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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. \(\text{A. bàd urim}_5^\text{ki} \text{-ma}^5 \text{ mu-na-dû}

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.


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 Geschichtspunkte in der Sumerischen Literatur,” \textit{Sumerological Studies in Honor of Thorkild Jacobsen} (AS 20), 1974, 205-316; D.O. Edzard, “Literature,” in: Realexikon der Assyriologie 7, 35-38. See further J. Black et alii, \textit{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. \(\text{/bàd-urim}_5^\text{ki} \text{-a(k)/} \).
He built the wall of Urim for him (Ur-Namma 7, 4)

B. **urim₃^ki^-ma bād-bi₆** mu-du₄

Of Urim — its wall he built (Ur-Namma 1,4:13-14)

2. A. **ud nam-til-la hé-en-na-éd**

May the light of life shine for him (Šu-Suen C 22)

B. **nam-til-la-na ud-bi** sud-a-da

that of his life — its days may be long (Gudea E 8: 9-10)

3. A. **d'amar₄^d-en.ZU kī-āğ □ urim₃^ki^-ma**

Amar-Suena, the beloved of Ur (Amar-Suena 10, 11)

B. **eridug₃^ki^d en-ki-ke₄^7** kī-āğ □-gā-ni

Eridug, of Enki — his beloved (Enki’s journey to Nibru 49)

4. A. **gīškim-tīl₃^d i din₃^d da-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 ⁴li-pf-it-e₄-tár-ra gīškim-tīl-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. /urim₃^ki^-a(k) bād-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‘”, *dubbar anta-men: Studien zur Altorientalistik Festschrift für Willem H.Ph. Römer* [AOAT 253], 1998, 457-485).


The stylistic role of the anticipatory genitive construction restricts its discussion of the anticipatory genitive to its stylistic and syntactic functions.\(^\text{11}\)

In my above mentioned study,\(^\text{12}\) 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.\(^\text{13}\) 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.\(^\text{14}\)

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 me\(^{1}\)-ka šul mē-ka en-du-ni ga-an-dug\(_{4}\)
   en \(^{2}\)GIŠ.BÍL-ga-mes šul mē-ka en-du-ni ga-an-dug\(_{4}\)
   á-úr sag\(_{9}\)-sag\(_{9}\) šul mē-ka en-du-ni ga-an-dug\(_{4}\)
   en TUR kalag-kalag-ga šul mē-ka en-du-ni ga-an-dug\(_{4}\)
   en na\(_{4}\)šu\(_{11}\) ku\(_{10}\)-ku\(_{10}\) šul mē-ka en-du-ni ga-an-dug\(_{4}\)
   gešpu\(_{2}\) lírum ...... šul mē-ka en-du-ni ga-an-dug\(_{4}\)

   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 gu-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 protegé, such as in: \(^{4}\)en-lí-lí-lá šag\(_{5}\)-ga-na-kam “of Enil — his favorite” (Gudea Cyl. A 11:17); and (3) the idiomatic phrase “of my/his throne — its foundations”, as in \(^{5}\)g-u-zá gub-ba-na sûhu₃-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 limmu₃-ba, which ever since Poebel’s analysis (Sumerteschen 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) — limmu₃-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 limmu₃-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. \(\text{é-temen-ni-gùr}^{-a'} \text{x-bi}
\text{é uru}_2-\text{zé-ba šu si sá-a-bi}
\text{é }^{\text{d} }\text{su-en-na-ka dadag-ga-bi}
\text{é-an-na-ka uri}_3 \text{ dú-a-bi}
\text{é šu-bi-šē hé-rig}_7

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. \(\text{aga an kug-ge sāg-za mu-ni-in-gen}_6 \text{-na ḡi}_6 \text{-bi}
\text{ga-ra-ab-bad-bad}
\text{ḡidru kug}^7 \text{ en līl-le ma-ra-an-šúm-ma}^{-a'}
\text{ud-bi ga-ra-ab-sud-sud}
\text{ḡi₄s u-z₄a }^{\text{d} }\text{ēn-ki-ke}_4 \text{ sāg ha-ba-ra-rig}_7 \text{-ga-a}
\text{suhus-bi ha-ra-ab-ge-ge-ge}_n

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. \(\text{igi-ḡá làl-bi-im }\text{šag₄-ḡá }\text{hi-li-bi-im}
\text{ud nam-t̄i₄a 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. \(\text{dumu nun }\text{é-kur-ra }\text{é }\text{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 mē-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!”
<en></en>
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-lîl-lá lú la-la-ni na-nam
\( ^d \)suen 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)

Often the anticipatory genitive construction forms a framework (i.e., inclusio) for a literary paragraph, emphasizing the key word or motif in the paragraph, or serves as a recurring theme, repeating the significant word over and over. 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 saq-men-na hi-li-bi
\( ^d \)sul-gi aga-zid-da hé-du₂-bi
O king, of the royal tiara — its joy,
Šulgi, of the legitimate crown — its ornament (Šulgi D 8-9)

13. é-kiš-nu-ḡal-la barag mah-bi gen₆-nē-dē
\( ^d \)nanna nam-lugal kalam-ma-ka ki-gub-bi gen₆-nē-dē
Of Ekišnuḡal — 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-ḡu₁₀ \( ^d \)en-lîl-le lú šag₄-ga-na-me-en ur-saḡ-me-en
ama-ḡu₁₀ \( ^d \)nin-lîl-lá ki áĝ-ni ḡe₂₆-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 (\( ^e \)š nidba gal-gal-ak-[\( ^k \)]/) 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.
in the Gudea cylinders, when they serve as the rectum of a genitive phrase.\textsuperscript{24} Upon examination of other literary texts, one finds that this phenomenon is quite widespread. 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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 refrain\textsuperscript{29} as well as throughout the text.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 fulfill 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.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{24} Zólyomi, JCS 48 (1996), 43f.
\textsuperscript{25} Šulgi D 28, 178, 211, 215-216, 250.
\textsuperscript{26} The Lament for Urim 88, 93, 111, 176, 185-186, 326, 340-341.
\textsuperscript{27} Gilgameš and Aga 30, 50; Enmerkar and En-suhgir-ana 3-5, 11.
\textsuperscript{28} The lament for Nibru 14 (uru), 70 (uru), 187 (nibrū\textsuperscript{b}), 216 (eridu\textsuperscript{b}), 222 (larsa\textsuperscript{b}).
\textsuperscript{29} Šulgi B 52-53, 77-78, 114-115, 150-151.
\textsuperscript{30} Šulgi B 4-6, 10, 27, 197, 241, 274, 293-294, 331-332, 341, 383-386.
\textsuperscript{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 stands always at the beginning of the sentence, regardless to its syntactical function. Thus, topicalization by placing a certain word at the beginning of the sentence, is not limited to 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 to 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. 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.

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

15. A 1 10 é-e lugal-bi gù ba-dé
11 é-ninnu me-bi an ki-a pa-éd mu-ak-ke₄
16 é kug dû-bi gù-bi mu-ši-ib-zi
19 é-a ni dû-ba mu-na-dug₄
20 é-ninnu me-bi gal-gal-la-âm
9 8 ensi₂ é-ênu₁₀ ma-ê-na
9 gù-dé-a é-ênu₁₀ dû-da giškim-bi ga-ra-ab-šûm
11-15 é-ênu₁₀ é-ninnu an-né ki degar-ra me-bi me gal-
gal me-me-a dirig ga
13-15 é lugal-bi igi sud il-êl anzud₂ mašen-gin₇ šeg₁₂
17 é-ênu me-bi šè an ishi-dûb-dûb
19 é-ênu₁₀ é-ninnu ge₂₆-en kur-ra ab-si-a
11 1 é-ênu₁₀ é sag-kal kur-kur-ra
4-6 é-ninnu u-êl nam-lugal-ênu₁₀ sipad zid gù-dé-a
ud șu-zi ma-ši-tûm-da
10 é-ênu uš ki gar-ra-bi-da
19 é-ênu₁₀ ud šu zi ma-ši-tûm-da
17 17 é-a ën-ki-ke₄ giš-hur-bi si mu-na-sá
18 é me-lem₄-bi an-né ûs-sa
22-23 é-ninnu anzud₂ mašen babbar₂-šê gû-dé-a sig-ta
ba-ši-ğen

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

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 Ebib myth, the two major protagonists – Inana and her foe, the mount Ebib, stand always at the beginning of the sentence regardless of its syntactic nature. 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. The same is true as to the location of the city names Uruk and Nibru in the lamentations over these two cities; the location of the name Lugalbanda in the Lugalbanda epic; the location of the divine, priestly title "Mistress" (nu-u₃-gig) in Idinn-Dagan A hymn; and the location of the personified noun "Hoe" in The Debate between the Hoe and the Plough.

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. 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, appearing in the earliest sources, and exhibiting the same grammatical order of

37. For (ki-sikil/kug) \( ^d \)inanna, 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-sa₃) ebibi\( ^s \) 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 Nibiru lines 16, 26, 34, 187, 198, 200, 210 (éš nibru\( ^t \)), 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 (mu₃en), in function of the ergative (cf. lines 134, 161, 184, 209); (b) where Lugalbanda is addressed in direct person by the vocative phrase: 

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. \( ^d \)inanna, 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-sa₃) ebibi\( ^s \) see lines 32, 52, 91, 111, 115, 123, 141, 144, 152, 177, 181, 182.

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**
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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 Enûma 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).