

Zitierhinweis

Vinagre-Lobo, Miguel A.: review of: Gregor Weber (ed.), Artemidor von Daldis und die antike Traumdeutung. Texte - Kontexte - Lektüren, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2015, in: Exemplaria Classica, 22 (2018), p. 329-331, DOI: 10.33776/ec.v22i0.3524, downloaded from Website

exemplaria
C L A S S I C A
Journal of Classical Philology

copyright

Dieser Beitrag kann vom Nutzer zu eigenen nicht-kommerziellen Zwecken heruntergeladen und/oder ausgedruckt werden. Darüber hinausgehende Nutzungen sind ohne weitere Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber nur im Rahmen der gesetzlichen Schrankenbestimmungen (§§ 44a-63a UrhG) zulässig.

GREGOR WEBER (ed.), *Artemidor von Daldis und die antike Traumdeutung, Texte-Kontexte-Lektüren*, Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015, 392 pp., ISBN 978-3-11-040725-9.

The present book, dedicated to the deceased Professor Peer Schmidt, follows two previous ones¹ that gathered the results of a series of conferences held since 2009 at Paul-Valéry Montpellier University under the auspices of the “Groupe Artémidore”. The main objective of this research team, formed by different French scholars, is to publish a new commented edition of Artemidorus’ *Oneirocritica*.

After a short introduction of the editor in German, we find twelve different contributions by some of the most relevant scholars on ancient interpretation of dreams in general and in Artemidorus and his work *Oneirocritica* in particular. These contributions, written in English (five), in French (five) and in German (two), have their origin in an international meeting that took place in collaboration with the “Groupe Artémidore” at the Institut für Europäische Kulturgeschichte of Augsburg University from the 21st to 23rd March 2013.

As the editor explains in the introduction of the present work (p. 8), it shows many starting points for a social, cultural, literary and historic evaluation. In pursuing some of these themes, the authors of the volume intend to promote the understanding of the Artemidorean text and ancient dream interpretation. Of interest here is, on the one hand, the contextualization of Artemidor in his time, and, on the other, the method used in the *Oneirocritica* as well as the relationship between Artemidorus’ dream interpretations and the intellectual and material culture of his time. Such an approach takes into account that oneirocriticism is not only the sum of a tradition, but also the result of a particular time and a specific cultural space.

In the introduction (p. 7-16), G. Weber describes briefly some works about dreams in the times of Artemidorus and the few details we know about his life, with special reference to uncertain numismatic and epigraphic evidence, along the same lines of recent research, which shifts the composition of *Oneirocritica* until AD 200.

In the first contribution (p. 17-37), D. Harris-McCoy analyses the composition of Books IV and V of Artemidorus’ *Oneirocritica*, as part of a series of publications about the composition of the work. This essay also draws

¹ Julien du Bouchet, Christophe Chandezon (ed.), *Études sur Artémidore et l’interprétation des rêves*, Nanterre 2012; Christophe Chandezon, Julien du Bouchet (ed.), *Artémidore de Daldis et l’interprétation des rêves. Quatorze études*, Paris 2014.

upon and synthesizes material found in his edition of the *Oneirocritica* of 2012, leading to the conclusion that those two books are clearly a vehicle for transmission of knowledge.

The second paper, also by G. Weber, deals with emotions in Artemidorus (p. 39-65): for Artemidor, emotions are among the basic conditions of human existence that are relevant in several ways. C. Chandezon studies (p. 67-99) the land and the countryside in Artemidorus, focusing on words, ideas, and realities, while H. Ménard examines (p. 101-125) the practices and representations of justice in the Artemidorean work. P. Monbrun writes about the place of the animal and bestiary of the dreams of Artemidorus on pages 127-160.

The next two chapters are about gods and myths in the *Oneirocritica*: J. Bilbija and J.-J. Flinterman (p. 161-187) address his classification of gods and focus on Athena and Dionysus, whereas D. Auger (p. 189-218) analyses the myths in Artemidorus' dream interpretation: Artemidorus testifies to a measured attitude towards them, aiming not to subject them to interpretation without examination. Artemidorus reminds his son on several occasions that their true work of invention is to find new analogies and apply "to explain the cause of everything." The analysis of the underlying myths in the first books of the treatise shows their value as explanatory tools and attests to their role in the constitution of the foundations of ancient dream science.

On pages 219-232 G. Guidorizzi tracks the evolution of Oedipal incestuous dreams from Sophocles to Artemidorus: they can be a relic of an ancestral way of dreaming, related to the symbolic system of antiquity, that is no longer recorded in many dream books from the Middle Ages. This kind of dream may have declined for different reasons: a stronger cultural censorship, the Christian identification of Mother with Virgin, and the fading of a symbolism of a fertility mother goddess.

The next contribution, by G.H. Renberg (p. 233-262), investigates the role of dream-interpreters in Greek and Roman religion: Greek and Latin literary sources do not show dream-interpreters serving the gods at their sanctuaries, while documentary sources (inscriptions, *ostraka*, papyri) provide evidence of this, although only in Greco-Egyptian cults rather than in traditional Greek or Roman cults, with the probable exception of a votive Dacian inscription (IDR III.4, 284). Dream-interpretation may have been behind the decision to make dedications that record dreams, but consultations themselves were not considered worth recording. If such consultations did occur, they would not have involved cult officials.

Precisely Artemidorus and the contemporary oneirocritic literature in Egyptian are the objective of L. Prada's contribution (p. 263-306). Here we can find an analysis of demotic dream books, and the mentions and dreams of Egypt in Artemidorus, including Egyptian gods and fauna. In opposition

to earlier scholarship (e.g. A. Volten²), which defended a strong connection between Egyptian oneiromancy and the Greek tradition as witnessed in Artemidorus, Prada discusses how none of the few mentions of Egypt in the *Oneirocritica* seem to stem from a direct knowledge of the Egyptian culture and how such influence is unlikely and remains unproven. According to Prada's comparative analysis of dream interpretations, the Egyptian tradition of dream books has no direct connection or influence on Artemidorus, although there was an interconnection between the Egyptian and the Graeco-Roman worlds with regard to the dream phenomenon. Again a lack of influence, in this case from Artemidorus to Byzantine oneirocritic, is pointed out by A. Timotin (p. 311-326).

In the last contribution B. Näf (p. 327-47) scrutinises the influence of Artemidorus on J. Ennemoser, author of *Geschichte der Magie* (1844) and S. Freud, author of *Die Traumdeutung* (1900). Unlike Ennemoser, Freud considered Artemidorus the most important authority in the interpretation of dreams in late antiquity.

The articles are closed by a postscript in French (p. 349-56), where J. du Bouchet offers some reflections on the previous chapters and some guidelines for future research. As we have been able to see, some of the contributions use the text as an open window over Greek-Roman world of second century AD. Four other ones touch on Artemidorus' interpretative method and way of composition. About future research Du Bouchet underlines the study of the influence of Artemidorus in Renaissance and the necessity of a new edition of the *Oneirocritica*, like the one that the Groupe Artémidore is preparing. This new edition would improve the classic ones of Hercher's (1864) and Pack's (1963) bearing in mind newer philological works from the Arabic translation edited by T. Fahd in 1964 to the recent edition of E. Harris-McCoy (2012). The language and composition of the Artemidorean work would also merit new detailed studies, as well as the comparison with other divinatory disciplines, such as astrology, physiognomy or palmomantic.

At the end of the work we can find four detailed and very useful indexes of names (p. 357-9), places (p. 359-60), objects (p. 360-6), and citations (p. 367-89, including those of inscriptions, *ostraka*, and papyri). The volume finishes with two pages (391-92) showing the places of work of the authors, from Germany to France, through United States, Netherlands, Italy, Switzerland, United Kingdom, and Romania, what gives an idea of the multinational approach of this indispensable book for any researcher on ancient dreams.

MIGUEL A. VINAGRE-LOBO
miguelvnr@gmail.com

² A. Volten, *Demotische Traumdeutung (Pap. Carlsberg XIII und XIV verso)*, Kopenhagen 1942.