

stand the importance of the Puteanus.⁶⁰ His intended edition of Statius' epics was left incomplete, with only an edition of the first six books of the *Thebaid* being published in the 1870, shortly before his death. Impressed by the importance of P, he was the first to devise the trifurcate transmission of the *Thebaid* with manuscripts representing P and the *codices deteriores* and a mixed group (to which he gave the siglum M), represented by B (Bamberg, Msc. class. 47). His edition is, thus, based mostly on readings from P and B.

Philipp Kohlmann produced his own editions of the epic poems in 1879 (*Achilleid*) and 1884 (*Thebaid*) and intended to edit the scholia of Lactantius Placidus. His decision in editing the poems was to rely on P in almost all circumstances, favoring that manuscript even more strongly than Müller did. The drawbacks of this approach were apparent even to his contemporaries,⁶¹ but his edition was certainly the best until the beginning of the 20th century, when Klotz' edition appeared.

The weightiest name in Statian studies of the past centuries is Alfred Klotz. He was one of the few scholars to edit all three of Statius' works, one of the first to try to locate and obtain collations of as many manuscripts as possible,⁶² as well as the first to apply modern paleographical methods in examining the manuscripts and the first ~~edition of the *Silvae*~~ to incorporate Poggio's copy (now in Madrid) into an edition of the *Silvae*. His key advancements of Statian scholarship were the argument that the Puteanus was copied from an insular parent, his support for the Politian's view that all manuscripts of the *Silvae* were descended from Poggio's copy (verified in 1977 by Reeve), and his ample apparatus, which, from a text-critical standpoint, made his edition much more important than Garrod's 1906 OCT.

Klotz' and Garrod's editions (which were reprinted occasionally, the former with an appendix by Thomas Klinnert in 1973 discussing new manuscript findings, and the latter with a second edition in 1926) were the only editions until 1983,⁶³ 99 years after Kohlmann's edition of the *Thebaid*, when Donald Hill's edition appeared. Hill's was the first edition to break from the *P-Begeisterung* of editors since Müller and the first complete edition to account for the discoveries and theories of the 20th century.⁶⁴ A second edition was published in 1996.

The *Achilleid*

Our understanding of the tradition of the *Achilleid* is the weakest of Statius' extant works. The poem is often treated as secondary to its sister, the *Thebaid*, and all discussions of its stemma and *Textgeschichte* have been based on corollaries from the *Thebaid*.⁶⁵ Other than one intended for use as a school text, no commentaries were published in the 20th century, and the poem remains largely unstudied, although there has been an increase in attention in the past 15 years. In any case, the poem has been treated since the 17th century as a minor work by a minor poet and, unread by most of the field.⁶⁶

⁶⁰ The manuscript was first used by Lindenbrog (1600). See Kohlmann 1879.vii.

⁶¹ Cf. A.D., review in *Literarisches Centralblatt* 26 (November 8, 1884), 1604–05 and the discussion in Klotz 1902.

⁶² Many of Müller's notes made their way from his Nachlass to Klotz' possession.

⁶³ This is not to understate the value of R.D. Williams' 1972 edition of Book 10, which was the first edition to incorporate new theories about the transmission of the poem, and even now provides one of the best introductions to the manuscript tradition.

⁶⁴ Cf. Reeve 1983.395, published before Hill's edition appeared.

⁶⁵ For example, the arguments for the insular origin of P from Klotz' 1902 edition were based almost entirely on observations from the text of the *Thebaid*.

⁶⁶ See, for example, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Lat. Class. d.7, where an 18th-century hand unfamiliar with the text pondered whether it was a translation of Homer.