

Those Who Saw the Abyss: *Gilgamesh* and *Hamlet*

Sabbar Saadoon Sultan*

Abstract

The following is an attempt to see the parallels and resemblances between the Sumerian classic epic, *Gilgamesh*, and the Renaissance Shakespearian *Hamlet*. It begins with an explanation of the reasons behind such an unusual topic and the methodology followed through out. It traces the common points between them in terms of underlying patterns, characterization, male friendships, and the destructive roles of women. In themes and concepts about the human predicament and how man is virtually helpless as regards what lies in store for him, the two texts have much in common as the following pages will show.

It may sound, at face value, uncommon if not peculiar altogether to have those two different characters yoked in a research paper, given their striking differences in culture, religion, time, or artistic mode and views of man and the universe. *Gilgamesh* is deeply rooted in the thought and conventions of Mesopotamian life 2000 B.C. while *Hamlet* celebrates the Christian Renaissance and perhaps medieval mode of thinking. But a close reading of the two texts and their details soon disperses such misgivings and apprehensions as there are many common points of interest that can not escape the discerning eye.

There is a need, however, to set a methodological point in advance. The present reading does not seek to establish any historical evidence or contact or indirect effect between the two and the influence of one on the other. The history of *Gilgamesh* and *Hamlet* has been a fertile field for hundreds of historians, archeologists, critics and researchers. In the case of the latter, the findings are still inconclusive and speculative as regards the origins of *Hamlet* which are traced to the ancient Norse legends and even classical and archaic echoes.⁽¹⁾ The act of comparison adopted here takes its cue from the renowned discussion of the American critic Rene Wellek of what he calls the “ crisis of comparative literature” when he asserts that “ The whole conception of fenced-off reservations with signs of “ no trespassing” must be distasteful to a free mind. ”⁽²⁾ Indeed the pursuit of “ recurrent structures” has been taken as the main

© Copyright 2006 by The Society of Arab Universities Faculties of Arts, All rights reserved

* Faculty of Arts, Al Isra University, Amman, Jordan.

objective of the comparatist. ⁽³⁾ The main point here is the pursuit of these structures and themes which eventually attest to the fact that the human creative subject or ego is invariably one and its intellectual and existential anxiety remains basically the same, irrespective of the differences in culture, religions, races and historical backgrounds.

No doubt *Gilgamesh* and *Hamlet* have been ones of the most famous representatives of the universal questions facing man since the dawn of creation. Many historians, scholars, linguists and archeologists have excavated and studied the contents of this Mesopotamian treasure to unravel its mysteries and wonders. Indeed the names of famous historians and scholars like Kramer, Mallowan and the Iraqi Taha Bakir instantly come to the mind whenever this classical epic is mentioned. As one of Kramer's serious students and admirers, Bakir devoted a whole lifetime to learn the Cuneiform studies and writing so that he could translate the original text into Arabic without any intermediary language. Also he translated from English Kramer's *The Tablets of Sumer* (1956). In one of the epic's English translations, Sanders sheds some light on the unanimous consent as regards its great significance, "These poems have a right to antedate Homeric epic by at least one and a half thousand years, but mainly because of the quality and character of the story they tell." ⁽⁴⁾ In another context, the universality of this classical text is stressed. It ranks, according to Heide, among "the great history masterpieces of mankind. It is one of the principal heroic tales of antiquity and may well be called the *Odyssey* of the Babylonians."⁽⁵⁾ Although the date of writing is 2000 B.C. and is attributed to the Babylonian era, the events go back much earlier, to the Sumerian culture and life. Indeed the relation between the Babylonian text and the original Sumerian sources, particularly the names of the gods and figures as well as the episodes is undeniable. But as Kramer reminds us, the Babylonian bards did not copy the Sumerian material literally but allowed themselves to introduce great modifications so that what remains is only the Sumerian nucleus. ⁽⁶⁾

Structurally, *Gilgamesh* consists of twelve long clay tablets written in cuneiform, each tablet comprising 300 lines arranged in six columns. Some of these columns are broken and therefore the line of narration is often disturbed. This is most evident in Tablet XII where half of the lines are missing. In its original language, the epic was written in accordance with the Babylonian mode of writing in that there is an inner rhythm, but without a rhyme. ⁽⁷⁾ Likewise, *Hamlet* has been a source of inspiration, challenge and controversy for all the practitioners in the fields of psychology, religion, anthropology, cinema, aesthetics, linguistics...etc. Especially is this prominent in the various interpretations and judgments of the central character's conflicts and attitudes. Philip Edwards refers to this issue in saying that "in the world's literature no

single work has been so extensively written about as *Hamlet, the Prince of Denmark*. ”⁽⁸⁾ Jacqueline Rose, among others, shows the same degree of enthusiasm and admiration of *Hamlet* as the Mona Lisa of literature(the phrase is originally coined by T. S. Eliot in his famous article on *Hamlet*) when she asserts that it is “ one of the most elevated and generally esteemed works of our Western literary Tradition. ”⁽⁹⁾ All types of casebooks, critical books, literary journals, annual seminars and conferences and film adaptations have centered their attention on Shakespeare’s magnificent achievement. Such is the tremendous reputation of *Hamlet* that Goethe could not resist its spell and had only to give his verdict “ Shakespeare und kein ende or Shakespeare ad infinitum. ”⁽¹⁰⁾ Hamlet’s image haunts so many creative writers in different ages and countries such as Schiller, Goethe, Gide, Stendhal, Balzac, Turgenev, Tolstoy, as Harry Levin reminds us.⁽¹¹⁾ The Japanese have their own Hamlet who shares the original one the basic archetypal patterns as seen in the characterization of Ichiro.⁽¹²⁾ In the Arab world there is at least one adaptation of this play, Mamdooh Idwan’s *Hamlet Wakes Up Late*(1984) and a theatrical experiment made by the creative Iraqi director Sami Abdulhameed under the title, *Hamlet as an Arab* in the 1980s of the 20th century. In fact the success in the demanding and extremely difficult role of Hamlet has often been taken as evidence of any actor’s competence in role-playing. Also the universality of this drama drives many critics not only to see in it an identification between writer and dramatic personae but also as a universal image, since, “ he is every one of us”, as he has been labeled.⁽¹³⁾

The two texts follow similar lines of action. In both the main characters (Gilgamesh and Hamlet belong to royal dynasty and spend their time in a state of inaction in the first part of the text. But their attitudes vary strikingly: Gilgamesh is seen in full conformity with the Uruk life while Hamlet undergoes a traumatic sense of isolation and alienation. The initial state of inertia is soon dissipated and replaced by a series of accelerating events. But it is apt to recall that it is Gilgamesh who voluntarily sets out to the wilderness while the case is not so in *Hamlet*. Hamlet finds himself torn by “many forces, emotions and decisions which defeat the protagonist’s usual ways of making sense of the world. ”⁽¹⁴⁾ Indeed the pattern of *Gilgamesh* rests in the following : brief but full indulgence in the sensual pleasure of the Uruk life, the complaints of his people against his sexual excesses, the creation of Enkidu who represents his double and antagonist and their friendship. From this moment on, Gilgamesh’s energy is directed elsewhere: Humbaba (Huwawa), the cider guardian, the Bull of Heaven, and the memorable search for the plant of life in the craggy mountains and the sea of the dead, to end in final defeat and resignation. If Hamlet has been categorized as an early image of the anti-hero or outsider in that he allows his psychic life to be a substitute for his social life, this is not so in the situations

following his voyage to England. Indeed this represents a turning-point in the course of *Hamlet*. He returns as a totally different person and the Elizabethans would “see Hamlet for the first time in the play, fighting the enemies, instead of talking.”⁽¹⁵⁾ (It is possible that the contact with the sea life, away from the stifling and suffocating Danish court has been a fresh impetus he badly needs). From this scene on, the soliloquies, monologues and sporadic meditations (with the exception of the graveyard scene) are minimized and the verbal exuberance is accompanied with daring acts—boarding the pirates’ ship, challenging Laertes, expounding for the first time his long-buried love for Ophelia and above all killing Claudius after debunking all his treachery and wholesale corruption. If Bradley locates the really “heroic qualities”⁽¹⁶⁾ in Hamlet’s character, and the other prince in the play finds Hamlet apt to be treated as a fighter “Bear Hamlet like- soldier to the stage”(V. ii. 333), it is mostly in this second episode or cycle in Hamlet’s attitudes. From this angle, Gilgamesh and Hamlet converge in their desperate attempts to fulfill what they have in mind, although both take different and unexpected turns.

Both hinge on the idea of quest, a brief but painful journey whether in the exterior or interior worlds. In both situations, frustration is the inescapable outcome. It is Gilgamesh who is told by the barmaid that his “face is like that of a man who has been on a long journey”(IX. iii. 34). In Gilgamesh’s case, there is a movement from the centre (Uruk) to the periphery. As the translators of one of the copies of *Gilgamesh*, the initial statement “The one who saw the “nagbu.”(abyss), the term could refer to a range of meanings, “spring”, “fountain” and “underground water.”⁽¹⁷⁾ The implication might be the inner, hidden life which Gilgamesh has a glimpse of and is shocked by,

The one who saw the abyss I will make the land know;
Of him who knew all, let me tell the whole story
...he who knew everything, Gilgamesh,
Who saw things secret, opened the place hidden,
And carried back word of the time before the flood,
He traveled the road, exhausted, in pain
And cut words into a stone table (I. i. 1-8).

Part of the fascination and greatness of *Hamlet* is the hero’s unusual skill in evading the plots of an evil and corrupting centre(Elsinore) and substituting that by a willful isolation⁽¹⁸⁾ and retreat from a world he despises. This deliberate self-enclosure, though detrimental to his immediate objective of revenge, proves to be useful for enabling him to see his tragedy as part of a wide and universal range of sufferings. The stasis of the first part gives way to the second highly moving action following his return from the voyage.

Gilgamesh was an actual historic figure who reigned about 2000 B.C. He was also known for his constructing power “ as the builder of the great walls of Uruk. ”⁽¹⁹⁾ He was the greatest hero of the Sumerian folklore whose heroic qualities and feats have mythologized him so that he can be compared to a Hercules, a Galahad-Paul Bunyan. On this controversial real-legendary issue, the historian Lansing has this to say “ Scholars weren’t quite sure whether Gilgamesh was a man or a myth until a document found at Nippur was translated. In this Nippur text, however, he takes his place as a real king. ”⁽²⁰⁾

One of the striking characteristics of Gilgamesh is his excessive indulgence in what is sensual and this is sometimes attributed not to any inherent villainy but to the fact that he is half-god, half-man.⁽²¹⁾ But this indulgence in sexual life and arbitrary rule is soon disrupted by gods’ intervention in the form of creating Enkidu. The challenge between these two giants is soon over and a bond of friendship is sealed. The other more fatal challenge is the advances of the goddess of love, Ishtar, that ends in the death of Enkidu. This represents a great change in Gilgamesh’s psychological, mental and emotional life. Although he fails to get the plant of immortality, he attains sagacity and wisdom and great constructing power. Later reports “ made him, like Minos of Crete, a judge in the Underworld, one to whom prayers were addressed”.⁽²²⁾

In contrast, Hamlet is a full-fledged character of Shakespeare’s imagination or Kyd’s or any of the earlier texts (the Ur- Hamlet) written before Shakespeare’s final authoritative version. In this sense Hamlet is non- historic. It is apt to recall Bloom’s enthusiastic assessment of Shakespeare’s creative skill in depicting his characters. As he puts it, Shakespeare bestows upon them a quality that renders them “more rammed with life than any actual person we might know. ”⁽²³⁾ Now that *Gilgamesh* is an epic necessarily entails the recourse to narration covering a long span of time. Conversely, *Hamlet* is a tragedy that has a limited scope. Thus the main character(Hamlet) is shown in his current status(as a melancholic young man disgraced by acts beyond his will) and the formidable task he is expected to undertake “ The time is out of joint. O cursed spite/ That ever I was born to set it right” (I. v. 188-9). Only in retrospect and by means of the ruminations or judgments of those familiar with him do we have a glimpse of the Hamlet before the whirlwind of events changes him altogether. Ophelia is one of those and she can give an intimate picture of him as “ The courtier’s, soldier’s, scholar’s eye, tongue, sword/The expectancy and rose of fair state”(III. i. 154-55). In his comment on Ophelia’s assessment of Hamlet’s character, Wolfgang stresses the hero’s mastering of many skills such as falconry and hunting, the soldier’s trade and strategy.⁽²⁴⁾ The popularity of Hamlet which Claudius takes into consideration in exempting the prince from any severe punishment can only be felt in Horatio’ views and genuine fears for

Hamlet's safety. Significantly enough, Hamlet emerges out of the mysterious and evil plans hatched against him as a totally different person, ready to embrace his fate "readiness is all" as he argues(V. iii. 194).

There is a further trait the two characters share: both of them are visionary and can foretell the catastrophic events before their actual occurrence. Although Enkidu betrays one instance of this quality in the days preceding his death, it remains the exclusive privilege of those two heroic figures—Gilgamesh and Hamlet. Gilgamesh perceives the creation of his rival(later his closest friend) even before seeing him in reality and this is because of the help of his mother, the goddess Ninsun. The narrator of the epic puts it thus,

" Even before you come out of the mountains Gilgamesh, in
the heart of Uruk, will have seen you in dreams, "
Gilgamesh rises, speaks to Ninsun- his mother to untie his dream.
" Last night, Mother, I saw a dream.
There was a star in the heavens
Like a shooting star of Anu it fell on me.
I tried to move it; I could not move it.
The people pressed themselves over it;
.....
I myself hugged him like a wife,
And I threw him down at your feet(I. v. 24-35).

Ninsun easily figures out this dream-vision and tells him that it is Enkidu, the friend and support. Hamlet's keen insight and probing of what surrounds him of people and events is matchless. This quality has been labeled as " over-nice speculation... and troubling visions of the Renaissance moral hero. " (25) The play abounds with examples of this. Immediately after the coronation scene and even before hearing about the ghost's usurping the night, Hamlet tells Horatio that he sees his own father in his " mind's eye"(I. ii. 185). When told about his father's ghost, his intuition is right about the corruption and evil of the court " Foul deeds will rise/ Though all the earth o'erwhelm them, to men's eyes"(I. iii. 257-8). When the ghost narrates the treachery of Claudius, Hamlet's instant answer is " O my prophetic soul"(I. v. 44). Another instance of this is his complaints to Rosencrantz and Guildenstern that he is prey to " bad dreams"(II. ii. 245). Of course the dreams he has in mind are not about the temporal and topical as they conjecture.

Another equally significant element they share is their communion or commingling with the metaphysical or supernatural powers. The aforementioned instance about the hero- mother relationship indicates that Gilgamesh has an access to gods' and goddess' council and judgments. In *Hamlet*, the hero is

given a brief but wide-ranging glimpse of that half-perceived world filling the mortals with fear and terror. It is Hamlet alone who has the guts to listen to such tales that can only be matched in their horror to what is going on in Elsinore. Each tale, the ghost assures Hamlet, can

harrow up thy soul, freeze thy young blood,
Make thy two eyes like stars start from their spheres,
Thy knotted and combined locks to part
And each particular hair to stand to an end
Like quills upon the fretful porpentine(I. v. 16-20).

This harrowing picture of the tortures of the afterlife coupled with Hamlet's own meditations about the terrifying end of human beings, even those endowed with the greatness of Alexander, can only be matched by Tablet XII of *Gilgamesh*. Here Enkidu tells us not only about the decay of human bodies eaten up by "vermin" but also about those who suffer because they have only one son. Such a person, "lies under the wall weeping bitterly"(XII. iv. 101). It goes without saying that both Gilgamesh and Hamlet are only sons and are doomed to remain childless.

In both cases the evolution of the character consists in the collaboration of metaphysical and supernatural elements(gods, goddesses, ghosts) and the mortal ones(kings, princes, and ordinary people like Laertes or the gravediggers). In both we have genial, warm-hearted and loyal sons and friends who take to heart many values pertaining to friendship, the family or the country. If *Gilgamesh* is part of the folklore of the Sumerian tradition whose author is necessarily anonymous, *Hamlet*, though commonly attributed to Shakespeare, dates back to different sources, cultures and even countries. The identity of the author here is debatable but the reputation of the text is worldwide just like any outstanding text. What matters in both is not the identity of the author, but the dazzling ability of the text to appeal to all people and tackle their innermost fears and aspirations.

Whenever the names of Gilgamesh and Hamlet are mentioned, their doubles or foils(Enkidu and Horatio) instantly come to mind, since it is very difficult to talk about any of the two without mentioning his friend. In both texts there is a deep and powerful tie that brings the two together. In both the relationship is disinterested and lifelong. Also this male relationship often compensates for the capricious and unreliable female attachment. In fact the whole corpus of *Gilgamesh* hinges on the presence and gigantic activity of Enkidu whose brief life and sudden death leave a lasting effect on Gilgamesh and his views of himself and others. The very genesis of Enkidu is a metaphysical question in that it is a prompt response to the wailings and

complaints of Uruk people as a result of Gilgamesh's excesses. His physical description and mode of living are striking enough,

In the wilderness she(Aruru) made Enkidu the fighter;
She gave birth in darkness and silence to one like the war god Ninurta.
His whole body was covered thickly with hair, his head covered with hair
Like a woman's;
The locks of his hair grew abundantly, like those of the grain god of
Nisabal(I. ii. 35-7).

This prelapsical and innocent image of man living with the wild animals, fully unconscious of the human evils and sins, is not for nothing, as he is destined to be a bulwark against Gilgamesh's malpractices. But before being entitled for such a task, he has to be tamed and civilized with the aid of woman, the harlot-priestess,

(Let her conquer him with) power (equal to his own)
When he waters the animals at the watering place
Have her take off her clothes, let her show him her strong beauty.
When he sees her, he will come near her.
His animals, who grew up in the wilderness, will turn from him(II.iii.21-24).

For six days and seven nights the process of seduction has been going on until Enkidu "grew weak; he could not gallop as before. Yet he had knowledge, wilder mind"(II. IV. 25-26). Obviously this act of seduction and loss of innocence which Wellard calls "perhaps the most significant and dramatic event in the story"⁽²⁶⁾, is a reminder that Enkidu may stand for the Sumerian Adam. From this moment on he is prepared to fulfill any task required of him. The physical struggle between Gilgamesh and Enkidu is a dramatic piece of world literature where power, courage, and diplomacy are fully manifested. From that moment when they realized that they were equal, their friendship starts on proper terms. The expedition of the cedar forest, the killing of its guardian Humbaba and its catastrophic consequences, is not fully explained in the epic. But it is possible that it stems from the major theme of friendship. It seems that Gilgamesh intends to find a means of exposing his heroism and prowess. Also he seeks to entertain his friend, Enkidu, who has been upset by the urban life and craves to see his early primitive life in the wilderness.⁽²⁷⁾

The action of *Gilgamesh* obviously derives its force from the theme of friendship between these two men. Although two thirds of Gilgamesh are divine and one third human while Enkidu is a sort of beast, the friendship between them is the strongest. In all the significant situations of the epic—the fierce encounters with the monster Hum-baba, the Bull of Heaven, the enchanted wood, the waters of death, Enkidu's role is no less significant. As in the case of classical tragic

characters, Enkidu has his own flaw: too much self-confidence and arrogance. In his frenzied grappling with the Bull of Heaven, Enkidu“ flings part of the Bull into her(Ishtar’s) face.”⁽²⁸⁾ If this represents a radical change in Gilgamesh’s life for the first time, the same holds true to his end. Enkidu’s death betrays what is typically human in Gilgamesh’ disposition,

For Enkidu, for my friend, I weep like a wailing woman, howling bitterly
(He was) the axe at my side, the bow at my arm,
The dagger in my belt...
An evil has risen up and robbed me(VII. iv. 2-6).

This deep and genuine grief which is reverberated by all the elements of nature and the walls of Uruk, will be the immediate cause for the hectic quest for the plant that rejuvenates life and conquers death. Thus thematically Enkidu is seen to be an indispensable element for the whole fabric of *Gilgamesh*.

Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* devotes much space to the Hamlet-Horatio friendship and singles out this only bright side of Elsinore’s otherwise totally somber and suffocating life. Any reading of Shakespeare’s play shows that all the main characters align themselves with the authoritative king and the usurper of the throne. This list includes Polonius, Laertes, Ophelia, Gertrude, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern and Osric. This does not simply mean that they are corrupt, but they are pragmatic and abiding with the doctrine of unquestionable obedience to the monarch. In this unhealthy maze of Elsinore, Horatio remains an exception in that he is Hamlet’s confidante and the support and witness of the most influential scenes in the play(the ghost’s appearance, the play- within-the play, the graveyard scene and the final duel and Hamlet’s death). Compared with the role of Enkidu, Horatio’s is that of the counselor, the safety valve and the guardian of Hamlet’s unpredictable and even whimsical responses to what is going on. Horatio is pacifying, sympathetic, understanding and appreciative of Hamlet’s catastrophic situation. He represents the only glimpse of hope in a totally desperate and alienating environment. In his usual rhetoric, Hamlet chooses the most felicitous phrases to describe him. The tone of great intimacy and admiration is self- evident and spares us of any further explication,

Since my dear soul mistress of her choice,
And could of men distinguish her election,
H’ath sealed thee for herself, for thou has’ been
As man that Fortune’s buffets and rewards
Hast ta ’en with equal thanks. And blest are those
Whose blood and judgement are so well commeddled
That they are not a pipe for Fortune’s finger

To sound what stop she please. Give me that man
That is not passion's slave, and I will wear him
In my heart' love, an' in my heart of heart
As I do thee(III. ii. 53-64).

Although Shakespeare does not show in concrete dramatic terms this much-desired equilibrium in Horatio's character, the most convenient reading of this character is that he represents along with Fortinbras and Laertes a kind of foil whereby Hamlet's character is delineated. But his presence transcends this functional element in that he proves to be of indispensable help and use for the bewildered Hamlet whose fate is that of "crawling between heaven and earth." One and perhaps the most beneficial help is his serious warning about communing with the ghost,

What if it tempt you toward the flood my lord,
Or to the dreadful summit of the cliff
That bettles o'er his base into sea
And there assure some other horrible form
Which might deprive your sovereignty of reason
And drive you into madness?(I. iv. 69-74)

Here in few sentences, Horatio not only echoes the Elizabethan apprehension of the occult and supernatural elements, but also prophecies what is to befall Hamlet in the rest of the play. Indeed the "madness" or sanity of Hamlet has been an endless and fertile topic for the researchers and students of literature for a very long time. The hero himself is seen swaying between these two poles of sanity(the striking scene with his mother and his insistence on his sanity) and madness(the graveyard scene and the grappling with Laertes). All this would not have happened had he listened to Horatio's sincere advice. Even in the fatal moments of the play, i. e. , the duel with Laertes, Horatio insists that it will not be for Hamlet's favor as Hamlet is "Nay good"(V. ii. 187). Once again Hamlet does not listen to his friend's suggestion and this time it is a fatal fault. As Hamlet is dying, he can only appeal to his friend to disambiguate his cause,

Horatio I am dead;
Thou livest; report me and y cause aright
To the unsatisfied(V. ii. 323).

But Horatio, just like any typical image of idealistic friendship and love in classics like *Anthony and Cleopatra*, insists on drinking the poison and joining his friend in his death journey. It is only after many pleas and requests that Horatio is dissuaded from this objective and accepts the less demanding role of being the reliable chronicler of Hamlet's pathetic story,

O God, Horatio, what a wounded name,
Th'ngs standing there unknown, shall live behind me!
If thou didst ever hold me in thy heart,
Absent thee from felicity awhile,
And in this harsh world draw thy breath in pain
To tell my story(V. ii. 325-29).

Clearly, *Hamlet* without Horatio's brilliant character and memorable participation in those events will be inadequate and lacking. This holds true more or less to the influential role played by Enkidu in substantiating the course of events in *Gilgamesh*. One striking difference, however, has become obvious by now : it is the protagonist who is doomed to die and be mourned by his close friend while it is the other way around in *Gilgamesh*.

The image of woman in both *Gilgamesh* and *Hamlet* is another common issue and it is elaborated in both texts in convincing details. It is a truism to state that Gilgamesh's problem is intricately linked with woman. The "civilizing" role played by woman in taming Enkidu can not mitigate the underlying negative image of her. Indeed it is hard to accept the assumption that "for once the primeval Eve is not the villainess." ⁽²⁹⁾ From the very start we learn that only one third of Gilgamesh is human and this is because of his mother's sexuality. His mother, the goddess Ninsun, the wife of the god Lugalbanda, had Gilgamesh from an unknown mortal, vaguely called "the high priest of Kullab." ⁽³⁰⁾ Apart from gods' and goddesses' interference in the affairs of mortals, it is obvious that Gilgamesh has something wrong with his physical build, a hybrid thing. Much has already been said about his beauty, bull-like strength and bravery, but his insatiable sexuality has to be stressed here as a direct outcome of breaching the boundaries between the metaphysical and physical, the divine and earthly. It is this curious blend in his character that explains his excesses in sexuality, "His desires were boundless. He took the wives of his choicest warriors for himself and stripped the brides of their virginity before their husbands." ⁽³¹⁾ Despite his being involved with this huge number of women, his desires remain on the sensual level only. His soul mate is not a woman but a man whom he "hugged like a wife"(I. v. 34). The reason behind all this is not given, although one may locate it in the reliable privileges of male friendship and concomitant fear of woman's selfish interests. This relation has its parallels in Hamlet's totally different treatments of both Horatio and Ophelia.

But when we turn to his relation with the goddess of love and her different incarnations, the parallels get closer and more relevant. Upon his arrival in Uruk after his fearful strife with Humbaba, Ishtar accosts him and seeks to seduce him in terms that can only be matched in Marlowe's song to his shepherdess. Her words are alluring enough,

To Gilgamesh's beauty greater Ishtar lifted her eyes.
Come, Gilgamesh, be my lover!
Give me the taste of your body.
Would that you were my husband, and I your wife!
I'd order harnessed for you a chariot of Lapis Lazuli and gold
Its wheels of gold and its horns of precious amber
.....
Kings, rulers, princes will bend down before you
Mountains and lords will bring their yield to you.
Your goats will drop triplets, your ewes twins(II. v. 6-18).

She, in short, wants from Gilgamesh a holy marriage or what is often called "Hieros Gamus."⁽³²⁾ As a wandering "restless spirit"⁽³³⁾, Gilgamesh is too wild to be tamed by such restraining ties. He simply finds that the whole project is incongruous and he rationalizes the matter in this cogent way,

What could I give you if I should take you for a wife? Would I give
You oil for the body, and fine wrappings?"
Would I give you bread and victuals?
You who drink wine fit for royalty?(II. v. 24-25)

But Ishtar cannot be easily dissuaded. In fact she and her different incarnations(the barmaid Siduri and the temple courtesan) has her say in affecting the lives of the two men drastically. It is true that the courtesan does Enkidu a service by ridding him of the animal type of life he has been leading. But this step has its own disadvantage: the bitter realization of the short span of human life. The consciousness of the brevity of human life and the inevitability of death drive him to curse the sacred harlot and the hunter that "have led him out of the state of nature."⁽³⁴⁾ Gilgamesh's own reaction to the consequences of Enkidu's humanization is no less violent and wrathful,

(His heart) urged him to curse the temple prostitute, the woman.
" Listen, woman. I will decree your fate,
(a destiny) that will have no end and(will last) for ever.
I will curse you with a great curse.
In a rush the throw-stick will strike you.
Your hunger will never be satisfied.
You will have the child who beats you.
.... of slave woman
.... wallow in the mud.
.... pollute(VII. iii. 5-13). (lines broken in the origin)

Gilgamesh has already rebuffed the advances of Ishtar for reasons related to woman's treachery and deceit. As he reminds her, the problem lies elsewhere: her moodiness and frailty,

Which of your lovers have you loved forever?
Which of your little shepherds has continued to please?
Come, let me name your lovers for you(II. v. 42-44).

An offence of this sort will not pass without a heavy price to be paid by the protagonist. Hamlet in Shakespeare's tragedy has the upper hand in dealing with Ophelia and can give her the worst harangue ever said to a woman. Here the personal and impersonal, the actual and fanciful are intermingled,

For, the power of beauty will sooner transform beauty from what
it is to a bawd than the force of honesty can translate beauty into
his likeness.

.....
I have heard of your paintings too well enough.
God hath given you one face, and you make
Yourselves another. You jig, you amble, and you
lisp, you nickname God's creatures, and make
your wantonness
Your ignorance(III. i. 137-139).

This applies to his own dealings with his mother as far as this point is concerned. In his soliloquies, reveries, solitary meditations the name of woman is instantly linked in his distracted mind and strained thinking with filth, corruption and infidelity. His early judgment of woman that has become a catchword for critics and students of this play is the key statement "Frailty, thy name is woman"(I. ii. 133). Even his body seems to him filthy and "solid"(sallied or sullied). The dirt he finds there is due to the fact that his body is an extension of hers. In the chamber scene, Hamlet brings home all her outrageous acts,

Such an act
That blurs the grace and blush of modesty,
Calls virtue hypocrite, takes off the rose
From the fair forehead of an innocent love
And sets a blister there, makes marriage vows
As false as dicers' oaths(III. iv. 40-45).

This line of misogyny and doubt of woman can be disrupted in one of Hamlet's unpredictable moods. Hamlet surprises all(including the audience) by his declaration of his long-buried love for Ophelia,

I loved Ophelia; forty thousand brothers
 Could not with all their quantity of love
 Make up my sum(V. i. 36-38).

In contrast to this inconsistent line of love-hate affair, Gilgamesh's is marked by one invariable stance : doubt, fear and misogyny. As already pointed out, Ishtar has her own revenge by asking her father, Anu, to make the Bull of Heaven destroy both Gilgamesh and Enkidu. This plan backfires and the gods decree the death of Enkidu.

As evinced by this synopsis, *Gilgamesh* centers on many eschatological and metaphysical questions that are to be foregrounded in *Hamlet*. Shakespeare, needless to say, does not raise this controversial matter between man and God or the metaphysical forces only in *Hamlet*. His equally great drama, *King Lear* (1608) gives a very impressive account of the helplessness of man before his fate. Here Gloucester shouts in despair after being blinded, " Like flies to wanton boys are we to the gods/ They kill us for their sport"(IV. i. 42-43). *Hamlet* devotes much space to exploring the various aspects of this issue. It is because of the great vistas of experience opened up to him by the ghost that Hamlet feels entitled for discussing many things in heaven and earth never dreamt of in Horatio's philosophy. In *Gilgamesh*, the hero realizes at last that all his plans and dreams of a life matching the gods's is a futile attempt. Hamlet's problem of fatalism or, for that matter, that of all Shakespeare's tragedies is of such a universal and wide-ranging dimension that even the absurdists find a kind of impetus in his works. In his conversations with Claude Bonnefoy, Ionesco can not but assert that " He(Shakespeare) is the forefather of the theatre of the absurd. "(35) From the start, the audience gradually gets the impression that Hamlet is put in an appalling predicament for which he is not to blame. The tale of his father's ghost of both the tortures of the other world and the disgrace and humiliation of the present one leaves no space for the sensitive young man to see any hope or remedy. His soliloquy, " To be or not to be" views equally painful choices open for man: a stoic suffering or suicide, a difficult choice between Scylla and Charybdis This mode of thinking appeals to the sensibility of many generations of different cultures and views of life. Along this unmistakably existential line of thinking, the play develops a parallel one: the religious line that advocates the main postulate of not getting involved in such sophisticated matters. Although, as Knight reminds us, it is often assumed that " Shakespeare's works have no positive religious meaning"(36), such a sense is at work in this play. Hence the arguments of H.D. Kitto that the whole play is a religious drama whose theological side is complementary to its artistic integrity.(37) This oscillation between the existential and religious sides will not be resolved until we reach the concluding scenes of the play. The overlapping between these lines

of thinking eventually tilts to the religious one. Examples are many. When Hamlet kills Polonius, he can only say these words to justify his action, “ For this same lord/ I do repent; but heaven hath pleased it so / To punish me with this, and this with me/That I must be their scourge and minister”(III. iv. 173-176). Such a submissive stance toward religious matters is felt again in Hamlet’s account of his voyage events. He tells Horatio how he has been rescued from the clutches of inevitable death by Divine will when he discovers by chance Claudius’s letter and takes prompt action,

Rashly,
And praised be rashness for it—let us know,
Our indiscretion sometimes serves well
When our deep plots pall, and that should learn us
There’s a divinity that shapes our ends,
Rough-hew them how we will(V. ii. 6-11).

This culminates in the general conclusion about the forces that exert their power in controlling man’s interests and destinies. As Hamlet puts it,

We defy augury. There is special providence
In the fall of a sparrow. If it be now, ‘tis not
To come; if it be not to come, it will be now;
If it be not now, yet it will come—the readiness is all(V. ii. 192-95).

Obviously there is a total submission to one’s fate and acceptance of what is to come as felt in Hamlet’s attitude that inevitably brings to mind Gilgamesh’s.

Yoked with this topic is the subject of death and the great space it engages in both texts. It is a commonplace remark that *Gilgamesh* is about the quest for immortality and the hero’s final disillusionment at the shocking inevitability of death, hanging over one’s head like the sword of Damocles. In both texts, death is likened to a kind of sleep.

This image is recurrent in all the complaints of Gilgamesh about the immediate cause of his friend’s decay—a continuous sleep, “ Now what is this sleep that has taken hold of you? You’ve become dark. You can’t hear me”(VIII. II. 13-14). Once again he tells the barmaid, Siduri, about the sleep that has taken hold of his friend. When Utnapishtem puts Gilgamesh to test to assess his stamina, “ sleep” is the touchstone. Gilgamesh is asked to “sleep for six days and seven nights”(XI. iii. 199). But the Sumerian sage is surprised to see “ this hero who asks for life/ Sleep has blown over him like a wet haze”(XI. iii. 201-202). The strange aspect of this issue is that the period of time Gilgamesh has spent in sleeping is exactly the same as that which Enkidu spent in sleeping with the

courtesan. The implication could be that sleep may stand for the genesis and apocalypses of human existence.

It is within these terms that Hamlet argues about what affinities he finds between the actual death and the sleep of death in his renowned soliloquy “To be or not to be”,

To die, to sleep—
 To sleep—perchance to dream; there’s the rub.
 For in that sleep of death what dreams may come
 When we have shuffled off this mortal coil,
 Must give us a pause. There’s the respect
 That makes calamity of so long a life(III. i. 64-69).

Both characters find no bones in telling us about their fears of death and its horrifying impact. But their attitudes differ in that this fear becomes the impetus for Gilgamesh’s journey in search of what can overcome death. Hamlet, in turn, gradually substitutes the mounting sense of the absurdity and meaninglessness of existence by a passive and complacent, semi-religious submission to its dictates. Hamlet’s task is simpler despite his great sensibility and imaginative mind if we remember that he has nothing to lose except his worthless life “I do not set my life at a pin’s fee”(V. ii. 65). Elsewhere he reiterates this painful recognition of the ambiguity of life, “a man’s life ‘s no more than to say “one”(V. ii. 73). In contrast, Gilgamesh has so many privileges to lose and fear for: beauty, youth, physical strength, vitality, admirable prowess and royal position. Hence his tremendous fear of death when he finds himself the only witness of his friend’s slow death,

He (Gilgamesh) roamed the hills
 “(Me!) Will I too not die like Enkidu?
 Sorrow has come into my belly.
I fear death; I roam over the hills.
 I will seize the road; quickly, I will go
 To the house of Utnapishtem, offspring of
 Ubaratute(IX. i. 2-7). (my italics)

Thus Gilgamesh sets out on his hazardous expedition in pursuit of the plant of life. At the other end of the earth, among the vineyards, Siduri reminds him of the impossibility of his enterprise,

The Barmaid says to him, to Gilgamesh:
 “ Why is your strength wasted, your face sunken?

 Your face is weathered by cold and heat
 Because you roam the wilderness in search of a wind-puff(IX. iii. 32-38).

To these questionings, Gilgamesh answers that his surprise springs from the fact that he has never envisioned such a fate after all the exposition of process and strength on his friend's part. In such a problematic situation, Gilgamesh has only to abide by the philosophical and basically deterministic philosophy expounded by the barmaid in a way that brings to mind the gravedigger's confuting remarks about the painful existence of man. Her advice which is colored by *carpe-diem* background has become exemplary,

You will never find that life for which you are looking. When the gods created man they allotted to him death, but life they retained in their own keeping. As for you, Gilgamesh, fill your belly with good things; day and night, night and day, dance and be merry, feast and rejoice. Let your clothes be fresh, bath yourself in water, cherish the little child that holds your hand, and make your wife happy in your embrace; for this is the lot of man.⁽³⁸⁾

To enhance this badly-needed lesson, Gilgamesh has the sage of the epic emphasize the transience and fleeting nature of all things,

Do we build a house forever? Do we seal a contract for all times?
Do brothers divide shares forever?
Does hostility last forever between enemies?

.....
From the beginning there is no permanence.
The sleeping and the dead, how like brothers!(IX. ii. 26-31)

Due to his excessive thinking, Hamlet's speculation about this issue turns into a kind of obsession and is seen in its physical and metaphysical contexts. Even before encountering the messenger of death(the ghost), Hamlet's mind is already preoccupied with it as seen in his "inky cloak" and his clipped, equivocal statements and the "darkness" and the sun and "son". Hamlet, as it were, has been isolated from the rest by the terrible and incurable blow of death. But what goes on in the mean time outside the castle is something else: it is part and parcel of this towering theme of death. Even the skeptic Horatio can only react with shock and terror, "it harrows me with fear and wonder" (I. i. 43). The idea of corruption and incest engages Hamlet's mind even before the ghost and his terror-stricken images,

O that this too sullied flesh would melt
Thaw, and resolve itself into a dew.
Or that the everlasting had not fixed
His canon 'gainst self-slaughter. God, God,
How weary, stale, flat and unprofitable
Seem to me all the uses of this world!(I. ii. 129-33)

Again this line of argument is felt in his “ To be or not to be” where he wishes all the toils and pains could be finished with “ a bare bodkin. ” Gilgamesh, after his friend’s death, is totally engrossed by its fear and presence “ Death lives in the house where my bed is;/ and whenever I set my feet, there Death is”(XI. v. 232-33). If Gilgamesh gets engrossed and distracted by this problem so that he becomes more and more careless about his appearance, Hamlet too appears and has the inner feeling of “ a beggar”. Even the gravedigger fails to identify him because of that. In all the significant scenes of the play(the decisive encounter with Ophelia, and its advice or order of going “ to a nunnery”; the players’ enacting of Hecuba’s agony; the impending death of the warriors of Fortinbras’s army; the interview with his mother and its subsequent death of Polonius), death is brought to the fore as a disruptive force both in its literal and metaphoric senses. But it is in the graveyard scene that the full conceptualization and abstraction of this subject is unfurled. Here Yorick’s skull triggers off all types of perceptions about his favorite topic,

Hamlet To what base uses we may return, Horatio!
 Why may not imagination trace the noble
 dust of Alexander, till a find it stopping
 a bung-hole?
 Horatio ’T were to consider too curiously consider so-
 Hamlet ’N faith, not a jot about to follow him thither
 with modesty enough and likelihood to lead
 it, as thus: Alexander died, Alexander was
 buried, Alexander returnth to dust, the dust
 is earth... (V. i. 171-177).

Whether the hero has to embark on that journey beset by all sorts of risks and threats (Gilgamesh) or has to take this horrible idea of death to heart so that all his visions are deeply affected by it(Hamlet), the two are to reconcile themselves to this terrifying fact. Gilgamesh is privileged with one thing that Hamlet never dreams of attaining: his actual meeting with the representatives of those who received the boon of immortality, (Utnapishtem, his wife, daughter, and boatman(Urshanabi). Although he gets the plant, Gilgamesh as an Everyman loses it in a moment of carelessness and exhaustion. Man, in short, is doomed to decay and only his acts can bestow immortality on him(Gilgamesh’s erecting the high walls of Uruk or his art as in the case of *Hamlet*.

This brings to the other common point between the two: both belong to the literature of edification and wisdom. The “ timeless” appeal of the epic ⁽³⁹⁾ is partly a result of its profound contemplation of human existence. Not only is man doomed to live a very short life but also he is subject to so many pressures

and afflictions. In his simple and spontaneous way, Gilgamesh describes the matter in this way,

Who, my friends, (says Gilgamesh) is superior to death?
Only the gods live forever under the sun.
As for mankind, numbered are their days;
Whatever they achieve is but the wind.⁽⁴⁰⁾

Is not this concluding statement absurdist in its main thrust, running in parallel lines to Hamlet's early arguments? The meditations about Alexander's status align themselves with Gilgamesh's views, since all the renown and pomp of this great historic figure does not save him from the humiliation and encroachment of such a vulgar gravedigger.

The other equally significant element they share and from which the title of this attempt is derived is the necessity of "not violating the boundaries between mortals and gods"⁽⁴¹⁾ and the serious danger of giving free rein to one's imaginings and fancies. If it happens that for once a human being reaches such a position (Utnapishtem), this position is not attained without great sacrifices and full conformity to gods' directives (Tear down The house/ Build an ark/ Abandon riches/ Seek life/Scorn possessions, hold on to life/ Load the seed of every living being into your ark, the boat that you will build"(XI. i. 24-28). In his solitude, Hamlet finds himself prey to many wild ideas about life and death. Indeed he raises many existential questions particularly in the first section of the play. To be precise, the two important soliloquies in *Hamlet*, "To be or not to be" and the one triggered off by the player's moving speech are meant to be a critique or unravelling of what dangers excessive thinking might incur,

Sure he that made us with such a large discourse,
Looking before and after, gave us not
That capacity and god-like reason
To fust in us unused(IV. iv. 3-6).

It is true that Hamlet does not keep this "god-like" faculty unused, but he has over-used it so that it turns to its opposite, a danger of breaching the common norms and laws. Prof. Knight rightly calls him "an inhuman- or superhuman presence, whose consciousness ... is centered on death".⁽⁴²⁾ Hamlet, one can easily infer, has gone too far in his speculations and broodings.

The patriotic sense of *Gilgamesh* is evident in the hero's great risks he undertakes for the sake of his people,

I will carry it to the Uruk of the Sheepfold ;
I will carry it to the elders to eat ;

They divide the plant among them
Its name is The-Old-Man-Will-Be-Made-Young
I too will eat it, and I will return to what I was in my youth”(XI.vi. 279-82).

Perhaps such an unprecedented step is a belated attempt to redeem his former indulgences and the sufferings he has caused. At the failure of such an ambitious project, Gilgamesh makes do with the act of engineering and building the high walls of Uruk for which he is currently remembered.

In Hamlet’s case, although he eventually redeems the sins and outrageous acts committed in his country by his own blood and physical sacrifices, his inner problem is essentially individual: he wants to put an end to his own disgrace and humiliation, “ O God, Horatio, what a wounded name/ Things standing thus unknown, shall live behind me!(V. ii. 322-3)

In short, *Gilgamesh* and *Hamlet* have many things in common in terms of structures, characterization, themes and final objectives as instruction and warning for all mankind. Despite the striking differences between them in their literary modes, the intellectual and religious backgrounds, the two texts do carry common postulates about certain norms, values and principles. Above all both advocate the necessity of recognizing the mystery and unpredictability of the human predicament and how it is safe to keep away from the baffling questions of existence that are beyond human scope.

محاولة لتبيان اوجه التشابه والتوازي بين الملحمة السومرية الكلاسيكية، جلجامش ومسرحية "هاملت" في عصر النهضة

صبار سعدون، كلية الآداب، جامعة الاسراء، عمان، الأردن.

ملخص

البحث التالي محاولة لتبيان اوجه التشابه والتوازي بين الملحمة السومرية الكلاسيكية، جلجامش ومسرحية "هاملت" في عصر النهضة. يبدأ البحث بتوضيح الأسباب الكامنة وراء مثل هذا الموضوع الخارج عن المألوف والمنهجية التي اعتمدها. ويسعى الى رصد النقاط الأساسية في التشخيص والصدقات بين الرجال والأدوار الضارة التي تضطلع بها المرأة في كلا العملين.

وكما توضح الصفحات التالية أن العمليين يشتركان بالمواضيع والمفاهيم حول الوضع الإنساني وعجز الإنسان ازاء ما تخفي له الأيام من مكابدات .

* The paper was received on June 1, 2005 and accepted for publication on June 12, 2006.

Notes

1. William Shakespeare, *Tragedies*, Vol. I. , introd. Tony Tanner(London: Everyman, 1906), p. xxi.
2. Rene Wellek, *Concepts of Literature*, ed. Stephen G. Nicholas, Jr. (New Haven&London:Yale UP, 1965), p. 291.
3. John Fletcher, “ The Criticism of Comparison: The Approach through Comparative Literature and Intellectual History, ” *Stratford-Upon-Avon- Studies, 12, Contemporary Criticism*(London: Edward Arnold, 1970), p. 125.
4. *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, trans. and introd. N. R. Sanders (London: Penguin, 1960), p. 7.
5. Alexander Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels* (Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 1946), p. 1.
6. Samuel N. Kramer, *The Tablets of Sumer* (Indiana Hills, Colorado: The Falcon’s Wing Press, 1956), p. 322.
7. Khalilk Kunsul, “ A New Reading of Gilgamesh”, *The Cultural Journal*, 59(Sept. , 1983), (Amman, University of Jordan), p. 262. (in Arabic)
8. Philip Edwards(ed.), *Hamlet: The Prince of Denmark*(Cambridge: CUP, 1985), p. 32.
9. Jacqueline Rose, “ Hamlet—the Mona Lisa of Literature, ” *A Shakespeare Reader: Sources and Criticism*, ed. Richard Danson Brown& David Johnson(London: Mamillan, 2000), p. 19.
10. Harry Levin, *Refractions: Essays on Comparative Literature*(Oxford: OUP, 1968), p. 117.
11. *Ibid.* , p. 120.
12. Shishoko Hamada, “ Kojin and Hamlet: The Madness of Hamlet, Ophelia and Ichiro, ” *Comparative literature Studies*, Vol. 33, No. 1(Sept. , 1996), p. 61.
13. A. C. Bradley, *The Shakespearean Tragedy*(London: Macmillan, 1904(1992), p. 122.
14. Robin Mary, *Who Was Shakespeare? The Man-The Times-The Works*(Newton Abbot: David& Charles, 1974), p. 74.
15. John Dover Wilson, *What Happens In Hamlet*(Cambridge: CUP, 1935(1979), p. 287.
16. A. C. Bradley, *op. cit.* , p. 85.

17. *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, trans. John Gardner & John Maier (NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1984), p. 32. All subsequent citations are to this edition and will appear in text parenthetically.
18. Janette Dillon, *Shakespeare and the Solitary Man* (London: Macmillan, 1981), p. 116.
19. Chester G. Starr, *Early Man: Prehistory and the Civilization of the Ancient Near East* (NY: OUP, 1973), p. 91.
20. Elizabeth Lansing, *The Sumerians: Inventors and Builders* (London: Cassell, 1974), p. 35.
21. Mick Lacey, *Narrative and Genre: Key Concepts in Media Studies* (London: Palgrave, 2000), p. 79.
22. *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, trans. N. K. Sanders, *op. cit.*, p. 21.
23. Quoted in Chrisy Desment and Robert Sawyer (eds.), *Harold Bloom's Shakespeare* (NY: Palgrave, 1993), p. 110.
24. Wolfgang H. Clemen, "The Imagery of Hamlet," *Hamlet: A Case Book*, ed. John Jump (London: Macmillan, 1968), p. 66.
25. Reuben A. Brower, *Hero & Saint: Shakespeare and the Graeco-Roman Heroic Tradition* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), p. 314.
26. James Wellard, *By the Waters of Babylon* (London: Hutchinson, 1972), p. 104.
27. *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, trans. and introd. Taha Bakir (Baghdad: Ministry of Information, 1975), p. 74. (in Arabic)
28. *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, trans. John Gardner, *op. cit.*, p. 21.
29. James Wellard, *By the Waters of Babylon*, *op. cit.*, p. 104.
30. Alexander Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels*, *op. cit.*, p. 4.
31. Jan Kott, *The Memory of the Body: Essays on Theatre and Death* (Evanston: Northwestern UP, 1992), p. 127.
32. Fadhil A. Ali, "The Epic of Gilgamesh," *Aalem Al Fikr*, Vol. 16, No. 1 (April-June, 1985), (Kuwait: Ministry of Information), p. 40 (in Arabic)
33. Elizabeth Lansing quotes his innate drive of restlessness and instability, "Why", asked his mother of the sun god, Utu, "having given me Gilgamesh for a son, with a restless heart didst thou endow him?", *The Sumerians*, *op. cit.*, p. 140.
34. Jan Kott, *The Memory of the Body*, *op. cit.*, p. 140.
35. Claude Bonnefoy, *Conversations with Eugene Ionesco*, trans. Jan Dawson (NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970), p. 49.
36. G. Wilson Knight, *Shakespeare and Religion: Essays of Forty Years* (London: RKP, 1967), p. 43.
37. H. D. Kitto, "Hamlet as Religious Drama," *Hamlet: A Case Book*, *op. cit.*, p. 113.
38. *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, trans. N. K. Sanders, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

39. James S. Pritchard(ed.), *The Ancient Near East: An Anthology of Texts* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1958), P. 40.
40. Quoted in Chester G. Starr, *Early Man, op. cit.* , p. 91.
41. *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, trans. , John Gardner, *op. cit.* , p. 21.
42. Quoted in John Jump(ed.), *Hamlet: A Case Book, op. cit.* , p. 40.

References

- Ali, Fadhil A. " The Epic of Gilgamesh, " *Aalem Alfikr*, 16, (April-June, 1985), 35-71.
- Bonnefry, Claude. *Conversations with Eugene Ionesco*, trans. , Jan Dawson. NY: Holt, Rhinehart& Winston, 1970.
- Bradley, A. C. *The Shakespearean Tragedy*. London: Macmillan, 1904(1992).
- Brower, Reuben A. *Hero and Saint: Shakespeare and the Graeco- Roman Heroic Tradition*. Oxford:Clarendon Press, 1971.
- Desment, Christy& Robert Sawyer(eds.). *Harold Bloom's Shakespeare*. NY: Palgrave, 1993.
- Dillon, Janette. *Shakespeare and the Solitary Man*. London: Macmillan, 1981.
- Edwards, Phillip(ed.)*Hamlet: The Prince of Denmark*. Cambridge:CUP, 1985.
- The Epic of Gilgamesh*. Trans. John Gardner& John Maier. NY:Alfreda. Knopf, 1984.
- _____. Trans. N. K. Sanders. London: Penguin, 1960.
- _____. Trans. Taha Bakir. Baghdad: Ministry of Information, 1975.
- Fletcher, John. "The Criticism of Comparison: The Approach Through Contemp-orary Literature and Intellectual History, " *Stratford-Upon-Avon Studies, 12, Contemporary Criticism*. London: Edward Arnold, 1970. pp. 107-30.
- Hamadi, Shishko. " Kojin and Hamlet: The Madness of Hamlet, Ophelia and Ichiro, " *Comparative Studies*, 33(Sept. , 1996), 59-73.
- Heidel, Alexander. *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1946.
- Jump, John(ed.) *Hamlet: A Case Book*. London: Macmillan, 1968.
- Knight, g. Wilson. *Shakespeare and Religion: Essays of Forty Years*. London:RKP, 1967.
- Kott, Jan. *The Memory of the Body: Essays on Theatre and Death*.Evanston: Northwestern UP, 1992.

- Kramer, Samuel N. *The Tablets of Sumer*. Indiana Hills, Colorado: The Falcon's Wing, 1956.
- Kunsul, Khalil. "A New Reading of Gilgamesh," *The Cultural Journal*, 59, (Sept., 1983), Amman: University of Jordan.
- Lacey, Mick. *Narrative and Genre: Key Concepts in Media Studies*. London: Palgrave, 2000.
- Lansing, Elizabeth. *The Sumerians: Inventors and Builders*. London: Cassell, 1974.
- Levin, Harry. *Refractions; Essays on Comparative Literature*. Oxford: OUP, 1968.
- Mary, Robin. *Who Was Shakespeare? The Man-The Time- The Works*. Newton Abbot: David & Charles, 1974.
- Pritchard, James S. (ed.) *The Ancient Near East: An Anthology of Texts*. Princeton :Princeton University Press, 1958.
- Rose, Jacqueline. "Hamlet—the Mona Lisa of Literature," *A Shakespeare Reader: Sources and Criticism*, ed. Richard Dawson & David Johnson. London: Macmillan, 2000.
- Shakespeare, William. *Tragedies*, Vol. 1, introd. , Tony Tanner. London: Macmillan, 1906.
- Starr, Chester G. *Early Man: Prehistory and the Civilization of the Ancient Near East*. NY: OUP, 1973.
- Wellard, James. *By the Waters of Babylon*. London: Hutchinson, 1972.
- Wellek, Rene. *Concepts of Criticism*, ed. Stephen G. Nichols, Jr. New Haven & London: Yale UP, 1965.
- Wilson, John Dover. *What Happens in Hamlet*. Cambridge: CUP, 1935(1979).