

BERNARD POUDERON – JOCELYNE PEIGNEY (eds.), *Discours et débats dans l'ancien roman: Actes du Colloque de Tours, 21–23 octobre 2004*, index établi par Cécile Bost-Pouderon (Collection de la Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée 36, Série littéraire et philosophique 10), Lyon, Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée – Jean Pouilloux
2006. Pp. 362. € 32,-
ISBN-10 2-903264-69-4, ISBN-13 978-2-903264-69-7

Reviewed by Ilaria L.E. Ramelli, Catholic University of Milan
ilaria.ramelli@virgilio.it

This is the third volume in the series of the proceedings of conferences on the ancient novel organized by Bernard Pouderon in Tours. The first was devoted to *Les personnages du roman grec* (2001); the second to *Lieux, décors et paysages de l'ancien roman des origines à Byzance* (2005), and a review of this volume is also available in this volume of *Ancient Narrative*. In October 2006 a new conference was held in Tours, and was entitled *Passions, vertus et vices dans l'ancien roman*; its proceedings will be published in 2008. The book under review examines how the ancient and Byzantine novelists and their characters used rhetoric, how speeches and debates are represented in the novels, and what relationship there is between these speeches and their cultural and moral environment. In this way, the present volume shows how rhetorical discourse was absorbed into the novel. In fact, speeches and debates play a remarkable rôle in the ancient novel, and the influence of the Second Sophistic on this genre has long since been recognized.

The introduction (9–11) helpfully presents the main themes addressed by the contributors, and contains the acknowledgments and an account of the scholarly context within which these studies belong and by which they are inspired: the editors mention the ICAN conferences, inaugurated by Bryan Reardon, the Groningen Colloquia on the Novel, organised by Heinz Hofmann and Maaïke Zimmerman, other relevant publications on the ancient novels, and also recent scholarship on ancient rhetoric, a very productive area.

The articles are grouped in two parts: the first, which includes the first twelve articles, is entitled *Discours et écriture: rhétorique, récit, et caractérisation des personnages*. It considers speeches and dialogues in the an-

cient novels essentially in relation to rhetoric, as well as the ways in which they contributed to the characterization of the novels as a literary genre; this is achieved through the study of the use of these *logoi* both in the construction of the *ēthos* of various characters and in the development of the plot.

Danièle Berranger-Auserve, “Dialogues et débats dans les *Éphésiaques* de Xénophon d’Éphèse” (15–26), argues that in the novel of Xenophon of Ephesus, which perhaps is epitomized in the form that has been handed down to us, the presence of dialogues between the characters, of whom she provides a classification and a functional analysis, proves that dialogues were felt as indispensable to lending the *Ephesiaca* the appearance of a novel. For this epitome corresponds well to the idea that the ancients had of a complete and real novel. Ewen Bowie, in his careful analytical survey “Le discours direct dans le *Daphnis et Chloé* de Longus” (27–40), studies the deployment of direct speeches in Longus’ novel, first taking into consideration the distribution of the fifty-one speeches among the several characters, and the remarkable variation in the length of these speeches, spanning a range from a single word to 460 words. Then, within these speeches, the author studies the effect of the vocatives, the use of metaphors and comparisons, subordination, questions, and the length of the sentences. From this minute analysis Bowie draws the conclusion that Longus seems to adapt the style of his characters’ discourses not primarily to the *ēthos* of each of them, but to the situation in which they happen to find themselves. This comes as no surprise, given what we know of the sophistic *epideixeis* and the rhetorical exercises of Longus’ time.

Hélène Frangoulis, “Un discours chez Nonnos ou la transposition du roman grec” (41–50), studies the speech of Aphrodite, in the form of Peisinoe, to her daughter Harmonia in Book 4 of Nonnus’ *Dionysiaca*. In this speech, aimed at persuading the maiden to follow Cadmus, Nonnus borrows an impressive amount of material and *topoi* from the Greek novels. Frangoulis convincingly shows that in this speech, which is a dense literary and rhetorical exercise, Nonnus has created a pastiche of Peisinoe’s masculine behaviour and the feminization of Cadmus’ beauty. But the persuasive task of the speech is achieved all the same, since at its end Harmonia actually is in love with Cadmus.

John Morgan, “Un discours figuré chez Héliodore: ‘Comment, en disant l’inverse de ce qu’on veut, on peut accomplir ce qu’on veut sans sembler dire l’inverse de ce qu’on veut’” (51–62), concentrates on the speech of King

Hydaspes in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*, 10.16. At this point in the narrative, Hydaspes proclaims his intention to sacrifice his own daughter, and in fact at first the narrator suggests that he really intends to do so, but, as the speech goes on, Hydaspes fashions it in such a way as to induce his public to prevent this horrible deed. In rhetoric, the speech that intimates the opposite of what it says was called *logos eskhēmatismenos*, some features of which are actually present in Hydaspes' *logos*; above all, we find it in a quotation of a line from Achilles' reply to Phoenix in *Iliad* 9, which was a canonical example of *logos eskhēmatismenos*. Since the line quoted precisely represents the passage in which the rhetoricians saw the unmasking of Phoenix's rhetorical strategy, Morgan brilliantly observes that, by means of this quotation, Heliodorus unmasks the ambiguous nature of his own discourse. Heliodorus, the most bookish of the ancient novelists, enjoys displaying his knowledge of rhetorical theories.

Koen de Temmerman, "Caractérisation et discours direct: le cas de Plangon" (63–76), analyzes the personality of Plangon as it emerges from this character's speeches in Chariton. The speech, in fact, in so far as it is a form of expression, is seen by the author as a technique of characterization, which is carefully set in its context. In this connection, de Temmerman offers also an analysis of the treatment of *ēthopoia* in ancient handbooks of rhetoric: this must have been a great resource for the ancient novels (I recall only one more recent work that may be useful on this subject: E. Amato and J. Schamp, eds., *ETHOPOIA. La représentation de caractères entre fiction scolaire et réalité vivante à l'époque impériale et tardive*, Salerno: Helios, 2005). The portrait of Plangon that finally emerges from this investigation is somewhat different from that which resulted from previous studies, and is that of a skilled person who takes advantage of the circumstances in her speeches.

A clear and very well developed argument is to be found in Alain Bil-lault's paper, "Rhétorique et récit dans le roman d'Achille Tatius" (77–86). He demonstrates how Achilles Tatius tells a story and at the same time discusses it in the speeches of his novel: this is a particular feature that shows this novelist's predilection for rhetoric and his display of the rhetorical texture of his writing. The interweaving of rhetoric and narrative in Achilles marks a new literary configuration that results in the transformation of the novel of love and adventures. In a suggestive paper, "Aux femmes convient – je crois – le silence" (87–96), Daria Crismani studies some female charac-

ters in the ancient novels, and the relation between their voice and their silence, against the background of the heritage of the theatrical tradition that is remarkably present in the ancient novels. The novelists drew heavily on the theatre (as Crismani herself has shown in *Il teatro nel romanzo ellenistico d'amore e di avventura*, Alessandria: Edizioni Dell'Orso, 1997), although at their time this was not a moral paradigm any more; myth had meanwhile become an image, crystallized as it was in icons fated to survive for many centuries.

Loreto Núñez, “*Daphnis et Chloé*: oralité – auralité dans un roman antique. Énonciation présente, énonciation au présent” (97–118), offers a fine and articulated reflection on the status of the ancient novels as literary products of a culture that was also characterized by orality, and meditates on the subtle interplay between orality and literacy in this genre. The novels, which were written but intended to be heard (although not on particular occasions or places, so that this genre enjoyed a remarkable liberty from the performative point of view), perfectly fit the category of “aurality,” which combines the literacy of their composition and the orality of their reception. An example is provided by the analysis of some passages of Book 1 of Longus’ novel: Núñez here points out several features that are well explained by the “aurality” of the novel. In fact, *asyndeta* and paratactic constructions, *ekphraseis*, digressions and summaries, sonority and rhythm, rhymes, as well as verbal repetitions and the use of the historical present are wholly suitable to the characterization of the ancient novels as a mixture of literary and oral elements. The relationship between written and oral in the ancient novels is a theme also developed by Nunzio Bianchi, “*Grammata et rhemata*: du rapport entre communication écrite et orale dans les romans grecs” (119–140), although his angle is different: he examines the cases in which dialogues and speeches in the novels of Chariton, Antonius Diogenes, Achilles Tatius, and Heliodorus draw elements from written communication, such as the epistolary and documentary genres. In the instances analysed the speeches seem to clarify the meaning of the written documents, of the *grammata*, in the plot.

Géraldine Puccini-Delbey, in her “Les discours dans les *Métamorphoses* d’Apulée: vérité ou mensonge, ou faut-il croire celui qui parle?” (141–152), focuses her attention on the question of the meta-diegetic *fabulae* included in Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*. For a Middle-Platonist such as Apuleius, this is a crucial problem. The doubt that always arises in the reader’s mind is the sign that the human word never possesses the truth in a definite and unquestion-

able way: only the divine possesses it in itself. In fact, in Book 11 it seems that the truthful divine word prevails over the deceit of beautiful but untruthful words. This reading follows an exegesis of Apuleius' novel that sees in it a deep difference between the first ten books and the last, considered as a *locus* of religious and philosophical revelation. A remarkable element which Puccini-Delbey points out and which helps to buttress her argument is that Lucius, after yielding his own word to a number of minor narrators, takes it back again after his return to the human form, and reveals it as the word of truth, that of Socrates, "the wisest of mortals," who was condemned because of false charges (*Met.* 10.33.1–3). The issue of truth and the difficulties associated with the knowledge of it are also at stake in Étienne Wolff's contribution, "Dialogue et discours dans l'*Historia Apollonii regis Tyri*" (153–160). In this novel, dialogues, often displaying a very simple structure, are central and play a key rôle, and in the characters' speeches *enigmata* occur several times. These riddles, which at once conceal and reveal truth, are regarded by Wolff as a sign of the nature of the novel itself, whose story is built after that of Oedipus – and it is well known how fundamental a function riddles have in Oedipus' story. Furthermore, this is perfectly in line with the dramatic richness of this novel, which Wolff does not fail to remark and to contrast with the novel's rhetorical poverty.

Michel Lassithiotakis' paper, "Discours et débats dans le roman grec vulgaire (Callimachos-Belthandros-Florios-Imbérios)" (161–174), focuses on four Medieval "chivalry" novels in vernacular Greek. Their characters employ speeches of three kinds: lamentations, discussions, and *analēpseis*, in which the speakers evoke their adventures, in whole or in part. A common trait in these writings is the duplication of episodes and speeches, a sign of the influence of oral epic poetry, which, however, appears here as literarily filtered: the repetition technique that we find in these novels is much more refined than that of the oral tradition.

The second part of the volume (*Discours et idéologie: Culture, religion, morale et politique*) comprises nine more articles and provides an analysis of the relation of the ancient novels to the moral and religious context of their time, with, moreover, a substantial portion of contributions devoted to the connection with politics. Romain Brethes, "Le discours du prêtre chez Achille Tatius (VIII, 9): une déconstruction de la *paideia*" (177–190), reads the plea of the unnamed priest of Artemis in defence of Clitophon in the last book of Achilles Tatius' novel as a paradoxical speech that illustrates well

the paradoxical nature of the whole novel. The priest of such a chaste deity does not refrain from using expressions with which he soils his mouth (the accusation of soiling one's mouth occurs several times in this novel). The initial reference to Aristophanes as the object of the priest's emulation in this discourse is not explained by any quotation of this author, but is sensibly seen by Brethes as a sign of implicit opposition to Menander, a playwright whom Chariton had echoed in many passages. Achilles' choice is seen as a critique of the *paideia* of the *pepaideumenos* inspired by such ideals as measure and *sōphrosynē*, which were widespread in his days: Brethes proposes a definition of Achilles' novel as "an anti-handbook of the *paideia*" characterized by a "rhetoric of *erōs*." In a rich and minutely articulated paper, "La rhétorique de Callirhoé au livre II du roman de Chariton" (191–216), Cécile Daude investigates Callirhoe's speeches, which are constructed in a "culture of speech" and used "in context." She analyses the metaphors and images employed by Chariton in these speeches and finds that they meet all the requirements of good metaphors as defined by Aristotle: clarity, charm, and originality. At a more general level, Daude notes that here rhetoric is still the bearer of the values of Hellenism, but also transforms them and explores the inner world of the characters. Words may be effectively used to construct a personal identity, as well as for subversive purposes.

Marie-Ange Calvet-Sebasti, "Dialoguer avec une femme. L'exemple du roman pseudo-clémentin" (217–230), provides a valuable analysis of the Pseudo-Clementine novel from the narratological point of view – a tale inside a tale, focussed on Clement's and his family's story. The intrigue emerges from the dialogue, which is both relevant to the progression of the story, and serves didactic purposes. Whatever the genesis of this novel may have been, the present study proves very well the high literary skill of its final redactor and the ability of Christians to absorb and adapt current literary genres to their message. The author studies the characteristics suitable to a dialogue with a woman in this Christian novel, by means of a careful analysis of dialogues of this type, in particular those between the apostle Peter and Mattidia, the woman who is presented as a model of conjugal chastity. Christophe Cusset, "Discours divins et débats intérieurs dans les *Pastorales* de Longus" (231–248), examines two kinds of covert speeches in Longus' novels: interior discussions and reflections, which never contribute to action, and speeches addressed by divine beings to some characters, which, if truthful, do lead to action, and in fact are mostly addressed to men,

who, as Cusset notices, appear to be somehow the more active characters in the story. Moreover, the truthful divine voices tend to take the place of the narrator. The intriguing conclusion is that both of the abovementioned types of speech, the interior monologue and the divine speech, are the expression of the narrator's voice, who perhaps may be the only real character of the whole discourse of the novel, namely Eros.

An interesting argument is to be found in Ken Dowden's "Pouvoir divin, discours humain chez Héliodore" (249–262): the novelist's conception of the divine is delineated via an analysis of three speeches in Heliodorus' novel. In this novel, which has long since been recognized as deeply concerned with a religious *Weltanschauung* and faith in divine providence, we find invocations to deities, oaths in their name, and evidence of belief in them. But it turns out that Heliodorus' conception of the divine is at least henotheistic – i.e. it recognizes a supreme deity, as monotheism does, but without completely excluding inferior divine beings: a well-known category, especially for Stoicism and Platonism – and that the traditional gods blur into the notion of *kreittones* beings or even a *kreitton* that was not, after all, incompatible with Christianity itself. Now, the employment of *kreittones* in reference to the gods and as a synonym of *theoi*, as a collective, is rather late: we find it in Iamblichus, in the age of Constantine (beginning of the fourth century), and in the Emperor Julian, with some anticipations in Numenius and Origen, of the third century. All of these are Platonizing authors, like Heliodorus, and the last was a Christian, as Julian too was for a while, and it may be revealing that Eusebius of Caesarea, in the age of Constantine, used this expression most of all, whereas it is not employed either by Plotinus or by Porphyry. Dowden convincingly suggests that it might be a Christian expression that allowed its users to eschew an explicit affirmation of the pagan deities, which could be easily reduced to demons. It might have come from the East and from Christian authors who were willing to take into consideration pagan religious imagery. Thus, according to Dowden, Heliodorus probably wrote in the fourth century, and precisely around AD 330, and might well have been a Christian ("it is not indispensable, but not impossible": p. 260): it is known that the Church historian Socrates, in the fifth century, is the first source which attests that Heliodorus, after writing his novel in his youth, became bishop in Tricca, a city in Thessaly, and introduced the custom of ecclesiastical celibacy there. It seems to me that a possible reap-

praisal of Socrates' evidence may further support Dowden's suggestion. In any case, his point appears to be well argued in itself and deserves attention.

An extensive and careful examination of a *topos* is Françoise Létoublon's "La rhétorique du suicide" (263–280). She studies the suicidal monologue in the ancient novels, present in Xenophon of Ephesus, in Chariton with frequent variations, in Achilles Tatius, where the treatment of this motive may involve a parodic intention, and in Heliodorus, where this topic is particularly interesting and stressed, given that the *Aethiopica* apparently is the only Greek novel in which speeches of lamentation contribute to the action. Examples of suicidal speeches are found even in Longus and in the Latin novels and confirm the relevance of this *topos*, which appears also in rhetorical school exercises, to ancient fictional narratives. In fact, most of these speeches seem heavily rhetorical, but sometimes the author can find in them signs of deep humanity.

The last three papers concern speeches linked to war or politics and the background of the ancient *polis* which is often reproduced in the novels. Dimitri Kasprzyk, "Discours de stratèges dans les roman de Chariton" (281–309), studies Hermocrates as a character in Chariton, in comparison with the portrait of him that emerges from Thucydides. Unlike the latter, Chariton presents Hermocrates as an altogether poor orator, both in political and in military speeches. In fact, the generals who deliver brilliant speeches in Chariton are Chaereas and two impostors, the Agrigentan man and Theron. This shows how Chariton goes beyond his historiographical models and reworks them in his novel – a work which, according to Kasprzyk, may well be considered as a historical novel. In this connection, in note 31 he refers to "Ramelli 2000", but in the final bibliography the reference seems to be missing; I indicate here that the article in question is: I. Ramelli, "Caritone e la storiografia greca. Il romanzo di Calliroe come romanzo storico antico," *ACME* 53 (2000), 43–62.

Corinne Jouanno, "Le débat d'Athènes dans la version ancienne du *Roman d'Alexandre*" (309–326), analyzes the scene in the old version of the Alexander romance in which the Athenians deliberate over Alexander's order to present him their best orators, after his conquest of Thebes. This passage clearly is an elaboration of school-rhetoric that does not take into account the real political position of the historical figures of Aeschines, Demades and Demosthenes, who appear here and deliver their speeches.

Their characters and words are modelled in order to fit the celebration of Alexander that constitutes the kernel of this novel.

Cécile Bost-Pouderon, “Discours et débats politiques dans le roman grec antique” (327–350), offers a close and careful study of political speeches in the ancient Greek novels, remarking first of all that the *politikos logos* in the imperial age subsumes both deliberative and judicial oratory. Such speeches, as she persuasively demonstrates, convey interesting information concerning the cultural environment in which they were composed and its value system. She sensibly suggests that these speeches – although devoid of substance and tending to become *logoi erōtikoi*, not real *logoi politikoi* any more – may show how much the novelists cherished the ideal of the classical *polis*. The abundance of speeches itself may reflect the wish to recreate the atmosphere of the *polis*, which, as Bost-Pouderon observes, was trying to flourish again in the imperial age. The most remarkable example is picked up by Bost-Pouderon from a political speech belonging, I note, to a historical novel, that of Chariton: Chaereas in a speech to his fellow-citizens of Syracuse tells them that they have another little fellow-citizen, his own son, who is being brought up in Miletus. He uses the term *politēs*, on which Bost-Pouderon rightly comments that it seems to be a highly significant term.

A useful index, both of the passages cited and of the themes touched upon throughout the book, is also provided by Cécile Bost-Pouderon (351–362). Perhaps some overall conclusions too might have been welcome, but the volume is rich and the contributions numerous and various. Moreover, they are generally clear and well distributed, and they often offer conclusions of their own. There is no lack of unity in the work. And, indeed, in the introduction (11) the reader can find the concluding remarks by Bernard Pouderon, expressed at the end of the conference, which summarize the meaning and import of the present contribution: the various papers have shown that rhetoric was in fact closely related to the novel, for the latter not only shared the same subjects with the declamatory exercises, but also competed with it by presenting speeches in which the novels employed the rules of the schools of rhetoric. Furthermore, the novels referred their readers implicitly, sometimes even with a hint of malice, to a culture that was substantially grounded in school exercises. In all, this volume is a valuable contribution to scholarship in this field, and it is highly recommended because it illuminates an essential aspect of the ancient novels with interesting observations and new and important insights.