Johnson, Marguerite. "Introduction." *Ovid on Cosmetics: and Related Texts*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016. 1–40. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781474218696.0008>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 14:55 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.

Introduction

Now and then . . . making-over a woman

It is fascinating to hypothesize Ovid's views on the cosmeceutical and cosmetic industry in the modern west. Equally intriguing would be his opinion on elective cosmetic surgery. Both industries, driven by increasingly high consumer demand, have yearly profits in the billions of pounds as women, and increasingly men, seek to improve, preserve and even alter their appearance. Each year millions of women undergo procedures such as Botox injections, chemical peels, liposuctions, breast augmentations or reductions, laser hair removal, even calf augmentation and vaginal rejuvenation surgery. Research has estimated that cosmetic surgery in the United States will increase from approximately 1,688,694 patients in 2012, to 3,847,929 in 2030 with more and more men contributing to this projected figure (Broer, Levine and Juran 2014).

The strangeness inherent in an ancient Roman's hypothetical encounter with modern beautification, as fanciful as the thought may be, underlines the implicit wonderment and anxiety-inducing responses that characterize the phenomenon. Transforming women into goddesses and men into gods through artificial means would surely have struck people from antiquity as somewhat miraculous in terms of surgical virtuosity but also perhaps as an ill-omened procedure that unwisely erased the physical demarcations between divinity and mortal. This is not to suggest, however, that the Romans were unfamiliar with plastic surgery. Celsus (7.8) records otoplasty to repair damage to the ears caused by heavy earrings (cf. Barini 1958: 43), procedures to repair parts of the body from the nose (Celsus: 7.10) to the mouth (7.12), and surgery to restore the prepuce (posthioplasty) for an aesthetically pleasing appendage (cf. Hodges 2001).

Even the application of a simple 'patch' (*aluta*), to which Ovid refers at AA 3.202, indicates awareness of body modification for the purpose of a more

appealing exterior. These leather patches concealed unsightly blemishes and were also used to hide tattoos on the bodies of manumitted slaves (cf. Jones 1987). Martial, who refers to the doctors skilled in the removal of slave tattoos at 6.64.26 and 10.56.6, also mentions patches at 2.29.9–10 and 8.33.22 (where they are called *splenia*). In an age in which cosmetic technologies were comparatively rudimentary, patches were one of the few options available for improving one's appearance, but if laser treatment had been invented, surely the Romans would have taken advantage of it.

Such fantasies and hypotheses may not seem so far-fetched when one considers a fragment from the *Isostasion* or *The Equivalent*, a play by the Alexandrian comedian, Alexis (*The Fragments*: 103 Arnott 1996), and recorded by Athenaeus (568a–d). The passage discusses courtesans and the procuress's modification of their bodies to meet clients' individual tastes:

πρῶτα μὲν γὰρ πρὸς τὸ κέρδος καὶ τὸ συλᾶν τοὺς πέλας
 πάντα τᾶλλ' αὐταῖς πάρεργα γίνεται, ράπτουσι δὲ
 πᾶσιν ἐπιβουλὰς. ἐπειδὴν δ' εὐπορήσωσιν ποτε,
 ἀνέλαβον καινὰς ἐταίρας, πρωτοπείρους τῆς τέχνης·
 εὐθὺς ἀναπλάττουσι ταύτας, ὥστε μήτε τοὺς τρόπους
 μήτε τὰς ὄψεις ὁμοίας διατελεῖν οὕσας ἔτι.
 τυγχάνει μικρά τις οὖσα· φελλὸς ἐν ταῖς βαυκίσιν
 ἐγκεκάττυται. μακρά τις· διάβαθρον λεπτὸν φορεῖ
 τὴν τε κεφαλὴν ἐπὶ τὸν ὦμον καταβαλοῦσ' ἐξέρχεται·
 τοῦτο τοῦ μήκους ἀφεῖλεν. οὐκ ἔχει τις ἰσχία·
 ὑπενέδυσ' ἐρραμέν' αὐτήν, ὥστε τὴν εὐπυγίαν
 ἀναβοᾶν τοὺς εἰσιδόντας. κοιλίαν ἀδρὰν ἔχει·
 στηθὶ' ἔστ' αὐταῖσι τούτων ὧν ἔχουσ' οἱ κωμικοί·
 ὀρθὰ προσθεῖσαι τοιαῦτα τοῦκλυτον τῆς κοιλίας
 ὥσπερ εἰ κοντοῖσι τούτοις εἰς τὸ πρόσθ' ἀπήγαγον.
 τὰς ὀφρῦς πυρρὰς ἔχει τις· ζωγραφοῦσιν ἀσβόλῳ.
 συμβέβηκ' εἶναι μέλαιναν· κατέπλασεν ψιμυθίῳ.
 λευκόχρως λίαν τις ἐστίν· παιδέρωτ' ἐντρίβεται.
 καλὸν ἔχει τοῦ σώματός τι· τοῦτο γυμνὸν δείκνυται.
 εὐφυεῖς ὁδόντας ἔσχεν· ἐξ ἀνάγκης δεῖ γελᾶν,
 ἵνα θεωρῶσ' οἱ παρόντες τὸ στόμ' ὡς κομπὸν φορεῖ.

b

c

ἄν δὲ μὴ χαίρη γελῶσα, διατελεῖ τὴν ἡμέραν d
 ἔνδον, ὥσπερ τοῖς μαγείροις ἃ παράκειθ' ἐκάστοτε,
 ἥνίκ' ἄν πωλῶσιν αἰγῶν κρανία, ξυλήφιον
 μυρρίνης ἔχουσα λεπτόν ὀρθὸν ἐν τοῖς χεῖλεσιν·
 ὥστε τῷ χρόνῳ σέσηρεν, ἄν τε βούλητ' ἄν τε μή.
 [ὄψεις διὰ τούτων σκευοποιοῦσι τῶν τεχνῶν.]

First, for gain and to swindle their male neighbours,
 all other things become secondary to them, but they weave
 plots against all men. When at some time they become rich
 they take new courtesans who are making their first experiments in the trade.
 At once they remake these girls, so that neither their behaviour
 nor their appearance remains the same any more.

One girl happens to be little: cork is stitched to the sole of her b
 ladies' shoes. One girl happens to be tall: she wears a thin slipper,
 and she goes out drooping her head on her shoulders, which
 takes away some of her height. One girl doesn't have a *derrière*:
 she dresses her with sewn-on haunches, under her clothes are stitched hips,
 so that those who see her cry out that she has beautiful buttocks.
 She has a bulky stomach: for such ones they have false bosoms
 made of the materials that the comedy actors have.

After adding these and setting them straight like props,
 they bring the clothing away from the belly in front. c

One girl has red eyebrows: they paint them with soot.
 One girl happens to be black: she plasters her with white lead.
 One girl is too pale: she rubs on rouge.

She has one part of the body beautiful: she shows it naked.
 She has pretty teeth: she must, of necessity, smile so that
 the men present may see what an elegant mouth she has.
 But if she does not enjoy smiling, she spends the day d
 indoors and, like things displayed by butchers
 when they sell goats' heads,
 holding upright between her teeth, a thin stick of myrtle;
 so that in time she shows her teeth whether she likes it or not.
 [By these crafts they artfully prepare their appearance.]

This passage reflects the application of cosmetics such as lead foundation and rouge, as well as more intrusive interventions to modify the body such as false haunches and bosoms and the insertion of a myrtle stick in the mouth to force a smile that reveals teeth. A passage such as this, which may have influenced AA.3.255–286 on compensation for natural flaws, and *Rem.* 325–342 on accentuating flaws as a cure for passion, indicates that the ancients interpreted the female body as adaptable or open to transformation, and made an association between female beauty and artificial adornment. Perhaps then, the modern obsession with the quest for youthful beauty, manifest in cosmeceuticals, cosmetics and plastic surgery, may be the end result of an evolutionary trajectory from before the time of Ovid.¹

Of course, like today's opponents of body modification, there were ancient critics of female beautification procedures. The passage from the *Isostasion* refers to the alteration of the bodies of the courtesans as *technē*, a 'skill' or 'art', but also a deception or sleight of hand. *technē* is essentially the same as the Latin word *ars*; a term employed by Ovid, particularly on beauty and beautification, but not usually with negative connotations. That Ovid does not usually judge feminine *ars* harshly is in contrast to other ancient sources. In Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* (10.2–9), for example, Ischomachus provides an anecdote about teaching his wife to heed his philosophical warnings about dressing-up. Observing her wearing too much make-up and high-heels, Ischomachus asks her whether she would prefer him to deceive her with untruthful tales of exaggerated wealth, showering her with fake luxuries. Of course, his wife replies in the negative. Next he asks her if she would like him to apply rouge and smear foundation under his eyes, then seek her embrace like a cheating consort presenting himself to his mistress. Again, she replies in the negative. The questions and answers inevitably lead Ischomachus's wife to realize the implicitly deceptive and artificial nature of cosmetics.²

Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* is a Socratic dialogue, an instructional prose treatise on agriculture and the management of one's house. Its endorsement of a morally upright life naturally caters for a section such as the one on cosmetics. The anti-cosmetic tradition, however, is also expressed in many other genres, including comedy, elegy and satire. In *The Haunted House*, for example, Plautus's character, Scapha ridicules cosmetics (ll.258–264) and perfumes (ll.273–278), exclaiming at l.273: *mulier recte olet, ubi nihil olet* ('a woman

smells right, when she smells of nothing'). Scapha believes that young women should let their natural beauty shine without embellishment, while old women who resort to artificial treatments are nothing short of hideous (ll.274–277):

Nam istae veteres, quae se unguentis unctitant, interpoles,
vetulae, edentulae, quae vitia corporis fuco occulunt,
ubi sese sudor cum unguentis consociavit, ilico
itidem olent, quasi cum una multa iura confudit cocus.

Now those old women, who besmear themselves with ointments, refurbished,
elderly, toothless, who hide the blemishes of the body with paint,
when their sweat mixes with ointments, immediately
they stink, as when a cook mixes many sauces together.

Of course, like Alexis's *Isostasion*, this is comedy. Nevertheless it reflects a common, albeit exaggerated, response to cosmetics. Some 250 years after Plautus, Seneca the Younger in a letter to his mother, *To Helvia, on Consolation* (16), praises her for never having defiled (*polluere*) her face (*facies*) with tints (*colores*) and meretricious adornment (*lenocinium*). Elsewhere, in one of his moral essays, *On Benefits* (7.9), he passes severe judgement on women who wear extravagant garments and jewellery:

Video uniones non singulos singulis auribus comparatos; iam enim exercitatae aures oneri ferundo sunt; iunguntur inter se et insuper alii binis superponuntur. Non satis muliebris insania viros superiecerat, nisi bina ac terna patrimonia auribus singulis pependissent. Video sericas vestes, si vestes vocandae sunt, in quibus nihil est, quo defendi aut corpus aut denique pudor possit, quibus sumptis parum liquido nudam se non esse iurabit. Hae ingenti summa ab ignotis etiam ad commercium gentibus accersuntur, ut matronae nostrae ne adulteris quidem plus sui in cubiculo, quam in publico ostendant.

I see this cluster of pearls, not single pearls attached to each ear, because these days ears must be able to carry a weight; the pearls are joined to each other and others are placed on top of the pairs. This womanly insanity had not sufficiently transcended men, unless they hung two or three inheritances from each ear. I see silk dresses, if they can be called dresses, in which there is nothing to protect the body or for that matter a sense of modesty, which,

upon donning, she will scarcely be able to claim unequivocally that she isn't naked. These are fetched at a great price from regions unknown even to trade in order that our matrons may not show more of themselves to their lovers in their bedrooms than they do in public.

Criticism of female luxury, adornment and use of cosmetics is also found between the ages of Plautus (254–184 BC) and Seneca (4 BC–AD 65), throughout the age of Plutarch (AD 45–120) and into the Christian era, providing a consistent tradition of attitudes, be they exaggerated, comic or moral. Poets closer to Ovid's era, Lucretius (99–55 BC) and Horace (65–8 BC) also express anti-adornment views. In the didactic work, *On the Nature of Things* (4.1121–1191), Lucretius warns against the dangers of passion, emphasizing that it blinds men to the covetous and vain nature of women who demand luxury items, including imported perfumes, clothing and jewellery. Horace, in *Satire* 1.2.123–124, claims adornment should be in keeping with nature and, in *Epode* 12.10–11, he furnishes a mocking image of a woman's melting make-up. The natural historian, Pliny the Elder (23–79 AD), writing roughly contemporaneously with Seneca and Plutarch, includes some sneers, such as the one at women wearing pearls on their feet and sandals (9.114). Pliny (13.20–25) also dislikes perfume, associating it with adulterous women and regarding it as the epitome of waste; expensive and prone to evaporation, it is even more decadent than pearls (which can at least be bequeathed). Satirists Martial (AD 40–102) and Juvenal (d. c. AD 130) provide various negative tropes associated with beautification (cf. Martial 2.41.11–12 on runny make-up and Juvenal 6.457–507 on the moral turpitude associated with female adornment, including cosmetics).³

The Roman elegists also expressed anxieties about, and dislike of, feminine adornment. Propertius (c. 50–15 BC), for example, is unimpressed by artificial enhancements:

1.2.7–8:

Crede mihi, non ulla tuae est medicina figurae:
nudus Amor formae non amat artificem.

Believe me, no doctoring [*medicina*] is needed for your form [*figura*]:
naked Amor does not love the artificial creator [*artifex*] of beauty [*forma*].

2.18.23–28:

Nunc etiam infectos demens imitare Britannos,
ludis et externo tincta nitore caput?

Ut natura dedit, sic omnis recta figura est:
turpis Romano Belgicus ore color.

Illi sub terris fiant mala multa puellae,
quae mentita suas vertit inepta comas

Oh mad one, do you now even imitate the dyed [*infectos*] Britons,
and play the coquette with a foreign tint [*nitore*] on a dyed [*tincta*] head?

Looks as nature bestowed them are always most becoming;
Belgian colour on a Roman face is ugly.

Let many evils come to that girl in the underworld,
who in her stupidity cheated and altered her tresses.

Ovid makes similar statements in *Ars* Book Three and *Remedia*, although there is a different rhetorical context for each criticism. In *AA* 3.211–218 he categorically states that applying cosmeceuticals in front of a lover is unadvisable because it looks unattractive and the smell of lanolin is awful. In *Rem.* 351–356 he advises any man who wants to get over a lover to witness her at her toilette (not a pretty sight).

The anti-cosmetic tradition has several motifs used as justification for an author's opinion. Cosmetics as well as ornate hair and clothing conceal facets of the real woman and are thus essentially deceitful. Additionally, they are artificial and thus not only contradict genuine feminine beauty but attempt to defy the laws of nature. Such accoutrements are also antithetical to perceived notions – particularly vocal in the Augustan age – of the ancestral traditions of Rome, which symbolized simplicity, modesty and chastity. They are consistently associated with the *meretrix* ('courtesan') or adulterous wife as evidenced in the passages above. As symptomatic of stereotypical feminine covetousness they also placed unnecessary financial burdens on men. Barton (2002: 221–222) considers such arguments within the context of *puđicitia* ('chastity') or, more specifically, its antonym, *impudicitia* ('immodesty'): 'Wearing *obvious* make-up ... proclaimed one's unwillingness to be ashamed ... Hiding behind painted-on blush proclaimed not one's blushing modesty but one's brazen shamelessness'.⁴ Finally, cosmetics are prone to instability – they melt, 'run' and smear – and thus achieve the opposite result of their intended purpose. Juvenal (6.463)

presents a comically exaggerated picture of the mucky nature of lotions in the image of a husband virtually glued to his wife's face when he attempts to kiss her.

High maintenance . . . the Roman body

Despite condemnation, cosmetics have an extensive history throughout the ancient Mediterranean. Like today, there was a distinction between cosmeceuticals and cosmetics in antiquity. Galen (12.434–435, 445–446, 449–450 Kühn 1826), writing in the second century AD, notes the difference between *kosmētikon* ('cosmeceutical') and *kommōtikon* ('cosmetic'). A cosmeceutical designed to enhance the skin by means of, for example, moisturizing it, was acceptable. But the application of a cosmetic such as rouge or skin whitener was deemed inappropriate, unsightly and even immoral. Similarly, applying a medicant to stimulate hair growth or to alleviate dandruff was something standard for both men and women, but dyeing one's hair was regarded as garish, unnecessary and subject to opprobrium. Galen disliked any form of *kommōtikon* but endorsed the use of *kosmētikon* to treat medical conditions such as alopecia (12.432–435 Kühn 1826). Typical of ancient medical texts, Galen's works reference other authors' treatments. He cites recipes preserved in the work entitled *Kosmētikon*, written by Cleopatra (*fl.* first century BC / first century AD),⁵ including a hair treatment that consisted of burnt mice, burnt wine dregs, burnt horse teeth, bear fat, deer marrow and reed bark mixed with honey (12.404 Kühn 1826). In addition to Cleopatra, Galen cites other authors of both cosmeceutical and cosmetic treatises, including Heraclides of Tarentum (*fl.* third to second century BC), Archigenes (*fl.* first to second century AD) and Criton (second century AD), physician to the wife of Trajan, Plotina. In his discussion of such authors, Galen (12.445–446 Kühn 1826) makes it clear that he deems writings on cosmetics to be an embarrassment, particularly for doctors.

The Hippocratic text, *Diseases of Women* (1.106), has two recipes for removal of body hair: (i) grapevine sap and oil, and (ii) burnt and pounded *alcyonea* (cf. pp. 71–74) diluted with wine. In the same section the author also recommends applying oil to the eye area after plucking, indicating that women shaped their eyebrows. There is also a remedy for hair loss that includes

pigeon dung and nettles (2.189). This recipe, situated amid medical treatments, again exemplifies the idea that cosmeceuticals for conditions affecting one's appearance were legitimate concerns of doctors. Theophrastus's *On Odours* discusses perfumes in detail – also uncontroversially and within a scientific framework of enquiry – and *Enquiry into Plants* 9.7 is devoted to the same. The direct association between perfumes and feminine beautification did not concern Theophrastus, whose works reflect the medical tradition that aligned sweet smells with good health (to promote it and as a symptom of it). This tradition was continued by later writers such as Dioscorides (first century AD) who were educated in the medical benefits of perfumes, particularly in the healing of sores and open wounds.

There are also extensive archaeological records that attest to the widespread use of cosmetics and cosmeceuticals. Cleanliness was important, particularly among the Roman elite, and the maintenance of personal hygiene included bathing and the use of oil-based soaps and exfoliants. Extensive remains of public baths such as the Stabian Baths at Pompeii reveal a highly ordered bathing routine. Although the women's area is smaller than the men's baths, the architecture shows several separate spaces, including waiting rooms and changing rooms. Balsdon (1962: 267) suggests that the baths also included beauty parlours and treatment rooms,⁶ as attested by Seneca the Younger's reference to the noises coming from a bath near his house, which included the cries of men being plucked (*Epistle* 56).

Wealthier Romans could bathe at home where they were afforded privacy and also protection from the side-effects of washing in other people's water. Bathing was not only for maintaining hygiene, and thereby recommended by various physicians,⁷ it was also associated with beautification. Feminine adornment scenes attest to the pivotal role of bathing from as early as the Homeric age (cf. *Iliad* 14.166ff.) and are regularly depicted in both Greek and Roman artwork with a focus on Aphrodite / Venus at her bath in heady representations of hygiene, beautification and eroticism.

After bathing, some Romans applied a deodorant (cf. p. 116) and cleaned their teeth (cf. pp. 117–119). They may have also applied certain unguents or lotions to soothe the skin, relieving any irritation and restoring moisture. Such substances, like cosmetics, were kept in various containers, usually called *pyxides*, made of bronze, ceramic, glass, silver and even ivory, mostly cylindrical

in shape with a separate lid. Plain *pyxides* are common archaeological finds (Fig. 1), as are more ornate ones that may have also served as display pieces on dressing tables (Fig. 2). The contents of such containers were extracted with specialized tools, many indistinguishable from medical implements, which took the form of spatulas, tiny spoons and phials. These objects, along with combs (Figs 3, 5 and 6), hair pins and other forms of adornment such as jewellery were categorized by Livy (34.7) and Varro (*De Lingua Latina* 5.29.129) as the *mundus muliebris* ('woman's toilette'). An excellent example of the *mundus muliebris* is the well-preserved cosmetic box from Campania that houses all sorts of beauty accoutrements, including a bronze mirror (cf. Fig. 3 and also p. 122).

Mirrors provided a means of monitoring the beautification process, ensuring that all the steps of enhancement were followed for a successful result. Ovid is aware of the significance of the mirror in the *mundus muliebris*. He instructs women to consult their mirrors before they embark on a particular hairstyle (*AA* 3.135–136); predicts the sorrow that will inevitably come to every woman when she looks at her mirror (*Med. ll.* 45–48); suggests to a newly bald Corinna to avoid gazing at herself (*Am.* 1.14.37–38); and even advises the would-be lover to hold his mistress's mirror for her (*AA* 2.215–216). The erotic connotations of feminine adornment are attested by the decorative scenes depicted upon mirrors; for example, the three Graces (Fig. 4),⁸ Venus, scenes of sexual congress, and myths such as Leda and the swan and Europa and the bull (further on the mirror, cf. Bartsch 2006; Wyke 1994).

Yet mirrors were also depicted in funerary reliefs of respectable women, namely those *matronae* ('matrons') who had embodied the esteemed value of *pudicitia* while they were alive. Such reliefs, often accompanied by other adornment motifs, may have been intended to signify familial wealth, but perhaps also to testify to individual women's refinement and circumspect sense of style.⁹ Taylor (2008: 35) suggests that there is no anomaly in such monuments: 'Bourgeois respectability, it seems, went in for common taste; many were the Roman women who preferred to be immortalized with some material reminiscence of their daily toilette. Even the mirror could be presented as an adjunct to matronly chastity.'

There is also a surfeit of archaeological evidence for hair adornment. Numerous hair ornaments and more functional pieces such as pins have been found in public baths – trapped in drains and secreted in other places – along

Fig. 1 Roman container with cosmeceutical cream. Mid-second century AD.

Fig. 2 Bronze cosmetics container. Fourth to third century BC.

with jewellery and other items. Official portraits, decorative frescoes, sculptures and coins provide evidence for various hairdos, which Bartman (2001: 1) argues ‘reproduce real styles that could be made with real hair.’ The more elaborate styles of the Flavian era and later, such as the elevated forehead crown of pin-curls adorning the Fonseca Bust, could be achieved with hair pieces if there were a dearth of one’s natural hair. Wigs and hairpieces, mentioned in written sources, have not fared as well as other material artefacts, except in Egypt where discoveries show a markedly different hair aesthetic compared to Roman styles. Additionally, while we know both women and men used dye, unlike the occasional deposits left in cosmetic jars, no equivalent traces of hair colourants are extant.

Fig. 3 Box containing toiletries, from Cumae, Campania. First century AD.

Fig. 4 Gilded bronze mirror depicting the Three Graces. Second century AD.

Fig. 5 Roman double-sided ivory comb. First century BC to second century AD.

Fig. 6 Stele of P. Ferrarius Hermes. First century BC to second century AD.

Ovid on *cultus*, *munditia* and *ars*

Three of the four texts under analysis herein belong to the middle period of Ovid's literary career. As Toohey (2013: 157) remarks: 'Ovid's didactic poems were published in quick succession' and all three of the erotodidactic works – the *Medicamina*, *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia* – follow on closely from the second edition of the *Amores*. In this respect, the *Amores*, published as late as 3 BC in its revised form, may be regarded as being on the cusp of the middle period, thereby providing a smooth segue to the erotodidactic collection. Indeed, Ovid references the *Amores* in the didactic works through

the unconventional choice of the elegiac couplet, which defines them as both instructional and erotic. A characteristic of Ovid's erotodidactic works is the tripartite system of *cultus-munditia-ars* and it is through this paradigm that he is able to explore feminine beautification (usually) free from opprobrium and express his philosophies on cultivation and simple elegance.

cultus is 'labour' or 'care' and in the process of *cultus*, one renders something improved, refined or, in effect, cultivated. It is therefore aligned with progress and civilization in relation to land, shelter, society and the individual. In relation to society, *cultus* marks a developed urban environment in contrast to one that is rustic and lacking in the sophisticated markers of cultural evolution. In an advanced society, the sophisticates participate in the process of self-improvement, applying the precepts of *cultus* to educate the mind, perfect etiquette and enhance appearance. *cultus* thereby competes with nature because it alters it in order to improve upon it.

In the Ovidian schema of adornment, *cultus* is linked with *munditia* and *ars*. As discussed above, the Romans associated beauty and beauty treatments with hygiene. Cleanliness was encapsulated in the term *munditia*, which also designates neatness, style, and simple elegance.¹⁰ The malleability and inclusiveness evoked by this word, as with *cultus*, ensured that its use to describe a woman's self-presentation denoted an overall package: clean skin, hair and breath; a fresh smell; stylish clothing, make-up and accessories. Gibson (2006: 126), who regards Ovid's views on such matters as decidedly moderate, particularly in the *Ars*, observes the distinction between the poet's position and that of the moralists, writing on *AA* 3.129–134:

The wearing of costly jewellery and expensive clothing is regularly regarded by moralists in opposition to personal simplicity. Ovid's female pupils are likewise warned to eschew *luxuria*. But it is clear from Ovid's earlier and provocative 'hymn' to *cultus* (101–34), and from instruction which follows in *Ars* 3 on hairstyles, clothing, and cosmetics, that Ovid does not accept that his pupils must therefore travel to the opposite 'extreme' of simplicity. In any case, the ground of Ovid's opposition to jewellery and clothing differs from that of the moralists. The latter saw in these items evidence of corrupting *luxuria*, while for Ovid they lack the qualities of taste and elegance (*munditiae*). That is to say, what for others is a matter of ethics, for Ovid is aesthetics: such displays of wealth repel lovers.

The moderation that characterizes Ovid's use of *munditia* also underlies his concept of *cultus*. Ovid does not extol the luxury associated with *cultus*, except when it clearly suits a particular rhetorical imperative (cf. pp. 52–53), and in this sense, he offers a unique understanding of the women of Augustan Rome. Rather than the simplicities of the idealized *matronae* of epic and historical texts, or the *meretrices* and the *puellae* ('girls,' 'girlfriends') of the elegiac poets, or even the ghastly hybrids of the wife-whore of satire, Ovid's women are sophisticated, classy, well-groomed urbanites.

The key to achieving this style, a combination of Ovidian *cultus* and *munditia*, is the application of Ovidian *ars*. Therefore, in the *Medicamina*, beauty can be improved upon and maintained by the application of carefully prepared cosmeceuticals. While some of the ingredients in the lotions are expensive and thus luxurious, Ovid also lists less costly items. The cheaper alternatives to expensive fabrics in *Ars* Book Three, for example, suggest that with an eye for a bargain and a skilled sense of style, non-elite women could also afford the markers of *cultus*.¹¹

Another important aspect of *ars* is privacy and secrecy. The processes of beautification are not to be shared, particularly with one's partner, for the revelation of such is inimical to the very 'point' of beautification. While this is not discussed in the extant lines of the *Medicamina*, it is explained in both *AA* 3.209–234 and *Rem. ll.* 343–356. In Ovid's system of beautification, *ars* is a trick or a deceit, which by alignment with *cultus* and *munditia*, is necessary for female refinement and sophistication. The women of Ovid's era, unlike the unsubtle courtesans of Alexis's *Isostasion*, who may look presentable from a distance, are more like the masterpieces of Myron (*AA* 3.219) or intricate jewellery that glitters and impresses (*AA* 3.221, 223–224). And, like such markers of civilization, they must only be unveiled when they are complete.

While Ovid usually presents an open, relaxed and somewhat egalitarian attitude to female adornment, he is not always as cavalier when it comes to issues of male *cultus*. As *AA* 1.505–524 illustrates, Ovid's opinions on male beautification can be traditional and reactionary. For a Roman male, a natural body was a culturally familiar and culturally approved body and one aligned with accepted and expected moralities. For a man to transcend the physical boundaries that segregated his body from the female via adoption of gender markers culturally assigned to women was to flirt with *mollitia* ('softness',

‘effeminacy’ and ‘voluptuousness’) and the social stigma attached to it. As Edwards (2002: 68) explains: ‘The victim of the accusation [of *mollitia*] is alleged to be over-careful in his dress, often affecting “feminine” and/or exotic clothes. . . . The “effeminate” man is perfumed, bathes more often than is necessary and depilates his legs.’ *mollitia* is, therefore, not to be encouraged, even by Ovid, who, in the aforementioned passage from *Ars* Book One, dissuades men from curling their hair and smoothing their legs. His recommendation for masculine appeal privileges *munditia*; a ‘look’ akin to carefully styled ruggedness.

At *Med.* ll.23–26, however, there is a different attitude expressed, with an emphasis on *cultus* in a vivid evocation of the dapper men of the Augustan age. Partly a picture of well-groomed men (ll.23–24) and partly a comic jibe at their expense (ll.25–26), these lines show the Ovid of the *Medicamina* as a man of moderation with a keen sense of taste. Here Ovid’s persona is that of the urbane sophisticate; a man who possesses a liberal attitude to male beautification with a touch of wry amusement.

Turning to *cultus* and related themes in the *Amores* we find Ovid to be relatively quiet. Nevertheless, the few references show the early stages of his philosophy on adornment. In *Am.* 2.10.5 he claims that the two women he loves are both *formosa* (‘beautiful’) and endowed with *cultus*. Similarly, in *Am.* 3.7.1, he uses *formosa* and *cultus* to describe a desirable woman. In *Am.* 3.4.37–42 there is also an attempt at defining *cultus* through an indirect contrast with *rusticus* (‘rustic’) when Ovid uses the latter of an overly protective husband¹² who is offended at his *adultera coniunx* (‘adulterous wife’). While *cultus* is not named, as a strong antonym of *rusticus*, it is implicit (cf. *AA* 3.127–128 for the juxtaposition of the two terms).

Ovid and Augustus’s moral legislation

The brief consideration of *cultus* in the *Amores* (above) shows occasions of Ovid’s amoral attitude towards sexuality and, in the case of *Am.* 3.4, his defiance of the *lex Iulia de adulteriis coercendis*. The law, introduced by Augustus in 18 BC, aimed to promote marriage and the birth of legitimate children, and consequently forbade sexual activities such as adultery, principally illicit relations with married women, be they divorcees or even widows. Other poems

in the collection that overtly address adultery are 2.19 (a companion poem to 3.4), 3.8 and 3.12. Ovid presents himself in the *Amores* as a decadent who appears to pursue erotic encounters free from any restraints, including that of class or social standing. He enjoys Corinna (*Am.* 1.5); he has sex with her hairdresser, Cypassis (*Am.* 2.8); he chides men who seek to protect their women, of whatever status; he is a slave to Cupid's power (*Am.* 1.1, 1.2, 3.9); he sees *amor* as a battle (*Am.* 1.9, 2.9); and even admits defeat (*Am.* 3.7). Not surprisingly, the cavalier attitude of the *Amores*, and the inherent indifference to the reforms of Augustus, have prompted scholars such as Davis (1999: 449) to regard the collection as equally controversial as the *Ars Amatoria*:

Whereas in the *Ars Amatoria* the poet at least gestures towards defending himself against the charge of promoting adultery, in the *Amores* he openly presents himself as an adulterer. Augustus exiled Ovid to Tomis because of the *Ars Amatoria*. He might equally have banished him for writing the *Amores*.

One may in fact conjecture that the collection is more controversial except that it lacks one integral ingredient: unlike the *Ars*, it is not a handbook promoting un-Roman activities.

In the first two collections of the erotodidactic period, Ovid's celebrations of *cultus* are particularly antithetical to another Augustan precept, namely the promotion of traditional attire and modesty in self-presentation. Ovid's position on adornment and consumption in the *Medicamina* and the *Ars* is, therefore, additionally provocative. This is exacerbated in the *Medicamina* because all women are free to enjoy the poem, and thus, by default, encouraged to delight in the material benefits of a healthy Italian economy and a robust trade market.¹³ There remains only one caveat: remember that inner integrity and good taste are integral parts of *cultus*. As Rosati (1985: 30–32) and Gibson (2003: 145) have commented, the emphasis on esteemed behaviour and inner fortitude, implicitly linked with *cultus* in the *Medicamina*, demonstrates Ovid's championing of feminine cultivation as something that can be practised without rejecting traditional societal values and respectability.

Despite an uncensored audience and a comparatively liberal attitude to female adornment, both of which Augustus may well have found irritating

(despite the caveat), the *Medicamina* is mild in comparison to the *Ars Amatoria*, which strays regularly into matters sexual and, by default, illegal. Ovid begins the *Ars* nobly enough, taking care to issue warnings that the collection is restricted; in *AA* 1.31–34, for example, he plays with Augustus's encouragement of the wearing of the *stola* ('robe') and *vittae* ('headbands') for *matronae*:

este procul, vittae tenues, insigne pudoris,
 quaeque tegis medios instita longa pedes:
 nos Venerem tutam concessaque furta canemus
 inque meo nullum carmine crimen erit.

Away, slim headbands [*vittae*], signs of modesty [*pudor*],
 and you long tunic trailing down past the ankles:
 I sing of safe Venus and permissible amours
 and in my song will be no crime.

These lines clarify Ovid's intended audience in Book One and, consequently, the other two Books (cf. 2.599–600; 3.57–58, 483, 613–616), by alluding to those women who are *not* his intended audience: *matronae*.¹⁴ Dress is important here; Ovid designates his intended readers as *meretrices* – women socially identified by their clothing – namely, the *toga*, not the *stola* and *palla*.¹⁵ In *Ars* Book Three, a female-oriented text, Ovid again makes it clear that *matronae* are not the intended audience, specifying that he is composing for 'she' who has been recently liberated from the rod (*l.*361). Earlier, at *ll.*57–58, he states that in respect to the audience of the Book, he is alert to the *lex Iulia* and to those women who, under its strictures, are permitted a degree of licence (that it, *meretrices*). The audience is, therefore, ostensibly comprised of *libertinae* ('freedwomen'), which clearly included *meretrices*. *libertinae*, however, is a slippery term. Griffin (1976: 103) encapsulates the ambiguities: 'Between *libertinae* and ἑταῖραι [*hetairai*], between actresses and *meretrices*, even between some professionals and some *matronae*, the dividing line cannot have been so easy to draw as in theory, perhaps, it should have been.' Additionally, Volk (2006: 238) points out:

This picture is somewhat complicated by the fact that there is no evidence that freedwomen were exempted from the strictures of the *lex Iulia* – which

does raise the question of what women Ovid really thinks he is teaching and whether he can possibly be sincere in his avowed adherence to the Augustan laws.

There are clearly problems, then, with Ovid's disclaimers, despite his later attempts in Book Three to 'interpret' the law as exempting all freedwomen (cf. *ll.* 611–658).¹⁶ But the glitches and complications extend much further than fluidity of categories and legal ambiguities.¹⁷ Watson (2002: 156) makes some pragmatically insightful observations that further contradict Ovid's stated claims not to be composing for a chaste, socially elite female audience, beginning with the obvious point that didactic teaching is not necessarily 'directed solely at the addressee of the poem', and further:

There are many indications that Ovid had *matronae* in mind. For instance, allusions to activities such as wool-making (2.686) and frequent childbirth (3.81–82) are more appropriate to married women than to courtesans. The use of the famous Mars/Venus love affair – an unequivocal case of adultery – as an exemplum has been commented on.

As for the *Remedia*, Ovid's focus on, or interaction with, the Augustan regime is characterized by a defensive stance in relation to the negative reception of the *Ars Amatoria*. The defence takes the form of a digression at *Rem.* 361–396 in which Ovid references detractors who have called the collection *proterva* ('shameless', *l.* 362). The digression may well include a not-so-veiled swipe at Augustus, or at least a fulsome resentment of him and his rules, as indicated by *ll.* 389–392, particularly the exclamatory words of *l.* 389: *rumpere, Livor edax* ('burst, greedy Spite'). In the illuminating article by Casali (2006), the *Remedia* is interpreted as Ovid's swan song to poetic games involving the *lex Iulia* and the moral platform of the *principate* in general. What these witticisms, mixed messages and, at times, outright subversions are replaced with are one more didactic elegy, the *Fasti*, Ovid's calendar cast as military service to Augustus (2.9), roughly coinciding with the *Metamorphoses*, followed by the poems of despair and repentance. It is no coincidence, then, that the *Remedia* farewells the fun of the erotodidactic collection in the nastiest of ways, as the *praeceptor* becomes the doctor, metaphorically returning to his model Nicander (cf. p. 25), whose works set out to heal the deadliest of bites. As Nicander instructs on removing snake venom, Ovid instructs on

healing the wounds of *amor* (cf. Watson 2002: 163). Rightly, the poet seeks the assistance of Apollo and his gift of healing (*Rem.* 75–78).

The texts

The following discussion provides introductory detail with attention to the sources of Ovid's inspiration. As his allusions, imitations and homages are assembled from a vast literary repertoire, the focus is a particularly selective one: didactic genres for the *Medicamina*; the poet's immediate elegiac predecessors, Tibullus and Propertius, for the *Amores*, plus Callimachus and Catullus for Alexandrian and neoteric inspiration respectively; a return to didactic works in the form of 'pillow-books' and illustrated sex manuals for the *Ars Amatoria*; and satire for the *Remedia*. All of these neatly packaged genres, poets and authors filter throughout almost every one of Ovid's poems to greater and lesser extents and bring with them numerous colleagues and compositions. The examples offered below are, therefore, a drop in the literary ocean.

Medicamina Faciei Femineae

The *Medicamina* (c. 2 BC)¹⁸ is a unique work in Roman literature, not only because it offers a counterbalance to the anti-cosmetic tradition and presents a more nuanced view of feminine cultivation, but because it is aimed at women and of specific interest to them. Most of the few publications on the work focus on its didactic nature, yet its sensual qualities are also important. Dispensing with the hexametric tradition of instructional poetry and adopting the elegiac metre of the *Amores*, Ovid speaks to his female audience on an intimate topic in an intimate manner.¹⁹ Thus he adopts the authorial pose of the teacher of women that echoes the persona of the *lena* ('procuress') whose role, among other things, is to prettify women for sex with clients (cf. Myers 1996; Watson 2001).

Ovid's awareness of the erotic nature of the metre, and his promotion of this, are conveyed in his personification of Elegy as emphatically feminine and sensual in *Am.* 3.1.7–10:

Venit odoratos Elegia nexa capillos,
 et, puto, pes illi longior alter erat.
 Forma decens, vestis tenuissima, vultus amantis,
 et pedibus vitium causa decoris erat.

Elegy comes with scented locks bound,
 and, I believe, one foot was longer than the other.
 Her appearance was becoming, her dress most delicate, her expression affectionate,
 and the imperfection with her feet was the source of her charm.

Assisted by this sensual metre, Ovid metaphorically enters the female chamber in the *Medicamina*, as he writes of woman's flesh and poetically touches woman's face and body. Like the poetic embodiment of Amor, sometimes depicted alongside the female at her toilette in Roman art,²⁰ Ovid cultivates female skin, instructs and assists in beautification and holds an elegiac mirror for woman to gaze at the finished product. The demarcation point of privacy and secrecy that traditionally marginalizes the woman at her toilette is thereby breached by Ovid in a poetic exercise that traverses gendered segregation.²¹

Ovid's intimacy is also tempered with down-to-earth instruction befitting didactic poetry. The technicality of traditional didactic poetry begins at l.51, which is a salient reminder to modern readers that ll.1–50 constitute a proem to what was originally a longer work. While the exact length of the original poem remains uncertain, the substantial introductory passage has been interpreted by Toohey (2013: 162) as indicative of a length of some 800 lines. In contrast, Watson (2002: 142), noting Ovid's description of the *Medicamina* as *parvus* ('small') at AA. 3.205, suggests something closer to Virgil's *Georgics* ('a piece that Ovid certainly had in mind'), which places the length at around 500 lines. Ovid's use of the term *parvus*, however, may be nothing more than a pseudo-bashful conceit, similar in tone to Catullus's description of his poems as *nugae* ('trifles') at 1.4. The possibility of an ironic tone, however, is not mutually exclusive to Watson's suggested length, particularly in view of the subject matter, which may have proven tiresome if excessively long.

Despite the usual regret expressed by scholars at the loss of ancient texts, Ovid's broken *Medicamina* has not always been met with lament.²² The robust dismissal by Wilkinson (1995: 118) is particularly memorable:

The subject chosen by Ovid was cosmetics (*medicamina faciei*), and after fifty clever and spirited lines of introductions he plunges into a series of versified recipes, presumably taken from some prose treatise by a professional pharmacologist. It is hardly a matter of regret that after a further fifty lines our manuscripts break off. One would like to think that Ovid broke off too. He tells us that the book was small, but he also indicates that it was published . . . What can have induced him to embark on such a poem? He was not a tasteless bore, as Nicander (to judge from his two extant verse treatises) most certainly was.

In addition to characterizations of the work as either boring or trivial or both, there has been limited scholarly attention paid to the *Medicamina*. The publication of Rosati's edition with extensive notes in 1985 has gone some way to legitimizing research on the work, and Watson (2001) and Rimell (2005 and 2006) have followed with insightful analyses. Prior to these studies, Green (1979) provided a detailed discussion of the recipes and addressed the significance of the work in extending approaches to Ovid's views on women, the didactic genre and the persona of the *praeceptor amoris*.²³ As these studies have shown, the *Medicamina* may be a parodic and incongruous example of didactic literature (cf. Toohey 2013: 161; Watson 2001; Watson 2002: 146–147), but it is far from mediocre. It may not have the spectacle of the *Metamorphoses*, or the intensity and haunting beauty of the *Tristia*, or even the delightful variations and erotic daring of the *Ars*, but in the context of its genre and subject matter, it is informative and interesting.

While the subject matter may be regarded as frivolous, it is not without precedent, and Ovid shows himself to be a poet who pays deference to his artistic heritage. Watson (2001: 458) has discussed the links to 'the subgenre of didactic poems (*artes*) on non-serious subjects, such as those composed for the Saturnalia'. In the *Tristia* 2.471–490, as Watson notes, Ovid provides a defence of poetry on such trivial subjects, describing works on dice and various board games, swimming instruction and painting (2.487). Such works, Ovid argues, are the subjects of play in the month of December (2.491), which references the Saturnalia and the provision of 'gift' books for amusement. At 2.493 Ovid acknowledges that such spirited didactic literature furnished the inspiration behind some of his own collections – works that were neither stern nor gloomy – but that, nevertheless, resulted in punishment.

Ovid was also influenced by more serious didactic poetry as well as technical prose works on medicine, cosmeceuticals and cosmetics from the Alexandrian age. The enthusiasm for didactic poetry during this period resulted in several innovations, including the liberation of subject matter to incorporate the trivial and comic, an emphasis on the ludic capabilities of didacticism and explorations of, and experiments in, the transformative effects of metaphrastic exercises (cf. Callimachus's adoption of the elegiac metre for his *Aetia*).²⁴ Extant examples of metaphrastic didactic include the *Phaenomena* of Aratus (c. 315–240 BC), a poem on star-signs and weather-signs, based on a prose text by Eudoxus and possibly a work by Theophrastus, and the *Theriaca* and *Alexipharmaca* of Nicander (fl. second century BC). Despite Wilkinson's dismissal of Nicander as a bore, his work influenced Ovid in various ways and in view of the subject matter of the *Theriaca* and *Alexipharmaca* – venomous creatures and remedies for their bites, and poisons and antidotes, respectively – they are lively and fascinating reads. What makes them so, and what would have appealed to Ovid, are Nicander's occasional liking for the gruesome, his random outbursts of sensationalism (described by Toohey (2013: 62) as similar to a style 'normally reserved for tabloid newspapers'), and the ludic qualities of his writing that are frequently expressed in obscurities of vocabulary and metaphor. Indeed, Nicander's wild flourishes, exhilarating descriptions of the effects of poisons, mythological *exempla* and heroic similes, interspersed with instruction, mark his works as precursors to both the *Medicamina* and also the *Metamorphoses*.²⁵

Of the Roman writers, Ovid's primary source of imitation is Virgil's *Georgics*. The allusions are, as Watson (2001: 461) states, designed to raise the theme of the *Medicamina* to the important level of agriculture, 'legitimising it as a subject for a didactic poem'. The immediate point of poetic debt is evidenced in Ovid's treatment of *cultus* and its relationship to *cura*, which is reminiscent of certain Virgilian passages, such as 2.35–37:

Quare agite o proprios generatim discite cultus,
agricolae, fructusque feros mollite colendo,
neu segnes iaceant terrae.

Wherefore come, farmers, learn the cultivation [*cultus*] appropriate to

each species, by cultivation [*colere*] tame the wild fruits,
that the earth should not lie idle.

As Virgil writes of cultivation to soften wild fruit and prevent fallow land, Ovid eulogizes *cultus* for similar reasons. Virgil extends his definition of *cultus* to embrace human achievements in the realms of engineering and architecture in his famous eulogy to Italy in *Georgics* 2.136–176, which recalls the praise of Italy's fertile soil in Varro's *De Res Rustica* 1.2.3–7. Again, this is matched by Ovid's segue from agriculture to civilization at *Med.* 11.7–10, which includes *cultus* in the form of golden halls and marble monuments. The *Georgics*, like the *Medicamina*, also acknowledges the benefits of an expansive empire in relation to the importation of the markers of *cultus*. In *Georgics* 1.56–57, Virgil lists saffron fragrance from Lydia, ivory from India and incense from Arabia; foreshadowing Ovid's references to imported luxuries such as Indian ivory (*Med.* 1.10) and gems from the East (*Med.* 1.21).

Virgil also includes plant knowledge that reveals his use of Theophrastus's *Enquiry into Plants*. In Book Four, Theophrastus focuses on the influence of environment and climate on plant and tree species, which Virgil references in *Georgics* 2.109–135. A more direct textual parallel occurs at *Georgics* 2.56–59 on the benefits derived from the Median citron²⁶ where Virgil cites two of the same benefits of the plant as listed by Theophrastus at 4.2 (its use as an antidote to poison as well as a mouth-freshener). The imitation of Theophrastus's didactic prose shows a shared poetic practice between Virgil and Ovid in their adoption of poetic renderings of Alexandrian technical treatises.²⁷

There are also significant points of poetic departure between the *Georgics* and the *Medicamina*, which reflect the different political and social climates in which they were composed, as well as different artistic imperatives. Otis (1970: 1–2) has stressed the need to recognize Ovid as an artist from 'a wholly different Augustan generation'; an approach revived by Habinek (2002: 46) as an important interpretive consideration when assessing not only these two poets, but the Augustan poets per se (cf. also Tarrant 2013: 14). Whereas Virgil's work, in part, reflects the newly (re)founded Rome with its ties to, and dependence upon, a past characterized by *labor* and *industria*; Ovid's work reflects the developed *principate* as an institution of revision that addressed and reshaped constructions of political authority, religion and cult, as well as

sexuality and gender. Virgil was witness to the rise of Augustan Rome but Ovid lived in it.

This generational difference is perhaps why there are moments of uncertainty in the *Georgics* in relation to *cultus* that are absent from the *Medicamina*. In Book Two in ‘The Praise of the Farmer’ (ll.458–542), Virgil returns to images of unprompted or uncultivated earthly bounties and juxtaposes them to images of cultivated luxury in the form of mansions, lavish clothing and other exotica. Here Virgil promotes the quietude and peace of a life free of deceit (*natura* transformed into *cultus* transformed into *luxuria*). In contrast, the *Medicamina* shows no such anxieties as Ovid records the women of his age making the most of the bounties of empire; as Habinek (2002: 50) states:

Here the age-old anxieties about women as consumers . . . are cast aside in favour of a celebration of the imperial cornucopia. Sumptuary laws and other strategies of élite ‘auto-conservation’ are unnecessary in the new global economy. *Cultus* becomes an end in itself, whether it’s planting, pruning, grafting, covering, or dyeing – your face.

The tensions between Virgil and Ovid’s responses to *cultus* and the generation ‘gap’ between them in regard to the evolution of the *principate*, succinctly expressed by Habinek in his summation of Ovid’s agenda, are also present in the prooemium of the *Medicamina*. As discussed above, Ovid echoes the *Georgics* here, and Watson (2001: 467) argues for a ‘mock-serious’ tone and an attitude that is ‘subversive (at least playfully, if not maliciously) of the ideology espoused in the *Georgics* and of Augustan ideology in general.’

Amores

Originally composed over a decade before the *Medicamina*, with its latest publication date merely a year or so before it, the *Amores* is a celebrated rejection of epic in favour of the amorous, playful and emotional genre of elegy. The decision to write elegy is a motif of the collection and is presaged as such in the opening poem of Book One. Ovid explains that he started with epic but was disturbed by Cupid who compelled him to write elegy instead. In other poems in the collection he further explains that elegy also came in the form of

the inspirational women around him, including Corinna (*Am.* 2.1, 2.12 and 2.18) who, coincidentally embodies key facets of the evocative image of the goddess Elegy of *Am.* 3.1.7–20 (on the motif, cf. also *Am.* 3.1, 3.8 and 3.9).

In comparison to the *Medicamina* and as traditional elegy rather than didactic or erotodidactic poetry, the *Amores* presents the reader with a different authorial pose – indeed there are several ‘authors’ speaking in the collection – and a different audience. The primary role adopted by Ovid is, obviously, that of the *amator* (‘lover’), but his is a most versatile, chameleon-like *amator* who shares a variety of experiences – celebratory, embarrassing and painful – and voices a variety of opinions on *amor* that are not necessarily consistent. The likelihood of an intended female audience, with the possible exception of *meretrices*, seems out of the question, and the memorable description of Ovid’s readership proffered by Greene (1994: 349) still remains one of the best: ‘[an] audience of sexually excitable (perhaps predatory) men.’ Ovid therefore writes for ‘himself’ in ‘others’, that is, with an understanding that his readers will be thoughtful in their responses to his themes, able to appreciate them and to see themselves mirrored therein. Thus the *Amores* not only foreshadows the metre and amatory concerns of the *Medicamina* and the *Ars*, it also predates and anticipates the jilted lovers for whom the *Remedia* is composed.

In *Am.* 1.15.9–30, Ovid provides a list of immortal authors and while he does not claim them as direct influences, their names evoke his literary learning and sources of homage and imitation. From this list, the most immediate and named influence is Tibullus. While Propertius is curiously absent, he is the primary influence on *Amores* overall and this very poem in particular (emphasized by Ovid’s imitation of Propertius 2.34.27–45 in this sweeping evocation of authors). In this instance acknowledgement is best suited to imitation rather than naming.

Both Propertius and Tibullus influenced Ovid’s *Amores* in their joint establishment of what were to become standard elegiac tropes: *servitium amoris* (‘the slavery of love’), *militia amoris* (‘the battle of love’) and *exclusus amator* (‘the locked-out lover’). The fixation on a specific *puella* – Tibullus’s Delia and Propertius’s Cynthia – is also the inspiration for Ovid’s Corinna. Both poets focus on women – not only as objects of desire – but as embodiments of female habits and concerns per se, which is particularly influential on the *Amores*.²⁸ In the adornment or cosmetic-themed poems of Ovid, principally

Am. 1.14, both Tibullus and Propertius's interest in matters pertaining to women is evident. Assuming the role of the *praeceptor amoris* in 1.8, ostensibly a homoerotic response to Marathus and his tryst with Pholoe, Tibullus explains his amatory credentials then proceeds to comment on the unappealing nature of ornate and artificial adornment (1.8.9–16), beginning with a couplet, 1.8.9–10:

Quid tibi nunc molles prodest coluisse capillos
saepeque mutatas disposuisse comas?

What good does it do now to have adorned soft locks
and to have styled your often-changed tresses?

Tibullus's message on the *cultus* of the elegiac *puella* is clear: she is most pleasing when unadorned (cf. Booth 1996; Damer 2014); of course, the lines are echoed in *Am.* 1.14.1. Following the lines on beautification, Tibullus employs what are to become by Ovid's time, standard themes of Latin elegy, such as a discourse against magic (1.8.17–26) and warnings against the ravages of old age (1.8.41–46).

In her study of the *Amores*, Morgan (1977: 2) problematizes the debt to Propertius, citing among other poems, *Am.* 1.14: 'Just because both Propertius and Ovid wrote poems about dyeing the hair, does not . . . mean that Ovid was directly copying Propertius. . . . It seems more likely that Ovid is repeating a cliché of the genre' (cf. also, Berman 1972; Zetzel 1996; Boyd 1997: 117–122). This statement provides a useful case study of *Am.* 1.14 and its interaction with Propertius (and Tibullus).

Morgan is both right and wrong. In *Am.* 1.14 Ovid directly imitates Propertius, and yet a preference for natural feminine beauty expressed in the same poem is *also* an elegiac cliché. Ovid's imitation of Propertius's 1.9.1 –

Dicebam tibi venturos, irrisor, amores
I was constantly saying, mocking one, that love would come

– is evident in *Am.* 1.14.1:

Dicebam 'medicare tuos desiste capillos'
I was constantly saying 'Desist from treating your locks'

Additionally, *Am.* 1.14.1 references both Propertius's 1.2.1 –

Quid iuvat ornato procedere, vita, capillo?

What use is it to come, my life, with locks adorned?

– and Tibullus 1.8.9–10 (quoted above). Yet the ultimate tone of *Am.* 1.14 is far from the earnest opprobrium of these poets. Verbal echoes may exist but Ovid's version is light with a decidedly parodic edge. His use of both Propertius and Tibullus shows the same hallmarks of his poetic responses to Virgil who is also referenced in the *Amores* (for an obvious example, cf. *Am.* 1.1 and *Aeneid* 1.1); flaunting imitation and clichés and producing elegies with 'a perverse kind of originality' (Zetzel 1996: 100).

Like the *Medicamina*, the *Amores* pays deference to the Alexandrians.²⁹ The preface makes this clear by mentioning that the second edition is slimmer³⁰ and by assuming a personified form that references Callimachus's chatty nautilus shell (*Epigram* 6 Pfeiffer 1953) and talking lock of hair (*Fragment* 110 Pfeiffer 1965).³¹ The latter poem, known as the 'Lock of Berenice' and imitated by Catullus (66),³² is worthy of a brief analysis here to demonstrate Ovid's innovative treatment of an Alexandrian original – and a Latin version – in *Am.* 1.14.

The inventiveness of Ovid's version is partly achieved by a carnivalesque reduction of this romantic tale. Queen Berenice II of Egypt is an archetypal heroine of antiquity, characterized by her wifely devotion to Ptolemy III Euergetes (reigned 246–222 BC) who, in turn, epitomized an ideal leader and husband. Berenice, who vowed to dedicate a lock of hair to ensure her husband's safety in his march against Syria, dutifully fulfilled her obligation on Euergetes' return, and her lock was committed to the gods (cf. Gutzwiller 1992). After the dedication to Aphrodite-Arsinoe in the temple at Zephyrium, the lock vanished, carried up to the heavens by Zephyrus on the command of the goddess, and became a new constellation. This well-known fantasy, intrinsically Alexandrian, with Theocritus also treating it (*Idyll* 17), and intrinsically neoteric, with Catullus's imitation (66), becomes parodic dynamite in Ovid's hands. Ovid combines the romance of Berenice's lock with the anti-cosmetic sentiments of Tibullus and Propertius to create an original discourse on the modern woman of the late-first century BC. Far from the dedicated spouse who is honoured by the goddess of love, Corinna is a poet's mistress whose locks fall out because she has over-

treated them with dye and hot curling irons. The romantic story of a graceful, royal woman thus rematerializes in *Am.* 1.14 as an unromantic comedy of errors.

Ars Amatoria

The first two Books of the *Ars* are feisty, at times incendiary, male-centred elegies with overtones of the sympotic songs of the Greek tradition. All manner of advice is given on the topic of controlling *amor* for the benefit of the individual male student with Ovid's overall dictum being that it should be approached like a career (on the latter, cf. Solodow 1977). To harness *amor* for the benefit of the *amator* one must learn the appropriate *artes* (AA 1.1–4). With an eye on the moral panopticon of the Augustan regime, Ovid makes it clear that the prescribed *artes* will ensure safe love-making and permitted secrecy while avoiding *crimen* or offence (AA 1.33–34). It failed, as we know, and along with the mysterious *error* (*carmen et error*, *Tr.* 2.207), resulted in Ovid's relegation to Tomis.³³

While the first two Books of the collection are all about men, Ovid does foreshadow his next book and its female audience at AA 2.745–746:

Ecce, rogant tenerae sibi idem praecepta puellae:
vos eritis chartae proxima cura meae.

Look, delicate girls are begging me to provide teaching:
you will be my tablet's next concern.

Sharrock (1994) reads these lines as a carefully constructed revelation of an agenda that was present all along, namely that the *Ars* was always going to be about men *and* women, and Book Three was always part of the plan. This strategy, unveiled in the last two lines of Book Two, was intended to surprise the male readers of Books One and Two and was, adopting Sharrock's argument, cleverly concealed until then. While there are alternative views (cf. Henderson 2006 who suggests the surprise is not a surprise at all), Sharrock's thesis maintains a disjuncture between the sexes that is suitably Roman. It also underscores the distinctly male perspectives at play in the erotodidactic corpus overall: the reductive assumption that (all) contemporary women are concerned with enhancing their faces and preserving their looks; the preference

for the well-presented woman over the one disinterested in attracting the male gaze; and the correlation between female adornment within the context of male precepts.

Turning to the authorial influences on the *Ars*, we see the reappearance of artistic ancestors already discussed in relation to other works. Therefore, in order to avoid repetition, the collection's erotodidactic nature is examined through the keyhole of sex manuals. We begin with Philaenis (*fl.* fourth century BC), author of an erotic handbook, of which only fragments remain (*Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 39: 2891 Lobel): part of a preface, a section on seduction (with a heading), a piece on flattery (without a heading) and a heading entitled 'On Kissing' (without a text).³⁴ The fragment from the preface introduces the author, explains that the book is for those who wish to be instructed with knowledge accrued from scientific enquiry, and specifies the toil entailed in the composition. On seduction, Philaenis advises a man to come to the object of desire in a dishevelled state to avoid appearing predatory. In the advice on flattery, a man is to compare his beloved to a goddess; if she is ugly she is told she is charming, and if she is old she is told she is like a young girl. The first piece of advice corresponds roughly to *Ars* 1.505–524 in respect to the expectation that a man should not be too fussy about his appearance, while the second is close to *AA* 2.657–666 on avoiding talk of a woman's flaws. It is likely that Philaenis discussed – or described – the best positions for sex, also at *Ars* 3.769–788, although Lobel maintains that the work must have been much broader than instructions on sexual positions – as the pieces mentioned above demonstrate – leading him to describe it as 'a systematic exposition of *ars amatoria*' (Lobel as per Tsantsanoglou 1973: 183). Taking Lobel's cue, therefore, allows one to posit that Philaenis may well have covered all of the bases of *Ars* Book Three (cf. Parker 1992). In addition to Philaenis, Ovid would have also had access to other handbooks, such as the didactic poetry of Elephantis (*fl.* first century BC) on sex and also medicine, a part of which, on abortifacients, is summarized by Pliny (28.81),³⁵ and another part, on cosmetics, is referenced by Galen (12.416 Kühn 1826).

In addition to such manuals, Myerowitz argues that Ovid was also most likely inspired by erotic *tabellae* (lit. 'small paintings') similar to the scenes from the House of the Vettii in Pompeii. For support, Myerowitz (1992: 156n3) notes the specific references to *tabellae* by Propertius, Pliny, Suetonius,

Plutarch, Athenaeus, the *Priapea* and *AA* 2.679–680 in which Ovid mentions that women are adept in assuming novel positions that went far beyond erotic paintings. While the intention(s) behind the inclusion of such decorative works in private homes is open to debate, there may well have been a didactic element to them. Myerowitz (1992: 148) notes Brendel's discussion of the paintings as originally sourced from illustrated handbooks and thereby serving a specifically didactic purpose – as well as a titillating one. Interestingly, in *Tr.* 2.521–528 Ovid implies that Augustus owned a *tabella* on which were depicted scenes of heroic or mythological figures demonstrating various sexual positions.

Remedia Amoris

Some scholars (Küppers 1981; Wildberger 1998; Rimell 2006) have suggested that the *Remedia* may be read as part four of the *Ars*, which consequently makes a quadrilateral series like Virgil's *Georgics*. Indeed, the poem is regularly in dialogue with the *Ars*, maintaining the emphases on *artes*, *amor* and *puellae*. But, as Rosati (2006) has discussed, the *Remedia* also connects with the *Amores*, beginning, like it does, with Amor. As Ovid was led to elegy by Amor in the *Amores*, he finds the god present once more as he composes the *Remedia*, except this time, Amor is alert to a war about to be waged against him (l.2). Ovid manages to persuade Amor, however, that the young men (*iuvenes*) sick with his wounds also need instruction; thus, at ll.39–40, the god acquiesces:

Haec ego; movit Amor gemmatas aureus alas,
et mihi 'propositum perficere' dixit 'opus.'

Thus spoke I; golden Amor moved his bejewelled wings,
and to me 'finish the proposed work' he said.

Not surprising, Ovid is indifferent to, and at times negative towards, *cultus* in the *Remedia*. Like the women he seeks to undo, the benefits and charms of *cultus* are minimized and sometimes scorned. Ovid ceases to wax lyrical on the evolutionary wonders of *cultus*; unlike the *Medicamina* and *Ars* Book Three, he does not marvel at the gifts of agriculture, but instead observes that the earth still produces noxious plants as well as healing herbs and the nettle

still grows next to the rose (*ll.*45–46). This is an inspired metaphor to foreshadow the woman at her toilette at *ll.*343–356 who, as it turns out, is more nettle than rose, and more inclined to dip into noxious substances for her beautification rather than the pleasant herbs and sweet ingredients of the *Medicamina*.

As we read Ovid's remedies, it soon becomes clear that he has spent a good deal of time contemplating satire and perhaps, according to Rosati (2006), even magical treatises. As with the section on the sources of imitation in the *Ars*, which acknowledged standard works but then moved on to discuss additional ones, this analysis of the generic and poetic inspirations for the *Remedia* does the same, and focuses on satire.

Satire is present in other works by Ovid but usually not to the same degree as the *Remedia*, which is not surprising considering its theme. With its aim to end desire and redirect its energies elsewhere, there is a particular need for the unleashing of the satirist's *stilus*. The object of desire requires the poet's skills in the areas of *reductio ad absurdum* and *reductio ad obscenam*. Ovid himself admits the use of the iambic metre is the most appropriate means, poetically, of driving off unwanted lovers and beckons it at *ll.*377–378, thereby invoking the satirists' links to the Greek iambic tradition of Archilochus, Semonides and Hipponax, and their poetry of vituperation. So too, Horace's *Satires* I and II (36–35 BC and 29–25 BC) as well as the often dark and foreboding elegies of the *Epodes* (32–30 BC), are present as important successors to the Greek tradition and important precursors to the *Remedia*.

The application of the satirist's misogyny – be it an affectation or something more – is important to this study because of its traditional use of motifs oppositional to much of the imagery of Ovid's evocations of feminine *cultus*. Rhetorically speaking, the combative voice of the satirist is needed in the *Remedia* and manifests itself in a passage selected herein, namely *ll.*343–356 on the anti-cosmetic tradition. It surfaces with far more vigour in *ll.*437–440 in Ovid's reluctant suggestion – immediately retracted – to watch the *puella* performing *obscena* (the adjective used as a substantive plural, denoting actions that are 'ill-omened' or 'obscene'; here meaning the bodily functions of defecation / urination). The focus on the woman's body as excessively moist, be it with mucky, greasy, malodorous creams (*ll.*351–356) or the moisture of

bodily fluids expelled, creates an image of an abject *puella* far removed from the elegiac beloved.³⁶

Such female-centred tropes of cruel observation and exaggeration come some thirty years after Horace's major works of satire and iambic, and the debt is evident. In *Epode* 12.1–20, Horace revels in a gross description of an old prostitute, evoking images of the stench of poor hygiene, hairy armpits (possibly hiding a goat), her oily and unstable foundation and her rouge of 'crocodile' shit (*stercus*). He extends the vituperation by evoking memories of her genitals, which are pungent and shrivelled, which foreshadows Ovid's anecdotal advice concerning a close-up of a woman's 'obscene parts' (*obscenae partes*) and an inspection of the 'shameful marks' (*signa pudenda*) she leaves on a 'filthy bed' (*immundus torus*), as effective means of killing desire (*Rem.* 429–432).

Reminiscent of the fragment of the *Isostasion* in which the physical faults of prostitutes are alleviated with artificial interventions, Ovid suggests that an effective cure for *amor* is to fixate on a woman's flaws (*Rem.* 325–342). This inversion of the bitter realism and misogyny of New Comedy not only suggests Ovid's familiarity with Alexis's play and its genre per se, but also his skills in accentuating the, at times, blurred lines between comedy and satire for biting effect. Perhaps more importantly, such nasty passages, which often trouble scholars because of the intratextual contradictions of other works within the Ovidian oeuvre, are revealed as nothing more than rhetorical devices to suit a given *topos*. Ovid goes where his Muse takes him.

Notes

- 1 There is an extensive history of beautification procedures prior to the age of Ovid. The first accounts of corrective surgery for facial defects are preserved in the *Edwin Smith Papyrus* (c. 3000 BC), cf. Rinzler (2009: 150ff.). In India by c. 800 BC, reconstructive surgery was being practised, with various techniques recorded in the Sanskrit text, the *Sushruta Samhita* (c. sixth century BC), cf. Bhishagratna (1907). For a concise history of elective plastic surgery in antiquity, cf. Marmelzat (1987) and, on cosmeceuticals and cosmetics in the ancient world, cf. Blanco-Dávila (2000).

- 2 Xenophon employs several key cosmetic terms in Greek. Ischomachus's wife uses *psimythion* ('white lead') to lighten her skin (cf. p. 70) and *egkhousa* ('alkanet'), which has a root that produces a red dye for rouge. Ischomachus, in his hypothetical depiction of himself after having applied cosmetics, mentions *miltos* or red ochre for his cheeks and also *andreikelos*, a flesh-coloured pigment.
- 3 On feminine adornment, including jewellery, cosmeceuticals and cosmetics in Juvenal, cf. Watson (2007), and also Watson and Watson (2014: 223–228).
- 4 On *pudicitia*, cf. Langlands (2006).
- 5 Probably not the famous Egyptian queen; cf. Parker (2012: 379).
- 6 The references to Balsdon and Seneca are from Stewart (2007: 54). On the possibility that women's baths also catered for beauty treatments, Stewart comments: 'Interestingly, tools believed to be surgical instruments have been found at bath complexes. The presence of these items may suggest that minor surgical operations, at least, may have been carried out on the premises. . . . However, cosmetic utensils including long-handled spoons (*ligulae*), spatulas and palettes do resemble surgical tools . . . It is possible that the bath administration may have profited from the sale of cosmetics and perfumes on their premises, as they did from other services offered to clients including catering and massage. No doubt individual women attending the baths may have reapplied their make-up and scent once they had bathed but finding concrete evidence for the sale or application of cosmetics and perfumes as a service provided for customers needs much more investigation.'
- 7 Cf. Fagan (1999: 85–103). Not surprisingly, there were critics of bathing, particularly when it came to frequent bathing; cf. Toner (1995: 53–64). Toner notes those opponents of such activities who saw attention to bodily cleanliness – particularly among men – as symptomatic of increasing femininity among Roman men and as a sign of general moral decline.
- 8 This mirror is without a handle and designed to fit comfortably in the palm. For a detailed discussion of the artefact, cf. Milleker (1998).
- 9 This is borne out by Shumka (2008: 173) in her work on representations of the *mundus muliebris* on funerary monuments. Of particular note is her discussion of the goodly matron who also spent time on her appearance in a modest way: 'Depending upon time, finances, or desire, a woman might turn her attention to adornment, apparel, complexion management, hair care and styling, or any combination of these endeavours. If performed conscientiously, this art produced an elegant appearance that publicly and privately asserted her gender identity.'
- 10 Throughout, *munditia* is translated as 'simple elegance' to best encapsulate Ovid's use of the term (cf. Watson 2002: 144).

- 11 Cf. Watson (1982) for discussion of the distinctions in Ovid's approaches to beautification and *ars* in the *Medicamina* and *Ars* Book Three. Watson argues that, while the *Medicamina* presents a *praeceptor* who adopts a traditional approach to *cultus* in terms of his casual recommendations of, at times, luxury items, the *Ars* depicts him as a mixture of *lena* ('procuress') and *pauper poeta* ('impoverished poet'). While the former requires an expensively adorned girl to attract wealthy clients, the latter avoids recommending costly items because they place financial burdens on poor boyfriends. The key is artistry, not extravagance.
- 12 On the motif of the *custos* ('guard') in *AA* 3.611–658, cf. Gibson (2003: 334–349).
- 13 On the irreversible and ever-increasing importation of luxury items during the Augustan age (and its representation in poetry), cf. Griffin (1976). On Ovidian women, *cultus* and empire, cf. also Bowditch (2012), especially: 'Ovid's elegiac-didactic poetry, in particular, suggests the favourable conditions to international commerce that came about with the *Pax Augusta*. The *Medicamina Faciei Femineae*, a handbook devoted to cosmetics, openly advertises the advantages of *imperium sine fine* for improving female appearance.' (Ibid. 128).
- 14 He reiterates the message of *AA* 1.31–34 as a means of self-defence in the exile poems; cf., for example, *Tr.* 2.212, 346 and *Ep.* 3.3.51–52.
- 15 On the reintroduction or promotion of traditional attire, cf. Zanker (1990: 162–166). Cf. also, Sebesta (1997), particularly on a statue of Livia, wife of Augustus, in which she is depicted wearing not only the *stola* and *vittae* but has her *palla* ('long robe' or 'mantle') covering her head (Ibid. 56); cf. National Archaeological Museum, Naples, Inv. Neg. Rom. 76.1157. It is important to note that extant ancient sources do not indicate that Augustus legislated on women's attire. For further discussion, cf. Watson and Watson (2014: 220).
- 16 The intricacies of the law remain difficult to interpret regarding the exact classes of women included in it and those exempt from it; cf. McGinn (1991). As the law specified the *mater familias*, 'whether she was married or not' (335n3), as the female category 'potentially liable to its penalties', it seems plausible, as McGinn argues, that only prostitutes and procuresses were exempt from the *lex Iulia*. In line with McGinn's interpretation, the law would have included freedwomen under its jurisdiction, which in turn problematizes the meaning of the term *matrona* ('married woman', 'wife', 'mother') within the traditional context of the Roman elite. On this point, cf. Veyne (1998: 74): 'How could former slaves be considered true matrons when they had not been raised and protected as virgins in order to become wives . . .?' Ovid's narrow definition of who exactly is a *matronae* at *AA*. 1.31–34 may therefore be a sly allusion to the uncertainty concerning members of this class within the confines of the *lex Iulia*.

- 17 Other common and often stable terms also become unclear and contested in the erotodidactic texts, particularly the *Ars*; cf. Watson (2002: 156) on words such as *vir* and *puella*. Cf. also Davis (1999: 445) on *Am.* 2.12.1–4 and the reference to Corinna's *vir* (l.3), which, in this context is ambiguous – does the poet mean her husband or her lover? 'We cannot tell.'
- 18 The *Medicamina* is usually dated to c. 2 BC, based in part on *AA* 3.205, which leads scholars such as Rosati (1985: 42–43) to suggest a date between *AA* Books One and Two (2 BC) and *AA* Book Three (AD 2). Lenz (1965: 81) posits that *AA* Books 1 and 2 were composed simultaneously with the *Medicamina*, while Hollis (1977: xii) dates the work somewhat earlier, arguing that it was a 'trial run' for the *Ars Amatoria*. Neither Lenz nor Hollis diverge radically from Rosati.
- 19 Toohey (2013: 161) draws attention to the inclusion of the second person singular – 'you' – in the second half of the poem; contra Watson (2001: 459n9).
- 20 Cf., for example, Scene 8 from the fresco in the Villa of the Mysteries at Pompeii and 'Venus at her Toilet' from Thuburbo-Majus (Bardo Museum, Tunis).
- 21 Transgressing the boundaries of privacy is a poetic conceit favoured by Ovid, as attested by his penchant for 'reading' people's mail in the *Heroides* and for revealing the secrets of others (cf. the discussion of Corinna's abortion in *Am.* 2.13 and 2.14). Often the sneak, he also eavesdrops (*Am.* 1.8.21ff.) and spies (*Am.* 2.5.13ff.).
- 22 Cf. Fränkel (1945: 63): 'From this work only fifty couplets have survived, and we have probably no reason to regret the loss of the rest.'
- 23 In addition to the scholarship mentioned above, other important studies on the *Medicamina* include the early work by Kunz (1881); studies by Leary (1988a, 1988b, 1990); Nikolaidis (1994); García (1995); and Cioccoloni (2006). The text is also included to varying degrees in research on Roman cosmetics; cf. Saiko (2005); Stewart (2007); and Olson (2008a, 2008b, 2009).
- 24 Further on Callimachean echoes in *Am.* 3.1 and in the collection per se, cf., McKeown (1987: 1: 32–62); Acosta-Hughes (2009: 250). The echoes of *Iambus* 4 as discussed by Acosta-Hughes may have been an additional acknowledgement of the metrical debt to Callimachus.
- 25 On the influence of Nicander on the *Medicamina*, cf. Rosati (1985: 47). On Nicander's work on metamorphoses, *Heteroeoumena* (*The Book of Changed Things*), preserved in a prose summary by Antoninus Liberalis, and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, cf. Griffin (1981 and 1991). Aratus's influence is also important, with a non-extant poem in hexameter titled the *Aratea*, almost certainly inspired by Aratus's *Phaenomena*.
- 26 Theophrastus refers to the plant as the Persian apple (*mēlon*). On the relevant passage of Theophrastus and the use and adaptation of it by Virgil, cf. Thomas

(1987: 236). Thomas (Ibid. 253–260) provides further and more extensive analyses of Virgil's direct use of Theophrastus in the *Georgics* and cites Jahn and also Mitsdörffer. In addition to Theophrastus, the *Georgics* also reflects the influences of Aratus and Nicander; cf. Gale (2000).

- 27 *Georgics* 2.109–135 is preceded by a digression on the misuse of botanical properties by stepmothers, against which the citron offers an antidote (2.126–130).^{*} Virgil returns to the trope of plants and stepmothers at *Georgics* 3.282–283 in his description of the magical ingredient, *hippomanes* (cf. p. 56). Similarly, Ovid writes of the potentially dangerous uses of herbs at *Med. ll.* 35–38, warning his female audience against meddling in botanical potions, including the infamous ingredient, *hippomanes*, for magical purposes (cf. also *Am.* 1.14.39–40). The powers of nature are treated with respect by both poets and their concern is that cultivation be confined to positive activities and outcomes.

^{*} *Georgics* 2.129 is regarded by some as an interpolation; cf. Thomas (1988: 178); for a detailed discussion, cf. Watson (1993).

- 28 The *Tristia* provides the most informative accounts of Ovid's interaction with the elegies of Tibullus and Propertius. Cf., for example, *Tr.* 2.447–448, on Ovid's analysis of the works of both poets and their influence on his own oeuvre. In an excellent study of this passage and its detailed homage to several of Tibullus's works, cf. James (2003: 159–160).
- 29 The choice of the elegiac metre over the hexameter for a didactic work such as the *Medicamina* references Callimachus's *Aetia*; likewise, if, as discussed above, the *Medicamina* was relatively compact in size, it pays heed to the Alexandrian preference for brevity. The scholarship on Alexandrian influences on Ovid is immense; for some examples, cf. Miller (1983); Boyd (1997); Hunter (2006); Lightfoot (2009); Acosta-Hughes (2009); Keith (2011).
- 30 Cf. Barchiesi (1988: 102–103) for the suggestion that perhaps the first edition was nothing more than a poetic ploy to provide a witty introduction to the collection; cf. also Cameron (1968); Boyd (1997). Cf. Jansen (2012) for a discussion of the suggestion.
- 31 Cf. also Catullus 67 on the house door and Propertius 1.16 on the same. Further on talking prefatory poems in Callimachus, cf. McKeown (1989: 2: 2); for Alexandrian influences on the elegiac precursors to Ovid – a most exhausting topic – cf. Lightfoot (2009); Acosta-Hughes (2009); on Catullus in particular, cf. Wheeler (1934); Ross (1969); Du Quesnay (2012); Nelis (2012). On the significance of Alexandrian influences on neoteric poets and their successors per se as well as technical approaches to *imitatio*, cf. Hinds (1998).

- 32 On the possibility of the allusion, cf. McKeown (1989: 2: 365); also Zetzel (1996: 77). Catullus's influence on Ovid is extensive and has only been referenced briefly herein; for a detailed study, cf. Wray (2009: 252–264).
- 33 Ovid's *relegatio* is an exhaustive scholarly topic, and cannot be dealt with in detail. For some examples of influential scholarship, cf. Norwood (1963); Green (1982); Holleman (1971); Goold (1983); Williams (1994); McGowan (2009). For the *relegatio* as poetic fantasy, cf. Fitton Brown (1985); Hejduk (2014: 34–40). For a concise survey of the topic, cf. Claassen (2008).
- 34 Philaenis was traditionally thought to have been a courtesan, although modern scholars tend to argue that the name is a pseudonym to disguise a male author. Cf. Tsantsanoglou (1973); cf. in particular the discussion of ancient disputes concerning her identity (Ibid.: 185–186). The readings adopted are based on the text as emended by Parker (1992) and Parker (1989).
- 35 In the same section, Pliny mentions the work of Lais (unknown) on abortifacients. Elephantis is also mentioned by Martial (12.43.4) as the author of a sex manual in verse and referred to by Suetonius (*Tiberius* 43.2) as a favourite of Tiberius.
- 36 I owe this reading to the work of Brunelle (2005), whose study is an excellent, persuasive interpretation of the *Remedia* from the perspective of the genre of satire.