

sur un « tout est politique » qui fasse perdre de vue les points nodaux où s'élabore et se manifeste la *polis*. On pourra ainsi regretter que les éditeurs du livre n'aient pas eux-mêmes pris la plume pour nous dire ce qu'ils pensent être le non-politique dans l'Athènes de Clisthène et de Lycurgue. Malgré ces remarques, on lira et fera lire sans hésiter ce recueil d'articles, qui, séparément et surtout ensemble, balisent un champ qu'ils enrichissent de la pluralité de leurs regards, faisant gagner l'objet en richesse et en complexité. Le colloque publié par V. Azoulay et P. Ismard montre la fécondité de l'emploi du concept du politique dans l'étude des cités antiques. Si cette approche a souvent été appliquée à l'Athènes classique, beaucoup reste à faire pour les autres cités, notamment d'époque hellénistique et romaine, où des études récentes ne font qu'ouvrir la route à ce renouvellement.

N. KYRIAKIDIS

Aurélie DAMET, *La septième porte. Les conflits familiaux dans l'Athènes classique*. Paris, Publications de la Sorbonne, 2012. 1 vol. 16 x 24 cm, 507 p. (HISTOIRE ANCIENNE ET MÉDIÉVALE, 115). Prix : 35 €. ISBN 978-2-85944-703-8.

In *La Septième Porte. Les Conflits familiaux dans l'Athènes classique*, Aurélie Damet presents the results of her doctoral research, which she conducted at the Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne. This book has been awarded the *Prix Sophau 2010*, a prize granted by the *Société des Professeurs d'Histoire Ancienne de l'Université*. One can easily understand why this well-written work has been award-winning. It provides a detailed and balanced discussion of one of the most complex subjects in Athenian social history, which manifests itself within various areas of Athenian society and is omnipresent in many representations of classical Athenian life: the problem of family conflicts in fifth- and fourth-century Athens. The extensive introduction (p. 11-32) discusses the concepts, historiography, and testimonials of family conflicts in Athenian society. It also defines the main objective of this book, namely to examine all sorts of conflict between relatives, and this by analyzing three main types of sources: drama, including both tragedy and comedy, philosophy, with in particular the texts written by Plato and Aristotle, and oratory. This approach is remarkable, since modern scholarship on themes like this often tend to focus on one type of sources, not least because each type conveys specific methodological problems. Additionally, it is not always easy to present the results of such an analysis in a coherent way. A. Damet, however, appears to feel comfortable enough to handle such a variety of sources in a critical way. The first chapter of this book (p. 33-78), titled "Fragile parenté : pour définir les contours flous de la famille" (Fragile kinship: to define the blurred contours of the family), attempts to define the Athenian family as a concept, which l'auteur considers difficult to do univocally, as its contours varied according to the context and situation in which it was used. She thinks the Athenian family was structurally weak, which allegedly made it an easy target for contemporary writers. After a detailed study of the vocabulary used in classical times to designate what we might call 'family' (*oikos*, *oikia*, *anchisteia*, *genos*, and *syn-geneia*), Aurélie Damet carefully considers the position of *philia* within the Athenian family, as described by Aristotle and Plato. According to her, the lack of an innate sense of family which their texts portray and their utilitarian interpretation of the

family are representative for the pressures inherent in the concept of the family in fifth- and fourth-century Athens. In addition, she interprets the structural rivalry within the Athenian family, such as between a mother and a father, between biological and adopted children, between members of kin, etc., as an important cause of continuous pressures upon the Athenian family as an institute. The second and largest chapter of this book (p. 79-209), titled “Typologie du conflit familial” (Typology of the family conflict), examines the different sorts of conflict between relatives in Athenian society. The various categories of sources, namely Athenian comedy, tragedy, oratory, and philosophy, each informs us about different sorts of family conflict, which is clearly mirrored in the way this chapter is structured. This structure might perhaps feel to be somewhat artificial. Nevertheless, this does not affect the reality that this chapter is an impressive piece of work critically presenting an overview of the various sorts of family conflicts. The third chapter (p. 210-319), titled “Crimes et châtements: le règlement judiciaire des violences familiales” (Crime and punishment: the judicial settlement of domestic violence), examines the judicial procedures regulating family conflicts and the ideologies behind these procedures. Although the punishment of domestic violence is dealt with differently by the various types of sources, l’auteur convincingly demonstrates how the Athenian polis has elaborated a legislative, ethical, and political system supporting the family, and this in its own interest. By establishing judicial procedures accessible to all citizens, the polis was able to combine both a consideration for the family as an institution and the preservation of its own values. The fourth chapter (p. 320-401), titled “L’infamille: occulter et dévoiler les conflits familiaux dans l’Athènes classique” (‘In-family’: hiding and revealing family conflicts in classical Athens), discusses how classical Athens has adopted two opposite attitudes towards family conflicts. On the one hand, a conflict between relatives was thought to be a cause of shame, the disclosure of which needed to be restricted. Indicative of this attitude, which A. Damet has even been able to observe in the works of Xenophon and Plato, are, for example, the practice of arbitration and the avoidance of pronouncing certain words related to family violence – even in tragedy. On the other hand, the fact that public speakers were keen on stigmatising political opponents by revealing the latter’s alleged “bad” private behaviour, caused many family conflicts to be made public; especially those conflicts occurring within families that were at the centre of attention in Athenian society. The fifth and last chapter (p. 402-432), titled “Famille en péril, cité menacée” (Family at risk, threatened city), examines the possible echoes of family conflicts within Athenian politics. This chapter expands the idea that the Athenians feared family conflicts, as they were thought to be a threat to the *polis*. As a consequence, every good citizen was supposed to be a good father or son. This principle was in such a way omnipresent in Athenian morality, that it was at the heart of the *dokimasiai* which candidates for public offices or magistracies had to undergo. Even in literature, the fear that family conflicts might threaten the Athenian polis is noticeable, not in the least by the fact that family conflicts were often situated in a non-Athenian and undemocratic context. This book is characterized by the typical elements of a PhD thesis written within a long tradition of high-standing French scholarship: it is a voluminous work with a detailed historiography, extensive footnotes, and an impressive and quasi-exhaustive bibliography. Some readers might find

these and other elements, such as the catalogue-like second chapter giving an overview of the relevant sources and case-studies relevant for the subject of study, to be troubling a smooth reading from start to end. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that these attributes of outstanding scholarly work also cause this work to be extremely valuable, not only for students and scholars interested in the Athenian family, but also for those working on many other aspects of Athenian society, such as law, politics, social relations, etc.

Marloes DEENE

Victor ALONSO TRONCOSO & Edward M. ANSON (Ed.), *After Alexander. The Time of the Diadochi (323-281 BC)*. Oxford-Oakville, Oxbow Books, 2013. 1 vol. 17 x 25 cm, x-277 p., 8 fig. Prix : 36 £. ISBN 978-1-84217-512-5.

Les études sur Alexandre le Grand et ses successeurs directs paraissent régulièrement et en nombre. Il est vrai que l'époque est d'une importance indéniable, à la charnière de deux mondes dont l'un, le monde hellénistique, est marqué par un réel bouleversement dans les institutions et les comportements. L'ouvrage recensé contribue de manière très intéressante à la connaissance de l'époque des diadoques. Il contient les actes d'un symposium international sur *The Time of the Diadochi (323-281 BC)* qui s'est tenu à l'Université de La Corogne en septembre 2010. Quatre autres colloques avaient déjà eu lieu sur la période charnière à laquelle je faisais allusion : *Crossroads of History : The Age of Alexander, Alexander's Empire : Formulation to Decay, Alexander and his Successors : Essays from the Antipode* (actes publiés à Claremont, CA en 2003, 2007 et 2009) et *Philip II and Alexander the Great : Father and Son, Lives and Afterlives* (Oxford, 2010). Les études publiées dans le recueil recensé relèvent de quatre domaines de la recherche sur les diadoques : les sources et leur usage, la lutte pour le pouvoir entre les diadoques, le rôle des Iraniens au temps des diadoques et l'utilisation des images et des slogans à l'époque des diadoques. On sait que les sources narratives relatives à l'époque des diadoques sont très rares. La recherche d'autres sources est donc nécessaire. T. Boiy présente une série de documents en caractères cunéiformes qui permettent de préciser la chronologie des débuts de l'époque hellénistique et de combler certaines lacunes des sources narratives. Pat Wheatley attire l'attention sur un document quasiment ignoré des spécialistes de l'histoire des diadoques, l'*épitomé de Heidelberg*. Celui-ci comprend quatre passages relatifs aux diadoques contenus dans le codex byzantin *Palatinus Graecus* 129 daté du XV^e s. Wheatley s'intéresse plus particulièrement à l'auteur de l'épitomé et à la tradition historiographique de cette œuvre. Les trois articles suivants veulent éclaircir des questions qui subsistent dans les sources narratives. C'est encore d'historiographie qu'il s'agit dans la contribution de Franca Landucci Gattinoni. Selon cette auteure, Démodamas de Milet serait la source primaire des passages sur la première phase de la troisième guerre des diadoques dans Diodore. Mais Douris de Samos serait l'intermédiaire entre Déodamas et Diodore. Douris de Samos qui, selon Frances Pownall, était hostile à tous les diadoques macédoniens. Seul Eumène de Cardia, un Grec, a trouvé grâce à ses yeux. Pour T. Howe, la divinité supposée d'Alexandre faisait partie d'une tradition inventée par les diadoques pour légitimer leur propre royauté. Au départ d'une analyse du texte de Strabon, B. Bosworth compare la