Appendix B: On Ramires’ family α[[1]](#footnote-1)

As was remarked in the Preface (see the text at n. 9), Giuseppe Ramires believed that he had identified an independent source, α, for the text of Servius in the agreement of Le (Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, MS Vossianus lat. F.25), Pc (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 7961), and r (a bifolium in Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Reg. Lat. 1495, containing the text of *A*. 11.604-759 and Servius on *A*. 9.94-348), which he usedin his editions of Servius on *Aeneid* 9 (1996) and (minus r) *Aeneid* 7 (2003). But these are simply τ MSS that happen to have more interpolations from Servius Auctus than the other members of that interpolated family, as can be demonstrated from a few examples.

For instance, at *A.* 9.616 Ramires prints as if Servius an addition to Servius’ comment found in α, *sane ‘habent’ bis subaudiendum* (F has the same, but with the simplex *audiendum*, found also in DS at *A.* 8.397, *et ‘tum quoque’ bis audiendum*). This means, ‘the word *habent* should be understood twice’. Now the gerundive *subaudiendum* or *audiendum*, in the meaning ‘to be understood’, occurs thirty times in the corpus, all thirty exclusively in DS. When Servius wishes to express the same idea, he usually writes ‘subaudis’ (74 times), a form used only three times in a non-Servian comment by DS (*Aen*. 2.79.2, 4.293, 8.35.1). This clear distinction in usage between Servius and DS is obscured by Ramires through his mistaken belief in the status of α.

Other places where internal evidence makes it clear that these interpolations in α derive from DS include the following:

*A*. 9.141

penitvs modo non genvs omne perosos f<eminevm> modo omne genus femineum non eos penitus perosos

| oportebat, propter quod ante perierunt. | decebat.

locutus est autem figurate.

Servius’ *modo … decebat* paraphrases and rearranges Vergil’s *penitus modo non genus omne perosos / femineum*. To this Fα add *propter quod ante* (*antea* α) *perierunt*, which is not part of the paraphrase, but an explanatory filler, probably composed by the Compiler. Ramires prints it as Servius, erroneously changing *propter quod* (antecedent *genus*) to *propterea quod*: the Compiler does not mean that the Trojans should hate women ‘because they died before’, but because a woman was the cause of their destruction (*propter quod genus*).

*A*. 9.155

qvos distvlit hector bene solius Hectoris facta est commemoratio, ut ostendatur perisse

| eum |

qui potuit esse terrori;

| et satis Hectori dedit, quasi plus esset differre quam vincere; |

per quod vult Aenean nihil fortiter in bello fecisse Troiano.

*Et satis … vincere* interrupts the connection between Servius’ two sentences. Servius says that Turnus’ apparent praise of Hector (‘who really could be a source of terror’ – *qui potuit esse terrori*, with emphatic *potuit*) is meant as belittlement of Aeneas (*per quod* . . . *Troiano*). But D, reflected here in the *et satis . . . vincere* of Fα, to have taken Turnus’ words as genuine praise of Hector.

*A*. 9. 300

per qvod pater ante solebat alii volunt ideo *ante* quia absens est Aeneas; sed iurare possumus etiam per absentis filii caput. alii ad causam religionis trahunt, quae praecepit ut filii imitentur in omnibus rebus suos parentes: ut nunc quasi imitatio sit iuris iurandi, ut dicat Ascanius ‘iuro per caput meum’, sicut praesens pater per suum caput iurare consuerat quotiens fidem suam confirmare cupiebat. alii volunt ideo dictum *ante* quia pontificibus per liberos iurare non licebat, sed per deos tantummodo, ut sit *ante* antequam pontifex esset Aeneas.

| ergo ante aut temporis est aut ordinis. |

Despite *ergo*, the addition found in Fα is, relative to Servius’ comment, a non-sequitur.

*A*. 7.1

tv qvoqve sicut Misenus, Palinurus etiam. nostris

| hoc est |

Italicis, ut ‘non eadem arboribus pendet vindemia nostris’,

non, ut Donatus ait

| in comparationem Oceani |

navigabilibus.

The Compiler has tried to rescue the apparently incomprehensible explanation Servius attributes to Donatus, that in saying *tu quoque nostris litoribus, Aeneia nutrix* / *aeternam moriens famam, Caieta, dedisti* (*A*. 7.1-2), Vergil intended *nostris* to mean ‘navigable’. But the insertion ‘in comparison to the Ocean’ does not work, since, unlike rivers and even the Ocean, shores cannot be literally navigated, especially when, as Donatus says in his comment on Ter. *Eun*. 320, *litoribus* stands for *terra*. The motive of mitigating an alleged mistake of Donatus cannot be Servius’, who is only too happy to denigrate Donatus. **Γ** omitted *non ut . . . navigabilibus,* as did the latest shared exemplar of Pa and α, so α supplied that part of the note from DS, while the margin of Pa supplied it from **Δ**, which correctly omits *in comparationem Oceani*.

*A.* 7.188

ancile scutum breve. regnante Numa caelo huius modi scutum lapsum est, et data responsa sunt, illic fore summam imperii, ubi illud esset. quod ne aliquando hostis agnosceret, per Mamurium fabrum multa similia fecerunt: cui et diem consecrarunt, quo pellem virgis feriunt ad artis similitudinem. dicimus autem ‘hoc ancile’ et ‘haec ancilia’, ‘anciliorum’ vero usurpavit Horatius dicens ‘anciliorum et nominis et togae oblitus’.

| septem fuerunt pignora, quae imperium Romanum tenent: acus |

| matris deum, quadriga fictilis Veientanorum, cineres Orestis, |

| sceptrum Priami, velum Ilionae, palladium, ancilia. |

The Compiler wished to list the seven guarantees of Rome’s imperium,[[2]](#footnote-2) but he tacked it on ineptly after Servius had switched from discussing the history of the *ancilia* to the form of the word, as belonging to the third declension.

Ramires prints in spread type most of the extra comment that he presents as Servius on the authority of Fα alone or, once, on the authority of α alone, so the damage done by this misunderstanding is often remediable; but more serious damage is caused by his choice of variants in the text of Servius when α sides with F. Consider the commentary on *A*. 9.705, where I print the following:

falarica venit de hoc telo legitur quia est ingens, torno factum, habens ferrum cubitale

| supra quod veluti quaedam sphaera, cuius | et rotunditatem de plumbo in modum

| pondus etiam plumbo augetur. dicitur enim | sphaerae. in ipsa summitate dicitur etiam

| ignem habere adfixum, stuppa circumdatum | ignem habere adfixum.

| et pice oblitum, incensumque aut vulnere |

| hostem aut igne consumit. |

hoc autem telo pugnatur de turribus, quas falas dici manifestum est:

| unde et in circo falae dicuntur divisiones inter euripum et metas, quod |

| ibi constructis ad tempus turribus, his telis pugna edi solebat: |

Iuvenalis (6.590) *consulit ante falas delphinorumque columnas.*

| hinc falarica hasta dicitur sicut alia muralis. | ergo a falis dicta est falarica, sicut a muro

| | muralis. sane falaricam Lucanus dicit nervis

| | mitti tortilibus et quadam machina, ut (6.198)

| | *hunc aut tortilibus vibrata falarica nervis*

| | *obruat.* Vergilius vero ait Turnum manu

| | iaculari potuisse: unde apparet aut a Lucano

| | ad auxesin illius qui occidendus fuerat esse

| | dictum, aut a Vergilio ad laudem Turni, qui

| | talem hastam manu iaculatus est.

Isidore in the early seventh century excerpted the following version of Servius (*Orig.* 18.8):

Falarica est telum ingens torno factum, habens ferrum cubitale et rotunditatem de plumbo in modum sphaerae. in ipsa summitate dicitur etiam et ignem habere adfixum. hoc autem telo pugnatur de turribus. quas dici manifestum est. Iuvenalis ‘consulis ante falas delphinorumque columnas’. a falis igitur dicta est falarica, sicut a muro muralis. sane falaricam Lucanus dicit nervis mitti tortilibus et quadam machina ‘ut nunc <tortilibus> vibrata falarica nervis. Vergilius vero ait Turnum manu †falaricae† iaculasse.

The excerpt supports the non-DS version of the Servian commentary, not only omitting many accretions from the D commentary, and having text that DS omits, but basically following the version of Servius transmitted by **Γ**. The lack of correspondence between Isidore and the accretions of DS was one of Thilo’s arguments that the longer version was not genuine Servius (vol. 1 praef. xxxix for this passage). But for *at rotunditatem* . . . *summitate* Pa and α read *supra quod est ueluti quaedam sphera cuius pondus etiam plumbo augetur*,forsaking the version of Servius inherited from τ, probably because the sentence reached τ in a corrupted and unintelligible state (Q shows the **Δ** error *rotunditate*, though τ’s basic text for all of book 9 is **Γ**; this may mean that a line was omitted in τ’s ancestor and supplied by Q from **Δ** and by Paα from DS). Ramires prints this version of the first half of the comment (with bold type serving the same purpose that italics did in Thilo’s edtion):

falarica venit de hoc telo legitur quia est ingens, torno factum, habens ferrum cubitale supra quod veluti quaedam sphaera, cuius pondus etiam plumbo augetur. dicitur enim ignem habere adfixum, **stuppa circumdatum et pice oblitum, incensumque aut vulnere hostem aut igne consumit**. hoc autem telo pugnatur de turribus, quas falas dici manifestum est: **unde et in circo falae dicuntur divisiones inter euripum et metas, quod** **ibi constructis ad tempus turribus, his telis pugna edi solebat**; Iuvenalis (6.590) *consulit ante falas delphinorumque columnas.* . . .

Here Ramires incorrectly imposed on Servius the version of FPaα, as he does with many or most agreements of Fα. We see the motivation of the interpolator. Not only α but the many other medieval MSS of Servius that contain interpolations from Servius Auctus, including the earliest extant for *Aen*. 9 (Pa), resorted to Servius Auctus not to supplement Servius (although they have occasionally done so) but to correct obvious errors or apparent omissions in their inherited text. Consequently, most of the DS versions found in α occur in passages where τ inherited an apparently corrupted text.

For a final example, compare Ramires’ text of the comment on *A*.9.631—sonat vna f**atifer** a**rcvs** simul ut cognovit augurium—with mine: sonat vna fatifer arcvs simul atque cognovit augurium. Here **Δ** correctly transmits *simul atque cognovit augurium*, F incorrectly has *simul ut cognovit augurium* (printed by Ramires, although Servius never uses *simul ut* for *simul atque*), and **Γ**, including τ, has *simul atque augurium*, omitting the needed *cognovit*. The α MSS present a conflation of a DS interpolation and the τ text, *simul ut cognovit augurium simulatque augurium*, which Ramires adopted in his dissertation. After it was drawn to his attention that the α reading was a conflation of DS and **Γ**, he adopted the **DS** version in his published text, seemingly because he was unwilling to recognize DS as the source of α’s peculiar readings. As a consequence, here and many times elsewhere Ramires prints as comments of Servius a text that is attested only for Servius Auctus, and the distinction between the two commentaries, which it was the aim of the Harvard Edition to make clear, is further blurred.

1. *Ed’.s note*: this appendix is adapted from the paper ‘Why is the APA/Harvard Servius?: Editing Servius’ that Charles E. Murgia presented at the meetings of the American Philological Association (now the Society for Classical Studies) in 2004 as a contribution to the panel ‘Whither the APA/Harvard Servius’, organized by Donald Mastronarde. For criticism of Ramires’ position discussed here see also the review of Ramires 1996 by Jocelyn (1998) and of Ramires 1996 and 2003 by Zetzel (2008). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *pignora* is Preller’s correction of the transmitted *paria*, which Ramires prints. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)