

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abusch, T 1993. Gilgamesh's Request and Siduri's Denial, in Cohen, ME Snell, DC & Weisberg, BD (ed), *The Tablet and the Scroll – Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William W. Hallo*. Maryland: CDL Press, 1 – 14.
- Abusch, T 1986. Ishtar's Proposal and Gilgamesh's Refusal: An Interpretation of the *Epic Tablet VI Lines 1 – 79*, in *History of Religions*, 143 – 187.
- Bal, M 1986. *De Theorie van Vertellen en Verhalen. Inleiding in de Narratologie*. Muiderberg: Coutinho.
- Boshoff, W & Sheffler, E 2000. The World of the Ancient Near East in Boshoff W, Scheffler E & Spangenberg I (eds), *Ancient Israelite Literature in Context*. Pretoria: Protea, 18 –57.
- Bottéro, J & Petchow, H 1972-1975. "Hierodules" in *Reallexicon der Assyriology, Band 4*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 459-468.
- Caplice, R 1988. *Introduction to Akkadian*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.
- Damrosch, D 1987. *The Narrative Covenant. Transformations of Genre in the Growth of Biblical Narrative*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Davis, C & Schleifer, R 1991. *Criticism and Culture. The role of Critique in Modern Literary Theory*. Essex: Longman Group UK Limited.
- De Jongh, M 1983. 'n Kritiese beskouing van die standverskille tussen teks en leser, veral by literatuuronderrig, in Malan, C (red), *Letterkunde en Leser*, Pretoria: Butterworth, 43-64.
- Denning-Bolle, S 1992. *Wisdom in Akkadian Literature. Expression, Instruction, Dialogue*. Leiden: Ex Oriente Lux.

- De Villiers, GG 2000. *Gilgamesh sien die Diepte: van Skande tot Eer*. Unpublished MA-thesis. University of Pretoria.
- De Villiers, GG & Prinsloo, GTM 2002. Gilgamesh sees the Deep: from Shame to Honour in *Journal for Semitics 11:1*, 23 – 43.
- Du Plooy, H & Viljoen, H 1992. Benaderingswyses in the Literatuurwetenskap, in Cloete, TT (ed). *Literêre Terme en Teorieë*. Pretoria: HAUM Literêr, 25 – 38.
- Eagleton, T 1983. *Literary Theory. An Introduction*. England: Basil Blackwell Publisher Limited.
- Edzard, DO 1967. The Early Dynastic Period, in Bottéro, J *et al*, *The Near East: The Early Civilizations*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 52-90.
- Ferguson, P 1994. Nebuchadnezzar, Gilgamesh and the Babylonian Job in *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 37:3 (Sept)*, 321-331.
- Fokkelman, JP 1999. *Reading Biblical Narrative*. Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Freund, E 1987. *The Return of the Reader. Reader-Response Criticism*. London: Methuen.
- Genette, G 1988. *Narrative Discourse Revisited*. Ithaca: New York Cornell University Press.
- Genette, G 1980. *Narrative Discourse*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- George, AR 2003. *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic. Introduction, Critical Edition and Cuneiform Texts, Volumes I & II*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

George, AR 1999. *The Epic of Gilgamesh. A New Translation*. New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc.

Hansen, W 2001. In het vuur gehard: Gilgamesj-epos na vijfduizend jaar nog steeds onverwoestbaar, in *de Volkskrant*, 16 November 2001.

Hardman, PD 1993. *Male Bonding from Gilgamesh to the Present*. San Francisco: Division GLB Publishers.

Harris, R 1972-1975. "naditu" in *Reallexicon der Assyriologie, Band 4*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 391-393.

Holub, RC 1984. *Reception Theory. A critical introduction*. London: Methuen.

Jackson, DP 1992. *The Epic of Gilgamesh*. Wauconda: Bolchazy-Carducci.

Jacobsen, T 1976. *The Treasures of Darkness*. London: Yale University Press.

Jauss, HR 1982. *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Great Britain: The Harvester Press Limited.

Kapelrud, AS 1993. You Shall Surely Not Die in Lemaire, A & Otzen, B (red), *Histories and Traditions of Early Israel*. Leiden: EJ Brill, 50 – 61.

Kloek, JJ 1978. Vielen de Juffrouwen van 'Erzelven? of Is receptiegeschiedenis mogelijk? in Segers, RT (ed), *Receptie Estetika, Grondslagen, Theorie en toepassing*. Amsterdam: Huis aan de drie Grachten, 87 – 107.

Kuhrt, A 1995. *The Ancient Near East c.3000-330 BC Vol I*. London: Routledge.

Loader, JA 2003. The Primeval Narrative, in *Old Testament Essays 16:2*, 309 – 321.

- Malina, BJ 1993. *The New Testament World. Insights from Cultural Anthropology*. Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Martin, W 1986. *Recent Theories of Narrative*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- McCall, H 2001. *Mesopotamian Myths*. London: The British Museum Press.
- Mc Hale, B 1987. *Postmodernist Fiction*. New York & London: Methuen.
- Nemet-Nejat, KR 2002. *Daily Life in Ancient Mesopotamia*. Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Nida, EA 1964. *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: EJ Brill.
- Ohloff, H 1985. Hoofbenaderings in die literatuurstudie, in Cloete, TT (red): *Gids by die Literatuurstudie*. Pretoria: HAUM Literêr, 31-64.
- Parker, D & Parker J 1979. *The Compleat Astrologer*. London: Mitchell Beazly Limited.
- Parpola, S 1999. *The Standard Babylonian Epic of Gilgamesh*. Finland: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project.
- Pollock, S 1999. *Ancient Mesopotamia. The Eden that Never Was*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Postgate, JN 1994. *Early Mesopotamia. Society and Economy at the Dawn of History*. London: Routledge.
- Rimmon, S 1976. A comprehensive theory of narrative: Genette's *Figures III* and the structuralist study of fiction, in *Descriptive Journal for Poetics and Theory of Literature 1*, 33 – 62.

- Rimmon-Kenan S 1983. *Narrative Fiction. Contemporary Poetics*. London: Methuen.
- Rolliger, R 2001. Zum Kulturellen Kontext des Epos in Schrott, R, *Gilgamesh Epos*, München: Carl Hanser Verlag, 279-302.
- Roodt, PH & Pieterse, HJ 1992. Epos in Cloete, TT (ed). *Literêre Terme en Teorieë*. Pretoria: HAUM Literêr, 102 – 105.
- Saggs, HWF 1962. *The Greatness that was Babylon*. New York: Hawthorn Books Inc. Publishers.
- Schretter, M 2001. Zum Literarischen Kontext des Epos, in Schrott, R (ed), *Gilgamesh Epos*. München: Carl Hanser Verlag.
- Schrott, R 2001. *Gilgamesh Epos*. München: Carl Hanser Verlag.
- Segers, RT 1978. Grondslagen van de receptie-estetika in Segers, RT (ed), *Receptie- Estetika, Grondslagen, Theorie en Toepassing*. Amsterdam: Huis aan de drie Grachten, 9 – 19.
- Selden, R 1989. *Practicing Theory and Reading Literature: an Introduction*. Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Selden, R 1988. *The Theory of Criticism. From Plato to the Present*. England: Longman Group UK Limited.
- Selden, R 1986. *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*. Great Britain: The Harvester Press Limited.
- Senekal, J 1983. Resepsie – 'n terreinverkenning in Malan, C (ed), *Letterkunde en Leser*, Pretoria: Butterworth, 1 – 42.

- Shukman, A 1976. The canonization of the real: Juri Lotman's theory of literature and analysis of poetry, in *Journal for descriptive poetics and a theory of literature 1*, 317 -- 338.
- Sternberg, M 1990. Telling in Time (1): Chronology and Narrative Theory in *Poetics Today 11:4 (Winter 1990)*, 901 – 945.
- Sternberg, M 1985. *The Poetics of biblical Narrative*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Steymans, HU 2003. Die neuassyrische Vertragsretorik der "Vassal Treaties of Esarhaddon" und das Deuteronomium in Braulik, G (ed). *Das Deuteronomium*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 89 – 152.
- Thompson, RC 1930. *The Epic of Gilgamesh*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Tigay, J 1982. *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Tompkins, JP 1980. *Reader-response criticism. From Formalism to Post-structuralism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.
- Tolmie, DF 1999. *Narratology and Biblical Narratives: A Practical Guide*. Bethesda: International Scholars Publications.
- Van de Mieroop, M 1999. *Cuneiform Texts and the Writing of History*. London: Routledge.
- Von Soden, W 1994. *The Ancient Orient*. Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Von Soden, W 1969. *Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik*. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.

Walker, CBF 1996. Cuneiform in Hooker, JT (ed), *Reading the Past*, London: British Museum Press, 15 – 73.

Westenholz, A & Westenholz, U 2000. Enkidu – the Noble Savage? in George, AR & Finkel, IL (ed). *Wisdom, Gods & Literature. Studies in Assyriology in Honor of WG Lambert*. Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 437 – 451.

Westerman, C 1984. *Genesis 1 – 11. A Commentary*. Great Britian: SPCK.

Young, R 1981. *Untying the text: a post-structuralist reader*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Zima, PV 1999. *The Philosophy of Modern Literary Theory*. London: The Athlone Press.

DICTIONARIES CONSULTED

Akkadisches Handwörterbuch, 1965. Göttingen: Hubert & Co.

The Assyrian Dictionary, 1961. Chicago: The Oriental institute.

A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian, 2000. 2nd (corrected) printing, ed. by Black, J George, A & Postgate, N. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

ANNEXURE: THE AKKADIAN TEXT

From the walls of Uruk - and back: the *inclusio*

The whole prologue of the *Epic of Gilgamesh* is cited. The *inclusio* pertains only to I:16-21 which is echoed in XI:315-320. This *inclusio* is one of the reasons (amongst others which is pointed out in chapter 6) that scholars regard Tablets I - XI as the *Epic proper* and consider Tablet XII to be an addendum.

Tablet I:1-46

1	<i>ša nagba īmuru lušēdi māti</i>	Of the Deep that he saw, I must tell the country
2	<i>ša kullati īdū kalāma ḥassu</i>	of (him) who knew everything, total reminiscence.
3	<i>ihītma mithāriš kibrāti</i>	He equally explored regions,
4	<i>naphar nēmēqi ša kalāmi ṭhuz</i>	he grasped the totality of all wisdom -
5	<i>niširta īmurma katimta iptē</i>	he saw the secret, he uncovered the hidden.
6	<i>ubla ṭēma ša lām abūbi</i>	He brought a message of that (which was) before the Deluge,
7	<i>urḥa rūqta illikamma aniḥ u šupšuh</i>	he went a distant road, weary, though calm,
8	<i>ihruš ina narē kalu mānaḥti</i>	he inscribed all his labours on a stela.
9	<i>ušēpiš dūru ša Uruk supūri</i>	He built the city wall of Uruk-the-sheepfold
10	<i>ša Eanna qudduši šutummi elim</i>	of holy Eanna, the sacred treasure
11	<i>amur dūrsu ša kīma qū nēbhūšu</i>	See its wall! Like bronze its friezes!
12	<i>itaplas samētašu ša lā umaššalu mamma</i>	Look at its parapet that has no equal!
13	<i>šabatma askuppati ša ultu ullānu</i>	Seize the threshold of ancient times!
14	<i>qitrub ana Eanna šubat lštar</i>	Draw closer to Eanna, the abode of Ishtar
15	<i>ša šarru arkū lā umaššalū amēlu mamma</i>	that no later king can equal, nor any man.

Lines 16-21 are also repeated in **XI:315-320**: *inclusio*

16	<i>elima ana eli dūri ša Uruk itallak</i>	Go up, onto the wall of Uruk, walk around,
17	<i>temennu ḥiṭma libitta ṣubbu</i>	Take note of the foundation, inspect the brickwork!
18	<i>šumma libittašu lā agurrat</i>	Is its brickwork not burnt brick?
19	<i>u uššišu lā iddū 7 muntaliki</i>	Did the 7 sages not lay its foundations?
20	<i>1 šar ālu 1 šar kirû 1 šar issû pitir bītu Ištar</i>	One sar is city, one sar is orchard, one sar is clay pit, open ground, the house of Ishtar.
21	<i>3 šar u pitru Uruk tamḥu</i>	3 sar and open ground, Uruk, (its) measurement!

Tablet I resumes:

22	<i>šeṭma tupšinna ša erû</i>	Search for the tablet-box of copper,
23	<i>puṭur ḥargallišu ša siparru</i>	release its clasp of bronze,
24	<i>petema pû ša niširti</i>	open the lid of the secret,
25	<i>išima ṭuppi uqnû šitassi</i>	find the tablet of lapis lazuli read out aloud
26	<i>ša šu Gilgameš alāku kalu maršāti</i>	of all misfortunes that Gilgamesh went through.
27	<i>šūtur eli šarrī šanu' udu adi gatti</i>	Surpassing all kings, impressive of stature,
28	<i>qardu lillid Uruk rīmu muttakpu</i>	a hero, native of Uruk, wild butting bull.
29	<i>illak ina pāni ašared</i>	He walks in front, first:
30	<i>arka illakma tukulti aḥūšu</i>	he walks behind, supporting his brothers.
31	<i>kibru dannu ṣulūl ummannišu</i>	a mighty bank, the protection of his troops;
32	<i>agû ezzu muabbit dūru abnu</i>	a violent flood-wave that smashes a stone wall!
33	<i>emu ša Lugalbanda Gilgameš gitmālu emūqi</i>	Gilgamesh: perfect of strength, son-in-law of Lugalbanda
34	<i>māru arḥi šīrti sinništu Ninsun</i>	son of the noble cow, Wild Cow Ninsun,
35	<i>šu Gilgameš gitmālu rašubbu</i>	Gilgamesh, perfect terror!
36	<i>petû nērebeti ša ḥuršāni</i>	He opened passes in mountains,
37	<i>ḥerû būrī ša kišādu sadī</i>	he dug wells on the hill-flanks,
38	<i>ebir tâmtu tâmati rapāšuti adi šit šamši</i>	he crossed the wide ocean of oceans, as far as sunrise.
39	<i>ḥiṭ kibrāti mušte'u balaṭi</i>	World-regions he explored - seeking life,
40	<i>kašid dannūssu ana Utnapistim rūqi</i>	by his strength he reached Uta-Napishtim, the Distant.

41	<i>mutir māḥāzi ana ašrišunu ša</i> <i>uḥhalliqū abūbu</i>	He restored the cult-centres in their place that the Deluge swept away.
42	<i>mannumma ina niši apātu</i>	Who among the people of mankind,
43	<i>ša ittišu iššannanu ana šarrūti</i>	that (can) rival with him, for king?
44	<i>ša kī Gilgameš iqabbu anākuma</i> <i>šarru</i>	and can say like Gilgamesh: 'I am king!'
45	<i>Gilgameš ištu ūmum i'aldu nabi</i> <i>šumšu</i>	Gilgamesh: since the day of birth, bright was his name.

A brave man? The hunter sees Enkidu: I:96-104

96	<i>šayyādu ḥabbilu amēlu</i>	A hunter, a trapper-man
97	<i>ina pūt mašqi šāsu uštamḥiršu</i>	came face to face with him before the water- hole.
98	<i>išten ūme šana u šalša ina pūt</i> <i>mašqi</i>	The first, the second and the third day was he before the water-hole.
99	<i>ṭmuršuma šayyādu uštaḥriru</i> <i>pānušu</i>	The hunter saw him, his face became petrified,
100	<i>šu u būlišu bituššu irūma</i>	He and his herds went home,
101	<i>ṭtadir ušḥarir iqūlma</i>	he was frightened, dumbstruck, silent,
102	<i>lummun libbašu pānušu arpu</i>	his heart depressed, his face cloudy,
103	<i>ibašši nissatu ina karšišu</i>	worry was inside him,
104	<i>ana alik urḫi rūquti pānušu mašlu</i>	his face was like one who has travelled distant roads.

His complaint to his father: 1:109-111

109	<i>ittanallak ina eli šadi kayyāna</i>	He wanders on the hills all the time,
110	<i>kayyānamma itti būlim šammi ikkal</i>	he eats grass with the herd, all the time,
111	<i>kayyānamma šēpūšu ina pūt</i> <i>mašqi išakkan</i>	all the time he is with his feet in the water-hole.

Who is the brave one? 1:171-180

171	<i>urtammi Šamḥat dīdāša</i>	Shamhat let loose her underware,
172	<i>ūrša iptema kuzubša ilqi</i>	she opened her vagina, he took her charm,
173	<i>ul išḥuṭ iltiqi nappissu</i>	She was not afraid, she took his scent:
174	<i>lubūsiša umaššima eliša iṣlal</i>	She spread her clothing and he slept on her,
175	<i>ṭpussuma lullâ šipir sinnište</i>	she did to him, the primitive man, the art of a woman.
176	<i>dādusu iḥbubu eli šēriša</i>	his lust made love on her open country -
177	<i>6 urrī 7 mūšī Enkidu tebima Šamḥat irḥi</i>	6 days and 7 nights, Enkidu, erect, poured (into) Shamhat.
178	<i>ultu išbu lalāša</i>	After he was sated with her delights,
179	<i>pānišu ištakan ana šēri būlišu</i>	he turned his face to the plains of his herd.
180	<i>ṭmurašūma Enkidu irappūda šabītū</i>	The gazelles saw Enkidu and ran away

Sîn-lēqi-unninni gives the *Epic of Gilgamesh* an ironic twist. The brave trapper-man, the hunter does not have the courage to face the savage: he runs to his daddy and asks for help. Help is not provided by means of a band of men, heavily armoured, but Shamḥat, a defenceless woman is told to go along with the petrified hunter. When Enkidu does appear, the hunter vanishes completely out of the narrative altogether. Šamḥat faces the savage: what are her weapons? Nothing. She gets rid of all the protection she did have: her clothes. And it seems to work very well (see above)!

Analepsis: Shamhat explaining to Enkidu that Gilgamesh dreamt about him:

I:226-228

226	<i>lām tallika ulta šadimma</i>	Before you came from the hilltops,
227	<i>Gilgameš ina libbu Uruk inaṭṭala šunateka</i>	Gilgamesh in the heart of Uruk saw your dream.
228	<i>itbima Gilgameš šunat pašar zakra ummišu</i>	Gilgamesh arose, to solve the dream he told his mother.

Prolepsis: Ninsun revealing Gilgamesh's dream about his future friend: I:250-255

250	<i>illakakumma dannu tappū mušezib ibri</i>	A mighty comrade, saviour of a friend will come to you,
251	<i>ina māti dan emūqi īšu</i>	in the land he has mighty power,
252	<i>kīma kišri ša Anu dunnuna emūqašu</i>	like a bolt from Anu is his mighty power.
253	<i>tarâmšuma kī aššati elīšu taḥbubu</i>	You will love him like a wife, on him you will make love.
254	<i>[x x x] uštenezibka kâša</i>	[x x x] he will always safely protect you.
255	<i>damqat šuqurat šunatka</i>	Your dream is favourable.

The problematic nature of the relationship between Gilgamesh and Enkidu:

239	<i>arâmšuma kī aššati elīšu aḥbub</i>
253	<i>tarâmšuma kī aššati elīšu taḥbubu</i>
263	<i>arâmšuma kī aššati elīšu aḥbub</i>
268	<i>tarâmšuma kī aššati taḥabbub elīšu</i>

The word in question is *ḥabābu*. Both Andrew George's translations (2003:553-557; 1999:10-11) follow the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary (CAD) and interpret *elīšu* together with the different conjugated forms of *ḥabābu* as caress and embrace. Parpola (1997) apparently agrees with CAD: at the end of his transliteration of the Standard Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic he supplies a glossary in which he translates *ḥabābu* with to make love. However, Wolfram von Soden's Akkadisches Handwörterbuch translates *ḥabābu* with 'murmeln, zirpen, zwitschern' - murmel, chirp, twitter. *ḥabābu* in this particular Gilgamesh-episode, he renders as 'flüstere' - to whisper. Such an interpretation would indeed soften the homosexual undertones - or overtones if you wish. However, most translations do interpret *ḥabābu* and

Its conjugated forms in the Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic as having to do with sex: therefore also the discussion in chapter 6 on the matter.

The fight between Gilgamesh and Enkidu - II:77-97

77	<i>illak Enkidu ina pāni u Šamḥat arkišu</i>	Enkidu goes in front and Shamhat after him.
78	<i>īrumba una libbi Uruk supūri</i>	He went into the heart of Uruk-the-sheepfold
79	<i>iḫhur ummannu ina šērišu</i>	The crowd gathered on the square.
80	<i>izzizamma ina sūqi ša Uruk supūri</i>	He is stood in the street of Uruk-the-sheepfold,
81	<i>[x x x] ibēš dannutima</i>	he produced a strong bifurcation
82	<i>iptaras alakta ša Gilgameš.</i>	he blocked the path of Gilgamesh.
83	<i>Uruk mātu izzaz elīšu</i>	The Uruk-folk stood around him,
84	<i>mātu puḫḫurat ina muḫḫišu</i>	the crowd gathered around him,
85	<i>idappir ummanni eli šērišu</i>	the mob frequented the one from the steppe,
86	<i>eḫlū uktammarū elišu</i>	the young men piled up around him -
87	<i>kī šerrī la'ī unūašaḳū šēpūšu</i>	like young children they kissed his feet:
88	<i>ullānumma eḫlu bani lānšu</i>	"There (is) a young man - his figure (is) good!
89	<i>ana Išḫāra mayyāl mūšiti nadima</i>	For Ištar the bed of the night is thrown,
90	<i>ana Gilgameš kīma ili šakiššu miḫru</i>	for Gilgamesh like a god, his placing is equal!"
91	<i>Enkidu ina nābi bīti emūti ipterik šēpīšu</i>	Enkidu had blocked the door to the wedding- house with his feet,
92	<i>Gilgameš ana šurubi ul innaddin</i>	Gilgamesh was not allowed to enter.
93	<i>iššabtūma ina bābi bīti muti</i>	They seized each other in the door of the groom's house,
94	<i>ina sūgi ittegrū ikbit mātu</i>	in the street they fought, the land became weighty.
95	<i>sippi īrubū igāra itūš</i>	They entered the doorjamb: the wall shook.
96	<i>Gilgameš u Enkidu iššabtūma kīma lê iludī</i>	Gilgamesh and Enkidu seized each other like young bulls...
97	<i>ikmisma Gilgameš ina qaqqari šēpušu</i>	Gilgamesh knelt, his foot on the ground.

Scholars differ with regard to who the winner of this fight is. The verb *kamāsu* means to squat or to kneel. Obviously it would suit the plot to have Gilgamesh the winner, therefore most translations also render Gilgamesh as the victor. Indeed, cylinder seals do depict figures that are engaged in some kind of wrestling activities, presumably similar to the struggle between Gilgamesh and Enkidu (George 2003:191). However, one has to admit that the poetic nature of the narrative is highly structured and therefore one should rather hesitate before concluding too quickly that Gilgamesh is indeed the victor and Enkidu the defeated one. In fact, Jacobsen (1976:199) interprets that it is the other way around: Gilgamesh has lost the fight! The fight ends with Enkidu's words to Gilgamesh :

104 *šarrūta ša niši išimka Enlil* Enlil made you king of the people.

Jacobsen regards this declaration as a magnanimous acknowledgement of Enkidu. He has won the fight. He does not wish to humiliate the king further. Moreover, he respects the decision of the god Enlil the god who appoints and dismisses rulers as he pleases. Fair enough, Enlil made Gilgamesh king of the people and he, Enkidu accepts that. In this regard I want to point out a certain catch-line effect between lines 98 and 99. The introduction is from line 74:

74 *ana zikri eṭli triqu pānušu* On the words of the young man, his (Enkidu's) face was green.

Enkidu and Šamḥat have just arrived in Uruk and the young man had told them about the king's habit of coupling with the bride-to-be before the groom does so. Enkidu's face becomes (yellow) green [(w)arāku] presumably with anger. Why else would he pick up a fight with the notorious king?

Then, just after the fight, and Gilgamesh is kneeling with his foot on the ground (see II 97). The text continues:

98 *ipših uzzašuma inūḥ irassu* his anger relents, his breast comes to rest:
99 *ištu irassu inūḥu* as his breast comes to rest,
100 *Enkidu ana šāšuma izakkar ana* Enkidu says to Gilgamesh....
Gilgamesh

Enkidu was the one who was angry (74) and whose anger subsided (98) after he realised that he has won the fight. He does not wish to pursue the matter further. Instead, he reaches out a hand to the defeated. Furthermore, this interpretation also agrees with Jauss's theory of *violating an existing horizon of expectations*. The *existing horizon of expectations* was certainly that Gilgamesh would gain the upper hand. With an ingenious poetic twist, he does not: therefore I agree with Jacobsen's interpretation.

Towards the Cedar Forest: IV:1-20

1	<i>ana 20 bēri iksupū kusāpu</i>	at 20 double hours they broke bread;
2	<i>ana 30 bēri iškunū nubattum</i>	at 30 double hours they pitched camp;
3	<i>50 bēri illikū kal ūmu</i>	50 double hours they travelled the whole (of) the day,
4	<i>mālak arḫiti u ūmu 15 ina šalši ūmi</i> <i>iṭḫū ana šadī Labānu</i>	a month and a half's journey by the third day; they drew near to Mount Lebanon.
5	<i>ana pān šamši uḥarrū būru</i>	to the face of the sun they dug a well,
6	<i>mē iškunū ina nādīmšunu</i>	they put water in their waterskins.
7	<i>īlima Gilgameš ina muḥḫi šadī</i>	Gilgamesh went up to the top of the mountain,
8	<i>maṣḥatusu utteqqa ana [x x]</i>	he offered a flour-offering to [x x].
9	<i>šadū bila šutta amat Šamši damqi</i>	O Mountain, bring me a dream, a word from good Šamaš.
10	<i>ipušašuma Enkidu ana [x x x]</i>	Enkidu made for him [x x x]
11	<i>etiḳ šarbilli irteti [x x x]</i>	he erected a bypass (for) a breeze [x x x]
12	<i>ušnilšuma ina kippatti [x x x]</i>	he made him lie down in a circle [x x x]
13	<i>šu kī še'u māti [x x x]</i>	he, like corn of the land [x x x]
14	<i>Gilgameš ina kinšišu utamedā</i> <i>zuqatsu</i>	Gilgamesh rested his chin on his knees,
15	<i>šittum reḫat nišī elišu imqut</i>	sleep that spills over people fell upon him.
16	<i>ina qabliti šittašu uqatti</i>	in the middle his sleep ended.
17	<i>itbema ītama ana ibrišu</i>	He arose and spoke to his friend:
18	<i>ibrī ul talsanni ammīni êreku</i>	My friend, why did you not call me, why am I awake?
19	<i>ul talputananni ammīni šašaku</i>	You did not touch me, why am I confused?
20	<i>ul ilu ētiḳ ammīniḫamū šīrūa</i>	A god did not pass by, why is (my) flesh benumbed?

These 20 lines are repeated five times in this tablet: 1-20; 73-92; 109-129; 145-163; 192-197. The slight deviations and omissions from the first 20 lines are discussed in chapter 4 under the heading *Frequency*. Obviously this trip is not a pleasure ride. Gilgamesh and Enkidu do not stop to admire their scenery. They do what is necessary to move ahead as fast as possible: travel, eat, sleep.

It is remarkable though, that the whole of Tablet IV is an account of the trip to the Cedar Woods in its purpose driven stages. The whole of Tablet V - or what remains of it - relates the encounter with *Humbaba*. However, at the very end of Tablet V (line 253) the two heroes return to Uruk:

253 *u Gilgameš qaqqadu Humbaba [x x x]* and Gilgamesh [x x x] the head of Humbaba.

There are no next tablet to describe the journey back. The return is suddenly. And the victory is final.

Humbaba is slayed. Gilgamesh and Enkidu are the heroes. Ishtar falls in love with Gilgamesh. She proposes, but he turns her offer down in no uncertain terms. She retaliates with her beloved pet, the Bull of Heaven, but Gilgamesh and Enkidu slay this monster as well. They celebrate their victory regardless of Ishtar's sorrow.

That night the great gods are in counsel. Gilgamesh and Enkidu have pushed their luck too far. Their time has run out. One of them shall die. It shall be Enkidu.

Gilgamesh cracks up. He becomes clinically depressed. He cannot do his work. He does not take care of his appearance. Clad only in the skin of a lion, he roams the steppe.

A long lament: re-inventing Enkidu

Gilgamesh is roaming the steppe. Wild, unkempt as Enkidu once had been, he is now. Gilgamesh is Enkidu re-invented. The only difference is that when Enkidu roamed the steppe, he was care-free and contented: Gilgamesh on the other hand is deeply worried and driven by fear. Here, in Tablet X, he has just met Siduri, the barmaid:

University of Pretoria etd – De Villiers, G (2005)

47	Gilgameš ana šašima izakkara ana sābitum	Gilgamesh said to her, to the barmaid:
48	kī lā akla lētaīa lā quddudu pānūa	Should my cheeks not be hollow, my face not sunken?
49	lā lummun libbī lā qatu zīmūa	Should my heart not be wretched, my features not wasted?
50	lā ibašši nissatu ina karšīa	Should agony not exist in my stomach,
51	ana alik urḫi rūqati pānūa lā mašlu	and my face be like one who has travelled a distant road?
52	ina sarbi u šeti lā qummu pānūa	Should not my face be burnt by frost and heat,
53	maški labbi lā labšakuma lā arappud šeri	should I not wear a lion-skin, should I not roam the plains?
54	ibrī kūdanu ṭardu akkannu ša šadī nimru ša šeri	My friend, a mule on the run, a wild donkey of the hills, panther of the steppe,
55	Enkidu ibrī kūdanu ṭardu KI.MIN	Enkidu, my friend, a mule on the run, a wild donkey of the hills, panther of the steppe,
56	ša ninnenduma nīlu šadâ	We joined (forces), we went up the mountain,
57	nišbatuma alâ nināru	we seized the Bull of Heaven, we slayed (him),
58	nušalpitu ḫumbaba ša ina qišti erēni ašbu	we overcame ḫumbaba who lived in the Cedar Woods,
59	ina nērebetī ša šadī nidūku nēsī	in mountain passes we killed lions.
60	ibrī ša arāmmu danniš ittīa ittallaku kalâ maršāti	My friend whom I love deeply(who) with me went through every danger,
61	Enkidu ša arāmu danniš ittīa ittallaku KI.MIN	Enkidu whom I love deeply, (who) with me went through every danger,
62	ikšudu šīmat amēluti	the fate of mankind overtook him!
63	6 urrī u 7 mūšātī elšu abki	Six days and seven nights I wept over him
64	ul addišu ana qebēri	I did not give him up for burial
65	adi tūltu imqut ina appišu	until a maggot fell from his nostril.
66	ādurma mūta aplaḫma arappud šeri	I was scared, I feared death, I roamed the steppe.
67	amat ibrīa kabtat elīa	The case of my friend is heavy on me,
68	urḫa rūqata arappud šeri	(on) a distant road I roam the steppe.
69	amat Enkidu ibrīa KI.MIN	The case of Enkidu is heavy on me
70	ḫarrānu rūqata arappud šeri	(on) a distant path I roam the steppe.
71	kīkī luskut kīkī luqūl	How can I be silent? How can I be quiet?
72	ibrī ša arāmmušu ītemi ṭittīš	My friend whom I loved, turned to clay,

73	Enkidu ibrī ša arâmmu ĩtemi ııııııııı	Enkidu whom I loved, turned to clay.
74	anâku ul kî šâšuma anēlamma	I, shall I not lie down like him?
75	ul atebba dūr dār	Shall I not rise, for ever (and) ever?

This long lament occurs thrice in Tablet X: 47- 75; 121-146; 221-248. What Gilgamesh has said to Siduri, he repeats firstly to Urshanabi and then to Utanapištim. Obsessive compulsive thoughts about death and dying were triggered by the death of a beloved friend. Now he cannot get rid of them, regardless of any good advice. Gilgamesh's reasoning remains stuck until he is shocked back to reality - not by means of success but by means of failure.

Yet, surprisingly a narrative of failure, of shame turns into one of success, of honour. Exactly how this happens is a mystery. The *Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic* does not have *Seven Steps to Success* or anything likewise. Its pedagogical nature is disguised by *narrative*. Perhaps the ancient readers did have *Seven Steps to Success*. Readers today have *success-recipes* that fit the time. But *success formulae* that are directed to a specific time and place are bound to become dated.

The *Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic* invites its reader to pause on the walls of his or her life: to look at it, but from a distance. Only then can life be re-interpreted and the narrative of one's own story be re-written, hopefully differently focalised.

In the end the *Epic of Gilgamesh* is also *narû*-literature for the twenty first century. In a positivist success-driven society, one is easily discouraged by failure. No-one likes to admit failure. In submitting a CV for a job-application, no-one would dream of including those rather embarrassing moments when life did not turn out too well, those moments of failure, of despondency. *The Standard Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic* would certainly not be a recommendation for a job these days.

Somehow the *Epic of Gilgamesh* becomes strikingly post-modern wisdom. King Gilgamesh obtained life everlasting not by means of success, but by means of failure. Why not admit failure? Why not learn by one's mistakes? Why not embrace the paradox of life? Why not embrace life? Why not live?