of the *Fasti*, which Ovid claims existed (*Tr.* 2. 549–52), possibly contained so much astrological material in the months from July to September that he deemed them inoperable, and so discarded them. The transferral of anniversaries from the latter half of the year to the first half, such as the foundation legend of Hercules' Ara Maxima from 12 August to 11 January (1. 543–86), and the slaughter of the Fabii from 18 July to 13 February (2. 195–242), or even of brief notices such as the Dog Days of July/August to April/May (4. 904, 937–40; 5. 723), indicates not only that those books had been written; it also makes one suspect that Ovid was papering over large gaps created by the removal of inappropriate material in an effort to salvage as much of his poem as he could. Ovid's *Fasti* is not only half missing; that which we have is also a provisional text, begun twice and abandoned twice in two different political climates, and approached from two different personal and geographical perspectives. Such a text, like a diary, cannot represent a coherent pattern or a fixed perception. Its historical value lies in its unfinished state, in its record of the immediacy of its author's attempts to negotiate his way around each landmine as he saw it planted in a rapidly changing political terrain. The text we have cannot have been circulated earlier than the principate of Tiberius. But if Ovid was celebrated as a poet who achieved perfection in his art (Vell. Pat. 2. 36. 3) in the very decade that Tiberius was conducting purges of subversive literature (see p. vii), then the political antennae of the *Fasti*'s author must have been picking up the right signals.

6

Seen, not Heard: *Feminea Lingua* in Ovid's *Fasti* and the Critical Gaze

PETER MARK KEEGAN

adnue conanti per laudes ire tuorum. (*Fasti* 1. 15)

The starting point for this study is an observation by self-confessed 'sedentary literary critic' Leslie Cahoon (1991). In a recent number of the methodological journal *Helios*, Cahoon was struck by the degrees of difference in 'understandings of the interpretative task'[1] brought to bear on classical literature in general and the Ovidian corpus in particular. This apprehension of critical perspectives should not necessarily surprise the reader of ancient (or modern) texts, but its implications for the continuing appraisal of gender relations, sexuality, and the body are considerable and warrant discussion.

The intention of this chapter is to explore the praxis underlying different interpretative understandings of canonical narratives, with particular reference to the first two books of Ovid's *Fasti*, and the extent to which these variations illuminate or occlude the (con)textualized female figures which often feature as entrées to critical exegesis. Specifically, I would contend that the ways by which Ovid engages in the process of meaning-production regarding *l'autre femme* are reflected (refracted?) in the interpretative practices of certain modern literary-critical commentators.

In other words, it is possible to draw a parallel between the ideological topography which tempered Ovid's textual artefact and that which (similarly?) constrains modern criticism's hermeneutic. The historical contingencies and aesthetic

[1] Cahoon (1991) 202.

dependencies delimiting Ovid's chosen (required?) oeuvre were indelibly rooted in a kyriarchic[2] and explicitly reactionary cross-cultural 'reality'. The marked discursive forces operating within this social-cultural *Wirklichkeit* extend from the so-called 'power politics' and abusive hierarchies of the developing Augustan milieu to the morally/legislatively repressed material circumstances and perceptible experiences of marginalized individuals/populations (slaves, foreigners, the poor, social-sexual deviants of any gender, women, and so on). Here, the excision of *feminea lingua* (on so many levels) may be shown to operate as a convincing litmus test for the degree to which a literary work like Ovid's 'tempora digesta' (*Fasti* 1. 1) was immersed in (and co-opted by) the prevailing masculinist standpoint. However, a parallel annihilation of the female subject-position in the preoccupations of some modern literary analyses of work may be viewed (on a sliding scale) as the product of unwitting accomplices or thinking perpetrators of *scientia sexualis*. While not wishing to have this (type)cast as another humourless overinterpretion of *intentio auctoris/operis*, I believe the study of a work so integral to the (?self-)definition of such an epistemically significant period in Roman history should acknowledge the enforced silencing of women (poetic constructs or Imperial consorts alike), and attempt to redress the continuing imbalance.

In this light, the following survey will include commentary on select excerpts from *Fasti* 1. As well, a 'rereading' of the successive *aitia* in *Fasti* 2 will seek to uncover the discursive imperatives which Ovid *and* his critics link to ritual(ized) female activity. To conclude the discussion, I append a gendered exploration of Ovid's account of the *Regifugium* (*Fasti* 2. 685–852). The rape of Lucretia has proven a fruitful narrative field for ancient (e.g. Livy, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Diodorus Siculus)[3] and modern (e.g. Donaldson, Moses, Joshel, Newlands,[4] *et al.*) (re)configurations of traditional discourses. The focus will linger on the manifold registration

[2] The terms 'kyriarchy' and 'kyriocentrism' relate to a socio-political system of domination and subordination based on the power and rule of the lord/master/father. These neologisms are explained in Fiorenza (1995).

[3] *AUC* 1. 53–60; Dionysius of Halicarnassus 4. 64–85; Didorus Siculus 10. 20–2.

[4] Donaldson (1982); Moses (1993); Joshel (1992); Newlands (1995).

of *feminea lingua muta*, the (often contradictory) strategies by which that voicelessness was/is constrained, and a reading which proffers a parallel (re)construction designed to coexist with (not subsume or suborn) extant interpretations. It is hoped that such a reading will interpenetrate the already circulating matrix of differing explanatory standpoints, and suggest a methodology for delimiting and abnegating the perpetuation of the Philomela/Tacita syndrome in contemporary literary-critical (and histori(ographi)cal) practices.

(i) Il Poeta e il Critico: Ovidio e il Discorso Fallogocentrico[5]

> tunc sic ego nostra [ora] resolvi
> voce mea voces eliciente dei.
>
> Then I opened [my lips] ['broke silence'] thus,
> drawing out the god's words with my (human) voice. (*Fasti* 1. 255–6)

An example offers. Over against the 'traditional interpreters' of the *Fasti* (giving priority to literary motivations in Ovid's treatment of cult and theology), a review of recent academic 'readings' of the Roman poet singles out a 'brilliant presentation' at the 1990 Cambridge University Laurence Seminar by Alessandro Barchiesi.[6] Let's look at what this distinguished contributor to intertextual Ovidian studies does to the metaphorical (metalinguistic?) female abstractions, the 'goddesses [who] disagreed' (*dissensere deae*) of *Fasti* 5. 9. Barchiesi's 'new vision' of Ovid's calendar[7] sees the pre-exilic poet's discordant chorus of Muses as 'a perfect analogy or illustration for the traditional range of literary forms'. That is, Polyhymnia may give voice to a hymnic tradition, Calliope conforms to a narrative tradition, and Urania may be in line with a tradition of Roman didactic poetry. But, Barchiesi adds to (his interpretation of) Ovid's discursive 'intention', the goddesses are (it would seem) inadequate to the literary programme of the work. As he tells us, the Muses' songs can 'only reproduce the

[5] I borrow this rubric from the title of Barchiesi (1994).

[6] The review: Fantham (1995) 51; the paper: Barchiesi (1991).

[7] Fantham (1995).

repertory of what has already been said, and cannot offer suggestions for a new literary genre'.[8] On functional, thematic, and literary levels, the god Janus displaces the discordant female convocation as a far more effective alternative voice. Without straining the analogy, one cannot help noting the operation of a parallel intertextuality between the criticized and the critic. The same masculinist imperative (which seeks at every turn to slay the 'fearsome woman') would also appear superordinate in the regulatory strategies of sociolinguistic aetiology (Ovid's or Barchiesi's).

In a similar vein, Ovid's first mention of mortal and divine female protagonists is given over to the selfsame *Ianus biceps*, originary deity of the calendrical cycle. The poet's declaration of narrative strategy is explicit, and an appropriate analogue for the alleged complicity of poetic-critical speaking voices (1. 255–6 cited above). In technical terms, Ovid elides the primary and secondary focalizers of his narrative by blurring the distinction between Janus' voice and his own. How the poet deploys gender here neatly mirrors his structural suppression. The two-headed god's response to Ovid's query about the location of his temple associates the topographical loci of 'arx', 'valles', and 'fora' (*Romanum* and *Iulium*) with a gendered account of the Sabine assault on Rome during Romulus' reign. Janus foregrounds the implements of war carried by the quasi-Spartan Sabine king (260: '[ille] protinus Oebalii rettulit arma Tati' ('[Janus] forthwith recalled the arms of Tatius of Oebalia'). In doing so, he (god and poet) contrasts militaristic Tatius with the anonymous, 'light-minded' guardian who took (as a bribe) bracelets in exchange for betraying her charge (261: 'levis custos armillis capta' ('capricious guardian, captivated by (Sabine) armlets')). To name Tarpeia is (it would seem) unnecessary. The *scientia sexualis* of this legendary 'traitress keeper' is common knowledge.[9]

So, too, is the prejudicial epithet of 'Saturnia invidiosa', invoked to describe the mythopoeic opponent of protective Janus. Although Livy accords Romulus the privilege of defending Rome from the Sabine attack, Ovid allots the lion's share

[8] Barchiesi (1991) 15.
[9] Frazer's equally complicit translation of 'levis custos' (1931) 21.

to his divine interlocutor. Moreover, Livian Romulus vows a temple to Jupiter, but Ovidian Janus thwarts Saturn's 'envious daughter'. Like Tarpeia, Juno is unnamed and lacks physical description. However, the poet's only other oblique reference (267: 'cum tanto veritus committere numine pugnam' ('afraid to engage in a hand-to-hand fight with so great a deity')) is enough to picture the goddess's martial iconography (wearing a goatskin and carrying a shield and spear). How much of the character of Greek Hera is subsumed in this (re)presentation can only be guessed. Yet the poet (like Janus) manages to divert whatever agency she might possess through the ingenuity of his craft.

In less than a dozen couplets, Ovid/Janus has reviled Tarpeia, subverted Juno, expunged any vestige of the un-Roman, and elevated masculinist cunning to the status of superordinate godhead. The allusive elegance of the poet's end-stopped, self-contained narrative should not blind us to its hegemonic economy. Consequently, when Barchiesi notes that this story 'could be seen as containing the poetics of the *Fasti* in a nutshell',[10] I concur. However, his argument (that the 'elegiac reduction' of Ovid's epic project in 1. 260 ff. sets up 'a new kind of poetic exercise') seems to rehearse the poet's gendered discourse in a manner analogous to the previously identified narrative strategy. Though named, we (the modern reader) are reminded that Tarpeia was 'killed with "armis" (in *Met*[*amorphoses*] 14. 777)'; though it is 'her story', 1. 260 ff. 'recalls Propertius 4. 4'.[11] Juno fares equally poorly. Her picture is 'far less grandiose [than we expect]', and her epithet is noted only for the abrupt reduction of its epic quality. In the penultimate paragraph of his critique, Barchiesi observes that 'it is not so easy to see the connection between Janus and the formal structure of the poem, the choice of elegiac metre'.[12] Against this, I would argue that the relationship is readily apparent, but only if the critical *sensorium* is attuned to sociolinguistic as well as metalinguistic references. After all, the bicapital gaze of Janus/Ovid may be just as much a desiring as an authoritatively reasonable one.

[10] Barchiesi (1991) 15. [11] Barchiesi (1991) 15. [12] Barchiesi (1991) 16.

A final discordant musing. Barchiesi views Ovid's treatment of *dissensere deae* in 5. 9 and the first hundred lines of Book 6 as 'iconoclastic', 'irreverent', and 'detached'.[13] To account for the poet's 'juxtaposition of alternative and incompatible versions' of aetiological explanation, Barchiesi invokes a 'mischievous inversion' of Callimachean technique and an aporetic aversion to the 'traditional range of literary forms'.[14] This literary-critical evaluation of the Muses' stylistic and didactic worth effectively metastasizes the singers to the song.[15]

Compare such an interpretative metamorphosis of the syncretic female (as poetic voice and intention) with Ovid's exposition of 'concordia' under the sign of 16 January (1. 637–50). In this entry, Ovid invests the 'templa' and 'ara' of Concord with an all-encompassing array of personal, familial, civic, and national insignia. For a start, much could be made of the poet's expressly gendered alignment of exempla, past and present, and *virtutes*, emblematic of harmonious social relations–Rome's steadfast military tribune, *interrex*, and dictator, 'populi superator Etrusci' (M. Furius Camillus); Germany's conquering 'dux venerandus' (Tiberius); and the idealized 'genetrix' (Livia). Consider, further, the explicitly gendered context of this citation. Under the Ides of January, Ovid celebrates the exclusively male prerogative of martial honour. Elegy is assimilated to *elogium*, and a catalogue of indelibly foundationalist family portraits is elucidated.[16] Viewing the imprimatur of military command is as imperative as attending to the memory of the dead (591: 'perlege dispositas generosa per atria ceras' ('survey the waxen images arranged through the noble entrance halls')). 'But nevertheless', Ovid sings, 'all these [Fabii] are praised with human honours' (607: 'sed tamen *humanis* celebrantur honoribus *omnes*'). Male-referential 'omnes' is reinforced by species-exclusive 'humanis'. If we

[13] Barchiesi (1991) 2. [14] Barchiesi (1991) 8, 14.

[15] 'We can now begin to understand why Ovid, unlike Callimachus, makes a limited use of the Muses as informants. *The Muses* differ from other divinities in that they *are associated with certain forms of speech*; we might even say that they *are tied to certain literary genres*' (Barchiesi (1991) 10–11; italics added).

[16] P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus and P. Servilius Vatia Isauricus (593), Q. Caecilius Metellus Creticus (594), P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus Africanus Numentinus (596), Nero Claudius Drusus (597), T. Manlius Torquatus (601), M. Valerius Corvus (602), Cn. Pompeius Magnus (603), the Fabii (605).

'read' Ovid's version of the 'imagines' in this way, his list may then logically be seen to culminate in the 'leading man', that is, hypermasculine Augustus. Moreover, signifier and signified (like the discordant *Musae*) are one: 'sancta augusta' (609). This business of imperial(ist) subordination (whether *res gestae* or *Romanae*) is unequivocally (and univocally) Man's work–one man's (Augustus, Tiberius, Germanicus), all men's. The equation is simple and ideologically rigid (613–16: 'imperium nostri ducis . . . orbis onus' ('the *imperium* of our leader . . . the weight of the world')), and exposes the 'Law of the Father' as the founding principle against which the burden of rule is measured (*deis, heres, pater*).

Interestingly, this normative explication of masculinist priority gives over under 15 January to a deviant aetiology firmly embedded in gendered elegiac terrain. In sharp contrast to the founding myth of 1. 468–542,[17] Ovid confounds reader expectations of further traditional topoi with a terse, evocative vignette of abortifacient mothers and capitulating fathers (621: 'matronaque destinat omnis' ('every married woman resolved')); 625–6: 'patres . . . | ius tamen ereptum restituisse ferunt' ('the fathers [that is, the senators] are said to have restored the right taken from [the mothers]'). Contextually and thematically, including this episode represents a poetic inversion as mischievous (in gendered terms) as Barchiesi's previously noted anti-Callimachean twist. No longer a sacred mother giving voice to divine truths (472: 'sacrae sanguine matris' ('by the blood of a holy mother')); 474: 'ore dabat pleno carmina vera dei' ('with sonorous voice, she continued to give utterance to the actual prophecies of the deity')), but rather a sceptical Ovid ('ferunt') retailing a story of expropriated honour, sexual abstinence and abnegation, baseless reprimand, and just restitution, enshrined in calendrical ritual. This scenario could not be further from the charted topographies of *res Romanae* (Evander > Pallas > Aeneas > Caesar > Augustus) and the economy of deified motherhood (536: Iulia Augusta = Livia apotheosized) foretold by Carmentis. Dynastic certitudes

[17] A quasi-ekphrastic lay of dynastic guardianship (along resolutely Virgilian lines), sung to the poet by Evander's prophetic mother, Carmentis herself, full of divine incantation ('carmen').

and imperial sureties are problematized (531–2: 'et penes Augustos patriae tutela manebit | hanc fas imperii frena tenere domum' ('and guardianship of the fatherland will remain in the power of Augustus; it is proper that this house control the bridle of *imperium*')). Instead, Ovid interweaves his aetiology of the two Carmentes (Porrima and Postverta) and the renewal of a reproductive social ethos with the twin stigmata of ritual prohibition and appeasement of indeterminate female entities (633–4: 'sive sorores | sive fugae comites Maenali diva tuae' ('whether sisters or companions of your exile, Maenalian goddess')). As such, the 'tempora digesta' may register the new 'templa' of Juno Moneta (629: 'scortea non illi fas est inferre sacello' ('it is not right to introduce leather things into her little shrine')) and its proximity in spatial and programmatic terms to *Concordia*. However, by then, the problematic nature of social relations and the fractured networks of exchange underpinning any vision of a normative Roman ideal have been exposed. Ovid's calculated contrast between the alternative entries for the Carmentalia cuts across specifically literary implications to highlight the integral relationship of sexuality and the body to *any* 'reading' of Roman social-cultural history.

(ii) Reviewing and Rereading the Agenda: Ovid and the 'New' Scholarship[18]

haec mea militia est: ferimus quae possumus arma.
This is my military service: I take up the weapons that I can. (*Fasti* 2. 9)

In the course of delivering the 1994 Todd Memorial Lecture at the University of Sydney, Elaine Fantham gave a checklist of approaches intended to supplement contemporary 'readings' of the *Fasti*.[19] While an otherwise embracing catalogue of evaluative tools was elegantly unpacked, the interpretative category of gender was not included as part of Fantham's literary-critical roster. Given the (at least reasonable) significance of the latter as a subdivision of textual explanation,

[18] This heading is a paraphrase of the title of Fantham (1995).
[19] Fantham (1995) 52–3.

one could remark at the absence. With a mind to instating the implications of the sex/gender sociolinguistic system, let's briefly consider Fantham's four-point guide to 'an informed neutral reading' of Ovid's text, with reference to a selection of *aitia* in *Fasti* 2.

We are first encouraged to examine the poet's historical choices, measuring these against prior and subsequent historiographical versions as well as the contemporary epigraphical record. In this regard, recognizing Ovid's criteria for his treatment of social-sexual episodes in Graeco-Roman mythopoeic and histori(ographi)cal tradition would seem an equally useful exercise preparatory to any 'reading'. In the same light, a case can be made for gendered studies of other members of the elite (male) literary canon, and even of the epigraphic corpus.[20]

J. G. Frazer's 1931 translation[21] of 2. 41–2 provides some idea of the need for extending the ambit of this initial approach.

vectam frenatis per inane draconibus Aegeus
credulus inmerita Phasida fovit ope:

Wafted through the void by bridled dragons, the Phasian witch received a welcome, which she little deserved, at the hands of trusting Aegeus.

Interestingly, Frazer interpolates the less-than-oblique 'Phasian witch' (with explanatory footnote) for the suffixed feminine abstraction *Phasida(m)*. Medea's monstrous choice and extraordinary flight (from the 'dead hearts' consequent on that choice) were deservedly notorious. Yet the poetry (re)presents her in terms which (at one and the same time) demark a locus prior to the distressing teleology of desire, murder, and sorcerous escape, and which place her within the protective embrace of a(nother) foster-male ('Aegeus credulus . . . fovit ope'). She is caught in the lyric spotlight of before-and-after, and all else (which might distinguish her humanity) is (like the vacuum of space across which she is drawn) *inane*–empty, lifeless, *without*.

Superimposed on this paradigmatic template (passive female/bestial consort > active male/naïve protector), Ovid

[20] For an example of the former, see Keegan (1997); for an extended study of the latter, see id. (forthcoming).
[21] Frazer (1931) 59.

associates the deviant infamy of Euripidean motherhood (Medeanhood?) with the matricidal son of Eriphyle and Amphiaraus. In each case, the female (as monster or victim) is unnamed; she is rendered through allusion only (aetiological or patronymic). Both women are already the stuff of mythopoeic invention, and thus apt for the receptive function of creative metonymy. Ovid further reduces them to the status of masculinist guilt-objects (Aegeus' help: 'inmerita'; Alcmaeon's murder (45): 'tristia crimina caedis'). If one hoped for anything approaching a sympathetic or rounded allusion to female agency or participation, 'a! nimium faciles' (45). Medea and Eriphyle are signifiers of betrayal for Ovid. Perversely rejecting the sureties of the reproductive and patriarchal economies, they are marked with/for death by the poet. The intertextual citation of Jason's and Achelous' responses to deviant female treachery puts paid to any suggestion that Ovid's choice was anything but deliberate.

As such, Ovid's 'choices' must be regarded (at least in this instance) as well and truly embedded in a sociolinguistic discursive system. In relation to Ovid's gendered allusions, it is perhaps apt to note a subsequent aside of the elegist (47): 'antiqui ne nescius ordinis erres'. 'Lest you, ignorant of the ancient order, go astray' is trenchant advice; and just as expedient in light of antiquity's regulatory idealization of sex/gender as when viewing the succession of the months and the significances of their rituals.

This leads into Fantham's second item, reading Ovid *against* the previous poetic tradition. Here, the need to take into account Virgil's *Georgics* as much as the *Aeneid* is given as exemplary practice. If, however, we were to attach a sexualized dimension to that poetic tradition, the modern interpreter might well catch sight of certain strategies employed by the poet in aid (or as a part) of the prevailing discursive system. Adopting this plan of attack might elicit a 'different narrative' indeed from the conventional reading of 'Aeneas's colonising achievement'.[22]

Arion's tale (2. 79–118) clarifies the narrative thrust already observed in the preceding entries. It is (once more) said

[22] Fantham (1995) 53.

('fertur') that the reputed author of the dithyramb could still the running water, the ravening wolf, and the chattering crow alike with his music; likewise, the natural(ized) instincts of hound, lioness, and hawk are reversed by his song (84–90). In the same mode, Cynthia (one of Ovid's allusive references to the goddess of the light and moon, the huntress Diana) is consistently struck dumb when Arion raises his voice. Just as she does (it is suggested) when exposed to her twin-brother Apollo's measured strains (91–2: 'Cynthia saepe tuis fertur vocalis Arion | tamquam fraternis obstipuisse modis' ('Cynthia is said to have been struck dumb often by your melodies, sonorous Arion, as if by her brother's measures')). Like the wild things of the world, even a goddess is astounded and stupefied ('obstipescit') at the sound of 'her master's voice'.

Bestial nature now senseless, Ovid is (as in 2. 55–66) at liberty to pursue his encomiastic subtext: 'di pia facta vident' (117: 'the gods see devout acts'). It is a familiar theme. And whose *res gestae* does the Ovidian muse extol? Arion, the lyre's master (82)—and, more importantly for Ovid's project here, the heir to Phoebus' crown (105–6: 'capit ille coronam | quae possit crines Phoebe decore tuos' ('he took the crown which might become the hair on your head, Phoebus')—stands firm against the venality and greed of the mob, in order that he might bring home the wealth his art had won (96: 'quaesitas arte ferebat opes'). Complementarily, Ovid, self-styled elegiac Homer (119–20: 'mihi . . . vellem Maeonide pectus inesse tuum' ('I could wish that your spirit, Maeonides, belonged to me')), sings of the super-Father—*sancte pater patriae* (127), *pater orbis* (130), *hominum pater* (132), *nomen principis* (142). And, if in any doubt, Ovid assures his audience that his previous intimations of divine consecration for Caesar—this guardian of Rome's boundaries (134–5), the conqueror of the known world (138), wrong's avenger (140), and foeman's pardoner (143)—were deliberate (144: 'caelestem fecit te pater'). The 'Law of the Father' reigns supreme (141: 'florent sub Caesare leges' ('under Caesar, laws flourish')). Even the reproductive economy is colonized by the kyriarchy's song; the discourse of appropriation completes the multiple inversions of Arion's (ironically) Lesbian lyre.

Fantham's third suggestion—not to forget Ovid's *earlier* work—follows closely on from the preceding supplementary approach. But by glossing 'the mindset of an erotic poet and a sympathy for sexual enjoyment' *only* in terms of the poet's relationship with the Augustan *mentalité*, Fantham's 'reading' seems inadequate (or, at the least, unnecessarily limiting). What does Ovid's deployment of 'a developed elegiac tradition' which 'left his readers with an expectation of eroticism' require of the (post-)modern literary-historical interpreter's 'reading' of episodes like, say, the previously discussed abortifacient Ausonian mothers of *Fasti* 1. 617–36?

In this light, the metamorphosis of the hamadryad Callisto (2. 153–92) is an explicitly eroticized narrative which extends Fantham's interrogation of the poet's earlier oeuvre into disturbing territory. The teleology of the account is clear-cut:

- vowed chastity (Diana = Cynthia = Phoebe sanctions Callisto's sexual renunciation) >
- divine rape (162: 'de love crimen habet' ('on account of Jupiter, she bears the offence')) >
- personal shame (168: 'erubuit falso virginis illa sono'; 170: 'hanc pudet') >
- community repudiation (173–4: Diana's rejection of Callisto) >
- divine anger (177: 'laesa furit Iuno formam mutatque puellae' ('vexed Juno is furious, and changes the young woman's form')).

The creative permutations of the story slot neatly into Laura Mulvey's definition of 'voyeurism'.[19] Under this rubric, sexual difference is (re)presented as 'woman's castration'; the complicit author constructs a plot exposing her crime and justifying her penalty. So, when Ovid poses the question, 'quid facis? Invito est pectore passa Iovem' (178: 'Why do you do this [Juno]? Though her spirit was unwilling, she submitted to

[19] Mulvey (1989). In the context of voyeuristic interplay between author and audience, Mulvey notes that 'pleasure lies in ascertaining guilt . . . asserting control and subjugating the guilty person through punishment or forgiveness' (22).

Jupiter'), we must measure his deceptively liberal rhetoric against the following citations:

'puer furto conceptus' (183: 'the boy conceived by trickery')
'gemitus verba parentis erant' (186: 'his parent's words were a groan')
'hanc puer ignarus iaculo fixisset acuto' (187: 'the unknowing boy would have pierced her with his sharp javelin').

Underpinning Callisto's transformation is a masculinist imperative naturalizing female speech as animal-like and evoking her polluted alterity in brutish physical terms. Callisto may be innocent, but she is powerless to defend herself against the desire of a (man-made) god, the intractable exclusionist fury of a (woman-hating?) goddess-consort, and the threatened initiate manhood of a (mother-fearing?) son.

It is simply impossible to accommodate an individual woman within so many deviant categories. The very suspicion that 'she, believed to be a maiden, was a mother' (176: 'virgo credita mater erat') resulted in outrage, relegation, and inversion. So all that is left for the *aition* to subside once more into semantic and sociolinguistic equilibrium is Ovid's stellar sleight of hand. Callisto and her son are translated into the astral plane, beyond (it would at first seem) the attitudinal tensions of the material world. Yet even here, Juno 'frets and begs' the wife of Ocean, Tethys (191: 'saevit, rogat') never to pollute her waters by touching and washing Maenalus' bear (192: 'tactis ne lavet Arcton aquis'). Because, in the mythological realm (and, by extension, the social-cultural 'reality' of the poet and his audience), that's the way it is.

Finally, Fantham suggests that her audience take into account the only partly revised nature of Ovid's text (whether pre- or post-exilic). This request does not preclude (and, in point of fact, implicitly encourages) an exploration of any developments in (or deviations from) the regulatory idealizations of class, ethnicity, wealth, ideology, gender, and so on; for example, the conceptualization of the (fe)male-as-category in the Lucretia episode culminating *liber secundus* (see the 'rereading' of this story in Section (iv) below). After all, gendered discourses may be just as revisionist as ideological (read: politico-civic) ones.

(iii) The Metamorphosis of Lara: Ovid and the Self-Conscious Inquirer[24]

> voltu pro verbis illa precatur
> et frustra muto nititur ore loqui.
>
> In place of words, [Lara] entreats [Mercury] with a look,
> And in vain makes an effort to speak with speechless mouth.
> (*Fasti* 2. 613–14)

A corollary to the foregoing study of gender-exclusive literary criticism can be found in other treatments of Ovid. The superordination of *Quellenfrage* over gendered critique is particularly evident in a recent study by Stephen Hinds. His discussion of the relationship between the archaic Greek poem the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* and Ovid's version of the rape of Persephone in *Fasti* 4 focuses on structural and material influences; his priority is artistic formulation, not sexualizing formations. This is not to gainsay Hinds's philological pursuit of sources and motivations or underrate his substantial critical exegeses. But the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* may legitimately be viewed as an archetypal textual treatment of ancient gender relations (divine and human) situated within an equally sexed ritual context (the Eleusinian Mysteries). Consequently, it would seem apt to consider what Ovid does—or, as Fantham[25] puts it, 'what Ovid always did by selection, combination, modification and choice of scale to emphasise or de-emphasise at will'—with the Homeric/Hesiodic tradition. To cite Hinds[26] with this 'new' emphasis in mind, 'half of the story of the *Homeric Hymn*'s influence on Ovid has yet to be told'.

Let's look first at the topological association between old women and sorcery prefacing Lara's tale (2. 571–82). 'Behold', says Ovid, 'an old woman, sitting down in the midst of girls, performs old rites for Tacita' (571–2: 'ecce anus in mediis residens annosa puellis | sacra facit Tacitae'). After the mysterious ritual actions are played out (in almost theatrical detail; compare the pantomimic conclusion to this Ovidian set-piece—582: 'exit anus'), the ostensible reason for the performance is

[24] I take this heading from the title of Hinds (1987*a*).

[25] Fantham (1995) 52.

[26] Hinds (1987*a*) 71.

revealed: to bind fast ('vincire') hostile tongues and unfriendly mouths (581: 'hostiles linguas inimicaque vinximus ora'). The female community is seen to enact a self-censorship which complements masculinist repressions: a policing of the 'enemy within' by those who 'speak-among-women'.[27] The phallogocentric imperative underlying such an interpretation of ritual female activity is emphatic. It (almost) goes without saying that wine is involved. It is shared by old and young women alike (580: 'aut ipsa aut comites . . . bibit'), and the prime celebrant departs drunk. It doesn't get any more stereotypical than this. Women are innately magical, indubitably bibulous, *and* prone to malicious gossip.

It is important to note the contradictory deferral of meaning Ovid invests in women's inherent relationship with natural, religious, and magical spaces. Women may be associated with the negative implications of these symbolic, social-cultural, and supernatural abstractions, but they are seldom allowed to use these abilities positively to effect change, especially regarding their own circumstances. In his aetiology of Juno Lucina (2. 425–52), for example, brides are incapable of achieving parthenogenetic or heterosexual conception, despite herbal lore, prayer, or magic spell (425–6: 'non tu pollentibus herbis | nec prece nec magico carmine mater eris' ('neither by strong herbs nor prayer nor magical incantation will you be a mother')). Only unsympathetic magic is deemed apt: a leather strap wielded by the reproductive male state (427: 'excipe fecundae patienter verbera dextrae' ('receive submissively the lashes of a prolific right hand!')).

The (inescapable) condition of female submission to male will is distressingly (en)gendered in Ovid's succeeding *aition*. By now, in the poet's enumeration of celestial libido, Jupiter's insatiable desire is (with apologies) legendary. As this discrete scenario unfolds (2. 583–616), Turnus' sister (Juturna) is the thunderer's object(ive). In a perhaps intentionally ironic twist, the lustful god's immoderate desire causes him to suffer

[27] This formulation draws on the philosophical insights of Luce Irigaray, particularly her focus on recovering the history of women and lost or marginalized traditions of female cultural production. 'Speaking-among-women' relates to Irigaray's work in identifying essentially feminine modes of (re)presentation as a challenge to the patriarchal symbolic order. A starting point for entry into this project is Irigaray (1991).

decidedly undivine ignominies (585–6: 'Iuppiter immodica Iuturnae victus amore | multa tulit tanto non patienda deo' ('Jupiter, overcome by immoderate love for Juturna, bore many things which ought not to be suffered by so great a deity')). The vocabulary of passive receptivity is singularly inappropriate when applied to the king of rapists. Such an offence will not be borne lightly.

As we have already seen in the account of Callisto's transformation, the intended victim's female companions (here, Juturna's sister-nymphs) are co-opted to the penetrator's gambit.[28] Thus, we (the modern reader, not Ovid's intended audience)[29] are treated to the unpalatable suggestion that the Tiberine nymphs collectively assent to the following syllogism. 'What is my great satisfaction', Jupiter declares, 'will be to your sister's advantage' (593–4: 'nam quae mea magna voluptas | utilitas vestrae magna sororis erit'). Masculinist 'voluptas' is identified with female 'utilitas'. Compelled union is (re)presented by the desiring god as 'for (Juturna's) good' (591: *quod expedit illi*).

It is at this point that the subordinationist[30] tradition takes a darker turn–and, given the plethora of twisted precedents, that's saying something. A Naiad nymph, Lara (or Lala) by name, unwilling to submit to such specious rationalization of manifest rape, spills the proverbial beans. Not only does this recidivist female speaker[31] inform Juturna of Jupiter's compact with a compliant sorority, but she sympathizes with the adulterer's/rapist's wife, Juno. Jupiter's vengeance is swift and terrible. Like Tereus, Jupiter is incapable of dealing with such

[28] We might also cite Livy's retelling of the compact forged between Romulus and the Sabine women (*1.* 9. 1–13. 6).

[29] I draw this distinction because many in Ovid's (male) audience would *not* have found 'Jupiter's' syllogistic argument 'unpalatable' at all. This is not meant to essentialize Ovid's gender-peers (elite and non-elite Graeco-Roman men of mid- to late Augustan Rome), but only to highlight a clear-cut discontinuity between ancient and modern perceptions of normative gender-relations.

[30] The 'subordinationist' standpoint avows domination of the Other (= any marginalized population). In relation to gender, it may be glossed as male domination of women's minds and bodies, and reflects a familial-social, ideological, political system of oppression.

[31] Ovid tells us that Lara's father cannot compel requisite silence (602: '"nata, tuo linguam". nec tamen illa tenet' ('"Hold your tongue, child!" And still she does not control it').

a blatant truth-telling. Swelling up, this time in the heat of anger, he tears out Lara's indiscreet tongue (607–8: 'Iuppiter intumuit quaque est non usa modeste | eripit huic linguam'). The destructive force of tumescent rapine is vivid and excruciatingly visceral. And, once again, the 'Law of the Father' intervenes (611: 'iussa Iovis fiunt').

This site of female subjection is well suited to the speechlessness of the dispossessed and deviant (609: 'locus ille silentibus aptus' ('that place is appropriate for those who are silent')). Disfigured and depersonalized, Lara is condemned to act out the role spared Juturna (612: 'dicitur illa duci tum placuisse deo [Mercurio]' ('it is said that she satisfied her guide the god')). Here, the disturbing voyeurism of the Callisto episode is revisited with scopophilic clarity and purpose.[32] Mercury's resolution to use force (613: 'vim parat hic'), in apposition to Lara's desperation and ultimately futile supplication (613–14 cited above), seems explicitly formulated to arrest and even stimulate an (inter-)active male imagination. Bereft even of the growl left to ursine Callisto ('gemitus verba parentis erant'), Lara is reduced to an assortment of coveted fragments ('voltus precans', 'os mutum'), qualified by vulnerable terminology ('pro verbis, frustra'). The irony of her name's etymological association (Lala, as if from 'lalein', 'to prattle') is intensified by the twin male burden she bears to her 'divine leader' (615: 'geminosque parit'). The 'prima syllaba' spoken twice (599–600) has been excised and recast as the paired guardians of the city (the *Lares Compitales* or *Praestites*). The final erasure of identity (*Lara*) through masculinized appropriation (*Lares*) completes this sordid episode.[33]

[32] Mulvey (1989) 21 notes that scopophilia 'builds up the beauty of the object, transforming it into something satisfying in itself'. One might compare this to Ovid's (re)presentation of the (unnamed) mistress of Hercules in the 'antiqua fabula plena ioci' of 2. 303–58. This 'mistress' (305: 'domnae iuvenis'), 'Maeonian *damsel*' (309, 352: 'Maeonis'), and 'Lydian *teen*' (356: 'Lyda puella')–Frazer's instructive translations (1931) 81, 83 are italicized–as portrayed as a collection of desirable fragments suggesting but still concealing the anatomical differences between the sexes. For instance, 'scented locks', 'shoulders' (309: 'odoratis capillis, humeros'), 'bosom' (310: 'sinu'); 'gauzy tunics' (319: 'tenuis tunicas'); and so on.

[33] Newlands (1995) 165 notes that, in Ovid's text, 'the *Lares* commemorate an act of sexual violence and the power of divine authority to restrict speech'. In doing so, she limits the impact of 'erotic and voyeuristic interest' by tying the generic expectations to 'the major founding myths' (160); in this instance, Augustus' restoration of the *Lares*

(iv) The (Other) Silence of Lucretia[34]

recordanti [imaginem] plura magisque [sensus] placent.
By remembering [her image], more and more [his senses] give him pleasure.
(*Fasti* 2. 770)

Inter alia, Fantham[35] and Newlands[36] recommend the 'new' reader to compare Ovid's version of events with that found in the Livian corpus. The 'historical romance' of the *Regifugium*–concluding the poet's treatment of February and the historiographer's account of pre-Republican Rome (*Fasti* 2. 685–852; *AUC* 1. 53–60)–seems most susceptible to analysis in this context. Ovid's claim to sing of a theme removed from the standpoint of annalistic prose (1. 1–2, 13–14), and the intervening years between publication of his work and Livy's (30 or more since the first edition of *Ab Urbe Condita*), argue the importance of noting any marked similarities or differences.

We may safely bypass the first two elements of this narrative (Sextus at Gabii, Brutus at Delphi). Ovid treads a similar path to Livy's variant, and follows the *patavinitas* of his retelling (if not in style or tone, then certainly in sequence and content). The fact that these episodes revolve around pivotal exploits and characterological expositions of male protagonists (the sons of lawless and tyrannical Tarquin and the un-Roman king's sister, Tarquinia) may reflect the social-cultural space within which certain stereotypical or idealized behaviours ('tyrannis', 'libertas') remained embedded over time, at least in the

cult. I have no difficulty in accepting the interdependency of the discourses of sexuality and power. What I am suggesting is that the affective, psychosexual dimension of this extremely (unusually?) brutal pattern of mutilation, rape, and silencing (as it relates to performative elegiac elaboration) cannot be glossed simply as an appropriated generic ploy. Ovid's annihilation of the female 'plays' as much with the (male) audience's psyche as its ideological complicities.

[34] This is a reworking of the rubric, 'The Silence of Lucretia', ch. 5 of Newlands (1995) 146–72.

[35] Fantham (1995) 52.

[36] For a close parallel 'reading' of Livy's and Ovid's dramatizations of the downfall of the Tarquins *in extenso*, see Newlands (1995) 146–55. I should add that her treatment only touches on (172) Lucretia's *oratio recta* in Ovid (see below), and makes no mention of the import of Tarquin's parallel speech (apart from its stereotypical masculinist controlling imagery).

(re)presentations of transgeneric literary modes like poetry and history.

Bringing each item to a climax, a comparison of the treatments given to the third anecdote (Lucretia's story) reveals a tell-tale deviation. This anomaly is bound up with the notions of freedom of female speech and gendered expression, masculinist description and the desiring gaze. For the first time in the second book, Ovid introduces a leading human female actor, and provides her with a fragment of *oratio recta* (*Fasti* 2. 745–54):[37]

'mittenda est domino (nunc nunc properate puellae)
quamprimum nostra facta lacerna manu.
quid tamen auditis (nam plura audire potestis)?
quantum de bello dicitur esse super?
postmodo victa cades: melioribus, Ardea, restas,
improba, quae nostros cogis abesse viros.
sint tantum reduces. sed enim temerarius ille
est meus, et stricto qualibet ense ruit.
mens abit et morior quotiens pugnantis imago
me subit, et gelidum pectora frigus habet.'

'The military cloak made by our hands must be sent to (y)our master–now! go quickly now, girls!–as soon as possible. But what do you hear (for you are able to hear a great many things)? How much do they say of the war is to come? After a while, you will fall in battle defeated. Ardea, you resist your betters. Shameless city, you who compels our men to be absent. Let them be! So greatly (do I wish) you to bring them back! But my husband is rash, and with two-edged sword he rushes wherever he wishes. Reason departs, and I die, whenever the image of fighting comes to me, and an icy-cold chill possesses my heart.'

At first glance, commonplace images of zealous domesticity and single-minded devotion are foremost. The twin decorum of women's work and mode of discourse (742: 'calathi lanaque mollis'; 744: 'tenui sono') are situated within binary spatial correlations (742: 'ante torum'; 744: 'inter quas'). These interdependent associations amplify and confirm the traditional domestic resonances of the reproductive (e)state and the phenomenon known as 'speaking-among-women'.

[37] Goddesses and supernatural female beings also speak in *Fasti* 2–Callisto and Cynthia (157–60, 167, 173–4, 180); Juno (180); Juno Lucina (441); Dione (469–70); Lara (606). The singularity of Lucretia's speech is, therefore, explicit.

What is there beyond the 'wicker baskets of soft wool' and Lucretia's 'delicate (read also: inferior) tone (or, character)', deposited 'before the bridal bed' and 'among her female servants' (cf. 743: 'famulae')? For a start, even if her attention is intimately related to her husband's survival, Ovid's Lucretia is passionate about the war. Her chauvinistic parochialism is the product of affective attachments over against those of the adult male citizen for the state. Ardea is a rival for Lucretia's female desiring gaze; 'improba' personifies the axis of sexualized tension on which Lucretia's evocative plaint hinges.

In a similar vein, while it may be the only tangible link (so Lucretia believes) remaining to her, Collatinus' 'lacerna' is a poor substitute for the man. One cannot help recalling the poet's professed stance as *Fasti* 2 began–'haec mea militia est'. Just as Ovid 'bears the only arms he can' (9: 'ferimus quae possumus arma'), in pursuit of Caesar's train, so Lucretia rehearses her husband's ventures on the battlefield. In a sense, Lucretia's hypersensitive condition[38] reifies in a feminized construct the raw psychic nerve of a people too long exposed to the inanitions (separation, trauma, grief) of internecine rivalries. In other words, we may postulate (along with recent feminist 'rereadings' of Roman literature)[39] that Ovid articulates here a few of the intense masculinist misgivings of his age through an act of female ventriloquism.[40]

The preceding narratives in *Fasti* 2 transmit many of the established social-cultural topoi associated with the active male–passive female binarism via multiple divine and supernatural female voices. On the other hand, Lucretia's speech encodes a deviant gendered discourse depending only partially on the revolutionary use of elegiac verse as the vehicle for *res Romanae*. This sociolinguistic subterfuge is further illuminated in the meditations and (sub-?)vocalizations given over to Sextus in Ovid's (certainly not in Livy's) treatment of the pre-rape scenario. The desiring gaze of poet, characters, and audience is a tangible presence. It sets the Ovidian version apart, and

[38] Demarked by her anxious demands for news of the conflict, her fears for Collatinus' safety, and her paralysing premonitions of tragedy.

[39] A recent example from the field of classics is Skinner (1998) esp. 4 ff.

[40] For an exploration of this concept in relation to Augustan and Renaissance appropriations of Sappho's poetic voice, see Harvey (1989) 219–30, see also (1992).

prepares us ('we' as interpreters and sympathetic readers) for an(other) unravelling of the *Fasti*'s discursive formation.

For Collatinus and his soldier-companions (as well as those others participating with Ovid in the exchange), Lucretia's meticulously choreographed collapse into grief (755–6: 'desinit in lacrimas intentaque fila remittit | in gremio vultum deposuitque suum' ('she ends in tears, and releases the stretched threads, and lays her face in her lap')) is a scopophiliac's 'dream' (read: 'fantasy'). Her aspect is 'becoming', and her modest tears are 'seemly' (757: 'hoc ipsum decuit lacrimae decuere pudicae'). The countenance (it would seem) is indeed the mirror of the soul (758: 'facies animo dignaque parque fuit'). Unsurprisingly, then, Collatinus' mere presence (759: '"pone metum, veni", coniunx ait'[41] ('"Lay aside your fear! I have come!" her husband said')–*his* choice, *his* registration) restores Lucretia in thought and spirit ('illa revixit'). The female conforms to a subordinationist logic. She is (literally) a dependent burden, agreeable and soft ('dulcis'); and she is attached in metaphorical 'servitium' to her husband's neck (760: 'deque viri collo dulce pependit onus').

Nothing new so far under the elegiac sun. Yet, in the space of a couplet, Ovid manages to insinuate himself into the mindset of an implacable rapist. Lucretia's physical and characterological virtues ('forma', 'color', 'capilli', 'verba', 'vox', 'decor', 'place(n)t,' 'corrumpere non est') suffer the same deconstructive emphasis here as in Ovid's explicit love poetry. This synecdochic dismemberment of Lucretia is a familiar ploy of otherwise amatory verse. But the sum of her parts (763–5) forms the subject of a far more dangerous 'amator praeceps' (*not* 'praeceptor'). The measure of this predator's desire is inversely proportional to the legitimacy of his object (766: 'quoque minor spes est hoc magis ille cupit' ('the smaller the hope, the more completely he desires it')). And in deliberate contrast to Lucretia's fearful imaginings, her likeness–that foregoing (re)presentation ('absentis imagine')–'gnaws at his senses' (769: 'carpitur sensus'). While Lucretia was frozen, Tarquin burns with anticipation (779: 'ardet').

[41] The will of the speaker is male; the agency of voice is active and complete.

At this point, Ovid openly declares his narratological ploy (770): 'recordanti plura magisque placent'. As for the poet, so his audience; as for Tarquin, so the reader. By calling these things (that is, the scopophilic fragments comprising Lucretia's (re)presentation) to mind, the pleasure principle of anticipated possession is intensified. Therefore, Tarquin rehearses the constellated matrix of his masculinist cupidity. By addressing himself in a travesty of Lucretia's hypernormative *oratio recta* (771–4), he gives voice to his audience's impulses. His express(ed) catalogue of desires–'voltus', 'verba', 'color', 'facies', 'decor oris' (773–4)–neatly recapitulates and enhances the focus and affect of sexualized pleasure forestalled and foregrounded in his prior internal reflections.

Certainly, the archetypal shadow of inherited 'tyrannis' hangs heavy in Ovid's depiction, as in Livy's. Violence, guile, and unrighteous love attest to Tarquin's turpitude and ignominy (779–80: 'iniusti ... amoris | ... indigno vimque dolumque ...'). However, in the same way that Ovid tests the strictures of Augustan mores, so he alludes to a relationship between the militaristic forays lauded in Livy and the mimetic rivalries of a more personal battlefield. This is not so much a conceptualization of co-active love as of the individualistic male libido's desire for the essentialized female form. Under this schema, Lucretia can only look to her own resources (782: 'viderit'). The female is cut adrift from the safety-nets of legislation and customary practice alike (782: '*audentes* forsque deusque iuvat' ('Luck and the divine help the bold')). Who dares wins (781: '*audebimus* ultima' ('we'll risk the extreme'); 783: 'cepimus *audendo* Gabios quoque' ('By daring, we took Gabii too')!

Ovid departs from Livy's annalistic account once more–at the moment when Lucretia is confronted by her assailant (801–3). Here, *we* confront the opposition between traditional female duty and voyeuristic male desire; in this case, to be the victim as well as the *victor* (811). Ovid utilizes the subjunctive of will to express what ought to be done by Lucretia as a matter of propriety ('quid faciat?' 'pugnet?' 'clamat?' 'effugiat?' ('What is she to do? Should she fight? Call out? Flee?')). But the deliberative force of the poet's questions is repudiated by the superordinate 'vis' of the independent, volitive male.

First, the normative equation (801: 'vincetur femina pugnans' ('a fighting woman will be "mastered"')); then, the deviant insertion of military might (802: 'at in dextra qui vetet ensis erat' ('but in his right hand was a two-edged sword to oppose her')). Note how the kind of sword which caused Lucretia such heartache when carried into battle by her imprudent husband ('stricto qualibet *ense*') may just as easily be turned against her ('in dextra qui vetet *ensis* erat'). By placing Lucretia's thoughts in the third person, and on the cusp of subjunctive will and desire, Ovid affords himself and his audience access to a psychological omniscience–the thoughts and verbal activities of hunter and prey rarely entertained, except perhaps on the stage.[42] And while the poet ensures that the consequences of such deviant behaviour are explicitly flagged (811: 'quid victor gaudes? haec te victoria perdet' ('Why, victor, are you pleased? This triumph will ruin you!'), by that point the audience has participated vicariously in the complete experience of rape (from precognition to consummation).

Further indications of this 'virtual' participation may be located. In rapid succession, Ovid presents us with:

- the abandonment of Lucretia's father and husband to grief (835–6: 'ecce super corpus communia damna gementes | obliti decoris virque paterque iacent' ('Behold! Indifferent to decorum, father and husband lay prostrate on her body, lamenting their common loss')),
- Brutus' violent and peremptory withdrawal of the death-dealing blade (838: 'semianimi corpore tela rapit' ('he tore the weapon from her half-alive/dead body')), and
- the (notionally male) community's display of the penetrated body (849: 'volnus inane patet' ('the hollow wound is exposed')).

Newlands[43] notes the sexualized force of Brutus' savage extraction at 2. 838 ('rapit'), but in the context of suggesting a relationship between Brutus and Sextus Tarquinius. In this light, I would assign significant freight to Ovid's treatment

[42] For a typically clear-sighted discussion of the extent to which poetry, mime, and satyr-play intersected in popular performance spaces, see Wiseman, 'Ovid and the Stage', in this volume.

[43] Newlands (1995) 154.

of the still-living 'animi matrona virilis' (847) by sire, spouse, and surrogate avenger. These linked elements (the indecorum of the men she summoned, the brutality of the man rehearsing revolution, and the desiring gaze of the adult male citizen population (*Quirites*) of Collatia) seem to be performative and participatory echoes of an amatory scenario deviant *in extremis*.[44] Nevertheless, we might 'read' Ovid categorizing this self-conscious scenario as the object(ive) of a(nother) kind of 'virtus dissimulata' (844). Lucretia concurs (2. 845–6):

> illa iacens ad verba oculos sine lumine movit
> visaque concussa dicta probare coma.
>
> Lingering still, Lucretia moved her lightless eyes to [Brutus'] words, and seemed to approve his remarks with her shaken hair.

(v) Recentring Gender: The Case of Ovid's *Fasti*[45]

> *Unless gender definitions (sexual differences as enforced by culture) are explicated by feminist critics, traditional texts will remain encrusted with patriarchal interpretation.* (Phyllis Culham, (1990) 172)

This discussion took as a starting point the considerable degree to which the *Fasti* is immersed in and co-opted by the prevailing masculinist culture of Augustan Rome. In doing so, it became clear that the interpretations of certain recent scholarship examining Ovid's calendrical formulations revealed some collusion with his conservative phallogocentric standpoint on ritual(ized) female activity. Indeed, select hermeneutic practitioners seem to have assimilated the ways by which the poet engages in negating, inhibiting, silencing, or slaying women—an intertextuality between the criticized and the critic.

I would argue that modern 'readers' of the *Fasti* need to be sensitive to Ovid's sexual(ized) nuances, primarily as a

[44] In a paper delivered at Sydney University on 22 Sept. 1999 (now Wiseman 2000), T. P. Wiseman drew attention to the interpenetration of Greek and Roman (re)presentations of mythological scenarios within a variety of aesthetic spaces (including early to mid-Republican *cista*, mirrors, and the 'contaminated' dramatic compositions of Gnesippos and Rhinthon). That these kinds of (re)presentation suggest performative contexts is an inviting corollary.

[45] I adapt this heading from the title of a pivotal discussion-paper in *Helios* (Culham 1990).

means of delimiting and abnegating the perpetuation of the Philomela/Tacita syndrome in contemporary literary-critical studies. Gender as a category of social-cultural and historical interpretation deserves a central role in 'revising and rereading' a work so embedded in the regulatory sociolinguistic system of ancient Mediterranean Rome. Otherwise, the 'dialogic imagination' of today's 'readership' is in danger of succumbing (intentionally or not) to those 'complicitous games of interpretation' by which Ovid sought to explore Roman identity in a period of transition and adjustment.[46] In other words, negotiating the serio-ludic quality of the *Fasti* is a treacherous pastime, and failing to recognize the importance of an anchoring explanatory principle (in this instance, sex/gender analysis) invites problematic interpretative engagement. I hope that this study has cleared a few of the critical pitfalls adhering to gender-exclusive 'readings' of one ancient text, and demonstrated the advantages of admitting a common focus into the praxis of meaning-production and reception.[47]

[46] Newlands (1995) 8. Drawing on the work of Johan Huizinga, Wolfgang Iser, and Mikhail M. Bakhtin, Newlands notes the interplay of 'unexpected, mimetic, subversive, and agonistic' elements in Ovid's text. However, I see the 'interactive readership' assumed to underpin Ovidian 'playfulness' as susceptible to the *same* power relations permeating *all* discursive practices. The potential for assimilation or appropriation by a *modern* audience is an aspect of this 'feedback-loop' requiring careful treatment.

[47] For close readings of the relationships among gender, silence, language, and power in the *Metamorphoses* and the love poetry, see de Luce (1993), Hardy (1995), and James (1997). For a non-gendered treatment of episodes in the *Fasti* (seen as an exercise in the creation of poetic and political authority), see Feeney (1992).

Ovid's *Fasti*

Historical Readings at its Bimillennium

Edited by

GERALDINE HERBERT-BROWN

OXFORD