

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

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 Harné (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