OVID

ARS AMATORIA BOOK 3

EDITED WITH INTRODUCTION
AND COMMENTARY

BY

ROY K. GIBSON

University of Manchester

CONTENTS

CONTENTS

TEXT AND CRITICAL APPARATUS

COMMENTARY

INTRODUCTION

For general introductions to the *Ars Amatoria*, see Hollis (1973), Socas (1995), Holzberg (1997) 101–21. The introduction to the present commentary offers some background to a range of themes and subject areas handled in the commentary proper (sections 2–5), and provides basic information on the content and structure of *Ars* 3 (section 1), on the date of the book's publication (section 6), and on its manuscript tradition (section 7).

1 CONTENT AND STRUCTURE OF *ARS* 3

(a) Content

I offer below a tabular analysis of the content of *Ars* 3.[1]

1–6: the *praeceptor*'s intention to make women's battle with men even

7–28: catalogue of Greek heroines faithful to men

29–42: catalogue of legendary faithless men and their female victims

43–56: narration of the *praeceptor*'s commission from Venus to relieve women of their ignorance of the art of love

57–82: call to (a restricted category of) women to use their youth wisely and heed his instruction

83–98: call to women to cast aside any doubts about sharing sexual pleasure with men

99–100: ANNOUNCEMENT: ELEMENTARY INSTRUCTION BEGINS

---

[1] For other (and some rather different) versions, see (e.g.) Fränkel (1945) 205f. n. 9; Pridik (1970) 48f.; Weisert (1970) 3–5; Hermann (1970); Rambaux (1986) 157–60; Wildberger (1998a) 365. For a tabulation of the main correspondences in subject matter between *Ars* 3 and the two preceding books, see Wellmann-Bretzigheimer (1981) 13 n. 23.

INTRODUCTION

747–68: the *conuiuium*
769–808: the bedroom

809–12: epilogue

(b) Principles of structure and unity

Fränkel (1945) 206 n. 9 notes two organising principles at work in *Ars* 3. The first is signalled in the cross-reference between:

> sed me flaminibus uenti maioris iturum,
>   dum sumus in portu, prouehat aura leuis
> <div align="right">(99f.)</div>

and

> si licet a paruis animum ad maiora referre
>   plenaque curuato pandere uela sinu
> <div align="right">(499f.)</div>

Together these lines imply that 101–498 contain 'elementary' instruction, and that 501–808 contain 'advanced' instruction.[2] Like those in the earlier books of the *Ars*, the distinction is some-what loose and artificial.[3] For example, during the initial stages of instruction the *praeceptor* must sometimes assume, before broach-ing the subject of how to meet men, that the *puellae* already

---

[2] However, Weisert (1970) 3f. places the main division at 467f. (*fert animus propius consistere: supprime habenas*, | *Musa, nec admissis excutiare rotis*), and labels 101–466 as 'Bildung' and 467–808 as 'Umgang mit Männern'. This has some validity, as instruction on how to deal with men directly does begin, at last, around 467ff. However the text of 467f. n., although programmatically significant, does not refer directly to a change of subject matter, but rather to a change in the style of treatment. Nevertheless, the reader's attention is suitably arrested by Ovid's declaration at this important juncture.

[3] Instruction proper in *Ars* 1 is subdivided into two explicitly marked parts: 'where to find the beloved' (41–262) and 'how to capture the beloved' (269–770). Some detect a bipartite structure also in *Ars* 2 (Wiesert (1970) 3; Kling (1970); Weber (1983) 113), but other subdivisions are possible here; see, e.g., Rambaux (1986) 154f.

have lovers. Yet such assumptions create few problems for the reader. Furthermore, some justification may be found for the division into 'elementary' and 'advanced' teaching: 'the "small" things are matters easy to understand and to master while the "greater" achievements require some measure of self-control . . . , comprehension and discrimination'.[4] (The distinction between 'advanced' and 'elementary' also corresponds broadly to 'old' and 'new' subject matter. Lines 501–808 deal with a world whose characters, scenes and emotions are familiar from earlier love-elegy. In 'elementary' instruction, however, Ovid takes us behind the scenes, as it were, and allows us to see the preparations of the *puella* for the first time in elegy. Readers of the *Amores* and of the elegies of Tibullus and Propertius had previously witnessed these scenes only as intruders in the *uitae postscaenia*; see the note on 135–290.) However the manner in which the *praeceptor* chooses to inform readers of the main structural principle of *Ars* 3 is rather oblique compared with his method in the first two books of the poem. There the overall plan is announced clearly in advance at 1.35–40, and the reader is forcibly reminded of it via recapitulations at 1.263–8, 1.771f. and 2.1–20.[5] Nevertheless, care is taken in other ways to mark the *praeceptor*'s progress through his material in *Ars* 3. Lines 99f. and 499f. (quoted above) form part of a programme of ship imagery, which guides the reader through Ovid's preparations for the voyage (26 n.), his departure (99f. n.), presence on the high seas (499f. n.) and intention to run for port (748 n.).[6] The image is not used so systematically in the

---

[4] Fränkel (1945) 206 n. 9; compare Hermann (1970). See also the note on 370 *maius opus*.

[5] See Hollis for parallels in didactic poetry for the preliminary announcement at 1.35–40. Similar passages are found in technical prose; cf. Cels. *proem.* 75 (on the tripartite structure of his first two books) *his propositis, primum dicam, quemadmodum sanos agere conueniat, tum ad ea transibo, quae ad morbos curationesque eorum pertinebunt*.

[6] For an explanation of the style of reference used here, see Method of the Commentary, p. 83.

earlier books of the *Ars* (1.771f.; 2.9f.) or in the *Remedia* (70, 577f., 811f.).[7]

The second organising principle in *Ars* 3 is that of the progress of the affair through its successive stages. Such a principle operates also in the first two books of the *Ars*: where to find the beloved (1.41–262), how to capture her (1.269–770) and how to keep her (2.9–732). In *Ars* 3 a sequence of sorts can be traced as Ovid progresses from preparation of the body (101–290), to personal charm and personal accomplishments (291–380), then to 'how to make contact with men' (381–498), and finally to 'how to deal with your lover after the initial contact' (501–808). This principle of organisation, however, appears to be of secondary importance. Some transitions, such as those between bodily *cultus* and personal accomplishments or between the boudoir and the streets of Rome, are theoretically of major importance but lack an explicit underlining in the text.[8] Furthermore, the linear progress of the affair becomes increasingly hard to trace towards the end of the book.[9] There are traces of a move between 'capturing the lover' (555–76) and 'keeping the lover' (577–610), which replicates the move made between the latter half of *Ars* 1 and the beginning of *Ars* 2 (see above). Yet in *Ars* 3 this transition is dimly marked; see the notes on 579 and 591. The clearest demonstration of the break-down of a linear treatment of the affair is found in the passage on the *conuiuium* (747–68). The dinner-party is an obvious place at which to meet and make contact with lovers for the first time, and the *praeceptor*'s emphasis here on attracting men reflects this. The passage might have

---

[7] Note also the complementary use of the image of the 'chariot of poetry', at 467f. and 809–12 nn.

[8] See the notes on 281ff. and 381–498.

[9] For comment, see Myerowitz (1985) 97ff. Nevertheless other, more formal, ways of uniting 'advanced' instruction are found. Note the parallelism between 525–54 and 555–76, where in each case the 'superior' benefits of a figure closely related to Ovid himself are extolled. Similarly 501–24, 577–610 and 611–58 are all united by the division of their main subject matter into three sections.

been more at home in the first half of the book, perhaps immediately after the passages on displaying oneself to potential lovers around the city of Rome (381–404, 405–32). This is confirmed by the fact that the two parallel passages for men on the *conuiuium* both occur in the first book of the *Ars Amatoria*, when Ovid is still dealing with how to find and capture the opposite sex (1.229–52, 565–602). No awkwardness however is felt in *Ars* 3. The length of the preceding Cephalus and Procris myth (683–746) helps to remove from the minds of readers any strict concern with the stage-by-stage progress of the affair. Furthermore, as Holzberg (1997) 114 points out, the subsequent transition from *conuiuium* (747–68) to bedroom (769–808) replicates the transition between *Amores* 1.4 and 1.5.

(c) Unity and the 'catalogue' style

Formal unity within *Ars* 3 is established by repeated returns to a select number of subjects, including the control of anger (235–42, 369–80, 501–8), the promotion of the *praeceptor* as poet and lover (341–8, 405–16, 525–76) and the celebration of the opportunities offered by the modern city of Rome (113–28, 387–96, 633–40). A looser unity is provided by the use of the 'catalogue' format.[10] Catalogues are an established feature of the didactic genre from Hesiod *Op.* 765–828 on, where a list of propitious and unpropitious days is provided (cf. *Ars* 1.399–418). Archestratus' *Hedupatheia* and Nicander's *Alexipharmaca*, for example, are essentially catalogues of foodstuffs and poisonous substances respectively, and lists of various kinds dominate much of the second book of Virgil's *Georgics* and the first book of Oppian's *Halieutica*. The three most prominent catalogues in *Ars* 3 are those concerned with hairstyles (135–54), shades of clothing (169–92) and sexual positions (771–88). Each has the same structure, whereby

---

[10] Female adornment is a subject which lends itself to the 'catalogue' style, from the earliest Greek literature onwards; cf. e.g. Hom. *Il.* 5.733ff. (Athene); 14.166ff. (Hera); *H. Hom.* 6 (Aphrodite). An allusion to the pseudo-Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* opens *Ars* 3; see on 1–6.

the addressee is to choose, from the range of options listed, the one which is most becoming to her. Cf. also 261–80, where a list of stratagems for concealing specific physical defects is provided. These passages are supported by catalogues of poets (329–48), of board and dice games (353–68), of sights around Rome (381–96), and of stratagems for secret communication (619–58). Compare further 7–28 (a catalogue of Greek heroines) and 29–42 (a catalogue of faithless men).

This preponderance of catalogues makes both the range of things included in *Ars* 3 very wide, and the text itself very dense (certainly by contrast with the *Amores* or *Heroides*). Long lists are found also in the first two books of the *Ars*, but these are generally more discursive than their counterparts in *Ars* 3; cf. especially the list of places and events where *puellae* may be found, at 1.67–262. Other indications of the relative 'density' of *Ars* 3 include the increased frequency of imperatival expressions (see Gibson (1997) 91f.) and the presence of only one extended narrative myth. The first book has four extended mythological narratives which, in addition to the *propempticon* for Gaius (1.177–228), account for just under a quarter of the text. In the second book the three extended tales plus the Lucretian 'myth' on the origin of civilisation (2.467–92) make up just over a fifth of the whole. In *Ars* 3 the solitary myth of Procris (683–746 n.) takes up around one thirteenth of the text.

2 THE DIDACTIC TRADITION AND *ARS* 3

(a) Characteristics of didactic

Toohey (1996) 4 usefully sums up the key characteristics of Greek and Roman didactic verse as follows:

A didactic epic speaks with a single authorial voice and this is directed explicitly to an addressee, who may or may not be named. It is usually a serious literary form. Its subject matter is instructional, rather than merely hortatory. It may be, and often is, quite technical and detailed. Included within the narrative are a number of illustrative panels. These

are often based upon mythological themes. The metre of didactic poetry is that of narrative epic, the hexameter. Traditionally such poems comprised one book of about 800 lines (but at least 400 lines), although this changed as the form developed.

Ars 3, like the first two books of the poem, possesses most of these key characteristics: around 800 lines long, it features a *praeceptor*[11] who instructs *puellae*[12] in subjects which are often highly technical, and includes an illustrative panel in the extended myth of Cephalus and Procris (683–746).[13] The obvious exceptions are the poem's non-epic metre and its characteristically playful tone.

The oddity (in one sense) of Ovid's choice of elegiacs needs to be underlined. The recent publication of fragments of an early imperial elegiac poem on the science of astrology by the Greek author Anoubion of Diosopolis may suggest that we are simply ill-informed about the use of elegiacs in didactic poems.[14] Nevertheless, Ovid's experiment with elegiac metre in didactic texts, begun in the *Medicamina* and completed in the *Remedia*, is not repeated amongst other surviving works until the short *De insitione* by the fifth-century agricultural author Palladius. The reasons for the rarity of elegiacs as a didactic medium are not far to seek. The relationship between didactic and epic was strong and close. Indeed no ancient critic defines didactic poetry separately from epic – undoubtedly because an 'instructional' strain was felt to be a fundamental part of Homer and his tradition.[15]

---

[11] I often use '*praeceptor*' when I want to distinguish the teacher in the poem (named Ovid) from the writer of the poem (also named Ovid). But I have not put a premium on consistency, not least for stylistic reasons.

[12] On the question of Ovid's addressees and the male audience of the book, see pp. 35–36.

[13] For fundamental studies of the formal characteristics which the *Ars* shares with the didactic genre, and of its intertextual relations with Lucretius and Vergil, see Kenney (1958); Leach (1964) 149–52; Hollis (1973) 89–94; Küppers (1981); Steudel (1992).

[14] *P. Oxy.* 4503–4507. On the rarity of elegiacs as a didactic medium, see further Obbink (1999) 64.

[15] See the critical survey of Toohey (1996) 5–7. On the difficulties of defining didactic as a separate genre, see, briefly, Gibson (2002) 338–9.

Casting the *Ars* in an uncharacteristic metre, then, serves one likely purpose, namely the establishment of a claim for the importance of teaching ('erotodidaxis') as a key element in earlier Roman love elegy and not just in epic.[16]

(b) Instruction in didactic: imperatival expressions

While the *Ars* stands apart from the mainstream of the didactic tradition in its choice of metre, it stands near the centre of that tradition in an important respect. A key feature of the genre is the aim to instruct, and instruction receives more explicit and sustained emphasis in the *Ars* than in the standard Roman exemplars of the genre, Lucretius and Virgil's *Georgics*. It should be noted here that the type of instruction and intensity of instruction offered by didactic texts vary widely.[17] Within the genre we find:

i. works which instruct readers in a body of knowledge, or about phenomena, which are somehow important or interesting (e.g. Aratus);
ii. works which instruct readers how to practise some art (e.g. Nicander's *Alexipharmaca*);
iii. works which instruct readers about some set of propositions, and try to persuade them to act or think in a certain manner on the basis of those propositions (e.g. Lucretius).[18]

As might be expected, texts usually display the characteristics of more than one type, or affect the appearance of one type while

---

[16] On erotodidaxis in elegy and elsewhere, see pp. 13–21. It is typical of Ovid's wit that, nevertheless, *Ars* 1 and 2 should open with references to epic figures, and *Ars* 3 with direct references to epic texts (1–6, 1 *arma dedi* nn.).

[17] For a full presentation of the argument and evidence summarised below, see Gibson (1997).

[18] Effe (1977) classifies didactic poetry on the system of the instructional intent of the texts. The three types identified are the directly instructional (e.g. Lucretius); the obliquely instructional, i.e. a text where a subject of apparently practical instruction is really a cover for another kind of instruction aimed at a different audience (e.g. Aratus, Virgil); and the ornamental (e.g. Nicander).

expecting the reader to understand it as another. Nevertheless Lucretius offers mostly the kind of instruction classified under (iii) (and to a lesser extent (i)) above; the *Ars Amatoria* offers mostly that classified under (ii) (and to a lesser extent (iii)); and the *Georgics* arguably displays a potent mixture of all three. The important differences in type of instruction offered by the three texts are reflected in the kinds of imperatival expression which they adopt and the frequency with which they use such expressions. Ovid favours the use of the ordinary imperative and the third person subjunctive active (as do later practitioners of the genre such as Grattius and Columella). Virgil, by contrast, shows a preference above all for the third person indicative active, and for the ordinary imperative.[19] An intuitive sense of Virgil's preference for the former may lie behind Wilkinson's decision to classify the *Georgics* as belonging to the genre of 'descriptive poetry'.[20] The character of the text as one which places less emphasis on explicit and sustained instruction is reflected further in the relative infrequency of imperatival forms in the *Georgics*. Whereas the *Ars Amatoria* has an imperatival expression roughly every 3·5 / 4 lines, the *Georgics* has one only every 7 / 8 lines. The *Ars* is thus made to appear a 'practical' and 'utilitarian' text by comparison with the *Georgics*. It is in the area of density of imperatival expressions that a stark contrast between Lucretius and the *Ars* may also be seen. Lucretius favours a mixture of active second person imperatival expressions and impersonal expressions, but in Book One, for example, an imperatival expression is found roughly only once every 33 lines. The very low density of imperatival expressions in Lucretius reflects the nature of his content. There is little for the reader actively to do (except believe and accept the poet's message) – hence there is comparatively little need for imperatival expressions, and the bulk of the book is

[19] For the third person subjunctive active, see the notes on 266 and 315; for the third person indicative active, see the note on 163. For other imperatival expressions in didactic poetry and prose, see the notes on 129, 201, 207, 216, 263, 333, 349, 431.
[20] Wilkinson (1969) 4.

taken up with Lucretius' arguments, demonstrations and explanations. It is thus possible to characterise the *Ars*, in one sense, as a text which gives more emphasis to the formal instruction of the reader than either Lucretius or the *Georgics*.

(c) 'Technical' subject matter in *Ars* 3

One further key feature of didactic poetry from among those listed by Toohey above deserves special comment in the context of *Ars* 3. The book is conspicuous for its inclusion of 'technical' subject matter – much of which can be paralleled in instructional prose texts. We hear, for example, of a work by Criton (doctor to Trajan's wife Plotina), which apparently summarised a good deal of earlier work. The first book, according to Galen's list of contents (12.446–9 K.), included recipes for hair dyes and facial creams, as well as information on dentifrices, odours from mouth and armpit, and hair removal etc. All of these subjects are covered in the first part of 'elementary' instruction in *Ars Amatoria* 3, and this alerts us to the existence of an extensive tradition of technical manuals in prose surrounding the poem. Many of these works are securely attested well before Ovid, and we know, among others, of 'Cleopatra' on hair-care (135–68 n.); Criton on hair-dyes (159ff. n.); Philodemus on anger (501ff. n.); Aeneas Tacticus on secret communication (617ff. n.); Gnathaena on the symposium (747–68 n.); and Philaenis on sexual positions (Introduction pp. 15–17; 769–808 n.).[21] It was of course a tradition in didactic to versify prose treatises in an entertaining (or palatable) manner: the most notable practitioners are perhaps Aratus, Nicander and Lucretius. Ovid, author of the technically demanding *Medicamina*, could claim to be following this tradition also in large portions of *Ars* 3. For this implicit claim to be effective, however, actual familiarity with such works is not necessary for either poet or audience. The only requirement is awareness

---

[21] On the development of handbooks on these and similar subjects, see Parker (1992) 100–5; also Citroni (1989) 201–6.

of a tradition of technical works on the subjects covered in the poem.[22]

(d) 'Technical' vocabulary in *Ars* 3

An issue closely related to the inclusion of 'technical' subject matter is that of Ovid's use and avoidance of special or technical vocabulary. I hope to treat this subject in detail elsewhere, but I offer a brief overview here. The poet does allow himself the use of some Greek items (e.g. 213 *oesypa*, 273 *analemptrides*, 294 *blaesaque*, 327 *nablia* nn.), but elsewhere favours Latin periphrases over (convenient) single Greek terms; see on (e.g.) 201 *supercilii confinia nuda*, 283 *paruaeque utrimque lacunae*. In particular Ovid avoids the Greek 'technical' vocabularies which must have surrounded, for instance, hairdressing and sexual positions; see on 135–68, 769–808. Latin technical and anatomical vocabulary too makes its appearance in *Ars* 3 (e.g. 140 *rotunda*, 169 *segmenta*, 216 *defricuisse*, 273 *scapulis*, 274 *fascia*), but Ovid frequently favours periphrases, sometimes for metrical reasons; cf. e.g. 163 (hair-dye), 173–84 nn. (names for dyes), 200 (rouge), 202 n. (beauty patch), 215 n. (deer marrow), 270 n. (crocodile dung), 277 n. (bad breath), 355–66 nn. (names and features of board games). The poet's lexical preferences in *Ars* 3 are perhaps encapsulated in one characteristic tactic noted by Langslow (1999) 196f.: at 213f. the 'low' Greek technical term in the hexameter (*oesypa*) is immediately balanced by a more elevated Latin gloss in the pentameter (*uellere sucus*); cf. *Pont.* 1.3.23f. Perhaps Ovid's general lexical restraint throughout the book is related to his explicit and sustained focus on the subject of moderation (for which see below pp. 32–35).[23] The text itself reflects the values of restraint and moderation

---

[22] For Ovid's knowledge of similar technical works in verse (including treatises on board games, cosmetics, and the *conuiuium*), cf. *Tr.* 2.471–92. The poet appears to imply the artistic superiority of his own *Medicamina* to products of this kind at *Ars* 3.206 and 208 nn.; see also on 353ff.

[23] On the use of special and technical vocabularies in Latin poets, see further Langslow (1999); Maltby (1999) (both with further references).

which are urged on the addressees. (Cf. also the significant advice given to the *puellae* on their own writing style, at 479f. n. *munda sed e medio consuetaque uerba, puellae,* | *scribite.*)

3 THE 'EROTODIDACTIC' TRADITION AND *ARS* 3

(a) The 'erotodidactic' tradition

Other traditions, less established than that of didactic poetry, are also relevant to understanding the *Ars*. Much advice was dispensed in the ancient world on the topics of love, marriage and relations between the sexes. The form might be prescriptive or descriptive, explicitly advisory or taken to be so implicitly, and could be expressed in the shape of a dialogue, treatise or philosophical essay. Particularly intriguing here is evidence for Platonic (and Stoic) theorising on love, which may have included the successive stages of γνῶσις, κτῆσις and χρῆσις with regard to the beloved.[24] These correspond to the three stages of the affair laid out by Ovid at the beginning of the first book of the *Ars*.[25] However, the particular strand of this (broadly conceived) tradition to which the *Ars Amatoria* belongs is one to which the term 'erotodidactic' might be given.[26] In this tradition advice, of varying degrees of formality, is given usually by a person of experience to an addressee (sometimes vaguely characterised) about a particular beloved or love affairs in general. In one respect *Ars* 3 shows a stronger affiliation with this tradition than with the didactic tradition. For while there appear to be no separate

[24] See Dillon (1994). Both Zeno and Cleanthes also composed works entitled ἐρωτικὴ τέχνη (Diog. Laert. 7.34, 175), but there is no evidence for what they contained. See also Parker (1992) 101, 110 nn. 26–8.

[25] 1.35ff. *principio, quod amare uelis, reperire labora,* | *qui noua nunc primum miles in arma uenis;* | *proximus huic labor est placitam exorare puellam;* | *tertius, ut longo tempore duret amor.*

[26] The term ἐρωτοδιδάσκαλος is attested at Athen. 5.219d following a quotation from the Hellenistic philosopher Herodicus (on whom see below); cf. Aristaenetus 1.4.

didactic works in verse (and few in prose) which are addressed
exclusively to women in the classical period, in the erotodidactic
tradition women are regularly recipients (and givers) of advice.
This tradition could not be called a 'genre' in the usual sense,
as few works of literary quality seem to have been cast wholly
in this form either before or after the *Ars Amatoria*. More often
'erotodidaxis' is inset as a feature in another genre. Below I offer
an overview of this tradition. From this overview it will become
clear that, where a female audience receives erotodidaxis, the
instructor is usually herself female. A number of consequences
follow from Ovid's usurpation of this female role in *Ars* 3.

(b) Erotodidactic texts and *Ars* 3

The element of erotodidaxis in comedy and Roman elegy, and its
importance for the *Ars Amatoria*, is well understood, and I return
to its influence below. Less well known perhaps are the elements
of erotodidaxis in the Socratic and Platonic traditions,[27] and in
the so-called 'pornographic' writers of antiquity. In the fourth
century BC a tradition emerged which placed Aspasia in the posi-
tion of offering impartial instruction to Socrates.[28] Of interest in
this tradition are the verses quoted by Athenaeus (5.219d) where
we find Socrates quoting a conversation with Aspasia in which
she gives advice on the erotic pursuit of his beloved Alcibiades.[29]
The importance of the lines for us lies in their formal parallels

---

[27] See in general Kleve (1983).

[28] Cf. e.g. Xen. *Mem.* 2.6.36; *Oec.* 3.14; Halperin (1990) 119–24; Henry (1995)
40–56.

[29] Cf. esp. 1ff. 'Σώκρατες, οὐκ ἔλαθές με πόθῳ δηχθεὶς φρένα τὴν σὴν | παιδὸς
Δεινομάχης καὶ Κλεινίου. ἀλλ' ὑπάκουσον, | εἰ βούλει σοι ἔχειν εὖ παιδικά,
μηδ' ἀπιθήσῃς | ἀγγέλῳ, ἀλλὰ πιθοῦ, καί σοι πολὺ βέλτιον ἔσται', 7ff.
'στέλλου πλησάμενος θυμὸν Μούσης κατόχοιο, | ᾗ τόνδ' αἱρήσεις, ὠσὶν
δ' ἐνίει ποθέουσιν· | ἀμφοῖν γὰρ φιλίας ἥδ' ἀρχή, τῇδε καθέξεις | αὐτὸν,
προσβάλλων ἀκοαῖς ὀπτήρια θυμοῦ' (*Suppl. Hell.* frg. 495). The lines are
probably the work of Herodicus of Babylon (*floruit* 125 BC), a pupil of
the Crates who visited Rome in 159 BC, and appear to be an attempt to
parody the Socrates-Aspasia tradition; see the note ad loc. on *Suppl. Hell.*
frg. 495.

with the *Ars Amatoria*. The approach via the Muses recommended
by Aspasia is a forerunner of the emphasis laid on poetry as
a means of seduction in the *Ars*. Furthermore the tone of the
fragment is parodic and manipulates the metaphor, images and
Homeric language of contemporary love poetry in ways that
have formal similarities with Ovid's own method in the *Ars*. It
was on the basis of this fragment that Day (1938) 92 n. 1 tenta-
tively conjectured a tradition of sustained satiric-technical eroto-
didaxis which culminated in the *Ars Amatoria*, independent of the
more usual line of descent through comedy and elegy. The par-
allels between the *Ars* and the erotodidaxis of comedy and elegy
are too great to ignore (see further below). Yet Day's suggestion
may be pushed a little further by considering another literary
'genre' whose authoresses, like Aspasia, were reputedly ἑταῖραι.
A number of authors are known to have written didactic works
on sex in antiquity, although our knowledge of the genre remains
sketchy.[30] Astyanassa (*Suda* s.v.) was the mythical foundress of the
genre περὶ σχημάτων συνουσιαστικῶν. A Sicilian Botrys (4th
cent. BC?) wrote ὑπομνήματα which are mentioned in the com-
pany of the celebrated Philaenis and other ἀναισχυντογράφοι
(Polyb. 12.13.1), and Paxamos (4th cent. BC or later) was known
for his Δωδεκάτεχνον, περὶ αἰσχρῶν σχημάτων.[31] A little more
is known about Elephantis (before 1st cent. AD), who is said or im-
plied to have written didactically on sex and sexual positions.[32]
Philaenis (5th / 4th cent. BC), however, was the most famous
of them all,[33] and that she wrote on sexual positions is often

---

[30] On the following minor figures, see Baldwin (1990); Parker (1992) 92–4.

[31] *Suda* s.v. Paxamos; cf. Arist. *Ran.* 1327f.; *Suda* s.v. Δωδεκαμήχανον.

[32] Cf. *Priap.* 4; Mart. 12.43; Suet. *Tib.* 43.2 (Tiberius) *cubicula plurifariam disposita
tabellis ac sigillis lasciuissimarum picturarum et figurarum adornauit librisque Elephan-
tidis instruxit, ne cui in opera edenda exemplar imperatae schemae deesset*; *Suda* s.v. A
writer of the same name, possibly the same woman, is said to have written
also on abortion and cosmetic subjects; cf. e.g. Pliny *Nat.* 28.81; Galen 12.416
K.; Parker (1992) 106; Flemming (2000) 39–41.

[33] See the scandalised *testimonia* collected by Vessey (1976) 78–80; Baldwin
(1990) 4. On her bad reputation, see further Herrero Ingelmo-Montero
Cartelle (1990).

explicitly stated in ancient sources.[34] However, when some frag-
ments from the beginning of this prose work were published in
1972 (*P. Oxy.* 2891), they proved to be on the more general sub-
ject of seduction. Admittedly only a few scraps survive, but these
include an introduction, short sections on methods of approach
and flattery, and the title of a section on kissing. The addressees
are apparently male:

Frg. 1.i.1–6

Frg. 1.ii.1–5
περὶ πειρασμῶν

τάδε συνέγραψε Φιλαι-
νὶς Ὠκυμένους Σαμία
τοῖς βουλομένοις με-
θ.[   ].ς τὸν βίον . .ε-
5 ξα[κ]αὶ μὴ παρέρ-
γω[ς

δεῖ τοίνυν τὸν πειρῶ[ν-
τα ἀκαλλώπιστον . .[
καὶ ἀκτένιστον, ὅπ[ως
ἂν τῇ γυναικ<ὶ> μὴ [δοκῇ
ἔπεργος εἶναι

Frg. 3.ii.2–9
..]ν τῇ διανοία[ι -
μεν, τὴν μὲν [
ὡς ἰσόθεον [
5 οὖσαν, τὴν δὲ αἰσχρὰ[ν
ὡς ἐπαφρόδιτον, τ[ὴν
δὲ πρεσβυτέραν ὡς . [
αν φαο[.]ωνεινα . [
     περὶ φιλημάτ[ων[35]

Specific parallels with the content of the *Ars Amatoria* are clear.[36]
More intriguing is Lobel's suggestion that from these fragments
'it is possible to infer that the book was a systematic expostion

---

[34] Cf. *Priap.* 63.17; Clem. Alex. *Prot.* 4.53 P.; Athen. 8.335d–e (compare
10.457c–e); *Suda* s.v. Ἀστυάνασσα.

[35] The text has received extensive critical attention; see esp. Tsantsanoglou
(1973); Parker (1989); Whitehorne (1990) 529–31, 540f.

[36] See Hollis on *Ars* 1.1 and 509–12, and Lobel (1972) 54 (on *Ars* 2.657ff.). For
Philaenis' possible influence on Lucretius, see Brown (1987) 129f.

of *ars amatoria*'.[37] The assertion cannot at this stage be validated or falsified. But if Lobel is right, then the other authors in the genre, whom the *testimonia* attest to have written (scandalously) about sex, may in fact have written more general works too. Furthermore it is likely that Ovid and his readers knew of these works; see on 769–808.

'Education in love', albeit of a less formal kind, may be found also in 'respectable' Hellenistic literature.[38] In the prose text of Philaenis above, teacher and author were identified, and this is a feature found also in some Hellenistic poetry (and continued in Roman elegy).[39] Rather more important for contextualising *Ars* 3, however, is New Comedy. In New Comedy author and teacher are of course not identical, for the pupil is seen receiving instruction from the teacher within a dramatic frame. Here we find such commonplace scenes as a *lena* offering cynical instruction in the trade to a young *meretrix*; or one *meretrix* sympathetically advising another; or, less commonly, an experienced lover passing on advice to a fellow male.[40] Particularly important is the scene where advice is given to a *meretrix* by a *lena* while her lover is eavesdropping (Plaut. *Most.* 157–290). This is precisely the scene reproduced in two of the most sustained examples of erotodidaxis in the Roman love elegists, Propertius 4.5 and

---

[37] Lobel (1972) 54. The suggestion is accepted by Parker (1992) 94, 96; see also Cazzaniga (1972) 284f.; Cataudella (1973) 260–3; (1974).

[38] Cf. e.g. Bion frg. 13 Gow; Giangrande (1991) 65–8 (on erotodidaxis in Hellenistic epigram). Kerkhecker (1999) 145 is rightly sceptical about the alleged pose of Callimachus as ἐρωτοδιδάσκαλος in *Iamb.* 5.

[39] Cf. e.g. Moschus frg. 2.7f. Gow; more remotely Bion frg. 10 Gow. Informal 'education in love' is an element also of the Greek and Roman novel (Chariton 6.3; Apul. *Met.* 9.15ff.; Ach. Tat. 1.9ff.; Heliodorus *Aeth.* 8.5; Longus 2.3–8) and appears later in Greek epic (Nonn. *Dion.* 42.205–73).

[40] Cf. e.g. Plaut. *Cist.* 78ff.; *Poen.* 210ff.; Ter. *Eun.* 434ff. A *lena* figure no doubt offered erotodidaxis in the related genre of mime; cf. e.g. Herodas 1; McKeown (1979) 78. Further examples can be multiplied from comedy's other literary descendants and relations, such as the works of Lucian, Philostratus, Alciphron and Aristaenetus. For some more sustained examples, cf. e.g. Lucian *Dial. meretr.* 3, 6, 8; Aristaenetus 1.4.

Ovid, *Amores* 1.8. Neither appears to be drawing directly on the Plautine passage, but there is every reason to suppose that their poems are variations on a common type-scene.[41] Elegy offers other kinds of erotodidaxis too, such as the poet's advice to the beloved, other lovers and even the beloved's *vir*.[42] More relevant to the *Ars Amatoria*, however, is Tibullus 1.4, where, as in the *lena* poems above, the speaker adopts the formal role of teacher and offers a programme of instruction. In 1.4 Priapus offers the poet lengthy instruction on the courtship of boys for Tibullus to pass on to a certain Titius in the role of *praeceptor* himself. Ovid and Priapus indeed share similar personas, in as much as both appear at times learned and rather dogmatic, only to have their magisterial positions undercut.[43]

It should now be clear that the extent of the erotodidactic tradition is much wider than is generally supposed, and the influence of comedy and earlier elegy (and arguably Philaenis) on the *Ars* is particularly strong. Furthermore, it can be seen that the scenario of a woman receiving systematic erotodidactic instruction provides the formal background to Ovid's project in *Ars* 3, equivalent to the formal background provided in the first two books of the *Ars* by the mainstream didactic verse tradition, where a male audience receives instruction from a male poet. Didactic verse provided no precedent for the systematic instruction of an exclusively female audience.[44] That precedent was

---

[41] See McKeown's introduction to *Am.* 1.8, where the importance of the comparable procuress scene in Herodas 1 is also emphasised. On *Am.* 1.8 and the development of the *Ars*, particularly the third book, see Romano (1980); also Wildberger (1998a) 348–54. On the figure of the *lena*, see Myers (1996).

[42] Cf. e.g. Tib. 1.6.15ff.; 1.8; Prop. 1.7, 9, 10, 20; Ov. *Am.* 1.4; 2.19; 3.4. On this feature of elegy, see the classic studies of Wheeler (1910); (1911).

[43] For Ovid's use of this poem in *Ars* 3, see (e.g.) on 63ff., 341f., 381–404, 547f., 812.

[44] However, a number of (pagan) technical treatises in prose are addressed or dedicated to women, e.g. the first book of Varro's *Res rusticae*, perhaps one of the works of Elephantis (see p. 15), and Nicomachus' *Manual of Harmonics*. A number of philosophical and ethical works are also addressed to women; cf. esp. a περὶ φιλοκοσμίας addressed by Plutarch's wife Timoxena to a certain Aristylla (Plut. *Mor.* 145a).

to be found only in the 'erotodidactic' tradition, particularly as manifested in comedy and elegy.

(c) The *praeceptor* as '*lena*' in *Ars* 3

As may be seen from the material surveyed above, women are established teachers in the erotodidactic tradition. Aspasia was alleged to have been the instructor of Socrates; Philaenis and Elephantis authored works in the 'pornographic' tradition;[45] and the *lena* is a familiar source of advice in comedy and mime. Indeed, where women are the recipients of erotodidaxis it is usual for their teacher to be female.[46] Thus when Ovid appoints himself teacher to a female audience in *Ars* 3, there is inevitably a sense of his usurping a role which is normally reserved for the opposite sex.[47] Ovid then marks his successful usurpation of the role of *lena* by adopting her traditional warnings on the brevity of youth (57–82, 68 nn.), and reflecting her traditional insistence that pupils take a plurality of lovers (83–98 n.). Similarly he espouses the *lena*'s rejection of antique standards for today's women (107ff. n.), appears to reproduce her traditional advice on feigning tears (291 n.), dispenses hard-nosed financial advice (462, 553f. nn.), encourages his pupils to lock their lovers out (577–610 n.), and tells them to flatter their man with a pretence of love (673ff. n.).[48]

---

[45] On the issue of the female authorship of these works, see Parker (1992) 105f.

[46] The only major exception is to be found in Xen. *Mem.* 3.11, where Socrates, in a reversal of his normal role as pupil to Aspasia, offers advice in conversation with the courtesan Theodote. When the elegists themselves teach a woman it is often in the rather self-interested area of instructing the beloved how to fool her *uir*; cf. Tib. 1.2.15ff.; 1.6.9ff.; Ov. *Am.* 1.4; also *Tr.* 2.447ff., 461ff.

[47] This indeed may be what impels Ovid to take the unusual step of introducing a theophany and divine commission from Venus in the prologue to *Ars* 3, after he has explicitly disclaimed heavenly inspiration for his instruction to men (*Ars* 1.25–30); see on 1–98, 43–56.

[48] Note also, in a context where Ovid is defending women (33f.), a more sympathetic attitude towards the mistreated Medea than is evident in Prop. 4.5.41f.

It is inevitable, however, that Ovid's adoption of the position of *lena* should result in a 'male' recuperation of her role. For example, his instructions on stoking men's passion or on flattering them are motivated by a clear sense that men will greatly benefit from such behaviour.[49] The *lena*, by contrast, was concerned only with the advantage of her female pupil. In particular she focused on the financial exploitation of lovers, but Ovid either omits *munera* from his advice or tries to introduce a new emphasis on reciprocity and the exchange of services (not necessarily involving presents or money).[50] The lovers of earlier elegy were particularly enraged when the *lena* placed a specific ban on her pupil's involvement with poets and their worthless poetry (Prop. 4.5.53–8; Ov. *Am.* 1.8.57–62). In *Ars* 3, however, Ovid pointedly attempts to change this state of affairs by underlining the particular advantages of the poet-lover; see on 525–54. Elsewhere, Ovid's version of the *lena*'s traditional advice on feigning tears is phrased with notable coolness (291 n.; cf. 159ff. n.), and anger is outlawed altogether (501–24 n.). Ovid's most ingenious recuperation, however, of the role of the *lena* is to be found at 57–82 n., where Dipsas' flattery of her female pupil in a 'persuasion to love' (*Am.* 1.8.43f., 49ff.) is converted into the seductive talk of a lover addressing his beloved.[51]

Ovid makes no great effort to disguise these modifications to the discourse of the *lena*. Indeed in the opening lines of the book he slyly draws the attention of his female addressees to the pressure put upon him by fellow men to protect their interests. Here Ovid is doing more than simply acknowledging the fact that men would read *Ars* 3 (just as they had read the *Amores* and *Heroides*). A male audience was virtually written into the traditional scenario of women receiving erotodidactic instruction. A male

---

[49] For the benefits accruing to men from Ovid's changes to the *lena*'s advice here, see on 577–610, 589ff., 594, 599f., 635f., 673ff.

[50] See on 57–82, 83–98, 332, 463–6, 525–54.

[51] For Ovid's visualisation or promotion of himself as lover to the *puellae*, see on 51, 69ff., 227, 309, 535ff., 555–76, 664. For Ovid's 'seduction' of his male pupils in *Ars* 1 and 2, see Sharrock (1994a) 21–86.