Introduction

Part Two of my monograph builds on the eclectic theory of speech margin pragmatics featured in Part One. In that study, we summarized the work of over one hundred scholars—working across a considerable range of languages—who have contributed to our understanding of the variety and function of the devices for signaling quoted speech.

We observed that quotation formulae—such as the italicized portion of ‘X said to Y ⟨QUOTE⟩’—come in a kaleidoscopic variety. Individual narrators/reporters take advantage of the formal permutations within these speech margins. These permutations arise because of the formal choices available in areas such as these (which by no means exhaust the options):

– tense and lexeme of the verb used to report speech
– participant (speaker / addressee) reference
– location of the speech margin (pre-quote, mid-quote, or post-quote)
– complementizers

The researchers featured in Part One not only catalogued this rich formal variety in speech margins; they also attempted to explain such variety with reference to the pragmatic goals of the narrator/reporter. These pragmatic goals are great in number (as are the forms of speech margins employed to these ends). The form-function correlations that emerged in Part One are too numerous to repeat here. Instead, I will offer a very limited review, designed to indicate the lines along which our investigations in Part Two will proceed.

In Part One, we noted that quoted speech occurs embedded within a considerable variety of host genres—novels, poems, newspapers, ordinary conversations, etc. These host genres employ quotations for numerous purposes, and these purposes constrain the forms of the speech margins employed to introduce quotations. We may illustrate such constraints with reference to the novel.

When a novelist selects a speech margin for tagging a particular utterance by a character, constraints at the global level of the narrative may be operative. These constraints prompt the novelist to tag the speech in a manner that assists the reader in grasping the significance of the utterance. Such global factors, which may prompt a distinctive choice of speech margin, include issues such as these:
– Does the utterance express a theme of the story?
– Does the utterance determine the plot line of the story?
– Does the utterance help to characterize the speaker?

On the other hand, when the novelist is representing a conversation, constraints at the local level of the narrative may be operative. These constraints prompt the novelist to tag the conversational exchange in a manner that assists the reader in grasping the conversational dynamics. Such dynamics, which may prompt a distinctive choice of speech margin, include issues such as these:

– Which party (if any) is in control of the conversation?
– Is the responder cooperating with the initiator of the conversation?
– Is the conversation resolved along the lines desired by the initiator?

In Part Two of the monograph, I undertake original research into speech representation in the ancient Greek novel Callirhoe by Chariton. Classical Greek scholarship—in contrast to New Testament scholarship—has, so far, expressed only a minor interest in discourse analytical approaches. This situation was explicitly attested by the classical scholar S.R. Slings, who wrote in 1992:

In Latin, pragmatic studies are becoming more and more common. Yet in the area of Greek, its concepts have been utilized only for the study of one isolated phenomenon, prolepsis; otherwise the field remains, as yet, virtually untilled.¹

Two decades later, the situation is marginally less bleak than the one painted by Slings. For example, if one peruses my bibliography, one will find applications of discourse analysis to Classical Greek by scholars such as Egbert J. Bakker, and C.M.J. Sicking.

It is hoped that Part Two of this monograph, undertaken using the disciplinary tools of pragmatics, can help to fertilize this still relatively untilled field. My investigations have shown that Chariton appears to employ speech margin variation with many of the pragmatic goals discussed by the researchers surveyed in Part One of this monograph—pragmatic goals that often transcend language differences.