Serenus opens his poem on medical remedies by invoking Apollo and Asclepius:

Phoebe, salutiferum quod pangimus adsere carmen
inventumque tuum prompto comitare favore;
tuque, potens artis, reduces qui tradere vitas
nosti et in caelum manes revocare sepultos,
qui colis Aegaeas, qui Pergama, quique Epidaurum,
qui quondam placida tectus sub pelle draconis
Tarpeias arces atque inclita templ a petisti
depellens taetros praesenti numine morbos,
huc ades et quicquid cupido mihi saepe locutus
firmasti cunctum teneris exponi papyris.

The manuscripts that count agree on all this except that in v. 3 B, defined by E. Baehrens in his edition as the archetype of all but A (Zürich Zentralbibl. C 78, s. ix), had artus for artis. In v. 4, however, Baehrens printed his own conjecture sub for in.

In the next edition F. Vollmer defended what he called the hiatus in v. 4: he inclined to regard it as acceptable in this versifier, and the sense, he added, is unobjectionable. Three editions more recent have no apparatus or note on the verse, and no-

1 Poetae latini minores, III, Leipzig 1881, 103-58.
2 Quinti Sereni Liber medicinalis, Leipzig and Berlin 1916, 5.
3 R. Pépin, Quintus Serenus (Serenus Sammonicus), Liber medicinalis, Paris 1950; Quinti Sereni Samonici liber medicinalis (praecipua saluberrima). Praefationem fecit, adnotavit versibusque Rossicis convertit Jurius Schulz, Moscow 1961, of which there are copies in London at the Warburg and Wellcome Institutes; C. Ruffato, La medicina in Roma antica: Il Liber medicinalis di Quinto Sereno Sammonico,
thing is said about its text in a recent discussion of the invocation\(^4\).

As the \(i\) of \(nosti\) is long by nature, what Vollmer called hiatus would have to be epic correction, the shortening of a long vowel or diphthong before an initial vowel or diphthong. Some recent manuals of Latin metre ignore epic correction 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 \textit{an qui amant}, and in hexameters embraces \textit{quam cum dum num tum}, as in Lucr. 3.1082 \textit{sed dum abest}\(^5\). Though it has been said that epic correction, unlike prosodic hiatus, occurs at the end of a foot\(^6\), the limitation is refuted in Greek by verse 2 of the \textit{Odyssey}, to go no further, and in Latin for instance by Verg. \textit{Georg.} 1.437 \textit{Panopeae et Inoo Melicertae}.

An article that surveys correction 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.), \textit{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.


Serenus\textsuperscript{7}. 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 \textit{m} and an initial \textit{h}:

\begin{align*}
108 & \text{Vipereae pellis cinerem his addito rebus} \\
780 & \text{Parva sabucus item (B: item est A), hircino conlita sevo}
\end{align*}

Poets of the Republic and early Empire treat \textit{h} as prosodically absent, and Serenus usually follows suit, but another verse irregular if \textit{h} is ignored becomes regular if it is treated as a consonant\textsuperscript{8}:

\textit{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 \textit{cineres}, \textit{apponito}, \textit{aspergito}, and one at 780, namely \textit{item si hircino conlita sevo est}\textsuperscript{9}. At 448 too he cites a conjecture, \textit{penitis}.


\textsuperscript{8} ‘Posteriorum plerique’ said L. Mueller, \textit{De re metrica poetarum latinarum praeter Plautum et Terentium}, St Petersburg and Leipzig 1894\textsuperscript{2}, 289, ‘\textit{h} pro consona adhibuere’. G. Cambier, “Le \textit{h}- initial fait-il parfois position chez Virgile et chez d’autres poètes latins classiques?”, \textit{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 \textit{h}.

\textsuperscript{9} Together with v. 4, Vollmer, \textit{Quinti Sereni Liber}, 79, lists these three passages under ‘licentiae metriceae’; the other four that he lists have nothing to do with hiatus. W. S. Teuffel, \textit{Geschichte der römischen Literatur}, Leipzig 1870, § 360, said that Serenus ‘folgt in der Verstechnik den besten Mustern …. In Bezug auf Synalöphe und Cäsur 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, \textit{Quaestiones Sammoniceae}, Giessen 1886, 75-8, treated only the prosody of single words and said nothing about initial \textit{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 hederae* 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*)⁸. 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: *nocis et in caelum* by Io. Sulpicius Verulanus in an

---

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

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

undated incunable published at Rome (ISTC is00470000), nos-
ti atque in caelum in the ed. Ven. 1488 (ISTC ia01432000)\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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. xliv); 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.

---

15 Burman, Poetae latini minores.
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