

## The Function of the Pellichus Sequence at Lucian *Philopseudes* 18-20

Daniel Ogden

One of the more extended exchanges on magic and the supernatural between the host Eucrates and his guests in Lucian's *Philopseudes* or *Lover of lies* is the sequence concerning Eucrates' own animated statue of Pellichus, which can dismount from its pedestal, heal the sick, and punish the sacrilegious.<sup>1</sup> This paper explores the multiple functions that that tale and the discussion surrounding it play within the dialogue.<sup>2</sup> We will consider: the sequence's positioning and structural function within the wider dialogue; the purpose of its ephrastic elements; the manner in which Eucrates may be seen to unravel his own story as he tells it; Lucian's commentary upon the phenomenon of healing statues; and finally the contextualisation of the sinister threats offered by the statue. First, the sequence itself,

18. 'At any rate the statue business', said Eucrates, 'was witnessed night after night by the entire household, children, young and old alike. You could hear about this not just from me but also from the whole of our staff'.

'What sort of statue?' said I.

'Did you not notice that gorgeous statue erected in the hall as you came in, the work of the portrait-sculptor Demetrius?'

'You don't mean the discus-thrower, do you', I said, 'the one bending into the throwing position, turning back towards the hand with the discus, gently sinking on one leg, looking as if he is about to lift himself up for the throw?'

'No, not that one', said he. 'The one of which you speak, the discus-thrower, is actually one of Myron's pieces. Nor do I mean the one next to it, the boy tying a fillet round his head, the beautiful one, for this is a work of Polyclitus. But forget the statues on the right of the entrance, amongst which there also stand models of Critius and Nesiotes, the tyrant-killers. But if you noticed a figure beside the water feature, protruberant of belly, only partly covered by his mantle, with some of his beard hair disturbed by the wind, conspicuously veined, a real-life image — that's the one I mean. He is thought to be Pellichus the Corinthian general'.

19. 'Yes by Zeus', said I, 'I saw one on the right of the fountain, with some dry fillets and garlands, his chest covered with gold leaf'.

---

<sup>1</sup> For general discussions of this episode, see Felton 2001 and the standard commentaries on the text *ad loc.*: Müller 1932 and Schwartz 1951 are substantial; Albini 1993 and Ebner *et al.* 2001 are rather more vestigial. Of the two German dissertations devoted to magic and superstition in Lucian, Koeffler 1949, 125-33 has a substantial discussion whilst Herzig 1940 passes over the episode in silence.

<sup>2</sup> I hope to discuss the statue's name and curious configuration elsewhere.

'It was I that gilded it', said Eucrates, 'after he cured me when I was dying of the tertian ague'.

'So was this excellent Pellichus a physician too?' said I.

'Yes he was, and do not mock', said Eucrates, 'or the man will come after you in a moment. I know how powerful this statue that you're laughing at is. Or do you doubt that one with the ability to cure agues is also able to inflict them upon whomever he wishes?'

'Let the statue (*andrias*) be propitious and gentle, being so manly (*andreios*) as he is', said I. 'What else do all of you in the house see him doing?'

'As soon as night comes on', he said, 'he gets down from the pedestal on which he stands, and does a circular tour of the house. We all come across him, and sometimes we find him singing. He has never harmed anyone. One need only turn out of his path. He passes by without troubling those who see him. Indeed, he often bathes and plays around all through the night, with the result that one can hear the splashing of the water'.

'You'd better make sure', said I, 'that your statue isn't Cretan Talos, the son of Minos, rather than Pellichus. For he too was made of bronze and patrolled the perimeter of Crete. If, Eucrates, he had been made not of bronze but of wood, there would be nothing to prevent him not being one of Demetrius' pieces, but one of Daedalus' machines. At any rate he too sneaks off his pedestal, as you say'.

20. 'Be careful that you don't repent of your joke later on, Tychiades. For I know the fate suffered by the man who stole the obols we give him each new month'.

'It ought to have been wholly terrible', said Ion, 'since his crime was sacrilege. What punishment did he exact from him, Eucrates? I'm keen to hear, even if Tychiades here is going to be as incredulous as it is possible to be'.

'Quite a few obols had been laid before his feet', said he, 'and some other silver coins and silver leaves had been stuck to his thigh with wax, votive gifts or payments for healing from all the people he had delivered from the grip of fever. We had an accursed African slave who looked after the horses. He made an attempt to steal them all during the night and steal them he did after watching for the statue to get down from his pedestal. As soon as Pellichus realized, upon his return, that he had been robbed, see how he punished the Libyan and revealed his crime. The poor man spent the entire night running round the courtyard in a circle without being able to find his way out, just as if he had been thrown into a labyrinth, until day came and he was caught with his loot. Upon capture he got a good beating there and then, but he did not live very long afterwards, dying in as miserable a fashion as he deserved. His story was that he was being whipped every night, so that weals could be seen on his body on the following day. So, Tychiades, make fun of Pellichus and consider me now to be as bewildered as one of Minos' generation'.

'But Eucrates', said I, 'so long as bronze is bronze, and the creator of the piece was Demetrius of Alopece, a maker of human figures, not of gods, I shall never be afraid of the statue of Pellichus, whom I would hardly have feared had he threatened me in his original living form'.

At one level this sequence belongs to one of Lucian's productive scene-types. In the *Lexiphanes* we meet an elderly but childless Damasias and wife who have a statue of Artemis ascribed to Scopas in their hall. They throw themselves on the statue and supplicate it. Artemis 'nods assent' (ἐπένευσεν), and the couple are blessed with a child. In thanks they make various dedications to the statue, including bows and arrows.<sup>3</sup> This briefly adumbrated episode shares with the Pellichus sequence the features of: a hall in which sculpture is displayed; a statue by a named artist; an animated statue; the statue's cure of a (quasi-)illness; and the rewarding of the statue with dedications. The *Lexiphanes* comparison may prove helpful when considering some of the finer points of the Pellichus story.

### 1. Structuring the dialogue

There have been numerous attempts to define a precise structure or patterning between the various tales within the dialogue as a whole, and these have been thematically based. None of them, however, is either neat or satisfactorily explanatory of all the tales, and we should conclude that although Lucian makes feints towards thematic patterning in more than one way (for example in the collocation of ghost stories at 22-32), it was not his purpose to carry any one grand architectural design through to completion.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Lucian *Lexiphanes* 12. Cf. Bompaire 1957, 624 and Anderson 1976b, 130.

<sup>4</sup> The following are amongst the less convincing schemes that have been proposed:

Schissel von Fleschenberg 1912, 39-42: there are seven narrative-groups, arranged under five themes, and arranged on a hidden concentric principle. The scheme is rightly dismissed by Müller 1932, 23-4, but finds a measure of approval from Anderson 1976, 30 and 33.

Radermacher 1927, 12-14: the tales fall into two groups, one recycling a collection of ghost stories compiled by Heraclides Ponticus (i.e. the tales at 18-32), the other recycling a collection of tales about sorcerers from the far corners of the world compiled by an unknown person at some point in the second century AD (i.e. the tales at 11-17, 33-7). Radermacher's opinions always deserve consideration, and his theory has accordingly been influential. Both Herzig 1940, 17 n. 48 and 18 n. 52 and Betz 1961, 32 and 56 write in his wake. But it is ultimately based upon no more than the broad coincidence between Philopseudes 22-24 and Heraclides F93 Wehrli (at Proclus Commentary on Plato's Republic ii p. 119, 18 Kroll). It is rightly dismissed by Anderson 1976, 31.

Helm 1927, 1755: the tales fall into 9 broad topics (1) healing through sympathetic means, 7-10; (2) snake-blasting, 11-13; (3) love spells, 13-15; (4) ghostly/spirit manifestations, 16-21; (5) manifestation of Hecate, 22-24; (6) underworld visit, 25-26; (7) manifestation of the dead, 27-28; (8) exorcism of ghosts, 29-31; (9) sorcerer's apprentice, 32-36. This breakdown is quite arbitrary, and the unification of 16-21 under 'ghostly/spirit manifestations' (Geisterspuk) seems to be particularly unsatisfactory.

Anderson 1976, 30-3 (with helpful observations on some of the other structures proposed): the tales break down into five pairs: pair 1, snake-messenger and eros-messenger; pair 2, Pellichus and Hippocrates statues; pair 3, description of Hades from Eucrates and then from Cleodemus; pair 4, ghost of Demaenete and Arignotus' ghost; pair 5, the sorcerer's trick, and his apprentice's attempt to reproduce it. This scheme does seem rather arbitrary. Some episodes (more substantial than the Hippocrates one) do not fit into the scheme at all, namely the Syrian's exorcism and the Democritus tale, to leave aside the amulets and Amphilocheus. The descriptions of Hades are relatively minor episodes in their

One architectural feature that may be noted, however, is a large central 'boss', created by the inseting of one substantial tale-sequence within another, both of them introduced by the host Eucrates himself. Such inseting is unique within the dialogue. The outer shell is constituted by the tale-sequence of Eucrates' encounter with Hecate (17, 22-24), and the inner core by the Pellichus tale-sequence (18-21). Eucrates initially provides a vestigial introduction for the Hecate story by advertising the miraculous ring given him by an Arab (17), which, we will discover, he was able to use to avert her (24). He is then diverted by Tychiades' continuing incredulity into the tale of Pellichus (18). The Pellichus sequence ends with a vestigial coda, which cannot easily be regarded as a further tale in its own right, supplied by Antigonus, who compares his own animated statue of Hippocrates to that of Pellichus (21). This leaves Eucrates free to return to the main body of his Hecate story (22).<sup>5</sup> Both of these tale-sequences can be understood therefore in terms of a main body and a vestigial supplement, and the arrangement between the two main bodies and vestigial supplements is chiasmic. The two main bodies can, furthermore, each be seen as a focal centre for the dialogue. The bulk of the

---

respective tales. The attempt to divide the Sorcerer's Apprentice into a pair of separate stories requires a considerable leap of faith, and Anderson does have to concede that the scheme may be 'relaxed' towards the end (he cites a parallel, to my mind unconvincing, from the supposed structure of *Calumny* in evidence). The chief element of value in this scheme is the attention paid to thematic correspondences between aspects of adjacent stories. Note further the criticism expressed at Ebner *et al.* 2001, 37 n. 3, also with a brief review of earlier theories.

Ebner *et al.* 2001, 36-42 posit a quite complex structure in which the principal section of Tychiades' monologue is divided into three main parts, namely 'What spells achieve' (11-16), 'Narrative evidence of the world of ghosts' (17-28) and 'The last hope of salvation: Arignotus the Pythagorean' (29-36). This is highly unsatisfactory: even though these categories are conceived from radically different perspectives, they still leak badly into each other.

The following approaches, however, are more persuasive:

Caster 1937, 329: the tales reflect the unstructured, natural order of conversation. This is an extremely minimal position, but one that can at any rate be defended.

Bompaire 1957, 465: the tales fall into two general groups, those pertaining to magicians and those pertaining to manifestations (the partial influence of Radermacher remains clear here), but there is neither a psychological nor a logical progression between the tales. Rather, they are principally arranged with a view to variety, following the natural ramblings of a conversation with its various interventions (cf. Caster).

Jones 1986, 47-8: adjacent tales are artfully linked to each other, one to the next, by shared themes (cf., to a limited extent, Anderson). The first tale, that of the bitten toe, follows on naturally from the discussion of Eucrates' gouty foot. The following stories pick up the theme of the alien professional: the Chaldaean is followed by a Hyperborean, a Palaestinian and an Arab. The Palaestinian's exorcism of a demon leads naturally into walking statues (this particular contention is surely disputable), underworld visions, and ghosts. Arignotus' tale links on to that of his master Pancrates. There is something in what Jones says here: we can accept a degree of informal thematic flow between the tales.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Müller 1932, 71-2. Eucrates' introductions to the Hecate and Pellichus tales, and his sashaying from one to the other do admittedly underline the fact that the two tales do at one level share a common theme, that of daemonic manifestation.

dialogue is devoted to Tychiades' recounting, to his friend Philocles, the tales he has heard in Eucrates' house (6-39), but this principal narrative is preceded by a substantial opening frame, an introductory exchange between Tychiades and Philocles on why grown men should feel the need to lie, to 'love lies' (1-5); a brief closing frame, a concluding exchange between Tychiades and Philocles, occupies the final chapter (40). It can be seen at once that the Pellichus sequence occupies a roughly central position for the dialogue as a whole (preceded by 17 chapters or roughly 10 OCT pages; followed by 19 chapters or roughly 11 OCT pages), whereas the main body of the Hecate tale-sequence occupies a roughly central position within Tychiades' principal narrative section (preceded by 17 chapters or roughly 9 OCT pages; followed by 15 chapters or roughly 8 OCT pages). In short, the chiasmic inseting of these tale-sequences allows Lucian to link the spatial centre of the text as a whole (the Pellichus sequence) with what might be thought of as its logical centre, the tale-sequence that occupies the central position in Tychiades' featured monologue.<sup>6</sup>

## 2. The tour of Eucrates' statuary

The tale of Pellichus, once properly embarked upon, is delivered with the light, swift pace that is typical of the *Philopseudes* tales. But the substantial, leisurely and dilatory preliminary discussion of Eucrates' statue collection, which ostensibly has little to do with the themes of the remainder of the dialogue, is anomalous.<sup>7</sup> What is its function? I suggest that it has several.

First this ephrastic discussion, situated as it is roughly in the centre of the text, opens up for us the physical scene in which the debate reported by Tychiades takes place, and gives us a flavour of Eucrates' house and cultural world. The physical description of the setting had been conspicuously lacking when Tychiades embarked upon his report. His introductory remarks had been confined rather to an adumbration of the individuals present (6). And one might assume that Tychiades' interlocutor Philocles, being already broadly familiar with Eucrates (as implied by the briskness of Tychiades' first mention of him: Εὐκράτους... τοῦ πάνυ, 'the great Eucrates', 5), had no need of a physical description of his house at this point.

At the basic level, we learn, beyond the fact that Eucrates' house commands an extensive staff, that the right side alone of his substantial court (αὐλή) boasts, *inter alia*, a copy of Myron's *discobolus*, a copy of a boy-statue by Polyclitus and a statue-pair of the tyrannicides by Critius and Nesiotes. We may assume that the statues on the left side of the court balance these in their number and quality. It is unclear whether the fountain<sup>8</sup>

<sup>6</sup> The two parts of the Hecate story constitute what we now term 'ring composition' (Anderson 1976, 31 underestimates the structural role of this passage), a technique which is of course pervasive throughout ancient literature. We might be tempted to think that Lucian's decision to anticipate the main Hecate narrative by bringing forward the motif precisely of the ring is therefore a literary joke. However, there is no evidence to suggest that the ancients employed the metaphor of the ring to describe the technique.

<sup>7</sup> It is also, be it noted, the section of the work in which Tychiades himself participates in the most vigorous exchanges with the storytellers: cf. Müller 1932, 73.

<sup>8</sup> There is a MSS dispute: is Pellichos on the right of the 'fountain' (κρουνοῦ, 19) or on the right of the 'Cronos' (Κρόνου), i.e. a statue of this god. Macleod, Harmon, Albini



and Pellichus are to be counted with the statues on the left, or belong in a more central location. Such details confirm that Eucrates belongs to the super-rich. This is something that anyone familiar with Lucian's world might already have suspected, since the name 'Eucrates' signifies a recurring character-type amongst the stock-in-trade of Lucian's oeuvre. This character-type is that of a rich man with a penchant for dinner parties and philosophers, just as we see in the *Philopseudes*. However, in the other manifestations of the character-type great interest is shown in the succession to the great man by those around him, a motif which seems to be wholly lacking here in the *Philopseudes*.<sup>9</sup>

Secondly, the excursus also allows Lucian to develop the characterisation of both Eucrates and Tychiades further. On the one hand it seems unlikely that Tychiades, who presents himself as a man of intellect and education throughout the dialogue, would not have been able to ascribe the famous (hackneyedly so?) *Discobolus* type to Myron. His tentative suggestion that the *discobolus* might be the work of Demetrius to which Eucrates has referred should accordingly be construed as deliberately disingenuous, one of playful awkwardness, or Socratic irony, as Müller would see it. Such a response may be interpreted to mean that Tychiades from the first realises which statue Eucrates is referring to, but is reluctant to accept his definition of it as 'gorgeous' (πάγκαλος). Or it may mean that Tychiades is indulgently or patronisingly offering Eucrates the opportunity to expatiate upon and glory in his art collection, to preen himself on his wealth, taste and connoisseurship, an opportunity that the rich man at once takes up. He dwells upon the details of the statues he is clearly proud to own to a degree that is quite superfluous to the job of indicating to Tychiades which is the Demetrius statue in question.<sup>10</sup>

Thirdly, the discussion allows Lucian to engage in a parody of the *ecphrasis* technique, which was at the height of its popularity in his day, and which features prominently in his *Eikones* or *Images* and his *The hall*, in the last lines of which he defines the technique: 'You observe the difficulty of the venture, to compose so many

---

(following Macleod's text) and Ebner prefer the former. Schwartz 1951 on 19, however, prefers 'Cronos', while noting that none of the known sculptures of the god is attributable to a famous artist, as the other named pieces of Eucrates' collection are.

<sup>9</sup> (1.) At *Hermotimus* 11-12 Peripatetic and Stoic philosophers are invited to a dinner at the house of Eucrates, 'the great cheese' (ὁ πᾶννυ, just like the Eucrates of the *Philopseudes*, 5), for a birthday dinner for his (only?) daughter, and they argue late into the night. (2.) At *Dream* 7-12 the poor cobbler Micyllus tells his pet cock, a reincarnation of Pythagoras, how the day before the rich Eucrates (ὁ πλούσιος) had invited him to his daughter's birthday dinner. Among his fellow guests is a tedious bearded philosopher, Thesmopolis. During the intervening night Micyllus has dreamed that Eucrates lies dying in a state of childlessness and makes him his sole heir, whereupon he throws himself into the lifestyle of a rich man. (3.) At Lucian *Dialogues of the Dead* 5 Pluto and Hermes plot the premature death of the fortune-hunting flatterers of a rich (τὸν πλούσιον), childless, ninety-year old Eucrates, together with the rejuvenation of the man himself. The *Philopseudes* Eucrates is said to be 60 years old (5). (4.) At *Lapiths* 5 the rich host is not Eucrates but Aristaenetus. However, he invites a range of philosophers, including a Peripatetic Cleodemus and a Platonist Ion, together with Stoics and an Epicurean, to the wedding of his daughter to the son of the rich *Eucritus*.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Müller 1932, 72 and Ebner *et al.* 2001, 124 n. 111.

pictures without colour, shapes or space. Painting with words is a bare thing'.<sup>11</sup> This technique of representing art works, paintings or sculptures, in a flowery and whimsical verbal description, is found most notably in the similarly titled *Eikones* by one of two of Lucian's near-contemporary Philostrati.<sup>12</sup> It was popular too in the novels, and notable examples of it are to be found in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*, Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* and Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*.<sup>13</sup> A distinctive feature of such *ecphrasis* was the recurring insistence on the lifelikeness of these still images, and the suggestion of movement, current or imminent, that they projected.<sup>14</sup> In Petronius' satirical take on the trope Trimalchio crassly contrives to attach the motif of lifelikeness to representations of dead bodies in his own rudimentary attempt at *ecphrasis*.<sup>15</sup> Here in the *Philopseudes* Tychiades applies the phrase *ἐοικότα συναναστησομένῳ*, 'looking as if he is about to lift himself up for the throw', to Myron's *discobolus*, while Eucrates directly proclaims the lifelike nature of Pellichus, *αὐτοανθρώπῳ ὅμοιον*. Lucian no doubt turns to *ecphrasis* here to construct a literary joke, since we are about to encounter a statue that does indeed come to life. This, then, is a restrained version of the joke found in Ovid's version of the myth of Pygmalion and Galatea, in which his rapturous *ecphrastic* description of the yet-to-come-to-life Galatea includes the observation that her appearance was 'that of a real girl, who you could believe was alive and wishing to move'.<sup>16</sup> Lucian economically overlaps his magical theme with the language of connoisseurship. The joke is prepared for subtly. We are reminded of the specific commonplace of imminent movement, although this is not applied to Pellichus himself — that would have been too obvious — but, in Tychiades' mouth, to the *discobolus*.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>11</sup> For further examples in Lucian see, e.g., *Toxaris* 6 (temple-paintings of Orestes and Pylades); *Dipsads* 6 (the tombstone of a man killed by a dipsad); *Herodotus* 4-6 (Aetion's painting of *The marriage of Roxane and Alexander* at Olympia); *Zeuxis* 3 (the artist's painting of a female Hippocentaur); *Ship* 5 (description of the ship). Note also his discussion of the Apelles painting at *On the importance of not placing casual trust in slander* 2-6. For Lucian's *ecphrasis*, see Andò 1975, 16-55.

<sup>12</sup> For *ecphrasis* in general see Heffernan 1993, Becker 1995, Boehm and Pfothenauer 1995, Puttnam 1998 (on the Latin side).

<sup>13</sup> Longus *Daphnis and Chloe* prologue, Apuleius *Metamorphoses* 2.4, where Lucius describes at some length a statue of Diana in Byrrhaena's atrium, Achilles Tatius *Leucippe and Clitophon* 1.1.

<sup>14</sup> For the productive theme of lifelikeness in *ecphrasis*, see, e.g., Homer *Iliad* 18.548, Hesiod *Theogony* 584, Theocritus 1.41, Apollonius *Argonautica* 1.739 and 764; see Ebner *et al.* 2001, 124 n. 109, with further references. Such emphasis was also common in references to Daedalic statues, to which Pellichus is also indirectly compared (19): cf. Morris 1992, 215-37, especially 219.

<sup>15</sup> Petronius *Satyricon* 52; cf. Smith 1975 *ad loc.* The reading *sic ut vivere* is owed to Heinsius' emendation.

<sup>16</sup> Ovid *Metamorphoses* 10.250-251; Müller 1932, 78 adduces the text but misses the joke.

<sup>17</sup> A similar technique to Lucian's is adopted by Philostratus in the *Heroicus*. The *ecphrastic* observation that Hector's statue at Troy is so alive (*ἐμπνους*) that the viewer is attracted to touch it is shortly followed by the indirect suggestion that the statue may have on occasion actually come to life, or at any rate succeeded in drawing up the ghost of Hector. Philostratus *Heroicus* 152 Kayser, where the statue seemingly causes a hostile charioteer to crash to his death; cf. Weinreich 1909, 138.

### 3. Pellichus and the literary, mythical and historical traditions of animated statues

The activities of animated statues in the supposedly historical reports of the Graeco-Roman world are etiolated and unimpressive by comparison with Pellichus' vigour.<sup>18</sup> We are told typically of statues laughing,<sup>19</sup> speaking,<sup>20</sup> sweating,<sup>21</sup> dropping things,<sup>22</sup> falling over,<sup>23</sup> turning to face in a new direction (or rather being found supposedly to have done

- <sup>18</sup> Porphyry and Iamblichus both wrote books *On statues* (περὶ ἀγαλμάτων). The fragments of Porphyry's book are collected at Bidez 1913, Appendix pp. 1\*-23\* (*sic*). Photius cod. 215 p. 173b Bekker preserves the following critical summary of Iamblichus' book: 'It is Iamblichus' purpose to demonstrate that effigies (εἰδωλα) are divine (he classifies these under the name of ἄγαλμα) and full of divine presence. This does not apply just to those which human hands, manufacturing by a secret technique and with the obscure skill of the craftsman, call 'fallen from Zeus'. These, he claims, are of heavenly nature and fell to earth from there, wherefore they came to bear the name. But it even applies to all those that the craft of the bronzesmith and that of the stonecutter and that of carpenters shaped on the basis of openly remunerated manufacture. Iamblichus writes that the works of all these men are supernatural and greater than human understanding. He recounts many implausible myths, he refers much to obscure causes, and he is not ashamed to write many things that contradict what is seen'. Cf. Hopfner 1921-4, i 216 and Müller 1932, 80.
- <sup>19</sup> Laughing: a statue of Zeus at Olympia roared with laughter as an omen of the death of Caligula (Suetonius *Caligula* 57); a statue of Hecate is made first to smile, then to laugh, and then its torches light spontaneously (Eunapius *Life of the sophist Maximus, Lives of the sophists* vii.2.7, p. 44 Giangrande — third century AD). Cf. Radermacher 1902, 201 and Weinreich 1909, 146.
- <sup>20</sup> Speaking: a statue of Juno at the sack of Veii agrees that it wants to be taken to Rome by Camillus, nodding its head and possibly also uttering words (Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Roman antiquities* 13.3.2; Livy 5.22.5-6; Valerius Maximus 1.8.3; Plutarch *Camillus* 6); a statue of Fortune funded by women tells them that their gift is acceptable to the gods (Valerius Maximus 1.8.4; Plutarch *Coriolanus* 37). Cf. Weinreich 1909, 146.
- <sup>21</sup> Sweating: an allusion to the phenomenon by the Delphic oracle prior to the Persian sack of Athens (Herodotus 7.140); the face of the statue of Adranus at Adranum sweated prior to Timoleon's attack (Plutarch *Timoleon* 12); a wooden effigy before Alexander's sack of Thebes (Diodorus 17.10.4); wooden effigies prior to Chaeronea (Apollonius *Argonautica* 4.1284-5 with scholiast); a cypress-wood statue of Orpheus prior to Alexander's Persian expedition (Plutarch *Alexander* 14; Arrian *Anabasis* 1.11.2); statues of the gods sweat as Caesar advances in the Civil War (Appian *Civil War* 2.36); the statue of Hector at Troy (Philostratus *Heroicus* 152 Kayser); the wooden effigy of Apollo-Nebo at Hierapolis (Lucian *On the Syrian goddess* 10); the statues of Apollo at Cumae and Victory at Capua (Cicero *On divination* 1.98). John Lydus *On portents* Prologue 8 refers more generally to statues sweating and weeping. Cf. Weinreich 1909, 146 and Lightfoot 2003, 332-3.
- <sup>22</sup> Dropping: Pausanias 4.13.1 (the Messenian statue of Artemis drops its shield as an omen of the death of Aristodemus); Tacitus *Histories* 1.86 (a statue of Victory drops its reins as an omen of the rise of Vitellus).
- <sup>23</sup> Falling over: the statue of Mitys at Argos falls on the subject's murderer (Aristotle *Poetics* 1452a7-9; cf. Kerényi 1927, 5 n. 23 and Caster 1937, 330 n. 48); the statue of Theogenes of Thasos falls on an old enemy and kills him (Dio Chrysostom 31.95-97; Pausanias 6.11.6; Eusebius *Praeparatio evangelica* 5.34.6-9; see below for further discussion of this episode); the statue of Virtus at Rome fell over in 38 BC (Dio Cassius 48.43). For other,



this),<sup>24</sup> closing their eyes,<sup>25</sup> following the viewer's gaze,<sup>26</sup> or making noises.<sup>27</sup> The statues were not, typically, observed strolling around in Pellichus' fashion. The nearest we come to the notion that statues could be observed in transit was a technique of prophecy in which the statue was carried up aloft by a group of priests and supposedly controlled the direction they took, no doubt the ouijah-board phenomenon writ large. Lucian himself provides an example of this in the *Syrian Goddess*. After speaking in general terms about statues at Hierapolis sweating, moving and prophesying, and perhaps also shouting, he goes on, more explicitly, to ascribe this method of movement to the Apollo (i.e. Nebo) statue there, although he does assert that the exercise is prompted by the statue stirring autonomously in its seat.<sup>28</sup> This was the way that Ammon's statue prophesied at Siwah,

---

vague, assertions of movement by statues: Proclus on Plato *Timarchus* iii.6, 155 (cf. also his *Theologia Platonica* 28 p. 70 and his *On the Republic* 2, pp. 212-3 Kroll). See the discussions at Radermacher 1902, 197-201, Weinreich 1909, 137-61, Hopfner 1921-4, i p. 216, Müller 1932, 79-80, Caster 1937, 330; Koefler 1949, 125, 129, 132.

- <sup>24</sup> Turning to face in a new direction: Caesar *Civil war* 3.105.2 (a statue of victory in the temple of Athene at Elis turns around); Livy 40.59.7 (a lectisternium in which the heads of the gods turn themselves around); Tacitus *Histories* 1.86 and Suetonius *Vespasian* 5 (a statue of Julius Caesar turns from West to East, heralding the rise either of Vitellius or of Vespasian; the reference to Tacitus 1.68 at Weinreich 1909, 146 is wrong); Dio Cassius 39.20 and Athenaeus 521f. (a statue of Hera/Juno turns around, East to North); Dio Cassius 46.33 (a bronze statue of the Mother of the Gods turns around, East to West), 54.7 (a statue of Athene turns round on its base, East to West, and spits); Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Roman Antiquities* 1.67 (statues in a temple change their pedestals overnight). Cf. Suetonius *Galba* 4, where Galba finds a bronze statue of Fortune on his threshold; cf. Radermacher 1902, 201.
- <sup>25</sup> Strabo C264 (a statue of Athene closes its eyes when a city is captured); Ovid *Fasti* 3.45 (the statue of Vesta was said to have closed its eyes as a portent of the birth of Romulus and Remus, but this episode evidently belonged to the realm of myth). Cf. Radermacher 1902, 201 and Weinreich 1909, 146.
- <sup>26</sup> Lucian *Syrian Goddess* 32 (the statue of Hera, i.e. Atargatis, at Hierapolis); we are all familiar with portrait paintings that seem to exhibit a similar effect. Cf. Weinreich 1909, 146. Pliny *Natural History* 36.32 records that the statue of Hecate in the precinct behind the temple of Artemis at Ephesus had eyes so glaring that priests warned visitors to be careful of their sight; cf. Radermacher 1902, 201.
- <sup>27</sup> At Horace *Satires* 1.8 a figwood statue of Priapus splits its buttocks to emit a 'fart' to frighten away witches. Lucian himself in the *Philopseudes* mentions the noises made by the Memnon statue in Egyptian Thebes (33). The statue is described by Strabo C816 and Pausanias 1.42. Strabo explains that the acoustic phenomenon ('like a blow', πληγήν) began when the top half of the seated form was broken off in an earthquake. Pausanias tells that it cried out every day before the rising sun (cf. also Lucian *Toxaris* 27), with a sound akin to that of a broken lyre-string. The statue in fact represented Amenophis III. See Bernard and Bernard 1960; cf. Koefler 1949, 131-2, Schwartz 1951 on 33, Sijpesteijn 1969, 112, Felton 2001, 82-3 and Ebner *et al.* 2001, 131 n.175.
- <sup>28</sup> Lucian *Syrian goddess* 10 and 36-37; the 'Herodotean' speaker also claims to have observed the statue flying aloft, but this claim is hardly projected as a historical report. Cf. Koefler 1949, 125-33 and Lightfoot 2003, 464-5. Anderson's comparison of a scatter of themes across *Syrian goddess* 26, 29 and 36-7 with a scatter of themes across *Philopseudes*

Diodorus and Curtius tell us, and Callisthenes may have said the same.<sup>29</sup> Macrobius ascribes a technique strikingly similar to that described by Lucian to ‘the Heliopolitan god’, i.e. Zeus, although Apollo is oddly credited with the prophetic power even so. Perhaps Macrobius is in part confusing Apollo at Hierapolis. He also seems to associate the technique with the statues of the two Fortunae at Antium.<sup>30</sup>

Pellichus is projected by the boastful Eucrates, in suitably incredible fashion, as having rather more in common with the animated statues that flourished in myth. Daedalus was famous for manufacturing such statues, and Tychiades’ explicit comparison of Pellichus to Daedalus’ creations is indeed apt. In the *Euthyphro* Plato tells that they would run away like a runaway slave, unless bound to their pedestals: the word used is δραπετεύει, which is precisely the word (indeed precisely the same inflection of the word) used by Lucian.<sup>31</sup> Already in the *Iliad* Hephaestus is served by animated golden maids he has endowed with understanding, speech, strength and skills.<sup>32</sup> The blurring of the distinction between the typical ‘historical’ phenomenon and myth of course aids the ridicule.

Eucrates to a certain extent seems to contradict himself, to tell a different story even as he speaks, ‘like Eurycles’.<sup>33</sup> He contrives to give the impression that for all his bold assertions about Pellichus’ vigorous night-time activities, his evidence for them really consists of no more than the occasional unremarkable noises heard about the house by night. The key passage is the brief one in which Eucrates addresses Pellichus’ bathing (19): ‘Indeed, he often bathes and plays around all through the night, with the result that one can hear the splashing of the water’. In the first instance this is seemingly a dig on Lucian’s part against the practice of giving ritual baths to statues.<sup>34</sup> But it has more work to do. Eucrates supplies this information in response to Tychiades’ question, ‘What else

---

13, 15 and 18-20 (statues of Combabus and Pellichus; use of bronze to frighten ‘spirits’; ‘solo’ flights) seems a little arbitrary (1976, 69).

<sup>29</sup> Siwah: Diodorus 17.50; Curtius 4.7.23-24; Callisthenes *FGH* 124 F14 (at Strabo C814: νεύμασι καὶ συμβόλοις); cf. Lightfoot 2003, 465.

<sup>30</sup> Heliopolis (?) and Antium: Macrobius *Saturnalia* 1.23.13; cf. Lightfoot 2003, 464-5.

<sup>31</sup> Plato *Meno* 97; cf. *Euthyphro* 11c. For the animated statues of Daedalus, see further Euripides *Hecabe* 836-40 and *Eurystheus* F188 Nauck; Cratinus *Thracians* F75 K-A; Plato Comicus F188 K-A; Aristotle *De anima* 406b15-22 and *Politics* 1.4; Diodorus 4.76. Cf. Morris 1992, 215-37, where most of these passages are discussed; see also Kassel 1991, 143-5, Albini 1993, 100 n. 43, Ebner *et al.* 2001, 126 n. 120 and Felton 2001, 79-80.

<sup>32</sup> Homer *Iliad* 18.417-421; cf. Bruce 1913, 2, Müller 1932, 101-02 (where the reference is wrongly given), Anderson 1976, 25, Faraone 1992, 18-26 and Ebner *et al.* 2001, 55.

<sup>33</sup> Plato *Sophist* 252c.

<sup>34</sup> The hero Eunostus was said to be seen going down from his heroon to the sea to bathe, according to Plutarch *Greek Questions* 40 (*Moralia* 300f-301a). Dio Cassius 48.43 tells that in 38 BC, after the statue of Virtus at Rome fell on its face, the Sibylline books were found to prescribe that it should be taken to the sea and purified in its waters. The notion that Lucian is talking about ritual statue-bathing at *On the Syrian goddess* 33 (cf. 12-13 and 48), where he speaks about the twice-yearly visits to the sea of the σημεῖον statue (variously identified as Dionysus, Deucalion and Semiramis), as found in Weinreich 1909, 139, Koefler 1949, 125, 129, 132, Schwartz 1951 on 19 and Ebner *et al.* 2001, 50, does not survive scrutiny of the exegesis provided by Lightfoot 2003 *ad locc.*

do all of you in the house see (ὁρᾶτε) him doing?', and the notion that he is talking about something that he or someone else has actually seen is reinforced by the immediately preceding reference to 'those who see him [sc. Pellichus]' (τοὺς ἰδόντας), although this is in the context of a generalising principle rather than a report of a specific sighting. The claim about the resulting hearing of the plashing of the water, while acceptable enough on a casual read-through, is reduced to unintelligibility upon scrutiny. Why should it be remarkable that one should be able to hear Pellichus taking a bath if one is watching him do it anyway? The point, we realise, is that Eucrates has never seen him in his bath after all. The only evidence for his baths are the plashing noises that are heard by night. And Lucian gives us all the clue we need to the true and unremarkable source of these noises, for he allows Tychiades, finally identifying the statue of Pellichus, to observe that it is located next to the fountain. And if we look back at the intervening claim, we see that this too is primarily aural: members of the household 'encounter' (ἐντυγχάνομεν) Pellichus, but they encounter him specifically in the act of singing (ᾄδουσι). Again we are given the idea that overheard snatches of song merely caught during the night are over-ambitiously ascribed to Pellichus. We may compare the way in which Eucrates similarly offers us ways to read him against himself in telling us the story of the visit of his wife Demaenete. She appeared to him as he was reading 'Plato's book on the soul' (i.e. the *Phaedo*) on the couch, and disappeared when the lapdog underneath the couch barked (27-28). Was the ghost frightened back to the underworld by this little agent of Cerberus, as Eucrates suggests, or has he merely fallen asleep while reading, entered a dream appropriate to his book's subject matter, and then been rudely awakened out of his dream by the dog's bark?

There is perhaps a related fudge in the parallel scene with a potentially animated statue in Lucian's *Lexiphanes*. There the statue of Artemis that cures Damasia and his wife of their childlessness is ostensibly said to 'nod assent' to them as they beseech it (ἐπένευσεν).<sup>35</sup> But here too it is not clear that animation is fully asserted for the statue. The statue has itself been referred to directly as the goddess, and it is she who is the subject of the verb, so that the phrase could be construed as meaning that the nod is given not by the statue itself but by the remote, ethereal Artemis it embodies. Or again the term could be construed here in its derived meaning of 'assent' without literal dependence upon its original meaning of 'nodding downwards'.

#### 4. Healing statues

Lucian himself puts mention of two other healing statues into the mouth of Momus in his *Assembly of the gods*,<sup>36</sup>

That's why you don't have any support any more, Apollo, because every stone and altar now gives out oracles, once drenched in olive oil and garlanded, and once it has found a sorcerer/charlatan (γόης), and there are a great many men of that sort. Even the statue of Polydamas the athlete now cures the fevered at Olympia, and Theogenes does the same in Thasos. (Lucian *Assembly of the gods*, 12)

<sup>35</sup> Lucian *Lexiphanes* 12.

<sup>36</sup> Caster 1937, 330 n. 48; Schwartz 1951 on 19; Albin 1993, 100 n. 40; Ebner *et al.* 2001, 49.

This text appears to shed some light on the Pellichus sequence, with its similar themes or commonplaces. Again specific attention is drawn to the statues' supposed ability to cure agues, and again scorn is expressed that mere statues should demand divine honours (cf. *Philopseudes* 21). These honours include the garlands Pellichus enjoys. The notion that, in Lucian's world at any rate, such statues are typically sponsored by charlatan sorcerers helps to explain how Pellichus deserves his place in the *Philopseudes*, alongside the Babylonian Chaldaean, the Hyperborean mage, the Syrian from Palaestine, the Arab and the Egyptian Pancrates.

It is perhaps more than coincidence that the famous healing statues named in the *Assembly* were both fine pancratiast athletes and exceptional physical specimens. Pausanias preserves our principal account of the magnificent exploits of Theogenes in life and in death. He tells us that he has numerous statues amongst Greeks and barbarians, and that he has curative powers, which seems to imply that these powers are focused through the statues.<sup>37</sup> We owe our information about Po(u)lydamas of Scotussa to Pausanias too, although he has nothing to say of the healing powers of this man's statue. He was the biggest man to have lived, 'heroes' aside. He killed a lion on Mt. Olympus. He held onto a massive bull by the hoof, and it only eventually escaped from him by leaving its hoof in his hand. He could hold back a chariot. He died holding up the roof of a collapsing cave so that his companions could escape from it.<sup>38</sup> As such they were both shining paradigms of health and could be held able to share this happy condition with others. As overweight, bald and inflamed of vein, Pellichus is a parody of such statues. He is supremely unfit and in no position to impart health to anyone.

It is hard to believe that the hated Peregrinus-Proteus is far from Lucian's thoughts here. Statues of Peregrinus do not feature explicitly in a comparable role in his oeuvre, but he does tell us at one point that the latter's daemon, encountered by night, was taken to heal quartan agues, and, at another point, that many statues were set up to him around the Greek world.<sup>39</sup> An important passage of Athenagoras, written between 176 and 189 AD, helps us to join the dots between these two facts. He tells us that Peregrinus' statues were held to give out cures and oracles.<sup>40</sup> This connection, incidentally, gives us our best clue as to how Pellichus is to be construed as effecting his cures, namely via a sort of informal incubation method. Alternative possibilities are that Eucrates simply prayed to the statue in the fashion of Lucian's Damasias in the *Lexiphanes*,<sup>41</sup> or, as Müller notes, that Eucrates would offer Pellichus vows of the sort, 'If you heal me, I will gild you'.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>37</sup> Pausanias 6.11; cf. Weinreich 1909, 142-4, Müller 1932, 77, Koefler 1949, 127-8 and 130-1 and Felton 2001, 79. For general discussion of Theogenes, see Pouilloux 1954, i 62-105 and, more generally, Bohringer 1979.

<sup>38</sup> Pausanias 6.5; Caster 1937, 330 n. 48.

<sup>39</sup> Lucian *Peregrinus* 38 and 41; cf. Weinreich 1909, 141-2, Hornsby 1933, 77-8, Schwartz 1951 *ad locc.*, Anderson 1976, 26 and Jones 1985, 41.

<sup>40</sup> Athenagoras *Legatio* 26.3-4. See further below on this text. For other general claims about statues giving out oracles, see Proclus on Plato *Timarchus* iii.6, 155.

<sup>41</sup> Lucian *Lexiphanes* 12.

<sup>42</sup> Müller 1932, 77-8. Schwartz 1951 on 19 compares *Scythian* 2, where Demaenete dreams that the hero Anacharsis visits her with the cure for the plague gripping the city; thenceforth the city gives him sacrifices at his tomb in gratitude; cf. also Ebner *et al.* 2001, 49, where the reference is mistakenly given as *Anacharsis* 2.

### 5. The statue's threats

The power of Pellichus to inflict suffering, which, amid the jaunty narrative and discussion, is yet successfully conveyed as something rather sinister (even if it is only a figment of Eucrates' imagination), is approached in three ways. First, Eucrates pointedly suggests it by asking the scornful Tychiades, 'Or do you doubt that one with the ability to cure agues is also able to inflict them upon whomever he wishes?' (19). The notion that healing statues could reverse their powers appears to have been a commonplace. It is stated more categorically in the *Asclepius* ascribed to Hermes Trismegistus,<sup>43</sup>

Animated statues, filled with the ability to perceive and with spirit and accomplishing deeds so great and of such a kind, statues that have foreknowledge of the future and predict it by means of the lot, a prophet, dreams and other means, imposing illnesses upon men and curing them again... (*Asclepius* 24)

The normally healing statue of Theogenes seemingly induced sterility in the Thasians when it was dumped into the sea.<sup>44</sup> We are not explicitly told that the statue of Euthycles of Locri could heal but, when it was mutilated, Zeus or Apollo sent a great plague or sterility upon the Locrians.<sup>45</sup>

Secondly, Eucrates makes the following observation on the eventuality of bumping into Pellichus during his nocturnal wanderings (19): 'We all come across him, and sometimes we find him singing. He has never harmed anyone. One need only turn out of his path. He passes by without troubling onlookers'. For all the broadly positive nature of this message, it carries a sinister undertone, and the threat seems to lurk that Pellichus may turn aggressive if not permitted to go about as he pleases, or if interfered with. It is difficult to contextualise this notion from statue lore as such. The best context seems rather to be offered by ghost lore. Pausanias, Lucian's rough contemporary, speaks of the ghosts of Marathon,

All night long there one can hear the sound of horses neighing and men at war. It has never been good for anyone to go there in the deliberate attempt to get a clear look, but the anger of the demons is not directed against those that find themselves there accidentally and for some other reason. These demons receive worship from the Marathonians, who identify them as the heroes that died in the battle... The Athenians claim that they gave the Medes due burial, it being universal religious practice to conceal bodies in the earth, but I could find no trace of a tomb. There was neither any barrow nor any other marker there to be seen, but they evidently took them and threw them carelessly into a pit. (Pausanias 1.32.4-5)

Innocent passers-by need not worry, but trouble awaits those who deliberately interfere. The Marathon phenomenon in fact has more in common with Pellichus' circumstances

<sup>43</sup> Weinreich 1909, 145, Müller 1932, 77 and 80; Copenhaver 1992, 238; Kroll 1914, 90-5. Already at the beginning of *Iliad* 1 healing Apollo is besought to send disease into the Greek camp; cf. Ebner *et al.* 2001, 125 n. 116; see, more generally, Weinreich 1909, 147-61.

<sup>44</sup> Pausanias 6.11.

<sup>45</sup> Callimachus F84-5 Pf. with Diegesis.



than first appears. Both occur by night.<sup>46</sup> The manifestation of the Marathon demons is, as is quite clear, entirely through the medium of sound: one hears horses neighing and men at war. Similarly, as we have seen, a careful reading suggests that even in Eucrates' feverishly over-active imagination the evidence for Pellichus' nocturnal activities away from his pedestal is principally aural, and that this similarly consists of two sounds (19).

The Marathon comparison may suggest that Pellichus is here being assimilated to a ghost. Pausanias evidently connects the Marathonian phenomenon with the ghosts of those in not one but two of the principal categories of ghostly restlessness: those dead by violence and those deprived of due burial.<sup>47</sup> And this certainly suits the nighttime context of his activities. It is clear that there were people about who considered 'animated' statues to be inhabited by the ghosts of the subjects represented. It was precisely against such a belief that Athenagoras, also writing at roughly the same time as Lucian, adduced the case of the statue of Neryllinus at Alexandria Troas, which was already performing its miracles prior to the death of its subject.<sup>48</sup>

The third indication of Pellichus' power to inflict suffering, his maddening and eventual killing of the slave by means of a supernatural whipping, is more explicit and more terrible. Both the act of the infliction of madness by the statue and the supernatural whipping can be contextualised separately in a relatively easy fashion. Diodorus, for example, preserves a striking example of the former for us. He tells how Medea contrived to send madness upon the house of Pelias by inserting magical herbs into a statue of Artemis. Medea then takes advantage of the universal bewilderment to have Pelias' daughters kill him.<sup>49</sup>

An example of a similar killing by means of a supernatural whipping is found in the well known witch story of Petronius' *Satyricon*. The body-snatching witches mete out their beating to the Cappadocian slave who (unsuccessfully) attempts to ward them off from the body of his master's dead favourite:<sup>50</sup>

Whilst his pitiful mother was mourning over him, and many of us were feeling miserable about it, the witches (*strigae*) suddenly started to screech. You would have thought it was a dog chasing a hare. We had at that time a Cappadocian slave, tall, quite daring, and strong. He boldly drew his sword and ran out of the door, carefully binding up his left

<sup>46</sup> Athenaeus 461c: 'Heroes are held to be difficult and wont to strike out, and more by night than by day'. Cf. Schuster 1930, 169.

<sup>47</sup> The standard statements of the principle are found at Homer *Iliad* 23.62-76, Virgil *Aeneid* 6.425-30 and Tertullian *De anima* 56-7; cf. Vrugt-Lentz 1960.

<sup>48</sup> Athenagoras *Legatio pro Christ.* 26.3-4, writing between 176 and 189 AD. The fundamental exegesis of this passage by Jones 1985 allows us to know that the Neryllinus in question was a *flamen* under Antoninus Pius. Cf. also Weinreich 1909, 140-1; Müller 1932, 77; Hornsby 1933, 77-8; Schwartz 1951 on 19; Hall 1981, 217-18; Jones 1986, 49.

<sup>49</sup> Diodorus 4.51. Cf. Faraone 1992, 100-01. The themes of Medea, statues and madness are also associated at Apollodorus 1.9.26. Here Medea destroys the animated statue of Talos by turning him mad (thus sending the madness into rather than out of the statue). For other examples of maddening statues, see Pausanias 3.16.9 (Astrabacus and Alopecus turned mad by the statue of Artemis Ortheia) and Aelian *History of animals* 14.18 (a bronze mare at Olympia, in which Hippomanes had been concealed, which drives real mares mad).

<sup>50</sup> As noted by Jones 1986, 49; cf. also Betz 1961, 177-8 and Ebner *et al.* 2001, 50. For discussion of Petronius' 'evil hand' in a folklore context, see Schuster 1930, 168-71.

hand in place of a shield. He ran one of the women through the middle, round about here – gods preserve the part of my body I indicate. We heard a groan, but – honestly, I won't lie – we did not actually see them. Our great hulk of a man returned within and threw himself down on the bed. His whole body was black and blue, as if he'd been beaten with whips (this was obviously because an evil hand had touched him)... But that hulking man never properly recovered after this adventure, and indeed he went mad and died a few days later. (Petronius *Satyricon* 63)

This tale in fact shares a significant number of motifs with the Pellichus story: in both cases the victim is a slave of specified ethnicity;<sup>51</sup> in both cases the slave is initially successful in defying the supernatural powers; in both cases the slave's body is subject to a supernatural whipping; in both cases the slave is maddened; in both cases the slave dies after a short interval. The text of Petronius explains that the cause of the invisible whipping was the touch of an 'evil hand' (*mala manus*), although it is possible that this explanation originates with a scholiastic intrusion rather than with Petronius himself.<sup>52</sup> We may also be confident that this was the cause of the madness too, since when Plautus' *Amphitruo* judges his slave Sosia to be raving mad as he tells him of meeting his double, he observes that 'some evil has been applied to this man with an evil hand (*mala... manu*).'<sup>53</sup>

On the face of it then, Lucian has combined two rather distinct motifs here in his story of Pellichus: that of statue-inflicted madness and that of 'evil-hand' whipping punishment. I suggest that the prompt for this amalgamation grew out of the prevalence of whipping-imagery in statue cults and associated tales. First, Pan. He was a deity more tightly grounded in his own statues than many. He was, famously, a maddening deity, the author of the 'panic' named for him, although admittedly no text derives the madness he inflicted explicitly from his statues.<sup>54</sup> Now in Arcadia his effigies were whipped with squills after an unsuccessful hunt, apparently a gesture to avert sterility.<sup>55</sup> Of particular interest is a question posed by Hector to his troops in the *Rhesus*: 'But are you in a state of fear induced by the trembling whip of Pan?' (ἀλλ' ἦ Κρονίου Πανὸς τρομερᾶ/ μᾶστιγι φοβῆῃ;).<sup>56</sup> This unexpected inversion, in which Pan gives out as opposed to receives the whipping, and the whipping is itself the mechanism by which he inflicts his madness, brings us particularly close to the world of Pellichus.

Secondly, we return to the healing statue of Theogenes. According to an evidently mythical story related by Pausanias, after Theogenes' death one of his enemies whipped

<sup>51</sup> Schwartz 1951 on 20 asserts, without explicit justification, that the Libyan slave maddened by Pellichus should be compared with the Libyan amulet-sage of chapter 7. But it is difficult to see any meaningful similarity between the two characters beyond their Libyaness.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Smith 1975 *ad loc.*

<sup>53</sup> Plautus *Amphitruo* 605. For discussion of Petronius' 'evil hand' in a folklore context, see Schuster 1930, 168-71. He compares the death of Sir Oluf in a Danish folktale. After receiving a blow from the daughter of the fairy king the hero becomes discoloured at the point of contact, and generally pallid. He is expressly told that he only has one more day to live, and indeed he lives on only a short time before dying.

<sup>54</sup> Euripides *Medea* 1173, *Hippolytus* 141-142, Aeneas Tacticus 27; cf. Boardman 1997, 923. Cf. Borgeaud 1988, 88-116.

<sup>55</sup> Scholiast Theocritus 7.108.

<sup>56</sup> [Euripides] *Rhesus* 36-37.

his bronze statue until it fell on him and killed him. By way of punishment, the Thasians dumped the statue in the sea. But then they were afflicted with sterility until they retrieved and re-erected it, offering sacrifices to it as to a god.<sup>57</sup> Here again then we have an association between a healing statue and a whipping, which may or may not have had some cultic correlate. Does Pellichus therefore punish the offending Libyan with a variety of punishment typically received by statues themselves?

Thirdly, the myth of Astrabacus and Alopecus is likely to have been one of particular antiquity, but it is preserved for us only by Pausanias. These two young men discovered what was to become Sparta's statue of Artemis Orthia, bound in withies. Upon untying it, it sent upon them the madness that the withies had contained within it (whipping and withies alike, it seems, can contain destructive forces).<sup>58</sup> But then in historical times this effigy was worshipped in a 'robber game' in which youths attempted to steal cheeses from the goddess' altar while being whipped. Are we to think that the Libyan slave was the victim of a sort of supernatural robber game as he attempted to steal Pellichus' obols?<sup>59</sup> Such thematic associations between statues and whipping may, I suggest, have prompted Lucian to blend the evil-hand motif into his treatment of the 'animated statue' theme.

## 6. Conclusions

The Pellichus-sequence, alongside the Hecate-sequence within which it is inset, forms a central 'boss' for the *Philopseudes*, which brings the central episode of the dialogue as a whole into counterpoise with the central episode of Tychiades' protracted monologue. We are offered the opportunity, appropriate at this central point, to see something of the wider context of Eucrates' party: not only do we learn something of its physical setting (information hitherto oddly withheld) but we also learn something of the subtleties of the relationship between Tychiades and Eucrates.

The sequence constructs a joking association between its magical tale and the ephrastic commonplace of statues looking as though they are about to come to life. The claims Eucrates makes for Pellichus' vigorous degree of animation appeal more to the divinely animated statues of remote myth than they do to more supposedly historical reports of statue movement, in which cases the degree of observable movement was characteristically meagre, and so smack of an absurd degree of exaggeration. Two clues in Eucrates' account of Pellichus' exploits invite us to consider that he has cooked the story of Pellichus' nocturnal activities up out of the banal sounds of the night.

In his healing aspect Pellichus may constitute a cynical comment upon the statues of Peregrinus. Elsewhere in Lucian's work healing statues represent superb physical specimens. Pellichus' manifestly unfit physical condition no doubt undermines the claim made for him that he can cure agues. The sinister threats that the statue of Pellichus is held to embody salutes a number of beliefs about statues. In particular, the need to avoid delib-

<sup>57</sup> Pausanias 6.11.

<sup>58</sup> Pausanias 3.16.9-11. We are similarly told that, according to some accounts, the daughters of Proetus were turned mad for disparaging a wooden statue of Hera: Apollodorus *Bibliotheca* 2.2.2; cf. Weinreich 1909, 138.

<sup>59</sup> Note also that whilst Astrabacus was a muleteer, the Libyan slave is a groom of horses.

erately interfering with Pellichus as he goes about his night-time business perhaps assimilates him to a ghost, and there does indeed seem to have been a school of thought that powerful statues were inhabited by the ghosts of the person they represented. Pellichus' punishment of the slave accords well with beliefs in maddening statues, although the motif of a witch's or sorcerer's 'evil hand', which could inflict an unseen but deadly whipping upon its victim, has also been amalgamated here, possibly because of ritual associations between statues and whipping.

University of Exeter

## References

- Albini, F., ed. 1993. *Luciano. L'amante della menzogna*. Venice.
- Anderson, G. 1976. *Studies in Lucian's comic fiction*. Leiden.
- Andò, V. 1975. *Luciano critico d'arte*. Palermo.
- Becker, A.S. 1995. *The shield of Achilles and the poetics of ekphrasis*. Lanham.
- Bernand, A. and Bernand, É. 1960. *Les inscriptions grecques et latines du Colosse de Memnon*. Cairo.
- Betz, H.D. 1961. *Lukian von Samosata und das Neue Testament. Religionsgeschichtliche und paränetische Parallelen, Texte und Untersuchungen der altchristlichen Literatur vol. 76*. Berlin.
- Bidez, J. 1913. *Vie de Porphyre le philosophe néo-platonicien*. Leipzig.
- Boardman, J. 1997. 'Pan', *LIMC* viii.1, 923-41.
- Boehm, G., and Pfothenhauer, H., eds. 1995. *Beschreibungskunst, Kunstbeschreibung: Ekphrasis von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*. Munich.
- Bohringer, F. 1979. 'Cultes d'athlètes en Grèce classique: discours mythique, propos politique', *REA* 81, 5-18.
- Bompaire, J. 1958. *Lucien écrivain: Imitation et création*. Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 190. Paris.
- Borgeaud, P. 1988. *The cult of Pan in ancient Greece*. Chicago. Trans. of *Recherches sur le dieu Pan*. Rome, 1979.
- Bruce, J.D. 1913. 'Human automata in classical tradition and medieval romance', *Modern philology* 10, 511-26.
- Caster, M. 1937. *Lucien et la pensée religieuse de son temps*. Paris. Reprinted New York and London, 1987.
- Clack, J. 1999. *Asclepiades of Samos and Leonidas of Tarentum. The Poems*. Wauconda, IL.
- Copenhaver, B.P. 1992. *Hermetica. The Greek Corpus Hermeticum and the Latin Asclepius in a new English translation with notes and introduction*. Cambridge.
- Ebner, M., Gzella, H., Nesselrath, H.-G., and Ribbat, E. 2001. *Lukian. Die Lügenfreunde*. Scripta antiquitatis posterioris ad ethicam religionemque pertinentia (SAPERE) iii. Darmstadt.
- Faraone, C.A. 1992. *Talismans and Trojan horses: guardian statues in Greek myth and ritual*. Oxford.
- Felton, D. 1999. *Haunted Greece and Rome*. Austin.

- 2001. 'The animated statues of Lucian's *Philopseudes*', *Classical Bulletin* 77.1, 75-86.
- Hall, J. 1981. *Lucian's satire*. New York.
- Heffernan, J.A.W. 1993. *The museum of words: the poetics of ekphrasis from Homer to Ashbery*. Chicago.
- Helm, R. 1927. 'Lukianos', *RE* 13.2, 1725-77.
- Herzig, O. 1940. *Lukian als Quelle für die antike Zauberei*. Diss. Tübingen 1933. Tübingen.
- Hopfner, T. 1921-4. *Griechisch-ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber*, Studien zur Paläographie und Papyruskunde. 2 vols. Frankfurt.
- Hornsby, H.M. 1933. 'The Cynicism of Peregrinus Proteus', *Hermathena* 48, 65-84.
- Jones, C.P. 1985. 'Neryllinus', *CP* 80, 40-5.
- 1986. *Culture and society in Lucian*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Kassel, R. 1991. 'Dialogue mit Statuen', in Kassel, R. *Kleine Schriften*. Berlin. 140-53; reprinted from *ZPE* 51 (1983) 1-12.
- Kerenyi, K. 1927. *Die griechisch-orientalische Romanliteratur in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung*. Tübingen.
- Koefler, D. 1949. *Aberglaube und Zauberei in Lukians Schriften*. Dissertation. Innsbruck.
- Kroll, J. 1914. *Die Lehren des Hermes Trismegistos*. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters. Münster.
- Macleod, M.D. 1972-87. *Luciani opera*. Oxford Classical Texts. 4 vols. Oxford.
- Morris, S. 1992. *Daidalos and the Origins of Greek Art*. Princeton.
- Müller, L., ed. 1932. *In Luciani Philopseuden commentarius*. Eos Supplement vol. 13. Leopoli.
- Pouilloux, J. 1954. *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos*. Vol.1. Paris.
- Putnam, M.C.J. 1998. *Virgil's epic designs: ekphrasis in the Aeneid*. New Haven.
- Radermacher, L. 1902. 'Aus Lucians Lügenfreund', in Schwind, M., ed., *Festschrift Theodor Gomperz dargebracht zum siebenzigsten Geburtstag am 29. März 1902*. 197-207. Reprint, Vienna, 1979.
- 1927 *Griechische Quellen zur Faustsage. Der Zauberer Cyprianus. Die Erzählung des Helladius. Theophilus*. Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaft in Wien 206.4. Vienna.
- Schuster, M. 1930. 'Der Werwolf und die Hexen. Zwei Schauermärchen bei Petronius', *WS*, 48, 149-78.
- Schwartz, J., ed. 1951. *Lucien de Samosate. Philopseudes et De morte Peregrini, avec introduction et commentaire*. Textes d'Études. Publ. Fac. Lettres Univ. Strasbourg, no. 12. Paris. Second ed., Paris 1963.
- Sijpesteijn, P.J. 1969. 'A new document concerning Hadrian's visit to Egypt', *Historia* 18, 109-18.
- Smith, M. 1975. *Petronius. Cena Trimalchionis*. Oxford.
- Stramaglia, A. 1999. *Res inauditae, incredulae. Storie di fantasmi nel mondo greco-latino*. Bari.
- Vrugt-Lentz, J.T. 1960. *Mors immatura*. Groningen.
- Weinreich, O. 1909. *Antike Heiligungswunder: Untersuchungen zum Wunderglauben der Griechen und der Römer* RGVV 8.1. Giessen.