

1961). But enough. Knowledge of earlier work in her field is simply hit or miss. Hence her book lacks context and cannot be treated as a permanent contribution.

The book abounds in errors of detail. Here are ten: (i) Aby Warburg's 'proverbial dictum' was not (p. 5) 'Der liebe Gott sitzt im Detail', but '... steckt im Detail'; (ii) Wilamowitz did not die in 1933 (p. 7 n. 3), but in 1931; (iii) Wilamowitz wrote *Überlebseln*, not *Überlebsen* (p. 49 n. 200); (iv) Aby Warburg did not study under Kekulé von Stradonitz at Bonn in 1886 (p. 162) because Kekulé only received his *von* from Wilhelm II in 1895; (v) after 1918, once-Kaiser Wilhelm II (p. 193 n. 31) was no longer Kaiser; (vi) Wuttke's edition of Warburg's selected essays appeared in 1979, not (p. 164) 1969; (vii) Roy Chernow (p. 172) is in fact Ron Chernow; (viii) we are told (p. 133 n. 11) that Richard Wünsch published his contribution to the *Corpus Inscriptionum Atticorum* [*sic*] when he was eight years old. For 1877, read 1897; (ix) We are told (p. 192 n. 29) that Otto spent thirty years as Ordinarius at Frankfurt. The dates given are 1914–34; (x) Heyne's *de caussis fabularum* appeared in 1764, not 1864 (p. 229). She has difficulties spelling the names of the great correctly. We have Theodor Gompertz (p. 131 n. 7, p. 241); Moses Hados (p. 187 n. 9; p. 199 n. 64); Herbert Harne (p. 175 n. 71); Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (p. 8). In short, students whose native language is German will certainly learn something and gain tips for further reading. If the volume contributes anything, in Housman's words, 'new and true', this has eluded us.

University of Illinois BJÖRN BIESTER and WILLIAM M. CALDER III

## HOMER IN AMERICA

J. SHAY: *Odysseus in America. Combat Trauma and the Trials of Homecoming*. With foreword by M. Cleland and J. McCain. Pp. 331. New York: Scribner, 2002. Cased, US\$25. ISBN: 0-7432-1156-1.

To produce a thorough review of this book 'Odysseus in America' by Dr J. Shay would require detailed consideration of his earlier work, *Achilles in Vietnam. Combat Trauma and the Undoing of Character* (New York, 1995). S.'s two books complement each other in the same way that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* do. The *Iliad* is a narrative describing trauma in war conditions, while the *Odyssey* describes it after the war's end. The source for the trauma is the 'betrayal of what's right [thémis]'. In the *Iliad*, Achilles is betrayed by his superior Agamemnon through the insult of his dignity and the violation of moral order (cf. Shay, *Achilles in Vietnam*, pp. 3–21), in the *Odyssey* it is Odysseus himself who betrays his own soldiers: 'His [Odysseus'] betrayal of responsibility . . . Odysseus has surely betrayed what's right by protecting himself and doing nothing to protect his men' (p. 64). According to S., 'Achilles and Odysseus might have been the same person—Achilles in war, Odysseus after war' (p. 12).

S. owes his broad knowledge of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* to a period of recovery from a stroke he suffered at the age of 40 which left him partly paralysed. In 1987 he started work at the Day Treatment Center of the Veterans Administration in Boston. At the end of 1987, S. filled in for the Christmas and New Year's holiday for Dr Lillian Rodríguez, a psychiatrist and cofounder of the 'Vietnam combat vet program'. A temporary replacement later became a permanent engagement, for Dr Rodríguez had died in Argentina and S. stayed on in her position. He states that the experiences of Vietnamese veterans are similar to the ones described in Homeric poems. Of importance in the process of publication of both his books was the rôle of Harvard

professor Gregory Nagy, who encouraged S. in the development of his conception and its final publication. The first book was finished after six years of work, the second after the following eight.

S. does not conceal the fact that his book ‘is written in a “personal voice”’ (p. 7). In fact, its foreword was written by two US senators, coming from different political parties but both veterans of the Vietnamese War, Max Cleland and John McCain. However, S. underlines that, on the one hand, he is against the traditional political left in having ‘respect for the military profession’, but on the other, he is opposed to the ‘traditional political right’ in being hostile to ‘war itself’ and ‘calls for its abolition’ (p. 249). S.’s book is based on two kinds of document, the literary and the clinical. The outcome presents practical propositions for prevention: ‘This book and *Achilles in Vietnam* are about the arts, especially the narrative arts, as social responses to trauma’ (p. 243).

Part I, the longest (pp. 11–146), entitled ‘Unhealed Wounds’, is a commentary on Odysseus’ adventures. For S., the *Odyssey* is ‘the earliest known and most famous account of a combat veteran trying to get home after the war, and of what he does after he gets there’ (p. 3). S. proposes his fundamental metaphorical explanation for Odysseus’ adventures (which he analyses in real-time order, not the order of narration): ‘Odysseus has served us as a metaphor of the veteran’ (p. 59), just as Achilles is ‘a very high-ranking officer . . . cares about the whole army . . . prototype of the berserker’ (Shay, *Achilles in Vietnam*, pp. 24, 77). The individual Homeric metaphorical elements achieve unexpectedly literal meanings thanks to the equivalents found by S. in the veterans’ documentation, especially in their personal comments. So the Land of the Phaeacians is a metaphor for ‘rich tourists in the landscape of suffering’ (p. 16), the pirate raid on Ismarus is a metaphor for ‘staying in combat mode’ even though the war is over (pp. 19–34), the Land of the Lotus Eaters is an attempt at escape from pain (pp. 35–41), etc. In the *Odyssey*, S. identifies further on the references to post-war boredom, workaholism, lack of security, dangerous women, memory and guilt, fatal addiction, dangers from all sides (‘up, down, and sideways’), blame game, sexaholism, hostility from one’s closest relatives after returning home, and finally a repeated departure, for Odysseus spends only one night in the family home. A conclusion for this part may be the first sentence from the ‘Introduction’ to Part II: ‘Odysseus has shown us how *not* to return home from war’ (p. 149).

Part II (‘Restoration’, pp. 149–201), apart from complex remarks on the ‘aversion to returning veterans’, which ‘is an old story’ (pp. 152–6), and a searching argument on the Homeric word *thumos*, contains a review of the actions undertaken within the realms of the VIP program (Veterans Improvement Program) in aid assistance and reinstatement of the Vietnamese veterans. The third chapter of the second part is a touching document, an abbreviated transcript of the responses of members of the VWAR internet community given within the first few days to the news that Lewis B. Puller, the author of the 1992 Pulitzer Prize for Biography, had killed himself,<sup>1</sup> and of their responses towards one another.

Part III (‘Prevention’, pp. 205–53) is a presentation of preventive measures to ‘protect the capacity for social trust and to *prevent* psychological and moral injury in military service’ (p. 205). The main meaning of prevention is love: ‘A leader’s love for his troops reduces that leader’s level of fear in the face of danger’ (p. 211). Love on the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also Shay, *Achilles in Vietnam*, pp. 50, 72 on the topic of possibilities for Achilles’ suicide and G. Devereux, ‘Achilles’ “suicide” in the *Iliad*’, *Helios* 6/2 (1978–9), 11: ‘Achilles’ fight against Hector is a combat with his own mirror-image: a suicide disguised as revenge’.

collective level appears through ‘cohesion’, which ‘both increases the ability to overcome fear (we call that courage) and reduces fear’ (p. 210). S. draws up a list of reproaches against ‘Captain Odysseus’ (pp. 236–7). In the conclusion he writes:

Prevention of trauma lies squarely in the realm of justice, ethics, and recognition of one another’s humanness, recognition that we are in this together and part of one another’s future. As such, prevention is intrinsic to the goals of our own polity and of any future world polity based on democracy. (p. 243)

Not counting notes, bibliography, and index, the book ends with appendixes. They reflect the core of the book: the first is a summary of *Odyssey* (‘A Pocket Guide to Homer’s *Odyssey*’), the second applies to veterans (‘Information Resources for Vietnam Veterans and Their Families’), the third to preventive indications (‘Some Proposals’).

Most important for a classical reader is the treatment of Homer’s epics in a metahistorical manner, which has the advantage over customary historical and cultural approaches in that it shows that Homeric descriptions could become a reference point for modern psychology: ‘Homer has seen things that we in psychiatry and psychology have more or less missed’ (Shay, *Achilles in Vietnam*, p. xiii). That would signify a major change towards a situation in which the tools of modern psychology are used in application to Homeric psychology, which could incur the charge of anachronism. Earlier, before S., Georges Devereux showed similarities between the behaviours described in *Iliad* and those from the Second World War (cf. Devereux, ‘Achilles’ “suicide” in the *Iliad*’, pp. 3–15). In his books S. showed that the only anachronism is to be found in the interpretation on the social level, for example elements applying to social stance towards an enemy in the *Iliad* (cf. Shay, *Achilles in Vietnam*, p. 108 and Chapter 6: ‘Dishonoring the Enemy’, pp. 103–19) or social standards in *Odyssey* in general (cf. Shay, *Odysseus in America*, p. 237), whereas the psychological level is common to both the epoch of Homer and the present day. This approach allows us to evade the ‘Homeric Question’: ‘I need not see “Homer” as one person’ (p. 278 n. 12).

In S.’s work I find valuable detailed remarks. I am speaking above all of the understanding of the Greek *thumos* as ‘human universal trait of commitment to people’ (cf. pp. 156–61 and 242–3).<sup>2</sup> On this ground, one may describe *thumos* as the personality core, which is plainly justified, for S. writes about the relation of *thumos* to honour, and distinguishes ‘thumotic emotions’ (p. 157). He also notices that *athumia* is ‘demoralization’ (p. 160), what may be understood to mean that the violation of *thumos* leads to the destruction of identification guarantees (cf. p. 242), especially since S. highlights ‘the less pathologizing and prejudicial’ role of *thumos* (p. 277, n. 7).

It is significant how S. sheds light on the meeting of Odysseus and Ajax (‘His encounter in the Underworld with the great Ajax is particularly revealing’, p. 76), and the emphasis on the context of feelings present in the scene. Although S. does not express it directly, his analysis may be used in favour of the hypothesis that, in the Homeric beyond, feelings (in the person of Ajax) survive and live on.

S.’s way of taking into consideration Odysseus’ son, Telemachus, is characteristic. He was excluded from Odysseus’ circle of cruelty, interior to which are his wife, father, citizens of Ithaca and servants, for in fact he makes up one with his father: ‘I do not

<sup>2</sup> In the article ‘Killing Rage: *Physis* or *Nomos*—or Both?’ [available at: [www.belisarius.com/author\\_index.htm](http://www.belisarius.com/author_index.htm)], S. writes directly: ‘I invite you to view *thumós* as a human universal . . .’.

respond quite so positively to Odysseus' warmth and truthfulness toward his son, because his son, Telemachus, is not in any sense a separate being from Odysseus. He literally lives or dies with Odysseus' (p. 280 n. 1; cf. also p. 280 n. 9).

There are further valuable observations on 'alethia' being not only the unconcealed, but also 'that which is unforgotten' (p. 92). S. would differentiate between the gods of *Iliad* (where 'they are arbitrary, heartless, capricious, and unconcerned with justice') and of *Odyssey* ('the justice of the gods', p. 105), on which point S. agrees with one of the most outstanding classical philologists from the turn of the nineteenth/twentieth century, Tadeusz Zielinski.<sup>3</sup> S. at times points out inconsistencies in Homer: to burden Odysseus' companions, who 'devoured the cattle of the sun god' (cf. *Odyssey* 1.6–9), with guilt for their own death, is enigmatic, because few of them arrived on the fatal island:

What are we to believe about the narrator in the first lines of the poem . . . , who, announcing Odysseus as his subject, blames the men for their own deaths? He says they ate the sun god's cattle. The men in these eleven ships, who drowned beneath the rocks rained down on them or who were butchered for the Laestrygonians' meal, had never reached the island where the sun god kept his cattle. (p. 61cf. also p. 62)

The narrator of the prologue seems to have forgotten that eleven out of twelve of Odysseus' flotilla had already been sunk before his one remaining ship reached the island where the sun god pastured his cattle (p. 272 n. 10).

It would be interesting if S.'s erudition would allow him to solve this mystery.

The accuracy and penetration of S.'s analyses derive from his acceptance of a multilevel and integral perspective. Thus he can freely explain seemingly contradictory viewpoints as complementary: in Homer, Odysseus' 'coldness is intentional', while in Owen, 'insensibility and numbed feeling are an adaptation to the pain, fear, and grief of combat'. Combat veterans too can be intentionally cold or emotionally distant and unresponsive (cf. p. 138). S.'s conclusion is as follows: 'I am inclined to say that both are true' (p. 138). Several times he uses the concept of multilevelness, e.g. 'hierarchy of suffering', pp. 79, 275 n. 12 (here a minor printing mistake has sneaked in and instead of p. 230 n. 10 we find p. 239 n. 10), 'level of fear' (p. 211), 'moral courage and physical courage' (p. 238). This is connected, on the one hand, to the distinction between intellectual and emotional spheres (cf. e.g. p. 57), but on the other to the consciousness of their complementarity (cf. e.g. p. 290 n. 19).

The exploitation of a literary text through psychological and psychiatric analysis allows S. to identify the crucial point in Odysseus' story, which is his accident in childhood: 'The scar on Odysseus' thigh . . . as central to understanding Odysseus . . . He is named and defined by this scar' (pp. 142–3). The tale of Odysseus may also provide data for a comprehensive analysis, especially in relation to the psychology of

<sup>3</sup> Zielinski points out the difference in 'moral consciousness' between *Iliad* 19.86–90 and *Odyssey* 1.32–43. Zielinski is the author of, among others, 'The Treatment of Simultaneous Events in Ancient Epic', *Philologus Supplementband* 8 (1899–1901), 407–13, 432–41, trans. C. Krojzl, S. R. van der Mije in *Homer. Critical Assessments*, ed. I. J. F. de Jong (London and New York, 1999), vol. iv: 'Homer's Art', pp. 317–27; and 'Gomerowskaja psychologija', in *Iz Trudow Razrjada Izjaszcznoj Slowesnosti Rossijskoj Akademii Nauk* (Petersburg, 1922), pp. 1–39 (in Polish: 'Psychologia homerycka', trans. T. Kobierzycki in *Heksis* 1–2 [1999], 3–33; in English: 'Homeric psychology', trans. N. Kotsyba in *Organon* 31 [2002], 15–46; a version without notes is also available at: [www.ihnpan.waw.pl/redakcje/organon/zielinsk.html](http://www.ihnpan.waw.pl/redakcje/organon/zielinsk.html)).

dependence: 'The impact of these childhood experiences, and of the family system that produced them, was evident even before Odysseus left for Troy . . . Odysseus' scar alerts us to the interconnection of childhood trauma, combat trauma and a veteran's adult character' (p. 144).<sup>4</sup>

S.'s astonishing and impressive range of references provided by modern psychology and psychiatry confirms, perhaps even in a larger degree than the often arduous philological inquiries, that poems maybe are 'fiction, but that the bard sang the truth' (p. xv). S.'s research shows that Homer turns out to be an object of vivid interest not only for philologists, lexicographers, and historians, but also for philosophers, psychologists, or anthropologists. It is worth highlighting that this merit fell to the lot of an American author to whom ancient Greece would not necessarily have been such an important focus as to a European. It is noteworthy that his intuitions find confirmation even though he admits to a non-philological point of departure. He is a Greekless reader of Homer's poems, but he still provides a refreshing reading of the Homeric poems, and points out their richness as a source for understanding human nature. Let us hope that classical scholars succeed in using this inspiration and these methodological guidelines in the future for the analysis and understanding of the descriptions of other experiences, less complicated than combat trauma, to be found in the works of Homer and in other ancient authors.

*Institute for the History of Science of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw*

ROBERT ZABOROWSKI

#### DER NEUE PAULY ANGLICIZED

H. CANCIK, H. SCHNEIDER (edd.): *Brill's New Pauly. Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World. Antiquity, Volume 1: A–Ari*. Pp. lxi + 1158, maps, ills. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2002 (first published as *Der Neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike. Band 1*, 1996). Cased, €160/US\$186. ISBN: 90-04-12258-3 (90-04-12259-1 set).

H. CANCIK, H. SCHNEIDER (edd.): *Brill's New Pauly. Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World. Antiquity, Volume 2: Ark–Cas*. Pp. xviii + 1190, maps, ills. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2003 (first published as *Der Neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike.*) Cased, €160/US\$186. ISBN: 90-04-12265-6.

'The entries have been translated by an international team of professional' (I.vi) is just about as deliciously inauspicious a start as could possibly be imagined for this vast project to render into English the German original. *Pauly*, later *Pauly-Wissowa*, later still *Pauly-Wissowa-Ziegler*, ranks as one of the great reference resources in the

<sup>4</sup> Cf. also p. 176. In the book *Poza miłoscia i wolnoscia [Beyond Love and Freedom]* (1992), T. Kobierzycki gave a model of the evolution of psychological dependence on the basis of clinical and therapeutic research. There exists therefore a correspondence between the conclusions of S. and the conclusions of Kobierzycki. I should add that Kobierzycki interprets *Odyssey* as the story of a long lasting psychotic episode of its main hero (1993, personal communication), and describes Odysseus as a 'border line' type personality. Cf. Odysseus' 'need to "live on the edge"' (Shay, *Odysseus in America*, p. 50).