THE VALUE OF THE PUTEANEUS OF STATIUS

By O. A. W. Dilke

(Rhodes University, Grahamstown, now at University of Glasgow)

The manuscript which in editions of the past 80 years has been most valued in establishing the text of the Thebaid and Achilleid, so much so that one scholar criticizes its 'superstitious cult', has been the Puteaneus (P), Parisinus latinus 8051. It dates from the late 9th or early 10th century, and belonged at one time to the monastery of Corbie in Picardy and later to Claude Dupuy. It seems to have been copied from a minuscule manuscript, which in turn was copied directly or indirectly from the liber Iuliani V.C. mentioned in P at the end of Book IV of the Thebaid. A. Klotz, Hermes xl (1905), 341-372, showed that the quotations from the Thebaid given by Priscian and Eutyches correspond fairly closely with the readings of P and less closely with those of the large w group. An exception to this correspondence is Th. iv. 717, where Klotz showed how PD had a scattered remnant, misplaced, of a seven-line interpolation found in L, the Leipzig manuscript. In his editions of the Thebaid and Achilleid, Klotz purposely excluded, in view of the very large number of extant manuscripts, all those of later date than the 12th century; and he omitted certain manuscripts of the Thebaid, of which perhaps he was unaware, dating from the 12th century. Thus apart from the w manuscripts he presented only P in the Thebaid and PE in the Achilleid. It is now clear that (a) in the Thebaid, three manuscripts akin to P should take a place in the recension:

\[ \Theta = \text{Matritensis 10039 (Toletanus), which starts at viii. 739; 11th century;} \]
\[ \delta = \text{Parisinus latinus 8054, 13th century;} \]
\[ t = \text{Bruxellensis 5337, 11th century;} \]

(b) in the Achilleid, we should take account, as I showed in my edition, of R = Monacensis 14557 (Ratisponensis), 14th century, which is akin to E. As an additional manuscript of the w class U = Parisinus latinus 8040, 11th century, should be used.

In their enthusiasm for P, which had been neglected by earlier editors, Kohlmann and Klotz sometimes printed its readings when they were clearly inferior to those of w. Thus, in his first edition of the Achilleid, Klotz adopted three readings of P which were poor Latin and which were withdrawn in his second edition. Similarly at Th. x. 76-8:

---

1 W. Morel, C.R. lv (1941), 75.
2 For details of the readings of these three manuscripts in Th. x. 1-274 I am most indebted to Mr. R. D. Williams, of the University of Reading.
3 Not to be confused with the manuscript in Emmanuel College, Cambridge, which Bentley, Kohlmann and Wilkins call \( \delta \). It is unfortunate that Boussard has assigned 8 to this Paris manuscript, since the Emmanuel one was always called 8.
4 Housman, in vol. 1 of his Manilius, p. xxxvii n. I drew attention to these with the words 'Mr. Klotz's Achilleis has just come into my hands. Turning over the first few pages I find that . . . ', followed by a scathing indictment of Klotz's reading
non saevius arsit

Herculeae cum matris onus geminosque Tonantis
concubitus vacuis indignaretur in astris.

Klotz prints P's *secubitus* with Kohlmann and other modern editors, although this word has quite the wrong sense (Lewis and Short 'a lying or sleeping alone'; Faccolati-Forcellini 'dicitur de femina quae sola sine viro cubat'); it is worth noting that ω's *concubitus* is supported by Ø8t.

This excessive enthusiasm for P has had its reaction, and two scholars have attempted to dehorne P, but for quite different reasons. J. Boussard, 'Le classement des manuscrits de la *Thebaide* de Stace', *R.E.L.* xxx (1952), 220-251, while upholding the manuscripts of the P-group (π) against ω, maintains that the best of this group is δ, which is three or four centuries later than P.

N. Terzaghi, on the other hand, 'Il codice "P" e l' "Achilleide" di Stazio', *B.C.P.E.* n.s. fasc. iv (1956), 1-16, maintains that in the *Achilleid* P has been given too much favour, and that in many passages the ω reading is preferable.

Boussard's article attempts the task, impossible within such limits, of classifying 112 manuscripts of the *Thebaid*, many of which are virtually worthless. For this purpose he confines himself to selected readings in or omissions from Book X, mostly in the first third of the book. Neither in that article nor in his previous one does he give anything like a full collation of δ, and he passes over many readings which do not throw such a good light on that manuscript. Thus in x. 16 Ø8t wrongly have ni, Ø ni with ne as alternative, BLMbQ (see Klotz) correct ni to ne; in x. 37 Ø8t have erat wrongly with QMfbv; and there are ten other passages in lines 1-274 of that book in which δ goes astray with various or all members of the ω group. The same is true to a lesser extent of Θ or τ. There are also eight passages in these same lines [17, 19, 61 *dispensa*, 139, 172, 173 (as alternative), 212 *cursu*, 262 *portas* from the following line] where δ goes wrong, or probably so, with P, and about 16 passages in which δ has its own mistakes, occasionally accompanied by another manuscript. Simple misspellings are additional to these figures. Moreover no readings in Th. x. 1-274 of δ or of Ø8t which are not also found in some or all other manuscripts represent the right tradition. In view of these facts, it is clear that Boussard is exaggerating when he claims that δ is the best manuscript of the *Thebaid*.

Nevertheless, the support given by these manuscripts to P or to ω may in any passage affect our view of the correct reading, and they therefore represent in these three passages. One wonders if Housman's turning of pages was more than casual, since no such misjudgments occur after i. 75.


an important mixed group, δt inclining more towards P than towards ω. In each of the following passages the preferred variant, which is supported (sometimes as an alternative) by one or more of Θδt, is put first.

Th. x. 26 firmat ωΘ: armat P; utrumque δt
42 multo P: mixto ωΘ: utrumque δt
55 inestis P: adgestis ωΘ: utrumque t
57 manus ωΘt: manu PM; Statius never has sterilis directly of persons, so that modern editors are wrong in preferring P’s reading.
78 Concubitus ωΘt: Secubitus P; see above, p. 2.
95 ullus P8: illicit ωΘ: utrumque t
97 circum P8: circa ωΘ: utrumque t
100-117 see below.

134 vultu quo nutat eodem P et δ prima manu: dubium mixtumque sopori (sonori δ) ω et δ secunda manu: utrumque Θt (N.B.: dea is a misprint for deae in Klotz’s text)
142 orbem PDN8: urbenωΘ: utrumque t
157 adiunctis P8t: aiunctis BN: a cunctis ωΘ: aliae lectiones apud Klotzium
174 cultrix PN8t: cultris ex cultrix Q prima manu: cultris ωΘ
183 vidui ωΘS: dubii P: utrumque t
198 equidem haec P8 et L prima manu: equidem hoc ωΘt
210 vade P8t: vade ex suade B prima manu: suade ωΘ
218 atque adeo PBQCFΘ: solus ωt: utrumque D, M prima manu, corrector vel iterum K
229 Cum P8t: Cui ωΘ: Qui C
248 sperantibus ω8: spiranibus PBLQ: utrumque Θt
250 robora ωΘ8: robore P; the former is perhaps more Statian.

In these examples δ contributes more than Θ or t (the latter having many double readings) towards the correct text. It seems to be dependent for its readings not on P but on a kindred manuscript, and despite its comparatively late date any future editor of the Thebaid will have to take account of it, collating it throughout. It should be noted that in the following lines of x. 1-274, where P goes astray, δ does not go astray with it (P’s readings given where necessary): 4, 21 lex, 26 subita, 38 ad haec, 45-6 in reverse order, 58, 59 sternenda, 97, 111, 117, 127 truces, 129 Perigiali, 131, 166 ecidunt, 168 Ecausitque PL, 179, 207 reddes, 219, 256, 274.

The passage Th. x. 100-117, in which two groups of six lines are omitted by all the ω manuscripts, deserves a completely revised apparatus criticus. Klotz cites only P and the deteriores, the latter not being specified; Garrod cites P and the 14th century Corpus Christi College, Oxford, manuscript. The apparatus criticus given below, thanks to the help of Mr. R. D. Williams, presents a more important selection of manuscripts.

mille intus simulacra dei caelaverat ardens
Mulciber: hic haecret lateri redimita Voluptas,
hic comes in requiem vergens Labor, est ubi Baccho, est ubi Martigenae socium pulvinar Amori obtinet. interius tecti in penetralibus altis et cum Morte iacet, nullisque ea tristis imago cernitur. hae species. ipse autem uementia subter antra soporifero stipatos flore tapetas incubat; exhalant vestes et corpore pigro strata calent, supraque torum niger efHat anhelo ore vapor; manus haec fusos a tempore laevo sustentat crinis, haec cornu oblita remisit.

adsunt innumero circum yaga Somnia vultu, vera simul falsis permixtae tristia laetis, noctis opaca cohors, trabibusque aut postibus haerent, aut tellure iacet. tenuis, qui circuit aulam, invalidusque nitor, primosque hortantia somnos languida succiduis exspirant lumina flammis.

100-5 habent PΘ8t et Tolos. 234: < h > i versus in reliquis non habentur corrector recentior cod. P in mg. 101 Mulgiber P 102, 103 ubi PΘt ubi Θ (ubi sod. dett.) 103 martigenae Θ: martigerae P: martigero t, dett. guidam 104 tecti in Pt: tectum Θ8 cum dett. 106-11 habent omnes codices 106 cernitur. hae (haec Klotz) species. ipse autem Vollmer: Cernitur haec species autem PΘt (est add. t in mg): Cernitur haec autem species Θ: Ipse autem vacus curis ω 107 stipatus BQNfrd: stipatus vel stipantes Θ floret apertas (ex -os) P prima mano tapetis LDCv et Θ, ut videtur: tapetis vel -tas Θ: tapetas (i sschr.) Qr; v. C.Q. xlii. 109 108 pigro vel ni Θ 110 vapor vel pavor M prima mano effusos vel haec (fusos) t: haec fessos N 111 Sustenta/t Q corum PQ: cornu ex cornum B prima mano 112-7 habent PΘ8t et Tolos. 234 113 tristis (edd. vett.) laetis Weyman (edam clausula apud Osidiam): lumina flammis (ex v. 117) PΘ8t: foriasse lubrica (Baehrens) firmis 114 ac Θ 115 qui Θ8: qua P: quoque t (qui in mg.) 117 lumina Θ8: lumina Pt

Terzaghi's criticism relates only to the Achilleid, though it could obviously be extended to the Thebaid. In the Achilleid too we find a π tradition and an ω tradition, but the ω tradition is represented by far fewer manuscripts. Account should be taken (a) on the π side, of PER, though ER often either go their own way or side with ω; although R is as late as the fourteenth century, it is, as I have tried to show, of value in establishing the text; (b) on the ω side, of BCKQU; the readings of C may be ascertained from Klotz, as corrected by p. 21 n. 2 of my edition, many of the readings of U (Parisinus latinus 8040) from Latomus xvii (1958), 708-11.

Terzaghi starts by listing errors of P. In Aeh. i. 255 the readings are: Hac U, as conjectured by Postgate: Hac ex Has B: Hae P: Has EKR, and with -s in an erasure Q. In ii. 141 curvato is certainly, in my mind, a preferable reading to P's scutato, but it is hardly warrantable to list the latter among the obvious errors. In i. 155 P's timideque, although unsupported, is preferable to tumidique

15 Terzaghi's statement 'Quindi PBCKQ si possono considerare come rappresentanti di una tradizione unica', if intended as a generalization, is untrue.
given by all the other principal manuscripts; both my edition and Terzaghi are inexact on this line. And to suppose with Jannaccone and Terzaghi that in i. 239 (senior P: tenuis other MSS.) P has a reading ‘inventata per sostituire tenuis, non inteso a dovere’ is, from what we know of P, most unlikely; clearly neither its scribe nor those of its predecessors were ingenious inventors.

In Ach. i. 292 Terzaghi supports animique, arguing that annique tumentes would suggest that the daughters of Lycomedes were violent and aggressive. Not so; coupled with virginitas matura fatis it clearly refers to the development of the bust; cf. Th. ii. 204 tumida iam virginitate, where Lewis and Short render tumida ‘with swelling breasts’, and Mulder ad loc.; Claud. Epit. Pall. 125f. matura tumescit virginitas, understanding and copying this passage of the Achilleid. In the Thebaid passage just quoted, Statius refers separately to the girls’ mental expectation, ii. 205 gaudia mente parant.

In Ach. i. 651 the variants Penes etc. given by all manuscripts other than P are recognized to be makeshifts. P’s paene Ioouis puts one on the right track; but this does not mean that genitum Ioouis is good Latin. Terzaghi explains it as a ‘patronymic genitive’, = genitum paene <filium> Ioouis, but such a construction is unparalleled.

In i. 723f. basta haec sat erit makes excellent Latin, but hardly tallies with the following line and a half, where Statius explains that in addition to the shield, spear and other gifts a trumpet will be needed for a purpose not to be divulged.

As to ii. 143, W. Morel, C.R. lv (1941), 75 shows that ‘errare in its active forms cannot govern an object’ (except in late Latin). In this and the preceding two passages Terzaghi, contrary to the general drift of his argument, supports P, but here he has fallen into the very ‘superstition’ he is out to destroy.

In i. 643f. vidit chorus omnis ab alto astrorum, P’s reading, is paralleled not only by Cat. 7. 7f. but by Juv. 6. 311 and in another context by Juv. 8. 149f. In i. 828f. Terzaghi finds a parallel for the w reading, euhia, from Enn. sc. 125 V.; but there the text is deficient (Remains of Old Latin i, ed. Warmington, Trag. 130), so that we cannot be sure of Ennius’ usage on this point. The reading qui in i. 905 is not strongly supported, but could well have accounted for the variants, were it not that qui instrumental practically disappears after Horace: Persius 1. 56 qui pote? is clearly an archaism. In the same line of the Achilleid, repelle vires is no more ‘brutal’ than i. 642 vi potitur votis. There can be no objection to terga (PR) in ii. 116 simply because it can also mean ‘hides’: Statius uses it, particularly in the plural, also frequently of the back of a man, Centaur or animal. Finally in defence of P, in i. 196 PKQU have blandusque, BE blandumque, R blandisque. Not only does blandus thus have much better

11 Cf. Latomus xvii (1958), 711 n. 2. In the same article I have shown why in Ach. i. 317 obstantique (P, Trev.) is the right reading.

12 Some scholars seem unwilling to accept a reading unless it actually has manuscript testimony; here Postgate’s teniior (cf. C.R. 1949, 50) gives the only logical explanation.

13 For commentary on and parallels to this ‘quasi-relationship’ see W. Schetter, Untersuchungen zur epischen Kunst des Statius (1960), 130f.

14 Schetter, op. cit., p. 136 n. 11.
manuscript authority, but Statius never uses *blandum* adverbially, and it is not otherwise well attested (Petronius and late Latin).

Thus, just as in the *Thebaid* the tradition represented by Pât is on the whole better than that of *o*, so in the *Achilleid* modern editors have been right in preferring in most passages the readings of P, not infrequently supported by ER, against those of *o*, though there is no doubt that this support has sometimes been pushed too far. And as in the *Thebaid* we have variants assiduously given by *t* (17 and 21 variants respectively in *Th*. x. 1-274) and other manuscripts, so in the *Achilleid* Terzaghi may well be right in concluding 'nell' archetipo c' erano glosse e varianti, parecchie delle quali sono di valore assolutamente equivalente'. Whether these variants go back to Statius himself is anyone's guess.
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