

un matériau substantiel pour toute étude de la *Lysistrata* sensible aux rythmes de la comédie.
Sylvain PERROT

Sebastian ZERHOCH, *Erinyes in Epos, Tragödie und Kult. Fluchbegriff und personale Fluchmacht*. Berlin, De Gruyter, 2015. 1 vol., VIII-393 p. (PHILOLOGUS SUPPLEMENT, 4). Prix : 109,95 €. ISBN 978-3-11-043550-4.

In this monograph, a reworking of his doctoral dissertation, S. Zerhoch sets out to trace the different usages and appearances of *erinyes* in Greek literature from Homer to Euripides and in ancient Greek cults. Building on meticulous analyses of an extensive corpus (the author claims to review every occurrence of the term *eriny(e)s* within the delineated time frame, p. 4), Zerhoch distinguishes between several such usages: *eriny(e)s* as (1) a noun in abstract sense, (2) a description used to identify a character (3) a singular deity, and (4) a collective force. His main argument, however, is that the seemingly different forms and uses of *erinyes* can be subsumed under one common denominator: the curse. Zerhoch consistently emphasizes that the term is multifaceted: it appertains to the active (speech) act of cursing, the working of the curse and the – often calamitous – consequences the curse brings to bear. In addition, special attention goes into the nuanced investigation of how these types relate to one another, as well as how *erinyes* – in its manifestation and working range – relates to other often abstract or personified concepts such as *ara*, *atè*, *moira* and *dikè*. – Following a brief introduction (chapter one) and reflective opening remarks (chapter two), in which Zerhoch outlines the different types and in which he situates the term *erinyes* within a broad and nuanced context of curses, there are five chapters in which the various aspects and forms of *erinyes* are discussed. Chapters three and four deal with the four types distinguished by the author. Zerhoch’s approach does not depart from the genre of text or from single text sources: rather, he systematically discusses the specific use of *erinyes*, linked to and substantiated with rich textual examples that he considers to be applicable to that particular use. At times, however, Zerhoch’s structure on the basis of text fragments leads to these chapters lacking overarching argumentation. At this point in the book, one is given the impression that it is a reference work, rather than a coherent interpretative narrative. On the other hand, the readings of these individual passages, which are subjected to meticulous lexical and grammatical analysis, often stand out because of their brilliance and through clever parallels between textual examples. Additionally, Zerhoch makes several interesting and innovative interpretations of single passages. An excellent example of both merits is the innovative reading of *Ilias* 9.454 (3.1.6 in Zerhoch’s work), where Phoenix tries to persuade Achilles to rejoin battle by telling two stories on wrath. One of these concerns Phoenix’ father Amyntor, by whom Phoenix was cursed. *Erinyes* in this passage has, according to Zerhoch, consistently been interpreted as a single deity who is directly involved in the action. Through thorough lexical and grammatical analysis, however, and through a beautifully construed parallel between this occurrence and a similar narrative in Sophocles’ *Oedipus at Colonus* (1382-1387), Zerhoch presents the persuasive alternative reading that *erinyes* is used here in abstract sense, lending new meaning to the passage. – The title of chapter five announces that it will treat “the

personified *erinyes* in the work of Aeschylus and Euripides”. The chapter, however, is limited to Aeschylus’s *Eumenides*, which is examined intelligently and with particular detail, and to a comparison between Aeschylus’s *Eriny(e)s/Eumenides* and Euripides’s Atreid plays. Again, one might appreciate a more overarching argumentation in this instance: there is no conclusion after the discussion of Aeschylus’s *Eumenides*, nor is there a general conclusion to end the chapter. Chapter six, by contrast, is a concise yet well-rounded discussion of the relationship between *erinyes* and concepts such as *ara*, *atè*, *dikè* and *moira*. The previous analyses allow Zerhoch to perfectly demonstrate how closely related these concepts are. In the final chapter, a well documented and seemingly complete treatment of the different cults in which goddesses with ties to *eriny(e)s* play an important role, Zerhoch appears to be at risk of losing focus towards the end (due to a digression about the Eumenides), but an extensive “Fazit” ties everything back together. Finally, a clear and complete conclusion rounds off all the main chapters. – Overall S. Zerhoch’s work presents a rather dense, but very thorough and informative investigation. The density is also apparent from the extensive, albeit valuable appendices: six appendices in total range from theories on the origin of *erinyes*, over Linear B-occurrences of the term, to the reception of tragic *Erinyes* in Aristophanes’s *Lysistrata* and *Ploutos*. One might wonder whether Zerhoch could not have integrated some of the elements from these appendices in the main body of the work for a more complete introduction (e.g. “Ursprungstheorien” or “Eymologie”). The six appendices precede an extensive bibliography, which, in turn, is followed by a useful *index locorum* as well as a general index and an index of the most important Greek terms.

Sarah-Helena VAN DEN BRANDE

Ralph M. ROSEN, *Making Mockery. The Poetics of Ancient Satire*. Oxford, University Press, 2007. 1 vol., XIII-294 p. (CLASSICAL CULTURE AND SOCIETY). Prix : 55 \$. ISBN 978-0-19-538595-3.

Le lecteur ne doit pas se laisser abuser par le caractère quelque peu trompeur du sous-titre de l’ouvrage qui laisse entendre qu’il s’agit d’une étude sur la poétique de la satire dans l’Antiquité. La satire n’est pas ici entendue comme un genre littéraire à part entière, mais comme une modalité de parole et c’est bien, comme le montre le premier élément du titre, à une étude du phénomène de la moquerie que se livre ici Ralph Rosen, indépendamment des genres et d’un cadre temporel limité. L’auteur revendique cette étude comme la première tentative pour conceptualiser le phénomène littéraire de la moquerie selon un même paradigme littéraire « qui transcende les limites des simples auteurs, des genres et des temporalités » (p. 4). De fait, R. Rosen est loin de s’intéresser uniquement à la satire mais, s’il se limite explicitement à la poésie, il travaille à la fois sur la poésie iambique archaïque, la comédie ancienne, l’élégie hellénistique et la satire romaine. Il s’agit donc moins d’étudier la satire comme telle que de trouver dans des textes de formes variées des éléments d’appréciation et de théorisation de l’expression de la moquerie. L’auteur expose avec clarté et efficacité sa méthode d’investigation dans le premier chapitre. Reprenant à son compte la distinction de Saussure entre « langue » et « parole » (p. 16), R. Rosen