

---

# Ovid and the Renaissance Body

EDITED BY GORAN V. STANIVUKOVIC



UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS  
Toronto Buffalo London

© University of Toronto Press Incorporated 2001  
Toronto Buffalo London  
Printed in Canada

ISBN 0-8020-3515-9



Printed on acid-free paper

---

**National Library of Canada Cataloguing in Publication Data**

Main entry under title:

Ovid and the Renaissance body

ISBN 0-8020-3515-9

1. Ovid, 43 B.C.-17 or 18 A.D. - Influence. 2. European literature - Renaissance, 1450-1600 - History and criticism. 3. English literature - Early modern, 1500-1700 - History and criticism. 4. Body, Human, in literature. 5. Sex in literature. I. Stanivukovic, Goran V.  
PN721.O94 2001 809'.9335 C2001-930064-6

---

The author gratefully acknowledges financial support received from Saint Mary's University.

University of Toronto Press acknowledges the financial assistance to its publishing program of the Canada Council for the Arts and the Ontario Arts Council.

University of Toronto Press acknowledges the financial support for its publishing activities of the Government of Canada through the Book Publishing Industry Development Program (BPIDP).

## Contents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS vii

Introduction: Ovid and the Renaissance Body  
GORAN V. STANIVUKOVIC 3

### Part I: Identification and Desire 19

Ovidian Subjectivities in Early Modern Lyric: Identification  
and Desire in Petrarch and Louise Labé

CARLA FRECCERO 21

Imagining Heterosexuality in the Epyllia  
JIM ELLIS 38

Inversion, Metamorphosis, and Sexual Difference: Female  
Same-Sex Desire in Ovid and Lyly

MARK DOOLEY 59

A Garden of Her Own: Marvell's Nymph and the Order of  
Nature

MORGAN HOLMES 77

'Male deformities': Narcissus and the Reformation of  
Courtly Manners in *Cynthia's Revels*

MARIO DIGANGI 94

Arms and the Women: The Ovidian Eroticism of  
Harrington's Ariosto

IAN FREDERICK MOULTON 111

vi Contents

**Part II: Speech, Voice, and Embodiment 127**

Localizing Disembodied Voice in Sandys's Englished  
'Narcissus and Echo'

GINA BLOOM 129

The Ovidian Hermaphrodite: Moralizations by Peend and  
Spenser

MICHAEL PINCOMBE 155

Ovid and the Dilemma of the Cuckold in English  
Renaissance Drama

BRUCE BOEHRER 171

**Part III: Textualization 189**

Lyrical Wax in Ovid, Marlowe, and Donne

RAPHAEL LYNE 191

Engendering Metamorphoses: Milton and the Ovidian Corpus

ELIZABETH SAUER 207

The Girl He Left Behind: Ovidian *imitatio* and the Body of  
Echo in Spenser's 'Epithalamion'

JUDITH DETCH 224

'If that which is lost be not found': Monumental Bodies,  
Spectacular Bodies in *The Winter's Tale*

LORI HUMPHREY NEWCOMB 239

**Afterword**

VALERIE TRAUB 260

**CONTRIBUTORS 269**

**INDEX 272**

## Acknowledgments

I would like to thank all the contributors in this volume, whose enthusiastic response to the idea of this book made the project possible. I am especially grateful to Valerie Traub for her generous help with, and support of, this project from its inception. Staff at the Folger Shakespeare Library and at the Huntington Library went out of their way to help me use their libraries' superb collections of Ovidiana. These two libraries also supported some of my work on this project, for which I am grateful. I thank Laura Symms and Mary Campbell, of the University College of Cape Breton Library, who patiently, efficiently, and with good humour, dealt with all of my requests to 'rush' the inter-library loans. For their advice, support, and interest in this project, I would like to thank Steven Bruhm, Lynn Enterline, Elizabeth Harvey, Natasha Hurley, Mary and Richard Keshen, Talia Rodgers, and Peter Schwenger. I am also grateful to Margaret MacLeod, Jennifer MacGillivray, and, especially, Pamela Weizel, who stepped in at some crucial moments to solve various computer glitches. I am grateful to Geraldine Thomas for her help with Latin. I am indebted to Jane Couchman, David MacNeil, Majorie Stone, and Linda Vecchi for making it possible for me to organize a special, double session, 'The Politics of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in the Renaissance,' at the 1997 Congress of the Canadian Learned Societies at Memorial University of Newfoundland in Saint John's. I gratefully acknowledge the financial support I received from Saint Mary's University. I thank The Special Collections of the Robinson Library of the University of Newcastle upon Tyne for the permission to reproduce the figure in Michael Pincombe's essay, and the Folger Shakespeare Library for the permission to reproduce the engraving on the book cover.

## Localizing Disembodied Voice in Sandys's Englished 'Narcissus and Echo'

GINA BLOOM

In the preface to his 1632 translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, George Sandys professes to be well aware of the ethical sensibility of his seventeenth-century readers. Dealing seriously with Ovid's mythography at a time when Ovid's popularity was waning or controversial amongst devout Christians,<sup>1</sup> Sandys carefully argues his case for the applicability of Ovid's stories to early modern mores, claiming that the stories give access to philosophical and moral truths despite having been narrated by a pagan writer. Participating in a long tradition of *Ovide moralisé*, Sandys foregrounds the instructional objective of his translation: 'For the Poet not onely renders things as they are; but what are not, as if they were, or rather as they should bee.'<sup>2</sup> This justification of 'the Poet[s]' artistic license seems directed towards the poetic practices of both Ovid and Sandys. Just as Ovid's poetry can bend the truth of 'things' in order to represent them 'as they are,' so Sandys's text is authorized to 'render ... things' as he, the poet, sees fit. Armed with the argument that poetry is always on some level a craft of translation, of re-presenting reality, Sandys defends his manipulation of Ovid's original: he explains that he has made Ovid's stories fitting and useful for seventeenth-century readers 'by polishing, altering, or restoring, the harsh, improper, or mistaken' (p. 9).

As Sandys constructs a space for editorial freedom in his translation and, as my essay will demonstrate, exercises that freedom liberally, his translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* offers scholars insight into (how Sandys construed) the moral fiber of early modern English society *vis à vis* Ovid. Which elements of Ovid's tales needed alteration in order to confer Sandys's 'vital moral message' to English readers? So that I may explore the strategies by which Sandys grapples with what would have

been considered 'harsh, improper, or mistaken' in his sociohistorical context, I examine closely one of the Ovidian tales, 'Narcissus and Echo,' that Sandys 'polish[es], alter[s], and restore[s]'. The 1632 edition of Sandys's *Metamorphoses* is a particularly useful text in which to examine these strategies at work, for Sandys appends to his translation of each of Ovid's books an extensive commentary section. My essay explores how Sandys's translation and commentary work in collaboration to 'English' Ovid's depiction of Echo – a figure who, with her powerful disembodied speech, challenges popular early modern views about human vocal communication and the agency of the voice.

As her name indicates, Echo's only mode of 'speech' is the repetition of the sounds of others; a reverberation by definition, her vocal sound is produced seemingly without her volition and irrespective of her body (as becomes evident when her body disintegrates later in the myth, leaving behind her echoic voice). Though disembodied and disconnected from her person, Echo's voice is rendered as able to express the nymph's desires. When Echo repeats the ends of Narcissus's words, her resonating language implies meanings alternative to the ones intended by Narcissus; despite her supposed inability to speak on her own accord, she articulates an erotic interest in the youth. Ovid's wittiest use of this echoic trope occurs when the lost Narcissus mistakes Echo's sounds for the voices of the friends he has been trying to locate:

perstat et alternae deceptus imagine vocis  
'huc coeamus' ait, nullique libentius unquam  
reponsura sono 'coeamus' rettulit Echo

(III. 385–7)

[He stands still, deceived by the answering voice, and 'Let us come together here,' he cries. Echo, never to answer other sound more gladly, cries, 'Let us come together.']<sup>3</sup>

For Echo's resounding response, 'coeamus,' to Narcissus's call 'huc coeamus,' Ovid plays with the Latin double meaning of *coetus* – 'to meet' and 'to have sexual intercourse.' From the perspective of the reader, the lost Narcissus requests a meeting, and the smitten Echo agrees to a copulation. When Ovid has Echo repeat back 'coeamus,' capitalizing on its sexual connotations, he not only enables her to express interest in erotic conversation with Narcissus but also suggests that this meaning was embedded in Narcissus's call. Echo, the poem goes on to show, believes that Narcissus reciprocates her affections: she is so convinced

that Narcissus intended the sexual undertones of the word 'coeamus' that she rushes out of the forest and embraces him. Intention, Ovid's poem submits, matters little once language leaves the speaker's body and enters a communal realm where it is subject to reinterpretation. Echo's words are not mere reflections of Narcissus's speech; they are copies that alter the stability of the 'original' they supposedly mimic. In uncoupling meaning and intention, Ovid's poem offers the eerie possibility that echoic sound may be read as the nymph Echo's volitional speech.

Whereas Ovid's Latin poem merely *suggests* that echoic sound may be volitional speech, Sandys's translation is particularly invested in representing aural reverberations as Echo's self-expression. Perhaps most tellingly, Echo's first word in Sandys's translation is the pronoun 'I.' Ovid's Narcissus asks 'ecquis adest?' ('is anyone here?') (III. 380j) and Echo answers, 'adest' ('here'), but Sandys translates the lines as follows: 'The Boy, from his companions parted, said, / Is any nigh? I, *Echo* answer made' (p. 137). By translating the Latin *adest* as 'nigh,' Sandys sets himself up for an echoic pun (aye/I) that personalizes Echo's response. Through her articulation of 'I,' Echo declares her personhood using the grammatical signifier of subjectivity; Sandys's choice of this particular translation is not a result of his formal constraints of rhymed couplets, as the 'nigh? I' appears in the middle of the line and has the same rhythmic effect as 'here, here' would have. Sandys, in other words, could have translated this exchange as 'here, here,' a direct translation which foregrounds the physical location of the subject.<sup>4</sup> Instead, he plays with the possibilities offered by the English language in much the same way as Ovid plays with the possibilities of Latin. Sandys could also have had Echo resound 'nigh,' Narcissus's exact word, and achieved the effect of Ovid's text; the word 'nigh' would still have given Echo a mysterious aural presence. But Echo's first word, though it sounds much like 'nigh,' is different both in textual appearance and in meaning. The effect of changing the word in appearance amplifies Echo's vocal independence, and the choice of 'I' as her first word emphasizes her status as a subject who, though unable to choose her words, constitutes her personhood through the words which are available to her. In Sandys's translation, Echo emerges as a locatable 'I' by using the very voice she has been denied.

The provocative pun is only one among a number of Sandys's enhancements to Ovid's original poem. Indeed, the format of the 1632 edition, with translation interspersed by commentary, provides its

author with two spaces in which to pursue his revision of Ovid. The translation grants Echo grammatical and linguistic 'ownership' of the voice she produces, lending her a greater aura of personal expression and of intentional articulation than is posited in Ovid's original. However, as I will explore later in the essay, the commentary on this translation revokes the potentially human origins of echoic sound, defining echoes as mere aural curiosity.<sup>5</sup> The two strategies might at first glance seem incomprehensibly counterposed: where the translation goes to great lengths to personify echoic sound, contemporizing it with the speaking subject Echo, the commentary goes to equal lengths to disqualify echoic sound from categories of voice and speech. The first of these strategies, linking Echo's voice to her body, might lead us to contrast the dehumanizing, scientific commentary with a translation that seems proleptically 'feminist.' Judith de Luce's work on the silenced women of Ovid's *Melamorphoses* considers Echo a pathetic figure whose loss of speech signals her degradation into beastliness,<sup>6</sup> if we follow de Luce's argument, we may be tempted to applaud Sandys's translation for restoring 'human' identity to Ovid's vocally disabled nymph. But is an embodied, 'human' voice necessarily more potent and more effective than a disembodied one?

Kaja Silverman's work on embodiment and the voice leaves room for suspicion. In her account of the ideological and psychic forces that shape the representation of female voices in mainstream cinema, Silverman argues that the obsessive attempts on the part of Hollywood's male directors to 'synchronize' women's voices with their visual images reflect male anxieties about the impotence of filmic representation.<sup>7</sup> Silverman contends, moreover, that although the practice of 'marrying' sound and image grants interiority to female characters – bolstering their authenticity of character by naturalizing their capacity for speech – such interiority is far from liberating where female subjectivity is concerned. As the disembodied voice is given a 'definitive localization,' it to Silverman, is the one presented by feminist filmmakers, who blur or eliminate a 'corporeal assignation' for the cinematic female voice.<sup>8</sup>

Silverman's argument suggests, then, that there is much at stake in terms of the construction of female subjectivity and its relation to the female body in Sandys's localization of the disembodied voice, in his personification and humanization of echoic sound. With the capacity (intentional or not) to manipulate the disembodied voice, Ovid's Echo is able to inhabit what Silverman calls a space of 'enunciative authority'

in the story. Like the male voice-offs (voices sounding from off-screen) of classical Hollywood films, the echoic, disembodied voice allows Ovid's Echo the 'invisibility, omniscience, and discursive power' that, according to Silverman, is never available to the female characters in classical films.<sup>9</sup> But like the Hollywood films that Silverman discusses, Sandys's poem evinces concern about the potential powers of this disembodied female voice. In fact, I would argue that when Sandys turns Echo's reverberating, disembodied sound into self-expression, he practices his own form of *synchronization*: in contrast to Ovid's original Latin poem, Sandys's Englished translation strives to set up a 'definitive localization' for echoic sound by representing it as intentional speech and emphasizing Echo's interiority. Rather than offering a 'feminist' revision of Ovid, then, Sandys directly undermines Ovid's more generous representation of female speech. In Ovid's narrative, Echo emerges as a subject not in spite of, but *because of* the indeterminate nature of her vocal power. The uncanny ability of echoic sound to construct linguistic meaning on the nymph's behalf enables Echo to announce her desires but to remain beyond the reach of censure. Sandys's text, by normalizing Echo's sound and realigning it with Echo's body, places echoic sound within the range of surveillance.

Whereas Silverman theorizes the anxieties of her artists through the discourse of psychoanalysis, for my reading of Sandys's practice of synchronization, I emphasize the historically-specific variables that shape representations of the female voice.<sup>10</sup> The eerie vocal power of Ovid's Echo would have been met with particular consternation by early modern audiences, many of whom embraced an ancient Aristotelian understanding of speech contrary to the view personified by Ovid's Echo and by the phenomenon of disembodied sound in general. Aristotle describes speech as the definitive trait of human identity: 'Voice,' he maintains, 'is a certain sound of an animate being'; it is the 'impact of air breathed on the so-called "windpipe," and is caused by the soul in these parts of the body.'<sup>11</sup> Voice, in essence, is the material manifestation of a conscious human subject, of the will of a sensible being. It is by the property of speech that humans can be identified. This Aristotelian understanding of speech was prevalent throughout the Tudor and Stuart periods, extending well into the late seventeenth century. Sermon writer William Gearing refers to Aristotelian speech philosophy when he opens *A Bridle for the Tongue or A Treatise of Ten Sins of the Tongue* (1663): 'As Man is a reasonable creature, so is speech given to him by God to express his reason ... Brutal creatures can make a noise, but man only

can articulate his voice.<sup>12</sup> A half century earlier, music theorist John Dowland, translating Andreadis Ornithoparcus's *Micrologus* (1609), remarks that only 'sensible creatures' can articulate voice: 'A voice therefore is a sound uttered from the mouth of a perfect creature.'<sup>13</sup> That is, vocal production becomes proof of a 'man's' perfection in the eyes of God and nature. Robert Robinson similarly reiterates the claim when he explains in his pronunciation manual (1617) that the primary cause of voice is spiritual: the 'Microcosmos of mans body' contains a mind that was created in 'God's image' and this mind is the cause of speech.<sup>14</sup>

The disembodied sound of an echo, a 'voice' which is not rooted in any clearly locatable subject, would be disconcerting to those who follow Aristotle, because echoic sound violates assumptions about the relation between speech and the human body, between voice and selfhood. If speech is the primary trait that defines 'humanness,' then how does one apprehend the message delivered by a voice that has no locatable origin at all, let alone no human one? Moreover, that such unconventional vocal power is depicted as belonging to a *female* figure would have compounded the shock value of Ovid's story for early modern readers. As many feminist scholars have pointed out, Sandys's contemporaries compulsively monitored, in order to restrict, female speech.<sup>15</sup> And how can one monitor a voice that does not emerge from a locatable body?

Ovid relieves the echo phenomenon of some of its eeriness by imagining that the sounds closely approximating human speech may be the vocal products of a human entity, but he allows his Echo figure to straddle the line between intentional 'human' speech and merely imitative, 'inhuman' sound. As Joseph Loewenstein writes, Ovid attempts through personification to 'regulate ... the threat to consciousness implicit in the phenomenon of echo,' but ultimately he 'restrains' this personification.<sup>16</sup> That is, although Ovid creates the character of Echo to depict more comfortably the strange echo phenomenon, the poem disarticulates the link between subjectivity and voice, between personhood and agency.

It is this uncertain, incomplete personification of echoic sound that proves for Sandys to be one of Ovid's 'harsh, improper, or mistaken' narrative elements. Where Ovid's poem revels in the indeterminate nature of the voice, Sandys's Englished edition clarifies and polices the line between human and inhuman sound. What Ovid leaves ambiguous, Sandys 'polishes,' in an effort to normalize the eerie vocality that Ovid's Echo possesses. Faced with the task of moralizing Ovid's example of

echoic linguistic production, Sandys ultimately finds a way to uphold Aristotelian logic about the relation between voice and subjectivity – but not without implications for the representation of early modern gender systems. For when Sandys's translation anchors echoic sound more firmly to Echo's personage, it not only imbues the nymph with a sense of interiority but represents her as having access to conventional forms of vocal power. Sandys's expressive Echo does not conform neatly to the Renaissance ideal of mute womanhood. Caught between the exigencies of early modern voice philosophy and ideologies of gender, Sandys works hard elsewhere in the text to undermine the agency that his own translation grants Echo.

By paying attention to the details of Sandys's 'Englishing,' I counter two trends in scholarship on the translated Ovid. First, though many scholars read Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in translation, few account for the sociohistorical circumstances of a particular translation and the effect these have on the representation of Ovid's stories.<sup>17</sup> The importance of factoring in history is particularly evident in the case of the 'Narcissus and Echo' episode, for in an early modern culture so preoccupied with marking the boundaries of expression, especially where women are concerned, the figure of Ovid's Echo and her startling vocal capacity resonate deeply. Secondly, while the methodology and content of Sandys's commentary have received serious attention from scholars, the Englished translation has been seen as less worthy of analysis, perhaps because, in the words of Deborah Rubin, it is 'notably literal and unbiased' in comparison to other 'Englished' classics.<sup>18</sup> Rubin's characterization of Sandys's translation merits further investigation. Because the semantic range of Latin words and the language's flexible syntax are almost impossible to represent fully in English, Sandys makes translation choices in places where Ovid's text is more ambiguous. Whether they result from the demands of poetics (e.g., Sandys's scheme of rhymed couplets) or from the pressures of an ideological project (*Ovide moralisé*), these changes metamorphosize Ovidian representations of female vocal agency into a narrative that would be comprehended and accepted more readily by seventeenth-century readers.

### Person-alizing Echo

Ovid narrates that Echo received her liminal vocality as a punishment from the goddess Juno, whom Echo had enraged. Before Echo earned her name, she was like all other nymphs, complete with body and self-

expressive voice. On Jove's order, Echo would distract Jove's spouse Juno by engaging her in conversation, so that the goddess would not discover Jove's infidelity:

fecerat hoc Iuno, quia, cum dependere posset  
sub Iove saepe suo nymphas in monte iacentis,  
illa deam longo prudens sermone tenebat,  
dum fugerent nymphae.

(III. 362-5)

[Juno had made her thus; for often when she might have surprised the nymphs in company with her lord on the mountainsides, Echo cunningly held the goddess with her long speeches until the nymphs had fled].

When Juno becomes aware of Echo's trickery, she curses the loquacious nymph: 'huius ... linguae ... potestas / parva tibi dabitur vocisque brevis-sinus usus' ('that tongue of yours shall have its power curtailed and have the briefest use of speech' [III. 366]). Echo's tongue, the instrument that stands in for her vocal capacity, will no longer work as efficiently after Juno's punishment: Echo will be restricted from owning her speech and will now merely have *usus* (use) of it. The term *usus* emerges from an ancient discourse about property law which, among other things, explains the conditions under which one may profit from the use of property which belongs to another. As Echo has only 'use' of speech, she reaps the benefits of a property that is not hers; Narcissus's speech passes through her momentary possession, and she profits from it, even though she does not officially own it. Loewenstein points out, moreover, that the legal notion of utility from which the term *usus* arises, 'challenges the boundary between object and subject ... *Usus* is a Janus-concept at the limits of property, sometimes splitting an object's utility off from its essential status of being-owned, sometimes revising ownership.' As a *usable* property, Echo's speech stands on what Loewenstein calls 'a weird frontier.'<sup>19</sup> It is neither as an embodied feature which inherently belongs to her (as speech, per Aristotle, would otherwise be assumed to be); nor is it a movable property entirely separable from her. Echo's speech is a product or tool of which she – whether owner or vehicle – temporarily claims possession.

Even before Echo's punishment, Ovid's descriptions of her speech convey its instrumental nature through corresponding grammatical form – the ablative of means. When narrating the history behind Juno's anger at Echo – 'illa deam longo prudens sermone tenebat' ('She

[Echo] cunningly held the goddess by means of her long speeches') – Ovid represents Echo's lengthy speeches to Juno in the ablative, 'sermone,' distinguishing and separating the speech from the nominative agent Echo. Speaking, in the Ovidian original, is grammatically the *tool* which Echo, the agent, deploys skilfully to fool Juno. When Sandys translates this moment, he shifts Echo's 'discourses' into the nominative position, into the position of the subject: 'Her long discourses made the Goddess stay.' Discourses that once were employed by Ovid's Echo become, for Sandys, the primary agents of the sentence. This grammatical change, though it does not significantly change Ovid's meaning and conforms very closely to the original Latin, still alters the overall sense of this line and distinguishes Sandys from his predecessors. Arthur Golding, whose translation choices Sandys usually follows, retains Ovid's ablative construction, translating this phrase, 'This elfe would *with her telling talke* detain her [Juno] by the way.' The ablative appears as well in Thomas Howell's 1560 translation: 'This Echo *with a tale*, the goddess kepte so longe.'<sup>20</sup> In Sandys the engaging discourses, rather than being the instruments that Echo *uses* to fool Juno, are metonyms for the nymph, indicating her power over Juno. When Sandys grants agency to 'her long discourses,' he grammatically (through the inclusion of the possessive pronoun 'her') yokes the speeches more closely to Echo; the foolery is performed by discourses that Echo inherently owns.

The significance of differences between Sandys's and Ovid's poetic choices become especially evident at the point in the narrative when Echo discovers Narcissus wandering in the forest and falls in love with him. While he tries to locate his friends with his voice, she is provided with phrases to articulate her interest in him. Ovid's language suggests that the words that Echo speaks in response are the combined result of her planning and good fortune. The Latin poem sets up these seemingly contradictory circumstances for echoic speech:

natura repugnat  
nec sinit, incipiat, sed, quod sinit, illa parata est  
expectare sonos, ad quos sua verba remittat.  
forte puer comitum sedectus ab agmine fido  
dixerat: 'ecquis adesit?' ...

(III. 376-80)

[Her nature forbids [her expression of desire for him], nor does it permit her to begin, but as it permits, she is ready to await the sounds to which she

may give back her own words. By chance the boy, separated from his faithful companions, cried out: 'is anyone there?']

Her nature forbids her from initiating speech, but '*illa parata est / expectare sonas*,' she is ready to await the sounds. Ovid's Echo does not merely hope that Narcissus will provide her with the opportunity to speak; she prepares herself for the event, *expecting* that such an occasion will present itself. And it does in the very next line. In his typically ambiguous style, however, Ovid prefaces the fulfillment of Echo's expectations with the word *forte*, by chance. The effect of this combination of anticipation and surprising luck is that Echo is represented as both an agent of her own desires *and* a victim of destiny who happens to benefit from the cards (or, in this case, the words) fate deals her. When Sandys translates these lines, however, the latter characterization falls away as Sandys sets *forte* aside:

But, Nature no such liberty affords:  
Begin she could not, yet full readily  
To his expected speech she would reply.  
The Boy, from his companions parted, said;  
Is any nigh?

(III. 379-83)

Omitting any translation of *forte*, Sandys's text moves directly from Echo's state of preparation to the conversation that allows her to fulfill her expectations. The effect of this absence, which differentiates Sandys from his predecessors,<sup>21</sup> is that Echo expects Narcissus to provide her with auspicious words, and he seems to speak at her passive bequest. Narcissus's initial words, the words which allow Sandys's Echo to announce her person ('I') narratively proceed not *forte*, 'by chance,' but as anticipated. Narcissus's 'nigh' is rendered as 'expected speech.' With less vacillation than Ovid, Sandys portrays Echo as exercising some measure of control over vocal expression and communication.

Echo's role in communication processes is figured as more active in Sandys than in Ovid. Ovid's Echo is defined as the eternal respondent, never initiating discourse but involuntarily reflecting its close: 'haec in fine loquendi / ingemina voces audiatque verba reportat' ('she doubles the phrases at the end of a speech and returns the heard words' [III. 368-9]). Unable to do more than 'return' heard words, Echo's speech is always the borrowed property of another. When Ovid's Echo speaks she moves that property *back* (*reportat*) into the possession of its ostensible

owner, the previous speaker. Some essence of this sense of movement *back* is retained in Sandys when he translates *reportat* as 'relates': 'she yet ingeminates / The last of sounds, and what she hears relates.' Sandys likely chooses this meaning to strike a rhyme with '*ingeminates*,' and his phraseology conveys the repetitious form of Echo's speech in accordance with Ovid's general description of her vocal posture. Yet in using the term 'relates,' Sandys's text delivers a slightly different sense of vocal property: as early as the fifteenth century, the term '*relate*' is 'to recount, narrate, tell, give an account of,' and this is still the primary meaning today.<sup>22</sup> To a greater extent than the speaker who *reportat* (the definition of which is 'to give back information' or, as in this case, words), the speaker who 'relates' participates in the conveyance of information; she does not merely act as a redeptacle but actually shapes the story. The focus of Ovid's *reportat* is on the initial source of the information, and the speaker acts as siphon; the focus of Sandys's 'relate' is on the task of narration itself. Thus, in Sandys's description of Echo as one who 'relates,' she is less an 'aural mirror'<sup>23</sup> who returns what belongs to someone else, than a messenger who offers selected information to a present and eager listener.

By virtue of this word choice, Sandys's earliest introduction of Echo links her to a tradition of echoic gossips or personified rumours that famously exaggerate the accounts that they relate. We might recall the echoic rumour that Warwick describes in Shakespeare's *Henry IV*, Part Two, when he reassures the king that the enemy's numbers cannot be as large as they are rumoured to be, for 'Rumour doth double, like the voice and echo, / The numbers of the feared' (3.2.98-9).<sup>24</sup> While the echo of this line is summoned in order to pun on 'double,' the association of echoes with errant gossip was long-standing. As a producer of rumours, Warwick's Echo does more than just repeat news that reaches her; her repetition can manipulate information, or, like Rumour who opens *Henry IV*, even manufacture falsehoods. The more active participation of Sandys's Echo in shaping the words that reach her might be further noted in his translation of Ovid's phrase 'audiatque verba reportat' (and she returns heard words). When Sandys translates this phrase as 'and what she hears relates,' he not only alters the definition of *reportat*, as I have noted, but also turns the modifying participle 'audia' into the verb 'hear.' The words that Sandys's Echo ostensibly reiterates are taken in and incorporated by her hearing body, and only then are they converted into vocal articulations. In grammatical terms, Echo's body is thus the site of a *listening* as active as the process of speaking.

In sum, Sandys's translation renders Echo as agent of her own desires, practically accountable for the words that issue forth from her body. Though Sandys does not (and, by virtue of the genre of translation, cannot) go so far as Ben Jonson in restoring Echo with independent speech and a visually recognizable body,<sup>25</sup> his translation still accentuates the personification of Echo that is only ambiguously suggested in Ovid. As such, readers of Sandys's Englished translation would have encountered a depiction of voice in Ovid commensurate with Aristotle's – that is, a voice that is expressive of human consciousness and will. In the process of aligning Ovid's tale more closely with Aristotelian voice philosophy, however, Sandys's text comes into conflict with early modern concerns regarding gender and vocal expression. To be sure, Sandys's Echo ignores the Pauline strictures of chastity, silence, and obedience and seems to escape regimes of discipline to which early modern women – in fiction and in reality – were subject often. But before we leap to the conclusion that Sandys's text evidences proto-feminist commitments, it is important to note that the text frames this generous rereading of personalized voice not as Sandys's, but as Ovid's. The English words might be Sandys's, but the essence of Echo's story – Sandys, the translator, insists – belongs to the heathen Ovid. This distinction and its strategic purpose become more evident when we consider the contrast between the translation and the moralizing commentary that follows it. Having insisted in the translation upon Echo's personhood, Sandys's commentary reduces Echo to an inhuman phenomenon, with a 'debility' (p. 156) in speech and a notable lack of vocal control.

### Only a Repercussion

Sandys's commentary is only one among a number of additions/improvements to the 1632 text, but it is certainly the most notable and is partly responsible for the author's popularity as an Ovid translator. Much as Arthur Golding had dominated the sixteenth century with the Englished *Metamorphoses* that Shakespeare reportedly consulted, so Sandys dominated English readings of Ovid's poem in the seventeenth, publishing at least eight editions of his full translation.<sup>26</sup> The 1632 edition was the most glamorous, accompanied by fifteen full pages of new illustrations depicting mythological figures (as well as the stunningly revised frontispiece), marginal glosses that highlight the names of the central characters of each story, and the extensive commentary, organized by narrative episode. The composition and placement of the com-

mentary strongly suggest that readers of the 1632 edition would have attended as much (if not more) to the commentaries as to the translation itself: the commentary sections are equal in length, sometimes even longer, than the Englished poem, and they take the form of pedagogical/philosophical essays, placed conspicuously between translated books.

Sandys justifies his commentary as a necessary 'since divers place in our Author are otherwise impossible to be understood but by those who are well versed in the ancient Poets and Historians' (p. 9). Having traveled to various worldly destinations and having settled for some time in Virginia, Sandys is indeed 'well versed.' The commentary evinces not only its author's experiences as a traveler but also his encyclopedic knowledge of classical history and philosophy, of mythology, and of science. The sources Sandys cites, whether these are stories relayed from scholastic traditions or drawn from his own observations, assess the credibility of Ovid's myths by appealing to scientific or historical precedent.<sup>27</sup> The commentaries are thus a reference book of sorts and, because they are posited as an assortment of alternative views, their ideological stance is tricky to determine.

The format of the commentary, like contemporary commentaries, positions Sandys as a capacious collector, not selective editor, of historical opinion. He draws on various sources, rarely offering his overt views except when he affirms the moral message of each tale. Some might say that Sandys presents himself as a 'mere' echo in that he claims to repeat the reports of others without much mediation. However, it is clear that the commentary provides some forum for Sandys's reflections on, and corrections to, the content of Ovid's tales. In addition to delivering the ethical lesson of the stories, announced with introductions such as 'now to the moral' (p. 160), each commentary draws on a limited selection of sources among the vast array from which Sandys could cull. By the time Sandys compiled his commentary on 'Narcissus and Echo,' Echo had received centuries of attention from writers with diverse interests in her as a mythical figure, a literary trope, a metaphoric emblem, and, of course, as a natural phenomenon. The constitution of Sandys's reference collection – the choice of citations in addition to the way he presents these pieces of evidence – tells us a great deal about the lessons that this pedagogue wishes to convey.

In its discussion of Echo, Sandys's commentary relies predominantly on the discourse of science. Exploring at length the nature of echoes as acoustic phenomena, Sandys appeals to empirical observations to dis-

pute the 'human' quality of Echo's sound. He maintains that an echo, though sometimes uttered 'without failing in one syllable' (p. 156) is not an original voice, and he emphasizes the source which creates the initial sound:

Now *Eccho* signifies a resounding: which is only the repercussion of the voice, like the rebound of a ball, returning directly from whence it came: and that it *reports* not the whole sentence, is through the debility of the reverberation.  
(p. 156; second emphasis mine)

Here Echo is reduced to object-status, an 'it' that helps explain the operation of percussive objects. Differentiated from expressive human speech or 'voice,' echoic sound is compared to a rebounding ball that has no control over its movements and, by its nature, can only return back to its place of origination. Where Sandys's translation had described an Echo who actively 'relates' what she hears, his commentary strictly interprets the verb *reportare* that Ovid had used to characterize Echo's voice. In the commentary, Echo returns the voice 'directly from whence it came'; she does not actively hear words, process the information, and relate what she chooses like a messenger, but 'reports' the heard words like a mindless resonator. Sandys carefully explains away any hint of Echo's vocal intentionality. Her auspicious reverberations of only the ends of sentences, which in his own translation had given Echo the opportunity to announce her subjectivity, are here figured as the result of faulty reverberation. By emphasizing the echo as a purely material phenomenon, the commentary disqualifies Echo's vocal production from the category of human speech.

Although elsewhere in his commentary on the *Metamorphoses*, Sandys incorporates both mythological and scientific findings, his commentary on Echo primarily cites natural philosophy. Elucidated thoroughly by the empirical criteria of the 'new' science, Echo, in the commentary, loses her peculiar vocal powers. The impact that this explanatory apparatus has on Sandys's presentation of Echo becomes clear when we consider how Sandys draws on Francis Bacon's scientific writings about Echo. Scholars have recognized that Sandys's 1632 edition registers the extent to which the poet was influenced by Bacon, especially by Bacon's mythography, *De Sapientia Veterum* (translated into English in 1619).<sup>28</sup> Yet references to *De Sapientia* are absent in Sandys's commentary on Echo. The allusions to Bacon that Sandys does include derive from Bacon's *Sylva Sylvarum* (1626), an assortment of empirical studies about

the nature of sound. In several of the experiments that appear in *Sylva Sylvarum*, Bacon discusses echoes, distinguishing between simple echoes, what he calls 'reflexion iterant,' and echoes of echoes, or 'super-reflexion.' In order to explain an observation about 'super-reflexions' reported to have been heard in a chapel outside of Paris, Bacon draws a parallel between visual and aural reflection:

Like to *Reflexions* in *Looking-glasses*, where if you place one *Glasse* before, and another behinde, you shall see the *Glasse* behinde with the *Image*, within the *Glasse* before; And againe, the *Glasse* before in that; and divers such *Super-Reflexions*, till the *species speciei* at last die. For it is every *Returne* weaker, and more shady. In the like manner, the *Voice* in that *Chappell*, createth *speciem speciei*, and maketh succeeding *Super-Reflexions*. For it melteih by degrees, and every *Reflexion* is weaker than the former.<sup>29</sup>

With his technical nomenclature and experimentally based logic, Bacon empties echoes of their eerie potential. Sound operates in predictable patterns, Bacon insists. And Sandys, who shares Bacon's language, shares his views as well. Sandys also refers to the chapel in Pavia where Lambinus heard 'not fewer then thirty' echoes answering one another, and comments: 'The image of the voice so often rendered, is as that of the face reflected from one glasse to another; melting by degrees, and every reflection more weak and shady then the former' (p. 156).<sup>30</sup> Sandys's appeal to Bacon's scientific explanations reduces Echo's liminal speech to predictable sound that, if given the time, will dissipate like the 'super-reflexions' at Pavia. Furthermore, the placement of this citation in a commentary on the 'Narcissus and Echo' myth associates Echo's aural reflections with the visual ones that mislead Narcissus. Through this analogy, Echo's presence is rendered as illusive and fictive as Narcissus's mirror image, and she is defined, like the mirror image, in relation to Narcissus, rather than as an entity all her own.

A markedly different sense of the nymph appears in Bacon's mythographic writings about echoes, which Sandys neglects to cite or mention. Bacon follows a different mythographic tradition, which couples the nymph not with Narcissus, but with Pan. In *De Sapientia Veterum*, Bacon explains that Pan desires Echo because she represents 'true philosophy,' the only thing that Pan (the World) lacks:

that alone is true philosophy; which doth faithfully render the very words of the world, and is written no otherwise then the world doth dictate, it

being nothing else but the image or reflection of it, not adding any thing of its owne, but onely iterates and resounds.<sup>31</sup>

In Baconian mythography, Echo symbolizes the purity of philosophical discourse, the most transcendent form of the human voice.<sup>32</sup> Bacon's laudatory views of Echo extend from the writings of Macrobius, who had depicted the nymph as the representative of the celestial realm. Why does Sandys, a known scholar of Bacon's *De Septentia*, forego mention of this tradition of the praiseworthy Echo? Why does he restrict his Baconian allusions to Bacon's scientific explanations, and what are the repercussions of his choices?

One might argue that Sandys excludes the Baconian reading because Bacon's Echo is derived from a mythological tradition that differs significantly from Ovid's. The story of Pan and Echo switches the roles of pursuer and pursued: Pan is captivated by Echo's song and pursues her, unlike in Ovid's narrative where Echo desires and chases Narcissus. The Echo of the Pan-Echo story pines for no man and courageously fends off her pursuer. In one rendition of the narrative, Pan becomes so enraged with Echo's refusal to surrender her chastity that he calls on wild animals to tear her limbs apart; under the tutelage of the Muses and the nymphs, however, Echo's invisible, scattered body parts retain their ability to produce captivating music, keeping Pan in a state of frustrated desire.<sup>33</sup> This account of Echo as defender of chastity, ally of nymphs and Muses, and desirable representative of the celestial heavens underlies Baconian notions of Echo as the representative of philosophical discourse. One might reasonably maintain that it was not appropriate for an Ovid commentator to muddy his commentary with discussions derived from a different mythological genealogy.

Yet at least one other translator of and commentator on Ovid's 'Narcissus and Echo,' coincidentally publishing in the same year as Sandys's expanded edition, *did* draw on the tradition of celestial Echo in his commentary. Mythographer and rhetorician Henry Reynolds follows his translation of Ovid's narrative with a moralizing commentary in which he condemns Narcissus for not listening to Echo's 'Divine voice.' Citing Pythagoras's notion 'while the winds breathe, adore Ecco,' Reynolds reports that Echo has been considered the 'reflection of divine breath,' since the wind is 'the Symbole of the Breath of God.'<sup>34</sup> Reynold's inclusion of a reference to the tradition of celestial Echo and her relationship to Pan results in a commentary that celebrates the uncanny, disembodied nature of Echo's speech. Her sound is not a simple rever-

beration of human voices, but a celestial prophecy that imitates and thus articulates the voice of God. Engaged in the same project and published at the same time, Sandys's and Reynolds's perspectives on Echo could not be more different.

Rather than cite the tradition of celestial Echo, Sandys includes a translation of Ausonius's Epigram XXXII, where Echo speaks to a painter, calling herself 'a voice without a mind' and the mother of 'judgment blind.' In Ausonius's poem Echo taunts the painter about his artistic limitations through a monologue. She challenges the painter to try to represent the 'Daughter of aire and tongue,' and goads him: 'If therefore thou wilt paint me, paint a sound' (p. 157). Echoes, she reminds him, can be processed only as aural experiences, and visual productions, like paintings, can never fully portray an aural happening. Representing Echo is quite impossible, the poem (and Sandys by including it) suggests, for Echo has no existence outside of her medium of sound.

Defining Echo as 'mere' sound is not inherently a slight against the figure. In early modern English culture, the medium of sound was understood to be incredibly powerful – for some writers even more powerful than vision.<sup>35</sup> Bacon's *Sylva Sylvarum* asserts the primacy of hearing over sight, claiming that sounds would more directly and more materially affect the spirits of a listener than sights would affect a visual observer. In comparison to other forms of sensory perception, Bacon writes, '*Objects of the Earre*, do affect the *Spirits* (immediately) most with *Pleasure* and *Offence* ... So it is *Sound* alone, that doth immediately, and incorporeally, affect most.'<sup>36</sup> And Echo's sound is especially potent given its pervasive nature – she is not found in one place but is rather 'omnibus auditur' (heard by all [p. 401]). In the context of Sandys's commentary, however, Ausonius's poem is a disparagement of the vocal nymph. Elsewhere in this commentary, Sandys undermines the efficacy and the materiality of sound, questioning, contra Bacon, whether sound has any power at all. In commenting on the bodily decay of Echo, Sandys writes that Echo 'consumes to an unsubstantiall voice.' She 'converts into a sound; that is, into nothing' (p. 156). The syntax of the latter sentence implies not only that Echo's body becomes 'nothing,' but that sound in general is 'nothing.'

The sober scientific and historical reality about Echo related in Sandys's commentary, like the corporealization of Echo in the translation, curbs the potential power of the disembodied voice – the translation by embodying this speech, and the commentary by disqualifying it

as speech. However, the significance of each part of the text as moral instruction for the reader is not equal in Sandys's rendering: for the translated poem belongs more directly to Ovid, with Sandys presented as 'only' a translator, whereas the commentary is compiled and composed by Sandys himself. The 1632 edition does not merely distinguish Ovidian fiction from early modern truth, as Deborah Rubin points out;<sup>37</sup> it asserts the preeminence of the latter and secures Echo's agency in the domain of the former. For the Echo that Sandys offers to early modern readers is either the expressive human agent created by the pagan Ovid or the 'modern' scientifically validated phenomenon presented by the Christian Sandys. By constructing for himself the dual role of commentator and translator, Sandys strategically dissociates himself from the empowered Echo who emerges from 'Ovid's' poem. By emphasizing Ovid's responsibility for narrating a story of Echo's vocal power and offering the commentary as a moral corrective, Sandys's edition protects its early modern readers from the uncanny agency that the echoic voice seems to possess in Ovid's poem.

### Now to the Moral

Ovid's capacity to produce potentially subversive representations of mythic and historical women has been recognized by several feminist critics, some of whom discuss, as I have, the reactions of Renaissance male writers to Ovid's characterizations. The most innovative scholarship on Ovid's depictions of women has centred on Ovid's *Heroides*, a collection of epistles narratively figured as authored by famous women to their lovers. According to Elizabeth Harvey, Deborah Greenhut, and others, the *Heroides* are especially interesting in terms of how Ovid represents female speech. Harvey situates her treatment of the *Heroides* in the context of a discussion about ventriloquized voices, the trope whereby male writers impersonate the female voice. She argues that Ovid's ventriloquization of Sappho's voice in *Heroides* challenges 'the epic and patriarchal ethos of Augustan Rome.'<sup>38</sup> Though Ovid's ventriloquization is motivated by a need to master the poetic legacy of Sappho, this project of anxious appropriation is self-consciously explored in *Heroides* XV. In a sense, Sapphic and Ovidian signatures are superimposed on one another in a palimpsestic transparency, and the usurpation that has made Ovid's ventriloquized speech possible is thus thematized in the text.<sup>39</sup> By calling attention to his ventriloquization, Ovid offers an unstable answer to the question, 'Who is speaking and to

whom does speaking belong?'<sup>40</sup> Greenhut similarly links Ovid's self-conscious ambiguity with subversive representations of gender identity in the *Heroides*. Assessing the rhetorical skill of female speakers in Ovid's text, Greenhut argues that Ovid creates a vital and unmoralized link between eloquence and sexuality, envisioning that the speakers of the *Heroides* articulate desire without shame and fear of social repercussions.<sup>41</sup> Harvey and Greenhut both note that Ovid's representations of women would have been difficult for Renaissance writers to accept. And both demonstrate how later adaptations of Ovid's *Heroides* alter the original to comply more easily with early modern attitudes towards female speech, thereby revealing the historical conditions that shape literary production.

Although attuned to the usefulness of Ovid for feminist literary historiography, Harvey and Greenhut, like most feminist scholars, dismiss the extraordinary potential of the echoic voice that Ovid himself suggests in the *Metamorphoses*. When both of these insightful critics recall the trope of echoing, they articulate views that bear closer resemblance to Sandys's writings than to Ovid's.<sup>42</sup> In her definition of the male poet's 'ventriloquistic appropriation' of the female voice, Harvey distinguishes echoing from the more masterful theft or 'linguistic rape' that Ovid pursues: 'Ovid knew Sappho's poetry and his epistle is full of its echoes, but whereas "echo" suggests a disembodied voice capable only of repetition, Ovid's radical reinscription of Sappho bears the marks of sexual mastery and theft, ... displacing the authority of her words.'<sup>43</sup> Harvey distinguishes impotent echoing from Ovid's authoritative, even violent, reinscription of voice, thereby implying that echoes are inherently incapable of the kind of powerful appropriation of another discourse that Ovid accomplishes. Greenhut, discussing the figuration of female speech as echoic in early modern conduct books, writes that in rhetorical terms the echo 'assigns polite women's speech the quality of an abstract or a digest, whose only value is in its confirmation of the original, or authoritative, sound. An echo is not original, and what it expresses is subordinate to and dependent on the original sound.'<sup>44</sup> Importantly calling attention to the misogynist nature of these characterizations of female speech, Greenhut inadvertently reiterates conduct book definitions of echoic speech. While there is no doubt that early modern conduct books use the trope of echoing to divest female speech of its potential power, one need not simply conclude that echoic speech is *inherently* impotent as a model of effective voicing.

Perhaps the tendency for feminist critics to view the mythical Echo as

purely a victim of misogynist silencing regimes, rather than as a potential challenge to them, follows from criticism's insufficient theorization of echoic voice tropes and from the narrow scope of historical work on voice in general.<sup>45</sup> Critical readings of Renaissance representations of female speech have generally focused on the way in which early modern conduct books prescribe women's morality through a conflation of silence and sexual continence.<sup>46</sup> While this focus has enabled critics to address the relation between enforced silence and the disciplined female subject, a tendency to focus on the speaker's body (the site of articulation) has limited scholarly recognition of the potential power of disembodied voice. What kind of power can the voice have *after* it leaves the speaker's body, before it reaches a listener's ears? How can theorizing the disembodied voice lead scholars towards a more capacious definition of female agency? In posing these questions, I am struck by the way in which Ovid's text seems to anticipate Judith Butler's contentious claim that 'agency begins where sovereignty wanes.'<sup>47</sup> It is precisely the disarticulation of speech from the speaker that opens up a space for Ovid's Echo to express and perform her desire for Narcissus. Transactive and dialogic, echoic speech enjoys a liminal kind of agency that is difficult to track and thus impossible to restrain fully. If Ovid's Echo speaks inappropriately, expressing desires that should, according to some readers, be left unarticulated, then how can Echo be held accountable and ultimately punished? Echo cannot be blamed for words that are not 'her own.' Echo thus reaps the benefits of speech, while the male subject, Narcissus, is held (anxiously) accountable.<sup>48</sup>

This ambiguous and yet powerful relationship of speech to agency changes in Sandys's translation of Ovid's story. By personifying Echo's voice and yoking the 'unintentionally' spoken words to their female speaker, Sandys places Echo firmly within the conduct book tropology of the loquacious and lascivious woman. Sandys translates disembodied echoic sound into the wilful, immodest expressions of (yet another) lusty woman. Although he grants Echo self-expressive power through her voice, he casts that power as immoral, and specifically, as indicative of a *classical* immorality which he aims to correct through his modern, scientific commentary. A generation of feminist criticism has, like Sandys, dismissed Echo's example by reading echoic voice through a discourse of moral instruction. But I would argue that Ovid's Echo offers us a way to think beyond the confines of the prescriptive literature and to reassess the terms by which we study 'voice' as a theoretical, historical, and performative vehicle of female agency. Critics who recog-

nize agency primarily in the form of outspoken female historical and literary figures risk dismissing alternative models of potent voicing. Other models of the relation between articulation and agency might have been available in early modern English culture, particularly to women, whose access to conventional forms of power was circumscribed by legal and social practices.<sup>49</sup> Ovid's Echo exemplifies one such model – at least until Sandys refigures her in his 1632 *Metamorphoses*, granting her interiority and, in effect, a voice of her own. That Sandys's text needs to normalize, in order to dismiss, Echo's unintentional but effective vocality indicates just how disconcerting Ovid's Echo was for some early moderns and, at the same time, how compelling her legacy can be for contemporary feminist theories of agency.

## NOTES

I am grateful to Valerie Traub for support and insightful feedback on this project during all stages of its conception and production. My thanks as well to Linda Gregerson and Elise Fraser for carefully reading various drafts; P.A. Skanze, Michael Schoenfeldt, and Theresa Braunschneider for their responses to early versions; and to the staff at the Folger Library for assistance with materials related to this project.

1 Lee T. Peary, *The Mediated Muse: English Translations of Ovid, 1560–1700* (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1984), p. 62.

2 George Sandys, *Ovid's Metamorphosis: Englished, Mythologized, and Represented in Figures* (London, 1632), p. 8. Citations to this work in the body of my essay correspond to the modern reprinting of the 1632 edition, ed. Karl K. Hulley and Stanley T. Vandersall (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1970).

3 For my translations of the Latin, I have consulted and modified Frank Justus Miller's translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. The Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, London: W. Heinemann, 1984). I am grateful to Joanna Alexander for her early help with Ovid's Latin. In the Latin original, references are to book and line number.

4 Sandys was not the first Ovid translator or the first seventeenth-century writer to recognize the pun on 'aye.' Golding had chosen a similar translation in his edition of the *Metamorphoses*, and Ben Jonson performed the same move in *Cynthia's Revels*. Whether Sandys was the originator of the pun, his use of it certainly characterizes Echo in a compelling manner. Other translators found creative English translations which do not include

- the aye/I pun. Sandys's contemporary Henry Reynolds translates this moment, 'Heare I not one; quoth he; One, sayes the mayde./ Framing a troth from the last word he sayd' in his translation affixed to *Mythomystes* (1632), (repr. Scholar Press, 1972), p. 91. Thomas Howell (1560) slightly less elegantly writes that Narcissus 'Dyd saye is anye here to whome, she answereth her a none' (sig. Aiiir).
- 5 The differences between the project of the translation and the project of the commentary have gone unnoticed in Sandys's criticism. Even Peary, one of the few critics to address Sandys's ideological positioning in a book which is admirably attuned to translation theory, does not consider the differences between the translation and the commentary. Peary sets up the two parts as equal, and he draws from both for evidence of Sandys's ideas.
  - 6 Judith de Luce, 'O for a Thousand Tongues to Sing': A Footnote on Metamorphosis, Silence, and Power, in *Woman's Power, Man's Game: Essays on Classical Antiquity in Honor of Joy K. King*, ed. Mary DeForest (Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci, 1993), pp. 305–21.
  - 7 Kaja Silverman, *The Acoustic Mirror: The Female Voice in Psychoanalysis and Cinema*. Theories of Representation and Difference (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1988), p. 164. On the role of sound-image synchronization in Hollywood films, see also Mary Ann Doane, 'The Voice in the Cinema: The Articulation of Body and Space,' *Yale French Studies* 60 (1980): 33–50. Doane argues that '[t]echnical advances in sound recording ... are aimed at ... concealing the work of the apparatus' (p. 35).
  - 8 Silverman, *The Acoustic Mirror*, pp. 49, 165.
  - 9 *Ibid.*, p. 164.
  - 10 On the ways in which historical study and psychoanalytic investigation mutually inform one another, see Carla Mazzio and Douglas Trevor, eds., *Historicism, Psychoanalysis and Early Modern Culture* (New York: Routledge, 2000). The collection *Embodied Voices: Representing Female Vocality in Western Culture* (ed. Leslie C. Dunn and Nancy A. Jones [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994]) analyses representations of the female voice in an array of historical periods and contexts, and from a number of different critical perspectives.
  - 11 Aristotle, *On the Soul*, trans. Hippocrates G. Apostle (Grinnell, IA: The Peripatetic Press, 1981), p. 34.
  - 12 William Gearing, *A Bride for the Tongue: or A Treatise of Ten Sins of the Tongue Cursing, Swearing, Slandering, Scoffing, Filly Speaking, Flattering, Conspiring, Murthering, Lying, Boasting and Shewing* (London, 1663), sig. A3r.
  - 13 John Dowland, trans. *Andreas Ornithoparcus His Micrologus, or Introduction: Containing the Art of Singing* (London, 1609; STC 18853), p. 6.
  - 14 Robert Robinson, *The Art of Pronunciation* (London, 1617; STC 21122), p. 11.
  - 15 See, among others, Margaret Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan, and Nancy Vickers, *Reinventing the Renaissance: The Discourses of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986); Linda Boose, 'Scolding Brides and Bridling Scolds: Taming the Woman's Unruly Member,' *Shakespeare Quarterly* 42. 2 (1991): 179–213; Karen Newman, *Fashioning Femininity and English Renaissance Drama* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991); Catherine Belsey, *The Subject of Tragedy* (London and New York: Methuen, 1985); and Ann Rosalind Jones, *The Currency of Errors: Women's Love Lyric in Europe, 1540–1620* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990).
  - 16 Joseph Loewenstein, *Responsive Readings: Versions of Echo in Pastoral, Epic, and the Jonsonian Masque* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984), p. 54. Loewenstein offers a wealth of information about and richly developed readings of representations of Echo in the period. For more on literary representations of Echo, see John Hollander, *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After* (Los Angeles: UCLA Press, 1981).
  - 17 There have been some attempts to historicize translations of the *Metamorphoses*. Some studies match particular Ovid translations with the early authors who draw on Ovid. See Robert H. Ray, 'Marvell's "To His Coy Mistress" and Sandys's Translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*,' *Review of English Studies* 44. 175 (1993): 386–8; and Anthony Brian Taylor's numerous discussions of Shakespeare, Spenser and others' uses of Golding's translation ('Shakespeare and Golding: Viola's Interview with Olivia and Echo and Narcissus,' *English Language Notes* 15 [1977]: 103–6; 'Shakespeare's Use of Golding's Ovid as a Source for *Titus Andronicus*,' *Notes and Queries* 233 [1988]: 449–51; and 'Arthur Golding and the Elizabethan Progress of Actaeon's Dogs,' *Connotations* 1 [1991], 207–23). The purpose of these studies, primarily, is to shed light on non-Ovidian texts, not to explore the historical context of translations of Ovid. More thorough historical work has been done by those interested in contextualizing translators within a history of ideas. For instance, Peary's tightly theorized chapters on Sandys's translation deal with Sandys's use of Bacon and general relation to neoplatonic ideas. The essay that most closely models the kind of historical scholarship on the translated Ovid that I advocate is Raphael Lyne, 'Golding's Englished *Metamorphoses*,' *Translation and Literature* 5 (1996): 183–200. Lyne situates the translator Arthur Golding within his English Renaissance context, suggesting that Golding's 'language of heightened Englishness' may be evidence of his 'wish to promote his national culture' (p. 183). My approach differs from Lyne's and Peary's in that I focus on how early modern social conditions – specifically, early modern gender systems – might have influenced translations of Ovid.

- 18 Deborah Rubin, *Ovid's Metamorphoses Englished: George Sandys as Translator and Mythographer* (New York and London: Garland, 1985), p. 21.
- 19 Loewenstein, *Responsive Readings*, p. 48.
- 20 Arthur Golding, *The First Four Bookes of P. Ovidius Nasos worke, intituled Metamorphosis, translated oute of Latin into Englishish meter* (London, 1565), III, sig. B<sup>2r</sup>. Thomas Howell, *The Fable of Ovid tretting of Narcissus* (London, 1560), sig. A<sup>2v</sup>. Emphasis added.
- 21 Golding maintains the sense of *forte* in his translation, beginning the line, 'By chance,' (III, sig. B<sup>2v</sup>); Thomas Howell, *The Fable of Ovid Tretting of Narcissus* (1560), also introduces this moment with 'By chaunce' (sig. A<sup>11ir</sup>). In Henry Reynolds's less literate translation (1632), Narcissus calls out to his friends because he hears a 'noise among the bushes greene / That unawares her [Echo's] foote did (tripping) make.' Echo's mishap, her unplanned misstep, thus serves as the catalyst for Narcissus's initiated discourse.
- 22 *The Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971).
- 23 Many critics refer to Echo in these terms, but I am citing specifically SunHee Kim Gertz, 'Echoes and Reflections of Enigmatic Beauty in Ovid and Marie de France,' *Speculum* 73.2 (1998): 383.
- 24 *The Riverside Shakespeare*, 2nd ed. Boston & New York: (Houghton Mifflin Company, 1997).
- 25 I am referring here to Jonson's *Gynthia's Ravels*, 1.2, where Mercury calls for Echo and she appears on stage, played by a visible actor. In Jonson's play, Echo does more than just repeat the ends of others' speeches – she speaks about forty independent lines.
- 26 Sandys completed his translation of the first five books of the *Metamorphoses* while settled in Virginia and published them in 1621 when he returned to England, making this the first printed work known to be written in the colonized New World. The first edition of this five-book translation has not been found, but a copy of the second edition is owned by the Folger Library (STC 18963.5). Sandys made very few changes to his translation as it moved from one edition to the next. For more publishing history and differences between editions, see Fredson Bowers and Richard Beale Davis, 'George Sandys: A Biographical Catalogue of Printed Editions in England to 1700' (New York: New York Public Library, 1950); and James C. McManaway, 'The First Five Bookes of Ovid's *Metamorphosis*, 1621, Englished by Master George Sandys,' in *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia* 1 (1848–9): 71–82.
- 27 Christopher Grose provides a helpful index of the names and places mentioned in Sandys's commentary section. See Ovid's '*Metamorphoses*': *An Index to the 1632 Commentary of George Sandys* (Malibu: Undena Publications, 1981).

- 28 The influence of Baconian thought on Sandys's *Metamorphosis* is discussed at length by Pearcy. See also Grace Eva Hunter, 'The Influence of Frances Bacon on the Commentary of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* by George Sandys,' PhD diss. (State University of Iowa, 1949).
- 29 Francis Bacon, *Sylva Sylvarum, or a Natural Historie* (London, 1626), p. 249.
- 30 Echo's 'weake and shady' reflection further recalls her fictive nature by reference to Platonic ideas about the relation between art, nature, and truth.
- 31 I cite Sir Arthur Gorge's translation of Bacon's *De Sapientia Veterum*, entitled *The Wisdom of the Ancients* (London, 1619), p. 37.
- 32 Loewenstein, *Responsive Reading*, p. 24. Loewenstein's remarks on Bacon's view of Echo are worth quoting in full: 'Echo no longer appears as the uncanny discursiveness of the world; instead, Echo figures the conformity of discourse to the world. Echo no longer opposes human voice, no longer mimics our voice, for her voice has become ours.'
- 33 This version of the Pan-Echo relationship appears in Longus's narrative of *Daphnis and Chloe*, trans. George Thornley (London: Heinemann, 1916), Book III, 23.
- 34 Reynolds, *Mythomystes*, p. 110.
- 35 On the centrality of sound to early modern modalities of perception and cognition, see Bruce R. Smith, *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England: Attending to the Q-Factor* (Chicago and London: Chicago University Press, 1999).
- 36 Bacon, *Sylva Sylvarum*, no. 700.
- 37 Rubin, *Ovid's Metamorphoses*, pp. 156–8.
- 38 Elizabeth Harvey, *Ventriloquized Voices: Feminist Theory and English Renaissance Texts* (New York: Routledge, 1992), p. 120.
- 39 *Ibid.*, pp. 122–3.
- 40 *Ibid.*
- 41 Deborah Greenhut, *Feminine Rhetorical Culture: Tudor Adaptations of Ovid's 'Heroides'* (New York: Peter Lang, 1988), p. 59.
- 42 Of course, neither Harvey nor Greenhut is specifically interested in the Echo figure of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. By singling out their limited readings of echoic voice, I intend only to demonstrate that oversights of echoic vocal power can occur even amongst feminist critics who are familiar with Ovid and with his subversive representations of female speech.
- 43 Harvey, *Ventriloquized Voices*, p. 120.
- 44 Greenhut, *Feminine Rhetorical Culture*, pp. 11–12.
- 45 In addition to Harvey and Greenhut, see de Luce, 'O for a Thousand Tongues to Sing,' and Jones, *The Currency of Eros*. Amy Lawrence similarly posits Ovid's Echo as victim of 'a patriarchal system that wants to keep women silent.' In Lawrence's study of the female voice in cinema, Echo – her

- 'voice ... continually taken from her' – is a symbol of cinema's subordination of sound to image (*Echo and Narcissus: Women's Voices in Classical Hollywood Cinema* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991], p. 7).
- 46 Other critics who have discussed the significance of this conflation include Boose, 'Scolding Brides and Bridling Scolds'; Patricia Parker, 'On the Tongue: Cross Gendering, Effeminacy, and the Art of Words,' *Style* 23 (1989): 445–65; and Peter Stallybrass, 'Patriarchal Territories: The Body Enclosed,' in *Rewriting the Renaissance*, pp. 123–42.
- 47 Judith Butler, *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative* (New York and London: Routledge, 1997), pp. 15–16.
- 48 Lynn Enterline discusses how the emergence of female subjectivity disrupts the stability of masculine identity. See especially her chapter 5, "'Hairy on the Inside': The Duchess of Malfi and the Body of Lycanthropy," which discusses echoes and linguistic slipperiness, in *The Tears of Narcissus: Melancholy and Masculinity in Early Modern Writing* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995), pp. 242–303.
- 49 Mary Ellen Lamb and Katharine Maus discuss Stoic silence as one such alternative model of female 'voicing.' Lamb and Maus point out ways that early modern women could work within the Stoic tradition of silence as a refusal to speak or express emotion, converting imposed constraints into heroic postures (Lamb, 'The Countess of Pembroke and the Art of Dying,' in *Women in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: Literary and Historical Perspectives*, ed. Mary Beth Rose [Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1986]; Maus, *Inwardness and Theater in the English Renaissance* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995], chapter 3). Work on silence as an empowered stance importantly problematizes the overly simplistic conflation of speech and power that has been pervasive in feminist criticism. But, as Lamb herself points out, 'the cost exacted by these forms of heroism is high,' for Stoicism necessitates 'the suppression of the display of basic emotions ... without which no person can be whole' (p. 223). I would add that studies of silence exact a further cost, for they can perpetuate a misleading speech/silence binary: reexaminations of silence challenge one side of the speech/silence binary, but this leaves intact the other side, reinforcing a narrow signification of speech.

## The Ovidian Hermaphrodite: Moralizations by Peend and Spenser

MICHAEL PINCOMBE

In the final stanzas of the three-book version of *The Faerie Queene* (1590), Edmund Spenser presents his readers with a visionary image of the reunion of the separated lovers Amoret and Scudamour. This reunion is a physical one, as is made clear by an intriguing comment of the author:

Had ye them scene, ye would haue surely thought,  
That they had been that faire *Hermaphrodite*,  
Which that rich *Romane* of white marble wrought,  
And in his costly Bath caused to be site.<sup>1</sup>

It is very curious that Spenser should refer his readers to what appears to be a fairly obscure example of hermaphroditic statuary described in an epigram contained in the *Greek Anthology*, rather than to the *locus classicus* of the theme as depicted by Ovid in the tale of Hermaphroditus and Salmacis in the fourth book of his *Metamorphoses*.<sup>2</sup> But Spenser had his reasons. By calling up an image of luxury and titillation – for what other purpose can be served by the marble hermaphrodite in the decadent Roman's 'costly Bath'? – Spenser draws attention to the sinister side of the legend of Hermaphroditus as told by Ovid and passed on by earlier Elizabethan writers, in particular, by the adaptation of the tale by the little-known Thomas Peend in his *Pleasant Fable of Hermaphroditus and Salmacis* (1565).<sup>3</sup> Peend's poem helps us see what might be called the 'satirical' perspective on the 'hermaphroditic union' of Scudamour and Amoret in *The Faerie Queene*.

Here I take my lead from Jonathan Crewe's comments in his *Trials of Authorship* on what he calls 'a certain mimetic or identificatory desire' to produce large, synthesizing representations of counteronomologal immo-