

Cite and Sound: The Prosaics of Quotation in the Ancient Novel

STEPHEN NIMIS
Miami University, Ohio

This article looks at three examples of the inscription of voice in the novels from the standpoint of prosaics, an approach that focuses on the characteristics of the novels pertaining to their status as *prose*, understanding that term to mean a discourse organized not around the activity of a performer, but around the interpretive activity of a reader.¹ Prose can be thought of as the practice of processing utterances that belong to other performance genres, treating these utterances as ready-made elements that can be deployed in new combinations. These elements will be put into quotation marks in a prose discourse, marking their special status as coming from somewhere else. Such displaced elements can be situated differentially in relationship to each other, put into ‘dialogue’ with each other, in the words of Bakhtin. The three passages I will discuss below all deal with different kinds of quotation, where different aspects of this processing of utterance can be seen at work.

In book 4 of Chariton’s *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, the hero tries to make his presence known to his wife in an episode that involves a series of letters. Letter-writing, with its built-in capacity for misdirection and the publication of secrets, is a key novelistic device, as well as a key example of the problems of ‘writing’ voice.² The episode begins with Chaereas’ confidant, Mithridates, urging the hero to employ an Odyssean self-restraint and test his wife’s feelings by writing her a letter rather than rushing to confront a dangerous rival (4,4,2-5). In the letter, Chaereas apprises Callirhoe of the fact that he is not dead, as she has been led to believe, reproaches her for remarrying, and begs forgiveness for his past actions. The words he addresses to Callirhoe are given to us in direct discourse, are ‘quoted’ directly in the text

¹ Godzich and Kittay 1987. For the prosaics of the ancient novel, see Nimis 1994.

² Rosenmeyer 2001. On this scene in Chariton, see Whitmarsh 2005.

as though someone was speaking, and are set off from the surrounding narrative by clear verbal cues (4,4,6-10). This letter is sent on with a cover letter from Mithridates addressed to Callirhoe as well, but this cover letter is merely summarized in indirect speech (4,5,1-2). In contrast, Chaereas' letter is an elaborate performance in which he pours tears and kisses on the letter like a libation, and then narrates this in the letter itself (4,4,8: *κατασπένδω τούτων μου τῶν γραμμάτων δάκρυα καὶ φιλήματα*). He also appeals to the intimate moments the two lovers shared in the past, the consummation of their marriage and his jealous attack. This performance is meant only for the eyes of Callirhoe, and only she could confirm that the proofs Chaereas presents to her of his identity are true.

But Fortune sees to it that the letter becomes sidetracked and Callirhoe never reads it. The divagations of the letter are detailed scrupulously by the author as they pass through the hands of several agents who have only partial understanding of their contents and proper destination. The discursive chaos endemic to 'orphaned' writing, of which Socrates warned in the *Phaedrus* (274d-e) is dramatized in this scene. The two letters are eventually intercepted by another agent, Bias, who sends them not to Callirhoe but to Dionysius himself, the hero's rival. Dionysius, we are told, in the middle of a symposium, is handed 'the letter' (τὴν ἐπιστολήν). There is a minor ambiguity here, since two letters have been mentioned, that of Chaereas and Mithridates, and we are not certain which letter is 'the letter' handed to Dionysius. What follows is a direct quotation of the words of this letter, and it turns out to be a third letter, now being mentioned for the first time, a letter from Bias explaining how he had come into possession of what he mistakenly believes to be the property of Dionysius. This minor surprise to us readers is a preliminary version of a much more surprising moment about to be narrated. Here is the passage (4,5,8-9):

Ταύτην τὴν ἐπιστολήν ἐν μέσῳ τῷ συμποσίῳ Διονύσιος ἀνέγνω, καλλωπιζόμενος ἐπὶ ταῖς βασιλικαῖς δωρεαῖς· ἐντεμεῖν δὲ τὰς σφραγίδας κελεύσας ἐντυγχάνειν ἐπειράτω τοῖς γράμμασιν. Εἶδεν οὖν «Καλλιρόη Χαιρέας· ζῶ.»

Τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ λύτο γούνατα καὶ φίλον ἦτορ.

Εἶτα σκότος τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ κατεχύθη. Καὶ μέντοι λιποθυμήσας ὅμως ἐκράτησε τὰ γράμματα, φοβούμενος ἄλλον αὐτοῖς ἐντυχεῖν.

Dionysius read this letter [of Bias] in the midst of the symposium, taking pride in the royal gifts [mentioned in the letter]. Then he gave orders to

break the seals and began reading the letters. And so he saw, ‘To Callirhoe, I Chaereas am alive’;
 and his knees collapsed and his heart within,
 and darkness spread over his eyes. But though fainting, he still kept hold
 of the letters for fear that another might read them.

At the climactic moment we read along with Dionysius and we readers speak or read these three words of Chaereas in the first person: ‘To Callirhoe, I Chaereas am alive.’ This is followed by a Homeric quotation, a paraphrase of a Homeric formula, and then the continuation of the narrative. So there are in this brief passage juxtaposed four different kinds of discourse. Modern editors use some standard layout conventions for clarifying these different registers. The three words of Chaereas’ letter are put into quotation marks; the Homeric line is indented in a separate paragraph, just like the directly quoted letters of Bias and Chaereas had been above. But the Homeric expression about the shadow over the eyes is left unmarked, because this phrase has been, so to speak, ‘translated into prose,’ or ‘prosimified’ by modifications to its poetic diction. These layout conventions are not ancient, of course, but they are based on real differences in the text, but differences that are not marked by anything non-verbal in Greek writing conventions.

The Homeric tag is a good example of a ready-made element that can be deployed in multiple circumstances, and it occurs a number of times in the novel. Because of its distinctive metrical shape and familiarity from Homer, where already it is used in a variety of contexts, the line is clearly distinguished from the surrounding context in the novel, the directly quoted letter before it and the Homeric paraphrase after it. Of the several occurrences of this phrase in Homer, two instances in the *Odyssey* are particularly apposite (23,205 and 24,345 differing only in gender), where first Penelope and then Laertes recognize proofs of Odysseus’ identity:

ὣς φάτο, τῆς/τοῦ δ’ αὐτοῦ λύτο γούνατα καὶ φίλον ἦτορ,
 σήματ’ ἀναγνούσῃ/-όντος, τά οἱ ἔμπεδα πέφραδ’ Ὀδυσσεύς·
 So he spoke, but his/her knees and heart gave way
 As s/he recognized the sure signs which Odysseus had spoken.

The Homeric scenes in which these lines occur, each an important part of the climax in the long-awaited return of Odysseus, provide some amusing contrasts to the novelistic scenario, but also a strong parallel. Note that in both of these cases, as in several others, the words that precede the part of the line

quoted in the novel are ὧς φάτο, ‘thus he spoke,’ which in Homer, where the differences between narrative and speech are scrupulously marked out by such formulaic expressions, comprise a kind verbal quotation mark that makes the transition from speech to narrative. The whole Homeric line thus marks the end of a speech and its impact on the addressee, which is exactly what happens in the passage in the novel, as though someone has actually ‘spoken’ in the novel. But who exactly has just ‘spoken’?

In the two Homeric scenes, Penelope and Laertes each ‘recognize’ the verbal proofs (σήματα) of Odysseus’s identity with the very word that comes to mean ‘read’ a text (ἀναγιγνώσκω), used of Dionysius’ reading of the letter of Bias (ἀνέγνω). It is difficult to know if an ancient audience would have felt any difference between this word and the other one used to mean ‘read’ in the Chariton passage, ἐντυγχάνειν, but the difference in tenses seems significant. The use of the aorist after the fact with the letter of Bias (‘This letter he read’) contrasts with the tenses of continuous action that describe Dionysius’ attempt to make out the letter of Chaereas (ἐντυγχάνειν ἐπειράτο), which we should perhaps translate as ‘he set about trying to decipher.’ The tense in the latter example emphasizes the fact that Dionysius’ reading of the letter was a linear process that in antiquity would have involved some kind of articulation, more like the ‘reading’ of a musical score than our own protocol of silent reading (*kal-li-rho-ei-chae-re-as-zo*,—Oh no!). What is being dramatized here is neither the private reading of a text, nor its public performance, but something in between: the ‘reading’ of something private in public by someone for whom it is not meant. We readers are able to view the letter at a distance, because we know its contents from its previous citation; it has been rendered ‘ready-made’ for us. But as we read, we also enact simultaneously the surprise resurrection of Chaereas and the shock of Dionysius’ reading of the letter. The juxtaposition of different kinds of discourse allows our author to vividly dramatize something, while simultaneously keeping it secret within the story. By following the words of the letter with the Homeric tag, Chariton falls back on the representational status of epic to transition back to the narrative, after having gone to the very edge of what can be represented in a prose text. He could of course have simply narrated the whole thing, but the arrangement of the different pieces here allows him to give a more vivid version, while folding multiple kinds of reading into the same narrative event. This is an example of the way prose uses the lack of a performer to its advantage. If you read this passage aloud, you would have to choose either to represent Dionysius’ unfolding realization, or our readerly recognition of the words of the letter we have already read, or Chaereas him-

self speaking in the letter. However, the whole passage fits seamlessly together because prose can conflate positions, something that is more limited in a performance.

My second example is Knemon's tale from Heliodorus' *Aithiopica*. This is a long and complicated 'story within a story' that bears a complex relationship to the main narrative, both thematically and discursively.³ Knemon later becomes the internal audience for the recounting of the main story in a long flashback modeled on the *Odyssey*. He thus has a special status as both teller and listener. Knemon narrates how he was exiled by the machinations of his stepmother, Demainete and her maid Thisbe. At the urging of the two lovers who are his internal audience, Knemon agrees to continue the story by reporting what he heard from his friend Charias. Knemon quotes Charias' words directly, who in turn sometimes quotes the very words of Demainete and Thisbe. These quotes within quotes again bring us to the very limit of representation. If we imagine the performative instance of these words, we would try to visualize Knemon telling this story to the two young lovers, and simultaneously try to imagine Charias telling the anxious Knemon this news for the first time, a telling that quotes dramatically the words of Demainete as reported to Charias by Thisbe. Most striking is the labyrinthine way in which the various voices are being managed in this passage, so that when we read the word 'Knemon,' when it is shouted out by the lovesick Demainete, it is hard to imagine the appropriate sound of that word, first voiced by Demainete, then by Thisbe to Charias, then by Charias to Knemon, and now by Knemon to the lovers and to us, at which point he is of course voicing his own name. What would that sound like?

The narrative of Charias goes from *Aith.* 1,14-17 and is remarkable on many levels, but I want to look at the layout conventions in the opening paragraphs by editors and translators. The Greek text in the Budé edition and its French translation rely on simple binary oppositions with quotation marks, indicating only places where something changes, and not bothering to keep track of the complications of multiple narrators. So sometimes the French translation flattens out the differences among speakers into indirect speech—saying for example that Demainete 'shouted out the name of Knemon,' rather than 'Demainete shouted 'Knemon.'" This follows formally the original Greek where only changes of speaker are signaled by postpositive particles like ἔφη, and the use of expressions like ἡ δέ or τὴν δέ to signal a change, relying on the reader to decipher from the context who is speaking. In contrast, John Morgan uses multiple graphic conventions in his English

³ Winkler 1982; Morgan 1989.

translation to specify whose voice we are hearing, with the result that some paragraphs begin with a triple set of quotation marks (“ ‘ “). The analysis that his layout conventions reflect is based on the distinction narratologists make among relative positions in the narrative that can be thought of as distinct voices. When we ask in these instances, ‘Who is that speaking,’ the answer is different for a performance text than a prose text; for in the latter, voice need not always be referred to just one source. As a result, the greater specification and information given by Morgan’s layout conventions sometimes can get in the way and call attention to potential confusions, because those conventions keep taking us back to the individual characters rather than to the mere differences that are sufficient for keeping things organized on a local level. As Charias’ narrative unfolds, it is possible to see how prose processes these utterances, vacillating between greater and lesser specificity, allowing particular voices to emerge at times, but exploiting the multiple layers of the narrative situation to violate a strict sense of representation. As in the example from Chariton, there seems to be a simultaneous desire to be indirect and yet ‘more vivid’ at the same time.

As Charias launches into his narrative, or as Knemon launches into his retelling of that narrative, he begins with an explicit reference to Hesiod (ἡ δίκη καθ’ Ἡσίοδον), followed by other references to epic and tragedy, including the direct citation of a unique half-line from the *Iliad* (6,202), evoking the story of Bellerophon. Homer’s telling there of the unjust accusation made against Bellerophon in writing (*semata*) by the spurned wife of his host is the epic prototype for the story of Phaedra and Hippolytus.⁴ The love-sick Demainete’s public behavior and the response of her friends are reminiscent of the exchange between Phaedra and the chorus in Euripides’ *Hippolytus*. Since the working out of Demainete’s undoing will involve an incredibly complicated set of mistaken identities and misrepresentations by the clever servant Thisbe that smacks of New Comedy rather than epic or tragedy, it is possible that there is an attempt here to characterize Charias as a narrator, maybe even make fun of him; but this is perhaps to pay too much attention to the representation of his character in the story, rather than the discursive effect of his agency. What is important is that Charias is being distinguished from Knemon, so that there is some sense of the layers of narrative voice, even if that difference fails to result in a fully realized character in the story. This is also underlined by a number of references to ‘you’ and ‘me’ (that is Knemon and Charias) that explicitly make their original conversation the *mise en scène* of the words: (‘your exile,’ ‘your father,’ ‘your ab-

⁴ Rosenmeyer 2001.

sence,' etc.). By the end of chapter 14 the story of Knemon's family has been given a familiar 'generic' shape by these references to epic and tragic models by Charias (but not necessarily by Knemon or Heliodorus).

The beginning of Chapter 15 turns from Demainete's public behavior to those situations when she is 'by herself' (καθ' ἑαυτήν) and here we might wonder who sees Demainete, who hears her words. We could assume that καθ' ἑαυτήν means that she is alone with Thisbe, who is present for the complaining that is reported in indirect discourse: 'she kept complaining that Thisbe had not served her properly,' (πολλὰ τὴν Θίσβην ἐμέμφετο ὡς οὐ προσηκόντως ὑπηρετησαμένην) but this is left unclear. Thisbe's presence, which guarantees the accuracy of the presentation, begins to get in the way of us seeing the real Demainete. Here is the passage along with John Morgan's translation, slightly modified (1,15,1-2):

Εἰ δέ ποτε γένοιτο καθ' ἑαυτήν, πολλὰ τὴν Θίσβην ἐμέμφετο ὡς οὐ προσηκόντως ὑπηρετησαμένην. «ἢ σπουδαία περὶ τὰ δεινὰ» λέγουσα, «ἢ πρὸς μὲν τὸν ἔρωτα μὴ συμπράξασα, ἐπὶ δὲ τὸ στερηθῆναι με τοῦ φιλότατου καὶ λόγου ταχίων ἀποδειχθεῖσα καὶ μηδὲ μεταβουλεύσασθαι μοι συγχωρήσασα.» Καὶ δῆλη παντοίως ἐγένετο κακόν τι διαθήσουσα τὴν Θίσβην. Ἡ δὲ βαρυμηνιώσαν ὀρώσα καὶ πάντῃ λυπηθεῖσα ἐπιβουλεύσαι πρόχειρον καὶ οὐχ ἥκιστα τῷ τε θυμῷ καὶ ἔρωτι περιμανῆ τυγχάνουσαν ἔγνω προλαβεῖν, καὶ φθῆναι τῇ κατ' ἐκείνης ἐπιβουλήν σωτηρίαν ἑαυτῇ περιποιούσα.

“‘Whenever she was alone, she would complain at length that Thisbe had not served her as a servant ought, saying ‘She is interested only in doing harm; she did nothing to help me in my love, but when it came to robbing me of my darling, it was no sooner said than done; she did not even give me a chance to change my mind!’

“And she was clearly plotting some harm against Thisbe, and when Thisbe realized that she was nursing such a burden of resentment and was so racked with the pain of her grief that she might strike at any moment, particularly as her fury and desire had undermined her reason, she decided to forestall her mistress: she would strike the first blow and thus secure her own safety.

The Budé text and translation does not bother distinguishing Knemon's words from those of Charias, but John Morgan begins the paragraph with double quotation marks, to indicate that Knemon is quoting Charias (who is

presumably summarizing what Thisbe told him). But there is a sudden switch in grammar signaled by the participle λέγουσα, ‘saying,’ which accompanies a series of participles in the nominative case. The Budé sets these words off with quotation marks, and Morgan introduces a third set of quotation marks to mark the shift from the accusative (τὴν Θίσβην ὑπηρετησαμένην) to the nominative (ἡ σπουδαία ... συμπράξασα ... ἀποδειχθείσα ... συγχωρήσασα); but it is not exactly a switch from indirect to direct speech, for these words are not addressed to Thisbe in the second person; instead, we have to imagine Demainete speaking about Thisbe in the third person, and translate the participles ‘vividly’ as simple indicatives, without really knowing how these vivid expressions, spoken in private, were originally voiced or how they have made their way to us.

The next sentence is construed closely with the previous one and is a conclusion drawn from Demainete’s behavior:

Καὶ δῆλη παντοίως ἐγένετο κακόν τι διαθήσουσα τὴν Θίσβην.
And she was clearly plotting some harm against Thisbe.

But to whom is this plotting clear and who makes this deduction? Not Thisbe, because she is explicitly represented drawing a similar conclusion in the next clause (...and when Thisbe realized...). Morgan’s translation begins a new paragraph with Καὶ δῆλη which makes the break between the two sentences stronger, obscuring the somewhat slippery transition. Moreover, Morgan sets this new paragraph off with a single set of quotation marks, which would indicate that Knemon himself is speaking these words, but this must be a mistake. Consistency requires that these be the words of the same person who began section fifteen, and that has to be Charias. But what difference does it make? If we follow along in the Greek, we note a difference in vividness introduced by the participle λέγουσα and the shift to the nominative case, but otherwise the question ‘Who is that speaking?’ seems to be one the author is intent on leaving obscure. Indeed, these first two sentences of chapter fifteen are about as close as one gets in antiquity to what scholars of the modern novel call ‘free indirect discourse,’ a modification that lies between direct and indirect discourse and produces an ambiguity about how a given expression is to be properly voiced.⁵ Any attempt to specify whether these actual words belong more to Demainete or to Charias or to Thisbe can’t be completely decided on the basis of the grammar itself. Instead the multiplication of voices leads to a kind of levitation of the discourse above

⁵ Lock 2001.

any clear grounding in a particular character. The sequence of chapters 14-15, which includes a wide range of quotations, dramatizes Derrida's point that all language quotes other language, based as it is on iterability and cultural clichés whose direct utterers are nowhere present. It is an illusion that language can represent inner thoughts and feelings, but here Heliodorus marshals all the resources of prose (which include the ready-made elements of verse) to render that illusion as vividly as possible.

The subsequent account of Thisbe's elaborate scheme to dispose of Demainete by telling a whole series of elaborate lies to several people may make us wonder whether Charias really got the whole truth from such a dubious source, or even whether Charias actually told everything he knew to Knemon. If Heliodorus' elaborate chain of repetitions seems to put us in touch with the original scenario, it has the simultaneous effect of putting into question any kind of telling. Knemon himself later expresses a high degree of suspicion about the truth of the very story he has related to us when he comes upon the dead body of Thisbe, clasping an undelivered letter addressed to him. Knemon scarcely knows what to believe (2,11,1):

I wonder what new scheme you were concocting against me in the cloak of this letter, when Justice preempted your plan with death. Even dead I regard you with suspicion, and am haunted by the fear that the story of Demainete's death is untrue, that the friends who brought me the news were deceiving me, and that you have come across the sea to make me the victim of another Attic tragedy, but in an Egyptian setting.

If the story of Knemon tells us anything, it is that the private and internal cannot be externalized in an unproblematic way. Yet this is the task that prose takes on and something the novels repeatedly thematize.

My final example is the description of the picture of Philomela and Prokne near the beginning of Book 5 of Achilles Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*. Today we call this kind of passage an 'ekphrasis,' although that term had a broader application in the imperial period; but the verb *ekphrazo*, meaning to 'speak out' indicates its connection with tomb inscriptions that frequently 'invoice' the buried person.⁶ These descriptions, which occur in several novels as well as other prose texts of the imperial period, set up a scenario of an 'original' which the verbal description 'supplements,' often indulging in a level of detail that would be hard to imagine in a two-dimensional painting. Needless to say the 'original' is actually a product of

⁶ Heffernan 1991, 302. On this passage in Achilles Tatius, see Morales 2004; Nimis 1998.

the description, rather than the other way around, since ekphrasis is a rhetorical trope; similarly, tomb inscriptions seem to ‘give voice’ to the buried, although the words they ‘speak’ in this way are not really theirs. Here is the passage in Jack Winkler’s translation (5,3,4-7):

The plot of the drama was there in every detail—the robe, Tereus, the banquet. A maid was holding the unfolded robe; Philomela stood beside her and pointed to the garment and she indicated the pictures; Prokne nodded that she understood; her eyes glowed fiercely and angrily at the picture.

King Tereus of Thrace was embroidered there (ἐνὸφαντο), wrestling Philomela to his lust; her hair had been torn, her waistband broken, her dress ripped open, one breast exposed; she planted her right hand against his eyes and with her left tried to hold the torn shreds of her garment across her breasts. Tereus held Philomela tightly in his arms, drawing her body as close as he could to his own and tightening his embrace on her flesh

—so deftly the artist designed (ὑφηνεν) this figured weft. The rest of the icon showed the women showing Tereus his dinner—scraps in a basket—the head and hands of his infant son....

Following the layout conventions of the Greek, Winkler sets this all out as a single block of text, but I have indented the central sentences which make up a kind of quotation within the fictive picture itself, a picture within a picture. Whereas the ‘whole story’ of Philomela and Prokne is painted on the canvas, the painter also represented the woven garment (τοῦ πέπλου) of Philomela, which is both an object in the story and also tells part of the story. The quotation-like status of the *peplos* is clearly marked by the repeated verb ὑφαίνω, which distinguishes the description of the weaving from the rest of the painting.

Inherent in the story of Philomela is the male dread of women’s capacity to use a secret language to circumvent the restrictions that males place on their circulation. In this version we can detect a desire to penetrate that secret somehow, to hear what women are really saying when they think men are not present or do not understand. As in the case with Thisbe in the *Aithiopica*, the presence of Philomela has a kind of contradictory effect, for it seems to conflict with the necessity of using a secret language at all. It is precisely because she is absent and thought to be dead that she must resort to a woven image to communicate to her sister her fate at the hands of Tereus. Yet her

presence is emphasized by three verbs of continuous action that precede the description of the woven image: She ‘was standing beside it and kept pointing her finger at the robe and indicating the pictures’ (παρεισθίκει καὶ ἐπετίθει τῷ πέπλῳ τὸν δάκτυλον καὶ ἐδείκνυε τῶν ὕφασμάτων τὰς γραφάς); it is as though she is reading it out loud. This emphatic presence of Philomela stresses the point that we are (over)hearing the real voice of Philomela here, that we are being allowed to ‘read’ a private message that not only was meant for someone else, but was designed in such a way that any other reader would not be able to decode it. And yet the ‘message’ of Philomela, as it is presented by the painter/Clitophon/Achilles Tatius, is clearly not the ‘voice’ of Philomela, but a salacious version of the events that borders on a pornographic representation. The description evokes not a secret message from one outraged sister to another, but an erotic scene directed to us readers, whose absence from the scene also guarantees its veracity. For the thrill that derives from the objectifying gaze of the voyeur comes from seeing without being seen, being present without our presence intruding upon the scene. Despite the generally scrupulous narrative fiction of mimetic autobiography in the novel as a whole, passages like this one reveal the simultaneous desire to publicize something secret and naughty, but from a point of view that is constructed entirely around and for us readers. Once again the ground seems to disappear and a scene is rendered vividly without emanating from a particular person or point of view within the story itself.

Bakhtin states that the novel arises as a private genre in contrast to the public character of other ancient literary genres, especially the major narrative forms:

Public life adopts the most varied means for accounting for itself (as does its literature). Therefore the particular positioning of a person to observe or eavesdrop on this life (a ‘third person’) presents no special problem, nor do the particular forms necessary for making that life public. But when the private individual and private life entered literature these problems inevitably were bound to arise. *A contradiction developed between the public nature of the literary form and the private nature of its content.* The process of working out *private genres* began. But this process remained incomplete in ancient times. This problem was especially critical in connection with larger forms (the ‘major epic’). In the process of resolving this problem, the ancient novel emerged.⁷

⁷ Bakhtin 1981, 123. Emphasis in the original.

He goes on to discuss some of the innovations that evolve to address this contradiction: the criminal trial, the eavesdropping *picaro*, etc. But the three examples of quotation that we have looked at briefly here—the private letter, the story within a story, and *ekphrasis*—although not specific to the novel, show the discursive possibilities they offer for producing a powerful form of presence that is neither public nor private, but is situated precariously between them.

Bibliography

- Bakhtin, M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination*, Austin: Univ. of Texas Press.
- Godzich, W., Kittay, J. 1987. *The Emergence of Prose*, Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press.
- Heffernan, J. 1991. 'Ekphrasis and Representation', *New Literary History* 22, 297-316.
- Lock, C. 2001. 'Double Voicing, Sharing Words', in J. Bruhn, J. Lundquist (eds.), *The Novelness of Bakhtin: Perspectives and Possibilities*, Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, 71-87.
- Morales, H. 2004. *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morgan, J.R. 1989. 'The Story of Knemon in Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*', *JHS* 109, 99-113.
- Nimis, S. 1994. 'The Prosaics of the Ancient Novel', *Arethusa* 27.3, 387-411.
- 1998. 'Memory and Description in the Ancient Novel', *Arethusa* 31.1, 99-122.
- Rosenmeyer, P. 2001. *Ancient Epistolary Fictions*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Voloshinov, V. 1973. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, New York – London: Seminar Press.
- Whitmarsh, T. 2005. 'Dialogues in Love: Bakhtin and his Critics on the Greek Novel', in R.B. Branham (ed.), *The Bakhtin Circle and Ancient Narrative* [Ancient Narrative Supplementum 3], Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library, 107-129.
- Winkler, J.J. 1982. 'The Mendacity of Kalisiris and the Narrative Strategy of Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*', *YCIS* 27, 93-158.