

an amorphous, mutable beast. (URLs for all sites are listed at the end of the chapter.) C. & N. note references to Seneca in various online encyclopaedias (almost all in English), some produced by reputable scholarly organizations, some of dubious value. They note Seneca's association with sites concerned with philosophy, with drama, with history, and with vegetarianism. More useful to readers of this journal are likely to be sites containing texts and bibliographies, most notably Latin Library (for texts) and the Katholieke Universiteit, Nijmegen (for bibliography of Senecan tragedy). They also note a number of essays on Seneca in online journals, again of mixed quality. Finally, they note sites which contain, among other things, courses on Seneca's *Medea* (both in French), an Italian hypertext version of *De breuitate uitae*, and another (from Louisiana) designed to enable accelerated reading of the *Letters to Lucilius*. The chapter concludes with sites containing collections of Senecan maxims.

The book is undoubtedly a useful one and a valuable starting point for more detailed research on recent Senecan reception.

University of Tasmania

PETER DAVIS

UNFAIR TO WILAMOWITZ?

I. GILDENHARD, M. RUEHL (edd.): *Out of Arcadia. Classics and Politics in Germany in the Age of Burckhardt, Nietzsche and Wilamowitz*. (Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies Supplement 79.) Pp. viii + 208, ill. London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London, 2003. Paper, £45. ISBN: 0-900587-90-3.

The volume began as papers delivered at a one-day conference in Princeton on 9 April 1999 on 'The Gods of Greece and their Prophets: Liberal and Illiberal Moments in German Classical Scholarship since Burckhardt and Nietzsche'. It seeks to make anglophone monoglots aware of earlier German scholarship. Translations of German citations are regularly provided. Its danger is that because they cannot control German sources readers will accept what is written as truth. Among scholars discussed are Jacob Burckhardt, Albrecht Dieterich, Werner Jaeger, Nietzsche, Franz Overbeck, Richard Reitzenstein, Hermann Usener, and Wilamowitz. Ignorance of essential sources (e.g. some twenty recent editions of scholarly letters) astounds. No proven authority in the subject matter of the conference participated nor apparently vetted the papers. The results are not unexpected. Exceptions are Lionel Gossman on Jacob Burckhardt and Martin Ruehl on a politically incorrect essay of Nietzsche on the Greek state. A selective *index nominum* omits much. Bibliography is scattered in notes. A critical collection of English language translations and contributions lacks.

Among the more bizarre chapters is Egon Flaig's (pp. 105–27) condemning Wilamowitz's *Glaube der Hellenen*, which he repeatedly dates to 1928, as anticipating Nazi ideology. The title is better 'What the Greeks Believed' than 'The Faith of the Hellenes' (p. 112). Yes, one can find occasional inconsistencies and strong statements of long-held views, but the octogenarian author was dictating from his deathbed and never corrected a proof. Wilamowitz's view that most men believe what they are told and but a few question accepted tradition is condemned (p. 115) as 'an elitist extremism', implying 'a social dichotomy between an elite endowed with superior intellectual abilities, and a large mass lacking them'. Surely Socrates, Plato, and

Aristotle differed a bit from Simon the Shoemaker, however amiable he may have been. Wilamowitz preferred (p. 120) ‘his beloved Greeks’ to ‘East African tribes’. This anticipates Nazi racism. He is reproved (p. 123) for not agreeing with Lincoln that ‘all men are created equal’. Did Karl Marx, with his Lumpenproletariat? And (pp. 115–16) silly ‘Wilamowitz claims that the Greek gods actually exist’. As an effective paedagogical device, which I have long adopted, Wilamowitz taught Greek religion as a believer. Quite different is J. G. Frazer’s evolutionary approach that it was a muddled stage on the way to Oxbridge rationalism. Why are we not told that Wilamowitz opposed Goethe’s dictum (*Maximen und Reflexionen* no. 763) that ‘Chinese, Indic, Egyptian antiquities are always only curiosities. It is well intended to make them and their world known but they will little benefit our practical and aesthetic education?’ Among his most cherished students were the Jews Felix Jacoby, Eduard Fraenkel, Paul Friedländer, and Paul Maas. The orthodox Jew Jacob Bernays was a beloved and influential mentor. He damned those denouncing the partly Jewish Egyptologist Adolf Erman as ‘Rassenschnüfflern!’ This is far from approval of Nazi racism. He could not understand why a Berkeley professor wrote him a letter assuring him that he would not bring a Jew into his home for tea. Who was the anti-Semite?

Scholars should seek to understand the thinkers they study in the context of their times. Plato bought and sold human beings. Should he be blacklisted? Classical scholars today lack the breadth and linguistic competence of their predecessors. Instead of gratitude for what they have been bequeathed, too many seek to prove themselves superior by citing ideas incompatible with contemporary dogma. It is anti-Semitic for Wilamowitz to call Carthage ‘a plutocracy’ (p. 109).

Suzanne Marchand, as always, must be read with caution—see *AJA* 102 (1998), 214–15. Harnack (p. 140) did not want ‘a scientific Christianity’, but a simple Christianity based on faith and ethics, God as Love, and the importance of the individual. See Harnack’s lecture *What is Christianity?*, p. 8. On Wilamowitz and Harnack, she (p. 143 with n. 41) omits the context. Harnack does not forbid chairs of *Religionsgeschichte*. He says sensibly that such chairs should not be in the theological faculty but the philosophical faculty. That is quite different. Wilamowitz opposed theologians editing Church Fathers.

In ‘*Philologia Perennis? Classical Scholarship and Functional Differentiation*’ (whatever the last words mean)—over forty pages, largely on Usener, Wilamowitz, and Jaeger—Gildenhard, if nothing else, introduces the uninformed to the complexity of the subject, but reaches no clear conclusion. There is no marked difference among their books caused by method, so how important was it? Gildenhard is unaware of the formative influence of Goethe on Wilamowitz, and never cites ‘Gelehrsamkeit tuts nicht, Gefühl ist alles’ (*Pindaros*, 201 after *Faust* 1.3456; cf. *AuA* I.338 n. 38). And amazingly, he does not know Wilamowitz’ famous and influential denial of method in philology: ‘Why this prized philological method? There simply isn’t any—any more than a method to catch fish. The whale is harpooned; the herring caught in a net; minnows are trapped; the salmon speared; trout caught on a fly. Where do you find the method to catch fish?’ (*Antiqua* 23 [1983], 258). Discussion of Wilamowitz’s ‘method’ against Usener’s and Jaeger’s yields little.

The subject deserved better. German philhellenism is alleged to start with F. A. Wolf. Walther Ludwig, *Hellas in Deutschland: Darstellungen der Gräzistik im deutschsprachigen Raum aus dem 16. und 17. Jahrhundert* (Hamburg, 1998) proves it started 200 years earlier. This book is unknown. Not a word on how German revulsion to the wartime atrocities of Napoleon caused Greece to replace France as the cultural

ideal. Careless errors abound. Jargon, with words like 'idiolect', intrudes. German bashing is ubiquitous. The book disappoints. *Latet dolus in generalibus*.

University of Illinois

WILLIAM M. CALDER III

USENER'S INFLUENCE

A. WESSELS: *Ursprungszauber. Zur Rezeption von Hermann Useners Lehre von der religiösen Begriffsbildung*. (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 51.) Pp. viii + 246. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2003. Cased, €74. ISBN: 3-11-017787-0.

The book, a revised Heidelberg dissertation, seeks to examine the influence of Hermann Usener on religious studies in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The title misleads. Usener has eighty-eight pages, dealing largely with his *Götternamen*. Over 150 pages concern Albrecht Dieterich, Ludwig Radermacher, Aby Warburg, and Walter F. Otto. A lucid, informed, and accurate treatment of the contribution of these five German scholars to the history of religion would have been welcome. Indeed, even an accurate summary of their writings indicating sources and influence precisely could have become standard. Instead, the author takes off on matters like 'the archaeology of the human psyche', 'Urangst und Artikulation', 'Personifikation und Narrativität', 'Glaube und Poetologie', 'Neopaganismus' in Walter F. Otto, and much else of this sort. Because such matters are so abstract and vague, any treatment is easily subjective and hence short-lived. Terms like 'Methodenpluralismus', 'Einzelwissenschaft', and 'Fachdisziplinen' are frequently used, but never discussed or defined. Jargon often renders the prose impenetrable.

The book suffers from two major defects. Fundamental source material is unknown. We note only Dietrich Ehlers' two volume edition of the Diels/Usener/Zeller letters (1992) or the second edition (1994) of the Usener/Wilamowitz letters with corrections, *Nachwort*, and index. She does not know the correspondence on method between Wilamowitz and Martin P. Nilsson at *Eranos* 89 (1991), 73–99. In her discussion of the student–teacher relationship between Wilamowitz and Usener (pp. 73–4 n. 309) she should cite the octogenarian Wilamowitz' dismissal of Usener: 'quibus nihil debeo inter philologos: Usener': see *Antiqua* 27 (1984), 161 with n. 98. She does not know F. Paulsen's criticism of Usener's lectures in his autobiography. These are sources, not secondary literature. Of the latter, fundamental modern work on William Robertson Smith and the Cambridge Ritualists goes unnoticed (p. 205 n. 106). Typical is her discussion of Albrecht Dieterich. There is never a reference to the standard biography, with bibliography, easily available in Dieterich, *Kleine Schriften* (Leipzig, 1911) pp. ix–xlii, by his student Richard Wünsch, nor to the trauma of his scholarly life, the brutal review by Wilamowitz of *Pulcinella* at *GGA* 159 (1897), 505–15, which caused Dieterich years of depression and scholarly inactivity: see Wünsch, pp. xxi–xxii. She claims falsely that Aby Warburg disdained theory and terminology (pp. 165–7). Again, she is ignorant of recent publications, and has never consulted the extensive Warburg archives in London. The most important journal, published in 2001, that Warburg kept concerning his library is never cited. Bernd Roeck's brilliant article on Warburg's 'Denksystem' (1996) is unknown. Her chapter on Walter F. Otto omits the only book-length treatment of her subject: Josef Donnerberg, *Die Götterlehre Walter Friedrich Ottos: Weg oder Irrweg moderner Religionsgeschichte?* (Diss. Innsbruck,

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved