Introduction

Scott B. Noegel has undertaken the complex task of studying the language and the cultural and religious context of dreams in the Ancient Near East. What are the criteria for the inner dependence between a dream or any other ominous sign and its meaning? If dreams are regarded as divine, hidden messages, who interprets them? Are the different types of punning rooted in the magical power of words? Do the dreams and divine names, once written down, serve to memorize speech acts? And if this applies, should the act of dream interpretation not be connected with rituals of transformation or crisis management?

These issues are discussed in the insightful introductory part of the book (pp. 1-55). The following chapters serve as illustrations of how the different forms of punning—homonymy, paronomasy, polysemy, paragrams, anagrams, and the semantic wordplay of Janus parallelism—can be detected and used to explain the ancient Near Eastern technique of dream interpretation. The only reservation one might make is the question of how to vindicate a suspected pundit. Noegel expertly demonstrates the manifold layering of meanings and the role of language in the process of dream interpretation, linking it to the role of language in transformation and crisis management. He illustrates how dreams can serve as a tool to contribute to interpretation as well as provide evidence.
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pericopes from Job and Jeremiah. Noegel also ventures into and more particularly on Daniel; and Chapter VI includes Pharao's dreams, Gideon's capacities as dream interpreter, focuses on sections from Jeremiah, Joseph's interpretation of cal passages examining their cultural setting. Chapter V following Chapter VI (p. 183-189) Noegel shows his expertise enigmatic dreams in Israel (p. 113-182); here and in the fol-

Among the many fascinating features of the Gilgamesh Epic is the narrative of Gilgamesh's hunt for the wild boar of Fidukka, his chin and below (believed). Apparently, after the ascent of the Gilgamesh epic version of the style ever presents the boar as a challenge which are placed at the beginning of the story as a means to an end (Higgitt, Jr., R.E. - Enschede: Brepols, 1999, p. 70). However, the boar hunt is also seen as a way of connecting with the divine, which explains the impor-
tance of the profession of the diviner. Near Eastern is the non-erotic and therefore more fitting to the culture. In both instances, one sees a pattern of devolution from cylinder seal, which is a major passage in both storey setting. Chapter V (p. 79-91) illustrates the role of the diviner in Mesopotamian and more particularly on Daniel; and Chapter VI includes (p. 92-107) the not uncommon apocalyptic and more particular on Daniel; and Chapter VI includes}

Oneiro- The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic in Ancient Mesopotamia; The Evolution of the Epic see A.R. George, The Civilizing of Ea-Enkidu: An Unusual Tablet of the Epic/ of the Ancient Near East in Memory of Jacob Joel Finkelstein, 1977, 39-44. The scholarly discussion has focused around two different approaches of how to relate “sweeter than honey and wine” and work with Enkidu: the interpretation departs from the assumption that these commodities are based on
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tation and comes to the conclusion "that Kilmer was..." (passim). Reflecting on the plausibility and common comprehensibility of "meteorite" and "axe". Very much in the line of George Enkidu as friend but also as sexual partner. S.B. Noegel follows M. Worthington who questions the interpretation of cleverly balancing antagonistic powers. Both Enkidu and Gilgamesh are strong and very similar in nature. Enkidu is of noble kingly blood, although not as tall as Gilgamesh. However, a detailed comparison of the two heroes is beyond the scope of this study. For a brief discussion see K. van der Toorn, G. Cunnigham, The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic, Leiden 1982, 73-85. For translations see W.H.Ph. Römer, "Geburts- und Entwicklungsinschriften aus Kish..." (J.H. Tigay, Sumer vol. II 793, 454). Concerning the function of cuneiform signs as symbols of heroism, see J.H. Tigay, "Mesopotamian Mythology II," in: J.H. Tigay ed., The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic, vol. 1, 2003, 49).

emphasizes that he will enjoy the company of Enkidu, he happily and laughing exclaims, "I know they exchanged kisses and formed a friendship" (SB I: 255; 18-19; 18-20). As we learn from the first fight, Gilgamesh has found in Enkidu a brother: "your heart will laugh" MB Priv 1: 255). 35) When the goddess Aruru brings Enkidu into being by throwing a pinch of clay down into the wild we learn: "In the vision of "lump(s) (falling) from the sky" should allude to the fact that Enkidu is not born by a woman and proposes that the expression refers to his animal stage. The fact that the young people of Uruk gathered around the "lump" (SB I: 255), Unu-Adad's son, was decided for Gilgamesh. 25) Yet, when the text in the Ur III text, UM 29-15-367 obv. 4 is slightly different: [\[\text{quote}]]
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