right of using and enjoying the fruits of property; and (c) and *(d) operas scrvorum sive animalium,* Praedial servitudes were either (*a*) *rustic,* such as *jus eundi,* the right of walking or riding along the footpath of another; *aquae ductus,* the right of passage for water; *pascendi,* the right of pasture, &c ; or (*b*) *urban.* Urban servitudes were of various kinds, as *oneris ferendi,* the right of using the wall of another to support a man’s own wall; *projiciendi,* the right of building a structure, such as a balcony or verandah, so as to project over another’s land; *stillicidii, fumι immittendi* and several others. Servitudes were created by a disposition *inter vivos,* or by contract; by testamentary disposition; by the conveyance of land or by prescription They might be extinguished by destruction of either the res serviens or the res dominans; by release of the right, or by the vesting of the ownership of the res serviens and res dominans in the same person.

In English law there may be certain limited rights over the land of another, corresponding somewhat to servitudes, and termed easements *(q.v).* In Scots law the term is still in use (see Easement).

SERVIUS HONORATUS, MAURUS (or Marius), Roman grammarian and commentator on Virgil, flourished at the end of the 4th century a.d. He is one of the interlocutors in the *Saturnalia* of Macrobius, and allusions in that work and a letter from Symmachus to Servius show that he was a pagan. He was one of the most favourable examples of the Roman “ grammatici ” and the most learned man of his time. He is chiefly known for his commentary on Virgil, which has come down to us in two distinct forms. The first is a comparatively short commentary, definitely attributed to Servius in the superscription in the MSS. and by other evidence. A second class of MSS. (all going back to the 10th or 11th century) presents a much expanded commentary, in which the first is embedded; but these MSS. differ very much in the amount and character of the additions they make to the original, and none of them bears the name of Servius. The added matter is undoubtedly ancient, dating from a time but little removed from that of Servius, and is founded to a large extent on historical and antiquarian literature which is now lost. The writer is anonymous and probably a Christian. A third class of MSS., written for the most part in Italy and of late date, repeats the text of the first class, with numerous interpolated scholia of quite recent origin and little or no value. The real Servian commentary practically gives the only complete extant edition of a classic author written before the destruction of the empire. It is constructed very much on the principle of a modern edition, and is partly founded on the extensive Virgilian literature of preceding times, much of which is known only from the fragments and facts preserved in the commentary. The notices of Virgil’s text, though seldom or never authoritative in face of the existing MSS., which go back to, or even beyond, the times of Servius, yet supply valuable information concerning the ancient recensions and textual criticism of Virgil. In the gram- matical interpretation of his author’s language, Servius does not rise above the stiff and overwrought subtleties of his time; while his etymologies, as is natural, violate every law of sound and sense. As a literary critic the shortcomings of Servius, judged by \* a modern standard, are great, but he shines in comparison with his contemporaries. In particular, he deserves credit for setting his face against the prevalent allegorical methods of exposition. But the abiding value of his work lies in his preservation of facts in Roman history, religion, antiquities and language, which but for him might have perished. Not a little of the laborious erudition of Varro and other ancient scholars has survived in his pages. Besides the Virgilian commentary, other works of Servius are extant: a collection of notes on the grammar (*Ars*) of Aelius Donatus; a treatise on metrical endings *(De finalibus);* and a tract on the different metres *(De centum melris).*

Editions of the Virgilian commentary by G. Fabrieius (1551); P. Daniel, who first published the enlarged commentary (1600); and G. Thilo and H. Hagen (1878-1902). The *Essai sur Servius* by E. Thomas (1880) is an elaborate and valuable examination of all matters connected with Servius; many points are treated also by O. Ribbeck in his *Prolegomena* to Virgil ; see also a review of Thilo’s edition by H. Nettleship in *Journal of Philology,* x. (1882). The smaller works of Servius are printed in H. Keil's *Grammatici Latini,* iv.

SERVIUS TULLIUS, sixth legendary king of Rome (578- 534 B.c.). According to one account he was the son of the household genius (Lar) and a slave named Ocrisia, of the house­hold of Tarquinius Priscus. He married a daughter of Tar- quinius and succeeded to the throne by the contrivance of his mother-in-law, Tanaquil, who was skilled in divination and foresaw his greatness. Another legend, alluded to in a speech by the emperor Claudius (fragments of which were discovered on a bronze tablet dug up at Lyons in 1524), represented him as an Etruscan soldier of fortune named Mastarna, who attached himself to Caeles Vibenna (Caelius Vivenna), the founder of an Etruscan city on the Caelian Hill (see also Tacitus, *Annals,* iv. 65). An important event of his reign was the conclusion of an alliance with the Latins, whereby Rome and the cities of Latium became members of one great league, whose common sanctuary was the temple of Diana on the Aventine. His reign of forty-four years was brought to a close by a conspiracy headed by his son-in-law, Tarquinius Superbus.

The legend of Servius presents certain similarities to that of the founder of Rome. His miraculous birth, commemorated by Servius himself in the festival established by him in honour of the Lares, recalls that of Romulus. Again, as Romulus was the author of the patrician groundwork of the constitution, so Servius was regarded as the originator of a new classification of the people, which laid the foundation of the gradual political enfranchisement of the plebeians (for the constitutional altera- tions with which his name is associated, see Rome: *Ancient History,* for the Servian Wall see Rome: *Archaeology),* His supposed Latin descent is contradicted by the Etruscan tradition alluded to above (on which see V. Gardthausen, *Mastarna oder Servius Tullius,* 1882), and his insertion among the kings of Rome is due to the need of providing an initiator of subsequent republican institutions. The treaty with the Latins is mentioned by Dionysius of Halicarnassus alone, who had not seen it himself; indeed, it is doubtful whether it was then in existence, and in any case, considering the changes which the language had undergone, it would have been unintelligible. It is also sus- picious that no list of the members of the league is given, contrary to the usual custom.

For a critical examination of the story see Schwegler, *Römische Geschichte,* bks. xvi., xvii. ; Sir G. Cornewall Lewis, *Credibility of early Roman History,* ch. xi. ; W. Ihne, *History of Rome,* i.; E. Pais, *Storia di Roma,* i. (1898); and *Ancient Legends of Roman History* (Eng. trans., 1906), where he comes to the conclusion that “ instead of being the sixth *rex* of Rome, he was originally the *rex serυus,* the priest of the cult of Diana Aricina transferred to the Aventine, the priest of the protecting goddess of fugitive slaves C. Pascal, *Fatti e legende di Roma antica* (Florence, 1903); also O. Gilbert, *Geschichte und Topographie der Stadt Rom im Altertum* (1883-1885), and J. B. Carter, *The Religion of Numa* (1906), on the reorganization of Servius.

SERVO-BULGARIAN WAR (1885). The Berlin Congress of 1878, by its revision of the treaty of San Stefano, created two states in the Balkan Peninsula—the principality of Bulgaria owning a nominal suzerainty to Turkey, and the autonomous province of eastern Rumeha, presided over by a Turkish governor-general, and apparently intended to remain in close relations with the porte. This settlement came to an end when the movement in favour of a united Bulgaria culminated (September 1885) in a revolution in the Rumelian capital. Prince Alexander of Bulgaria, recognizing that the movement was irresistible and that, unless directed by authority, it might degenerate into anarchy and civil war, placed himself at its head, and, proceeding to Philippopolis, formally accepted the government of the united Bulgarian states. As it was assumed that the sultan would reassert his claim by force of arms, the Bulgaro-Rumelian forces were concentrated as rapidly as possible near the Turkish frontier. Prince Alexander, however, had taken the step of acknowledging the sultan’s suzerainty; and Turkey was not inclined to begin a war which would probably cause a revolt in Macedonia and might end by rendering Russian influence paramount in Bulgaria. But, while a conference of ambassadors was vainly discussing the situation at Constantinople, the Gordian knot was cut by the announcement that