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](#)

Butler's *Trapanese Origin of the Odyssey On the Trapanese Origin of the Odyssey*. By Samuel Butler. Cambridge: Metcalfe. 1893.

Arthur Platt

The Classical Review / Volume 7 / Issue 06 / June 1893, pp 254 - 255

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00197902, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00197902

How to cite this article:

Arthur Platt (1893). The Classical Review, 7, pp 254-255 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00197902

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

who turn to individuals to see whether the same εἶδος constitutes justice there. For ἰὼν read ἰούσιν. Cf. to some extent Badham's correction of εἶδος...ἰὼν in *Phaedr.* 249 B.

436 D. ὡς οὐ κατὰ ταῦτά ἐαυτῶν τὰ τοιαῦτα τῷ μενόντων τε καὶ φερομένων.

Τὰ τοιαῦτα is clearly an error for τῶν τοιούτων, perhaps arising from 'accommodation' to ταῦτά.

437 D. Ἄρ' οὖν, καθ' ὅσον δῖψα ἐστί, πλέονος ἂν τινος ἢ οὐ λέγομεν ἐπιθυμία ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ εἶη; οἷον δῖψα ἐστί δῖψα ἄρά γε θερμοῦ ποτοῦ ἢ ψυχροῦ ἢ πολλοῦ ἢ ολίγου κ.τ.λ.;

Probably this is the only place where δῖψα takes a genitive, and the repetition of the word is awkward. All through this passage (as in the first words here) δῖψα is called an ἐπιθυμία of some kind. No doubt Plato wrote here οἷον δῖψα ἐστὶν ἐπιθυμία ἄρά γε θερμοῦ ποτοῦ κ.τ.λ.

438 A. Μήτοι (μὴ τοίνυν;) τις, ἣν δ' ἐγώ, ἀσκέπτους ἡμᾶς ὄντας θορυβήσῃ (<λόγος>? cf. *Phaedr.* 245 B μὴδέ τις ἡμᾶς λόγος θορυβεῖτω ὡς κ.τ.λ.) ὡς οὐδεὶς ποτοῦ ἐπιθυμεῖ ἀλλὰ χρηστοῦ ποτοῦ, καὶ οὐ σίτου ἀλλὰ χρηστοῦ σίτου, πάντες γὰρ ἄρα τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐπιθυμοῦσιν.

The last words would give a much clearer sense, if we might read πάντες γὰρ ἄρα πάντων ἀγαθῶν ἐπιθυμοῦσιν: 'any one desiring anything desires it good.'

440 D. κἂν νικᾷται (Madvig's emendation for καὶ νικᾷ καὶ) οὐ λήγει τῶν γενναίων.

What are τὰ γενναῖα? The expression is most feeble. Plainly Plato wrote οὐ λήγει ἀγανακτῶν, possibly with some additional word before ἀγανακτῶν. Cf. ζεῖ τε καὶ χαλεπαίνει and ὀργίζεσθαι above.

444 B. ἵν' ἄρχῃ ἐν αὐτῷ οὐ προσήκον ἀλλὰ τοιούτου ὄντος φύσει οἷον πρέπειν αὐτῷ δουλεῖν τῷ τοῦ ἀρχικοῦ γένους ὄντι.

Τοιούτου ὄντος οἷου δουλεῖν would be Greek. So would τοιούτου ὄντος ὥστε πρέπειν αὐτῷ δουλεῖν. But the text as it stands is not Greek at all. Πρέπειν αὐτῷ appears to be a gloss intended to explain οἷον with the infinitive.

Just below for ταῦτά μὲν οὖν ταῦτα read αὐτὰ μὲν οὖν ταῦτα. Ταῦτά is unmeaning here, and the confusion of the words is common.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

(To be continued.)

BUTLER'S TRAPANESE ORIGIN OF THE ODYSSEY.

On the Trapanese Origin of the Odyssey. By SAMUEL BUTLER. Cambridge: Metcalfe. 1893.

THE following is the 'argument' by which Mr. Butler hopes to convince us that the *Odyssey* hails from Trapani. He read the poem, and could not understand what it was driving at; he concluded after a bit that it was written by a young lady; he thought the Phaeacian scenes and the Cyclops incident drawn from real life; he 'made a note' that Scheria must have a rock like a sunken ship off its harbour; he decided that Scheria was the 'eye of the *Odyssey*' and must have certain features; he 'learned that Col. Mure and others placed the Cyclopes on Mount Eryx'; and—voilà! Mount Eryx is Scheria. The hardest sceptic will surely not hold out against that. But not only did our author find that Trapani and Eryx have all the marks of Scheria, they can also be shown to have all the marks of Ithaca and all the marks of the Cyclops incident. Argal, the

Odyssey was written at Trapani. Q.E.D. It is a pity Mr. Butler did not look for the marks of the Trojan war too. He has not asked whether any other place has the marks, he has visited no other site to test his conclusion, he has been content to take the first that came into his head. Before he can show that Trapani suggested Scheria, let alone the rest, he must show that no other spot could have suggested it, and that it was necessary for any spot to suggest it at all.

The geographical knowledge shown in the *Odyssey* is familiar to all; we all know that the author had no accurate information about the Ionian islands or the Peloponnese, and that west of them everything, ὡς εἰπεῖν, is fairyland. Instead of the natural deduction that the author lived to the east, Mr. Butler boldly draws the precisely opposite inference. Whenever the author 'writes' from 'her' own observation, she purposely changes names and throws an air of mystery over everything; whenever the names are real, it is a sign that the author

did not know the places! Did ever poet or poetess compose a poem on such a perverse and preposterous system before or since?

If Mr. Butler expects the current view to be abandoned, he must really condescend to bring forward some evidence against it. He has not said one single word to overthrow the view that the *Odyssey* comes from the Aegean region. Instead of doing so, he puts forth a hasty conjecture and expects us all to surrender a position he has not attacked; like a new Hasdrubal he thinks to take Rome by pitching a camp on Mount Eryx. And now he boasts that the *Classical Review* has only been able to oppose one objection to his theory (see Prof. Warr's review of Butler's *Humour of Homer* in the November number). That objection was that 'the Greek Drepane did not exist till long after the close of the Homeric age.' Mr. Butler replies now that Thucydides (vi. 2) says a Phocian settlement was established there long before. Well, it cannot be proved by $A+B$ that no Greeks had ever got there at such a date, though one would like to know what happened to them afterwards, but how then is Mr. Butler going to explain the fact that the *Odyssey* was introduced into Greece from Ionia? And what right has he to say that the *Review* 'has been able to bring' only one objection to his theory? Here is another for him; Laestrygonia, says he, was close to the abode of the poetess, yet she talks of it as though it were the North Cape, saying it is light all night there. Now it is all very well for Milton to say that in heaven night comes only as a grateful twilight, but fancy him saying this of Cornwall or Lancashire! True, our author has utterly misunderstood the passage in question, for he extracts from it the remarkable discovery that the Laestrygons 'insisted on having fresh milk twice a day.' It is not the only passage he has misunderstood, though quoting few enough. For he thinks that Pantellaria is the island of Calypso, 'from which, if

Ulysses steered as Calypso had told him, he would make Trapani,' i.e. if you steer by keeping the Bear on your left hand you will sail north. But with Mr. Butler all roads lead to Trapani. It may interest him to know that before now Calypso's isle has been placed in the Persian Gulf and the Laestrygons at Cyzicus on evidence about on a par with his own.

But it is really too absurd for a man to complain that such a hap-hazard theory is not demolished. As Prof. Clifford once asked on a similar occasion, if Mr. Butler proved the moon made of green cheese, would he expect the man in the moon to come hurrying down to assure us it was a mistake? Or if he proved to his own satisfaction that the book of Job was written by a young lady in Damascus, who could disprove it? Yet this Galileo of mares' nests is 'afraid the views must be reconsidered in spite of all the professors at King's College or at Palermo'; he brings out a pamphlet of thirteen pages with a rambling preface nearly double as long as the pamphlet, and expects the walls of Jericho to fall at the first blast of this penny whistle; he protests against the 'slovenly unscholarly habit of ascribing the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad* indiscriminately to Homer,' as if any scholar ever did; he falls foul of poor Prof. Ridgeway because he argues from a talent of the Troad to a talent of a country so far distant as Sicily (!) and in the same breath thinks the watchman of Clytemnestra received £500 for his trouble; he imagines he will convert the world to his views by recounting the hasty manner in which he jumped at them himself. I can assure Mr. Butler that when he puts forward his views in a manner deserving attention, attention they will receive; but when he irritably attacks responsible scholars on the strength of this sort of thing, he has very much mistaken the situation.

ARTHUR PLATT.

STEUP—CLASSEN, THUCYDIDES BOOK III.

Thukydides, erklärt von J. CLASSEN. Dritter Band. Drittes Buch. Dritte Auflage besorgt von J. STEUP. Berlin, 1892. Pp. iv. 282. Mk. 2. 70.

In this volume, the second of Steup's edition of Classen, the former editor's work has

been thoroughly overhauled, with results that are in every way creditable to his successor's judgment. The notes here are decidedly more polemical than those with which Steup fitted out the second book; but with this it is scarcely possible to find fault, since there is undoubtedly even more