

ence (or absence) of lines 10.100–105 and 112–17, which usually only occur in Π manuscripts. In addition, a large number of readings vary greatly between the two families, with those from Π being usually preferable.³⁰ The purest member of the Π family is the manuscript Paris, BnF, lat. 8051 (IX s. ex.), henceforth “P” (Puteanus), which was heretofore the oldest known witness of the text. ~~The~~

Paleographical evidence from P suggests that it was copied from a manuscript written in a minuscule script. Although P is written in an early Caroline script, the words are not properly divided, and there is a great deal of confusion between certain letters.³¹ In addition, the scribe often interspersed uncial letters. On the basis of this, Klotz argues that P was copied from a manuscript written in an insular minuscule (Klotz 1904b) that was itself copied from an antique witness (Klotz 1902.xx).

Even without these paleographical features, and in spite of several obvious errors and lacunae,³² P’s virtues are still clear. It transmits a very large number of unique readings, an otherwise unreported monostich argument (Incipitarium 94), and, most importantly, an antique endorsement in the form of a subscription: *Codex Iuliani U<iri> C<larissimi>*.³³

Modern scholars immediately recognized the importance of the manuscript: Müller, even though he had to rely on the collation of Paul Meyer and did not see the manuscript himself, discussed the importance of the manuscript extensively. Kohlmann, who saw the manuscript in Paris, was so overwhelmed by it that he based his edition of the poem on this manuscript alone, using other manuscripts more to point out differences or correct errors in P than as valid witnesses. Müller’s collations eventually came to Klotz, who originally planned similarly to base his edition thereon until he was able to see P in Munich, whereupon he became convinced of the superior readings in some other manuscripts. Still, it was not until Hill’s 1983 edition that an edition appeared that escaped Müller’s and Vollmer’s unbalanced preference for ~~with~~ P.

Other than P, a very small group of early manuscripts contain readings from the Π family. This has led scholars to argue that only two manuscripts of the *Thebaid* survived into the late eighth century: π and ω .³⁴ According to this theory, the two families were collated in the tenth century, resulting in a mixed group of manuscripts (the group $\tau\Theta\delta$).³⁵ There was a significant amount of subsequent contamination between π and ω , with the result that readings from both families are often transmitted as interlinear *variae lectiones*.³⁶ Further, as $\tau\Theta\delta$ manuscripts oc-

³⁰ Since the manuscripts of the *Achilleid* show the same intensity of differentiation between the two families, it has usually been argued that Statius composed two versions of the *Thebaid* and the *Achilleid* (cf. Garrod 1906.viii). I find this tenuous, not least because of the chronological problems involved with Statius composing two versions of the *Achilleid*. The manuscripts of Virgil’s and Ovid’s works also pose this transmission, and I suspect that there may have been some late-antique recension of ancient texts, but the purpose, circumstances, and methodology of this must have been very unique.

³¹ Klotz 1902 lists the following errors as being common in the manuscript: *n-r, a-x, c-g, t-i, r-p, d-b, r-b, p-d, b-p, and d-r*. The terminals *us* and *ur* are often confused, and *u* is often written as *a* or as *ic*.

³² See the description of P in Klotz 1902.v–xxiii.

³³ The presence of a subscription was—and to a degree still is—seen as evidence of an antique collation or correction. See O. Jahn, “Über die Subscriptionen in den Handschriften römischer Classiker,” *Bericht über die Verhandlungen der k. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philol.-Hist. Klasse 3* (1851), 327–72, and, more recently, L.D. Reynolds and N.G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars* (Oxford, 1968³), 39–43.

³⁴ This was first proposed by O. Müller (*Quaestiones Statianae*, Progr. Berlin, 1861; see too the introduction to his Teubner edition (Müller 1870). The theory is still generally accepted; see Hill 1966 and Reeve 1983.394–99.

³⁵ τ is Bruxelles, 5337 (XI s.); Θ is Madrid, Bn, 10039 (XI s.); δ is Paris, BnF, lat. 8054 (XIII s.). The relationships among these manuscripts are discussed by R.D. Williams (1972.xxii–xxiv). See too the introduction to Hill 1983 and Barreda I Edo 1992.

³⁶ Müller (1870.IX) believed that π readings were first used for this purpose in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Cf. Getty 1933.138.