θεὸς δὲ R p.c.: θεὸς R a.c.: θεὸς δὲ ⟨ἐποίησε⟩ Meiser: κληρουχίας ⟨ἔκτισε⟩ vel ⟨ἐγέννησε⟩ Davies

Meiser's and Davies's conjectures address the need for a transitive verb to govern κληρουχίας, but they leave a second problem untouched. If the passage is to make any sense as it stands, the subject of ἐμίγη in the previous sentence has to be supplied, rather awkwardly, from κακά, and even then the overall run of thought is not of the smoothest. The key to something better, I suspect, is to suppose that the early correction in R, from θεὸς to θεὸς δὲ, is itself a mistake, and that there should be no sentence break between ἐμίγη and θεός. If this is so, then it also follows that ἐμίγη must be corrupt, since (as already noted) a transitive verb is needed to govern κληρουχίας; and besides, the notion of God becoming entangled in the physical world is entirely unwanted in such a Platonizing passage as this one. What then should be read in place of ἐμίγη? ἐμείγνυ would be close in sound, but an aorist would sit better than an imperfect; perhaps then ἔμιξε or (as Donald Russell suggests to me) ἐνέμιξε. Alternatively, drawing on a parallel passage in *Dial.* 36 (413.4), ἔνειμε.

King's College London   M. B. TRAPP

THE TEXT OF *PERVIGILIUM VENERIS* 74

The extant MSS. of the *Pervigilium Veneris*, which all derive from a single archetype,[1] are unanimous in their reading at line 74. Yet, as is widely agreed, this reading cannot be correct. The poet is describing the descendants of Venus:

> ipsa Troianos nepotes in Latinos transtulit;
> ipsa Laurentem puellam coniugem nato dedit;   70
> moxque Marti de sacello dat pudicam virginem;
> Romuleas ipsa fecit cum Sabinis nuptias,
> unde Ramnes et Quirites proque prole posterum
> †Romuli matrem† crearet et nepotem Caesarem.   74

> It was she who made Latins of her Trojan descendants,
> she who gave the girl of Laurentum as wife to her son;
> soon afterwards from the sanctuary she gave the chaste
> virgin to Mars. It was she who made the marriage of
> Romulus' men with the Sabines, that, from their union,
> she might create the Ramnes, the Quirites, and, for later
> generations, †the mother of Romulus† and Caesar, the grandson.[2]

Romuli matrem makes no sense in what is otherwise a clear chronological sequence from the ancient Trojans to 'Caesar': the Ramnes and Quirites, themselves the offspring of Romulus' army, cannot also be the distant ancestors of Romulus' mother. Emendation is unavoidable. Catlow discusses the various restorations that have been suggested, and rightly concludes that none of them is satisfactory. He agrees with the consensus view (adopted by Lipsius, Wernsdorf, Clementi and Schilling) that, whatever the exact wording of the poet's original line 74, the line's *meaning* was 'that she might create Julius Caesar and Augustus'. Catlow summarizes: 'In this line reference is probably made to Julius and Augustus Caesar, but the

---

[1] The tradition of the MSS. is discussed by L. Catlow in his edition of the poem: *Pervigilium Veneris: Collection Latomus 172* (Brussels, 1980), pp. 7–17.
[2] I cite here the text and the translation of Catlow, op. cit.

labours of scholarship have not produced a convincing restoration. I have, therefore, obelised *Romuli matrem*, although corruption may extend further.'[3]

Proposed restorations have assumed that the correct reading begins with a word starting *Rom-*. That is neither a necessary nor a safe assumption. The correct opening must, almost certainly, mean 'Julius Caesar'; furthermore, the existence of *Rom-* at the opening of 72 raises the possibility that an element of dittography is at work, and that the incomprehensible *Romuli matrem* may owe its origin to a copyist whose eye wandered to 72 while he was writing 74. The repetitiousness produced by the extant version (*Romuleas...Romuli*) does not sound characteristic of the lightness of touch which the poet generally exhibits. For these reasons, the extant opening *Rom-* in 74 may be unsound.

If, then, we may abandon the assumption that the original line 74 must necessarily have begun *Rom-*, it immediately becomes possible to propose a reading which carries the required meaning of 'Julius and Augustus Caesar':

> Iulium mater crearet et nepotem Caesarem.

('That she, the mother, might create Julius Caesar and his grand-nephew Caesar.')

The course of the corruption was probably as follows. The copyist realized that he was on the wrong line, and so started again, thus producing:

> Romiulium mater crearet et nepotem Caesarem.

Either he omitted to delete the *Rom-*; or else he did delete it, but rather lightly, and the next scribe staunchly and stolidly copied the lot. The word now looked rather like *Romulus* and so it was easy enough for the 'i' in the middle to drop out in some subsequent copy:

> Romulium mater crearet et nepotem Caesarem.

A later copyist, realizing that this does not scan, wrote:

> Romuli mater crearet et nepotem Caesarem.

A subsequent copyist, realizing that this has no sense, wrote:

> Romuli matrem crearet et nepotem Caesarem.

In the proposed emendation, Augustus is the *nepos* of Julius Caesar. The actual historical relationship was, of course, that of grand-nephew. Can *nepos* mean this?

Throughout its history, the word *nepos* can mean 'distant descendant', 'protégé', or 'grandson'. After the second century A.D., additional meanings develop, alongside these: the chief is 'nephew', but 'cousin' and 'grand-nephew' are also found.[4] 'Nephew' occurs in Jerome,[5] for example, and in inscriptions.[6] Most significantly of all, Eutropius describes Augustus as *Caesaris nepos*.[7] The proposed emendation of

---

[3] Catlow, op. cit., p. 90.

[4] See articles in, for example, A. Souter, *Glossary of Later Latin* (Oxford, 1949); F. Blatt, *Novum Glossarium Mediae Latinitatis* (Hafnia, 1959); J. F. Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus* (Leiden, 1976). The meaning 'nephew' seems to have become increasingly important; observe, however, that the Italian *nipote* retains the meaning 'grandson' as well as 'nephew', whereas the French *neveu* and the English *nephew* do not. I suspect that there was a nuance of the connotation 'a person to whom I behave indulgently' *within* the meaning 'grandson' from the outset, and that that was how *nepos* came to be used for other blood-relatives to whom one behaves indulgently, as well as for grandsons.

[5] Jerome, *Ep.* 14.2; 60.9.

[6] *CIL* 3.3684; 3.4321; 3.6480.

[7] Eutrop. 7.1.

Pervigilium 74 is therefore permissible. If correct, it suggests that the *Pervigilium* is more likely to belong to the fourth century than to the second, for *nepos* had not acquired the additional meaning 'nephew' as early as the second century.[8] This affords confirmatory evidence for the fourth-century date for which Catlow, on quite separate grounds, has convincingly argued.[9]

Venus, the *mater*, is the mother of the *family line* which ran from Romulus' men to Julius Caesar and Augustus. The Julian *gens*, as Julius Caesar himself remarked in a speech, claimed descent from Venus;[10] he dedicated a temple to Venus Genetrix. The descent of the whole Roman race from Venus Genetrix is portrayed by Ennius (*Venus et genetrix patris nostri*)[11] and Lucretius (*Aeneadum genetrix*).[12] The word *mater* is used by various writers as a title for a goddess (for example *Flora mater*[13] and *Vesta mater*[14]), but in describing Venus as *mater* the poet is doing something a little more specific than just giving her an honorific title or designating her as the mother of the Romans: she is, in the *Pervigilium*, the mother of the Julian line.[15]

Any proposed emendation of the *Pervigilium* must preserve the elegance of style which characterizes the poet, and we must therefore test our suggestion by that criterion too.

<div align="center">Iulium mater crearet et nepotem Caesarem.</div>

Mater is juxtaposed with *Iulium*, emphasizing that Venus is the mother of the Julian *gens*. The position of *Caesarem* is neatly arranged so that it can complement *each* of the nouns *Iulium* and *nepotem*: 'Julius Caesar and his grand-nephew Caesar'. The two famous names, *Iulium* and *Caesarem*, occupy the prominent positions in the line – the first and last words. The line is well crafted: proper name; blood-relative; verb; blood-relative; proper name. Enjambement, which is not a characteristic of the poet,[16] is avoided in this emendation.

I therefore believe that this is what the poet wrote at 74:

<div align="center">Iulium mater crearet et nepotem Caesarem.</div>

Bolton   P. S. DAVIES

---

[8] The *Latin Dictionary* of Lewis and Short wrongly lists Suet., *Div. Iul.* 83, as an instance of the meaning 'nephew'. *Nepos* in fact means 'grandson' in this passage, because the phrase is *sororum nepotes*, 'the grandsons of his sisters'. (The reference is to the three grandsons of Caesar's sisters.)

[9] Catlow, op. cit. (n. 1), pp. 18–21.

[10] Suet. *Div. Iul.* 6.

[11] Ennius, *Ann.* 53.

[12] Lucr. 1.1.

[13] Cic. *Verr.* 5.36; Lucr. 5.739.

[14] Cic. *Font.* 47; Vir. *Geo.* 1.498. That Cicero does not coin the phrase *Venus mater* could be due to his antipathy to Caesar.

[15] Conceivably *nepotem* is intended to carry a hint of a double meaning: Augustus Caesar is the *nepos* (grand-nephew) of Julius Caesar, but he is also the *nepos* (distant descendant) of Venus, the subject of the sentence – cf. the use of *nepos* in this sense at the start of this section of the poem (*Pervigilium* 69).

[16] Catlow, op. cit. (n. 1), p. 89, points out that the complete lack of enjambement in the *Pervigilium* is an argument against those proposed emendations which involve it.

BERLIN LATIN MANUSCRIPTS NOW IN CRACOW

In L. D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission: a Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford, 1983), it is stated by J. G. F. Powell (p. 122) and by M. D. Reeve (p. 327 n. 4) that MS. Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Lat. 4° 404 (s. ix), containing Cicero,