The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Two Errors of Memory in the Telemachy

C. M. Mulvany

The Classical Review / Volume 15 / Issue 06 / July 1901, pp 291 - 294

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00030754, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00030754

How to cite this article:

C. M. Mulvany (1901). Two Errors of Memory in the Telemachy. The Classical Review, 15, pp 291-294 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00030754

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

TWO ERRORS OF MEMORY IN THE TELEMACHY.

IN the Prolegomena to his book *de tribus Hom. Od. codd. ant.* pp. 14 and 22-5, Molhuysen shows how the scribes have often added or miswritten a line of Homer through untimely recollection of other passages in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, so that our MSS. of these poems display errors of memory, as well as errors of eye and ear. Thus, to take two of his instances, after *Od.* iv. 796, which ends δέμας δ' ἤκτο γυναικί, the good MS. P adds the verse καλή κ.τ.λ., which follows the same verse-ending *Od.* xiii. 288-9; and the Florentine F has in *Od.* xiv. 485 instead of ἐμπαπῆς ὑπάκουσε, ἐμμ. ἀνόρουσε through recollection of *Il.* v. 836 ἐμμ. ἀπόρουσεν, the only other Homeric instance of ἐμπαπῆς. These errors are probably the result of association affecting the mind of the copyist at the very time of writing. But a little consideration will show us that there were times when the scope was far greater for the influence of mental association on the Epic text.

For, at whatever date writing was first used in the transmission of Greek Epic, we may be sure that for a considerable period the written copy was not intended to delight private readers, or to be read to an audience, like the Jewish and Christian Scriptures. It served the same purposes as the copy of an actor's part, *i.e.* professional reciters learnt it by heart, and afterwards used it to refresh the memory. Of parts, at least, of their *répertoire* the Greek reciters no doubt took about with them MSS. which served the same purpose as the Oxford MS. of the Song of Roland:— 'it is' writes M. Léon Gautier, *La Chanson de Roland*, p. xxvi. 'one of the little volumes for the use of the *jongleurs* which they carried with them wherever they went, and in which they doubtless refreshed their memory.'

Besides reciting, the rhapsodist would also train pupils, for in primitive societies the same man both teaches and practises a craft; and he would give them his own written texts, or copies of them, to get by heart. But where the papyrus or parchment (cf. Herod. v. 58 and Birt, *d. ant. Buchwesen*, p. 47) was rubbed or torn or otherwise obliterated, he would have to supply the deficiency from memory; and he would again have to rely on memory, if he wished his pupils to learn any part of his *répertoire* that he had not by him in writ-

ing. For where should he procure copies? He would have to make the copy by writing or dictating from memory. Evidently, a text thus dependent on memory would be likely to contain such errors as are incidental to transmission by memory; and the mistakes of a popular rhapsodist would, through his pupils and pupils' pupils, obtain a widespread and enduring circulation.

So long as the Epics appealed only to the listening circle in the noble's hall or at a public festival, the only written texts must have been those produced for and through the reciters; for the demand regulates the supply. They alone, therefore, can have formed the written basis of those copies that were produced for private persons in ever increasing numbers as education developed; and to them, or immediately to the living voice of the rhapsodist, we must ultimately trace back our own MSS. of Homer. These, therefore, are likely to contain errors due to misrecollection on the part of the rhapsodists.

It is true that the rhapsodists were men whose memory was highly trained and developed. They may also have had some sort of *memoria technica* to assist them. But even a highly trained memory does not quite completely secure its contents against the subtle, half-unconscious influence of association; and I have, I think, found two lines in the Telemachy in which the right reading has been displaced by the influence of other passages that were associated in thought with these. If I am right, then, as the present readings are clearly those of the old vulgate, they may be safely referred to the period before the texts of the Epics ceased to be dependent on the memories of reciters.

The lines are ii. 251 and iv. 514. In the former πλεόνεσσι (so MSS. and Scholia, see Note B) has, I submit, supplanted περὶ δαιτὶ; and in the second, the universal Μαλειάων should be Ἀθηναίων.

I.—*Od.* ii. 251.

At the third and final stage of the debate in *Od.* ii. Telemachos demands a ship that he may go in search of his father. Before any reply is made to this request, Mentor, an aged friend of the royal family, makes an appeal to the people to interfere on be-

half of Telemachos. This appeal is expressed in the form of a reproach and ends with the lines:

νῦν δ' ἄλλω δῆμῳ νεμεσίζομαι, οἷον ἅπαντες
240 ἦσθ' ἀνεψιῶν οὐ τι καταπτόμενοι ἐπέεσσι
παύρους μνηστῆρας κατερύκετε πολλοὶ
έόντες.

To this speech a contemptuous reply is made by Leokritos son of Euenor (vv. 243-51), after which he winds up the debate by dismissing the assembly and refusing Telemachos' request for a vessel (vv. 252-6). The difficulties of the first part of this speech, the reply to Mentor, are notorious; and for the results of previous efforts towards a solution, I may be allowed merely to refer to Ameis-Hentze, *Anhang* on ii. 243; the editions of Merry,¹ and of v. Leeuwen-da Costa; and a note at the end of Butcher and Lang's translation. As a preliminary to setting forth the present proposal, I will quote the passage.

τὸν δ' Εὐηνόριδης Λειώκριτος ἀντίον ἦν δα·
Μέντορ ἀπαρηγέ, φρένας ἡλέε, ποῖον
ἔειπες
ἡμέας ὀτρύνων καταπανέμεν. ἀργαλέον δέ
245 ἀνδράσι καὶ πλεόνεσσι μαχέσασθαι περὶ
δαιτί.
εἴ περ γάρ κ' Ὀδυσσεὺς Ἰθακήσιος αὐτὸς
ἐπελθὼν
δαινυμένους κατὰ δῶμα ἐὼν μνηστῆρας
ἀγανούς
ἐξέλασαι μεγαροῖο μενοιρήσει' ἐνὶ θυμῷ,
οὐ κέν οἱ κεχάροιτο γυνή, μάλα περ
χατέουσα,
250 ἔλθόντ', ἀλλὰ κεν αὐτοῦ ἀεικέα πότμον
ἐπίσποι,
εἰ πλεόνεσσι μάχοιτο· σὺ δ' οὐ κατὰ μοῖραν
ἔειπες.

The logic of this reply is as follows. Mentor has urged the people 'being many' to check the 'few' suitors by words, *καθαπτόμενοι ἐπέεσσι*, a colourless phrase, which is as suitable to friendly as to unfriendly address (cf. 39). But, obviously, the suitors are not men to be influenced by words, or by anything short of force. Accordingly, Leokritos wastes no time discussing a policy of diplomatic representations. Tacitly assuming (a shrewd stroke of debate) that interference means fighting—the Epic, let us always remember, not needing to be as explicit in respect to the readily obvious, as, say, a Government

report—he tells Mentor that he is a down-right fool to urge the people to stop the suitors, inasmuch as to pick a quarrel at a feast is a grievous matter, even for men that have numbers on their side.

The clause ἀργαλέον δέ κ.τ.λ. is a justification of the preceding abuse. ἀργαλέον has the meaning, less of 'difficult,' than of 'burdensome,' 'grievous,' 'more than can be expected of a man,' as in Od. xiii. 15—

ἀργαλέον γὰρ ἔνα προικὸς χαρίσασθαι.

καὶ has the same force as in *Il.* xx. 356—

ἀργαλέον δέ μοι ἐστὶ καὶ ἰφθίμῳ περ ἐόντι
τοσσούσδ' ἀνθρώπους ἐφέπειν καὶ πᾶσι μάχεσθαι.

The use of *μαχέσασθαι* without an expressed object is common enough; e.g. we have *ὀτρύνων μαχέσασθαι Il.* v. 496, vi. 105, xi. 213. On this point and on the force of the aorist, 'to begin,' 'take up the combat,' cf. Mutzbauer, *Grundlagen d. gr. Tempuslehre*, p. 88.

In *περὶ δαιτί* the local force is alone present, as is usual in Homer, or is, at least, predominant; for the only effective means of stopping the feastings of the suitors would be armed interference at the banquet itself.

Leokritos goes on to show how the general proposition ἀργαλέον δέ κ.τ.λ. applies to the particular case of the Ithacan δῆμος. 'For even,' he says, 'if Odysseus of Ithaca should return himself and desire to expel from the hall the lordly suitors as they feasted in his house, his wife would have no joy in him, though she should be very desirous of him, on his coming, but he would meet an unseemly fate on the spot' (vv. 246-50). So far the reasoning is clear and pertinent, though it is not fully set forth. Plainly, if the suitors would not brook interference at the banquet from Odysseus himself, they would not submit to it from the δῆμος, not even in face of superior numbers, without first taking some lives; but to risk their lives in this fashion is more than can be expected of the people.

But the MSS. go on with v. 251, 'if he (sc. Od.) should fight against superior numbers.' This cannot be right, for Leokritos and his audience are not concerned with the danger involved in an attack on a majority, but with the danger to that majority to which Mentor has appealed, if it attacks the suitors at the feast. We must either excise the line, as do many editors, or emend it. Now, if we excise it, we lose the words *σὺ δ' οὐ κατὰ μοῖραν ἔειπες*, which round off very

¹ Merry's theory that Mentor is the subject of the infinitive *μαχέσασθαι*, might incline one to read in v. 245 ἀνδράσι σε πλεόνεσσι for ἀ. καὶ πλ. of MSS.

fittingly the part of the speech dealing with Mentor; but if, instead of εἰ πλεόνεσσι μάχοιτο, we read εἰ περὶ δαιτὶ μ., it seems possible to explain readily both the line and its corruption.

εἰ περὶ δαιτὶ μάχοιτο briefly repeats vv. 246–8 εἰ περ γάρ κ' ... δαιννμένους ... ἐξελάσσει μέγαροιο μεινινήσει', which is itself a repetition of the more general expression μαχέσασθαι περὶ δαιτί in 245. The corruption was easy for two reasons. In the first place, πλεόνεσσι and περὶ δαιτί agree in their first and last sounds, and in the number and the quantities of their syllables. In the second place, there occurs six lines above πλεόνεσσι μαχέσασθαι περὶ δαιτί, which would tend to make the memory hesitate in 251 between the two expressions πλ. and π.δ. and would suggest πλ. μάχοιτο for that line rather than π.δ.μ.: cf. the reading, noted by Molhuysen, *l.l.*, p. 24, of Eustathius and one or two other authorities of *Od.* xiv. 21 ἔκτος ἱανον instead of αἰὲν ἴ., because ἔ. ἴ. has come just before in v. 16. But in the case of ii. 251 the decisive factor in the corruption was, probably, the half-unconscious influence on the rhapsodist of other Odyssean passages where a majority and a minority are contrasted, the suitors being in these the majority, not their assailants. Such passages are:

xvi. 244.

ἄνδρε δὴ πολλοῖσι καὶ ἰφθίμοισι μάχεσθαι.

xx. 30.

μοῦνος ἔων πολέσι.

xxii. 12.

τίς κ' οἴοιτο μετ' ἀνδράσι δαιτυμόνεσσι
μοῦνον ἐνὶ πλεόνεσσι κ.τ.λ.

The remainder of the speech is not difficult. I deal in Note A with the question, who was Leokritos, and in Note B, with a supposed reading of Didymus and Aristarchus in ii. 251.

II.—*Od.* iv. 514.

In Proteus' account of the return and death of Agamemnon, we read that he escaped shipwreck, for (δὲ adding an explanation) Here saved him (vv. 512–3). The passage continues

514 ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ τάχ' ἔμελλε Μαλειῶν ὄρος
αἰπὺ
ἵξεσθαι κ.τ.λ.

As we have just been told of Here's protection, we should expect to find that Agamemnon was about to reach some point on his

proper course; but this would not take him to Malea. Ameis-Hentze, *Anhang*, suggest that he followed the Phoenician sea-route from Asia through the southern series of islands to Malea; but this would be a very roundabout way from Troy. He would naturally go to the southern Euboean promontory, Geraistos, either, if the weather was fair, leaving Psyrie on his left, or by the route between Chios and Cape Mimas on the peninsula of Erythrai (cf. *Od.* iii. 169–178 and Tozer, *Hist. of Anc. Geogr.*, p. 23). From Geraistos he would pass on to Sounion, like Menelaos and Nestor (iii. 278). But while they had to round Malea, in order to reach the Laconic Gulf and Pylos respectively, any one returning to Mycenae would coast round the Argolis, making for some point at or near Nauplia; or, rather, in the days when Argos and Tiryns were as independent of Mycenae as Pylos or Athens, he would sail up to the head of the Saronic gulf and reach the capital along one of those three Cyclopean highways connecting Mycenae with Corinth, and 'pointing to Corinth' as the northern base of which the Pelopid Mycenae was an outpost' (cf. Tsountas and Manatt, *The Mycenaean Age*, pp. 16 and 35–8).

Dr. Merry (*ad. loc.*) suggests that a storm (*Od.* v. 109) first drifted Agamemnon south, and he worked up again until he sighted Malea. But, on this view, the passage omits details that are not obvious from the context, and is not worded with the usual Homeric lucidity.

If, however, we read² ἔμελλεν Ἀθηνῶν instead of ἔμελλε Μαλειῶν, all becomes clear. Ἀθηνῶν ὄρος αἰπὺ is Σούνιον ἶρον . . . ἄκρον Ἀθηνῶν (*Od.* iii. 278) which is on the natural route from Troy. The change to the vulgate was possible because of the similarity in sound, the difference being only -ma-lei-ā- for -na-thē-nā-, and was caused by recollection of the parallel passage in the account of Menelaos' return:—

Od. iii. 286.

ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ καὶ κείνος ἰὼν ἐπὶ οἶνοπα πόντον
ἐν νηυσὶ γλαφυρῇσι Μαλειῶν ὄρος αἰπὺ
ἵξε θεῶν τότε δὴ στρυγερὴν ὁδὸν κτλ,

For another corruption in the account of Agamemnon's return, I refer to Note C.

¹ In connecting Corinth, etc. rather than Argos, with Mycenae, the Catalogue (559–80) is in harmony with the results of modern investigation.

² Rather 'if we "hear"' since recollection of a text is recollection of sounds, rather than of writing, especially on the part of a reciter who probably learnt the text by repeating it many times aloud.

NOTE A.—LEOKRITOS.

We receive no information in *Od.* ii about this person, though we are told something about all the others that we first meet at the debate, Aigyptios, Halitherses, and Mentor—we have already found Antinoos and Eurymachos among the suitors in Bk. i. It is usual to regard him as a suitor, since one of the same name and patronymic is mentioned among the killed in xxii. 294. Besides, Telemachos' demand for a boat seems to be addressed to the suitors (ii. 212). On the other hand, a label so rarely used might be attached inadvertently to two minor personages in passages so far apart—the composers of early Epic had no convenient *index nominum* to prevent such slips—and the name ('Chosen-of-the-people') would be very suitable in ii for a spokesman of the people. Besides, both the grammar and sense of the speech are in favour of the speaker not being a suitor. The order of words, coupled with the fact that Mentor has just been urging the people to check the suitors, makes it more natural to construe *ἡμέας ὀτρύνων καταπαύμεν* 'urging us to check (the suitors)' than 'urging (the people) to check us.' If Mentor gives bad advice to the people, it is rather for them to reproach him with folly than for the suitors; and the statement that the suitors would kill *Odysseus*, if he interfered with them while they feasted, is in marked contrast with the affectation of right that the suitors have in the previous speeches maintained; it would come far better from one who was not a suitor.

The logic of the speech is the same in both cases.

NOTE B.—AN ANCIENT EMENDATION OF
Od. ii. 251.

The scholia show that the line was emended to *πλέονεσσιν ἔποιτο* instead of *πλ. μάχοιτο*, on the principle that if *Odysseus* 'went along with many,' many would be going along with him, and so the suitors would be the minority as Mentor suggested (v. 241). After deducting the emendations of Buttmann and Dindorf, we get the following scholion:—

εἰ πλέονεσσιν ἔποιτο [ἔποιτο] εἰ πολλοὶ αὐτῷ ἔποιντο ἢ εἰ πολλοὺς ὁπαδοὺς ἔχοι. τινὲς δὲ γελοῖως γράφουσι *μάχοιτο*. It is strange that Buttmann and later editors have not seen that the lemma is perfectly sound, and shows, perhaps a naive, but an intelligible correction of the ordinary *μάχοιτο*; and, as a note on the reading *πλ. ἔποιτο*, the scholion is necessary and correct. The Buttmann-Dindorf change to *πλέονές οἱ ἔποιντο* renders the note 'if many accompanied him, or if he had many attendants' superfluous and inept: it makes necessary Dindorf's insertion of *εἰ πλέονεσσι* before *μάχοιτο*, besides being itself impossible in Homer because the opt. 3 pl. *ἔποιντο* is un-Homeric, as v. Leeuwen-da Costa point out in their note. When Ludwig writes '*πλέονές οἱ ἔποιντο* (Aristarchus?) Didymus,' he wrongs those worthies.

NOTE C.—*Od.* iv. 519-20.

According to the vulgate, (1) Agamemnon is swept away by a storm to the neighbourhood of Aigisthos (vv. 515-8); (2) the wind changes, and he reaches home (519-23); and (3) he is invited to Aigisthos' house and murdered (524 *seq.*). Of these three stages in the story, it can hardly be doubted that (1) was intended to lead up to (3), whereas in the existing version it has no bearing at all on (3). Some editors, therefore, transpose 517-8 and 519-20, so that the stages become (1) Agamemnon is swept away by a storm (515-6), (2) a favourable wind brings him home to the neighbourhood of Aigisthos (519-20, 517-18, 521-3), and (3) as before. But with this arrangement, *οἰκάδ' ἴκοντο* at the end of 520 is immediately followed, as by an explanation, by *ἀγροῦ ἐπ' ἐσχατὴν* at the beginning of 517. 'Home,' however, should mean the city, but the expression *ἀγροῦ κτλ.* means a place far from the city; cf. *Od.* v. 489.

It is more probable that vv. 519-20 beginning with the words *ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ* were composed by a reciter as a substitute for vv. 514-8 beginning with the same words, *i.e.* 519 *ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ καὶ κείθεν* was composed to follow 513, and *κείθεν* meant from the storm in which Aias was wrecked. The change was made in order to suit hearers who believed that the murder took place at Mycenae.

After the removal of these lines the story becomes quite clear. Aigisthos, who had removed Klytæmnestre from the royal house in Mycenae (cf. iii 272) was living on his father's old estate at a distance from the capital (iv 517-8). For a year a man in his service had been watching, iv 527 *μή ἐλάβοι παριῶν μνήσαιτο δὲ θούριδος ἀλκῆς*, *i.e.* lest Agamemnon should pass unobserved by him (the watchman, or perhaps Aig.) to the capital, find his wife gone, and prepare to attack Aigisthos before the latter had news of the husband's return. Fate favoured Aigisthos by carrying Agamemnon out of his course so that he landed at a distance from the city near Aigisthos' lonely dwelling. The watchman caught sight of him, gave word of his arrival, and there followed the paramour's invitation to the husband, who little suspected that his wife was living in his host's zenana.

We need not be troubled because Agamemnon, landing unexpectedly near Aigisthos' house, was seen by a man who was looking for him on the route to Mycenae. The watcher *ἀπὸ σκοπιῆς εἶδε* (524), *i.e.* the outlook is from the top of a hill whence a wide prospect is enjoyed of sea and land. Cf. II. iv 275, v 771, or take as an example of what the poet meant by *σκοπιή* the real ancient fort near Mycenae 'on the lofty summit of St. Elias, which served at the same time as a watch-tower and beacon-station,' and from which 'the whole Argolic plain and gulf and the mountain region to Corinth and beyond can readily be watched' (Tsountas and Manatt, *l.l.* p. 38).

C. M. MULVANY.

Benares, 1901.