$ is always an object capable of being manipulated and created by handicraft. So we see weapons, vessels, cases, doors etc. amongst them. In a secondary way it might be used to express a mental elaboration getting meanings like «to design», «to plan».
4) /ak/ is «to do» in the most extensive and generic sense of the term. It is the negative term of all the privative oppositions that can be established, with regard to the other verbs of "to make». And that explains how it can be used in place of the other verbs by virtue of its character of neutralized term.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{13}$ Akkadian uses in these cases a term similar zaqāpu to designate the raising of a weapon. Cf. $C A D \mathrm{Z}, 53$ e) and $A H w 1512$. For the sumerian construction look up H. Steible, Die Neusumerischen Bau- und Weihinschriften, Stuttgart 1991, II, p. 19, note 48.

    14 Also in this case Akkadian uses zaqāpu. Cf. CAD Z, 55 c) and $A H w 1512$.
    ${ }_{15}$ Cf. A. Falkenstein, Die Inschriften Gudeas von Lagash, Roma 1966, p. 8, number 6.
    ${ }^{16}$ For a better understanding of the text, let us see the whole paragraph: $\mathbf{a}_{2}{ }^{\text {d }}$ nanše-ta $/ \mathbf{a}_{2}{ }^{\mathrm{d}}$ nin- $\hat{g} \mathrm{gir}_{2}$-su-kata / $\mathbf{g u}_{3}-\mathrm{de}_{2}$-a / ĝidri sum-ma / ${ }^{\mathrm{d}} \mathrm{nin}^{2}$ - $\mathrm{gir}_{2}$-su-ka-ra / $\mathrm{ma}_{2}$-gan ${ }^{\text {ki } / m e-l u h-J a ~}{ }^{\text {ki }} / \mathrm{gu}-\mathrm{bi} / \mathrm{kur}$ dilmun ${ }^{\text {ki } / \mathrm{gu}_{2}-}$
     mu-na-DU (D 4: 2-12) «For the authority of Nanše, for the authority of Ningirsu to Gudea, whom was confered the sceptre by Ningirsu, Magan, Meluhha, Gubi and Dilmun which had put at his disposition wood loads, led

[^1]:    ${ }^{17}$ Cf. H.Steible-H,Behrens, Glossar zu den Altsumerischen Bau- und Weihinschriften, Wiesbaden 1983, p. 67.
    ${ }^{18}$ Cf. H.Steible-H.Behrens, Die Altsumerischen Bauund Weihinschriften II. Stutttgart 1982, p. 13.
    ${ }^{19}$ In the royal epigraphic documentation we can confirm the following examples: $\hat{\mathrm{g} i s ̌}-\mathrm{kes}_{2}$-DU-lum-ma-gim-du ${ }_{10}$ nigin $_{2} 3600$ gur-2-UL [m]u-ni-du ${ }_{3}$ (Eannatum 2, 7: 10-13) «He dag the Lummagimdu waterway ditch which capacity is 3600 gur-2-ul» ; ĝiš-$\mathrm{keš}_{2}$-DU-lum-[ma]-gim-[du $\left.{ }_{10}\right] 3$ Šar $_{2}$-gal $\operatorname{sig}_{4}$-BA.
     mena. 35, 4: 2-8) «He dag the Lummagimdu waterway ditch made of 648000 bricks which capacity is 1840 gur-saĝ-ĝal...>; < $\hat{g}_{i}$ ̌̌->keš ${ }_{2}$-DU-[lu]m-ma-gu ${ }_{2}$-eden-

[^2]:    ${ }^{20}$ The use of this verb is only testified from the New Sumerian. Cf. $\mathbf{i}_{7}$-uri ${ }_{5}{ }^{\text {ki}}{ }^{-m a} \mathbf{i}_{7}$-nidba-ka-ni mu-na-ba-al (Urnamu 22, 8-10) ${ }^{\text {«He dag (the waterway) Urina for }}$ him, his waterway for the offering (of food)»; $\mathbf{i}_{7}$-en-eren-nun $i_{7}$-nidba-ka-ni mu-na-ba-al (Urnamu 23, 9-11) «He dag (the waterway) Enerennun for him, his waterway for the offering (of food)»; $\mathbf{i}_{7}$-nun $\mathbf{i}_{7} \mathbf{k i} \mathbf{a} \hat{\mathbf{g}}_{2}$-ni mu-na-ba-al (Urnamu 24, 7-9) «He dag (the waterway) Inun for him, his loved waterway".
    ${ }^{21}$ e-bi $\mathbf{i}_{7}$-idigna-ta $\mathbf{i}_{7}$-nun-Se $\mathbf{e}_{3}$ e-ak (Entemena 28, $5: 9-11=29,5: 32-34) « H e$ built his pit from (the waterway of) Tigris to (the waterway of) Inun»; e-mab..... mu-na-ak (Entemena 41, 2: 4---3: 1) «He built....the magnificent pit».
    ${ }_{22}$ a-a-suhur mu-dun e-tir-sig mu-dun den-lil ${ }_{2}$ -$\mathrm{pa}_{3}$-da-uš-gal mu-dun sur $_{2}$-du $\mathbf{7}_{7}$-gim-du $\mathrm{x}\left[\mathrm{x}\right.$ (?) (?) $\left.{ }^{2}\right]$ mu-dun nin-ba-ra - REC 107 mu-dun (Urnanshe 26, 3: 7-5: 4) «He dag the Asuhur waterway, he dag (the pit) Etirsig. He dag (the waterway) Enlilpada. He dag.... (the waterway) Surdugindu. He dag (the waterway) Ninbara»; ${ }^{\text {d }}$ nin- $\hat{\mathbf{g}}\left[\mathbf{i r}_{2}\right]$-su-ra a-gibil mu-na-dun (Eannatum 2, 5: 15-17) «He dag a new waterway for Ningirsu»; $\mathbf{u}_{4}$-[ba] $\mathbf{e}_{2}$-an-na-tum ${ }_{2}$-e $\mathbf{i}_{7}$-gibil mu-na-dun (Eannatum 3, 6: 6-9) «In that time Eannatum dag a new waterway; a-subur mu-dun (Urnanshe 51,6: 1-2) «He dag (the wareway) Asuhur»; a-REC 107 mu-dun (Urnanshe 24,2: 3-4); ${ }^{\text {d }}$ nin- $\hat{\mathrm{gir}}_{2}$-su- $\mathrm{pa}_{3}$-da LAK 500 (= $\operatorname{erim}_{\mathrm{x}}$ (?)-ma-ni mu-dun (Urnanshe 27,3: 2-4) «He dag (the waterway) Ningirsupada, his....»; pa ${ }_{5}$ ! (= E.PAP.PAP)-

[^3]:    27 For the construction of this verb cf. H.Steible-H. Behrens, Glossar zu den Altsumerischen Bau- und Weihinschriften, Wiesbaden 1983, pp. 333-334.
    ${ }^{28}$ In our documentation we have testified the following cases: I 5: 1-2 alan-na-e mu-tu; M 2: 7-31 alan-na-ni mu-tu; N 3: 2-3 = M 2: 7-31; O 2: 6-3-1 alan-na-ni mu-tu; P 5: 1-2 alan-na-e mu-tu; Q 2: 2-3 alan-na-ni mu-tu; T 1: 3' alan-na-ni mu-tu.
    ${ }_{29}$ In our documentation we have testified the following cases: A 3: 1-3 na4 esi im-ta- $\mathbf{e}_{11}$ alan-na-ni-še ${ }_{3}$

[^4]:    ${ }^{40}$ In this work, we can read in line 39: ${ }^{\text {d nin-tu-ra }}$ ni $\hat{\mathrm{g}}_{2}-\operatorname{dim}_{2}$ - dim $_{2}$-ma-mu $\mathrm{si}_{3}$-[......] ga-ba-ni-ib-gi ${ }_{4}$ $\mathbf{g}\left[\mathbf{i}_{4}\right]$ «For Nintu, I want to stop the annih[ilation of $]$ my creatures». Cf. M.Civil «The Sumerian Flood Story» pp. 138-145 in W.G.Lambert-A.R.Millard, Atra-hasis, Oxford 1970.
    ${ }^{41}$ In lines 27-28 of section A we read: nam-lu $\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{2}}-1 \mathbf{u}_{6}$
     $\operatorname{dim}_{2}-\mathrm{e}$ «Who can sculpe forever the statue of the mankind the whole that was created if it was not him?». Cf.

[^5]:    ${ }^{43}$ In the documentation of OS. royal inscriptions we can see this range more clearly, especially in what refers to the abstract concepts. In this way beside e-bi mu-ak (Lugalzagesi 2: 16) «He built his ditch» we can read the following examples: nam-dag ${ }^{\text {d }}$ nin- $\hat{g i r}_{2}$-su-da e-da-ak-ka-am $\mathbf{6}^{\text {(Uruinimgina 16, }} 8: 1-3$ ) «He has committed a crime against Ningirsu»; $\mathbf{u}_{4}{ }^{\text {d }}$ en-lil ${ }_{2}$-le .... nam-en nam-lugal-da e-na-da-tab-ba unu ${ }^{\text {ki }}$-ga nam-en mu-ak-ke ${ }_{4}$

