

A theological, ancient Hellenistic, and psychological look at the dreams of Pharaoh's chief cupbearer and chief baker (Genesis 40: 5-13, 16-18)

Yong Lu

Faculty of Theology, Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw, Poland

Summary. The intriguing study of dreams in the Bible has cut across not only some traditional fields such as biblical textual criticisms, comparative religions, philosophy, and genre writing analyses, but also psychoanalyses. However, psychological interpretation is still not underscored in Christian tradition. In this paper, first, hermeneutical exegeses on the biblical dreams and especially Pharaoh's chief cupbearer's (or butler's) and chief bakers' dream narratives (Gen. 40: 5-13, 16-18) are investigated. Second, the general meanings of dreams are defined and explained from some ancient Hellenistic philosophers', i.e. Aristotle, Cicero, Eusebius, Heraclitus, Herodotus, Philo of Alexandria, and Plato, understandings. Furthermore, special attention is given to Philo of Alexandria's hermeneutics on the two dream narratives. Third, it is the thesis of this paper that the two dream narratives are exceptions and can be also interpreted in the light of modern dream interpretation, especially Freudian, Jungian, and other psychoanalysis, as well as a cognitive judgment approach called the equate-to-differentiate model. Seeing them through the lens of psychology and for the first time through the baker's cognitive perspective can aid us in our understanding of human nature while enhancing the study of both traditional theology and psychology.

Keywords: Dream; Vision; Chief cupbearer; Chief baker

1. Introduction

Dream can conjoin us with transcendent reality, and is the inner eye to reflect our conscious awareness through two categories: primarily direct auditory message or primarily symbolic visual scene. Modern physiological and neuropsychological theory believes that the majority of dreams are natural dreams that work through mental activity to process issues in daily lives (Hobson, 2002). In contrast, in ancient Egypt of Pharaoh period, the word "dream" not only refers to "see something in a dream", but also means "awaken", representing dreaming as a special state of consciousness, something like "watching during sleep" (Botterweck & Ringgren, 1977, p. 421-422).

The history of dream interpretation in Christian theology is accompanied periodically the belief that "God was able to speak to man through dreams and visions persisted until Aquinas began to be so universally accepted" (Kelsey, 1968, p. 220), and by smoldering distrust by the early Christians in the Middle Ages as well as the Jews, the Greeks, who were told that dreams are possible delusions and can only be connoted as temptations of the Devil. Clement of Alexandria said, speaking of dreams, "The soul, released from the perceptions of sense, turns in on itself and has a

truer hold of intelligence" (*Strom.*IV, xxii). However, it was Thomas Aquinas, following the sensory epistemology of Aristotle, who rejected dreams as irrational, that eroded the gradual decline of the use of dreams and visions as a direct intuitive experience of God, and afterwards was convinced by St. Jerome among the church fathers in the eighteenth century. The fact is that the Old and New Testaments are chock full of dreams. From Abraham's dream that told him of his descendants' exile for four hundred years in a country not their own (Gen. 15:13), to Paul's dreams that inspired his missionary work in Macedonia (Acts 16:9-10), dreams are clearly depicted as connecting God's people to the divine for the purpose of direction, encouragement, and reassurance. Despite Christianity's rich intertwining with dreaming, Christian dream interpretation is alive and well, as is evidenced by contemporary Christian dream scholars and clergymen (see Bulkeley, 2008, Kelsey, 1978, Sanford, 1978, and Taylor, 1983).

On the other hand, professional dream interpretation in history was claimed to be an acrobatics at the royal courts in Mesopotamia, Babylonian, and especially in Egyptian. For example, an Egyptian manual of dreams (ca. 1300 BC) contains over 200 interpretations and figured prominently in "Gilgamesh" (Sarna, 1989, p. 282; Plaut, Bamberger & Hallo, 1981, p. 261). In Egypt's Ramesside Age, dream interpretation began raising against the social and political backdrop of the New Kingdom (Szpakowska, 2006). Enigmatic dreams and the function of "word play" also appeared in ancient Near East Akkadian literary, epistolary accounts in the later appearance of Egyptian oneirocritic, Israelite literary reports, and early Greek and Talmudic literature (Noegel, 2007). The preserved Hittite texts pronounce that dreams were understood as a medium of communication between

Corresponding address:

Yong Lu, M.A., postgraduate student, Faculty of Theology,
Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw, ul. Dewajtis
5, Warsaw 01-815, Poland.
Email: luyong@student.uksw.edu.pl

Submitted for publication: January 2016

Accepted for publication: April 2016

the supernatural and the natural which was believed to be received directly and clearly (Husser and Munro, 1999, p. 53). However, dream interpreters were regarded as a kind of low-standing acrobatics even until nowadays and were not highly esteemed in Mesopotamia, and often women also practiced necromancy. Consequently, there are very few references to professional dream interpreters and interpretations in general.

Modern psychology has recovered the importance of dreams and parallels in several dream theories, e.g., our socially tabooed desires (see Freud, 1965), expressions from our higher self and the key to the unconscious (see Jung, 1963), reflections of our waking concerns (see Domhoff, 1996), although more and more contemporary psychologists who become to abandon using dreams in psychoanalysis.

In the rest part of this article, general connotations of dream interpretations and hermeneutical exegeses on the biblical dreams, specifically the dreams of Pharaoh's chief cupbearer and chief baker, are discussed through theological, ancient Hellenistic philosophers', and psychological perspectives. To be reminded the lack of psychological comprehension on the Pharaoh's two officials' dreams, if any, the current study attempts to preliminarily propose an interpretation on the two dreams from the perspectives of Freudian, Jungian, and Chinese oneirology theories. In addition, the chief baker's self-evaluation process based on a cognitive judgment approach is proposed as well.

1.1. Theological Perspectives on Dreams

According to biblical point of view, God can speak through dreams (cf. Eusebius, *Onir.*1.1, Herodotus, *Hist.*7.16.2, and Cicero, *Div.*1.45 that is introduced in 1.2 *Philosophical Perspectives on Dreams*), as in Genesis 15:13 when God appeared to Abraham in a dream and as were Urim in 1 Samuel 28:6. In ancient Israel, Judaism, Greek, and the New East, prophets sometimes visited sanctuaries in order to obtain oracles (Metzger & Coogan, 2004; Gnuse, 1997, p. 51), although there was in Jewish tradition also a reluctance to have dream incubation. The ancient Israelites no doubt shared many of the prevailing ideas about dreams and considered their dreams a legitimate source of divine guidance. Dreams of theophanies and with other divine direction are usually regarded as prophecies that contain messages from God, and on the other hand, a biblical prophecy is not necessarily a dream (see Rossel, 2003). Especially the dreams or visions that were experienced by prophets were frequently regarded as vehicles of divine revelation (Num. 12:6-8).

However, the distinction between dreams and visions is not always clear. Some biblical dreams and visions both constitute theophanies or appearance of God's angles, e.g., God's appearance and speaking to Abraham while he falls sleep deeply (Gen. 15:12-13), Jacob's dreams at Bethel about the vision of the staircase between heaven and earth and God's angles ascending and descending on it (Gen. 28:10-15), Jacob's nightly message vision received directly from God to go to Egypt (Gen. 46:2-4). In some old Jewish and Christian traditions, even some visions are described as possible means of divine communication as well, e.g., Paul's dream in Acts 16:9-10, which legitimates his new move from Asia to Europe (See Koet, 2008, 2009). In reality, the English language is not clear as well since *Webster's Collegiate* uses "dream" and "vision" interchangeably as does any thesaurus (*dream*: [a] a series of thoughts, images,

or emotions occurring during sleep. [b] a visionary creation of the imagination. [c] an object seen in a dreamlike state: *vision*. *Vision*: [a] something seen in a *dream*, trance, or ecstasy: a supernatural appearance that conveys a revelation. [b] an object of imagination).

Some other fragments as concerns dreams are also described in the Scripture. For example, many causes including worry drive people to dream "as a dream comes when there are many cares" (Eccl. 5:3a). Thus the character of dream is fleeting and insubstantial (Job 20:8; Ps. 73:20). On the other hand, a negative evaluation of dreams is found in Ecclesiastes 5:7, that the revelatory nature of dreams is associated with nothingness. Prophets' and all kinds of soothsayers' false dreams were also criticized by the Hebrew prophets (among others Jer. 23:25-32, 27:9-10, 29:8-9; Zec. 10:2). A prophet whose announcement encourages apostasy is, in the view of the Deuteronomic law, to be put to death (Deut. 13:2-5). In dreams or visions, God "may speak in their ears and terrify them with warnings", says Elihu (Job 33:16). The book of Job alludes to the physical reality by describing that a dream's relation to trouble and fright (Job 4:14; 7:14), hair standing on end (Job 4:15), and a dream being forgotten upon wake up (Job 20:8), in which it is also noticed in verse 12 ("a word was secretly brought to me, my ears caught a whisper of it") is the mystery and secrecy that seems to surround the oneiric event as well as somehow privy to words originating from another (sacred?) realm. Besides, in the last days, according to Joel 2:28, the old men will dream dreams (cf. Acts 2:17).

The dreams in the Bible abound mainly in Genesis, Daniel, and the infancy narratives of Matthew; elsewhere dreams are mentioned only sporadically. Scholars try to explore the biblical dreams from different aspects, e.g., linguistic style and genre (Prabhu, 1976) of the Matthean dreams (Mt. 1:20-22; 2:12-13, 19-20), contextual studies (Doukhan, 2000; Hartman & DiLella, 1990; Pinker, 2005; Wood, 1973) and etymological and linguistic analysis (Regalado, 2005) on Nebuchadnezzar's dreams (Dan. 2), textual and form-critical study (Hendel, 2011) on Joseph's two dreams (Gen. 37:5-7, 9).

There are two kinds of biblical dreams: one is called message (or called non-symbolic) dreams, and another is called symbolic (or called allegorical or enigmatic) dreams (for a survey of the message versus symbolic dream-genre, see Jeffers, 1990, Bar, 2001, p. 9-77, and Redford, 1967, p. 90-91; for an exhaustive research on symbolic dream/version accounts in the Hebrew Bible, see Long, 1976, Lowery, 1999, Niditch, 1983, and Oppenheim, 1956). The biblical message dreams (e.g., Gen. 20:3, 6; 31:24; 1 Kg. 3:5; Matthean infancy dreams in Mt. 1:20-22; 2:12-13, 19-20) convey direct patriarchal information or divine revelation that is immediately comprehensible. These dreams are described as for the sake of simplicity, having no visual content of any import to the message, that is, God or angels speak directly in the dream, and no interpretation is needed (see Pirson, 2002, p. 41-42 for a review). On the other hand, the symbolic dreams which are experienced by non-Israelites are almost always obscure in content, convey through images regarding the future, and need interpretation. Conversely, for Israelites, the symbolic dreams are always self-explanatory. For example, Joseph's dreams are defined by most scholars as symbolic in nature (e.g., Lowenthal, 1973, p. 20). According to Botterweck and Ringgren (1977), a symbolic dream can be interpreted in three different ways:

(a) intuitively through the agency of a qualified individual; (b) through the use of collections of dream omnia; (c) through appeal to a deity. Except for the above three ways, Judges 7:13-15 shows the only single instance that Gideon overhears that a Midianite soldier telling his symbolic dream to a friend, who, in turn, is capable to interpret it. The symbolic dreams in the Old Testament (i.e. Gen. 28:12; 31:10; 37:5, 9; 40:9, 16; 41:1; Judg. 7:13; Dan. 2:3; 4:10; 7:1) "serve as a vehicle for the display of the piety and the sagacity of their god-inspired interpreter" (Oppenheim, 1956, p. 210) and often cause consternation in the recipient (Gen. 40:7; 41:8; Judg. 7:13; Dan. 2:1; 4:2; 7:14).

The relationship between message and symbolic dreams, according to Lasanté (2001, p. 75), are two aspects: first, since it is believed that message and symbolic dreams developed from distinct "religious" practices, i.e. message dreams from incubation rites and symbolic dreams from oneiromancy (Husser and Munro, 1999, p. 100), therefore, there is little relation between message and symbolic dreams. Second, they share similarities based on the so-called "phenomenological foundation of universal experience" and develop their distinctions due to variations of that experience (for further explanation on the experience, see Lasanté, 2001, p. 10-11).

Another typology of biblical dream incubation is provided as intentional (1 Kg. 3:5-15), incidental unintentional (Gen. 46:2-4, 1 Sam. 3:2-14), and accidental unintentional (Gen. 28:12-15) dreams (Gnuse, 1993).

There are two types of considerations when approaching biblical dream interpretation (Hendel, 2011), although on the whole, the Bible says considerably little on the subject of dream interpretation. First, the dreams of kings, like the dreams of prophets, as well as the dreams with divine symbols have special significance as indicating long-term communal and spiritual events. Those include Abimelech's dream about Sarah (Gen. 20: 3-7), Jacob at Bethel (Gen. 28:12-15), Jacob warned to flee from Laban (Gen. 31:10-13), Laban warned (Gen. 31:24), Pharaoh's famine/satiety dreams (Gen. 41: 1-7), Jacob/Israel's vision to go to Egypt (Gen. 46:2-4), God's call to the child Samuel (1 Sam. 3:4-10), Solomon's dream (1 Kgs. 3:4-15), King Nebuchadnezzar's dreams (Dan. 2, 4), and Mary's husband Joseph's dreams (Mt. 1:20-22; 2:12-13, 19-20). The divine information in those dreams discloses a transcendent reality that depicts God's sovereignty and ultimately inscrutability. For example, Jacob's staircase dream (Gen. 28:12-15) dealt with estrangement, divorce, and the path to salvation (Rossel, 2003). The dreams in Matthew 1-2 indicate that God directed significant human action through dream and changed the natural direction initially undertaken by them (Gnuse, 1990a; Walsh, 1983). Pharaoh's dreams (Gen. 41:1-7) are so-called "royal dreams" (Von Heijne, 2014) and are comprehended as dealing with long-term communal events since they were associated with the whole Egypt's grain harvest and the subsequent famine-ridden wasteland. Also according to Ancient Egypt mythology, Pharaoh dreams the Egyptian symbol of the goddess Hathor who takes care of the Milky Way, which the Egyptians call the Nile in the Sky, and is visualized as a gigantic cow (Newman, 2012). The biblical narrative argues that only God's chosen people are given the ability to understand the symbolic biblical dreams, and therefore a professional dream divination cannot interpret it since God hides truth from the wise and gives it to the humble and foolish. That is why in Pharaoh's dream that

after he told all the magicians and wise men of Egypt his dreams, no one could interpret them (Gen. 41:8), since the dreams are relatively straightforward: cows and grain were often referred to as signifying fertility.

Second, on the other hand, those biblical dreams without divine symbols that occur to ordinary people, deal with immediate personal matters. Those include Joseph's dreams (Gen. 37: 5-7, 9), the dreams of Pharaoh's chief cupbearer and baker (Gen. 40:5-18), and Pilate's wife's dream (Mt. 27:19). For example, Pharaoh's chief cupbearer's (or butler's) and chief baker's dreams are neither visions or oral messages that were given by the deity to the recipients, nor the dreamers were kings or prophets. Furthermore, the two dreams are similar and happened in the same night, but were interpreted by Joseph as two opposing destinies in three days. Since the two dreams are not apocalyptic, although Joseph's interpretations are from apocalypse, interpretation or divination from other disciplines, e.g., philosophy, psychological analysis, could be used besides traditional theological look in order to better understand the two biblical dreams.

Actually dream interpretation was not an Israelite's acrobatics, and only Joseph and Daniel interpret symbolic dreams in the Bible which happen all at foreign courts. In fact, only Jacob and Joseph act as an exception of their own dreams (Gen. 28:12; 31:10; 37:5, 9); as a rule, symbolic dreams in the Bible are given to non-Israelites, although they are considered to be sent by God. Joseph's dreams are labeled as symbolic and are characterized by the fact that they are fully consisted of images and that divine element (e.g., God, angel) is entirely missing. This kind of dream is rare in the Bible and only occurs in the Joseph and Daniel narratives. However, there are also differences between Joseph and Daniel as dream interpreters. Daniel's dreams and visions contain eschatological and universal themes which are absent from Joseph narrative. As a matter of fact, in the Bible only Joseph and Daniel engage successfully in dream interpretation, and it is believed that God only choose a qualified and pious man as an interpreter. As a retribution, both of Joseph and Daniel give the credit unreservedly to God.

Joseph's narrative in fact stands out as the longest coherent story. It forms an integrated whole in Genesis, with exception of chapter 38 (Judah and Tamar) and 49 (Jacob). Joseph's interpretative abilities on dreams develop in three stages, each including in pairs differing visual content but similar meaning and purpose, according to the interpreter: his own two dreams and his family's interpretations (Gen. 37:5-11), the dreams of the chief cupbearer and the chief baker and Joseph's interpretations, and Pharaoh's two dreams and Joseph's interpretation as well as practical advice (Gen. 41).

The first one pair of Joseph's dreams is regarded by most scholars as self-explanatory, and the latter two pairs need interpretation. It is noteworthy that there is still another debate presuming that Joseph's first two dreams appear like "self-explanatory" by his father and brothers since the family had learned certain principles of dream interpretation (see Lasanté, 2001, p. 31 for an example). Whether or not Joseph disguised to ignore the meaning of his earliest one pair of dreams and was telling them in order to tease his brothers, both his father and brothers presumed the dreams' interpretations and rebuked his suppressed ambitions of greatness. The fact that Jacob and his other sons rebukes Joseph for

sharing these dreams indicates that they were not recognized as inspired by divine, although there is still debate on the indication of the inspired dreams or not. On the other hand, Pirson (2002, p. 50) suggests that Joseph's second dreams (Gen. 37:9-11) is fundamentally different from the first one. Furthermore, comparing with the cupbearer's, the baker's, and Pharaoh's dreams, the number 11 in Joseph's second dream, combined with the appearances of the sun and the moon, represents 13 years, the exact number of years that Joseph spends in Egypt before he is promoted as Pharaoh's right-hand man at the age of 30 (Gen. 41:46). An alternative explanation of the Joseph's second dream proposed by Pirson (2002, p. 57-58) is to multiply the number of the stars (eleven) by the number of the sun and the moon (two), which adds up to the number 22, the exact number of years spending before Joseph's reunion with his brothers and his father. Joseph is also referenced in Psalms 105:19 about his dream interpretation: "until the time that his word came: the word of the LORD tried him" (KJV).

The second pair of Joseph's dream narratives is rather as a plot of the springboard for Joseph to be elevated by God to correct injustices, to protect the line of Abraham, and also to achieve his apocalyptic dreams (Gen. 37:5-7, 9), when his brothers come to Egypt in order to buy grain (Gen. 41:37-45). Just through this elevation, Joseph can represent as an interpreter for the subsequent Pharaoh's dreams (Gen. 41:1-7, 14-36), be in the position as Pharaoh's second-in-command over the entire land of Egypt (Gen. 41:38-40).

The third pair of Joseph's dream narratives is shown to demonstrate his humility before God as well as to depict Pharaoh as a man of honour who listens to and even recognizes wisdom in reference to Joseph. As to the content of Pharaoh's dreams, there are no spoken words, but only images. Gnuse (1990b) remarks the reason as obviously theological as that God cannot be seen to indicate to a pagan ruler, and therefore, the divine message must be veiled and cryptic. The narratives also have similarities to the context and genre of Daniel 2, e.g., troubled spirit upon waking, prophets' acknowledgement that dream is from God, professionals' insufficiency to interpret dream. Both of the latter two pairs of Joseph's dream narratives also teach of God Who communicates dreams with slaves and Pharaoh alike in order to achieve a particular purpose.

1.2. Ancient Hellenistic Perspectives on Dreams

In antiquity, dreams were dividedly understood as a means of how divinities communicate to humanity as well as just daily thoughts. For example, in Homer's *Iliad*, Agamemnon's dream is sent from a god, but his *Odyssey* 19.535 ff. expresses that only some dreams have prophetic significance. Herodotus in the fifth century BC seems to argue in his *The Histories* that divinities arrive via dreams that contain inevitable truths about the future. However, Herodotus also records Artabanus's interpretation on his own dream in rational terms: "but (dreams) are not divine, child. For the things of a dream are the sorts of things that have been wandering about amongst men just as I, being much older than you, will teach you. These visions of dreams are accustomed to wander about, things that someone is thinking of during the day" (*The Histories* 7.16. β .2) (Greek translation quoted from Cox, 2011, p. 25).

In Plato, dreams are used to figuratively refer to something fleeting and/or unreal, and an epistemological distinction is specified: the one who has false knowledge or

opinion is seen to be dreaming while the one who has true knowledge is regarded as being awake (Reddoch, 2011). Therefore, the lives of most people who have false knowledge may be characterized as a dream in which reality is not truly comprehended. Plato continuously presents dreams as both the fulfillment of our desires (non-predictive) in *Republic* IV 571B-572B and of "inspired prophesying" from the divine origin in *Timaeus* 71D-72B. Plato proposes that God devises for a dreamer divination through sleeping or illness when the dreamer is not in rational mind (King, 2004, p. 38).

On the contrary, Aristotle in his treatise of *De Divinatione per Somnum* (*On Divination by Dreams*) is skeptical of the divine inspiration of dreams (462b21-23) and thinks that most dreams are simply the result of coincidence or simply the result of statistical probability (463b12-22). In other words, the odds of dreams inevitably fall into one of visions that comes out to be true, and dreams lack divine will or providence. Although they seem predictive, it is their nature, and not a divine origin, which makes such dreams prophetic. One of his major reason to object godsent dreams is that it is utterly unbelievable that on one hand, the gods would send dreams to so many random people who are not especially bright, and on the other hand, they proclaim that their dreams are prophetic. It is noteworthy that although Aristotle denies godsent dreams, he still accepts divination through dreams. Furthermore, he theorizes that dreams are either signs, e.g., of illnesses (463a3-21), or causes of actions (463a21-31), or coincidences (463a31-b11), or a combination of these. Aristotle maintains that if the gods do send messages in dreams, they are more likely to send prophetic dreams to best and wisest people in a way that cannot be accounted for by natural phenomena (*De Divinatione per Somnum* 464a20-4).

Aristotle goes on to explain that dreams are not divine, but daemonic (*De Somno et Vigilia* [On Sleep and Waking] 463b11-15). Concretely, he proposes that "in short, since some other living creatures dream, dreams could not be godsent, nor do dreams occur for this reason (dreams are indeed daemonic; for nature is daemonic, but not divine)" (463b12-14). Therefore, his concept on the origin of dreams is somewhere in a mysterious quasi-divine status between the divine and the human. As concerns Aristotle's use of the word "daemonic", according to Ross (1955), it means "something mysterious and superhuman, something that has a touch of the divine about it, but is not a direct work of God" (p. 282) (see also the Neoplatonist Iamblichus's work *De Mysteriis* 3.2.11 on his distinction between dreams which are godsent and those which have physical or mental causes). However, Freud thinks that Aristotle distinguishes the natural from the supernatural and that Aristotle's concept of the daemonic has a kinship with the divine (Reddoch, 2010, p. 75) (for the more detailed comments on Freud's understanding about Aristotle's concept of the daemonic dreams, see Gallop, 1990, p. 39-40, Wijsenbeek-Wijler, 1978, p. 238-239, and Dodds, 1951, p. 120).

Aristotle also discusses the work of psychobiological processes in dreams, and argues that dreams are not at all related to human perception, but to imagination (*De Insomniis* 459a). Cicero after two centuries not only follows and expands Aristotle's argument against revelatory power of dreams, but also proposes another positive view of dreams held by the Stoics (Miller, 2007, p. 33-34). Besides, Aristotle proposes that dreams can have a number of different causes such as the condition of the body, the results of ex-

ternal stimuli which one overhears during sleeping, and the result of daytime actions (*Div. Somn.* 463a3-8, 463a8-22, 463a22-32, 463b1-22).

On the basis of Philo of Alexandria in the first century BC, the one whose dreams are obscure is the one whose moral and spiritual progress is not sufficient to enable clarity of mental vision (Hay, 1991; Reddoch, 2010, p. iii). He makes references to dreams which are usually ontological and epistemological metaphors. He declares that the dreamer is one who is subject to an epistemological limitation and thus is asleep to the truth, whereas the dream interpreter is the one who is equipped with knowledge and thus is capable of dispelling ignorance (Reddoch, 2011). As concerns Joseph, for Philo's understanding, he often loses his status as a dreamer but instead of as a dream interpreter. However, Philo also criticizes that although Joseph is successful in Egypt as a dream interpreter, as a dreamer, his first two dreams lack mental clarification and require prophetic interpretation assistance as well. Furthermore, Joseph is vain-glorious in his own dreams since he dreams of future power and glory. In addition, Philo also treats the biblical dream narratives as exegesis of allegories.

The part legendary history of Alexander the Great in the first century BC is accounted of divination through dreams. While according to Eusebius in the second/third century AD (*HEII.*18.4), there were unknown two books dealing with non-prophetic dreams not sent by God in the oneirocritical tradition.

The extant *Oneirocritica*, the only surviving work from Artemidorus in the second century A.D, is the earliest Greek work on the subject of dream interpretation. *Oneirocritica* contains five books in which the first two argue theoretical and technical accounts on the interpretation of dreams, and the rest of the three introduce a collection of 95 dreams and their connotations. Empirical methods of personal and transmitted experience and analogy can be found sporadically in his writings which are also variously influenced by Stoics and Sceptics. Artemidorus furthermore divides dreams into two categories: a) continuation of day's activities which is called *enhyponia* and are seen as being frequently prompted by bodily needs or by recent significant events; and b) dreams foretelling the future which is called *oneiroi* and can also be categorized into prophetic dreams and mantic answers. On the other hand, according to the exoteric (extrinsic) contents, he divides dreams into anxiety dreams and those without any worries (Papamichael and Theochari, 2008).

For other Hellenistic philosophers, for example, Heraclitus in the fifth/fourth century BC, as same as Philo of Alexandria, uses the concept of sleep in epistemological contexts instead of referring to dreams per se in the extant fragments to portray the masses of foolish people like the dead in a similar manner as Homer. Philodemus in the first century BC in *De pietate* (Col. 1, line 1450) interprets dreaming in the form of a smile to refer to those who are mentally imbalanced (Granger, 2000).

In conclusion, generally ancient dreams had a socio-religious implication. The Hellenistic oneirocritic tradition from Artemidorus' time continuously proves Greek culture through the ages. It is still not sufficient as Bar (2001, p. 78-101) asserts that dreams were regarded as mediums of divine communication.

1.3. Psychological Perspectives on Dreams

The value of dreams is recognized by Sigmund Freud and many other his contemporaries as avenues into greater knowledge on potential consciousness. This is because hidden in the dream are secrets that pertain a broad and varied range of fragments of past and present psychic longings, perceptions, and dreads, although nowadays dreams have been neglected in a certain extend in psychoanalysis. Dreams can be approached from the perspectives of Freud, Carl Jung, and James Hillman, the three major proponents on depth psychology and consciousness. Although they consider dreams differently in their approaches, all of them regard dreams to be of central importance.

According to Freud's most famous scientific book on dreams, *On the Interpretation of Dreams*, dreams are likely to contain hidden thoughts and links to earlier experiences. A dream is a message, but not from God or gods. Furthermore, he teaches that all dreams represent wish fulfillments --- "the fulfillment of a wish is its only purpose ... the dream therefore is the fulfillment of a wish" (Freud, 1965, p. 151), and the dream work involves condensation, displacement, and the translation of thoughts into visual images and symbols (Kaufmann, 1980).

The symbolism of dreams plays a significant role in Freud's theories, and the conscious part of our minds of punning in dreams is convicted by him. For Freud, the understanding of the meaning of the dream was, however, inextricably tied to the dreamer's conscious associations to the dream material. The function of the dream, then, is to preserve sleep while expending unconscious energy which is constellated around wish fulfillment. The dream may be an actual unconscious picture of the dreamer's personality. Moreover, noting the saying that "Man sees in his dreams only the stirrings of his own heart", Freud puts forth that dreams are prompted by "residues" that have been stirred up in the potential consciousness of the previous day. Although these residues are usually minor and despised things that are discarded to be aware when awake, they possess energy and power that still need to be discharged or resolved.

Freud's one of the critical techniques as concerns complex dream's interpretation is to break up the dream into fragments and then to analyze and compare each of the elements. Other Freud's notions include the necessity to know the client's history and personality and the use of analogy method.

In the field of Jungian psychology, dreams are thought as an area of human cognition that contains the potential for both good and evil in our lives (Jung, 1963). Dream is categorized by Jungian as originating from three aspects, namely, daily life, the personal unconscious, and the collective unconscious. An individual dream may be arisen out of a mixture of all three aspects, or be conveyed of one of these dimensions (Sanford, 1978; also see Walsh, 1983).

Jung and Freud all consider visual images and symbols as the important language of dreams and as a kind of extract from past memories, experiences, daily life, or physical stimuli. They are part of the dreamer's consciousness but stem from unconscious sources and may be indicative of future psychic development. In *Man and His Symbols* Jung states, "Because there are innumerable things beyond the range of human understanding, we constantly use symbolic terms to represent concepts that we can't define of fully comprehend. This is one reason why all religions employ symbolic language or images" (Jung et al., 1971, p. 21).

Speaking specifically of the Christian tradition, Jung writes that the traditional religious symbol "is a living thing that carries in itself the seeds of further development. It can go on developing; it depends only on us, whether we can make up our minds to meditate again, and more thoroughly" on its premises (Jung, 1970a, p. 279).

However, Jung's and Freud's discriminations on symbolism lie in that Freud assumes dream images and symbols disguising the real meaning of the dream and indicating certain specific meanings, e.g., a pillar as standing for a penis, a house for a womb. From Jung's standpoint, symbols are the natural language of the soul and should be thought as, "properly speaking, a highly objective, natural product of the psyche", since "they arise spontaneously without our assistance and are representatives of psychic activity withdrawn from our arbitrary will" (Jung, 1963, p. 131).

Furthermore, Jung views symbols as "the best possible formulation for still unknown or unconscious facts" (Jung, 1970b, p. 540). Jung sees some symbols as relatively fixed, and those symbols should be validly interpreted through the method of amplification (Rollins, 1983, p. 100-103). Amplification is a method that may include the dreamer's personal associations, data from the dreamer's culture and particular environment, and archetypal parallels that are connected to universal imagery (Mattoon, 1984). Its goal is the "elaboration and clarification of a dream-image by means of directed association and of parallels from the human sciences (symbolology, mythology, mysticism, folklore, history of religion, ethnology, etc.)" (Jung, 1963, p. 391). Amplification technique reminds us that a scriptural image, symbol, or story may contain a deep meaning of which the biblical dreamers and even scriptural interpreters are unaware.

Freud and Jung are all expert in free association which is seemingly influenced by Artemidorus' *Oneirocritica*. Both Jung and Artemidorus believe in the aim of dreams to foretell the future in accordance to mantic dreams and universal customs of humanity. Freud mentions Artemidorus 8 times in his book *On the Interpretation of Dreams*. The only real divergence between them is that Freud and Jung let their clients do the association on their dreams by themselves, while Artemidorus did it on his clients' dreams by himself.

Hillman raised in the Jungian school but has a different slant on dreams. He believes that images are just images which are not from the unconscious and should be regarded as an aspect of psychic reality. Furthermore, he believes that dreams should not be interpreted and should let dream as its own best interpretation since any interpretation will distort the images (Hillman, 1978, p. 157).

Other psychological dream theories differ from Freud and Jung concerning dreams' purposes. Dreams are regarded as revealing important aspects of psychological lives of dreamers as well as providing problem solving and coping functions.

2. The Dreams of the Chief Cupbearer and Chief Baker

The dream narratives of the chief cupbearer (the so-called royal taster, an important government official [Plaut, Bamberger & Hallo, 1981, p. 258]) and chief baker (the so-called Egyptian renowned gourmet who knew many varieties of bread and cakes [Plaut, Bamberger & Hallo, 1981, p. 258]) describe that when Joseph sojourns in Egypt and is framed up by Potiphar's wife into prison (this Hebrew word *Sohar*

[*prison*] used in Gen. 39:20 appears only in Genesis in the Bible. It probably was a special place to confine important prisoners [Plaut, Bamberger & Hallo, 1981, p. 258]) for accusing Joseph having sexually assaulted his master's wife, despite being innocent (Gen. 39). After some time, in jail Joseph is put in charge of the two former officers of the royal household, Pharaoh's chief cupbearer and chief baker. On the same night Joseph's two fellow inmates have dreams when confining with Joseph together. Upon awakening, they are troubled because not only they themselves cannot interpret their dreams (Gen. 40:8a), but also there are no professional dream interpreters in the prison. By implication, Joseph responds to them with self-confident that there is not necessary to find a specialist to interpret their dreams and that he can represent himself as a conduit to God Who is in charge of interpretations of dreams ("Do not interpretations belong to God?", Gen. 40:8b).

First the chief cupbearer confides his dream to Joseph (Gen. 40:9-11). He dreams three clusters of grapes on a grapevine, from which he squeezes wine into a cup and presents it to Pharaoh. Similar viticulture scenarios are also commonly found depicting in some Egyptian wall paintings (see Poo, 1995; Murray, 2000). Joseph interprets the dream, of course, as an omen that the chief cupbearer would be released from prison and reinstated to his former official position three days later (Gen. 40:12-13).

After the chief baker hears a positive interpretation of his colleague's dream and recognizes the similarities between their dreams, he dares to tell Joseph his dream (Gen. 40:16-17) and hopes for also a positive result. He dreams three baskets of bread (others translate the word "bread" as "open-work baskets", "baskets with white bread", or "white baskets", of which the meaning of Hebrew is uncertain [Plaut, Bamberger & Hallo, 1981, p. 259]) on his head, from which he presumes to present to Pharaoh, but the birds carry them off and eat them. However, the chief baker overlooks the crucial difference between the dreams and does not think out that his own dream predicts his execution. Joseph interprets the dream, unlike the chief cupbearer's, as a misfortune that the chief baker would be hanged after three days.

Both of the dreams' predictions were released after three days on Pharaoh's birthday. The chief cupbearer is reinstated but the chief baker is hanged (Gen. 40:20-22).

2.1. A Theological Look

The two officials of Pharaoh's dreams are similar in structure: three stalks of vines corresponding to three baskets of bread. The two dreams also have a similar genre being created to parallel the Joseph dreams (Gen. 37:5-7, 9). However, in syntax, the two dreams show differences (Pirson, 2002, p. 53): the chief cupbearer's dream is constructed by means of three verbless clauses (vv. 9d, 10ab), followed by two clauses (v. 10cd), to which another verbless clause (v. 11a) is attached, and is concluded by three clauses; on the contrary, the chief baker's dream has one verbless clause (v. 16d), but has no development and no dynamic elements in it --- representing nothing but an image.

The two dreams are symbolic dreams in which the visual scenes act out in a more complex fashion and require interpretation. From a narrative-critical and socio-historical perspective, the function of symbolic dream is primarily in the treatment of characters and the development of plot (Miller, 2010). As for the chief cupbearer's dream, he dreams partly

in symbolic fashion, that he squeezes grapes from three branches. As for the chief baker's dream, he also dreams partly in symbolic fashion, that the food for Pharaoh stacked on the uppermost of the three baskets is eaten by the birds. Their dreams do not reveal what those symbolic visions represent. Joseph's apocalyptic interpretation is regarded as being God-given and involves an ability to construe the pattern of future events from symbolic features of the two dreams, which gives him an opportunity to elevate himself through his particular capability as God's chosen interpreter (cf. Daniel in Dan. 2).

Certain numbers in Scripture and in the ancient Near Eastern world have been found eminently well-suited to convey reasons dimly apparent to reason (for a contemporary perspective on scriptural numerology, see Pope, 1962, p. 564-567). The numbers *three* in the interpretation of the two dreams also play a prominent role. It is rather evident for Joseph to distribute the unit of time being "days" because Pharaoh's birthday was to fall within those three days (Gen. 40:20), although if making a comparison, the references to "years" in Pharaoh's dreams are not self-evident. Joseph probably knows that in Pharaoh's reign time, it is customary to pardon prisons on some celebration days, e.g., on Pharaoh's birthday (Gen. 40:20) (see Bar, 2001, p. 53; Sarna, 1989, p. 278; Von Heijne, 2014). Joseph's this interpretation skill on numbers, though it is believed that Joseph's interpretation is inspired by God and is emblematic blessing of God upon his righteousness, is nonetheless the doing of the human person. Therefore, Joseph not only tells God's revelation to him (as in the archetype of prophecy), but also uses his own wisdom in developing the interpretation (cf. Jeremiah 23:25-28 states that a prophet who hears the word of the LORD should speak it faithfully without intermediary human wisdom). Both of the two dreams refer to the same time span, but are respectively reversal on the destinies of the chief cupbearer and the chief baker at the same time.

The symbolic meanings of vine (Hebrew *gepen*) and bread have positive religious functions, symbolizing the "true" nourishment of blood and body. Vine is the first cultivated plant mentioned in the Bible (Gen. 9:20) and is used as a symbol of Israel (Jer. 2:21; Ezek. 15:6; Hos. 10:1) and of peace and prosperity (1 Kgs. 4:25; Mic. 4:4). The depictions of various activities related to the production of wine and bread are also found in archaeological discoveries in Egypt in ancient time, e.g., sculpture and wooden models that depict people grind grain, make dough, and bake bread (Darby, 1976).

Bakers are listed along with perfumers and cooks as important for governmental service in 1 Samuel 8:13 and are a fitting metaphor for wayward Israel in Hosea 7:4. Bread is frequently part of offerings and sacrifices (e.g., Lev. 7:13; Exod. 29:2), and bread of blessing is seen as a gift of God in theology meaning. As part of the first fruits of the harvest, bread was offered to God. According to Freedman (1992), bread also has a means for the provision of the daily needs of the priests, and when eaten as part of a religious meal it provides fellowship among community members and the deity. This daily bread is the very symbol for subsistence, representing the minimal need for existence. In the temple sanctuary that is next to the holy of holies, the bread of Presence, that are twelve loaves of unleavened bread, are displayed and are separated only by a curtain from God's immediate presence. In this important location, the loaves

symbolize the covenant between God and his people Israel (Lev. 24:5-9) (Freedman, 1992).

From a theological viewpoint, an extraordinary fertility and growing from which Pharaoh consumes the drink represents a good fortune for the image of the chief cupbearer's dream (I. Fröhlich, personal communication, June 16, 2015). On the other hand, the chief cupbearer's restoration to his former rank in Pharaoh's "the great house" means a metaphor for a symbol of the self (Matt. 7:24f) and for a renewal of the flow of wine, a necessary rejuvenation of spirit and consciousness from Pharaoh's troubled spirit (Gen. 41:8) (Leeming & Marlan, 2010, p. 252). The chief cupbearer sees the three branches of a vine filled with blossoms and clusters of grapes that are quickly ripened. On the other hand, his dream involves things of three, e.g., three branches of the vine, three verbs ("budded", "blossomed", and "ripened") used in v. 10 to describe the growth of the vine and the branches, three times mentioned of Pharaoh, three word "cup" used in v. 11, three first person singular verbs ("I saw", "I pressed", and "I placed") to describe his activities (Hamilton, 1995, p. 479). The Pharaoh's cup symbolizes the chief cupbearer's "lot" (Luke 22:14-23). The quick ripened grape and the three branches are probably a metaphor for his soon release after three days. In addition, from a sequential hypertextual perspective, the chief cupbearer's offering of the first fruits of a vine to Pharaoh can also illustrate the Deuteronomic idea of bringing the first fruits of Canaan to God (Deut. 26:1-11), and the third day can allude to the related Deuteronomic instruction concerning giving a tithe in the third year (Deut. 26:12) (Adamczewski, 2012, p. 147).

In contrast to the flow of wine that the chief cupbearer serves to Pharaoh, Joseph's interpretation on the chief baker's dream is opposite. Contrary to Leeming and Marlan's (2010, p. 253) exegesis that bread symbolizes a metaphor that the produce of the earth will not arrive at "the great house", the reason for the chief baker's worst fortune should be ascribed as that he is not able to shoo the birds away, as did Abram (Gen. 15:11). The animal symbolism, e.g., bull, wolf, viper, scorpion, dragon, may lie in its native fitness for symbolizing the instinctual side of the self, which includes the unleashed and destructive side of the self. Also according to Hamilton's (1995, p. 481) exegesis on the words "birds" and "eating", the birds refer to a collective and are normally some kind of even rapacious animal such as "wild beasts" (Gen. 37:20, 23; Hos. 2:14) or "dogs" (1 Kg. 13:28; 14:11; 16:4; 21:23, 24). The rendering "bread" in Genesis 40:16 is favored to be in white color (Hamilton, 1995, p. 481). Therefore, according to the oldest surviving manual of Egyptian dream interpretation called the Chester Beatty's "Dream Book", if a man see himself in a dream, white bread being given to him is good, which bodes things at which his face will light up (Pritchard, 1969, p. 495; also see Ritner, 2002, p. 53). Afterwards the birds peck at the bread out of the basket, which seems self-explanatory: that his good fortune has vanished and his bad fortune is ahead. Theoretically clean birds do not bring impurity to anything touched by them, however, unclean birds do (I. Fröhlich, personal communication, June 16, 2015). Although v. 17 is not informed which kind the birds are, Hamilton (1995, p. 481) assumes that the birds are unclean, and they make the bread unclean. The causes of the chief baker's misfortune are rather the aggressivity of the birds that brings a negative meaning to this image and the food that is eaten by alien offenders (I. Fröhlich, personal communication, June 16,

2015). In addition, from a sequential hypertextual perspective, the baker's strangely heaping baskets with new bread on his head negatively alludes to the idea of bringing the first fruits of Canaan to God in a basket (Deut. 26:1-11) (Adamczewski, 2012, p. 147).

2.2. An Ancient Hellenistic Look

Driven by Philo of Alexandria's oneirocritical concerns, he addresses a philosophically oriented exegesis on the chief cupbearer's and chief bakers' dream narratives in his treatise of *De somniis* II and reminds his readers that the two officials' dream narratives are closely related. Furthermore, since the two dream narratives are interpreted as complementary symbols both for nourishment of food and drink and offer the opportunity to discuss related vices, gluttony, they also complements his interpretation of Joseph's dreams. For Philo, nourishment can be either negative or positive depending on its connotation, and he makes it clear that in the dream narratives of the chief cupbearer and chief baker, each of them contributes to half of nourishment for Pharaoh and are thus complementary (Reddoch, 2010, p. 238). Since they are both eunuchs, as a result, Philo considers them unproductive of wisdom (cf. *Somn.*II.184).

Philo connects the association between grape wine and drunkenness and considers the chief cupbearer's dream ultimately as an allegory for thoughtlessness and folly (Reddoch, 2011; Torallas, 2003, p. 44). At here the chief cupbearer's dream narrative is to be regarded as negative in Philo's eyes since it does not simply prepare for necessary nourishment intending for basic body strength and well-being needs (cf. Philo's praise on Jacob's austerity when sleeping on a rock in Genesis 28:11, as well as the command "now see to it that you drink no wine or other fermented drink" in Judges 13:4a and Judges 13:14a to Manoah's wife by the angel of the LORD), but associates with indulgence in pleasure and enjoyment comparing with austere way of life (*Somn.*I.155-163 and *Somn.*II.48-51). Also see *Somn.*II.10. and *Somn.*II.46. for Philo's another two interpretations on "nourishment" in relation to respectively Isaac's pursuing for a beneficially pure good necessity (a positive portrayal) and Joseph as a massive food distributor to the whole land of Egypt to be a grave threat to the soul (a negative portrayal).

Joseph is described actually as a veiled symbol for the corrupt Roman leadership in Alexandria in *De somniis* II. It is noteworthy that in Philo's another treatise *De Iosepho*, Joseph is described as a leader primarily for his virtue. The Philo's two contradictory interpretations of Joseph have received considerable scholarly attention, e.g., Harold (1986, 1987). However, another approach (e.g., Reddoch, 2011) emphasizes that Philo's treatment of Joseph does not conflict since Philo sees Joseph as a multi-faceted character. The chief cupbearer began his description of his dream by saying "in my sleep" (Gen. 40:9), which, according to Philo, suggests the chief cupbearer's foolishness because he was in a constant state of sleep. "And deep and immense sleep, by which every fool is possessed, destroys true perceptions and fills the mind with false images and unsteady phantoms, persuading [the fool] to accept blameworthy things as praiseworthy" (*Somn.*II.162, quoted in Reddoch, 2011, p. 288).

According to Philo, the one who is asleep in relation to knowledge is more likely to lack moral uprightness since he is unable to distinguish the good from the bad and thus to make correct ethical decisions. On the other hand, con-

tradictorily, Philo also proposes that the nature of wine can also lead to merriment of pure goodwill (*Somn.*II.190-194), and Philo also explicitly classifies the chief cupbearer's dream in his category of predictive dreams sent from God (*Somn.*II.5-6).

While Winston (1984, p. 407-408, see also Lévy, 2009, p. 161-162; Reddoch, 2010, p. 238) supposes a moderate illumination on Philo's approach that drunkenness can be both in good and bad sides to asceticism which considers austerity a virtue but excessive austerity detrimental. In Philo's philosophy, the positive or negative association of the vine is to be distinguished as a fit of allegorical interpretation of gluttony or basic needs.

If distinguishing between God with Pharaoh, as well as between the high priest in the sanctuary as a servant of God with the chief cupbearer as the high priest of Pharaoh, the high priest in the sanctuary serves God Who is completely without passion and pours a pure drink, whereas the chief cupbearer is said to serve one who is intemperate, lacks self-mastery, and disperses destruction (for a more detailed interpretation on God's complete pure nourishment in relation to Philo's understanding of ethical standard of human beings, see Winston, 1984, p. 400; also Philo develops the idea of God's high priest allegorically representing as the father of holy *logoi*, contrasting to the chief cupbearer as the eunuch who is sterile [*Somn.*II.185-189]). The prominent spiritual functions of the high priest in the sanctuary as an agency of God to redeem souls are contrasted with the chief cupbearer whose functions are superfluous and detrimental for saving souls. Philo differentiates Pharaoh who is conjuncted with Egypt and thus the gluttony of drunkenness (i.e. thoughtlessness) with the temperance of God (Reddoch, 2010, p. 239).

In the chief baker's dream narrative, first, the three baskets are allegorically represented as past, present, and future desires of passion. Second, the winged creatures are symbolic for God's attempt to thwart the lover of the excessive pleasures. Third, the head is allegorically represented as the mind that is stripped of the immoderate pleasures by God. Philo interprets the chief baker not as the equivalent position of the chief cupbearer who is allegorically represented as the high priest of Pharaoh, but he explicitly accounts for the chief baker as just an attendant of Pharaoh (*Somn.*II.210) (Reddoch, 2010, p. 241-242).

2.3. A Psychological Look

The dreams of the two officials of Pharaoh can be considered to derive not only from divine revelation but also from the psychological state of the dreamer. The cupbearer's and chief baker's dreams are, psychologically speaking, two anxiety dreams.

From the perspective of Freud, the chief cupbearer and baker are both present in their dreams which reflect their daily life, as they perform their customary duties at the royal court. The day residues of their dreams consist in the conscious desire of them to know what the grand finales of their custody would be. In the cupbearer's dream experience, the vine, its three budded and afterward blossomed branches, its ripe grapes, and Pharaoh's cup were all minor residues happening in his daily works. Similarly, in the baker's dream experience, the three baskets, baked goods, and birds were also all minor residues happening in his daily works. The difference is that there are good and bad sides between the two dreams. The cupbearer serviced well since he brewed

a good grape wine to Pharaoh, which can be interpreted as an optimistic result. Oppositely, the baker serviced worse since he did not take good care of the baked goods, which can be interpreted as a pessimistic result. Since the cupbearer is such a kind of person who knew and were willing to correct his shortcomings (Gen. 41:9), we can conjecture that he should fulfill his duty well when serving Pharaoh. This is maybe an important reason why he was restored to his position, although he once gave no further thought to Joseph (Gen. 40:23).

From the perspective of Jung, both of the two dreams all reflect the recipients' daily life that the chief cupbearer makes wine and that the chief baker makes bread for Pharaoh. Since wine was also used practically as an anaesthetic and to reduce the anguish of capital punishment (Freedman, 1992, p. 810), it symbolically indicates that the chief baker's penalty term would be relieved. On the other hand, some also translate "the baskets" as "the wicker baskets", e.g., New American Bible, New International Version. However, it is worth noted that the translations as "wicker" are debated (see Hamilton, 1995, p. 481 and Speiser, 1964, p. 306-307 for the interpretation of the translation). The crib in front of the chief baker in the jail probably becomes his unconsciousness and constitutes the wicker baskets in his dream.

In addition, according to a folk dream interpretation legend entitled by an ancient Chinese interpreter named Chou Kung, when a man dreams grape vine, it indicates a successful career in his future (Du, 1965). Therefore, as concerns the chief cupbearer's dream, the grape vine forebodes his continuity in his career. On the contrary, according to a dream interpretation book that was compiled by Scribes and Augurs who lived in the Later Han Dynasty and the Five Dynasties in Dunhuang area in China, when dreaming an object that is carried off by birds, it indicates that death is near to the dreamer (Zheng & Yang, 1995). Therefore, as concerns the chief baker's dream, his negligence of taking care of the bread indicates his misfortune.

On the other hand, the chief baker's self-judgment on his own dream, that is to know whether he would live or die, according to Gen. 40:16-17, can also be interpreted through a so-called "the equate-to-differentiate model" (Liu & Lu, 2007; Lu, 2015a,b). The model "assumes that when people make judgments or choices among a few propositional statements (e.g., concerning occupations or personality dispositions), people implement such a judgmental process by filtering one or several less distinct dimension(s) of each statement. Furthermore, the model assumes that people base their judgments of the relative likelihoods of the conjunctive/disjunctive and single statements on the values derived from the most distinct dimension of each statement (while neglecting other less distinct dimension(s))" (Lu, 2015a, p. 6). The judgment criterion is that "one statement with a larger outcome of its most distinct dimension is preferred to another statement with a less outcome of its most distinct dimension" (Lu, 2015a, p. 6). The chief baker's evaluation can be regarded as that he compared the probabilities of the following statements:

(G) *The chief cupbearer "took the grapes, squeezed them into Pharaoh's cup and put the cup in his hand"* (v. 11b).

(C) *The chief cupbearer will be restored to his position in three days* (v. 13).

(H) *The chief baker's head has the basket which "were all*

kinds of baked goods for Pharaoh, but the birds were eating them out of the basket on my head" (v. 17).

(B) *The chief baker will be restored to his position in three days.*

(G \wedge C) *The chief cupbearer "took the grapes, squeezed them into Pharaoh's cup and put the cup in his hand" and will be release in three days.*

(H \wedge B) *The chief baker's head has the basket which "was all kinds of baked goods for Pharaoh, but the birds were eating them out of the basket on my head", and he will be released in three days.*

According to the model, in the first place, the chief baker uses only the subjective marginal probability of $G \wedge C$ and $H \wedge B$, and furthermore respectively uses the information of one of the two involved dimensions of $G \wedge C$, G or C , and of one of the two involved dimensions of $H \wedge B$, H or B . The chief baker's cognitive information process can be assumed as follows: When he compares $G \wedge C$ with $H \wedge B$, he evaluates that the dimension G of $G \wedge C$ yields equal outcomes to the dimension H of $H \wedge B$, since he assumes that Joseph's interpretation on his colleague official's dream is favorable, and therefore his own dream is favorable as well (v. 16). Hence, the two dimensions are equated. Then he restricts the situation only to another two dimensions, C of $G \wedge C$ and B of $H \wedge B$ in which C is hence compared to B . Since Joseph predicts that the chief cupbearer "will be restored to his position in three days" (v. 13), then the chief baker interprets that his destiny is as same as the chief cupbearer's, yielding that $G \wedge C$ equates to $H \wedge B$.

In a nutshell, the chief baker presumes his destiny the same as Joseph's prediction of release to the chief cupbearer since, in the equate-to-differentiate model's interpretation, the chief baker's judgment is based on his incorrectly discernment on the distinct differences between their duties' outcomes. He neglects his dereliction of duty and moreover equates his failure as same as the success of his colleague's duty.

3. Conclusions

Dream has often been in its long history treated not merely as an internally stimulated phenomenon, but also as possible means of divine communication. In early Christian society, dreams were seen as an important meaning of reception (Cox-Miller, 1998). Because psychologists such as Kant, Freud, and Jung confine dreams to the psychological or physiological sphere, people nowadays with dreams or visions seek for clinic interpretation. Actually in religious propaganda in Christian, Jewish, and Muslim traditions, dreams are often used to promote religion or to propagate an interpretation of religion (Koet, 2008). Biblical scholars also regard the dreams in the Bible as playing a critical role in the narrative and as the segment that joints the separate plots together into a unitive episode.

Note also the form that the interpretation takes more often called "atomization" which refers to the interpret's method of isolating a dream's various visual elements and assigns each its meaning. Some kind of handbooks of dream may be useful to resolve the meaning of a symbolical dream or vision. It is also noteworthy that dream interpretation should use common sense rather than simply relying upon dream handbooks. For example, Fröhlich (1996, p. 24-25) presumes that in reality it may not be the case when looking at Nebuchadnezzar's dreams in Daniel 2, although the

use of the interpreter-theme makes it appear that this interpretation and revelation process was done according to the dream handbooks and techniques of the time (Dan. 2:4, 10-11).

In summary, the aim of this article has been to analyze the meaning and function of the biblical dreams in the Joseph narrative from the perspectives of theological, ancient Hellenistic philosophers', and psychological aspects. The study has been set in the context of the Hebrew Bible as a whole, discussing the element of biblical dreams, especially the dream interpretations of Pharaoh's chief cupbearer and chief baker, in relation to biblical literature in general. First, from a theological perspective, by squeezing grapevine into a cup of wine, and by flatteringly delivering it to Pharaoh without committing mistakes, the chief cupbearer successfully regains Pharaoh's employment. The chief cupbearer's encounter with Joseph in prison and his regain to Pharaoh's side also demonstrate afterwards as a recalling so that he could recommend Joseph as a godsent dream interpreter for Pharaoh's dreams. On the contrary, the chief baker's improper dispose of the symbolic holy bread in the baskets in his dream forebodes his punishment. As a successful dream interpreter, Joseph represents as God's instrument, demonstrating dream interpretation from God. Second, from the perspective of Philo of Alexandria, the two dreams contribute to complementarily half of the indulgent nourishment for Pharaoh who is conjuncted with the gluttony of drunkenness, excessive pleasures, and desires of passion. Third, from a Freudian perspective, the two dreams retrieve the day residues of the chief cupbearer and the baker and excavate their conscious desire to know the grand finales of their custody. Fourth, on the other hand, from a Jungian perspective, the two dreams reflect their daily life and unconsciousness. Fifth, from the perspective of the superstitions of the Chinese folk dream books, which provides mechanical interpretations for divining the future, however, there is similarity with the theological explanations. Unavoidably, this kind of activity inclines to encourage fatalism. Sixth, the chief baker's self-evaluation on his own dream can be interpreted through the equate-to-differentiate approach.

Acknowledgement

I thank Prof. Bartosz Adamczewski at Faculty of Theology, Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw, the supervisor of my postgraduate studies, Prof. Ida Fröhlich at Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Pázmány Péter at Catholic University, and the two anonymous reviewers, who give me invaluable insight, direction, or comments on this work. The views expressed herein are mine and should not be attributed to any of the persons who provided commentaries.

References

- Adamczewski, B. (2012). *Retelling the Law: Genesis, Exodus-Numbers, and Samuel-Kings as Sequential Hypertextual Reworkings of Deuteronomy*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Bar, S. (2001). *A Letter That Has Not Been Read: Dreams in the Hebrew Bible*. Cincinnati, OH: Hebrew Union Press.
- Botterweck, G. J., & Ringgren, H. (1977). *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament Volume 4*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Bulkeley, K. (2008). *Dreaming in the World's Religions: A Comparative History*. New York: University Press.
- Cox, E. A. (2011). *Deception and narrative technique in Herodotus' Histories*. Ph.D. thesis University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Cox-Miller, P. (1998). *Dreams in Late Antiquity: Studies in the Imagination of a Culture*. (2nd ed.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Darby, G. P. . G. I., W. J. (1976). *Food: The Gift of Osiris Volume 2*. London.
- Dodds, E. R. (1951). *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Domhoff, G. W. (1996). *Finding Meaning in Dreams: A Quantitative Approach*. N.Y.: Plenum.
- Doukhan, J. B. (2000). *Secrets of Daniel: Wisdom and Dream of a Jewish Prince in Exile*. Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald.
- Du, Y. F. (1965). *Modern Complete Collection of Chou Kung Dream Interpretation*. Shaanxi, China: Shaanxi Normal University Press (in Chinese).
- Freedman, D. N. (1992). *The Anchor Bible Dictionary Volume 1*. N. Y.: Doubleday.
- Freud, S. (1965). *The Interpretation of Dreams*. N.Y.: Avon.
- Fröhlich, I. (1996). *Time and Times and Half a Time: Historical Consciousness in the Jewish Literature of the Persian and Hellenistic Eras*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Gallop, D. (1990). *Aristotle on Sleep, Dreams, and Final Causes*. In *Proceedings of the Boston Area Colloquium in Ancient Philosophy (Vol. IV, pp. 257-290)*. Lanham: University Press of America.
- Gnuse, R. K. (1990a). *Dream genre in the Matthean infancy narratives*. *Novum Testamentum*, 32(2), 97-120.
- Gnuse, R. K. (1990b). *The Jewish dream interpreter in a foreign court: The recurring use of a theme in Jewish literature*. *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha*, 7, 29-53.
- Gnuse, R. K. (1993). *The temple experience of Jaddus in the Antiquities of Josephus: A report of Jewish dream incubation*. *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, 83(3/4), 349-368.
- Gnuse, R. K. (1997). *Dreams and Dream Reports in the Writings of Josephus*. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill.
- Granger, H. (2000). *Death's other kingdom: Heraclitus on the life of the foolish and the wise*. *Classical Philosophy*, 95(3), 260-281.
- Hamilton, V. P. (1995). *The New International Commentary on the Old Testament: The Book of Genesis (Chapters 18-50)*. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Harold, R. K. (1986). *A survey of previous scholarship on Philo's "De Josepho"*. In *One Hundred Twenty-Second Annual Meeting (November 22-25)* (pp. 262-270). Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press volume 25 of Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers.
- Harold, R. K. (1987). *A survey of previous scholarship on Philo's "De Somniis I-II"*. In *One Hundred Twenty-Third Annual Meeting (December 5-8)* (pp. 394-402). Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press volume 26 of Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers.
- Hartman, L. F., & DiLella, A. A. (1990). *Daniel*. In Brown, R. E., Fitzmyer, J. A., & Murphy, R. E. (Ed.), *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Hay, D. M. (1991). *Both Literal and Allegorical: Studies in Philo of Alexandria's Questions and Answers on Genesis and Exodus*. Brown Judaic Studies.
- Hendel, R. J. (2011). *Joseph: A biblical approach to dream interpretation*. *Jewish Bible Quarterly*, 39(4), 231-238.
- Hobson, J. A. (2002). *Dreaming: An Introduction to the Science of Sleep*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Husser, J., & Munro, J. M. (1999). *Dreams and Dream Narratives in the Biblical World*. Biblical Seminar. Sheffield (Vol. 63), England: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Jeffers, A. (1990). Divination by dreams in Ugaritic literature and in the old testament. *Irish Biblical Studies*, 12, 167–183.
- Jung, C. G. (1963). *Memories, Dreams and Reflections*. N.Y.: Pantheon.
- Jung, C. G., von Franz, M.-L., Henderson, J. L., Jacobi, J., & Jaffé, A. (1971). *Man and His Symbols*. N.Y.: Doubleday.
- Jung, C. G. (1970a). The undiscovered self. In *The Collected Work of C. J. Jung* (Vol. 10). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press (Original work published 1963).
- Jung, C. G. (1970b). *Mysterium coniunctionis*. In *The Collected Work of C. J. Jung* (Vol. 14). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press (Original work published 1963).
- Kaufmann, W. A. (1980). *Discovering the Mind: Freud versus Adler and Jung*. N. Y.: McGraw-Hill.
- Kelsey, M. (1968). *Dreams: The Dark Speech of the Spirit*. N.Y.: Doubleday.
- Kelsey, M. (1978). *Dreams: A Way to Listen to God*. N.Y.: Paulist Press.
- King, C. J. (2004). *Alexander and Divination: Dreams, Omens, and Aristander of Telmessus in Alexander Historians*. Ph.D. thesis Brown University.
- Koet, B. J. (2008). Is started with a dream: Paul's dream (acts 16, 9-10) and Aeneas as a biblical example of dreams as intercultural legitimation strategy. *Dreaming*, 18(4), 267–279.
- Koet, B. J. (2009). *Divine Dream Dilemma's: Biblical Visions and Dreams*. In K. Bulkeley, K. Adams, & P. M. Davis (Ed.), *Dreaming in Christianity and Islam: Culture, Conflict and Creativity* (pp. 17–31). New Jersey: Rutgers University.
- Lasanté, P. (2001). *A King's Dreams: A Study of the Second Chapter of Daniel within the Context of Dreams in Canonical and Non-Canonical Sources*. Ph.D. thesis McGill University.
- Leeming, M. K., D. A., & Marlan, S. (2010). *Encyclopedia of Psychology and Religion Volume 1*. Springer.
- Lévy, C. (2009). Philo's Ethics. In A. Kamesar (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Philo* (pp. 146–175). Cambridge University Press.
- Liu, L. Q., & Lu, Y. (2007). The Linda problem: The equate-to-differentiate interpretation. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 15(5), 735–742 (in Chinese).
- Long, B. O. (1976). Reports of visions among the prophets. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 95, 353–365.
- Lowenthal, E. I. (1973). *The Joseph Narrative in Genesis: An Interpretation*. N. Y.: KTAV.
- Lowery, J. M. (1999). *The Form and Function of Symbolic Vision Reports in the Hebrew Bible*. Ph.D. thesis The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.
- Lu, Y. (2015a). The conjunction and disjunction fallacies: Explanations of the Linda problem by the equate-to-differentiate model. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, (pp. 1–25). doi:10.1007/s12124-015-9314-6.
- Lu, Y. (2015b). Is experiential-intuitive cognitive style more inclined to err on conjunction fallacy than analytical-rational cognitive style? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6(85). doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00085.
- Mattoon, M. (1984). *Understanding Dreams*. Dallas: Spring Publications.
- Metzger, B. M., & Coogan, M. D. (2004). *The Oxford Companion to the Bible*. Oxford University Press.
- Miller, J. B. (2007). *Convinced that God had Called Us: Dreams, Visions and the Perception of God's Will in Luke-Acts*. The Netherlands: Brill.
- Miller, J. B. (2010). Exploring the function of symbolic dream-visions in the literature of antiquity, with another look at 1qapgen 19 and acts 10. *Perspectives in Religious Studies*, 37(4), 441–455.
- Murray, M. A. (2000). *Viticulture and Wine Production*. In Nicholson, P. T., & Shaw, I. (Ed.), *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Technology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Newman, S. (2012). Pharaoh's dreams: An extended interpretation. *Jewish Bible Quarterly*, 40(4), 253–254.
- Niditch, S. (1983). *The Symbolic Vision in the Biblical Tradition*. Volume 30 of *Harvard Semitic Monographs*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.
- Noegel, S. B. (2007). *Nocturnal Ciphers: The Allusive Language of Dreams in the Ancient Near East*. American Oriental Series 89. New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- Oppenheim, A. L. (1956). *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East: With a Translation of an Assyrian Dream-Book*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
- Papamichael, E., & Theochari, A. (2008). Artemidorus' Oneirocritica. *Dream analysis in second century A. D. Hellenic Psychiatry: General Hospital*, 5(2), 83–85.
- Pinker, A. (2005). A dream of a dream in Daniel 2. *Jewish Bible Quarterly*, 33(4), 231–240.
- Pirson, R. (2002). *The Lord of the Dreams: A Semantic and Literary Analysis of Genesis 37-50*. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement* (Series 355). Sheffield Academic Press.
- Plaut, W. G., Bamberger, B. J., & Hallo, W. W. (1981). *The Torah: A Modern Commentary*. N. Y.: Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
- Poo, M. (1995). *Wine and Wine Offering in the Religion of Ancient Egypt*. Columbia: Columbia University Press.
- Pope, M. (1962). Numbers. In G. A. Buttrick (Ed.), *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. v. K-Q. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Prabhu, G. S. (1976). *The Formula Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew: An Enquiry into the Tradition History of Mt. 1-2*. Rome: Biblical Institute.
- Pritchard, J. B. (1969). *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Reddoch, M. J. (2010). *Dream Narratives and Their Philosophical Orientation in Philo of Alexandria*. Ph.D. thesis University of Cincinnati.
- Reddoch, M. J. (2011). Philo of Alexandria's use of sleep and dreaming as epistemological metaphors in relation to Joseph. *The International Journal of the Platonic Tradition*, 5, 283–302.
- Redford, D. B. (1967). *History and Chronology of the Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt: Seven Studies*. Near and Middle East Series (Vol. 3). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Regalado, F. O. (2005). The meaning of " " in Daniel 2:5, 8 and its implications for Nebuchadnezzar's dream. *DavarLogos*, 4(1), 17–37.
- Ritner, R. K. (2002). *Dream Oracles, in the Context of Scripture: Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World Volume 1*. Brill.
- Rollins, W. G. (1983). *Jung and the Bible*. John Knox Press.
- Ross, W. D. (1955). *Aristotle: Parva Naturalia*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Rossel, S. (2003). *Bible Dreams: The Spiritual Quest. How the Dreams in the Bible Speak to Us Today*. N. Y.: S.P.I. Books.
- Sanford, J. A. (1978). *Dreams and Healing*. N.Y.: Paulist Press.
- Sarna, N. M. (1989). *The JPS Torah Commentary: Genesis*. Philadelphia, PA: The Jewish Publication Society.

- Speiser, E. A. (1964). *The Anchor Bible. chapter Genesis: Introduction, Translation and Notes*. N.Y.: Doubleday.
- Szpakowska, K. (2006). "Word play" in the Ramesside Dream Book. *Studien zur Altägyptische Kultur*, 35, 193-212.
- Taylor, J. (1983). *Dream Work*. N.Y.: Paulist Press.
- Torallas, T. S. (2003). Philo of Alexandria on Sleep. In *Sleep* (pp. 41–52). Bari: Levante volume Nottingham Classical Literature Studies.
- Von Heijne, C. H. (2014). OTSEM: Conference in Old Testament Studies vid Oxford University, Oxford, Storbritannien, 2012 (OTSEM: Old Testament Studies Epistemologies and Methods, internationellt nätverk). *Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies*, 584 Chapter The dreams in the Joseph narrative and their impact in biblical literature. (pp. 30–46). London: Bloomsbury.
- Walsh, J. A. (1983). The dream of Joseph: A Jungian interpretation. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 11(1), 20–27.
- Wijsenbeek-Wijler, H. (1978). *Aristotle's Concept of Soul, Sleep, and Dreams*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- Winston, D. (1984). *Philo's Ethical Theory Volume 21.1*. Boston: ANRW.
- Wood, L. (1973). *A Commentary on Daniel*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan.
- Zheng, B. L., & Yang, P. (1995). *Dunhuang Dream Interpretation*. Gansu, China: Gansu Culture Press (in Chinese).