

thing is said about its text in a recent discussion of the invocation⁴.

As the *i* of *nosti* is long by nature, what Vollmer called hiatus would have to be epic correption, the shortening of a long vowel or diphthong before an initial vowel or diphthong. Some recent manuals of Latin metre ignore epic correption and instead discuss the feature known by the far from transparent name ‘prosodic hiatus’, best regarded as ‘ein Sonderfall des anapaestischen Gruppenbetonungsgesetzes’ and therefore as peculiar to Latin; it concerns long monosyllables shortened rather than elided before a short vowel, as in Verg. *Ecl.* 8.108 *an qui amant*, and in hexameters embraces *quam cum dum num tum*, as in Lucr. 3.1082 *sed dum abest*⁵. Though it has been said that epic correption, unlike prosodic hiatus, occurs at the end of a foot⁶, the limitation is refuted in Greek by verse 2 of the *Odyssey*, to go no further, and in Latin for instance by Verg. *Georg.* 1.437 *Panopeae et Inoo Melicertae*.

An article that surveys correption in Latin verse, though without distinguishing it from prosodic hiatus, does not mention

Turin 1996, who reprints Pépin’s text and dispenses altogether with his apparatus. K. Smolak and K.-D. Fischer in P. L. Schmidt and R. Herzog (ed.), *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike*, Munich 1989, V, § 556, say that Schulz’s text is based on Vollmer’s, but in v. 4 he follows Baehrens, and indeed Anna Bellettini, who is working on the transmission of the poem, kindly tells me that he follows Baehrens throughout.

⁴ Anna Rita Corsini, “La *praefatio* di Sereno Sammonico al *Liber medicinalis*”, in C. Santini and N. Scivoletto (ed.), *Prefazioni, prologhi, proemi di opere tecnico-scientifiche latine*, Rome 1990, I, 355–9. She uses Pépin’s edition without mentioning Vollmer’s.

⁵ H. Drexler, *Einführung in die römische Metrik*, Darmstadt 1967, 46; J. Soubiran, *L’élision dans la poésie latine*, Paris 1966, 332–7, 373–80. Soubiran, *L’élision*, 374, listed the instances known from hexameters up to 1979, when the first hexameter of the Gallus papyrus added another, *tum erunt*; see E. Courtney, *The fragmentary Latin poets*, Oxford 1993, 263. Like Drexler, S. Boldrini, *La prosodia e la metrica dei Romani*, Rome 1992, 68–70, discusses prosodic hiatus but not epic correption.

⁶ E. J. Kenney, *Lucretius De rerum natura Book III*, Cambridge 1971, in his note on the verse just quoted.

Serenus⁷. The rest of Vollmer's text, which runs to 1107 verses, exhibits no other instance of it after v. 4, and the only instances of hiatus involve a final *m* and an initial *h*:

108 *Viperae pellis cinerem his addito rebus*
 780 *Parva sabucus item (B: item est A), hircino conlita*
sevo

Poets of the Republic and early Empire treat *h* as prosodically absent, and Serenus usually follows suit, but another verse irregular if *h* is ignored becomes regular if it is treated as a consonant⁸:

448 *Cum saevit penitus haerens iniuria lumbis*

If these three verses support one another, there is no hiatus in 108 or 780. If they do not, there may be, but Vollmer cites three conjectures that would remove it at 108, namely *cineres*, *apponito*, *aspergito*, and one at 780, namely *item si hircino conlita sevo est*⁹. At 448 too he cites a conjecture, *penitis*.

⁷ M. Bonaria, "L'elisione parziale nella poesia latina", *Hermes* 90, 1962, 173-86. No mention either in F. Cupaiuolo, *Bibliografia della metrica latina*, Naples 1995.

⁸ 'Posteriorum plerique' said L. Mueller, *De re metrica poetarum latinorum praeter Plautum et Terentium*, St Petersburg and Leipzig 1894², 289, '*h* pro consona adhibuere'. G. Cambier, "Le *h*-initial fait-il parfois position chez Virgile et chez d'autres poètes latins classiques?", *Latomus* 17, 1958, 360-1, is not a survey but makes the important point that in Virgil hiatus at syntactical breaks occurs before vowels as well as before *h*.

⁹ Together with v. 4, Vollmer, *Quinti Sereni Liber*, 79, lists these three passages under 'licentiae metricae'; the other four that he lists have nothing to do with hiatus. W. S. Teuffel, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, Leipzig 1870, § 360, said that Serenus 'folgt in der Verstechnik den besten Mustern In Bezug auf Synalöphe und Cäsar werden strenge Gesetze befolgt, die nur selten zu Gunsten technischer Ausdrücke durchbrochen werden'. I have not encountered an adequate discussion of his metre. In a 'Pars metrica' A. Baur, *Quaestiones Sammoniceae*, Giessen 1886, 75-8, treated only the prosody of single words and said nothing about initial *h* (Otto Zwierlein kindly supplied me with a copy of the work, absent, as

Also relevant are the many instances of elision in the poem. To exclude for the moment elision after the first *longum*, Serenus elides over 30 long vowels or diphthongs. After the first *longum* he elides short syllables over 40 times. Elision there of a long syllable is unanimously and credibly transmitted only in 827 *Quare aptam* and 1073 *Quodsi hederæ* but occurs as a variant in 618 *aut qui olim* (A: *aut olim* B) and 1031 *Collo igitur* (A² with the best descendant of B, certainly right: *colligitur* A and the other descendants of B) and has been introduced by a conjecture that Vollmer accepts in 415 *si qui ervum* (Baehrens: *si quis ervum* AB)¹⁰. Why then should Serenus allow himself just one epic correction, and that in a conspicuous part of the poem where no unavoidable plant or ailment limited his options?

Vollmer does cite conjectures, not just Baehrens's *nosti et sub caelum* but three more. All three were printed from manuscripts¹¹: *noscis et in caelum* by Io. Sulpicius Verulanus in an

far as I can discover, from libraries in Britain). Both Ruffato, *La medicina in Roma*, 25, and Smolak and Fischer, *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur*, comment mostly and not always accurately on features that had been normal since at least the principate of Claudius. L. Ceccarelli, *Contributi per la storia dell'esametro latino*, Rome 2008, includes Serenus in his statistical tables but comments on nothing more specific than the frequency of 'clausole non canoniche' (I 196; cf. II tab. 37, which uses notation explained at I 92-3 in n. 110).

¹⁰ Mueller, *De re metrica*, 345, said that Serenus 'pedi hexametri primo admisit elisionem longae in arsi' but cited only 1031 and 1073.

¹¹ I owe this information to Anna Bellettini (cf. n. 3).

¹² On the earliest editions see Joanne H. Phillips, 'The incunable editions of the *Liber medicinalis Quinti Sereni*', in I. Mazzini and Franca Fusco (ed.), *I testi di medicina latini antichi: problemi filologici e storici*, Rome 1985, 215-35. Schulz, *Quinti Sereni Samonici liber*, 23 illustrates the first page of the text in the ed. Ven. 1488. One manuscript that has *nosti atque* is Cesena S. 25.5 (a. 1457), illustrated by Ruffato, *La medicina in Roma*, opposite p. 113.

undated incunable published at Rome (*ISTC* is00470000), *nosti atque in caelum* in the ed. Ven. 1488 (*ISTC* ia01432000)¹², *nosti seu caelo* by H. Ranzovius (Leipzig 1590). As Barth pointed out, however, Sulpicius's *noscis* will not do, because unlike the perfect *no(vi)sse* the present *noscere* is never given the sense and construction of *posse*¹³. Ranzovius's *nosti seu caelo* departs furthest from the transmitted text, and his dative of destination is questionable. Anyone who disbelieves the metre of *nosti et in caelum* is therefore left with a choice, it might seem, between *nosti atque in caelum* and *nosti et sub caelum*. Add Barth's transposition, *et nosti in caelum*¹⁴.

Neither Vollmer nor anyone else, however, has remarked on another fault in vv. 3-4: the absence of anything to define the *ars* that Asclepius is master of.

Both faults can be removed by a simple measure: read *artis ... quae ... novit*, an art capable of bringing people back to life. In an address to Apollo and Asclepius, with *tu* at the beginning of v. 3 and *qui* looming four times in vv. 5-6, corruption of *quae* to *qui* is hardly surprising. Once it had happened, someone less at home in metre than Serenus reinstated concord by changing the verb from third person to second.

After making this conjecture, I found it in print; but whose is it? The last editor to mention it was J. C. G. Ackermann (Leipzig 1786). He reports it from 'Ald.', which 'editio Asulani

¹³ C. Barthius, *Adversariorum commentariorum libri sexaginta*, Frankfurt 1624, 2679. P. Burman (the Elder), *Poetae latini minores*, Leiden 1731, II, 188-9, unconvincingly replied that the idiom could have been extended to *noscere* by so late a writer as Serenus.

¹⁴ Barthius, *Adversariorum commentariorum libri*, 2679. R. Keuchenius in his edition, Amsterdam 1662 and 1706, 83, misunderstood the conjecture as the reading of Barth's *membranae* and took him to be rejecting it when in fact he was rejecting *nosti et*. The last editor to mention it was Burman, *Poetae latini minores*, who reproduced Keuchenius's note without correcting him. By *membranae*, incidentally, Barth seems to have meant not a manuscript of his own but the source collated in France by Sambucus and reported in the edition *sine loco* of 1581 by C. Wolphius, who had acquired the collation from Gesner.

est Venetiis anno 1525 edita' (p. xlv); but there is no such thing either in his own list of editions (p. xxxiii) or anywhere else, and the conjecture does not appear in either Aldine (Venice 1528 with Celsus, 1547 amongst *medici antiqui*). Evidently he was relying on Burman, who said this¹⁵:

Ego malim cum Aldis *Tuque potens artis, reduces quae tradere (vel reddere) vitae / Novit, et in caelum manes revocare sepultos, ut reduces ad manes referatur; nam illi dicuntur rectius vitae tradi vel reddi quam ipsae vitae reduces tradi.*

In his note on v. 4, however, Burman rightly cites from 'ed. Aldorum' not *novit et* but *nosti atque*. On the other hand, they did print *vitae*. It was *vitae*, then, that he favoured 'cum Aldis': *quae ... novit* was his own.

MICHAEL D. REEVE
Pembroke College, Cambridge
mdr1000@cam.ac.uk

¹⁵ Burman, *Poetae latini minores*.

For comments on a draft I should like to thank Stephen Oakley, Otto Zwierlein, David Butterfield, and the two referees.