Johnson, Marguerite. "Appendices." *Ovid on Cosmetics: and Related Texts*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016. 137–142. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781474218696.0009>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 04:35 UTC.

Copyright © Marguerite Johnson 2016. Released under a CC BY-NC-ND licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>). You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Notes on the Latin texts

Medicamina Faciei Femineae

Line 25: *poliuntur* is the reading of Heinsius adopted by Kunz (1881: 39) and Rosati (1985: 56, 66); contra Kenney (1995: 113) who reads *potientur*.

Lines 27–28: Kunz (1881:39), Rosati (1985: 67), García (1995: 285), Kenney (1995: 113) and Watson (2001: 464n31) draw attention to the grammatical problems of this couplet, and Kenney is right to obelize it. Some editors have also posited, on the basis of the problems, that there must be a lacuna after *l.26*, with Kunz (1881: 59–62) even suggesting that *ll.26–27* are most likely an interpolation. Each scholar attempts to resolve the matter by punctuation that joins *refert* at *l.28* with the hexameter of *l.27*. The lines have been left untranslated herein.

Line 31: *quaecumque* is read with *voluptas*; contra *cuicumque* read with *sibi* as per Kenney (1995: 113) and Mozley-Goold (1979: 4). Both Kunz (1881: 62) and Rosati (1985: 68) accept *quaecumque* with *voluptas*, arguing that there are no major grammatical problems.

Line 34: *muta . . . avis* is adopted by most editors (Kunz 1881, Rosati 1985, Kenney 1995); cf. also Heldmann (1982) for a detailed defence. Kunz (1881: 40) notes several manuscripts read *multa . . . avis* ('many . . . a bird'), which does not make sense after the specificity of *l.33* (namely, *the* peacock).

Line 35: *nos urget* as per Rosati (1985: 56) and García (1995: 285). Other readings include: *nos urat* (Heinsius); *consurget* (Kunz 1881: 40); *nos uret* (Mozley 1962: 4); *iungendus* (Mozley-Goold 1979: 4); *vos urget* (Kenney 1995: 113).

Line 51: *discite* repeats the opening word of the poem and is found in several manuscripts listed by Kunz (1881: 42). Kunz (42), Rosati (1985: 56) and Kenney (1995: 114) read *dic age*. Rosati (1985: 72) represents ll.51–52 as direct speech to argue that the lines are spoken by Venus, citing AA 3.43 where the goddess orders the poet to give instruction; cf. Gibson (2003: 104–5) for a discussion of the passage from the *Ars*.

Line 60: editors raise the problem of punctuation at l.60. Punctuation after *contere* is required and herein a hyphen has been inserted. While Kenney (2004) is rightly concerned that the necessary punctuation causes ambiguity as to the substance to be added, *in haec* has been taken as a reference to the dry ingredients prepared in ll.53–58, hence the translation of the line reads: ‘see that a sixth of a whole *as* [i.e. of the crushed horn] goes in [i.e. into the vetch and barley].’

Line 65: *trahat* indicates ‘draw out’ or ‘weigh’; also at l.80 and l.92. Translated in these lines as ‘weigh out’, ‘weighs’ and ‘weighing’ respectively to emphasize that it is an action being performed.

Line 72: *pigris* as per Kenney (1995: 115), rather than *nigris* as per Kunz (1881: 43) and Rosati (1985: 58).

Line 85: *radenti tubera*; contra Kenney (1995: 115) who adopts *rodenti corpora*. *radenti corpora* is adopted by Rosati (1985: 78–9), who notes the overlap between the two verbs, but posits that *radere* is more appropriate as it suggests the process of smoothing the skin while vigorously washing it (*rodere* appears to be too harsh a process for facial beautification, lending itself more to a medical procedure).

Line 86: *utrimque* follows Heinsius, Kunz (1881: 45), Rosati (1985: 58) and Kenney (1995: 115). Kenney notes that the alternative, *utrumque* ‘does not seem ... to be possible Latin: can an ingredient ‘be’ a weight? Heinsius’s *utrimque*, one *hasta* different, sets the matter right literally at a stroke.’

Line 98: *nullus* has been adopted to govern *color* as opposed to *multos*. *nullus* is adopted by Kunz (1881: 77–8), Rosati (1985: 60) and Kenney (1995: 6); contra Mozley-Goold (1979: 8). The meaning of the line varies significantly depending on what adjective is adopted: *nullus* indicates that the skin would be colour-free, meaning blemish-free, and thus ready for the application of make-up; in contrast, *multus* denotes a face full of colour, namely, a healthy glow, after the cream has been applied. As Ovid has used ingredients known

for their ability to reduce spots and facial markings, *nullus* seems the appropriate choice.

Amores 1.14

Line 4: McKeown (1989: 2: 366) draws attention to the problems of punctuation. He cites Kenney (1958: 58), who comments that ‘there is much to be said for not punctuating at all in such sentences.’ In his second edition of the text, Kenney (1995: 32) prints the line without punctuation, a procedure adopted here.

Line 21: *Thracia* is adopted now by most commentators as opposed to the variant form, *Threcia*; contra Showerman-Goold (1977: 372) who read *Threcia*. McKeown (1989: 2: 372) notes that *Thracia* is supported by the manuscripts at *Ep.* 1.4, *Met.* 6.661 and 11.92.

Line 24: *mala* in preference to *male* as per Kenney (1958: 58) who aligns *quanta* with *quot*. He argues that if *quanta* were taken alone, the line would have to mean *quam inmania*, ‘and editors who adopt it cite no parallels’; further, cf. Kenney (2004: unpagged). Barsby (1973: 150–1) and McKeown (1989: 2: 373) adopt the same reading; contra Showerman-Goold (1977: 372) who read *male*.

Line 46: *tuta* causes no problems (in keeping with the concept of protecting or safeguarding one’s beauty). Kenney (1958: 58) rightly draws attention to *Med.* l.1–2, *AA* 3.207 and *Rem.* l.347 for the same idea.

Ars Amatoria 3.101–250

Line 155: *casum simulet* as per Kenney (1995: 191) and Gibson (2003: 157), the jussive subjunctive ensuring a sensible segue to the examples of Hercules and Iolē (*ll.* 155–156), and Bacchus and Ariadne (*ll.* 157–158). Mozley-Goold (1979: 128) reads *simulat* with the accusative, which as Gibson argues, ‘lacks the point’.

Line 158: *Cnosi* per Kenney (1995: 191) and Gibson (2003: 158). The translation references Gibson’s version of the couplet.

Line 213: *mittatur* as per Kenney (1995: 193) is adopted rather than *mittantur*. Gibson (2003: 184) adopts the latter: *oesypa quid redolent quamvis mittantur Athenis, / demptus ab immundo vellere sucus ovis!* Gibson’s edit causes a

disjointed effect (and an awkward translation). However, the exclamation at the end of the pentameter, as he suggests, makes better sense than Kenney's question mark.

Line 231: *splendent* as per Goold (1965: 80–1) who presents a convincing case in support of Burman's (1727) reading; cf. also Gibson (2003:190). *Contra pendent* (Kenney 1995: 194).

Line 241: *ut* as per Heinsius; cf. Goold (1965: 81) and Gibson (2003: 194). *Contra* Kenney's emendation to *et*.

***Remedia Amoris* 343–356**

Line 351: *cum collinet* is metrically sound as opposed to, for example, *cum linet* from the Monacensis 14809, saec. xii manuscript (cf. Kenney 1995: 240). *sua cum linet* preserves the metre but further problematizes the line by the inclusion of the unnecessary pronoun, which is described by Henderson (1980: 162) as 'totally otiose'. Goold (1965: 99–101) argues convincingly for *cum collinet*, pointing out the contextual soundness of the verb as well as its contribution to 'the successive gutturals' of *quoque compositis cum collinet*, which he exemplifies by the translation: 'when caking her cheeks with crude concoctions.' (Ibid. 101). Kenney was not initially in support of the reading (1961: 578n1) but does adopt it in his second edition (1995: 240). Cf. also Henderson (1980: 162) in support of *collinet*.

***Ars Amatoria* 1.505–524**

Line 515: †*lingua ne rigeat*† is problematic. As Hollis (1977: 120) has discussed, it would make sense to assume the whole line refers to oral hygiene; cf., therefore, Kenney (1995: 142), where the clause is obelized and reads *lingua ne rigeat*. *Contra* Goold (1965: 65–6) who endorses Palmer's emendation, *lingula ne ruget* ('let not the shoe-strap be creased'), with the maintenance of the verb, *rigeat* ('let not the shoe-strap be tied too tight'). Thus, the remainder of the line – *careant rubigine dentes* – can be rendered as 'keep the teeth [of the buckle] free from stain', which then links the imagery to the pentameter of l.516. This latter reading seems overly forced, and accepting Kenney's reading still maintains any conscious *double entendre* of l.515, particularly in the context of l.516.

Appendix 2: Glossary of cosmeceutical terminology

Astringent: a product that shrinks or tightens body tissues and dries up secretions.

Cleanser: a product made from natural and / or synthetic ingredients to clean the face and / or the body by removing dirt, dead skin cells, sweat, excess oils and bacteria. The process of cleansing unblocks pores and prevents or reduces skin conditions such as acne. Cleansers are removed with water.

Decoction: a method of extraction by the boiling of dissolved chemicals from plant material (e.g. bark, stems, roots). The process involves mashing or pounding materials and then boiling them in order to extract oils, volatile organic compounds and other chemical substances. A decoction is also the name of the liquid produced.

Emollient: a moisturizer that softens the corneum or outer layer of the epidermis by stimulating rehydration.

Emulsifier: also known as a suspending vehicle or fixative that combines ingredients (that is, stabilizing the volatile components).

Exfoliant: a product made from natural and / or synthetic ingredients to provide a deep cleanse of the face and / or the body by targeting, in particular, the build-up of dead skin cells. Exfoliation results in a healthier looking skin. Exfoliants are removed with water.

Infusion: the process of extraction of properties from plants in a solvent (water, for example), by allowing the substance to remain suspended in the solvent over a period of time (that is, 'steeping'). The liquid produced is also called a 'decoction'.

Steeping: cf. 'infusion'.

Unguent: In antiquity, an unguent took the form of a greasy ointment. As a perfume, an unguent had a liquid base and a scented essence. It could also have additions such as a preservative (salt, for example) and an emulsifier or fixative (such as a gum or resin).

Appendix 3: Ingredients in the *Medicamina* recipes*

Recipe	Cleanser	Emollient	Emulsifier
Recipe 1: ll.53–68	Narcissus bulbs	Libyan barley Bitter vetch Hartshorn Tuscan seed	Eggs Gum Honey
Recipe 2: ll.69–76	Hydrated soda ash Iris	Lupin seeds Beans	White lead
Recipe 3: ll.77–82	<i>Alcyonea</i>	Honey	Honey
Recipe 4: ll.83–90	Frankincense Natron	Myrrh	Gum
Recipe 5: ll.91–98	Fennel Frankincense Salt	Honey Myrrh Rose	Honey Barley water

* Some ingredients have a dual action, such as frankincense, which can act as a cleanser as well as an emollient. Such ingredients are placed in the category that best reflects their main action in each recipe. In recipes 3 and 4, honey has been categorized as both emollient and emulsifier.

Appendix 4: Roman weights and measures and equivalents

Roman unit	relationship to <i>as</i>	metric (g)	imperial (oz)
<i>as</i> / <i>libra</i> / <i>pondus</i>	1	327.05	11.54
<i>semis</i> / <i>semissis</i>	1/2	163.53	5.77
<i>triens</i>	1/3	109.02	3.85
<i>quadrans</i> / <i>teruncius</i>	1/4	81.76	2.88
<i>sextans</i>	1/6	54.51	1.92
<i>uncia</i>	1/12	27.25	0.96

Roman unit	relationship to <i>uncia</i>	metric (g)	imperial (oz)
<i>semuncia</i>	1/2	13.63	0.48
<i>duella</i>	1/3	9.08	0.32
<i>sicilicus</i>	1/4	6.81	0.24
<i>sextula</i>	1/6	4.54	0.16
<i>semisextula</i>	1/12	2.27	0.08
<i>scripulum</i>	1/24	1.14	0.04