

THE STYLISTIC ROLE OF THE ANTICIPATORY GENITIVE CONSTRUCTION IN SUMERIAN LITERATURE¹

BY
Esther HABER

1. INTRODUCTION

Since the publication of Poebel's ground breaking book on Sumerian grammar,² there is a consensus among Sumerologists that two genitive constructions co-exist in Sumerian – the “standard genitive construction” and the “anticipatory genitive construction”.³ The standard genitive construction is the simple, conventional construction appearing in prose as well as in poetry, while the anticipatory genitive construction is the rare construction appearing infrequently, almost exclusively in poetic and liturgical texts.⁴

In the standard genitive construction the governing noun precedes the governed noun, in the anticipatory genitive construction, on the other hand, the order is inverted: the governed noun is the first to appear, followed by a preliminary genitive morpheme, and the governing noun is connected to the governed noun by a possessive pronoun corresponding in number and class.

The following examples illustrate the differences between the standard genitive construction (A) and the anticipatory genitive construction (B):

1. A. **bàd urim₅^{ki}-ma⁵** mu-na-dù

1. The following preliminary notes on the anticipatory genitive are based on my doctoral dissertation “The Anticipatory Genitive in the Sumerian Language” in which this grammatical phenomenon is subjected to a comprehensive and definitive investigation, containing a morpho-syntactic description of the anticipatory genitive, an examination of its stylistic role and a full documentation of its occurrences in Sumerian literary texts. The dissertation was written under the supervision of Professor Jacob Klein, and presented to Bar-Ilan University, 2005. The dissertation is being revised and prepared for publication in the near future. I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to my teacher, Professor Klein, who has been my guide throughout my research; his wisdom has been of great aid and a constant source of inspiration.

2. A. Poebel, *Grundzüge der sumerischen Grammatik*, Rostock 1923, 59-60.

3. The English term “anticipatory genitive”, usually applied to this construction, is a literal translation of the German “*vorangestellte Genitiv*” (see: Poebel, *Grundzüge der Sumerische Grammatik*, 60; Falkenstein, *Grammatik der Sprache Gudeas*, vol. 2, 13-16). Edzard (*Sumerian Grammar*, 2003, 38-39) prefers to use the term “bound genitive” for the standard construction, and “unbound/free genitive”, for all other, non-standard constructions, including the anticipatory genitive construction.

4. Examples of the anticipatory genitive construction are to be found, for the most part, in literary texts, i.e., literary compositions written in elevated poetic and rhythmic language, such as myths, epics, hymns, wisdom compositions, prayers and lamentations, school debates etc. Most of these compositions entered the literary tradition and formed part of the scribal curriculum. For a definition and classification of Mesopotamian literature in general, and Sumerian literature in particular, see C. Wilcke, “Formale Gesichtspunkte in der Sumerischen Literatur,” *Sumerological Studies in Honor of Thorkild Jacobsen* (AS 20), 1974, 205-316; D.O. Edzard, “Literature,” in: *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 7, 35-38. See further J. Black et alii, *The Electrical Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature*, Catalogue (<http://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk/>). Note that all references to Sumerian literary texts below will follow the above corpus.

5. I.e. /bàd-urim₅^{ki}-a(k)/.

He built **the wall of Urim** for him (Ur-Namma 7, 4)

- B. **urim₂^{ki}-ma bàd-bi⁶** mu-dù
Of Urim — its wall he built (Ur-Namma 1,4:13-14)
2. A. **ud nam-tìl-la** hé-en-na-éd
 May **the light of life** shine for him (Šu-Suen C 22)
- B. **nam-tìl-la-na ud-bi** sud-a-da
 that **of his life — its days** may be long (Gudea E 8: 9-10)
3. A. ^damar-^dEN.ZU **ki-áĝ** □ **urim₂^{ki}-ma**
 Amar-Suena, **the beloved of Ur** (Amar-Suena 10, 11)
- B. eridug^{ki} ^d**en-ki-ke₄⁷** **ki-áĝ** □ **-ĝá-ni**
 Eridug, **of Enki — his beloved** (Enki's journey to Nibru 49)
4. A. **ĝiškim-tìl^d i-din-^dda-gan-na** kur nu-še-ga hé-gul-lu
Supporter of Iddin-Dagan, may you destroy the insubordinate land!
 (Iddin-Dagan C, SEG. B 24)
- B. an u₁₈-ru **lugal^d li-pí-it-eš₄-tár-ra ĝiškim-tìl-la-ni** na-nam
 An, the almighty, is indeed **of king Lipit-Eštar — his supporter**
 (Lipit-Eštar C 31)

As of to date, no comprehensive investigation of the anticipatory genitive construction has been undertaken by students of the Sumerian language. Poebel, Thomsen and Edzard provide a concise description of this grammatical construction, discussing only its basic structural aspects.⁸ Falkenstein in his study of the Syntax of Gudea's inscriptions devotes a specific section to the documentation of the anticipatory genitive, classifying it by three distinct morphological categories;⁹ Hayes, in his article devoted to the anticipatory genitive, primarily discusses the origins of this phenomenon, assuming that the anticipatory genitive was the original construction preceded the standard genitive construction since it was suspended and restricted exclusively to idiomatic phrases;¹⁰ Zólyomi in his article on the various Sumerian

6. I.e. /urim₂^{ki}-a(k) bàd-bi/.

7. The appearance of /e/ as an alternative form of the vowel /a/ in the anticipatory genitive morpheme is characteristic of inferior copies of literary texts and royal inscriptions from the Isin-Larsa period. It is not attested in the Gudea inscriptions, Ur III literature or in standard Sumerian texts (see especially C. Wilcke, "Zu 'Gilgameš und Akka'", *dubsar anta-men: Studien zur Altorientalistik Festschrift für Willem H.Ph. Römer* [AOAT 253], 1998, 457-485).

8. See: Poebel, *ibid.*, 60; M.L. Thomsen, *The Sumerian Language* (Mesopotamia 10), Akademisk Forlag, Copenhagen 1984, 91; D.O. Edzard, *Sumerian Grammar*, Brill, Leiden 2003, 39.

9. A. Falkenstein, *Grammatik der Sprache Gudeas von Lagaš*, vol. 2 (*AnOr* 29), Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, Rome 1950, 13-16.

10. J.L. Hayes, "Some Thoughts on the Sumerian Genitive," *ASJ* 13 (1991), 185-194.

genitive constructions restricts his discussion of the anticipatory genitive to its stylistic and syntactic functions.¹¹

In my above mentioned study,¹² I collected all instances of the anticipatory genitive construction, which I could find in literary sources from the three main periods of the Sumerian language. A statistical examination indicates that in absolute numbers, the bulk of anticipatory genitive constructions are attested in Standard Sumerian. However, when we take into account the ratio between the number of anticipatory genitive occurrences and the number of lines in the various literary compositions, it turns out that the anticipatory genitive construction was used most frequently and productively in the Neo-Sumerian period. A survey of the Sumerian literary texts indicates that, contrary to Hayes' claim, the anticipatory genitive construction is definitely not restricted to idiomatic frozen phrases.¹³ The fact that the anticipatory genitive construction is a relatively rare construction appearing infrequently and almost exclusively in poetic and liturgical texts, supports Zólyomi's hypothesis that it derives from the standard genitive construction, its usage having been basically stylistic.¹⁴

2. THE ANTICIPATORY GENITIVE CONSTRUCTION AS A DEFINITE STYLISTIC TOOL IN THE COMPOSITION

The anticipatory genitive construction has a definite stylistic role in Sumerian literature – that of topicalization: it emphasizes the key words in the literary composition, such as royal names, royal titles or insignia, major divine names, names of temples, cities and lands, cosmological concepts, social human categories etc. Consequently, the anticipatory genitive frequently appears at the beginning of a composition, emphasizing and highlighting the name of the hero and his epithets, as in the first six lines of Gilgameš and the Bull of Heaven:

5. **šul mē¹-ka šul mē-ka en-du-ni** ga-an-dug₄
en ^dGĪŠ.BĪL-ga-mes šul mē-ka en-du-ni ga-an-dug₄
á-úr sag₉-sag₉ šul mē-ka en-du-ni ga-an-dug₄
en TUR kalag-kalag-ga šul mē-ka en-du-ni ga-an-dug₄
en ^{na4}su₁₁ ku₁₀-ku₁₀ šul mē-ka en-du-ni ga-an-dug₄
gešpu₂ lirim šul mē-ka en-du-ni ga-an-dug₄
Of the man of battle, of the man of battle — I will sing his song,
Of lord Gilgameš, the man of battle — I will sing his song,

11. G. Zólyomi, "Genitive Construction in Sumerian," *JCS* 48 (1996), 39-45. In this article, Zólyomi was the first to point out the importance of the anticipatory genitive's stylistic functions. In our present study we develop some of his pertinent observations.

12. Cf. note 1 above.

13. In reviewing all the relevant data collected, I have found only three clear instances in which the anticipatory genitive serves as a frozen, idiomatic phrase: (1) The so called "name-giving formula", recurring at the end of royal inscriptions, such as e.g.: alan-ba gù-dé-a ma-ba mu-bi "Of this statue — 'Gudea gave (it) to me' is its name" (Gudea St. R 4: 5-7); (2) The formulaic phrase "of DN – the man of his heart", which expresses the love of a god to his protégé, such as in: ^den-líl-lá lú šag₄-ga-na-kam "of Enlil — his favorite" (Gudea Cyl. A 11:17); and (3) the idiomatic phrase "of my/his throne – its foundations", as in ^{g18}gu-za gub-ba-na suhuš-bi na-an-ge-né "Of his erected throne — may she not secure its foundations!" (Gudea St. C 4: 13-15). Note further the frozen royal epithet lugal an-ub-da limmu₂-ba, which ever since Poebel's analysis (*Sumerischen Grammatik*, 112 ff.) was considered an anticipatory genitive construction, to be translated literally: "The king of – 'of the quarters — its four'" (i.e. /lugal an-ub-da(-ak) — limmu-b(i)-a(k)/). Recently, however, Zólyomi questioned this analysis, claiming that the pronoun -bi which stands at the end of the construction is not a retrospective pronoun but an enclitic one, which turns the limmu into an apposition, that is: /lugal an-ub-da limmu-b(i)-a(k)/ "King of the quarters, the four of them" (Zólyomi, "Genitive Construction", *JCS* 48 [1996], 39 ff.).

¹⁴ "AGs derive from "simple" definite genitive constructions... an AG is a marked construction compared to its simple equivalent" (Zólyomi, "Genitive Construction", *JCS* 48(1996), p. 40; see also pp. 40-45).

Of him with the well-proportioned limbs, the man of battle —

I will sing **his song**,

Of the mighty young lord, the man of battle — I will sing his song!

(Gilgameš and the Bull of Heaven 1-6)¹⁵

In the first four lines of Dumuzid-Inana D₁ the anticipatory genitive highlights a list of important temples by placing them at the beginning of each sentence:

6. **é-temen-ní-gùr²-a²** x-bi

é uru₂-zé-ba šu si sá-a-bi

é^dsuen-na-ka dadag-ga-bi

é-an-na-ka uri₃ dù-a-bi

é šu-bi-šè hé-rig₇

Of Etemenniguru — its,

Of the house of Eridug — its organization,

Of the house of Suen — its purification,

Of the Eana — its erected banners

were all given as gifts to the house (Dumuzid-Inana D₁ 1:1-5)

Occasionally the anticipatory genitive appears at the epilogue of a poem, to highlight its concluding principal theme. In Šulgi R, for example, this construction appears at the hymn's most climactic point – at the goddess' blessing of the king; it is used by the poet to emphasize the three symbols of royalty: the crown, the holy scepter and the throne:

7. **aga an kug-ge saĝ²-za mu-ni-in-gen₆-na ĝi₆-bi**

ga-ra-ab-bad-bad

ĝidru kug² ^den líl-le ma-ra-an-šúm-ma-a²

ud-bi ga-ra-ab-sud-sud

^{giš}**gu-za ^den-ki-ke₄ saĝ² ha-ba-ra-rig₇-ga-a**

suhuš-bi ha-ra-ab-ge-ge-en₆

Of the crown that was placed upon your head by holy An —

I will **prolong its nights**,

Of the holy scepter that was given to you by Enlil —

I will extend **its days**,

Of your throne that was bestowed on you by Enki —

I will make firm for you **its foundation!** (Šulgi R 85-87)

The following two examples also appear at the epilogue of a poem, emphasizing the significant phrases in the sentences:

8. **igi-ĝá lál-bi-im šag₄-ĝá hi-li-bi-im**

ud nam-tìl-la hé-en-na-éd

Of my eyes — he is their honey, of my heart — he is its charm;

May the light of life shine for him! (Šu-Suen C 21-23)

9. dumu nun é-kur-ra é nam-dumu zid-da

15. The above transliteration and translation are based on the Nippur version. The Me-Turan version differs both in content and line-order, and reads: šul mè-kam “he is a man of battle”. Accordingly, it does not contain anticipatory genitive constructions, but nominal clauses followed by a verbal clause. Thus e.g. line 1 reads: “He is a man of battle, he is a man of battle – I will sing his song!”

lugal ^den-líl-ra túm-ma-àm ...

^den-líl-lá lú šag₄-ga-na

In the true house of youth, the princely son of the E-kur
is worthy of Enlil the king ...

of Enlil — he is **his favorite** (Hymn to the E-kur 67-70)

In royal inscriptions dealing with building and dedication, one finds many instances of topicalization and emphasis in the last sentence by the means of the anticipatory genitive, particularly in the name giving formula. In the shorter inscriptions, in which the topicalization forms the greater part of the inscription, this feature is even more outstanding.¹⁶

One can find quite frequently a series of anticipatory genitive constructions in sentence sequences also appearing in the middle of literary compositions. This chain of anticipatory genitives marks a distinct thematic unit, forming a highlight in the storyline. A conspicuous example of this stylistic phenomenon is the lengthy prologue of the second Ur Lament, which consists of a series of 54 purpose clauses subordinate to an independent clause (line 55). In the middle of this section, a segment of five lines (27-31), containing the main protagonists of the lament (namely Ur, Nanna the 'Princely Son', and his temple, the Ekišnugal), is emphasized and highlighted by the means of the anticipatory genitive, recurring in each line of the segment:

10. **ki-en-gi-ra me-bi** ha-lam-e-dè **ĝiš-hur-bi** kúr-ru-dè

urim₅^{ki}-ma me nam-lugal-la **bal-bi** sù-sù-ud-dè

dumu nun-na é-kiš-nu-ĝál-la-na šu pe-el-lá di-dè

^dnanna ùĝ **u₈-gin₇ lu-a-na igi te-en-bi** si-il-le-dè

urim₅^{ki} èš nidba gal-gal-la nidba-bi kúr-ru-dè

Of Sumer — so as to obliterate **its divine powers**, to change **its preordained plans**,

Of Urim — to alienate the divine powers and **its reign of kingship**,¹⁷

Of the princely son — to send a defiling hand in **his**

E-kiš-nu-gal,¹⁸

Of the people of Nanna, numerous as ewes — to break up **their unity**,¹⁹

Of Urim, the shrine of magnificent food offerings — to change **its food**

16. Cf. Gudea 69; Nammah~ani 7; Ur-Namma et passim. In longer inscriptions, one finds the important word accented twice in two separate anticipatory genitive constructions, as in Amar Suen 10:10-17.

17. The present translation follows that of Kramer (cf. S.N. Kramer, "Sumerian Lamentation", in: *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*³ [1969], 612). For other translations see P. Michalowski, *The Lamentation over the Destruction of Sumer and Ur* (Mesopotamian Civilizations, 2), Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake, IN 1989, 37; W.H.Ph. Römer and K. Hecker, *Lieder und Gebete 1* (Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments II/5), Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, Gütersloh 1989, 702.

18. Michalowski translates the /-a/ at the end of *dumu nun-na* as a locative suffix or as compensatory lengthening of an adjective, translating the line accordingly: "to humiliate the princely son in his house E-kiš-nu-ĝál" (Michalowski, *The Lamentation over the Destruction of Sumer and Ur*, 37). For a similar translation, see *ETCSL*, 2.2.3. Kramer takes *dumu nun-na* to be the subject of the sentence, translating: "That the princely son stretch a defiling hand on his Ekishnugal" (Kramer, "Sumerian Lamentation", 612). However, the line under discussion is part of a sequence of anticipatory genitive constructions, and therefore it should also contain an anticipatory genitive; and the governed nouns throughout the passage are the major protagonists of the lament (Sumer, Ur and Nanna), with their cherished possessions (i.e. the me-s, the plans, the temple and the people) constituting the governing nouns. Hence, most probably, it is the temple Ekišnugal, which is said here to have been defiled, not the god Nanna.

19. This translation follows Michalowski (Michalowski, *The Lamentation over the Destruction of Sumer and Ur*, 37). For a similar translation, see *ETCSL*, 2.2.3. Kramer assumes that there is only one anticipatory genitive construction in this sentence, and that Nanna is its subject: "That Nanna show no respect for his people as numerous as ewes" (Kramer, "Sumerian Lamentation", 612). Although Kramer's translation is grammatically correct, from a stylistic point of view it is more reasonable to assume that "the unity of the people" is the object of the catastrophe, and that Nanna is not the subject of the sentence.

offerings²⁰ (The Lament for Sumer and Urim 27-31)

Nanna A consists primarily of monologues, interspersed with narrative segments. The first narrative segment in the hymn is formed entirely of anticipatory genitive constructions, which constitute a bridge between two of the god's monologues:

11. **ki áĝ-bi** na-nam **ki áĝ-bi** na-nam
 en **é-kur-ra** **ki áĝ-bi** na-nam
^d**en-líl-lá lú la-la-ni** na-nam
^dsuen **ama ugu-ni i-lu-ni** na-nam
 He is **its beloved**, he is **its beloved**,
 The lord, **of E-kur** — he is **its beloved!**
Of Enlil — He is **his man of delight**,
 Suen, **of his own mother** — he is her cry of joy! (Nanna A 21-24)²¹

Often the anticipatory genitive construction forms a framework (i.e. inclusio) for a literary paragraph, emphasizing the key word or motif in the paragraph,²² or serves as a recurring theme, repeating the significant word over and over.²³ Many literary works include two consecutive anticipatory genitive constructions in synonymous parallelism, thus elevating the poetic level of the thematic unit formed by this stylistic device, as in:

12. lugal **saĝ-men-na hi-li-bi**
 šul-gi **aga-zid-da hé-du₇-bi**
 O king, **of the royal tiara** — **its joy**,
 Šulgi, **of the legitimate crown** — **its ornament** (Šulgi D 8-9)
13. **é-kiš-nu-ĝál-la barag mah-bi** gen₆-né-dè
^dnanna **nam-lugal kalam-ma-ka ki-gub-bi** gen₆-né-dè
Of Ekišnuĝal — to make firm **its lofty dais**,
 Nanna, **of the kingship of the Land** — to make firm **its seat**
 (Nanna L 26-27)
14. **a-a-ĝu₁₀** ^d**en-líl-le lú šag₄-ga-na-me-en** ur-saĝ-me-en
ama-ĝu₁₀ ^d**nin-líl-lá ki áĝ-ni** ĝe₂₆-e-me-en
Of my father Enlil — I am **his favourite**, I am the hero,
Of my mother Ninlil — I am **her beloved** (Ninurta C 55-56)

One of the most significant stylistic functions of the anticipatory genitive is the singularization of a certain key word throughout the entire composition by relocating it at the beginning of the genitive construction. This has been already observed by Zólyomi, who noted that the noun *é* "house" and its synonyms are often moved to the beginning of the construction

20. The double genitive suffix in line 102 (/èš nidba gal-gal-ak-a[k]/) indicates that this line is also in the anticipatory genitive construction form.

21. See also Ninurta C 61-63.

22. See Šulgi G 38-43, in which the two anticipatory genitive constructions form an inclusio, emphasizing the temple and the king as its provider.

23. As in: Ur-Namma B 44, 50; Šulgi B 52-53, 77-78, 114-115, 150-151; Ibbi-Suen C 5,10; The lament for Urim 286-287, 302-303. Some poems contain two different refrains that appear consecutively: Ninurta G 29, 32, 34, 36 and 89-90, 94-95.

in the Gudea cylinders, when they serve as the rectum of a genitive phrase.²⁴ Upon examination of other literary texts, one finds that this phenomenon is quite wide spread. In Šulgi D, for example, the term “foreign land” (*kur*), is relocated at the beginning of the genitive construction, thereby positioned at the head of the poetic line, whenever it serves as the governed noun, emphasizing the main topic of the poem – vengeance on the “foreign land” which was responsible for the death of Šulgi's father.²⁵ In the Lament for Urim, the enemy is described as a merciless storm (*ud*) sent by Enlil to destroy the inhabitants of Sumer. Accordingly, in the instances wherein this word appears as the governed noun, it is nearly always relocated to the beginning of the construction, underscoring its terror and might.²⁶ In the poem Gilgameš and Aga, as well as in Enmerkar and En-suhgir-ana, the city of Uruk is topicalized by its placement at the beginning of the phrase.²⁷ Uruk is not the only city that is emphasized in this manner; in the Lament for Nibru, for example, every time the governed noun is the name of a city, it is found at the onset of the phrase, and thereby frequently it also opens the poetic line.²⁸

Finally, in some highly poetic and artistic compositions we can observe a group of abstract nouns, forming a joint semantic field, related to the central theme of the work, highlighted by the anticipatory genitive construction. In Šulgi B for example, this construction serves to express and highlight the infinite power, wisdom, majesty and vitality of the king, in the refrain²⁹ as well as throughout the text.³⁰ In the Lugalbanda epic, the sensation of being on a journey is expressed through accentuation of the words “mountain” and “river” appearing in anticipatory genitive constructions.³¹

We have seen that the anticipatory genitive construction functions as a stylistic tool to emphasize key words and central themes within sentences, paragraphs, and even in the framework of entire compositions. It fulfills this function by relocating the governed noun at the head of the sentence, whereby usually it is placed at the head of the poetic line as well. Upon a further examination it turns out that in some of the major Sumerian literary compositions the anticipatory genitive is not the only syntactic anomaly, used to fulfil this function, but it is part of a wider range of syntactic anomalies serving the same stylistic purpose.

3. THE ANTICIPATORY GENITIVE CONSTRUCTION AS PART OF A WIDESPREAD STYLISTIC PHENOMENON

As I pointed out before, in the Gudea cylinders *é* and the temple name *é-ninnu*, as governed nouns in a genitive compound, are often moved to the beginning of the construction, generally appearing at the beginning of the sentence.³² An in-depth reading of the Gudea Cylinders reveals, however, that these nouns generally appear at the beginning of the sentence, whether their role is that of a subject, object or governed noun, regardless to the standard

24. Zólyomi, *JCS* 48 (1996), 43f.

25. Šulgi D 28, 178, 211, 215-216, 250.

26. The Lament for Urim 88, 93, 111, 176, 185-186, 326, 340-341.

27. Gilgameš and Aga 30, 50; Enmerkar and En-suhgir-ana 3-5, 11.

28. The lament for Nibru 14 (*uru*), 70 (*uru*), 187 (*nibru^{ki}*), 216 (*eridu^{ki}*), 222 (*larsa^{ki}*).

29. Šulgi B 52-53, 77-78, 114-115, 150-151.

30. Šulgi B 4-6, 10, 27, 197, 241, 274, 293-294, 331-332, 341, 383-386.

31. Lugalbanda and the Anzud Bird 29-30, 33-35, 99, 102, 389-392.

32. Since normally the beginning of the sentence overlaps with the beginning of the poetic line, the relocated noun falls at the beginning of the line as well.

Sumerian word order. For illustration, I documented below all instances in which *é* and its synonyms appear in four columns (cols. 1, 9, 11 and 17) of Cylinder A.³³

15.	A	1	10	É -e lugal-bi gù ba-dé
			11	É-ninnu me-bi an ki-a pa-éd mu-ak-ke ₄
			16	É kug dù-dè gú-bi mu-ši-íb-zi
			19	É -a-ni dù-ba mu-na-dug ₄
			20	É-ninnu me-bi gal-gal-la-àm
	9	8		ensi ₂ É -ĝu ₁₀ ma-dù-na
		9		gù-dé-a É -ĝu ₁₀ dù-da giškim-bi ga-ra-ab-šúm
		11-12		É -ĝu ₁₀ é-ninnu an-né ki gar-ra me-bi me gal-gal me-me-a dirig-ga
		13-15		É lugal-bi igi sud íl-íl anzud ₂ ^{mušen} - gin ₇ šeg ₁₂ gi ₄ - a-bi-šè an im-ši-dúb-dúb
		17		É -ĝá ní-gal-bi kur-kur-ra mu-ri
		23		É -ĝu ₁₀ é-ninnu ge ₂₆ -en kur-ra ab-si-a
	11	1		É -ĝu ₁₀ é sag-kal kur-kur-ra□
		4-6		É -ninnu u□ é nam-lugal-ĝu ₁₀ sipad zid gù-dé-a ud šu-zi ma-ši-tùm-da
		10		É ĝá uš ki gar-ra-bi-da□
		19		É -ĝu ₁₀ ud šu zi ma-ši-tùm-da
	17	17		É -a ^d en-ki-ke ₄ ĝiš-hur-bi si mu-na-sá
		18		É me-lem ₄ -bi an-né ús-sa
		22-23		É -ninnu anzud ₂ ^{mušen} babbar ₂ -šè gù-dé-a sig-ta ba-ši-ĝen□

As one can see, in these four columns *é* stands always at the beginning of the sentence,³⁴ regardless to its syntactical function. Thus, topicalization by placing a certain word always at the beginning of the sentence, is not limited to the anticipatory genitive construction.

The phenomenon of highlighting key words, central to the major theme of the composition, by placing them at the beginning of the sentence, regardless of their syntactical function, is wide spread in Sumerian literature. Here we can offer only a limited number of examples. In *Šu-ilišu A*, dedicated to the god Nergal, the names *Šu-ilišu* and *Nergal* are consistently situated at the beginning of the sentence, even when accepted Sumerian word order dictates otherwise. However, out of the 27 attestations of this phenomenon, only two contain an anticipatory genitive.³⁵ The same syntactic anomaly underlies also the Neo-Sumerian royal inscriptions, which normally begin with the formulaic phrase "for DN + divine epithets", although this phrase constitutes the indirect object of the first, extended sentence of the inscription, thus topicalizing the name of the god to whom the inscription is dedicated.³⁶

33. Note that the anticipatory genitives are printed in bold to show that this construction is only part of the wider stylistic phenomenon of topicalization.

34. Note that in column 9, lines 7 and 9, the words *ensi* and *Gudea* are in the vocative, and therefore are not a part of the sentence; the actual sentence starts with the word *é*.

35. The two occurrences of anticipatory genitives are in lines 35 and 37. The names *Šu-ilišu* and *Nergal*, however, stand at the beginning of the sentence also in lines 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 14, 16, 19, 21, 23, 26, 28, 31-33, 40, 42, 44, 46, 50, 52, 54, 56, 58, 60, 62, 65.

36. For this phenomenon, which has been observed long ago, see W.W. Hallo, "The Royal Inscriptions of Ur: A Typology," *HUCA* 33 (1962), p. 16.

In the Inana and Ebih myth, the two major protagonists – Inana and her foe, the mount Ebih, stand always at the beginning of the sentence regardless of its syntactic nature.³⁷ Similarly, in The Lament for Sumer and Urim, we find the city name Urim standing at the beginning of the sentence no less than 20 times, out of which it functions as anticipated governed noun only in four cases.³⁸ The same is true as to the location of the city names Uruk and Nibru in the lamentations over these two cities;³⁹ the location of the name Lugalbanda in the Lugalbanda epic;⁴⁰ the location of the divine, priestly title "Mistress" (nu-u₈-gig) in Iddin-Dagan A hymn;⁴¹ and the location of the personified noun "Hoe" in The Debate between the Hoe and the Plough.⁴²

In these and other similar literary works, the anticipatory genitive construction is only one of the syntactical constructions used to emphasize the relevant key word(s). Relocation of a certain key word at the beginning of a sentence regardless of, and sometimes contrary to the normal word order, throughout the literary composition, reflects poetic singularization and emphasis. However, when this particular key word is a governed noun in a genitive phrase, the author has only two ways to solve this problem: He can use the morphological and stylistic aid provided by the anticipatory genitive construction in order to relocate the key word at the beginning of the sentence; or else he can use the *casus pendens* for the same purpose.⁴³ Although the Sumerian poets were free to choose between these two stylistic devices, it seems to us that they preferred the anticipatory genitive over the *casus pendens*.

It is a common knowledge that the anticipatory genitive construction is existent also in Akkadian,⁴⁴ appearing in the earliest sources, and exhibiting the same grammatical order of

37. For (ki-sikil/kug) ^dinanna, see lines 2, 5, 11, 24, 26, 31, 53, 88, 90, 114, 129, 135, 151, 183. The only instance where Inana's name is not in initial position is line 62, in which Anu precedes her. However, her name never appears in this composition as a governed noun, in an anticipatory genitive construction. For (hur-saĝ) ebih^{ki} see lines 32, 52, 91, 111, 115, 123, 141, 144, 152, 177, 181, 182.

38. Cf. Lamentation for Urim 28, 31, 102, 350 (cf. the editor's comment to line 28, on p. 73).

39. Cf. Lament for Unug, Segment A 18, 25; E 78, 79, 93; H 21, 26. For exceptions to this rule see Segment A 26; E 86, 100; Lament for Nibru lines 16, 26, 34, 187, 198, 200, 210 (èš nibru^{ki}), 271.

40. Cf. lines 1, 50, 111, 141, 148, 154, 158, 167, 206, 208, 219, 223, 238, 244, 250, 284, 322, 338, 351, 353, 357, 417. The only two exceptions to this rule are: (a) instances where the hero's name is preceded by the name of the other major protagonist, Anzud, or its epithet (mušen), in function of the ergative (cf. lines 134, 161, 184, 209); (b) where Lugalbanda is addressed in direct person by the vocative phrase: ĝá-nu lugal-bàn-da-ĝu₁₀ (lines 135, 162, 210, 227, 354).

41. See lines 2, 7, 15, 82, 149, 162, 218, 219. Note that only in lines 82, 162 and 218 is this title the subject of the sentence, and therefore the word order accords with the accepted form. In all other cases (lines 2, 7, 15, 149, 219), this title stands at the beginning contrary to the accepted word order.

42. See lines 1-8, 61A, 63, 176, 189, 191, 192, 194, 195. Exceptions to this rule are: (a) when the Plow's answer to the Hoe is introduced (cf. line 20) and when the Hoe speaks of itself in the third person, and has the function of a direct object (line 144).

43. The sole difference between the anticipatory genitive and the *casus pendens* consists of the presence or absence of a genitive morpheme after the anticipated noun. Compare the anticipatory genitive construction (A) versus the *casus pendens* (B) in the following examples: A. **kalam-ma** di-bi ši-in-ga-kud-dè "Of the Land — he actually decides its lawsuits" (Lugal-e 42); B. **kalam** ní-g-daĝal-ba igi mu-ni-íl "the land — I have looked through (it) in all its extent" (Šulgi P, seg. A:12). A. ^d**en-líl-lá** lú šag₄-ga-na-kam "Of Enlil — the man of his heart" (Gudea Cyl. A 17:11); B. ^d**en-líl** šag₄-ga-na húl-húl-e im-de₆ "Enlil — (Sud) brought great rejoicing in his heart" (Enlil and Sud 103). Since the *casus pendens* and the anticipatory genitive are so closely related, one may question whether the *casus pendens* originated from the anticipatory genitive construction, shedding the genitive morpheme at some point, or vice versa — the anticipatory genitive construction was originally a *casus pendens*, to which a genitive morpheme was later added to the anticipated noun. A survey of the extant Sumerian literary corpus reveals that the anticipatory genitive construction and the *casus pendens* co-existed since the earliest periods, and therefore it is impossible to determine, which of the two arose earlier.

44. Studies of Akkadian grammar also provide little, if any, discussion of the anticipatory genitive construction, and the treatment of this phenomenon is negligible. See: W. von Soden, Grundriss der Akkadischen

elements as in Sumerian.⁴⁵ In Akkadian, like in Sumerian, the anticipatory genitive construction is the rare form, appearing primarily in the, so called *hymnisch-epische Dialekt*, although it is found in prose as well.

A comparison of the instances of anticipatory genitive in the two languages reveals that the usage of this grammatical construction in Sumerian is unquestionably more productive and creative than in Akkadian.⁴⁶ While the usage of the anticipatory genitive construction in Akkadian is rather limited and unproductive, it is altogether non-existent in North-West Semitic languages. Hence it may be assumed that the anticipatory genitive is not characteristic of Semitic languages in general and therefore, it originated in Sumerian. Apparently, Akkadian borrowed it from Sumerian, seeing in it a useful stylistic tool in language and literature.

SUMMARY

The anticipatory genitive construction is undoubtedly an original Sumerian morpho-syntactical construction, derived from the standard genitive construction as a stylistic tool in the literature. The anticipatory genitive serves as a distinct tool for singularizing and emphasizing the governed noun, by relocating it at the beginning of the genitive construction.

One of the most significant stylistic functions of the anticipatory genitive is the singularization of one or more key words throughout the literary composition by relocating it at the beginning of the sentence. An examination of the Sumerian literary texts indicates that this stylistic-grammatical phenomenon is quite wide spread. A further investigation reveals that in many important Sumerian literary works, the anticipatory genitive constitutes only one stylistic-grammatical tool for the singularization of key words. In such compositions, the key word very often appears at the beginning of the sentence, whether its role is that of a subject, object or governed noun, regardless of the standard Sumerian word order.

RÉSUMÉ

Adresse

Grammatik, Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, Rome 1969, p. 239; J.A. Huehnergard, A Grammar of Akkadian, Scholars press, Atlanta, Georgia, 1997, 363f.

45. Such as: da-al-hu-nim-ma **šá ti-amat kar-as-sa** "They troubled, **of Tiamat — her mood**" (Enuma eliš 1: 23); **šá kakkabī ša-ma-mi al-kāt-su-nu** li-kin-ma "May he establish **the course of the stars of heaven**" (Enuma eliš 7:130). Quotations are based on Ph. Talon's edition (The Standard Babylonian Creation Myth Enūma Eliš [SAACT 4], Helsinki 2005, pp. 33ff.).

46. This preliminary assumption I hope to substantiate by a statistical survey of Akkadian literature in my forthcoming publication (cf. note 1 above).