Kristeva's Novel:
Genealogy, Genre, and Theory

RICHARD FLETCHER
University of Cambridge

In the final section of his *O teorii prozy* [Theory of Prose], published in 1929, the Russian Formalist critic Viktor Shklovsky juxtaposes the plotless prose genres of essay and anecdote against those of the ancient Greek and classic Russian novel:

> Greece has not left us a theory of the novel, although it has left us both novels and novelistic schemata, part of which is still alive to this very day. Still, little respect was paid to this genre. Although in existence for centuries before, the novel was deemed outside the scope of theory. The same was true of Russian literature, where the only theory of the novel available, perhaps, was to be found in the translator's preface. The novel and tale were long considered to be a genre outside the scope of theory. This is the position [in which] plotless prose finds itself today. Its specific gravity today and its historic significance are very great. Nearly the entire work of the Encyclopedists, of Russian social journalism, of the essay and of a whole array of works by the so-called Russian belletrists [*sic*] lies outside the scope of the plotted genre. Nevertheless, even without a genealogy, this genre exists.[1]

In comparing the lack of theoretical grounding for the ancient Greek novel to the plotless genres of essay and anecdote, Shklovsky contends that, unlike these plotless genres, the novel does have a genealogy, since both the ancient Greek novels themselves and their 'novelistic schemata' are 'still alive to

---

[1] Shklovsky 1990, 206.

this very day'.[2] However, despite its classical pedigree, the ancient Greek
novel itself and the genre of the novel in general were 'deemed outside the
scope of theory'. These conceptions of the genealogy and theory of the genre
of the novel are juxtaposed with the genres of essay and anecdote, which,
unlike the novel exist 'without a genealogy' and which found themselves in
the same position as the novel, being 'outside the scope of theory'. Shklov-
sky's observations concerning differing genealogical and theoretical
foundations for several genres threatens any unified conception of genre.

In claiming the classical pedigree of the genre of the novel, some classi-
cists have looked to the *Bibliotheca* of the Byzantine patriarch Photius to
tentatively bring the ancient novel within the scope of theory, to find a be-
lated 'ancient' theory of the novel.[3] This appropriation of the *Bibliotheca* as
a starting point for discussions of the genre of the novel has also provoked a
re-evaluation of this work's own genre. Divided into 'codices', the *Biblio-
theca* consists of notes, of varying lengths, on a vast range of works from
Classical Athens to the Byzantine period, including several works of ancient
narrative fiction. In the introduction to his translation of selections from the
Bibliotheca, Wilson declares that, '[o]ne is tempted to call each of the 280
items a review, and some modern critics have spoken of Photius as the first
reviewer'.[4] It seems strangely appropriate that Wilson has championed a
modern generic label for the *Bibliotheca* — a text that has been the primary
source for ancient accounts of the 'modern' genre of the novel. What Wil-
son's statement indicates is that our conceptions of ancient genre are often
driven by unexamined ideas of modern genres, as the choice of the term
'novel' for several ancient narrative texts further shows.[5] The adoption of the
generic label of the 'review' for the *Bibliotheca*, not only highlights the
problem of anachronistic terminology, but also explains the pressure put on
this text by classicists to account for the ancient novel as a genre. We can
compare this search for the genre of novel in Photius with Shklovsky's

---

[2] See Shklovsky 1990, 95 for an example of such 'novelistic schemata' from Apuleius'
Golden Ass, the Spanish picaresque novel *Lazarillo of Tormes* and Gogol's *Dead Souls*.

[3] For example, see Morgan 1993, 194–197 and Ruiz-Montero 1996, 34–35.

[4] Wilson 1994, 1–2.

[5] Perry 1967, 3. 'For English and American readers the general type of ancient book with
which we are here concerned, whether it be the serious or the comic variety that is in
question, would be somewhat better indicated by the term *novel*, with its implications of
modernity, than by the broader term *romance*, which we are likely to associate with
something old-fashioned.'

comment about the translator's preface for the classic Russian novel, as the place where 'the only theory of the novel available, perhaps' was found. Furthermore, both Shklovsky's focus on a genealogy of the novel that stretches back to antiquity and classicists' search for an ancient pedigree for the novel in Photius, show the interdependence of genealogy and theory in discussions of genre and theoretical constructs in classical philology.

Shklovsky's account of a genealogy of the novel that goes back to antiquity, despite its lack of theorisation, and the use of Photius by classicists to bring the ancient novel within the scope of theory, both set up this paper's main question: what is the relationship between the genealogy of a genre and (the genealogy of) the theory of that genre? An interesting approach to the interrelationship between genre, genealogy, and theory can be found in the influential work of Shklovsky's contemporary, Mikhail Bakhtin, in his account of the novel. He shared Shklovsky's interest in a genealogy of the genre of the novel that stretched back to antiquity, but transformed this genealogical observation into a theory of the novel. Largely in response to Bakhtin, there have been several more recent revisions of the traditional genealogy of the genre of the novel, moving its origins back to antiquity.[6] According to Bakhtin, '[t]he novel parodies other genres (precisely in their role as genres)'.[7] This parodic role can be seen in the novel's genealogy, mapped by Bakhtin as developing through the classical genres of Socratic dialogue and Menippean satire.[8] In his formulation of the novel as a parodic genre originating in antiquity, Bakhtin demonstrates the relationship between theory and genealogy in the case of the novel.

The question of the relationship between genre, genealogy, and theory is of particular relevance to the theme of this volume with its focus on theoretical genealogy ('Bakhtin, the Russian Formalists …') and genre ('… Ancient Narrative'). Furthermore, this volume also questions the relationship between 'theory' ('Bakhtin, the Russian Formalists …') and 'the Classics' ('… Ancient Narrative'). Indeed, to reiterate the double aim of a 'Bakhtin and the Classics' project, this volume must be 'of equal interest to Bakhtinians and theorists, who rarely know the classics well, and to classicists, who rarely have a working knowledge of Bakhtin.'[9] This aim makes a less than clear

---

[6] Doody 1996. Branham 1995. Branham 2002.
[7] Bakhtin 1981, 5.
[8] For the troublesome 'classical' genre of Menippean satire see Relihan 1993, 3–36.
[9] Branham 2002, xiii.

distinction between 'Bakhtinians', 'theorists', and 'classicists'. To some
extent, there is a hidden distinction between Bakhtin scholars and classical
scholars and other generalised 'theorists'. The case of Julia Kristeva exem-
plifies this distinction. She is both a Bakhtinian and a theorist, although one
might not call her a Bakhtin scholar. By introducing Kristeva, as a 'Bakhtin-
ian theorist' into such a 'Bakhtin and the Classics' project, I aim to critique
the simplistic notions of (ab)use and (mis)understanding in both classicists'
relationship with her and her relationship with the classics.

This paper will approach the relationship between genre, genealogy, and
theory through two texts by Kristeva, which ostensibly aim to introduce
Bakhtin's genealogy and theory of the genre of the novel: 'Bakhtine, le mot,
le dialogue et le roman', her 1967 review of Bakhtin's *Tvorchestvo François
Rabelais* [Rabelais and His World] and *Problemy poetiki Dostoïevskovo*
[Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics] and 'Une Poétique Ruinée', her 1970
preface to a French translation of his Dostoevsky book (*La Poétique de
Dostoïevski*).[10] Interest in Kristeva's introduction of Bakhtin's theories has
been considerable.[11] However, such interest has not penetrated to classical
scholarship, except in discussions of intertextuality, since Kristeva's intro-
duction of Bakhtin marked the first occurrence of the concept, presented in
'Bakhtine, le mot, le dialogue et le roman'. Kristeva, as the concept's 'origi-
nator', has played an important role in a recent debate within classical schol-
arship concerning the choice of methodology for approaching intertextuality,
especially in relation to Roman poetry.[12] Between Stephen Hinds' *Allusion
and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* and Lowell
Edmunds' *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman poetry* there emerges a
clear distinction in the methodology of classical intertextualist scholarship, a
distinction based on Edmunds' referencing of Kristeva and his accusation
that Hinds *should* have done so. The central question of scholarly reference
leaks into Edmunds' own discussion of intertextuality itself, in his claim that
intertextuality operates as a mode of quotation. I will consider Edmunds'

---

[10] Kristeva 1967a, 440 n. 2 and 1970b, 22 n. 1, refer to several other works by Bakhtin,
including Bakhtin 1968 and the Bakhtin circle in general. For a re-evaluation of the rela-
tionship between Bakhtin and Kristeva in light of his works unknown to the latter, see
Erdinast-Vulcan 1995. She does not mention Medvedev and Bakhtin 1978 [1928], a
blind-spot that makes her genealogical account of Russian poetics (Historicist poetics,
Formalism, post-Formalism-Bakhtin) especially interesting.
[11] See Bové 1983 and Pfister 1985.
[12] Namely Hinds 1998 and Edmunds 2001.

choice of quotation in relation to his choice of a genealogical intertextualist method by looking to the presence of Kristeva within his text, according to ideas of quotation, reference, and citation. Moving from this debate within classics, I will consider how Kristeva dealt with Bakhtin's use of the ancient genres of Socratic dialogue and Menippean satire in his genealogy of the genre of the novel, offering as my examples her incorporation of 'Bakhtinian' anti-Aristotelianism and the Bakhtinian figure of Socrates. I will end with a brief examination of the relationship between intertextuality and the genealogy of the novel in Kristeva's neglected doctoral thesis *Le texte du roman*, a link that has attracted classicists, seeing a theoretical predecessor to sanction their own reading of the intertextual novel.[13]

I shall not be using Edmunds' Kristeva or Kristeva's Bakhtin to provide an exegetical reading of either Kristevan intertextuality and its reception, or the Bakhtinian novel and its reception, to contribute to the *Rezeptionsgeschichte* of the classical world or Bakhtin's work in modern literary theory. Nor am I attacking operative theoretical concepts (such as intertextuality) in contemporary classical scholarship. I am, rather, investigating the interplay between theoretical and generic genealogy in both 'theoretical' and 'scholarly' contexts, and the relationship between theorist and classicist implicit in the figure of Bakhtin and problematically evident in Kristeva's appropriation of Bakhtin.[14] The distinctions between Hinds' and Edmunds' methodological approaches to intertextuality and between Bakhtin and Kristeva's conception of the genre of the novel are vital to the configuration of recent research into ancient narrative and its focus on the intertextual strategies of these texts.

Intertextualité and Classics: 'Kristeva' between Hinds and Edmunds

Imagine this citation, for example, arriving from a number of places at once, both past and future: "There, there is citation." (By the way, even though this citation is invented, a simulacrum of a citation, so to speak, this "phantom quotation" is nonetheless a citation for all that; the quota-

---

[13] Fusillo 1996, 279 — 'The term "intertextuality" was coined in 1970 by Julia Kristeva, and applied not by chance to a medieval romance.' See also Fusillo 1989, 17.

[14] We must see Kristeva as committed to Bakhtin the classicist — Kristeva 1980, 64 — 'Writer as well as 'scholar'…', as classicists commit him to themselves — Branham 2002, xiii.

tion marks signal this condition ["Geschlecht" 390].) You can just hear the voice, can't you? Where is citation? Nowhere, as such, yet, in the tone, bearing or, let's call it a family atmosphere or resemblance. (This statement amounts to "quasi-quotation" again in a double manner: for, on the one hand, the remark resonates with an unacknowledged quotation while, on the other hand, the recognition of a resemblance is suggestive of a certain haunting citational force where intertextuality is read in a genealogical fashion.[15]

Where is intertextuality? Whether we consider the application of this concept or accounts of its genealogy, the name 'Kristeva' has divided both 'theorists' and 'scholars' in discussions of intertextuality.[16] Should you cite 'Kristeva', the originator of intertextuality, to write intertextual theory or intertextualist scholarship, no matter how far the term's usage has travelled from the site of its origination? In the last few years, this debate of intertextualist method has percolated to the classics. In his *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman poetry*, Lowell Edmunds presents a reading of Roman poetry through an impressive survey of intertextual theories, based on various facets of the concept ('Text', 'Poet', 'Reader' and so on).[17] One of the ways in which Edmunds positions his project is to counterpose Stephen Hinds' *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*.[18] He charges Hinds with ignoring the historical origins and development of the term intertextuality by pointing out that: '*Intertextuality*, the term and the concept, go back to Julia Kristeva, though she will not be found in Hinds's index.'[19] He further states his case by reiterating that, '[t]he function of the reader in Hinds's intertextualist model is in no way a consequence, historically or logically, of Kristevan intertextuality.'[20]

---

[15] Wolferys 2002, 23. Wolfreys' 'source' here is conspicuous in his absence.

[16] For the most recent survey of intertextualist scholarship see Orr 2003, 6–19.

[17] For an earlier investigation see Edmunds 1995.

[18] Hinds 1998. For another account of the relationship between these two studies see Hardie 2002.

[19] Edmunds 2001, 164. Both Hinds' omission and Edmunds' criticism reflect differing aspects of the politics of scholarship. See the comments made in Hardie 1993, xii, concerning the series' aim not to annotate exhaustively.

[20] Edmunds 2001, 165. Compare Culler 1973, 901 [on *Le texte du roman*] — 'The basic problem is that Mlle Kristeva does not see her task as that of accounting for the way in which readers structure a text.'

The first of these statements implies that Hinds' project was required to 'go back' to Kristeva, as the originator of intertextuality, but failed to do so. The manner in which this 'going back' would have manifested itself would have been marked by the presence of Kristeva's name in Hinds' index — a reference to 'Kristeva'.[21] The second dramatises a theoretical split between Hindsian and Kristevan intertextuality, the former not being a 'consequence' of the latter. The phrases 'go back' and 'a consequence' both hint at this concept's genealogy. Why is it important that Kristeva is not found in Hinds' index rather than, say, the text itself? Is quoting the name 'Kristeva' in the appropriate place (an index) a special prerequisite of intertextualist scholarship? In general, the two distinct ways in which Edmunds positions 'Kristeva' between his project and that of Hinds speak volumes about the politics of scholarship through conceptions of quotation, reference and citation, their attributes and their limits. I wish to interrogate this question of method in intertextualist scholarship by taking a closer look at these ideas of quotation, reference and citation in Edmunds' study and the importance of such ideas for Kristeva herself at the site of the origination of intertextuality.

At the beginning of his eighth chapter, 'Intertextuality: Terms and Theory', Edmunds defines the terminology for his discussion of intertextuality:

> The study of intertextuality is the study of a certain kind of relation between texts: One text quotes another or others. *Quotation* is chosen here, in preference to the more common *reference*, *allusion*, *echo*, *reminiscence*, or *transformation*, as a general, inclusive way of describing the phenomenon.[22]

Edmunds continues by mapping out the features particular to the act of quotation:

> To quote means to repeat part of another text in such a way (which would sometimes entail sufficient quantity) that its status as a quotation

---

[21] On the phenomenon of the 'index' see Bennington 1994. Bennington 1994, 274, relates his shock that Genette's *Seuils* [Paratexts], 'a sort of poetics of approaches to books (titles, prefaces, acknowledgements, dedications, cover-notes, etc.), does not include a chapter on indexes…although the work does have one [an index], a little unusually for a French publication of this kind.'

[22] Edmunds 2001, 134.

and its source may be discernible. Quotation, of whatever length, may be either exact or inexact.[23]

Edmunds' definition of quoting practices amounts to a generic conception of quotation.[24] This generic reading of quotation can be supplemented by adopting Don Fowler's terminology in his account of generic analysis:

> The aim of generic analysis is rarely to enable the critic to fasten a label to a particular work but rather is to construct a competence or horizon of expectations for a reader against which the particular details are read, and it is the secondary elements that go to make up that competence.[25]

Therefore, our question becomes: what is the presumed 'competence' or 'horizon of expectations' for the 'genre' of quotation?[26] Other than the formal aspects mentioned by Edmunds above, several more particular features mark out a quotation. The use of quotation marks, the colon that introduces the quotation, a proper name or source followed by a verb (said/wrote) and then the demonstrative pronoun 'this' and sometimes a footnote tells us more precisely the source-text of the quotation.

In addition, ellipsis is central to the process of quotation. We have always been taught that, grammatically speaking, 'to quote' is an acceptable idiom, but a quotation, the thing that is quoted, can never be 'a quote'. However, this improper slippage offers a tell-tale sign of what makes up a quotation, laying down the law concerning its generic affiliation. Quotation, and the act of quoting, relies upon finessing, sketching, and even misrepresenting ('exact or inexact').[27] Obviously, ellipsis occurs before and after the quoted text, but often within it. The dot-dot-dot of ellipsis further marks another important aspect of quotation — its inherent otherness and fragmentation:

---

[23] Edmunds 2001, 134.

[24] On reading quotation generically see Garber 2003, 2 — 'The quotation resides somewhere in the territory between the aphorism and the echo — which is to say, between the essay and the lyric voice.'

[25] Fowler 2000, 205–206. For a general survey of genre theory see A. Fowler 1982. On the genre of genre criticism see Selden 1994.

[26] For a recent account of quotation, as a written 'genre' and as an oral act, see Garber 2003, 1–32, which discusses a range of views, including those of Johnson, Emerson, Benjamin, Derrida, Said and Lewinsky.

[27] As we will see, this aspect is more often a seductive possibility with citation.

the presence of part of another text within the quoting text, an indeterminacy in quotation. This sense of otherness is further heightened by the phenomenon of translingual quotation. For example, are we quoting the same text when we quote a translation as when we quote the text in the original language?[28]

It should already be clear that the term 'quotation' used generically has its limits. If we return to Edmunds' first comment about Hinds and Kristeva, we can see how the politics of scholarly reference has impinged on our neat exposition of quotation as a genre. Is Hinds' failure to reference Kristeva a failure to quote? Or is the presence of a name in an index a paratextual form of quotation, somewhat like the footnote or the list of 'Works Cited'?

Furthermore, between quotation and reference lies the ghostly concept of citation. Edmunds himself finesses his choice of quotation with an ensuing discussion of citation as: '[a]n especially perishable kind of quotation is citation, where a poet quotes not simply another poet's words but someone else's saying of those words'.[29] Edmunds gives an example from the third *Suasoria* of the Elder Seneca. Seneca refers to the speaker Fuscus who liked to use a 'Vergilian' phrase 'not in extant Vergil': *plena deo*.[30] Seneca goes on to refer to how his friend Gallio used the same phrase to allude to bombastic speech. Gallio himself stated that his friend Ovid also liked to use the phrase and used it in his *Medea*. This double function of citation seems to bridge both quotation and reference.[31]

The particular point of questioning Hinds' project through the absence or misunderstanding of Kristeva and her concept of intertextuality is to highlight Edmunds' own focus on Kristeva, as he introduces her to classicists, and particularly his quotation of Kristeva's texts. Accordingly, now that we have given an account of the generic make-up of quotation in Edmunds'

---

[28] These questions concerning the relationship between quotation, reference, and citation and translation are beyond the scope of this paper, but will be significant for the discussion as a whole. See Leavey's interview in *Mosaic* — McCance (2002), 1 — 'I don't see how one could argue that a translation *isn't* citation.' We must at least quote a translation in order to explore its difference from the 'original'.

[29] Edmunds 2001, 134.

[30] Edmunds 2001, 134–135.

[31] The slippage between quotation, reference, and citation may be juxtaposed with the French term *citation* that covers all three English meanings. Thus, when we reach Kristeva's *mosaïque de citations*, this semantic range must be kept in mind. On *citation* in general see Compagnon 1979.

texts and others and pushed the limits of this genre by juxtaposing reference and citation, let us consider a key quotation of Edmunds' own.

As we have seen, by way of introducing the concept of intertextuality, Edmunds gives a brief survey of the term's history and its beginnings in the work of Kristeva, specifically in the course of her readings of Bakhtin.[32] In this section of his chapter called 'Text' ('Julia Kristeva and Intertextuality'), Edmunds states that:

> 'The transition from Bakhtin's notion of the dialogized word in the novel to intertextuality can be seen in this formulation by Kristeva: "each word (text) is an intersection of words (texts) where at least one other word (text) can be read. … Any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the transformation and absorption of another." In this way, intertextuality assumes the function of a critical concept.'[33]

As with his critique of Hinds' referential strategies, pointing out how Hinds did not 'go back' to Kristeva and how Hinds' mode of intertextuality is not a 'consequence' of Kristevan intertextuality, Edmunds explains Kristeva's concept as a genealogical 'transition' from a Bakhtinian concept. Furthermore, Edmunds later refers to how Kristeva 'went beyond' Bakhtin in several ways.[34] Now, clearly, Edmunds' Kristeva quotation shows several of the features that mark the generic make-up of the quotation: we have the quotation marks, the proper name as source ('by Kristeva'), the verb ('seen'), the demonstrative ('this') and the ellipsis.

However, by returning to Kristeva's original text, and filling in Edmunds' ellipsis, we are able to see some problems surrounding my neat exposition of generic make-up ('horizon of expectations') for the quotation and the question of genealogy (Bakhtin then Kristeva). Here is an extended quotation of the Kristeva passage, with Edmunds' text underlined:

> Hence horizontal axis (subject-addressee) and vertical axis (text-context) coincide, bringing to light an important fact: <u>each word (text) is an inter-</u>

---

[32] Specifically in Edmunds 2001 and not in Edmunds 1995.

[33] Edmunds 2001, 8–9, quoting Kristeva 1980, 66, which is a translation of Kristeva 1969b, 84–85. Originally published as Kristeva 1967a, 440–441. In all cases, I will refer to the *Critique* review, 1967a.

[34] Edmunds 2001, 9.

section of words (texts) where at least one other word (text) can be read**.** In Bakhtin's work, these axes, which he calls *dialogue* and *ambivalence*, are not clearly distinguished. Yet, what appears as a lack of rigor is in fact an insight first introduced into literary theory by Bakhtin: <u>any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the transformation and absorption of another</u>. The notion *intertextuality* replaces that of inter-subjectivity, and poetic language is read as at least *double*.[35]

In general, the 'mosaic of quotations' passage has become synonymous with the concept of intertextuality because it serves to introduce the first ever occur-rence of the concept.[36] The ellipsis *within* Edmunds' quotation requires an understanding of terms used before the quoted passage (horizontal axis and vertical axis). These terms represent Kristeva's conception of textual space: its three dimensions (writing subject, addressee and external texts) and its double coordinates (the horizontal being the writing subject and addressee while the vertical is the past, other texts). Edmunds' ellipsis (within the quotation) by-passes the fact that Kristeva is herself seemingly, and only seemingly, quoting Bakhtin, as represented by the 'horizon of expectations' of quotation marked by the verb ('introduced'), the proper name as source ('by Bakhtin'), and the colon. True, Edmunds repackages his quotation with a prefatory reference to Bakhtin. However, Edmunds' repackaging confuses an apparently Bakhtinian quotation with a reference to the 'transition' from Bakhtin's concept of the dialogized word to Kristeva's intertextuality, confirmed by later stating that, 'she went beyond him'. Thus, the focus on theoretical genealogy (Bakhtin to Kristeva) upsets the generic expectations of the quotation ('by Bakhtin').

However, the most important point must be that Kristeva is only 'seem-ingly' quoting Bakhtin. You will not find the word intertextuality in any

---

[35] Kristeva 1980, 66/Kristeva 1967a, 440 — 'de sorte que l'axe horizontal (sujet-destinataire) et l'axe vertical (texte-contexte) coïncident pour dévoiler un fait majeur: le mot (le texte) est un croisement de mots (de textes) où on lit au moins un autre mot (texte). Chez Bakhtine d'ailleurs, ces deux axes, qu'il appelle respectivement *dialogue* et *ambivalence*, ne sont pas clairement distingués. Mais ce manque de rigueur est plutôt une découverte que Bakhtine est le premier à introduire dans la théorie littéraire: tout texte se construit comme mosaïque de citations, tout texte est absorption et transformation d'un autre texte. A la place de la notion d'intersubjectivité s'installe celle d'*intertextualité*, et le langage poétique se lit, au moins, comme *double*.'

[36] See Schmitz 2002, 92, for a reference to the 'Mosaik von Zitaten'. Also see Culler 1975, 139, Pfister 1985, 6 and Orr 2003, 21.

index of Bakhtin's texts or within the texts themselves.[37] Nor does he ever refer to a mosaic of quotations, textual transformation or absorption. The Bakhtinian text from which Kristeva quotes does not exist, except as a 'quotation'. Therefore, according to his own terminology, Edmunds is actually citing Kristeva, 'quoting' Bakhtin. Thus, there is a vital role for Bakhtin and of quotation in the origination of the concept of intertextuality.[38] We could even compare Edmunds' own example of the non-existent Vergilian *plena deo* with the equally non-existent Bakhtinian *intertextuality*.[39]

My approach to Edmunds' method of quotation marks an important starting point for my main question concerning the relationship between the genealogy of a genre and (the genealogy of) the theory of that genre. If quotation can be marked as a genre that requires a 'horizon of expectations' and shows certain formal features, and if intertextuality can be marked as the theory of that genre, then Edmunds' project, as opposed to that of Hinds, pays considerable attention to the genealogy of this theory — marking the concept's use from Bakhtin to Kristeva and beyond. However, as the 'horizon of expectations' of Edmunds' Kristeva quotation shows, there are inherent problems with the way in which Edmunds uses the Kristevan quotation to ground his approach to intertextuality. Is Kristeva quoting Bakhtin according to the genre of quotation? Is Kristevan intertextuality a theory of the genre of quotation?[40] Is it inseparable from Bakhtin's dialogism?[41] This confusion seems to me to be based on the genre of Kristeva's own text — the so-called 'review'. This genre seems especially parasitic on another's text, so that its role as the site of an 'original' theory — intertextuality — must be especially pressured by the text under review. For though one could argue that a review such as Kristeva's was, in truth, more like an essay or a theo-

---

[37] Arrivé 1986, 13 — 'Il est intéressant de constater que, si le concept est, ici, explicitement présenté comme emprunté au seul Bakhtine, le nom d' intertextualité n'apparaît pas, sauf erreur, dans les travaux de Bakhtine lui-même: il emploie avec, apparemment, le même sens, le terme dialogisme (dialogisatsya).'

[38] Orr 2003, 26 — 'The mosaic of quotations phrase is then a *gloss* and transposition of Bakhtin's thought.'

[39] Compare Bakhtin's concepts 'carnival', 'dialogic', 'chronotope' and the 'productivity of his ideas' as referred to by Goldhill 2002, 362.

[40] On intertextuality and quotation in general see Orr 2003, 130–167.

[41] Holquist 1990, 15, notes that *dialogism* is not actually used *by* Bakhtin.

retical text, its ostensible aim of reviewer's introduction (of Bakhtin *and* Kristeva) must significantly inform its status as a form of discourse.[42]

Edmunds' Kristeva, by 'going beyond' Bakhtin in the formulation of the concept of intertextuality, exemplifies Edmunds' own genealogical method of intertextualist scholarship, which he set up to transcend Hinds' project. My focus on the genre of Kristeva's own text shows how the 'review' genre upsets a genealogical reading of intertextuality.

Reciting *Bakhtine*: Kristeva's Novel and the Classics

Going beyond Kristeva's introduction of Bakhtinian 'intertextuality', I wish to consider Kristeva's introduction of Bakhtin's genealogy of the genre of the novel, through the ancient genres of Socratic dialogue and Menippean satire. However, we will not really 'go beyond', as the intertextual relationship between Kristeva and Bakhtin becomes even more complex when we are dealing with the 'large-scale intertextual program' of generic theoretical introduction.[43]

Therefore without leaving behind issues of *citation*, I wish to consider the genre of the novel and the joint problems of writing a genealogy of this genre and presenting a 'horizon of expectations' for the formal qualities of this genre. As we shall see, there is an inextricable link between Kristeva's genealogy of the theory of the novel (from Russian Formalism, through Bakhtin, to her own studies), and the genealogy of the genre of the novel itself (from Socratic dialogue, Menippean satire, to what she terms the 'subversive' novel) and the actual attributes of the novel as a genre which operate independently of the tradition and its alleged genealogy. As with Edmunds, the conflict between Kristeva's genealogies occurs when Bakhtin is both adopted and transgressed — when he is introduced via *citation*.

As I have shown, Edmunds sees Kristeva's theory of intertextuality as a 'transition' from Bakhtin's concept of the dialogized word, in which she 'goes beyond' the Russian critic. However, the details of Kristeva's formula-

---

[42] Even a form of *scholarly* discourse. Where does Kristeva's review fit into Bakhtin's comments on the scholarly article? Bakhtin 1984, 188: 'The scholarly article — where various authors' utterances on a given question are cited, some for refutation and others for confirmation and supplementation — is one instance of a dialogic interrelationship among directly signifying discourses within the limits of a single context.'

[43] A phrase used by Edmunds at Edmunds 2001, 134.

tion of the concept of intertextuality directly point to the problems of quota-
tion and reference in a text explicitly aimed at introducing the text of another
(the site of *citation*). Edmunds' quotation of Kristeva, although prefaced by a
reference to Bakhtin, does not interrogate the difficulties of Kristeva's own
attribution of responsibility for the concept *to* Bakhtin. This relationship
between Kristeva and Bakhtin in discussions of intertextuality is vital to both
figures' relationship to the classics in conceptions of the theory and geneal-
ogy of the genre of the novel. I wish to offer two examples of Kristeva's
engagement with the classics through Bakhtin: the generalising force-field of
anti-Aristotelianism and the slippery character of Socrates. As with intertex-
tuality, Kristeva's engagement with these features of classicism is confused
by her role in introducing Bakhtin in the introductory genre of her own texts,
the 'review' and 'preface'. Thus, while the previous section discussed the
appropriation of Kristeva for intertextualist scholarship by classicists, the
following two sections will focus on Kristeva's *citation* of classical genres in
her recitation of Bakhtin's genealogy of the genre of the novel.

Modernism and anti-Aristotelianism

the second-order genre of the review[44]

Published in *Critique* in 1967, although first delivered in 1966, 'Bakhtine, le
mot, le dialogue et le roman' sets out to introduce Bakhtin's theories to Ro-
land Barthes' seminar and beyond. Kristeva's role in Bakhtin's introduction
was acknowledged by her contemporaries. For example, Barthes in his essay
on Kristeva entitled 'L'étrangère' refers to Bakhtin 'whom she [Kristeva]
has introduced to us.'[45] It has been argued that Barthes' title pinpoints both
the idea of otherness inherent in Kristeva's project of introduction and
Kristeva's own otherness as a Bulgarian in Paris.[46] Like her contemporary
Tsvetan Todorov, also a native Bulgarian, Kristeva stands between the Rus-
sian theories she aims to introduce and the French audience to whom she is
introducing those theories. As with the problem of translinguistic quotation,

---

[44] Wilson 1994, 1.

[45] Barthes 1984, 212. See Moi 1986, 2. On Kristeva's own conception of her role in intro-
ducing Bakhtin see her remarks in Kristeva 1983, 42–44.

[46] For Kristeva's own sense of the otherness of her Bulgarian/French identity see Kristeva
1995. See Moi 1985, 149–150 for a feminist reading of Barthes' title.

this otherness is vital to Kristeva's introduction of Bakhtin. Indeed, by the time Todorov wrote his book on Bakhtin, Kristeva's introduction had been assimilated into Bakhtin's own theories, dropping 'dialogism' for 'intertextuality'.[47]

Although marked as a quotation of or as a reference to a Bakhtinian concept, intertextuality is still ostensibly Kristeva's own coinage. However, the same could not be so easily said of a Kristevan theory of the novel. The search for such an original theory of the novel is hindered by her closeness to Bakhtin in her explication of his theories within the context of the 'review'. Moreover, the orthodox view is that Kristeva was not even interested in the genre. Allen has argued that:

> Kristeva is, in fact, interested less in the genre of the novel than in what she calls *poetic language*, something found by Bakhtin in the novel but which can be equally discovered in poetic genres and, as she will argue in later work, in other kinds of texts.[48]

This view simplifies Kristeva's relationship with Bakhtin, claiming that she merely interprets him for her own ends.[49] A further problem arises if we juxtapose her presumed lack of interest in the novel as a genre with her supposed lack of interest in (or even misunderstanding of) classical texts. Commenting on her formulation of the concept of intertextuality, Mai claims that Kristeva 'did not expound her concept of intertextuality by reference to (or even reverence for) the ancients. Her points of reference are not Plato/Aristotle/Ovid but Hegel/Marx/Husserl/Freud/Saussure/Chomsky.'[50]

---

[47] Todorov 1984, 60 — 'I will therefore use, for the more inclusive meaning, the term "intertextuality" introduced by Julia Kristeva in her presentation of Bakhtin…'.

[48] Allen 2000, 38.

[49] Mai 1991, 33 — 'Kristeva, it can safely be said, appropriated Bakhtin's ideas for her own purposes.' Jefferson 1980, 237 quoted in Corredor 1983, 97–98, states that Kristeva reads Bakhtin 'in terms of her own theoretical preference for rupture and modernity.' See further Morson and Emerson 1990, 4.

[50] Mai 1991, 32. A traditional, pedantic approach to Kristeva's general lack of reference to or reverence for the classics *could* flag up several of her mistaken references to classical authors. For example, 'Lucain' [Lucan] for 'Lucien' [Lucian], Kristeva 1967a, 457 on two occasions, both unhelpfully translated as 'Lucan' in Kristeva 1980, 82 and 83. Kristeva 1970b, 19, translated as 'Lucan' in Kristeva 1973, 115. 'Antisphène' for Antisthenes, Kristeva 1967a, 455 and 457, helpfully translated as 'Antisthenes' in Kristeva 1980, 80 and 82. 'Héraclyte' [Hericlitus] for Hericlides Ponticus, Kristeva 1967a, 457, translated as 'Heraclitus' in Kristeva 1980, 82. But what does this actually show?

Thus, as classicists interested in Kristeva's relationship with ancient narra-tive genres, so as to cement the link between intertextuality and ancient nar-rative, we have a twofold problem in accounting for Kristeva's relationship with Bakhtin's novel.

By considering Kristeva's conception of the genealogy of the genre of the novel in her focus on Socratic dialogue and Menippean satire as precur-sors to the 'subversive' modernist novel, I wish to see just how far and in what ways she 'goes beyond' Bakhtin, if at all, in going back to antiquity. My approach will be through a generalised focus on anti-Aristotelianism, in figuring her conception of the modernity of the novel genre.

By extending Bakhtin's genealogy beyond Dostoevsky, Kristeva makes a strong claim for the modernity of the dialogic novel. Her application of the Bakhtinian model to the modernist novels of Kafka and Joyce and the French literary avant-garde (including the works of Artaud and Bataille), has been taken as perhaps one of the clearest arguments that she misreads Bakh-tin.[51] Kristeva expounds this genealogical extension as follows:

> In the Middle Ages, Menippean tendencies were held in check by the au-thority of the religious text; in the bourgeois era, they were contained by the absolutism of individuals and things. Only modernity — when freed of "God" — releases the Menippean force of the novel.[52]

Kristeva's interest in the 'subversive' novel of modernity operates as a radi-cal 'extrapolation' from Bakhtin's genealogy. However, it follows the ortho-dox opinion of their relationship by showing Kristeva's concerns transgress-ing those of Bakhtin's original project.

Nevertheless, as we move from 'subversive novel' to ancient narrative to consider Kristeva's exposition of Bakhtin's sections on ancient genres, her most faithful response to Bakhtin, all is not as it initially seems.

It is in Kristeva's account of the evolution of narration from epic to novel, through Socratic dialogue and Menippean satire that she shows her-self to be most dependent on Bakhtin as a classicist. When introducing her

---

[51] See Cavanagh 1993, especially 290 n. 34.

[52] Kristeva 1980, 85/Kristeva 1967a, 460 — 'L'aspect ménippéen a été dominé au moyen âge par l'authorité du texte religieux, durant l'ère bourgeoise par l'absolutisme de l'individu et des choses. Ce n'est que la modernité, si elle est libre de « Dieu », qui af-franchit la force ménippéenne du roman.' In Kristeva 1970b, 19, the genealogy includes classical authors, namely 'Lucain et Pétrone'.

sections on Socratic dialogue and Menippean satire, she culls her information and some of her phrasing from the relevant sections in Bakhtin's Dostoevsky book. For example, in her sections entitled 'Le dialogue socratique ou le dialogisme comme annihilation de la personne'[53] and 'La ménippée: le texte comme activité sociale',[54] Kristeva reuses information and phrasing from the equivalent passages in Bakhtin's Dostoevsky book.[55] From the list of ancient authors of both genres, to ideas such as the non-rhetorical nature of the Socratic dialogue genre[56] and the analogy of the Menippean genre with the figure of Proteus,[57] the closeness of Kristeva's text to that of Bakhtin's prompts the question whether it is possible to identify a distinctly Kristevan genealogy of the novel originating in classical texts. Is Kristeva's Bakhtin interesting for classicists when she replicates Bakhtin's way of handling classical genres? We will find that, as with Kristeva's use of modern examples of the Menippean novel, so her supplementation of Bakhtin's classical references is radical.

The only significant way in which Kristeva develops Bakhtin's typology of narratives from antiquity is in her theoretical framework, in her attack on Aristotelian logic. As with the problem of Bakhtinian 'intertextuality', there is no reference to an anti-Aristotelian logic in his approach to Menippean satire. However, Kristeva sees this anti-Aristotelianism as vital to what she calls Bakhtin's 'Menippean dialogism'.

Kristeva represents Menippean satire as the genre that undermines the 'very structures of official thought founded on formal logic.'[58] Kristeva saw the formalization of the Aristotelian logical tradition applied to notions of text and textuality as too restrictive.[59] Earlier on in the 'review', Kristeva

---

[53] Kristeva 1967a, 455–456.

[54] Kristeva 1967a, 456–460.

[55] Bakhtin 1984, 109–112, 112–114.

[56] Kristeva does sometimes acknowledge her reliance on Bakhtin with phrases such as 'D'après Bakhtine…' Kristeva 1967a, 456.

[57] Simply comparing translations shows this closeness. Bakhtin 1984, 113 — 'This carnivalized genre, extraordinarily flexible and as changeable as Proteus, capable of penetrating other genres, has had an enormous influence and as yet insufficiently appreciated importance for the development of European literatures.' Kristeva 1980, 82/Kristeva 1967a, 457. — 'This carnivalesque genre — as pliant and variable as Proteus, capable of insinuating itself into other genres — had an enormous influence on the development of European literature and especially the formation of the novel.'

[58] Kristeva 1980, 85.

[59] See Lechte 1990, 92–95.

uses the term 'ambivalence' (the vertical axis discussed above) to refer to 'the insertion of history (society) into a text and of this text into history'.[60] At the end of her discussion of Bakhtin's typology of discourses she returns to this notion of 'ambivalence':

> Menippean ambivalence consists of communication between two spaces: that of the scene and that of the hieroglyph, that of representation *by* language, and that of experience *in* language, system and phrase, metaphor and metonymy. This ambivalence is the novel's inheritance. In other words, the dialogism of Menippean and carnivalesque discourses, translating a logic of relations and analogy rather than of substance and inference, stands against Aristotelian logic. From within the very interior of formal logic, even while skirting it, Menippean dialogism contradicts it and points to other forms of thought.[61]

In a basic sense this is because Menippean satire is not a 'genre' that could be represented by the Aristotelian logic of non-contradiction, the axiom that something is either 'A' or 'not-A'. For Menippean satire, because of its double acceptance and simultaneous transgression of religion and law, through the event of the carnival, *can* somehow be both 'A' and 'not-A'.[62]

So, why does Kristeva use Aristotelian logic as a foil to Bakhtin's Menippean dialogism? An orthodox approach that privileges Kristeva's aim in 'going beyond' Bakhtin to introduce her own ideas and those of her age, would look to a generalised anti-Aristotelian turn in Parisian critique as it looked to

---

[60] Kristeva 1980, 68.

[61] Kristeva 1980, 85/Kristeva 1967a, 459–460 — 'L'ambivalence ménippéenne consiste dans la communication entre deux espaces, celui de la scène et celui du hiéroglyphe, celui de la représentation *par* le langage et celui de l'expérience *dans* le langage, le système et le syntagme, la métaphore et la métonymie. C'est de cette ambivalence que le roman va hériter. Autrement dit, le dialogisme de la ménippée (et du carnaval) qui traduit une logique de relation et d'analogie plutôt que de substance et d'inférence, s'oppose à la logique aristotélicienne et, de l'intérieur même de la logique formelle, tout en la côtoyant, la contredit et l'oriente vers d'autres formes de pensée.'

[62] The relationship between Aristotelian logic in Kristeva and Aristotelian genre theory in Bakhtin is very difficult to reconcile. See Bakhtin 1981, 8, on how Aristotle's *Poetics* represents the 'stable foundation for the theory of genres.' That is, until any mention of the novel is made.

move past the binary oppositions of Structuralism.[63] Kristeva herself makes this claim for Bakhtinian dialogism:

> More than binarism, dialogism may well become the basis of our time's intellectual structure.[64]

However, this view, as with the origination of intertextuality, simplifies the relationship between Kristeva and Bakhtin and her role in his introduction. Kristeva seems to use this anti-Aristotelian stance to show an inherent aspect of the Menippean genre: transgression. Furthermore, when Kristeva supplements Bakhtin's genealogy of the novel with modernist authors, the attributes of transgression and subversion are important as well as the link between modernist texts and the Menippean tradition. Thus, there is a profound connection between Kristeva's extension of Bakhtin's genealogy of the genre of the novel and her representation of Bakhtinian Menippean dialogism through an anti-Aristotelian stance, since both claim to elucidate Bakhtin's theory of this transgressive genre.

My aim in explicating Kristeva's use of the Aristotelian axiom of non-contradiction, which she may have owed to mediation through modern linguistic theories,[65] is to point not to Kristeva's understanding or misunderstanding of Aristotle, but to the fact that she felt the need to conflate Bakhtin's genealogical conception of the novel genre with a reference to a theoretical notion of its break from formal logic.[66] Therefore, Kristeva's geneal-

---

[63] Compare Vernant 1980, 239–240 — 'Thus myth brings into operation a form of logic which we may describe, in contrast to the logic of non-contradiction of the philosophers, as a logic of the ambiguous and equivocal, a logic of polarity…not the binary logic of yes or no….'. See also Moi 1985, 118, on Cixous acting against Aristotelian non-contradiction as patriarchal logic.

[64] Kristeva 1980, 89/Kristeva 1967a, 464 — 'Le dialogisme, plus que le binarisme, serait peut-être la base de la structure intellectuelle de notre époque.'

[65] See Kristeva 1967b (reprinted as 1969c) for her Saussurian reading of the *paragramme* as a transgression of Aristotelian logic. For example, 1967b, 59 — 'On comprend alors pourquoi, dans le *dialogisme* des paragrammes, les lois de la grammaire, de la syntaxe et de la sémantique (qui sont les lois de la logique 0–1, donc aristotélicienne, scientifique ou théologique) sont transgresses tout en étant implicites. Cette transgression, en absorbant le 1 (l'interdit), annonce *l'ambivalence* du paragramme poétique: il est une coexistence du discours monologique (scientifique, historique, descriptif) et d'un discours détruisant ce monologisme.'

[66] See Sokal and Bricmont 1998, 37–41, for Kristeva's 'misunderstanding' of mathematical logic.

ogy may rewrite that of Bakhtin, while her focus on the Menippean nature of modernist and avant-garde novel writing extends Bakhtin's theoretical model. In line with the main thrust of this paper, the question of a Kristevan genealogy and theory of the novel becomes muddied through her role in introducing Bakhtin's genealogy and theory. Again, the genre of her text upsets any neat configuration of her relationship with Bakhtin.

Therefore, as we have seen, the genre of 'Bakhtine, le mot, le dialogue et le roman', as a 'review', systematically queers Kristeva's relationship with the source text, Bakhtin. In some other connection, apart from *within* the review genre and *on* the topic of intertextuality, it would be tempting to denounce Kristeva's use of Bakhtin as a way of sanctioning (or chartering) her own ideas. Her review is indeed an amalgam of invention (anti-Aristotelianism), mistranslation (*intertextualité*), and paraphrase — in a word, of *citation*. What she does not do is a straight account of Bakhtin. But, of course, readers of her review *expected* him to be grist for her mill: they could anticipate a forcing, galvanising protreptic, which brought a fecund body of ideas to bear on the current critical configuration, in ways that stirred Barthes' seminar, and would have startled Bakhtin's circle. Since Bakhtin himself wrote as a forcing, inspi-rational, processor of ideas, and this common outlook is at the heart of Kristeva's notion of the intertextuality latent, or petrified, or heralded within Bakhtin's dialogism, there could be no straightforward 'good faith' in her splash of 'post-Bakhtinian' (*propter* Bakhtin) speculation. Suddenly, Kristeva's *citation* of anti-Aristotelianism to somehow represent Menippean discourse both exemplifies and transgresses Bakhtin's conception of the genre of the novel. This double logic is interestingly that of the *citation* discussed earlier, an intertextuality that is both Bakhtinian and not at the same time.[67] Furthermore, since Kristeva cites a generalised 'theory' of Aristotelian logic rather than any text by Aristotle, her method of representing Aristotle parallels her (mis)appropriation of Bakhtin. This gap between a direct referencing of Aristotle, the historical author and his texts, and positioning of a generalised concept of anti-Aristotelianism, is even more apparent when we consider Kristeva's use of the Bakhtinian figure of Socrates.

---

[67] Wolfrey 2002, 33, on his citations of Derrida being 'neither visible nor not visible'.

From Formalism to Socrates

the only theory of the novel available, perhaps, was to be found in the translator's preface.[68]

In 1970 Kristeva published 'Une Poétique Ruinée' as a preface to the first French translation of Bakhtin's *Problemy poetiki Dostoïevskovo*.[69] She opens this text by setting out the problems of such a project of belated and cross-cultural introduction:

> The presentation of the book to foreign readers after a lapse of forty years entails certain risks (how will this text be understood?) and poses a problem which is as much theoretical as ideological: how does one interpret a work when it is taken out of its place, time and language and then revived beyond a gap which is temporal, geographical, historical and social?[70]

How do we set about contextualising Bakhtin and his ideas? How do we set about contextualising Kristeva's Bakhtin? Kristeva's answer lay in a genealogical approach to theoretical contextualisation and otherness, claiming:

> the best way to participate in the trend of modern foreign research is to integrate earlier foreign research into it, insofar as this earlier work has something to tell us about the difficulties which were its own and are now ours.[71]

In response to her call for theoretical contextualisation, 'Une Poétique Ruinée', unlike 'Bakhtine, le mot, le dialogue et le roman', introduces Bakhtin with a particular emphasis on his transcendence of Formalism — it is For-

---

[68] Shklovsky 1990, 206.

[69] See Erdinast-Vulcan 1995 for another engagement with this text.

[70] Kristeva 1973, 102/Kristeva 1970b, 5 — 'Le présenter à un public étranger avec un décalage de quarante ans comporte des risques (comment ce texte sera-t-il entendu ?) et pose un problème théorique autant qu'idéologique : que veut-on faire dire à un travail lorsqu'on l'extrait de son lieu, de son temps et de sa langue, pour le reprendre au-dessus d'une distance temporelle et géographique, historique et sociale?'

[71] Kristeva 1973, 107/1970b, 10 — 'c'est la meilleure façon de participer au mouvement de la recherche moderne que d'y intégrer la recherche étrangère antérieure dans ce qu'elle *a à nous dire* des difficultés qui ont été hier les siennes, aujourd'hui les nôtres.'

malist poetics that Bakhtin 'ruins'. Unlike the 'review', this 'preface' required a more literal approach to Bakhtin's 'post-Formalism'.[72]

Kristeva's work in introducing Bakhtin came off the back of a collection of Formalist texts translated by Todorov.[73] However, what Formalism is for Kristeva is difficult to reconcile with the group's own self-perception, since, matters are just as problematic when considering the concept of schools of thought, as with the problems surrounding the term intertextuality in the clash of formal features and genealogical readings. What Formalism is and from whom or what it originates are complex questions. In 'Une Poétique Ruinée', Kristeva defines Formalism in relation to its focus on the 'work in itself' and its origins in Kantian aesthetics:

> The Formalist writings are oriented towards the internal organisation of the 'work in itself'; they isolate individual elements of the discourse and posit relationships between them, pursuing a deductive process which was inspired, as to its origins, by Kant, and as to its specific details by the structural linguists of the first half of the century. These Formalist writings introduced what was lacking in literary history or in the impressionistic literary essays associated with the French tradition, that is, an approach which was in intention theoretical, but which also, so as to take root, developed some echoes of, or similarity with, that process of treating 'human' and 'social' factors scientifically which is currently referred to as 'structuralism'.[74]

However, members of the group have resisted such a definition of Formalism. Roman Jakobson has stated that:

---

[72] A term used of Bakhtin by Kristeva — for example, Kristeva 1973, 108/Kristeva 1970b, 11. See also Roudiez's introduction to Kristeva 1980, 2 and 3.

[73] Todorov 1965. On the history and theory of Formalism the landmark study is still Erlich 1965.

[74] Kristeva 1973, 102/Kristeva 1970, 5 — 'Orientés vers l'organisation interne de l' "œuvre en soi", découpant des unités dans le récit et posant des relations entre elles, suivant en ceci une démarche déductive inspirée dans ses fondements de Kant et dans ses particularités de la linguistique structurale de la première moitié du siècle, les textes des formalistes ont apporté ce qui manquait à l'histoire littéraire ou à l'essayisme impressionniste propre à la tradition française, à savoir une approche se voulant théorique, tout en trouvant, pour s'implanter, un écho ou une analogie dans le procès de scientifisation de l' "humain" et du "social" couramment désigné comme *structuralisme*.' See also Kristeva 1973, 111/Kristeva 1970b, 16.

> This school [Formalism], say its detractors … calls for an art for art's
> sake approach and follows in the footsteps of Kantian aesthetics … [but]
> none of us ever proclaimed the self-sufficiency of art![75]

Elsewhere, Kristeva notes how the Formalists did not make the distinction
between the novel and other narrative genres.[76] She further highlights this
point in her section of this essay called 'De Socrate au Capitalisme'. In this
section she maps a genealogy of Russian poetics from pre-Formalist histori-
cism to the 'post-Formalist' historicism of Bakhtin. To explain this shift in
literary history, Kristeva appropriates the Bakhtinian character of Socrates to
mark her introduction of Bakhtin through the limitations of the Formalists
work on narrative genres.

Kristeva states the theoretical genealogy of Russian poetics as follows:
'[b]efore becoming Formalist, the Russian poetics was historical', while,
'[c]oming after the Formalists, and having learnt from their efforts the fact
that one must study meaning in all its verbal materiality, Bakhtin again takes
up *historical poetics*.'[77] Having set up this 'speculative' theoretical geneal-
ogy, bridging between the Formalists and Bakhtin through the notion of po-
etics, Kristeva goes on to explain this transition through Bakhtin's focus on
the specific genre (meaning system) of the novel linked with the tradition
(meaningful practice) of Menippean satire. In Kristeva's formulation:

> Formalism put forward a more or less arbitrary inventory of the compo-
> nent elements of Narrative. Instead, Bakhtin introduces a typology of lit-
> erary universes, which are mutually irreducible and which divide the lin-
> ear flow of history into sections of *meaningful practices*.[78]

---

[75] Jakobson quoted in Todorov 1985, 136.

[76] Kristeva 1970a, 15.

[77] Kristeva 1973, 107/Kristeva 1970b, 10 — 'Avant d'être formaliste, la poétique en Russie
fut *historique*.' Kristeva 1973, 107/Kristeva 1970b, 11. 'Après le travail des formalistes,
et ayant retenu de l'expérience formaliste qu'il est nécessaire d'étudier la signification
dans sa matérialité verbale, Bakhtine renoue avec la *poétique historique*.'

[78] Kristeva 1973, 107/Kristeva 1970b, 11 — 'A la place de l'inventaire plus ou moins
arbitraire que le formalisme proposait des composantes du Récit, Bakhtine fait intervenir
une *typologie* des univers littéraires, irréductibles les uns aux autres et découpant la linéa-
rité historique en blocs de *pratiques signifiantes*.'

Kristeva does not see Bakhtin's focus on the specificity of the meaningful practices of literary history as reductivist and to make her point she introduces the figure of the Bakhtinian Socrates:

> But there is no vulgar sociologism or historicism either: the meaning-systems do not 'reflect' socio-historical structures; they have a history of their own, which passes through the history of production-methods, and answers them from its own vantage point, where there is a linking-up of the 'formative ideologies' of the 'age of Socrates', of mediaeval carnival (with the Romans' protest against the Law of the Father: '*Sia ammazzato il signor Padre!*') and of capitalism which, 'as in the Athenian Agora, brings men and ideas face to face …'[79]

In this confusing passage, Kristeva links together several distinct sections from Bakhtin's *Problemy poetiki Dostoïevskovo*. The reference to the 'formative ideologies' of the 'age of Socrates', although not a quotation from Bakhtin, refers to a passage that characterises Socrates, his pupils and the Sophists as ideologists:

> The heroes of Socratic dialogue are *ideologists*. The prime ideologist is Socrates himself, but everyone he converses with is an ideologist as well — his pupils, the Sophists, the simple people whom he draws into dialogue and makes ideologists against their will. And the very event that is accomplished in a Socratic dialogue (or, more precisely, that is reproduced in it) is the purely ideological event of seeking and *testing* truth.[80]

Bakhtin's reference to the Law of the Father comes from Goethe's *Italian Journey* in which a boy at the Moccoli carnival, at which each participant in the carnival tries to put out each other's candle, shouting *Sia ammazzato* ('Death to thee'), puts out his father's candle with the shout of 'Death to

---

[79] Kristeva 1973, 108/Kristeva 1970b, 11–12 — 'Mais pas de sociologisme et d'historicisme vulgaires non plus: les systèmes signifiants ne *reflétent* pas les structures socio-historiques; ils ont une *histoire propre* qui traverse l'histoire des modes de production, et leur répond depuis son lieu à elle, où se rejoignent les "ideologies formatrices" de "l'époque de Socrate", du carnival medieval (avec le cri des Romains contre la Loi du Père: "*Sia amazzato il signore Padre!*") et du capitalisme qui, "comme sur la place d'Athènes, confronte les hommes et idées…"'

[80] Bakhtin 1984, 111.

thee, Signor Father!'.[81] Finally, the reference to capitalism comes from a later passage in the Dostoevsky book where Bakhtin states that: 'Capitalism, similar to that "pander" Socrates on the market square of Athens, brings together people and ideas.'[82]

To understand Kristeva's references to Bakhtin's Socrates, separated by an *exemplum* of carnivalization, a brief consideration of Bakhtin's own conception of Socrates is required.

Bakhtin's Socrates can only be approached through a scattering of comments made in Bakhtin's works. Zappen refers to a unified Bakhtinian Socrates who 'is a figure who speaks and listens to many voices, none of them certain; who is more concerned with living than he is with knowing'.[83] It is this split between the idea of Socrates (the 'Socratic') and the historical Socrates (the 'person') that interested Bakhtin in his study of Socratic dialogue in his Dostoevsky book:

> In the Socratic dialogue the idea is organically combined with the image of a person, its carrier (Socrates and other essential participants in the dialogue). The dialogic testing of the idea is simultaneously also the testing of the person who represents it. We may therefore speak here of an embryonic *image of an idea*. We should also note that this image is treated freely and creatively. The ideas of Socrates, of the leading Sophists and other historical figures are not quoted here, not paraphrased, but are presented in their free and creative development against a dialogizing background of other ideas. As the historical and memoir basis of the genre is weakened, the ideas of others become more and more plastic; people and ideas which in historical reality never entered into real dialogic contact (but could have done so) begin to come together in dialogues. This is only one step away from the future "Dialogue of the Dead," in which people and ideas separated by centuries collide with one another on the dialogic plane.[84]

---

[81] Bakhtin 1984, 126.
[82] Bakhtin 1984, 167.
[83] Zappen 1996, n.p. Could Kristeva's Socrates ever be configured to vie with those of Hegel, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche and Bakhtin?
[84] Bakhtin 1984, 111–112.

In 'Bakhtine, le mot, le dialogue et le roman', Kristeva more aggressively exemplifies the effacement of the Bakhtinian Socrates as a subject (an 'embryonic *image of an idea*') by referring to the general destruction of the subject in dialogic discourse, when '[s]peech affronts death, measuring itself against another discourse; this dialogue counts the *person* out.'[85] However, as we have seen, in the section 'De Socrate au Capitalisme', Kristeva's Socrates is introduced in the course of an exposition of a theoretical genealogy that pits historicist against formalist approaches to literature. Therefore, her references to the Bakhtinian Socrates represent his 'post-Formalist' historicism that privileges *both* the 'age of Socrates' (the ideological focus on the historical figure of Socrates) and the transcendent force of these ideas in the form of capitalism, that brings 'men' (historical specificity) and 'ideas' (transcendent ideologies) 'face to face'.

By uniting these various references, Kristeva has appropriated the Bakhtinian character of Socrates as emblematic of 'post-Formalist' conceptions of text, expressing a particular meaning-system and a genealogy. Kristeva concludes that:

> This historic[ist] poetics, filtered through the 'structuralism' of the Formalists, goes on towards a definition of its object as a type of meaning-system, towards a concept of a kind of historical treatment appropriate to modes of meaning, without their being subordinated to a sociological determinism.[86]

As Bakhtin's use of Menippean satire locates the formulation of the genre of the novel in a tradition, both Kristeva's figure of Socrates and Socratic dialogue are historically situated, while also crossing temporal and cultural boundaries. Thus, there is a significant conflict between the historically specific genealogy of the origins of the novel, as formulated by Bakhtin (from monological epic to Socratic dialogue and Menippean satire) and the figure of Socrates, who represents a dialogic character (or characteristic) that persists throughout the genre's genealogy. Therefore, how can we read this

---

[85] Kristeva 1980, 81/ Kristeva 1967a. 456 — 'La parole affronte la mort en se mesurant avec un autre discours, et ce dialogue met la *personne* hors circuit.'

[86] Kristeva 1973, 108/Kristeva 1970b, 12 — 'Passé par le filtre du "structuralisme" des formalistes, la poétique historique s'achemine vers une définition de son objet comme type de système significant, et vers une conception de l'historicité propre aux modes de signifier, sans les subordonner à un déterminisme sociologique.'

double conception of the genre, historically and formalistically, in relation to Kristeva's strict theoretical genealogy from Russian historical poetics, through the structuralism of the Formalists to Bakhtin? As with the question of *citation*, this speaking through another is vital to Kristeva's reconfiguration of the Bakhtinian Socrates, not only through another person, but also through another time, space, and culture. Therefore, Kristeva's stress on the importance of contextualisation of foreign theory and her exposition of the genealogy from historicist, to Formalist, to 'post-Formalist' poetics, is personified by the transcendent figure of Socrates.[87]

By bringing together these quotations of Bakhtin, Kristeva makes Socrates stand for the Bakhtinian novel, as a particular meaningful practice (the dialogic) within a history of meaning systems (dialogic genres). So, the contention that Kristeva's understanding of intertextuality, through the 'mosaic of quotations', as a matter of a poem's relation to its present, as opposed to Conte's conception of intertextuality as a matter of a poem's relation to the past, is contradicted by the role Socrates plays in her theory.[88]

Coda: Looking for intertextuality in *Le texte du roman*

'There, there is intertextuality'. We began by investigating intertextuality's origins in Kristeva's introduction of Bakhtin through the debate concerning intertextualist method in Roman poetry. We then traced the large-scale intertextual relationship between Bakhtin and Kristeva in their discussions of the genre of the novel. Kristeva's formulations of Bakhtinian intertextuality, anti-Aristotelianism and the figure of Socrates all complicate the orthodox view of Kristeva as simply going beyond Bakhtin to introduce her own theories. Furthermore, each manifestation of the 'Bakhtinian' has been distinct.

---

[87] Compare Bové's radical thesis that Kristeva was either reading psychoanalytic theories into Bakhtin's work or that Bakhtin was himself working out a theory of the unconscious. She makes the following statement that could express the Bakhtinian Socrates: Bové 1983, 124. 'She [Kristeva] transforms Bakhtin by making the psychoanalytic implications of his work explicit — she reads him as if he were a Freudian. Bakhtin becomes a "character" whom she describes and who gives her the opportunity to express, through him, her own theory of the text, i.e., the necessities of her hidden psychic life, her desires as theorist.' Sadly it is beyond the scope of this paper to investigate the effect of Kristeva's psychoanalytic works on her relationship with Bakhtin and Classicists relationship with her.

[88] Edmunds 2001, 9.

Kristeva cites intertextuality as a Bakhtinian concept, despite the lack of the term in Bakhtin's works, thus problematising both Bakhtin's and Kristeva's roles in its origination, as well as the thrust of the term. Kristeva's insertion of an anti-Aristotelianism theme into Bakhtin (in 'Bakhtine, le mot, le dialogue et le roman') is a possible extension of Bakhtin that represents itself in paraphrase. Finally, Kristeva's Socrates epitomises Bakhtinian 'post-Formalism' by constructing a speculative theoretical genealogy of Bakhtin's own thought. Each manifestation of the 'Bakhtinian' in Kristeva operates a conception of *citation* that trades on the genres of her texts as 'introductory'.

However, unlike the *Critique* review or the translation's preface, *Le texte du roman* — her doctoral thesis — does not ostensibly aim to introduce Bakhtin. Here, Kristeva positions Bakhtin as a model to adhere to — this is Kristeva's *applied Bakhtin*, in which Bakhtin is no longer in need of introduction but is cited as an important reference.[89]

In an interview in 1988, Kristeva explains how she planned to write her doctoral thesis on the *nouveau roman* but eventually decided to study the structure of the Renaissance novel.

> Rather than investigate the way the *nouveau roman* decomposed the form of the novel, I wanted to pose a different question: how did the novel establish itself as a genre? So I shifted my focus from the end to the beginning …[90]

Kristeva's doctoral thesis produces a further genealogy of the novel by introducing the mediaeval romance of Antoine de la Salle, *Le Petit Jehan de Saintré* as an important moment in the birth of the dialogic novel.[91] It is in *Le texte du roman* that we see the unification of Kristeva's interest in the novel and in intertextuality.[92] As I have noted, this link between the origins of intertextuality and the rise of the novel has attracted classicists. Furthermore, *Le texte du roman* offers a further site for the formulation of the concept of intertextuality, in a chapter called 'L'Intertextualité'.[93] Indeed, this chapter is an important site for exploring Kristeva's use of the term and its theory in

---

[89] See Kristeva 1970a, 25 n.1.

[90] Kristeva in Guberman 1996, 6.

[91] See also Kristeva, 1968a.

[92] It is strangely appropriate that Massimo Fusillo claims that it was this text that first coined 'intertextuality'. Fusillo 1989, 17, and Fusillo 1996, 279.

[93] Kristeva 1970a, 139–176.

relation to the novel genre. However, it has been called 'the most incomplete and disappointing section of the book.'[94] The reason for this disappointment is evidently that the conception of intertextuality differs from that formulated elsewhere. For example, the conception of intertextuality in *Le texte du roman* pays considerable attention to the difference between written and oral 'texts' within the novel genre.[95]

Furthermore, as with the 'introductory' genres of the review and preface, the genre of the 'thesis' impinges on Kristeva's conception of intertextuality in the novel and also highlights the question of scholarly *self*-reference. In the thesis there are traces of material from several of her published articles. The most obvious example is the article 'Le texte clos', which was published in 1968, but also included in the doctoral thesis.[96] Since Kristeva states that she wrote the thesis between 1966 and 1967, it is difficult to tell how the textual crossover operates.[97] Furthermore, in her bibliography to the thesis, Kristeva acknowledges several of her works up to and including her *Semiotike* of 1969. This confusion as to the strict chronology (the genealogy) of Kristeva's texts makes her concept of intertextuality even more slippery.

In the chapter 'La Transformation Actantielle', Kristeva repeats material from 'Bakhtine, le mot, le dialogue et le roman'. Indeed, pages 86–94 are basically the same as in the article, give or take a few significant changes. One of these changes is vital to the debate concerning ideas of *citation* in the origination of intertextuality. When we get to the passage quoted by Edmunds, in the thesis we have:

> de sorte que l'axe horizontal (sujet/destinataire) et l'axe vertical (texte/contexte) coïncident pour dévoiler un fait majeur: l'énoncé (le texte) est un croisement d'énoncés (de textes) où on lit au moins un autre énoncé (texte).

---

[94] Culler 1973, 901.

[95] See Kristeva 1970a, 141–144, for a genealogy of the written and the oral. This conception of the intertextual space of the novel representing both written and oral 'texts' was also the force of Kristeva 1968a.

[96] See the statement at the end of the article — 'Extrait d'un travail sur la théorie du roman juillet 1967'. See also Kristeva 1968b, 34 n. 1. The whole article is found within the thesis: Kristeva 1970a, 12, 13–14, 26–28, 33–34, 44–49, 56–62, 154–156, 147–148. Compare also Kristeva 1968c, especially 303f.

[97] Kristeva, 1970a, 193 ('Post-Face').

Despite the change from *mot* to *énoncé* this seems to be the same text.[98] However, the next passage, the ellipsis in Edmunds' text and beyond, is missing. Thus, in *Le texte du roman*, the foundational passage of intertextuality that includes the 'mosaic of quotations' and the actual use of the word 'intertextuality' is finessed or not yet formulated. How can we be sure which conception of intertextuality is prior, either 'historically or logically'?[99] Thus, the problems of *citation* and confused genealogy that marked our reading of Kristeva's relationship with 'Bakhtin and the Classics' operate within Kristeva's theoretical works themselves. These problems surrounding Kristeva's self-citation and transformation take us back to the site of the origination of intertextuality. Strict adherence to genealogy (Bakhtin, then Kristeva) queers theoretical concepts such as intertextuality and intertextual genres such as the novel. Neither the genealogical readings of genre, from Menippea to the 'subversive' novel, and theory, from Formalism to 'post-Formalism', nor ideological readings, that mark the function of *citation*, anti-Aristotelianism and the Socratic, in the review text, can be separated in the relationship between genre and theory.

Throughout my discussion of genealogy and the novel genre, my focus on 'Kristeva and the Classics' as a way of introducing 'Bakhtin and the Classics' has posed some very awkward questions. Her relationship to the classical texts and motifs that she adopts from Bakhtin as well as those that she takes on herself, such as anti-Aristotelian logic and the character of Socrates, are obviously more dependent on contemporary linguistic, sociological and literary discussions than on a classicists 'direct' engagement with antiquity. However, my tour through classicists' responses to Kristevan intertextuality and Kristeva's reading of Bakhtin and the classics in focusing the novel, has shown that dialogue between the three matrices of genre, genealogy, and theory acts as a form of 'commentary'. Near the end of 'Bakhtine, le mot, le dialogue et le roman', Kristeva rewrites her phrase 'mosaic of quotations' to refer to dialogue as the commentary of a *citation*: '… dialogue (de commentaire d'une citation) …'.[100] Thus, by offering a commentary on Edmunds' *citation* of Kristeva in figuring his method of intertextualist

---

[98] On this change see Rabau 2002, 56 n. 1.

[99] Compare Edmunds 2001, 165, on the relationship between Kristevan and Hindsian intertextuality.

[100] Kristeva 1980, 88/Kristeva 1967a, 464. We can compare a similar rewriting at Kristeva 1970a, 152 — 'mosaïque de discours…'

scholarship and on Kristeva's *citation* of Bakhtin in her protreptic conceptions of intertextuality and the novel, this paper has offered a version of 'Bakhtin, the Russian Formalists and Ancient Narrative' that warns against any simplistic approach to questions of genre, genealogy, and theory at the crossroads of ancient narrative studies and literary theory — a cautionary introduction to the (scholar of the) intertextual novel of antiquity.[101]

Bibliography

Allen, G. 2000. *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge.

Arrivé, M. 1986. 'Intertexte et intertextualite chez Ferdinand de Saussure?'. In R. Theis, and

Siepe, H. T. eds. *Le Plaisir de l'intertexte: Formes et fonctions de l'intertextualité.* Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Bakhtin, M. 1968. 'L'énoncé dans le roman'. *Langages* 12: 126–132.

— 1970. *La Poétique de Dostoïevski*. Paris: Seuil.

— 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.

— 1984. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Trans. C. Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bann, S, and J. E. Bowlt. eds. 1973. *Russian Formalism*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.

Barthes, R. 1984. 'L'étrangère'. In *Le bruissment de la langue: Essais critiques IV*. Paris: Seuil. 211–214.

Bennington, G. 1994. 'Index'. In G. Bennington. *Legislations: The Politics of Deconstruction*. London and New York: Verso. 274–295.

Bové, C.M. 1983. 'The Text as Dialogue in Bakhtin and Kristeva'. *University of Ottawa Quarterly* 53: 117–24.

Branham, R. Bracht. 1995. 'Inventing the Novel'. In A. Mandelker, ed., *Bakhtin in Contexts: Across the Disciplines*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press. 79–87.

— 2002. ed. *Bakhtin and the Classics*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

Cavanagh, C. 1993. 'Pseudo-Revolution in Poetic Language: Julia Kristeva and the Russian Avant-Garde.' *Slavic Review* 52. 2: 283–297.

Compagnon, A. 1979. *La seconde main ou le travail de la citation*. Paris: Seuil.

Corredor, E. 1983. 'Lukács and Bakhtin: A Dialogue on Fiction'. *University of Ottawa Quarterly* 53: 96–107.

Culler, J. 1973. 'Tzvetan Todorov. *Poétique de la prose* and Julia Kristeva *Le texte du roman*'. *Modern Language Review* 68. 4: 900–902.

— 1975. *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics, and the Study of Literature*. London: Routledge.

Doody, M.A. 1996. *The True Story of the Novel*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Edmunds, L. 1995. 'Intertextuality Today'. *Lexis* 13: 3–22.

— 2001. *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Erdinast-Vulcan, D. 1995. 'Bakhtin's Homesickness: A Late Reply to Julia Kristeva'. *Textual Practice* 9: 223–242.

Erlich, V. 1965. *Russian Formalism: History — Doctrine*. The Hague: Mouton.

Fowler, A. 1982. *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Fowler, D. 2000. 'The Didactic Plot.' In M. Depew & D. Obbink (eds*.). Matrices of Genre. Authors, Canons, and Society*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press. 205–219.

Fusillo, M. 1989. *Il Romanzo Greco. Polifonia ed Eros* . Venice: Marsilio.

— 1996. 'Critical Theories and the Ancient Novel'. In Schmeling 1996: 277–305.

Garber, M. 2003. *Quotation Marks*. London: Routledge.

Goldhill, S. 2001. Review of Branham (2002). *CR* 52. 2: 362–363.

Guberman, R. M. ed. 1996. *Julia Kristeva, interviews*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hardie, P.R. 1993. *The Epic Successors of Virgil: a study in the dynamics of a tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

— 2001. Review of Edmunds (2001). *CR* 52. 2: 296–297.

Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holquist, M. 1990. *Dialogism: Bakhtin and His World*. London: Routledge.

Kristeva, J. 1967a. 'Bakhtine, le mot, le dialogue et le roman'. *Critique* 239: 438–465.

— 1967b. 'Pour une sémiologie des paragrammes'. *Tel Quel* 29: 53–75.

— 1968a. 'Le texte clos'. *Langages* 12: 103–125.

— 1968b. 'Du symbol au signe'. *Tel Quel* 34: 34–40.

— 1968c. 'Problèmes de la structuration du texte'. In *Théorie d'ensemble*. Paris: Seuil. 298–317.

— 1969a. *Sémeiotikè: Recherches pour une sémanalyse*. Paris: Seuil.

— 1969b. 'Le mot, le dialogue et le roman'. In Kristeva 1969a: 82–112.

— 1969c. 'Pour une sémiologie des paragrammes'. In Kristeva 1969a: 113–146.

— 1970a. *Le texte du roman: approche sémiologique d'une structure discursive et transformationelle*. The Hague: Mouton.

— 1970b. 'Une Poétique Ruinée'. In Bakhtin 1970: 5–27.

— 1973. 'The Ruin of Poetics'. In Bann and Bowlt 1973: 102–119.

— 1980. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, ed. L. S. Roudiez, trans. T. Gora et al. New York: Columbia University Press.

— 1983. 'Mémoire'. *L'Infini* 1: 39–54.

— 1995. 'Bulgarie, ma souffrance'. *L'Infini* 51: 42–52.

Lechte, J. 1990. *Julia Kristeva*. London, New York: Routledge.

McCance, D. 2002. 'Translation/citation: An Interview with John P. Leavey Jr'. *Mosaic* 35. 1: 1–20.

Mai, H.-P. 1991. 'Bypassing Intertextuality. Hermeneutics, Textual Practice, Hypertext.' In *Intertextuality*. Ed. Heinrich F. Plett. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1991. 30–59.

Medvedev, P. N and M. M. Bakhtin. 1978. *Formal method in literary scholarship: a critical introduction to sociological poetics*. Trans. A. L. Wehrle. Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press.

Moi, T. 1985. *Sexual/Textual Politics*. London and New York: Routledge.

— 1986. *The Kristeva Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Morgan, J.R. 1993. 'Make-believe and Make Believe: The Fictionality of the Greek Novels', in C. Gill and T. P. Wiseman, eds. *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press: 175–229.

Morson, G.S., and C. Emerson. 1990. *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press

Orr, M. 2003. *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts*. Cambridge: Polity.

Perry, B.E. 1967. *The Ancient Romances: a Literary-Historical Account of their Origins*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pfister, M. 1985. 'Konzepte der Intertextualität'. In *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*. Ed. U. Broich and M. Pfister. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer. 1–30.

Rabau, S. 2002. *L'intertextualité*. Paris: Flammarion.

Relihan, J. C. 1993. *Ancient Menippean Satire*. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press.

Ruiz-Montero, C. 1996. 'The Rise of the Greek Novel'. In Schmeling 1996: 29–85.

Schmeling, G. ed. 1996. *The Novel in the Ancient World*. Leiden: Brill.

Schmitz, T.A. 2002. *Moderne Literaturtheorie und antike Texte. Eine Einführung*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Selden, D.L. 1994. 'Genre of Genre'. In Tatum 1994: 39–64.

Shklovsky, V. 1990. *The Theory of Prose*. Elmwood Park, Illinois: Dalkey Archive Press.

Sokal, A, and J. Bricmont. 1998. Intellectual Impostures: Postmodern philosophers' abuse of science. London: Profile.

Tatum, J. ed. 1994. *The Search for the Ancient Novel*. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press.

Todorov, T. ed, and trans. 1965. *Théorie de la literature: textes des formalistes russe reunis*. Paris: Seuil.

— 1984. *Mikhail Bakhtin: The Dialogical Principle*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

— 1985. 'Three conceptions of poetic language'. In R. L. Jackson and S. Rudy. Eds. *Russian formalism : a retrospective glance : a festschrift in honor of Victor Erlich*. 130–147.

Vernant, J.-P. 1980. *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece*. Trans. J. Lloyd. Sussex: Harvester Press.

Wilson, N.G. 1994. trans., *Photius: the Bibliotheca*. London: Duckworth.

Wolfreys, J. 2002. 'Citation's Haunt: Specters of Derrida'. *Mosaic* 35. 1: 21–34.

Zappen, J..P. 1996. 'Bakhtin's Socrates'. *Rhetoric Review* 15: 66–83. Consulted at: http://www.rpi.edu/~zappenj/Publications/Texts/socrates.html