

**James ZETZEL**

**In Rand's Margins: From Fraenkel's Review to a Post-Modern Servius**

Eduard Fraenkel's devastating review of Harvard Servius II both delayed the appearance of HS III for 17 years and set such a high standard for editing ancient scholarly texts that there have been very few editions of Latin scholia since then. Fraenkel's review was accurate, but excessively harsh. Some of his criticism deserves close scrutiny, because it reveals that no satisfactory edition of Servius is possible.

Fraenkel's discussion of the abysmally narrow testimonia of HS II shows that parallels can assist either to uncover a better text underlying what Servius wrote or to restore the manuscripts' reading to what Servius actually wrote. The two goals are radically different but not always easy to distinguish, and Fraenkel fails to do so. Servius represents one moment in a long tradition; many notes in Servius originate in earlier scholarship, both Greek and Roman, and have descendants in Carolingian marginalia and renaissance commentaries. To edit Servius is to examine one moment in the tradition, not to write its history.

As Fraenkel knew, however, the meaning of "Servius" is also unclear, and that is the real problem for editors. Thilo and the Harvard editors defined "Servius" differently: for one, it is the vulgate, core commentary, to which some irresponsible person added learned marginalia in the early middle ages; for the others, Servius is the full text, which a brave soul in the early middle ages tried to restore to the glory of Donatus. Since Servius and DS differ in countless small details as well as in the large number of additional notes in DS, one's definition of "Servius" determines a great deal about what the surface text of the edition looks like.

In this respect, the format of HS III can give a reader a sense of two varieties of "Servius", but it does not deal with the core issue: Servius is a text, but DS is part of a process that extends over centuries. Many manuscripts used by editors do not exactly correspond to either the vulgate or DS, and once alteration of the vulgate began, every manuscript becomes a witness not to Servius, but only to its own text. No type of text is less amenable to the Method of Lachmann than ancient commentary. Servius can be edited, but the Servian tradition can not, because there is no text that can uniquely claim authenticity. So why keep trying to edit him? Thilo's text is indeed inadequate; but then no edition on paper can be adequate. We need to use modern resources to produce a post-modern non-text of Servius with its penumbra of accretions and changes: a hyper-text in which any given note can morph from Servius to DS (giving full weight to the abridged and eccentric versions as well), and perhaps to the Berne marginalia. In dealing with Servius, as with every other medieval survival of ancient scholarship, one is simultaneously dealing with multiple witnesses to a single text—à la Lachmann—and with a set of manuscripts each of which is a unique witness to a unique text, the creative act of a scribe/reader/editor both preserving and creating "Servius" in manifold forms, each of which is both true and false at the same time.