

lee. That's not common. But to distinguish from those ~~we~~ this French scholar put a grave accent there. Then this line, this is illu - god. Sometimes it's used for ~~im+um~~ lee in certain texts. So they mark it lee with a for == a 4 after it. Even a straight line sometimes represents lee, so they mark that lee with with a 5; and the sign ih is sometimes used for lee so they make that lee with a 6. Many scholars prefer instead of using an acute and grave accent to put 2 and 3 after them. But (this French scholar) said == system was first acute, then grave, then 4, 5, and 6. That way the scholars have worked out a system of having a sign if it is pronounced a different way, they put it down in their transliteration the way they figured it was pronounced in that context. But then they put a mark on it to indicate which of the signs it could mean lee it is. That is just a note in reading these.

Another thing I ought to mention is that in Sumerian the ends of syllables became very obscure. You might say like in ^{Scotland} ~~Seheland~~ today a great many swallow the end of syllables. Like instead of saying I've got a b good book, the'd say I've go and goo boo. The end of the syllable disappears. Well in Sumerian the sign ba and pa are entirely different. B and P are entirely different. Boo and Poo are entirely different. But op and ap is the same sign. There is no difference. The same with g, k, and koph. At the beginning of the syllable they are all different. At the end Sumerian has only one sign. The result is that in Babylonian the end of a syllable can be tremendously important. Actually there is only one sign for all three of them. That makes a confusion in writing. It's not as bad as our confusion in English, using the Latin alphabet but it is a very confusing thing. The result is that in writing you are apt to write it the way that in context it is pronounced or the way that