Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr.

on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday

Gilgamesh in Ḫatti

GARY BECKMAN

Ann Arbor

Benno Landsberger exaggerated only a little when he referred to the story of Gilgamesh as Mesopotamia's "Nationalepos,"[1] for it cannot be denied that the cycle of tales surrounding this Sumerian ruler was well known in Babylonia and Assyria. Terra cotta plaques and seal designs depicting the killing of the monstrous Ḫuwawa by Gilgamesh and his comrade Enkidu are attested from the Old Babylonian period through Achaemenid times.[2] Knowledge of Gilgamesh also reached the Hittite capital of Ḫattuša, as demonstrated by the recovery at Boğazköy of two Akkadian versions of his adventures. Hurrian and Hittite translations have also turned up. But there is absolutely no evidence that the hero of Uruk was familiar to the Hittite in the street. No representations of Gilgamesh are to be found in the corpus of Hittite art,[3] nor are there allusions to him or his exploits in texts outside of the literary products just mentioned.[4]

It seems, therefore, that the Gilgamesh tradition was imported to Ḫattuša solely for use in scribal instruction,[5] although it cannot be absolutely excluded that the Hittite-language text was read aloud at court for the entertainment of

---

1. "Einleitung in das Gilgameš-Epos," in *Gilgameš et sa légende*, ed. P. Garelli (Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1960), 31.

2. For details see W. G. Lambert, "Gilgamesh in Literature and Art: The Second and First Millennia," in *Monsters and Demons*, ed. A. Farkas et al. (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1987), 37–52; and A. Green, "Myths in Mesopotamian Art," in *Sumerian Gods and Their Representations*, ed. I. L. Finkel et al. (Groningen: Styx, 1997), 137–39.

3. Note only a bas relief from Tell Halaf illustrating the attack on Ḫuwawa (pictured by Lambert, "Gilgamesh in Literature," figure 15), which is, of course, a product of the "Neo-Hittite" period.

4. The mention of an "(omen) of Gilgamesh" (Š[A ᵈGI]Š.GIM.MAŠ) in KBo 13.34 iii? 13′ (*CTH* 540; ed. K. K. Riemschneider, *StBoT* 9, 26–27) is no exception, since this text is a translation of a Mesopotamian birth omen collection.

5. See A. Kammenhuber, "Gilgameš-Epos. Die hethitischen und hurritischen (hurrischen) Gilgameš-Überlieferungen," *Kindlers Literatur Lexikon* 3 (Zurich: Kindler, 1967), 816; and cf. my "Mesopotamians and Mesopotamian Learning at Ḫattuša," *JCS* 35 (1983): 97–114.

the king and his associates.[6] Nonetheless, as has long been recognized,[7] the material from Boğazköy is of particular importance to modern scholars in reconstructing the epic and analyzing its development, since it documents a period in the history of the narrative's progressive restructuring and elaboration for which very few textual witnesses have yet been recovered from Mesopotamia itself.[8] And it is this very Middle Babylonian or Kassite period to which scholarly consensus assigns the composition of the final, "canonical,"[9] version of the epic.[10]

I have re-edited all of the Gilgamesh material from Boğazköy in the Akkadian, Hittite, and Hurrian languages, an undertaking which grew out of a collaborative project with Benjamin Foster and Douglas Frayne to produce a new and comprehensive translation of all Gilgamesh texts.[11] I have succeeded in bringing further order to the chaos presented by the Hittite-language fragments,[12] having identified several new joins and duplicates, and having placed all but nine or ten pieces in their proper position within the narrative.[13]

As is well known, the tradition surrounding the figure of Gilgamesh[14] goes back to the Early Dynastic II period (ca. 2700–2500 B.C.E.), when a man of this name may actually have ruled as the fifth king of the Sumerian King

---

6. Harry Hoffner points out to me that the heroic activities carried out by the hero would be most appropriate thematically to an audience made up of a warrior monarch and his military entourage. Cf. notes 54 and 84 below.

7. Text from the Hittite version has traditionally been used to fill a gap in Tablet V of the Twelve-Tablet-Version. See A. Schott, *Das Gilgamesch-Epos*, ergänzt und teilweise neu gestaltet von Wolfram von Soden (Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam, 1958), 46–47, and the translations by E. A. Speiser in ANET², 82, and M. Gallery Kovacs, *The Epic of Gilgamesh* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1985), 40–47.

8. This is not an uncommon situation. See J. S. Cooper., "Bilinguals from Boghazköi. I," *ZA* 61 (1972): 1–2.

9. I use this term loosely here. On the question of applying this concept to Mesopotamian literary texts, see W. W. Hallo, "Assyriology and the Canon," *The American Scholar* 59 (1990): 105–8. Cf. F. Rochberg-Halton, "Canonicity in Cuneiform Texts," *JCS* 36 (1984): 133–50.

10. W. von Soden, "Das Problem der zeitlichen Einordnung akkadischer Literaturwerke," *MDOG* 85 (1953): 23.

11. *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, translated and edited by Benjamin R. Foster. Norton Critical Editions (New York: W. W. Norton, 2001). Foster has translated all Akkadian-language material and Frayne the Sumerian poems.

12. See the pioneering works of J. Friedrich, "Die hethitischen Bruckstücke des Gilgameš-Epos," *ZA* 39 (1930): 1–82, and H. Otten, "Die erste Tafel des hethitischen Gilgamesch-Epos," *IM* 8 (1958): 93–125. I have also consulted with profit the transliteration by E. Laroche, "Textes mythologiques hittites en transcription. II. Mythologie étrangère," *RHA* 82 (1968): 121–38.

13. For details, see my forthcoming edition, *The Hittite Gilgamesh*.

14. In general see J. H. Tigay, *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982).

List's first dynasty of Uruk.[15] Already in the middle of the third millennium (Fara period) Gilgamesh makes his appearance in a list of gods,[16] and he received offerings in pre-Sargonic Lagash[17] and under the Ur III state.[18]

Tales featuring Gilgamesh are first known from early in the second millennium, the so-called Isin-Larsa period. These Sumerian texts—found for the most part at the old religious center of Nippur—are almost certainly copies of compositions created at the court of the Ur III kings (twenty-first century B.C.E.), monarchs who claimed Gilgamesh as their semi-divine forbear. At this stage, the tradition—so far as known to us—consisted of five independent poems centering on the deeds of our hero.[19] Some of the events presented here were to become the building blocks of the later unified epic, while others would simply disappear.

The earliest Akkadian texts telling Gilgamesh's story were composed in Old Babylonian times, perhaps by scribes in the service of Rīm-Sîn I of Larsa, or in that of Ḫammurapi and Samsuiluna of Babylon. (See the key to Chart 1 for a list of the six known relevant manuscripts dating to this period.[20]) Unfortunately, most of these tablets are in very poor condition indeed, but the best-preserved witness (that of the "Pennsylvania" and "Yale" Tablets) makes it clear enough that the process of integrating the story elements into a single coherent narrative had already begun in this period.

The published Middle Babylonian sources from sites other than Boğazköy are in even worse condition than the Old Babylonian texts. (See the key to Chart 1,[21] and note that while the discovery of the bracketed text from Ugarit

---

15. T. Jacobsen, *The Sumerian King List* (Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1939), 88–89, iii 17–18.

16. See W. G. Lambert, "Gilgameš in Religious, Historical and Omen Texts and the Historicity of Gilgameš," in *Gilgameš et sa légende*, 48.

17. A. Falkenstein, "Gilgameš," *RlA* 3 (1957–71): 359.

18. W. G. Lambert, "Gilgameš in Religious, Historical and Omen Texts," 47–48.

19. See the translations by A. George, *The Epic of Gilgamesh* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1999), 141–208.

20. Particular information on the place of publication of these Old Babylonian sources is given by J. Tigay, *Evolution*, 305–6. Nos. 5 and 6 are presented by A. George, *Gilgamesh*, 115–18, and No. 6 has now received a full edition by A. Cavigneaux and J. Renger, "Ein altbabylonischer Gilgameš-Text aus Nippur," in *Wisdom, Gods and Literature. Studies in Assyriology in Honour of W. G. Lambert*, ed. A. R. George and I. L. Finkel (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000), 91–103. In the same anniversary volume, A. Westenholz provides new copies of the Pennsylvania Tablet and UM 29-13-570, as well as of the MB sources 2N-T79, *UET* 6, 394, and the Megiddo tablet. See A. Westenholz and U. Koch-Westenholz, "Enkidu—the Noble Savage?" 445–51.

21. See once again J. Tigay, *Evolution*, 305–6. N. Veldhuis has treated the Nippur school texts in a review of S. Parpola, *The Standard Babylonian Epic of Gilgamesh*, SAACT 1, *BiOr* 46 (1999): 389–90 (2N-T79 and 2N-T75), and in "Kassite Exercises: Literary and Lexical Extracts," *JCS* 52 (2000): 72 (CBS 14167 and UM 29-16-606, both of which are too fragmentary to be placed

has been reported by its excavator,[22] it has not yet been made available for study. Its state of preservation is said to be very good.) All but one of these Middle Babylonian pieces deal with the portion of the cycle stretching from Gilgamesh's encounter with Ishtar to the death of Enkidu.

The ancient development of the Gilgamesh Epic culminated in the Twelve-Tablet Edition traditionally attributed to Sîn-leqe-unninnī.[23] In this work we have a magnificent *Bildungsroman* in which the hero, following Herculean efforts and abject failure, comes to accept the limitations of human existence as well as the consolations that it offers.[24] It is this crystallization of the tradition that forms the basis for the translations and retellings of the epic[25] encountered today in introductory world literature courses. It has also provided the stuff for modern literary-critical studies,[26] psychological interpretations,[27] and novelistic allusions and reworkings.[28] This Twelve-Tablet Edition, small

---

within the narrative). Two of the Emar fragments (*Emar* VI, 781–82) have been edited by D. Arnaud, *Emar* VI.4, *Textes de la bibliothèque* (Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1987), 383–86, while the fragmentary third piece (*Emar* VI, 760) is discussed by Cl. Wilcke, "Ein weiteres Gilgameš-Fragment aus Emar?" *NABU* 1989/5. On the Akkadian-language sources in general, see now A. George, "What's New in the Gilgamesh Epic?" *BCSMS* 34 (1999): 57f.

22. See A. George, *Gilgamesh*, 139–40.

23. W. G. Lambert, "Ancestors, Authors and Canonicity," *JCS* 11 (1957): 4–5. See now P.-A. Beaulieu, "The Descendants of Sîn-lēqi-unninni," in *Assyriologica et Semitica. Festschrift für Joachim Oelsner*, ed. J. Marzahn and H. Neumann (Münster, 2000), 2–5.

24. Two of the most thought-provoking interpretations of the Twelve-Tablet Version are those of T. Jacobsen, *The Treasures of Darkness* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976), 195–219, and W. L. Moran, "The Gilgamesh Epic: A Masterpiece from Ancient Mesopotamia," in *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*, ed. J. Sasson et al. (New York: Scribners, 1995), 2227–2336. Both essays have been reprinted in B. R. Foster, *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, 171–207. See now also T. Abusch, "The Development and Meaning of the Epic of Gilgamesh: An Interpretive Essay," *JAOS* 121 (2001): 614–22.

25. Popular translations include M. G. Kovacs, *The Epic of Gilgamesh* (see note 7 above), and J. Gardner and J. Maier, *Gilgamesh* (New York: Knopf, 1984). N. K. Sandars, *The Epic of Gilgamesh* (Baltimore: Penguin, 1960), is a rather free "English version" based not on the ancient texts but on earlier renderings into modern European languages (see p. 48).

26. Many of these have been collected in *Gilgamesh. A Reader*, ed. J. Maier (Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, 1997).

27. T. Abusch, "Gilgamesh's Request and Siduri's Denial," in *The Tablet and the Scroll, Near Eastern Studies in Honor of W. W. Hallo*, ed. M. E. Cohen et al. (Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 1993), 1–14; "Gilgamesh's Request and Siduri's Denial. Part II: An Analysis and Interpretation of an Old Babylonian Fragment about Mourning and Celebration," *JANES* 22 (1993): 3–17; R. Scharf Kluger, *The Archetypal Significance of Gilgamesh: A Modern Ancient Hero* (Einsiedeln, Switzerland: Daimon, 1991). V. Schneider's exegesis of the symbols of the epic in *Gilgamesch* (Zurich: Origo Verlag, 1967) is truly in a class of its own.

28. Robert Silverberg's novel *Gilgamesh the King* (Toronto: Bantam Books, 1985) is described on its cover as "[t]he towering saga of power, passion, and the quest for immortality." And who could forget Gil Gamesh, anti-hero of Philip Roth's *The Great American Novel* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973)?

portions of which are still lost,[29] is known from multiple copies held in the tablet collection of the seventh-century Assyrian king Assurbanipal at Nineveh (Küyünjik).[30] Additional, partial, manuscripts have come from Nimrud[31] and Assur[32] in the north, and from Uruk and another, unknown, site in Babylonia.[33] The earliest witness to this recension seems to be a tablet from Assur,[34] to be dated to the eighth or ninth century.[35]

Such, in a nutshell, was the evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic. We are left with a number of unanswered questions concerning the details of this process. Here I wish to consider but one: When during the second half of the second millennium B.C.E.[35] was something approximating the standard, or "canonical," form of the narrative achieved? Consideration[36] of cast of characters[37] and onomastics,[38] as well as general cultural-historical factors,[39] point to a date sometime in the Kassite era, which came to an end ca. 1150 B.C.E. Greater precision is difficult to achieve because we have only two Kassite-period Gilgamesh manuscripts from Babylonia (from Ur and Nippur), and both are tiny. Can the material from Boğazköy contribute to the resolution of this question?

Almost a century of excavation at the Hittite capital has yielded more textual sources for Gilgamesh than are known from all other Late Bronze Age sites combined. These have been assigned to Number 341 in E. Laroche's *CTH*.[40] (See the column headings at the top right of Chart 1.)

---

29. A. George, *Gilgamesh*, xxviii, estimates that around 575 lines of an original complement of 3000 are still lacking.

30. On the "library," see O. Pedersén, *Archives and Libraries in the Ancient Near East 1500–300 B.C.* (Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 1998), 158–65.

31. For publication details see J. Tigay, *Evolution*, 306.

32. See note 34. A later manuscript from Assur is VAT 11000 (+) 11087—see S. Maul, "Wer baute die babylonische Arche? Ein neues Fragment der mesopotamischen Sintfluterzählung aus Assur," *MDOG* 131 (1999): 155–62.

33. See note 31 and A. Heidel, "A Neo-Babylonian Gilgamesh Fragment," *JNES* 11 (1952): 140–43.

34. KAR 115; cf. also KAR 319 and 320.

35. So A. Falkenstein, "Gilgameš," *RlA* 3 (1957–71): 367.

36. See W. G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960), 13–14.

37. Neither Marduk nor Assur, paramount gods of the first millennium, appear here.

38. The personal designation Ur-shanabi may reflect a revived interest for things Sumerian in the later second millennium (see note 105 below), and this period of Hurrian prosperity and influence is also a most reasonable time to place the borrowing of the alewife's name Shiduri (see note 104). Finally, "*Gebetsnamen*" (see J. J. Stamm, *Die akkadische Namengebung* [Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1939], 167) like Sîn-leqe-unninnī are also characteristic of Kassite times.

39. See W. von Soden, "Das Problem der zeitlichen Einordnung akkadischer Literatur," *MDOG* 85 (1953): 14–26.

40. *Catalogue des textes hittites* (Paris: Éditions Klincksieck, 1971), 58–59. Information on publication of the relevant fragments is given here.

Fragments of two separate Akkadian-language recensions have come to light at Boğazköy. One was composed in the local variety of peripheral Akkadian and is to be dated to the empire period, probably to the thirteenth century.[41] The second, only recently discovered,[42] is written in a Boğazköy hand dated by its editor to around 1400 B.C.E.[43] In this version the text was apparently distributed over three tablets. Although it was seemingly inscribed in Ḫattuša, the language of this earlier Akkadian edition does not display the characteristics of Hittite Akkadian. It appears in Chart 1 under Boğazköy simply as "Akkadian."

The Hurrian-language texts present considerable difficulties. Not only is the Hurrian tongue still poorly understood, but each of the four recovered tablets is broken precisely down the middle of a column. Thus my recognition of story elements here is based upon the presence of personal names and of particular lexemes—a weak reed indeed! Two of the Hurrian texts may belong to the fourteenth century,[44] and one is definitely of thirteenth-century date.[45] A final piece is too small to allow a judgement.[46] Perhaps the most interesting feature of this group is the colophon: "Tablet 4 of Ḫuwawa; unfinished."[47]

We come at last to the Hittite-language texts. All of these fragments show New Hittite script, indicating a date in the mid-fourteenth century or later, and a fair number were inscribed in the Late Hittite hand of the thirteenth century. Based on the preservation of the upper left corners of the obverse of three tablets, I have reconstructed an edition in three tablets, although it is clear from the placement of text on duplicates that the material was not distributed in a standardized manner in all manuscripts. (In contrast, each copy of a tablet of the Twelve-Tablet Edition begins and ends with the same line of text.[48]) Heinrich Otten has shown that at least four exemplars of Tablet 1 have been preserved.[49] I am unable to add anything definite in this regard. Although I have identified further duplicates of portions of Tablet 1, and the text of my "Tablet 3" has been reconstructed from eight manuscripts, most of these fragments are small and non-contiguous, and show no distinctive orthography. Identification

---

41. We must always be careful, however, when applying paleographic criteria identified for Hittite-language texts when considering Akkadian materials. Cf. my remarks in *JCS* 35 (1983): 99 n. 11, and see now J. Klinger, "Zur Päleographie akkadischsprachiger Texte aus Ḫattuša," in this volume (pp. 237–48).

42. See G. Wilhelm, "Neue akkadische Gilgameš-Fragmente aus Ḫattusa," *ZA* 78 (1988): 99–121.

43. G. Wilhelm, "Neue akkadische Gilgameš-Fragmente," 116–21.

44. KUB 8.60 +? KUB 47.9 and KBo 19.124.

45. KUB 8.61 + KBo 8.144.

46. KBo 33.10.

47. KUB 8.61 + KBo 8.144 left edge: DUB.4.KAM ŠA ᵈḪu-wa-wa NU.TIL.

48. J. Tigay, *Evolution*, 138 with n. 37.

49. *IM* 8 (1958): 94.

of pieces originally belonging to the same tablet might be done only through inspection of the fragments themselves.

In the left-hand column of Chart I are listed the basic elements of the Gilgamesh Epic as recounted in the Twelve-Tablet Edition, although a couple of episodes absent from that version have also been included. Motifs in bold are those found only in the late rendition; those bracketed are present solely in the Hittite-language recension. "X" indicates the presence of a motif in a particular source. For the Hittite-language edition, which alone is sufficiently well preserved to permit such a determination, "O" denotes the definite absence of a story element, while a question mark means that the motif has perhaps been lost in a break.

The Hittite author or adapter has made several major changes to the narrative as known from the Old Babylonian and contemporary (MB) Akkadian sources. First, in the Mesopotamian texts the hero is said to be of mixed parentage, fruit of the union of Lugalbanda, King of Uruk, and the goddess Ninsun.[50] But the Hittite Gilgamesh is not born at all, but created—and then by a committee! His semi-divine nature has been translated into extraordinary physical proportions:

> The heroic [Ea(?) fashioned] the frame of the creature Gilgamesh. [The great gods] fashioned the frame of Gilgamesh. The Sun-god of Heaven lent him [manliness]. The Storm-god lent him heroic qualities. The great gods [created] Gilgamesh: His body was eleven yards [in height]; his breast was nine [spans] in breadth; his . . . was three [. . .] in length.[51]

We cannot help but note the participation here of the Sun-god and the Storm-god, not deities usually concerned with creation in Sumer or Babylonia. This must be a reflection of the importance of these particular gods in the Hittite pantheon. Yet later on in the saga, when Enkidu dreams of the divine assembly,[52] he mentions the presence there of Anu, Enlil, Ea, and the Sun-god. This is the group we would expect to find at an early Mesopotamian divine meeting.[53] In this instance the source material has not been modified to accommodate Hittite conceptions.[54]

---

50. ᵈNin-sún, "the Lady Cow"—see G. J. Selz, "The Holy Drum, the Spear, and the Harp," in *Sumerian Gods*, ed. I. L. Finkel et al., 172.

51. Tablet 1, §2. For details, see my forthcoming edition.

52. Tablet 3, §1.

53. See the texts excerpted by T. Jacobsen in "Primitive Democracy in Ancient Mesopotamia," in *Toward the Image of Tammuz*, ed. W. L. Moran (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970), 163–69.

54. One might ask, however, whether the epithet UR.SAG, "Hero," employed for deities here has been borrowed from the Hittite royal titulary, on which see H. Gonnet, "La titulaire royale hittite au IIᵉ millénaire avant J.-C.," *Hethitica* 3 (1979): 25.

Another difference is that for the Hittite writer Uruk is not Gilgamesh's hometown. Rather, the hero takes up residence—and rule—in the city only after a period of aimless roving: "He wandered around all the lands. He came to the city of Uruk and he [settled] down. Then every day he overpowered the [young] men of Uruk."[55] Furthermore, in sharp contrast to the great attention paid to the walls of Uruk in the Twelve-Tablet Edition, the Hittite recension does not even mention the city's fortifications.

On the other hand, note the interest shown by the Hittite author in the Cedar Forest, scene of the struggle between the protagonist and the forest's guardian, a location to which he refers elsewhere as the "Mountain of Ḫuwawa":

> [And when] they arrived [. . .] in the heart of the mountains, they [looked at(?)] the mountains and stared at the cedars. . . . [Then Enkidu] and Gilgamesh said (to one another), "[The deity . . . has . . .] (these) inhospitable mountains and has made the mountains thick [with cedars]. [They] are covered in brambles(?), [so that it is not possible for a mortal] to cross. [. . .] hold the [. . .] limbs of the cedars, and [they are] within the mountains."[56]

This shift in geographic focus from southern Mesopotamia to the Amanus or Taurus Mountains is undoubtedly due to the fact that the latter were located in the later Hittite sphere of influence.[57] Similarly, the Mala River, which is to be identified as the middle to upper Euphrates or one of its tributaries,[58] twice appears as a landmark in the Hittite text.[59] Needless to add, this body of water is not mentioned in any of the Mesopotamian Gilgamesh sources.

Hittite incomprehension of an alien culture seems to account for slightly divergent depictions of Gilgamesh's attentions toward the virgins of Uruk. The Pennsylvania Tablet (Old Babylonian source 1) relates, "He will couple with the wife-to-be, / he first of all, the bridegroom after. / By divine consent it is so ordained: / when his navel-cord was cut, for him she was destined."[60] This deflowering is hardly illicit; it is divinely sanctioned. But the Hittite text says, "[When a woman] is given in marriage to a young man, before [her hus-

---

55. Tablet 1, §3.

56. Tablet 1, §16. Compare Nūr-Daggal's description of the road to Puruš̮anda in *šar tamḫāri* (EA 359 rev. 4′–5′): "Until no[w, Sargo]n has not come to us. Let the bank hold him, the height(s), the huge [mountai]n. Let the reed thicket form a forest, a copse, a wood: knots will be bound." Translation by S. Izre'el, *The Amarna Scholarly Tablets* (Groningen: Styx, 1997), 70.

57. The Cedar Forest itself was originally conceived of as lying to the east of Sumer. See J. Hansman, "Gilgamesh, Humbaba, and the Land of the ERIN-Trees," *Iraq* 38 (1976): 23–35; G. Steiner, "Ḫuwawa und sein 'Bergland' in der sumerischen Tradition," *ASJ* 18 (1996): 198; and J. Klein and K. Abraham, "Problems of Geography in the Gilgameš Epics: The Journey to the 'Cedar Forest,'" in *Landscapes: Territories, Frontiers and Horizons in the Ancient Near East*, ed. L. Milano et al., Part III (Padua: Sargon srl, 2000), 63–73.

58. See G. del Monte and J. Tischler, *RGTC* 6, 537, for attestations and suggestions for localization.

59. Tablet 1, §14; Tablet 2, §1.

60. A. George, *Gilgamesh*, 106, ll. 159–62.

band] has yet drawn near to her, [they] *discretely*[61] [take that woman] to Gilgamesh."[62] The Anatolian writer here displays his ignorance of the putative *droit de seigneur* exercised by the Sumerian king—possibly itself a relic of the practice of sacred marriage(?)[63]—and assumes that the actions of Gilgamesh were illegitimate and called for concealment.

Let us now compare the structure of the Hittite-language Gilgamesh text with that of the Twelve-Tablet Edition by considering the story elements absent from one or the other source. I begin with the plusses of the Late version over against the Hittite.[64]

Element No. 1:   Strictly speaking, the Prologue is present only in the Late text, although the incipit "Surpassing all [kings]" included in the colophon of the Old Babylonian Pennsylvania Tablet implies that the composition of which it forms a part also began with a hymnic introduction.[65] And indeed one might argue that the Hittite recension does contain a prologue, albeit a very short one. It begins: "[Of Gilgamesh], the hero, [I will sing his praises . . .]" (Tablet 1, §1), while one manuscript of "Tablet 3" bears the colophon "Tablet 1 of the Song of Gilgamesh" (A iv 1′–2′). Although the text is in fact written in prose,[66] the Hittite Gilgamesh thus joins several constituents of the Hittite-language Kumarbi cycle in being termed a "song" or "lay."[67]

Element No. 4:   The Hittite version lacks a complaint by Uruk's populace about their suffering under Gilgamesh's tyranny, but such an appeal is implied by the citation of the king's continual overpowering of the young men as the motivation for the Mother-goddess in fashioning Enkidu.

---

61. *appa arḫa*. See L. Zuntz, *Ortsadv.*, 42–43. Cf. also H. C. Melchert, "On §§56, 162, and 171 of the Hittite Laws," *JCS* 31 (1979): 60, for EGIR-*izziaz/n* (*apezziyaz/n*) as "secretly, stealthily."

62. Tablet 1, §10.

63. It remains uncertain whether this had ever been a genuine human religious practice. Perhaps it was rather a metaphorical description of the relationship between a king and a patron goddess, or simply a mythical activity attributed to early rulers—see W. Sallaberger, *Mesopotamien. Akkade-Zeit und Ur III-Zeit* (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1999), 155–56, and cf. W. von Soden, "Gab es in Babylonien die Inanspruchnahme des *ius primae noctis*?" *ZA* 71 (1981): 103–6. See A. Boureau, *The Lord's First Night. The Myth of the Droit de Cuissage* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998) for a demonstration that the *droit de seigneur* was never an actual institution in medieval France.

64. See already H. Otten, "Gilgameš (C. Nach hethitischen Texten)," *RlA* 3 (1957–71): 372.

65. This was first recognized by A. Schaffer *apud* D. J. Wiseman, "A Gilgamesh Epic Fragment from Nimrud," *Iraq* 37 (1975): 158 n. 22.

66. On the problems involved in recognizing Hittite poetry, see O. Carruba, "Hethitische und anatolische Dichtung," in *Intellectual Life of the Ancient Near East*, ed. J. Prosecky (Prague: Oriental Institute, 1988), 67–70.

67. See H. A. Hoffner, Jr., "The Song of Silver. A Member of the Kumarbi Cycle of 'Songs,'" *FsOtten*², 143 n. 2, 146–47.

Element No. 10:   The Hittite text ignores Gilgamesh's dreams anticipating the imminent arrival of Enkidu in Uruk. This may be due to the complete absence from the Boğazköy material of his mother Ninsun, to whom he relates these visions in the Twelve-Tablet Edition. But since the dreams are also present in the Old Babylonian Pennsylvania Tablet, it is more likely that the Hittite redactor eliminated them from his composition.

Element No. 13:   Since a consultation with the elders of Uruk is found in the older Akkadian text from Boğazköy, this element was also probably excised by the Hittite-language editor, who streamlined the preliminaries to Gilgamesh's expedition by including only one discussion with local authorities, that with the fighting men. This is consonant with his general abridgement of events in the Sumerian city.

Element No. 14:   The adoption of Enkidu by Ninsun is found only in the Late version, the sole text to feature the mother of Gilgamesh as an active character.

Element No. 17:   The omission from the Hittite-language text of Gilgamesh's dreams foretelling the conflict with Ḫuwawa and the aid of the Sungod is puzzling, since this story element is found in both Akkadian versions from Boğazköy.

Element No. 20:   The encouragement of a disheartened Enkidu by Gilgamesh is most likely to be recognized in mutilated passages in both Old Babylonian source 5[68] and the Hittite recension.

Element No. 32:   A return to Uruk should probably be restored in the Hittite text, since story elements 33 and 35, included in this recension, are seemingly set in that town.[69]

Element No. 34:   It is uncertain whether Enkidu's curses and blessings of the hunter and harlot were originally present in the Hittite edition. My reconstruction of the text includes a gap which might accommodate them.[70]

Elements Nos. 36 and 38:   The funeral of Enkidu and Gilgamesh's encounter with the Scorpion-people are definitely included only in the Twelve-Tablet Edition.

---

68. A. George, *Gilgamesh*, 115–16.
69. Either between §§1 and 2 of Tablet 2, or before Tablet 3, §1.
70. Tablet 2, between §§5 and 6.

Element No. 45: While it is clear in both Old Babylonian source 2 and the Hittite edition that Gilgamesh travels to visit the primeval hero Uta-napishtim (Ullu in the Hittite text), there is no indication that the latter is a survivor of the great flood. The bestowal of eternal life upon Ullu is also featured in another Boğazköy piece,[71] but here he seems to have escaped the ravages of plague, not flood. The name of the protagonist in the fragmentary account of the deluge recovered at Boğazköy (*CTH* 347[72]) is Atra-ḫasīs as in the Old Babylonian version.[73]

Elements Nos. 44 and 46–48: These units, which treat Gilgamesh's confrontation with the only human being ever to be granted immortality, his own challenge of death in the form of sleep,[74] his failure in this contest, and his second return to Uruk, are found only in the Late version. The same holds true for *Element No. 49*, Enkidu's visit to the netherworld, a literal translation of part of one of the Sumerian Gilgamesh tales. Of course, this twelfth tablet is generally regarded as a very late and awkward addition to the first-millennium text.[75]

I turn now to the plusses of the Hittite version compared to the Twelve-Tablet Edition:

Element No. 21: This is found solely in the Hittite and presents a formal challenge of Gilgamesh and Enkidu by Ḫuwawa before their battle:

> [Ḫuwawa] said to them, "[I will . . .] you up, and I will carry you up to heaven!
> I will smash you on the skull, and I will bring you [down] to the dark [earth]!"[76]

Such saber rattling is a familiar topos in Hittite myths of the empire period. Compare, for example, the taunting of the Storm-god by the stone monster Ullikummi:[77]

> "What can I say to you Teššub? I held [counsel(?)], and before my mind I lined up wisdom like (a string of) bead(s) as follows: 'I will go up to heaven to kingship. I will take to myself Kummiya, [the gods'] holy temples, and the *kuntarras*-shrines. I will scatter the gods down from the sky like flour."[78]

---

71. Fragment B.1 = KUB 8.62.

72. This is true for both the Akkadian and the Hittite texts.

73. W. G. Lambert and A. R. Millard, *Atra-ḫasīs: The Babylonian Story of the Flood* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969).

74. See Tigay, *Evolution*, 5 n. 2.

75. Tigay, *Evolution*, 105–7; Jacobsen, *Treasures*, 214–15. But cf. Abusch, *JAOS* 121 (2001): 620–21.

76. Tablet 1, §20.

77. As already recognized by H. Otten, *IM* 8 (1958): 123.

78. Tablet 3, §69. Translated by H. A. Hoffner, Jr., *Hittite Myths* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1990), 60.

Element No. 39:   This element again is found only in the Hittite version and recounts Gilgamesh's visit to the personified Sea in the course of his wanderings:

> But [when] Gilgamesh [arrived] at the Sea, he bowed down to the Sea, [and said to the Sea], "Long may you live, Oh Great [Sea, and long may] the minions who belong [to you] live!" The Sea cursed Gilgamesh, [. . .], and the Fate-deities.[79]

And the vizier of the Sea, the Hurrian god Impaluri, is attested in an unplaced fragment.[80] These additions may be explained by the greater importance which the Anatolians, as compared to the people of Mesopotamia, attached to the sea, both as a body of water and as a mythological character.[81]

Finally, there is another plus in the Hittite edition—*Element No. 40*, the encounter of Gilgamesh with the Moon-god in the steppe:

> [. . .] the heroic Moon-god [said to Gilgamesh], "Go and [make] these two [lions] which you slew into two images for me! Transport them into the city! Go and take them to the temple of the Moon-god!"[82]

According to the Hittite text, the lions alluded to here had been dispatched by Gilgamesh during his earlier travels in the wilderness.[83] This episode may have some connection to the mention of a lion in an obscure context in the Twelve-Tablet Edition.[84]

In sum, the Hittite-language recension bears many similarities to the Late edition, the sole Mesopotamian text full enough to allow a meaningful consideration of its structure. Only a few story elements found in the latter are certainly absent from the former: Nos. 10, 13, 14, 17, 36, 38, and 45–49. Where the respective states of preservation permit assessment, the episodes follow one another in the same order in the two recensions. Plusses in the Hittite may easily be explained as nods to local Anatolian tastes and interests, much like

---

79. Tablet 3, §§8–10.

80. Fragment A.2 = KBo 19.120 iii 1′.

81. J. Puhvel, "The Sea in Hittite Texts," in *Studies Presented to Joshua Whatmough on His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. E. Pulgram (Gravenhage: Mouton, 1957), 225–37. See also J. Klinger, " 'So weit und breit wie das Meer . . .'—Das Meer in Texten hattischer Provenienz," in *The Asia Minor Connexion: Studies on the Pre-Greek Languages in Memory of Charles Carter*, ed. Y. Arbeitman (Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 151–72.

82. Tablet 3, §11.

83. Tablet 3, §7.

84. Tablet X, 34; A. George, *Gilgamesh*, 77. Presumably his slaying of lions underscores the regal character of Gilgamesh. See S. Maul, "Das 'dreifache Königtum'—Überlegungen zu einer Sonderform des neuassyrischen Königssiegels," in *Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte Vorderasiens. Festschrift für Rainer Michael Boehmer*, ed. U. Finkbeiner et al. (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1995), 399, who observes that the dispatching of lions was the "vornehmste Aufgabe des König als 'guter Hirte.' "

the shift of geographic emphasis from Uruk to the Cedar Forest considered earlier.[85]

It is just not credible that the concise Hittite-language edition[86] represents either a direct reflection of oral tradition[87] or an independent composition based on the Old Babylonian materials. Rather, the Hittite editor/translator must have begun with an Akkadian *Vorlage* very much like the work generally credited to Sîn-leqe-unninnī, but lacking elements No. 14, 36, 38, and 45–49. I believe that the final redactor of the Twelve-Tablet Edition was responsible for: (1) alloting an active role to the goddess Ninsun, (2) composing the description of Enkidu's lavish funeral, (3) adapting the flood story for its place in the epic, (4) inventing the scorpion-men and the fabulous passage to the sea, and possibly (5) appending the translation of the Sumerian *Märchen* "Gilgamesh, Enkidu, and the Nether World" as the concluding tablet.

Precisely when this redactor worked is difficult to say with any confidence. Perhaps the Late version did not yet exist in the closing decades of the fourteenth or the early thirteenth century to serve as a model for our Hittite writer. On the other hand, we might well imagine that there was a certain lag between literary developments in Mesopotamia and those in Ḫatti. Indeed, it is even possible that the Anatolian adapter worked with an antiquated text from some Syrian backwater.[88] But given the demonstrated presence and literary activity of Babylonian and Assyrian scribes at Ḫattuša,[89] that is, of men whose familiarity with the standard Mesopotamian curriculum may be fairly assumed, I feel it likely that the Twelve-Tablet Edition had not yet been assembled before the middle of the thirteenth century, or at least that it had not yet attained its later "canonical" status.

---

85. H. Otten, "Zur Überlieferung des Gilgameš-Epos nach den Boğazköy-Texten," in *Gilgameš et sa légende*, 143, is certainly correct when he writes "Damit ist die hethitische Version entschieden kürzer, indem anscheinend alle Episoden mit stärkerem [mesopotamischen] Lokalkolorit fortgelassen sind."

86. J. Tigay, *Evolution*, 112 calls the Hittite version a "drastic abridgement."

87. See in general J. Cooper, "Babbling on: Recovering Mesopotamian Orality," in *Mesopotamian Epic Literature. Oral or Aural?*, ed. M. E. Vogelzang and H. L. J. Vanstiphout (Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1992), 103–22.

88. Emar and Ugarit spring immediately to mind. For the Mesopotamian literary repertoires of these sites, see Th. R. Kämmerer, *šimâ milka. Induktion und Reception der mittelbabylonischen Dichtung von Ugarit, Emār und Tell el-ʿAmārna* (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1998), 9–14.

89. See my Figure 4, *JCS* 35 (1983): 108, to which add Ilim-abī (KUB 56.55 iv 3), and NÍG.BA-^{d}U (KUB 29.4 i 39 = 29.5 i 23; cf. H. M. Kümmel, review of KUB 39, *ZA* 59 [1969]: 324). Several Mesopotamian scribes, including Adad-bēlī, Ilī-kakkabī, Ilī-tukultī, Ilum-bēlī, and Šumi-^{d}A.A, are now attested at Maşat Höyük/Tapikka—see the personal name index to S. Alp, *Hethitische Keilschrifttafeln aus Maşat-Höyük* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1991), xxiii–xxviii.

I would like now to consider the orthography of the names of the characters in the epic, and particularly their manifestations in the sources from Boğaz-köy (see Chart 2).[90]

No. 1:   The name of Gilgamesh himself shows a variety of spellings in third-millennium documents,[91] quite possibly representing divergent pronunciations, but the normal manner of rendering his name in the Sumerian-language texts is ^{d}Bil ($^{GIŠ}BÍL$)[92]-ga-$mes/meš$. The standard form in Old Babylonian versions of the cycle is $^{d}GIŠ$, an abbreviation of the initial grapheme in the older literary writing. This sign group is retained at the beginning of most later spellings, perhaps indicating a restricted value bil_{x} or even gil_{x}[93] for the sequence DINGIR.GIŠ. I have yet to arrive at an explanation for the Middle Babylonian writing $^{m}GIM.MAŠ$: How is the syllable /gil/ represented here? But note that this spelling is paralleled by $^{d}GÍN$.MAŠ in the older Akkadian text at Boğazköy. This latter writing, as well as $^{d}GIŠ.GÍN.MAŠ$ of first-millennium orthography, should probably be transcribed with the reading GÍM for the third sign,[94] thus B/Gil_{x}-$gím$-$maš$. Compare here the Boğazköy Hurrian, Akkadian, and Hittite spelling $^{d}GIŠ$.GIM.MAŠ. Perhaps the choice of GÍN reflects a clever play on its alternate value TÙN = $pāšum$, in allusion to the axe of which Gilgamesh dreams.[95]

No. 2:   For Enkidu,[96] a standardized Sumerian spelling—without divine determinative—En-ki-du_{10}, which might be understood as "Lord of the Favored Place[97]/ Good Earth,"[98] is continued in Old Babylonian Akkadian, where, befitting the character's promotion from servant to companion of Gilgamesh,[99] he is awarded the DINGIR diacritic. This opened the way for

---

90. For textual citations, see my edition and, for the divine characters, B. H. L. van Gessel, *Onomasticon of the Hittite Pantheon* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1998).

91. These have been collected by S. Parpola, "The Esoteric Meaning of the Name of Gilgamesh," in *Intellectual Life of the Ancient Near East*, 316.

92. T. Jacobsen, *Sumerian King List*, 89–90.

93. The earliest certain evidence for a velar pronunciation of the initial consonant is from the Old Babylonian omen text YOS 10, 42 i 2 and 3(!): ^{d}Ge-el-ga.

94. So already A. Heidel, *JNES* 11 (1952): 140–41.

95. Tablet I, 278, 289. As explicated by Ninsun, this implement is a harbinger of Enkidu.

96. [95] See G. Dossin, "Enkidou dans l'*Epopée de Gilgameš*," *Bulletin de l'Academie royale de Belgique* 42 (1956): 580–93.

97. H. Limet, *L'anthroponymie sumerienne dans les documents de la 3ᵉ dynastie d'Ur* (Paris: Société d'Édition «Les Belles Lettres», 1968), 262.

98. Since this name is never written with -ga(-), which would clearly indicate a genitive construction, D. O. Edzard has remarked to me that it is more probably an abbreviated form of a longer designation, *En-ki-du_{10}_ . . . , "the *en*-priest who . . . the 'favored place.'" Cf. H. Limet, *L'anthroponymie*, 239.

99. J. Tigay, *Evolution*, 29, identifies this change as a crucial element in the development of the Gilgamesh materials into a unified epic.

the later reinterpretation of the name as theophoric, "Enki is Good," and its subsequent recasting as ^{d}EN.KI.DÙ, "Enki Has Created."[100] At Boğazköy, however, the scribes usually[101] employed phonetic spellings: ^{d}*En-ki-du* and ^{d}*En-ki-du$_4$*[102] in Akkadian and Hittite, and ^{d}*En-ki-ta* in Hurrian. The Hurrian desinence also appears once or twice in a Hittite-language manuscript.

No. 3: For Ḫuwawa, the labialized, voiced, and dissimilated form Ḫumbaba is unknown before the first millennium. Hittite declension of this name as an *ai*-stem has been taken over from Hurrian.

Nos. 4 and 5: Note that the Akkadian common nouns for "hunter" and "whore" have been transformed by the Hittite redactor into the proper names Shangashu (literally, "Murderer") and Shanḫatu, respectively.

No. 6: At Boğazköy the barmaid is designated in two ways: by the Hurrian personal name Naḫmazulel or Naḫmizulen,[103] or by *šidurri* (in the Hurrian texts) and *ziduri* (in the Hittite). I believe that at this stage the latter term is an epithet, "maid; young woman"—an ordinary Hurrian noun,[104] and that it only later became the proper name Shiduri attested in the Twelve-Tablet Edition.

No. 7: The ferryman Ur-Shanabi is represented only phonetically at Boğazköy. The single instance of the divine rather than the personal determinative with this name is surely a scribal error. I cannot give a convincing interpretation of this name. Neither "Servant of Two-Thirds" nor "Servant of Forty" makes much sense, while substitution for the numerical component yields "Servant of Nabû," which seems extraneous to the epic.[105]

No. 8: The mutations in the name of the survivor of humankind's primeval dangers are somewhat complicated.[106] Sumerian Zi-u$_4$-sud-rá, "Life of Long Days," was apparently metathesized as *U$_4$-zi-sud-rá and rendered into

---

100. Cf. S. Parpola, "Esoteric Meaning," 318.

101. Except in the older Akkadian version where we find ^{d}EN.KI.DÙ.

102. This spelling of course simply reflects the frequent practice by which Hittite scribes writing Akkadian texts or proper names retained CV*m* signs in final position despite the general loss of mimation.

103. Cf. A. Kammenhuber, *Kindlers Literatur Lexikon* 3, 816.

104. E. Laroche, *GLH*, 229.

105. W. G. Lambert, *JCS* 11 (1957): 6, suggests that this personal name was borrowed from an actual person living in the Kassite era, a time when various Sumerian traditions were revived. However, the second element of this name, where we expect a theonym or perhaps a numinous object or location, remains peculiar.

106. Cf. J. H. Tigay, *Evolution*, 229–30.

Akkadian as (admittedly unattested) **Um-napištim rēqum,* "'Day of Life,' the Distant One." That is, sud-rá = *rēqum* became an epithet for the bearer of the name rather than an adjective modifying "day." The final stage of this development involved giving u_4 a phonetic value *ud/t*, culminating in *Ut(a)-napištim,* "I / He Found Life." This exegesis provided the character with a programmatic personal name, even if it is an affront to correct grammar in its retention of the genitive case. In the Hurrian and Hittite sources we encounter a completely different form, Ullu. As Ernst Weidner observed long ago,[107] this is simply the nominative singular masculine of the Akkadian pronoun of far deixis, "The One Over There; The Distant One," surely a reasonable substitution for the adjective *rēqum.*

No. 9:   Inanna of the Sumerian texts has been modernized as $^d I\check{s}_8$-*tár*[108] in all later sources, occasionally appearing even as simple $^d I\check{s}$-*tar* in Neo-Assyrian texts. It should be noted that phonetic complementation ($^d I\check{S}_8$-*TAR-iš*) shows that in the Hittite version the name of the goddess is not Šawuška,[109] as it is, of course, in the Hurrian fragments.

For our query concerning the date of composition of the Twelve-Tablet Edition of Gilgamesh, this onomastic survey has produced results in harmony with those arrived at earlier through analysis of the distribution of story elements. A perusal of the right-hand columns of Charts 2A and 2B shows that the Hittite version seldom employs the onomastic renderings found in the edition of Sîn-leqe-unninnī. Creation of the "canonical" Mesopotamian text subsequent to the redaction of the Hittite text is therefore a reasonable, if not a certain, deduction.

---

107. Cited by J. Friedrich, *ZA* 39 (1930): 65 n. 1.

108. This rendering (see R. Borger, *Zeichenliste,* no. 418) is purely conventional.

109. For the uncertainty surrounding the Hittite name behind $^d I\check{s}_8$-*TAR* see my "Ištar of Nineveh Reconsidered," *JCS* 50 (1998): 3.

Chart 1: Distribution of Motifs in Gilgamesh Sources

Story element	Late XII Tblt.	OB 1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	MB 3	4	[5]	Boğazköy Akk.	Bogh. Akk.	Hurr.	Hitt.
1. Prologue	X	[X]														O
2. Description of Gilgamesh	X															X
3. Oppression of Uruk	X															X
4. Complaint of populace	X															O
5. Creation of Enkidu	X								X							X
6. Gilgamesh and hunter	X															X
7. Harlot and Enkidu	X	X									X?		X			X
8. Civilizing of Enkidu	X	X											X			X
9. Report of Gilgamesh's acts	X	X														X
10. Gilgamesh's dreams, I	X	X														O
11. Arrival of Enkidu; Combat	X	X											X?			X
12. Planning of expedition	X	X											X			X
13. Consultation with elders	X	X											X			O
14. Adoption of Enkidu	X															O
15. Consultation with assembly	X															X
16. Journey to Cedar Forest	X															X
17. Gilgamesh's dreams, II	X			X			X						X	X		O
18. Entrance to Cedar Forest	X														X?	X
19. Reassurance by Sun-god	X															X

Chart 1: Distribution of Motifs in Gilgamesh Sources

Story element	Late	OB								MB			Boğazköy			
	XII Tblt.	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	[5]	Akk.	Bogh. Akk.	Hurr.	Hitt.
20. Encouragement by G.	X					X?					X					?
[21. Challenge by Huwawa]																X
22. Awe at Cedar Forest	X															X
23. Encouragement by Enkidu	X			X	X											X
24. Combat with Ḫuwawa	X														X	X
25. Aid of Sun-god	X								X							X
26. Huwawa's plea	X												X			X
27. Enkidu's rejoinder	X												X			X
28. Killing of Huwawa	X				X											X
29. Gift for Enlil	X															X
30. Encounter with Ishtar	X										X			X	X	X
31. Bull of Heaven	X										X			X	X?	X
32. Return to Uruk, I	X															X?
33. Enkidu's dream	X									X			X			X
34. Enkidu's curses & blessings	X							X								?
35. Death of Enkidu	X									X						X
36. Funeral of Enkidu	X															O
37. Grief of Gilgamesh	X															X
38. Scorpion-men; passage	X															O
[39. Visit to the Sea]																X

Chart 1: Distribution of Motifs in Gilgamesh Sources

Story element	Late	OB						MB					Boğazköy			
	XII Tblt.	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	[5]	Akk.	Bogh. Akk.	Hurr.	Hitt.
[40. Meeting with Moon-god]														?	?	X
41. Siduri the barmaid	X		X											?	X	X
42. Ur-shanabi the boatman	X		X													X
43. Crossing the sea	X															X
44. Uta-napish-tim "the distant"	X														X	X
45. Deluge narrative	X															O
46. Gilgamesh's trial	X															O
47. Plant of life	X															O
48. Return to Uruk, II	X															O
49. Enkidu in netherworld	X															O

Key
Sources

OB
1. Larsa? (Penn-Yale tablets)
2. Sippar? (Meissner+Millard frag.)
3. Harmal (*TIM* 9, 45)
4. Ischali (Greengus, No. 277)
5. Nippur? (UM 29–13–570)
6. Nippur (IM 58451)

MB
1. Ur (*UET* 6, 394)
2. Nippur exercises (2N-T79, 2N-T75, CBS 14167, UM 29–16–606)
3. Megiddo (*Atiqot* 2, 121–28)
4. Emar (*Emar* VI, 760, 781–82)
[5. Ugarit]

Story Element
bold = present only in late version
bracketed = present only in Hittite version
X = present
O = definitely absent (Hittite version only)
? = perhaps lost in break (Hittite version only)

Gary Beckman

Chart 2A: Orthography of Character Names in Gilgamesh Sources

Sumerian	OB	MB	Late
1. ^{d}Bìl(^{GIŠ}BÍL)-ga-mes	^{d}GIŠ	^{d}*Bìl-ga-mes* (2), [. . . -*g*]*a-mes* (4), ^{m}GIM.MAŠ (3)	^{d}GIŠ.GÍN.MAŠ
2. En-ki-du$_{10}$	^{d}*En-ki-du*$_{10}$	^{d}*En-ki-du*$_{10}$ (1, 2), ^{m}*En-ki-du* (3)	^{d}*En-ki-du*$_3$
3. $^{(d)}$Ḫu-wa-wa	^{d}*Ḫu-wa-wa*, *Ḫu-wa-wa* (4)	—	^{d}*Ḫum-ba-ba*
4. —	—	*ṣayyādu*	*ṣayyādu*
5. —	*ḫarimtum*, *šamkat*	KAR.KID (1), *šam-ḫatu* (1)	^{f}Šamḫat
6. —	*sabītum* (2)	—	^{f}Siduri
7. —	Sursunabu	—	^{m}Ur-40
8. Zi-u$_4$-sud-rá	—	—	^{m}UD.ZI(-*tim*), Atra-ḫasīs
9. ^{d}Inanna	—	[^{d}]*Iš*$_8$-*tár* (4)	^{d}*Iš-tar*, ^{d}*Iš*$_8$-*tár*
10. ^{d}Utu	^{d}UTU	—	^{d}UTU, ^{d}*Šá-maš*

Chart 2B: Boğazköy

	Akkadian	Boğazköy Akk.	Hurrian	Hittite
1.	ᵈGIŠ.GIM.MAŠ, ᵈGÍN.MAŠ	ᵈGIŠ.GIM.MAŠ	ᵈGIŠ.GIM.MAŠ, ᵈ*Gal-ga-mi-iš*, ᵈ*Bíl-ga-mes*	ᵈGIŠ.GIM.MAŠ(-*uš/-un*)
2.	ᵈ*En-ki-du₃*, ᵈ*En-ki-du*	ᵈ*En-ki-du₄*	ᵈ*En-ki-ta*(-)	ᵈ*En-ki-du*(-), ᵈ*En-ki-du₄*(-), ᵈ*En-ki-ta*(-)
3.	ᵈ*Ḫu-wa-wa*	ᵈ*Ḫ*[*u-* . . .]	ᵈ*Ḫu-wa-wa*(-*in*)	ᵈ*Ḫu-wa-wa*(-*iš/-in*)
4.	—	—	—	ᵐ*Ša-an-ga-šu*(-)
5.	—	—	—	ᴹᵁᴺᵁˢKAR.KID, ᶠ*Ša-an-ḫa-tu*(-)
6.	—	—	*Ši-du-ur-ri*(-), ᵈ*Na-aḫ-ma-zu*ˡ-*le-el*	ᶠ*Zi-du-ri-iš*, ᶠ*Na-aḫ-mi-zu-le-en*
7.	—	—	—	ᵐ(*U*)-*ur-ša-na-bi*(-*iš*), ᵈ*Ur-ša-na-bi* (1x)
8.	—	—	*Ú-ul-lu-uš*, ᵐ*Ul-lu-u*ʔ-[. . .]	ᵈ*Ul-lu*(-*uš*), ᵈ*Ul-lu-ya*
9.	—	ᵈ*Iš₈-tár*	ᵈ*Iš₈*-TÁR-*ga*	ᵈ*Iš₈*-TÁR(-*iš*)
10.	—	—	—	ᵈUTU *ŠA-ME-E*/AN-*E*

Note: Numerals following names refer to sources as listed in key to Chart 1.

ANATOLIAN STUDIES

Journal of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara

Volume 48   1998