

PAN AND THE NIGHTMARE

being the only English Translation
(from the German by A. V. O'Brien, M.D.) of

EPHIALTES:
A PATHOLOGICAL-MYTHOLOGICAL TREATISE ON
THE NIGHTMARE IN CLASSICAL ANTIQUITY

by
Wilhelm Heinrich Roscher
(1900)

together with
AN ESSAY ON PAN
serving as a Psychological Introduction
to Roscher's *Ephialtes*

by
James Hillman

1972



DUNQUIN SERIES 4

Spring Publications
Suite 306, 130 East 39th Street
New York City 10016

CONTENTS

PART ONE

AN ESSAY ON PAN	James Hillman
The Text	i
Roscher: Life, Work and Contribution to Psychology	ii
The Dream in 1900	xii
Pan, Goat-God of Nature	xvi
'Instinct'	xxiii
Panic	xxvi
Pan and Masturbation	xxxii
Rape	xxxv
Pan's Nymphs	xliv
Spontaneity — Synchronicity	lvi
Healing our Madness	lix

"An Essay on Pan" Copyright © 1972, James Hillman

"*Ephialtes*" Copyright © 1972, Spring Publications

The Analytical Psychology Club of New York, Inc.

This translation is published under license from
B.G. Teubner, 7 Stuttgart 80, Germany, who
reserve all rights on behalf of the Roscher heirs.

*Composed, Photo-offset and Manufactured in Switzerland
by Buchdruckerei Schrumpf, 8123 Ebmatingen Zürich
for Spring Publications, Postfach 190, 8024 Zürich.*

PART TWO

EPHIALTES	Wilhelm Heinrich Roscher
Preface	1
I. The Nature and Origin of the Nightmare from the Modern Medical Aspect	3
II. The Nature and Origin of the Nightmare According to the Ancient Physicians	18
III. The Old Designations of the Nightmare	45
IV. The Most Important of the Greek and Roman Nightmare Demons	58
Abbreviations used in the Present Work	82
Sources and Notes	83
Bibliographical End Note	88

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This translation was made by A.V. O'Brien in Vienna in 1963-64 and edited there by A.K. Donoghue, who, although foreseeing the difficulties ahead, nevertheless also foresaw the value of the undertaking. He, together with Renate Welch, grappled with most of the references. The final version was prepared for publication by Murray Stein; James Fenwick assisted him with the transliterations of Greek words. Patricia Berry edited my essay, Valerie Donleavy designed and supervised the book's production, I am grateful to Rafael Lopez for conversations on the Pan theme and to James Redfield who, at the University of Chicago in 1968, read through the translation and an earlier sketch of the essay suggesting improvements for its revised form.

I wish also to acknowledge my debt to books (mentioned below in appropriate places) by Ernest Jones, Reinhard Herbig and Patricia Merivale in whose essential works for this theme the necessary scholarly references can be found, and, of course, my debt to Wilhelm Heinrich Roscher.

J.H.

AN ESSAY ON PAN

A Psychological Introduction to Roscher's *Ephialtes*

Socrates: Beloved Pan, and all ye other Gods who haunt this place, give me beauty in the inward soul; and may the outward and inward man be at one.
Plato, *Phaedrus*, 279B

For the true significance of the Nightmare to be properly appreciated, first by the learned professions and then by the general public, would in my opinion entail consequences, both scientific and social, to which the term momentous might well be applied. What is at issue is nothing less than the very meaning of religion itself.

Ernest Jones, *On the Nightmare*, 1931

THE TEXT

The monograph by Roscher which follows this essay is a classic example of nineteenth-century European scholarship. Here we can follow a significant problem — both for scholarship and for life — amplified and analysed by a man of massive learning. This monograph is also an example of neglected learning. Like a pre-historic creature, the bulk and complexity of its appendages made it not viable for translation into another time and culture, so that it has remained an unread relic preserved in the bogs of academic libraries and only referred to in footnotes as a pre-formation of later works. Inasmuch as my essay is one of those "later works" depending upon his research, it is appropriate to begin with an introduction to that text and the man who wrote it.

Owing to the fact that this monograph was written in a more leisurely age when the cost of printing detailed footnotes in Greek was not as inhibiting as it is now, scholars would liberally back up any statement made in a text with a wealth of quotes in Greek of similar examples. Sometimes this ostentation went beyond the useful, becoming more a mannerism which academic publications in this century too still at times affect. In preparing this translation it was necessary first

to choose between the essential and the merely curious. The ideal choice, to include every note in literal exactitude, was no real choice at all since it would have meant abandoning the project altogether. Instead, we have decided to print an accurate translation of the text with ample notes, so that the non-specialist reader in English might profit from an essential work, yet without the exorbitant footnote apparatus supplied by Roscher. Those footnotes that in our view are relevant have been mainly woven into the body of the text, which has been faithfully and completely rendered into English. The reader is thus not obliged to move his eyes both horizontally across the page and vertically up and down between footnotes and text. For this same reason, easier reading, all Greek terms have been transliterated into familiar letters, even in Chapter Three which is an etymological investigation. An End Note on page 88 of this volume describes the lay-out of the original monograph as well as giving full bibliographical information.

Anyone with enough expert knowledge to follow the matter beyond what is given here would of course also be able to pursue his interest directly to the original – not only the German of Roscher but the Greek on which Roscher's work is based. Therefore this translation is less for the philologist than it is for us whose wider interest in dreams, myths and the terrors of the soul is cramped by the contemporary malaise of 'little Latin and less Greek'. We need not thereby be cut off totally from knowledge of antiquity, and so this translation aims to re-connect us to that tradition, but in our own language.

2 ROSCHER: LIFE, WORK AND CONTRIBUTION TO PSYCHOLOGY

Wilhelm Heinrich Roscher was the son of the famous German national-economist Wilhelm R. Roscher, who receives more space in the biographical dictionaries than does his son. Roscher senior was one of the founders of the historical school of political economy, which played its part in the development of modern Germany under Bismarck. Roscher junior was born in Göttingen, February 12, 1845, and the family moved to Leipzig three years later. He was educated there at the Nikolai Gymnasium and at St. Afra's school near Meissen, moving on to study Classics for three semesters at Göttingen, receiving his doctorate back in Leipzig in 1869.

During the second half of the nineteenth century, Leipzig was a

major focus of German scientific and scholarly activity. It was important not only for its economic expansion, but it grew also as a publishing center and as the scene of new architectural achievements, including its famous art museum. Robert Schumann and Richard Wagner had studied in Leipzig, as did Pavlov later; Theodore Mommsen held a chair, while in the medical sciences, there was His in anatomy, Flechsig in brain research, Strümpell in neurology, and Wunderlich, a reformer of German medicine and the man to whom we owe the foundations of clinical thermometry. Ostwald's work in physical chemistry took place in Leipzig which was also where Fechner had his laboratory. Psychophysics can be said to begin with Fechner, as experimental psychology begins with Wundt, who founded his institute in Leipzig in 1878, which soon became the desired sanctuary of American graduate students in psychology.

This was Leipzig, intellectual background of Roscher's youth and mid-life, and he too was a pioneer investigator and indefatigable assembler of data in the nineteenth-century style. It is only now that we can see his achievements in scholarship as equalling those of his contemporaries in the natural sciences. He more than any other classicist is responsible for having collected into one place the mythical and religious material of the ancient world, providing the ground for the scientific study of myth and symbol.

Among his fellows at the University of Leipzig were Friedrich Nietzsche and Erwin Rohde, the classicist known to us perhaps best for his work *Psyche, or the Cult of Souls*. With them Roscher founded the Philology Club. Roscher and Rohde travelled together to Italy, and Roscher visited Greece and Asia Minor in 1873/74. In 1876 he married Eveline Koller, who, according to Roscher's obituary in the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* (*Zweite Morgenblatt*, March 20, 1923) was a Swiss from Herisau. They had three children. Roscher's only son (again a Wilhelm) and his son-in-law served on the Western Front during the 1914-1918 war, and Roscher found in his research solace from anxiety over them and the war, which his father had long before predicted. He is said to have had a quiet and contained nature, working into old age at his table as long as the day-light lasted.

His external career was entirely as an educationalist. He taught Classics at his old school St. Afra's for eleven years, and then until he was sixty (1905) he taught at the Gymnasium at Wurzen. He rose

through various ranks in the secondary school system: Oberlehrer, Oberstudienrat, Konrektor, Rektor, Geheimrat. The benefit of all his learning went to pupils in the equivalent of the Senior High School. This points to a difference between the selective Continental and the democratic American notions of education. It also points to a difference regarding the role of the Classics between the end of the last century and the latter part of this. Roscher lived another eighteen years after retirement, dying at seventy-eight in Dresden on March 7, 1923.

Roscher devoted the major part of his scholarly life to an encyclopedia, the title of which in English would read *The Detailed Dictionary of Greek and Roman Mythology* (*Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*). Publication began in 1884, and it had been completed under Roscher's editorship through the letter 'T' when he died. Each of his eight volumes contains about sixteen hundred columns of small (8 point) print, which, if re-set today would give us at least twelve thousand pages. Yet, the articles — not each authored by Roscher, even if all under his supervision — are written almost in a short-hand, abbreviating and condensing everything possible. The *Lexikon* surveys not only the entire corpus of the Classical authors, but reviews the later literature, makes comparisons, offers comments, and as well is richly illustrated, for Roscher was completely familiar with the art, architecture and archeological finds relevant to his subject. The work is still basic and still valuable; a recent printing of it, as completed by other hands, in ten volumes has been reproduced photomechanically by Olms of Hildesheim. It continues to provide the stuff for countless articles on mythology today, and the *Lexikon* is standard in footnote apparatus. Most of his earlier researches and those done contemporary with the production of the *Lexikon* — *Apollon und Mars* (1873), *Juno und Hera* (1875), *Hermes der Windgott* (1878), *Die Gorgone und Verwandtes* (1879), *Nektar und Ambrosia* (1878), *Selene und Verandtes* (1890) as well as his works on Pan — were integrated into the larger *Lexikon*.

As the titles indicate, he was particularly interested in *comparative* mythology, which in his later works extended beyond the Greek and Roman sources. So we find, for instance in this study on the nightmare, that Roscher turns to Byzantine works, psychological studies of his day on sleep and dreams, and expands upon material from other mythologies and lore of Northern Europe and Asia. In 1897 he examined the role of dog and wolf in the eschatology of the Greeks, trying to discover

connections between religious ideas of these animals in antiquity and the problem of the werewolf, cynanthropy and lycanthropy. He published on these subjects before this monograph on the nightmare appeared in 1900, when he was fifty-five years old. Later he became fascinated with more abstract topics: numbers in Greek medicine, the numbers seven, nine and forty, and the concept of an imaginary middle point, the omphalos or world-navel, a recurrent theme in Greek, Roman and Semitic mythology. He published also on these subjects. We can see a biographical pattern in his writings, which move from a study of the separate archetypal personifications of the Gods through an interest in the more terrifying psychological forces (nightmare, sexuality, werewolf, lycanthropy) to subjects typical for senex consciousness when Saturn rules, e. g., numbers and the idea of the center.

But Roscher was more than a compiler and encyclopedist. His mind sought out unusual aspects of his subjects, going beyond the historical and philological. His scholarship was, in a way, touched by the Romantic currents which flowed through late nineteenth-century rationalism, warming it and breeding within it surprising new kinds of life, the most important of which was the psychology of the unconscious. Roscher's work in mythology belongs as much to the sources of depth psychology as does the work of Tylor, Frazer, and other early anthropologists, or the work of the Grimms and the folklorists, or in another line, Roscher's contemporaries in the medical field: Charcot, Bernheim, and Freud. The exploration of the background of the rational mind, whether through the disciplined investigation of hysterical dissociation, of the thought habits of primitive peoples, or of the beliefs of the past through linguistic, mythological, or archeological investigation, all culminated in what is today the psychology of the unconscious. Jung's concept of the archetype rests on the evidence accumulated by these different disciplines.

If we see only one of the intertwined roots of Jung's work — for example, Freud or Bleuler or the basis in Wundtian association experiments, or the early interest in parapsychology and occultism, or the problems of Christian theology and its heresies (alchemy) — we are likely to miss many other aspects of the background to modern depth psychology. Moreover, since modern depth psychology was emerging by means of these new nineteenth-century disciplines (psychiatry, anthropology and folklore, spiritualism, comparative religion and mythology), we must read the history of these fields also from the *psycho-*

logical point of view. They did not describe in their hypotheses and their findings merely material from their respective fields; they were as well speaking of what was soon to be called the psychology of the unconscious.

These pioneer works therefore provide not only the historical background for their modern descendents in 'scientific' psychiatry, anthropology and mythology, they as well contain a psychological ferment, swelling many of their hypotheses preposterously beyond what today would be allowed by the 'facts'. We thus may not blame Roscher for the wide casting of his net nor for some of the odd fish he comes up with. Classical studies of this century have put tight critical restrictions upon nineteenth-century scholarship, questioning its method and evidence, doubting its conclusions, and worse — laughing at its ambition. Modern academic scholarship frowns upon the scope and conjecture of Roscher, and especially it disapproves of the comparative study of motifs, which last is a basic tenet of depth psychology and a basic method employed by all psychoanalytic investigations from R  heim through Neumann. The academics insist upon their departments: a myth or motif or figure shall be studied within its historical, cultural, textual, linguistic, economic, formal, sociological, or what-have-you context, but anathema it is to compare the mythical motif or figure with those of another period, area or culture or to regard a myth, motif or figure as relevant primarily for the human psyche and its imagination.

For depth psychology, however, the themes and personages of mythology are not mere subjects of knowledge. They are living actualities of the human being, having existence as *psychic realities* in addition to and perhaps even prior to their historical and geographical manifestation. Depth psychology turns to mythology less to learn about others in the past than to understand ourselves in the present. Roscher's investigation of ancient Pan in connection with the contemporary nightmare is just a case in point.

The academic treatment of myth in terms of departments of knowledge results in a plethora of theories of myth and in various explanatory fallacies. We have each been treated to many of these. It is hardly possible to find a myth recounted today without having to suffer within the same breath as its telling an interpretation of its meaning. Paramount among the various fallacies is simplification.

The complexity of a mytheme, or of a personage in it, is presented

as an account of a social, economic or historical process, or a pre-rational witness to some philosophical contention or moralistic instruction. Myths are assumed to be metaphorical (and primitive) expositions of natural science, metaphysics, psychopathology or religion. But before each of these applications of mythical meaning there is the myth itself and its naked effect within the human soul, which, in the first place, created the myth, and, in the second place, perpetuated it with embellishments; and the soul still re-dreams these themes in its fantasy, behaviour and thought structures. The primary approach to myth thus must be psychological, since the psyche provides both its original source and its continually living context. Here, however, a psychological approach does not mean a simplified exchange of terms, exotic metaphors cashed in for the common currency of familiar concepts, the big made small for easy application.

A psychological approach, as I understand it, does not mean a psychological interpretation. It does not mean to take myth over into the department of psychology or into a school of depth analysis, preparing a new series of psychological reductions equal in their narrowness to the other departmental simplifications (couched in technical conceits) that I would challenge. As myth belongs more to *theoria* than to pragmatics, so its understanding belongs to exegesis and hermeneutics, not to interpretation.

A psychological approach means what it says: a way through the psyche into myth, a connection with myth that proceeds via the soul, including especially its bizarre fantasy and its suffering (psychopathology), an unwrapping and leading out of the soul into mythical significance and vice versa. For only when the psyche realizes itself as enacting mythemes can it 'understand' myth, so that a psychological exegesis of myth begins with the exegesis of oneself, soul-making. And, from the other side: only when myth is led back into the soul, only when myth has *psychological significance* does it become a living reality, necessary for life, rather than a literary, philosophical or religious artifice. Scholarship belongs within this process as part of the psychological approach; how else approximate mythical reality than by immersion in its field, the contexts which breed it, the imagery it has shown throughout history. But scholarship in the psychological approach becomes a method of soul-making rather than mainly a method of knowing. For the therapeutic revivification of the psyche and for the renaissance of myth —

two inseparable processes which may be one and the same — insighting what we know is as important as knowing.

The value of scholarship is thus to be judged not only for its contribution to intellect but as well for its contribution to imagination. This should be borne in mind when reading Roscher. Ideally, the two kinds of contribution should add to each other, but often modern Classical scholars see the exorbitant fantasies of their forbears in the field as intellectual faults. They do not see that the reverse is taking place in themselves: the poverty of fantasy, the psychological simplistics, the very dryness of their touch in the midst of their intellectual accomplishments expose imaginal faults no less serious. When this is the case, we readers should not turn away from scholarly books, but instead learn how to read them. We can read them as part of the psychological approach, both experiencing the effect on imagination of the intellectual data and noting the imaginative fantasy within which the author organizes and by which he implicitly interprets the data. No matter who deals with myth and no matter how unimaginative the approach, the imaginal world is struck and it echoes in what is being said. We cannot touch myth without it touching us.

Though we may query the speculative nature of nineteenth-century scholarship, and take it to task for an adventurousness which the sophisticated, sceptical — and maybe cynical — mind obtaining in the field today would hardly dare, we should not forget that the late nineteenth-century psychiatrists, archeologists, ethnologists and mythographers were carried by tremendous passion. They were not mere workers. Nor was their drive mere obsession with knowledge, and through knowledge, authority, and from there to eminence and power. There seems to have been something else breaking into our age through them, some vision, some essential question about the nature of the depths of man.

Or, was theirs a search for lost Gods? Perhaps the fascination with the unknown depths indicated something further than the secular humanism of their intentions, reaching into impersonal, inhuman dimensions of the soul where heathen, pagan and mythic figures still moved and still drew their devotees, even if in the academic garb of impartial scholarship. Psychology may not take the reports of scholars at their literal face-value only; we regard their passion for discovery as archetypally governed. Like the alchemists, the explorers and the crusaders

in earlier centuries who also took their activities and goals literally, the investigators of the nineteenth-century were engaged not only in 'scientific research' but as well in a psychological quest into a new terrain of 'depth'.

These depths were projected, as we now would say, into the remote past, into mythology, into foreign dark tribes and exotic customs, into the simple folk and their lore, and into the mentally alienated. The thorough exploration of any of these fields of scholarship is also a thorough exploration of human personality in its obscure reaches, where it merges with the impersonal background of life at its 'primitive' level in the childhood of thought and language, of man and society. Roscher's thoroughness, as Frazer's or Cook's or Kraepelin's in psychiatry, may better be seen as a driven attempt to encompass man's depths, to chart what has been called the unconscious. Like Evans in Crete or Schliemann at Troy, they were driven by the private fantasies of imagination to rediscover an imaginal world. Even if performing in a scientific, sober and scholarly manner, these towering professorial figures of the late past century with their massive written output, their systematizations and their hunger for work re-incorporated into Western consciousness that which had been excluded since the Renaissance: the imaginal and its power in life. Their research led to the recognition that man was not only Western, modern, secular, civilized and sane, but also primitive, archaic, mythical, magical and mad. Paradoxically, they used the most advanced methods of reason to establish the reality of the irrational — or that which had to be called the irrational because of the shrunken definition of reason determined by the century's positivism, mechanism and utilitarianism.

If the psychiatry of the period did not produce new cures for insanity despite (or because of) its classificatory zeal, neither did the history of religion, linguistics, anthropology and Classical studies reawaken the dying rituals and beliefs of other cultures or transform these aspects of ours. But a cure, a reawakening did come about as a reconstruction of Western consciousness, which, because of the rediscovery of the imaginal function of the soul, could no longer identify itself with its former one-sided psychic structure. The mind with an ego at its center had lost its moorings; things were splitting up, and psychiatry discovered schizophrenia as the century came to its close. A new relativism was at hand: there were other myths than the Bible, other Gods than Christ,

other peoples than white, and, within each individual, there were other kinds of consciousness with diverse intentions and values.

Roscher, it would seem, did not intend his work to hasten this process of disintegration. Quite the opposite. He complained in his 1908 Preface to Volume III, 1 ("Nabaiiothes-Pasicharea") of the *Lexikon* of the "unpropitiousness of the present" for work such as his. He saw around him "an ever-increasing turning away from what hitherto had been the foundation of our higher education and culture, i.e., Classical antiquity, the Renaissance, and the indigenous classics of literature and art." These constituted for him the bulwark against the "abyss of barbarism". But he did not see that, though his method was reasoned and ordered, his material was Olympus itself, nay, the entire corpus of ancient polytheism whose resurrection was his life's work. For more than two thousand years Judeo-Christianity had bent its will toward the repression of this pagan past which now thanks to Roscher was conveniently packaged in a *Lexikon*. It seems as if his intellect had no notion of the possible effects upon the imagination. Like a detached natural scientist operating upon the primordial elements of fissionable materials, Roscher had painstakingly assembled (and made available to everyone who could subscribe) the stuff for psychic detonations no less dynamic for the fate of culture. Roscher's early association with Nietzsche is thus no accident; they founded more than a Philology Club.

Yet Roscher's use of mythology for the defense of culture is still valid even if not in quite the way he intended. We return to mythical roots not merely for knowledge of the Classics, but for the psychological reality which is their context. In this reality myth is paramount, and the polytheistic imagination which he systematically catalogued plays a role equal with reason and feeling. The defense of culture then lies less in tightening the rational order, less in extending the rule of human feeling, than it does in exploring and charting the imaginal. We must know the archetypal substructures which govern our reactions; we must recognize the Gods and the myths in which we are embroiled. Without this awareness, our behaviour becomes wholly mythic and consciousness a delusion. When Christ was the operative myth, it was enough to know his modes and those of the Devil. We had the Christian structure for our reflection. But now that this single model of consciousness has dissociated into the root multiples which lay dormant below it and which are presented by mythology, we cannot get by without mythological

reflection upon our patterns of reaction, our attitudes, our fantasies.

Although Roscher was a contemporary of Freud (born eleven years later in 1856), Roscher's work like that of the other pioneers differs in one significant way from the great psychologists Freud and Jung, who too belong in this scholarly line by virtue of their prodigious output, scholarly method, speculative daring — and concern with culture. Freud and Jung knew they were writing about themselves, even when discussing Moses and Job. Could Roscher have conceived Pan or any of the antique figures he elaborated to be 'his problem' in the same way? This kind of psychological identification — and distance — was possible not even for Nietzsche, while the other contemporaries in anthropology, history of religion, psychopathology and mythology, still enjoyed the Cartesian delusion that their work and their psychology could be held separate. They were still carried by the fantasy of subject and object. Scholarship, like natural science, retains a vested psychological interest in the 'objective fantasy', by means of which investigators can still defend themselves against learning through their research something about themselves and not only about their material.

Unfortunately, the pioneers combined the childhood of thought and language, of man and society too literally. They believed that *actual* childhood in man (Freud), of language (Max Müller), or of culture in the primitives or in antiquity or in archeology would reveal the key. They were still labouring under an 'origins of the species' fantasy, and they too easily interchanged at a literal level the child, the primitive, the mythical and the insane. This interchange has caused immeasurable confusion about so-called primitive thinking, about childhood, about mental aberration, and also about myth. They did not enough realize that their scholarly activities were also psychological, and that the origins and the childhood they were seeking to elaborate were also psychological, i.e., 'child' and 'origin' and 'primitive' as psychic factors which are prior to, and perhaps a priori within, the rational intellect performing the inquiry. They assumed they were studying subjects 'out there' in archeological digs, asylum patients, Classical texts, whereas they were at the same time studying the subject 'in here', in search of the primordial child of the imaginal level, of the psyche whose mythical mode of perception provides the archetypal origins within science itself. So these researchers at the very pinnacle of their scientific scholarship were preparing its collapse. For the imaginal forces which their inquiries led to (whether

in anthropology, psychiatry or Classical religion) eventually threw into question the rational, adult and civilized man of the Enlightenment, his method and even his mind. Roscher's work on *Ephialtes* is a piece of the process that undermined the nineteenth-century and opened the way for irrational man of the twentieth.

THE DREAM IN 1900

This monograph might rightly belong among the works on dreams which Freud reviews so carefully in the first section of his revolutionary *Traumdeutung*. It could not of course have been mentioned there, since that work and this monograph were published but a few months apart. At the turn of the century, the dream was a subject of interest to many besides Freud. The nineteenth-century witnessed a spate of writings upon the dream especially in France, Germany, and even in the United States. The literature of this period generally falls into three kinds, indicating the three distinct approaches to the dream which were then current.

The first approach was *materialistic*; it held that the dream was an echo in the mind of physiological events in the body. Dream images were the psychological translation of physical events. Research investigated the physical origins of dreams in sensations of coldness, wetness, etc., in subliminal and forgotten perceptions, in nitrous oxide; so too, there were investigations upon the physiological states during dreaming in order to discover the basis of the dream in somatic events. This view is still with us today when we attribute a dream to something we ate, to a late television stimulus, or to heavy blankets. It is also still with us on more sophisticated levels, as for instance when we assume that the physiological correlates of dream states (electrical patterns of brain activity, neuro-hormonal or circulatory changes) are the necessary and sufficient conditions of dreams.

The second view was *rationalistic*. It held that the dream made no sense at all, being a sort of derangement of the mental functions when they relaxed during sleep, like bits of mosaic falling apart without the cohesive cement of conscious willing and association. Thus dreams were akin to madness, a meaningless jumble of fragments which did not tell more about the person who dreamt them, but less. They were therefore not a proper subject for serious attention, let alone scientific investiga-

tion. The third, the *romantic* view, can be found mainly in the works of poets, writers and thinkers with a mystical bent — Novalis, Gerard de Nerval, Coleridge, Schubert, as has been discussed by A. Beguin in his *L'Âme romantique et le rêve* (Paris, 1967 edition). The romantic view reflects in poetic and philosophical language the older religious view of archaic man and traditional man that during sleep the mind or soul is open to occult powers. The dream was an avenue of communication with the Gods; in sleep the psyche wandered, received intuitions and messages, could meet the dead in the beyond, so that therefore dreams were a source of inspiration and knowledge, and they held real personal significance.

One of Freud's great accomplishments was to blend together these three contemporary illuminations of dream-life into one brilliant theory. In agreement with the rationalists, he held that the dream did not make sense, *prima facie*. It was indeed nonsense on the manifest level, showing signs of dissociation, distortion and condensation such as one finds in the products of the insane mind. However, like the romantics, he thought that the dream could be deciphered; it contained a personal message with a meaning for the dreamer and was a *via regia* to 'another world', the unconscious. He also accepted in part the position of the materialists, for he found the ultimate purpose of the dream to be in the psychophysiology of sleep (protecting sleep) and its ultimate source in somatic stimuli (sexual tensions).

Freud's theory, by its very encompassing elegance, opened new perspectives while it eclipsed others, mainly the experimental and physiological. During the first fifty years after Freud, nearly all the literature on the dream was published by psychoanalysts. The new romantics were the professional dream interpreters, while the kind of dream research that had taken place in psychological laboratories previous to Freud faded to a tiny percentile of the literature on dreams. Dream *interpretation* was in the ascendancy over dream *research*. Today, the alternative approaches which Freud united are appearing again, and, as Freudian theory seems on the decline, no longer holding the mystical and the material together in a rational coherence, the trend seems to be moving out of the consulting room and back to the laboratory as the place for dream investigation. Perhaps we are again expecting a new synthesis, such as made by Freud in 1900, which can bind together the current interpretations of the dream as a manifestation of

an archetypal substratum of the personality.

Roscher's study does suggest a movement in this direction, for he brings together fantasy and physical experience, dream and body reactions, behind both of which stands the figure of Pan. The archetype expresses itself as a pattern of behaviour (panic and nightmare) and as a pattern of imagery (Ephialtes, Pan and his entourage). In other words, Roscher's work also suggests a method for psychosomatic investigation based on archetypal psychology. Such investigations would give, as does Roscher, primary place to patterns of fantasy as precisely described by mythology.

Therefore, his little monograph, ostensibly a mythological study only, is a parallel work to Freud's *Traumdeutung* in that it offers a path for approaching the dream other than the psychological dream-work elaborated by Freud. Roscher goes deeper even if he is less overtly psychological because his approach to dream events through Pan goes beyond personal psychodynamics. Pan cannot be remitted to any complex of one's personal life; he is not accountable through psychological explanation. Roscher's difference with Laistner and what ultimately became the Freudian tradition of dream theory may make this point clearer.

Roscher's approach to the nightmare takes off from the work of Ludwig Laistner. Roscher criticizes him and develops his ideas in contrast to Laistner. Ernest Jones, however, according to the index of his book *On the Nightmare* (London: Hogarth, 1931), refers to Laistner thirty-one times (to Freud thirty-five times, to Roscher thrice). Although parts of Jones' work were written already in 1910 and 1912, he did have ample time to use Roscher's study on the same theme, so that Jones' reliance upon Laistner, and Roscher's divergence from Laistner, point to two different views of the dream still operative today.

Laistner (November 3, 1845 – March 22, 1896) trained first for theology but then moved into the field of Germanic studies and edited eight editions of Goethe's works in Stuttgart. His interests were particularly German myths and grammar, and he examined folklore, fairytales, Greek and other European mythical figures, including "Mittagsfrauen" and other noon-demons. His ideas on the nightmare appear in his untranslated book *Das Rätsel der Sphinx* (The Riddle of the Sphinx: Fundamentals of the History of a Myth), Berlin, 1889, in two volumes. This is mainly an investigation of the relation between dreams on the one hand and folklore and fairytale on the other. Jones says of this work:

In it he took the clinical characteristics of the Nightmare and with extraordinary ingenuity traced them through a very large series of myths. There was of course at that time (1889) no knowledge of the unconscious layers of the mind, so that today the chief value of his work is a casuistic one. Partly because of certain philological difficulties, Laistner's work was unduly neglected by mythologists, though before Freud's attempt it should be counted as perhaps the most serious attempt to place mythology on a naturalistically intelligible basis. (Jones, p. 73.)

It would seem that the real difference between Roscher and Laistner is one which still exists in psychology, and not only in regard to the interpretation of the nightmare. Roscher blames Laistner for his attempt, which did not succeed, to raise the dream "and in particular the nightmare, to the main and fundamental principle of all mythology". For Laistner, as for Freud and Jones after him, there is a psychological naturalistic ground for myth and religion. Laistner points to the erotic character of these dreams, comparable with Freud and Jones who later can reduce all mythology and religion to psychological mechanisms connected with sexuality. Roscher, on the other hand, is primarily a mythologist who would not reduce the mythic to intra-personal processes.

Even when he uses the rationalistic fallacies of his time, even if he is unaware of his own associationist style of thinking, and even though he attempts explanations and does not show awareness of his contemporary Dilthey and the importance of 'personification', Roscher would more likely adhere to an attitude towards both dream and myth represented, albeit in different ways in a different age, by Jung, Kerényi and Eliade. Myth and religion are not reducible to dreams, but both have their source in something transpersonal, in a reality that is not personally human, even if human in an archetypal sense. Myth and religion are *sui generis* aspects of life, if not also of nature. Just as sexuality is a *sui generis* function of the psyche (and not the psyche a derivative of sexuality), so too are the dreaming, the mythmaking, and the religious functions. They tell of each other, but they are not each other. Their tellings are myths and their connections with each other are by means of analogies, not because of a common root. Their

base is not naturalistic, as Jones says, for nature is itself a metaphor; therefore, to understand the dream we must speak as it speaks, not in natural concepts but in images. Consequently, our fundamental metaphor in this essay, whether it be for the dream or for Pan, is not 'natural', but 'imaginal'.

PAN, GOAT-GOD OF NATURE

Roscher's thesis, briefly, is that the nightmare demon in antiquity is the great God Pan in any of his several forms, and that the experience of the nightmare demon then was similar to that reported in the psychiatry and psychology of his own day. Having established this, Roscher leaves it. But we might go further, concluding that Pan is still alive, although we experience him only through psychopathological disturbances, other modes having been lost in our culture.

Thus we may expect him in the psychotherapist's consulting room, and indeed there is evidence of his appearance there. (For two examples of Pan in Jungian analysis see R. Michel, "Die Gestalt des Pan und Träume der Gegenwart", Diss, C. G. Jung-Inst., Zürich, n.d. and R. Blomeyer, "Die Konstellierung der Gegenüberstellung beim Auftauchen archetypischer Träume", *Zeitschrift f. Analyt. Psychol. u.i. Grenzgebiete*, III, 1, Berlin, 1971. This conclusion accords with a thesis I have been developing in several publications and which is presented in sum in *The Myth of Analysis* (Evanston: Northwestern, 1972): the repressed Gods return as the archetypal core of symptom complexes. Dionysos and hysteria were elaborated as an example. The relation of Kronos-Saturn to paranoid aspects of depression and of Hermes-Mercurius to what we now speak of as schizoid behaviour have yet to be worked in the same detail. These relations are part of the larger task of exploring psychopathology in terms of archetypal psychology. One of the many implications of this psychology is that mythology becomes an indispensable discipline for the training of psychotherapists. Roscher's monograph which links mythology and pathology in its very title would be a basic text of training for psychotherapy.

Because of the satyr-goat-phallus nature of Pan, both the panic anxiety of the nightmare and its erotic aspects can be subsumed by one and the same figure. In Roscher's treatment of the figure, Pan is not a projected image, a kind of psychopathological complex created by fantasy to express sexual anxiety. His is a mythical reality. Although Roscher

falls prey at moments to the rationalist-materialist view of the dream presented by Börner (that goat-haired bed-clothes and dyspnea give rise to the Pan experience), this 'explanation' of the nightmare nevertheless still rests upon the epiphany of Pan, who always remains as a vivid reality in the pages of Roscher. Despite his occasional efforts to compromise with his times by reducing the God to a sensible medical account, what emerges from the pages is the unity of the mythological and the pathological.

The independence of Pan from the simplification of his reality to a by-product of sleeping-discomfort comes out most clearly when Roscher discusses panic and nightmare in animals. Here Roscher shows his awareness of the instinctual level of the nightmare — particularly its sexuality. We see in his writing the same struggle with the 'sexual problem' that was emerging at that time through many of his psychological contemporaries, Havelock Ellis, Auguste Forel, Ivan Bloch, and of course Freud, to say nothing of the work of the painters and writers at the end of the century who were re-discovering the phallic-goat-satyr in the deeper layers of man's drive, and who, as did Freud with Oedipus and Roscher with Pan, expressed their insights in the configurations of Greek myth. Patricia Merivale in her fine book, *Pan, the Goat-God: His Myth in Modern Times* (Cambridge: Harvard, 1969) has collected a staggering assortment of examples of the nineteenth-century's devotion to Pan, the period in literature which she says saw his heyday. Pan, by the way, has been the favorite Greek figure in English poetry; he out-distances his nearest rivals (Helen, Orpheus and Persephone) in statistical appearance nearly two to one.

Greek myth placed Pan as God of nature. What is meant by that word 'nature' has been analysed into at least fifty differing notions, so that our usage of 'nature' here must be discerned from the qualities associated with Pan, with his description, his appearance in imagery, his style of behaviour. All Gods had aspects of nature and could be found in nature, leading some to conclude that antique mythological religion was essentially a nature religion, the transcendence of which by Christianity, therefore, meant the suppression especially of the representative of nature, Pan, who soon became the goat-footed Devil. To specify Pan's nature we shall have to see how Pan personifies it, both in his figure and in his landscape, which is at once an inscape, a metaphor and not mere geography. His original place, Arcadia, is both

a physical and a psychic location. The "caves obscure" where he could be encountered (The Orphic Hymn to Pan) were expanded upon by the Neoplatonists (see *Thomas Taylor the Platonist, Selected Writings*, edited by Kathleen Raine and G. M. Harper, Princeton: University Press, 1969, pp. 225, 297ff.) as the material recesses where impulse resides, the dark holes of the psyche whence desire and panic arise.

His habitat in antiquity, like that of his later Roman shapes (Faunus, Silvanus) and companions, was always dells, grottos, water, woods and wilds — never villages, never the tilled and walled settlements of the civilized; cavern sanctuaries, not constructed temples. He was a shepherd's God, a God of fishers and hunters, a wanderer without even the stability provided by genealogy. The lexicographers of myth give at least twenty parentages of Pan. (Roscher wrote a separate study on this subject *Die Sagen von der Geburt des Pan*.) He was possibly fathered by Zeus, Uranos, Kronos, Apollo, Odysseus, Hermes, or by Penelope's crowd of suitors; hence his is a spirit that can arise from most anywhere, the product of many archetypal movements or by spontaneous generation. One tradition has him fathered by Aether, the tenuous substance that is invisible yet everywhere, and which word first meant bright sky or weather associated with Pan's hour of noon (see below). If so unspecific and spontaneous, then why attribute to him parentage at all. This line was taken by Apollodorus (Frag. 44b) and Servius (*On Vergil's "Georgics"*).

Certainly his maternal line is obscure. The main account from "The Homeric Hymn to Pan", and the one given by Kerényi in his *Gods of the Greeks*, has Pan abandoned at birth by his wood-nymph mother, but wrapped in a hare's pelt by his father Hermes (to be sired by Hermes emphasizes the mercurial element in Pan's background), who took the babe to Olympus where he was accepted by all (*pan*) the Gods with delight. Especially Dionysos enjoyed him.

This one tale places Pan within a specific configuration. First, enwrapped in the skin of the hare, an animal particularly sacred to Aphrodite, Eros, the Bacchic world, and the moon, implies his investment with those associations. (See, J. Layard, *The Lady of the Hare*, London, 1944, pp. 212-220.) His initial garment means his initiation into their universe; he has been adopted by those structures of consciousness. Second, Hermes is his patron, giving to Pan's actions a hermetic aspect. They can be examined for messages. They are modes of communication, connections

which mean something. Third, Dionysos' delight expresses the sympathy between them. These Gods, then, provide the archetypal cluster into which Pan fits and where we may most expect him to be constellated.

The mythologems — "the abandoned child", "wrapped in animal skin" and "pleasing to the Gods" — may be pondered a long while. Their exegesis, which comes through living their meanings out in our lives, may tell us much about our Pan-like behaviour during moments of weakness and lostness (abandonment), as well as about our erotic *luxuria*, for, within the little love gage that the hare was, lies concealed the uncultivated wilderness of Pan. What starts soft turns rough and beneath the rabbit's fur lurks the goat. Yet the Gods smile on our goat-footed child; they take it as a gift to the divine; they each find an affinity with it; Pan reflects them all.

As God of all nature, Pan personifies to our consciousness that which is all or only natural, behaviour at its most nature-bound. Behaviour that is nature-bound is, in a sense, divine; it is behaviour transcendent to the human yoke of purposes, wholly impersonal, objective, ruthless. The cause of such behaviour is obscure; it springs suddenly, spontaneously. As Pan's genealogy is obscure so is the origin of instinct. To define instinct as an inborn release mechanism, or to speak of it as a chthonic spirit, a prompting of nature, puts into obscure psychological concepts the obscure experiences that might once have been attributed to Pan.

Above all we must remember that the Pan experience is beyond the control of the willing subject and his ego psychology. Even where the will is most disciplined and the ego most purposeful, and I am thinking now of men in battle, Pan appears, determining through panic the outcome of the fray. Twice in antiquity (at Marathon and against the Celts in 277 B.C.) Pan appeared and the Greeks had their victory. He was commemorated with Nike. The panic flight is a protective reaction even if in its blindness the outcome can be mass death. The protective aspect of nature that appears in Pan shows not only in his affinity for herdsmen, nor in the word-root (*pan*) of "pastor", "pastoral" and *pabulum* (nourishment), but as well in his role in the Dionysos train where Pan carries the shield of Dionysos on the march to India. (Cf. Roscher's "Pan", *Lexikon*, 1388-90 for Classical references to Pan the Warrior.)

In the Eros and Psyche tale told by Apuleius Pan protects Psyche from suicide. The soul disconsolate, its love gone, divine help denied,

panics. Psyche throws herself away, into the river which refuses her. In that same moment of panic, Pan appears with his reflective other side, Echo, and brings home to the soul some natural truths. Pan is both destroyer and preserver, and the two aspects appear to the psyche in close approximation. When we panic we can never know whether it may not be the first movement of nature that will yield, if we can hear the echo of reflection, a new insight into nature.

As R. Herbig says in his monograph (*Pan - der griechische Bocksgott*, Frankfurt a/M., 1949), this God is always a goat, the goat always a divine force. Pan is not 'represented' by a goat, nor is the goat 'holy' to Pan; rather, Pan *is* the goat-God, and this configuration of animal-nature distinguishes nature by personifying it as something hairy, phallic, roaming and goatish. This Pan nature is no longer an idyllic display for the eye, something to walk through or long back to for sweetness. Nature as Pan is hot and close, his hairy animal smell, his erection, as if nature's arbitrary wayward force and uncanny mystery were summed into this one figure.

The "union of God and goat" — the phrase is from Nietzsche's *The Birth of Tragedy* — signified for the post-Nietzschean world the Dionysian mode of consciousness and the final diseased insanity of its promulgator. But though Nietzsche was speaking overtly of the goat-God, "in Nietzsche's biography", writes Jung (C.W. 11, §28) "you will find irrefutable proof that the god he originally meant was really Wotan". (Cf. my "Dionysos in Jung's Writings", *Spring* 1972, N.Y./Zürich: Spring Publications, 1972). Thus, in attempting to understand the union of God and goat which as Merivale states (*op. cit.*, p.226), is "the stable focal point of my investigations", we must avoid confusing it with the Dionysos of Nietzsche in whose background was the Germanic Wotan. Yet, Nietzsche does penetrate one riddle of goat-existence (and there are many, since the goat of the senex and the scape-goat and the Dionysian kid and the milk-goat do not belong here) when he speaks of the horror of nature and the horror of individual existence. For the solitary goat is both the Oneness and the aloneness, a cursed nomadic existence in empty places, his appetite making them yet emptier, his song, "tragedy". This is not the fat jolly Pan of some statuary or the elfin piper we call Peter or the "deep emotional self" of D. H. Lawrence's Pan, but the Pan of the Homeric Hymn who in Chapman's Renaissance translation is called "leane and lovelesse".

The lechery, then, is secondary, and the fertility too; they arise from the dry longing of nature alone, of one who is ever an abandoned child and who in innumerable pairings is never paired, never fully changes the cleft hoof for rabbit's paw. He may please the Gods, but he never makes it to Olympus; he couples, but never wives; he makes music, but the Muses are with Apollo.

To grasp Pan as nature we must first be grasped by nature, both 'out there' in an empty countryside which speaks in sounds not words, and 'in here' in a startle reaction. (This Pan no one has better re-created than D. H. Lawrence.) Uncanny as the goat's eye, nature comes at us in the instinctual experiences that Pan personifies. But to speak of 'personification' does the God injustice, since it implies that man makes the Gods and that nature is an impersonal abstract field of forces, such as thought conceives it. Whereas, the demonic shape of Pan turns the concept 'nature' into an immediate psychic shock.

Western philosophical tradition from its beginnings in the Presocratics and in the Old Testament has been prejudiced against images (*phantasia*) in favour of thought-abstractions. In the period since Descartes and the Enlightenment, during which conceptualization has held pre-eminence, the psyche's tendency to personify has been disdainfully put down as anthropomorphism. One of the main arguments against the mythical mode of thinking has been that it works in images, which are subjective, personal, sensuous. This above all must be avoided in epistemology, in descriptions of nature. To personify has meant to think animistically, primitively, pre-logically. The senses deceive; images that would relay truth about the world must be purified of their anthropomorphic elements; the only persons in the universe are human persons. Yet the experience of the Gods, of heroes, nymphs, demons, angels and powers, of sacred places and things, *as persons* indeed precedes the concept of personification. It is not that we personify, but that the epiphanies come as persons.

Precisely this we learn from Roscher, in spite of himself. For Roscher, like his contemporaries (e.g., Ameling on personification) tended to conceive Pan as a composite embodiment of the rough and fearful qualities of nature, just as his charming nymphs were visions of nature's tender, graceful and lyrical seductiveness. But Roscher's conceptual framework taken from empirical associationist psychology (ideas are bundles of sense-perceptions) does not accord with what he

discovered in the actual empirical reports about nightmare demons. They are not a reassembly of frightening qualities, personifications *post hoc* of bed-clothes' sensations. They are vividly real persons.

Dilthey insisted that personification was essential for humanistic understanding in contradistinction to scientific explanation, whose method requires conceptualization and definition. Lou Andreas-Salomé, following Dilthey, urged Freud to maintain this method of procedure essential to advance psychoanalysis as a humanistic rather than a scientific psychology. Jung built his psychology upon the archetypes, which, though describable conceptually, are experienced and even named as persons. Jung went against the current of the times, moreover, by standing for images as primary data of the psyche and then taking these images at their sensuous emotional level, as the empirical phenomena that they are, and not as personifications of abstract ideas. Dream language (as the nightmare shows), delusional and hallucinatory language, folk language — speak in terms of persons. So must a psychology that would talk to the psyche in its own speech. Jung's movement away from abstract concept and toward sensible person corresponds, as we discussed above, with the movement from intellect to imagination which is peopled with palpable sense images. Thus, Roscher's monograph in yet another way — by stressing the *person* of Pan — contributes to that rediscovery of the imaginal which came to be known as the psychology of the unconscious, one of whose essential methodological departures from philosophy and science has been its language of personification.

A cry went through late antiquity: "Great Pan is dead!" Plutarch reported it in his "On the Failure of the Oracles" (*de def. or.* 17), yet the saying has itself become oracular, meaning many things to many people in many ages. One thing was announced: nature had become deprived of its creative voice. It was no longer an independent living force of generativity. What had had soul, lost it; or lost was the psychic connection with nature. With Pan dead, so too was Echo; we could no longer capture consciousness through reflecting within our instincts. They had lost their light and fell easily to asceticism, following sheepishly without instinctual rebellion their new shepherd, Christ, with his new means of management. Nature no longer spoke to us — or we could no longer hear. The person of Pan the mediator, like an aether who invisibly enveloped all natural things with personal meaning, with bright-

ness, had vanished. Stones became only stones — trees, trees; things, places, and animals no longer were this God or that, but became 'symbols' or were said to 'belong' to one God or another. When Pan is alive then nature is too, and it is filled with Gods, so that the owl's hoot *is* Athene and the mollusc on the shore *is* Aphrodite. These bits of nature are not merely attributes or belongings. They are the Gods in their biological forms. And where better to find the Gods than in the things, places and animals that they inhabit, and how better to participate in them than through their concrete natural presentations. Whatever was eaten, smelled, walked upon or watched, all were sensuous presences of archetypal significance. When Pan is dead, then nature can be controlled by the will of the new God, man, modelled in the image of Prometheus or Hercules, creating from it and polluting in it without a troubled conscience. (Hercules, who cleaned up Pan's natural world first, clubbing instinct with his will-power, does not stop to clear away the dismembered carcasses left to putrefy after his civilizing, creative tasks. He strides on to the next task, and ultimate madness.) As the human loses personal connection with personified nature and personified instinct, the image of Pan and the image of the Devil merge. Pan never died, say many commentators on Plutarch, he was repressed. Therefore, as suggested above, Pan still lives, and not merely in the literary imagination. He lives in the repressed which returns, in the psychopathologies of instinct which assert themselves, as Roscher indicates, primarily in the nightmare and its associated erotic, demonic and panic qualities.

Thus the nightmare indeed gives the clue to the re-approximation to lost, dead nature. In the nightmare repressed nature returns, so close, so real that we cannot but react to it naturally, that is, we become wholly physical, possessed by Pan, screaming out asking for light, comfort, contact. The immediate reaction is demonic emotion. We are returned by instinct to instinct.

'INSTINCT'

Like many psychological words we use daily — soul, human, emotion, spirit, consciousness, feeling — instinct is more a metaphor, even if in conceptual dress, than a concept. Perhaps it is an idea in the original sense of that term where it meant "to see", so that by means of this word 'instinct' we are able to see certain kinds of behaviour,

both looking upon it as an observer and looking into it, insighting it, as a participant. There is much spilled ink, and milk, about instinct, some regarding it as a primordial intelligence knowing more about life than we can ever learn, others taking it as the opposite of intelligence, something mechanical, archaic and without any possibility for transformation. To it has been ascribed the best and the worst in human nature — and this gives us the hint for how we shall approach it here. For if Pan is the God of nature 'in here', then he is our instinct. Again, since all Gods partake of nature and have their mimesis in human nature, in our modes of fantasy, thought and behaviour, of course Pan is not all instinct any more than he is all the Gods. Which aspects of instinct he is, like which aspects of nature he is, can only be discerned from the study of his phenomenology.

One major line of thought holds that instinctual behaviour is characterized mainly by compulsion, by what has been called the "all-or-none reaction". Beyond the primary biological processes — tropisms, ingestion and elimination, reproduction, cell growth, division and death, etc. — animal life *as behaviour* moves automatically between the two poles of approach and retreat. A basic polarity of organic rhythm has been presented again and again through the centuries. One and the same archetypal idea about the rhythm of natural life occurs in those pairs called at different times and by different theorists: *accessum/recessum*, attraction/repulsion, *Lust/Unlust*, diastole/systole, introversion/extraversion, compulsion/inhibition, fusion/separation, all-or-none, etc. Under the domination of "inborn release mechanisms" (as instinct is now often called), patterns of approach and retreat become compulsive, undifferentiated, unreflected.

The two opposing positions regarding instinct — that it is intelligent and that it is not — have been combined in Jung's theory. He describes two ends to instinctual behaviour: at the one, a compulsive archaic behaviour pattern; at the other, archetypal images. Thus, instinct acts and at the same time forms an image of its action. The images trigger the actions; the actions are patterned by the images. Thus, any transformation of the images affects the patterns of behaviour, so that what we do within our imagination is of instinctual significance. It does affect the world, as alchemists, mystics and Neoplatonists believed, but not quite in the magical way they believed. Because the images belong to the same continuum as instinct (and are not sublimations of it), arche-

typal images are parts of nature and not merely subjective fantasies 'in the mind'. The figure of Pan both represents instinctual compulsion and offers the medium by which the compulsion can be modified through imagination. By working on imagination, we are taking part in nature 'in here'. The method of this work, however, is not as simple as it might seem, for it is not merely an activity of the conscious mind or will, though they play their roles. The modification of compulsive behaviour requires another psychic function which we shall discuss below in regard to Pan's loves. First, we must look more closely at compulsion.

Already in the Orphic Hymn (Taylor) we find compulsion in the description of Pan where he is twice given the epithet "fanatic", and in the Homeric Hymn (Chapman) we can read that he climbs ever higher "and never rests". The same fanatic compulsion appears in the behaviour attributed to him: panic, rape — and the nightmare.

The poles of sexuality and panic, which can instantly switch into each other or release each other, exhibit the most crassly compulsive extremes of attraction and repulsion. In the latter we blindly flee helter-skelter; in the former, just as blindly we close upon the object with which we would copulate. Pan, as ruler of nature 'in here', dominates sexual and panic reactions, and is located in these extremes. His self-division is presented in the Homeric Hymn by his two 'regions' — snowy, craggy mountain-tops and soft valleys (and caves) — and mythologically by the chasing phallic Pan and the fleeing panicked nymph. Both belong to the same archetypal pattern and are its nuclei. These two foci of Pan's behaviour, representing the inherent ambivalence of instinct, also appear in his image, commented upon ever since Plato's *Cratylus* 408C, which is rude, rustic and filthy below, smooth and spiritually horned above.

Yet for all of his naturalness, Pan is a monster. He is a creature that does not exist in the natural world. His nature is altogether imaginal, so that we must understand instinct too as an imaginal force and not conceive it literalistically in the manner of natural science or of a psychology that would base itself upon science or meta-biology. Paradoxically, the most natural drives are non-natural, and the most instinctually concrete of our experiences is imaginal. It is as if human existence, even at his basic vital level is a metaphor. If psychological behaviour is metaphorical, then we must turn to the dominant metaphors of the psyche to understand its behaviour. Therefore, we may learn as much about the psychology of instinct by occupation with its

archetypal images as by physiological, animal and experimental research.

PANIC

It might be well at this point to interpose something on the nature of fear. That it is a so-called primary affect has been stated by psychologists since St. Thomas and Descartes and is still confirmed by physiologists and by biologists specialising in animal behaviour. Cannon has it as one of the four fundamental reactions that he investigated, and Lorenz regards it as one of the four basic drive complexes.

The traditional Western approach to fear is negative. In keeping with the attitudes of our heroic ego, fear, like many other affects and their images, is first of all regarded as a moral problem, to be overcome with courage as Emerson might say, or Tillich's "courage to be" in an "age of anxiety". Fear is to be met and managed by the hero on his path to manhood, and an encounter with fear plays a major part in initiation ceremonies. Because our first reflection upon the psyche is habitually moral, the psychological evaluation of fear tends to be prejudiced if not occluded from our perspectives altogether. So entrenched is the moral approach to psychological events that psychology has had to go to physiology and to the study of animals in order to find a path free of moralisms.

In physiology, although the protective effects of fear are recognized, the emotion of fear is generally regarded to be either an accompaniment of instinctual flight patterns or these same patterns blocked or retained within the organism. This inhibition of motoric behaviour together with increased and prolonged excitation of the organism (vegetative nervous system and neuro-hormonal-chemical activation) is anxiety. Simply, there are two faces to panic: lived out in relation to a stimulus and called fear; held in with no known stimulus and called anxiety. Fear has an object; anxiety has none. There can be panicky fear, a stampede, say; there can be panicky anxiety as in a dream. In either condition death can result. Psychoanalytic and psychosomatic case reports, as well as dream research and anthropological studies, (for instance, on Voodoo death) provide instances of the fatal consequences of anxiety.

The anxiety dream can be distinguished from the nightmare in the classical sense. The classical nightmare is a dreadful visitation by a demon who forcibly oppresses the dreamer into paralysis, cuts off his breath, and release comes through movement. The anxiety dream is

less precise, in that there is no demon, no dyspnea, but there is the same inhibition of movement. (A collection of these dreams is given by M. Weidhorn, "The Anxiety Dream in Literature from Homer to Milton", *Studies in Philology* 64, pp. 65-82, Univ. N. Carolina, 1967.) A literary prototype of the anxiety dream, emphasizing an inhibited peculiarity of movement, occurs in the *Iliad* xxii, 199-201 (Achilles in pursuit of Hector):

As in a dream a man is not able to follow one
who runs from him, nor can the runner escape,
nor the other pursue him, so he could not run
him down in his speed, nor the other get clear.

Some theorists of emotion would use the anxiety dream as evidence for their view that anxiety is inhibited fear, a flight pattern retained within the organism, as if instinct were divided into two pieces: action and emotion. During the anxiety dream, action being impeded, emotion intensifies. Anxiety, whether in dreams or not, remains in this rather positivistic and behaviouristic perspective a substitute, secondary, inadequate reaction. Could we take arms against the sea of troubles we would not be sicklied over.

Contemporary existential philosophy gives to anxiety, dread or *Angst* a more intentional, a more fullsome interpretation. *Angst* reveals man's fundamental ontological situation, his connection with not-being, so that all fear is not just dread of death, but of the nothing on which all being is based. Fear thus becomes the reflection in consciousness of a universal reality.

Buddhism goes yet further: fear is more than a subjective, human phenomenon. All the world is in fear: trees, stones, everything. And the Buddha is the redeemer of the world from fear. Hence the significance of the *mudra* (hand gesture) of fear-not, which is not merely a sign of comfort but of total redemption of the world from its "fear and trembling", its thralldom to *Angst*. Buddha's perfect love, in the words of the Gospels, "driveth out fear".

To further mix the contexts: let us say that the world of nature, Pan's world, is in a continual state of subliminal panic just as it is in a continual state of subliminal sexual excitation. As the world is made by Eros, held together by that cosmogonic force and charged with the libidinal desire that is Pan, an archetypal vision most recently presented by Wilhelm

Reich — so its other side, panic, recognized by the Buddha belongs to the same constellation. Again, we come back to Pan and the two extremes of instinct.

Brinkmann has already pointed to the bankruptcy of all theories of panic that attempt to deal with it sociologically, psychologically or historically and not in its own terms. The right terms, Brinkmann says, are mythological. We must follow the path cleared by Nietzsche whose investigation of kinds of consciousness and behaviour through Apollo and Dionysos can be extended to Pan. Then panic will no longer be regarded as a physiological defense mechanism or an inadequate reaction or an *abaissement du niveau mental*, but will be seen as the right response to the numinous. The headlong flight then becomes a breakthrough, out of protected security into the “uncanny wilderness of elementary existence”. Panic will always exist because it is rooted in human nature as such. So its management, Brinkmann says, must also follow a ritual, mythological procedure of gestures and music. (One is reminded of the pipes in battle and that Pan’s instrument in many paintings, is not a syrinx but more a trumpet.) (D. Brinkmann, “Neue Gesichtspunkte zur Psychologie der Panik”, *Schweiz. Zeitschrift f. Psychol.* 3. 1944, pp. 3-15.)

Roscher’s enumeration of animal panics does indeed remove the discussion from the level of the only human and psychological in the narrow sense to more universal hypotheses such as offered by the existentialists, the Buddhists and the archetypal psychology exhibited in Pan. If we take the evidence that Roscher cites of Pan’s terror to be a form of psychic infection attacking both man and animals, then we would seem to have an archetypal event that transcends the only human psyche, thereby placing the nightmare panic in a profound realm of instinctual experience which man shares at least with animals. With trees, stones and the cosmos at large this sharing remains a speculation.

If panic in animals is not substantially different from panic in man and if panic is at the root of the nightmare, then the Jones nightmare hypothesis is not enough. For even the boldest Freudian has not extended the universality of the Oedipus complex and of repressed incest desire/fear beyond the shepherd to the sheep. Freud’s psychological hypotheses stop with the human world, (even if his metapsychology of Eros does urge us into the direction we are here taking). Roscher

however points beyond the human to a wider area of panic phenomena.

The Freud/Jones hypothesis explains the nightmare intrapsychically: repressed desire returns as demonic anxiety. But Roscher opens the way for a mythological perspective: the demon instigates both the desire and the anxiety. They do not convert into each other, owing to censors and mechanical hydrostatics through libido-damming and dream-distorting according to the formula:

The intensity of the fear is proportionate to the guilt of the repressed incestuous wishes that are striving for imaginary gratification, the physical counterpart of which is an orgasm — often provoked by involuntary masturbation. If the wish were not in a state of repression, there would be no fear, and the result would be a simple erotic dream (Jones, p. 343).

From this we are led to believe that the nightmare is unhealthy, the result of a faulty psyche, and to put the matter in a Reichean parody of an older idea: perfect orgasm driveth out fear.

The view we are elaborating in this essay with its focus upon Pan and his role in the nightmare takes many of the same phenomena reported by Jones but sees them as evidence for another hypothesis. Not anxiety is a secondary result from subliminal sexuality, but anxiety and desire are twin nuclei of the Pan archetype. Neither is primary. They are the sensuous qualifications of the more abstract poles of instinct, which moves between all-or-nothing, *accessum — recessum*, *Lust and Unlust*.

Jones himself brings supportive evidence for the idea that anxiety and sexuality appear together, which would seem to contravert his own formula. Like Roscher he refers to Börner (Jones, p.46):

Sometimes voluptuous feelings are coupled with those of *Angst*; especially with women, who often believe that the night-fiend has copulated with them (as in the Witch trials). Men have analogous sensations from the pressure exerted on the genitals, mostly followed by seminal emission.

And p. 49:

It is important in this connection to remember how frequent is a voluptuous trait in the *Angst* attacks of the waking state; indeed this often passes on to actual emission during the attack, a phenomenon to which attention was first drawn by Loewenfeld in the case of men, and by Janet in the case of women.

Since Jones and the authors he relies upon, there has of course been prodigious energy directed toward investigating correlations between physiological sexuality and dreaming. We know today from laboratory observation of human dreamers that penile erections come and go during sleep rather rhythmically following the curve of dreaming. But these investigations rather than making the understanding of the relation between sexuality and dreaming simpler have convinced us all that the field is more complex than it was envisioned by Jones and Freud. The relation between overt sexual content of a dream and the physiological sexual excitation (or its absence), the psychological and physiological subtleties of nocturnal emissions, the periodicity of sexual rhythm (both psychic and somatic), qualities of psychic sexuality in terms of specific archetypal constellations (e.g., whether the governing fantasy is Apollonic, Priapian, Narcissistic, and so on), the relation between the physiology of anxiety and the psychology of repression, more, *what is repression* and what is an 'adequate' orgasm — these enigmas stand as mute as ever. They certainly are not resolved by psychodynamic simplifications which derive from theories that do not match the psyche in its complexity. Both anxiety and sexuality are words covering an immensely sophisticated range of experiences. Furthermore, these words cover experiences that are neither only actions or reactions, but are also metaphors for situations of consciousness governed by archetypal fantasies. In fact the actions and reactions are themselves part of a metaphorical pattern and are meaningful within that pattern, expressing something always more sensuously qualified than what is covered by the definitions of anxiety and sexuality. One of these metaphorical patterns is provided by Pan. By placing anxiety, fear or panic against that background, we may not solve the dubious, if not nonsensical, 'what is fear?', but we may gain insight into kinds of experience for which we use that word and thus make more precise the intentionality of fear.

Jung, in his unpublished *Seminar Notes*, discusses at times the problem of fear, finding it a legitimate path to follow. He seems to mean that one goes where one is afraid, not as the Hero in order only to meet the Dragon and overcome it. But fear, as an instinctual pattern of behaviour, as part of the "wisdom of the body" to use Cannon's phrase, provides a connection with nature (Pan) equal to hunger, sexuality or aggression. Fear, like love, can become a call into consciousness; one

meets the unconscious, the unknown, the numinous and uncontrollable by keeping in touch with fear, which elevates the blind instinctual panic of the sheep into the knowing, cunning, fearful awe of the shepherd.

When Jung said that we need to learn to fear again, he picked up the thread from the Old Testament — the beginning of wisdom is the *fear* of the Lord — and gave it a new twist. Now the wisdom is that of the body that comes into connection with the divine, as panic with Pan, with the same intensity as described in the sexual visions of Saints. For where panic is, there too is Pan. When the soul panics, as in the story of Psyche's suicide, Pan reveals himself with the wisdom of nature. To be fearless, without anxieties, without dread, invulnerable to panic, would mean loss of instinct, loss of connection with Pan. The fearless have their shields; they have constructions preventing emergencies, the startle pattern held at bay by means of systematic defenses.

In other words, to borrow the formula-style from Jones: panic and paranoia may show an inverse proportion; the more susceptible we are to instinctual panic, the less effective our paranoid systems. Further, as first corollary, the dissolution of any paranoid system will release panic; as second corollary, psychoanalytic statements about paranoia and the fear of homosexuality can be expanded beyond the erotic to include the implied other nucleus of the Pan archetype, panic; and, as third corollary, any complex that brings on panic has not been integrated into a construction and *should not be*; therefore any complex that brings on panic is the *via regia* for dismantling paranoid defenses. This is the *therapeutic way of fear*. It leads out of the city walls and into open country, Pan's country.

Panic, especially at night when the citadel darkens and the heroic ego sleeps, is a direct *participation mystique* in nature, a fundamental, even ontological experience of the world as alive and in dread. Objects become subjects; they move with life while one is oneself paralyzed with fear. When existence is experienced through instinctual levels of fear, aggression, hunger or sexuality, images take on compelling life of their own. The imaginal is never more vivid than when we are connected with it instinctually. The world alive is of course animism; that this living world is divine and imaged by different Gods with attributes and characteristics is polytheistic pantheism. That fear, dread, horror are natural is wisdom. In Whitehead's term "nature alive" means Pan, and panic flings open a door into this reality.

Roscher's article on Pan in the *Lexikon* states that Pan invented masturbation. Roscher refers to Ovid's *Amores* 1, 5, 1 and 26 and to Catullus 32, 3; 61, 114. But the principal source is Dio Chrysostomus (ca. 40-112 A.D.), who in his sixth oration refers to Diogenes for witness. (Diogenes was the Greek Cynic philosopher who supposedly masturbated in public.)

A second, indirect connection between Pan and masturbation is brought out by Jones through an etymological analysis of *mare* (also discussed by Roscher), the "crusher" or oppressive night-fiend retained in our word nightmare. Jones sees the meanings of the *MR* root to have "an unmistakable allusion to the act of masturbation" (p. 332).

The sum of information we have on masturbation shows it to be historically and anthropologically a widespread practice. We know also that it occurs in certain higher animals (not only in captivity) and that it extends in the biography of a person from infancy into senility, that is, before other genital activities begin and often long after they have lapsed. In adults masturbation runs parallel with so-called sexual behaviour, never being a mere substitute for it. It is discovered spontaneously (by animals, infants, and small children); furthermore, it is the only sexual activity performed alone.

When considering the relation between the mythical figure and the psychological act, let us first put aside the usual reductive simplifications which attempt to explain the unknowns of a psycho-mythological association in terms of common sense. We are not dealing here merely with an eruptive sexual urge that occurs in solitude to hunters, fishers, warriors and herdsman; we are not merely mythologizing what we fantasize about the sexual habits of shepherds during their noonday rest; nor is this association of Pan with masturbation another way of stating that the devilish inhuman goat in man will have its out no matter how. Rather, the assignation of masturbation to Pan is *psychologically appropriate*, even necessary, since masturbation provides a paradigm for those experiences we call instinctual, where compulsion and inhibition join. The psychology of masturbation makes more precise the ideas we touched upon above in regard to the two poles of instinctual behaviour.

As I have elaborated elsewhere ("Toward the Archetypal Model for the Masturbation Inhibition", *J. Analyt. Psychol.* 11, 1, 1966), mas-

turbation brings together two aspects of the instinctual spectrum: on the one hand, the urge; on the other, conscience and fantasy which accompany and divert the urge. We have long confused the shame which accompanies masturbation with a social prohibition, that is, with an internalized authority. We have long assumed that masturbation is wrong because it serves no extravertedly visible end. Biologically, it does not further procreation, so it must be 'unnatural'; emotionally, it does not further relationships, so it must be 'autoerotic' and unloving; socially, it does not bring the libido into the social nexus, so it must be anomic, schizoid, suicidal even. Our views of it have been taken altogether from the standpoint of civilization, and so our understanding of its inhibition have come from the same standpoint. The introspective worry, guilt feelings, psychological conflict, in short, the inhibiting phenomena of conscience is considered but the voice of a prohibiting authority, a super-ego.

The converse of this view tries to liberate masturbation from the restraining prohibition, freeing it to follow a Romantic's Pan in unbridled delight, neglecting the conscience factor and that the inhibition is *sui generis*, part of the compulsion itself, its other side. (Even hardened sexual offenders, that is, those imprisoned for rape, multiple child molestings, sadistic killings, report guilty feelings and troubled conscience *about masturbation (!)*, according to the work of Kinsey's successors at the Indiana Institute. Guilt seems as inherent to masturbation as the compulsion itself.) The liberated approach to masturbation at least does not condemn it as psychologically regressive (appropriate for the young but not for adults). But this approach does make the activity psychologically meaningless. Deprived of its fantasy, shame and conflict, masturbation becomes nothing but physiology, an inborn release mechanism without significance for the soul.

This widely held notion and its physiological converse simplifies both masturbation and Pan. Both are a complexity of opposites in which the moment of inhibition is as strong as the compulsion. These opposites of Pan appear in the activity itself: either we retreat in fear from masturbating, pervaded by shame or frightening fantasies, or we shift from fear into courage by exciting our own genitals. Masturbation alleviates anxiety — as well as causing it, too, on another level. Fear of the evil eye was met, and is still met in some societies, by genital manipulations or at least genital signs. We ward off fear by touching sexuality, thereby propitiating Pan who invented masturbation and panic both. *Note bene:*

the sexuality that wards off fear is not coitus, i.e., connection with another, or even with an animal, but masturbation.

Furthermore, the fantasy factor appears in Pan as the configurations of his entourage, the exfoliation of nature, the water, caverns and the noise of which he is fond (as well as his silence), his dance and music, his frenzy; the conscience factor manifests in shame and in what our concepts call the 'laws of nature', the rhythmical self-inhibition of sexuality. Human self-inhibition is less apparent than in animals whose sexual periodicity is clearly marked. Ours is more subtle, more psychic, and probably reflects first in fantasy and in the archetypal basis of conscience. Were the inhibition not there as an archetype, laid down in the same psychoid structure that is our sexuality, then whence the prohibitions concerning incest and other sexual laws?

Therefore, when regarding masturbation, let us bear in mind its *psychological significance*. If psychological events have their bases in archetypal dominants, then behaviour always has meaning, and the more archetypal (instinctual) the behaviour, the more primordially significant it must be. To see the regression and not the significance is a blindness therapy may not allow itself. The psychology of the unconscious has established at least one axiom: meaning is in behaviour itself; it is not given by consciousness to behaviour. Acts we do that are regressively far from consciousness, like masturbation, may be serving other purposes than those of our conscious orientation. They may be senseless to our human mind and archetypally significant at the same time.

In this case, masturbation is governed by the goat-God of nature, who 'invented' it, and is an expression of him. This mythological statement says that masturbation is an instinctual, natural activity invented by the goat for the shepherd. It says further that masturbation is significant and divinely sanctioned. Because it belongs to a God, the activity is mimetic to the God, conjuring him and summoning him in the concrete body. Masturbation is a way of enacting Pan.

Curiously, D. H. Lawrence did not see this. He was the closest to Pan of all the moderns (see Patricia Merivale, *op. cit. sup.*), and yet he also wrote strongly against masturbation. However, the suppression of masturbation kills not only Pan as compulsion, but Pan's fantasy and Pan's shame, the inhibitory complications that accompany masturbation and are part and parcel of it. The suppression of masturbation as a phys-

ical act is also the suppression of its psychic counterparts. And when this suppression begins, the battle over masturbation becomes an interior theological dispute echoing the Judeo-Christian refusal and reformation of nature 'in here'. In our culture, let us remember, masturbation is attributed to Onan whom God struck dead, and not to Pan who was himself a God.

In sum: masturbation may be understood in its own right and from within its own archetypal pattern, condemned neither as substitute behaviour for prisoners and shepherds, as regressive behaviour for adolescents, as recurrence of Oedipal fixations, nor as a senseless compulsion of physiology to be inhibited by the opposite prohibitions of personal relations, religion and society. As masturbation connects us with Pan as goat, it also connects us with his other half, the *partie superieure* of the instinctual function: self-consciousness. Because it is the only sexual activity performed alone, we may not judge it solely in terms of its service to the species or to society. Rather than focussing upon its useless role in external civilization and procreation, we may reflect upon its usefulness for internal culture and creativity. By intensifying interiority with joy — and with conflict and shame, and by vivifying fantasy, masturbation, which has no purpose for species or society, yet brings genital pleasure, fantasy and guilt to the individual as psychic subject. It sexualizes fantasy, brings body to mind, intensifies the experience of conscience and confirms the powerful reality of the introverted psyche — was it not invented for the solitary shepherd piping through the empty places of our inscapes and who re-appears when we are thrown into solitude. By constellating Pan, masturbation brings nature and its complexity back into the *opus contra naturam* of soul-making.

RAPE

Like masturbation, rape is psychological behaviour and so it deserves psychological attention. Like masturbation and panic, it also exemplifies the relation between mythology and pathology, the theme at the heart of both this essay and Roscher's monograph. Part of the complex of rape is an emotional aversion to it; it is a violation, a transgression, a horror. An inquiry into this subject will therefore evoke the same aversion that is inherent to the archetypal pattern. The theme acts upon us itself as a rape, closing our subjectivity to it. Rape becomes a closed subject: what is there to discuss; it is what it is. Psychology would not

be exposed to it, even as a matter for disquisition; or, if it must turn to it, then by means of sophisticated conceptual avoidances, such as 'sadism' or 'aggression'. One has to go outside psychology to literary minds (Genet, for instance) in order to find a readiness and an intelligence to look phenomenologically at rape.

To begin with: rape has belonged to human and divine existence long before psychology came on the scene to account for it. We therefore should not expect too much from psychology; its accounts have the puny tradition of only a few generations within the confines of a narrow culture, mainly Northern, Western, and Jewish-Protestant. Furthermore, besides the general inadequacy of psychology in dealing with the great archetypal themes, there is the specific lacuna in regard to rape, as if psychology's abstention from inquiry kept it out of a horror. (Other criminal acts and other sexual acts get far more attention.) A. Grinstein's (*Index of Psychoanalytic Writings*, N. Y.: I.U.P., 1960) five volumes with forty-thousand entries give only four, and these peripheral, on rape. The classic view of psychoanalysis connects rape with infantile libidinal fantasies about a raping parent or an omnipotence fantasy about raping the parent. The Jungians have extended this with the idea of the phallic mother where sexuality is joined with aggression and imaged by the uroboric boar. I would like to dismiss this boring psychological tradition and make a fresh start.

If masturbation is "divinely sanctioned", invented by a God, then surely rape has even firmer ground in divinity since the rape of nymphs and of mortals — and of one God by another — is a convention of Greek mythology. Rape is not specific to Pan, yet it is characteristic of Pan and, as we shall see in the next section, it is his principal way with feminine figures, occasioning their flight and his frustration. (His raping attempts are not solely upon nymphs; there is Daphnis the shepherd boy, who, some tell, was attacked while taking music lessons from Pan, and there are the goats with which Pan copulates in various positions, shown by gem-seals and statuary.)

A Neoplatonist hermeneutic would say that rape of nymphs expresses the immediate, undeflected and determined essence of divinity in the realm of natural affairs. Rape shows the compulsive necessity within and behind all generation. The closer one is to the world of material nature, the more sexual and compulsive will the divine power show itself. Rape is the paradigm for the divine penetration and

fecundation of the resistant world of matter. All rapes in mythology may not be understood on a literal level, but should be perceived as theo-philosophical allegory.

Now the "depravity" of myth, or what we refer to as its psychopathology, has long been a concern of exegetical readers. The apologists for the antique religion had to contend with the charge of moral corruption thrown at them especially by the Christians (who, at least since Eusebius, saw the devil in Pan). The Neoplatonist defense of myth was the most elaborate, consistent and intellectual; its height of psychological understanding was reached in the Orphic philosophy of Renaissance Italy. (See Wind *op. cit. sup.* and also T. Taylor's translation of Proclus' "An Apology for the Fables of Homer" in Raine and Harper, *op. cit. sup.* for two newly published and easily accessible works explaining this approach.)

Nevertheless, Neoplatonism is a defense. It apologizes. It explains. Masturbation would not be really masturbation, but a symbolic expression for something else like self-generativity. Neoplatonism uses a hermeneutic method we are familiar with nowadays through Freud: the manifest is but a cover for a latent meaning that is more true and more real and more liberating than psychopathological (symptomatic) appearances. So with rape; this mode of exegesis does not accept *psychopathology as an essential mode of psychological life*. Yet this is precisely what myth says.

We may get a main point of the relation between mythology and pathology if we grasp that pathological behaviour is mythical enactment, a *mimesis* of an archetypal pattern. After all, this is what Freud told us by 'discovering' the Oedipus complex: he discovered that psychopathology is the enactment of myth. In the case of rape, the archetypal pattern being enacted is a specific one that has been condemned by the other archetypes dominating our consciousness, outlawing as renegade both Pan and rape.

The second main point about this relation reverses the first: mythology is necessarily pathological (descriptive of psychopathology), otherwise it could not speak about the actual soul. Then mythology would be 'only myth', a kind of idealized religion (such as the German tradition has often tried to make of the Greek world, thereby paying a dreadful price in psychopathology). Mythology without its 'moral depravities' would become a book-religion, a construction or an in-

spired revelation of ethical dogmas and not the ongoing embodiment of human experience in which pathological patterns cannot help but be incorporated. So it seems myth condones rape as one of the events that must be portrayed by any system adequate to the true range of the soul.

Where then lies the difference between your or my raping and a raping by the figures of myth? If the myth explains (and sanctions) the pathology, then an *imitatio Dei* means rape too. Does the difference lie wholly within the context in which they are done? If we take this view, then we make a separation between holy and secular, and are back with the Neoplatonists. We would take the copulation of goats with women within an Egyptian temple (reported by Herodotus) on a sacred, ritual level. But does this help with the psychopathology of the rapist in the alleyway. Where are the ritual contexts today for transposing archetypal enactments from secular to ritual?

To answer this, new forms of psychotherapy have been devised, and there are witch-cults and sects, such as the one led by Aleister Crowley that was dedicated to Pan and, according to Crowley's verse, included rape. (See Merivale, p. 122f.) But they remain secular, since we cannot alone revive the Gods. Pan must be present prior to the cult in his name. And thus these are not mythical enactments, but mythical constructions. In a sense there is truer myth being enacted in the alleyway than in Crowley's Sicilian temples or in a psychodramatic, Pan-dancing Californian workshop.

If not these external attempts, then perhaps the dream and fantasy and the imagination of the arts can transpose us to the mythical world where other laws obtain and where rape is appropriate. This solution says that we may do whatever we want 'in here', but not act it 'out there'. The sacred and mythical now becomes intra-psychic and mental, while the secular becomes behaviour. This solution takes us back in another direction. This time we return to the Cartesian position and their radical separation between mind and matter. But it is the express aim of this essay to follow Pan by keeping 'in here' and 'out there' together, inseparable.

A fourth solution would say that what is pathology in the streets is also such in the mind. What we do in imagination has the same consequences for the soul as acting out. Now we are back in the Christian situation, where looking upon a woman with lust is the same and

as sinful as external action. Fantasy is taken wholly literally.

Clearly, the issue remains insoluble as long as we insist that behaviour and fantasy are two different realms. This schism produces all the others: between secular and sacred, between 'in here' and 'out there', between mythology and pathology. Therefore, the first step toward resolving the particular problem of rape is to recognize the larger mistake behind it. This mistake can be rectified by remembering that behaviour is also fantasy and fantasy is also behaviour, and always.

This means, first, that fantasy is also physical; it is a mode of being in the world. We cannot be in the physical world without at the same time and all the time demonstrating an archetypal structure. We cannot move or speak or feel without enacting a fantasy. Our fantasies are not only in the mind; we are behaving them.

Second, the union of fantasy and behaviour means that there is no pure, no objective behaviour as such. Behaviour may never be taken on its own level, literally. It is always guided by imaginal processes and expresses them. Behaviour is always metaphorical and requires a hermeneutic approach as much as does the most fantastic reverie of mystical vision.

These observations may relieve the term 'psychopathology' from having to serve two masters, the legitimate one of psychology and the parasitical one of morality. Moral criteria of behaviour belong to ethics, law and religion, but these fields should not influence the perspectives of psychopathology, whose judgments concerning behaviour are determined less by what, where and with whom actions take place than *how*. We become *more* psychopathological when we miss, in this or that segment of our lives, the fantasy in what we are doing or that what we are fantasizing is physically happening, even if subtly and indirectly. Instead we literalize, and the metaphor, that which keeps life psychologically intact, breaks apart. As extreme examples we have, on the one hand, literalized fantasy in hallucinations and delusions; on the other, literalized behaviour called psychopathy or behaviour disorder of which rape is sometimes considered a symptom.

We become *less* psychopathological when we can restore the metaphorical appreciation of what is going on. Therapy speaks of "psychological insight", which would mean the reconnection of fantasy with

behaviour, and the dissolution of literalism through the power of insight. Because law, ethics and religion tend to take behaviour with the same literalism that psychology regards as the origin of psychopathology, these fields must not encroach on ours — more, their judgments arise from the same psychopathological literalism as the behaviour they judge. (I have already expressed this necessary conflict between psychology and these other fields in regard to suicide, where the emphasis too was upon the metaphorical perspective to behaviour.)

So, psychology is obliged to consider rape always as metaphorical, even yours and mine, even in the street. This premise is already a therapeutic act for it affirms the unity of fantasy and behaviour. Even in the street there is always ritual taking place in behaviour and something sacred is always going on in everything profane. The transposition we have been searching for is a transposition in our vision of things, a psychological transposition so that we can see the unity of fantasy and behaviour. Then we do not need to construct literal enactments and call them rituals. This essay is just such an attempt at the transposition of our vision. By seeing Pan in behaviour in panic, masturbation and rape, we restore both the God to life and life to the God.

Without this vision of the God in behaviour, rape becomes only psychopathology. As I showed in earlier works, when we lose sight of Eros in analysis, transference erotics become only neurosis; without Saturn and Dionysos, depression and hysteria become only psychiatric diagnoses. We lose sight that, though sufferings, they belong to a wider pattern. In each of these situations the modern mind has tended to see the pathology before the psychology, forgetting that the sickness is a part of significance. The *pathos* is part of *psyche* and has its *logos*. The pathological — however drivenly distorted and concretistic — nevertheless belongs to soul-making. This the Neoplatonists recognized. They saw that since the mythical stories had meanings for the soul, so did all the parts of the stories, including their bizarre depravities, the horrors which are imaginatively essential to the stories, but which today we call psychopathological.

Let us keep in mind that the archetypal horror of rape affects even this discussion of it. The best witness to the effects of the archetypal horror is the legal suppression of rape. In the United States, generally, neither does a seminal emission nor actual penetration of the vagina belong to its definition. Forced juxtaposition of the genitals is enough

to bring down the power of the judiciary. More: there is a purely legal (statutory) rape, such as congress with a consenting minor, or a genital examination by a physician or a general anaesthetic by a dentist (with no third party present). These are not trivialities. The death penalty for rape including statutory rape still exists in some parts of the United States. This displacement of horror into non-sexual, legal niceties belongs to a long tradition of suppression, going back to Colonial times. In Pennsylvania, for instance, blacks already in 1700 were castrated for *attempted* rape (of whites).

Let us place the horror of rape within the constellation of Pan. First of all, Pan goes after nymphs, that is, rape aims at a form of indefinite consciousness located still in nature but not personally embodied. This consciousness is still only-natural, just as Pan's drive is only-natural. The nymph is still attached to woods, waters, caves, wispy figments, mistiness; she is chaste, nature still intact, a maiden (see below, "Pan's Nymphs"). Pan brings body, goat-body. He forces the sexual reality of physical generation upon a structure of consciousness that has no personal physical life, whose life is all 'out there' in impersonal nature. Pan's assault suddenly turns nature into instinct. Rape makes it intimate. Rape brings it 'in here' from 'out there'. The impersonal enters from below into the very private body, bringing an awareness of the impersonal as a personal experience.

As such, rape is a horror because it is an archetypal *transgression*. It forcibly crosses between two unrelated structures of consciousness, whose distance from each other is stated in the language of opposites: old woman/young man, young girl/old man, virgin/lecher, white/black, native/foreigner, soldier/civilian, master/slave, beauty/beast, upper-class/lower-class, barbarian/bourgeois. But this transgression is also a connection between these structures. Rape puts the body's drive toward soul into a concrete metaphor. It presses the soul into concreteness. It forcibly ends the division between behaviour and fantasy, violating the soul's privileged distance to live life through reflection and fantasy. To interpret the force and transgression in rape as aggression is archetypally wrong. *Aggression is insignificant in the constellation of Pan*. His assaults and our rapes mimetic to them are not aggressions; they are compulsions. They are not so much attacks to destroy the object as they are a clutching need to possess it.

The language of rape usually speaks of deflowering, the paradigm

for which is Persephone, picking flowers when seized by Hades. De-flowering too must be taken metaphorically for we are not speaking of the hymen-breaking of actual virgins, but of flower consciousness broken through and its death. How few actual rapes are of actual virgins, yet in fantasy all are virgins, whether sisters, daughters or nuns, whether school-girls or old maids. The fantasy of defloration and virginity appears together with rape. Empirically this association makes little sense; psychodynamically it is a secondary elaboration and not essential; but archetypally the association of rape and virginity is necessary for it shows that the behaviour is ruled by the fantasy of Pan and the nymphs. On the one hand, the untouched, a consciousness without bodily senses; on the other hand, the toucher, the touching sensuous body. Touch, contact, connection — this is crucial to the metaphor which so dwells on body language. Pan, who is sometimes called the invisible, is nonetheless envisioned most physically as raper. He is called jumping, bold, barbarous, ferocious, rough, unwashed, hairy, black Pan. These epithets in Latin were given to Pan (J. B. Carter, "Epitheta Deorum" in Roscher's *Lexikon*, VII).

The fear of the black and primitive raper existed in Western consciousness long before Pennsylvania was founded. If, as is said, a sexual fear is the psychological source of the repression of the black people, and if Pan has been imagined as *niger, instabilis, lubricus, rusticus, brutus, nudus, nocturnus*, etc., then is not one archetypal source of our social ills the loss of Pan.

The law has incorporated the nymph-Pan fantasy by formulating protective concern for nymphets and for anaesthetized women and by projecting the rapist into the touch of the examining physician. Legally, rape is necessarily neither coitus nor ejaculation. These essentials of the sexual act do not define rape legally. Even the law recognizes in a sinister way that rape is something over and beyond actual sexuality. The true transgression is the connection on the genital level between two structures of human existence that have different ontological status.

Pan the raper is a potential within every sexual impulse. Every erection may release him, implying a need for psychic deflowering. As psychologists we must first see this fact before we accuse it or defend it. Some necessity of the psyche can convert an impulse into a rape fantasy, or even produce a rape fantasy without sexual arousal. There

is an attempt at transgression going on, an attempt to move across from one level to another, bringing sex and death to a part of the soul that is altogether resistant to this kind of awareness.

Pan the raper will be conjured up by those virginal aspects of consciousness that are not physically real, that are 'out of touch', unsensed. Feelings and thoughts that remain wispy and flighty, that still are cool, remote, reflective will call rape upon them. They will be assaulted again and again by concretisms. Pure reflections will be raped again and again in order to bring them into behaviour. The raper chasing the virgin is another way of putting behaviour in search of fantasy to cool its compulsion. The loathing of the virgin is another way of putting fantasy's fear of physical behaviour. But the virgin's violation is inevitable whenever the boundaries are drawn too tight between fantasies too removed from body and fantasies wholly immersed in body. Then the concrete metaphor of 'forced genital juxtaposition' is constellated re-uniting fantasy and behaviour.

The psychodynamic idea of compensation would express this idea by saying that the concrete bears in on one — as rape, panic or nightmare — when consciousness is too ethereal, ephemeral. The concrete compensates for distance from physical life, which is represented in concentrated paradigm by the genitals. But psychodynamics, while trying to put events back into the psyche gets them back only into the ego. These horrors (rape, panic, nightmare) are said to happen because the ego is doing something wrong. The inrush of the numinous power becomes only a psychic mechanism to correct the ego. Explanations in terms of compensation forget that the experience is altogether trans-psychological. It comes as the numinous.

Yet, this emphasis on the concrete in psychodynamics has importance if we take it phenomenologically, letting go of the theory of balancing opposites. Phenomenologically, rape, and panic and nightmare, embarrass consciousness with concreteness, and thus always strike us as psychopathological: the events are so literal. Again, the psychopathology resides not in *what* happens but in the *how*, the concrete metaphor of the happening. Rape, panic and nightmare belong where anxiety and sexuality are taken concretely so that the psyche has already become a victim, caught, oppressed, its freedom lost. The horror has already begun.

However, from the perspective of the nymph's consciousness rape will always be horror. It is archetypally authentic and therefore this

horror too is significant and not merely a prissy resistance and a symptom of anxiety. Horror warns. It tries to keep a structure of consciousness intact. Reflective consciousness is in danger of being overwhelmed (*vergewaltigt* = rape in German) and violated (*viol* = rape in French) by the very physical world that it reflects. Reflective consciousness turns away. This is its natural movement, for reflection too is instinctual (see below, "Pan's Nymphs"). To keep its reflective structure untrammelled, this aspect of consciousness must not let the nightmare that is nature get on top of it and cover it. Nature's nightmare side is the suffocating oppressive concretism expressed by the epithets of Pan and in the experience of Ephialtes.

But — concretism occurs in every literal question we put to someone, in every thrust of hard-headed advice, every penetrating interpretation about how to live and what to do. We rape and are raped not only sexually. The sexual is but a metaphor for moving 'from below' (reductively) into someone's personal intimacy in a crude and 'only natural' manner. Nothing constellates these transgressions across the border more than do innocent questions from the ambiguous nymphic mind.

Concretism obscures the light and blocks the movement of fantasy. From this perspective defloration means not penetration and transformation but a broken soul. From this perspective a purity of reflective light must be kept intact at all costs, for it gives the freedom to move away from nature's oppression and the capacity to imagine life and not only to live it.

PAN'S NYMPHS

Earlier (p. xxiv *sup.*) we read a digested account of Jung's idea about the transformation of instinct through imagination. We saw that instinctual compulsion and fantasy-image were part of the same continuum. It was hinted there that the transformation of compulsion does not come about through efforts of the mind and will only. They are not conceived on the same continuum as are an archetypal drive and its archetypal image, which are inherently connected.

In this respect myth can be compared with alchemy. In alchemy the transformation of compulsive sulphur requires a *substance equal* to it (mainly salt, but also, and by means of mercury, an evasive psychic substance that is the true instrument of change); the operator's

mind and will play a role subsidiary to the effects of one substance upon another. So, too, in the changes represented by myth, a *mythologem equal* to Pan is required. An axiom of psychic change is: like cures like.

Before we go further, I must qualify the idea of change in myth by hastening to add that we are *not* engaged in moral instruction. There is nothing 'wrong' with Pan, with instinct, compulsion, and the like, that has to be improved by transformation. Rather, myth is describing fundamental subjective processes in which changes are embedded. It is our mistake if we read these changes as moral improvements, as progresses of any sort. Thus to speak of the 'cure' of compulsion is, on the one hand, a therapeutic notion implying betterment; but, on the other hand, 'cure' means only the change from one form of affliction into another. Let us do all we can to keep distinct the core notion of change from its interpretative coatings, some sugary as 'growth' and 'progress', some more bitter as 'loss' and 'decay'.

If an axiom of psychic change is like cures like, we can hardly bring about change on one level by doing things on another. Of course, sulphur and salt are opposites, and cure comes, as Herakleitos would have enjoyed remarking, through the opposites. But the opposites are within the same class and at the same level. The alchemical substances of salt and mercury and sulphur are metaphors at the same psychoid level; so too are the mythologems. Thus a change of compulsion is not a matter of consciousness working on the unconscious, for these are opposites of two different classes, similar to will working on imagination, super-ego working on id, or mind working on body. Mind may work on mind, body on body, and so to change events of an imaginal nature we shall be obliged to stay within an imaginal field.

Furthermore, for change to take place at an instinctual level, the process must be natural; it must be as the alchemists said: nature both loving and enjoying nature and at the same time nature changing nature. The opposites must be of the same class and there must be an affinity between them. In alchemy *sol* loves *luna*, and fire and water embrace. In mythology Pan wants nymphs.

We have seen above, again and again, how Pan divides between mountain-top and grotto, between noise and music, between

hairy thighs and spiritual horns, between panic and rape. Another instance, and one more imaginative and appealing, is Pan and his partners, the nymphs. For a God and his partner describe the two main components of an archetypal complex. And if the noblest truth of psychological thinking (Jung) as well as of mythical and mystical philosophy (E. Wind "Pan and Proteus" in *Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance*, Harmondsworth, 1967) is the identity of the opposites, then not only are the twin nuclei within Pan's nature one and the same, but also Pan and the nymphs are necessarily entailed because they too are one and the same.

Roscher's etymological and 'natural' explanation of nymphs (*Lexikon* "Pan", 1392f.) takes them as personifications of the wisps and clouds of mist clinging to valleys, mountain-sides and water-sources, veiling the waters and dancing over them. And indeed Homer (*Odyssey* 6, 123) says that is where the nymphs live. (In the same volume, Bloch, "Nymphen", 500f., refuses Roscher's hypothesis by saying that the word in Greek mythology means nothing else than "mature maiden", or "miss", coming from swelling as does a bud, and rather like our 'nubile', but not 'nebulous'.) W.F. Otto, in his chapter on the nymphs (in *Die Musen*, Darmstadt, 1945), agrees that the word means girl or bride, but connects them mythically first of all with Artemis and the Greek feeling of *Aidos*, shame, a modest bashfulness, a quiet respectful awe within nature and toward nature. He describes this feeling as the opposite pole to the overwhelming convulsiveness of Pan (god of epilepsy). The nymphs belong to the same inscape of our interior nature as does Pan. (Concerning the interior nymph, its attractiveness and its dangers, see Emma Jung, "The Anima as an Elemental Being" in *Animus and Anima*, N.Y./Zürich: Spring Publications, 1969⁴ ; also Jung, *Coll. Works* 13, para. 179f., 215f.)

Who are these nymphs of myth, these loves of Pan? First of all, many had no names; these 'impersons' bespeak on the level of the drive-object the impersonality of the drive. The same invisible un-specific power instigates Pan's rapes as objectifies them in the unknown obscure nymph. Of those named, there is Syrinx, a water-maiden who, fleeing his sexual assault, transformed into a reed from which Pan made his pipes. Although perhaps the most famous of all his loves, Syrinx is given secondary attention by scholars because the tale is said

to be a late mythologizing explanation for Pan's pipes. Before considering the tale of Syrinx and its dismissal by scholarship, let us allow the nymphs to pass in review.

Pitys, a nymph of the pine tree, was another. Pan often wears a pine wreath or a chaplet made of fir, and the pine cone occurs often together with Dionysos, its shape and its many seeds allowing it to be called that favourite interpretative euphemism, a "fertility symbol". But here the pine is feminine, and reflects Dionysos in another way, for the mixture of pine and wine in *retsina* expresses a *coniunctio*. D.H. Lawrence amplified Pitys in his own fashion, experiencing Pan in and through the pine, its "bristling", pungent roughness; less the comforting shade on a hill-slope of Roscher's fantasy evoking the wood-nymph of bucolic Greece, than the aggressive maleness of the Red Indian in Lawrence's work "Pan in America". The pine tree as Pan, as male, re-states the Orphic thesis that the opposites are identical, Pan and the nymphs are one. There are, for instance, statues of female Pans and there are pictures and reliefs where Pan appears together with a hermaphrodite. (Wernicke on Pan in Art in Roscher's *Lexikon*.)

A third of Pan's loves was Echo, whom we have already met in Apuleius' tale of Eros and Psyche. Here, too, Pan was frustrated, for Echo had no body, no substantial existence of her own. In relationship with Pan she was altogether he himself returned upon himself, a repercussion of nature reflecting itself. (In the case of Narkissos, whom Echo loved, it is Narkissos who refuses her for the joys of his own reflection.)

Reflection seems the aim as we proceed further through the list of his loves. For another was Eupheme, wet-nurse to the Muses. She and Pan had a boy together, named Krotos, who as the Muses half-brother used to play with them. Eupheme's name means 'spoken fair', 'good repute', 'religious silence'. From that root we have 'euphemism' which means the propitious use of words in which the evil and unlucky is transformed by a good name. The right use of euphemism nourishes the Muses. It lies at the source of the transformation of nature into art. The evil, ugly misfortunes of nature may be given other shapes by imagination. If the Muses have this connection with Pan through suckling at the breast of his counterpart, Pan has a connection with the Muses through this same counter-

part, whose discretion in the use of language is the object of Pan's sexual drive.

Finally, the one who fully reveals Pan's intention is Selene, Goddess of the Moon. (Her entire configuration and her son Musaios and his connections with Orpheus and with the Eleusinian mysteries are implicated by the Pan-Selene story, but to take them up would require a separate monograph on Selene, which Roscher, by the way, also accomplished.) But we must note these characteristics of Selene: her unsurpassing *beauty*; her *eye* which saw all things happening below; her rule of *menstruation*, the orderly rhythm of feminine instinct; her gift of *dew*, the cooling moisture; her relation with *epilepsy* and *healing*; the *veil* that kept her partly hidden, indirect; the *torch* she carried and the light-bestowing *diadem* she wore; the obscure *cave* from which she rose and in which she set.

For his conquest of the moon, it is said that Pan had to disguise his black and hairy parts with white fleece. This is the language of alchemy, corresponding to the movement into the *albedo* of lunar consciousness. What is resistant to light, obscure and driven, suffering nature in ignorance, turns white and reflective, able to see what is going on in the night. The white fleece does not halt Pan in the course of his conquest. The whitening is not an *askesis* of the goat. It is not that Pan now knows and so does not act out, but the action, by becoming white, turns reflective and thus the connection with Selene (*selas* = light like that of a torch shining in the night) has been made possible. Like cures like: Pan, by becoming like Selene is already connected with her.

Nor does this tale say that Selene's lunar consciousness reflected Pan and thus deflected him. To the contrary, the seduction takes place. Lunar consciousness can be swept away by a Pan; it can be convulsed and can panic, faint and collapse (also belonging to Pan, according to E.R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational*, Boston: Beacon, 1957).

The lunar state is particularly vulnerable to Pan, just as Pan is particularly attracted to it. This we have already seen above in regard to rape. Here, it is reaffirmed, for Pan makes his most vivid impression as Ephialtes in dreams which traditionally belong to the Moon. And there, in nightmares his feminine demonic nature appears especially. Pan was one of the Gods directly associated with lunacy, as were the

nymphs a cause of madness (*nympholeptoi*).

We are now in a position to return to Syrinx and to recognize that though this tale may be a late invention, a mere consciously literary conceit, its pattern is authenticated by its similarity with the other tales. It is as if the mythologist's invention was pre-formed by the archetype of Pan and the nymph to tell us in one more version the relationship between Pan, frustration and reflection. Because a tale is late does not mean it has lesser psychological insight or mythical value. The origins and source of myth are as much in the psyche today as in that of the past. Archetypal primordiality must not be confused with historical antiquity.

In the Syrinx tale Pan pursues the possibility of reflection, which, by ever-receding, transforms into its instrument. The music of the Syrinx is the self-consciousness that inhibits and transforms the compulsion. Instead of rape on the river-bank, there is plaintive piping, song and dance. The compulsion is not sublimated, however, but expressed in and through another image, for song and dance are also instinctual. Through the syrinx the noise which Pan is fond of becomes music, the tumult, a measured step; patterns elaborate; there is space, distance and air, like the sighing of the wind in the pine. Like Echo, who provides the feminine receptivity of the ear and of recalling—and memory is the Mother of all Muses — the music made through Pan's pipes offers a musing fantasy that inhibits compulsion. Pan's sexual compulsion seems wholly directed towards the end of reflection, since he is not mainly a Father God, his offspring being mythologically insignificant. His generativity is of another sort.

These tales tell us that instinctual nature itself desires that which would make it aware of itself. No new principle is introduced, no corrective of compulsion from above or outside the configuration of Pan himself. He seeks an intangible other pole — a mere reed, a sound, an echo, the pale light, the muse's nurse — a helpful awareness through the dark of concretistic sexuality and panic. Pan tells us that the strongest longing of nature 'in here' (and maybe 'out there' as well) is towards union with itself in awareness, an idea we have already seen pre-figured in masturbation and conscience. The other whom Pan chases so compulsively is none other than himself reflected, transposed to another key.

If Pan contains an elemental kind of reflection, then we should

expect to find it also in his own imagery and exemplified not only in the nymphs. And this we do find. Besides the music and dance, there are his shielding protective activities. Besides the Nike link with Athene — having Penelope for a mother and/or Ulysses for a father, as told by some traditions, already implicates Athene — there is the seed of Hermes (or Zeus, Apollo, Kronos, Uranos, Aither or Odysseus, each of whom presents a mode of reflective spirit), which is his source. Moreover, there is the motif of his early-rising, his appearance on vase-paintings together with the dawn, the breakthrough of day-light.

More significant perhaps than any of these images of reflective consciousness is the fact that Pan appears in the representations of art again and again as an *observer*. (Wernicke *op. cit* lists three columns of examples). There he stands, or sits or leans or crouches, midst events in which he does not participate but where he is instead a subjective factor of vital attention. Wernicke says he serves to waken the interest of the onlooker, as if when we look at a painting with Pan in its background, we are the observing Pan.

Pan the observer is shown us most strikingly in those images of him with his hand raised to his forehead, gazing into the distance: Pan the “far-seeing”, the “sharp-eyed”, the herdsman above the herd, on guard, watching. Within the physical intensity of Pan there is a physical attentiveness, a goat’s consciousness. The consciousness is not Olympian, although it is an embodiment of that superior detachment. Its reflection is in connection with the herd, the awareness identical with the physical signals of nature ‘in here’. The reflection is *in* the erection, *in* the fear, an awareness that is nature bound, as are the nymphs to their trees and rivulets, blind, yet intuitive, far-seeing and prophetic. Pan reflects altogether in the body, the body as instrument, as when we dance, and for which Lawrence used the metaphor of the Red Indian. This is a consciousness moving warily in the wisdom of fear through the empty places of our inscapes, where we don’t know which way to take, no trail, our judging only by means of the senses, never losing touch with the flock of wayward complexes, the small fears and small excitations.

Body consciousness is of the head, but *out* of the head, lunatic and yet like the spirit in the horns. It is not mental and figuring-out; it is a reflection but neither after nor even during the event

(in the manner of Athene). Rather it is the manner in which an act is carried through, appropriate, economical, a dance style. As Pan is one with the nymphs, so his reflection is one with behaviour itself. Rather than an epistemic subject who knows, there is the animal faith of *pistis*, surefooted like a goat.

The path of Pan can still be “let nature be your guide”, even where nature ‘out there’ is gone. Nature ‘in here’ can nevertheless be followed even through the cities and domestications, for the body still says ‘yes’ or ‘no’, ‘not this way, that’, ‘wait’, ‘run’, ‘let go’, or ‘move in now and have it’.

What more could we wish from prophecy than this immediate body awareness of how, when and what to do. Why ask for grand visions of redeemers and the fall of civilizations; why expect prophecy to come with a long beard and thunderous voice. That is too easy, the pronouncements too loud and clear. The prophet is also an interior figure, a function of the microcosm, and thus prophecy may sound no stronger than an intuition of fear or a jet of desire.

Plutarch placed his story about the death of Pan in a discussion about why the oracles had become defunct in the late antique world so pervaded by Christianity. With the death of Pan, the maidens who spoke out the natural truths were no more either, for the death of Pan means as well the death of the nymphs. And, as Pan turned into a Christian devil, so the nymphs became witches and prophecy, sorcery. Pan’s messages in the body became calls from the devil, and any nymph who evoked such calls could be nothing but a witch.

Pan’s kind of consciousness is inherently mantic, from the ground up, so to speak. (We shall return to this theme in the next section.) It was from Pan that Apollo learned the art before he took over Delphi from Themis (Bloch on the Nymphs in the *Lexikon*). The nymphs excite to a madness, both to nympholepsy and to the prophetic gift. The nymph Erato was *prophetis* at Pan’s Arkadian oracle, and Daphnis, the name of Pan’s shepherd love, was *promantis* at the oldest of all Delphic oracles, that of Gaia (Pausanias 10, 5,5). The list is long of those turned mad by nymphs or gifted by them with mantic powers. Pan and the nymphs also therefore played their part in a special kind of mantics, those that healed. (See below Roscher’s evidence on Pan and healing dreams.) The waters and places beneficial for physical restoration had their

spiritus loci, usually a nymph. According to Bloch, the nymphs brought about healing, madness and prophecy by their effects upon fantasy. As Otto says (*op. cit. sup.* on the Nymphs and Muses), the nymphs are preformations of the muses. The nymphs excite imagination, and one still turns to nature (instinctual in here or visible out there) to excite imagination.

There is no access to the mind of nature without connection to the natural mind of the nymph. But when nymph has become witch and nature a dead objective field, then we have a natural science without a natural mind. Science devises other methods for divining nature's mind, and the nymph factor becomes an irregular variable to be excluded. Psychologists then speak of the anima problem of the scientist. But the nymph continues to operate in our psyches. When we make magic of nature, believe in natural health cures and become nebulously sentimental about pollution and conservation, attach ourselves to special trees, nooks and scenes, listen for meanings in the wind and turn to oracles for comfort — then the nymph is doing her thing.

The nymph in the modern soul has made the modern cult of Pan; if Pan lived vividly in the literary imagination, especially of the nineteenth century, then so did the nymph. That recrudescence of Pan may be seen altogether as a product of the nymphic imagination, an anima style of consciousness that hovered in nubile not-yetness and horror of sexuality, in fainting, in the neurasthenic retreats into the vegetative nervous system of the misty Victorian England of Elizabeth Barrett Browning. Her first rapture on Pan was written when she was herself a nymphet of eleven or twelve (Merivale, p. 81). Another encounter of a Victorian with the nymph can be read in Clifford Allen's paper "The Problem of John Ruskin", *Int. J. Sexology* 4, pp. 7-14, 1950.

In every nymph there is a Pan, in every Pan a nymph. Rawness and shyness go together. We cannot be touched by Pan without at the same time fleeing from him and reflecting upon him. Our reflections about our impersonal, filthy, ugly, sexuality, and our delight in it, are echoes in us of the nymph. The nymph still makes us feel shocked, and lascivious. And when goaty feelings and fantasies break out in the midst of daydreams, Pan has again been evoked by a nymph.

In each of the stories of Pan and the nymphs, including the one of his birth — for Dryope his mother in the Homeric Hymn was a wood nymph — the nymph flees in panic from Pan. Now Pan is not the only one to make nymphs flee. Flight is essential to nymphic behaviour. Think of the chases of Zeus and Apollo and Hermes. So we must ask what is going on here; what does this archetypal pattern of flight signify? Since "all of the Gods are within" and since myth is going on all the time at the mythical level of our existence, then this flight of the nymph is also going on as a process in the backwoods of the soul.

Let us put together Pan's compulsions (panic and rape) with the feminine object of his compulsion. Let us recapitulate the relation between instinct and inhibition. It was believed that Pan himself was in panic when the animals ran, and that this vision of Pan's panic set the world in terror. It is as if Pan was himself a victim of nightmares, epileptoid convulsions, and the horror that he brings. The God is what he does; his appearance is his essence. In one and the same nature is both the power of nature and the fear of that power.

In our discussion of panic we said that fear is a call to consciousness. The nymphs show this fear in their panicked flight. They are thus showing one of nature's ways, flight, which is one of the four primary instinctual reactions described by Lorenz. Psychologically, flight becomes reflection, (*reflexio*), the bending backward and away from the stimulus and receiving it indirectly through the light of the mind. As Jung says about this instinct:

"*Reflexio* is a turning inwards, with the result that, instead of an instinctive action, there ensues a succession of derivative contents or states which may be termed reflection or deliberation. Thus in place of the compulsive act there appears a certain degree of freedom....

"The richness of the human psyche and its essential character are probably determined by this reflective instinct. Reflection reenacts the process of excitation and carries the stimulus over into a series of images which, if the impetus is strong enough, are reproduced in some form of expression. This may take place directly, for instance in speech, or may appear in the form of abstract thought, dramatic representation, or ethical conduct; or again, in a scientific achievement or a work of art.

"Through the reflective instinct, the stimulus is more or less wholly transformed into a psychic content, that is, it becomes an

experience: a natural process is transformed into a conscious content. Reflection is the cultural instinct *par excellence* ..." (Coll. Works 8, para. 241–43).

Here Jung has conceptualized the archetypal mytheme of Pan's chase and the nymph's flight. The same story is told by Jung's conceptual fantasy as is expressed by the imaginative fantasy of the tales. In both we find the transformation of nature into reflection, into speech, art and culture (the Muses). In both the base of this transformation is the power of images released by the flight-reaction. In a sense, culture begins in Pan's compulsion and the flight from him.

But lest we give too much to reflection – for alone it is sterile (see my *The Myth of Analysis*, Part I, *op. cit.*) – let us keep reflection close to its prototype, fear. There consciousness and culture are instinctually rooted. When reflection is rooted in fear, we reflect in order to survive. It is no longer just mental reverie or knowledge.

By emphasizing the importance of the fear-flight-reflection complex we are deliberately diminishing the usual major role of love in creating culture. Eros does not seek reflection in the same compulsive way as Pan. Rather, love would abjure reflection that impedes its course; love would be blind. Even when its aim is Psyche as in the Apuleius tale, there is a distinct difference between Eros and Dionysos, on the one hand, and Pan, on the other. Their similarities are evident and their clustering (together with Aphrodite and Ariadne, with satyrs and silenoi, rabbits and kids, pine, wine and ivy, etc.) in mythical and allegorical representations is familiar enough. The differences are less familiar.

For one thing, Pan is active, the nymphs passive; the maenads are active to Dionysos' sombre quietness. For another, Eros is not a nature figure as much as he is a daimon. He is often winged with unpronounced genitals, whereas Pan is often a goat with an erection. The metaphor of Eros is less concrete, physical; his intentions and emotions are different in quality and physical locus. In contrast to Pan's chases, there are no stories as such (excepting that told by Apuleius) of his loves. He is usually the *agens*, not the agonist. In both Eros and Dionysos psychic consciousness seems to be present and active (maenads, Psyche, Ariadne), but in Pan instinct is always in search of soul.

A way of looking at this cluster is to follow the tradition which

places both Eros and Pan in the train of Dionysos, as subsidiaries of that cosmos. A long tradition of wall and vase paintings shows Eros and Pan wrestling, to the amusement of the Dionysian circle (Wernicke, *op. cit.*, 1457, and Herbig, *op. cit.*, p. 32). The contrast between the clean stripling Eros and the hirsute awkwardness of rustic paunchy Pan, with victory to Eros, was moralized to show the betterment of love to sex, refinement to rape, feeling to passion. Moreover, the victory of Eros over Pan could be philosophically allegorized to mean Love conquers All.

This opposition I see also in terms of love versus panic, but not in the Christian sense of love overcoming fear. The issue here is not who conquers whom and the morals that can be derived from this victory, but rather the issue is the contention between the way of Pan and the way of love. The death of Pan supposedly coincided with the rise of love (the Christ cult); perhaps, the recognition of Pan as a psychic dominant implies a lessening of the tributes we pay to love, whether as Eros, Christ or Aphrodite.

Love plays no part in Pan's world of panic, masturbation, rape, or in his chase of nymphs. These are not love stories; these are not tales of feelings and human relationships. The dance is ritual, not a couple moving together; the music sounds the uncanny pipes of Mediterranean tones, not a love song. We are out of the cosmos of Eros altogether, and instead there is sexuality and fear. Perhaps this explains why we have had such trouble with masturbation and rape. They could not be fitted into a world of love. When judged from love's perspective, they become pathological.

We must then draw the conclusion that the realm of love does not include all the instinctual factors of man, just as the figure Eros is only one God among many. Eros does not provide appropriate guiding images for areas of our behaviour governed by Pan. To go on judging our Pan-behaviour in the light of love continues a suppression of instinctual qualities and an enmity towards nature that cannot but have psychopathological results. The struggle between Eros and Pan, and Eros' victory, continue to put Pan down each time we say that rape is lower than relatedness, masturbation inferior to intercourse, love better than fear, the goat uglier than the hare.

Finally, the insights drawn from the relation of Pan and the

nymphs can correct the Christian idea of Pan as God of unbridled pagan sexuality to be controlled by Judeo-Christian prohibitions whether through love or law. If the nymphs and Pan are one, then no prohibition is necessary. An inhibition is already present in the compulsion itself. Thus, sexual passion is both holy and one aspect of reflection, as Lawrence insisted. Animal desire brings with it its own shame, its own piety.

"...in composite gods the tension between chastity and passion, or penitence and pleasure, which is generally associated with the conflict between Christianity and paganism, was revealed as a phase of paganism itself" (Wind, *op. cit.*, p. 204).

SPONTANEITY - SYNCHRONICITY

Pan's hour was always noon. At this moment he would appear in the blaze and shimmer of midday, startling man and animal into blind terror. This seems to have little to do with the nightmare. Perhaps we need to regard high noon, the zenith of the day, as the highest point of natural strength, which constellates both the life force and its opposite, the necessary fall from this height. It is the uncanny moment when I and my shadow are one. Noon like midnight is a moment of transition and, like midnight, daybreak and sunset, a radix of primordial orientation for what might be called the symbolic clock. These are the moments when time stands still, when the orderly procession of moments disrupts. So must certain things be accomplished before the cock's crow at dawn, or the stroke of midnight, or before night falls. At these moments time is broken through by something extraordinary, something beyond the usual order. The "Mittagsfrauen" appear, or ghosts at midnight — compare Nietzsche's vision of the eternal at noon in his *Thus Spake Zarathustra*. This is the moment when only the moment itself matters, where the moment is severed from before and after, a law unto itself, a quality, altogether a constellation of the forces in the air, without continuity and therefore without connection to "...the waste sad time/ Stretching before and after" (T.S. Eliot, "Burnt Norton" V).

This is the unrelatedness of Pan, and of the spontaneous aspect of nature. It simply is as it is, at where it is at; not the result of events, not with an eye to their outcome; headlong, heedless, brutal and direct, whether in terror or desire. This is what is meant by.

the spontaneity of instinct — all life at the moment of propagation or all death in the panic of the herd. We may read into this behaviour many explanations. We may find spontaneity 'caused' by deeper laws of self-preservation and the survival of the species. We may see a larger ecological pattern to lie behind these sudden events, that they belong to a wider network of interwoven conditions. We may consider quantum jumps and the principle of discontinuity to be operative in humans and animals (and not only in inorganic physics). Or, we may conceptualize spontaneity in terms of inborn genetic codes being released within an inborn time cycle. Still the spontaneous frolic of kids, the gambol of lambs, as well as, the erection of the shepherd or his uncanny fright come to experience as instantaneous unconnected events. Spontaneity remains an experience and an idea that, by definition, is outside ordering systems of explanation. By definition it cannot be accounted for.

Spontaneity means self-generating, non-predictable, non-repeatable. It does not belong within the domains of natural science as science is now defined, although it does seem to be a natural phenomenon. To find laws of the spontaneous would be a contradiction in terms, for these events are renegade, irregular, lawless. Thus to consider spontaneous events as random events that can be charted in Fisher's tables blurs the categories between quantity and quality. Random is a quantitative concept; spontaneous is qualitative and significative, pointing to what Whitehead called "importance". There is emotion with spontaneity. It means radically free.

By considering Pan to be the background for spontaneity, we are suggesting an approach to spontaneous events by means of archetypal psychology. We look for the principle which governs them, their archetypal dominant, so as to imagine them more psychologically, and also so as to understand more psychologically the tradition of difficulty in comprehending and conceiving such events. Pan will not explain them but he may offer an avenue of insight.

The spontaneous panic out of noon's stillness reappears in another configuration, the *kobold*, or little demon, also said by Roscher to cause panic and nightmare. This being too has a sexual connotation: it is phallic, dwarf-like, fertile, both lucky and fearful.

Herbert Silberer (probably Freud's most talented and adventurous pupil whose depth of psychological insight into alchemy, active imagination and dreams did not save him from suicide) took up the *kobold* in relation to 'accidental' events. His work is one of the first psychological investigations into the archetypal background of chance, or so-called uncaused phenomena.

Silberer attributed chance events to the spontaneous appearance of these *kobold* figures. They may be taken as a kind of "*Augenblicks Gott*" in the language of Usener. Or, they may be imagined like the daimon that suddenly cautioned Socrates, or any 'personification' (see above, p. xxif.) of a self-willed event that works like an entity crossing our path. Jung took these events partly as psychic complexes, partly as spirit demons (*Coll. Works* 8, para. 570–600). Above all he gave them full recognition as authentic to nature.

Today we use concepts for these experiences, concepts like hunch, intuition, uncanny feeling, or even prophecy, in the sense we mentioned above. And parapsychology speaks of a sixth sense which man shares with animals. These concepts do not take us very far. We are still left with the feeling assumption that there is a level of awareness, distributed wherever there is instinctual life; which echoes this life in sudden signals.

Myth has put this idea as the dismemberment of Echo. In Longus' tale of Daphnis and Chloe, Echo was torn apart by Pan's herdsmen (for refusing him). Her singing members were flung in all directions. Let us say that Pan speaks in these echoing bits of information which present nature's own awareness of itself in moments of spontaneity. Why they occur at this moment and not that, why they are so often fragmentary, trivial and even false — these questions would have to be explored through the *mythology of the spontaneous* rather than through either empirical or logical methods. We would have to penetrate further into the nature of Pan (and the nymphs) in order to fathom these manifestations that seem to want to remain renegade and wispy, half-pranks and half-truths, and so bound to strong emotions. But the approach to their irregularity would be hermeneutic rather than only systematic.

Jung worked both systematically and hermeneutically upon chance events in connection with the problems of synchronicity.

This term refers to meaningful coincidences of psychic and physical events for which no satisfactory account can be given through the usual categories of causality, space and time. Jung considered synchronicity to be a principle equal to the other three and, like them, a part of nature. He found that synchronistic events happen mainly when instinctual (emotional, archetypal, symbolic) levels of the psyche are engaged.

Pan cannot be identified with all emotion, with all of the archetypes. But when a meaningful coincidence occurs that has a particularly sexual cast, or starts up a panic, or refers to his time (noon and nightmare), or his landscape, and attributes, or the mood of his nymphs, then we should look to him for insight. But even more than this, Pan may play a role in synchronicity *in general*, since Pan like synchronicity connects nature 'in here' with it 'out there'. Again Jung's conceptual fantasy of synchronicity and the imaginary fantasy of Pan say the same thing.

If the principle of synchronicity is another way of speaking about Pan, then we may also begin to understand why anyone occupied with this field of spontaneity, called parapsychology, becomes a renegade from the civilized order of rational men. As synchronicity is the devilish fourth principle, so Pan is the devilish shadow of our dominant archetypal Trinity. The integration of parapsychology into respectable science and psychology would then require a revaluation of Pan and a view of instinct and nature from his perspective. Until then parapsychology will tend to be cast in his shadow, a field of sentimentalities and natural religion, something at once comic, untrustworthy, obscure and lunatic.

HEALING OUR MADNESS

The God who brings madness can also take it from us. Like cures like. Yet, how little attention has been given to Pan in all the writings on mental illness. Pan was one of the few figures in Greek mythology to whom mental disease was directly attributed (Dodds, *op. cit.*, p. 79 with note; cf. G. Rosen, *Madness in Society*, London: Routledge, 1968, p. 77f.) We read from Roscher that Soranus considered Pan responsible for both mania and epilepsy which we might delimit with the language of today by saying that Pan (inflator) rules our hypomanic states, especially those with sexual compulsions

and hypermotor activity, and he rules sudden seizures that convulse the whole person, whether panics, anxieties, nightmares, mantics (speaking with tongues).

Using the psychoid, genetic metaphor, Pan would rule at the deepest level of our frenzy and our fear. At the same time Pan heals at this level, and there are connections between Pan and Asklepios through the attributes of music, phallus, nightmare vision and mantic insight. Both Pan and Asklepios heal by means of dreams. Through the nymphs special localities heal and bless. We have also seen Pan help the despairing Psyche; similarly, he frees the captured Chloe in Longus' tale.

Perhaps now we should read again Plato's prayer to Pan quoted as a motto to this essay. The prayer is said by Socrates in a dialogue whose main concern (much disputed) is the right manner of speaking about eros and madness. The dialogue ends with Pan as it opens on the shady banks of a river near a place sacred to nymphs. Socrates reclines there, barefoot. There at the beginning Socrates mentions, as is his wont, that he is still struggling with the maxim "know thyself" and with his sense of ignorance about his true nature.

Then at the end comes the prayer with its appeal for inner beauty, which would mean an end to ignorance, for in Platonic psychology insight into the true nature of things brings about true beauty. Pan, then, is that God able to bestow the special sort of awareness that Socrates needs. It is as if Pan is the answer to the Apollonic question about self-knowledge.

What is this awareness and how is it achieved? We have seen all along that Pan is God of both nature 'in here' and nature 'out there'. As such Pan is the bridging configuration who keeps these reflections from falling into disconnected halves where they become the dilemma of a nature without soul and a soul without nature, objective matter out there and subjective mental processes in here. Pan, and the nymphs, keep nature and psyche together. They say that instinctual events reflect in the soul; they say that the soul is instinctual.

All education, all religion, all therapy that does not recognize the identity of soul with instinct as presented by Pan, preferring either side to the other, insults Pan and will not heal. We can do nothing for the soul without recognizing it as nature 'in here' and we can

do nothing for instinct without remembering it has its own fantasy, reflection and psychic intentions. The identity of the twin nuclei of Pan, whether as behaviour and fantasy, compulsion and inhibition, sexuality and panic, or the God and his nymphs, means psyche and instinct are inseparable in every moment. What we do to our instinct, we also do to our souls.

This idea, if taken in the full reaches of the mythological motifs and behaviour of Pan, has consequences. It means that self-knowledge recognizes the presence of Pan in the obscurest caverns of the psyche and that he belongs to it. It means further that self-knowledge recognizes that Pan's 'horror' and his 'moral depravities' also belong to the soul. This insight, by giving the goat its due, may bring the beauty for which Socrates prays. And by recognizing Pan so completely Pan may provide the blessing Socrates seeks, where inward and outward are one.

Socrates' prayer to Pan is even more relevant today. We shall not be able to find our way back to harmony with nature through the study of it alone. Though our major concern is ecological, it cannot be solved through ecology alone. The importance of technology and scientific knowledge for protecting nature's processes goes without saying, but part of the ecological field is human nature, in whose psyche the archetypes dominate. If Pan is suppressed there, nature and instinct will go astray no matter how we strain on rational levels to set things right. In order to restore, conserve and promote nature 'out there', nature 'in here' must also be restored, conserved and promoted to precisely the same degree. Otherwise our perceptions of nature out there, our actions upon it and our reactions to it, will continue to show the same mangled exaggerations of inadequate instinct as in the past. Without Pan our good intentions to rectify past mistakes will only perpetrate them in other forms.

The re-education of the citizen in relation to nature goes deeper than the nymph consciousness of awe and gentleness. Respect for life is not enough, and even love puts Pan down, so that the citizen cannot be re-educated through ways which are familiar. These all start with Pan dead. The re-education would have to begin at least partly from Pan's point of view, for after all it is his world that we are so intensely worried about. But Pan's world includes masturbation, rape, panic, convulsions and nightmares. The re-education of the citizen in relation to nature means nothing less than a wholly new

relationship with these 'horrors' and 'moral depravities' and 'madness' which are part of the instinctual life of the citizen's soul.

This leads us back to the nightmare and the revelation through it of the horrifying side of the instinctual soul. Socrates' puzzlings upon himself at the opening of the *Phaedrus* (230a) have a similar focus. He considers his likeness to Typhon, an overwhelming demonic giant of volcanic eruptions, storms and underground earthquakes, "the personification of nature's destructive power" (Schmidt, "Typhoeus, Typhon", *Lexikon* V, 1426). To "know thyself" in the *Phaedrus* begins for Socrates with insight into nature's demonic aspect.

The nightmare reveals this, *par excellence*. There the healing re-education might begin because there the instinctual soul is most real. Jones (p. 71) reminds us that "the vividness of Nightmares far transcends that of ordinary dreams". Roscher and Laistner both observed this, and Jones (*ibid.*) quotes others who have stressed this reality:

The degree of consciousness during a paroxysm of Nightmare is so much greater than ever happens in a dream....Indeed I know no way which a man has of convincing himself that the vision which has occurred during a paroxysm of Nightmare is not real...(J. Waller)

The illusions which occur are perhaps the most extraordinary phenomena of nightmare; and so strongly are they often impressed upon the mind, that, even on waking, we find it impossible not to believe them real...(R. Macnish)

From this kind of experience Jones draws his main point condensed into the second motto I placed above: the vividness of the nightmare experience has given rise to the belief in the objective reality of personified demons and Gods: the nightmare is the experiential base of religion. Of course, for Jones, below the manifest experience are personal psycho-sexual dynamisms, so that the power of his insight into the relation between the nightmare and the reality of the Gods is gelded by the theory to which he yokes it.

The horror and the healing effect of the nightmare takes place not because it is a revelation of sexuality as such, but of the fundamental nature of man who as sexual being is at one with animal being, with instinct, and thus at one with nature. Pan's vision of man is

that man too is pure nature in whom the volcanic eruptions, the destructive seizures and typhoons also reside. This reality cannot be borne home in abstract concepts. Nature's metaphor is concrete and shaped. It must be felt, sensed, visioned in the actual, very real experience of hair and hooves. We must be paralyzed and suffocated by this reality as if there were something euphemistic in consciousness that always is in flight from "the horror". This sense experience was once, and still is, the vision of Pan in his various nightmare forms. Thus, indeed, Roscher and Laistner and Jones, each in different ways, are right in finding immense significance in the nightmare. Its numinous power requires a commensurately overwhelming idea: through the nightmare the reality of the natural God is revealed.

James Hillman

PREFACE

A detailed preoccupation for many years with the myth and cult of Pan — the old Greek god of herds and herdsmen — has led other investigators and myself to an enquiry into his function as Ephialtes, the demon or evil spirit of nightmares. To attain a basic understanding of this function, it now seems absolutely imperative to master as thoroughly as possible the whole field of the Greek and Roman presentations of nightmares and demons; I have, therefore, sought to assemble all that antiquity has preserved for us concerning Ephialtes and to form this into a clear picture which I now offer to the public. I was obliged to do this because Ludwig Laistner, the learned and ingenious author of *The Riddle of the Sphinx, Fundamentals of a History of a Myth*, did not succeed, despite his valiant efforts, in dealing with and clarifying the Greek and Roman traditions and conceptions about nightmares and demons in sufficiently strict a manner for scholarly requirements. This deficiency, in a work meritorious in many respects, is due to two reasons: first, because of his understandable and excusable position as a specialist in Germanic studies, Laistner was able to draw only from the sphere of German mythology as a whole, inasmuch as he lacked an obvious and fundamental knowledge of the Greek and Roman sources; and secondly, because he attempted to write a work which would appeal to a very large number of people. Closely connected with this is the fact that Laistner's style is more literary than scholarly. His writing is always stimulating, but frequently the desirable moderation and strict self-criticism of a genuinely scholarly work is lacking. This is true not merely of his Greek and Latin words and proper names — at times much too daring and sometimes full of unsupported etymology — but also of his total failure to elevate the dream, and in particular the

nightmare, to the main and fundamental principle of all mythology. For these reasons I was compelled to disregard and avoid Laistner's book in my treatment of nightmares and demons; and I had rather to limit myself and only occasionally borrow individual and valuable German and Slavic parallels. Here and there I have been obliged to mention the views and explanations of Laistner and either to agree with or to dissociate myself from them.

My research falls under four main chapters. In the first I have tried to unravel the essence, origin and constituent elements of the nightmare on the basis of observations made by more recent medical practitioners; in the second chapter, on the other hand, my objective has been to furnish proof that the views of the ancient physicians — which are all more or less dependent on Soranos — are to a great extent in complete harmony with the modern ones. This chapter has also an instructive collection and precise analysis of the nightmares of antiquity handed down in literature, for the critical examination of their extremely diverse fund of ideas. Among these is the nightmare related of Jacob (Genesis 32:23 ff.) wrestling with Elohim. The third chapter interprets etymologically the Greek and Roman designations of nightmares and demons, such as Ephialtes, (H)pialos, Epheles, Tiphus, Pnigalion, Baphugnas, Inuus, Incubo, Faunus ficarius and others. These are subjected to a thorough examination and are explained etymologically on the basis of present views on the essence of the nightmare. The fourth chapter deals in detail with those demons of the Greeks and Romans to whom in the first place the excitation of nightmares was ascribed (Pan, Satyr, Faunus, Silvanus), and aims to answer why especially these demons have become the demons of the nightmare.

CHAPTER I

THE NATURE AND ORIGIN OF THE NIGHTMARE FROM THE MODERN MEDICAL ASPECT

In the past I have often used the applied method in discussions of mythological and religious-historical themes; this method was to proceed from the basic and objective consideration of the inner and outer experiences and facts that lie at the basis of an enquiry into mythic and religious conceptions. In the same frame of mind I now wish first of all to try and explain as objectively as possible the observations and experiences of modern and ancient medicine in relation to the origin and nature of the nightmare. I have placed the modern views at the start of this investigation, not simply because they are derived from a wide and comprehensive actual observation of facts, but because they are also less suspect of uncritical, untenable and obsolete theories of biased observation than are those of the ancient physicians. At the same time we shall achieve in this way a rather more accurate yardstick for the critical examination of the theories established by the physicians of the classical era in relation to these aspects of the nightmare.

For the most essential particulars concerning the nature and origin of the nightmare we are indebted primarily to J. Börner¹, who in 1855 in his inaugural dissertation enunciated the essential points that, as far as I am aware, are accepted by all the authorities on medical and psychological science. Börner obtained his main results partly through personal observation, having himself frequently suffered from severe forms of nightmare, and partly from observing fellow sufferers in the throes of a nightmare. By these means and

after the most critical study of the conditions under which a nightmare arises, he was finally able to bring about nightmares whenever he so desired, that is to say, experimentally. On the basis of numerous observations made on himself and on other people, Börner described the character of the nightmare as follows:

The onset may be at any time during the night and usually commences with the feeling of troublesome breathing. . . . It is generally thought that the attack starts when lying on one's back, whereas in reality lying face downwards is the more frequent position. The increase of dyspnea secondarily rouses the imagination — the dream — which motivates a large variety of reasons for the dyspnea. The most common (but by no means exclusive) dream is that in which the person sees some hairy animal. This is often a dog who in an inconceivable manner has arrived in the room and slowly and deliberately creeps up upon the bed to sit on the person's chest, usually on the area of the jugular vein. This is then taken to be the cause of the difficulty in breathing and the pressure which has become proverbial. (Transl. Note: "nightmare" in German: *Alp-druck*, literally alp-pressure). Frequently there is a vision of some disgusting creature, an ugly human being, an old woman, or just a simple burden setting itself down on the chest. . . .

Anxiety increases with the degree of dyspnea, and sweating, palpitation, turgescence of the face and swelling of the nerves at the neck set in. The victim feels a need to alter his position so that he can shake off the oppressive agent and he is firmly convinced that this will bring relief. The muscles concerned, however, refuse to react to the most strenuous efforts of the will. This likewise contributes to the unrelieved anxiety. . . . Finally the extreme anxiety and the accompanying interrupted sleep bring about a violent movement produced with great

effort and preceded by plaintive moans, which usually results in an immediate and extremely pleasant feeling of relief and ease and is followed either by waking up or by continued sleep. When both sleep and dream are uninterrupted, it is frequently most difficult to convince oneself that the visions seen were not real.²

According to other observers the feeling of deliverance is ushered in by a loud cry.³ Macnish in his book on dreams says:

At the moment of throwing off the fit, we seem to turn round upon our sides with a mighty effort, as if from beneath the pressure of a super-incumbent weight; and the more thoroughly to awake ourselves, we generally kick violently, beat our breasts, rise up in the bed, and cry out once or twice. As soon as we are able to exercise our volitions or voice with freedom, the paroxysm is at an end.⁴

As regards the origin of nightmares in otherwise healthy people, Börner arrived at the conclusion from precise observation of himself "that since the trouble always disappeared suddenly after a vigorous movement, it follows that a hindrance to respiration must have been removed."⁵ Further, observation of himself showed "that during a nightmare, the external orifices of respiration — the nose and mouth — were more or less completely covered. When I was lying on my back or on my side, this was caused by the bed-clothes pressing quite firmly over my face, or more frequently by lying face downwards with my face pushed into the pillow."⁶ Dealing with this point, Macnish says:

I have frequently had attacks of this disorder while sitting

in an armchair or with my head leaning against a table. In fact, these are the most likely positions to bring it on, the lungs being then more completely compressed than in almost any other posture. I have also had it most distinctly while lying on the side, and I know many cases of a similar description in others.⁷

Börner, on the other hand, asserts that according to his observations lying face downwards is the most frequent position for the nightmare.

Börner's studies on himself were completely confirmed by successful experiments on other people and were cleared of the suspicion of subjectivity and self-deception. By covering the mouth and nose of other people, Börner in many instances succeeded in producing exactly the same signs that he had observed on himself. In these cases the nightmare was a peculiar bastard animal — half dog and half monkey — that did not, as before, slowly slink up to the bed, but sprang in one leap upon the breast of the victim without being previously noticed (as the result of covering the patient's face). This sudden leaping jump of the nightmare is characteristic of the majority of cases and hence the Greek word "Ephialtes" — "the one who jumps up" — is very apt. The animal then remained quiet as if sleeping on his victim while the unfortunate person, out of sheer anxiety, did not dare to move until finally the animal fell down as the result of some movement executed at the height of the torture.

The form attributed by the dreamer to the nightmare depended mainly upon the articles which Börner used to cover the face.

Cloth of a coarse or shaggy quality always brought on the apparition of an animal with hair, such as a poodle or cat. If the mouth and nose were covered by the hand alone, this dream

picture of a hairy animal did not arise but was generally replaced by that of another human being who was ugly and hostile and who seized and throttled the sleeper. When only a small area of the respiratory orifices was gradually covered, there arose a mild degree of anxiety and dyspnea with a corresponding incapability of movement . . . In this case the phantom generally entered the room slowly and at ease. It then looked around for some time until it finally occurred to it to haunt the person lying on the bed. But if the covering of the mouth and nose is such that it causes marked dyspnea, the phantom is instantly in the room and upon the sleeper's chest; thus the dreamer cannot give any information as to how the phantom arrived there. These apparitions are very vivid but their course is short.⁸

Occasionally — and more commonly in women — the feeling of anxiety is coupled with that of lust, and women often believe that the phantom has had sexual intercourse with them. Men have analogous sensations and generally emissions of semen resulting from the pressure exerted on the genitalia by lying on the abdomen.⁹

Börner states that the main symptoms of the nightmare are the feeling of pressure generally brought about by lying face downward, inability to move, and anxiety. Macnish calls particular attention to the extraordinary and inexplicable anxiety of the patient as a symptom that is practically never absent.¹⁰ An essential prerequisite for the origin of a nightmare is deep sleep.

The experiences and observations of other doctors and psychologists have supplemented and confirmed Börner's studies which were carried out only on clinically normal people. It is almost generally admitted that the difficulty in breathing, which produces a nightmare in healthy people

and is caused by an external impediment like bedclothes, can also originate from certain illnesses and likewise give rise to very severe nightmares. Examples of these illnesses are croup, tuberculosis, organic heart disease, asthmatic complaints, advanced stages of hypochondria and hysteria, mental illnesses and fever deliria. Börner adds: "Thus I believe that there will be a kind of nightmare preceeding suffocation by gases, just like the sudden nocturnal shutting off of the respiratory tracts by foreign bodies, croupous membranes, etc."¹¹ According to Binz, one can see in the deliria of typhoid fever the same symptoms as in poisoning by the thorn-apple, i.e., confused sensual dreams, intoxication and narcotization.¹² Occasionally a nightmare can result from a faulty diet, as for example from the intake of indigestible food.

Binz indeed asserts on the basis of his own experiences that when he is suffering from a head-cold, a rather heavy evening meal is sufficient to produce a nightmare. He says:

The state of dreaming which we know under the term of nightmare can be produced by acute poisoning . . . The validity of Börner's researches can be established by paying some attention to oneself. If, when one is suffering from a cold which obstructs both nasal openings, one eats a rather heavy evening meal and then goes to sleep while the nose is reasonably free from obstruction and the mouth closed as usual, it will frequently happen that catarrhal secretion and swelling of the nasal mucous membrane occurs during the deepest sleep. The passage of the air becomes more and more obstructed and the carbon dioxide and other suffocating products of metabolism accumulate in the blood and insult the nervous system. A profound uneasiness pervades our mind in completely blurred forms; sometimes this takes the form of a definite process of suffocation, at other times the un-

easiness remains obscure and confused in accordance with the duration and strength of its origin. Eventually a sudden movement of the body is imparted to the closed lips, or more often — as I have observed repeatedly on myself — there is a loud cry of fear and need of assistance which opens the mouth to allow the rescuing atmospheric air a free pathway. Oxygen is the antidote. The oxygen equalizes the perverted irritation caused by excretions retained in the cells of our brain; it does this by binding with and chemically altering the excretions.¹³

As we shall see later, this theory was already formulated by the physicians of ancient times.

A special feature to which attention has been called by most observers is the unusually vivid nature of nightmare visions which frequently far surpass the impressions left by what is experienced while awake. Laistner says in this connection:

The intensity of the apparitions in nightmares is far greater than in the ordinary dream-images, so much so that the subject when awake is fully convinced that he has not simply had a dream. The impression exceeds the most vivid intuition of the person's waking imagination, however extraordinarily "mythic" that may be, and so there can be no doubt that the living belief in nightmare monsters can be explained most simply by the vividness of the dream presentations.¹⁴

Thus Macnish recounts an actual observation by the physician Waller, who had a nightmare apparition which he mistook for reality for a long time until he finally realized that it was only a dream. Macnish also states:

Sometimes we are in a state closely approximating perfect

sleep; at other times we are almost completely awake; and it will be observed that the more awake we are, the greater is the violence of the paroxysm. I have frequently experienced the affection stealing upon me while in perfect possession of my faculties and have undergone the greatest torture.¹⁵

This view of Macnish seems to some extent to be endorsed by Cubasch, who says in his article, "Der Alp" (The Nightmare):

Dream pictures often seem to continue after awakening; this is a peculiarity which is not only associated with nightmares but is often observed in vivid dreams of all kinds. This continuation of the visions must be attributed to sleep-drunkenness which is the state between being fully awake and deeply asleep or the reverse. It demonstrates only that a person has not yet ceased to dream and that sleep has not yet been completely shaken off. The conditions most favourable for this state are provided when a person is suddenly aroused from deep sleep either by alarming dreams or by other circumstances.¹⁶

The so-called *pavores nocturni* (night terrors) of children between the ages of three and seven years seem to belong in this context. Of these Soltmann says:

They usually occur during the deepest sleep and several hours after falling asleep, without any prior warning. The children commonly sit up suddenly in bed about midnight with a flushed face and bathed in sweat. Their fixed gaze directed at one point, the confused talk, the absence of response to calls and questions, all indicate that consciousness is dulled. The carotid blood vessels pulsate, the heart beats strongly, and the hands tremble with terror. Persuasion is of no avail and the senses remain spell-bound under the heavy pressure of terror and fright brought about by

the vision. Sometimes the children will utter monosyllabic garbled sounds and words — like "there, there," "dog," "man," etc. — which obviously relate to the alarming visions. It often requires fifteen to twenty minutes to calm down the child.¹⁷

Soltmann further points out that the majority of these children suffer from indigestion, dyspepsia, constipation, gastritis, anaemia, scrofula, and rickets. Occasionally these night terrors occur in typhoid fever, scarlet fever, and in psychic excitement produced by fright and fear. A twelve-year-old boy afflicted with advanced *spondylitis dorsalis* imagined during his attacks that an animal had jumped on his back and wanted to crush him to death.

It can be seen from this how closely related children's night terrors are to the nightmare. Compare Tylor: "Some say these 'mury' nightmare demons come by night to men, to sit upon their breasts and suck their blood, while others think it is only children's blood they suck, they being to grown people merely nightmares."¹⁸ The sucking of children's blood, as Tylor points out, relates to certain emaciating diseases of childhood. To return to the main subject of our theme —

... dream pictures play with the half-awake consciousness, and the mind is made to believe things that do not exist in reality. Thus the forms or shapes of that fanciful world of fairy stories in which a person saw himself transfigured remain as an echo before his clouded consciousness, and the person thinks he is observing these things fully awake, whereas in fact he is not yet quite fully conscious. Sleep-drunkenness is a fruitful soil for all kinds of deceptions of the senses. . . . A person in the state of sleep-drunkenness who is fully convinced that he is master of himself is seeing just the phantoms that assailed him while he was asleep; and he sees them now with his eyes open and with apparently normal consciousness.¹⁹

In his *Physiologie der Nervenfaser* (Physiology of Nerve Fibres), H. Meyer²⁰ gives many characteristic examples of this continuation of the dream apparition after awaking. I need scarcely call special attention to the fact that, after waking, such phenomena remain for some time and are directly on the borderline between a dream and a hallucination — that is to say, between normal consciousness and disturbed consciousness. They differ merely quantitatively from the hallucinations of insanity by their shorter duration; if they continue to persist undiminished over a period of days, weeks or months, they must be looked upon as an undoubted sign of insanity. At this point it is well to heed the fact that “frequently dreams are blamed by mental patients as the starting points of certain fixed ideas, in so far as what is dreamt is thought to have been a genuine experience.”²¹

As regards the dangers of nightmares when these occur frequently and are very intense, Börner²² thinks that a severe degree of dyspnea with its attendant retarding of the blood circulation could easily give rise to cerebral haemorrhage and possibly even acute oedema of the brain. According to Radestock,²³ nightmares sometimes precede mental illness and occur in organic cardiac diseases, asthmatic syndromes, and repeatedly in the more advanced stages of hypochondria and hysteria. Macnish²⁴ is of the opinion that they can produce apoplexy or may be the cause of epileptic and hysteric attacks in people who are unusually sensitive.

Finally, may I add a few words about what has been observed more recently concerning the composition of the nightmare apparition. This, as described by Macnish,²⁵ who himself suffered greatly from nightmares, is extraordinarily variegated but in general two types of nightmares can be differentiated: one dreadful and highly alarming, the other milder, more benevolent, and at times even voluptuous (erotic). The

nightmare creates a frightful and alarming impression especially when a hairy animal appears in it, such as a black shaggy dog (poodle) — the most usual form of embodiment for evil demons. Other frequent forms are the cat, marten, hedgehog, mouse, bear, he-goat, pig, horse, tiger, snake, toad, eel, dragon, or finally a peculiar hybrid that is half dog, half monkey. The shape or form of the animal in which the nightmare incarnates itself, seems — as we have already seen — to depend essentially on the nature of the respiratory obstruction which produces the dyspnea, as for example, the quality of the bedclothes impeding the mouth and nose. These may be either smooth and soft or coarse and hard. Meyer²⁶ explains that the apparition of a hedgehog can easily arise if the dreamer is lying face downwards on prickly straw. The opposite is the nightmare demon clothed in mole fur which naturally corresponds to an obstruction to breathing by a very smooth material. When occasionally the apparition shows itself in the form of an inanimate object — such as a wisp of straw, a down feather, or smoke — this can easily be explained by the sleeper waking up from the nightmare and holding in his clenched fingers a piece of straw or a feather which has come from his bedding. He will imagine such objects to be the final form assumed by the nightmare demon which he has grasped, or he imagines that the smoke filling the bedroom and tormenting him on awakening by hindering his breathing is the last metamorphosis of the demon.

If the spectre appears in human shape, it can assume forms which are extraordinarily diverse. Sometimes it is a man and sometimes a woman; it can be ugly or beautiful; at times it is a dwarflike goblin of scarcely human form, or it may be an enormous giant. The apparition may be dumb or it may enter into conversation with the dreamer. (Börner says in

this connection that "only in rare instances is the monster barbaric and the woman sometimes even lovable. In such cases the monster talks and is occasionally so incautious as to unveil the future to the haunted person. Here the apparition is looked upon as an emissary of the godhead from whom torments as well as benefits are accepted with a willing heart."²⁷ The form may be that of a living being or of a dead one. This has naturally led to the supposition that the living — for example, witches — as well as the dead possess the power of appearing to a sleeper in a dream and tormenting him. Thus Spitta reports that an eighteen-year-old girl in an advanced stage of tuberculosis and having great difficulty in breathing experienced, whenever she fell asleep, the horrible dream of her dead grandmother coming in through the window and kneeling on her chest in order to crush her to death.²⁸ Another nightmare given by Radestock was the following:

Once in the early hours of the morning I saw appear before me at the foot of my bed a hideous small brute of barely human form. It seemed to me to be of medium height and to have a thin neck, spare figure, very dark eyes, and a narrow, wrinkled brow. The nose was broad, the mouth large, the lips pouting, and the chin short and pointed. Furthermore it had a goatbeard, upright pointed ears — like Pan — dirty dry hair, dog's teeth, a pointed occiput, a projected chest, a humped back, withered hips, and wore dirty clothing. The phantom took hold of the edge of my bed, shook the bed with tremendous force and said: "You will not remain here much longer!" As soon as I awoke from terror . . . I sprang out of the bed, hurried to the cloister and threw myself down before the altar and remained there a long time, numbed by fear.²⁹

Collective apparitions are sometimes met with in the nightmare, just as in what has been called the panicky terrors and mental disorders. This means that a large number of people are attacked at the same time by the nightmare — just as in an epidemic — and that these people all have the same visions. On the basis of such "collective apparitions" A. Krauss³⁰ assumes that a specific "Alpmiasma" (nightmare miasma) gives rise to these apparitions. A very interesting example of the condition is seen in the following report by Radestock:

A complete battalion of French soldiers quartered in an old abbey near Tropea in Calabria was attacked by a nightmare during the middle hours of the night. The whole battalion to a man arose from their beds and, chased by panicky terror, ran out into the open. (Note here the close link between the nightmare and the panicky terror of man and animals.) When questioned what had so frightened them, they replied one and all that the devil in the shape of a large black shaggy dog had entered through the door, rushed on their chests with the speed of lightning and then disappeared through a door opposite the entrance. The same scene was repeated on the following night. Notwithstanding the fact that the officers had distributed themselves on all sides to stand watch against the devil, no power on earth could make the soldiers return to their quarters. This extraordinary manifestation is explained very simply. These soldiers had, on a hot June day, done a forced march of 25 miles and were then crowded into the abbey which was too small for so large a number. They had lain down to sleep on a little straw and had not taken off their clothes because they had nothing with which to cover themselves. The exhaustion, the primitive sleeping conditions, and the constricting uniforms all caused the physio-

logical excitation which soon produced an apparition already known to the troops, since the locals had told them that they would experience something uncanny in the abbey where the devil prowled in the guise of a black shaggy dog.³¹

The erotic dreams described by Börner as occasionally associated with nightmares can be divided into two types according to the sex of the erotic demon who appears. This depends generally – but not necessarily – upon the sex of the sleeper. Hence even today Germanic superstition differentiates between the female love-phantom (*mare*) and the male one (*mar*). The former is by far the more frequent. According to a mediaeval and current popular belief, devils and witches – i.e. daemonic living beings – appear in both forms to seduce or torment the sleeper in his or her dream. (The incubus and succuba of the Middle Ages come to mind!) Indeed, there exist numerous partly highly romantic fairy-tales and legends in which the sleepers fall in love with the love-phantom and even have offspring by it. Obviously some of these are often the result of organic sexual complaints, as Krauss in particular demonstrates in his “Der Sinn im Wahnsinn.”³² As examples I quote here only two well-established instances, one of which was observed by no less an authority than Esquirol. In the first of these, a mentally affected woman with uterine disease asserted in all seriousness that she had been the devil’s wife for a million years, had slept with him every night, and had born him fifteen children. The other case comes from Radestock, who describes how Salomon Maimonides, having been occupied with the Cabbala over a long period, dreamed that the devil Lilith fell upon him, while at another time after being engaged in exalted ideas he enjoyed in a dream the gracious embrace of the angelic Shechina.³³ There is

a specially noteworthy example of a sensual dream mixed with erotic feelings (physical intercourse with Christ) also to be found in Radestock.³⁴ Comparison may also be made with the fables around the births of Merlin and Robert the Devil.

THE NATURE AND ORIGIN OF THE NIGHTMARE
ACCORDING TO THE ANCIENT PHYSICIANS

Having objectively established the current theories on the nature and origin of the nightmare, we are now in a firm position to criticize the attitude of the ancient physicians.

The first Greek physician who we know for certain to have dealt with the nightmare in his scientific research was Themison of Laodicea. He was the founder of the so-called Methodical school and a contemporary of Caesar and Cicero. Unfortunately all we know is that in his letters he called the nightmare not Ephialtes ("leaper") as did other doctors but employed a rarer but at the same time rather characteristic term, Pnigalion ("throttler"). We obtain much more exact information from the theories of the leading member of the school, Soranos, who, next to Hippocrates and Galen, was perhaps the most productive and significant of the ancient physicians. His views, long known to us from the Latin adaptation of Caelius Aurelianus³⁵ (5th century) and to a great extent from later medical text books, especially from the works of Paulus Aegineta (7th century), Oreibasios (4-5th century) and of Aetios (beginning of the 6th century).

In the era before Soranos, incidentally, Rufus of Ephesos had also considered the nightmare. Compare the extant fragment of Rufus from the excerpts of the Arab Rhazes, which Darmberg and Ruelle quote in their edition of Rufus: "When someone is plagued by the incubus, prescribe emetics and laxatives, put the patient on a light diet, purge the head by sneezing and gargling, and later rub in beaver oil and the like to prevent epilepsy."

We have also an account of the nightmare in the late Byzantine writer, Michael Knostantinos Psellos (11th century), and in the *Anecdota Graeca et Graecolat.* II, edited by V. Rose, in which we find various reminiscences of the nightmare theory of Soranos.

Concerning the views of the ancients on the nature of the nightmare, the very expression "pnigalion" ("throttler"), which Themison probably borrowed from the vernacular, shows that he considered "choking, becoming strangled" as the most essential characteristic of the nightmare, the symptom to which Soranos, Oreibasios, Aetios, Paulus Aegineta and others have also drawn special attention. Further symptoms mentioned are the feelings of the sleeper that somebody is sitting on his chest or suddenly jumps upon it or that somebody climbs up and crushes him heavily with his weight. The sufferer feels incapacity to move, torpidity, and inability to speak. Attempts to speak often result only in single, inarticulate sounds. According to Soranos and Paulus Aegineta the impression may arise that the demon sitting on the sleeper's chest is trying to violate him but vanishes as soon as the sleeper seizes his fingers or joins his own hands or clenches his fists: "Some are so affected by empty visions that they believe they are being attacked and forced to the vilest acts: if they grasp the oppressor they believe it will vanish."³⁶ The passage is absolutely clear and obviously means that according to popular belief the person tortured by the nightmare must grasp the monster with his fingers if he is to chase it away. This belief is also current in Germany and among the Slavs. Laistner says: "He whom the Murawa oppresses must touch her small toe, and then she leaves him." "One must hold firmly the finger of Pschezolnica (a Slavonic female spirit) and then she flees." "One must seize the Murawa

or nightmare witch or hold her fast by the hair."³⁷ The expression "with closed fingers," quoted from Paulus Aegineta, is not so easy to explain because it is not clear whether he refers to the fingers of the nightmare demon or to those of the victim. If the former, it is virtually identical with the words of Soranos; if the latter, we are reminded of the ancient superstition that folding the hands or clenching the fists was an effective antidote for magic. According to Wuttke,³⁸ the nightmare can be dispelled by placing the thumb under the fingers. Veckenstedt³⁹ and Laistner⁴⁰ say that whoever succeeds in pressing his big toe three times against the bedstead will frighten the Murawa away. All these suppositions arise from the observed fact that the nightmare disappears as soon as the sleeper recovers the lost capacity for movement by a slight motion of the fingers or toes.

The Greek physicians also observed regular epidemics of nightmares. Caelius Aurelianus writes: "Silimachus (an error for Callimachus) a pupil of Hippocrates, relates that many were carried away by this contagion just like the plague in the city of Rome." This obviously refers to the Hippocratic Callimachos, who was a pupil of Herophilus in the third or second century B. C. The ancient writers, and in particular Soranos, emphasize that the nightmare can be considered a dangerous ailment only when it affects the same person time and again. Under these circumstances there may be chlorosis, emaciation, insomnia, constipation, and, if the attacks are especially violent and frequent, sometimes even epilepsy and death. Soranos believes that in its essence every nightmare is identical with an epileptic attack. (Even before the time of Soranos, the Ephesian physician Rufus, explained the nightmare as a sign of incipient epilepsy.) The victims of a night-

mare suffer while asleep exactly the same as does the epileptic while awake. Hence the evil must be dealt with energetically at its root so that the condition does not become chronic and permit the onset of epilepsy, mental disturbance, mania or apoplexy. (Soranos describes epileptics as those who have heavy and appalling dreams and easily become insane.) As faithful pupils and followers of their great master Hippocrates, the ancient physicians strongly opposed the prevalent popular belief that the nightmare was a god or wicked spirit. Soranos in particular refutes this superstition in detail in his *Aetiology*. Caelius Aurelianus writes: "The above mentioned disease is however incipient epilepsy. Soranos explained fully convincingly in his books on the causes of disease, which he called *Aetiology*, that there is here neither a god nor a semi-god nor Cupid" (in error for concupiscence). I presume that Soranos is thinking here of erotic nightmares and of the teaching of Herophilus, according to which our concupiscence or our erotic instinct can produce dreams of this kind. Soranos considers even erotic nightmares as incipient epilepsy, especially since epileptic attacks are often associated with gonorrhoea without the erotic instinct (cupido) being present. As soon as the attack has passed and the victim is awake one can observe that the face and body orifices are covered with moist sweat, and the patient feels a heaviness in the nape of the neck and has a mild irritating cough. This cough is presumably only a natural sequel to the precedent dyspnea.

As regards the aetiology or cause of the nightmare, the ancients had already noted that it frequently originates from digestive upsets following overeating, alcoholic excesses, and eating indigestible food. Naturally the ancients knew nothing about its causation through mechanical ob-

struction of the respiratory inlets as first noted by Börner. Another feature correctly observed in ancient times was that the state of sleep-drunkenness or the transition period between fully asleep and fully awake is very favourable to the production of a nightmare; and that the visions of the dream may then persist so vividly for a period before falling asleep or after waking up that the sleeper will deceive himself into believing that he sees the vision with open eyes and in actual reality. Thus for example Macrobius, probably following one of the old physicians, writes:

Fantasma is indeed a vision, which, as they say, between waking and deep sleep, in those first mists of sleep when one still believes oneself to be awake and has just fallen asleep, seems to be forcing its way in as wandering forms of varying size, shape or temper, either joyful or disturbing. Ephialtes is of this type, which popular belief holds to come in on the sleepers and weigh on them heavily and oppress them severely."⁴¹

More modern medical opinion confirms that deception of the senses often occurs in the state directly preceeding sleep.

The fact that certain illnesses — especially those associated with hectic fever — produce a variety of terrifying nightmarish visions of vivid intensity was quite familiar to the ancient physicians. Let us compare, for example, Hippocrates: "the evil in these fevers and cramps (contortions) from dreams,"⁴² to which Galen adds: "We also notice in dreadful illnesses oppressions, fears and cramps stemming from dreams." Again Hippocrates: "Once he has gone to sleep he jumps up from his sleep when he sees the monstrous visions" (previously the talk was of fever).

Later he continues: "Kritias reports on feverish dreams." Galen: "I have called those who suffer from physical illnesses clear-sighted and those who are frightened by dreams prophets and seers through phantasmata."

From these fears which, according to Hippocrates, also attack small children in their sleep (as noted above, the *pavores nocturni*) the god of dreams, Phobitor, obviously derives his name in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and to him are ascribed in particular the production of all kinds of terrifying animal apparitions. The frightful and monstrous things, the confusion of the senses, the startled flight from the bed presumably also belong in this context, i. e., those night deliria and nightmares which were considered signs of epilepsy in the broader sense and which Hippocrates talks about in *The Sacred Disease*. We learn from Hippocrates that people believed them to be the influence of evil spirits of the dead against which one employed sacrifices of purification and expiation and incantations.

Even the layman had such frequent opportunity of witnessing nightmarish deliria and hallucinations during fever that it does not seem strange if sometimes the two conceptions of fever and nightmare are interchanged and the usual Ephialtes as the demon of the nightmare is repeatedly called Ipialos, Ipialis. Aristotle in "On Dreams" acknowledged the close kinship between deliria and dreams when he wrote "we meet the same symptoms in people startled from their dreams, as indeed dreams cause illnesses." Aristophanes is obviously thinking of severe fevers allied with dangerous dyspnea and nightmares and of their demons when he boasts that he fought as a second Hercules: "For you he fought, and for you he fights: / And then last year with adventurous hand / He grappled besides with the Spectral Shapes, / The Agues and Fevers that plagued our land."⁴³

The remedies and dietetic discipline employed by the ancient doctors for nightmares were closely aligned with their views on their origin. The majority and most important of these remedies aimed at removing the damaging morbid humours and changing them into beneficial ones — corresponding to the basic theory of the humours in ancient medicine. The main therapy used was primarily venesection and various kinds of purgatives. One of these was a mixture of black hellebore and the juice of convolvulus with the addition of anise, daucus and parsley. Another time-honoured domestic remedy was the black pips of peony which was employed against fears, demons, epilepsy and cold fever, i. e., nightmares and deliria of all kinds. Galen recommended hellebore and venesection also for apoplexy, epilepsy and melancholy. According to Dioscur a mixture of hellebore and scammony should be used as catharsis for epilepsy, melancholy and insanity (delirium). In the vernacular the peony was even called Ephialtion. For effective dietetic treatment Soranos-Caelius advises several days of fasting and then an easily digestible simple diet, strictly avoiding all foodstuffs producing flatulence, above all beans. Beans were strictly forbidden to the Pythagoreans because they were considered to be very indigestible and causative of evil dreams and nightmares by their flatulent action. Plinius even reports a remarkable superstition according to which the "souls of the dead," i. e., evil spirits, were believed to dwell in beans.⁴⁴ This notion is immediately understandable if one remembers that evil spirits were believed to act personally in evil dreams, nightmares and illnesses and to alarm and torment the sleeping or the sick with their appearances. Hence the belief that they dwell in certain injurious foods and that the intake of these foods would bring the spirits temporarily into the human body. The most important of these demons living

in plants was Dionysos, the god of wine, ivy and perhaps also of hemp, endowed with narcotic strength. He was directly identified with ivy and vine and, having transferred himself to men by their enjoyment of the produce of these plants, he animated and inspired, indeed possessed them.

We also meet the same — and probably a most ancient — popular superstition in Porphyrios. He observes on the demons causing nightmares that they enter into the human body with the food and there do all kinds of mischief and, in particular, bring on flatulence: "As we eat, they enter into us and settle in us and thus they pollute, not by divine interference. They generally delight in blood and filthiness and invade the possessed. In a word, a compulsion of greed and desire, and general excitation cloud rational thinking and unintelligible sounds connected with them and also flatulence cause man's breakdown which satisfies the demon."⁴⁵ It seems to be evident from the fragment found in Proclus that Porphyrios was probably thinking of the demons of vicious dreams and nightmares which live in certain unwholesome foods when speaking of the flatulence aroused by malevolent demons. Zeller has related this to the ancient beliefs about incubi.⁴⁶ The unintelligible sounds most probably refer not only to belches and flatulence but also to the inarticulate shrieks of the victim tormented by the nightmare.

The constituent elements of the apparition in the classical nightmare were approximately the same as in the modern one. In the classical era, too, the spectre was sometimes terrifying, sometimes erotic, sometimes combining both characteristics; it revealed itself either in animal or in human form (male or female) or in a form part human, part animal. The most generally accepted concept about the essence of the spectre was that he or she was a wicked demon — particu-

larly a malicious spirit of the dead — who intended to torture men in their sleep. Nevertheless, there was an ancient popular belief that wicked people like sorceresses and witches can also appear as nightmares. Finally there occurs here and there the apparition of a kindly and benevolent nightmare spirit who renders useful service to man by curing him, revealing the future to him and bestowing treasures upon him. This becomes very evident from the following small collection of nightmares, that, incidentally, makes no claim to absolute completeness.

1. A he-goat appears as a nightmare spirit in the rhetorical novel of Iamblichos of which, unfortunately, only a far too brief outline has been preserved by Photius in his library: “a he-goat spectre lusted after Sinonis; so they fled across the meadows of Rhodanis,” i.e., the pair of lovers, Rhodanes and Sinonis who form the centre of the novel, had escaped to a meadow from the persecution of the king of Babylon and were driven from the meadow by a nightmare demon in the form of a he-goat who assaulted the beautiful Sinonis in her sleep. Since Iamblichos was of Syrian extraction — and consequently semitic — and brought up in Babylon, the he-goat is probably a so-called *sair*, i.e., one of the field ghosts or field devils related to the Pans, Satyrs and Fauns who are mentioned repeatedly in the Old Testament. Mannhardt had previously conjectured this correctly.

2. Philostratos tells an exactly parallel story in the *Life of Apollonios of Tyana* (6,27), of an erotic nightmare spirit appearing in the form of a satyr. While Apollonios and his companions were staying in an Ethiopian village not far from the Nile cataracts and were eating their evening meal, they suddenly heard shouting by women who called out to one another, “Seize him and persecute him!” They also asked their husbands to punish the “adulterer.” This village

had been haunted for ten months by the ghost of a satyr who had evil designs on the women and was even said to have murdered two with whom he was particularly in love. (A similar love-demon, Asmodaios — from the Jewish *Aschmodai*, the marriage-wrecker, “limping devil” — is mentioned in the Book of Tobit. He was in love with Sara, the daughter of Raguel, and had killed her seven husbands one after another during their bridal nights. Tobias banished him into the desert by cremating the liver of a fish). The story continues to tell how Apollonios tamed and rendered harmless the demonic satyr by intoxicating him with wine — just as Midas did to the Silen (or satyr) — and banished him into a nymph grotto nearby. Philostratos adds a further parallel from his own experience when he says:

But we must not disbelieve that satyrs both exist and are susceptible to the passion of love; for I knew a youth of my own age in Lemnos whose mother was said to be visited by a satyr, as he well might to judge by this story; for he was represented as wearing on his back a fawn-skin that exactly fitted him, the front paws of which were drawn around his neck and fastened over his chest.

Considering the frequent mixing of the concepts of Pan and Satyr (Faunus) in the Hellenistic age, one could in this case again think of Pan as the chief representative of the nightmare in the last centuries of the classical period.⁴⁷ The legend of the procreation of the sophist Apsine is probably based on a similar concept. One can assume that his mother imagined to have had intercourse with Pan in a dream and afterwards considered Apsine to be Pan's son, especially as he bore a certain resemblance to him. The story of Apollonios of Tyana as narrated by Philostratos is remarkable, by

the way, in that a ten-months' epidemic of nightmares should have prevailed among the women of the Ethiopian village; however, after the analogies quoted above this is by no means improbable.

3. A type of nightmare which we may deduce from Horace⁴⁸ has a completely different and non-erotic character. In these verses an unfortunate boy who was ruthlessly murdered by a number of witchlike women to gain an effective love-potion threatened his bloodthirsty murderesses just before his death with the following words:

As soon as you shall have satisfied your rage and I expire
My ghost shall haunt you every night.
I will mangle your cheeks with my curved nails,
For such is the power the manes give to spectres.
Every night, incumbent on your troubled breasts
I will chase off your sleep with fear and trembling.

Obviously the unfortunate victim is threatening his murderesses that after his death he will become a terrible ghost of the dead, a nightmare demon, and will wreak frightful vengeance upon them. (Compare Porphyrius: "the lemures, the shadows of the dead wandering at dawn, are to be feared."⁴⁹) The nightmare is marked quite distinctly in the second and fifth lines — compare the "climbing up and settling on the chest" that Soranos (through Caelius) uses of the nightmare. The last line again finds an admirable explanation in Soranos where he says of the incubus: "Those who have suffered from the affliction for a long time are pale and thin for because of their fear they do not get sleep." Plutarch also states that frightful dreams and nightmares usually end with a sudden awakening which is sometimes followed by very great psychic unrest. Line 3 of the Epode presents much

more of a problem; it seems to suggest a scratching or lacerating of the face by a being equipped with claws. Perhaps they can be explained by recollecting the "great claws" of the goddesses of fate in Hesiod,⁵⁰ the clawed feet of the harpies and sirens, and finally of the Etruscan Charon. As I have recently pointed out, the original concept of the vulture form of such demons of the dead has been retained in these claws. Compare also Gervasius of Tilbury,⁵¹ where in the chapter on "Witches and Nocturnal Spectres," the lamiae are interpreted as "lamiae from *laniando* = lacerate, because they lacerate children." More on this subject is to be found in Grimm's *German Mythology*.

The same holds true for the Roman *striges*, owlish demons with curved claws and beaks like vultures who lacerate the cheeks of children and eat their intestines as do vultures.⁵² Compare also what Deinon in Pliny⁵³ tells of the Indian sirens: "they charm people with their song and when they are sunk in heavy sleep tear them to pieces." According to modern Greek superstition, the *Kalikantsaroi* who belong to this type of demon also tear the face of those whom they meet during the night. I presume this motif is explained by the observation of a facial eruption that is called *Epinuktis* and breaks out suddenly during the night. This occurs especially in children and is associated with severe nightmares.

Often victims appear to their murderers in dreams at night or in hallucinations when half awake but still drunk with sleep. They take the form of ghostly evil demons, terrify their victims and foretell their imminent destruction. An example is the ghost of the murdered Julius Caesar who appeared to Brutus and Cassius. Plutarch calls the ghost appearing to Brutus "your evil daemon." According to Valerius Maximus the same is true for the "man of enor-

mous size, black in colour, with filthy beard and unkempt hair" who terrified Cassius Parmensis shortly before his death "in the first sleep, when he lay on his couch asleep with anxiety and troubles."⁵⁴ In both cases the evil daemon can only be Caesar himself or his personal *genius*. What is described is most probably a nightmare and yet some of the most characteristic signs are missing: jumping up, rushing in, burdening, weighing down; likewise in the dreadful dream of Caecina in Tacitus.⁵⁵

4. In the very dramatically depicted nightmare in Apuleius⁵⁶ there are two witches who appear to the unhappy Aristomenes while he is asleep and torment him in the most appalling manner. It is possible that the concept lying at the basis of this dream is similar to that found in many Nordic sagas, i.e., that the soul of the living possess the power of leaving the body during sleep and of appearing to others in their dreams, thereby imparting a kind of reality. (I am referring to the Scandinavian Fylgjur saga.) After a sumptuous evening meal, filled abundantly with meat and drink, Aristomenes went to bed together with his friend Socrates. The latter fell at once into a deep sleep. Aristomenes, however, bolted the door securely and placed his own bed against it for further protection. When he had at last gone to sleep, the door sprang open with a mighty crash and enormous force. This overthrew the bed and the sleeper came to rest underneath it. At the same time two old witches entered and pierced his sleeping friend with a sword, drew his blood, and closed the wound with a sponge. After this the two witches attacked Aristomenes who was covered with cold sweat from fright. They dragged him from under his bed and "straddling over my face they emptied their bladders and drenched me with the foulest urine." (The modern Greek Calicant-sares, who are in many ways related to the Pans and Satyrs,

act in a similar fashion.) In this classical nightmare we find once more nearly all the characteristics which were regarded as specific to the nightmare by the ancient physicians: the nightmare originated from indigestible food, there was profuse sweating, particularly on the face (Soranus through Caelius: "Then, when they awake from sleep, the face and the parts used in swallowing feel moist and humid"), which then led to the disgusting impression of the two witches micturating on his face. Furthermore, the feeling of pressure and being strangled is excellently motivated by the overturned bed on top of the sleeper and the two women sitting on his face. Finally there is the dreadful condition and fright of the unhappy sleeper when he wakes up, which is very dramatically described: "Lifeless, naked and cold and covered with urine, as if but recently emerged from the maternal womb, or rather half dead."

5. In his story of Damartus, King of Sparta, Herodotus⁵⁷ describes a very remarkable erotic nightmare which is mythologically of special importance because a large number of fables about birth can be explained on this analogy. When Leotychides, his adversary, reproached Damartus that he was not the real son of the king Ariston, since the king himself had cast doubts on his paternity, Damartus charged his mother in the most solemn manner to tell him the whole truth of his origin. His mother replied:

On the third night after Ariston had brought me to his house, there came to me an appearance like to Ariston, and lay with me, and then put on me the garlands which he had. So when that figure was gone, presently Ariston came to me. Seeing the garlands on me, he asked me who had given them. I said they were his gift, but he denied it. Then I said, and swore it, that he did not well to deny it; for I told him he had come

but a little while ago and lain with me and so given me the garlands. When Ariston saw that I swore to that, he perceived that the hand of heaven was in the matter; and not only were the garlands plainly seen to have come from the hero's shrine they call Astrobacus' shrine, that stands by the door of the courtyard, but the diviners declared that it was that same hero, Astrobacus, that had visited me. Thus, my son, you have all that you desire to know. For either you are the son of that hero, and the hero Astrobacus is your father, or Ariston is, for on that night did I conceive you.

(The same motif is found in the legend of Robert the Devil.)

The fable is important for us as it comes from historic times. It is especially clearly transmitted and has a number of analogies from historical and mythological times. Here the tradition about Alexander the Great comes to mind, whose mother Olympias is said to have conceived him during a dream in which Zeus appeared in the form of lightning. Then there are the supernatural births of Plato, Seleucus and Augustus and the Thasian legend about the birth of Theagenes; finally the fables concerning Zeus and Alcmene, Zeus and Danae, Zeus and Semele, Mars and Ilia, etc. Even today the impulse to fable similar legends has not fully died. The following extract from Pashley throws a light on folklore traced in Crete:

A vampire appeared in Anapolis, plagued the people and raped a woman. He induced the men to leave their wives, called some other vampires and made the women believe they were their husbands. When one of the men came and asked "What is wrong with you?" the wife answered, "You have used me clumsily and frequently." The man, however, said, "It was not I who came," and the wife retorted "Then it was a vampire."

Later they banished the vampire by exorcism onto the island of Santorin.⁵⁸

In the Middle Ages the ancient heroes, demons and gods who mingled with man in erotic nightmares naturally became devils. They appear sometimes as incubi, sometimes as succubae, and occasionally father children who afterwards become evil sorcerers, witches, etc. This concept plays a large part in proceedings against witches. Goethe's "Braut von Korinth" shows what a high poetical understanding and representation is capable of. The poem is based on Phlegon's history of a vampire.

6. We meet yet another type of erotic nightmare in the very interesting Hellenic relief⁵⁹ for which we are indebted to Crusius' delightful work *Die Epiphanie der Sirene*. A siren of beautiful voluptuous form with half-stretched wings and human legs which terminate in pointed falcon-like claws is lowering herself onto a shepherd or peasant apparently asleep in the open air and is obviously showing erotic intentions. (Compare Joseph Antt.⁶⁰: "During the night Matthew appeared to have intercourse with a woman in a dream," and primarily the sculptures showing the sphinx attacking a recumbent youth, where the monster may signify a nightmare demon.) Crusius points out correctly that in Hellenistic literature — which must be cited to understand the imagery — the sirens were believed to be the daughters of Achelous and a muse, rather akin to Naiads: and according to Deinon in Pliny⁶¹ these sirens "charm people with their song and when they are sunk in heavy sleep tear them to pieces." The Naiads were also reputed to be daughters of the river gods and especially of Achelous.

We find similar beliefs about the north-German elves. These are also distinguished by their beauty and like to bask

in the sunshine. (Our siren is also a Southern demon.) If a female elf wishes to unite herself with a man, she flies to him on a sunbeam through some opening such as a key-hole or a crack in the room — exactly like the nightmare demons. It is dangerous to approach her hillock and many a youth who has gone to sleep on an elves' hillock has never returned to his companions (this is also true of the nymphs). The elves are very fond of dancing on meadows in moonlight nights. Corresponding to the elves dancing on moonlit meadows are the sirens as playmates of Persephone as she picks flowers in the fields. A blow from an elf causes lameness or brings on illness. The elves shoot their arrows down through the air and similarly the elf's "shot" carries death. The same holds true for the nymphs. In Icelandic folklore the elves have love affairs with human beings. Closely connected with the elves are the vampire like *empusia* and *lamia* of whom it is said in Philostratus: "These beings fall in love and they are devoted to the delights of Aphrodite, but especially to the flesh of human beings. And they decoy with such delights those whom they mean to devour in their feasts."⁶² Let us take this opportunity to recall the *insomnia Veneris* or *somni Venerei* ("bad dreams of Venus") that are so closely allied pathologically with nightmares. These are erotic dreams associated with gonorrhoea, and the doctors in ancient times believed them to be the precursors or symptoms of epilepsy and insanity — just as with nightmares. The people also attributed them to the powers of the daemons.

7. A very obvious nightmare or nightmare vision is portrayed in the Book of Genesis. Here it says:

And he rose up that night and took his two wives, and his two womanservants, and his eleven sons, and passed over the

ford Jabbok. And he took them, and sent them over the brook, and sent over that he had. And Jacob was left alone; and there wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day. And when he saw that he prevailed not against him, he touched the hollow of his thigh; and the hollow of Jacob's thigh was out of joint, as he wrestled with him. And he said, Let me go, for the day breaketh. And he said, I will not let thee go, except thou bless me. And he said unto him, What is thy name? And he said, Jacob. And he said, Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel: for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed. And Jacob asked him, and said, Tell me, I pray thee, thy name. And he said, Wherefore is it that thou dost ask after my name? And he blessed him there. And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel — the face of God — : for I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved. And as he passed over Peniel the sun rose upon him, and he halted upon his thigh. Therefore the children of Israel eat not of the sinew which shrank, which is upon the hollow of Jacob's thigh in the sinew that shrank" (Gen.32: 22-32, Authorized Version).

The notion that mortals who see God against God's will must die or become blind is very widespread: one thinks of Actaeon, Semele, Tiresias, etc.

Even if in this remarkable legend of Elohim it is not explicitly stated that the nocturnal struggle between Jacob and Elohim is to be interpreted as a dream or a nightmare, there can scarcely be any doubt after all the evidence has been taken into consideration, and any other interpretation such as a violent struggle in prayer, or an actual reality, is unthinkable. Most of the more recent commentators on the Book of Genesis look upon Jacob's struggle with Elohim as a work of fiction or a myth; yet they abstain from

a scientific interpretation and, strange to say, reject the earlier opinion that the struggle is to be construed as a dream. When Dillmann says:

that the struggle with God in the sense of the legend is a physical and external one is undeniable and is more than confirmed by Jacob's limping. Only a misinterpretation of the facts could explain what was narrated as a simple mental event, either as a vivid dream-vision or a violent struggle in prayer...⁶³

he pays no attention to the fact that vivid nightmares often appear to the sleeper as objective external experiences and he does not heed the fact that all the motives contained in the legend — for example, the paralysis of the hip — recur in nightmares, as will be pointed out in the following.

The fact that the struggle in question is not specifically designated as a dream experience must not be considered an obstacle, for dreams, and especially nightmares which have been conspicuous by their peculiar vividness, have frequently not been recognized as dreams but have been described as factual experiences. As we have already seen, even modern physicians accustomed to accurate observation of themselves, have sometimes mistaken subjective dream phenomena of great intensity for real experiences.

Let us compare, for example, in the *Odyssey*, where Odysseus hidden in the form of an eagle appears to Penelope in a dream and calls out to her: "This is not a dream but a happy reality which you shall see fulfilled." One thinks also of the remarkable story of the cure of Sostrata in the second catalogue of *Epidauros*,⁶⁴ where it is reported how this patient had set out on her return journey without having received a clear vision in a dream and on the way was cured by Asclepius when she was fully awake

and not through the agency of a dream. A charming ode of Horace⁶⁵ is based on a similar dream vision. The best analogy of all, however, is furnished by the nightmare of Hyginus⁶⁶, which is expressly stated to be a real experience. Furthermore there is the not unimportant fact that the Elohist to whom we are indebted for our legend also makes God reveal himself in dreams elsewhere.

If we now look at the story more accurately, we can see in point of fact that all the motives found in this legend are also found in dreams, and especially in nightmares, and in the myths derived from them. Thus we can see primarily the motive of the night struggle and this, according to Artemidor, not only happens frequently in dreams but also plays a role in undoubted nightmares. The words to be specially noticed in Artemidor are, "the dream which brings victory to one of the two wrestlers, who keeps his strength until the break of dawn."⁶⁷ According to Artemidor, "a struggle with an unknown opponent means danger through illness," and this is certainly true of Jacob who acquired a paresis of the hip from the struggle with the stranger. Thus, for example, Veckenstedt tells us the following story about the Slavic nightmare demon Serpolnica: "A woman went out late in the evening to cut grass and did not hear the clock strike twelve. She was assaulted by Serpolnica and struggled with her for a full hour until it struck one o'clock, when the ghost left her. She returned to her home completely exhausted and dishevelled."⁶⁸ We shall see later that wood-ghosts often appear as nightmare demons, as for example the Celtic Dusii and the Italic Silvanus and Faunus. Similarly, Veckenstedt in his *Lithuanian Myths* says of the Lithuanian Medine or forest woman: "It can happen to whoever goes through the wood that the Medine forces him to struggle with her;

should he be victorious he is richly rewarded" (as Jacob was by the blessing!) "but if he is defeated, she devours him." Kolrusch⁶⁹ and Perty⁷⁰ say that the nightmare is sometimes so intense that the sleeper contending with the spectre tumbles out of his bed; obviously the fall may cause sprains, laming and all kinds of injuries.

A second nightmare motif can be seen in the duration of the struggle up to daybreak and in the request of Elohim to the victorious Jacob to release him because dawn is breaking; for it is one of the characteristics of night-demons and spectres that they are linked with night and darkness and that they have to escape if either a light is kindled or if day breaks;⁷¹ Bürger says: "the first ray of daylight banishes the night demons,"⁷² or if the first cock-crow is heard heralding the break of day. The crowing of the cock proclaims that it is day and frightens the spirits away (Grimm). This view is also expressed in Parsee teaching and in the Talmud. In proof of this I refer to the following Lithuanian legend communicated by Veckenstedt.⁷³ It relates to the *Caucie*, small nightmare demons with long grey beards who glide into the room to throttle the sleeper when the moon is full:

A peasant who was often plagued by them asked his neighbours for advice and afterwards he lit a torch as soon as he noticed that the *Caucie* had come. Thereupon they avoided him because the bright light frightened them. Another peasant in like circumstances bought three cocks on the advice of the parish priest. He kept these cocks constantly awake so that they crowed during the night, too. During the next night the *Caucie* had scarcely begun to torment him when the cocks crowed and the *Caucie* disappeared.

Moreover, the fact that Jacob asked Elohim his name and that Elohim did not wish to divulge it, points decidedly to a nightmare. In Germanic superstition you must call the demon by his own name if you are going to capture him, i.e., get him into your power.⁷⁴ "For protection against witches in the form of animals (who often act as nightmare demons) and to force them to resume their human form again they must be called three times by their Christian name." The witches then usually appear naked. Compare also Grohmann in *Aberglauben und Gebräuche aus Böhmen und Mähren*: "When the haunted person addresses the animal form (of the nightmare) squatting on him by the name of the person who is causing the nightmare in the metamorphosis of the animal, the person will stand before him in his or her human form and cannot hurt him any more."⁷⁵ A sentence in Bühler's *Davos in seinem Walserdialekt* runs: "If you know the name of a *Doggi* (nightmare spectre) or of a *Fänken* you have him in your power."⁷⁶ The same belief exists among the Slavic Wends whose nightmare demon is called *Murawa*. In this context Laistner writes: "If you can more or less conjecture who it is you feel to be lying upon you (as a nightmare demon) you must call him by his name and the *Murawa* will escape."⁷⁷ This motif plays a big part in numerous fairy-tales and saga collected by Laistner. The best known is that of "Rumpelstilzkin."

When it is further said in the Genesis legend that Jacob acquired a dislocation (that is to say, a paresis) of the hip from his struggle with Elohim, this motif can be accounted for without difficulty from the scope of nightmares. In the first place the rheumatic pains contracted by slumbering incautiously in the open air and known as witch or demon "shots" spring to mind. This designation clearly shows that such pains and pareses were ascribed by the people to

the beings who became visible in nightmares.⁷⁸ The "blow" of the Greek Nereids is a similar belief. This was directed particularly against people who went to sleep about midday in a lonely spot in the open air near springs and streams, and manifested itself by mental or physical illness. Note that the laming of Jacob took place on the bank of the river Jabbok where the cold exhalations during the night — due to the steep fall in temperature — could produce rheumatic lameness. Finally the Brandenburg nightmare demon Scherber (*Serp, Serpel*) falls into this category. This is the male counterpart of Serpolnica and hacks the plagued victim in the heel with a curved knife, just as in the Austrian alplands it is considered highly dangerous to tread barefoot into the footprints of the Habergeiss when this demon goat appears as a nightmare devil, because one immediately feels the *Gallschuss* (lit. "bile shot") which produces a piercing pain in the foot as caused by rheumatism or gout.⁷⁹

Finally, there only remains to prove that the blessing that Jacob forced the defeated Elohim to bestow on him is also a motif of the nightmare dream. To make this comprehensible I refer once more to the Lithuanian Medine or forest woman who compels anyone going through the woods to wrestle with her, and if the person is victorious he is richly rewarded, but if he is defeated, she devours him. Very frequently the victory over the nightmare demon consists in the person seizing the spirit's cap and compelling the demon to grant or divulge a treasure — a concept which Petronius knew when he said about a penniless man who had suddenly become rich by some mysterious means: "He who has robbed the incubus of a hair finds a treasure."⁸⁰ This motif is found in numerous Italian, modern Greek, Germanic and Slavic sagas from which I shall narrate only the following very characteristic one. Among the Sandomier

forest dwellers the nightmare demon is called the *Vjek* ("old man") or *Gnotek* ("small oppressor"). Nobody knows where he spends his days. He is not big but exceedingly heavy. The *Vjek* lies down on an unsuspecting sleeper and compresses his chest with all his strength, so that the victim cannot move. People say that if anyone can snatch away the *Vjek's* cap, the *Vjek* will bring him plenty of money.

The blessing that the nightmare demon confers may also consist in the communication of important and useful secrets or in the granting of strength and good health. As we shall see later this feature of blessing, of doing good and being of service, is imprinted and developed to an exceptional degree in the Germanic domestic spirits (*spiritus familiares*) who are at the same time nightmare demons. Thus the connection between the hitherto unexplained name of Mephistopheles and Ophelis-Epophelis (helper, benefactor) becomes clear since he was one of these useful domestic spirits according to the old Faust legend.

8. The view mentioned above of a health-promoting and blessing-bestowing field of activity of the nightmare demon is expressed in an epigram in Kaibel, which has been variously misunderstood. This inscription was found in Rome, and Kaibel dates it about the second century A.D. In it a shepherd claims to have been cured of a serious illness by the appearance of Pan-Ephialtes while he was taking his midday rest. The epigram runs:

To you, o flute-player, hymnist, benevolent God
Pure leader of the naiads pouring bath waters,
Hyginis, whom you yourself healed of severe illness
by coming near him, presents this oblation.
For you have appeared to all my sheep,
not as a dream vision but in the middle of the day.⁸¹

The phrase *ktin essin* ("to the sheep") would of course relate to a shepherd resting at noon. If a hunter were the person concerned, *skylakessin* ("to the puppies") would be appropriate. The conjecture of E. Curtius, *tekessin* ("to the children"), I consider to be less probable, although it must be conceded that such a reading is not out of the question if we assume here an epidemic occurrence of nightmares, i.e., if at the same time as Hyginus, his children were also attacked by the nightmare. Compare Artimidorus where the same antithesis of dream and day is found, and of course the *Odyssey* where Odysseus calls to Penelope in a dream, "Take heart, daughter of the noble Icarius. This is not a dream but a happy reality which you shall see fulfilled."

Almost all scholars who have reviewed this interesting inscription hold the opinion that the godhead who is presented with the oblation is Apollon-Paian although nowhere else is he called *soriktis* ("flute-player"). Plew and Drexler are the only writers who have connected the epigram correctly with Pan, who is elsewhere, as here, called hymnist, leader of the Naiads and flute-player, as Drexler correctly noted. Furthermore, the fact that Pan⁸² reveals himself in dreams to people during their midday sleep — just as here — justifies this interpretation. In Longus⁸³, all kinds of terrifying day and night visions are interpreted as "revelations of Pan's anger with the sailors." We advance further in the understanding of our epigram by the insight that the instance of Hyginus does not — as Plew and Robert assume — deal with an ordinary dream but is rather one of those vivid nightmares which, as we have just seen, were attributed to Pan-Ephialtes and according to ancient popular belief were said to have curative effects on illness. Pan — like Asclepius — healed the sick through dreams: "The sanctuary of the

Lytic Pan at Troizen." "The Troizans had a sanctuary from time immemorial which bestowed prophetic dreams and indicated cures for pestilence." ⁸⁴

Nightmares may well be concerned in this case as well, for, as we shall see later, they correspond better with the nature of Pan than do ordinary dreams. Drexler believes this is not a nightmare but a vision experienced while awake, because it states expressly that the god appeared to Hyginus "not as a dream vision but in the middle of the day." I, however, wish to point out that the notions of dream and vision intermingle in many ways and nightmares are often so vivid that they can be confused with real experiences even by experienced physicians. The facts at the basis of our epigram are most probably these: a shepherd Hyginus is afflicted with a severe physical complaint and about midday lies down to rest among his flock. While he believes that he is still awake, Pan-Ephialtes (the god of both shepherds and hunters) appears to him in an exceedingly vivid dream and by this apparition cures him. The same is true of the incubation dreams in which the god, demon, or hero who lives physically in the temple appears to the dreamer and cures him either by personal intervention or by telling him the therapy. The vividness of the dream sometimes reaches the pitch where the sleeper believes that he has seen the appearance of the god when awake and not when asleep. This is evident in the remarkable story of the cure of Sostrata in the second catalogue of Epidaurus.

In accepting a physical and not simply dreamed apparition of the god, Hyginus is strengthened by the fact that at the same time his animals fell victims to a panicky terror (likewise attributed to the god), and out of gratitude he offers an oblation to the rescuing god for having been cured. Perhaps Pan's appellation Paian relates to him in his capacity as helper and saviour, as the rescuer from illness. The representa-

tion of Ephialtes as a rescuing and redeeming healing-god is easily explained by the feeling of rescue and redemption following most nightmares. We shall see later that nightmare and panicky terror are closely related concepts and are therefore frequently assigned to the same demons.

CHAPTER III

THE OLD DESIGNATIONS OF THE NIGHTMARE

We have by now become sufficiently acquainted with the nature and working of nightmares and nightmare demons to be able to understand their multiplicity of names etymologically, and we can therefore pass on to a short enumeration and investigation of these.

1. The two most widely known words for the nightmare are *epialtēs* and *ephialtēs*, which are related phonetically like *epiorkos* and *ephiorkos*. Another form seems to be present in the name of the Lycian *epaltēs* (Iliad II, 415). Alcaios is said to have used the unaspirated form; otherwise it is considered to be Ionic and sometimes Attic. Moeris considers *epialtēs* and *ephialtēs* to be Hellenic forms, in contradistinction to *tiphus* which he declares to be Attic. The name of the notorious traitor in Herodotus is *Epialtēs*; a vase from Keos bearing a representation of the giants' struggle shows the name of a giant which on Attic vases and in the literature is sounded *Ephialtes* and is written as *Hipialtēs*. Kretschmer derives this name from *iallō* (*hiallō*) and believes that the painter had written or wished to write *Hepialtēs*. As to the significance of this, the ancient and the modern scholars vacillate between the derivations *iallō* ("I send," "I shoot") and *hallomai*. Phonetically both derivatives seem equally valid, but for content *hallesthai* is to be preferred because on the one hand *hallesthai* corresponds much more than *iallein* to the meaning of the verbs used elsewhere for the entrance of the nightmare, such as *epipiptein* (*pēdan*), *irruere*, *invadere*, *incumbere*, *epherpein*, *eperche-*

sthai. The name given to the nightmare by the Romans was *incubo* (-us) from *incumbere* ("to lay oneself upon, to rush upon, to throw one's weight upon"). The name of the giant *Ephialtēs* is obviously derived from *ephallesthai*, since Philostros of Apollo says of the giants: they jump up into the heavens and will not permit the Gods to abide there (*ouranō de epipēdēsai kai mē sunchorēin tois theois ep'autou einai*.) On the other hand, it is employed elsewhere in a similar manner, just as of the nightmare, to describe the quick and sudden attacks of the warriors in Homer or to portray the lightning descent of the bird of prey on its booty. Indeed it even allows of a meaning of *ephallesthai*, corresponding to the erotic character of Ephialtes. Homer uses it in this sense in the *Odyssey* when speaking of Odysseus impetuously embracing and kissing his old father (*Kusse de min periphus epialmenos ēde proseuda*).

2. Likewise the rarer forms of *epi-al-ēs*, gen. *-ētos*, *epi-al-os*, *iphi-al-os* and *epi-al-tos* may be derived from *hallesthai*. For *epialēs* — as testified by Hesychios and Choitoboskus — one is referred to a fragment of Saphron which runs: *Epialēs ho ton patera pnigōn* (Epiales strangled his father). Since we are ignorant of the context, it must unfortunately remain doubtful whether the nightmare demon Epiales is to be considered as strangling his own father or the father of another. In the latter instance it could perhaps be taken for granted that the nightmare demon was originally a godless man and patricide who after his death became a tormenting strangler spirit. (When Aristophanes says in the *Wasps*, speaking of the *ēpialoi* and *puretoi*: "who strangled the fathers in the night and choked the grandfathers," and at the same time indicates that he, as a second Hercules, conquered these fiends, this could be an allusion to the position of Saphron or to these sources.) Alcaios is said to have used *epialos* as closely connected with

epialtēs. Regarding the clearly active sense of the suffixes *-tos* in *epial-tos* I would refer the reader to Kühner and H. Meyer (*Ausf. gr. Gramm.* I, p. 715, *Gr. Gramm.* § 600). Only with hesitation do I venture to name in this connection the form *epialēs* mentioned by Hesychius, possibly instead of *epiallēs*. M. Schmidt prefers to read for it either *epialtēs* or *ēpialēs*.

3. The forms *ēpialos* and *ēpialēs* are more difficult to elucidate. The most important entry on them is found in the *Etymologicum Magnum*: *ēpialos*, *ēpialēs* and *ēpiolēs* mean the agues of fever that also attack the sleepers as demons. Euphemistically *ēpios* is called "Tender One," "Friendly One." Apollonius however says that *epialtēs* is called *ēpialēs*, even with the *a* changing into *o*-*ēpiolēs*. The following extract from Eustathios shows that these words originate from Herodian: "In the writings of Herodian appears *ēpialēs ēpialētos*, who, as he says, is used similarly by Sophron when Heracles strangles Epiales." From these scripts we can learn that on the one hand the shivering fit *rhigorpuretos*, as well as the nightmare and its demon, are designated by the same terms *ēpialos*, *ēpialēs* and *ēpiolēs*. On the other hand it is clear that the words *kat'antiphrasin* were derived from *ēpios*, i. e., were thought to have originated from the striving for euphemism. The duplicate meaning of *ēpialos* and *ēpialēs* (shivering fit and nightmare) can easily be explained from the above-mentioned fact that nightmares frequently occur during fever deliria. (One should mention here the *Paione* — also called *epialteion*, — which is said to be an equally effective remedy for both nightmares and agues.) However, it must for the time being be left undecided whether these words really are related to *ēpios* and can be traced back to an euphemism. It certainly is not

inconceivable that the dreaded demon of fevers and nightmares was given a pleasant-sounding name. One need only recall such euphemisms as "hospitable sea" in place of "inhospitable sea," "friendly night" for "deadly night," "auspicious" for "ominous" or "left" (unlucky signs come from the left), Eumenides (gracious ones) for Erinyes (Furies, lit. avengers), and so on. One may hold the view that in the suffixes *-alos* and *-alēs*, the *-al-* is identical with the root of *hallomai* ("to jump upon") and thus points to the *Ēpi-al-os* and *Ēpi-al-ēs* as a *daimōn ēpiōs ephallomenos*, and thus perhaps the apparently identical parallel forms of *Epi-al-os* and *Epi-alēs* (see above) may have contributed considerably to this idea. In extracts of Greek verse there are several undoubted demons in the form of animals, and I think it probable that in *epaphos* we should see an animal demon, the hoopoe bird.

By far the most important fact we learn from Eustathios is the myth contained in the fragment of Sophron from which it appears that Hercules was haunted by the nightmare (and fever?) demon; he repaid like with like by throttling this fiend just as the fiend had attempted to throttle him. We must perceive in this otherwise forgotten legend a parallel to the struggle — handed down only in ancient sculpture — of Hercules with Gyas (Geras), the personification of old age, or with Thanatos in the *Alcestes* of Euripides. Possibly the myth of Epiales and Hercules is represented on the cameo in King's "Antique Gems and Rings." This is in a beautiful severe style and has remained unexplained hitherto. Hercules sits in the position of a completely exhausted man or a man dropping off to sleep. His head and chest are bent far forwards, he is sitting on a stone (?) with his right hand leaning on his club. Approaching him from behind — it would seem furtively — is a powerful bearded man with large wings who

holds a branch of a tree or a poppy stalk in his left hand and, to all appearances, snatches at the hero's throat with his right as if to throttle him. (Compare the definition of *Ēpiālēs* as a demon who creeps up to the sleepers or attacks them.) Similarly Hypnos also frequently appears in sculptures as a bearded demon. He usually stands behind the sleeper or, less frequently, steps up to him pouring out sleep from a horn. Sometimes he touches the temples of the sleepy person with a twig or poppy stalk moistened with the dew of Lethe. He is frequently winged. It need scarcely be mentioned that the demon of the nightmare, working only in sleep or the state preceeding sleep, or the demon of fever accompanied by restless, fearful dreams (*epialos*, *Ēpiālēs*), must have had a great deal in common with Hypnos (and Oneiros) from the first.

4. Just as was the demon of fever and shivering fits, the demon of typhoid fever (*tuphos*, *tuphomanīē*, *tuphōdēs puretos*), which is often associated with raving delirium, confused sensual dreams (nightmares), intoxication and stupor, also seems to have been identified or confused with the nightmare demon Epialtes. (The sensuous dreams are probably connected with the emissions of semen which Hippocrates had already observed in certain forms of typhoid.) Clearly Typhos, which signifies smoke or fumes, must denote an allied illness, sometimes accompanied by delirium and sometimes by heavy stupor, which in both symptoms is similar to the condition of those who have remained in smoke for a long time and who finally, if not rescued, must be suffocated by it. Smoke incidentally has the same effect on animals as on man. During the fire in October 1899 in the carnivora house of the Berlin Zoological Gardens, the animals were first infuriated by the smoke but then became quiet and stupefied rather quickly, and it was only with

difficulty that they were aroused from this state.

The use of *tuphoō* (which means basically "to surround with smoke") is in complete harmony with this concept, because Hesychius explains *tetuphōsthai* ("full of smoke") by *memēnenai* ("rage"), *tetuphōtai* ("full of fumes") by *embebrontētai* ("dumbfounded"); *tuphōsai* ("to fill with smoke") by *pnixai* ("suffocate"), *apolesai* ("destroy"); and by *tetuphōmenos* we understand a narcotized, foolish, irresponsible person. I should like to derive from *tuphus* ("smoke," "fume," typhoid fever") *tiphus* as equal to Ephialtis, as is testified to by Didymos, Moeris, Photios and Hesychios. That is, I assume that *tiphus* stands for the older *tuphus*, just as *phi-tu-s* stands for *phu-tus* and *phituō* for *phutuō*, because, according to Greek phonology, where two "u"s follow each other the first "u" often changes into an "i" by dissimilation. The ending *-us* seems to correspond to the usual *-eus*, as is seen from a number of vase inscriptions collected by Kretschmer — for example, *Nērus* = *Nēreus*, *Tudus* = *Tudeus*, *Oinus* = *Oineus*, *Thesus* = *Theseus* — and from names occurring in literature like *Hippus* = *Hippeus* and *Nikus* = *Nikeus*. For that matter, it would also be possible to deduce *Tiph-us* ("nightmare") directly from *Tuphus* ("smoke," "fumes") and to assume that the "choking dream" (German: *Sticktraum*) or *pnigaliōn* owes its name *tiphus* to the effect of the smoke which, according to Börner, produces attacks of choking in sleeping people and therefore most probably nightmares. In this instance, *tiphus* would signify the smoke dream (German: *Rauchtraum*). It is easy to think that in view of the poor quality of fire and lighting equipment in the classical period — especially in earliest times — poisoning by smoke and instances of stupor and nightmares (*tuphoi*) were exceedingly common, and every- and anybody had frequent opportunity of observing these upon themselves and

others.

5. The word *ephelēs* ("a ghostly being") was twice attested by Hesychius and considered by him as Aolic. It should probably be derived from the verb *eph-el-ein* which means "to seize or attack." It would seem therefore to signify "attacker" and to mean the nightmare demon as the one who seizes the sleeper by the throat or closes his mouth so that the sensation of suffocation arises. We may recall in this context the Homeric *helōn epi mastaka chersin ouk ea eipemenai* which expresses Odysseus holding Eurycleia's mouth tightly shut. A similar presentation forms the basis for the use of *epilambanein* (compare *epilēpsia*) which is often used of illnesses.

6. The word *pnigaliōn* ("throttling") used by the physician Themison and probably derived from the vernacular is based on a similar concept. The nightmare demon was most appropriately designated "the choker" or "strangler" and, in view of our previous exposition, this does not require any further explanation.

7. We have already dealt with all that is necessary for the understanding of *Epophelēs* and *Ophelēs* ("helper," "saviour"), testified by Soranos and Hesychios.

8. In the old commentaries on Aristophanes (*Wasps*, 1038) it says about the *epialoi kai puretoi* ("agues and fevers") whom Aristophanes attacked as a second Heracles: "Dydimos however says, The demon Epialos who is also called *Epialēs* and *tiphus*." In place of the hitherto unexplained and difficult to understand *Euopan* Rohde wishes to read *Euapana* (with reference to Suidas) which would of course excellently designate Pan, bleating like a he-goat, who frequently appears as a nightmare demon. Among the vase collections in the National Museum of Naples there is one showing an actor or chorus member who is preparing himself for a satyr drama.

He is crowned with ivy and wears around his loins the shaggy apron of the satyrs (*tragoi*) with tail and phallus. A clear parallel to this is the goat-footed Panisscos on the Etruscan-Roman mirror of Vibius-Philippus from Praeneste. Similarly the he-goat *koutsodaimonas* of the modern Greeks who attacks young girls and who, because of his horns, is dangerous to pregnant and post-parturient women, has the voice of a he-goat. Schmidt sees in him a direct descendant of the old Greek Pan.

The following are to be quoted from the medieval and neo-Greek designations of the nightmare demon:

9. *Baruchnas*, noted by Eustathios and Psellos, together with the markedly deviating auxiliary forms *Barupnas*, *Braphnas*, *garupnas*, and *Brachnas* and *sbrachnas*. Sakellarios considers it a derivation from *barus* ("heavy") and *pneō* ("sleep") and understands *barupnas* to signify *barupnous* ("breathing hard"). Politis would prefer to consider it as a combination of *barus* and *hupnos*. The apparently irrational vowel changes are best explained by the noticeable tendency of superstitious people to alter arbitrarily the names of frightening demons because they fear the latter may cause mischief if called by their correct names. I can only say for certain that the adjective *barus* ("heavy") which, as we have already seen, correctly designates an essential characteristic of the nightmare, is to be sought in this expression.

10. It is extremely difficult to establish the etymology of *baboutzias* and *baboutzikarios*, which first appear in later Byzantine literature. The first of these is found in a lexicon as an explanation of Ephialtes, according to Du Cange (*Ephialtes vulgo Babutcios*); the second is testified by Suidas and Mich. Psellos in the work of Leo Allatius (*ephialtēs: ho epi pollou aboutzias*). Since the distinguished family of the Babout-cicoi is mentioned by Genesios in the first half of the ninth century, both these designations of the nightmare must have

arisen in the eighth century at the latest. Psellos thinks that the *baboutzikarios* is an evil spirit that wanders around at Christmas time. Leo Allatius had already related this characteristic to the vampires of the later Greeks: that is, a demon who sometimes appears as a werewolf, sometimes as a nightmare demon with the feet of a donkey or goat, with goat's ears and a hairy skin and in many ways recalls the old Greek Pan and the satyrs who of course also appear as nightmare demons. Psellos has tried to connect the *baboutzikarios* with Baubo, the mother of Damophon, known from the Demeter cult of Eleusis; this suggestion is however highly questionable. Perhaps the name is related to the modern Greek *papoutzas* ("shoemaker"), *papoutzion* ("slipper") which, according to Littré, originated from the Arabic-Persian *baboudj*, *papoch* ("slipper") and has been taken over by most modern languages (compare the French *babouche*, the German *Babusche* or *Papu(t)sche*). It is difficult to explain how the ideas of slipper or shoemaker are connected with the concept of a nightmare demon. It may however be pointed out that according to Grimm a German hobgoblin who is also a nightmare demon is called puss-in-boots or simply "boot"; also as Sartori points out, there is occasionally talk of the slippers of the nightmare demons or night spirits, just as the dwarfs sometimes appear as shoemakers. Perhaps the demon itself is of oriental origin, like his name. This is not surprising when one recollects the numerous and close connections between old Constantinople and the Orient.

11. Of the modern Greek words for the nightmare, *mora* is by far the most widely used. It seems to have taken its origin from the Slavic because the nightmare is called *mora* in Polish and *mura* in Bohemian. Grimm has connected it with the German *mar*, (Anglo-Saxon *moere*, English "nightmare", French *cauchemar(e)* from *calcare* — "to trample upon," "squeeze" — and *mar*

meaning nightmare). *Mora* is an epithet of the Gillou, a demon who chokes children, probably identical with the ancient Gello. The confusion between the demon of an illness causing children to choke (*paidopniktria* – “the one who strangles children”) and the nightmare is not extraordinary when one remembers the *pavores nocturni*, which are on the one hand a pathological state and on the other are very similar to nightmares.

This would seem an appropriate point to append the other titles for the nightmare found in classical writers, primarily in Latin.

12. The name *Inuus* stands out clearly as the oldest of all the Latin appellations of the nightmare. It first occurs in Virgil (*Aeneid* VI, 775), but seems to be used here in the sense of the camp of Inuus. Its antiquity is also emphasized by Rutilius Namatianus. The ancients identified Inuus with Faunus (Pan) and liked to derive the name from *inire* in the sense of *concumbere* (“to lie together”). This seems hardly plausible on phonetic grounds because in this instance we should expect an earlier form *in-i-vus*. It seems much more probable that *In-uus* is no more than a word-form which has arisen from the preposition *in* (“on,” “upon,” “to,” “toward”) by means of appending the suffix *-vus* which after *n* had to change to *-uus* (compare *in-gen-uus*). One has to take for granted that this word-form was employed for the nightmare demons in the very apt sense of “someone squatting or sitting on another,” obviously in an erotic sense.

13. Closely related to *inuus* in concept are the two terms *In-cub-o* and *In-cub-us* which apparently classify the demon as the “sitter-on,” i.e., a demonic being lying on the sleeper and burdening him. It should be noted at this point that *cubare*, *cubitare*, *concumbere*, *concubinus-a*, *concubitus*, etc., were used primarily for sexual intercourse and that therefore *incubo* and *incubus* sometimes have a decidedly erotic secondary meaning.

The use of *incubus* and *succubus* in the sense of “paramour devil” is known in the Middle Ages. Generally speaking *incubus(-o)* and *inuus* stand for an epithet of Faunus (Pan) or of Silvanus identified with Pan (faunus); on the other hand, *incubus* is also found as an appellative of Hercules in his role as the guardian of treasures and even appears once to have been thought of as a demon completely different from Faunus (Pan, Silvanus), who reveals or betrays treasures to the sleeper – just like the Greek Ephialtes – if the sleeper is able to rob him of his headcovering. When *incubo* is used in the meaning of a guardian of treasures, it is well to note that *incubare* is often used of zealous watching, guarding money or treasures, etc.

14. Since the first century A.D. the term *fauni* (*fatui*) *ficarii* is repeatedly found for nightmare demons, as for example Cornelius Celsus in Pelagonius: “The horses are frequently disturbed at night by Faunus Ficarius; they are then afflicted by the most horrible pains and the restlessness often causes emaciation.” Hieronymus in Esai writes: “Certain people call those whom many call fauni ficarii either incubi or satyres or silvestres (wood spirits).” According to Jordanis (who drew on Cassidor), the race of Huns originated from an intermixture of such fauni ficarii with witchlike women; and in old glossaries the Indo-germanic word *vudevasan* is explained with satyrs and faunic ficarii. (Grimm says that the nightmare demons, fairies and witches appear as butterflies and especially as moths whose caterpillars naturally live on or near trees.) Du Cange correctly relates the adjective ficarius to fig trees in his glossary, while Bochart thinks of ficus in the sense of fig-warts (the Greek *sukē*), i.e., the small swellings on the necks of goats and satyrs (*phērea*, *verruculae*) which commonly appear in imagery. Du Cange’s view seems to be supported by Sicilian folk-songs and Greek superstition, where even today fig-trees are reputed to be the seats

of evil spirits. Perhaps the indecent meaning of fig (*sukon*, Italian *fica*, French *figue*) is in context here. Compare also the Greek *sukazein* ("to gather ripe figs").

15. The designation *pilosus* belongs to about the same era as the name *faunus ficarius*. We first meet it in the Latin translation (Vulgate) of Isaiah where it says: "*Nec ponet ibi tentoria Arabs nec pastores requiescent ibi, sed requiescent ibi bestiae et replebuntur domus eorum draconibus et habitabunt ibi struthiones, et Pilosi saltabunt ibi.*" (Authorized Version: "Neither shall the Arabian pitch tent there; neither shall the shepherds make their fold there. But wild beasts of the desert shall lie there, and dragons in their pleasant palaces, and owls shall dwell there, and satyrs shall dance there.") The septuagint translates here: "*kai daimonia ekei / orchēsontai*" ("and the demons shall dance there"), while the Hebrew original uses the word *seirim* (literally "goats") from which we are to understand goat-shaped demons, obviously akin to Pan, satyrs and fauns, who live in lonely wildernesses and call to one another. That in fact nightmare demons are to be understood in the term *pilosus* follows not just from: "Fauni, however, are those whom the people call incubi or pilosi and who give answers when consulted by the pagans," but also from Isidorus (Orig. 8, 11, 103): "Pilosus ("the hairy ones") whom the Greeks call Panitae, the Latins incubi or inui from indiscriminately copulating with animals, often indeed spring forth shamelessly; also to the women, and have intercourse with them. These demons the Galli call by the name Dusios, since they incessantly perform such filthiness." In addition, the old Bohemian commentary of Wacerad says: "The Moruzzi pilosi, whom the Greeks call panitae, the Latins incubi, whose form is derived from the human but ends in the extremities of beasts." We may recollect here that in Polish and modern Greek *mora* signifies the nightmare demon. As regards the

Pilosus, the fact that the fauns or pilosi answer questions put to them shows that they are genuine nightmare demons. Obviously the term pilosi specifies the nightmare demon as a rough-haired, shaggy being. This representation, as we have already seen, is quite simply explained by the rough-haired bedclothes made out of sheep and goat hides or wool. If these bedclothes impede the respiratory orifices of the sleeper, they will necessarily give rise to the concept of a rough-haired, goat-like nightmare demon. Thus we understand at the same time why the goat-shaped Pans, satyrs and fauns necessarily came to be considered as nightmare demons: because in those days goatskins or sheep skins or cloaks made of goats' hair and sheep's wool were used to protect the sleepers from cold and inclement weather.

16. Finally there remain the Gallic *Dusii*. These were first mentioned by Augustinus and were characterized as nightmare demons lying in wait for women. Since almost all the evidence for these has already been carefully assembled by Holder (*Altceltischer Sprachschatz* I 1387 ff.) I can justifiably dispense with reproducing it here. The *Dusii* were thought to live in woods and on hills like the Pans, fauns and sylphs. *Dusius* has now become "deuce." The word *Dus-ii* is probably connected with the Greek *dus-*, Sanskrit *dus-*, Parsee *dush-i-ti* ("misery"), old Irish *du-* and denotes the nightmare demons as wicked spirits. This explanation is in excellent agreement with the epithet *improbi* conferred upon them by Augustine and Isidor. Completely different and, to my mind, less applicable is the etymology given by Holder who would like to connect it with the Lithuanian *dvaese* ("spirit," "soul"), the Slavonic *duchu* and the Greek *theos*.

CHAPTER IV

THE MOST IMPORTANT OF THE GREEK AND ROMAN NIGHTMARE DEMONS

As is already clear from our small collection of ancient nightmares, their creation was attributed to various gods and demons according to their widely varying content. Thus we see in No. 1 of our collection a goat-shaped being, in No. 2 a satyr, in Nos. 3 and 5 spirits of the dead (heroes), in No. 4 human beings possessing demonic witchcraft, in No. 6 a siren, in No. 7 even Elohim, and in No. 8, Pan. In general it seems therefore, to judge from the few ancient nightmares depicted in more detail, that much the same holds true for them as for ordinary dreams: each god or demon — and in fact each demonic human being — is capable of causing nightmares and of appearing in them in his own shape or in another form. But although the number of divine or demonic originators of nightmares — and ordinary dreams — is almost unlimited, it is soon apparent on more exact investigation that there are really only a very few demons to whom the excitation of nightmares was ascribed. These demons have characteristics all their own. The fact that almost all gods and demons are possible producers of nightmares has probably misled Laistner to see nightmare demons in all gods and demons and accordingly to elevate the nightmare to the chief and basic principle of all mythology.

We shall now consider each of these instigators and seek to answer the question: on what grounds has each individual one been regarded as a nightmare demon? or, in other words, how can their relation to nightmares be explained from their other attributes and functions? (I have not considered here those

nightmare demons who seem to be no more than personifications of the concept "nightmare" and of whom we really know only the names, e.g., Ephialtes, Tiphys, Incubo, Inuus, etc., because these have been dealt with in the preceeding chapter. They play rather the same unimportant role as the dream demons in Ovid, e.g., Morpheus, Phobetor or Ikelos, Phantasos.) We shall begin our investigation with Pan who is the best known and most important of these demons. I conceive this God as the divine or demonic prototype of the old Greek shepherd and goat herdsman and as the incarnation of the collective ancient shepherds' life with all their experiences, customs, joys and sorrows.

1. *Pan*. Direct evidence for the significance of Pan as Ephialtes or exciter of nightmares first appears in the era of Augustus; nevertheless, on fundamental consideration of all relevant facts there can hardly be any doubt that the concept of Pan as a nightmare demon originated very much earlier, even in his original Arcadian home. (I have tried to show that the cult of Pan stems from Arcadia in "Archiv für Religionswissenschaften" I, 54ff.) The evidence is as follows:

a. Aristophanes (*Wasps*, 1038): "Didymus says, 'a demon whom they call Ipialis or Typhis or Euapan.'" Compare Chapter III, 8.

b. Artemidorus (*On*. 2, 37): "Ephialus, who has also been taken for Pan frequently, yet shows some differences: oppressive and heavy, he is the same in nightmares and terrors. However, whatever he answers is true. He grants various favors to those with whom he consorts, and he prophesies, particularly when he does not act as a nightmare. When he wishes them well, he cures the sick, but he never approaches the dying."

c. The interesting epigram of Hyginus in which it is avowed that he was cured of a severe illness by a vision of Pan-Ephialtes originates from the second century A.D. See page 41.

d. Augustine (*City of God*, 15,23): "The story is often repeated by people who have experienced it and by some who have heard it from eye-witnesses whose truthfulness is above doubt, that the Silvans and Pans, whom the people also call *incubos*, always carry on shamelessly with women, desire them and perform intercourse with them." We find virtually the same in Isidorus (*Orig.* 8, 11, 103) and Gervasius of Tilbury (*Otia imper.* 3, 86), both of whom are indebted to Augustine. The humorous legend by Ovid, incidentally, which is probably retold from the Alexandrine poets, is obviously based on this aspect of Pan. It begins with the words: "Twas midnight. What durst not wanton love essay?" Compare also Heraclitus (*de incred.* 25): "On Pans and satyrs: They are born in the mountains and not used to women. If they meet a woman, they have intercourse with her. In great numbers they are wont to frighten the women into panicky terror."

The following considerations make it evident that these concepts of Pan-Ephialtes did not originate in the first century B.C. but are much older. First of all, Pan was at all times considered to be the initiator of all kinds of dreams and visions and especially the instigator of violent and sudden terror. Thus we know, for example, from Pausanias (2, 32,6) about a sancturary of *Pan Lytirus* ("Pan the redeemer") at Troas which was founded in memory of the town's liberation from an epidemic. Pan had revealed efficacious remedies to the town officials in their dreams. (The attested significance of Pan as a mantic god and teacher of Apollo in the art of divination in, e.g., the Lycosura and the-arcadian Lyceum, can just as easily be traced back to a dream oracle as to Pan's function as the sender of mania, ecstasy, and *furor divinus*.) This clearly recalls the cure of Hyginus through a dream or vision of the god. The famous adventure of the herald Pheidippides, who immediately before the battle of Marathon claimed to have had a vision of the god on the Parthenian

mountains at Tegea while he was on the way from Athens to Sparta, should presumably also be interpreted as a dream or vision. It then became the occasion for the establishment of the cult of Pan on the Acropolis at Athens. Furthermore, the *phasma* ("apparition") which robbed Epizelus (or Polyzelus) of his eyesight in the battle of Marathon where Pan bestowed victory upon the Athenians by sending panicky terror⁸⁵ was none other than an appearance of Pan according to the unknown informant of Suidas. (Whoever sees a god or the secret of a god against the god's will becomes blind or insane or dies. Compare the legends of Tiresias, Astrabacos, Aglaurus, Acteon, Semele.) Equally Longus⁸⁶ explains various dreadful visions and sounds by day or night which cause panic as "revelations of Pan's anger with the sailors." This is expressly confirmed later by an appearance of the God in a dream that the leader of the fleet had during his midday sleep. How widespread was the concept that Pan when angry sends terrifying dreams and visions clearly appears from several glossaries of Hesychius and Photius which have not been rightly understood till now. Photius (*Lex.*, ed. Naber, p. 51): "because Pan is the instigator of visions causing insanity"; Hesych.: "the emanations of Pan cause nightly visions." The anger of Pan is also frequently mentioned elsewhere, e.g., in the *Medea* by Euripides (1172), in relation to the onset of epilepsy. It can easily be recognized that the connection of Pan with dreams and visions — especially nightmares — is most intimately associated with panic, terror, the excitation of which was likewise ascribed to Pan.

I may be permitted here once again to state what I have already observed for the understanding of this remarkable phenomenon, which is easily comprehensible from the nature of Pan as the god of shepherds and herds: it is an acknowledged fact that even completely tame animals, such as sheep and goats,

are affected by the most violent disquiet and terror which frequently come on very suddenly — primarily during the night — and generally without any objectively perceptible reason. The animals become completely senseless and, as if insane, rush to one spot, even if this is highly dangerous for them. For example, they may charge into a precipice or into deep water and thus some animals or even the whole herd can perish. In Valerius Flaccus (*Argon.* 3, 43ff.), the panicky terror that was fatal for the Dolions is traced to nocturnal trumpet calls and shouts of terror. The description runs: "Men's rest was broken; the god Pan had driven the doubting city distraught. Pan, lord of the woodlands and of war, whom caverns shelter from the daylight hours. About midnight in lonely places are seen that hairy flank and the roughing leafage in his fierce brow." The description ends with the words, "Sport it is to the God when he ravishes the trembling flock from their pens and the steers trample the thickets in their flight." Suidas says: "The terrors of Pan — something which occurs in military encampments; horses and men are suddenly thrown into agitation for no apparent reason; so called because these groundless terrors are attributed to Pan." J. Fröbel writes on this panic of horses, dogs, etc.: "One of the most dangerous incidents that could happen on a journey is a night stampede, or to express myself in the classical manner, the effect of a panicky terror on a team of mules.... The least misfortune to be feared is that one of the mule drivers will be trampled under foot by the team suddenly running away as if it were enraged. All the mules may be lost and the entire caravan perish." Modern zoologists have observed that goats and sheep in particular are subject to this terror, and one may remember also the panic that seized the herd of swine in the New Testament. Tylor writes⁸⁸: "Animals shy and are startled where we cannot see any cause; do they perhaps see spirits which are

invisible to me?" This belief which Tylor supports by several examples demonstrates that not only acoustic but also, and just as frequently, visual phenomena bring on panicky terror, in accordance with the ancient views.

The reader is invited to compare Dionysius (*Roman Antiquities*, 5, 16): "For the Romans attribute panics to this divinity; and whatever apparitions come to men's sight, now in one shape and now in another, inspiring terror, or whatever supernatural voices come to their ears to disturb them, are the work, they say, of this god." These supernatural voices are the "ghost sounds of nature" about which E. Thiessen has recently published a stimulating article.⁸⁹ This is the so-called panicky terror of which the essential characteristic — as affirmed by the ancients — is the sudden unpredictable onset and the dangerous recklessness, heedless of all sense of reason, which attacks a number of individuals at the same time. Hence this is frequently called madness (*mania, pavor lymphaticus*). The Greek shepherds, naturally trying to explain the undoubtedly demonic character of this phenomenon (which, as has been said, frequently affected shepherd life) and to make it to some extent comprehensible, ascribed it to the destructive demonic action of Pan as the god of herds and shepherds. They were on their guard against arousing the anger of the god so that he might spare their herds from madness.

Thus Pan also becomes a god of war because he often sends panicky terror to large groups of people, particularly armies. This played a decisive part in ancient military history, as for example at Marathon and Delphi. The fact that the idea of panicky terror owes its origin primarily to the experiences and observations of shepherd life can also be seen in Aeneas (Poliorcet 27), who states explicitly that *paneia* ("panic") has to be considered a Peloponnesian or Arcadian name, because Arcadia and the Peloponnese were held to be the true seat and

original home of the cult of Pan from time immemorial. For a deeper understanding of the close association between the two concepts of nightmare and panicky terror, I draw attention to 1) the epidemic nightmares already mentioned, which in their effects are fully on a par with panicky terror, and 2) the fact that elsewhere the demons inciting panicky terror are also identical with those of the nightmare. Thus, for example, a description of a stampede (i.e., the effect of panicky terror on the herds in the southwest of North America) says: "The herdsmen call this 'the nightmare' and attribute it to invisible powers, hobgoblins or dwarfs who stupefy the cattle in this manner, frighten them and drive them apart."⁹⁰ It was evidently taken for granted that animals as well as men were tormented in certain morbid states by terrifying dreams (nightmares) and hallucinations which produced panicky terror. The most unequivocal evidence is found in Suidas: "Excitation through dreams: agitated by dreams, animals also fall ill, says Pythagoras"; and in Lucretius who says about the dreams of animals: "In truth you will see strong horses, when their limbs lie at rest, yet sweat in their sleep and go on panting and strain every nerve as though for victory."⁹¹

The pathological condition mentioned here is undoubtedly identical with the one known to German superstition and outright ascribed to nightmare demons. Let us compare, for example, Wuttke:⁹²

Even horses and other animals are tormented by nightmares; the animals sweat profusely and snort loudly and become completely disarranged and have knotted manes which cannot be combed out and can only be burned out with blessed candles or excised by a cut in the shape of a cross. The *Walriderske* (Westphalian and Oldenburg name for nightmare demons) ride on them to their business.

I presume that this very widespread illness of horses was

actually called "nightmares," but for the present I cannot produce any definite proof for this designation. Snorting (dyspnea), sweating and great unrest at night are also characteristic for nightmares afflicting humans, according to Soranus. It was indeed generally believed that horses and sheep suffered from almost the same illnesses as man. On this point see Aristotle:⁹³ "Experience shows that almost all diseases affecting men also afflict horses and cattle." The peculiar belief of the Huzuls that Kaindl tells us about certainly also belongs here:⁹⁴

At Christmas time these small devils (*szczeszlyki, chowanci*) visit the stables and allow the cattle no peace. They ride and jump around on them so that the cattle die from exhaustion even during the night or become very emaciated; moreover, these devils break all the stable equipment to pieces. In order to prevent this, the stables must be fumigated with incense (*ladan*) in the evening and the locks of the doors bound with garlic which keeps away all evil.

Very reminiscent of this is the story of the Leetons — the nightmare demons of the Letts — where:

the horses are said to be ridden by the Maar or Leeton, as they are called, at night so that the horses become very feeble and tired; and they point out marks on some horses which are believed to have come from such riders. They put the head of a dead horse under the forage in the manger, because this will chase off the Maars.

The Romans ascribed a similar illness to a wicked nightmare demon whom they called *Faunus ficarius*. The signs of this illness were emaciation, violent unrest at night, and agonizing pains. The Greeks knew the same type of demon who made horses timid and restless and called him *Taraxippos*. This demon was venerated in the hippodromes in Olympia, on the Isthmus, and at Nemea. As a rule he was considered a hero, i.e., an ill-

natured spirit of the dead, but other interpretations took him to be, for example, the giant Ischenus, other giants and titans, and even Poseidon. The question about the nature of Taraxippos entered a new stage through the interesting essay by Pernice on an old Corinthian picture which shows a dwarf-like, beardless and definitely erotic demon who stands behind the rider at the base of the horse's tail and clasps his very prominent phallus with both hands. (An "apelike squatting" teasing spook is said to be found on a vase from Tragliatella, but this was not accessible to me.) He is almost certainly a Taraxippos. We see a demon of similar build with the inscription *LAI* on another ancient Corinthian slab in which he stands in front of a potter's oven. Considering the erotic character of this demon, various completions are possible; most of them would translate as libidinous, wanton; rake and perversion are also possible. Pernice has interpreted this as one of the malicious 'kobolds' who, according to the Homeric pottery-blessing (*kaminos hē keramēs*), create mischief in the potter's oven by wrecking the vessels. Robert⁹⁵ already considered these oven kobolds to be a type of satyr. This could be correct, although all the characteristics borrowed from the goat or horse are absent in the demon portrayed on the Corinthian slab. As Furtwängler first recognized, grotesque dancers with conspicuously enormous bellies and pelvis and often a huge penis appear in ancient Corinthian ceramics in place of the here completely unknown satyrs and silenēs, who are very like the Taraxippos and this oven 'kobold.' We may, moreover, take this opportunity to recollect that in Sophocles' satyr play "Heracles on Tainaros" helots take the place of the satyr. In the Corinthian satyrlike pot-bellies one automatically thinks of Hesiod's⁹⁶ coarse characterization of the uneducated, uncouth shepherd: "shepherds sleeping in the open, consisting of stomachs only, dastardly scoundrels." When one considers that the nightmare demons of the Huzuls also disturb horses and wreck

the equipment of the stables, the idea suggests itself that the two phallic dwarflike 'kobolds' on the Corinthian picture are basically those mischievous nightmare demons who at times make horses shy or become ill and sometimes operate in the potter's oven to the detriment of its owner.

Compare also the similar appearances of malicious dwarfs and kobolds described by Grimm in his German Mythology. The strongly marked phallic character of these spirits speaks for this interpretation; the characteristic explains itself easily by the unmistakable erotic trait which is proper to all nightmare demons. In addition, there is the observation of the ancients that dwarfs have large genitals. Aristotle says:⁹⁷ "the mule, like the dwarfs, also has a large private part." The presentation of such dwarfs (pygmies) in art correspond to this idea. It is true that the common identity of Taraxippos and Pan cannot be proved. The former seems to have more in common with the satyrs than with Pan because he is still lacking the goat horns and feet which are specific to Pan. Nevertheless we may take it for granted that there was an inner relationship between these two demons based on the common connection to the erotic nightmare and to panicky terrors, i.e., the shying of animals.

On the other hand the reports of the remarkable modern Greek demon, the *Laboma*, who even today lives on in the beliefs of the shepherds of Parnassus, have to be considered as undoubted reminiscences of the ancient representations of the nature and actions of Pan. B. Schmidt says:⁹⁸ "This being is in the habit of mounting goats in the form of a he-goat and bringing about their sudden death. Many shepherds from the Parnassus claim to have been eye-witnesses of this and say that the animals are seized by excruciating pains during copulation with the demon, shriek fearfully and die after a short time. Sometimes the demon simulates the usual call or the pipes of

the herdsman leading the herds and thus lures the unsuspecting animals to himself. Nobody dares to fire his gun or pistol when he is aware of the Laboma because many a weapon has exploded and caused a fatal wound to the shooter." Schmidt asserted with great emphasis the fact that because the Corycic grotto was already dedicated to Pan and to the nymphs in ancient times, and was always a secure place of refuge for the shepherds of Parnassus and their flocks, and because Pan was considered and even portrayed as an attacker like the present-day demon Laboma, we must therefore perceive in the goat-demon of contemporary Parnassian shepherds just one particular metamorphosis of Pan. The validity of this assumption seems beyond doubt, particularly as we have just seen that demons ascribed to the nightmare are frequently held responsible for certain fatal illnesses in cattle, manifesting themselves in multifarious ways in frightful excitement and unrest; we can assume that these demons in such cases rode or jumped on these animals. With the familiar secondary erotic meaning of these words, they obviously stand for copulation (compare the Latin *salire, inire*, the Greek *thornistai*, etc.). As regards the riding habits of the nightmare demons, I refer to Grimm.⁹⁹

In closest association with these views of Pan as a nightmare demon and exciter of panicky terrors as well as certain veterinary diseases is the fact that he was also considered to be the originator of epilepsy and mental illness. Definitive evidence for the ancient beliefs on Pan's relation to epilepsy is found in the *Medea* of Euripides where it says of the onset of Creusa's disease (caused by the poisoned garment of Medea) that to begin with the illness gave the impression of an epileptic attack brought about by Pan, in so far as the sudden rigors, the falling on the ground, and the pallor are the three main signs of epilepsy. The ancient scholiast already summed up the position when he remarked of the words, "That frenzy was of Pan or some god

sent," that "men assumed from time immemorial that those who suddenly fell (the epileptics) were deranged by Pan or Hecate"; recognizing the inner connection between such epileptic attacks and panicky terror and the sudden mental disturbances arising from it, he adds further: "the reason for sudden frights and mental disturbances they ascribe to Pan." Modern medicine also holds that a sudden violent terror frequently produces spasmodic forms of epilepsy, St. Vitus' dance, asthma, and indeed even mental disturbance. Abortion following a sudden shock also belongs in this context. This gave rise to the theory that the demons of panicky terror are dangerous to pregnant and puerperal women and that they cause the feared puerperal fever with its attendant delirium. Aretaeus has observed with remarkable accuracy that many epileptics imagine directly before the attack that they are being persecuted by a horrible wild animal or a ghost and have all kinds of evil and strange dreams as well as peculiar aural hallucinations that remind us of the visual and acoustic phenomena of Pan's anger in Longus. It is interesting that Hippocrates does not mention Pan among the demons to whom popular belief ascribed the origin of epilepsy (Cybele, Poseidon, Enoida [=Hecate], Apollon Nomios (?), Ares, the heroes). The reason is probably that in the time of Hippocrates the cult of the ancient Arcadian shepherd god had not yet extended to Kos and the coast of Asia Minor.

Pan, as author of severe and sometimes fatal epileptic attacks, which occasionally were not convulsive and could then give the impression of death, could eventually become a vicious death demon, as is shown by an incantory tablet found in a grave near Constantine. These tablets were inscribed with a curse and buried in a grave to establish contact with the underworld. The inscription says:¹⁰⁰ "He (the one to be cursed) shall be carried away, so that you (the death demon) shall make

him devoid of feeling, memory, breath, that he shall become a shadow of himself." The rest is illegible. The demon portrayed on the tablet is described by Wünsch as follows: "In the ancient times the demon who was invoked had the split hairy hoofs of a he-goat and was armed with two slings and a hook."¹⁰¹ Loss of feeling, consciousness, memory, speech and withholding of the breath are familiar symptoms of epilepsy, and it is therefore my conjecture that it is not improbable to consider Pan, in the form of the goat-footed demon, as the originator of nightmares and epileptic fits. In conclusion we may once again recollect the view of Soranus that the nightmare is incipient epilepsy. This claim, as we have just seen, now appears to be quite natural and also comprehensible from the viewpoint of ancient popular belief.

Thus Pan finally developed into being an originator of mental disturbance (*mania*). (Incidentally, I would like to draw attention to how closely related the two concepts of mania and epilepsy are.) As such Pan appears in the writings of Euripides, who in *Hippolytos*, v. 141 ff. makes the chorus say the love-frenzied Phaedra:

Hers is no wild ecstasy
Sent by Hecate or Pan,
Mountain-frenzy, Corybantic wandering
By Cybele's power possessed.

The scholiast adds: "Enthusiasts are those whose reason has been robbed by an apparition and who are possessed by the god who has appeared to them and executed his orders." This observation of the ancient commentator is psychologically quite correct in so far as hallucinations, visions and illusions are in fact the surest sign of mental illness and first appear in the dreams of the insane; this fact is in complete harmony with the observation made in ancient times that heavy dreams — and nightmares in particular — precede the onset of epilepsy and

insanity. Thus it can be easily understood how Pan, the agent of nightmares, visions, hallucinations and epileptic attacks had to become the originator of mental diseases. Two further facts contributed to this: the first is the experience of a sudden violent fright, as the phasmata of Pan usually cause, frequently producing not merely epileptic fits but severe mental disturbances as well; the second is the panicky terror of animals and men, interpreted as mania or fits of rage and therefore attributed to the demons who elsewhere, too, induced madness or insanity according to the ancient point of view. This fact is further elucidated by the passage in the synoptic gospels¹⁰² where Jesus cast out a legion of devils who had possessed a man and their unclean spirits entered into a herd of two thousand swine. The swine were then possessed by such panicky terror that "the herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea and were choked in the sea." On the other hand there is the story of Pausanias (X, 23, 7) about the panicky terror which befell the Gauls under Brennus at Delphi in the year 278 B.C., which was actually called mania.

In order to justify further the equal position of panicky terror and insanity in the classical period I should like to draw attention to the relative frequency of epidemic nightmares and insanity, i.e., that a large number of individuals succumb at the same time, which again resembles panicky terror. In the following passage we learn of such an instance of epidemic insanity in the form of cynanthropy or pycanthropy traced back to Pan, where it says of Pan and Echo: "Pan is enraged with the girl because he envies her, her music and because he is ugly. He demented the shepherds and goat herdsman. They tear the girl apart like wolves or dogs and throw her limbs in all directions. The limbs however go on singing."¹⁰³ There is also further evidence of Pan being the inciter of insanity elsewhere. If we refer to Rhein. Mus. 1898, p. 199 we shall find several other cases of this type of epidemic

insanity and also proof that the illness of the daughters of Pandareos (*Odyssey* 20,66 ff.) mentioned by the scholiast was most probably cynanthropy (lycanthropy).

I shall conclude this consideration of Pan-Ephialtes with its expressed objective of specifying as completely as possible the reasons why the ancient Arcadian shepherd god became a nightmare demon — by alluding to the erotic impulse attributed to him at all times and especially in innumerable sculptures. One should remember his rough-haired, he-goat image which he shares with other nightmare demons, because, as we have seen, the usual bedding in ancient times was the skin of a goat or cloth made of goat's hair, which by its very nature must have conjured up the appearance of goat-like nightmare demons in the person afflicted with the nightmare. We may think of the appearance of the he-goat to Sinon, the satyr in Philostratos appearing as a nightmare demon — probably also in semi-goat form — and finally we may remember the Germanic *Bocksmahrte* (lit. he-goat nightmare), the *Habergeiss* (lit. oat-goat, presumably from the erotic connotation of oats; cf. the English "to sow wild oats") and lastly the he-goat as the mount of the Murawa and the Trude.

2. *Satyrs*. As we have already seen, the satyrs sometimes appear as nightmare demons in absolutely genuine erotic nightmares. This is easily understandable because in this respect as in many other ways the satyrs are closely related to Pan whose image they represent, distorted into the vulgar, comical, burlesque and mischievous. The satyrs also originated in Argos. Like Pan, they are goat-shaped demons; their relation to him is virtually the same as that of the little Pans who — as is evident from Wernicke's collection of illustrations on vases — are visually completely identical with the satyrs and are constantly mistaken for them in modern descriptions. The word he-goat is equally suitable for both of them. The position is similar with the so-

called "horned satyrs" who frequently cannot be differentiated from the human-legged Pan. They have the partial or complete shape of a goat in common with Pan, as is evident from their permanent designation he-goat or Titiros (actually a long-tailed monkey) and from their representation on ancient Attic vases with red figures which have been excellently dealt with by Wernicke (*Hermes* XXXII p. 297 ff). Furthermore, they are shaggy and possess an irresistible erotic impulse. These characteristics are all common to other nightmare demons, too. Compare also the satyr Lasios of the Munich drinking bowl, and the names of satyrs found on vases: Peos (phallos), Sybas (sybarite), Stygon (erector), Poston (little tail), Eraton (lecher). In other respects, however, they closely resemble the above mentioned kobolds of the Germans and other northern races, who also frequently appear as nightmare demons. Here belongs their pronounced propensity to all kinds of practical jokes and pranks which they would even play against the mighty Hercules. There is, moreover, their passion for stealing, plundering and deceiving, just like the wicked kobolds are wont to do. The cercops are very similar in their nature. They are also incapable of any work; they are plunderers and thieves. Their lasciviousness is probably expressed in their very name (*kerkos*=phallus). I shall not venture a guess about monkeys' tails because, as far as I know, these are missing on the sculptures, although the cercops, like the satyrs and Pan, are connected with monkeys. Lobeck has combined them with the *kobaloi*, a type of demon in the following of Dionysus, as belonging to the sphere of these burlesque and multifariously spiteful kobold-like nightmare demons. However, at present there is no definitive evidence that they are connected with the nightmare.

3. *Faunus*. It cannot be my task here to prove that Faunus

in his origin and basic meaning is very close to Pan. This is to say that, just like Pan, he is an ancient demon of shepherds (peasants) and herds and because of his obvious similarity to the old Arcadian shepherd was placed on a par with Pan at the first contact of Greek religion with the religion of the Romans. I must content myself here with showing that Faunus became a nightmare demon for exactly the same reasons as Pan. While appealing to the evidence for the validity of Faunus as a nightmare demon communicated above, I shall draw attention primarily to the fact that Faunus is wont to reveal himself exactly like Pan in prophetic dreams and in all kinds of optical and acoustic visions, especially of the fearful variety. How old and widespread was the belief in Faunus as a sender of Prophetic dreams appears evident from the incubation rites described by Virgil¹⁰⁴ about an oracle of Faunus in a sacred grove which surrounded the source of the Albunea. Likewise in Ovid¹⁰⁵ these rites had to be observed if a revelation in a dream was desired from Faunus. First of all, sheep had to be sacrificed and then the pilgrims had to lie down to sleep on the skins of the slaughtered animals in the grove sacred to Faunus. In addition, a coronation with beech leaves, chastity, abstinence and the removal of finger rings were necessary. In most primitive races a frugal diet or fasting is the chief means for securing visions and prophetic dreams, as is evident from the excellent observations of Tylor. This ritual, as Preller¹⁰⁶ rightly notes, gives the impression of being very ancient indeed and agrees strikingly with the Greek customs of incubation. I do not know how Marquart¹⁰⁷ came to the conclusion that the Roman incubation rite came into use only late and originated in Greece. At all events, the most competent authority on this facet of very ancient religions, Bouché-Leclercq,¹⁰⁸

takes it for granted, with good justification, that the dream-oracle of Pan Lyterios of Troizen is concerned with incubation. If this assumption is correct, the parallel existing between Pan and Faunus is increased by an important point.

Even more numerous are the testimonies for the belief that Faunus — just as Pan — displays himself in optical and acoustic phenomena of all kinds which for the most part produce horror. The main passage on this point is found in Dionysios of Halicarnassus¹⁰⁹ and runs: "For the Romans attribute panics to this divinity; and whatever apparitions come to men's sight, now in one shape and now in another, inspiring terror, or whatever supernatural voices come to their ears to disturb them, are the work, they say, of this god." Notice how the acoustic and optical phenomena of Faunus are linked with panicky terror which, after what I have just said about Pan, is easily comprehensible and affords a gratifying confirmation of the explanation I have given here. Possibly the words of Lucretius relate to the acoustic phenomena of Faunus: "People affirm that the peace of night is broken by the noisy ram-paging and play of the fauns." However, it cannot be excluded that this concept is of Greek origin and borrowed from Pan and the satyrs, who are mentioned directly beforehand together with the nymphs. The characterisation of Picus and Faunus given by Plutarch (*Numa* 15) in connection with the familiar ancient Roman legend where Numa overpowers these two demons, says that, as genuine nightmare demons, "they renounce their own nature by taking up various forms and shapes and conjure up terrifying visions before men's eyes. They predict much of the future and inform men about it," particularly when they are sodden with wine and held fast. Similarly,

Ovid¹¹⁰ says of the dream god Icelos or Phobetor: He "takes the form of beast or bird or the long serpent. Him the gods call Icelos, but mortals name him Phobetor." Compare also Laistner's *Riddle of the Sphinx*, I, 62ff, 87ff, 92f, and II, 4f on the metamorphoses of nightmare demons.

Other nightmare demons can also be induced to prophesy and impart useful instruction or perform useful services if they are intoxicated with wine or are seized and held fast. That these concepts of Faunus are not borrowed from the cult and myth of the Greek Pan but are of genuine Italian origin is primarily guaranteed by the very old historic legend of the battle in the wood Arsia where either Faunus or Silvanus — like to him in nature and therefore identified with him — inspired the enemy with panicky terror by nightly acoustic phenomena and thus decided the issue in favour of the Romans. The belief of the Roman people in the acoustic and visual phenomena of Faunus was indeed so deep-rooted that one could even venture to explain the name of the god on this basis: According to Servius,¹¹¹ Faunus was to be derived from *phone* = "utterance," while Hesychios interprets the name from *phainon auton* = "the one who shows himself." Other sources attribute the same significance to the visual as to the acoustic phenomena of Faunus. We have already seen that attempts were made to derive Pan from *phainein* = "show" on the same grounds.

Certain equine illnesses with emaciation and nocturnal unrest for symptoms were also attributed to *Fatuus ficarius*, i.e., Faunus, as a nightmare demon. These have already been discussed. The following prayer of Horace¹¹² directed to him shows that he was generally thought of as both sender of and protector against animal diseases, in particular those of young sheep and kids:

Across my farm in sunshine bright
Come gently, and retire from sight
Kind to my cattle's young.

Porphyrius explains here: "He invokes Faunus who is said to be a low and pestilential god." Compare also Acron on this passage: "the young calves which the Fauns are said to harm most" and Servius: "Horace represents Faunus as injurious, saying: 'come gently.'"

There is no direct tradition that Faunus was like Pan held to be the producer of insanity, but this is not improbable when we consider that the mantic ecstasy or divination inspiration was at all times interpreted as "frenzy" (*furoris divinalis*.¹¹³), just as prophecy through dreams was always connected with Faunus (*Fatuus*) and his wife Fauna (*Fatua*). Faunus therefore received the appellatives *fatidicus*,¹¹⁴ *Fatuchus*, and *Fatuus* ("prophet"); and the oldest sayings and prophecies of the inhabitants of Italy in the saturnal or "faunish" scansion were attributed to him. I have perceived in this a definite parallel to Pan, who dispensed oracles "from time immemorial" and whose prophetess is said to have been the nymph Erato, the wife of Arcas. A collection of prophecies comparable to those of the sibyls circulated under her name even as late as Pausanias which Perieget claimed to have read himself.

Finally, the familiar relationship to he-goats characterized by hirsuteness and a strongly pronounced erotic impulse can be called upon to prove the development of the ancient Italian god of shepherds and their herd, Faunus, into a nightmare demon. We cannot prove definitely that Faunus, even before being equated with Pan, was represented as a mixture of goat and man (that is, with a goat's horns and legs) like Pan, but it is certain that his ancient Roman priests, the Luperci, were called "Creppi," i.e., he-goats, because they were clothed only in goatskins, and

that Faunus himself was represented pictorially in this attire, which reminds one of that of the satyrs who were equally called he-goats. The sacrifice of male and female goats which was customary in the cults of both Pan and of Faunus is of course closely associated.

4. *Silvanus*. The forest god Silvanus arose from an almost identical sphere of thought and experience as Faunus and Pan. The similarity with these gods was so obvious to the ancients that Silvanus was sometimes identified with one and sometimes with the other. According to Probius¹¹⁵ writing on Virgil, the shepherd Crathis fathered the goat-shaped Silvanus with a goat. Aelianus¹¹⁶ tells the same legend about the birth of Pan. The myth is of Sybarite origin; the Sybarites however came partly from Achaia (where there was also a river called the Crathis) and partly from Troizen and consequently from the original home of the cult of Pan. The equation of Silvanus and Faunus is also testified to by Aurelius.¹¹⁷ It seems from the legend of the battle of the Arsian wood that this equation is very old. Sometimes it is Faunus and sometimes Silvanus who is credited as the demonic caller and originator of the panicky terror. The essential similarity to Pan and Faunus is further shown in the fact that, like them, Silvanus became a nightmare demon. This is evident in Augustine: "There is also a very general rumor, which many have verified by their own experience, or which trustworthy persons who have heard the experience of others corroborate, that sylvans and fauns, who are commonly called incubi, had often made wicked assaults upon women and satisfied their lust upon them."¹¹⁸ Again, like Pan and Faunus, Silvanus was held to be an originator of panicky terror, particularly through acoustic phenomena; hence the terror-awakening call in the battle in the Arsian wood was sometimes ascribed to Silvanus and sometimes to Faunus. Varro (as quoted by Augustine) suggests the belief that Silvanus also brought about the terrifying visions and dangerous deliria of puerperal fever when he says: "Post-parturient women are watched

over by three gods so that Silvanus should not break in at night and vex them. In order to signify these guardians three men patrol the threshold at night and first hit the threshold with an axe followed by a pestle and finally sweep the threshold with a broom. These signs show that the house is occupied and should prevent Silvanus from entering. For neither can trees be felled and cut without iron, nor can corn be prepared without a pestle, nor can the harvest be heaped up without the broom. From these three things the Gods derive their names: Intercidona from the fall of the axe, Pilumnus from the pestle (*pilus*), and Deverra from the broom. The powers of these three gods guard the post-parturient woman from the god Silvanus." Augustine adds further: "Therefore the watch of the just would not prevail against the wrath of the malicious god if there were not several against one to repulse him, who is rough, uncultivated and repugnant, as from the woods, with the signs of cultivation which are opposed to his nature."¹¹⁹ (Possibly the "certain illnesses" of the moon-struck [somniaambulists] in Macrobius¹²⁰ partly relate to puerperal fevers, in particular where fatal illnesses are concerned. The belief that post-parturient women were especially endangered by wicked demons and must be protected against them is very widespread indeed.) It was obviously taken for granted that the same demon who importuned women in nightmares also appeared to them in the deliria of puerperal fever and could become dangerous. The same is true of the goat-shaped Koutsodaimnoas of the modern Greeks, who most probably corresponds to the ancient Greek Pan. He has "a very long chin with a beard (goat's beard), his eyes are embedded in wiry hair, and he has the voice of a goat. He not only assaults young girls but is also dangerous to post-parturient and pregnant women because he butts their abdomens with his horns."¹²¹

Not only the post-parturient women but also the new-born infants were believed to be in danger from Silvanus, as is evident from a fragment of Varro: "If the child is born alive and has been picked

up by the midwife, it is laid on the ground to ensure favorable auspices; an offering is prepared in the house for Pilumnus and Picumnus, the gods of matrimony." Servius comments on Vergil, *Aeneid* 10, 76: "Varro attests that Pilumnus and Picumnus are the gods of new-born infants and that an offering is prepared for them in the atrium on behalf of the post-parturient woman to enquire whether the new-born baby is fit to survive." We see here that Pilumnus and Picumnus had to protect not only the mother but her new-born child as well. There would also seem to have been a belief that Silvanus abducted and exchanged children (changelings), which is supported by the superstition still current in the South Tyrolean Fassa Valley that the *Salvegn* (=Silvani) frequently exchange children.

As a final point it is worth noting that Silvanus also corresponds to Pan and Faunus in that he, too, sometimes takes on the form of a he-goat, receives goats as sacrificial victims, and is rough-haired and shaggy; all these characteristics have contributed to no small degree to his development into a nightmare demon.

The old Indian nightmare demons, the Gandharves and Rakshas, show a remarkable similarity to Pan, Faunus, Silvanus and the satyrs. Covered in hides and skins they dance and rage in the woods in the evening; they avoid the daylight; they skip around the houses, braying like a donkey. Taking on the shape of a brother or father, or muffled up, or in hideous deformity, they appear hunchbacked and humped, flabby bellied with excessive torso, black hair, bristly, unkempt and with the stench of a goat. The most effective antidote against them is a yellow, strong-smelling herb — Baja or Pinga or Ayacringi (goatshorn) — which plays the same part as the *paionie* in Greek and Roman superstition. They lie in wait for sleeping women, at the wedding procession, at the first nuptials, and just after childbirth; they haunt the women as licentious, permanently

excited sex spirits with large testicles, and they enjoy killing newly born children. They abide in darkly shaded places (cf. Silvanus) and they are capable of driving women into a frenzy. They are rough-haired and hence compared with monkeys and dogs. Their female counterparts are the Ap-saras, who are comparable to the elves, nymphs and sirens, and are almost the same as the Gandharves.

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE PRESENT WORK:

Ael. Aelianus NA <i>De natura animalium</i>	Long. Longus Pa. <i>Pastorales</i>
Apul. Apuleius Met. <i>Metamorphoses</i>	Macrobian. Macrobius Sat. <i>Saturnalia</i> S.S. <i>Somn. Scrip.</i>
Ar. Aristophanes Vesp. <i>Vespae</i>	Ov. Ovid Fast. <i>Fasti</i> Met. <i>Metamorphoses</i>
Aris. Aristotle HA <i>Historia animalium</i>	Paus. Pausanias
Artem. Artemidorus Daldianus On. <i>Oneirocritica</i>	Petron. Petronius Sat. <i>Satura</i>
August. Augustine De. civ. D. <i>De civitate Dei</i>	Philostr. Philostratus VA <i>Vita Apollonii</i>
[Aur. Vict.] [Aurelius Victor] De. Vir. Ill. <i>De Viris Illustribus</i>	Plin. Pliny (the Elder) HN <i>Naturalis Historia</i>
CA Caelius Aurelianus M.c. <i>Morb. chron.</i>	Po. Porphyrius D.p. <i>De philos. ex. orac. haur.</i>
Cic. Cicero (Marcus Tullius) Div. <i>De Divinatione</i>	Verg. Virgil Aen. <i>Aeneid</i>
Ep. Epidauros E.a. <i>Eph. arch.</i>	VM Valerius Maximus
ERGH <i>Eulenburs Realencyclopädie der gesammten Heilkunde</i>	
GT Gervasius of Tilbury O.i. <i>Otia imper.</i>	
Hippoc. Hippocrates A. <i>Aphor.</i>	
Hes. Hesiod A. <i>Aspis</i> Th. <i>Theogonia</i>	
Hor. Horace Carm. <i>Carmina</i> or <i>Odes</i> Epod. <i>Epodi</i>	
Joseph. Josephus AJ <i>Antiquitates Judaicae</i>	

SOURCES AND NOTES

1. J. Börner, *Über das Alpendrücken, seine Begründung und Verhütung*, Würzburg, 1885.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 8ff.
3. C. Binz, *Über den Traum*, Bonn 1878, p. 26ff.
4. Robert Macnish, *The Philosophy of Sleep*, Glasgow, 1830, p. 130.
5. Börner, *op. cit.*, p. 15 ff.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
7. Macnish, *op. cit.*, pp. 131-32.
8. Börner, *op. cit.*, p. 22.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 12.
10. Macnish, *op. cit.*, p. 125.
11. Börner, *op. cit.*, p. 28.
12. Binz, *op. cit.*, p. 17.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 26ff.
14. L. Laistner, *Das Rätsel der Sphinx, Grundzüge einer Mythengeschichte*, Berlin, 1889, p. x.
15. Macnish, *op. cit.*, p. 136.
16. C. Cubasch, *Der Alp*, Berlin, 1877, p. 25.
17. ERGH, see "Night Terrors" by Soltmann, p. 425.
18. E.B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, 4th edn., London, 1903, Vol. 2, p. 192.
19. Cubasch, *op. cit.*, p. 25.
20. H. Meyer, *Physiologie der Nervenfasern*, p. 309.
21. ERGH, see "Delirium" by Mendel, p. 464.
22. Börner, *op. cit.*, p. 10.
23. Paul Radestock, "Schlaf und Traum, ein physiologische-psychologische Untersuchung," Leipzig, 1879, p. 130.

24. Macnish, *op. cit.*, p. 142.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 125.
26. El. H. Meyer, *Germanische Mythologie*, Berlin, 1891, §107.
27. Börner, *op. cit.*, p. 11.
28. H. Spitta, *Die Schlaf- und Traumsustände der menschlichen Seele*, 2nd edn., Tübingen, 1882, p. 242.
29. Radestock, *op. cit.*, p. 126.
30. A. Krauss, *Der Sinn im Wahnsinn*, p. 632.
(Quoted in Spitta, pp. 236ff.)
31. Radestock, *op.cit.*, p. 126.
32. Krauss, *op. cit.*, p. 618.
33. Radestock, *op. cit.*, p. 128.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 289, n.133.
35. CA, *M.c.*, i, I cap.
36. *Ibid.*
37. Laistner, *op. cit.*, I, 41; I, 52; I, 53.
38. Wuttke, *Der deutsche Volksaberglaube der Gegenwart*, §419.
39. Veckenstedt, *Wendische Sagen*, p. 131.
40. Laistner, *op. cit.*, p. 230.
41. Macrobian, *S. S.*, I, 3, 7.
42. Hippoc., *A.*, III, 736, K.
43. Ar., *Vesp.*, 1037ff.
44. Plin., *HN*, 18, 118.
45. Po., *D.p.*, ed. Wolff, p. 149.
46. Zeller, *Philos. d. Gr.*, III, p.604.
47. Compare Fürtwängler, *Der Satyr aus Pergamon*, p. 30ff.
48. Hor., *Epod.*, 5, 91ff.

49. Po., *D.p.*, 2, 2, 209.
50. Hes., *A.*, 254.
51. GT, *O.i.*, p. 39.
52. Ov., *Fast.*, 6, 134.
53. Plin., *HN*, 10, 136.
54. VM, 1, 7, 7.
55. AJ, 1, 65.
56. Apul., *Met.*, 1, 11ff.
57. Hdt., 6, 65ff. (Loeb Lib., No.119).
58. Pashley, *Travels in Creta*, II, p. 221.
59. see Schreiber, *Reliefbilder*, plate LXI.
60. AJ, 17, 6, 4.
61. Plin., *HN*, 20, 136.
62. Philostr., *VA*, 4, 25.
63. Dillman, *Genesis* 345.
64. Ep., *E.a.*, 26-35.
65. Hor., *Carm.*, II, 19.
66. Kaibel, *Epigrammata Graeca ex lapid. collecta*, No. 802.
67. Artem., *On.*, 1, 60.
68. Veckenstedt, *op.cit.*, p. 109.
69. Kolrusch, *Schweizer Sagenbuch*, p. 318.
70. Perty, *D. Myst. Erscheinungen der Menschl. Natur*, I, 140.
71. Wuttke, *op.cit.*, §772.
72. Lenore v. Bürger, Vers. 28.
73. Veckenstedt, *Lit. Mythen*, II, p. 145ff.
74. Wuttke, *op.cit.*, §404.

75. *Ibid.*, 415.
76. Val. Bühler, *Davos in seinem Walserdialekt*, I, 365.
77. Laistner, *op.cit.*, I, 41ff.
78. Grimm, *D. Myth.*, p.381.
79. Alpenburg, *Mythen*, p.385.
Also, Laistner, *op.cit.*, I, 334.
80. Petron., *Sat.*, 38.
81. Kaibel, *op.cit.*, No.802.
82. Long., *Pa.*, 2, 26.
83. *Ibid.*, 2, 25.
84. Paus., 2, 32, 6.
85. Hdt., 6, 117.
86. Long., *Pa.*, 2, 25 and 26.
87. *Selene und Verw.*, p. 157ff.
88. Tylor, *Anf. d. Cultur*, 197f.
89. E. Thiessen, *Die Woche*, Berlin, 1900, No. 20, p. 878ff.
90. *Illustr. Ztg.*, No. 2821, 22 Juli, 1897, p.122.
91. Translation by H.A.J. Munro, 1908, ed. 1947.
92. Wuttke, *op.cit.*, §403.
93. Aris., *HA*, VIII, 24.
94. Kaindl, *Zauberglaube b. d. Huzulen*, Globus 72, p. 255.
95. see Robert in Preller's *Greek Mythology*, Vol.I., p. 726ff.
96. Hes., *Th.*, 26.
97. Aris., *HA*, VI, 24.
98. B. Schmidt, *Volksleben der Neugriechen*, I, p. 156.
99. Grimm, *D.Myth.*, p.384ff. f.

100. C.I. L., VIII supp. n. 19525 = Wunsch, *Defixion. tabell. praef.*, p.xxvi.
101. Wunsch, *Defixion. tabell. praef.*, p.xxvi.
102. St. Mark 5:1-14; St. Matt. 8:28ff.; St. Luke 8:26ff.
103. Long., *Pa.*, 3, 23.
104. Verg., *Aen.*, VII, 81ff.
105. Ov., *Fast.*, IV, 641.
106. Preller, *Roman Myths*, I, p. 383.
107. Marquart, *Röm. Staatsv.*, III, p. 97ff.
108. Bouché-Leclercq, *Hist. de la Divination*, II, p. 386.
109. Dionysios of Halicarnassas, *Roman Antiquities*, 6, 16.
110. Ov., *Met.*, 11, 638ff.
111. Servius, on the *Aeneid*, VII, 81.
112. Hor., *Carm.*, III, 18, 2ff.
Translation by Lord Dunsany, London, 1947.
113. Cic., *Div.*, 1, 2, 4.
114. Verg., *Aen.*, VII, 82.
115. Probius, *Georgics*, I, 20.
116. Ael., *NA.*, 6, 42.
117. [Aur. Vict.], *De Vir. Ill.*, 4.
118. August., *De civ. D.*, 15, 23.
Translation by M. Dods, II, p. 92ff.
119. *Ibid.*, 6,9.
120. Macrobi., *Sat.*, 1, 17, II.
121. B. Schmidt, *Das Volksleben der Neugriechen*, I, p. 153ff.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL END NOTE

The title page of the original monograph is printed as follows:
EPHIALTES, eine Pathologische-Mythologische Abhandlung über die
Alpträume und Alpdämonen des klassischen Altertums von Wilhelm
Heinrich Roscher. (Des XX. Bandes der Abhandlungen der philo-
logisch - historischen Classe der Königl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der
Wissenschaften, No.II, Leipzig, bei B.G. Teubner, 1900.

The monograph consisted of 123 pages of text (plus a "sys-
tematic" table of contents, i.e., a digest of contents, and an index).
Here, 92 pages have been translated together with most of the 285
footnotes which have been, for the most part, lifted into the text.
The translations of the classical passages have been mainly — but not
in every case — ours. The reader who wishes to pursue any reference
in detail may consult either his favorite English version of the Classical
author or the original Greek and Latin. The references have been
generally adapted to the standard English abbreviations which preface
The Oxford English Dictionary, the *Greek-English Lexicon* of Liddell
and Scott, and the *Latin Dictionary* of Lewis and Short.

The three short appendices that have not been included in this
edition are: I. "The Meaning of the Name Mephistopheles" in which
Roscher concludes that the Mediaeval and Renaissance devil is not
only figuratively, but also etymologically, connected with the night-
mare-Pan demon; II. "Passages from Ancient Physicians on the Nature
and Origin of Nightmares" presents in the light of results obtained in
the monograph, improved texts (in Latin and Greek) of everything
concerning the nightmare in the works of ancient physicians (Soranus,
Oribasius, Aetius, etc.); III. A Latin quotation from Trithemius
(*Annales Hirsaugiensis* II) from the seventeenth century on nightmare
demons which possessed cloistered nuns. Finally, pages 120—123
contain in small print Roscher's "Nachträge", or post-script comments,
internecine scholarly arguments, corrections and after-thoughts to
the work as a whole. It was customary then to include additional
information gathered subsequent to the printing of the first sheets in
a "Nachtrag", so that the work would be as up-to-the-minute and
completely authoritative as possible.

J.H.