

tual auch aufgrund einer mündlichen, mehr oder weniger präzisen Tradition, die in ihrem Kern auf den jeweiligen Ritualexperten zurückgeht, erstmals verschriftlicht haben. Schließlich ist jedoch auch in Betracht zu ziehen, daß die Texte lediglich diesen ritualkundigen Personen zugeschrieben wurden.⁷

Ch. is certainly to be congratulated for providing the research community not only with current, high-quality editions of three groups of ritual texts, but also with well considered observations and insights into the processes by which those texts may have emerged.

JARED L. MILLER – Mainz/München

MOUTON, ALICE: *Rêves hittites. Contribution à une histoire et une anthropologie du rêve en Anatolie ancienne.* (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 28). Leiden/Boston: Brill 2007. xxx, 346 S. 16,8 × 24,7 cm. ISBN 978-90-04-16024-8. Preis: € 84,00.

Over the last fifty years the dream in the ancient Near East has enjoyed considerable scholarly interest.¹ But whereas numerous studies on ancient Mesopotamian, Egyptian and Israelite dreams have seen the light of day, until recently only a few smaller articles had been published on Hittite oneirology and oneiromancy.² Now a much required systematic study of Hittite dreams has finally appeared. Mouton analyses Hittite dream-terminology and the contexts of the sources (Ch. I), Hittite dream-conceptions (Ch. II), and the role the dream played in Hittite daily life (Ch. III). The greater part of this work, however, consists of an impressive corpus of 133 (fragments of) Hittite dream-texts (Ch. IV). Transcriptions and translations of more than forty of these texts are presented here for the first time, which adds greatly to the value of the book. Among these texts are (fragments of) historical texts, rituals, royal dream-reports, and a large number of divinatory texts. Through the publication of this collection of dream-texts and the discussion of these texts an important contribution has been made to the study of Hittite and ancient Near Eastern oneirology and oneiromancy. This being said, I will now concentrate on a number of issues from the introductory chapters.

First, there is the issue surrounding the use of the word 'anthropology'. When it is given such a central position as in a title ("... une anthropologie du rêve ..."), one expects the investigation to be somehow connected to the concepts, methods, and theoretical frameworks used by anthropologists today. But such a connection is not established in this work. Here 'anthropology' is defined "dans son acception la plus large" as "l'étude de l'homme et de son comportement" (xxiii, n. 14). Although there is nothing wrong with this definition, one may wonder whether a simple 'inquiry into the dream', or anything of the like, would not have been less ambiguous. Perhaps the term 'anthropological' was thought to suit the central questions addressed in this investigation, namely those related to Hittite notions concerning the origin of dreams, and to the value of dreams in the lives

¹ The first general study of ancient Near Eastern oneirology and oneiromancy is considered to be A.L. Oppenheim's *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East with a Translation of an Assyrian Dream-Book*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society NS 46/3 (Philadelphia 1956).

² These are briefly discussed by Mouton on pages xxi–xxiii of the introduction.

of Hittites. But such questions have been addressed in numerous works on ancient Near Eastern dreams, yet have never been called anthropological.³ In the introduction it is stated that “La voie de l’anthropologie n’a été que superficiellement explorée dans le domaine du rêve au Proche-Orient ancien” (xxiii). If we interpret “la voie de l’anthropologie” here as research in which the concepts, notions and insights deriving from the discipline of anthropology are used, this investigation does not follow that road either. If, however, we interpret it as a ‘study of mankind and its behavior’, several studies, including this one, have followed that road for many miles. One thing is for sure though; this is the first study to address these issues using primarily a *Hittite* corpus of dream-texts.

Next, a few comments should be made on a number of smaller issues addressed in chapter II (“La nature des rêves d’après les textes hittites”).

On page 31 n. 5 the *ὄνειροπόλος* mentioned in the *Iliad* (I.62–63) is said to be an “oniocrite”, whereas A.H.M. Kessels, who is referred to in this place, concluded that “in this passage it means ‘Traumseher’ rather than ‘Traumdeuter’”.⁴ On page 54 n. 87, however, this conclusion is followed by Mouton: “Même la Grèce homérique ne semble pas connaître d’oniocrite spécialisé.” It should also be noted that Kessels’ view on (the absence of) official dream-interpretation in Homeric times has been criticized.⁵

On pages 37 n. 28 and 52 n. 81 the dreams of Pharaoh (Gen. 41) are said to have been interpreted by Daniel instead of by Joseph.

On page 50 n. 72 the Ramesside dream-book⁶ is said to be “sans doute une copie ramesside d’un original du début du deuxième millénaire”.⁷ In more recent literature,

³ For discussions of the nature and origin of the dream in the ancient Near East see e.g. Oppenheim, *The Interpretation of Dreams* 225–237; J.-M. Husser, *Le songe et la parole. Etude sur le rêve et sa fonction dans l’ancien Israël* (Berlin/New York 1994) 17–25 (ancient Israel); S.A.L. Butler, *Mesopotamian Conceptions of Dreams and Dream Rituals*. AOAT 258 (Münster 1998) 25–57; 73–94; K. Szpakowska, *Behind Closed Eyes. Dreams and Nightmares in Ancient Egypt* (Swansea 2003) 15–40 (Egypt); A. Zgoll, *Traum und Welterleben im antiken Mesopotamien. Traumtheorie und Traumpraxis im 3.–1. Jahrtausend v. Chr. als Horizont einer Kulturgeschichte des Träumens*. AOAT 333 (Münster 2006) 259–299 (not yet available to Mouton). In the chapter on the dream in Hittite daily life (Ch. III) Mouton focuses on three aspects of the dream, i.e. “Le rêve et la pureté”, “Le rêve et la maladie” and “Le rêve et la mort”. For previous discussions of the dream and purity see e.g. Butler, op. cit. 62–65; 68–69; 191–194; of the dream and illness, e.g. Butler op. cit. 52–57; 89–95; T. Abusch, *Witchcraft and the Anger of the Personal God*, in: T. Abusch/K. van der Toorn (eds.), *Mesopotamian Magic. Textual, Historical, and Interpretative Perspectives* (Groningen 1999) 83–121 *passim*; W. Sommerfeld, *Traumdeutung als Wissenschaft und Therapie im Alten Orient*, in: A. Karenberg/C. Leitz (eds.), *Heilkunde und Hochkultur I* (Münster 2000) 213–218; Szpakowska, op. cit. 162–166 (Egypt); of the dream and death, e.g. Butler, op. cit. 59–61; 70–72; 78–79; Szpakowska, op. cit. 21–27 (Egypt).

⁴ A.H.M. Kessels, *Studies on the Dream in Greek Literature*. Dissertation Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht (Apeldoorn 1973) 18.

⁵ E.g. by R.G.A. van Lieshout, *Greeks on Dreams* (Utrecht 1980) 165–167.

⁶ P. Chester Beatty III, *recto* (ed. A.H. Gardiner, *Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum*. Third Series. Chester Beatty Gift I [London 1935]).

⁷ Reference is made to S. Sauneron, *Les songes et leur interprétation dans l’Égypte ancienne*, in: A.M. Esnoud/P. Garcelli (eds.), *Les songes et leur interprétation*. Sources Orientales 2 (Paris 1959) 33.

however, the possibility of an origin in Ramesside times (13th c. BC) has been left open.⁸

On page 51 it is implied that the Hittite dream-book fragment reflects a Hittite environment despite the fact that it is called a possible translation from an Akkadian original (50). Does the author think that only those dream-omens which suited a Hittite environment were translated?

On page 51 Mouton states: “Il a souvent été dit que l’oniromancie était une discipline divinatoire mineure compte tenu du peu de textes la mentionnant, en comparaison avec l’énorme corpus préservé pour l’extispicine par exemple. En réalité, le nombre limité de témoignages concernant le songe ne prouve pas forcément le peu d’importance du rêve mais simplement le caractère marginal de la discipline oniromantique.” The construction of this argument is somewhat askew: at first the author seems to disagree with what is frequently stated about oneiromancy, then it turns out that she disagrees with another thing and shares the general view on oneiromancy after all.

On page 52 it is argued that the production of dream-books in Mesopotamia should be seen as an attempt by the diviners to monopolize dream-interpretation: “Seuls les membres de cette caste avaient accès à ces ouvrages et ils ont probablement tenté de les garder secrets, ce qui leur permettait de conserver leur monopole sur l’interprétation des rêves du roi en particulier et de jouir ainsi d’un pouvoir politique non négligeable.” Though it might be true that the diviners desired to have some political influence, it is impossible for us to ascertain, on the basis of the few extant ‘royal dream-omens’,⁹ if dream-interpretation could really have been used as a vehicle for obtaining such power, or for even marginally influencing royal policy. Furthermore, it is doubtful that they needed to preserve their monopoly as *royal* interpreters in the first place. There are at least no indications that there was any competition with other (types of) oneirocritics for this position. And even if there were rival oneirocritics, writing the omens down and guarding them would not have effected a monopoly: the rivals would have had their own sets of omens and methods of interpretation. The same holds true for dream-interpretation outside the palace, with the one difference that here, as Mouton observes herself, it cannot be monopolized: “ils ne réussirent sans doute jamais à s’accaparer entièrement l’oniocritique, car une tradition populaire devait perdurer parallèlement” (52). Based on the available evidence the only thing we can be sure of, is that the production of dream-books was an attempt by Mesopotamian scholars to collect and organize dreams and their interpretations.

On page 57 n. 92 the allegedly¹⁰ sexual dreams from the Assyrian dream-book *Zaḳīqu* are provided as examples of ‘impure dreams’.¹¹ But even if these dreams do list various

⁸ Cf. Szpakowska, op. cit. 69–71.

⁹ K. 273 + 1944b + 9064 (ed. Oppenheim, *The Interpretation of Dreams* 293–295; 337–338; pl. 13). Unfortunately, of these ‘royal dream-omens’ no apodoses (interpretations) have been preserved. It should be added that we can not exclude the possibility that the diviners also consulted the ‘regular’ tablets with dream-omens to interpret the king’s dreams.

¹⁰ There is some uncertainty about the interpretation of the sign UM, which is the recurring sign (or ‘kenning’) in these (sexual) dreams. It has been read as DUB and equated to *teḫū*, ‘to approach (sexually)’. See on this interpretation of UM J.-M. Durand, *RIA* 4, 460; R. Borger, *Mesopotamisches Zeichenlexikon* 300, no. 238. Despite this uncertainty, the dreams with ‘kenning’ UM (DUB) will here be referred to as ‘sexual dream-omens’.

¹¹ *Zaḳīqu*, Fragment 1 (non-assigned) no. 1 lines x+3–11; no. 2 lines x+1–10; no. 3 lines

types of sexual relations – and it is likely that they do – they should not be treated as ‘impure dreams’, but as dream-omens that happen to have sexual relations as subject matter. Perhaps sexual dreams which were caused by demons, such as we encounter in other sources,¹² were regarded as ‘impure dreams’, but sexual dream-omens were treated differently. Four of the extant dream-omens from *Zaḫiqu* are in fact interpreted positively,¹³ which seems to indicate that a sexual dream-omen was treated as any other dream-omen, i.e. as an encrypted message.¹⁴ It was not interpreted on the basis of a moral judgment,¹⁵ but mostly on the basis of a ‘decipherment’ of dream-elements through word-play, analogy and/or the alternate reading of signs. Mouton, as said, treats sexual dream-omens as ‘impure dreams’, and speculates that because of their impurity “très peu de rêves de tabous sexuels nous ont été communiqués” (57 n. 92).¹⁶ As far as the sexual dream-omens

1–9 (ed. A.L. Oppenheim, *The Interpretation of Dreams* 290–291; 333–334; pl. 13). Additional fragments with the same ‘kenning’ have been published by Oppenheim in 1959 (A.L. Oppenheim, *New Fragments of the Assyrian Dream-Book*, Iraq 31 [1959] 155–157; pl. 35).

¹² For a discussion of these types of dreams see Butler, op. cit. 62–65.

¹³ E.g. Fragment 1 (non-assigned) no. 1 line x+10: *DIŠ ana DUMU.MUNUS.LUGAL DUB SILIM MU.[I.KAM]*, “If he approaches the daughter of the king: wellbeing for [one] year”; Fragment 1 no. 2 line x+5: *[DIŠ] ana LÚ.TUR DUB SILIM MU.[I.KAM]*, “[If] he approaches a child: well-being for one year” (based on the edition and translations of A.L. Oppenheim, *The Interpretation of Dreams* 291; 334; pl. 13). K. 9169 line 5’: *[DIŠ ...] DUB SILIM MU.1.KAM ina KUR MUNUS.SIG, TUK KUR S[ISÁ]*, “[If ...] approaches [...]: wellbeing for one year; the land will have good fortune; the land will prosper”; K. 9169 line 6’: *[DIŠ ...] DUB SILIM MU.1.KAM (blank) [...]*, “[If ...] approaches [...]: wellbeing for one year [...].” (ed. Oppenheim, *New Fragments* 157; translations by the reviewer). Furthermore, the dream-book fragment from Susa (ed. V. Scheil, *Tablette des présages. Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique de Perse* 14 [1913] 48–57) contains a dream (col. iii line 8) in which the dreamer is “going” (*GIN = alāku*) to a wild animal, a possible reference to bestiality according to Butler (op. cit. 63). This dream is interpreted as “[his house] will become prosperous” (translation: Oppenheim, *The Interpretation of Dreams* 258). Cf. also the terrestrial omen CT 39, pl. 45 line 26: “If a man has an ejaculation (*MIN-ma*) as a result of his dream, and is bespattered (*bul-lul*) by his semen: that man will have good luck (or) profit” (translation: Butler, op. cit. 65).

¹⁴ The same applies to other ‘taboo dreams’. As Oppenheim (*The Interpretation of Dreams* 266) observed: “... it should be noted that infringements of the pan-human inhibitions against contact with excreta, corpses, etc., are in our Dream-Book, as a rule, rewarded by favorable prognostics. ... This holds likewise true for the infringement of sexual taboos ...”

¹⁵ Cf. W. Sommerfeld, op. cit. 208: “Da der Traum auf göttlichen Anstoss zurückgeht, gibt es keine Zensur der Inhalte und auch keine Traumverantwortung des Einzelnen im moralischen Sinne.”

¹⁶ A similar suggestion has been made by Butler (op. cit. 63): “If sexual dreams were considered to be nightmares, it is not surprising that only one such dream is mentioned amongst the omens of the Mesopotamian *Dream-Book* ...” Here she refers to the ‘royal dream’ K. 273 + 1944b + 9064 Obv. 12’: “[If] the king sleeps with a woman in his dream [...]” (ed. Oppenheim, *The Interpretation of Dreams* 293; 337; pl. 13; translation: Butler, op. cit. 63). Butler does mention the dreams with the ‘kenning’ UM (DUB) as possible sexual dreams.

are concerned, this is not true. The number of sexual dream-omens is in fact relatively high: from the series *Zaḫiqu* alone, some forty sexual dreams have been (partially) preserved.¹⁷

On page 78 (Ch. III) mention is made of ‘Anzagar/Zāḫiqu, le dieu Rêve mésopotamien’. An equation of these two gods, however, is unfounded.¹⁸

It should be emphasized that these are all relatively minor points of criticism, and that the reviewer’s over-all impression of the book is highly positive. It is clear that this study, with its carefully presented collection of sources, and detailed discussions of Hittite terminology, dream-texts and various aspects of Hittite dream-conceptions and -practices, is an essential contribution to the study of the dream among the Hittites and other ancient Near Eastern cultures.

JOVAN BILBIJA – Amsterdam

FRIEDRICH, JOHANNES †, ANNELIES KAMMENHUBER †, INGE HOFFMANN: *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*. Zweite, völlig neubearbeitete Auflage auf der Grundlage der edierten hethitischen Texte, Band III: H, Lieferung 17. Unter Mitarbeit von P. Cotticelli-Kurras und A. Hagenbucher-Dresel. Heidelberg: Winter, 2007. xix S., 17 × 24,5 cm.

Diese neueste Lieferung des großangelegten hethitischen Wörterbuchs (für die 1991–2004 erschienenen vorangehenden Lieferungen 11–16 des Buchstabens H s. hier Bd. 96 [2006] 149–152) enthält auf S. II ein Vorwort, in dem insgesamt 22 Personen aufgezählt werden, die in der einen oder anderen Weise an der Erstellung mitgearbeitet haben. Gezeichnet ist dieses Vorwort von A. Hagenbucher-Dresel, die seit der Lieferung 15 zum ständigen Mitarbeiterstab gehört.

Die vorliegende Lieferung reicht von *hasulathi* (ein hurr. Epitheton der Göttin Hebat) bis *hazzuwanni-* (ein Gartenkraut) und wurde von verschiedenen Mitarbeitern erstellt. Dies macht sich an der unterschiedlichen Ausführlichkeit der verschiedenen Lemmata bemerkbar: So wird das wichtige **ha(t)tu(s)-* „Silber“ mit wenigen Worten abgetan (s.u.), während die gar nicht existierende Insektenbezeichnung *hazarti-* ausführlich besprochen wird.

Im übrigen fallen zunächst die bereits in der Lieferung 14 eingeführten unterschiedlichen Abkürzungen für die beiden Haupteditionsreihen KUB (Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi) bzw. KBo (Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi) auf: Die Sigle „KBo“ wird seitdem aus unerfindlichen Gründen konsequent mit einem Punkt versehen („KBo.“), analog übrigens die gleichfalls mit einem Punkt versehene Grabungsnummersigle „Bo.“

An weiteren Einzelheiten ist anzumerken:

S. 456b ist mal von einer Pflanzenbezeichnung *sanakugulla*, mal von zwei Lexemen *sana* und *kugulla* die Rede: In der Tat war zunächst unklar, ob es sich um ein oder um zwei Wörter handelt: Die Akkusativform *ša-a-na-ku-uk-ku-ul-la-an* KUB 7, 1 i 37 mit „unflektiertem“ *sana* und nur einmal gesetztem Determinativ SAR, vor allem jedoch die

¹⁷ These are the dream-omens with ‘kenning’ UM (DUB) as published by Oppenheim (cf. n. 11).

¹⁸ Cf. Butler, op. cit. 77.