

Ariphrades, auquel Aristote consacre plusieurs lignes de sa *Poétique*, en lui reprochant de s'être moqué indûment d'Homère en le parodiant (*Poet.* 22, 1458b31-59a4). Nous n'avons aucun autre renseignement sur cet auteur, à part le fait que, selon Aristophane qui le mentionne à trois reprises, il aimait faire des cunnilingus (avec un jeu de mot assez drôle au vers 1283 des *Guêpes*, où Aristophane invente le verbe γλωττοποιεῖν sur le modèle de γελωτοποιεῖν). Dans la mesure où c'est Sommerstein lui-même qui suggère ce jeu de mot dans l'une de ses études ('Notes on Aristophanes' *Wasps*', CQ 27 [1977], p. 276), cette absence étonne... On dira sans doute que nos données dignes d'intérêt sur cet Ariphrades sont assez minces. Mais il y a bien d'autres auteurs dont on ne sait pratiquement rien : voyez par exemple ce Polyclète dont nous savons seulement qu'il a gagné un concours aux Lénéennes aux environs de 270, ou cet Aristocratès qui a gagné aux Grandes Dionysies en 215, et qui pourtant ont droit, eux, à une entrée. Et je note que d'assez nombreuses notices sont d'un intérêt beaucoup plus marginal encore, ou alors inutilement redondantes. Ainsi l'entrée 'Onesicles', un avocat qu'une inscription décrit comme étant aussi « un poète épique, de nouvelle comédie, et d'iambes », mais dont Sommerstein rappelle que son premier éditeur l'avait (sans doute mieux) compris comme écrivant « de la poésie iambique dans le style de la nouvelle comédie ». Dans d'autres cas, le lecteur ne saisit pas l'intérêt de la notice. S'il était important de mentionner le Timothée auteur de la Comédie Moyenne, on ne saisit pas pourquoi le Timothée musicien et poète dithyrambique a bénéficié lui aussi d'une entrée, qui est d'ailleurs beaucoup plus longue que celle concernant le premier. Pour la redondance, le cas le plus flagrant est sans doute le triplé 'Oenanda', 'Demosthenes' et 'Demostheneia' qui relatent la fondation et l'exercice du festival établi par ce Démosthène ; il s'agit d'un fait important dans l'histoire du théâtre gréco-romain, mais fallait-il lui consacrer trois entrées (aux références bibliographiques identiques) ? Enfin, si la brièveté est une vertu, certaines notices sont trop courtes pour être utiles : si on les compare à celles consacrées à Aristote ou à Plutarque, très riches en quelques paragraphes, celle qui présente Cicéron, pourtant un auteur-clé pour comprendre l'humour ancien, est particulièrement rapide. Ces critiques de détail n'ôtent cependant rien à la valeur et à l'intérêt de l'entreprise : les étudiants y trouveront des présentations succinctes mais bien informées (avec quelques références bibliographiques utiles), et les spécialistes seront ravis d'y glaner ici ou là des informations ou des idées qui leur permettront de reconsidérer tel ou tel aspect du monde touffu et foisonnant de la comédie grecque.

Pierre DESTRÉE

Daniel KING, *Experiencing Pain in Imperial Greek Culture*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2017. 1 vol. relié, 21,6 x 13,5 cm, XI-291 p. (OXFORD CLASSICAL MONOGRAPHS). Prix : 69 £. ISBN 978-0-19-881051-3.

The book under review is a revised version of the author's PhD thesis, and aims to investigate theories and representations of pain in Imperial Greek culture, especially in the ways these are interlinked with representations of the body's reality, with the process of articulating pain, and with the self-positioning of both sufferers and medical authorities. The book falls into three parts: 1. "Diagnosing and Treating Pain", deals

with medical authorities, primarily Aretaios and Galen; 2. “Representing Pain”, engages with literary authors such as Plutarch, Lucian, and Aelius Aristeides; and 3. “Viewing Trauma, Seeing Pain”, examines emotional reactions to seeing pain in Philostratos, Akhilleus Tatios, and Plutarch. While D. King deals with texts from several and widely different genres, and occasionally draws some interesting connections between them, I feel that the book is largely a missed opportunity. Not the least of its weaknesses is that it purports to examine “pagan culture’s interest in the process of viewing pain” (p. 242, my emphasis) during the first three centuries CE, as if Christianity existed in a parallel universe and was not a child of – and phenomenon that shaped – the exact same period. Even if we accept D. King’s dismissal of Christianity (summarily, in the Introduction) and his positing of an entirely separate “pagan” culture, there are several disappointing shortcomings in the author’s analysis of the texts. To take first the medical authors examined in Part 1, “Representing Pain”: the passage from Aretaios’ *On the Causes and Signs of Chronic Diseases* cited on p. 59-60 is taken to represent the physician’s “power to alleviate pain and transform it into pleasure” (p. 60) and the elevation of both patient and doctor as heroic figures, based on the adjective ἄλλκιμον (misprinted as ἄλλκιμου on p. 60; on the same page, σὺ should have read σὺ). There is no doubt that the doctor here attaches heroic markers to himself. D. King strangely does not notice the pun on Aretaios’ own name in the phrase ἔνθα δὴ ἄρετη δατείδεται ἄνδρὸς ἰητροῦ. While D. King notes the doctor’s “great-spiritedness” (μακροθυμίας), his “variety” (in treatment, ποικιλίας) is far more significant, but goes unmentioned. As the doctor has to find diverse strategies to defeat the disease, he becomes a hero of μῆτις – a medical Odysseus. The long-standing connection between the doctor and a kind of heroic versatility goes back to the Hippocratic Corpus (*Precepts* 7), as has been pointed out in relation to this passage by A. Roselli in “Medico e poikilia: nota su Areteo III 1,2”, In: E. Berardi, F.L. Lisi and D. Micallella (Ed.), *Poikilia. Variazioni sul tema*, Acireale-Roma, 2009, p. 289-296 – a work not cited by D. King. This same notion is also used by the Christian Fathers, who frequently portray themselves as versatile doctors applying different remedies for the various ailments of their (resisting) congregations. Throughout Part 1, D. King highlights the ways in which medical authors project and uphold the validity of their voices. This “arrogation of authority” (p. 81), should, in my opinion, have sparked at least some comparison with the genre of didactic poetry, where poets are engaged in similar struggles of projecting scientific authority through speech. In particular, the discussion of Galen’s tendency to refer to various pains and sensory perceptions as “unspeakable” (p. 82) could have benefited considerably from comparison with didactic poetry, which often qualifies its subject matter as vast, difficult to describe, and impossible for mortals fully to master. In both didactic poetry and medical treatise, authors reveal knowledge that is not easily available (or comprehensible) to others, and the limits of this knowledge need to be demarcated against all that can never be properly communicated. Perhaps the strongest chapter of Part 2, “Representing Pain” is the one on Aelius Aristeides, an author who presents his many symptoms in the detached manner that would make him “Galen’s ideal patient” (p. 136). Even here, however, opportunities are missed: D. King cites a passage (48.69K, on p. 141) in which Aristeides tells us that his doctors failed to recognize the ποικιλίαν of his disease. D. King, in his turn, fails to see that Aristeides evokes here the trope of the physician’s ποικιλία, as

Aretaios had done (above), but subverts it by endowing his own, unique disease with a craftiness that defeats even the versatile doctors' ruses. Equally, Aristeides' claim that he is silent at the beginning of the *Tales*, before he "immediately proceeds to narrate his experiences *ad nauseam*" (p. 142) should (also) be seen in the light of a well-established trope, according to which rhetoricians claim to perform under compulsion. Robert Penella's "Silent Orators: On Withholding Eloquence in the Late Roman Empire", *RET* Supplément 3, 2014, p. 331-347 demonstrates how this (apparent or real) refusal of speech is actually a display of power on the part of the sophists. The most interesting contributions in Part 3 "Viewing Trauma, Seeing Pain" come in the chapter on Akhilleus Tatios. D. King rightly observes that the contortions of pain in this novel *show*, rather than invite the reader to interpret (p. 201). Pain and trauma arrest the gaze, wounding vision itself and exercising an irrational hold over the reader / listener that is akin to the effects of sublime language as described by Pseudo-Longinos. Perhaps it would have been useful here to include some discussion of the striking simile in Akhilleus Tatios 7.4.4-6, where emotional trauma is compared to a physical injury in the delay with which its intensity is felt. The description of the physical wound's "flowering" in 7.4.4 would have been relevant for D. King's discussion of scars in this chapter. Apart from the issues detailed above in relation to content, I have found the author's style distracting and not helpful in getting his message across. There is a tendency to use overly rhetorical language, which at some points is not well thought out (e.g., "Powerful astounding imagery overpowers the reader's rational engagement" p. 171). The author also has a habit of stating the obvious or the extremely vague (e.g., "Medicine's interest in pain is long-standing", p. 34; "Experiencing pain induces a certain kind of language", p. 127). There is no consistency in the way Greek is written: on p. 61 we see both ἀκροασίη and *lambanein*. It is not clear to me why one is written in Greek and the other transliterated. Unfortunately there are also some errors and typos, of which I only note here: *καταλειπέται* instead of *καταλείπεται* (p. 82); *taraxia* instead of *tarachê* (p. 172); "agenda" instead of "agendas" (p. 115); "diverges" instead of "diverge" (p. 147).

Fotini HADJITTOFI

Angelos CHANIOTIS & Pascale DERRON (Ed.), *La nuit. Imaginaire & réalités nocturnes dans le monde gréco-romain. Neuf exposés suivis de discussions*. Genève, Fondation Hardt, 2018. 1 vol. relié, x-412 p., 15 fig. n/b & coul. (ENTRETIENS SUR L'ANTIQUITÉ CLASSIQUE, 64). Prix : 55 CHF. ISBN 978-2-600-00764-1.

Ce recueil de contributions réunit neuf textes sur le thème de la nuit. Ceux-ci ont été prononcés au cours d'une série d'entretiens organisés par la fondation Hardt, qui se sont tenus durant la semaine du 21 au 25 août 2017. Chaque texte est suivi de la discussion à laquelle il a donné lieu. Dans le premier, Angelos Chaniotis commence par rappeler les conceptions universelles de la nuit : moment de récupération, de contact avec le surnaturel, de danger... Or, il semble que ces conceptions vailent aussi pour le monde grec. Ainsi, souligner dans un récit qu'une scène se déroule de nuit exacerberait l'impression de violence ou d'érotisme qui s'en dégage. Après ces constats généraux, l'auteur se penche sur les raisons de l'augmentation des activités nocturnes aux époques