

What's new in the Gilgamesh Epic?

ANDREW GEORGE

School of Oriental and African Studies

University of London

Summary. The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic exists in several different versions. There were at least two versions current during the Old Babylonian period, and no doubt a similar situation obtained later in the second millennium BC, when versions of the epic were copied out in Anatolia, Syria and Palestine, as well as in Mesopotamia proper. But the best-known version is the one called "He who saw the Deep", which was current in the first-millennium libraries of Assyria and Babylonia. Because this text was so much copied out in antiquity we keep finding more of it, both in museums and in archaeological excavation. This means that editions and translations of the epic must regularly be brought up to date. Some of the more important new passages that are previously unpublished are presented here in translation.

WHAT THERE IS

It was a great pleasure to be able to share with the Society at the symposium of 20 September 1997 some of the results of my work on the epic of Gilgamesh. My paper of this title was given without a script and was essentially a commentary on the slides that accompanied it. The written paper offered here on the same subject tells the story from the standpoint of one year later. Being the written counterpart of an oral presentation, I hope it may be recognized at least as a distant cousin of the talk given in Toronto.

I should say at the outset that my work has been concerned primarily with the textual material in the Akkadian language, that is to say, with the Babylonian poems. These falls into four categories. The most important of them is the composition that was standard in the first millennium, the text in eleven "Tablets" (plus an appended twelfth) that was known in antiquity as *Sha naqba imuru*, "He who saw the Deep" (Text 4 in the appended list of sources). This poem can be divided into a Prologue and five unequal episodes: the Taming of Enkidu (Tablets I–II), the Expedition to the Cedar Forest (Tablets II–V), the Slaying of the Bull of Heaven (Tablet VI), the Death and Funeral of Enkidu (Tablets VII–VIII), and Gilgamesh's Quest for Immortality (Tablets IX–XI). It gives the hero's story in its most complete form. In brief, Gilgamesh is king in Uruk. The gods create Enkidu to be his friend and counterpart. In a quest for fame and glory the two heroes conquer the ogre Humbaba in the Forest of Cedar. Gilgamesh repudiates the goddess Ishtar and despatches with Enkidu's help the fiery bull she brings down from the sky to wreak her vengeance. The gods condemn Enkidu to die, and after a vision of Hell he duly meets his doom. Gilgamesh holds a lavish funeral for his friend and takes to the wild, distraught with grief and in fear of death. He wanders in search of the survivor of the Flood, the immortal Uta-napishti, from whom he expects to wrest the secret of eternal life. Eventually he finds him, beyond the edge of the world, and learns of life and death, the different destinies of gods and men. Uta-napishti tells the famous story of the

Flood, in whose aftermath the gods made him immortal. He explains that since this was a one-off event, Gilgamesh cannot attain his desire in the same way. He tests Gilgamesh's ability to defeat sleep. In abject failure Gilgamesh is sent home with a gift, the magic plant of rejuvenation, but even this he loses. He returns to Uruk with Uta-napishti's ferryman.

Because this poem was so well represented in the famous libraries of the Assyrian king Ashurbanipal (668–627), it was the first Gilgamesh text to be rediscovered in modern times and was quickly identified as the great masterpiece of Babylonian literature. Accordingly it is, for most people, *the* epic of Gilgamesh. But “He who saw the Deep” is only the most recent version of a poem with a very long literary history. Native Babylonian tradition held that it was the work of a man named Sîn-liqe-unninnī, by profession an exorcist. Most Assyriologists assume that this man lived in the late second millennium BC, and accept that his contribution to the epic was not authorship but a great revision of the kind known to have been carried out on other Babylonian literary works by scholars of the Middle Babylonian period (as, for example, the twelfth-century scholar Esangil-kin-apli did with the prognostic omen series *Sakikku*). In other words, it was Sîn-liqe-unninni who was responsible for the epic in its final form, but he was using existing materials. I shall often refer to this text as the “standard” version.

The older versions of the Babylonian epic of Gilgamesh are much more fragmentary than the standard version, but they allow us some idea of the poem's history and also, perhaps, of the nature of the material at Sîn-liqe-unninni's disposal. Much older than the eleven-tablet epic is the Old Babylonian material, from the eighteenth and seventeenth centuries BC. Two big library tablets of this period are all that has come down to us of an edition of the epic known in antiquity as *Shutur eli sharri*, “Surpassing all other kings” (Texts 1.a.i–ii in the appendix). They offer us a glimpse of a long narrative poem of great majesty which dealt at least with the Taming of Enkidu and the Expedition to the Cedar Forest. This text is very similar to the standard version, at least in episodes that are preserved in both versions, but not identical with it. Many differences can be put down to the fact that the late epic is much longer than the Old Babylonian. In the interval between the two poems the story of Gilgamesh's adventures was considerably expanded. We know, for example, that Sîn-liqe-unninni's text has a 28-line prologue that was lacking in the Old Babylonian epic.

An unpublished Old Babylonian fragment from Nippur, which comes from the episode of the Taming of Enkidu but is not an exact match of the text of “Surpassing all other kings”, shows us that there was definitely more than one version of the Babylonian epic current at the time (Text 1.b). Another Old Babylonian library tablet, reportedly from Sippar, may belong to one or other edition or to a third (Text 1.c). It is from later in the epic, from the Quest for Immortality. Made up of joining fragments in London and Berlin, this tablet is most famous for the wise advice of an old goddess who keeps a tavern at the end of the world. Other pieces of the Old Babylonian period are five small tablets now in Baghdad that contain short episodes only (Texts 1.d–g). Originally from such towns as Nippur, Nerebtum (Ishchali) and Shaduppûm (Tell Harmal), they all carry passages from the Expedition to the Cedar Forest, but where the same episode is

found on two of them their texts do not match. They are perhaps all exercises in Akkadian composition by learner scribes.

Three or four hundred years later we find Babylonian Gilgamesh a long way from home, at Hattusa (Boğazköy), the Hittite capital in Anatolia. Fragments excavated there in 1983 bear witness to an edition of the epic with many similarities to “Surpassing all other kings” (Text 2.a.i). The episodes represented are the Taming of Enkidu, the Expedition to the Cedar Forest and, perhaps, the Death of Enkidu. Another, later fragment from Hattusa may come from the Cedar Forest episode (Text 2.a.ii). A third tablet from the Hittite capital is from a paraphrase of the epic (Text 2.a.iii). It holds text from the Expedition to the Cedar Forest and the Slaying of the Bull of Heaven. In places it is very corrupt, and it was probably composed locally (like paraphrases of the Gilgamesh story in Hittite and Hurrian), if not elsewhere in the West. For the Late Bronze Age, specifically the Amarna Age in the mid-fourteenth century, was a time when the Akkadian language, written in time-honoured fashion in the cuneiform script, was the medium of diplomacy in many lands at the eastern end of the Mediterranean Sea. From Anatolia to the Levant to Upper Egypt, Babylonian literature spread with the writing system. Thus, a fragment of roughly this date was found at Megiddo in Palestine (Text 2.b). It carries text from the Death of Enkidu. In the early twelfth century, Gilgamesh was copied out by the scribes of Emar (Tell Meskene), on the great bend of the Euphrates. They knew at least the episodes of the Expedition to the Cedar Forest and the Bull of Heaven (Texts 2.c.i–ii), and perhaps also the Taming of Enkidu (Text 2.c.iii). In the Bull of Heaven tablet the surviving text is quite similar to Tablet VI of the standard version, and can be seen to represent one of the intermediate, Middle Babylonian stages in the history of the epic.

Other Middle Babylonian tablets come from southern Mesopotamia itself and constitute a fourth category. This is represented by two pieces, a small exercise tablet from Nippur (Text 3.a) and a larger tablet from Ur (Text 3.b). Like the Emar tablets, these are close to the standard version, but clearly not the exact same edition.

Briefly summarized, the history of the Babylonian Gilgamesh material is typical of the development of literature in the Akkadian language. In the early second millennium, a time of great literary creativity in Akkadian, the epic already consisted of the essential episodes, but there were several editions of it current. The reason for the presence of different editions in the Old Babylonian period is very likely that at this time the written epic was not far removed from the oral tradition, and various oral versions doubtless existed. The small scraps of text that seem to be the work of learner scribes may be the result of a more immediate exposure to the oral tradition. Babylonian youngsters of the day may have grown up with an oral telling of the epic, sung in market-places, of which we know nothing. Like other Babylonian literary texts, the Gilgamesh epic was transmitted to the West, a process which had already begun in the middle of the second millennium (and earlier), but which is most visible in the fourteenth century, the Amarna Age. In the late second millennium it appears that one *Sîn-liqe-unninnī*, presumably collating whatever copies of the epic he could find, reworked the poem into the version that was standard in the libraries of Babylonia and Assyria in the first millennium BC:

“He who saw the Deep”. In this form the epic survived at Babylon until at least the late second century BC; echoes of the story resound in other, later literatures.

What is not typical of Babylonian literature in general is the appended twelfth tablet. This is an Akkadian translation of the latter part of Gilgamesh and the Netherworld, one of the Sumerian poems of Gilgamesh. This and the other Sumerian poems of Gilgamesh (about which others have talked at this symposium) were probably composed at the end of the third millennium BC as court entertainments for Shulgi, the second king of the Ur III Dynasty, though they, too, may have been based on traditional poems transmitted orally. Like many other works of Sumerian literature, these poems of Gilgamesh are known to us because they were texts used in the curriculum of scribal schools at Nippur, Ur and elsewhere in the eighteenth century BC. Very few Sumerian literary works survived the upheavals of the mid-second millennium to take their place in the scribal curriculum of the first millennium. Those that did were provided with Akkadian translations and come down to us as bilingual texts, almost without exception. The five poems of Gilgamesh were not among the survivors. The presence of part of Gilgamesh and the Netherworld in a monolingual Akkadian translation, tacked on to the eleven-tablet Babylonian epic, is thus extraordinary.

WHAT THERE WAS

Like other Sumerian and Babylonian literary works written on clay tablets, the Gilgamesh Epic is in the process of reconstruction. The current state of the various versions of the epic depends on chance. All clay tablets come to us as a result of the investigations of archaeologists and the discoveries of local people, and are thus random and haphazard finds. As described above, the Old Babylonian and Middle Babylonian versions of the epic are not well represented in terms of the numbers of pieces currently known. All told, they amount at present to no more than 28 fragments, less than fourteen per cent of the total number of fragments of the Babylonian epic extant, which at the time of writing stands at 208. In this statistic the word “fragment” means a piece of clay tablet bearing its own museum number or other inventory mark, which may or may not be joined to one or more other such fragments. The first-millennium epic, “He who saw the Deep”, which accounts for the remaining 86 per cent, is thus disproportionately well known. The reason for this is twofold.

First, in an age when scribes were trained on literature in Sumerian, not in Akkadian, the Old Babylonian epic was not nearly as heavily copied as the Sumerian poems of Gilgamesh. So Old Babylonian Gilgamesh tablets were a comparative rarity, even in antiquity. One thousand years later the tables had turned. By this time it was the Babylonian material and not the Sumerian that was copied out by learner scribes. Most libraries of the first millennium have surrendered tablets of the standard version.

Second, though Mesopotamian archaeologists have so far unearthed several large collections of Sumerian literary tablets of the Old Babylonian period and not a few Assyrian and Babylonian libraries of the middle and later first millennium, they have not yet found comparable numbers of literary tablets from the late second millennium. Thus our evidence for the state of the Babylonian literary “canon” in southern Mesopotamia

during this intermediate, Middle Babylonian period is limited to comparatively few tablets of even fewer literary compositions, including only two tablets of Gilgamesh, as we have seen.

The Gilgamesh texts that are easiest to reconstruct are those that benefit from the survival of large numbers of manuscripts, and this means the Sumerian poems (which are not my concern) and “He who saw the Deep”, the version of the epic copied out by first-millennium scribes. The work of reconstruction of this text cannot be done once and for all. For one thing, archaeologists keep finding more of it in the ruin-mounds of ancient Mesopotamia. For another, Assyriologists keep finding more of it in the museums of the world. This second point needs a little explaining. Simply put, the first large consignment of clay tablets to be shipped back to Europe, the tablet collection of Ashurbanipal discovered by Austen Henry Layard and Hormuzd Rassam at Kuyunjik (Nineveh) in 1850 and 1853, was so overwhelming that the discipline of Assyriology, then in the latter stages of a protracted birth, was swamped. It has never really recovered. Despite the efforts of George Smith, Carl Bezold, L. W. King and R. Campbell Thompson, to mention only the greatest, most prolific and earliest copyists and cataloguers of the Kuyunjik collections now stored in the British Museum, there is still work for several generations of Assyriologists in the continuing task of sorting, joining, identifying and publishing the tablets of Ashurbanipal.

The dearth of Assyriologists trained to deal with the ancient sources became several times more acute in the 1870s and 1880s when first George Smith, on his fatal last trip to Mesopotamia, and then, especially, Hormuzd Rassam and Wallis Budge began sending back thousands upon thousands of clay tablets from Babylon, Borsippa, Sippar and other sites in Babylonia. The work of sorting these tablets was begun by George Smith's successor at the British Museum, T. G. Pinches. The task of cataloguing them still goes on. And occasionally, as it goes on, new pieces of Gilgamesh turn up. Eventually, after several further generations of Assyriologists have lived and died, the British Museum and other smaller collections will have surrendered all their cuneiform secrets, and we will have cleared the backlog of work left over from the nineteenth century. But archaeological excavation will continue, and so it will still be impossible to produce truly *final* editions of Babylonian literary compositions as scholars have done for Greek and Latin literature. Wherever problems remain, cuneiform scholars will always be able to say, “Some day a new fragment will show up and we will know better.”

As it is, my edition of the Babylonian Gilgamesh, currently nearing completion, is the third attempt to collect all the Akkadian texts together in one place. Though in 1875 the pioneer of Gilgamesh studies, George Smith, gave a full edition of the fragments of the standard version that he had found among Ashurbanipal's tablets, he did not publish all of them in cuneiform. The first comprehensive collection of the cuneiform texts was by Paul Haupt in 1884 and 1891, which made possible Peter Jensen's complete edition and translation of 1900. Campbell Thompson's edition of 1930 again collected the Akkadian text in cuneiform and transliteration. By then three pieces of Old Babylonian Gilgamesh had been published, and Thompson was thus the first editor of the epic to include fragments from more than just the standard version.

Since Thompson's day many other pieces of older versions of the epic have been published, thus increasing enormously our knowledge of the epic's history. A further four Old Babylonian pieces, of the six more that are known, have become available, as well as all the many fragments of the late second millennium described above. However, in terms of numbers of new pieces, the standard version has done far better. Thompson knew 108 fragments of the first-millennium text, all but one in the British Museum, and all but six from the royal libraries of Nineveh (here again, as also below, the word "fragment" means a piece of clay tablet bearing its own number). Five of these six were from the British Museum's Spartali collections, bought from the dealer of that name in 1879. The other was a solitary piece in Berlin, excavated by Walter Andrae in 1913 during the Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft's seasons at Ashur. Archaeological excavation in Babylonia, especially Uruk, and in Assyria, has resulted in the publication since Thompson's time of a further sixteen pieces of the standard version. Research in museums has been even more productive, resulting in the publication of another 34 fragments: 31 in the British Museum (25 Babylonian and six Assyrian), including one in a private collection at the time of its publication, a further two fragments in Berlin and one in Chicago. The British Museum's 25 Babylonian fragments all came into its possession between 1876 and 1881.

The history of publication of the standard version since Thompson's day can be seen from the appended bibliography (section 4.a.iv). The roll-call of participants is long, but the champion is undoubtedly Professor W. G. Lambert of the University of Birmingham, with Professor Egbert von Weiher (University of Cologne) in runner-up position.

WHAT'S NEW

Still the work goes on. Two Old Babylonian tablets remain to be published definitively. News came recently of a Gilgamesh composition from Ugarit, another example of a Gilgamesh text in the West. But here again the standard version steals the limelight. Another 21 fragments of this version of the epic have been identified in the British Museum (thirteen Babylonian and eight Assyrian), the last of which entered the museum in 1883, and one further piece has turned up in a private collection. Credit here is mainly due to Irving Finkel of the museum staff and, again, to W. G. Lambert. Several of these new fragments join each other or already known pieces. In total, 180 fragments of the standard version are now available with which to reconstruct the text, a significant improvement on the situation when Thompson published, 68 years ago. Many fragments join to form larger pieces, so that the total is reduced to 114. In turn, some of these 114 joined pieces belong together, in that they can be seen to be from the same tablet and would join if the missing parts could be found to bridge the gaps. Thus at present we actually have to reckon with a figure of 73 different tablets.

The newest discoveries of text have improved our knowledge of the epic in many small ways. The greatest progress has been made in Tablets II, III and VIII, where large pieces of Late Babylonian tablets found in the British Museum by Irving Finkel have added considerably to our knowledge of what were very poorly preserved parts of the

epic. Completely new, for example, is the heroes' send-off as they start on the journey to the Cedar Forest at the end of Tablet III:

- The officers stood there wishing him well,
the young men of Uruk ran behind in a mob,
while the officers kissed his feet:
III 215 "To Uruk's quay come back in safety!
- "Do not rely, O Gilgamesh, on your strength alone,
look long and hard, land a blow you can count on!
'Who goes in front will save his comrade,
who knows the road shall [guard] his friend.'
- III 220 "Let Enkidu go before you,
he knows the journey to the Forest of Cedar.
He is tested in battle and [tried] in combat,
through the mountain passes [*he often has journeyed.*]"

More spectacular still is a big Late Babylonian piece of Tablet VIII that provides more than sixty lines of completely new text from the funeral of Enkidu. Much of it consists of the repetition a stereotyped prayer that Gilgamesh pronounces to Ishtar, Ereshkigal and the gods of the Netherworld as he lays out the grave goods in a ritual public display:

- VIII 135 [A *throw*]stick of . . . , the gleaming wood,
[for] the great queen Ishtar he displayed to the Sun God:
"[May] the great queen Ishtar . . . accept this,
may she [welcome] my friend [and walk at his side!]" . . .
- A flask of lapis lazuli
- VIII 145 for Ereshkigal, [the queen of the Netherworld, he displayed to the Sun
God:]
"May Ereshkigal, the [queen of the teeming Netherworld,] accept this,
may she welcome [my friend and walk at his side!]"
- A flute of carnelian
- for Dumuzi, the shepherd beloved of [Ishtar, he displayed to the Sun
God:]
- VIII 150 "May Dumuzi, the shepherd beloved of [Ishtar,] accept this,
may he welcome my friend and [walk at his side!]"
- A chair of lapis lazuli
a staff of lapis lazuli

- for Namtar, [the vizier of the Netherworld, he displayed to the Sun God:]
 VIII 155 “May [Namtar, the vizier of the teeming Netherworld,] accept this,
 [may he welcome my friend and walk at his side!]”
-
- for [Hushbisha, the stewardess of the Netherworld, he displayed to the
 Sun God:]
 VIII 160 “May [Hushbisha, the stewardess of the teeming Netherworld, accept this,]
 [may she welcome my friend and walk at his side!]” . . .
- A clasp of silver, a bracelet of*
 for Qassu-ṭabat, the sweeper of [Ereshkigal, he displayed to the Sun
 God:]
 VIII 165 “[May] Qassu-ṭabat, the sweeper [of Ereshkigal,] accept this,
 may he welcome my friend and [walk at his side!]
 May my friend not . . . , nor become sick at heart!”
- . . . of alabaster, the inside inlaid with lapis lazuli and carnelian,
 [*depicting an image*] of the Cedar Forest,
 VIII 170 inlaid with carnelian
 for Ninshuluhha . . . the cleaner of the house, he displayed to the Sun
 God:
 “May Ninshuluhha . . . the cleaner of the house, accept this,
 may she welcome my friend and walk at his side!
 [May she] . . . before my friend,
 may my [friend] not . . . , nor become sick at heart!”
- VIII 175 A double-edged dagger with a haft of lapis lazuli,
adorned with an image of the pure Euphrates,
 for Bibbu, the butcher of the Netherworld, he displayed to the Sun God:
 “[May Bibbu, the butcher] of the teeming Netherworld, [accept this,]
 [may he] welcome [my friend] and walk at his side!”

Sometimes, in fact more commonly, newly discovered fragments do not provide completely new text but instead help to complete extant but fragmentary passages, enabling us to fill in one or more of the very many gaps and holes that still pepper the epic. Another British Museum fragment, discovered by W. G. Lambert, helps to recover the text of a passage in which Gilgamesh's mother, the goddess Ninsun, charges Shamash, the Sun God, to look after her son on his journey to the Cedar Forest. Some of this passage was known, thanks to the recent publication of Gilgamesh tablets from Uruk by E. von Weiher, but the new piece clarifies the lines a little:

- III 100 Again Wild-Cow Ninsun made her bequest before Shamash:

“O Shamash, will not Gilgamesh . . . the gods?
 Will he not share the heavens with you?
 Will he not share with the moon a sceptre and crown?

“Will he not grow wise with Ea of the Ocean Below (*Apsû*)?
 III 105 Will he not rule with Irnina the black-headed people?
 Will he not dwell with Ningishzida in the Land-of-No-Return?”

This passage is not without problems, but it reveals that long before her son's death, Ninsun already knew his ultimate fate, which was to join the ranks of the dead gods and rule the shades of the departed in the Netherworld. This anticipation of the hero's traditional role in theology is not unexpected, for it is also a feature of one of the Sumerian Gilgamesh poems, the Death of Gilgamesh (as re-edited by Antoine Cavigneaux). There, the same foreknowledge of his doom is given to Gilgamesh in a dream as he lies on his deathbed.

Even the smallest, most insignificant-looking fragments can make a dramatic difference to our understanding of the text of the epic. A little piece of inscribed clay tablet, about two by three centimetres, was identified in September 1998 by Theodore Kwasman as part of the opening lines of the epic. It had lain unnoticed in the British Museum since 1878. The fragment reveals that, for over one hundred years, Assyriologists had not correctly understood how the fragmentary lines were to be reconstructed, and had telescoped the first two couplets into one. Though we still lack a word of lines 2 and 4, now at last the text's beginning becomes clear:

He who saw the Deep, the country's foundation,
 [who knew . . . ,] was wise in all matters!
 [Gilgameš, who] saw the Deep, the country's foundation,
 [who] knew . . . , was wise in all matters!

15 [He] . . . everywhere . . . ,
 and [*learnit*] of everything the sum of wisdom.
 He saw what was secret, discovered what was hidden,
 he brought back a tale of before the Deluge.

Thus the very beginning of the epic summarizes the momentous implication of the story to come. It celebrates the hero Gilgamesh as privy to the arcane secrets of Ea's cosmic abode, the Deep. This was the source of the profound wisdom on which Babylonian civilization was built. In journeying to the ends of the earth, Gilgamesh learnt from Ea's favourite, the immortal Uta-napishti, the wisdom of olden times and restored human society to its ideal, antediluvian state.

WHAT THERE WILL BE

By way of conclusion one may say something of the future prospects of the Gilgamesh poems. It is very exciting that there regularly continue to appear fragments of the great first-millennium epic, and of the five Sumerian poems that lie at the other end of the long history of Gilgamesh in literature. Three of the latter are now pretty much completely recovered, and the two that are not have become much better understood as a result of recent work by Antoine Cavigneaux and others. As it stands, the great epic is only two-thirds recovered. Even then, many lines are not well enough preserved to be useful. Every new piece found is a step towards the eventual recovery of the whole poem. I have no doubt that, one day, the great masterpiece of Babylonian literature will be complete again, as it last was more than two thousand years ago. All it will take is time – and the continuing benevolence of the governments and other benefactors who make Assyriological research possible.

Appendix: Sources for the Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic

1) Old Babylonian Gilgamesh poems

- a) *“Surpassing all other kings” Tablets II–III*
 - i) Tablet II (Pennsylvania): S. Langdon, *The Epic of Gilgamesh*. PBS X/3 (Philadelphia, 1917)
 - ii) Tablet III (Yale): M. Jastrow and A. T. Clay, *An Old Babylonian Version of the Gilgamesh Epic*. YOR IV/3 (New Haven, 1920)
- b) *A fragment in Philadelphia*: UM 29-13-570, unpublished
- c) *A tablet reportedly from Sippar*: B. Meissner, *Ein altbabylonisches Fragment des Gilgames Epos*. MVAG 7/I (Berlin, 1902); A. R. Millard, “Gilgamesh X: a new fragment,” *Iraq* 26 (1964): 99–105 = CT 46, no. 16
- d) *The Nippur school tablet*: edition forthcoming by A. Cavigneaux and J. Renger, “Ein altbabylonischer Gilgamesh-Text aus Nippur” (translations by Bottéro, Hecker, Tournay and Shaffer already published)
- e) *The Tell Harmal tablets*
 - i) J. J. A. van Dijk, *Sumer* 13 (1957): pl. 12 = TIM IX, no. 43; W. von Soden, *ZA* 53 (1963): 216–19
 - ii) J. J. A. van Dijk, *Sumer* 15 (1959): 9–10 and pls. 3–4, 13–15 = TIM IX, no. 45
- f) *The Ishchali tablet*: T. Bauer, “Ein viertes altbabylonisches Fragment des Gilgameschepos,” *JNES* 16 (1957): 254–72; S. Greengus, *Old Babylonian Tablets from Ishchali and Vicinity* (Istanbul, 1979), no. 277
- g) *A tablet in Baghdad, of unknown provenance*: J. van Dijk, *Cuneiform Texts of Varying Content*. TIM IX (Leiden, 1976), no. 46

2) Old and Middle Babylonian texts of the late second millennium BC, from outside Babylonia

- a) *The fragments from Hattusa*
 - i) Fragments from House 16, the Middle Hittite period: G. Wilhelm, “Neue akkadische Gilgamesh-Fragmente aus Hattusa,” *ZA* 78 (1988): 99–121 = H.

- Otten and C. Rüster, *Die hurritisch-hethitische Bilingue und weitere Texte aus der Oberstadt. KBo 32* (Berlin, 1990), nos. 128–33
- ii) Small fragment, probably Gilgamesh: F. Köcher, *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi* 37 (Berlin, 1953), 128
- iii) Fragment of an Akkadian paraphrase: E. Weidner, *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi* 4 (Berlin, 1922), no. 12
- b) *The Megiddo tablet*: A. Goetze and S. Levy, “Fragment of the Gilgamesh Epic from Megiddo,” *Atiqot* 2 (1959): 121–8
- c) *The fragments from Emar*
- i) Cedar Forest fragment: D. Arnaud, *Recherches au pays d’Aštata. Emar VI/4* (Paris, 1987), no. 781
- ii) Bull of Heaven fragments: D. Arnaud, op. cit., no. 782
- iii) Fragment, possibly from the Taming of Enkidu: D. Arnaud, op. cit., no. 760; C. Wilcke, “Ein weiteres Gilgamesh-Fragment aus Emar?,” *NABU* 1989, no. 5
- d) *A tablet from Ugarit*: unpublished

3) Middle Babylonian texts, from sites in Babylonia

- a) *The Nippur exercise tablet*: J. H. Tigay, *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic* (Philadelphia, 1982), 192 f., 266 f. and 297 (obv. only)
- b) *The Ur tablet*: C. J. Gadd, “Some Contributions to the Gilgamesh Epic,” *Iraq* 28 (1964): 105–21 = *UET VI/2*, no. 394

4) The Standard Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic, “He who saw the Deep”

- a) *Editions*
- i) George Smith, *The Chaldaean Account of Genesis* (London, 1875), 167–295
- ii) Paul Haupt, *Das babylonische Nimrodepos* (Leipzig, 1884 and 1891); cunei-form only
- iii) Peter Jensen, *Assyrisch-babylonische Mythen und Epen. KB 6/1* (Berlin, 1900), 116–265
- iv) R. Campbell Thompson, *The Epic of Gilgamish* (Oxford, 1930; reprint New York, 1995)
- N.B. additional manuscripts of the SB epic, published up to 1998: –
- E. Ebeling, *KAR*, nos. 319–20 (1923); A. Falkenstein, *LKU*, nos. 39–40 (1931); E. Weidner, *AfO* 10 (1936): 363; A. Heidel, *JNES* 11 (1952): 140–3; O. R. Gurney, *JCS* 8 (1954): 87–95 = *STT I*, nos. 14–15; D. J. Wiseman, in *Gilgamesh et sa légende*, ed. P. Garelli (Paris, 1960), 124–33; W. G. Lambert, in Garelli, op. cit., 53–5 (1960); R. Frankena, in Garelli, op. cit., 113–22 (1960); W. G. Lambert, *CT* 46, nos. 17–35 (1965); B. Landsberger, *RA* 62 (1968): 128–30, O; E. von Weiher, *ZA* 1962 (1972): 222–9 = *Uruk II*, no. 30; D. J. Wiseman, *Iraq* 37 (1975): 157–61 = *CTN IV*, no. 199; E. von Weiher, *Bagh. Mitt.* 11 (1980): 90–105 = *Uruk III*, no. 59; I. L. Finkel, *AfO* 29–30 (1984): 16; R. Borger, *Or NS* 54 (1985): 25–6; J. van Dijk, *VAS* 24, nos. 95–6 (1987); E. von Weiher, *Uruk IV*, nos. 122–4 (1993); J. A. Black, *CTN IV*, no. 153 (1996); T. Kwasman, *NABU* 1998, no. 99

v) A. R. George, *The Babylonian Gilgameš Epic* (Oxford, in preparation)

b) *Student reader*

Simo Parpola, *The Standard Babylonian Epic of Gilgamesh* (Helsinki, 1997)

5) Some recent translations of the Babylonian texts

Alexander Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic* (Chicago, 1946)

E. A. Speiser and A. K. Grayson, in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, ed. J. B. Pritchard (Princeton, 1969), 72–99, and Supplement, pp. 503–7

René Labat, *Les religions du Proche-Orient* (Paris, 1970), 145–226

Florence Malbran-Labat, *Gilgamesh* (Paris, 1982; 2nd edn 1992)

Albert Schott and Wolfram von Soden, *Das Gilgamesch-Epos* (5th edn Stuttgart, 1989)

Stephanie Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia* (Oxford, 1989), 39–153

Maureen Gallery Kovacs, *The Epic of Gilgamesh* (Stanford, Ca, 1989)

Jean Bottéro, *L'épopée de Gilgameš* (Paris, 1992)

Giovanni Pettinato, *La saga di Gilgamesh* (Milan, 1992)

Karl Hecker, “Das akkadische Gilgamesch-Epos,” in *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments* III/4, ed. O. Kaiser (Gütersloh, 1994), 646–744

Raymond Jacques Tournay and Aaron Shaffer, *L'épopée de Gilgamesh* (Paris, 1994)

Jorge Silva Castillo, *Gilgamesh o la angustia por la muerte (poema babilonio)* (Mexico, 1996)

Shin Shifra and Jacob Klein: “Alilôt Gilgameš,” in *In Those Distant Days* (Tel Aviv, 1996), 183–294

Ulla and Aage Westenholz, *Gilgamesh, Enuma Elish: Guder og mennesker i oldtidens Babylon* (Denmark, 1997), 61–168

Andrew George, *The Epic of Gilgamesh. The Babylonian Epic Poem and Other Texts in Akkadian and Sumerian* (Harmondsworth: Allen Lane The Penguin Press, February 1999)