Introduction*

VICTORIA RIMELL
Sapienza, University of Rome

It has become commonplace in recent years, and as classicists have become more and more familiar with Bakhtin, to discuss the ancient novel in terms of its 'hybridity'. Bakhtin's formulation of the novel as a 'genre of becoming', as 'dialogic' or 'heteroglossic' in its mingling of styles, registers, poetry and prose, seems especially apt when applied to ancient fiction.[1] This volume explores an understudied but crucial and in many ways all-encompassing aspect of the novel's representational complexity, which perhaps also epitomises its modernity – its treatment of (the dialectic between) writtenness and orality.

As Nimis puts it, the Greek and Roman novels can be seen as an important 'transitional moment' in the trajectory from performance to reading, from oralism to textuality, that has underpinned the history of discourse in European consciousness since the fifth century BC.[2] Many of these texts seem almost to *stage* the rupture with tradition and the emergence of prose fiction in the late Hellenistic and imperial periods, presenting themselves as jumbles of theatrical voices caught in the very process of metamorphosis into a more fixed, monumental and self-consciously written form. Within this transition, the roles of writer and reader, performer and audience, appear malleable and loose, just as the oral and written (or their characterising features) seem often to become mere masks that the novel and its characters can try on for size. Of course, this kind of polyphony, or dichotomy, is not unique to the ancient novel, and in many ways is a major theme in ancient literature generally,

* Many thanks to Gareth Schmeling, Maaike Zimmerman and the editorial board at *Ancient Narrative* for offering me the opportunity to propose this project, and especially to Stephen Harrison for help in proofreading. I am also immensely grateful to Roelf Barkhuis for his hard work, patience and expertise.

[1] See especially Bakhtin 1981.

[2] Nimis 2004, 181. Also see Havelock 1986.

colouring texts as divergent as Plato's Socratic dialogues (for Bakhtin, the 'novels of their time'[3]), which compromise between oral and written structures even while apparently opposing them (most overtly in the *Phaedrus*),[4] and Virgil's *Eclogues*, pastoral 'songs' highly conscious of being analysed and read. Indeed it is only gradually, in the first and second centuries of the empire, that we see forms developing that are truly remote from (the mimesis of) oral performance – such as the treatise, the encyclopedia, or the handbook. Ancient literary theory is very aware of the distinctive generic associations, and implications, of the written and the oral/performed, the differences between experiencing a poem visually and aurally, privately on a page, at a recitation, or at the theatre: as Horace warns poets in the *Ars Poetica*, there is much at stake in deciding whether your work remains on paper in a drawer or is released as a 'voice' into the public domain ('what you have not published you can destroy: the word [*vox*] once set forth can never return' 389–90). Yet this fusion and play-off of modes of representation is especially marked and fascinating in the sophistic novels, displaying as they do a 'recurrent interest in paradoxes',[5] while Apuleius and (especially) Petronius respond to a more characteristically *Roman* deconstruction of monumentality in the early empire advanced most strikingly in Horace's *Odes* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, and reaching its witty zenith in the *Epigrams* of Martial, which present themselves as at the same time inscribed Horatian memorials and throwaway ephemeral quips.[6] The prologue to Apuleius' *Metamorphoses,* most obviously of all the novels, announces a disjunctive work that derives its energy and enigma precisely from this continual oscillation between and enfolding of orality and textuality.[7] As Kahane suggests, the strange thing about this ancient novel is that we normally associate such explicit signalling of representational paradoxes not with antiquity but with the modern age.[8]

---

[3] Bakthin 1981, 22.

[4] See e.g. Whitmarsh 1998, 122, on the debate that has grown up around Plato's highly paradoxical arguments here: 'why does a written text contain an argument devaluing its own status? …Is it a relevant epilogue to the text? An 'ironic' moment? A failed attempt to privilege a logocentric metaphysics? …Is the *Phaedrus'* paradoxical trickiness part of its point?' Also see Tarrant 1996.

[5] As noted, for example, by Whitmarsh 2001, 78.

[6] See Fowler 2000.

[7] As well as the essays by Graverini and Keulen in this volume, see Kahane and Laird 2001, especially the essays by Fowler and Kahane.

[8] Kahane 2001, 241 sees Apuleius' novel as a 'book from antiquity's future'. When Miles Foley 1999 is looking for examples of 'oral-derived texts which employ the language of

Most of the surviving ancient novels explore, in different and intriguing ways, the contrast, tension, conflict, competition or dialogue between modes of discourse, which amplify and frame the novel's concern with identity and self-fashioning, as well as advertising innovation more generally. In recent years, cultural and literary historians have been especially focused on the relationship between the Greek novel and an apparent intensification of interest in the self in the first and second centuries AD. And as Foucault underlines, this imperial culture of 'care of the self' is inseparable from a culture of writing:[9] written texts in the novel are bound up with and regularly express, or conceal, individual identity, from the deceptive slave-like 'brandings' written on stowaways' heads in Petronius' *Satyricon*, to the embroidered silk belt explaining the heroine's parentage and exposure in Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*. Moreover, as Ong and Havelock highlight, there are important differences in mentality and psychology between oral and writing cultures: oral and written modes, as many of the contributors in this volume suggest, can evoke moods, landscapes, characters, cultures, kinds of dynamics between text/author and reader/audience.[10] It is no accident that the novel which most immediately and self-consciously presents itself as both oral and written is Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, a work about transformation and multiple identities (of author, narrator and reader) in which boundaries between slave and free, man and animal, Greek and Roman, are ever-shifting and unstable. For Bakhtin, likewise, heteroglossia is always about more than just literary form. Modes of representation are often inseparable from wider socio-cultural factors and perspectives, especially in an empire whose literary culture (with its fast-growing book trade) is so overtly indebted to Greek genres and Greek oral poetic heritage. The representation of spoken and/over written language, as Plato, Derrida and others have shown, can reflect and expose an entire metaphysics.

Since Parry's oral-formulaic theory of Homeric verse rekindled debate on primary oral cultures in the 1930s and 40s, classicists have been increas-

---

oral tradition but were in many cases never intended for oral performance', he thinks first of the 'hybrid novels' of twentieth century African and African-American writers (13–14). See also Erzgräber 2002 on James Joyce.

[9] See Foucault 1988 ('one of the main features of taking care involved taking notes on oneself to reread, writing treatises and letters to friends to help them, and keeping notebooks in order to reactivate for oneself the truths one needed…Taking care of oneself became linked to constant writing activity. The self is something to write about.' 27).

[10] See Ong 1982 and Havelock 1986.

ingly interested in the interrelationship between orality and literacy in the Greek and Roman worlds. Yet as Mackay's collection of essays emphasizes (1999), we have moved on from the early days of oral theory, in which societies and texts were labelled either oral or literate/written, and reached less dichotomous conclusions about, for example, the various ways in which an oral tradition might function, and the porousness of the category 'oral art' in general in a post-Platonic age. Although they are regularly seen to have their own peculiar associations, oral and written utterances are not discrete modes of discourse: as Kahane puts it (and as May also stresses in her contribution to this volume), 'it may be difficult to decide, for example, if Greek tragedy is a written record of a voiced performance, or the voiced enactment of a written text'.[11] Likewise, after Derrida and Freud, the spoken word is never immune to the snares of textuality.[12] In thinking about the Roman world, Valette-Cagnac's work on the practice of *recitatio* has been important in complicating our traditional understanding of oral versus written culture: *recitatio*, which effectively unites the written and spoken word, so that they reinforce and complement each other, makes it possible to talk of 'oral texts' and 'spoken writing'.[13] Rome, Valette-Cagnac suggests, is characterised by a kind of 'mixed orality' that reflects a Derridean deconstruction of the hierarchical binary of speech and/over writing.[14]

The topic is also an increasingly familiar one in the study of the ancient novel, with recent discussions by, for example, Fowler and Kahane in Kahane and Laird's collected essays on Apuleius' prologue (2001), by Jensson (2004) and Rimell (2002) on Petronius, or by Nimis in Mackie (2004), and in Watson (2001). Thus since Havelock, in 1986, criticised some classicists' premise that 'orality and literacy, the oral word and the written, constitute categories mutually exclusive of each other', some work has been done which conceives of and analyses a creative partnership between the two in ancient fiction. Yet book-length studies have been more interested in investigating (traces of) oral storytelling in the novel: see Scobie (1983), on Folkloric patterns in Apuleius, and O'Sullivan (1995), which argues that we should view Xenophon's *Ephesiaka* as a very early, written version of an

[11] Kahane 2001, 235.
[12] See Derrida 1977.
[13] Valette-Cagnac 1997, 307.
[14] Valette-Cagnac 1997, 308.

oral tale, analogous to Homeric epic and Irish popular stories.[15] Indeed, readings of the novel have tended to become polarised into oralist and textualist camps: those investigating marks of the oral storyteller on one hand, who are inclined to view the novels as less complex, rather more improvised and straightforwardly entertaining works, and on the other critics influenced by post-structuralist theory, who in tune with the critique of logocentrism in French philosophy which has so dominated criticism since the 1960s, experience these same texts as contrived, self-conscious, elaborate literary games.[16] Deconstruction is inseparable from Derrida's general theory of writing, and in recent decades the analogy of the script has become a generalised feature of contemporary critical discourse.[17]

This volume draws inspiration from both these fields of criticism, and aims to play a part in moving novel studies away from those rigid categories already well unpacked by Ong, Vallette-Cagnac, and others.[18] The essays collected here explore ancient constructions of orality and writing (as reflected/manipulated) in the ancient novel, while taking on board both the Derridean rejection of the absolute primacy of the spoken word, and Ong's caveat that 'to try to construct a logic of writing without investigation of the orality out of which writing emerged and in which writing is permanently and ineluctably grounded is to limit one's understanding.'[19] Moreover, the volume addresses such issues across the Greek and Roman novels, dealing not only with questions of genre, oral poetics and traditions, but with how various ways of pitting/collapsing modes of representation become loaded articulations of wider world-views, of cultural, literary, epistemological anxieties and aspirations. This project also recognises that the issues confronted in thinking about electronic publication might inform, influence, and in a sense are inseparable from discussion of modes of representation in the novel: we cannot ignore the fact that the theoretical insights of critics working on secondary orality in the late 20th and 21st centuries, such as Ong, Lanham, Bolter and Landow, constitute the most extensive body of work on orality and writtenness in recent times, and also offer new, fascinating ways into ancient texts and ancient literary culture in general, forcing us to reas-

[15] Cf. Trenkner 1958, 178–86, Hägg 1994, and Ruiz-Montero 2003.
[16] See for example Bartsch 1994, Morales 2004, 36.
[17] For further discussion see Johnson 1993.
[18] Ong 1982, Valette-Cagnac 1997.
[19] Ong 1982, 77.

sess stale preconceptions. Lanham, a historian of rhetoric, puts this most radically when he argues that 'Electronic text will…serve as the vehicle for displaying all of Western literature in a new light,'[20] and suggests that the computer returns us to a 'classical, rhetorical model of education and social existence'.[21] Bolter, similarly, underlines what he sees as a striking resemblance between the fluidity of hypertext and that of Homeric oral performance.[22] It is, at the very least, an intriguing coincidence that these essays, all written by critics who have become classicists in an electronic age, have been discussed and first published on the internet, a new world of quasi-oral, fluid, open-ended and evanescent communication. Are we more likely to want to give voice to the active, performing reader (as Keulen and Graverini do here) when our senses have been sharpened by manoeuvering in a maze that is as Daedalean, and moves as fast, as we like? Do our texts come alive, and strain against the limits of the printed page, when exposed to and considered within the realms of this medium, or do they seem *more* written and visual? Do we hear different notes and rhythms, or see different patterns in the ancient novel when we write for the coloured, interactive screen rather than (or as well as) for the black and white page? All these, and other questions, have shadowed and invigorated both the writing and the reading of this (web-)book.

In different ways, then, the essays collected here all analyse how the novels manage and evince shifting overtones of written and spoken language in the ancient world. To what extent, we ask, are written texts associated (as Western philosophy since Plato has presumed) with fixity, immortality, silence, with the contrived, closural, separated, deceptive and visual, just as oral poetics are linked with communality, competition, truth, ephemerality, spontaneity, fluidity and endlessness? Do the novels corroborate the Platonic idea that twins logos with truth and understands writing as untrustworthy and secondary? Plato's *Phaedrus* was a popular and well-known text throughout the Roman period,[23] alluded to, for example, as Marinčič discusses in his essay,

---

[20] Cf. Havelock 1986, 118: 'since, as literates, we have only very recently woken up to the presence of orality as a contemporary fact in our midst revived by the electronic media, there need not be surprise if this provokes a new look at what may have been the role of orality in ancient Greece.'

[21] Lanham 1993, 131, 47–8.

[22] Bolter 1991.

[23] On its popularity see Trapp 1990.

at the beginning of Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*, where it creates an interesting and in many ways awkward stage for the living, sophistic *sermo* of Clitophon's narration, and in Aristomenes' tale in Book one of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, as Graverini explains. Similarly, as Cucchiarelli notes, the *Cena Trimalchionis* is much indebted to Plato's dialogues, especially the *Symposium*, which frames a dialectic between orality and writing so central to the 'new' language of the freedmen-guests. If the novel presents itself as poised on a moving line between the oral and the written, how does its patchwork effect exploit (the friction between) the conventional orality or writtenness of different genres, from incantatory lyric, live mime, colloquial joke-telling and vatic epic to inscribed letters, epigrams and gravestones? To what extent do the novels uphold Lévi-Strauss' construal of writing as almost synonymous with systematisation and exploitation,[24] or Derrida's rather different view of writing as violence, in the sense that it is the 'free play' or element of roguish undecidability within every system of communication? Are characters in the novels *enslaved* to the written word (just as loss of voice accompanies Lucius' transformation into a slave-like ass in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*)? The association of writing with tyranny, authority, silence, oppression and death seems to emerge at points in several of the novels – indeed, this is a theme that runs throughout Western literary culture, from fourth and fifth century BC Greece (as discussed, for example, by Steiner[25]), to Horace's monumental *Odes*, to the New Testament ('the letter kills but the spirit gives life' 2 *Corinthians* 3.6). As Henry Vaughan assured Sir Thomas Bodley, refering to Oxford's Bodleian library, 'every book is thy epitaph'.[26] The Philomela myth, which links the 'birth' of writing with the violent rape of a woman and the cutting out of her tongue, mirroring a larger history of associating writing, or weaving, with female guile, appears in several of the novels, in particular Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* (see remarks by Marinčič), where Philomela is paralleled by the silent Leucippe, in stark contrast to the verbose Clitophon, and Petronius' *Satyricon*, where, perversely, an aged 'Philomela' is reborn as a wily-tongued legacy hunter inhabiting a city of illiterates. In my essay on the *Satyricon*, I also discuss a similar Petronian

[24] See Lévi-Strauss 1961.

[25] Steiner 1994: nevertheless, as Steiner and the contributors to this volume recognise, paradox haunts the image of writing in the ancient world. 'Writing may elucidate and obfuscate, help and harm, preserve and destroy, liberate and enslave.' (Steiner 1994, 8).

[26] See discussion in Ong 1982, 81.

metamorphosis, in which the Homeric Siren figure Circe loses her seductive power and ends up exchanging letters with her 'Odyssean' lover, Encolpius, who is overtly construed as a textual subject/object. Elsewhere, writing seems to be strongly representative of power and (especially imperial) authority: as Chew explores in her reading of Heliodorus, written narrative is aligned throughout the *Aithiopika* with rigorous scientific knowledge, in direct contrast to the religious beliefs articulated in popular speech by characters. And in Petronius' *Cena Trimalchionis*, the 'tyrant' Trimalchio attempts to construct an image of himself as writer, eventually fixing his life and the events of the dinner party on the surface of a permanent monumental tomb (see Cucchiarelli and Rimell). In his essay, König argues that Xenophon's *Ephesiaka*, while on one hand blurring the boundary between orality and writtenness, can be seen gradually to resolve itself into a fixed, monumental, and in some ways disturbingly claustrophobic form, while Panayotakis reads the *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri,* a text which appears to mimic oral, folkloric traditions, as increasingly obsessed by written inscriptions and riddles, becoming a puzzle for *readers* which ultimately defies decoding. Writtenness potentially also has strong cultural overtones: Petronius, for example, seems to connect private composition and reading with Latin literature, and with the higher echelons of education, beyond the more fundamental schooling in classical Greek poetry and the youthful skills of rhetorical performance. And in his essay, Keulen makes a case for reading the prologue to Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* as paying homage to an enduring *Roman* oral tradition that is closely intertwined with Roman rhetorical pedagogy, while also reminding readers of the provocative connotations of specifically *Greek* (and as Graverini stresses, specifically *novelistic*) sing-song diction. The prologue speaker's concern with rhetoric, Keulen argues, is phrased in terms of a cultural clash between Greece and Rome, where Greece stands for the enchanting rhetoric of poetry, and Rome for rhetorical and literary pursuits in Latin. The multicultural, saddle-jumping *Ego* we meet here offers a model for readers' shifting between and performance of different identities, nudging us to reflect on what it is to read/listen as a Roman, as a man (or woman), and as a (asinine?) human.

At the same time, many of the novels self-consciously construe the limitations of writing, and seek in various ways to transcend the deadness of representation. Themistocles' epistolary novel, for example, as Hodkinson suggests, seems to echo the Platonic view that perceives writing as inferior to oral communication, staging the 'failure' of the epistolary genre to

achieve the presence for which it continually strives. Robiano also discusses, in relation to Chariton's *Callihroe*, how the letter attempts to burst out of its obviously written form by becoming an incarnation of its writer, and thus encapsulating the representational tensions that characterise the novel more broadly. Many of the contributors touch on the ways in which Homeric epic tinges novelistic orality: Graverini explores the figure of Lucius in Apuleius as a (failed) Odysseus, who becomes an important model also for Petronius' Encolpius (see Rimell), and for the wandering heroes of Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*, as Brethes notes. In Brethes' discussion, Heliodorus' extensive and idiosyncratic allusion to Homeric epic frames a complex and deeply paradoxical relationship between orality and fiction which finds its embodiment in the curious character of Chariclea, who is both a skilled Odyssean speaker and dazzling, Siren-like beauty, a philosophically awkward union of soiled, mendacious mouth and pure, virginal body. Graverini, Keulen and May are all in different ways interested in how the ambiguous orality of the *Metamorphoses* is bound up with theatricality: Graverini and Keulen consider further how the reader of Apuleius' prologue becomes an active participant in an exchange, even an 'impersonator' of the authorial *ego*. Graverini sees this 'immersion' as the key to the charms of Apuleian theatricality, and traces its import through the *Metamorphoses*, while May concentrates on the layers of narrative within the *Risus* festival in *Met.*3 in her analysis of how the prose novel 'captures' the idea of performance. Similarly, Marinčič's discussion of *Leucippe and Clitophon* as a 'consistent fiction of discourse' dissects the effects of the fictive narrator's aural and visual *presence* in the novel.

When oral display is evoked in the novel, power relations between reader and text/author are stirred as the reader is drawn *into* the text: as Zumthor proposes, 'The listener is author, scarcely less than the performer is author' (just as on the internet, Zumthor stresses, the distinction between author and reader fades in the collaborative effort of navigating the hypertextual network).[27] Oral culture is a social one, involving its audience: as Havelock puts it, 'the oral audience participated not merely by listening passively and memorizing but by active participation in the language used. They clapped and danced and sang collectively, in response to the chanting of the singer'.[28] In thinking about the dynamics of performance, the volume also asks

[27] Zumthor 1990, 187.
[28] Havelock 1986, 78.

whether we are meant to hear bits of our novels out loud, or are made to *want* to listen (even if we can't always make out or get our tongues around the sounds), and to what extent this binds speaking character and hearer. Several of the contributors (in particular Keulen) corroborate Ong's formulation that 'sight isolates', while 'sound incorporates' and 'pours into the hearer',[29] although they also stress the extent to which the ancient novel presents itself as a 'multi-sensory' experience which bombards and seduces its readers' eyes and ears simultaneously. In the case of Petronius (see Rimell), we are faced with an odd, potentially satiric version of, or parallel to, the winning, sensual stories that characterise the Greek fiction of the second Sophistic: the *Satyricon* envelops its readers in different, and not always pleasurable ways, grating on their *aures* in a way reminiscent of Perseus' dark scratchings, even as it also tickles and entertains.

Another core element in our mapping of modes of representation, their associations, interaction and impact in the novel, is gender. I have already mentioned the overt association of female silence and (violated) flesh with writing in one of antiquity's most crucial myths about the birth of writing, the tale of Philomela and Tereus, retold by Achilles Tatius. It is significant, as Marinčič underlines, that Clitophon the orator is also Clitophon the aggressive *male* speaker.[30] In *Leucippe and Clitophon*, we only hear Leucippe's voice directly through her letter, which in tune with Phaedra's myth is the classic locus for illicit female desire, as well as the genre of the disempowered, as Hodkinson explores in his essay. Yet at the same time, the charms of rhetoric and of oral performance (captured, for example, in the *lepidus susurrus* of Apuleius' prologue and its novelistic promise to *aures permulcere*) are regularly and explicitly gendered as female in the novel. *She* is the pleasure of the novelistic text, and as Morales reminds us in her recent discussion of Achilles Tatius 'the view that a female's speech was influenced by and in turn indicative of her sexual experience is enshrined in the linguistic double meaning of the Greek word στόμα, meaning both oral and genital mouth/lips.'[31] The oral poetics of ancient fiction are often mirrored and enacted in the novel's obsession with mouths, tongues and kisses (almost always from female lips): paradigmatically, at Achilles Tatius 2.7, Clitophon pretends he has been stung on the lip so that Leucippe can cure him

[29] Ong 1982, 72.
[30] See also Morales 2004.
[31] Morales 2004, 209.

with her kiss, and the spell she pronounces blends into and becomes the kiss itself. As the narrator puts it at 4.8, 'three charming things come from the mouth: the breath, the voice, the kiss'.[32]

Just as orality is associated with sex and female sensuality, so it becomes entwined with fluidity, water, instability, the forces of flux and *fortuna*, which are all in turn regularly gendered female. We see this especially in Petronius' *Satyricon*, which in many ways is dominated by the fickle, sexy whims of Fortuna (the goddess who comes to be embodied in Trimalchio's wife Fortunata, but who is also one of the chthonic deities responsible for rousing the chaos of civil war in Eumolpus' *Bellum Civile*),[33] and in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*: For example, the narrator speaks of the 'stormy waves of speech' that swell inside silent Leucippe at 2.29.5, while water 'sings like a lyre' at 2.14.8, and at 6.10.4, slander (διαβολή) is 'more persuasive than any Siren' and rumour (φήμη) 'more slippery than water'. In Apuleius, the idea that speech is endless, boundless, ungovernable (just like a man's desire for a sexy woman like *lepida* Photis, whose gyrating hips and sweet nothings rejuvenate the bewitching moves of the prologue and its *lepidus susurrus*) is continually bound up with the infinite circularity and mystery of the novel itself. As Lucius sobs before the goddess Isis at *Met.*11.25: 'the fullness of my voice is inadequate to express what I feel about your majesty; a thousand mouths and as many tongues would not be enough, nor even an endless flow of inexhaustible speech' (*'indefessi sermonis aeterna series'*). Ironically, the religious ecstasy felt in gazing at a goddess finally reduces our garrulous, horny narrator to silence. There are also points in the *Metamorphoses* when all this focus on mouths and talking is overwhelming and draining: see for example 1.26, where Lucius is (already) exhausted by the endless flow of talk (*'fabularum quoque serie fatigatum…defectum'*). Oral utterances are not always liberating in their unpredictability, as König emphasizes in his reading of Xenophon of Ephesus, while in Petronius, the raw rhetorical skill wielded by the educated free man in the opening speeches boomerangs as the anarchic and disturbing forces of Furor and civil war in Eumolpus' *Bellum Civile*.

Indeed, there is a provocative wickedness to (female) orality, and there are clearly points in the novel at which male characters either compete with

---

[32] On the oral poetics of Achilles Tatius also see Goldhill, 1995, 88–90.

[33] On the role of Fortuna in the *Satyricon* see Connors 1998, 76–83 and Rimell 2002 *passim.*

womanly voices, or want to appropriate or brutally destroy them. The seductive Siren, or Siren-figure, with her honeyed kisses and flower-mouth, is also potentially menacing and debilitating for the post-Odyssean hero (or reader). In his essay, Keulen underscores the riskiness of identifying with the delightful, effeminate and feminizing rhetoric of Apuleius' prologue. We might also consider Circe in Petronius' *Satyricon*, who is not only dangerous and sexually overwhelming, but, in provocative Petronian style, so poisonous that Encolpius' encounter with her is sucked dry of all its potential pleasure. We are reminded that the Sirens are mythic cousins of more bellicose divinities such as *Fama* and *Furor* (just as the evil sisters of sweet-tongued Psyche are described as scary Sirens with their 'fatal songs' at Apuleius, *Met.*5.12). Within the sweet oral poetics of *Leucippe and Clitophon*, for example, speech is also the 'arrow of the tongue', the begetter of shame, grief and anger (2.29.4), even if at 3.10.2, the (unpredictable) tongue can also persuade a furious mind to calm itself. Nor do women necessarily (fully) control their own oral power, and can become instead its passive subjects: in Chariton, for example, Callihroe's seductive beauty means that *fama* fills every house and street with talk of her (5.2.6), and at Apuleius *Met.*3.15, Photis fears the power of her own tongue.

Moreover, as the use of the Philomela myth emphasizes in Achilles Tatius, female orality is often staged in competition with, or upstaged/eradicated by male speech. Look for example also at the myth of Pan at *Leucippe and Clitophon* 8.6: Pan pursues the frightened Syrinx into a cave in some marshland, and as he grabs hold of her hair, about to rape her, she metamorphoses into a clump of reeds, which he cuts (just like Tereus slicing off Philomela's tongue) and uses to make a set of pipes; when the limb-like reeds are 'kissed' and breathed into longingly, they find their 'voice' (8.6.10–11). Virgins who enter the grotto cause the pipes to play sweetly, while those who claim to be virgins but are lying cannot make them play at all, and are condemned by this silent verdict. In all of these cases, Pan and his pipes have violently stolen and appropriated the women's voices, which are inseparable from their sexuality and allure. In Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*, similarly, Daphnis 'teaches' Chloe the story of Pan and Echo (3.23): Echo is the most musical of the woodland nymphs, excelling at the pipe, lyre and lute, and singing with the Muses. Yet her talent, together with her avoidance of men, rouses Pan's anger and jealousy, and in his rage he 'sends a madness' among the shepherds and goatherds so that they tear her to pieces like wolves and

scatter her 'still singing limbs' over the earth (as in Achilles Tatius 8.6.10, Longus puns on μέλη meaning both 'limb' and 'song'). Interestingly, in the following chapter, 3.24, Daphnis is now equal to Chloe in musical skill ('he competed with the pines on his pipe, whereas she sung in competition with the nightingales'), whereas falling in love with her had initially silenced him and made him fling his pipe aside ('how sweetly the nightingales sing, while my pipe is silent' 1.18). At Apuleius *Met.*5.25, Echo appears in her more conventional (post-Ovidian) role as vehicle for the repetition of male voices: Pan is sitting beside the stream into which Psyche has thrown herself, embracing Echo and 'teaching her to sing back to him all kinds of tunes' (these *voculae omnimodae* are just like the *variae fabulae* of this novel). But when he sees Psyche, he 'calls her gently over to him and calms her with soothing words' (*sic permulcet verbis lenientibus*), rehearsing his own version of the prologue's suggestively feminine or effeminate cadences.

Thus while the essays in this volume assess the different, competing claims of speech and writing in the novel, many of them conclude that a strict opposition between modes of representation is often if not always liable to collapse, either explicitly or implicitly, and moreover that this deconstructive tendency is core to the novel's experimental modality. The associations of orality and writing can oscillate, as König suggests in his reading of the *Ephesiaka,* where speech appears as a tool of oppression as much as an expression of liberty. Petronius' *Cena*, with its edible, riddle-like delights, seems to play out the novel's mixing of written and oral presentation (see Cucchiarelli and Rimell). Panayotakis' reading of the *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* pinpoints just how difficult it can be to isolate oral from written influences, especially when inscriptions (e.g. in the form of riddles) can be just as slippery (to read) as orally perpetuated tales. And both Hodkinson and Robiano see the letter, in Achilles Tatius and Chariton respectively, as a synthesis of orality and writing which comes to stand for the intricacy and contradiction of the novel as a genre. The surviving ancient novels, this volume suggests, involve readers (listeners, spectators) in negotiating a series of representational paradoxes which come to characterise their idiosyncratic, hybrid and seductively modern form.

Works cited

Bakhtin, M. 1981, *The Dialogic Imagination. Four Essays.* M.Holquist (ed.), trans. C.Emerson and M.Holquist. Austin, Texas.

Bartsch, S. 1994, *Decoding the Ancient Novel.* Princeton.
Bolter, J.D. 1991, *Writing Space: The Computer, Hypertext and the History of Writing.* Hillsdale, NJ.
Bolter, J.D. 1993, 'Hypertext as classical commentary' in J.Solomon (ed.) *Accessing Antiquity: The Computerization of Classical Studies.* Tucson and London.
Connors, C. 1998, *Petronius the Poet. Verse and Literary Tradition in the Satyricon.* Cambridge.
Derrida, J. 1977, *Of Grammatology.* Trans. G.Chakravorty-Spivak. Baltimore and London.
Erzgräber, W. 2002, *James Joyce. Oral and Written Discourse as Mirrored in Experimental Narrative Art.* Trans. A.Cole. Frankfurt, Berlin, Bern, Brussels, New York, Oxford.
Foucault, M. 1988, 'Technologies of the self' in L.H.Martin, H.Gutman and P.H.Hutton (eds.) *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault.* Amherst.16–49.
Fowler, D.P. 2000, *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin.* Oxford.
Fowler, D.P. 2001, 'Writing with style: the prologue to Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* between *fingierte Mündlichkeit* and textuality' in Kahane and Laird (eds.), 225–230.
Goldhill, S.D. 1995, *Foucault's Virginity: Ancient Erotic Fiction and the History of Sexuality.* Cambridge.
Hägg, T. 1994, 'Orality, literacy and the "readership" of the early Greek novel' in R.Eriksen (ed.) *Contexts of Pre-Novel Narrative: The European Tradition.* Berlin. 47–81.
Havelock, E.A. 1981, *The Muse Learns to Write: Reflections on Orality and Literacy from Antiquity to the Present.* New Haven and London.
Jensson, G. 2004, *The Recollections of Encolpius: The Satyrica of Petronius as Milesian Fiction.* Groningen.
Johnson, C. 1993, *System and Writing in the Philosophy of Jacques Derrida.* Cambridge.
Kahane, A. 2001, 'Antiquity's future: writing, speech and representation in the Prologue to Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', in Kahane and Laird (eds.) 231–241.
Kahane, A. and Laird, A. (eds.) 2001, *A Companion to the Prologue of Apuleius' Metamorphoses.* Oxford.
Landow, G.P. 1992, *Hypertext. The Convergence of Contemporary Critical Theory and Technology.* Baltimore and London.
Lanham, R.A. 1993, *The Electronic Word. Democracy, Technology and the Arts.* Chicago and London.
Lévi-Strauss, C. 1961, *Tristes Tropiques.* Trans. J.Russell. London.
Mackay, E.A. (ed.) 1999, *Signs of Orality. The Oral Tradition and its Influence on the Greek and Roman World.* Leiden, Boston, Cologne.
Miles Foley, J. 1999, 'What's in a sign?' in Mackay (ed.), 1–27.
Nimis, S. 2001. 'Cycles and sequences in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe.*' in Watson, J. (ed.) *Speaking Volumes. Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman world.* Leiden, Boston, Cologne.
Nimis, S. 2004, 'Oral and written forms of closure in the ancient novel' in C.Mackie (ed.) *Oral Performances and their Contexts.* Leiden, Boston, Cologne, 174–94.
Morales, H. 2004. *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius'* Leucippe and Clitophon. Cambridge.
O'Sullivan, J. 1995, *Xenophon of Ephesus. His Compositional Technique and the Birth of the Novel.* Berlin and New York.
Ong, W. 1982, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word.* London and New York.

Parry, A. ed. 1987, *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry.* Oxford and New York.

Rimell, V. 2002, *Petronius and the Anatomy of Fiction.* Cambridge.

Ruiz-Montero, C. 2003, 'Xenophon of Ephesus and orality in the Roman Empire' Ancient Narrative 3, 43–62.

Scobie, A. 1983, *Apuleius and Folklore.* London.

Steiner, D. 1994, *The Tyrant's Writ: Myths and Images of Writing in Ancient Greece.* Princeton.

Tarrant, H. 1996, 'Orality and Plato's narrative dialogues' in I.Worthington (ed.) *Voice into Text. Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece.* Leiden, New York, Cologne.

Trapp, M.B. 1990, 'Plato's *Phaedrus* in second-century Greek literature' in D.A.Russell (ed.) *Antonine Literature.* Oxford. 141–73.

Trenkner, S. 1958, *The Greek Novella in the Classical Period.* Cambridge.

Valette–Cagnac, E. 1997, *La Lecture à Rome. Rites et Pratiques.* Paris.

Whitmarsh, T. 1998, 'The birth of a prodigy; Heliodorus and the genealogy of Hellenism' in R.Hunter (ed.) *Studies in Heliodorus.* Cambridge. 93–124.

— 2001, *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire. The Politics of Imitation.* Oxford.

Zumthor, P. 1990, 'Oral poetry. An introduction', trans. K.Murphy-Judy. Theory and History of literature 70, Minneapolis.