

Artemidor von Daldis und die antike Traumdeutung

Colloquia Augustana

Herausgegeben von
Bernd Oberdorfer, Gregor Weber
und Wolfgang E. J. Weber

Redaktion
Elisabeth Böswald-Rid und Tobias Ranker

Institut für Europäische Kulturgeschichte
der Universität Augsburg

Band 33

Artemidor von Daldis und die antike Traumdeutung



Texte – Kontexte – Lektüren

Herausgegeben von
Gregor Weber

DE GRUYTER

Gefördert von der Fritz Thyssen Stiftung

ISBN 978-3-11-040725-9

e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-040740-2

e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-040746-4

ISSN 0946-9044

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.dnb.de> abrufbar.

© 2015 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston

Abbildung auf dem Einband: Der träumende Alexander der Große unter einer Platane (Smyrna, ca. 147 n. Chr.).

Staatliche Münzsammlung, München. Foto: Nicolai Kästner

Druck und Bindung: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen

☺ Gedruckt auf säurefreiem Papier

Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

Inhaltsverzeichnis

| | |
|---|-----|
| Zur Einführung <i>Gregor Weber</i> | 7 |
| Writing and Reading Books IV and V of Artemidorus' <i>Oneirocritica</i> <i>Daniel Harris-McCoy</i> | 17 |
| Emotionen in Artemidors <i>Oneirokritika</i> <i>Gregor Weber</i> | 39 |
| La terre et les campagnes chez Artémidore : Mots, idées, réalités <i>Christophe Chandezon</i> | 67 |
| Pratiques et représentations de la justice dans l'œuvre d'Artémidore de Daldis <i>Hélène Ménard</i> | 101 |
| Quand on rêve d'animaux : Place de l'animal et bestiaire du rêve dans les <i>Oneirokritika</i> d'Artémidore <i>Philippe Monbrun</i> | 127 |
| Dreaming of Deities: Athena and Dionysus in the <i>Oneirocritica</i> <i>Jovan Bilbija and Jaap-Jan Flinterman</i> | 161 |
| La place des mythes dans l'interprétation des songes d'Artémidore <i>Danièle Auger</i> | 189 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| On Dreaming of One's Mother: Oedipal Dreams between Sophocles and Artemidorus <i>Giulio Guidorizzi</i> | 219 |
| The Role of Dream-Interpreters in Greek and Roman Religion <i>Gil H. Renberg</i> | 233 |
| <i>Oneirocritica Aegyptiaca</i> : Artemidorus of Daldis, Egypt, and the Contemporary Oneirocritic Literature in Egyptian <i>Luigi Prada</i> | 263 |
| La réception d'Artémidore dans l'oniocritique byzantine <i>Andrei Timotin</i> | 311 |
| Artemidor – antike Formen der Traumdeutung und ihre Rezeption: Joseph Ennemoser (1844) und Sigmund Freud (1900) <i>Beat Näf</i> | 327 |
| Postface <i>Julien du Bouchet</i> | 349 |
| Register | 357 |
| Personenregister | 357 |
| Ortsregister | 359 |
| Sachregister | 360 |
| Stellenregister | 367 |
| Die Autoren | 391 |

Zur Einführung

Gregor Weber

in memoriam Peer Schmidt (1958–2009)

Die Beiträge des vorliegenden Bandes gehen auf eine internationale Tagung zurück, die vom 21.–23. März 2013 in Zusammenarbeit mit der ‚Groupe Artémidore‘ (EA 4424, Montpellier) und dem Institut für Europäische Kulturgeschichte der Universität Augsburg veranstaltet wurde.¹ Sie stellen damit eine Ergänzung zu zwei Bänden dar, die die Erträge von mehreren ‚Journées d’études‘ beinhalten, die seit 2009 an der Université Paul-Valéry Montpellier stattgefunden haben.² Jenseits dieser Tagungen verfolgt die dortige ‚Groupe Artémidore‘, die Kolleginnen und Kollegen aus ganz Frankreich assoziiert hat, vor allem das ambitionierte Ziel, eine neue Textausgabe der *Oneirokritika* des Artemidor von Daldis samt Kommentierung vorzulegen, die im Jahre 2020 in drei Bänden in der renommierten Collection Budé erscheinen soll. Diese Ausgabe ist umso willkommener, als eine neue Überprüfung des Textes seit der kritischen Teubner-Ausgabe von Roger A. Pack aus dem Jahre 1963 ein Desiderat darstellt und eine ausführliche Kommentierung der *Oneirokritika* noch in den Anfängen steckt.³ Diese Publika-

¹ Vgl. Alexander Boss/Christopher Schliephake: Tagungsbericht Artemidor von Daldis und die antike Traumdeutung. Texte – Kontexte – Rezeptionen. In: Mitteilungen. Institut für Europäische Kulturgeschichte der Universität Augsburg 21 (2013). S. 69–78.

² Julien du Bouchet/Christophe Chandezon (Hg.): Études sur Artémidore et l’interprétation des rêves. Nanterre 2012; Christophe Chandezon/Julien du Bouchet (Hg.): Études sur Artémidore et l’interprétation des rêves. Quatorze études. Paris 2014.

³ Einen wichtigen Schritt unternahm zuletzt Daniel E. Harris-McCoy: Artemidorus’ *Oneirocritica*. Text, Translation, and Commentary. Oxford 2012.

tionen belegen das Interesse an der antiken Traumdeutung im Allgemeinen und an Artemidor und seinem Werk im Besonderen, das vielfältige Anknüpfungspunkte für eine sozial-, kultur- und literaturhistorische Auswertung enthält.

Indem sie einigen dieser Themen nachgehen, beabsichtigen die Autoren des Bandes, das Verständnis des Artemidortextes und der antiken Traumdeutung zu befördern. Von Interesse ist hierbei zum einen die Kontextualisierung von Artemidor in seiner Zeit, und zwar in Beiträgen zu der in den *Oneirokritika* umgesetzten Methode sowie zu den Beziehungen zwischen Artemidors Traumdeutungsmaterial und der intellektuellen wie materiellen Kultur seiner Zeit.⁴ Eine solche Vorgehensweise berücksichtigt, dass die *Oneirokritika* nicht nur die Summe einer Tradition darstellen, sondern auch das Resultat einer bestimmten Zeit und eines spezifischen Kulturraums. Zum anderen sollen Artemidor und seine Welt mit weiteren, durchaus konkurrierenden Vorstellungen von Träumen und ihrer Deutung in Beziehung gesetzt werden; denn die *Oneirokritika* stehen in einer Tradition, die lange vor Artemidor begann und weit über ihn hinausreicht, die aber auch eng mit verschiedenen Diskursen innerhalb der Antike verflochten ist. Dabei geht es nicht nur um eine adäquate Erfassung der Bedeutung verschiedener Symbole, sondern auch um die Frage nach kulturellen Kontexten für Traumdeuter innerhalb der griechischen und römischen Religion, zumal im Vergleich mit und in Konkurrenz zu anderen Divinationsformen. Einige der Traditionen, etwa in den demotischen Texten oder die byzantinische Traumdeutung, sind in letzter Zeit stärker in den Fokus des Interesses gerückt, doch ist das Material noch längst nicht umfassend aufgearbeitet und ausgewertet. Schließlich betrifft ein weiteres Forschungsfeld die Artemidor-Rezeption zwischen Renaissance und dem Beginn der Psychoanalyse, zumal für die Jahrhunderte nach der Aufklärung noch etliche Desiderate bestehen.⁵

Artemidor und seine *Oneirokritika* stehen im Zentrum des Interesses. Es handelt sich bekanntlich um das einzige aus der griechisch-römischen Antike erhaltene Traumdeutungs(lehr)buch; dessen Autor nimmt für sich in Anspruch, alle thematisch einschlägige Literatur zum Thema erworben – und hoffentlich auch gelesen und verarbeitet – zu haben:

„Das Buch über Traumdeutung gibt es nicht, das ich nicht erworben hätte, da ich in dieser Hinsicht viel Ehrgeiz entwickle. Außerdem bin ich viele Jahre mit den Wahrsagern auf den Märkten zusammengetroffen, obwohl sie sehr verachtet sind und von jenen Leuten mit den ehrwürdigen Mienen und hochgezogenen Augenbrauen als Bettler, Gaukler und Lumpengesindel beschimpft werden; ich ließ diese Verleumdungen unbeachtet und hielt mich in den Städten und auf Volksfesten in Griechenland sowie

⁴ Zur Datierungsfrage siehe unten S. 9.

⁵ Zu einigen Perspektiven der Forschung siehe die Postface von Julien du Bouchet in diesem Band.

in Kleinasien, Italien und auf den größten und volkreichsten Inseln auf, um von alten Traumgesichten Kunde zu erhalten und, wie sie in Erfüllung gingen.“⁶

Die explizite Hinzuziehung von mündlich überliefertem Material durch Artemidor ist aus quellentechnischer Sicht in jedem Fall begrüßenswert, doch bringt sie die Herausforderung mit sich, verschiedene Schichten des Textes zu sezieren und zu datieren. Dies erweist sich umso schwieriger, als der Autor nur in einigen wenigen Fällen und dann meist nur zu Einzelstellen Auskunft über seine Quellen gibt.⁷ Daraus resultiert die Frage nach der Datierung des Werkes: Bislang ging man aufgrund textimmanenter Indizien von einer Zeitstellung in der 2. Hälfte des 2. Jh.s n. Chr. aus, doch haben aktuelle Forschungen dazu geführt, dass sich diese Datierung immer mehr verschiebt: Favorisiert wird nunmehr die Zeit des Septimius Severus um 200 n. Chr.⁸ Verkompliziert wird die Sachlage durch Artemidors Behauptung, die fünf Bücher seines Werkes in drei Etappen – zunächst Buch I und II, dann III als Nachtrag sowie IV und V als Ergänzung und Handreichung für seinen gleichnamigen Sohn – publiziert zu haben.⁹ Er gibt jedoch, wenn er explizit die Kritik anspricht, auf die er reagiert habe, keine Informationen über die zeitliche Relation dieser Publikationsschritte.¹⁰

Es bleibt jedenfalls festzuhalten, dass die Zeit zwischen 170 und 200 n. Chr. nicht zum Wenigsten durch ein starkes Interesse an Träumen und ihrer Deutung gekennzeichnet ist: Dies lässt sich zum einen an den *Heiligen Reden* (Ἱεροὶ λόγοι) des Aelius Aristides ersehen, die unzählige Traumanweisungen enthalten und unlängst wieder stärker das Interesse der Forschung geweckt haben,¹¹ zum anderen an der zwar knappen, doch immerhin vorhandenen Auseinandersetzung mit Träumen durch

⁶ Artem. I, prooem., 2, 11–20: ἐγὼ δὲ τοῦτο μὲν οὐκ ἔστιν ὅ τι βιβλίον οὐκ ἐκτησάμην ὄνειροκριτικὸν πολλὴν εἰς τοῦτο φιλοτιμίαν ἔχων, τοῦτο δὲ καὶ σφόδρα διαβεβλημένων τῶν ἐν ἀγορᾷ μάντεων, οὓς δὴ προίκτας καὶ γόητας καὶ βωμολόχους ἀποκαλοῦσιν οἱ σεμνοπροσωποῦντες καὶ τὰς ὄφρῦς ἀνεσπακότες, καταφρονήσας τῆς διαβολῆς ἔτεσι πολλοῖς ὠμίλησα, καὶ ἐν Ἑλλάδι κατὰ πόλεις καὶ πανηγύρεις, καὶ ἐν Ἀσίᾳ καὶ ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ καὶ τῶν νήσων ἐν ταῖς μεγίσταις καὶ πολυανθρωποτάταις ὑπομένων ἀκούειν παλαίους ὄνειρους καὶ τούτων τὰς ἀποβάσεις (Übersetzung Friedrich S. Krauss/Gerhard Löwe). Dazu Harris-McCoy: Artemidorus' *Oneirocritica* (Anm. 3). S. 412–414.

⁷ Dazu vgl. Miguel Ángel Vinagre Lobo: *Los libros griegos de interpretación de sueños*. Zaragoza 2011. S. 187–287.

⁸ So dezidiert und mit weiteren Hinweisen Christophe Chandezon: En guise d'introduction: Artémidore et la civilisation de son temps. La réception des *Oneirokritika*. In: Chandezon/du Bouchet: *Études* (Anm. 2). S. 11–29, hier S. 14–15.

⁹ Dazu Harris-McCoy: Artemidorus' *Oneirocritica* (Anm. 3). S. 18–25.

¹⁰ Es ist nicht auszuschließen, dass es sich dabei um eine Strategie des Autors handelt, sich und sein Werk interessant zu machen, dazu Gregor Weber: Artemidor und sein ‚Publikum‘. In: *Gymnasium* 106/3 (1999). S. 209–229, hier S. 213–214.

¹¹ Vgl. allein die drei Monographien aus den Jahren 2012 und 2013: Ido Israelowich: *Society, Medicine and Religion in the Sacred Tales of Aelius Aristides*. Leiden/Boston 2012 (Mnemosyne Supplements. Bd. 341); Janet Downie: *At the Limits of Art. A Literary Study of Aelius Aristides'*



Abb. 1: Der träumende Alexander der Große unter einer Platane. Staatliche Münzsammlung München. Foto: Nicolai Kästner

Marc Aurel in seinen *Selbstbetrachtungen* (Τὰ εἰς ἑαυτόν).¹² Darüber hinaus hat sich der Historiker Cassius Dio in besonderer Weise mit Träumen befasst und eine größere Sequenz für Septimius Severus zusammengestellt.¹³ Nur in seltenen Ausnahmefällen wurden Träume auch auf Münzen dargestellt, so etwa auf dem Revers einer Bronzemünze, einer städtischen Prägung aus Smyrna (Abb. 1) – ein Traum von keinem geringeren als von Alexander dem Großen. Pausanias berichtet in einem Exkurs über Smyrna, Alexander sei aufgrund eines Traums Oikistes, in diesem Fall Neu-Gründer der Stadt, geworden:

„Alexandros habe nämlich im Pagosgebirge gejagt, so erzählt man, und sei, wie er von der Jagd zurückkam, zum Heiligtum der Nemesis-Göttinnen gekommen und habe dort eine Quelle getroffen und eine Platane vor dem Heiligtum, die am Wasser wuchs. Und wie er unter der Platane schlief, seien ihm die Nemesis-Göttinnen erschienen und hätten ihm befohlen, hier eine Stadt zu gründen und die Smyrnaier dorthin zu führen aus ihrer früheren Stadt fort.“¹⁴

Hieroi Logoi. Oxford 2013; John Stephens: The dreams and visions of Aelius Aristides. A case study in the history of religions. Piscataway, NJ 2013.

¹² Zu Marcus Aurelius: Gregor Weber: Kaiser, Träume und Visionen in Prinzipat und Spätantike. Stuttgart 2000 (Historia-Einzelschriften. Bd. 143). S. 107–108.

¹³ Vgl. Weber: Kaiser (Anm. 12). S. 109–110 und S. 202–210 mit weiterer Literatur, außerdem Peter Weiss: Septimius Severus' Hochzeitstraum. In: Chiron 42 (2012). S. 389–398.

¹⁴ Paus. VII, 5, 1–2: Ἀλέξανδρον γὰρ θηρεύοντα ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ Πάγω, ὡς ἐγένετο ἀπὸ τῆς θήρας, ἀφικέσθαι πρὸς Νεμέσεων λέγουσιν ἱερόν, καὶ πηγῇ τε ἐπιτυχεῖν αὐτὸν καὶ πλατάνῳ πρὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, πεφυκνία δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὕδατος, καὶ ὑπὸ τῇ πλατάνῳ καθεύδοντι κελεύειν φασὶν αὐτῷ τὰς Νεμέσεις ἐπιφανείσας πόλιν ἐνταῦθα οἰκίζειν καὶ ἄγειν ἐς αὐτὴν Σμυρναίους ἀναστήσαντα ἐκ τῆς προτέρας. Das Folgende nach Gregor Weber: Herrscher und Traum in hellenistischer Zeit. In: AKG 81/1 (1999). S. 1–33, hier S. 32–33; außerdem William V. Harris: Dreams and Experience in Classical Antiquity. Cambridge, MA/London 2009. S. 41–42.

Zum ersten Mal ist diese Szene auf dem Revers einer Münze zu sehen, die auf dem Avers Marc Aurel als Caesar zeigt und in das Jahr 147 n. Chr. zu datieren ist.¹⁵ Derselbe Typus wurde auch unter Gordian III. und Philippus Arabs geprägt. Die Erklärung liegt auf der Hand: In einer Zeit großer Konkurrenz zwischen den Städten, nicht zuletzt um die Gunst des Kaisers, konnte ein dezidiertes Verweis auf den Gründungsvorgang durchaus hilfreich sein. Das ‚Ereignis‘ an sich ist in der sonstigen Alexanderüberlieferung nicht belegt, doch wurde die Visualisierung über 450 Jahre nach Alexanders Tod offenkundig nicht als abwegig empfunden, was nicht zum Wenigsten für die Attraktivität und Bedeutung der Traumthematik spricht.

Mit Smyrna ist man nun gar nicht so weit von Ephesos, Artemidors Geburtsort, und von Daldis, dem Geburtsort seiner Mutter in der westkleinasiatischen Landschaft Lydien, entfernt.¹⁶ Von Daldis-Flaviopolis, nördlich des Flusses Hebros und des heutigen Sees Marmara Gölü gelegen, sind kaum mehr Überreste vorhanden bzw. vieles ist aufgrund von unkontrollierter Grabungstätigkeit heute zerstört (Abb. 2); über ein Heiligtum des in den *Oneirokritika* (II, 70) erwähnten Apollon Mystes ist nichts bekannt. Das heutige Nardi Kalesi, zwischen den Dörfern Kemer und Kale gelegen, befand sich in der Antike an den Fernstraßen von Sardeis (h. Salihli) nach Iulia Gordos (h. Gördes) bzw. von Thyateira (h. Akhisar) nach Philadelphiea (h. Alaşehir). Unsere Kenntnisse verdanken sich vornehmlich Inschriften und Münzen.¹⁷

Auch über Artemidor, seine Person und sein Umfeld bleibt vieles im Dunkeln.¹⁸ So gibt es eine Bronzemünze der Stadt Daldis aus der Zeit des Caesars Geta (197–209 n. Chr.) mit dem Namen eines Artemidor auf dem Revers (Abb. 3a,b) – die nicht leicht lesbare griechische Umschrift auf dem Revers lautet: Ε(πι) ΑΥ(ρηλιου) ΑΡΤΕ-

¹⁵ Die Münze wurde unter dem Strategen Theudianos geprägt. Vs: ΑΥΦΗΛΙΟΣ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ, Rs: ΘΕΥΔΙΑΝΟΣ ΣΤΡΑΤ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕ ΣΜΥΡΝΑΙΟΣ. Für Abbildungen und Beschreibungen vgl. Dietrich O. A. Klose: Die Münzprägung von Smyrna in der römischen Kaiserzeit. Berlin 1987 (Antike Münzen und geschnittene Steine. Bd. 10). S. 36 mit Taf. 39–40 (R1–13), 53 (R14) und 54 (R1). Während der römischen Kaiserzeit prägten die Städte Kleinasiens eigenes Münzgeld für den lokalen Gebrauch. Die einzelnen Emissionen sind unter der Regie städtischer Beamter ausgegeben worden.

¹⁶ Zuletzt Frank Daubner: Daldis. In: The Encyclopedia of Ancient History 4 (2013). S. 1913–1915. Ein 360°-Panorama ist unter http://www.mekan360.com/360fx_nardikalesidaldis-manis-salihli.html zu sehen (letzter Zugriff: 20. Juni 2014); zahlreiche Abbildungen bei Harun Ürer: Kültür ve Tabiat Varlıklarıyla Salihli. İzmir 2009 (freundlicher Hinweis von Hasan Malay, dem ich auch für die Überlassung von Abb. 2 danke).

¹⁷ Zu den Inschriften: Peter Herrmann: *Tituli Asiae Minoris* 5,1. Wien 1981, S. 200–218; Peter Herrmann/Hasan Malay: *New Documents from Lydia*. Wien 2007. S. 49–65. Zu den Münzen, dazu mit einer Analyse der auf ihnen bezugten Gottheiten: Frédéric Maffre: *Artémidore, Daldis et les divinités locales sur les émissions provinciales romaines*. In: du Bouchet/Chandezon: *Études* (Anm. 2). S. 27–52, dort auch eine Karte der Region.

¹⁸ Alle biographischen Informationen finden sich ausgewertet bei Christophe Chandezon: *Artémidore: le cadre historique, géographique et social d'une vie*. In: du Bouchet/Chandezon: *Études* (Anm. 2). S. 10–26.



Abb. 2: Das Siedlungsgebiet des antiken Daldis. Foto: Hasan Malay, Bornova-İzmir

ΜΙΔΟΡΟΣ ΑΡΧ(οντος) ΔΑΛΔΙΑΝΩΝ, was aufzulösen und zu übersetzen ist mit: „(Münze) der Bewohner von Daldis (geprägt) zur Zeit der Amtsführung des Aurelios Artemidoros“. Ob diese Person jedoch mit dem gleichnamigen Traumdeuter identisch ist, lässt sich nicht sagen, zumal unser Autor keinerlei Informationen über eine eigene politische Betätigung – auf welcher Ebene auch immer – preisgibt.¹⁹ Auch auf Inschriften ist der Name Artemidor bezeugt, und zwar nicht weniger als sechs Mal, doch lässt sich in Ermangelung genauer Informationen über die Familie und etwaige Ämter keine von ihnen auf den Autor der *Oneirokritika* beziehen.²⁰ Letztlich ist man also darauf angewiesen, sich der Person Artemidors durch die Interpretation verschiedener Aussagen in seinem Werk anzunähern.

Schließlich ist noch ein mehrfacher Dank abzustatten: Zum einen allen Autoren, die sich der Mühe unterzogen haben, ihre Tagungsbeiträge für den Druck zu

¹⁹ Artemidor erwähnt seine Reisen, seine Abkunft aus Ephesos und weitere Werke (I, 1; III, 66); außerdem gibt es einen Eintrag im Suda-Lexikon mit der Zuschreibung anderer Werke (Οἰωνοσκοπικά καὶ Χειροσκοπικά), dazu den Hinweis auf einen Artemidor, Sohn des Phokas und Autor eines Werkes über den Vogelflug, bei seinem Zeitgenossen Galen sowie Anspielungen in der byzantinischen und arabischen Tradition. Dazu jeweils Chandezon: Artémidore (Anm. 18).

²⁰ Dazu Maffre: Artémidore (Anm. 17). S. 29–32 mit Anm. 20–22.



Abb. 3a.b: Bronzemünze aus Daldis mit dem Namen Artemidor auf dem Revers. Staatliche Münzsammlung München, Fotos: Nicolai Kästner

überarbeiten, insbesondere Christophe Chandezon und Julien du Bouchet für die freundschaftliche und konstruktive Zusammenarbeit bei der Vorbereitung der Tagung und der Publikation des Bandes; zum anderen der Fritz Thyssen Stiftung für die großzügige Gewährung einer Druckbeihilfe; außerdem Katharina Friedl, Felix Guffler und Verena Hügler für ihre Hilfe bei der Korrektur der Beiträge und bei der Erstellung des Registers, ebenso Elisabeth Böswald-Rid und Tobias Ranker für die gewohnt souveräne und aufmerksame Einrichtung der nicht einfachen Manuskripte.²¹

Gewidmet sei der Band dem Gedenken an meinen vor fünf Jahren verstorbenen Freund und Kollegen Peer Schmidt, zuletzt Professor für Lateinamerikanische und Südwesteuropäische Geschichte an der Universität Erfurt. Seit gemeinsamen Eichstätter Assistentenzeiten Anfang der 1990er Jahre verband uns auch ein gemeinsames Interesse an Träumen in politischem Kontext, das über die Epochen- und Kulturgrenzen hinweg zu zwei Tagungen – 2005 am Institut für Europäische Kulturgeschichte der Universität Augsburg, 2006 am Forschungszentrum Gotha der

²¹ Die in diesem Band verwendeten Abkürzungen antiker Autoren und deren Werke orientieren sich an der Vorgabe des *Neuen Pauly* (Bd. 1 [1996], S. XXXIX–XXXVII) und darüber hinaus an den Angaben des *Liddell/Scott/Jones/McKenzie*. Für die Zitation von Zeitschriften wurden die Abkürzungen der *Année Philologique* verwendet. Artemidor ist nach der Ausgabe von Roger A. Pack (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner 1963) zitiert: Dabei zeigen die ersten beiden Ziffern stets Buch und Paragraph bei Artemidor an, während in Fällen, in denen wort- und satzgenau zitiert wird, noch zwei weitere Ziffern für die Seite und Zeile in Packs Edition hinzugefügt sind.

Universität Erfurt – geführt hatte.²² Gerade Artemidors Welt der Symbole und deren Rezeption in der Frühen Neuzeit sowie die Traumdiskurse im Neostoizismus waren Bereiche, die er mit großer Beharrlichkeit, klarem Urteil und forschender Neugier immer wieder angesprochen hat. Weitere Forschungs- und Publikationspläne konnten wir nicht mehr realisieren, aber einem neuen Band zu Artemidor und zur antiken Traumdeutung hätte er bestimmt zahlreiche Anregungen entnommen.

²² Die Beiträge sind publiziert in: Peer Schmidt/Gregor Weber (Hg.): Traum und *res publica*. Traumkulturen und Deutungen sozialer Wirklichkeiten im Europa von Renaissance und Barock. Berlin 2008 (Colloquia Augustana. Bd. 26); Sonia V. Rose/Peer Schmidt/Gregor Weber (Hg.): Los sueños en la cultura iberoamericana (siglos XVI–XVIII). Sevilla 2011 (Colección *Universos Americanos*. Bd. 6).

Bibliographie

- Alexander Boss/Christopher Schliephake: Tagungsbericht Artemidor von Daldis und die antike Traumdeutung. Texte – Kontexte – Rezeptionen. In: Mitteilungen. Institut für Europäische Kulturgeschichte der Universität Augsburg 21 (2013). S. 69–78.
- Christophe Chandezon: Artémidore: le cadre historique, géographique et social d'une vie. In: Julien du Bouchet/Ders. (Hg.): Études sur Artémidore et l'interprétation des rêves. Nanterre 2012. S. 10–26.
- Christophe Chandezon: En guise d'introduction: Artémidore et la civilisation de son temps. La réception des *Oneirokritika*. In: Ders./Julien du Bouchet (Hg.): Études sur Artémidore et l'interprétation des rêves. Quatorze études. Paris 2014. S. 11–29.
- Christophe Chandezon/Julien du Bouchet (Hg.): Études sur Artémidore et l'interprétation des rêves. Quatorze études. Paris 2014.
- Frank Daubner: Daldis. In: The Encyclopedia of Ancient History 4 (2013). S. 1913–1915.
- Janet Downie: At the Limits of Art. A Literary Study of Aelius Aristides' Hieroi Logoi. Oxford 2013.
- Julien du Bouchet/Christophe Chandezon (Hg.): Études sur Artémidore et l'interprétation des rêves. Nanterre 2012.
- William V. Harris: Dreams and Experience in Classical Antiquity. Cambridge, MA/London 2009.
- Daniel E. Harris-McCoy: Artemidorus' *Oneirocritica*. Text, Translation, and Commentary. Oxford 2012.
- Peter Herrmann: Tituli Asiae Minoris 5,1. Wien 1981.
- Peter Herrmann/Hasan Malay: New Documents from Lydia. Wien 2007.
- Ido Israelowich: Society, Medicine and Religion in the Sacred Tales of Aelius Aristides. Leiden/Boston 2012 (Mnemosyne Supplements. Bd. 341).
- Dietrich O. A. Klose: Die Münzprägung von Smyrna in der römischen Kaiserzeit. Berlin 1987 (Antike Münzen und geschnittene Steine. Bd. 10).
- Frédéric Maffre: Artémidore, Daldis et les divinités locales sur les émissions provinciales romaines. In: Julien du Bouchet/Christophe Chandezon (Hg.): Études sur Artémidore et l'interprétation des rêves. Nanterre 2012. S. 27–52.
- Sonia V. Rose/Peer Schmidt/Gregor Weber (Hg.): Los sueños en la cultura iberoamericana (siglos XVI–XVIII). Sevilla 2011 (Colección *Universos Americanos*. Bd. 6).
- Peer Schmidt/Gregor Weber (Hg.): Traum und *res publica*. Traumkulturen und Deutungen sozialer Wirklichkeiten im Europa von Renaissance und Barock. Berlin 2008 (Colloquia Augustana. Bd. 26).

- John Stephens: The dreams and visions of Aelius Aristides. A case-study in the history of religions. Piscataway, NJ 2013.
- Harun Ürer: Kültür ve Tabiat Varlıklarıyla Salihli. İzmir 2009.
- Miguel Ángel Vinagre Lobo: Los libros griegos de interpretación de sueños. Zaragoza 2011.
- Gregor Weber: Artemidor und sein ‚Publikum‘. In: *Gymnasium* 106/3 (1999). S. 209–229.
- Gregor Weber: Herrscher und Traum in hellenistischer Zeit. In: *AKG* 81/1 (1999). S. 1–33.
- Gregor Weber: Kaiser, Träume und Visionen in Prinzipat und Spätantike. Stuttgart 2000 (Historia-Einzelschriften. Bd. 143).
- Peter Weiss: Septimius Severus' Hochzeitstraum. In: *Chiron* 42 (2012). S. 389–398.

Writing and Reading Books IV and V of Artemidorus' *Oneirocritica*¹

Daniel Harris-McCoy

What makes Artemidorus and his catalogue of dream-interpretations, the *Oneirocritica*, special? Why do they deserve a lofty position in the study of the classical past? Several answers immediately present themselves, mostly relating to the *Oneirocritica*'s status as the only surviving dream-manual from Greco-Roman antiquity as well as the important contributions it has made to our knowledge of ancient culture and, in particular, the history of sexuality and social history.²

¹ This essay is part of a sequence of studies relating to the composition of Artemidorus' *Oneirocritica* that includes Daniel Harris-McCoy: Artemidorus' Self-Presentation in the Preface to the *Oneirocritica*. In: CJ 106.4 (2011). P. 423–444 and Daniel Harris-McCoy: Artemidorus' *Oneirocritica* as Fragmentary Encyclopedia. In: Jason König/Greg Woolf (eds.): *Encyclopaedism From Antiquity to the Renaissance*. Cambridge 2013. P. 154–177. Overlaps between them are highlighted throughout in the footnotes. This paper also draws upon and synthesizes material found in my edition of Artemidorus' *Oneirocritica* (Daniel Harris-McCoy: *Artemidorus' Oneirocritica: Text, Translation, Commentary*. Oxford 2012), esp. p. 19–25 and p. 520–558. I want to thank Professor Sandra Schwartz for her valuable comments on this paper. Any errors that remain should, of course, be attributed to the author.

² On Artemidorus and the history of sexuality, see the well-known chapters by Michel Foucault: *The Care of the Self: Volume 3 of the History of Sexuality*. New York 1986 and John J. Winkler: *The Constraints of Desire. The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece*. New York 1990. On social history, see Jacques Annequin: *Les esclaves rêvent aussi. Remarques sur La clé des songes d'Artémidore*. In: DHA 13 [1987]. P. 71–113 and Arthur Pomeroy: *Status and Status-Concern in the Greco-Roman Dream-Books*. In: *AncSoc* 22 [1991]. P. 51–74. Scholars have also used the contents of the *Oneirocritica* to add to our understanding of various aspects of Greco-Roman culture, for example, the theater (Danièle Auger: *Artémidore et le théâtre*. In: Julien du Bouchet/Christophe Chandezon [eds.]: *Études sur Artémidore et l'interprétation des rêves*. Nanterre 2012. P. 99–159), suicide (Anton J. L. van Hooff: *Self-Killing in Artemidorus'*

But what about the inherent merit of the *Oneirocritica* itself, that is, as a composition and as an intellectual production? For there has been a historical tendency for scholars to look at ancient technical and compilatory literature as sources of information about some item of primary interest or, more recently, their role in reflecting and replicating contemporary power structures.³ Content and context are important, of course, but composition matters, too, even in the case of so-called ‘sub-literary’ technical documents.⁴

Unfortunately, we are not going to convince many people of the beauty of Artemidorus’ writing, at least not in the catalogic portions of the *Oneirocritica*, which make up the bulk of the work. Artemidorus’ writing is beautiful in its own way. It is spare, clear, swift to read and is therefore ideally suited to its purpose in that it is designed to convey information to the reader in an efficient manner.⁵ If we wanted to be provocative, we could even compare Artemidorus’ prose style with the Imagist poetry of William Carlos Williams – both contain potent visuals unencumbered by excessive linguistic apparatus.⁶ But it could also be argued easily enough that the *Oneirocritica* reads like a phone book or instruction manual for a fax machine. Its composition is formulaic, repetitive and has no narrative structure. It is therefore unsurprising that Roger A. Pack, editor of the 1963 Teubner edition of the text, refers to reading the entire *Oneirocritica* as a “penitential exercise”.⁷

Dream-World. In: André P. M. H. Lardinois/Marc G. M. van der Poel/Vincent J. C. Hunink [eds.]: Land of Dreams. Greek and Latin Studies in Honour of A. H. M. Kessels. Leiden 2006. P. 32–42), and even color (Dimitri Kasprzyk: Les couleurs du rêve: l’*Onirocriticon* d’Artémidore. In: Laurence Villard [ed.]: Couleurs et visions dans l’antiquité classique. Rouen 2002. P. 129–152).

- 3 Cf. Alice König: From Architect to Emperor: Vitruvius and his Addressee in the *De Architectura*. In: Liba Taub/Aude Doody (eds.): Authorial Voices in Greco-Roman Technical Writing. Trier 2009. P. 31–52, here p. 31–32 esp. nn. 3 and 4, who divides the history of Vitruvian scholarship (and technical literature generally) into two phases that are content- and context-centered, respectively. In Artemidorus-studies, scholars have similarly tended to emphasize content and context. For the former, see the works cited above at the end of n. 2. For Artemidorus and his political context, see Glen Bowersock: Artemidorus and the Second Sophistic. In: Barbara Borg (ed.): *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic*. Berlin 2004. P. 53–63, here p. 57–59 and Harris-McCoy: Fragmentary Encyclopedia (n. 1). P. 173–177.
- 4 Harm Pinkster: The Language of Pliny the Elder. In: Tobias Reinhardt/Michael Lapidge/James N. Adams (eds.): *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*. Oxford 2005. P. 239–256, here p. 239–240 provides a summary of negative appraisals of the low style of technical literature as well as more recent reappraisals of texts that belong to this genre and of our expectations of them as readers.
- 5 Harris-McCoy: *Oneirocritica*. Text (n. 1). P. 10; cf. Pinkster: Language of Pliny (n. 4). P. 240.
- 6 Williams’ poem *Self Portrait*, which opens his *Pictures from Brueghel*, calls to mind the stark, bright imagery, unobtrusive prose and gentle rhythm of the *Oneirocritica*: “In a red winter hat blue / eyes smiling / just the head and shoulders.” Cf. the interpretation of a dream of waking up from sleep: “And it means the same thing to see clearly with one’s eyes and to see a light suddenly blazing up in the dark of night” (II, 1, 101, 7–9).
- 7 Roger A. Pack: Artemidorus and his Waking World. In: *TAPhA* 86 (1955). P. 280–290, here p. 282.

The solution is to rethink our definition of composition when it comes to information-centric authors such as Artemidorus, Athenaeus, Pausanias, Vitruvius, Pliny the Elder, or Frontinus among many others. These authors are atypical in the sense that, unlike the orator or historiographer, they are not interested in writing linear narratives. Instead, the act of composition is equivalent to compilation and arrangement.⁸ They are collectors and organizers of lots of discrete bits of information that they arrange for the consumption of their readers. In this sense, they belong to the same intellectual and literary history as the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Google and the Wikipedia.

I want to argue that, when considered from the point of view of the history of information science – that is, the history of the various ways data has been organized and conveyed to its consumers and their intellectual, technological, aesthetic and political underpinnings – Artemidorus is one of the most fascinating and important authors we have from Greco-Roman antiquity, if not the most important. And, when studied from this point of view, the *Oneirocritica* is no longer the sole example of an otherwise extinct genre, but rather one outstanding example among many texts whose goal was to convey information, thus inviting cross-disciplinary comparison.⁹

This paper will test out this approach, looking at several aspects of Books IV and V of the *Oneirocritica* and their place in the history of information science. To me, these books are in many ways the most interesting of the five. I say this because they represent the culmination of Artemidorus' struggles – twice met by failure – to write an ideal book of knowledge. In what follows, I will consider why, according to Artemidorus, Books I and II, as well as the subsequently published Book III, are

⁸ Artemidorus asks his reader, by way of his addressee Cassius Maximus, to evaluate the *Oneirocritica* on the basis of these criteria: “But I ask that you consider the arrangement of my undertaking and the precision of my interpretations, to which alone I have given serious attention [...]” (II, prooem., 100, 13–15). In the same preface, he acknowledges the utilitarian style of his text and, elsewhere, rejects the rhetorical pretensions of his competitors (I, prooem.) and claims to have written in a “bare bones” style without “theatrical setting or dramatic pomp”. Apologizing for low style is thematic in Roman technical literature (Tore Janson: *Latin Prose Prefaces: Studies in Literary Conventions*. Stockholm 1964 [Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Studia Latina Stockholmiensia. Vol. 13]. P. 98–100) but rarely found in Greek authors. Loveday Alexander: *The Preface to Luke's Gospel. Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1.1–4 and Acts 1.1*. Cambridge 1993. P. 73 cites only three: Erotianus, Artemidorus and Serenus, whom she notes were probably influenced by Roman stylistic conventions.

⁹ Cf. the comparative study of the tables of contents in Scribonius Largus, Pliny the Elder, Columella and Aulus Gellius in Andrew Riggsby: *Guides to the Wor(l)d*. In: Jason König/Greg Woolf (eds.): *Ordering Knowledge in the Ancient World*. Cambridge 2007. P. 88–107. The contents of these authors' works could not be more different: medicine, the natural world, farming and a miscellany.

insufficient vehicles of knowledge, and the various ways in which he attempts to improve upon them in composing Books IV and V. Special attention will be given to the composition, structure, practical use as divinatory manuals, prefatory themes and readership of these culminating books of the *Oneirocritica*. In each case, we will find an increased sense of realism and practicality, as well as pessimism and bitterness. Over the course of writing the *Oneirocritica*, Artemidorus becomes increasingly aware of the limitations of the technology of the book and his readership and, in Books IV and V, he responds to these limitations in a variety of ways, in particular, by forcing the reader to participate in the interpretation-process in a more proactive fashion.

Conditions leading to the publication of Books IV and V

It is fair to say that, even at the beginning of the *Oneirocritica*, Artemidorus is somewhat cranky.¹⁰ But, by the time we arrive at Book IV, he has become downright angry. He begins the preface to this book by remarking piously to his son that the project of the *Oneirocritica* was initially inspired both by a *daimon* and “that most lordly Cassius Maximus” and proceeds to explain his intentions for the project in a patient and humble fashion.¹¹ But soon Artemidorus is expressing his frustration that, in Books I and II, “small things [...] not worthy of much concern” were found wanting by “those who examine everything closely and endeavour to leave nothing untested in their investigations” (IV, prooem., 237, 6–9). And, in describing the reception of Book III, he characterizes these men as possessed by the personification of blame Momus “shunned by the gods and *daimones*, against whom one must forcefully take a stand” (IV, prooem., 237, 14–16). These critics and misusers of his text are called impious and possessed by Momus, who is hated by the very *daimon* that inspired the composition of the *Oneirocritica*, and whom Artemidorus, for his part, dutifully obeys.¹²

¹⁰ In the preface to Book I, for example, Artemidorus expresses his chagrin at the current state of treatises on dream-interpretation and at the incompetence and ulterior motives of their authors and does so at length. In fact, he literally adopts a siege mentality, assuming the identity of a Homeric warrior going into battle (cf. Harris-McCoy: Self-Presentation [n. 1]. P. 425–429).

¹¹ Most scholars accept that Artemidorus’ “Cassius Maximus” is Maximus of Tyre, the famous sophist and author of the *Diallexeis* (cf. Pack: Waking World [n. 7]. P. 285 n. 22).

¹² Technical authors often invoke deities in their prefaces to secure their blessings and, in the process, help define their projects and, in Artemidorus’ case, their morals and values. As is the case with Momus and the tutelary *daimon* of the *Oneirocritica*, distinct gods or categories of gods are sometimes juxtaposed to this end. Cf. Varro’s declaration in the *De Re Rustica* that, unlike Homer and Ennius, he will not invoke the Muses of poetry but the various gods of agriculture, highlighting the practical orientation of his text (I, 1).

How did we get to the point of a divine war in a manual on dream-interpretation? Or, put differently, why did Artemidorus' initial plan for the *Oneirocritica* fail so badly that he felt compelled to publish two more sets of books so remarkably different from the first? For the three-phase publication of the *Oneirocritica* is like no other that I know of from antiquity both in terms of its serial nature and the shifting organization of the contents of the text.¹³ Artemidorus originally wanted to write only Books I and II, which were published as a single group, but later felt compelled to supplement these with what would become Book III and, still later, Books IV and V. Moreover, whereas Books I and II contain a carefully organized compendium of dream-interpretations as well as a concise treatise on dreams and dream-divination, Book III takes the form of a miscellany. By contrast, Book IV, which includes a second treatise on dream-divination, provides general principles for interpreting broad categories of dreams while Book V simply lists ninety-five actual dreams and their outcomes.

This kind of radical revision of a treatise is disconcerting insofar as it suggests an admission of failure on the part of the author. And yet Artemidorus still seems pleased with his original plan for the first two books, insisting in the preface to Book IV on their technical brilliance as well as their completeness so long as they are handled by an intelligent reader.¹⁴ And herein lies the heart of the issue. In light of the reception of Books I–III, Artemidorus has become increasingly convinced of the inability of his readers to use the *Oneirocritica* correctly as a manual of dream-interpretations. He therefore feels compelled to revise his text to accommodate the insufficiencies of these readers, resulting in the publication of Books IV and V.

But why did these problems relating to the use of the *Oneirocritica* arise to begin with? They are, I would argue, rooted in Artemidorus' divinatory method, which insists upon a case-by-case approach to interpreting dreams.¹⁵ While a dream relates to its outcome on the basis of some similarity (ὁμοίου παράθεσις), this outcome is further complicated by the dreamer's identity and personal circumstances

¹³ Artemidorus' self-correcting, multi-phase publication has few parallels in antiquity. In certain small respects it recalls Quintilian's publication of the *Institutio Oratoria* in order to counter the effects of two volumes on rhetoric published by his students but circulating under Quintilian's name (I, prooem. 7). More generally, the publication of the *Oneirocritica* reflects a broader concern with controlling the integrity and circulation of texts as well as how readers engage with them. For a full discussion, see Harris-McCoy: *Oneirocritica*. Text (n. 1). P. 523.

¹⁴ See the quotation from the preface to Book IV, for example, in which Artemidorus states that the original books of the *Oneirocritica* "did not lack in the greatness of our craft" and implies that they had, instead, been mishandled by "complete nitwits" (cited below).

¹⁵ See Harris-McCoy: *Oneirocritica*. Text (n. 1). P. 13–18 for an overview of Artemidorus' divinatory technique; cf. Winkler: Constraints (n. 2). P. 23–33.

as well as the broader context of its appearance.¹⁶ Artemidorus is aware of the vast number of potential dream-interpretations that result from this context-based approach to divination and which, as the author of the definitive collection of dream-interpretations, he is expected to record. In Books I and II, he therefore attempts to impose a degree of order, first, by using experiences common to all humans (the so-called κοινὰ ἔθη) as the major organizing principle and also inserting common variables pertaining to how a given dream might turn out.¹⁷ The most typical include gender, age, social class and profession.¹⁸

In spite of these features, however, the *Oneirocritica* was intended from the start to serve as a protreptic device. That is, it was meant to be a guide to the reader – an example of how, under certain conditions, one should interpret dreams – but was never intended to be relied upon passively as an all-encompassing and self-sufficient compendium of dream-interpretations. Indeed, we see exhortations to use the book as a guide rather than a crutch in both the opening books as well as the later ones. In Book I, for example, Artemidorus writes (I, 12, 20, 12–16):

“Therefore I maintain that it is necessary for the interpreter of dreams to have prepared himself from his own resources and to use his native intelligence rather than simply to rely upon manuals, since a man who thinks that he will perfect by theory without any natural talents will remain imperfect and incomplete, and all the more, the more he is set in this habit.”

And a similar statement is found in Book IV, which is addressed to Artemidorus’ son (IV, 4, 247, 17–21):

“You should learn local customs and the peculiarities of every place if you are not already acquainted with them. Travelling and extensive reading will provide you with the best information on the subject. For books on dream interpretation are not sufficient in themselves to assist you, but you need other sources of information as well.”

In both cases, Artemidorus is directing the reader to use something other than the *Oneirocritica* itself – his own resources, native intelligence and travel – in order to supplement the text.¹⁹ In particular, by stating to his son that actual travel and ethno-

¹⁶ These factors are the six στοιχεῖα, in terms of which all dreams must be evaluated. They include: nature, law, custom, occupation, words or names and time (I, 3). The στοιχεῖα are, in fact, described in the text as categories to which all phenomena can be assigned (IV, 2); a dream-language that is idiosyncratic to each dreamer (I, 2); and the means of evaluating dreams (I, 3; IV, 2).

¹⁷ Cf. Harris-McCoy: *Oneirocritica*. Text (n. 1). P. 17.

¹⁸ It is for this reason that Pomeroy: Status (n. 2) can use the *Oneirocritica* to make observations about social class and Winkler: Constraints (n. 2) about gender and sexuality.

¹⁹ See Harris-McCoy: Self-Presentation (n. 1). P. 435–439 for Artemidorus’ adoption of the travel-persona. On the relationship between travel and the acquisition of knowledge, see Daniel

graphic research will be required to do this supplemental work, Artemidorus is indicating that any finite text is, in fact, insufficient and must be augmented by the reader who must go beyond the text and contribute actively to the process of interpretation.

And, indeed, the reader's failure to use the text appropriately seems to be at the very heart of why Artemidorus wrote Books IV and V, and likely Book III as well. In the preface to Book III, Artemidorus says that he himself noticed that a few things were missing from his original presentation, and that he wrote Book III to prevent any censure. But in Book IV the blame rests squarely on the reader for the failure of all previous versions of the *Oneirocritica*. In reference to Books I and II, Artemidorus says that he "composed [these books] to the best of my ability, so that, in my opinion, they were not lacking in the greatness of our craft, nor were they insufficient – at least for those who aren't complete nitwits" (IV, prooem., 236, 5–8). And, later, he notices that certain nitpickers did in fact find insufficiencies in these books. So he wrote Book III, a miscellaneous compendium of items that were missing from the previous books.²⁰ But again Momus inspired Artemidorus' critics to levy claims of insufficiency, namely, that not everything had been worked out in these books and that certain pertinent items had still been omitted.²¹

Harris-McCoy: The Metaphors and Meanings of Travel in Artemidorus' Dream Book. In: NECJ 36.2 (2009). P. 83–104, here p. 95–97.

²⁰ Artemidorus refuses to add material to the perfect plan of Books I and II, which he says would be like adding a growth upon a "healthy and gorgeous body" (III, prooem., 204, 10–11), preferring to write a separate third book that includes all omitted material jotted down "at random" (σποράδιον). Elsewhere I have argued that Artemidorus' selection of the title *Enodion* for Book III – "By the Wayside" – reflects its status as a miscellany comprised of recherché materials insofar as it connotes something off the beaten track and, for this reason, recalls the titles of miscellanies listed, for example, in Aulus Gellius' *Attic Nights*, e.g. *Helicon*, *Side-Dagger*, *By-Work*, *Discoveries*, *Meadows*, *Woods* (Harris-McCoy: *Oneirocritica*. Text [n. 1]. P. 22). More recently, however, it has been argued that the title should be translated as something like "Handbook" (cf. Epictetus' *Encheiridion*); Julien du Bouchet/Christophe Chandezon: Artémidore: le cadre historique, géographique et social d'une vie. In: Julien du Bouchet/Christophe Chandezon (eds.): *Études sur Artémidore et l'interprétation des rêves*. Nanterre 2012. P. 11–26, here p. 11 n. 1.

²¹ He also refers to the readers who considered his previous publications deficient literally as "those who examine everything closely with their nails" (ὑπὸ τῶν ὀνυχιζόντων πάντα), that is, nitpickers. Artemidorus himself says that he will adhere to a doctrine of simplicity and straightforwardness at various points in the text, e.g. in his adoption of six στοιχεῖα (IV, 2) and the claim that his interpretations will avoid excessive commentary. That said, at other points he observes that he, unlike his careless forebears, will address a point in full detail, e.g. in his introduction to dreams of body-parts (I, 16) or dreams of intercourse with one's mother (I, 79). This tension between including material for the sake of completeness and its exclusion due to the finite nature of the book is present in all compilatory texts and therefore not surprisingly becomes a common theme in catalogic and technical literature. Cf. Plin. nat. praef. 17–18; Colum. I, praef. 22; Quint. inst. I, 10; cf. Tim Whitmarsh: Aelius Aristides. In: Irene J. F. de Jong/René Nünlist/Angus M. Bowie (eds.): *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Lit-*

The point is that Artemidorus' ancient readers repeatedly identified faults in his text and, in particular, levied charges of incompleteness against it. Artemidorus clearly considered these charges to be unfair, arising from a misunderstanding about how divination works and how the *Oneirocritica* should therefore be used. So he decided to publish Books IV and V as a result. In what follows, then, we will examine how these books attempt to solve the problem, steering the reader towards a more active interpretive role.

Formal features of Books IV and V

Before proceeding to the use of Books IV and V, I want to say something about their basic stylistic and formal features, as they play a major role in how the reader interacts with the information contained in these books. Book IV consists of an additional treatise (IV, prooem.–4), which occupies about 1/7 of the total length of the book. It reiterates many of the items found in the treatise in Book I, for example, the distinction between ὄνειροι and ἐνύπνια, theorematic and allegorical ὄνειροι, and the στοιχεῖα. Artemidorus openly acknowledges his reiteration of previous material: “I will write down for you everything that relates to these areas of inquiry in a manner that agrees with the content found in the first two books starting from the very beginning” (IV, praef., 238, 8–10).

One gets the sense that the treatise of Book IV was written for practical use. It reveals, in particular, an awareness of the need to respond effectively when consulting with a client or responding to critics or competitors. This sense of competition is found at the close of the preface, with Artemidorus declaring that “many, and almost all, treatises that are concerned with success in divination are inferior to ours [...]” (IV, prooem., 238, 6–8). Artemidorus commonly includes imagined critics in the text. The treatise proper begins with the declaration: “[...] to those who say that the explanation has not been spelled out in every case, you will rightly state the words from the preface to the first book [...]” (IV, prooem., 238, 11–13). The section on the στοιχεῖα is introduced similarly: “So that you will be able to respond to those speaking with hostility about the six elements [...]” (IV, 2, 242, 16–17). And, in fact, hypothetical detractors are found throughout Book IV.²² Finally, Artemidorus sometimes

erature. Leiden 2004. P. 441–447, here p. 442–444 and, more generally, Anna Arnar: *Encyclopedism from Pliny to Borges*. Chicago 1990. P. xi.

²² In Book IV, Artemidorus often imagines hypothetical conversations between his son and his potential questioners or detractors, instructing him in what he “will” or “should say” in response to different lines of questioning, e.g. IV, prooem. 21. 63. 84. Cf. Harris-McCoy: *Oneirocritica*. Text (n. 1) P. 524.

refers to things that need to be kept in mind when actually divining. For example, he introduces a section on one of the finer points of dealing with ἐνύπνια with the statement “[...] in order that you never be deceived” (IV, prooem., 239, 20–21).²³

It seems clear from the composition of the treatise to Book IV then, that Artemidorus is, first, seeking to provide more detailed information about the most crucial aspects of his method of dream-divination. But, second, he is encouraging his reader to imagine scenarios in which he will have to put this information into practice – that is, when actually divining and when responding to critics. Furthermore, by telling his reader how to respond to critics who have misread the earlier books, he is urging him to become an active defender of the *Oneirocritica*. Artemidorus clearly considers this necessary in light of the previous failures of the text to defend itself and, indeed, of any text to do so given the limitations of the technology.²⁴

It should also be noted that Book IV, in the treatise and elsewhere, is, relatively speaking, full of imperative language. Artemidorus often commands his reader to “find out” (IV, 4, IV, 59) or “know that [...]” (IV, 8 x 2, IV, prooem. x 2, IV, 63, IV, 83). This reflects his more familiar relationship with his son and the elite inner-circle of diviners meant to read the book, but may also be indicative of the relative seriousness of these books, insofar as they are, as we shall soon see, explicitly imagined to be for practical, professional use.²⁵

From Chapter 5 onward – that is, the end of the treatise – Book IV becomes more complex in terms of its content and organization. Essentially, it consists of instructions for how to approach the interpretation of some broad type of dream, frequently followed by examples of dreams that fit the category, followed by an example of an actual dream, to which these instructions apply. Occasionally these dream-types are very specific. For example: “To build a hearth in a foreign land prophesies death for one who is not preparing to marry or to dwell in that land. A Bithynian youth who imagined that he built a hearth in Rome died” (IV, 34, 267, 22–24). This is, however, more the exception than the rule. Much more common are interpretations or, rather, guidelines for interpreting broad types of dreams or categories of dream-images bound by some defining feature. This stands in contrast to the dream-outcome-explanation sequence followed in Books I through III. For example, the first several dream-categories found in Book IV are: “Anything that

²³ References to potential error on the part of the interpreter are almost unique to Book IV, appearing at IV, prooem. 2. 20. 21. 23. 28. 59. 71. Other instances, which are made in a much less direct manner, occur at I, 2, 8 and 12.

²⁴ Artemidorus shares a set of concerns similar to those found in Plato's *Phaedrus*, in which Socrates derides the technology of the book due to its inability to defend itself against a confused or hostile readership (275d-e).

²⁵ Cf. Harris-McCoy: *Oneirocritica*. Text (n. 1). P. 532.

is braided [...]” (IV, 6), interpretations of different types of people one can meet in dreams (7–10), “anything that sprouts and grows slowly” and “anything that is tall” (11), “anything that is solid” (12), etc.

There is also a tendency to introduce these broad categories of dream-objects or dream-types using an indefinite pronoun or other sort of inclusive adjective, which is typically the first word in a section. ὅσα (anything that is [...]) is the most common, followed by πάντα (all things that are [...]), ὅμοια (things of this sort [...]), or ὅταν (whenever [...]).²⁶ For example, Artemidorus provides interpretations for “whatever grows”, “whatever is good smelling”, “whatever is similar” and “whatever is braided” among many other items. This is worth paying attention to, in particular because the beginnings of sections on the various types of dreams receive special treatment throughout the *Oneirocritica*. For example, in Book III, which is a miscellany, separate sections usually begin with the word signifying whatever is being interpreted: dice, sacrilege, lying, quail, etc. This tendency reflects the random organization of the book, allowing the reader to quickly pick out the topic of each section.

Artemidorus does not say anything explicit about the organization of Book IV apart from the fact that “[...] in a manner that is rational and defines its terms, I will write down for you everything [that relates to] these areas of inquiry in a manner that agrees with the content found in the first two books starting from the very beginning” (IV, prooem., 238, 8–10). The book begins with a treatise, just like Book I, but following this its contents do not correspond to the well-organized structure of the initial books. In fact, it resembles the random organization of Book III. The section on family members (30) is followed by interpretations of things that encompass (31), kings, temples and soldiers (32), life and statements made that do not pertain to the addressee’s trade (33). If there is order in this list, it resembles Borges’ infamous Chinese encyclopedia, the *Celestial Emporium of Benevolent Knowledge’s Taxonomy*, which includes such categories as those that belong to the emperor; embalmed ones; those that are trained; suckling pigs; and mermaids (or sirens)!²⁷ Why Artemidorus would therefore choose to compose another miscellany, this time for a treatise meant for practical use, must also be considered.²⁸

²⁶ Cf. Harris-McCoy: *Oneirocritica*. Text (n. 1). P. 531.

²⁷ The Chinese encyclopedia is described in Borges’ story *The Analytical Language of John Wilkins*. Sadly, it seems to have no real-life counterpart. However, George Lakoff: *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About the Mind*. Chicago 1990. P. 5 presents the remarkable case of the Australian aboriginal language Dyirbal, which includes the linguistic categories of women, fire, dangerous things, birds that are not dangerous, as well as a hodge-podge of exceptional animals.

²⁸ As an ostensibly practical and professionally-oriented text, the *Oneirocritica’s* adoption of the miscellanistic form in Book III is surely unusual. That said, “well-organized” texts like Varro’s *De Re Rustica* or Pliny’s *Natural History* occasionally exhibit miscellanistic tendencies.

Book V is less difficult to characterize. It, too, is a miscellany of sorts, consisting of real, historical dreams and outcomes. In this sense, it shares certain characteristics with Book IV: its random organization and its inclusion of specific dreams and outcomes. There is not much else included in the book. Indeed, Artemidorus himself states: "But here [in Book V] you will find, for each of the dreams, only their bare-bones outcomes, exactly as they came to pass, without any theatrical setting or dramatic pomp" (V, prooem., 301, 16–17).²⁹ Simply put, we receive dreams, outcomes, explanations and as much context as Artemidorus deems necessary, but nothing more.

The use of Books IV and V

Now that we have considered the formal features of Books IV and V, we should turn to how they might have been used by their ancient readers, and how their composition solves the problems outlined above – namely, the perceived need to compel his readers to work with the text, taking a more proactive role in dream-interpretation.

We can be fairly certain that Books IV and V were meant to be used alongside each other, but that Book IV could also stand on its own and that Book V was meant to function as a supplementary workbook of sorts. This is clear enough from the statement at the close of the preface to Book V, where Artemidorus says: "Nevertheless, since I believe that you still have need of additional experience and practice, I have resolved to fulfill the promise I made at the close of the fourth book" (V, prooem., 302, 9–11).³⁰

Beginning with Book IV, then, let us return to Artemidorus' use of indefinite pronouns and other words of inclusivity at the start of its major sections. In addition to serving as section-markers, they are also signs that broad categories of dream-types

One also wonders if the *Oneirocritica*, in spite of its professional veneer, may have simply been read for pleasure and, in that sense, is similar to the *Deipnosophistae* of Athenaeus or Plutarch's *Sympotic Questions*.

²⁹ Artemidorus is not implying that the dreams located in the previous books were presented in a manner that was more dramatic or, for that matter, more visual than those in Book V. Indeed, he is essentially repeating the point, made in the preface to Book I, that he will not "babble on" in the manner of his more rhetorically-inclined predecessors. That said, while Artemidorus allows for auditory dreams, the majority of his dreams are visual in nature, a point that is indicated by his dream-terminology (cf. Harris-McCoy: *Oneirocritica*. Text [n. 1]. P. 423).

³⁰ Cf. Harris-McCoy: *Oneirocritica*. Text (n. 1). P. 25. It is unclear from the text how much time passed between the various publications of the *Oneirocritica*. Although planned as a group, enough time apparently passed between the publication of Book IV and Book V that Artemidorus is able to joke that he wouldn't be surprised if his son were in a litigious mood on account of the delay (V, prooem.)!

and dream-objects are being considered here in contrast to the specific dreams and interpretations found in the previous books.

One could argue that, in Books I and II, we also receive broad categories of dreams, which are organized according to contents and events of a typical human day and life. These include long chapters on dreams pertaining to birth, the body, arts and professions, etc. Any similarity between the categorization and presentation of dreams in Books I or II versus Book IV is, however, false. In Books I and II, Artemidorus provides specific instructions for interpreting specific dreams. The categories of dreams found in Book IV, however, tend to be much broader as is indicated by the use of the indefinite pronouns that introduce them. And the instructions Artemidorus provides for interpreting them are similarly schematic. For example, Artemidorus declares: “Anything that happens to babies that is inappropriate for their age is grievous” (IV, 19, 252, 20) and he goes on to provide the additional broad instructions: “And, appropriately, anything else that takes place prior to the appropriate time signifies death, because it is proximal to old age, which death always follows” (IV, 19, 253, 2–5).

This stands in stark contrast to the long and detailed section on specific pregnancy- and baby-related dreams that begins the *Oneirocritica* (I, 13–16), in which relatively specific instructions for how to interpret such dreams are provided. It is notable that, while the two simple instructions provided in Book IV for interpreting baby-related dreams do not encompass all the specific interpretations of baby-dreams found in Book I, they can account for several, both there and elsewhere.³¹

The important point is that, because the diviner who consults Book IV is only able to rely upon these broad schematic instructions, he is forced to think actively and dynamically about the interpretation-process and can no longer rely passively on the relatively specific dreams and outcomes found in the earlier books.³² And yet a gradual weaning process is also allowed for, insofar as its broad instructions are sometimes supported by specific examples of the types of dreams that apply to them. This helps train the interpreter to associate particular dreams he encounters in his practice with the broad dream-categories whose interpretations are provided in Book IV. For instance, Artemidorus offers dreams of babies with beards, gray hair, or who marry or bear children as examples of the broader principle that dreams of babies doing something contrary to their age foretells misfortune (IV, 19). In other

³¹ Age-appropriate behavior forms the basis of several baby-related dream-interpretations though typically in reference to the identity of the dreamer. If an artisan dreams of being born, for example, it predicts unemployment insofar as babies do not work (I, 13). And if a very young girl dreams of having milk in her breasts, it foretells death “for all things contrary to age are grievous with the exception of a few” (I, 16, 25, 3).

³² Cf. Harris-McCoy: *Oneirocritica*. Text (n. 1). P. 24.

cases, specific historical dreams that belong to a dream-category are provided serving roughly the same function.³³

I would argue that the most important aspect of Book IV is its coupling of instructions for the interpretation of broad categories of dream-objects with the miscellaneous organization of its contents. The effect of this is disorienting.³⁴ In the absence of an obvious guide to the text, the reader is forced to think for himself. In Books I and II, we get a table of contents, which directs the reader but simultaneously prejudices him as to how he will access the text. In Book IV, however, the interpretations have no organization at all, nor is a table of contents provided to orient the reader.

This has several consequences. First, the reader will potentially search through much of Book IV before finding the section that is relevant to the particular dream he is attempting to interpret. Thus he will read and re-read the instructions found in Book IV, becoming more and more familiar with all of its contents as he searches through the book. Second, the reader will consider the possibility of there being multiple ways of interpreting any one dream, thereby being forced to a certain extent to employ Artemidorus' complex, empiricist approach to divination. For example, if one dreams of a vine, does this mean that it should be interpreted according to the rules that pertain to things that are braided, i.e. the twining of vines (IV, 5) or things that sprout and grow quickly (IV, 11) or things that encompass (IV, 30) or things that are alike in color (IV, 38) or items that relate to the mysteries, for example, of Dionysus (IV, 39)?³⁵ The answer is not clear, and I think purposefully so, since it forces the reader to make the decision for himself.

At last we come to Book V, which is characterized by Artemidorus as composed for the sake of providing "additional experience and practice" (τριβῆς τε καὶ γυμνασίας). As mentioned above, this suggests that Book V had something like a workbook function. The book is comprised of actual dreams and outcomes, followed by an

³³ A concise example appears at IV, 50. Artemidorus gives instructions for interpreting any dream of seeing one's friends and enemies consorting with one another and then observes that a man named Philinus had a dream of this sort, in which a friend and enemy traveled together, with an identical outcome.

³⁴ Withholding answers or even purposefully disorienting the reader in order to encourage their participation in the reading and learning experience is common in antiquity. We see it in the aporetic dialogues of Plato, the literary principle of *variatio* and the genre of the miscellany just to name a few examples. As an incomplete and disorienting catalogue of information, however, the *Oneirocritica* looks ahead to relatively modern encyclopedias such as Novalis' *Das Allgemeine Brouillon* or even David Wilson's postmodern Museum of Jurassic Technology located in Culver City, California.

³⁵ Vines appear in Book I in a much more straightforward fashion, being designated as beneficial to actors due to the connection with Dionysus; signifying bondage due to their clinging tendrils; and beheading for criminals (I, 77). This encourages a far more passive approach to interpreting this dream than in Book IV.

explanation of the interpretation of that particular dream-interpretation. What is missing is any connection of these individual dreams and interpretations to a larger genus of dream or to the broader principles of their interpretation as presented in Book IV. The kind of “practice” that Book V provides, at the most obvious level, is therefore practice in identifying the relationship between relatively complex sets of historical dreams and outcomes. But the miscellanistic nature of the book, in addition to the fact that it fails to mention the larger principles that underlie its dream-interpretations, again encourage an active role on the part of the reader insofar as he will be inclined to impose a sense of order and system where none is forthcoming.

There are further reasons to think that, in Book V, Artemidorus hopes his reader will relate the individual dreams to others found in the *Oneirocritica*, thereby building a sense of the systematicity of dream-interpretation while preserving an essentially empiricist point of view. While Artemidorus insists that the dreams of Book V are culled from actual experience, it seems likely that some of the dreams in this book were manipulated so that they corresponded with the dream-interpretations found in the earlier books and, hence, would facilitate a more active and dynamic use of the text. The clearest example is a dream which appears at V, 78.³⁶ It is almost identical to a dream presented at I, 64 with the exception that certain variables are changed. In both dreams, the dreamers (a cithara player and runner) were unable to draw water from a source (a bath and spring) when competing in a ‘sacred contest’. Furthermore, both dreams foretell cheating on the part of the dreamers (the cithara player bribed the judges while, in the case of the runner, a friendly judge rigged the competition on his behalf).

The number of parallels between these dreams is so extraordinary that one wonders whether they are ‘real’ dreams as Artemidorus suggests or if, perhaps, the dream in Book V is a fabrication designed to encourage the reader to draw connections between it and dreams found elsewhere in the text. Whether Artemidorus fabricated some or all of the dreams of Book V or not, it is clear enough that the book is meant to be used dialogically with the previous books. Of course, having been weaned from the simple dream-interpretations found in Books I through III in Book IV, the would-be diviner is, in Book V, completely on his own and must work back and forth between the dreams found there and the instructions found previously, internalizing the principles of dream-interpretation more and more in the process.

³⁶ Cf. Harris-McCoy: *Oneirocritica*. Text (n. 1). P. 557.

The prefaces

Now that we have considered the composition and structure of Books IV and V, and have made some suggestions as to their possible use, let us look at the composition of their prefaces and see how the themes and images developed therein relate to the composition and intellectual/divinatory concerns found in these books.

The theme of our discussion so far has been that, in Books IV and V, Artemidorus is more aware of the limitations of the technology of the book and, in particular, of his incompetent and sometimes antagonistic readership. These issues become the dominating themes of the prefaces to Books IV and V. All of the prefaces of the *Oneirocritica* are paranoid to a certain degree. Even in Book I, Artemidorus expresses an acute awareness of the diminished state of dream-divination and the hostile environment his text will be entering. But the prefaces to Books IV and V are even more emotional and dramatic, and express this heightened state of tension by alluding to and amplifying themes found in the earlier prefaces.

One of the hallmarks of all of Artemidorus' prefaces is his simultaneous inclusion of lofty and pedestrian imagery, which he uses to express his intentions for the individual books in an effective manner. In the preface to Book I, Artemidorus adopts several personae, about which I have written elsewhere.³⁷ These include such high-flown personalities as the epic warrior – with accompanying Homeric quotations and imagery – as well as the more day-to-day doctor, traveler and book connoisseur who is also willing to consult with the low-brow diviners of the marketplace in the pursuit of his research.³⁸ This lends a sense of glory and flair to Artemidorus' project, while also reminding the reader that Artemidorus is humble and relatable in contrast to his arrogant and incompetent competitors.³⁹ In the preface to Book II, Artemidorus uses the binary images of the sun and the lamp to illustrate the gap in rhetorical skill between Cassius Maximus and himself. And, in the preface to Book III, the binaries of harmony and disharmony and of beauty and ugliness are used in Artemidorus' discussion of the challenges involved in writing a supplemental volume of dream-interpretations.

³⁷ Harris-McCoy: Self-Presentation (n. 1).

³⁸ Artemidorus says he consorted for many years with the "much-maligned diviners of the marketplace, whom the high and mighty and the eyebrow-raisers call beggars and charlatans and altar-lurkers" (I, prooem., 2, 13–16). The marketplace is, moreover, a potent pedestrian symbol in the text. It is a place of potential public shame (I, 76, II, 26), dirtiness (II, 26), disturbances and scandals (II, 30, III, 62).

³⁹ See Alexander: Preface (n. 8). P. 44–46 and p. 76–78 for the author's orientation to his given field and treatment of competitors in Greek scientific prefaces.

In Book IV, Artemidorus alludes to and intensifies both ends of this thematic spectrum. Instead of citing Homer and mentioning that he is prepared to “go into battle, bringing into [the] fray my experience and observation of actual outcomes of dreams” as he does in Book I (praef., 1, 16–18), Artemidorus elevates the conflict between himself and his competitors and detractors from a human- to a divine war, pitting the *daimon* that inspired the *Oneirocritica* – likely Apollo Mystes – against the fallen spirit Momus, who is the child of Night according to Hesiod’s *Theogony* and is said to be capable of finding fault with anything.⁴⁰

In the preface to Book IV, Artemidorus also develops the theme of debt and the return he expects on his investment, namely, the composition of Books I and II, which he wrote “in order that I might please my companion and not, investing my wisdom in silence and hesitation, squander it in vain [...]” (IV, prooem., 236, 3–4).⁴¹ The financial meaning of παραδίδομι, which I have translated as “invest” and which can mean “to give” or “transmit” but may also refer to the delivery of goods or articles entered into an inventory, is confirmed by Artemidorus’ use of ἀναλίσκειν, meaning “to spend”.⁴² Given the failure of Artemidorus’ hope for a return, I have translated this verb as “to squander”. The theme of investment and failed return developed in Book IV complements the theme of breach of contract and litigation that appears in Book V, which Artemidorus begins by saying jokingly to his son: “It would perhaps be appropriate, my child, to take me to court for my tardiness if it were due to laziness [...]” (V, prooem., 301, 1–2).⁴³ Taken together, these prefatory themes – monetary and legal troubles – reflect our overarching thesis that, in Books IV and V, Artemidorus exhibits less naïveté and more world-weariness.

And, once again, Artemidorus emphasizes this change by playing off of themes found in Books I and II. The reference to his bad investment, in particular, seems to reflect his frustration over spending considerable time and, we assume, financial resources in doing research for Books I and II. This is suggested in the preface to Book I,

⁴⁰ Complementing the Homeric reference in Book I, Artemidorus may well be alluding to Callimachus’ *Hymn to Apollo*, whose closing line offers a final “hail” to Apollo and tells Momus (Blame) to go where Envy – whom Apollo has just spurned – dwells. This could be meaningful, not least because, in Callimachus, Envy expresses his affection for big but indiscriminating poetry, whereas Apollo is solely concerned with quality. This difference in poetic taste can easily be translated onto the conflict between Artemidorus and his rival divers who, unlike him, are highly interested in copious publication and less interested in the quality of the material they publish (e.g. I, prooem.; V, prooem.). Cf. Harris-McCoy: *Oneirocritica*. Text (n. 1). P. 523.

⁴¹ Cf. Harris-McCoy: *Oneirocritica*. Text (n. 1). P. 521.

⁴² LSJ s.v. παραδίδομι 1: to transmit knowledge (Plat. Men. 93c); enter into an inventory: IG XII 324, 2.

⁴³ The verb in question is ἐγκαλεῖν, which means to “call in a debt” (LSJ I.1) or to “levy a charge”, potentially legal, against someone (II. 1–2).

in which Artemidorus describes his travels throughout the Mediterranean for the purpose of collecting dreams and outcomes as well as the “zeal” (φιλοτιμία) – one of whose meanings is expense – for collecting old books on divination.⁴⁴ It is therefore fitting that Artemidorus expresses his annoyance at the *Oneirocritica*'s less-than-perfect reception in part by using imagery of finance and lawsuits.

Change of addressee and publication

In Book IV, there is a remarkable shift from a public to a restricted, private readership that again reflects Artemidorus' increased awareness of the insufficiencies of his readers and, in particular, the challenges faced by dream-diviners working in this competitive and risky profession.⁴⁵ Book IV is explicitly re-addressed not to Cassius Maximus but to Artemidorus' son, also named Artemidorus (IV, praef.). This change in addressee is of symbolic importance. If we accept that Cassius Maximus is Maximus of Tyre, the famous orator, and we accept that in some senses the author's relationship to the addressee stands for his relationship to his readers, then we are observing a shift from a public audience to a more private and intimate one. This is apparent from Cassius Maximus' descriptions in the earlier books, where he is said to be “as good at speaking as anyone who has ever come before the people of Greece” (I, prooem., 3, 3–5).

This public-figure addressee is left behind, however, for a member of Artemidorus own family, who is addressed in familiar terms. Artemidorus' son is referred to at the close of Book IV and in the preface to Book V using the intimate address ὦ τέκνον (“my child”, IV, 84).⁴⁶ We should also recall Artemidorus' increased use of the imperative mood in this book, again implying a familiar addressee. Extending this interpretation a bit, the other characteristics of the now former addressee Cassius Maximus include his extraordinary intelligence and ability to grasp concepts swiftly. It is tempting to read his disappearance as addressee as an indictment against those previous readers who were not able to follow Maximus' superlative example.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ For φιλοτιμία as a lavish outlay of wealth, see LSJ 3–4 (e.g. Lys. XXXIII, 2; Aischin. III, 19). Cf. Harris-McCoy: *Oneirocritica*. Text (n. 1). P. 413, 521.

⁴⁵ For a survey of instances of restricted readership in antiquity, see Harris-McCoy: *Oneirocritica*. Text (n. 1). P. 523. The impulse to control the circulation of a text is traceable to Plato (e.g. Phaidr. 275d–e). Artemidorus' desire to restrict one's readership to an elite audience finds a parallel in Aulus Gellius' comparison of literary criticism to a religious rite and his decree to men who are absorbed in business affairs to stay away from his text (praef. 19).

⁴⁶ A parallel address is, for example, used by Alcestis when she questions her daughter (Eur. Alc. 313–14). Cf. Harris-McCoy: *Oneirocritica*. Text (n. 1). P. 549.

⁴⁷ In fact, Artemidorus modifies his presentation of Cassius Maximus – the addressee of the first three books – to suit his immediate purpose. A preeminent orator in Books I and II, he is turned

Just as Artemidorus has selected a more familiar addressee – namely, his son – he asks his son to restrict the *Oneirocritica*'s publication and avoid circulating it amongst a wide readership. His reasoning is, in fact, not that others will misuse it, though this is implicit given the indictment against his readers just a bit earlier in the preface, but rather that his exclusive possession of these books will make him uniquely outstanding as a professional diviner: “For the items written therein, so long as they remain with you alone, will make you a loftier dream-interpreter than all or, rather, left in the dust by none” (IV, prooem., 238, 2–4). This suggests that Books IV and V were written primarily for practical, professional purposes. In this sense they differ from Books I and II, which were not really written for practical reasons, but to defend oneiromancy against its detractors and to shore up the confidence of those who tried and failed at dream-interpretation due to a lack of good treatises on the subject (I, prooem., 1, 13–2, 1).

And indeed Book IV is suffused with a sense of its practical, real-world use. In reference to its language, Artemidorus states that, in Book IV, he will use technical terms and, in Book V, that he will present the dreams in a stripped-down, unadorned fashion, reflecting his irritation at those incompetent readers who demand more and more explanations and who read (and write) dream-manuals for rhetorical pleasure rather than for practical aid.⁴⁸ Ironically, in Book IV, Artemidorus instructs his son for the first time to show off when divining to entertain his clientele: “Attempt to explain all things and to provide an explanation for each interpretation as well as some credible proofs, since even if you speak the truth, [by relating] outcomes that are plain and stripped down, you will seem less experienced. But you should not be deceived into thinking that there is a prevailing cause behind these outcomes” (IV, 20, 253, 12–17). In other words, by Book IV, Artemidorus recognized that, in order to be competitive in the profession, the diviner must provide his clients with a divinatory experience that is impressive as well as accurate.

Finally, in Book IV, there is an increased sense of the professional stakes involved in being a diviner. It is suffused with the vocabulary of mockery – γελοῖος and γελᾶν words appear, in particular, at several points – indicating that the diviner who fails at his task will be laughed at and lose face, something Artemidorus wants his son to avoid.⁴⁹ For example, Artemidorus urges his son to constantly look into the cir-

into a man of wisdom in Book III, with Artemidorus himself talking up the rhetorician's mantle here (cf. Harris-McCoy: *Oneirocritica*. Text [n. 1]. P. 504). Artemidorus' explicit statement to his son that Cassius Maximus is no longer his addressee in Book IV may be similarly meaningful.

⁴⁸ On Artemidorus' competitors as unscholarly, fame-seeking sophists, see Harris-McCoy: *Self-Presentation* (n. 1). P. 429–435.

⁴⁹ For the phrase “it would be laughable that [...]”, see IV, 2, 22 x 2, IV, 23, 65, 83; cf. I, 3, III, 24; for warnings against “losing face”, see IV, 22, 59. Cf. Harris-McCoy: *Oneirocritica*. Text (n. 1). P. 535.

cumstances surrounding dreams, “since it would be laughable to mention, in the manner of most authors, things that have been written or said in the past alone” (IV, 65, 288, 15–17). The implication is that, if Artemidorus Jr. wants to avoid professional humiliation, he should heed his father’s advice. Conversely, Artemidorus even instructs his son to “mock” or “have contempt for” those who make so-called “contracts” with the gods (IV, 2, 245, 14–15). Clearly, Artemidorus is aware that competition in the field of divination is fierce, and his composition of Books IV and V, which emphasizes the self-sufficiency of the reader, reflects this.

Conclusions

This paper began by observing that the literary style of technical and compilatory authors like Artemidorus is typically underappreciated, and that this lack of appreciation is based on a misunderstanding of their generic goals. When understood as a vehicle for the appropriate transmission of knowledge, the peculiar composition of Books IV and V of the *Oneirocritica* becomes illuminated. From his most basic choices relating to the phrasing of individual dream-interpretations and their organization, to his choice of addressee and recommendations for the publication and circulation of the text, Artemidorus exhibits an increased awareness of the limitations of writing as a means of conveying information and, in particular, of his readers as competent learners. The result is a radical experiment in the history of information science: a sourcebook that is simultaneously informative and disorienting, unique in ancient literature, but grounded in much consideration about how meaning is made and how people come to know.

Bibliography

- Loveday Alexander: The Preface to Luke's Gospel. Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1.1–4 and Acts 1.1. Cambridge 1993.
- Jacques Annequin: Les esclaves rêvent aussi. Remarques sur La clé des songes d'Artémidore. In: DHA 13 (1987). P. 71–113.
- Anna Arnar: Encyclopedism from Pliny to Borges. Chicago 1990.
- Danièle Auger: Artémidore et le théâtre. In: Julien du Bouchet/Christophe Chandezon (eds.): Études sur Artémidore et l'interprétation des rêves. Nanterre 2012. P. 99–170.
- Jorge Luis Borges/Anthony Kerrigan (ed. and tr.): Ficciones. New York 1962.
- Glen Bowersock: Artemidorus and the Second Sophistic. In: Barbara Borg (ed.): Paidia: The World of the Second Sophistic. Berlin 2004. P. 53–63.
- Julien du Bouchet/Christophe Chandezon: Artémidore: le cadre historique, géographique et social d'une vie. In: Julien du Bouchet/Christophe Chandezon (eds.): Études sur Artémidore et l'interprétation des rêves. Nanterre 2012. P. 11–26.
- Michel Foucault: The Care of the Self: Volume 3 of the History of Sexuality. New York 1986.
- Daniel Harris-McCoy: The Metaphors and Meanings of Travel in Artemidorus' Dream Book. In: NECJ 36.2 (2009). P. 83–104.
- Daniel Harris-McCoy: Artemidorus' Self-Presentation in the Preface to the *Oneirocritica*. In: CJ 106.4 (2011). P. 423–444.
- Daniel Harris-McCoy: Artemidorus' *Oneirocritica*: Text, Translation, Commentary. Oxford 2012.
- Daniel Harris-McCoy: Artemidorus' *Oneirocritica* as Fragmentary Encyclopedia. In: Jason König/Greg Woolf (eds.): Encyclopaedism From Antiquity to the Renaissance. Cambridge 2013. P. 154–177.
- Tore Janson: Latin Prose Prefaces: Studies in Literary Conventions. Stockholm 1964 (Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Studia Latina Stockholmiensia. Vol. 13).
- Dimitri Kasprzyk: Les couleurs du rêve: *l'Onirocriticon* d'Artémidore. In: Laurence Villard (ed.): Couleurs et visions dans l'antiquité classique. Rouen 2002. P. 129–152.
- Alice König: From Architect to Emperor: Vitruvius and his Addressee in the *De Architectura*. In: Liba Taub/Aude Doody (eds.): Authorial Voices in Greco-Roman Technical Writing. Trier 2009. P. 31–52.
- George Lakoff: Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About the Mind. Chicago 1990.
- Roger A. Pack: Artemidorus and his Waking World. In: TAPhA 86 (1955). P. 280–290.

- Harm Pinkster: The Language of Pliny the Elder. In: Tobias Reinhardt/Michael Lapidge/James N. Adams (eds.): *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*. Oxford 2005. P. 239–256.
- Arthur Pomeroy: Status and Status-Concern in the Greco-Roman Dream-Books. In: *AncSoc* 22 (1991). P. 51–74.
- Andrew Riggsby: Guides to the Wor(l)d. In: Jason König/Greg Woolf (eds.): *Ordering Knowledge in the Ancient World*. Cambridge 2007. P. 88–107.
- Anton J. L. van Hooff: Self-Killing in Artemidorus' Dream-World. In: André P. M. H. Lardinois/Marc G. M. van der Poel/Vincent J. C. Hunink (eds.): *Land of Dreams. Greek and Latin Studies in Honour of A. H. M. Kessels*. Leiden 2006. P. 32–42.
- John Winkler: *The Constraints of Desire. The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece*. New York 1990.
- Tim Whitmarsh: Aelius Aristides. In: Irene J. F. de Jong/René Nünlist/Angus M. Bowie (eds.): *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*. Leiden 2004. P. 441–447.

Emotionen in Artemidors *Oneirokritika**

Gregor Weber

Gegen Ende des zweiten Buches seiner *Oneirokritika* behandelt Artemidor Träume, die den Tod und seine Umstände beinhalten und die für unser Thema einschlägig sind. Da heißt es: „Im Traum in den Hades hinabzusteigen und alles zu schauen, was dort nach unserer Vorstellung existiert, verkündet Leuten, denen es gut geht und die nach ihren Neigungen leben, fehlende Arbeit und Schaden; denn die Leute im Hades sind ohne Beschäftigung, gefühllos und gleichgültig. Aber den Leuten, die Furcht, Sorgen oder Kummer haben, prophezeit es Befreiung von Trübsal und Kummer, denn die Leute im Hades sind ohne Trauer und frei von jeder Sorge.“¹ Wie üblich gibt Artemidor bei seiner Interpretation des Traumes eine Deutung mit Blick auf die Folgen für den Träumenden (oder für eine andere Person), ebenso macht er seine Deutung mit einer in der Regel allgemeingültigen und vermutlich auch

* Ich danke allen Teilnehmern an der Diskussion für Ihre Anregungen, außerdem Sitta von Reden für einen wichtigen bibliographischen Hinweis und Sergej Kasper für seine Hilfe bei der Materialdurchsicht; die Thematik konnte auch beim althistorischen Kolloquium an der Universität Bonn zur Diskussion gestellt werden, wofür Winfried Schmitz und Konrad Vössing herzlich gedankt sei. Artemidor wird zitiert nach: Roger A. Pack: *Artemidori Daldiani Onirocriticon libri V*. Leipzig 1963; die Übersetzungen sind entnommen aus: Gerhard Löwe: *Artemidor. Traumkunst*. Leipzig 1991.

¹ Artem. II, 55, 184, 4–10: Εἰς Ἄιδου καταβῆναι δοκεῖν καὶ τὰ ἐν Ἄιδου ὄραν, ὅσα ἐκεῖ εἶναι νενόμισται, τοῖς μὲν εὖ πράττουσι καὶ κατὰ προαίρεσιν ζῶσιν ἀπραξίαν καὶ βλάβην σημαίνει· ἀπρακτοὶ γὰρ οἱ ἐν Ἄιδου καὶ ψυχροὶ καὶ ἀκίνητοι. τοῖς δὲ εὐλαβομένοις ἢ φροντίζουσιν ἢ λυπούμενοις ἀμεριμνίας καὶ ἀλυσίας προαγορεύει· καὶ γὰρ ἄλυποι καὶ πάσης ἐκτὸς φροντίδος εἰσὶν οἱ ἐν Ἄιδου. Dazu Gregor Weber: *Le rêve et la mort dans les Oneirokritika d'Artémidore*. In: Julien du Bouchet/Christophe Chandezon (Hg.): *Études sur Artémidore et l'interprétation des rêves*. Nanterre 2012. S. 79–97, hier S. 91–92.

für seine Klienten – nicht unbedingt immer für uns – verständlichen Begründung plausibel. Der Text verweist auf emotionale Zustände, in denen sich die Personen vor bzw. während ihrer Träume befunden haben – genannt werden, an dieser Stelle in partizipialer Form, „Furcht“ (εὐλαβεῖσθαι), „Sorgen“ (φροντίζειν) und „Kummer“ (λυπεῖσθαι) –, und verwiesen wird auch auf solche, die sich nach dem Traum bzw. der Deutung eingestellt haben, nämlich das Fehlen von „Trübsal“ (ἀμεριμνία) und „Kummer“ (ἀλυπία). Bei den erstgenannten, eindeutig emotionalen Zuständen handelt es sich um offenkundige Prädispositionen, wenngleich nicht gesagt wird, ob sie auf das Traumgeschehen eine unmittelbare Wirkung ausgeübt haben. Eindeutig ist hingegen, dass Träume dazu angetan waren, den emotionalen Haushalt der Menschen zu verändern.² Indem Artemidor auf die Verstorbenen verweist und ihnen genau solche Zustände abspricht – sie seien „kalt/gefühllos“ (ψυχροί), vor allem „ohne Trauer“ (ἄλυποι) und „frei von jeder Sorge“ (πάσης ἐκτὸς φροντίδος)³ –, sieht er Emotionen als unmittelbar zum menschlichen Leben gehörig an. Das Erfahrungsspektrum in Artemidors Material reicht freilich noch weiter, wenn er einige Kapitel später formuliert: „Dagegen ist es nicht gut, beim Fliegen von einem wilden Tier oder Menschen oder Dämon verfolgt zu werden; es bringt große Besorgnisse und Gefahren, denn die Furcht war im Traum so groß, daß man die Erde für die Flucht nicht ausreichend hielt, sondern auf den Himmel auswich.“⁴ Die Passage lässt sich als Beleg dafür verstehen, dass entsprechende Emotionen, wie Artemidor in seiner Begründung ausführt, einem Träumenden auch *im* Traum selbst widerfahren konnten – im vorliegenden Fall ist es „große Furcht“ (φόβοι μεγάλοι).⁵

Aus diesen beiden Beispielen für Emotionen, die sich noch vermehren ließen, ergeben sich einige Fragen: Sind die genannten Zustände überhaupt als Emotionen zu verstehen bzw. arbeitet Artemidor hier mit klaren Definitionen? Was haben die Zeit-

² So auch explizit William V. Harris: *Dreams and Experience in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge, MA/London 2009. S. 16.

³ An anderer Stelle (II, 39, 174, 13–14) heißt es noch, „Pluton und Persephone bringen den Ängstlichen Glück, denn sie herrschen (im Totenreich) über Leute, die sich nicht mehr fürchten“ (Πλούτων και Περσεφόνη τοῖς φοβουμένοις εἰσὶν ἀγαθοί· ἄρχουσι γὰρ τῶν οὐκέτι φοβουμένων). II, 69, 196, 3–4: „Diejenigen aber, die weder hoffen noch fürchten sprechen natürlich die Wahrheit, und das sind besonders die Toten“ (οἱ δὲ μήτε ἐλπίζοντές τι μήτε φοβούμενοι εἰκότως ἀληθῆ λέγουσι. μάλιστα δὲ οἱ νεκροὶ εἰσι τοιοῦτοι). II, 49, 182, 2: „die Verstorbenen sind ohne Furcht und Kummer“ (ἄφοβοι γὰρ καὶ ἄλυποι οἱ ἀποθανόντες). Dazu Weber: *Le rêve* (Anm. 1). S. 92.

⁴ Artem. II, 68, 193, 16–21: διωκόμενον δὲ ὑπὸ θηρίου ἢ ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπου ἢ ὑπὸ δαίμονος ἵπτασθαι οὐκ ἀγαθόν· φόβους γὰρ μεγάλους καὶ κινδύνους ἐπάγει· καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ὕπνοις τοσοῦτον ἦν τὸ δέος, ὥστε μὴ ἰκανῆν ἠγήσασθαι εἰς τὸ φυγεῖν τὴν γῆν ἀλλὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐπιλαβέσθαι.

⁵ Der Gedanke an Alpträume legt sich hier durchaus nahe, die Artemidor aber als nicht mantisch relevant ausschließt, dazu Gregor Weber: *Die Alpträume der römischen Kaiser in Prinzipat und Spätantike. Definition – Begleitumstände – diskursive Kontexte*. In: Jean-Marie Husser/Alice Mouton (Hg.): *Le cauchemar dans les sociétés antiques*. Paris 2011. S. 113–125, hier S. 115–116.