FOREWORD

When Charles E. Murgia (hereafter CEM) died in February 2013, the files that he had gathered while preparing his edition of Servius’ commentary on *Aeneid* 9-12 ran to many thousands of pages. Meticulously reviewed and sifted by Donald Mastronarde, as CEM’s scholarly executor, these materials included essentially complete and publishable drafts of the Latin text and—in line with the format of previous volumes of the ‘APA / Harvard Servius’— both an upper and a lower critical apparatus.[[1]](#footnote-1) These drafts embodied the judgments that CEM had formed over the course of four decades, and I have made no substantive changes.[[2]](#footnote-2) The core of this edition is thus entirely CEM’s own, as is the editorial ‘*ego*’ that speaks throughout the critical apparatus.

There were, however, two crucial parts of the project that were only partially drafted, and several peripheral pieces that were not drafted at all: my work since June 2015 has aimed to provide what was lacking. I can describe here what those parts and pieces were.

**Testimonial apparatus**

Bearing in mind the second part of Eduard Fraenkel’s famous review of Rand et al. 1946 (Fraenkel 1949), CEM and at least eleven graduate assistants had gathered the data for an extensive *apparatus fontium et testium* intended to stand between the text and the critical apparatus. These data resided on thousands of 5 x 8 cards but had not yet been fully winnowed and compiled in electronic files at the time of CEM’s death: while a draft existed for all of *Aeneid* 10, the drafts of the remaining books were only partial (*A.* 9.1-212, 11.1-243, 12.1-299), and it was my task to complete the winnowing and compiling. This task was made more challenging by the fact that at some point before the 5 x 8 cards were shipped to Princeton from Berkeley, the cards for *Aeneid* 11. 244-416 and 652-915 and all the cards for *Aeneid* 12 went missing. I have done what I could to reconstitute the lost data and have also refined and supplemented the surviving data that CEM and his assistants had gathered.

**Preface**

CEM’s partial draft of the preface addressed several important technical questions: the edition’s relation to volumes 2 and 3, an explanation of the way it presents the two versions of the commentary (the ‘vulgate’ Servius and Servius Auctus), and its deviation from the previous volumes in a small but important detail of layout (pp. 000-00); the way in which it treats matters of orthography, including the assimilation (or not) of prefixes (pp. 000-00); the constitution of the *apparatus superior*, which serves a purpose here different from that served by the upper apparatus in the previous volumes (pp. 000-00); and the constitution of the *apparatus inferior*, which in this edition serves as the true critical apparatus (pp. 000-00). But it did not include either an overview of the textual tradition or descriptions of the principal manuscripts, though cross-references in the draft showed that CEM intended to provide both. I have supplied a concise summary of the tradition by adapting the article CEM wrote on the subject for *The* *Virgil Encyclopedia*[[3]](#footnote-3) and have drawn on Murgia 1975 and other studies for the descriptions. Readers should be aware, however, that a remark in CEM’s draft of the preface made it plain that he intended to include in his descriptions details about scribal habits requiring a breadth and depth of knowledge that only he could have brought to bear.

**Peripheral pieces**

Other finishing touches I have supplied include the following:

* Appendix B, a critique of the view of the textual tradition adopted by Giuseppe Ramires in his editions of Servius on *Aeneid* 7 and 9 (2003 and 1996, respectively), based on an unpublished paper by CEM (see Appendix B n.1) edited to suit the present context;
* a list of the abbreviations of scholarly resources (*CIL*, *TLL*, etc.) used in the edition;
* a table of authors, works, and editions cited in the text and testimonial apparatus, so that interested readers can track the citations to their sources;
* full bibliographical references for the emendations cited in the critical apparatus, provided for the same reason;
* an updating of many of the editions cited in the text, testimonial apparatus, and table of authors and works;
* a list of previous editions of Servius cited in the critical apparatus and a bibliography of the secondary literature cited throughout;
* a table of *sigla* to precede the Latin text, with a list of abbreviations used in the critical apparatus.

\* \* \*

Had CEM been able to complete this work, he would have acknowledged, by name, many scholars on whose assistance he had relied over the years, and I regret that I am able to offer only a general and inadequate expression of gratitude in his stead. Thanks, however, to Donald Mastronarde’s canvass of present and former students of Berkeley’s Department of Classics, I can gladly acknowledge eleven of the graduate assistants who worked with CEM on the testimonial apparatus or, in a few cases, on collations: these are, alphabetically by surname (and with apologies to anyone unintentionally omitted), Shadi Bartsch-Zimmer, Andrew Finch, Stefan Gruen, Karalee Strieby Harding, Tom Hendrickson, Jared Hudson, Miriam Pelikan Pettinger, Josephine Crawley Quinn, Dylan Sailor, Wilson Shearin, and Sarah Stroup; I can also express more personal thanks to Tom Hendrickson and Jared Hudson for answering my queries at an early stage of my work.

All users of this edition should know that the project would not have reached this point if Donald Mastronarde had not devoted countless hours to managing CEM’s Servian *Nachlass*: for those efforts we all owe him great thanks, as do I more particularly for the many questions he has answered and other forms of help he has provided over the past eighteen months. I also gladly thank the Regents of the University of California, as owners of the copyright for CEM’s papers under the terms of his will, who granted me joint ownership so that I might do what was necessary to bring the edition to publication, and Berkeley’s Department of Classics, chaired by Nelly Oliensis, for providing funds to help underwrite the cost of production. At Princeton Joseph Gauvreau gave invaluable assistance in compiling the table of authors, works, and editions, as did Nancy Blaustein, department manager of Princeton’s Classics Department, in helping with several administrative issues that arose; and the Classics Department’s Magie Fund once again supported my work by providing a generous subvention grant. Cynthia Damon came to the aid of the ‘APA / Harvard Servius’ at a critical juncture over a decade ago, working to ensure the project’s continuity; more recently, as a referee, she suggested several important improvements in presentation and provided help by answering some scholarly queries. For similar responses I am grateful also to David Armstrong, James Brusuelas, Michael Flower, Chris Pelling, John Ramsey, and Jim Zetzel. Finally, I warmly thank three individuals, and the institutions they represent, for the advice, encouragement, and support that has made publication possible, first in print and ultimately as an open-access online edition: Michael Gagarin, Vice President for Publications and Research of the Society for Classical Studies (formerly the American Philological Association); Samuel Huskey, Director of the Digital Latin Library; and Stefan Vranka, Classics editor of Oxford University Press - USA.

Robert A. Kaster

*Princeton, New Jersey*

*20 December 2016*

1. Those previous volumes—Rand et al. 1946 (*Aeneid* 1-2) and Smith et al. 1965 (*Aeneid* 3-5)—were numbers 2 and 3 of what was conceived as a 5-volume set, of which CEM’s was to be the last. Volume 1, intended to include the commentaries on the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, was abandoned after the death of its editor, G. P. Goold, in 2001; volume 4 (*Aeneid* 6-8) was entrusted to an editorial team that now comprises E. Christian Kopff, Dirk Obbink, and James Brusuelas, after its editor, P. K. Marshall, died, also in 2001. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. I have, however, made minor adjustments in the format of citations for the sake of economy, for example replacing ‘Aen. XII 775’ with ‘A. 12.755’ in cross-references to Vergil’s text. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. ‘Servius, manuscripts of’. by Charles E. Murgia, in: *The Virigil Encyclopedia*, ed. J. Ziolkowski and R. F. Thomas, pp. 1154-57. Copyright © 2014 Wiley Blackwell. Reproduced with permission of Blackwell Publishing Ltd. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)