In the course of his *Apologia*, Apuleius treats an astonishing number of subjects, radiating out from the central charge of using magic to win the affection of his wealthy wife. Ancillary to that charge is his composition of *versus amatorios*, in which he used pseudonyms for two boy favorites called Critias and Charinus. In dealing with this charge, Apuleius speaks of the traditional use of pseudonyms by poets in referring to their lovers (*Apol. 10*). The passage is frequently cited as a precious piece of evidence which helps us unlock the secret of the identity of various poets' mistresses, but there is less to it than meets the eye.

One identification has caused particular difficulties. Apuleius states that Ticidas wrote of his mistress Metella and gave her the pseudonym Perilla, but the statement is not supported by any other evidence, and is apparently contradicted by the only other source on the matter, Ovid (*Tr.* 2.433-38), with whom we may begin.

The exiled poet has been defending his *ars amatoria* on the grounds that erotic themes have been treated by other authors, both Greek and Latin, with impunity. In the portion of the catalog on Roman authors, Ovid speaks of Ennius and Lucretius as treating their special fields (423-6), and then says that other poets likewise sang of their own expertise:

427 sic sua lascivo cantata est saepe Catullo
   femina, cui falsum Lesbia nomen erat,
   nec contentus ea, multis vulgavit amores,

430 in quibus ipse suum fassus adulterium est.
   par fuit exigui similisque licentia Calvi,
   detexit variis qui sua furta modis.
quid referam Ticidae, quid Memmi carmen, apud quos
rebus adest nomen nominibusque pudor?

435 Cinna quoque his comes est, Cinnaque procacior Anser,
et leve Cornufici parque Catonis opus,
et quorum libris, modo dissimulata Perillae
nomine, nunc legitur dicta, Metelle, tuo.

It is immediately obvious that the passage as it stands in
all our MSS does not suggest any connection between Ticidas
and Metella / Perilla, nor would any such association have
been imagined had it not been for Apuleius, who responds as
follows to the criticism of his having used pseudonyms:
eadem igitur opera accusent C. Catullum, quod Lesbian
pro Clodia nominarit, et Ticidam similiter, quod quae
Metella erat Perillam scripserit, et Propertium, qui
Cynthiam dicat, Hostiam dissimulet, et Tibullum, quod
ei sit Plania in animo, Delia in versu.

Can these two accounts be reconciled as they stand?
Perhaps the most fundamental problem is that Ovid would then
be alluding to Ticidas twice, and in contradictory ways:
first in the company of Memmius as an example of an indis-
creet writer, and then (after the poet turns to four other
authors) in unspecified company and unnamed, as one who
showed discretion by employing a pseudonym. This would be
unexpected both because of the internal contradiction from
the first reference to the second, and also because Ovid does
not elsewhere in this catalog use the same author twice to
make his points.2)

But the question is complicated by the uncertainties about
the text and meaning of 434. The MSS report rebus adest nomen
nominibusque pudor, and it is tolerably clear, from the point of
the whole passage, that Ovid is referring to a bluntness in
the description of activities. But is he saying, in the
second hemistich, that the poets were discreet in naming the
participants - i.e. used pseudonyms? In the face of ambiguity,
various emendations have been proposed, of which two are
significant. Bentley suggested rebus abest nomen nominibusque
pudor, by which he meant that real names were not used 'rebus
sive argumento, cum hic Perillam, alter Lesbian, alter aliam
quam falsa inscriberent' - that is, rebus means both events
This makes for awkward, if possible, Latin. Rottendorf's *rebus abest omnis nominibuque pudor* is ingenious and smooth, but unnecessary, for the received text may just as readily mean what Rottendorf intended. If *pudor* is taken in its negative sense of ignominy or source of disgrace, the same point is made. But which did Ovid intend?

The sequence of thought in the passage beginning at 427 helps us decide the meaning of 434. Catullus gave a *falsum nomen* to Lesbia, but openly discussed his own role in various affairs (427-30); Calvus was similarly indiscreet (no mention of pseudonyms) and described his own activities (431-2); and what of Ticidas and Memmius, who spell matters out bluntly - and bring disrepute on their names. The matter of names is important for Ovid in this passage, and 434 stands with 430 and 438 in emphasizing them. The shift from singular *nomen* to plural *nominibus* is also significant, albeit not very happy stylistically. It is precisely the shift in number which points to the change of referent: *nomen* is the equivalent of 'frankness' and *nominibus* refers to the participants (whether the poets or the poets and their mistresses together). It can be argued that *nomen* and *nominibus* must refer to the same notion (as Owen does, p. 235-6), but then the change of number is not accounted for, and is felt as awkward. *Nominibus* is used in the same sense as *nomina tanta* (442), "such distinguished persons".

It would seem then that Ovid is not saying that Ticidas and Memmius used pseudonyms for their mistresses, in which case the association with 437-8 must be regarded as improbable. Nevertheless, there is a long tradition of attempting to reconcile Ovid with Apuleius by linking 433-4 and 437-8. I need not review here the arguments presented from N. Hein-sius to S. G. Owen for or against transposition, for I believe that the internal contradiction between the indiscretion of Ticidas and Memmius and the discretion alluded to in 437-8 operates against the association. I would note, however, that there are some strange implications if the two couplets are taken as a single statement. It would imply that both Ticidas and Memmius wrote of the same woman and used the same
pseudonym for her. This would be at variance with the normal practice of the poets, for they clearly chose a name which would not only match the number of syllables, or even the metrical value, of the mistress' name, but also reflect their view of the woman herself and her relation to their poetic activity. Apuleius in choosing names drawn from the Platonic context was obviously suggesting the nature of his relationship to the boys identified as Critias and Charinus, and one may readily assume, for those instances where the writings do not survive in which a pseudonym occurred, that there was a definite association in the author's mind between the name he assigned to his lover and his view of that lover.

The picture is confused somewhat by the fact that Ovid and Apuleius are working with different sets of information. Ovid lists several poets, only a few of whom he associates with pseudonyms, but all of whom are linked to indiscretion; Apuleius focuses on pseudonyms, and treats indiscretion as a separate topic. I would simply note that in all examinable cases where an author uses a fictitious name for a lover, that name reflects a view of the lover peculiar to the author himself. We are surely justified in suspecting that the same would be true for those poets whose work is no longer available but who are known to have used nomina ficta. It is then unlikely that two poets would use the same poetic name for one whom they successively (or even concurrently) loved, unless the woman herself had invented the nom de guerre for professional purposes - we may think of Volumnia, who took the name Cytheris; but when her third recorded lover, the poet Gallus, took to immortalizing her in verse, he called her Lycoris. And in such instances, questions of discretion and anonymity would be less likely to arise.

In any case, as to Memmius there is no evidence - outside the reworking of these very lines - that he wrote on Metella in any fashion. Pliny's reference (Ep. V. 3.5) to his numerous predecessors in erotic composition conveys no details and so the mention of Memmius there does nothing more than confirm Ovid's observation in principle.
This being the case, there is no help to be had from associating 433-4 and 437-8, and thus even Leo's conjecture that 435-6 were for some reason missing in Apuleius' copy of Ovid will not improve the situation.9)

It is useful at this point to note some structural features of the Roman catalog as a whole (421-470). Apart from the transitional couplet (421-2), the catalog falls into two main segments of 24 lines each. The first (423-446) treats a variety of poets, while the second gives the full-length portrait of Tibullus (447-464) and concluding comments on the brotherhood of elegists. Within the first segment, we may discern two series. Ovid starts (ignoring Ennius and Lucretius) with two couplets on Catullus (427-30), and then goes on to one couplet (Calvus 431-2), then a distich shared by two poets (Ticidas and Memmius 433-4) and eventually four authors in a single couplet (435-6). This first series of examples ends by dropping the identity of the authors entirely (437-8). It is roughly unified by its focus on the neoterics and allied poets. The second series turns on elegy (plus the related taste of the Milesian tales), preparing for the extended treatment of Tibullus which occupies the other half of the Roman catalog.

This pattern suggests that the rearrangement of the couplets is unwarranted. But the difficulty then shifts to 437-8: et quorum has been a focus of controversy, and if the pronoun does not refer to Ticidas and Memmius, to whom does it allude? Or, to put the question from a different angle, what poet does the present text conceal? Luck proposed that Metella herself was referred to as the poet, as contrasted with unspecified poets who wrote about her as Perilla.10)

My colleague Miroslav Marcovich has kindly shown me his treatment of this line, in which he would go further and eliminate further new poets by reading quaeque horum libris etc. This is an interesting approach, but I would note that his objection (that the text as transmitted provides the only instance of unnamed poets in the entire Roman catalog) is not quite accurate: the very next couplet similarly refers to Varro Atacinus only by his work and its contents without mentioning his name. And of course horum then requires Metella to have been sung by the authors listed in 435-6, for which there is not the least evidence. There is also no evidence
that Metella wrote poetry herself: it would, as Luck notes, not be surprising, but that is not sufficient reason to postulate it in the process of reinterpreting a vexed line.

The plural is, I believe, sound: this raises again the question of the identity of the poets, and the reason for their anonymity. Both of these questions may hinge on the identity of Metella / Perilla, and some progress can be made on this matter. Ovid mentions Lesbia, Perilla and Lycoris (but the last in order to say that it was not Gallus' poetry on her which led to his tragedy). Of these, he identifies only Perilla. The formation *nomine dicta, Metelle, tuo* points to associations with a famous Metellus. Merkel suggested that this Metella was the notorious wife of the younger Lentulus Spinther, with whom P. Dolabella was entangled. And from another angle, Shackleton Bailey has argued plausibly that the wife of Lentulus Spinther was the daughter of Metellus Celer - and of Clodia / Lesbia.\(^1\) This therefore means that Ovid has singled out for comment the most celebrated of the freewheeling ladies of poetry and her daughter: *matre pulchra filia pulchrior.*

If indeed Metella / Perilla is the daughter of Lesbia and Metellus Celer, one can see the interest in her activities, the probability of references to her in a variety of sources in her lifetime, and the need for discretion at that time. One can also understand the interest in recovering the real name behind Perilla after the need for discretion had faded following her death.\(^2\) The contrast between *modo* and *nunc* will then consist in the restoration of Metella's real name where formerly the pseudonym had stood (as Bentley suggested). It is not likely that a fresh circle of poets would have taken to writing about Metella a generation after her death, with or without pseudonyms. The vagueness of *quorum* need not be seen as ominous: it is simply the generalizing effect at the end of the sequence noted earlier with more and more poets per couplet from 427 on.\(^3\)

The passage is therefore sound, and Ovid does not say that Ticidas and/or Memmius wrote about Metella, directly or otherwise. Indeed he distinguishes these poets from the authors of
poems referring to her. Apuleius is thus thrown on the defensive and we must choose between Ovid and Apuleius as reliable sources for matters touching erotic poetry in the first century B.C. Our choice is made somewhat easier by Apuleius' record in the matter of names elsewhere. Despite his enormous fund of knowledge on authors famous and obscure, there is reason to question the names given in this passage of the *Apologia*. I have argued elsewhere¹⁄₄) that only the Lesbia / Clodia identification is secure - and for that, the poems themselves are almost enough to guarantee a positive identification.¹⁵)

The pursuit of Delia's original is a fruitless task. As I have tried to demonstrate,¹⁶) the total evidence of Tibullus' poems shows that the figure of Delia is developed in and for the elegies themselves, not without a backdrop of actual experience but shaped in all essential aspects by the demands of the poetic world in which she moves. This includes the choice of her name. The old explanation of Delia as the Greek equivalent of a real woman named Plania (as δηλος = planus) is untenable. We cannot now guess when the suggestion arose, and I am not claiming that Apuleius invented it, but it is an unlikely theory when assessed in light of Tibullus' practice.

Cynthia / Hostia is more complicated, as the identification is found not only here but also in a scholion to Juvenal 6.7: *Cynthia Properti anica sumptuosa proprio nomine Hostia dicebatur*...¹⁷) Despite this corroboration, there has long been a view that the name should be Roscia. The question is not settled by any means, but plausible arguments in favor of Roscia have been presented by Marx and Boucher on quite different grounds.¹⁸) At any rate, it is not at all clear whence the scholiast obtained this information. The remark is not found in any of the standard collections of scholia on Juvenal.¹⁹) One is lured to the idea that the scholiast may simply have obtained the report from this passage in Apuleius (he certainly did not glean it from the poems of Propertius).

Wiseman has attempted to trace Apuleius' source for this passage, and believes the trail leads back through Suetonius' *descritis illistribus* to Santra and Hyginus.²⁰) It is not altogether clear whether Metella would be a suitable candidate for inclusion in a book on *scorta*; and if she is not, the link with Suetonius and thence to Hyginus is weakened accordingly.
Moreover, if the identifications of the other mistresses are as shaky as they seem, they are unlikely to have derived from a contemporary source.

In fact, I believe that Apuleius is looking, at least in part, to Ovid as a model for ch. 9-10 of the Apologia. The general nature of such a defence for writing erotic verse was fairly standard; but the two passages have in common, beyond the general similarities, that they both present first authors who wrote erotic verse, then authors who used pseudonyms for their lovers, and then authors who lacked even this discretion. Moreover, both start their series with Anacreon (Apol. 9, Tr. 363) - in both instances called by his place of origin, Teius, rather than by name - and both refer to Sappho with the national epithet Lesbia (significant, perhaps, with Catullus showing up on both lists soon thereafter). Obviously Apuleius will have supplemented his list from his own very extensive knowledge or from other sources, but I think that the agreement of the two accounts, together with the fact that the identification of Perilla as Metella appears only in these two places, encourages us to think that Apuleius had one eye on Ovid.

And finally in assessing Apuleius' reliability, we may note that he has difficulties with names elsewhere in the Apologia. In ch. 66 we find another list, this time of orators: four of them are given the wrong praenomen, and one also has a false nomen.21) On this passage, A. S. Owen has the following comment: "With reference to the general inaccuracy of this passage it may be pointed out that there was no special need for Apuleius to trouble about accuracy on details of this kind dealing with the history of the law-courts two centuries previously. There was little fear of his accuracy being checked in a provincial law-court."

The observation has some bearing on Apuleius' treatment of literary history as well. For even a casual reader must be struck by the flamboyant use of quite extraneous learning which parades through the pages of that speech. Butler remarks that Apuleius "plays with his accusers, mocking them from the heights of his superior learning."22) The comment
may be taken further. The very wealth of his casual references to every branch of learning and culture, as Vallette noted,\(^{23}\) means that many areas are being paraded beyond his actual control of the facts — but who in this provincial court will challenge him? It is clear enough that he is mocking his accusers; he seems even to enjoy implying the ignorance of the judge as well.\(^{24}\) It would seem on the surface that he would have more to gain by assuming that the judge and his concilium were men of refinement whose educated good judgment could be placed against the superstitious ignorance of his accusers, but the display of learning and lore gets the upper hand, and all falls as it were before the sophist's brandished erudition.

In the last analysis, it is impossible to say why Apuleius got the information on Ticidas in its present form, but his carelessness in handling other details suggests that he may simply have slipped here; or he may have drawn the detail from some intervening source which is quite lost to us. But either way, we are not encouraged to take his word ahead of Ovid's.\(^{25}\)
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**NOTES**

1) *Perillae* is found only in Bern. 478. Most MSS read *per illos*. S. G. Owen at one time (ed. 1889) read *Perilla est*, which as he later admitted cannot be right (see his note in *Ovidi Tristium liber secundus* [Oxford 1924] p. 240), although it was accepted by Ehwald, Ellis et al.

2) There is one apparent exception. Aristides' *Milesian Tales* are mentioned in 413-4, and Sisenna's translation of the work in 443-4. But these are after all references to two different people (in separate parts of the catalog), the Greek author and his Roman translator; and *historiae turpis inseruisse locos* may imply a further contribution by Sisenna beyond straight translation.

3) Bentley *ad* Hor. C. 2.12.13.

4) As an illustration of the confusion attending this question, one reader of an earlier version of this paper stated that the transposition of 433-4 to follow 436 was the only possible solution, while the other claimed that nobody has believed in the transposition since Owen discredited it in 1924!
5) One instance of the arguments: the juxtaposition of *apud quos... et quorum* has been a severe difficulty for some (such as Ehwald, *Ph* 54 [1895] 461) because of the apparent solecism; but Heinsius was quite untroubled by the effect.

6) Pseudacro *ad* Hor. *C*. 2.12.13 requires the same number of syllables; Bentley on the same passage requires a metrical equivalency, which is not always the case. See further J.-P. Boucher, *Études sur Propére* (BEWAR sér. 1, fasc. 204: Paris 1965) 460 ff.


8) This claim, obviously, can be made only where the poetry is extant, and in the case of Metella / Perilla we have no such material. Boucher conjectures that the name may be a complimentary gesture towards the family history of the Metelli: *Perillos* being a Macedonian form of *Perilac* would be an allusion to Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus (Boucher 466 n.1 and additional bibliography there). Boucher properly dismisses the *jeu grammatical* of T. Frank, "Ticidas the Neoteric Poet" *CR* 34 (1920) 92, who explained the name by the substitution of *περί* for *μετά*. Boucher's guess is hardly less stretched, however, and it is best to admit our ignorance here.

9) Fr. Leo, "Über einige Elegien Tibulls" *Phil. Unt*. 2 (1881) 20 n.7.


12) T. P. Wiseman, *Cinna the Poet and other Roman Essays* (Leicester 1974) 188-91, accepts the identification of Metella / Perilla as the daughter of Clodia / Lesbia, and reviews her career, identifying various characters standing in the shadows. He assumes (cf. Münzer, *RE* VI.A 846) that the poet in *Tr*. 2.433 was Ticida, and that he is the Caesarian L. Ticida (*Bell. Afr*. 44, 46) and that he wrote of Metella as Apuleius claims. Wiseman guesses at the anonymous writers in 437-8: perhaps Furius Bibaculus, L. Torquatus, Asinius Pollio or Q. Hortensius.

13) J. Micyllus suggested, as explanation for the anonymity, either respect for the poets involved or metrical problems (reported in *P. Ovidii Nasonis opera omnia ex req. P. Burmanni* [Turin 1823] VI. p. 90). But Ovid certainly could have found any number of periphrases to identify them if he had wished; and how are these poets entitled to discretion when Metella herself has just been mentioned by name?

14) D. F. Bright (above n.7) 107-110.

15) See the very full assessment of the problem in G. Deroux, "L'identité de Lesbie" *ANRW* I.3 (Berlin 1973) 390-416.


17) First adduced by G. Barth, *adv. Lib*. 56.3; quoted in Forcellini's *Onomasticon* s.v. 'Hostia.'

18) A. Marx, *De S. Properti vita et librorum ordine temporibusque* (Diss. Leipzig 1884) 47 f.; Boucher (above n.6) 460-62.
19) On the sources and blind spots of the early scholastic tradition of Juvenal see G. Townend, "The Earliest Scholiast on Juvenal" CQ 22 (1972) 376-87.


23) P. Vallette, L'Apologie d'Apulée (Paris 1908) 171 ff.

24) The whole situation is summed up in Vallette's comment (p. 177): "Il n'est pas certain qu'il ait lu tous les ouvrages dont il parle, et il a presque l'air de se moquer du juge quand il lui dit avec une gravité de pince-sans-rire: pro tua eruditione, legisti profecto Aristotelis περὶ ζωῆς γενέσεως... (36)."

25) I wish to record my thanks to the readers of earlier versions of this paper for many helpful criticisms and suggestions.