

The first incunabula of Statius' *Achilleid* and their manuscript sources : towards a detailed analysis of their relationship¹

Valéry Berlincourt

Abstract

The *Achilleid* of Statius was often disseminated in print in the first decades of the new medium. While the source used for the *editio princeps* has been identified, an analysis of the relationship between later incunabula and the manuscript tradition remains a desideratum. The difficulties involved in the task are partly due to the plethora of manuscripts (more than 220 extant witnesses). This paper attempts to tackle this problem with regard to the first two editions posterior to the *princeps*, namely those of Ferrara 1472 and Venice 1472. Systematic examination of more than 60 witnesses now accessible on the website *Digital Statius: the Achilleid* (achilleid.unige.ch) make it possible, on the one hand, to show that the preparation of each of these editions was mainly based on a manuscript rather than on a previous printed text and, on the other hand, to identify some characteristics – missing lines, rare readings, inverted words – of the manuscripts that the editors used as their main models.

La *Aquileida* de Estacio fue difundida muchas veces en forma impresa durante los primeros decenios de la técnica tipográfica. Mientras que ya se ha identificado la fuente utilizada para la *editio princeps*, un análisis de la relación entre otros incunables y la tradición manuscrita sigue constituyendo un desideratum. Las dificultades inherentes a esta tarea se deben en parte a la plétora de manuscritos (más de 220 testigos conservados). El presente artículo trata de abordar este problema con respecto a las dos primeras ediciones posteriores a la *princeps*, es decir las de Ferrara 1472 y de Venecia 1472. Un examen sistemático de más de 60 testigos ahora accesibles en el sitio web *Digital Statius: the Achilleid* (achilleid.unige.ch) hace posible, por una parte, mostrar que la preparación de cada una de estas ediciones se basó en una fuente manuscrita y no en un texto impreso y, por otra parte, identificar ciertas características – versos faltantes, lecturas raras, palabras invertidas – de los manuscritos que los editores usaron como sus modelos principales.

Introduction

The *Achilleid* of Statius, an unfinished epic poem that was meant to tell the whole life of Achilles, and the extant part of which deals with episodes anterior to the hero's participation in the Trojan war, was among the first works of classical Latin poets to

¹ This article was prepared within the framework of the projects “Towards a digital edition of the *Achilleid* of Statius” (SNSF 170010, dir. Damien Nelis, University of Geneva) and “Estudio filológico de los textos clásicos latinos transmitidos en impresos incunables y postincunables conservados en España III” (MINECO FFI2015-67335-P, dir. Antonio Moreno Hernández, Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia). A preliminary version was presented at the conference *Une lecture de l'Achilléide de Stace*, Fondation Hardt, Genève–Vandœuvres, 18-20 october 2018.

appear in print. The *editio princeps*, which also includes the *Thebaid*, was printed in Rome around 1470.² Two further editions were printed in 1472, first in Ferrara (Andreas Belfortis) and then in Venice (Gabriele di Pietro).³ In 1473 this poem was printed twice again in Parma (Stephanus Corallus), first together with the *Thebaid*⁴ and then on its own.⁵ However, it was only in 1483, in Venice (Octavianus Scotus), that the first edition of all three works by Statius, including the *Silvae*, was published.⁶

If we want to analyse how the editions posterior to the *princeps* relate to the manuscript tradition, the primordial question is whether their editors mainly based their work on pre-existing editions (and used manuscripts only to correct some readings of these printed models) or rather on manuscripts. A further question is whether, and how, editors used manuscripts as sources for correcting their models (be they editions or manuscripts) or rather corrected these models by resorting only to editions or conjecture. In the cases when an editor actually used a manuscript as the main basis of his work, a key issue is whether any specific knowledge can be gained about its textual characteristics, because if we do not, we cannot reasonably make any hypothesis at all about the editorial work he did, that is to say about how he corrected the text he found in his model. In this article, I will examine to what extent we can say anything precise about the manuscripts that were used as sources of the editions of Ferrara 1472 and Venice 1472 in light of two obstacles : on the one hand the manuscript tradition of this poem is very extensive (and includes an important component of horizontal transmission), and on the other hand only a very small part of it has been collated to the present day.

State of knowledge about the manuscripts of the *Achilleid*

Some preliminary remarks are called for with respect to the state of our knowledge about the manuscripts of the *Achilleid*. It goes without saying that at least some of the manuscripts used by early editors may be either lost or unknown because held in private possession. However, I would like to make a different point regarding the huge gap between the very large number of manuscripts whose existence is known and the very small number of those whose text is known, notably because they are cited in modern critical editions. Thanks to the exhaustive catalogue of the manuscripts of Statius established by Harald Anderson, more than 220 witnesses of the *Achilleid* are now known, the vast majority of which contain all or most of the extant text.⁷ In contrast, the critical editions of Dilke 1954 and Marastoni 1974 are mainly based on just 7 manuscripts. The recent edition of Hall 2007-2008, which is mainly based on 8

² GW M4329910, ISTC is00700600.

³ GW M43280, ISTC is00695500.

⁴ GW M43284, ISTC is00695000.

⁵ GW M43306, ISTC is00701000.

⁶ GW M43282, ISTC is00701300.

⁷ Anderson (2009) includes 223 witnesses, to which add SCHLÄGL Stiftsbibliothek Cpl. 154 (Katalognummer 231).

manuscripts, also selectively cites 42 further witnesses, for a total of 50. However, in spite of this spectacular increase in the number of manuscripts cited, Hall's edition does not provide enough material for reconstructing the *history* of the text, nor, in particular, for ascertaining the connections between the incunabula and the manuscript tradition. One obvious reason for this situation is that the number of 50 documented witnesses, while impressive in itself, remains low compared to the total number of extant manuscripts. Another, equally important reason is that Hall systematically documents only 8 manuscripts. The crucial point is that the remaining 42 manuscripts are not documented evenly : while some are very frequently cited (11 manuscripts are for more than 400 or 500 readings),⁸ some other, on the contrary, are cited very rarely (12 manuscripts are for less than 25 readings) ;⁹ in addition, while sometimes Hall cites all or almost all the manuscripts that contain a given reading, sometimes, on the contrary, he cites only a small part of those that contain a given reading, or even none of them.¹⁰

Although the fast development of optical text recognition will make dramatic progress possible in a near future, at the moment we cannot realistically hope to collate in a systematic way not only the 42 manuscripts that Hall does not fully document but also the more than 170 other extant witnesses. However, the targeted examination of the manuscripts of the *Achilleid* has recently become possible thanks to the ongoing research project "Towards a digital edition of the *Achilleid* of Statius", directed by Professor Damien Nelis at the University of Geneva and funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation, in which I am involved.¹¹ The website *Digital Statius : the Achilleid* (achilleid.unige.ch), which is still in development, is intended to provide online access to all the manuscripts of this poem, and in particular to make it possible to visualize easily the whole series of manuscripts for a chosen line. It currently offers line-by-line visualisation for 67 manuscripts (including the 50 witnesses that are very unevenly cited in Hall's edition), most of which contain all or most parts of the poem. The study that I present here is based essentially on the examination of these manuscripts, which means that its results are provisional and expected to be complemented as the website will be further expanded.¹²

⁸ For instance : CAMBRIDGE University Library Peterhouse 207 (p-Hall = 87-Anderson) ; LONDON British Library Harley 2744 (o-Hall = 311-Anderson) ; OXFORD Lincoln College Lat. 27 (H-Hall = 438-Anderson).

⁹ For instance : LONDON British Library Add. 17510 (U22-Hall = 290-Anderson) ; OXFORD Bodleian Library Lat. class. d 7 (y-Hall = 432-Anderson) ; CITTÀ DEL VATICANO Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Barb. lat. 41 (Z13-Hall = 593-Anderson).

¹⁰ For example, the following manuscript readings (on which more below) are not cited although they are present in several witnesses quoted in the apparatus : 1.66 *hospita spolia*, 1.133 *et saepe*, 1.623 *silent*, 1.627 *nec*, 1.635 *pudetque* (and *pudet atque*).

¹¹ Prof. Damien Nelis (principal investigator), Valéry Berlincourt, Lavinia Galli Milić, Jean-Philippe Goldman. SNSF Project 170010 (<http://p3.snf.ch/project-170010>).

¹² In what follows, the analysis of the sample 1.619-674 (and of the additional sample 1.1-200) is based on these witnesses only, but that of lines 1.463, 1.830 and 1.905 takes into account a much larger corpus of 208 witnesses.

Textual analysis of the first incunabula

Printer's copy and editor's model

I now turn to the question of what we can say, respectively, about the manuscripts that the editors of the *Achilleid* used as the main basis of their work and about the manuscripts that they used only as sources for correcting their main textual models.

The ambitions of this kind of analysis are necessarily limited. In most cases we cannot hope to identify the editor's sources themselves, but only to identify manuscripts that were closely related to these sources, or even only to ascertain some of their characteristics.

In the case of *Achilleid* these limitations are notably due to several facts already mentioned, namely that at least some among the manuscripts used by early editors are either lost or unknown because held in private possession, that the manuscript tradition of the poem concerned is extensive (with much horizontal transmission), that only a very small part of it has been collated systematically, and that no more than 67 witnesses can easily be consulted at the moment.

More generally, the limited ambitions of any such analysis are also due to the production techniques of printed editions and to the modalities of editorial interventions. With regard to the texts that were used as the main bases of editions, it is helpful to distinguish between two notions that are close to each other but not identical.¹³

- the document, manuscript or printed, that the editor chose as the main basis of his work ; this document may be called the editor's model
- the document, manuscript or printed, that the editor provided to the printing house for typesetting ; this document is usually called the printer's copy or printer's exemplar¹⁴

If the editor, after choosing the pre-existing document to be reproduced and possibly correcting it, transmitted this document itself to the printing house, the editor's model and the printer's exemplar are one and the same object. In contrast, the editor's model and the printer's exemplar are two distinct objects if the editor transmitted to the printing house, not the pre-existing document itself, but an intermediate copy, possibly including corrections, that he had made for this specific purpose. When the printer's exemplar (whether identical or not to the editor's model) is preserved,¹⁵ we can reasonably hope to identify it, based both on its textual proximity to the edition and, more crucially, on marks made in the printing house. Such cases, however, are rare for

¹³ This distinction is notably discussed in Severyns (1962, 19-20).

¹⁴ Hellinga (2014, 39-41) deals specifically with documents of this kind in her discussion of the preparatory work carried out by the editor or corrector.

¹⁵ Cf. Hellinga (2014, 40) : "If manuscripts expressly made for use in the printing house were treated with some nonchalance, the opposite is true for manuscripts which had to be returned to owners."

the incunabula period : the list drawn up by Lotte Hellinga includes only 40 items, few of which are Greek and Latin classics.¹⁶ In the much more common situation in which the printer's exemplar is not preserved, the essential question is this : which goal can the analysis reach ? On the one hand, if the printer's exemplar was identical to the editor's model, we can hope, at best, to find manuscripts that are more or less closely related to it. On the other hand, if the printer's exemplar was only an intermediate copy, there is more hope that the editor's model is still extant ; however, unless we have external evidence, is it improbable that we can achieve any certainty in identifying it, both because the editor's model does not bear marks made in the printing house and because the copy by which it is separated from the edition may not have been faithful (and may even have been an eclectic text).

The *editio princeps* of Rome 1470

In the tradition of the *Achilleid*, the *princeps* printed in Rome around 1470 is one of these exceptionally fortunate situations where the very manuscript that was used in the printing house is preserved. Harald Anderson, the author of the exhaustive catalogue of the manuscripts of Statius, deserves the credit for recognising a manuscript now in Carpentras, Bibliothèque-Musée Inguimbertaine 369 = @92 (Italy, s.XIV), as the printer's copy of the *princeps*, and also for analyzing in detail how this edition was produced.¹⁷ This case should therefore be added to Hellinga's list of printer's copies from the fifteenth century.

The identification of this printer's copy lets us see precisely how the editor but also the compositors worked. As shown by Anderson, the edition is very close to the manuscript. With a very few exceptions, the separative readings amount to no more than different choices with regard to orthography and simple errors made by the typesetters, which are quite numerous.¹⁸ Clearly the editor was not interested in correcting any other aspect of the text found in his model.

After the *editio princeps* : printed models or manuscript models ?

The analysis of the editions posterior to the *princeps* which I present below shows that the two following editions, those of Ferrara 1472 and of Venice 1472, were also based mainly on manuscripts. In this regard, the earliest printed tradition of the *Achilleid* is therefore similar to, for instance, that of Virgil's works.¹⁹ The fact that this situation was no exception during the initial years of the printed production of classical texts deserves emphasis because it runs counter to the notion that all post-*princeps* editions are usually

¹⁶ Hellinga (2014, 67-101).

¹⁷ The full demonstration and detailed analysis are provided in the article Anderson (2010).

¹⁸ A full collation of the differences is provided in Anderson (2010, 6-7 and 31-34).

¹⁹ As shown by Venier (2001), several among the earliest post-*princeps* editions of Virgil are mainly based on manuscripts rather than on previous printed models.

based on printed models, which might arise from convenient but potentially misleading shortcuts found in scholarship.²⁰

Neither for the edition of Ferrara 1472 nor for that of Venice 1472 has it been possible to recognise the printer's copy. The demonstration that they are primarily derived from manuscript sources must therefore exclusively rely on textual evidence. At a general level, it is worth noting that they divide the text of the *Achilleid* in ways different both from the *princeps* and from each other :

Rome 1470 (*princeps*) : five books (beginning at 1.1, 1.198, 1.397, 1.675, 2.1)

Ferrara 1472 : two books (beginning at 1.1, 2.1)

Venice 1472 : no division

These differences may already suggest that the editions of Ferrara 1472 and Venice 1472 are each mainly based on a manuscript, since they correspond to variations observed in the manuscript tradition,²¹ but they do not offer any compelling argument, since an editor could of course divide the poem differently from his textual model. In contrast, as we will now see, the analysis of more specific textual features proves that the main model of the text printed in each of these two editions was a manuscript, and it also makes it possible to identify some characteristics of that model. However, we will also see that these editions do not let us achieve equally precise results, and that this is due to the quite different nature of their respective texts.

²⁰ Consider for instance Kenney (1974, 18) : « With remarkably few exceptions the descent of any given text through the printed editions is in a single line, and each editor is found to base his work on that of his (usually though not invariably) immediate predecessor. » and Reynolds–Wilson (1991, 208) : « The *editio princeps* of a classical author was usually little more than a transcript of whatever humanist manuscript the printer chose to use as his copy, a replica in print of the current manuscript article. The repetition of this text, with only minor changes, from one edition to another soon led to the establishment of a vulgate text; and while there was nothing to prevent one from improving the vulgate by piecemeal emendation, the forces of inertia and conservatism made it difficult to discard it in favour of a radically new text. »

²¹ On the division of the *Achilleid* into books, see de Angelis 1984, Hall–Ritchie–Edwards (2007–2008, III 208–210) (who also correct the inaccurate information given in Dilke [1954, 23]) and Anderson (2009, I XII–XIII). The two-book division found in the edition Ferrara 1472 is considered to be Statius' division and is accordingly adopted by scholarly editors ; attested only in a minority of manuscripts, which includes the most ancient witness, it is very unequal (960+167 lines), which reflects the incompleteness of the poem. The five-book division, which results in much more equal sections either in the form found in the edition Rome 1470 or in alternative forms, prevails in the manuscript tradition since the twelfth century. The lack of any division found in the edition Venice 1472 is also attested in some manuscripts, including most of the earliest witnesses. Further division schemes are found in manuscripts, namely in three, four, and six books.

The edition of Ferrara 1472

With regard to the second edition of the *Achilleid*, printed in Ferrara in 1472, the examination of missing lines does not provide any substantial indication about whether the main model used by the editor was the *princeps* or a manuscript.²²

Rome 1470 : 1.661 *om.* ; 1.781 *om.*²³

Ferrara 1472 : 1.781 *om.*²⁴

The absence of line 1.781 could be inherited with equal probability from the *princeps* or from a manuscript used as the main model, since many witnesses lack it. The presence of line 1.661, which was missing in the *princeps*, could come from a manuscript used either as the main model or as a source for correcting the text of the *princeps*.²⁵

In contrast, the readings of the Ferrara edition show that the main model is indeed a manuscript rather than the previous edition. In the sample 1.619-674, the following readings differ from those in the *princeps* :²⁶

1.622 *consedere Ro1470* : **concedere Fe1472**

1.623 *tacent Ro1470* : **silent Fe1472**

1.628 *Sperchie Ro1470* : **Sparchie Fe1472**

*1.629 *promissaque Ro1470* : **promissasque Fe1472**

*1.631 *et omittit Ro1470* : **habet Fe1472**

1.632 *nostros tu Ro1470* : **nostros en Fe1472**

1.639 *te matris Ro1470* : **teque mīe (i.e. marem aut matre ?) Fe1472**

1.640 *et habet Ro1470* : **omittit Fe1472**

1.643 *uidit Ro1470* : **risit Fe1472**

1.647 *notus Ro1470* : **motus Fe1472**

1.649 *solatus Ro1470* : **solatur Fe1472**

1.651 *Pellaei filius Ro1470* : **Peliacis siluis Fe1472**

²² Neither the *princeps* nor the Ferrara edition include the additional line “2.168” at the end of the poem in many manuscripts.

²³ These omissions are duly mentioned in Hall–Ritchie–Edwards (2007-2008, III 105). The lines in question are also missing in the Carpentras manuscript that served as the printer’s copy.

²⁴ This omission is duly mentioned in Hall–Ritchie–Edwards (2007-2008, III 107).

²⁵ The presence of line 1.661 also provides little information useful to identify the manuscript concerned, since this line is found in many witnesses.

²⁶ Those instances in which the reading present in the Ferrara edition is clearly correct are marked with an asterisk.

1.651 inmisit *Ro1470* : **misit *Fe1472***

1.657 igne *Ro1470* : **igni *Fe1472***

1.658 Scyros *Ro1470* : **Ccyros *Fe1472***

*1.661 uersum omittit *Ro1470* : **habet *Fe1472***

1.662 regina *Ro1470* : **regma *Fe1472***

1.667 hausurum *Ro1470* : **hausturum *Fe1472***

*1.670 precibusque *Ro1470* : **precibus quae *Fe1472***

*1.670 iuncta *Ro1470* : **uicta *Fe1472***

*1.670 duobus *Ro1470* : **duorum *Fe1472***

The separative readings with regard to the *princeps* are numerous, amounting to 21 instances in this sample (some of which involve several words). More significantly, many of them can neither be considered as mere errors made by the typesetters nor easily explained as correcting the readings of the *princeps*, because they do not seem superior or are even obviously inferior the latter. For instance, it is hardly likely that the readings 1.623 *silent* and 1.632 *nostros en* were introduced as corrections of the readings *tacent* and *nostros tu* found in the *princeps*. While the editor or the typesetter could admittedly have introduced some such variants in isolation, it is much harder to imagine that they would have repeatedly done so. Separative readings of this kind therefore clearly suggest that the main model of the Ferrara edition was not the *princeps*.

Most of the readings in the Ferrara edition which differ from the *princeps* are attested in the manuscript tradition.²⁷ This situation in itself would not prove that the main textual model is a manuscript, since the editor could have used manuscripts only as a source for correcting the text of the *princeps*; however, as we have just seen, the nature of many separative readings make it quite unlikely that the editor used the *princeps* as the basis of his work. In addition, a significant proportion of the readings in question, including rare readings, are correlated with each other in the manuscript tradition, that is to say are jointly present in the same witnesses. This fact demonstrates that the main model was a manuscript, even though none of those I have examined so far can be identified as the editor's model or as an intermediate copy. One is extremely similar to the edition, namely Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin / Preußischer Kulturbesitz Ms. lat. oct. 112 = @48 (Italy, s.XV ex.),²⁸ but it must in all probability be discarded as having been copied from the

²⁷ The manuscripts are available for consultation at achilleid.unige.ch.

²⁸ Anderson (2009, I 33) gives the date as s.XV med., but the manuscript contains (in the same hand as the poem), the *vita Statii* by Calderini (Anderson [2009, II 61, *Incipitarium* 233]), which was

edition,²⁹ at least as far as lines 1.619-674 are concerned.³⁰ However, other manuscripts, while much less similar to the edition, clearly are related to the model and let us catch a glimpse of its characteristics. In this regard, the edition most notably shares several of the readings quoted above, including some that seem very rare in manuscripts, with the witness Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana Ashburnham 918 = @141 (Italy, s.XV) :³¹ notably 1.622 *concedere* (which thereby proves to have manuscript support even if its prosody is incompatible with the metrical position it occupies), 1.623 *silent*, 1.632 *nostros en* ; to these instances should probably be added also the particular case of 1.639, where the abbreviation *m̄re* in the edition may be meant to represent, not the correct *marem* as one might be tempted to think at first sight, but rather the faulty *matre* which is found precisely in @141. It is also significantly close to other manuscripts, one of which deserves to be singled out for reasons that will become apparent below, namely London, British Library Add. 10091 = @283 (Italy, s.XV),³² although almost none of the readings it shares with the edition in the sample 1.619-674 is rare : 1.623 *silent*.

Table : agreements on distinctive readings of the edition
with @141 @283³³

1.622 <i>concedere</i> <i>Fe1472</i> @141	7% (4 of 61)
1.623 <i>silent</i> <i>Fe1472</i> @141 @283	13% (8 of 61)
1.632 <i>nostros en</i> <i>Fe1472</i> @141	5% (3 of 61)
1.639 <i>teque m̄re</i> (<i>i.e. marem aut matre ?</i>) <i>Fe1472</i>	
: <i>teque marem</i> @283	: 75% (44 of 59)
: <i>teque matre</i> @141	: 2% (1 of 59)
1.643 <i>risit</i> <i>Fe1472</i> @141 @283	82% (49 of 60)
1.647 <i>motus</i> <i>Fe1472</i> @141 @283 <i>p.c. m.pr.</i>	35% (21 of 60)

most probably copied from Calderini's edition of the *Silvae* dated 1475 or from a later edition that reproduced it.

²⁹ A strong argument in favour of this hypothesis comes from the fact that the incomplete text breaks off in the middle of a page (f.63r) after 2.162, which corresponds to the final line of the last verso in the Ferrara edition. The most probable explanation is that at least the final part of the manuscript was transcribed from a copy of the Ferrara edition which lacked the last recto bearing lines 2.163-167, and hence that the text of lines 1.619-674, which is extremely close to the edition, was also copied from it. This article is not the place for a full discussion of the matter, and in particular for the exposition and tentative explanation of occasional differences.

³⁰ Cf. n.34 on the paradoxical fact that this manuscript is quite different from the Ferrara edition in the initial part of the poem.

³¹ Not included in the apparatus of Hall-Ritchie-Edwards (2007-2008). Differently from the edition of Ferrara 1472, @141 has a five-book division and includes line 1.781.

³² Quoted (under the siglum v) for 18 readings in the apparatus of Hall-Ritchie-Edwards (2007-2008). Differently from the edition of Ferrara 1472 (and similarly to @141), @283 has a five-book division and includes line 1.781.

³³ Those instances in which the reading present in the Ferrara edition is clearly correct (marked with an asterisk in the list of separative readings above) are excluded from this table. The figures in the right-hand column include @48, which was probably copied from the Ferrara edition in this portion of the text (cf. n.29) ; @48 contains all the readings quoted in this table (at 1.639 it seems to have *matre* a.c. and *marem* p.c.).

1.649 solatur <i>Fe1472</i> @141 @283	83% (50 of 60)
1.651 Peliacis siluis <i>Fe1472</i> @283	45% (27 of 60)
1.657 igni <i>Fe1472</i> @141 @283	72% (43 of 60)

The additional sample 1.1-200 confirms that the Ferrara edition is related to these two witnesses.³⁴ In this portion of the text, @141 and in particular @283 contain several distinctive readings of the edition that seem very, and even extremely, rare in the manuscript tradition (my quotations here are restricted to such instances).

Table : agreements on distinctive readings of the edition (most remarkable instances only)
with @141 @283

1.42 o <i>Ro1470</i> : proh <i>Fe1472</i> @141	8% (5 of 60)
1.56 infraque rotantur <i>Ro1470</i> : rotantur et infra <i>Fe1472</i> @283	5% (3 of 60)
1.133 saepe <i>Ro1470</i> : et saepe <i>Fe1472</i> @283	3% (2 of 61)
1.174 conexus <i>Ro1470</i> : complexus <i>Fe1472</i> @283	2% (1 of 61)
1.184 tunc <i>Ro1470</i> : dehinc <i>Fe1472</i> @283	2% (1 of 61)

Since it is the case that among the distinctive readings of the edition (and in particular among those which seem neither to result from errors nor to correct the text of the *princeps*) several are found both in the Florence and the London witnesses while one part of them is found only in the former and another part only in the latter, most of these readings probably entered the edition from a single manuscript that the editor used as his main model. The alternative hypothesis that their presence in the edition results from contamination by the editor seems less probable in view of the fact that several among them are simultaneously present in @141 and in @283. It seems likely that further study of the tradition may bring to light a manuscript which more systematically includes characteristics of these witnesses and is therefore closer than them to the editor's model.

The edition of Venice 1472

I now turn to the third edition of the *Achilleid*, printed in Venice in 1472. The examination of missing lines provides more substantial results about the main textual model of this edition than was the case with the Ferrara edition.³⁵

Rome 1470 : 1.661 *om.* ; 1.781 *om.*

Ferrara 1472 : 1.781 *om.*

Venice 1472 : 1.781 *om.* ; 1.830 *om.* ; 1.905 *om.*³⁶

³⁴ In contrast, and quite remarkably, in this additional sample there is no close connection between the Ferrara edition and @48, while, as shown above, other parts of that manuscript seem to have been copied from this edition. Instead, the text in this additional sample is paradoxically quite close to the Venice edition (cf. n.51).

³⁵ Contrary to the two previous editions, the Venice edition includes the additional line "2.168" at the end of the poem in many manuscripts.

Whereas the omission of line 1.781 is not informative since it matches what is found not only in both previous editions but also in many manuscripts, the missing lines 1.830 and 1.905 are very telling. Their omission could be simply due to errors made in the preparation of the new edition, and therefore does not prove independence from the previous editions where these lines were present – nor, by the way, from a manuscript where these lines were present. However, it should be noted that the lines in question are also missing from some of the 208 manuscripts I have been able to check in this regard, namely Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin / Preußischer Kulturbesitz Ms. lat. qu. 303 = @44 (Italy, s.XIV+XV in.)³⁷ on the one hand, and Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana plut. 91 inf. 10 = @167 (Italy, s.XV (a.1404))³⁸ and Oldenburg, Landesbibliothek Cim I 9 = @403 (Italy, s.XV (a.1447))³⁹ on the other.

1.830 *uersum omittunt Ve1472 @44 (add. mg.)*

1.905 *uersum omittunt Ve1472 @167 @403*

This observation at least somewhat increases the probability that, in the edition, the omission of the lines concerned is not due to errors made in the process of its preparation (either from a printed or from a manuscript main model), but rather inherited from a manuscript used for that purpose. Although none of the 208 witnesses I have examined lacks both lines, we must certainly consider the possibility that another one did and that the edition stems from such a manuscript. Moreover, and more significantly, a material aspect of the edition strongly suggests that these lines were not omitted at the stage of typesetting but were already missing from the printer's exemplar (be this identical or not to the editor's model). This material aspect consists in the remarkable regularity of the layout, and more specifically in the fact that all pages contain exactly 24 lines, including – this is the key issue – the very last page. This regularity, which seems obviously deliberate, most probably means that the distribution into print pages, that is to say the casting-off, was done based on a model that contained the exact same number of lines as the edition, which in turn strongly suggests that the model did not include the two lines in question. That manuscript may have been related to the extant witnesses where either 1.830 or 1.905 is omitted – @44 and @167 @403 respectively –, but it may also have lacked these lines independently from them.

The readings of the Venice edition confirm that the main model is indeed a manuscript. In the sample 1.619-674, the following readings differ either from the *princeps*, or from the Ferrara edition, or from both:⁴⁰

³⁶ While the omission of 1.781 and 1.905 is duly mentioned in Hall–Ritchie–Edwards (2007-2008, III 107-108), that of 1.830 is not.

³⁷ Not included in the apparatus of Hall–Ritchie–Edwards (2007-2008).

³⁸ Not included in the apparatus of Hall–Ritchie–Edwards (2007-2008).

³⁹ Not included in the apparatus of Hall–Ritchie–Edwards (2007-2008).

⁴⁰ Those instances in which the reading present in the Venice edition is clearly correct are marked with an asterisk.

1.620 somnus *Ro1470 Fe1472* : **sonus** *Ve1472*

*1.622 concedere *Fe1472* : **consedere** *Ro1470 Ve1472*

1.623 tacent *Ro1470* : **silent** *Fe1472 Ve1472*

1.627 non *Ro1470 Fe1472* : **nec** *Ve1472*

*1.628 Sparchie *Fe1472* : **Sperchie** *Ro1470 Ve1472*

*1.629 promissaque *Ro1470* : **promissasque** *Fe1472 Ve1472*

1.630 nullus *Ro1470 Fe1472* : **ullus** *Ve1472*

1.630 umbras *Ro1470 Fe1472* : **undas** *Ve1472*

*1.631 et omittit *Ro1470* : **habent** *Fe1472 Ve1472*

1.632 nostros tu *Ro1470* : nostros en *Fe1472* : **tu nostros** *Ve1472*

1.635 pudet *Ro1470 Fe1472* : **piget** *Ve1472*

1.635 taedetque *Ro1470 Fe1472* : **pudetque** *Ve1472*

1.637 aequaeuamque *Ro1470 Fe1472* : **aequalemque** *Ve1472*

*1.639 te matris *Ro1470* : teque m̄re *Fe1472* : **teque marem** *Ve1472*

1.639 nec *Ro1470 Fe1472* : **sed** *Ve1472*

*1.639 probaris *Ro1470 Fe1472* : **probabis** *Ve1472*

*1.640 et omittit *Fe1472* : **habent** *Ro1470 Ve1472*

1.643 uidit *Ro1470* : **risit** *Fe1472 Ve1472*

1.646 nube *Ro1470 Fe1472* : **nocte** *Ve1472*

1.647 indicta *Ro1470 Fe1472* : **inducta** *Ve1472*

1.647 notus *Ro1470* : **motus** *Fe1472 Ve1472*

1.649 solatus *Ro1470* : **solatur** *Fe1472 Ve1472*

1.650 ego *Ro1470 Fe1472* : **ego sum** *Ve1472*

1.651 Pellaei filius *Ro1470* : **Peliacis siluis** *Fe1472 Ve1472*

*1.651 niuibus quem *Ro1470 Fe1472* : **niuibusque** *Ve1472*

*1.651 misit *Fe1472* : **inmisit** *Ro1470 Ve1472*

- 1.654 pensa *Ro1470 Fe1472* : **densa** *Ve1472*
- 1.655 defles *Ro1470 Fe1472* : **efles** *Ve1472*
- 1.657 pater *Ro1470 Fe1472* : **patria** *Ve1472*
- 1.657 igne *Ro1470* : **igni** *Fe1472 Ve1472*
- 1.657 iacebit *Ro1470 Fe1472* : **manebit** *Ve1472*
- 1.661 (uers. om. *Ro1470*) : arreptum *Fe1472* : **acceptum** *Ve1472*
- 1.661 (uers. om. *Ro1470*) : celes taceasque *Fe1472* : **taceas celesque** *Ve1472*
- *1.662 regma *Fe1472* : **regina** *Ro1470 Ve1472*
- 1.664 facies multum *Ro1470 Fe1472* : **multum facies** *Ve1472*
- 1.667 hausturum *Fe1472* : **hausurum** *Ro1470 Ve1472*
- 1.670 precibus quae *Fe1472* : **precibusque** *Ro1470 Ve1472*
- 1.670 iuncta *Ro1470* : uicta *Fe1472* : **eucta** *Ve1472*
- *1.670 duobus *Ro1470* : **duorum** *Fe1472 Ve1472*
- 1.671 tacito *Ro1470 Fe1472* : **trepido** *Ve1472*
- 1.674 index *Ro1470 Fe1472* : **iudex** *Ve1472*

The overall number of separative readings with regard to previous editions is here particularly large, amounting, compared respectively to Rome 1470 and to Ferrara 1472, to 34 and 31 instances in this sample (some of which involve several words). More tellingly, a large portion among them can neither be considered as typesetting errors nor explained as correcting the readings previously printed. Readings of this kind are even much more numerous in the Venice edition than in that of Ferrara, and they also represent an even higher proportion of all separative readings. It is unlikely, for instance, that 1.635 *pudetque*, the prosodical structure of which does not fit its position in the verse, and 1.650 *ego sum*, which is ametrical, were meant to correct *taedetque* and *ego*. Above all, it is most improbable that the editor would repeatedly have performed such alterations, which demonstrates that he did not make use of a previous edition as his main model.

Among the distinctive readings of the Venice edition, most are attested in the manuscript tradition.⁴¹ More relevant is the fact that some witnesses jointly contain a significant proportion of them, including rare readings. Here again, in spite of our currently limited knowledge of the extant witnesses, it is possible to identify some to

⁴¹ The manuscripts are available for consultation at achilleid.unige.ch.

which the edition is closely related, and thereby to catch a glimpse of the characteristics of the editor's model. The edition is actually related to a number of witnesses with which it shares different distinctive features from case to case (missing lines, rare readings, word inversions). First, the edition shares some distinctive readings with the witnesses mentioned above from which line 1.905 is missing, namely @44, @167 and @403 : notably 1.630 *ullus* in @44 and especially the metrically impossible 1.650 *ego sum* in @167. Secondly, and more significantly, we can observe recurrent agreements, including readings that seem very rare in manuscripts, with the three witnesses Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek BPL 136 K = @241 (France, s.XII²),⁴² London, British Library Add. 10095 = @284 (Italy, s.XV),⁴³ and Oxford, Bodleian Library Canon. class. lat. 122 = @420 (Italy, s.XIV) :⁴⁴ agreements which involve all three manuscripts concern in particular 1.630 *undas*, to which may be added the especially remarkable, because metrically incorrect, 1.635 *piget ... pudetque* in @241 along with its remediation *piget ... pudet atque* in @284 @420 ; noteworthy agreements which involve only some of them concern 1.623 *silent* in @241 and @284, 1.630 *ullus* in @284, 1.637 *aequalemque* in @241, 1.661 *acceptum* in @420, 1.674 *iudex* in @284. The edition also shares distinctive readings with another manuscript, Nottingham, University Library (Wollaton Library Collection) Mi L M 2 (130) = @402 (England, s.XIII) :⁴⁵ these most notably regard the inversions of word order 1.661 *taceas celesque* and 1.664 *multum facies*, both of which are very rare in manuscripts (which is not the case of 1.632 *tu nostros*), and also 1.674 *iudex*.⁴⁶ Among the further manuscripts that show noteworthy agreements with the edition, two at least deserve mention here, among other things in connection with facts exposed below, namely Cologne, Bibliotheca Bodmeriana Bodmer 90 = @102 (Italy, s.XV)⁴⁷ and Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Chigi H.VIII.272 = @604 (Italy, s.XV).⁴⁸

Table : agreements on distinctive readings of the edition
with @44 @102 @167 @241 @284 @402 @403 @420 @604⁴⁹

1.623 <i>silent</i> <i>Fe1472 Ve1472 @102 @241 u.l. @284 @604</i>	13% (8 of 61)
1.627 <i>nec</i> <i>Ve1472 @102 @284 @604(?)</i>	11% (7 of 61)

⁴² Quoted (under the siglum L) for 59 readings in the apparatus of Hall–Ritchie–Edwards (2007–2008).

⁴³ Mentioned in the list of sigla (as M2), but not quoted for any reading in the apparatus, in Hall–Ritchie–Edwards (2007–2008).

⁴⁴ Quoted (under the siglum t) for 126 readings in the apparatus of Hall–Ritchie–Edwards (2007–2008).

⁴⁵ Quoted (under the siglum n) for 185 readings in the apparatus of Hall–Ritchie–Edwards (2007–2008).

⁴⁶ Hall's edition does not satisfactorily reflect these agreements, since it cites @402 only for 1.632, not for the more significant 1.661 and 1.664.

⁴⁷ Not included in the apparatus of Hall–Ritchie–Edwards (2007–2008).

⁴⁸ Quoted (under the siglum Z18) for 20 readings in the apparatus of Hall–Ritchie–Edwards (2007–2008).

⁴⁹ Those instances in which the reading present in the Venice edition is clearly correct (marked with an asterisk in the list of separative readings above) are excluded from this table.

1.630 ullus <i>Ve1472</i> @44 @284	10% (6 of 61)
1.630 honor <i>Ve1472</i> @102 @604	11% (7 of 61)
1.630 undas <i>Ve1472</i> @102 @167 @241 @284 @420 @604	23% (14 of 60)
1.632 tu nostros <i>Ve1472</i> @102 @167 @402 @403 @420 @604(?)	51% (31 of 61)
1.635 piget <i>Ve1472</i> @241 @284 @420	13% (8 of 61)
1.635 pudetque <i>Ve1472</i> @241	3% (2 of 61)
: pudet atque @284 @420	: 3% (2 of 61)
1.637 aequalemque <i>Ve1472</i> @241 p.c. ⁵⁰	5% (3 of 58)
1.639 sed <i>Ve1472</i> @241 p.c. (-t) @284 @403 @420 @604	54% (32 of 59)
1.643 risit <i>Fe1472 Ve1472</i> @102 @167 @241 @284 @402 @403 @420 @604	82% (49 of 60)
1.646 nocte <i>Ve1472</i> @102 @167 @241 u.l. @284 @402 @403 @604	53% (32 of 60)
1.647 motus <i>Fe1472 Ve1472</i> @167 @241 p.c.? @420 @604	35% (21 of 60)
1.649 solatur <i>Fe1472 Ve1472</i> @44 @102 @167 @241 @284 @402 @403 @420	83% (50 of 60)
1.650 ego sum <i>Ve1472</i> @102 @167	7% (4 of 60)
1.657 patria <i>Ve1472</i> @241 p.c.? @420 p.c. @604(?)	20% (12 of 60)
1.657 igni <i>Fe1472 Ve1472</i> @102 @167 @241 @284 @402 @403 @420	72% (43 of 60)
1.661 acceptum <i>Ve1472</i> @420 @604	4% (2 of 48)
1.661 taceas celesque <i>Ve1472</i> @402 (celebs-)	8% (4 of 48)
1.664 multum facies <i>Ve1472</i> @102 @402	7% (4 of 60)
1.667 hausurum <i>Ve1472</i> @44 @102 (au-) @167 @241 p.c.? @284 (au-) @402 @403 @420 @604 (au- a.c.)	97% (58 of 60)
1.670 precibusque <i>Ro1470 Ve1472</i> @44 @167 @284 a.c. @402 @403 @604	44% (27 of 61)
1.674 iudex <i>Ve1472</i> @284 a.c. @402	18% (11 of 60)

In some ways, the various witnesses to which the edition is closely related seem to be rather neatly separated from each other, and the possibility might therefore be considered that either the editor himself or his model (or an antecedent of the latter) merged manuscripts belonging to quite distinct strands of the tradition. However, since several points of contact between the witnesses in question are discernible, one may more legitimately hypothesize that the editor's model jointly contained the features concerned as the result of long-running processes of contamination.

The additional sample 1.1-200 both confirms that the Venice edition is related to the witnesses just mentioned.⁵¹ The most striking fact concerns inversions of word order

⁵⁰ This count includes one witness which omits *-que*.

⁵¹ In addition, the text in this sample is also closely related to @48, which is paradoxical since in the other sample, namely 1.619-674, that manuscript is extremely similar to the Ferrara edition and probably was copied from it, as shown in the previous section. Just as with regard to the latter point (cf. n.29), this article is not the place for a full discussion, and in particular for the exposition and explanation of occasional differences.

(and similar accidents), which are extraordinarily frequent in this edition.⁵² While the inversions in question are, with one exception, very rarely attested in manuscripts in general, a significant number of them are present in these specific witnesses, in particular @284 on the one hand, @102 and @604 on the other. This reveals that these various (groups of) witnesses are even more closely related to each other than it appears from the sample 1.619-674. Quite remarkably, in contrast, only one of the word inversions present in 1.1-200 is found in the witness that shares with the edition two striking instances of this phenomenon in 1.619-674, namely @402 ; it therefore turns out that such inversions are not an essential component of the relationship between @402 and the edition at a general level, contrary to what one might think based on the evidence of 1.619-674. While the discrepancy in @402 between 1.1-200 and 1.619-674 might suggest that the inversions found in the edition might have a different source in each sample, some other witnesses have inversions in both sections, most notably @102, which seems to endorse the idea that all the inversions of the edition come from one and the same source.

Table : agreements on distinctive readings of the edition (inversions of word order *uel sim.*)
with @44 @102 @167 @241 @284 @402 @403 @420 @604⁵³

1.14 <i>primum longe</i> <i>Ve1472</i> @102 @241 @604	31% (19 of 61)
1.61 <i>rector genitorque</i> <i>Ve1472</i> @102 @604	7% (4 of 60)
1.66 <i>hospita spolia</i> <i>Ve1472</i> @241 @284	10% (6 of 60)
1.68 <i>terris gemitus</i> <i>Ve1472</i> @284	3% (2 of 60)
1.84 <i>natum illic</i> <i>Ve1472</i> @102 @604	5% (3 of 60)
1.96 <i>iamque</i> <i>Ve1472</i> @284 @403	7% (4 of 61)
1.154 <i>campis ... semet</i> <i>Ve1472</i> @102 @167 @604	8% (5 of 61)
1.156 <i>pinus Argoos</i> <i>Ve1472</i> @102	3% (2 of 61)
1.167 <i>aderat laetus</i> <i>Ve1472</i> @284	5% (3 of 61)
1.178-179 <i>flumina ... proxima</i> <i>Ve1472</i> @284 @402	7% (4 of 61)

The fact that the edition is related to the various witnesses mentioned above is confirmed by the sample 1.1-200 with regard not only to inversions of word order, but also to others among its distinctive readings. These witnesses contain indeed a large proportion of the latter, including some that seem to be very, and even extremely, rare in the manuscript tradition (my quotations here are restricted to such readings), which is especially true of @284.

⁵² The inversions present in this additional sample 1.1-200 include, in addition to those quoted in the table below, 1.150 *haud procul* and 1.151 *non ... nunc*. In comparison, Rome 1470 has only 1.96 *iamque* (also *Ve1472*), 1.97 *iterum alios* instead of *alios iterum* or *alios animo*, 1.131 *mihi ... modo*, and Ferrara 1472 has only 1.14 *primum longe* (also *Ve1472*), 1.56 *rotantur et infra* instead of *infraque rotantur*.

⁵³ The figures in the right-hand column include @48 (cf. n.51) ; @48 contains all the readings quoted in this table.

Table : agreements on distinctive readings of the edition (other, most remarkable instances only)
with @44 @102 @167 @241 @284 @402 @403 @420 @604⁵⁴

1.53 perfusus <i>Ve1472</i> @284	5% (3 of 60)
1.59 spumosos <i>Ve1472</i> @284	3% (2 of 60)
1.79 fatur <i>Ve1472</i> @403 <i>u.l.</i>	5% (3 of 60)
1.147 <i>me om. Ve1472</i> @284 <i>p.c. ras.</i>	7% (4 of 61)
1.148 <i>tenues (-que om.) Ve1472</i> @102 @403	10% (6 of 61)

As can be seen both from word inversions and from distinctive readings of other kinds, the additional sample 1.1-200 tends not only to comfort the hypothesis that the editor made use of a model which jointly contained the features that the edition shares with the witnesses mentioned above, but also tends to make clearer that these properties of the editor's model resulted from long-running processes of contamination.

In the end, connections with the witnesses examined so far are significantly more complex in this edition than in that of Ferrara. At the same time, the analysis of this edition allows for more precise results. This contrast is mainly due to the fact that, while the Ferrara edition has only few highly distinctive readings, that of Venice contains many more of them. In spite of the currently limited state of our knowledge about the extant manuscripts, it is therefore already possible, as has just been shown, to isolate a much larger number of textual features that were quite probably present in the editor's model.

Conclusions

The present attempt at analysing the relationship between the earliest incunabula of Statius' *Achilleid* and their manuscript sources, in which 67 witnesses out of a total of roughly 220 have been taken into account, cannot pretend to produce more than provisional conclusions. However, through systematic examination of this partial evidence, it has advanced our knowledge of the first two editions posterior to the *princeps*, those of Ferrara 1472 and Venice 1472, on some important points. It has not only shown beyond doubt that the preparation of each of these editions was mainly based on a manuscript rather than on a previous printed text,⁵⁵ but also identified some characteristics of the manuscripts that the editors used as their main models. However, this paper suggests that the precision of the results to be gained from this kind of analysis may vary considerably depending on the nature of the text printed in each edition : at least judging from the evidence studied so far, we can get a clearer picture of the manuscript used as the editor's model for the edition of Venice than for that of

⁵⁴ The figures in the right-hand column include @48 (cf. n.51) ; @48 contains all the readings quoted in this table (1.147 a.c.).

⁵⁵ The first editor to base his work mainly on a previous edition was that of the the fifth edition, printed in Venice in 1483 ; he used as his model the edition of Parma 1473.

Ferrara, because the Venice edition contains many more readings that are very rarely attested in the manuscript tradition.

The next step towards a more detailed analysis would be to assess to what extent each editor corrected his main textual model, and how manuscripts other than the latter were involved in this process. That step would require us to have a very accurate notion of the features of the manuscript that the editor used as his main model. Such is currently not the case for either of the editions printed in 1472. To put it more precisely, there are good reasons to believe that some of the manuscripts hitherto not taken into account are more closely related to the main models of these editions than the witnesses examined so far and may therefore give us a better idea of their exact characteristics. That is why even a tentative analysis of the correcting practices of the editors concerned would make little sense at the present stage. The general impression that emerges from the data discussed in this article is that they introduced at best minimal changes with regard to their main textual models. The question of how they altered the latter – and whether they corrected them at all – remains an open question, which only full examination of the extant manuscripts of the *Achilleid* will make it possible to answer at some point in the future.

**Appendix : Stat. Ach. 1.619-674, separative readings in Rome 1470,
Ferrara 1472, Venice 1472**

1.620 somnus *Rol470 Fel472* : sonus *Vel472*

1.622 consedere *Rol470 Vel472* : concedere *Fel472*

1.623 tacent *Rol470* : silent *Fel472 Vel472*

1.627 non *Rol470 Fel472* : nec *Vel472*

1.628 Sperchie *Rol470 Vel472* : Sparchie *Fel472*

1.629 promissaque *Rol470* : promissasque *Fel472 Vel472*

1.630 nullus *Rol470 Fel472* : ullus *Vel472*

1.630 honos *Rol470 Fel472* : honor *Vel472*

1.630 umbras *Rol470 Fel472* : undas *Vel472*

1.631 et *omittit Rol470* : *habent Fel472 Vel472*

1.632 nostros tu *Rol470* : nostros en *Fel472* : tu nostros *Vel472*

1.635 pudet ... taedetque *Rol470 Fel472* : piget ... pudetque *Vel472*

1.637 aequaeuamque *Rol470 Fel472* : aequalemque *Vel472*

1.639 te matris *Rol470* : teque marem *Fel472 Vel472*

1.639 nec *Rol470 Fel472* : sed *Vel472*

1.639 probaris *Rol470 Fel472* : probabis *Vel472*

1.640 et *habent Rol470 Vel472* : *omittit Fel472*

1.643 uidit *Rol470* : risit *Fel472 Vel472*

1.646 nube *Rol470 Fel472* : nocte *Vel472*

1.647 indicta *Rol470 Fel472* : inducta *Vel472*

1.647 notus *Rol470* : motus *Fel472 Vel472*

1.650 ego *Rol470 Fel472* : ego sum *Vel472*

1.651 Pellaei filius *Rol470* : Peliacis siluis *Fel472 Vel472*

1.651 niuibus quem *Rol470 Fel472* : niuibusque *Vel472*

1.651 inmisit *Rol470 Vel472* : misit *Fel472*

1.654 pensa *Ro1470 Fe1472* : densa *Ve1472*

1.655 defles *Ro1470 Fe1472* : efles *Ve1472*

1.657 pater *Ro1470 Fe1472* : patria *Ve1472*

1.657 igne *Ro1470* : igni *Fe1472 Ve1472*

1.657 iacebit *Ro1470 Fe1472* : manebit *Ve1472*

1.658 Scyros *Ro1470 Ve1472* : Ccyros *Fe1472*

1.661 uersum omittit *Ro1470* : habent *Fe1472 Ve1472*

1.661 (*uers. om. Ro1470*) : arreptum *Fe1472* : acceptum *Ve1472*

1.661 (*uers. om. Ro1470*) : celes taceasque *Fe1472* : taceas celesque *Ve1472*

1.662 regina *Ro1470 Ve1472* : regma *Fe1472*

1.664 facies multum *Ro1470 Fe1472* : multum facies *Ve1472*

1.667 hausurum *Ro1470 Ve1472* : hausturum *Fe1472*

1.670 precibusque iuncta duobus <i>Ro1470</i> : precibus quae uicta duorum <i>Fe1472</i> : precibusque euicta duorum <i>Ve1472</i>

1.671 tacito *Ro1470 Fe1472* : trepido *Ve1472*

1.674 index *Ro1470 Fe1472* : iudex *Ve1472*

Manuscripts examined⁵⁶

- ANTWERPEN Museum Plantin-Moretus 357 = @6 (F, s.XIII)
BERGAMO Biblioteca Civica “Angelo Mai” MA 340 (Δ 6.25) = @24 (I, s.XV med.)
BERLIN Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz Hamilton 607 = @36 (I, s.XIV/XV)
BERLIN Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz Ms. lat. qu. 303 = @44 (I, s.XIV-XV in.)
BERLIN Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz Ms. lat. oct. 112 = @48 (I, s. XV med.)
BERN Burgerbibliothek 156 = @54 (F, s.XII)
BRUXELLES Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique 5337-5338 = @70 (B, s.XI1)
CAMBRIDGE University Library Peterhouse 207 = @87 (F, s.XIII)
CAMBRIDGE University Library Peterhouse 215 = @88 (I, s.XIII)
CHICAGO IL University Library 704 = @100 (I, s.XV)
COLOGNY Bibliotheca Bodmeriana Bodmerianus 90 = @102 (I, s.XV)
ETON Eton College Library 150 = @134 (I, s.XI)
FIRENZE Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana Ashburnham 918 = @141 (I, s.XV)
FIRENZE Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana plut. 24 sin. 12 = @147 (F, s.XII2)
FIRENZE Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana plut. 91 inf. 10 = @167 (I, s.XV in. (a. 1404))
FIRENZE Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana Strozzi 131 = @173 (I, s.XIV in. (a. 1308))
FIRENZE Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale II. IV. 333 = @179 (I, s.XIV ex. (a. 1375))
FIRENZE Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale Landau Finaly 202 = @181 (I, s.XV in. (a. 1413))
FIRENZE Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale Magl. VII. 1087 = @184 (I, s.XV)
LEIDEN Universiteitsbibliotheek BPL 136 K = @241 (F, s.XII2)
LINCOLN Cathedral Library 132 = @273 (E, s.XIII)
LONDON British Library Add. 10090 = @282 (F, s.XIV)
LONDON British Library Add. 10091 = @283 (I, s.XV)
LONDON British Library Add. 10095 = @284 (I, s.XV)
LONDON British Library Add. 11995 = @285 (I, s.XIV/XV)
LONDON British Library Add. 11996 = @286 (I, s.XV)
LONDON British Library Add. 16380 = @287 (E, s.XIII)
LONDON British Library Add. 17510 = @290 (F, s.XV)
LONDON British Library Add. 21213 = @292 (G, s.XIII)
LONDON British Library Add. 22314 = @293 (I, s.XIV)
LONDON British Library Harley 2560 = @304 (I, s.XV)
LONDON British Library Harley 2744 = @311 (I, s.XIV2)
LONDON British Library Royal 15.A. VII = @318 (F, s.XII)
MÜNCHEN Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 14557 (Ratisbonensis) = @369 (G, s.XIII/XIV)
NOTTINGHAM University Library (Wollaton Library Collection) Mi L M 2 (130) = @402 (E, s.XIII)
OLDENBURG Landesbibliothek Cim I 9 = @403 (I, s.XV med. (a. 1447))
OXFORD Bodleian Library Auct. F. 2. 14 = @410 (E, s.XI2)

⁵⁶ The sigla of the manuscripts follow the numbering established by Anderson (2009).

OXFORD Bodleian Library Auct. F. 5. 6 = @411 (E, s.XIII)
 OXFORD Bodleian Library Canon. class. lat. 72 = @413 (F, s.XIII ex.)
 OXFORD Bodleian Library Canon. class. lat. 122 = @420 (I, s.XIV)
 OXFORD Bodleian Library Lat. class. e 47 (ex-Garrod) = @433 (I, s.XIII)
 OXFORD Corpus Christi College, Parker Library 219 = @437 (P, s.XV ex. (a. 1475/6))
 OXFORD Lincoln College [Linc Coll MS] Lat. 27 = @438 (E, s.XII in. (a. 1119))
 PARIS Bibliothèque Nationale de France lat. 8040 (Colbertinus) = @467 (F, s.XI)
 PARIS Bibliothèque Nationale de France lat. 8051 (Puteaneus) = @468 (F, s.IX2/3)
 PARIS Bibliothèque Nationale de France lat. 8052 = @469 (F, s.XI1)
 PARIS Bibliothèque Nationale de France lat. 10317 = @493 (G, s.X ex.)
 TRIER Stadtbibliothek 1089/26 (91b) = @582 (G, s.XIII)
 CITTÀ DEL VATICANO Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Barb. lat. 41 = @593 (F, s.XIII)
 CITTÀ DEL VATICANO Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Barb. lat. 74 = @595 (F, s.XII2)
 CITTÀ DEL VATICANO Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Chigi H.VIII.272 = @604 (I, s.XV)
 CITTÀ DEL VATICANO Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Ott. lat. 1475 = @611 (F, s.XII ex.)
 CITTÀ DEL VATICANO Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Pal. lat. 1573 = @617 (F, s.XIII)
 CITTÀ DEL VATICANO Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Pal. lat. 1691 = @621 (I, s.XIV/XV)
 CITTÀ DEL VATICANO Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Pal. lat. 1695 = @625 (G, s.XV)
 CITTÀ DEL VATICANO Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Urb. lat. 648 = @643 (I, s.XV)
 CITTÀ DEL VATICANO Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Vat. lat. 1663 = @650 (F, s.XIII)
 WOLFENBÜTTEL Herzog August Bibliothek Gud. lat. 52 = @709 (I, s.XIV)
 WOLFENBÜTTEL Herzog August Bibliothek Gud. lat. 292.2 (Dommerichianus) = @713 (G, s.XIII + XIV)
 WOLFENBÜTTEL Herzog August Bibliothek Helmst. 319b (354) = @714 (I, s.XV med. (a. 1454))
 WORCESTER Cathedral Library F 147 = @718 (E, s.XIII/XIV)

Works cited

Website “*Digital Statius: the Achilleid*”, <http://achilleid.unige.ch> (Damien Nelis, Valéry Berlincourt, Lavinia Galli Milić, Jean-Philippe Goldman)

Anderson, H.J. (2009). *The manuscripts of Statius*, revised edition. [s.l.].

Anderson, H.J. (2010). “On the editio princeps of Statius’ epics (May 14, 2010)” [available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1607843> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1607843>].

De Angelis, V. (1984). “Magna questio preposita coram Dante et domino Francisco Petrarca et Virgiliano”. *Studi Petrarqueschi*, n.s. 1, 103-209.

Dilke, O.A.W. (1954). *Statius: Achilleid, edited with introduction, apparatus criticus and notes*. Cambridge.

Hall, J.B. – Ritchie, A.L. – Edwards, M.J. (Eds.) (2007-2008). *P. Papinius Statius: Thebaid and Achilleid*. Newcastle.

Hellinga, L. (2014). *Texts in transit: manuscript to proof and print in the fifteenth century*. Leiden–Boston.

Kenney, E.J. (1974). *The classical text: aspects of editing in the age of the printed book*. Berkeley.

Reynolds, L.D. – Wilson, N.G. (1991). *Scribes and scholars*. Oxford.

Severyns, A. (1962). *Texte et apparat: histoire critique d'une tradition imprimée*. Bruxelles.

Venier, M. (2001). *Per una storia del testo di Virgilio nella prima età del libro a stampa (1469-1519)*. Udine.

preprint