



THE RHETORIC  
OF THE BODY  
FROM OVID TO  
SHAKESPEARE

LYNN ENTERLINE

CAMBRIDGE

more information - [www.cambridge.org/0521624509](http://www.cambridge.org/0521624509)

This page intentionally left blank

This book analyzes the complex, often violent connections between body and voice in narrative, lyric and dramatic works by Ovid, Petrarch, Marston and Shakespeare. Lynn Enterline describes the foundational yet often disruptive force that Ovidian rhetoric exerts on early modern poetry, particularly on representations of the self, the body, and erotic life. Paying close attention to the trope of the female voice in the *Metamorphoses*, as well as early modern attempts to ventriloquize women's voices that are indebted to Ovid's work, she argues that Ovid's rhetoric of the body profoundly challenges Renaissance representations of authorship as well as conceptions about the difference between male and female experience. This vividly original book makes a vital contribution to the study of Ovid's presence in Renaissance literature.



*Cambridge Studies in Renaissance Literature and Culture 35*

## The Rhetoric of the Body from Ovid to Shakespeare

## *Cambridge Studies in Renaissance Literature and Culture*

*General editor*

STEPHEN ORGEL

*Jackson Eli Reynolds Professor of Humanities, Stanford University*

*Editorial board*

Anne Barton, *University of Cambridge*

Jonathan Dollimore, *University of York*

Marjorie Garber, *Harvard University*

Jonathan Goldberg, *Johns Hopkins University*

Nancy Vickers, *Bryn Mawr College*

Since the 1970s there has been a broad and vital reinterpretation of the nature of literary texts, a move away from formalism to a sense of literature as an aspect of social, economic, political and cultural history. While the earliest New Historicist work was criticized for a narrow and anecdotal view of history, it also served as an important stimulus for post-structuralist, feminist, Marxist and psychoanalytical work, which in turn has increasingly informed and redirected it. Recent writing on the nature of representation, the historical construction of gender and of the concept of identity itself, on theatre as a political and economic phenomenon and on the ideologies of art generally, reveals the breadth of the field. *Cambridge Studies in Renaissance Literature and Culture* is designed to offer historically oriented studies of Renaissance literature and theatre which make use of the insights afforded by theoretical perspectives. The view of history envisioned is above all a view of our own history, a reading of the Renaissance for and from our own time.

Recent titles include

29. Dorothy Stephens, *The limits of eroticism in post-Petrarchan narrative: conditional pleasure from Spenser to Marvell*
30. Celia R. Daileader, *Eroticism on the Renaissance stage: transcendence, desire, and the limits of the visible*
31. Theodore B. Leinwand, *Theatre, finance, and society in early modern England*
32. Heather Dubrow, *Shakespeare and domestic loss: forms of deprivation, mourning, and recuperation*
33. David M. Posner, *The performance of nobility in early modern European literature*
34. Michael C. Shoenfeldt, *Bodies and selves in early modern England: physiology and inwardness in Spenser, Shakespeare, Herbert, and Milton*

A complete list of books in the series is given at the end of the volume.

# The Rhetoric of the Body from Ovid to Shakespeare

---

Lynn Enterline

*Vanderbilt University*



**CAMBRIDGE**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK

40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain

Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa

<http://www.cambridge.org>

© Lynn Enterline 2004

First published in printed format 2000

ISBN 0-511-03556-X eBook (Adobe Reader)

ISBN 0-521-62450-9 hardback



I dedicate this book to my parents,  
Joyce and Robert Enterline



# Contents

---

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	page xi
1 Pursuing Daphne	1
2 Medusa's mouth: body and voice in the <i>Metamorphoses</i>	39
3 Embodied voices: autobiography and fetishism in the <i>Rime Sparse</i>	91
4 "Be not obsceane though wanton": Marston's <i>Metamorphosis of Pigmaliions Image</i>	125
5 "Poor instruments" and unspeakable events in <i>The Rape of Lucrece</i>	152
6 "Your speak a language that I understand not": the rhetoric of animation in <i>The Winter's Tale</i>	198
<i>Notes</i>	227
<i>Index</i>	265



## Acknowledgements

---

Were it not for many of the colleagues and friends named here, this book might never have found its way into print. Always a fabulous and absorbing interlocutor, Wayne Koestenbaum liberally gave both his time and attention when I first began to explore the idea for this book; I feel his inspiring presence everywhere in its pages. For his unwavering support, sensitive suggestions, gentle editorial presence, and impeccable timing, I owe Stephen Orgel an enormous debt. Leonard Barkan's close reading, at once magnanimous and authoritative, kept my spirits high even in moments of adversity; the book is much better for his suggestions. And Richard Halpern, who has generously read so much of my work over the years, helped me strengthen the argument in significant ways.

I am grateful to Patricia Rosenmeyer for informative conversations as well as for apt bibliographical suggestions; her work on the *Heroides* allowed me to refine my ideas about Ovidian narrative considerably. A number of colleagues at Yale – Peter Brooks, Ian Duncan, Kevin Dunn, Elizabeth Fowler, Ann Gaylin, Lynne Huffer, Heather James, David Marshall, Giuseppe Mazzotta, Tyrus Miller, Kathryn Rowe, Deanna Shemek, Sara Suleri Goodyear – carefully read much of this book while it was still in progress. I appreciate their numerous insights, queries, and suggestions. Jay Clayton's enthusiasm for this project came as a delightful surprise. Lena Cowen Orlin offered support and advice at a time when it was least expected – and thus all the more gratefully received. I would like to thank the Vanderbilt English Department, as well, for their collective enthusiasm for this project.

An earlier version of chapter 6 appeared in *Shakespeare Quarterly* 48.1 (Spring, 1977): 17–44 and a part of chapter 3 appeared as “Embodied Voices: Petrarch Reading (Himself Reading) Ovid” in *Desire in the Renaissance*, ed. Valeria Finucci and Regina Schwartz (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994). I thank both *Shakespeare Quarterly* and Princeton University Press for allowing me to reprint them here.

And finally, for long standing personal, moral, and intellectual

support, I am deeply indebted to Carla Kaplan, Jonathan Lamb, Jeff Nunokawa, Bridget Orr, Adela Pinch, and Sharon Willis. I count myself fortunate indeed to call each a dear friend. Mark Mushkat has always believed in me and for that I remain grateful.

# 1 Pursuing Daphne

---

## Purple notes

At the center of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* lie violated bodies. Sometimes male, at other times female, a few of these ruined forms elude the grasp of gender and its reductive nominations. Fractured and fragmented bodies from Ovid's poem cast long, broken shadows over European literary history. Sometimes, these shadows fall back on the poem that gave them shape. As Quintilian put it when deliberating the frequently heard charge that Ovid's manner is too ingenious, there is "some excuse" for his invention, since so much of it is required if this poem's author is to "assemble" such extremely diverse things into "the appearance of a unified body" ("res diversissimas in speciem unius corporis colligentem").<sup>1</sup> That a poem fascinated with the fracturing of bodies should have been passed down through the middle ages and into the Renaissance, thanks to Lactantius, predominantly in fragments, a reordered collection of pieces torn away from their original arrangement, is one of the ironies of literary history that continues to echo and ramify.<sup>2</sup> For it is not merely that the body's violation is one of the poem's prominent thematic concerns. As Philomela's severed "lingua" mutely testifies – her "murmuring tongue" designating both the bodily organ and "language" as such – dismemberment informs Ovid's reflections not only on corporeal form, but linguistic and poetic as well.<sup>3</sup> An elaborately self-reflexive poem, the *Metamorphoses* traces, in minute and sometimes implacable detail, the violent clashes between the poem's language and the many bodies of which it speaks. In this book, I contend that the violated and fractured body is the place where, for Ovid, aesthetics and violence converge, where the usually separated realms of the rhetorical and the sexual most insistently meet.

I take my cue in the following chapters from Philomela's severed *lingua*, "murmuring on the dark earth." In them, I analyze the complex, often violent, connections between body and voice in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and several Renaissance texts indebted to it. In addition to

Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, I read lyric, narrative, and dramatic works: Petrarch's *Rime Sparse* (1359–74), John Marston's *The Metamorphosis of Pigmalions Image* (1598), Shakespeare's *The Rape of Lucrece* (1594) and *The Winter's Tale* (1610–11). My general purpose is twofold: to interrogate the deeply influential connections between rhetoric and sexuality in Ovid's text; and to demonstrate the foundational, yet often disruptive, force that his tropes for the voice exert on early modern poetry, particularly on early modern representations of the self, the body, and erotic life. After demonstrating the complex connections between Ovid's rhetorical strategies in the *Metamorphoses* and his distinctive way of portraying the human voice, I turn to works by Petrarch, Marston, and Shakespeare in which tropes for the voice allow each author to restage, in his own way, many of the dilemmas central to Ovid's representation of subjectivity, sexuality, and gender. I do not try to offer an exhaustive account of Ovid's presence in early modern poetry. Others have already attempted that greater task.<sup>4</sup> Rather, I have selected a few prominent texts to consider in detail, texts in which Renaissance writers are as captivated in their turn, as was Ovid, by the idea of the voice. At the same time, I have chosen texts in which desecrated and dismembered bodies are imagined to find a way to signify, to call us to account for the labile, often violent, relationship between rhetoric and sexuality as it was codified, transmitted, and rewritten in an Ovidian mode. In the chapters on Petrarch, Marston, and Shakespeare, I argue that Ovid's rhetoric of the body – in particular his fascination with scenes of alienation from one's own tongue – profoundly troubles Renaissance representations of authorship as well as otherwise functional conceptions about what counts as the difference between male and female experience.

To recall something of the extraordinary cultural reach of Ovidian narrative, and therefore something of my reasons for returning to analyze this legacy, I should observe here that Ovid's stories fascinate contemporary feminists writing about female subversion and resistance much as they once did medieval and early modern writers preoccupied with stories about love and male poetic achievement.<sup>5</sup> As the story of Philomela's tongue should make clear, an important hallmark of Ovidian narrative – by which I mean not only Ovid's poem but also the many European texts that borrow from it – is its unerring ability to bring to light the often occluded relationships between sexuality, language, and violence. The poems arising from that reflection have been at once deeply influential (in poetic practice) and sorely neglected (in critical practice). Such neglect of the foundational yet unsettling consequences of Ovidian rhetoric has come about, in part, because when viewed from the



perspective of the history of classical scholarship, it is only in recent years that literary critics have reinvigorated a serious study of rhetoric by analyzing the ways that various practices and forms of writing raise difficult epistemological, ethical, and political questions. Much of this theoretical work has just begun to reach criticism of the *Metamorphoses*.<sup>6</sup> The habit of treating Ovid's stories piecemeal, rather than in light of the poem's larger narrative strategies and self-reflexive fantasies, may have furthered such neglect. Selective reading informs not only literary appropriations of Ovidian material but critical reception of it, too. As one critic observes, because we inherit the *Metamorphoses* as a kind of collection or anthology, "the temptation to read Ovid's tales and not Ovid's epic is very strong."<sup>7</sup>

The opening chapter therefore situates several stories central to feminist criticism – among them, Philomela, Medusa, Echo, Arachne, the Bacchae – in the context of Ovid's larger narrative and rhetorical strategies. It argues that Ovid's penchant for ventriloquizing female voices occupies a crucial, if mysterious, place in the *Metamorphoses* as a whole. But I open this study with the example of Philomela's amputated, "murmuring" tongue because it so succinctly captures the characteristic way that Ovid uses stories about bodily violation to dramatize language's vicissitudes. Other bodies will be put to similar use as the Renaissance authors examined here revisit Ovid's poem. Fantasies of fragmentation permeate Ovidian narrative, and they do more than convey a message about the body's vulnerability or, more importantly, the violence that subtends the discursive production of what counts as the difference in sexual difference. Scenes of dismemberment and rape, of course, do convey both of these culturally laden meanings and I endeavor to keep them in mind. But as Philomela's tongue suggests, violated bodies also provide Ovid with the occasion to reflect on the power and limitations of language as such. Before being cut out, for instance, Philomela's tongue speaks about rape as a mark of the difference between what can and cannot be spoken: she says "I will move even rocks to share knowledge" of an act that is, literally, *ne-fas*, or "unspeakable" ("et conscia saxa mouebo" 6.547; and "nefandos" line 540, derived from the verb *fari*, "to speak or talk"). Of Ovid's representation of the rape itself – "and speaking the unspeakable, he overwhelmed her by force, a virgin and all alone" ("fassusque nefas et uirginem et unam / ui superat" lines 524–25) – Elissa Marder points out that Ovid's text tellingly "insists on the convergence between speaking the crime and doing the deed. One cannot speak 'rape,' or speak about rape, merely in terms of a physical body. The sexual violation of the woman's body is itself embedded in discursive and symbolic structures."<sup>8</sup> When Tereus "speaks the unspeakable,"

language becomes a productive, violent act that is compared to rape even as the act of rape resists representation.

This book attends to the many places in Ovidian narrative where the idea of a speaking body – often literalized as the figure of a moving tongue – becomes a single, memorable image that brings together the usually separate realms of aesthetics and violence, representation and the body, language and matter. Further brief elaboration of the way Ovid tells the story of Philomela's tongue will therefore be a useful way to introduce the problems guiding the analyses that follow. In the middle of his story, the narrator begins to stutter over the word “unspeakable.” Ovid's iterated *nefas* signals a kind of narrative impasse, a fixation on the poem's troubled failure to speak about an event that defies speech. *Nefas* stresses that all we get, from Philomela or the narrator, are mere words and signs about an event that escapes words and signs. Resistance to narration, however, only induces further narrative. Thus when Tereus literalizes his “unspeakable” act by cutting out her tongue, giving her an “os mutum” line 574 – literally, “speechless mouth” – Philomela finds recourse in art, weaving a tapestry to represent the crime. “Great pain” begets in her the very “talent” to which Ovid elsewhere often lays claim as a poet (“ingenium,” line 575). She sits at a “barbaric loom” (“barbarica tela” line 576) that is, etymologically speaking, a loom of incomprehensible utterance (derived from the onomatopoeic Greek word, βάρβαρος, for the meaningless sounds on other people's tongues). On such an instrument, Philomela manages to weave threads that are “skillful,” “expert,” or “practiced” (“stamina . . . callida,” line 576), turning her body's bloody mutilation into “purple marks” on a white background (“purpureasque notas,” line 577). Like her narrator, Philomela struggles at the limits of representation: where the narrator stutters at the effort to turn an unspeakable act into verse, Philomela is imagined to coax an expert weaving out of an unintelligible, hence “barbarous,” instrument.

The work that Philomela produces, moreover, amplifies the problems raised by her “moving” tongue: her tapestry takes up where her tongue left off, telling us that in this story, presumed distinctions between language and action, the speakable and the unspeakable, aesthetics and violence verge on collapse. On her tapestry, Philomela weaves a set of purple “notae,” a noun that, as Marder observes, suggests several divergent yet crucial meanings. *Nota* may signify a written character – a mark of writing used to represent “a sound, letter, or word.” It may signify the “vestige” or “trace” of something, like a footprint. It may also designate a mark of stigma or disgrace, particularly an identifying brand on the body. And in the plural form used in Ovid's narrative,

“notae,” can, by extension, also suggest “a person’s features.”<sup>9</sup> Artist of her own trauma, Philomela sits down to translate something – an event, a body – that cannot be translated: rape is an “unspeakable” sound; the medium of its communication, a “barbaric” loom; the “notes” that represent it, neither letter, mark, nor physical imprint. Philomela’s “purple notes” on a white background hover somewhere between being a self-portrait, a physical remnant of the crime (like a bruise), and a stigmatizing “brand or tattoo” that re-marks the violated body it was supposed merely to represent.<sup>10</sup> This weaving, in its turn, proves every bit as persuasive as the tongue Philomela once hoped would “move the very rocks to consciousness” (6.547). It moves her sister, Procne, to terrifying action. The tapestry then extends the confusion between the “speakable and the unspeakable” to another person (again, “fasque nefasque,” 6.585) because the crime conveyed in these marks resists the “indignant words” Procne seeks with her “questing tongue” (“uerbaque quaerenti satis indignantia linguae / defuerunt,” 6.584–5).

All the aspects of language enacted in this story of Philomela’s rape and mutilation are not necessarily compatible, though each fleetingly shades into the other. Through her murmuring tongue and bruised marks Ovid invites us to reflect on the power and limitations of language in its several overlapping functions: instrumental, poetic, and rhetorical. As an instrument of communication or expression, language is necessary but inadequate to its task. As a sign hovering between literal and figural meanings, Philomela’s “lingua” or “tongue” functions as a productive yet potentially violent distortion of the world (and body) it claims to represent. On Philomela’s loom, signs become objects of aesthetic appreciation. And as a rhetorical tool, language wields enormous power, although its force may, without warning, exceed the control of the one who uses it. The figure of Philomela’s severed “lingua” and her bruised “purple notes,” moreover, refuse any final distinction between language and the body, or between ideas and matter. Ovid’s narrator knowingly poises his text on a divide between what can and cannot be represented, aesthetic form and violence, poetic “ingenium” and barbarism, language and the body. And he mercilessly draws our attention, all the while, to the fading of that divide. Disquieting erasures such as these characterize the *Metamorphoses*: in Ovid’s rhetoric of the body, poetic and rhetorical self-reflexivity can become “grotesquely violent and yet intensely moving.”<sup>11</sup>

When I refer to Ovid’s “rhetoric of the body,” I mean not merely to designate a language that describes the body, but to draw attention to several other, more elusive issues. First, I mean to suggest that in the *Metamorphoses* Ovid refuses commonplace distinctions between the

body's ability to speak and its ability to act: the narrator continually draws attention to such mysterious and complex images as that of Philomela's "moving" tongue. Capturing in one figure a Roman commonplace for the aims of rhetorical speech (*mouere*, to "move" one's audience), Ovid tells us that her tongue has motion and that it "moves" those who listen. Rhetoric, in the story of Philomela's tongue and tapestry, means taking the idea of symbolic action very seriously. It means acknowledging that the body is both a bearer of meaning as well as a linguistic agent, a place where representation, materiality, and action collide.

Second, by Ovid's "rhetoric of the body," I am referring to the sense conveyed throughout the *Metamorphoses* that our understanding and experience of the body itself is shaped by discursive and rhetorical structures. Ever alert to language's shaping force on what we know about our own body and the bodies of others, Ovid's poem frequently dramatizes in minute detail the action and effects of this productive, at times even performative, process. In it, the mark of an image, sign or figure repeatedly falls between the body and a character's perception of it. Between Narcissus and self-understanding falls an *imago*; between Pygmalion and womankind, a *simulacrum*; between Perseus and the body of the Gorgon, a protective, mirroring shield; between Actaeon's experience and understanding of his swiftly changing shape, a strange sound that "neither human nor any deer could make." Representation, in fact, becomes foundational to how we perceive the human race: the narrator imagines new beings arising from the stones of Deucalion and Pyrrha, but between our eyes and the bodies of these new humans arise forms "such as statues just begun out of marble, not sharply defined and very like roughly blocked out images" ("uti de marmore coepta / non exacta satis rudibusque simillima signis" 1.405–06). I call this introduction "Pursuing Daphne" in order to suggest the way that the form of the body – Daphne's sense for *figura* – both inspires and eludes the capture of language – Apollo's sense for *figura*. Like Daphne, the bodies in Ovidian narrative take shape under the formative pressure of figural language. And yet something about those bodies remains, like Daphne, forever fugitive.

To understand why Ovidian poetry insists on drawing such close connections between language, sexuality, and violence, this book directs attention back to the often overlooked scene of writing in the *Metamorphoses*. By "scene of writing" I am referring to two, related, matters: the poem's systematic self-reference, its complex engagement with its own figural language and with the fact of having been a written rather than a spoken epic; and its equally complex engagement with the materiality of reading and writing practices in the Roman world. Symbolically and

historically resonant, this scene of writing, I contend, left indelible traces not only on Ovid's representation of the body but also on many of the later European works derived from his epic. The Ovidian narrator habitually emphasizes the poetic, rhetorical, and corporeal resonance to the various "forms" (*formae*) and "figures" (*figurae*) about which the poem speaks, deriving many of the *Metamorphoses*' erotic and violent scenes out of the entanglement of poetic and bodily "form." For example, Ovid's interest in the double nature of Daphne's beautiful "figure," for example, turns a story of rape into one of the first book's successive stories about the birth of certain poetic forms (in this case, epideictic). Similarly, the vacillation between the literal and figural meanings of "lingua" allows Philomela's mutilated tongue to tell another, related story about the uneasy relationship between a body and what is usually taken to be its "own" language. The specific metalinguistic resonance of one memorable scene in the *Metamorphoses* has grown somewhat dim, perhaps, because of material changes in practices of writing. But in Book 10, Pygmalion's statue undergoes a change from marble to flesh by passing through a stage like wax growing soft under pressure from the thumb:

subsidit digitis ceditque, ut Hymettia sole  
cera remollescit tractataque pollice multas  
flectitur in facies ipsoque fit utilis usu. (10.284–86)

The ivory yields in his fingers, just as Hymettian wax grows soft in the sun and molded by the thumb is changed into many forms and becomes usable through use itself.

In a poem that habitually renders its interest in the "forms" and "figures" of its own language as erotic stories, it is no accident that this simile for the ivory maiden's animation refers to an actual tool for writing in the Roman world. As the narrator of the *Ars Amatoria* suggests in another erotic context when advising lovers to be cautious when counterfeiting, wax was the malleable surface used to coat writing tablets: "nor is it safe to write an answer unless the wax is quite smoothed over, lest one tablet hold two hands" (3.495–96). Ovid conveys Pygmalion's rapt attention to the body taking shape like wax under his fingers with a metaphor as weighted, in his day, as was the one Shakespeare uses for *Much Ado's* Hero, stained with slander: "O, she is fall'n / Into a pit of ink" (4.1.139–40).

Renaissance authors, particularly those educated according to a humanist model of imitating classical precursors, were extremely sensitive to Ovid's rhetorically self-conscious verse. An important phase in the history of rhetoric is embedded in the subtle details of Renaissance

returns to Ovidian narrative. Each chapter therefore focuses on the particular problems raised by a later writer's equally self-conscious revision of Ovidian rhetoric. Because of Ovid's frequent metapoetic, metalinguistic, and metarhetorical turns, however, he has often been condemned as an author marred by rhetorical excess, insincerity, and misplaced ingenuity.<sup>12</sup> It is therefore a revealing index of a shift in both taste and critical practice that *Titus Andronicus* – the Renaissance play that most consciously endeavors to bring the violated Ovidian body to the stage while rivalling his self-reflexive word play and rhetorical inventiveness – was once an embarrassment in the Shakespearean canon and yet has become, in recent years, the object of critical fascination.<sup>13</sup> One notable speech in that play, of course, prominently leans on a truly Ovidian juxtaposition of aesthetics and violence. When Marcus sees the tongueless and handless Lavinia before him, raped and mutilated because her attackers have read Ovid's story of Philomela, he speaks about her as if she were an aesthetic object, a marred beauty best understood in terms of the dismembering rhetoric of the *blason*. Pulled apart by the language of lips, tongues, hands, and fingers, hemmed in like Lucrece by Shakespeare's Petrarchan tropes of red and white, Lavinia endures yet one more male reading. She hears her "crimson ... blood" likened to "a bubbling fountain stirr'd with wind" that flows between "rosed lips;" she can signify very little as her cousin remembers the way her "lily hands" once trembled "like aspen leaves upon a lute" (2.4.22–47). Borrowing from Ovid's text as the two rapists did before him, Marcus reads Lavinia as more than Philomela: with her "body bare / Of her two branches," she exceeds Ovid's Daphne; the "heavenly harmony" of her former singing betters Ovid's Orpheus (2.4.17–18 and 44–51). Even Lavinia's reluctance to be interpreted yet again by the book written across her wounded body – her apparent attempt to flee when Marcus first sees her – is immediately, relentlessly pulled back to the story of Philomela. In a play dedicated to enacting the literal and figural pressure of the *Metamorphoses*, Marcus' demand, "Who is this? my niece, that flies away so fast?" (2.4.11) chillingly recalls Philomela's final flight, as a bird, to escape Tereus' angry beak ("petit ... siluas ... prominet inmodicum pro longa cuspidē rostrum" *Metamorphoses* 6.667–73). Given the supremely literary origin for the horrible events written on Lavinia's body, Marcus' speech perpetuates the violence it haltingly tries to comprehend. But it does more than exemplify the play's larger fascination with language's devastations. A point of rupture in the history of literary taste, the speech has also become a kind of touchstone for each critic's sense of the relation between text and the social world, aesthetic form and cultural violence.

In a similarly well-known, if ostensibly more refined, poem that involves critical in ethical judgment, Ronsard captures in one word the collapse between language, a sense of aesthetics, and sexual violence that characterizes all the texts in this study. Wishing he were like Jove, transformed into the bull that raped Europa, the love poet aspires to write about a beauty that is “ravishing.” In so doing, the poem imports Ovid’s story of rape into its sense of its own attractions:

Je voudroy bien en toreau blandissant  
 Me transformer pour finement la prendre,  
 Quand elle va par l’herbe la plus tendre  
 Seule à l’escart mille fleurs *ravissant*.<sup>14</sup>

I wish I were transformed into a whitening bull in order to take her subtly as she wanders across the softest grass, alone and isolated, ravishing thousands of flowers.

In the *Metamorphoses*, Europa is raped as the result of her aesthetic sense. The bull is so white, its bodily “form” so beautiful (“tam formosus”), its horns so “various” that “you would maintain that they were by someone’s hand.” Europa “admires” this bull (“miratur”) and is, therefore, raped (2.855–58). Ronsard, too, imagines his beloved to be both subject and object of aesthetic appreciation; his brief phrase for her pastime, “ravishing flowers,” joins her capacity for aesthetic pleasure to violence in true Ovidian fashion.<sup>15</sup> A chiasmatic exchange takes place between speaker and his second Europa – a suspicious slippage of agency that, as we shall see again in the chapter on Shakespeare’s *Lucrece*, characterizes Ovidian narratives of rape. Here, the poet derives his aesthetic sensibility from “elle” while his own desire to “ravish” – expressed in his opening wish to be like the golden shower that fell into the lap of Danaë – suddenly becomes hers.<sup>16</sup> Through Ronsard’s pun on *ravir*, moreover, Ovid’s already metapoetic story becomes yet another meditation on the conjunction between rape and the “flowers” of rhetoric – in this instance, as in much Renaissance Ovidian poetry, Petrarchan rhetoric. Similarly, Perdita’s desire, in *The Winter’s Tale*, for the flowers that Europa, “frighted,” let fall “From Dis’s waggon” (4.4.116–18), borrows Ovid’s favorite technique of turning metaphors – particularly metaphors about poetic language – into literal objects in the landscape. Invoked in the context of a debate about the relationship between nature and art, Ovid’s text surfaces in the form of Proserpina’s lost “flowers” and forces us to reflect yet again on the disquieting conjunction between poetic form and sexual violence.

This book is devoted to reading figures such as Philomela’s “purple notes,” Marcus’ “lily hands,” Ronsard’s “ravissant,” or Perdita’s

flowers. In such figures, poetic language and the ruined body insist on being read together. By taking us on sometimes intricate pathways through the erotic landscape of Ovidian and Petrarchan rhetoric, these figures keep asking us to ask: what, precisely, is the relationship between literary form, cultural fantasy, and sexual violence? And what, moreover, do these jarring conjunctions mean for the subjects of Ovidian narrative? It perhaps does not go without saying that I find the conjunction between aesthetic form and culturally inflected sexual violence disquieting, and hence illuminating, because I do not believe they are the same thing.<sup>17</sup> Ovid's deliberately troubling juxtapositions compel me to extend an already well-developed feminist critical tradition in which the question of how to read rape has become central to the question of how to read the *Metamorphoses*. But in order to expand the feminist critique of the thematics of sexual violence in Ovid's text, this book considers how representations of the body, subjectivity, and sexual difference are bound up with, and troubled by, the poem's intense rhetorical and aesthetic self-reflection.<sup>18</sup> If I direct attention to Ovid's characteristically ironic move from admiring the beauty of a *figura*, *imago*, or *simulacrum* to a distinctly rapacious "love of having" ("amor . . . habendi" 1.131), it is because I believe the narrative's incessant turn of attention to the beauty of a mediating screen of poetic form allows one a certain (though certainly not inviolable) space for reflection, distance, and critique. To address the frequent juxtaposition of poetic language and violence in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and to understand the place of the embodied subject in it, therefore, I have taken a lesson from Philomela's purple notes and moving tongue, analyzing the scene of writing out of which such urgent figures emerge. I do so because I believe it important to understand the *conjunction* of aesthetics and violence, rhetoric and sexuality, in this influential tradition. I understand this to be a critical and productive interference between two different orders, not an utterly saturated translation of one into the other.

These readings suggest, moreover, that the problems raised by Ovidian rhetorical practice alter the sense of certain terms crucial to discussions of the relationship between representation, sexuality, and violence. That is, his rhetorical practice continually calls into question what we mean when we make such distinctions as those between male and female, subject and object, author and reader, agent and victim. At the same time, it also tells us that the relationship between a speaker's discourse and his or her mind, feelings, or experience is far from transparent. Ovidian narrative therefore troubles the link that, as John Guillory argues, is often made in debates over the canon between "representation" understood as a literary term and representation understood as a political



term.<sup>19</sup> In this regard, the story of Philomela's severed tongue may once again be instructive. Marder observes that Philomela's murmuring *lingua* directs attention to a rupture between "access to language" and her "experience of violation." Ovid's emphasis on Philomela's "os mutum" and writhing tongue tells us that such an experience exceeds any words its victim can utter – that the very sense of violation is measured by the extent to which that experience is "unspeakable." Both Philomela and Procne are bound together by Philomela's bruised, purple notes and their brutally symbolic act of stopping the rapist's mouth with the body of his own child. The enraged sisters may speak a kind of body language, but it remains "a language without a tongue." In other words: "to speak in rage is to be 'beside oneself.' It is to abandon the possibility that one's speech coincides with the place of one's experience."<sup>20</sup> But such a rupture between one's discourse and "the place of one's experience" in the story of Philomela's rape characterizes many other Ovidian stories as well. One thinks of Echo in the *Metamorphoses* but also of Io, Semele, Byblis, and Actaeon; in the *Heroides*, of Cydippe; in the *Fasti*, of Lucretia.<sup>21</sup> This characteristic rupture between experience and discourse in Ovid's texts tells us that they cannot be understood merely to reflect this or that person's or social group's experience (the slide from textual to political "representation"). In fact, one could argue that the moment of speaking "beside oneself" that Marder locates in the story of Philomela and Procne typifies Ovidian narrative: the poet who developed the art of female complaint in the *Heroides* into its own influential genre also gives us a narrator in the *Metamorphoses* who constantly engages in acts of ventriloquism. Over and over, Ovid tries to speak as if he were a woman, to find a convincing "voice" for female suffering. He continually speaks "beside" himself in his poetry, a trademark displacement of voice with which Shakespeare in particular was fascinated. As soon as Ovid's poems provoke the Barthesian question – "whose voice is this?" – one can no longer say, with any certainty, whose "experience" of violence or desire the text is representing, or for whom its stories may be said to "speak."

### Medusa's mouth

To analyze the relationship between rhetoric and sexuality in this tradition, then, I concentrate not on violated bodies alone but also on the voices imagined to issue from them. What Shoshana Felman calls "the scandal of the speaking body" has particular resonance for this tradition, concerned as these Ovidian texts are with bodies whose stories testify to the power, failure, and disturbing unpredictability of the human voice.<sup>22</sup> In all the texts examined here, the moment when the voice either fades or

spirals out of the speaker's control is also the moment that speech is revealed at its most material. Recall, for example, the important yet evasive signifiers that neither Io nor Actaeon can utter because of the other, frightening noises that issue from their lips; or the unexpectedly deadly power of one word – *aura* – that the unfortunate Cephalus speaks in the forest. At such moments, we are also asked to consider language not merely as a mode of representation but as a (deeply unreliable) mode of action. As many characters discover to their peril, the performative dimension of Ovidian rhetoric is in excess of, or to the side of, thought. A material effectivity of rhetoric in the poem exceeds any functionalist account of language defined by the concepts of matter or intention. Though volatile, language's action in the *Metamorphoses* can be extremely effective – its forms of action at once profound and unpredictable for the speaking subject and the world to which that subject addresses herself.

Renaissance authors revisit these Ovidian rhetorical problems, moreover, because they were acutely sensitive to the way that Ovid tends to invoke a *uox* at the moment it is lost. Fascination with lost voices is crucial to this tradition's literary representations of a self. Thanks in large part to Petrarch's rendition of Ovidian figures, Philomela's lost tongue, Orpheus' failed voice, Actaeon's vanished speech, and Echo's subtly subversive repetitions became commonplace in the mythographic vocabulary of Renaissance self-representation. And yet in Ovid's and Petrarch's texts, each of these stories undermines generally functional assumptions about subjectivity, authorship, and language *from within* the voice itself. Merely mentioning Echo, Actaeon, or Orpheus here reminds us how important the fading of the human voice is for the *Metamorphoses*. Ovid's signature habit of intertwining figures for the voice with reflections on the poem's own scene of writing – captured most memorably in the story of Echo but prominent throughout the epic – gave rise to what I call a kind of phonographic imaginary in Ovidian poetry. Losing one's voice becomes a precise index of a variety of linguistic dilemmas that hollow out the poem's "speaking subjects" from within. Paying attention to the dilemmas specific to each text's mode of representation, I argue that in the Ovidian tradition these dilemmas are sometimes a matter of language as a differential system; sometimes a matter of a text's own rhetorical fabric; sometimes of its scene of address or enunciative structure; and sometimes of the specific literary history informing a particular narrative or trope. I call Ovid's trope of the voice "phonographic" because the kinds of self-endorsing fantasies that Derrida describes as "phonocentric" are no sooner entertained in the *Metamorphoses* than they are eroded.<sup>23</sup> Like much theoretical work

undertaken in light of Derrida or Lacan, Ovid's text effectively dismantles empiricist conceptions of the voice. These chapters therefore consider tropes for the voice in Ovid's poem and its Renaissance heirs from a number of directions, demonstrating how these texts paradoxically endorse and unsettle the fantasies of phonocentrism. In them, I consider such problems as the bodily figure of the speaking tongue and the listening ear; how the voice itself may become an object of desire, even a fetish; the unexpected erotic consequences of apostrophe; voice and the language of music; the unconscious dynamics set in motion by ventriloquism; and the often unpredictable connections between speaking and carrying out an action.

The second chapter sets the stage for those that follow by examining the phonocentric illusion that sustains many of the stories in the *Metamorphoses* and yet is also eroded by them. I pay particular attention to the Ovidian narrator's place in the poem's recurrent fantasies and anxieties about the body's vocal power. Chapter 3 argues that Ovid's rhetoric of the body has a significant impact on the relationship between voice and idolatry in Petrarch's *Rime Sparse*. I place Petrarch's self-portrait as one obsessed by his own words in its Ovidian frame, analyzing the part that such figures as Ovid's Pygmalion, Narcissus, Actaeon, Echo, and Medusa play in constituting the fetishizing unconscious of Petrarchan autobiography. Chapters 2 and 3 provide a foundation for the rest of the book, since those that follow presume knowledge of the increasingly codified Ovidian-Petrarchan lexicon from which both John Marston and Shakespeare derive their figures. Chapter 4, on Marston's *Metamorphosis of Pigmaliions Image*, considers the role that apostrophe, a privileged trope for poetic voice, plays in that poem's barely suppressed homoerotic scene and its attendant attempt to distinguish between pornography and what the narrator calls his own merely "wanton" verse. I place my analysis of Marston's epyllion between chapters on Petrarch and Shakespeare because his satire pushes Petrarchan discourse to its extreme, excising female voices altogether. Indeed, Marston's *Pigmalion* forges a path that Shakespeare quite pointedly does not take. Chapters 5 and 6 turn to *The Rape of Lucrece* and *The Winter's Tale*. Chapter 5 connects the problems haunting Lucrece's voice with the poem's representation of authorship and argues that in order to examine the consequences of Petrarchan rhetoric, Shakespeare stages a return to Ovid's text that differs profoundly from Marston's. And I analyze the unravelling of voice, authorial agency, and gender "identity" in *Lucrece*'s various Ovidian figures by looking at Shakespeare's language of musical "instruments" and of the borrowed tongue. Finally, chapter 6 examines what female voices in *The Winter's Tale* have to say about the play's

Orphic desire for a truly performative utterance. In the voices of Paulina and Hermione, Shakespeare stages an ethical critique of Petrarchan autobiographical discourse – a critique that hinges on a return to Ovid’s text to listen once more to a number of its forgotten but still troublesome female voices.

In thinking through the many complex problems raised by figures for lost voices in the Ovidian tradition, I discovered a peculiar but telltale sign of Ovid’s presence in Renaissance poetry: the scene of an impossible demand. This is usually, but not always, the demand for love or for pity from someone who will give neither. In the *Metamorphoses*, very few characters ever persuade their listeners to respond. Narcissus pleads in vain with his image, Echo with Narcissus, Apollo with Phaethon, Pentheus with his aunt and mother, Actaeon with his hounds, Orpheus with the horde of Bacchic women, Apollo and Pan with Daphne and Syrinx. It is as if the hopelessness of the scene – which Petrarchanism will codify as the lady’s stony resistance to persuasion – augments the beauty, pathos, or rhetorical ingenuity of words spoken to no avail. This refusal does not become a question of deep psychological significance for the addressee, since nothing will change his or her mind. But it does instigate considerable aesthetic and rhetorical significance: resistance to another’s address underlines language’s formal beauty, its unexpected and uncontrolled duplicity, or, more generally, its moving force (for readers and audiences if not for the implacable addressee).

Let me illustrate this general observation with a few brief examples. When Lucrece speaks to persuade Tarquin to refrain, the delay caused by her words merely fuels his desire; his violent purpose, born from her resistance, “swells the higher by this let.”<sup>24</sup> At the moment Lucrece utters the plea we know will have no effect, Shakespeare turns her into a second Orpheus. In *Titus Andronicus*, similarly, Lavinia becomes another Philomela when she fails to persuade the inexorable Tamora to relent: “’Tis present death I beg, and one thing more / That womanhood denies my tongue to tell. / O, keep me from their worse than killing lust / And tumble me into some loathsome pit . . .” (2.3.173–75). Lavinia’s way of wording the request for what we know she will not get – pity – suggests the very Ovidian rape it hopes to fend off. Much like Lucrece’s painfully naive *double entendres* in her bedchamber, Lavinia’s “tumble me” encourages what it tries to evade. Tamora responds only, “let them satisfice their lust on thee” (2.3.180). In Shakespeare’s narrative poem and tragedy, the failure to persuade throws thought back upon how readily words escape control of the one who utters them. This insight about the conditions of becoming a speaking subject, as I hope to show, is deeply Ovidian. It is all the more so because this crisis is embodied in a

story of rape. In Petrarch's hands, the beloved's refusal of the speaker's demand for love provides the very condition for writing poetry. It is therefore as a second Apollo, unable to persuade his Daphne to stay, that Petrarch inaugurates his autobiographical version of Ovidian narrative.<sup>25</sup> The *Rime Sparse*, and much love poetry derived from it, elevate this Ovidian scene of the failure to persuade into a virtual poetic ontology. Both the beauty of words themselves – Petrarch's famous form of "idolatry" – and the subjective condition of "exile" emerge as a kind of after-effect of language's failure to bring about the changes of which it speaks. My third chapter traces how deeply this Petrarchan "subjectivity effect" is indebted to Ovidian rhetorical self-consciousness, particularly as embodied in failed aspirations for the human voice. Actaeon's dismemberment, rather than Philomela's rape, becomes an emblematic analogue in the *Rime Sparse* for the voice's failure.

Understood most generally, this book analyzes the many ways that Ovid's fantasies and anxieties about the performative power of his own rhetoric inform each text's libidinal economy. It shows that the failure of the voice and attendant fascination with the scene of an impossible demand – the demand for love or pity, the demand that death return to life, the demand that words change the world rather than merely represent it – shape the Ovidian narrator's self-representation in the *Metamorphoses* and give distinctive shape to his representation of art, passion, and the body. Based on such an understanding of Ovidian rhetoric, the rest of the book shows that Ovid's many tropes for lost voices, at once foundational and disturbing, continue to unsettle Renaissance representations of authorial and sexual identity, whether male or female. In other words, I ask why Ovid's stories about lost voices or voices that fail to effect the change they seek draw to a close only when the body containing that voice is destroyed, dismembered, or raped. Such dire endings tell us that a struggle over the meaning of the human body – as molded by and yet resistant to culture's differential law – casts a shadow over what might otherwise seem to be the most abstract formal, symbolic, and tropological concerns of each text.

By exploring the paradoxical conditions of subjectivity that Ovid's influential tropes for lost voices reveal, I demonstrate something further still. In this tradition, it is the *female* voice – even when it falls resoundingly silent – that puts greatest strain on each poem's thinking about itself and its effects, about the connection between rhetoric and aesthetics, rhetoric and violence. The example of the way Marcus reads Lavinia's bleeding mouth in Ovidian-Petrarchan terms may have suggested as much. Female voices are not always heard (or rather, quoted) in these texts. Sometimes their glaring excision from representation is as