

ability to speak is in fact commented on by almost all ancient authors who mention them.<sup>39</sup>

The account of the parrot in Ctesias' *Indica* is worth noting, for here he introduces the Greek world to something unfamiliar, as he does elsewhere in the work in the case of other Indian products and animals. Moreover, whatever his failings in later passages, this description, in so far as we know the details, is certainly far from being absurd. Although a little exaggerated, the claims made about the bird's speaking abilities are, it is clear, no fantasy. Likewise the comments on its appearance, which suit a real parrot, can scarcely be deemed fictional. Ctesias, of course, strives to impress the reader by relating something which will astound. Still, he describes what was in reality a remarkable bird. His *Indica* does not entirely merit the ridicule that it has received.

Victoria College, University of Toronto

J. M. BIGWOOD

<sup>39</sup> See the passages listed above (n. 31). Other references are supplied by D'Arcy Thompson (n. 28), pp. 236ff.

#### RESTORING A MANUSCRIPT READING AT PAUS. 9.3.7

Pausanias preserves what we know about the Little and the Great Daidala, religious celebrations which took place in Plataia from the classical into the Roman period (Paus. 9.3.1–9). To his account can be added a fragment from Plutarch's work (Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelii* 3.1.6 = Plutarch fr. 157), and a brief mention in Menander Rhetor (*Peri Epideiktikon*, ed. L. Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci* iii, p. 367.7).<sup>1</sup> At the celebration of the Little Daidala, which occurred about every six years or so (Paus. 9.3.3), the Plataians made an image from the trunk of an oak tree (Paus. 9.3.4); they called the image a daidalon, because 'the men of old' called the wooden images, the xoana, daidala (Paus. 9.3.2). Every sixty years, the Plataians celebrated the Great Daidala, to which other Boiotian states sent representations (Paus. 9.3.5–6, Men. Rhet. iii, p. 367.7). At this Great Daidala, all the images which had been made at the Little Daidala were gathered together and burnt (Paus. 9.3.8). The process by which this was done was to allocate by lot to each of the important Boiotian towns one of the daidala, and to distribute the rest amongst the lesser Boiotian states, who would pool their resources so as to be able to participate in the ceremony (Paus. 9.3.6). Each large city, or a group of smaller cities, was thus responsible for one daidalon.

The manuscripts of Pausanias state that once the daidala had been allotted to the various cities and towns, τὸ δὲ ἄγαλμα κοσμήσαντες παρὰ τὸν Ἄσωπὸν καὶ ἀναθέντες ἐπὶ ἄμαξαν, γυναῖκα ἐφιστάσι νυμφεύτριαν (Paus. 9.3.7).<sup>2</sup> This would mean that there was one main image (daidalon), more important than the other daidala, which was to form the focal point of the burning ritual; it would represent the archetypal wooden daidalon which Zeus had used in his ruse to win back Hera (this aetiological myth is discussed below). The image was 'adorned at the river

<sup>1</sup> Modern bibliography on the Daidala is collected by A. Schachter *Cults of Boiotia*, i (University of London: Institute of Classical Studies, Bulletin Supplement 38.1, 1981), p. 245 n. 3; to which add in particular C. Kerényi, *Zeus and Hera* (London, 1975), pp. 141–7; I have found M. P. Nilsson, *Griechische Feste* (Leipzig, 1906), pp. 50–6 the most useful account.

<sup>2</sup> All the manuscripts of Pausanias derive from a copy made by Niccolò Niccoli of Florence (1364–1437); this is now lost, but all the manuscripts read κοσμήσαντες, so this must have been the reading in the manuscript which Niccolò copied. For the manuscript tree and the derivation of surviving manuscripts of Pausanias from Niccolò's text, see M. H. Rocha-Pereira, *Pausaniae Graeciae Descriptio* i (Leipzig, 1973), pp. vi–viii.

Asopos, set up on a wagon, and a bridal attendant placed in the wagon'. The remaining daidala were each put on a separate wagon, at the river Asopos, and led on from there to Mount Kithairon, where they were ritually burned (Paus. 9.3.7–8, cf. Plut. fr. 157).

But Sylburg emended *κοσμήσαντες* in Paus. 9.3.7 to *κομίσαντες*, and this emendation has been accepted by modern editors of the text.<sup>3</sup> The meaning then becomes that the image was not *adorned* at the river but rather *taken* to it. Schachter does not use the emendation, but prints *κοσμήσαντες* when quoting Paus. 9.3.7.<sup>4</sup> He points out that *πάρ* and the accusative can be equivalent to *παρά* and the dative in the Boiotian dialect. However, the question which Schachter poses about Pausanias' sources, 'Could Pausanias' ultimate source have been written in [Boiotian] dialect?', must be answered in the negative. There is no indication that Pausanias relied on a written text at this point, and in fact he mentions his source at Plataia: *ὁ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων ἐξηγητής* (Paus. 9.3.3). This, coupled with the phrase *ἐφ' ὅτῳ* with which he introduces the aetiological myth for the ceremony (Paus. 9.3.1), must indicate that Pausanias was making use of oral testimony for his account of the Little and Great Daidala. Schachter fails to argue on the basis of the nature of the ceremony itself why the manuscript reading *κοσμήσαντες* is preferable to the emendation *κομίσαντες*. It is an understanding of the festival itself which provides the best grounds for rejecting the emendation, and for accepting that, although awkward,<sup>5</sup> *κοσμήσαντες παρά τὸν Ἀσωπὸν* can stand to yield the meaning 'adorned at the Asopos'. While the emendation suggested by Sylburg might yield a more suitable verb to link with *παρά τὸν Ἀσωπὸν*, this is not strictly necessary.

This emendation distorts Pausanias' account of the nature of the festival. One reason why the emendation should be rejected is that Pausanias does not need to tell the reader that the daidalon which was forming the focus of the ceremony was taken (*κομίσαντες*) to the river. The phrase *παρά τὸν Ἀσωπὸν* indicates that the daidalon was at the river. While it might have been less awkward for Pausanias to have stated explicitly that the daidalon was taken to the river, it can be noted that the account of the ceremony is compressed. The wagons on which the other daidala were placed are mentioned by Pausanias at 9.3.7 as being driven off from the river, without the wagons having been previously mentioned in the account. That is, Pausanias is not giving a detailed account of each and every stage of the proceedings. The statement that the wagons were driven away from the river, once lots had been cast as to the order in which the wagons were to travel in the procession, makes it clear the the main daidalon, which was to be followed by these wagons, was at the river. It is not necessary to amend *κοσμήσαντες* to *κομίσαντες* in order for the reader to know that the main daidalon was at the river. The image which was *παρά τὸν Ἀσωπὸν* was clearly in the company of the other daidala; *κομίσαντες* is not required to give the geographical location.

A further reason relates to the aetiological myth surrounding the festivals of the Little and Great Daidala. According to this myth Hera was angry with Zeus and in

<sup>3</sup> F. Sylburg, *Πανσανίου τῆς Ἑλλάδος Περιήγησις* (Leipzig, 1696); reading retained in F. Spiro, *Pausanias: Graeciae Descriptio* iii (Leipzig, 1903), p. 7, W. H. S. Jones, *Pausanias: Description of Greece* iv (London, 1935), p. 184, with p. 185 n. 2, M. H. Rocha-Pereira, *Pausanias: Graeciae Descriptio* iii (Leipzig, 1981), p. 6. J. H. S. Schubart, *Pausaniae Descriptio Graeciae* ii (Leipzig, 1883), p. 190, retains *κοσμήσαντες* but prints a lacuna after it, implying that he thinks a verb of motion is required in the text at this point.

<sup>4</sup> Schachter, op. cit., p. 246 n. 1.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

a state of high dudgeon had gone off to Euboia. Zeus could not persuade her to come back to him. So he paid a visit to Kithairon, at that time ruler of Plataia and, Pausanias informs us, wiser than anyone else of his time. He told Zeus to make an image of wood (*ἄγαλμα ξύλου*), to enshroud it (*ἐγκεκαλύμενον*), put it on a bullock-drawn wagon, and to say that he was taking Plataia, daughter of (the river) Asopos as wife (Paus. 9.3.1). Zeus followed this advice. Hera heard about what was happening, came to Plataia, and having approached the wagon, tore off the covering of the wooden image (*τοῦ ἀγάλματος τὴν ἐσθήτα περιέρρηξεν*), presumably in order to reveal the identity of the bride. Hera, amused at the ruse, was reconciled with Zeus (Paus. 9.3.2, Plut. fr. 157). It is clear that the image of wood was covered by some sort of clothing, presumably wedding clothes. This was essential to the ruse of Zeus: the wooden image had to be disguised so as to have the appearance of a woman. The festivals of the Daidala were a re-enactment of this myth, according to Pausanias' sources. The daidala involved in the festivals would surely thus have been in imitation of the archetypal image: a clothed image. When he records that *τὸ δὲ ἄγαλμα κοσμήσαντες παρὰ τὸν Ἀσωπὸν*, Pausanias is stating that the clothing of the image took place at the river Asopos. That this took place here is explained by the aetiological myth: the daidalon made by Zeus as part of his stratagem to win back Hera was meant to be Plataia, daughter of the river Asopos. Furthermore, Plutarch records that the Tritoneian nymphs washed the image which Zeus had made (Plut. fr. 157). This element was probably also a part of the celebration of the Great Daidala, although Pausanias does not mention it.

The manuscript reading at Pausanias 9.3.7 is *τὸ δὲ ἄγαλμα κοσμήσαντες παρὰ τὸν Ἀσωπὸν* and this reading must be accepted. Pausanias has recorded a feature of the Daidala, and his statement must not be emended, for to do so is unnecessary, and distorts his account of the Great Daidala. The emendation of *κοσμήσαντες* to *κομίσαντες* was first conjectured several hundred years ago and has until now marred the text of Pausanias; this emendation must be abandoned for the events of the Daidala to be clearly understood.

*University of New England, Armidale*

M. P. J. DILLON

#### THE STAGE ACTION OF TERENCE, *PHORMIO* 979–989

Scene V.viii of Terence's *Phormio* (894–989) brings to a climax the confrontation between the trickster Phormio and the two old men Demipho and Chremes. Phormio, exploiting his knowledge of Chremes' extra-marital affair in Lemnos, persuades Chremes to surrender any claim to thirty minae, extracted by false pretences, which have in fact been used to purchase a girl for Chremes' son Phaedria. Demipho urges resistance to this blackmail, suggesting that they have more chance of placating Chremes' wife Nausistrata if they themselves tell her about the Lemnian affair. Phormio reacts by moving towards Chremes' house and calling out Nausistrata by name. The old men try in vain to restrain him.

These are the last eleven lines of the scene as they appear (with minor variations) in the Bembinus (A) and in the current standard editions of Terence:<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This has been the vulgate version since about 1870: it appears, for example, in Umpfenbach (1870), Dziatzko-Hauser (1898), Fleckeisen (Teubner, 1898<sup>3</sup>), Tyrrell (OCT, 1902), Laming (1902), Ashmore (1908), Sargeant (Loeb, 1912), Kauer-Lindsay (OCT, 1926), Marouzeau (Budé, 1956), Martin (1959), Rubio (1961), and Coury (1982); it is also the basis of the translations of Copley (1967), Radice (Penguin, 1967), and Due (1984). The only significant