THE CYNIC AND THE STATUE

ίδών τις τῶν Λακώνων Διογένη τὸν κύνα περιλαμβάνοντα ἀνδριάντα χάλκεον, ψύχους ὄντος σφοδροῦ, ἐπύθετο εἰ ρίγοῖ. ἀρνησαμένον δέ, 'τί οὖν' ἔφη 'μέγα ποιεῖς;' (Plutarch, Lac. Apoth. 16 [Mor. 233a])

One of the Spartans saw Diogenes the Cynic holding his arms around a bronze statue in very cold weather, and asked Diogenes if he were cold; and when Diogenes said 'No', the other said 'What great thing are you doing then?'

(trans. F. C. Babbitt [Loeb])

But many of the tales involving Diogenes are fairly scabrous, and frequently touch upon his shameless and disgusting public behaviour, as for example a well-known one about his masturbating ($\chi \epsilon \iota \rho o \nu \rho \gamma \hat{\omega} \nu$) in the marketplace in Diog. Laert. 6.46, ib. 69,² who adds there that $\epsilon \iota \omega \theta \epsilon \iota \pi \alpha \nu \tau \alpha \pi o \iota \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu \epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \sigma \omega$. Another similar anecdote in Theodoretus Cur. Gr. Aff. 12.172 (Migne 83 col. 1137), dealing with his $\delta \eta \mu o \sigma \iota \alpha \tau \alpha \hat{\iota} s \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota \rho a \iota s \mu \iota \gamma \nu \nu \nu \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma s$, involves the same $\tau \iota \pi o \iota \epsilon \hat{\iota} s$ question as in Plutarch:

φασὶ δὲ αὐτόν, μεμψαμένου τινος τὸ γιγνόμενον καὶ εἰρηκότος 'Τί ποιεῖς, ὧ Διόγενες;' φάναι ἐκεῖνον, τῆ συνήθει λοιδορία χρησάμενον, 'ὧ κάθαρμα, εἰ ἐπιτύχοιμι, ἄνθρωπον'. οὕτως ἀνέδην ἐλάγνευε.

Here $\pi o \iota \epsilon \hat{\iota} s$ is used with the direct accusative of the individual who is the object of his sexual intercourse, as in Luc. *D. Meretr.* 5.3 $\pi o \iota \epsilon \hat{\iota} s$ την Δημώνασσαν ἄπερ οἱ ἄνδρες, Longus 3.18 δράσει Χλόην, id. 3.14 δ οἱ κριοὶ ποιοῦσι τὰς οἶς, Alciphr. 3.55.9 $\Delta \omega \rho \hat{\iota} \delta a$. . $\hat{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu$. (One might compare how, in contemporary vulgar English usage, 'do' or 'make' are used with the feminine individual as direct object. 4) In the Theodoretus quotation, $\tilde{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi o \nu$ shows that Diogenes in his enthusiastic sexual pursuits was indifferent about the sex of the other party. 5 And for $\tau \nu \gamma \chi \acute{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$ used of either the initial encounter which proceeds to the inevitable consequence, or

¹ See F. Sayre, *Diogenes of Sinope: A Study of Greek Cynicism* (Baltimore, 1938), 80, and his reference to Montaigne's allusion to this story in his essay 'On Managing the Will'.

² Cf. D.Chr. 6.17ff., 8.36, Gal. 8 p. 419 Kühn, A.P. 5.302, 19.20 (Agathias), Diog. Ep. 35.2. I have a certain affection for the translation 'doing manual work in public', which is the cautious rendering of the Diogenes anecdote by C. D. Yonge in the Bohn Library translation of Diogenes Laertius!

³ In the last citation another Cynic, in the shameless tradition of the sect, urinates prior to engaging in sexual activity; and in Luc. *Vit. Auct.* 10 a Cynic recommends carrying out boldly even the more absurd sexual activities.

⁴ See Eric Partridge, A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English, suppl. vol. 2 (1967), svv. For the latter, I think of the amusing modern joke, in answer to the question 'Who's Maid Marian?', the answer 'Practically everybody'!

⁵ On $\ddot{a}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\sigma\sigma$ feminine, see J. D. Sosin, 'A word for woman', GRBS 38 (1997), 75–83.

of its ultimate success or failure, note Alexis fr. 271.3 τὸ τῆς Αφροδίτης τυγχάνειν, A.P. 5.51 ἔτυχον, κατέπραξα, 16.152.3–6 πρᾶξαι followed by τυχεῖν, and τυγχάνειν in P1. Lys. 205e τοιούτων παιδικῶν ἔτυχες, D.L. 3.2 βιάζεσθαι . . . καὶ μὴ τυγχάνειν.

The three commonest verbs of 'doing'— $\pi o \iota \epsilon i \nu$, $\pi \rho \acute{a} \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$, $\delta \rho \acute{a} \nu$ —are all much used of sexual congress, 6 and particularly common in the combination of $\pi o \iota \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu$ (or πράττειν, οτ δραν) καὶ πάσχειν (or sometimes ὑπομένειν) of active/passive involvement⁷—schol. Luc. Pseudol. 32 defines κίναιδος as ὅ τε ποιῶν ὅ τε πάσχων, and see also Lys. 14.22, Dem. 18.130, Aeschin. 1.41 (and other examples in this speech), id. 3.162, Arist. Pr. 879b31, Plut. Pel. 18, Mor. 530a, Dio C. 45.26.2, Ath. 517e, Luc. Ind. 23, 25, Pseudol. 17, 25, Smp. 36, Cyn. 10, A.P. 11.225.1, 12.210.1-2, 12.238.4, Harp. s.v. $\alpha \dot{v} \tau o \lambda \dot{\eta} \kappa v \theta o \iota$, and Cosmas in Greg. Naz., P.G. 38 cols. 402, 405. For $\pi o \iota \epsilon \hat{\iota} v$ alone, see also Ar. Th. 158, Luc. D. Meretr. 5.4, Pseudol. 20, Ach. Tat. 2.10.4; and for πάσχειν, Men. Dysc. 892, Plut. Mor. 768e, D.L. 5.76, Luc. D. Meretr. 5.2, A.P. 11.73.7 παθικεύεται, παθήματα at Ar. Th. 201, παμ—and παντο—παθής in Manetho 4.311, 5.283. (I am surprised how Sandbach on the Menander passage says that the sexual use of $\pi \acute{a} \sigma \chi \omega$ is 'rare in classical Greek', echoed in J. N. Adams, The Latin Sexual Vocabulary 190.) For instances of $\delta \rho \hat{a} \nu$ and cognates, see Archil. fr. 119.4 $\pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \hat{i} \nu$ δρήστην ἐπ' ἀσκόν,⁸ Ar. Vesp. 1381, Crates fr. 2D, Babr. 116.14, Ael. Ep. 1, Long, 2.38, 3.14 and 19, 4.40, Aristaen. Ep. 2.4, Hsch. s.v. δράκεν. And for πράττειν and cognates, see Pind. fr. 112B, Xen. Oec. 12.14, Conv. 9.6, Aeschin. 1.41 (and frequently⁹), Plut. Mor. 1089a, Long. 2.11, 3.18, D.Chr. 60.1, Luc. Alex. 39, A.P. 11.29.2, 12.240.3 (ὄρχεις ἄπρηκτοι), the phrase τὰ τῶν ἄνδρων πράττειν in Hdn. 5.6.2 and Gnom. Vat. 403. In Harp. αὐτολήκυθοι, in the explanation έτοίμους πρὸς τὰς $\mu i \xi \epsilon i s$, the actual reading of the fifteenth-century MS N is $\pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \xi \epsilon i s$, where the

 $\mu i \xi \epsilon_{iS}$, the actual reading of the fifteenth-century MS N is $\pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \xi \epsilon_{iS}$, where the euphemism has been corrected by the explicit gloss above. And finally the question τi $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \alpha \pi o i \epsilon \hat{i} s$ put to Diogenes by the Spartan in Plutarch reminds me of $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \chi \theta \eta \tau \dot{\alpha}$ $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \gamma i \sigma \tau a$ in the climax to the love affair in Theoc. 2.143, a moment that Longus 3.18 calls $\tau i \mu \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \alpha \kappa a i \theta \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \mu \pi \tau o \nu$. Small wonder that Aphrodite had a temple in Megara (Paus. 1.43.6) where her ancient statue was called $\Pi \rho \hat{\alpha} \xi_{iS}$.

In fairness to Diogenes, it must be added here that at least on this occasion his conduct may have been above reproach, since he was doubtless engaged in the rigorous and abstemious training reported by his namesake (D.L. 6.23): καὶ θέρους μὲν ἐπὶ ψάμμου ζεστῆς ἐκυλινδεῖτο, χειμῶνος δ' ἀνδριάντας κεχιονισμένους περιελάμβανε, πανταχόθεν ἑαυτὸν συνασκῶν. But give a Dog a bad name, and a compiler of Laconic bons mots might be guaranteed to out-trump those other stories of Diogenes' exhibitionist aberrations with an allegation of the sort of Pygmalionism which, harmless enough in the story of Laodameia and Protesilaus, the promise of Admetus to his wife (Eur. <math>Alc. 348–54), or the bowdlerized version of Helen's

⁶ So too ἔργον of the sexual 'act'—h. Ven. 1, Luc. D. Deor. 17.1, Philostr. Ep. 30, Long. 3.14, A.P. 12.209; ἐνεργεῖν Theoc. 4.61, Alciphr. 1.39.4 and 3.55.9, Diocl. fr. 141; ἔπεργος in a fragment of Philaenis, P.Oxy 39 (1972), fr. 2891—'on the job', as Lobel renders it; also ἐργασία, ἐργάσιμος, ἐργαστήριον, ἐργάτις—see LSJ references.

So too, of course, facere and pati in Latin.

See D. Gerber, Phoenix 29 (1975), 181-4.

 $^{^9}$ At 1.52, Aeschines expresses impatience about how he is obliged to gloss over in words the behaviour of Timarchus, and regularly uses simply $\pi\rho\hat{a}\xi\iota_S$ of 'the act', which Aristotle (H. A. 539b21) terms $\pi\rho\hat{a}\xi\iota_S$ γεννητική.

¹⁰ See also R. Merkelbach and M. L. West on $\tau \delta$ $\theta \epsilon \hat{\iota} \delta \nu \chi \rho \hat{\eta} \mu a$ in 'Ein Archilochus-Papyrus', ZPE 14 (1974), 105.

abduction (Lyc. Alex. 110–14), finds a more perverse expression in stories of fascination and attempted intercourse with statues such as Luc. Am. 15–16 and Im. 4 (cf. Philostr. V.A. 6.40, Ael. V.H. 9.39, Ath. 605f, Aristaen. Ep. 2.10, Luc. Tox. 15).

I do not know whether the Spartan's first question, εὶ ριγοί;, should be interpreted with reference to what one might call the frigidus in Venerem theme, but am reminded of a bon mot of Lais about Xenocrates, who remained unmoved by her blandishments, ώς οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνδρός, ἀλλ' ἀπ' ἀνδριάντος ἀνασταίη (D.L. 4.7). In any case, statues are proverbially cold ('stone-cold', as we say)—cf. the ψυχρὰν τέρψιν of Alc. 353, ψυχρὸν παραγκάλισμα of Lyc. 113, the ψυχρότης, ἀντίτυπον of the statue in Ath. 605f, ανδριάντος γυμνότερος (D.Chr. 34.3), τί πειράζεις τὸν λίθον; οὐ δύναται (Α.Ρ. 12.213), fixus in lapidem steti gelidus, nihil secus quam una de ceteris theatri statuis vel columnis (Apul. Met. 3.10); and this is a recommendation of Meineke's ψυχρότερον instead of ισχυρότερον in the saying of Stilpo¹¹ (Stob. 4.88, III p. 239 W.-H.) Στίλπων έρωτηθείς τί ισχύροτερον ανδριάντος, 'Άνθρωπος', είπεν, 'αναίσθητος'. A similar comparison happens to be attributed to Diogenes himself in one of the apocryphal letters (xi, p. 238 Hercher) τεύξη γὰρ ἀνθρώποις ἀπαθεστέροις ἀνδριάντων (cf. Epict. 3.2.4 ἀπαθή ώς ἀνδριάντα, Αρρ. Prov. 1.27 ἀνδριὰς σφυρήλατος: ἐπὶ τῶν $a\nu\alpha\iota\sigma\theta\dot{\eta}\tau\omega\nu$), ¹² and the theme of this letter—that one might as well expect charity from a statue as from a man of no sensibility—is the point of another Diogenian anecdote involving a statue, in D.L. 6.49 (cf. Plut. Mor. 531f) ήτει ποτε ἀνδριάντα· έρωτηθείς δε διὰ τί τοῦτο ποιεῖ, 'μελετω', εἶπεν, 'ἀποτυγχάνειν'.

'Embracing statues' as a form of gymnastic training has not apparently been given much prominence in books on Greek athletics—I find no trace of it, for example, in the books and articles of Norman Gardiner—but is mentioned on a number of occasions in Epictetus (3.12.2, ib. 10, 4.5.14, Ench. 47) as a difficult feat requiring practice: τούτου ἔνεκα δεῖ καὶ ἡμᾶς μελετᾶν ἐπὶ σχοινίου περιπατεῖν ἢ φοίνικα ἱστάνειν¹³ ἢ ἀνδριάντας περιλαμβάνειν (3.12.2). One presumes that these 'statues' were not the sort of sand- or meal-filled κώρυκοι or punch-bags, which Plato calls εἴδωλα ἄψυχα (Leg. 830b), used for sparring practice by boxers, since they would provide negligible counter-force, and certainly could not be compared in gymnastic expertise to tightrope walking, head-stands, or weight-lifting, which Epictetus gives as further examples later in this chapter (3.12.9). They must have been solid statues (of

¹¹ Cf. Gnom. Vat. 516, ib. 145 where the saying is attributed to Aristotle. Sternbach ad loc. defends $l \alpha \chi u \rho \acute{o} \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu$ in the sense of $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon \acute{o} \nu$ ('solid from the neck up', as we would say in English), for which cf. $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon \omega \tau \acute{e} \rho \eta \lambda \acute{e} \theta o \iota o$ (Hom. Od. 23.103), etc.

¹³ See the Appendix on the meaning of φοίνικα ἱστάνειν.

¹⁴ The three exercises mentioned here are τὸ στέγην δερματίνην καὶ ὅλμον καὶ ὕπερον περιφέρειν. The first must involve balancing a heavy object of some kind above the head—cf. Sen. De Ira 2.2 ille qui meditatus est . . . sarcinae ingenti cervices supponere (cited by Oldfather). The other two are probably objects for weight-lifting: for ὕπερον, see Epictetus himself 3.20.10; for ὅλμος, Lib. Ep. 473.3.

Harris, it is true, in his book *Greek Athletes and Athletics*, ¹⁷ proposes a novel view, that the $d\nu\delta\rho\iota\dot{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon_S$ so often referred to (including Demosthenes' celebrated gibe at Aeschines as $\kappa\alpha\lambda\dot{\delta}s$ $d\nu\delta\rho\iota\dot{\alpha}s$ in *De Cor*. 129) are, in popular terminology, sparring partners who would hire themselves out to take a drubbing from some great boxer or pancratiast in training without trying very hard (even if they could do so) to return the blows in equal measure. He does not refer, however, to the two Diogenes stories discussed here, where, as the statues are called $\chi\dot{\alpha}\lambda\kappa\epsilon_0s$ (Plut.) or $\kappa\epsilon\chi\iota\nu\iota\iota\sigma\mu\dot{\epsilon}\nu\iota\iota$ (D.L.), they must be interpreted quite literally; nor does Epict. 3.12.10, which he cites, necessarily make this point: a person, says Epictetus, is to get used to being reviled or insulted without reproach, and, if he does, $\epsilon\dot{l}\theta'$ οὖτως προβήση ὖνα, κᾶν πλήξη σε τις, $\epsilon\ddot{l}\pi\eta s$ αὐτὸν πρὸς αὐτὸν ὅτι 'δόξον ἀνδριάντα περιειληφέναι'. Here the ἀνδρίας could as well be the inanimate ἀπαθής, ἀναίσθητος statue, as the non-retaliating προσγυμναστής.

But any remaining doubts about the common use of statues (in this case bronze ones) in wrestling practice are removed by an interesting passaage in Galen 12 p. 116 Kühn: writing of the medicinal use of a large variety of substances, he refers to the dirt from the *statues in the gymnasia*, ¹⁹ where the verdigris which may be scraped off has an apparently effectual admixture of human sweat and oil (i.e. transferred from the bodies of the athletes who have been laboriously clutching them all day!)

' Ρύπος ὁ μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν τοῖς γυμνασίοις ἀνδριάντων, ἐν οῖς ἂν ἄφθονον ἔλαιον κεῖται, διαφορητικός τέ ἐστι καὶ μαλακτικός. [There follows a contrast with the ρύπος ἐν ταῖς παλαίστραις in which κόνις is also present.] ἡ μὲν οὖν κόνις ἐμπλαστικόν τέ ἐστι καὶ ψυκτικὸν καὶ ἀποκρουστικόν, τὸ δ' ἔλαιον μαλακτικόν, ὁ δ' ἱδρὼς καὶ ὁ ρύπος διαφορητικά. ὁ δ' ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνδριάντων οὕτε τὴν κόνιν ἔχων καὶ τοῦ χαλκοῦ τινα προσειληφὼς ἰὸν εἰκότως δριμύτερός ἐστιν. ἐμνημονεύσαμεν δὲ τούτου καὶ νῦν, ὅτι τὸ πλεῖστον ἐν αὐτῷ ἐλαιώδους οὐσίας ἐστίν, ἐκ φυτοῦ τὴν γένεσιν ἐχούσης.

Now I believe that Harris may be right that sparring partners were sometimes jocularly referred to as statues,²⁰ just as Plautus twice²¹ uses verberea statua as a contemptuous term, and today we might call a boxer hopelessly outclassed in the ring

 $^{^{15}}$ See Luc. Anach. 33, where it is said that the Athenian athletes would flee from Anacharsis and his dagger $\pi\epsilon\rho$ ί τοὺς ἀνδριάντας $\pi\epsilon\rho$ ιιστάμενοι καὶ $\pi\epsilon\rho$ ὶ τοὺς κίσνας κατακρυπτόμενοι.

¹⁶ Cf. Plut. Mor. 780a μόνιμον καὶ ἀκλινῆ, and the proverbial ἀνδριάντων ἀκινητότερον (Luc. Im. 1).

¹⁷ H. A. Harris, Greek Athletes and Athletics (London, 1964), 177 and 216, n. 14.

 ¹⁸ Cf. Timocles, fr. 29 έαυτοὺς ἀντὶ κωρύκων δέρειν / παρέχοντες ἀθληταῖσιν, Plaut. Rud.
 722, Aul. 409-10.
 19 Cf. Plin. N.H. 28.13.

²⁶ Luc. Anach. 31 compares the resistance to blows by Athenian athletes toughened by exercise to that of statues.

²¹ Capt. 951, Pseud. 911.

as 'a mere punch-bag'; but the expression doubtless arose from the use of dummy figures as punch-balls by boxers, or heavy statues for muscle-building exercises by wrestlers. I recall reading about, and seeing pictures of, German wrestlers before the Olympic games practising their holds and throws with heavy, life-size dummies. And the controversial 'game' played by the 'Late-Learner' in Theophrastus (*Char.* 27.12) shows, I think, the transition from the literal to the metaphorical usage, when an opponent (here his slave) without actually resisting, could, by making himself rigid and a 'dead-weight', give a wrestler the practice he sought in lifting, which he might otherwise practise on his own 'embracing statues' as described in the Diogenes anecdote and in Epictetus: καὶ μακρὸν ἀνδριάντα παίζειν πρὸς τὸν ἐαυτοῦ ἀκόλουθον.

Here μακρόν may simply mean that the adversary stands erect and rigid, pulling against the tension being exerted to lift him, but the text is often reckoned corrupt, and various emendations proposed. I have thought of reading καὶ 'δρον ἀνδριάντα' $\pi\alpha i \zeta \epsilon i \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$. as a command often given to a pupil by a wrestling trainer to grip and lift one of these training statues: cf. the imperatives of the Homeric $\ddot{\eta}$ μ' $\dot{a}\nu\dot{a}\epsilon\iota\rho'$ $\ddot{\eta}$ $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\dot{\omega}$ $\sigma\dot{\epsilon}$ (II. 23.724), alpe $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \kappa \tau \rho o \nu$ (Ar. Av. 759), $\chi \epsilon \hat{\iota} \rho a s$ a $\epsilon \hat{\iota} \rho o \nu$ in the boxing challenge of Amycus to Polydeuces in Theoc. 22.65, the weight-lifting instructions given by the trainer in Epict. 3.20.10 καὶ ὁ ἀλείπτης καλώς ποιών λέγει 'ἆρον ὕπερον $a\mu\phi\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\sigma$, and the joking series of 'wrestling' instructions given by Palaestra in Luc. Asin. 9-10, and in A.P. 12.206. See also the series of directions for bodily movements in the fragments of a wrestling manual in P.Oxy. 3 (1903), pp. 137-8. The Opsimathes in Theophrastus is nothing if not determined to master even late in life all the different athletic skills, and there is another ostentatious display of his lifting powers, undertaken on the spur of the moment, in para. 5, where at a sacrifice to Heracles ρίψας τὸ ἱμάτιον τὸν βοῦν αἴρεσθαι, ἴνα τραχηλίση. Similarly, he is always ready to try a throw $(\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu\alpha\tau\rho'\beta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha)$ with the youngsters in the palaestra (6), and shows off his skill at the cross-buttock ($\tilde{\epsilon}\delta\rho\alpha\nu$ $\sigma\tau\rho\dot{\epsilon}\phi\dot{\epsilon}\nu\nu$, 14) in a wrestling demonstration at the baths, ὅπως πεπαιδεῦσθαι δοκῆ.

Edinburgh

E. K. BORTHWICK

APPENDIX: THE MEANING OF Φ OINIKA 'I Σ TANEIN

'Setting up a palm' is the translation of φοίνικα ἱστάνειν by W. A. Oldfather in the Loeb Epictetus, who, however, inclines to accept the explanation found in Schweighäuser's edition, that the athletic skill referred to is the climbing of a pole using hands and feet only, like the climbers of date-palms (φοινικοβατέοντες) in Arabia and Egypt, mentioned in Luc. Syr. D. 29 (cf. Plin. N.H. 13.29). (His reference to φονεικοφόρος, σπαδεικοφόρος in second-century A.D. inscriptions from Tegea is irrelevant.) But undoubtedly the phrase φοίνικα ἱστάνειν is a slang expression of gymnasts for 'to do hand (or head) stands', as was proposed by J. Meunier, Ant. Class. 21 (1952), 166, who quoted the corresponding modern French expression faire le poirier: 'La forme en éventail des feuilles du palmier n'évoque-t-elle pas la position écartée jambes de celui qui "fait le poirier"?' Faire l'arbre fourchuldroit are also terms used for 'to stand (or walk) on one's hands', while it appears that in Italian fare pero = to stand on one leg. But even more remarkably, I am informed by Dr J. Y. Nadeau that in Mauritius the very expression found in Epictetus (i.e. with a palm, rather than plane tree), faire le palmier, is in current use for 'standing on one's hands'.

To judge from vase-paintings, etc., hand-stands seem to have been practised by the Greeks both for athletic and entertainment purposes—see the many illustrations in W. Deonna, *Le symbolisme de l'acrobatie antique*, *Coll. Latomus* 9 (1953).