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ABSTRACT

The Latin poet Statius, though popular in the Middle Ages, was known then only through two epic poems, the *Thebaid* and *Achilleid*. Without his partially autobiographical *Silvae*, medieval scholars knew little of the poet's life. Since the interpretation of literature then was largely rooted in biographical criticism, scholars had to create a fictional life for him. Through an edition with commentary of twenty-five medieval introductions to manuscripts of his works (termed "accessus"), the methods, sources, and quality of this fictional biography are discussed.

The earliest *accessus* to Statius, which dates to the ninth century, demonstrates that the medieval scholars worked extremely cautiously and conservatively, refraining from interpretations that could not be rooted in the text. In the succeeding *accessus*, which are all based on the original one, scholars show very little desire to change previous results and hypotheses, but shared its careful approach, avoiding allegorical interpretations. Unlike the case of *accessus* to other authors, *accessus* to Statius are all very traditional and vary from one another according to external circumstances, such as the changing role of the poems' readership or advancements in the genre of *accessus* in general. However, without any new information about the poet, the scholarship on Statius begins to stagnate in an age where other authors' *accessus* reach their fullest and most elaborate form.

The rediscovery of Statius' *Silvae* in the beginning of the fifteenth century provided a wealth of new information to scholars. At first, they tried to adapt the new correct data to the old incorrect ones. When they finally realized the importance of this
new data, they chose not just to change the biographical tradition, but to change the form of its presentation as well.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Medieval Accessus

On the first flyleaf of his copy of Ovid's *Opera amatoria*, a seventeenth-century schoolboy wrote:

\[\text{Est familiaris amicorum absentium et quasi mutuus sermo, ut faceremus amicos absentes certiores si quid esset quod eos scire aut nostra aut ipsorum interesser.}\]
\[\text{In exponendis auctoribus sex sunt consideranda (marg.: quare inventa est epistola): 1. authoris vita; 2. titulus operis; 3. dicendi qualitas; 4. scribentis intentio; 5. operis divisio; 6. eiusdem explanatio.}\]

The end of this note quotes the beginning of Servius' commentary to the *Aeneid*, and pays final homage to the literary critic whose style, terminology, and methodology dominated medieval criticism.

Servius' commentary begins (ad *Aen.* 1. praef. 1-3):

\[\text{In exponendis auctoribus haec consideranda sunt: poetae vita, titulus operis, qualitas carminis, scribentis intentio, numerus librorum, ordo librorum, explanatio}\]

---

1 British Library, 11355 aa.26, AiV (P. Ovidii Nasonis poetae Sulmonensis poemata amatoria [Antwerpen: Joannis Loeus, 1566]; this volume is not listed in R.C. Alston's catalog, *Books with Manuscript: A Short Title Catalogue of Books with Manuscript Notes in the British Library* [London, 1994]). Hand 1, which wrote the note, is, according to T.W. Baldwin (*William Shakspere's Small Latine and Lesse Greeke* [Urbana, IL, 1944], vol. 2, p. 423), likely Jacob Butler, but Hand 2 (possibly Christopher Philipsome) writes, "Jacob Butler est verus professor huius;" and he may actually have been the lecturer on whom the notes are based.

2 On AiII, the note continues: "Poetae intentio et quod frugis offerent Heroidum epistolae, nec non cui parti philosophiae debeant supponi."

3 On this assessment, see O.B. Hardison, Jr., "Toward a History of Medieval Literary Criticism," *M&H* 7 (1976) 1-12 [5].
and provides us with seven periocha, circumstantiae, or characteres,⁴ that is, the seven types of information we need in order to study an author. The rest of his introduction to the Aeneid is spent exppositorily answering these questions.

In their ancient usage, these introductions, or accessus, as they were later termed,⁵ served as prefaces to commentaries. There are only a few examples that date from antiquity.⁶ The medieval accessus tradition seems to begin in the ninth century, and represents an intentional scholarly archaism that developed independent of the new and largely insular scholarship of the day.⁷

In their earliest medieval usage, accessus were attached to a commentary or some other exegetical text, and provided the reader with the basic terms and framework in which the commentary would operate.⁸ After the tenth century, however, their usage changed. Accessus began to exist as independent entities, forming a genre which was now separate from the genre of their commentaries. Accessus in this time were used as introductory lectures in university courses, and this change probably represents the professors’ desire to maintain tradition while showing some academic originality. The professors did not just discuss the author and text at hand; rather, the accessus became the lens through which the students would read and learn to read. As such, these texts

---

⁴The terms are used interchangeably in medieval accessus and in modern criticism. I prefer to use the term circumstantiae, to distinguish the terms from textual penoche (that is, plot summaries) and characteres.

⁵See Curtius 228 n. 2. Another term, didascalia, seems only to have been used by Boethius and his direct scholarly descendants.

⁶We only have the accessus to Virgil by Donatus, Probus, and Servius; the Life of Horace by Porphyry, and the accessus to Porphyry by Boethius (see bibliography). Many accessus and vitae that found in editions of other early commentaries (e.g. O. Keller, ed. Pseudacron Scholia in Horatium Vetustiora [Leipzig, 1902], pp. 1-3) are more likely later accretions.

⁷This is the conclusion reached by B. Bischoff (“Wendepunkte in der Geschichte der lateinischen Exegese im Frühmittelalter,” Sacris eruditi 6 [1954] 189-279 [201-3] [Mittelalterliche Studien 1 (Stuttgart, 1966), pp. 205-73 [217-9]). No other scholars have been able to find a date or place of origin for this genre of criticism.

⁸Cf. the accessus to the B commentary to Juvenal (Löfstedt 3.1-4): “Ante adiacentis littere istius operis expositionem quedam inquisitioe digna videntur, quibus expositis, post intelligendum memoria infixis, tocius libri series ad intelligendum erit facilior et sentencia ad retinendum elucidior.”
provide us with an awkward mixture of specific and peripheral interpretation. In discussing a text, the typical late accessus mixes the circumstantiae with notes on literary genres, lists of authors or emperors, as well as other information that was useful to the medieval professor and student, but seems superfluous to us.

As a result, scholars after the twelfth century used accessus more freely, composing, copying and re-writing accessus for transmission either as introductions to literary texts or separately from their texts altogether, often in a collection of accessus ad auctores. However, in spite of these changes, the accessus remained formally and stylistically close to the commentaries that were their origin, and we often find elements of the two overlapping. It is tempting, then, but equally difficult to argue for a kind of accessus genre, since their genre is closely connected to that of the commentary.

Servius is the ultimate generic source for accessus, but he is not the only one. In spite of his proclamation, "In exponendis auctoribus," it was clear from the very beginning that different authors required different approaches, and different scholars preferred different scientific methods. Therefore, in later periods, scholars felt free to syncopate, expand, and combine different traditions, depending on how they viewed the text at hand. At any rate, by the beginning of the "high" Middle Ages, there were four sources at hand for scholars to use: Servius, Boethius, Ps.-Augustine, and the Aristotelian causae.

---

9. These accessus ad auctores are puzzling entities. For some reason that has yet to be explained, accessus to dozens of authors were collected together, separate from their related texts. There are only a few traditional instances (one of which was most recently edited by R.B.C. Huygens, Accessus ad auctores — Bernard d'Utrecht — Conrad d'Hirsau, Dialogus super auctores [Leiden, 1970]), but there are scores of collections that are extant in but a few witnesses.

10. Many accessus end, for example, with a discussion of the propositio, invocatio, and narratio of the work; as these deal more specifically with the text at hand, they are more typical of a commentary. Likewise, as many commentaries begin with a similar discussion, it is often difficult to tell where the one ends and the other begins. In any case, this narrative division of the work derives either from Quintilian (3.3.9, 7.praef. 4, and 7.1.1-2) or from a reading in the two P manuscripts of Servius (1.praef.89-96: tribus modis omnis auctoritas poetica consat: praefatione, invocatìone, <narratìone>, veluti hic abentur [sic] praefatio "Arms ururum," invocatio "Musa mihi," narratio "Urbs antiqua"). See Curtius 491.
First, Servius, as I mentioned above, lists seven circumstantiae: poetae vita, titulus operis, qualitas carminis, scribentis intentio, numerus librorum, ordo librorum, and explanatio. The vita begins with brief notes on Virgil’s parents, his nationality, his education (4-7) and a list of his character attributes (7-10). The bulk of the vita (and of the accessus as well) is a discussion of Virgil’s literary life and the condition of the text (10-74).

The titulus is simply a grammatical or etymological explanation of the title of the present work. While Servius just provides us with the name of the work, Aeneis, in later accessus, this was expanded to include the full incipit of the work, i.e., Virgillii Maronis Aeneidis liber primus incipit. The title, especially the ”full” title, was an important aspect of the accessus, and is always transmitted ”with considerable uniformity.”

The qualitas carminis, or genre, is always defined along metrical lines. Virgil writes in a heroic meter (metricum heroicum, 77). Servius (and many other accessus authors) further defines the heroicum metrum as consisting of factual (manifestum, 79) and fictional (compositum, 81) details. Lastly, he subdivides this circumstantia into the actus and stilus of the poem. The actus is the relationship between the actor and the narrator of the poem. In the Aeneid, the actus is mixtus: Virgil himself narrates as well as introduces other (or ”imbedded”) narrators. The stilus, or tone, is divided into three groups, humile (which later scholars would use to describe the Bucolics), mediocre (later used to describe the Georgics) and grandiloquum.

---

11E.M. Sanford, ”The Manuscripts of Lucan: Accessus and Marginalia,” Speculum 9 (1934) 286
12For a full discussion of the metra and stilli, see F. Quadlbauer, Die antike Théorie der Genera dicendi in lateinischen Mittelalter, Österreichischer Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, 241.2 (Wien, 1962).
13Cf. Isidorus, Etymologiae 8.7.11: ”Apud poetas autem tres characteres esse dicendi: unum in quo tantum poeta loquitur, ut est in libris Vergilii Georgicorum; alium dramaticum, in quo nusquam poeta loquitur, ut est in comoedias et tragoeidias; tertium mixtum, ut est in Aeneide. Nam poeta illic et introductae personae loquuntur.”
Servius’ last four *circumstantiae* can be discussed more briefly. The *intentio* represents the intention of the author, and has some connection with the *vita*. The *numerus librorum*, *ordo*, and *explanatio* are simple details necessary for proving the integrity of the text at hand. In most *accessus*, these are discarded or are relegated to the *titulus* or to a plot summary.

Boethius, our second source, began his commentary *In Porph. Dial.* \(^{14}\) with six *circumstantiae*: *intentio*, *utilitas*, *ordo*, *germanitas*, *inscriptionio*, and *ad quam partem philosophiae cuiuscumque libri ducatur intentio*. While the first three and the fifth *circumstantiae* are familiar from Servius’ commentary, the other two show the difference between Boethius’ approach and that of his predecessor.

The first difference between the two approaches resides in the texts in question. The authenticity of the *Aeneid* was never in question; with Porphyry, that was not the case. *Germanitas* reflects the question as to whether a text is genuine; or, as Boethius wrote: \(^{15}\)

\[
\text{si eius cuius esse opus dicitur, germanus propriusque liber est, quod γνήσιον interpretari solet.}
\]

This *circumstantia* would only be used, often under the rubric of *auctenticitas*, for works whose authority was in question.

Secondly, the question of the *pars philosophiae* represents a different approach to genres than that which we saw in Servius above, and reflects the developments in education since Servius’ time. Here, instead of classifying a text on meter alone, Boethius classifies it on the basis of the *septem artes liberales* into three *partes*: *logica*, *physica*, and *ethica*. Logic, which corresponded to the *trivium*, was divided into grammar, rhetoric, and logic; *physica*, corresponding to the *quadrivium*, into music, astronomy,

---

\(^{14}\) ed. Migne, *PL* 64 (1847) col. 1A-C
\(^{15}\) 64.1B-C
geometry, and arithmetic; *ethica*, which was never divided, was simply explained as *moralis scientia*, and came to encompass most literature.¹⁶

The third source for *circumstantiae* is in ps.-Augustine, *Rhetorica* 7: *quis, quid, quando, ubi, cur, quem ad modum, and quibus adminiculis*. Here, after the first four rubrics, which are self-explanatory, *cur* corresponds to the *intentio* of Servius; *quem ad modum* (later also termed the *modus tractandi*) to his *stilus*; lastly, the rubric *quibus adminiculis* (more often termed *quibus auxiliis*) designated the patronage and literary friends of the author.

The final source for *circumstantiae* were the four Aristotelian *causae* (the *causa efficiens*, the *causa formalis*, the *causa materialis*, and the *causa finalis*).¹⁷ The *causa efficiens* usually identified either the author or the patron and could be subdivided into two groups, the *mediata* and the *immediata*. The former was usually ascribed to God as the prime mover of all things, and the second to the author, who moves the text.

The *causa formalis*, corresponding to the Servian *stilus* and the ps.-Augustinian *modus*, was subdivided into the *forma tractatus* and the *forma tractandi*.¹⁸ The *Casualis* *eventus accessus* to Statius' *Achilleid* explains the difference between the two:¹⁹

*Forma tractatus est compositio seu diuisio libri in suas partes.*
*Forma tractandi est modus agendi quem seruabit autur,*
*qui est metricus.*

---

¹⁶See Clogan 9. This seems to have been a matter of some debate. The *accessus* to the P commentary to *Juvenal* (Löfstedt 217.19-26; cf. Conrad of Hirsau [Huygens 19.228-9]), notes: "Magister vero Bernardus dicebat hoc [sc. que pars philosophie] non esse in auctoribus querendum, cum ipsi nec partes philosophie nec de philosophia tractant. Magister Wilelmus de Conchis dicit auctores omnes, quamvis nec partes sint philosophie nec de ipsa agant, philosophie suponi, propter quam tractant, et omnes illi parti philosophie suponi, propter quam tractant. Utraque ergo lectio falsa est: auctores suponuntur philosophie, id est propter ethicam, que pars est philosophie, tractanti, ut scilicet moralem comparent instructionem" (cf. the *accessus* of William of Conches [ed. B. Wilson, *Glosae in Juvenalem* (Paris, 1980)]).


¹⁸On these two elements, see J.B. Allen, *The Ethical Poetic of the Later Middle Ages: A Decorum of Convenient Distinction* (Toronto, 1982), pp. 67-178.

¹⁹This unedited *accessus*, which de Angelis classified as a *recollecta* (117), was likely written in the 1380s. See de Angelis 1984 *passim.*
The *causa finalis* is the *intentio*, and can be divided into two groups, the *intrinseca* and the *extrinseca*. The *intrinseca intentio* was the plot. The *extrinseca intentio* was usually tied to some event contemporary to the author’s writing. Again, the *Casualis eventus accessus* shows us how these categories worked in practice:


Though *accessus* can be delineated into these groups in theory, in practice they appear quite different. As *accessus* became more detached from commentaries, scholars freely picked and chose from the systems of *circumstantiae* depending on the work at hand, the goal of the scholar, and the depth of the exegesis that followed, if there was any. What I have just depicted as delineated groups are only seldom found purely intact in individual *accessus*. In practice, actual *accessus* tend to borrow and adapt from all traditions.

One scholar, R.W. Hunt, made an effort to analyze and classify the varied patterns of *circumstantiae*, and found four groups, which he labeled A, B, C, and D. Unfortunately, these groups are mostly tied to the sources of the *circumstantiae* I listed above (groups B, C, and D are simply the schema of Servius, ps.-Augustine, and Boethius, respectively), and afford us little practical aid in classifying actual *accessus*. His group A, however, does represent actual *accessus*, not because of its *circumstantiae*, but because of its methodology.

---

20 *Accessus* which preface full commentaries tend to be more detailed than those before glossaries or texts without notes. This is, however, only a tendency, and it is not uncommon for a lengthy *accessus* to precede a very simple commentary or a very simple *accessus* to precede a detailed commentary.
Group A, which is chronologically the last of Hunt’s groups,\(^2\) gives three circumstantiae: persona, locus, and tempus. While ultimately a simplification of the Servian scheme, this group is derived from the early-fifth-century *De nuptiis Mercurii et Philologiae* of Martianus Capella (§ 552), where we see the circumstantiae of persona, causa, modus, locus, tempus, and res.\(^2\) In order to form Hunt’s group A, the circumstantiae of causa, modus, and res were collected under the rubric persona. It is this simplification of groups, together with conflation, that governs the formation of actual accessus. Unfortunately, not enough accessus have been edited to allow an adequate scientific study of the circumstantiae used by individual scholars or to create a useful classification guide.

Accessus are our best tool for understanding popular medieval criticism, much better than scholia and commentaries.\(^2\) This is because most of the medieval commentaries that we have are aimed at school students and provide us with more glosses and etymologies than they do criticism.\(^4\) General interpretation, especially biographical interpretation, is stated most succinctly in the accessus, and often only there. So, one thread that passes through all of the circumstantiae I have discussed is the importance of

\(^{2}\) Scholars first seem to use this group in the early-to-mid-eleventh century (see Klopsch 52). There are a few examples of the circumstantiae locus, tempus, and persona before this time. Bischoff 202 (218) notes that they can be found in a few Evangelical commentaries as early as the eighth century (he did not specify which ones), and also cites two tenth-century Donatus commentaries: Vaticano, Pal. lat. 1754 (H. Keil, *Analecta grammatica*, prog. Königliche Pädagogium zu Halle [Halle, 1848], p. 21, which begins, "Notandum est quia in capite unius scusque libri tria sunt requirenda, id est locus, tempus, persona") and the so-called Quae sunt, quae commentary (H. Hagen, *Anecdota Helvetica*, GLK supp. 1 [Leipzig, 1870], p. XLI; discussed below on p. 22).

\(^{2}\) Hugh of St. Victor discusses and refines these categories in his *De tribus maximis circumstantiis* (last edited by W.M. Green, *Speculum* 18 [1943] 488-92).

\(^{3}\) This is one beneficial aspect of medieval introductions that did not survive into the age of the printing press, where introductions contained very little methodological nor scientific information and "forbade too much discussion of technical problems as boring and inelegant" (Grafton 1983.6).

\(^{4}\) The commentary to Statius in Vaticano, Pal. lat. 1695, for example, is simply a collection of extracts from Isidorus’ *Etymologiae*. The accessus that precedes it, however, is extensive and shows evidence of much more research. See below, n. 122.
the auctor. In practice, it is the vita of the auctor that governs the accessus, in that most of the circumstantiae are answered on the basis of the vita. Put briefly, non-allegorical interpretation of an author was then, as it is today, intimately tied to the biography of the author. It is not surprising, then, that our modern interpretations and the medieval interpretations often overlap, even though our methodology does not. So, since the end of the sixteenth century, scholars have been content to ignore medieval scholars when they "correctly" interpreted a text and simply to damn them when they did not. It is only within this century that scholars have begun to ask not so much what medieval scholars "got right" or "got wrong," but to ask why. Still, after nearly a century of research, we do not fully understand how the medieval mind worked. This dissertation seeks to address some specific aspects of this question.

1.2. Statius in the Middle Ages

Although a popular poet during his own lifetime, Statius was not widely read between the second and fourth centuries. Not until the late fourth century are his epics regularly cited in glosses and commentaries, it is about the same time that a commentary

---

25 We also find the spelling variants auctor and author. The pejorative/laudatory distinctions between auctor, auctor, and author that Minnis saw is groundless (see Minnis 10), as we find that different witnesses of the same accessus, prefer different spellings. If we agree with Minnis, then we have to argue that these witnesses can have a very different view of the author, although preserving the same criticism and commentary.


27 There is little glossary or scholarly reference to Statius before the third century; only Donatus (ad Terentium) cites him regularly. See P. Wessner, "Lucan, Statius, und Juvenal bei den römischen Grammatikern," PhW 47 (1929) 296-303, 328-335; H.J. Thompson, "Lucan, Statius, and Juvenal in the
to his epics was written, which would be attributed to Lactantius Placidus. During the
next two centuries, his popularity only increased. In the end of the fifth century, Sidonius
Apollinaris extolled the *Silvae* (*Carm. 9.228* and *Carm. 22 Epist. 6*), and in the beginning
of the fifth century, Claudian rose to fame by following Statius much in the same way that
Statius followed Virgil.

Statius' fate after the sixth century is unclear. During the "Dark Ages" of the
Middle Ages, we have little evidence for the readership of his poems; our manuscript
evidence from the ninth and tenth centuries shows that interest in his works seems to have
waned: the *Silvae* suffered the same fate as the other ancient occasional poets,
disappearing for all intents and purposes; further, few manuscripts of his epics survive.

---

28 This attribution stems from what seems to be a *sphragis* note by one of the interpolators at 6.342:
"...libellium composui Caecilius Firmianus Lactantius Placidus." The dating of the commentary is more
problematic. Our earliest manuscript, Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 394, dates to the end of the
ninth and beginning of the tenth centuries, and shows heavy of interpolation, taking extracts from several
ancient and medieval commentators (cf. Vossius' deprecation [De poet. lat. 3.45]: "Est vero
commentarius ejus cento ex Servio, Hygini mythologicis et astronomico Arato et quibusdam aliis quos
ad verbum exscribit."). The only reason the way the commentary is dated to the fourth century and not
earlier is that it is not mentioned in Jerome's library. A. Klotz placed the author in Gaul in the sixth
century, mostly on stylistic grounds ("Die Statiusschollen," *ALLG* 15 [1908] 485-525), and J. Breese (De
scholiis Statiani quae Lactantii Placidii nomine feruntur, quaestiones selectae, Diss. Grieswald, 1919;
see Lammert in *JAW* 231 [1931] 93-5), argued on the same information for a date in the beginning of the
fifth century and a location in northern Africa. However, Klotz also discovered that the "core"
commentary was written in Ciceronian, non-accentual clausulae (*ibid.,* pp. 504-8), and on the basis of
this, modern scholars place the composition between the ages of Donatus and Servius (AD 350-400),
although M. Reeves feels that a good critical edition might push back the date even further (see his article
Brugnoli, *Identikit di Lattanzio Placido: Studi sulla scolastica staziana, Testi e studi di cultura classica* 3
(1988).

29 See, *inter alios*, A. Cameron, *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius* (Oxford,

30 There are a few instances in which they were known. See E. Courtney, *P. Papini Stati Silvae*
(Oxford, 1992) V-VIII. The argument put forth by de Angelis (1984.181-4) that an *accessus* in Vaticano,
Barb. lat. 74, citing a *Silbarum* proves knowledge of the poems in northern Italy before Poggio's
discovery is incorrect. The citation, as M. Reeves pointed out (see de Angelis, *ibid.*) is ultimately derived
from Priscian, *Inst. 13.15* (GLK 3.10.21), as all of the extant manuscripts contain this reading. Likewise,
the often-cited catalogue-entry, "Staceri odarum" (in Toul, Pfaffers, Wessobrunn, Anchin, and the Dover
399]) is a *lapsus calami* from Oracius (cf. Bern 407, where the *Thebaid* is attributed to *Oracius*).
from the ninth to the eleventh centuries.\textsuperscript{31} But by the beginning of the "high" Middle Ages (in the twelfth century), interest in Statius again increased. However, the Silvae had been lost, and until the fifteenth century, he would be known only through the Achilleid and the Thebaid.

Even with the Silvae, Statius poses a serious problem for biographical criticism, since he is what we might term a detached narrator. The Thebaid and Achilleid deal with events that are in no way contemporary to him;\textsuperscript{32} and in these epics, outside of generic apostrophes, he is personally present only at the very beginning and the very end.

Likewise, in the Silvae, his narrative personality is always subordinated to his subject.\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{31}Our oldest Statius manuscript, Firenze, BML, Plut. 29.32, preserves only Silvae 2.7. As for his epics, there are two manuscripts of the Thebaid in the ninth and tenth centuries: Valencianae 394, with Lactantius Placidus’ commentary, and the Worcester fragments. In the tenth century, we have Archivio de la Corona de Aragón, fondo de Ripoll, ms. 83 (extracts); Düsseldorf, K2: F.49; Milano, Ambrosiana, S. 49 sup.; Montpellier, H. 62; Leipzig, Rep. I. 12a; a manuscript in Pavia (see G. Bezoia, "Un fragmento de codice della Tebaide di Statio,", \textit{Athenaeum} 18 [1940] 51-3), Paris, BnF, n.a.l. 1627, and Vatican, Pal. lat. 1694 (Lactantius Placidus’ commentaries). From the end of the tenth and beginning of the eleventh century, we have Berlin, Ms. lat. quart. 228 (a commentary to the Thebaid); Cambridge, UL, Gg.5.35; Eton, MS 150; London, BL, Royal 15.C.X; Madrid, B.n., 10039; Paris, BnF, lat. 1528 and 4883 (extracts), lat. 8040, lat. 10317, and lat. 13046; Vatican, Reg. lat. 5 (extracts); Venecia, Lat. Zan. 497 (extracts); Wien, 15480; Wolfenbüttel, cod. Guelf. 54 Gud. lat. 20\textsuperscript{o}; and Wüzburg, M.p.th.q.117 (Lactantius Placidus’ commentary to the Thebaid).

In medieval catalogues, his works are found in six pre-twelfth-century catalogues: Corbie?, (in an eighth-century catalog), "libri papini statii thebaidis. libri duodecim" (see B.L. Ullman, "A List of Classical Manuscripts [in an Eighth-Century Codex] Perhaps from Corbie," \textit{Scriptorium} 8 [1954] 24-37)—B. Bischoff \textit{[Sammelhandschrift Dizel. B Sant. 66: Grammatici latini et catalogus librorum, Codices selecti} 42 (Graz, 1973), pp. 38-9] feels that it is actually a catalogue from the court of Charlemagne); \textit{Bibliotheca quadam regni Francogallici} (in a ninth-century catalog), "Libri Papini Statii Thebaidios. libri duodecim" (Becker 42 [\#2]); Reichenau, Stiftsbibliothek (in a ninth-century catalog), "Item Ovidii Metamorphoseon. Silii et Statii, Volumen I" (Becker 35 [\#310, as St.-Gallen], MBD 1.265.34-5); Sankt-Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek (in a catalog dating to the end of the tenth century), "Statius" (MBD 1.101.13); Toul, (in a catalog before 1084), "Statii vol. I" (Becker 152 [\#201]); and Hamerslev, (in an eleventh-century catalog), "Duos Statios Achilleidos cum glossis" (Becker 141 [\#62-3]).

\textsuperscript{32}On Statius’ chronological separation from his material, see D. Vessey, \textit{Statius and the Thebaid} (Cambridge, 1973), p. 57.

Our only personal depiction of him comes in the fifth Book of the Silvae, which was in all likelihood not edited by Statius himself, but by a friend or some close relation after his death.\textsuperscript{34}

What we do know of Statius' life is admittedly little. He was born in Naples in about AD 45\textsuperscript{35} to a father of Greek origin who had come to Naples and was to become a celebrated poet and grammaticus in Naples, perhaps even teaching members of the Flavian household. Statius the son learned from his father and also became a celebrated poet in Naples, winning a prize at the Augustalia festival while still young. He later moved to Rome, where he won a crown at the Alban games and took part in the Capitoline contests, but without success.

Under his father's influence,\textsuperscript{36} he composed the Thebaïd, which he published in 90 or 91 after 12 years' toil\textsuperscript{37} and then began publishing the Silvae, a collection of his occasional poems. He also wrote a pantomime, Agave, which we know of only on Juvenal's authority,\textsuperscript{38} and a Bellum Germanicum quoted by Georgius Valla in his commentary to Juvenal.\textsuperscript{39} His last poem, the Achilleid, was likely left incomplete at his death.

\textsuperscript{34}See F. Vollmer, ed., Silvae (Leipzig, 1898), p. 3 nr. 7; L. Legras, "Les dernières années de Stace," REA 9 (1907) 338-49 and 10 (1908) 34-70; and the introduction to H. Cancik, Untersuchungen zur lyrischen Kunst des P. Papinius Statius, Spudasmata 13 (Hildesheim, 1965).

\textsuperscript{35}The date of his birth can only be inferred; guesses have ranged from AD 35 to AD 61. See F. Speranza, "Note sulla cronologia di P. Papinio Stazio," AFLN 7 (1957) 107-116.

\textsuperscript{36}Silv. 5.3.233-4. To what degree this is accurate and to what degree filial flattery is unclear.

\textsuperscript{37}The number is likely an exaggeration, based on elements from Virgil's life.

\textsuperscript{38}For a discussion of why so little Roman tragedy has been transmitted (without reference to Statius) see S. Goldberg, "The Fall and Rise of Roman Tragedy," TAPA 126 (1996) 265-86.

\textsuperscript{39}Editio princeps Venezia, 1486. Where Valla got the quote from is unclear. His personal manuscript collection, which passed through the hands of Albertus Pius and his nephew Rudolf Pius, came ultimately to the Biblioteca Estense in Modena, but there is no trace of this fragment there. It was thought that he invented the passage until O. Jahn ("Vermischtes," Röm 9 [1854] 627 nr. 5) realized that Statius alludes to the work at Silv. 4.2.64-6. On the fragment, see G. Aricò, "De Statii carminis, quod de bello germanico inscributur, fragmento," ALGP 11-13 (1974-6 [1977]) 249-254. Cf. as well J. Adamietz (above, n. 26), F. Beuchler, "Coniectanea," Röm 39 (1884) 283-5 nr. 7; J. G. Griffith (above, n. 26); V. Tandoni, "Per la comprensione del De bello Germanico staziano muovendo dalla parodia di Giovenale," Disiecti membra poetae 2 (1986) 223-234; and G.B. Townend (above, n. 26).
Statius married a widow named Claudia, and adopted her daughter. The two remained faithful to one another but the marriage was without fruit and the couple adopted a son, who died at a young age. Statius the father died of lethargy some time before Statius the son began the *Achilleid*. Statius himself left Rome likely in 94 and retired to Naples, where he died ca. 96.

Without the *Silvae*, our knowledge of Statius’ biography is much more limited. From the epics, we can ascertain only that his patron was a Roman emperor (*Theb.* 12.814) who had had several successes against the Germans (1.18-33), that Statius had worked on the *Thebaid* for twelve years before publishing it (12.811), that he was so successful that students in the schools already were reading his works (12.815), and lastly, that he respected the *Aeneid* (12.816).

Now, although there is a dearth of manuscripts of Statius’ works during the Carolingian age, we have abundant evidence for his popularity in the later middle ages: by the end of the twelfth century, the *Achilleid* found its way into the so-called *Liber catonianus*; and by Dante’s time, Statius was one of the four standard school poets and

---

40Sidonius Apollinaris, on the basis of *Silv.* 3.5.3-52-3, suggests that Statius married Pollia Argentaria, Lucan’s ex-wife. See D. Vessey, “Sidonius, Polla and the two poets,” *CB* 50 (1973-4) 37-39 and A. Hardie (above, n. 33), p. 59. This was also the (erroneous) belief of Poliziano. See Grafton 1983.42 and note 140.

41The Latin word is "torpor" (*Silv.* 5.3.260).

42J. Garthwaite ("Statius' retirement from Rome: *Silvae* 3.5," *Antichthon* 23 [1989] 81-91) believes that it was because of the Capitoline loss that Statius returned to Naples and dates the loss to the summer of 94.

43The only reason for this date is that Statius seems not to have survived the emperor. It is an interesting coincidence that Statius seems to have lived 51 years, just as long as Virgil.

44This is a loose term used to classify any medieval collection of short ancient works to be used in the schools. The name derives from the *Disticha* of pseudo-Cato, which were usually present in the collection. The oldest *Liber catonianus* that includes Statius is the eleventh-century Eton, MS 150 (de Angelis mistakenly suggests that this manuscript also contains the *Thebaid* [184.139]), and, based on manuscript evidence, the *Achilleid* began to be regularly included in the thirteenth century (see M. Boas, "De librorum catonianorum historia atque compositione," *Memosyne*, n.s. 42 [1914] 17-46, esp. 46). Still, there is evidence for an earlier date, such as Helmold von Bosau (*Chronica Slavorum* 42), who suggests that the poem was commonly read in schools at least by the beginning of the twelfth century. A. Glauche has argued that Gerberto d’Aurillac is singularly responsible for the inclusion of the poem ("Die Rolle der Schulautoren im Unterricht von 800 bis 1100," *Settimane di Studio del Centro italiano di studi sull’Altro Medioevo* 19 [1972] 617-36), but the claim is tenuous.
played an important role in the *Purgatorio*.\(^{45}\) Statius did not have a traditional *vita*, such as Virgil had, nor, without the *Silvae*, did he have one that could be gleaned from his texts, as was the case with Ovid\(^ {47}\) and Pindar.\(^ {48}\) This brief information, combined with the lines from Juvenal, was all that the medieval scholar definitely knew about the poet,\(^ {49}\) and it is from this that scholars constructed a biography for him.

Statius is, then, an extreme instance of medieval scholars “getting the facts wrong,” not because of a difference of interpretation or methodology, but simply because of a lack of information. This situation is exacerbated by his popularity, such that we have a great number of manuscripts providing us with a wide array of interpretation. Using this as a starting point, I investigate the critical problems that medieval students faced, and the methodology they used to solve them.\(^ {50}\)

---

\(^{45}\)Dante, *De Vulg. Elog.* 2.6.79-81, lists the standard poets as Virgil, Ovid, Statius, and Lucan.

\(^{46}\) *Purgatorio* 21-2. See below, p. 105.


\(^{49}\)Oddly, medieval scholars never seem to have paid mind to the poems that Sidonius Apollinarius praises and names. There is no mention of that poet in the notes to Statius, and in the manuscripts of Sidonius Apollinarius’ poetical works (which are admittedly few), there are no notes that mark the problem. Sidonius Apollinarius’ prose works are cited in the *accessus* to Lucan, that begins “*Equalis uero ideoque familiaris...*” (edited by Weber 2, pp. 12-5 as the “*Laur. cod. vita*”): “*memoriter hoc Sidonius in epistolis referret*”.

\(^{50}\)The *accessus* to Statius have still not been fully studied. The only scholarly discussions are those of de Angelis 1984 and 1985, in which she sought to investigate the completeness or incompleteness of the *Achilleid* in the medieval school; and those of C. Jeudy (Y.-F. Riou and with C. Bozzolo), which treat the *compendia* of Laurence de Premierfaut to Statius’ epics.
1.3. Editorial Principles

In creating this edition, I have located 699 manuscripts containing Statius' works and have personally examined 657. From these manuscripts, I have discovered and edited 116 different accessus. Since the accessus to Statius are very closely related, both in interpretation and in wording, the accessus that I edit here represent the most significant witnesses of interpretations and advancements found in those 116 accessus.

In editing the texts, I have taken a very conservative approach to emending the texts at hand. In my recension, I chose to favor two types of manuscripts: the oldest and those witnesses that preserve the longest, most complete text (without visible interpolation). I have sometimes favored witnesses that contain the wording that is preserved in accessus of other traditions. I have done this (albeit only occasionally) because of the close relationship among all accessus to Statius; the phraseology that persists through most of the witnesses of all accessus is sometimes logically preferable to that found in one or two anomalous manuscripts, although not always.

In emending these manuscripts, I follow the modern epigraphical rules: emendations of words lost due to physical problems with the manuscript, such as a hole or a tight binding, are surrounded by square brackets ([]); text that has been interpolated into a manuscript of tradition is written in italics; my own emending insertions are surrounded by triangular brackets (<>). The deduced presence of lacunae is indicated by asterices (**), and text which does not make sense and I have been unable to correct is obelized (†). I also strive to preserve the spelling and the distinction between u and v found in the oldest or best manuscripts, even when that flows contrary to our sense (such as the retention of a medial σ when used terminally). I have resolved the manuscript abbreviations in accordance with the general pattern of the best manuscripts. When, because of orthography, a reading requires clarification (but not correction), I surround the added letters with round brackets, e.g. ill(a)e, to distinguish it from ille.
In my citation of manuscripts, I have chosen to follow a kind of short-hand method in the text of my commentary; full citations will be found before the edited text. For the sigla of each edition, I follow the traditional practice of using Roman letters to represent extant manuscripts, Greek letters to represent non-extant archetypes, and fracture letters (e.g. Ῥ and Ὑ) to represent extant witnesses whose authority can be somewhat undermined (such as revisions and florilegia). I have adopted the newer practice of using ac and pc after a siglum to indicate ante correctionem and post correctionem respectively.

Since all of the accessus show varying degrees of interrelationship, I have added two appendices at the end of this dissertation, one (Appendix A on pp. 179 ff.) showing the relationships between the various texts in a graphic form, and the other (Appendix B on pp. 184 ff.) showing the chronological relationship among the various accessus I edit here.
CHAPTER 2

ACCESSUS TO STATIUS THROUGH THE TWELFTH CENTURY

2.1.1. The Quaeritur accessus (Appendix A, sig. Q)

Statius is a difficult author to read, and of the eleven earliest manuscripts containing his epic poems, five contain the poems with Lactantius’ commentary,\(^{51}\) two contain the commentary of Lactantius Placidus without text,\(^ {52}\) one is of a different commentary without text,\(^ {53}\) and one contains text with a full commentary of a different tradition.\(^ {54}\) Our earliest complete manuscripts of Statius also contain the so-called Quaeritur accessus,\(^ {55}\) a text which clearly shows that scholars were grappling even then with the problem of Statius’ background and identity.

From the beginning, this accessus is associated with the commentary of Lactantius Placidus,\(^ {56}\) although the tradition of the accessus and that of the commentary do not

\(^{51}\) the Worcester fragments (Cathedral Library, add. 7 and Q. 8 [X s.]), Düsseldorf, Landes- und Stadtbibliothek, K2: F. 49 (X-XI s.), Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, Rep. 1. 12a (XI s.); Montpellier, Bibliothèque interuniversitaire de médecine, Ms. H. 62 (X s.); and a tenth-eleventh-century fragment, now in a private collection in Pavia (see G. Bezola, "Un fragmento di codice della Tèbaide di Stazio," Athenaeum 18 [1940] 51-3)

\(^{52}\) Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 394 (IX-X s.) and Vaticano, Pal. lat. 1694 (X s.)

\(^{53}\) Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preussischer Kulturbesitz (Haus 2), Ms. lat. qu. 228 (XI s.)

\(^{54}\) Paris, BnF, n.a.l. 1627 (X s.)

\(^{55}\) Manuscripts often call this the vita Statti (e.g., Bruxelles, BR, 5337-8, [XI s., but the title was added by a later hand]), and Clogman and Sweeney classified it as such, but it is clearly an accessus, as it deals exclusively with the Thebaid. The only modern discussions of this accessus (which has yet to be critically edited) are those of G. Brugnoli (“Due note dantesche,” RCCM 7 [1965]=Studi in onore di A. Schiaffini, p. 246-51; and “Stazio in Dante,” Cultura Neolatina 29 [1969] 117). For his text, Brugnoli simply copied the accessus from the Lindonbrogius edition (Paris, 1600), without understanding the printing and abbreviation conventions of the time.

\(^{56}\) The error has been perpetuated even into this century; in 1902, H.F. Tozer (Notes on the Purgatorio [Oxford], p. 321) wrote, "Statius was a native of Naples. Dante’s error as to his having been born at
always overlap.\textsuperscript{57} The earliest manuscript of this \emph{accessus}, which is of north-central Italian origin and dates to the tenth century,\textsuperscript{58} is also our oldest complete manuscript of Lactantius Placidus.

Our only clue for the date and origin of this \emph{accessus} is the phrase "\textit{supra taxati ... tempore}" (15). To take \emph{taxati} first, "to mention" or "to cite" is an uncommon usage for the verb \emph{taxo}. It is used by Tertullian (\textit{pr. 6 advers. Marc.} 4.20 and 27), Cyprianus (\textit{Epist. 63.7}), and Commodianus (\textit{Apol.} 386); Latham cites further uses in 786, 939, and c. 1146;\textsuperscript{59} but these instances are sporadic. The greatest concentration comes in the mid-ninth century, in the \textit{Benedicti regula} 18 (ca. 840),\textsuperscript{60} Charlemagne 1.6 (ca. 858) (Migne 98.1019 D), and Eulogius’ \textit{Memorialia Sanctorum} 3.6 (ca. 860) (Migne 115.803 D). This evidence would point to a date in the ninth century for the composition of the \emph{accessus}. Next, the usage of \textit{supra} meaning "in the time of" or "back then when" seems to be a uniquely Gallic usage.\textsuperscript{61} This helps us pinpoint the origin of the text; the only documented usage of \textit{supra} in this time period is by St. Remigius of Reims, \textit{Polyptychum} 3.1 (mid-ninth century).\textsuperscript{62} From this scanty evidence, it is possible to argue that the \emph{accessus} was written some time in the mid-ninth century in France, perhaps northern France, but since

\textsuperscript{57}For example, although Firenze, BML, Plut. 38.6 lacks the \emph{accessus}, its \textit{codex descriptus Roma, Biblioteca Vallicelliana C.60,} contains it.

\textsuperscript{58}\textit{Vaticano,} Pal. lat. 1694. The scribe writes æ uniquely as æ in the \emph{accessus}, but in the commentary to Lactantius Placidus that follows, æ is heavily favored; it is likely, then, that the scribe copied the \emph{accessus} and the commentary from different parents.

\textsuperscript{59}R.E. Latham, \textit{Revised Medieval Latin Word-list} (London, 1965)

\textsuperscript{60}ed. J. Sennler, \textit{Corp. consuet. monast.}, vol. 1 (Siegburg, 1963), pp. 513-36

\textsuperscript{61}See Du Cange, s.v. \emph{taxo}.

the modern medieval lexica have not yet reached the letters S or T, this conclusion cannot be fully substantiated.

The sources of the biographical section of this _accessus_ have been studied and criticized since the rediscovery of the _Silvae_, most copiously by Gevartius in 1616, whose treatise was frequently reprinted and cited throughout the seventeenth century. The date for Statius’ poetic activity was derived from the preface of Domitian in the poems and from Juvenal’s contemporary reference to him. His presumed birth-place and name stem from confusion with L. Statius Ursulus, a rhetor from Toulouse who is mentioned in Suetonius’ _De Rhetoribus_ (12) and Jerome’s translation of Eusebius’ _Chronica_.

The sources for Statius’ character are more conjectural: the assumption of his noble stock (_nobili ortus prosapia_, 7) may stem from a misunderstanding of _prisca parentum nomina_ (Ach. 1.12-3) or from his patronage; he was ”_clarus ingenio, doctus eloquio_” (7) either because in the poem in which Juvenal praised him, _ingenium_ and _eloquium_ are mentioned as important virtues of a poet, or because of some unstated assessment of the poems. Lastly, the cognomen ”Surculus” is explained as meaning he

---


64Domitian is nowhere named; _Thebaïd_ 1.17-33 summarize the achievements of some emperor against the Germans; he is mentioned still more generally in _Achilleid_ 1.14-19 and _Thebaïd_ 1.814.

65Many of the _accessus_ transmit variant readings in this passage, especially in line 83. I have been unable to find any of these in the standard critical editions or in the manuscripts of Juvenal I have seen.

66Olymp. 209 (R. Helm, _Die Chronik des Hieronymus_, Eusebius Werke, vol. 7, Die Griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte, 47 [Berlin, 1956], p. 182.11; in Migne [PG 19.542], the entry is in the 210th Olympiad.)

67Cf. the note to 1.12 in Venezia, Biblioteca nazionale Marciana, Lat. XII.10 (=3973) (XIII s.):

"_prisca, notandum quod isst Stacius nobilis estiterat genere a primo auis._"

68Sat. 7.19: _eloquium_; 7.63: _ingenio_

69The difference between _Sursulus_ and _Surculus_ is one of methodology. Both were seen as etymologically descended from _sursum canens_, but _Sursulus_ was derived from _sursus_ and _Surculus_ from _sur[sur]_ canens.
sang sursum (18), which is usually explained as "iocundam et altam habebat uocem" (London, BL, Burney 258) or "super omnes poetas" (London, Royal 15.C.X).70

Formally, the accessus follows Hunt's schema A, giving the tempus, the locus, and persona of the author, each appropriately framed by the word autem. At the end is a concluding note on the opus.

Although short and simple, the accessus poses serious taxonomic problems. Hunt's schema A is representative of later medieval accessus, usually after the eleventh century.71 Before then, we would expect to see a more Servian structure, in which the scholar began with some sort of preface and discussed the work under some rubricated plan, including details from the author's life. Surprisingly, none of these elements is present here. But that is not its only problem.

Before the twelfth century, the incipit "quaeritur" is only found in our text and in introductions and commentaries to Priscian.72 In later manuscripts, the incipit "quaeritur" is found in medical, scientific, and religious treatises, on such topics as why water evaporates, why we need to confess, etc. There are a few early literary instances, one

---

70 The scholia to Juvenal repeat this, saying, "poema ipsud [sc. Thébaïs] delectabile et ipse dicitur bonam vocem habuisse" (Schol. ad Juv. 7 83 [Wessner 126]). Huguccio of Pisa (c. 1140-1210) explains this assessment in his Liber de derivationibus, s.v. sursum. "Surculus ille dictus est quasi surcum canens, quia post Virgilium inter celeras poetas principatum obtinuit" (München, Clm. 14056).

71 See above, p. 8 and note 21. Another scheme of three circumstantiae is found in the late-eleventh-early-twelfth-century accessus to Ovid's Metamorphoses of Manegold of Lautenbach: "...moderni quaedam gaudentes brevitate tria principaliter inquirenda statuere, id est materiam, intentionem et cui parit philosophiae supponatur". See Ghisalberti 1947.17 n. 3; Roy-Coulson nr. 62; and C. Meiser, "Ueber einen Commentar zu den Metamorphosen des Ovids," Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-philologischen und historischen Classe der k.b. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München, 1885 (München, 1885), 47-89 (49).

72 The genre of the quaestio has a long history in classical literature, with the most famous authors being Cicero, Plutarch, and Papinian. The incipit quaeritur, however, is a much later development, appearing first in the eleventh century ("Quaeritur cur omne studiorum genus sapientiae dixit" [Barcelona, Archivo de la Corona de Aragon, Cod. Ripoll 59 (XI s.) 1r]; see G.L. Bursill-Hall, A Census of Medieval Latin Grammatical Manuscripts, Gramatica Speculativa 4 [Stuttgart, 1981], 18.1.1). Its presence in literary accessus is a later development, beginning in the thirteenth century, as in an accessus to the Ps.-Ovidian De Vetula (Roy-Coulson, nr. 309), incipit "Queritur unde mihi quod opus processit istud..." The word quaeritur is found internally in a few accessus before then, (cf. that to Boethius edited by Huygens [pp. 47-8], line 26: "queretur tempore cius imperatoris fuit iste Boetius") but never at the beginning.
being Rabanus' thirteenth-century preface to the *Judith* in the Bibliothèque Mazarine in Paris. Rabanus' preface dates the events of the text by interrelating Assyrian, Hebrew, and Persian king-lists and then counting the number of years each king ruled. Now, what Rabanus' investigation and the scientific treatises have in common is that the information they give us is not available to the average reader. To connect three calendar systems or to answer a scientific problem, such as the nature of confession, requires knowledge, perhaps access to a library, and, most importantly, authority.

In the other *accessus* of this time, authority posed no problem. For readers of Ovid and Horace (that is, poetry in which the narrative persona plays a central role), the material for the author's biography was easily verifiable—it was in the text in front of them. For readers of Virgil, in addition to the autobiographically programmatic passages in the *Bucolics*, there was also Servius' preface to the *Aeneid*, which had the added authority that comes with age. Scholars could also arrogate the authority of Servius by borrowing his schema and then inserting their own material, which was based upon verifiable facts. Without a biography or enough information to fill in the Servian scheme, however, scholars of Statius could claim authority from none of these sources. The question arises, then, how can research, especially "new" research, have authority?

In the mid-thirteenth century, Dante, following Boethius' lead, would solve this problem by arguing in favor of a new authority (and nobility), one that does not come

---

73 Ms. 199, 2va, "Prefatio quaedam Rabini de tempore Judith", inc. "Queritur quo tempore quibusue regibus historia Judith fuerit."

74 On the abilities and inabilities of chronologists before Scaliger, see Grafton 1993:25-75 and 145-357.

75 We should remember that these treatises, like *accessus*, were at heart scholarly lectures.

76 Dublin, Trinity College Library 312, 24r: "Queritur utrum qui habet mortaia plura et confitetur alique et alique non..."

77 By authority, I mean the credibility of the scholarship involved; that is, to what degree the reader can rely on the interpretation of the scholar. Authority was a major issue in medieval literature and scholarship, and still remains unsatisfactorily discussed today. The best discussion of the problem is in Minnis and Scott, *passim.*
from age, but from reason, even if this reason is that of the fallible individual. But Dante lived a good three centuries after the composition of the *quaeritur-accessus*, and we must ask ourselves if the *quaeritur-accessus* embraces this "new" authority long before Dante’s time, or if it only uses reason because age is lacking. To answer this, we must look at the *quaeritur-accessus* as a piece of research.

The *accessus* to the *Thebaid* is succinct. Its rubrics are clearly delineated, and it is connected by a running narrative, in the tone of a lecturer. There is no information that could not have come from research, and the *accessus* makes a point of making a division between what is common knowledge (*constat ueraciter, 1*) and what is not (*imuenitur, 4*). Further, the life does not give any methodology or allegory for interpreting the epic or understanding its composition. A good parallel to this is the tenth-century so-called *Quae sunt, quae commentary edited by Hagen.* The commentary begins:

*Quae sunt, quae omnem veritatem scripturae commendant?*

We have here a very simple commentary, that is formed around a series of questions, without expansion. Like our *accessus*, it is sparse and keeps very close to the material at hand, but it lacks the narrative tone and succinctness that we find in our text.

It is the sparseness that we find in the *Quaeritur-accessus*, combined with its keen scholarly responsibility, that leads me to believe that the author deliberately composed the *accessus* as a scientific *quaestio*, both because of the dearth of available information on Statius and to lend the life a scientific or even scholarly authority. The incipit *quaeritur*

---

78 *Conv.* 4.8.12-4. This is germane to Augustine’s precept that his readers accept only those things in his works that, upon examination, they found to be true. Both of these passages are discussed more fully in Minnis and Scott 68.

79 See above, note 21.
emphasizes this, and if this is not the earliest use of this incipit, then the author deliberately chose it to identify the genre of the *accessus*; if not then we can see that the author saw his work as more appropriate for the genre of a *quaestio* than for the genre of an *accessus*.

My answer is a problematic one. Accurate scholarship and honest reasoning are usually seen as late developments, beginning in the early thirteenth century. To argue, as I have done, that a scholarly treatise that dates at least to the ninth century, embraces reason and logic to the exclusion of all else, suggests either that the piece is an anomaly or that it gives us a glimpse into a poorly represented period of intellectual history which was much richer in scholarly ideas than we had thought, ideas that would persist and culminate in the works of Dante.

The *Quaeritur accessus* was a bold undertaking, especially given its early date. It may be because of this, combined with its scholarly attitude, that made the *accessus* such a formidable and tenacious force in medieval scholarship on Statius. It eclipsed all other contemporary and earlier biographies of the poet (if there were any); and gained so much authority that out of the ca. 200 extant manuscripts of the *Thebaid*, at least fifty transmit the text. It is by far the most common *accessus* to Statius, and with the exception of one *accessus* to the *Achilleid*, which I discuss below, all medieval *accessus* to the poet were based on it. It was reproduced in several printed editions (although never critically edited) and proved so contentious that in the first two centuries of the printed book, most

---

80I say "his" because, from what we know of medieval schooling, it is more likely that these *accessus* were written by males. Women were certainly involved in writing and illuminating manuscripts. Unfortunately, their presence is usually indirectly noted, either by means of tax-roles or by feminine endings on colophas (see C. de Hamel, *A History of Illuminated Manuscripts* [Oxford, 1986], pp. 130 and 172 for some examples). The only evidence for female scribes in manuscripts of Statius is a *probatio penneae* in the eleventh-century manuscript Bamberg, Statliche Bibliothek, Msc. class. 47 (93v):

"Probatio penne atque puellae | probatio penne atque scriptoris".

81Minnis and Scott, *passim* and 373-394

82pace de Angelis, who believes that a thirteenth-century *accessus* that names Statius’ mother and notes his schooling in Narbonne and Bordeaux represented a second tradition. I discuss this problem below on p. 59.
editors and commentators occupied themselves with the biographical problems posed by this text.\textsuperscript{83}

The stemma of the text is divided into two families, and betrays what appears to be several recensions, especially between the \( \sigma \) and \( \delta \) branches to form \( \pi \), and between the \( \pi \) and \( \delta \) branches to form \( \gamma \). Most later witnesses are derived from \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \).

![Stemma of Manuscripts of the Quaeritur accessus](image)

Figure 2.1: Stemma of Manuscripts of the Quaeritur accessus

\textsuperscript{83} Cf. the somewhat exaggerated claim by Thomas Stephens (\textit{An Essay upon Statius} [London 1648], A3v): "For those critical pens which have published their ingenious disputes, between Ursulus and Surculus, (although, I conceive, neither were of kin to our Statius) would have deserve'd better of the Commonwealth of Learning, if they held a torch to the darke and mysterious places of the poem: which, I dare say, would not be so much neglected, but that it is so little understood."
Queritur quo tempore fuerit iste Statius, sed constat ueraciter
uisse eum temporibus Uespasiani imperatoris et peruenisse usque
ad imperium Domitiani fratris Titi, qui etiam et Titus iunior dictus
est. Si quis autem unde fuerit querat, inuenitur uisse Tholosensis,
que ciuitas est Gallie. Ideoque in Gallia celeberrime docuit
rethoricam, sed postea ueniens Roman ad poetriam se transtulit.
Fuit autem nobili ortus prosapia, clarus ingenio et doctus eloquio
cuius Juvenalis sic meminit dicens:

Curritur ad uocem iocundam et carmen amice
10 Thebaidos, letam cum facit Statius urbem,
Promitque diem tanta dulcedine captos
Afficit ille animos, tantaque libidine uulgi
Auditur, sed cum fregit subsellia uersu
Esurit, intactam Paridi nisi uendat Agauen.

15 Scripsit autem Thebaiden supra taxati imperatoris tempore. Est
autem Thebais femininum patrimonicum sicut Eneis et Theseis.
Dictus est autem proprio nomine Statius, Papinius autem
cognomine, Surculus autem agnomine, quasi sursum canens.

Text 2.1: The Quaeritur accessus to the Thebaid (Appendix A, sig. Q)
sed om. BN Statius iste fuerit r1 ueraciter post eum (l. 2) pos. r1 2 eum om. q eumuisse BNqr1S imperatoris om. N et] atque BV uenisse B usque...Domitian i (3)] ad imperium usque ad domician i B 3 imperium om. N et] ac r2S : om. ABNPr1 ad Domitianum fratem N iunior om. BNr1Z 4 alius querat r1 autem om. Pr1V inde V fuit A fuerit...inuentur om. N tolonensis Br1: colosensis qZ : Tholonensem N 5 uocata Tholosa post Gallie add. r1 ideoque...Gallia] ibique r1 decuit Sac rethoricam docuit r1 6 Romam ueniens B poetam B contulit BNr1 7 autem] enim AqSTV : om. PNZ prosapia orus AP et om. BN et doctus] edoctus r1 8 cuius] de quo r1 sic] in libro suo N dicens om. AP1 9 iucundam V ad post et add. r1 10 Statius post cum pos. A (fecit cum Statius P) fecit PSTV cum confacit r1 facit cum Z urbem facit B 11 promisitque...Agauen (14) om. BNr1 que om. T misitque S 12 que om. A 13 aditur A 15 scripsit...Theseis (16) om. N scripsit r1 sumpsit r1 sub r1 taxati] tanti r1 tempore imperatoris A 16 sic r2S 17 est om. NS autem] a B : om. N Statius proprio nomine cognomine Papinius N autem post Papinius om. ABNrl 18 Sursius AacTV autem] uero fort. rectius ABNqr1 : om. P
2.1.2. The Zürich *accessus* (Appendix A, sig. Z)

Outside of the *Quaeritur accessus* and two re-writings of it,84 there are no other *accessus* to the *Thebaid* before the end of the eleventh century. After the eleventh century, interest in *accessus* seems to increase greatly,85 and in the twelfth century, we find some eleven individual *accessus* to Statius, which, although they are mostly brief, do show us the new critical problem faced in that age. As I noted above, the *Quaeritur accessus* gives us very little information. In this century, scholars, likely influenced by the development of *accessus* as a genre, sought to expand the *Quaeritur accessus* along the lines of the *accessus* to other authors. A good demonstration of such an attempt is a short *accessus* in Zürich, Zentralbibliothek, Rh. 53 (XII s.) (Appendix A, sig. Z). On page 96 of the manuscript,86 we see a good deal of interest in *accessus*, both to Statius and in general:87 aside from two *accessus* to the *Thebaid*, there are also some notes on rhetorical devices, and an *accessus* to Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*.88 Further, across the top of the page is a fragment of an *accessus*:

\[
\textit{incipiendis auctoris VII inquiruntur, uita poety, titulus operis, qualitatis carminis, intentio scribentis, numerus librorum, nac\textsuperscript{o}, ordo lib<rorum>.}^90
\]

The first *accessus* to Statius is the *Quaeritur accessus*; the second, which is separated only by an initial,91 reads:

---

84The exceptions are the brief *accessus* in London, Royal 15.C.X (X-XI s.) and the lengthy one in Paris, BnF, lat. 13046, which confuses Domitian with Nero. Both of these *accessus* are simply adaptations of the *Quaeritur accessus* with lengthy expansions explaining why Statius chose his material.

85Of the Ovidian *accessus* catalogued by Roy and Coulson, some 5 *accessus* can be dated before the twelfth century; some 32 *accessus* can be dated to the twelfth century.

86The manuscript is paginated, not foliated.

87The odd combination of texts on the page suggests that the *accessus* were copied from a now lost *accessus ad auctores*.

88Roy-Coulson nr. 312

89This is likely a mistranscription of *explanatio*, rather than of *naiio*.

90Cf. the *accessus* of Servius (above, p. 1). Here, only the order of the last two *circumstantiae* is changed (*ordo librorum* and *eiusdem explanatio*).

91It is a common feature of short *accessus* to Statius to append a second *accessus* to the *Quaeritur accessus*.
Tria primitus inquiruntur in hoc libro, sicut in aliis, materia, intentio, utilitas. Materia eius est fratrum bellum pro Thesib quod fuit inter Ethioecem et Polinicum. Intentio eius dissuadere fratrum odium ne tale incurramus periculum. Vititias eius est ut perfectis istis libris pulchras et ornatas sententiarum positiones imitemur.

Here, the Thebaïd is given an educational interpretation. First, we should avoid fraternal enmity, and second, as students, we ought to imitate the rhetorical passages and sententiae in the work. As such, this accessus suggests that the Thebaïd (and perhaps, too, the accessus ad auctores this accessus may have been extracted from) was read by younger students, and represents as well the growing interest in the rhetorical nature of Statius’ works.92

2.1.3. The Bern-Burney accessus (Appendix A, sig. B)

The notion of fraternal enmity is a common explanation of the Thebaïd not only in this century, but throughout medieval interpretation of the poem; most accessus make some connection between the theme of the Thebaïd and the rivalry between the imperial brothers Titus and Domitian that Suetonius records. The more advanced accessus normally see Statius as operating more in a socio-political framework: he is seen as a teacher of morals and values both to the crown and to the Roman people. This later group is best evidenced by the accessus preserved in Bern, cod. 528, and London, BL, Burney 258.

The most noteworthy aspect of this accessus, however, is its tradition. Both witnesses preserve the first 22 lines of text, which provide us with the locus, intentio, and

---

92This last detail, pulchras...positiones is also found in the second accessus to Ovid’s Amores edited by Huygens (p. 37, l. 3). The rhetorical interpretation of Statius’ poems seems to have been present since the beginning of the Middle Ages. Most of the manuscripts of his works have various marginal rhetorical flags, the most common of which is Co, an abbreviation of comparatio (cf. E.M. Sanford, "The Manuscripts of Lucretius: Accursius and Marginalia," Speculum 9 [1934] 278-9). Likewise, at the end of Firenze, BML, Plat. 91 inf. 10 (XV s.) the scribe wrote, "Centum et octoginta septem totius libri comparationes numine nonantae" and at the end of Vaticanus, Pal. lat. 1690 (XII s. in.), a scribe wrote "Comparationes centum octoginta septem."
a brief discussion of the materia, but thereafter, the two diverge. In the Bern manuscript, we find 20 lines in which the author expands on the materia and discusses the pars philosophiae. The Burney manuscript, on the other hand, provides us with the utilitas, titulus, and a plot summary. Since the later lines in the two witnesses do not overlap, but seem more to complement one another, it seems likely that both manuscripts preserve only part of the original accessus. The scribe of the Burney manuscript skipped over lines 23-41 because of their lengthy, tangential nature, whereas the scribe of the Bern witness stopped writing in the middle, or was working from a damaged parent. Alternatively, it is possible that the material in the Bern witness is simply a rambling interpolation.

According to this accessus, Rome herself was plagued by civil wars and strife during the time of Domitian (who is given the epithet nequissimus imperator), and Statius wrote this poem as an exemplum to bring concord back to the people. The emperor, however, in his desire to intensify his own crimes, decreed that no one be allowed to insult the Roman nobility. The penalty for this is a rather gor54 death (13-4):

\[
\text{facta fossa circumque illuminato igne, fixo pale in guture uius consurgetur,}
\]

---

93 The Bern version shows many textual problems. There is a lacuna at line 40, and the scribe mistakenly copied "in de ethicam moralis scienza" out of sequence (at line 32). A second accessus to the Thébaid (on lv) is also incomplete.

94 I do not favor this explanation because the witnesses do not provide contradictory or redundant statements (except for the repetition of materia in 21 and 23), and it is not uncommon for accessus to discuss the partes philosophiae at length (such discussions are found in the accessus in Oxford, Lincoln College 27 and Sankt Florian, XI.58).

95 References to Domitian as a bad emperor are rare this early in the accessus tradition. However, Paris, BnF lat. 13046, to which this accessus is indebted, said that Statius wrote under Nero; this epithet may be a lingering trace of that confusion.

96 The accessus then adds the confusing note "etsi naturalem Thébanorum et Grecorumexitum minetur" (10-11). This seems to be an extension of the oft expressed idea that Statius' poem has an applicability to the Romans, even though it has nothing thematically to do with Rome. Here, Statius seeks to correct the Romans, "even though he discusses the natural demise of the Greeks and Thébans." (For minor as a synonym of mino [agere, irahere], see J. W. Fuchs, et al., Lexicon latinitatis nederlandicae medii aevi [Leiden, 1991], vol. 5, col. M 312.)
the source of which is derived from Juvenal’s hypothetical description of the fate of the poet who would write about Nero’s favorite Tigellius (1.155-7):

\[\text{toeda lucebis in illa} \\
\text{qua stantès ardent, qui fixo gutture fumant,} \\
\text{et latim media sulcum dedulcis harena.}\]

Statius, the accessus continues, who is of noble stock,\textsuperscript{97} decides to save his city.

He chose the history of the Theban war, not only because of its historical relevance, but also to rescue the myth from oblivion (19-20). But first and foremost, Statius’ aim is the "\textit{correctio malorum et per hæc exempla a bis [sc. malis] continere}" (39-40).

The accessus then continues with a plot summary, which begins: \textit{Laius rex Thebanorum}. Nine manuscripts of Statius (representing five accessus) contain plot summaries of the \textit{Thebaïd} that have this or a similar incipit,\textsuperscript{98} all of which are derived from the second Vatican mythographer.\textsuperscript{99}

The summary spends some 20 lines on the myth of Oedipus, 5 lines in summary of Books 1-6,\textsuperscript{100} one line on Books 7-11 and 3 lines on Book 12. What is interesting about this summary is the version of the myth of Oedipus. Of course, Sophocles was not known in the Latin Middle Ages, and the only lengthy versions of the myth were those in Ovid, Seneca, Statius, and the French \textit{Roman de Thèbes}, each of which varies in many details.\textsuperscript{101}

Here, the myth is a re-written version of the Vatican mythographer’s story, with some

\textsuperscript{97}The relation of \textit{de cui genere iste descendereat} (16) to its surrounding text is puzzling. It might be the result of a lacuna or of a marginal note that has been incorporated into the text.

\textsuperscript{98}Outside of this accessus, Assisi, Biblioteca comunale del Sacro Convento di S. Francesco, 302 (XV s.); Augsburg, Staats- und Stadtbibliothek, 4\textsuperscript{0} cod. 21 (XV s.); Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, 18.5.12 (XII s.); Genève, Bibliothèque publique et universitaire, Lat. 96 (XII-XIII s.); Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, BPL 136K (XIII s.); London, BL, Burney 258 (XII/XIII s.); London, BL, Harley 2693 (XV s.); and Napoli, Biblioteca Oratoriana dei Girolamini, CF 2.14 (dated 1478).

\textsuperscript{99}"\textit{Laius rex Thebarum habuit uxorem nomine loxastam, cui precepti ut omnes filios ex se genos necaret...}" (P. Kultsár, ed., \textit{Mythographi vaticani I et II, Corpus Christiaorum, series latina}, vol. 9\textsuperscript{ic} [Turnholti, 1987], pp. 331-2 nr. 320.

\textsuperscript{100}The only noteworthy part of the summary is the misidentification of Aphaerus, Tydeus’ brother, as Meleager. This is a common confusion that we also find in Padova, Vescovile 41.

\textsuperscript{101}The poem is (still) best discussed in L. Constans, \textit{Légendes d’Édipe} (Genève, 1974 [Paris, 1881]), passim.
minor variations. Oedipus hears from Delphi that he is the son of a king of Greece (59). He asks Polibus, who tells him he must be the son of Laius (60-1). War then breaks out between the people of Corinth and the people of Thebes, and Oedipus unwittingly kills his own father and marries his mother.\textsuperscript{102} The revelation in this version is the same as in the source: one day when Oedipus is putting his shoes on, Jocasta "pedes illius considerans" (66), notices the scars and tells him who he is.

The most interesting aspect of this accessus, however, is the identification of Statius. There was, as I shall discuss in my next chapter, a great deal of confusion regarding Statius’ origin. Here, the Bern exemplar tells us that he came from Tullum and the Burney, that he was from Tul (which is either a shortening for Tulos or a misspelling of Toul, the vulgar name for Tullum). Next, under the rubric of the titulus, the names Surculus and Papinianus are to be attributed to Statius’ voice, Surculus being derived from sursum canens (as we saw in the Quaeritur accessus) and Papinianus from pape, meaning mirabilis.\textsuperscript{103}

The two manuscripts seem to transmit the beginning of the original accessus and half of the following material. I suspect further that they are descended from a second hyperarchetype that added the puzzling decui...descenderat (16; see above, n. 97).

\textsuperscript{102}In the Vat. Myth. version (2.230), Oedipus goes to Delphi because of impugned stock (improperatum fuisset se genus suum ignorare, 7-8), and kills his father accidentally on the way.

\textsuperscript{103}Cf. Remigius, Expositio de celebratione misse (Migne, PL 101, col. 1257\textsuperscript{C}): "papa autem secundum quosdam dicitur admirabilis vel coronatus." du Cange cites the definition "papa: admirabilis, major, pater, et custos" as being in Walafridus Strabo, De rebus ecclesiasticis 7, but I could not find the reading either in Migne (PL 113) or in the edition of A. Boretius and V. Krause (De exordiis et incrementis quorundam in observationibus ecclesiasticis rerum, Capitula regum Francorum, vol. 2 [MGH 2.2] [Hannover, 1897], pp. 474-516).
Figure 2.2: Stemma of the Bern-Burney *Accessus*
B= Bern, Burgerbibliothek, Cod. 528 (XII s.), 1r
L= London, British Library, Burney 258 (XII/XIII s.), 2r

Tullum est ciuitas Gallie, unde auctor iste oriundus Tulosensis dictus est. Inde Romam ueniens rhetoriam didicit, quam etiam in Gallia celeberrime docuit. Sed quomod ex ciuilibus guerris et dissensionibus conteniones et discidia magna per omnia mouebantur, maxime suo tempore, cum regnaret nequissimus imperator Domitianus, voluit Romanos a discordiis ciuilibus reuocare. Sed quam imperator Domitianus ut suæ iniquitates liberius augerentur, edictum fecerat ne aliquis poeta alienum nobilém Romanum publice reprehenderet, historiam Romanam assumere non audens, Thebanam incepit, vt saltim per alienum exemplum et bellorum effectum Romanos corrigat, esti naturrem Thebanorum et Grecorum exitum minetur, neque enim si Romanorum historiam scriberet omnino reprehensionem eorum utare posset. Penam autem reprehensionis talis erat, ut scilicet facta fossa circunque illuminato igne, fixo polo in guture uius consubseretur. Quod uiderat per effectum Lucani qui concisis uenis utriusque brachii iussu eiusdem imperatoris occisus est quod uitium Cesarem aliquando notasset. † Decui genere iste descenderat, † et cum itaque nihil Romanum audeat, intendet in hoc opere describere ciuilib facta inter duos fratres, scilicet Ethiochem et Polynicem et infortunia tum ex una parte ut periculum utiaret supradictum, tum, quia populus Romanus, cum illam historiam non satis frequentasset, multum habere in cognitionem optabat. Hec est causa intentionis.


Text 2.2: The Bern-Burney accessus to the Thebaid (Appendix A, sig. B)
grammatica, litteralis scienca. Grammatica docet nos iungere casum
Dialogica docet nos uere et probabiliter loqui. Rethorica docet apte
et habilitur loqui. Phisica Grece, Latine natura, inde naturalis scienca.
Phisica diuiditur in quatuor partes, in musicam, in astronomicam, in
geometricam, in arithmetican. Musica loquitur de tonis, astronomia
de astra, arithmetica de numero, geometria de mensura. *** in <de>
ethica moralis scienca.

Vililitas siue finis est correctio malorum et per hce exempla ab eis
continere. Titulus est Statii Papiniani Surculi liber Thebaidos incipit. Statius
praeventum aum, Papinianus uero dictus est propter quod et Surculus, quasi
sursum canens, quia iocundam et altam habebat uocem et in hoc ipso
Papinianus id est mirabilis in recitatione, cum etiam in dictamine satis ualuit.
Pape enim uox est mirabiliis.

Hec est historia de commento tracta. Laius rex Thebanorum filius
Labdacii cum a fatis accepisset manu filii se moriturum, uxori suo Iocaste
praecepit ut onnes partus exponeret. Quare illa pariens filium plantis
perforatis, dedit pedisequis, quem ill(a)e in nemus portantes opertum foliis
inter truncos dimiserunt. Casu autem contigit dum quidam diues Polibus
nomine in illa silua uel uenaretur uel aliu ageret, puerum inuenit et
inuentum pro suo nutriuit. Sed cum adoleuisset uirtute pollens, per inuidiam
ei imperatum est quod inuenticis esset. Quare ira commotus a rege
sciscitans sic esse reperit. Regem itaque relinquens et scrutatus deum
Appollinem de patre consultum iet, monstri scilicet Spingis in cauerna,
uerba soluit, ipsamque interfecit et ad Apollinem perueniens cum se
filium regis Grecie accepisset, ad Polibium reddiens ei retulit. Ad quem ille,
"Scio quod si filius regis es, cuius regis sis, scilicet Laii cum in eius regno
te inueniorem". Ductis ergo secum conpluribus hoc ipsum a Laio perscutari
uouit. Cum interim orta seditione inter suas ciuitates et Laium, cum aliis
aliis, ipse patrem interfecit inscius et capta ciuitate uxor <en> matrem
duxit, de qua duos filios, scilicet Ethioelem et Polinicem et duas filias,
scilicet Antigonom et Himenem procreauit. Quodam autem mane dum ille
in lecto se calciarebat, uxor pedes illius considerans, calces perforatas adueruit
et filium esse agnouit. Eique rem patefecit. Miserum ille se clamans oculos
sibi eruit et in fossa propter pudorem ab illa die latuit. Filii autem cum se in
regno pati non possunt, iacta sorte ut alternis regnarunt annis, Ethioles
primus regnauit, Polinicex exulans ad Adrastum eius filiam duxit Argiam.
Alteram autem, id est Deiphilem, habuit Tideus, qui ideo de patria ejectus
erat quia fratrem Mel <eagram> interfecerat. Preterito itaque anno, cum
missus esset Tideus ut regnum a fratre requireret et ille negaret, motus

(continued)
Adrastus cum VII ducibus et finito bello cum Thebis uix solus refugere potuit. Fratres autem postquam se mutuis uuineribus occiderent, rex Creon est factus. ipse etiam quia cremari Grecos prohibuerat, a Theseo est interfectus et hic est finis.

More scribentium, prologum facit in quo materie sue partes aperit et geminam excusationem facit, vnam erga Romanos, quia de historiis eorum non scribat, alteram ad imperatorum quod facta eius non decantat.

2-3 in...docuit Quaeritur accessus 5
3 dissensio cf. Sallustius, BJ 41 fin.
13 facta...conburretur (16) cf. Juvenalem 1.155-7; cf. accessum in Paris, BnF, lat. 13046, ll. 14-6
45 quasi...canens (46) Quaeritur accessus 18
46 iocundam] Juvenalis 7.82
46 mirabilis...pape (47) cf. Paris, BnF lat. 13046, ll. 24-5
48 pape] cf. Remigius, Expositio de celebratione misse (Migne, PL 101) col. 1257d
49-78 cf. Mythogr. vat. [Kulcsár] 2.230
49 Laius...Thebanorum] ibid. 1
51 illa...perforatis (52)] ibid. 4
68 oculos...eruit (69)] ibid. 20: sibimet oculos eruit
76 mutuis...ceciderent] ibid. 26-7

2.2. The *Achilleid*

The earliest *accessus* to the *Achilleid* are much more consistent in approach than was the case with the earliest *accessus* to the *Thebaid* and present us with an entirely different set of issues. Authorship here was not an issue, and the earliest *accessus* seem unfamiliar with the problems behind or even the solutions reached by the *Quaeritur accessus*. What was at issue was the structure of the *Achilleid* and, in particular, why the poem ends where it does.

In order to answer this question, scholars paid close attention to two aspects of the poem. First, what the *intentio auctoris* was, and second, what happens at the end of the poem (likely in the belief that the end of the poem and the completion of the *intentio* would coincide). Scholars noted three elements at the end of the poem that suggested various *intentiones*. The first is that the poem ends, thematically, with the triumph of Fate over Thetis’ scheming; second, the end of the poem is occupied by Achilles’ lengthy discussion of his education; lastly, they paid attention to the very last word of the poem, *mater*. In the earliest *accessus* to the *Achilleid*, scholars focused their attention on the first of these, the triumph of Fate.

2.2.1. The *accessus* in Firenze, BML, Plut. 24 sin. 12 (Appendix A, sig. P)

The earliest extant *accessus* to the *Achilleid* is found in Firenze, BML, Plut. 24 sin. 12 (XI s.) and Bruxelles, BR, IV 719 (dated 1418). In it, we learn that Statius was born in Thebes, where he wrote the *Thebaid*, whereafter he was crowned. He then drank from the fountain from which poets normally drank after the publication of a poem.\(^{104}\) The

\(^{104}\) The crowning and drinking from the fountain are literal interpretations of the invocation of Apollo (*Ach.* 1.8-10):

\[
\begin{align*}
tu \ modo, \ si \ veterem \ digno \ deplevimus \ haustu, \\
da \ fontes \ mihi. \ novos \ ac \ frende \ secunda \\
necet \ comas.
\end{align*}
\]

The crowned poet is a common motif in *accessus* (cf. the so-called *Vacca accessus* to Lucan, ed. C. Hosius, *Lucani Pharsalia* [Leipzig, 1913], pp. 334-6).
identification of Thebes as Statius' home occurs only in this *accessus*, and stems either from some unexpressed etiological explanation of why Statius wrote the *Thebaid* or from a scribe’s mistransmission of Tholosa.\(^{105}\) As the point is never elaborated, we cannot be sure; however, as the *accessus* is nowhere else related to the *Quaeritur accessus*, I think it is unlikely that its author knew of the tradition that Statius came from Tolosa.

The rest (and the bulk) of the *accessus* is an etiological explanation of why Statius chose his material. Statius, after coming to Rome, received great honors and was invited into the emperor’s court to aid in the solution of a question that had arisen as to whether one can escape destiny. Statius, in answering the question, composed this poem.

In this *accessus*, we see the beginning of an important theme that will persist throughout the *accessus* to Statius, the idea of the *poeta doctus*, that is, the poet whose wisdom is recognized through his poetry. As is the case here, this is usually indicated by the emperor’s asking for Statius’ help in some matter.\(^{106}\) The source of this judgment is unclear; it may stem from the same source as the claims of his intelligence (such as *clarus ingenio, doctus eloquio, and tenacis memorie*) or from the invocation of the emperor at 1.17-19, in which Statius suggests that he has been requested to write an imperial *res gestae*. It is important, in any case, that Statius is usually personally associated with the emperor. In *accessus* to the *Thebaid*, he is in a position to chastise or instruct the emperor; here, the emperor turns to him for philosophical advice.

\(^{105}\) The confusion *Tholosexis* > *Theb[s]ensis* is possible in the Gothic hand in which the Firenze witness of this *accessus* is written.

\(^{106}\) It is noteworthy that before the discovery of Tacitus’ *Historiae*, Domitian was not depicted as the tyrannic emperor that we now think he was.
This *accessus* does have one aspect in common with the *Quaeritur accessus*, its conservatism. Even though the *accessus* provides us with a fanciful, etiological myth, it does not over-extend this into the realm of allegory. The interpretation here, as we saw in the earliest *accessus* to the *Thebaid*, stems entirely from evidence that can be found in the text. The author of the *accessus* adapted this information to what he knew about Rome during Statius' lifetime.
Stacius iste Thebanus fuit poeta qui librum Thebaidos compositum, quare coronatus fuit, et de fonte quo alii poete in fine libri bibebant potauit. Postea uero Romam ueniens a Domitianno imperatore oneste suscepturn est. Interea in eius curia, questio talis facta est, utrum ea que predestinata sunt euitari queant necne. Ad quam soluendam Stacius a Domiciano inuitatus fuit. Qui imperatoris suisque fidelibus questionem soluere cupiens hunc libellum compositum, ostendendo qualiter Thetis fatis resistere soluit et nequiquit.


1 iste post quare add. B 2 poete om. B in fine libri | in-fine F 3 honorifice B 4 eius incuria F quesipo F 5 Domitio B est B questionibus F 7 fuerit F 8 fuerit F

(continued)

Text 2.3: The Firenze, BML., Plut. 24 sin. 12 accessus to the Achilleid (Appendix A, sig. P)
2.2.2. The København accessus (Appendix A, sig. K)

The solution to the structure of the Achilleid posited in the Plut. 24 sin. 12 accessus found a more formal version in the twelfth century, in what is our next oldest tradition\(^{107}\) of accessus to the Achilleid, what I term the København-accessus. This accessus, which is completely extant in 5 manuscripts, is the earliest accessus to Statius that follows the more traditional form of medieval accessus, in that it is prefaced by a catalog of circumstantiae.

The text of the accessus is problematic, even in its earliest witness. In most of the witnesses, we see the conflation of two distinct accessus, Ω and ω. The former accessus, Ω, sought to answer only the questions of the intentio scribentis, the materia, the vitilitas, and the titulus (1-2), and in the discussion of the titulus, notes the debate of the number of books into which the poem is divided (18-20). Between the materia (5) and utilitas (16), however, is a lengthy interpolation from a second accessus, ω. Here, we find a different intentio (5-12), a brief discussion of the pars philosophiae (12), and a summary of the poem, broken into books (13-16). Two later manuscripts, A and Z, lack the interpolated lines 5-16.\(^{108}\) If these witnesses descended from the "pure" Ω, then the stemma would appear thus:

\(^{107}\) The accessus in Oxford, Lincoln College, MS. 42, which seems to exist only in one manuscript, is older, but its findings and results are unique and never copied. I discuss this manuscript below, p. 51.

\(^{108}\) This is also the case with a few re-written versions of the København accessus, such as that in Paris, BnF, lat. 8207 (XIV s.).
However, since A also has close relations to R, and Z is related to P and K, it seems more likely that their respective scribes realized that the lines were interpolated and deleted the supposedly superfluous material. All of our extant witnesses, then, are descended from one archetype, \( \gamma \), and our stemma should actually appear thus:\(^{109}\)

---

\(^{109}\) The separation of K and P is suggested by the borrowings from this accessus in Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 38.10 (dated 1394) (see below, p. 136).
The original *accessus* (Ω) was based closely on Statius’ words in the beginning of
the poem, and quotes him almost verbatim: the *intentio scribentis*, for example, simply
states that Statius wanted to expand the story of *Achilles* as told by Homer (3-5):\(^{110}\)

*forcia et bellicosa Achilis facta describere nec in Hectore tracto more
Homerico desistere, sed supplexendo ea que minus ab eo dicta sunt plene
ae omnibus tractare,*

which is itself simply a re-statement of *Achilleid* 1.3-7:

*quamquam acta viri multum inclita cantu
Maenonio (sed plura vacant), nos ire per omnem--
sic amor est--heroa velis Scyroque latentem
Dulicha proferre tuba nec in Hectore tracto
sistere, sed tota iuvenem deducere Troia.*

The major importance of this *accessus* resides in the *utilitas*, which follows the
interpolated passage in lines 16-7: *Vititias est ne fatis obviare temptemus, cum Thetidem
eis obviatam nichil profecisse nowerimus*. Now in the Plut. 24 sin. 12 *accessus*, Statius’
*intentio* was to demonstrate that Thetis sought to resist fate, but was unable (*qualiter
Thetis fatis resistere voluit et nequit*, 6). In this *accessus*, the same idea is given under
the *utilitas* in a slightly modified form: Statius tells us the story so that we might avoid the
frustration Thetis faced.\(^{111}\)

The ω interpolation provides us with two *intentiones*, the first of which (5-6) is
germaine to the *utilitas* of Ω, that is, Statius wanted to write Achilles’ *gesta*. The second
(6-12) states that Statius specifically wrote what he did with the intent to keep us from
avoiding fate (*ut retrahat nos ab hoc vitio, ne velimus resistere fatis, 8-9*) and to help us
avoid frustration (*et quod nil illi dee profuit, multo minus nobis mortalibus prodessem, 11-
12*).

\(^{110}\) I have underlined the words used in common.

\(^{111}\) The negative exemplum is common in *accessus*. Cf. the *accessus* to Arator edited by Huygens (pp.
27-8, li. 15-6): "*utilitas...ne perversae eos imitando damnationem Ananiae et Saphirae incurramus.*"
The interpolation then continues and gives information that was not in the \( \Omega \) accessus, including an answer to the question *cui parti philosophie supponatur* (11), and a plot summary, which is similar to the periochae in the commentary that follows in K, P, and R.\(^{112}\)

The solution reached by these two accessus (\( \Omega \) and \( \omega \)) as to why the *Achilleid* ended where it did is obviously influenced by the end of the poem, and is likely rooted in a very neat structural division of the poem. The *Achilleid* begins with Thetis' worries and the beginning of her scheming, then continues with Achilles' education, and concludes with a scene in which Thetis' scheming is undone, and Achilles relates the details of his education; the last word of the epic reminds us of Thetis' governing role.

However, this structural analysis is not the only foundation of this interpretation. The inexorability of Fate was a common topos in ancient literature, with the best examples being Horace, *Odes* 1.11.1-3:

\[
Tu ne quaesieris, scire nefas, quem mihi, quem tibi  
Finem di dederunt, Leuconoe, nec Babylonios  
Temptaris numeros;
\]

and two *Epistles* of Seneca: 88.15.3-6:

\[
Sed siue quidquid eventit factunt, quid inmutabilis rei notitia  
proficiet? Sive significant, quid refert providere quod effugere  
non possis? Scias ista, nescias, fient;
\]

and 107.11.5:

*Ducent volentem fata, no lentem trahunt.*\(^{113}\)

This motif was also popular in the Middle Ages. There is, buried in the middle of the pseudo-Catonian *Liber distichorum*, a queer little maxim (Duff, *MLP* 2.12):

---

\(^{112}\) The summary is similar to several others in the thirteenth century, including Paris, BnF, lat. 8207 and 8559, Escorial, El, Real Biblioteca, ms. f.III.11, and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Lat. class. e.47.

\(^{113}\) This line had further exposure by virtue of being quoted by Augustine, *Civ. Dei* 5.8.
Quid Deus intendat, noli perquirere sorte
Quid statuit de te, sine te deliberat Ille.

Now, it was not until a century later that the Achilleid was included in the Liber catonianus, but the similarities between the moral of this accessus and this distich show that there was already some moralizing interpretation of the Achilleid already in the twelfth-century. That the Achilleid was so well integrated into this popular wisdom may have been one reason for its inclusion in the Liber catonianus. Alternatively, the presence of this interpretation may likewise reflect the beginning of Statius’ presence in the schoolroom.

Text 2.4: The Köbenhavn accessus to the Achilleid (Appendix A, sig. K)

2.2.3. The Lincoln College *accessus* (Appendix A, sig. L)

The second explanation of the end of the *Achilleid* is based on the last 73 lines of the poem, in which Achilles gives the details of his education. Statius Ursulus, as Jerome and Suetonius tell us, was a celebrated teacher of rhetoric in Gaul. As a teacher, Statius the poet had the authority to write about the raising and education of children, and the *Achilleid*, under this interpretation, was seen partially as a treatise on the raising of children.\(^{114}\)

The earliest such approach is found in a twelfth-century manuscript now housed in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Lincoln College lat. 27 (dated 1119). The *accessus* in this unique witness portrays Statius as a moral man and a teacher of rhetoric. The two allegories of his name illustrate this. First, *Statius* is derived from the verb *stare* (16-20):

\[Vocabatur nomine proprio Statius, quod tunc eius probitati quasi quodam presagio congruебat, quia enim Statius a stando dicitur. Recte fuit hoc nomen eius proprium, qui per omnia scripta sua non solum tamquam in uertice litterarum, sed in morum dignitate stetit et eminentia uirtutum.\]

Second, the name *Pampinius*\(^{115}\) attests the rhetorical nature of his poetry (20-5):

\[Cognominatur etiam Pampinius, a Pampino, folio uitis, quia sicut pampinus sui densitate utem circumcngit et uestit, sic iste poeta totum opus suum uariis arbore ornametns et maxime comparatuum uenustate compaginat. Appellabatur preterea Surculus ad modum tenere uirgule pullulantis ab arbore, quia in omnibus quae scriptis pre nimia stili elegantia recens sempem et nouus apparuit.\]

Based on Statius' role as a teacher and a moral man, the author of this *accessus* argues that Statius is a teacher of morals, the *poeta doctor*; from this come two conclusions: first,

---

\(^{114}\)Outside of these *accessus*, we have much indirect evidence for the *Achilleid* being read in such a manner; compare Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery, MS W.358, a fifteenth-century composite manuscript containing St. Basel's *De poetis legendis*, Guairinus' translation of Plutarch's *De libris educandis*, and the *Achilleid*. The first of these discusses which poets should be read in schools, the second discourses on literature and education in general. See S. De Ricci, *Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada* (Washington, D.C., 1944), p. 818 nr. 373.

\(^{115}\)This variant for *Papinius* occurs in about 60 of the manuscripts I have seen. It is likely derived entirely from the false etymology suggested by *pampinus*.
that Statius wrote the *Achilleid* to eliminate the effeminacy which had come to be typical of the Romans and to urge the Romans to arms (8-11):

> Arbitrabatur enim utilius fore rei publice alicuius magni et bellicosoi uiri facta describere, cuius exemplo ciues Romani prouocarentur ad amorem milicie et usum armorum, sine quibus non potest res publica salua consistere.

These are not the *arma* of war, however. Under the rubric of *utilitas*, the *accessus* allegorically defines these *arma* based on *Proverbs* 16.32 (41-6):

> Cum enim dicat Salomon, "melior est patiens uiro forti et qui dominatur animo suo expugnatore urbium", patet profecto quia sicut est milicia armorum, tia est et milicia morum. In milicia armorum decentur uiribus corporis; in milicia morum contenditur uiribus mentis. Igitur preter emulationem corporalis militie, que plurima est in hoc libro, etiam spiritualis milicie doctrinalia sunt gesta Achillis.

The *Achilleid*, then, seeks to teach us to train ourselves for moral combat, as opposed to Achilles’ mortal combat.

The second interpretation, found in the *intentio*, is that Statius put forth an *exemplar* of magnanimity for the Romans to imitate (30-1):

> magnanimitatem discerent imitari.

In this regard, the *Achilleid* is seen as a collection of character exempla, and Statius is seen as a *poeta doctor* (73-81):

> Ergo et hic liber Stattii merito subponitur ethice, id est morali parti. Agit enim de moribus multiplicitar: agit de affectu materne pietatis in Thetide, de magisterio sedule eruditionis in Chiron, de culpando adulterio in raptu Helene, de zelo uste uctionis in Menelao et Agamemnone, de malo prescriptionis et preceptacionis in Prothesilao militie, de consilio et prudentia in Ulixe, de animositate et fiducia in Diomede, de honore regie mansuetudinis in Liconede, de titulo uerecundie puellaris in Deidamia uirgine, de uirilis animi constantia in iam reperto et mutato Achille.

There is, however, one other important facet of this *accessus*, the realization that the *Achilleid* is incomplete (26-8):
Materia huius libri gesta sunt Achillis, que omnia quidem Statius a primeua etate usque ad eius obitum scribere proposit, sed morte preuentus opus incepit, non expluit.

We should note, however, that it is only the content of the poem that is affected by its incompleteness. In no accessus to the Achilleid do we find that the style, structure, or language of the poem was affected by its incompleteness. Indeed, the poem seems to have been exactly planned beforehand, even down to the length of the individual books, which Statius intentionally shortened to keep his audience from getting overwhelmed (83-5):118

et sunt ... libelli longe breuiiores quam in Thebaide, ne populus audiens recitantem proximitate gravaretur.

---

116 We note in accessus to other authors that the death of the author affects the style of the poem. Cf. the accessus to Theodolus, edited by Huygens (pp. 26-7): "morte praeventus non emendavit."

117 Note that the scholars, likely because of Juvenal, see Statius as singing his poetry, not necessarily as writing it to be read.

118 On avoidance of proximitas, cf. the accessus to Ovid's Fasti and Metamorphoses (Coulson 1990,273-75; Roy-Coulson 215); the accessus to the "vulgate" commentary (Coulson, 1991; Roy-Coulson 326); and Roy-Coulson 318-9.
Materialis prelibatio in Achilleida Statii

Quis sit auctor huius libri, que materia, que scribentis intentio, quis modus uel ordo scribendi, que legentium utilitas, que causa suscepi operis, cui parti philosophie supponatur, quis sit titulus eiusdem libri uidearum. Auctor huius libri Statius poeta est. Qui cum Rome positus Thebaida, id est historiam de bello Thebano, XII annis elucub[ravit]. Cum per dies XII recitasset, singulis uidelicit diebus libellos, rogatus est a Domiciano [imper]ato[re] ut gesta sua imperialis disceret. At ille secum deliberans seque excusans quod petebatur facere supersedit. Arbitravit enim uti fabulare forei publice aliquius magni et bellicosius uirtu facta describere, cuius exemplo ciues Romani prouocarentur ad amorem milicie et usu armorum, sine quibus non potest res publica saluare consistere. Et quoniam eo tempore nondum subiecto Romanis orbe terrarum, sed bellis undique consurgentibus, uiribus opus erat, non oculo, et armis potius decertandum quam legibus. Achillis multum fortissimi et uirorum strenuisseri gesta scribere agressus est quatinus et ipsi Domiciano magnificentiam animi et populo Romano circa usum bellandi conciliaret affectum.

Erat autem idem poeta trinomi<n>us. Vocabatur nomine proprio Statius, quod tunc eius probitati quasi quodam presagio congruebat, quia enim Statius a stando dicitur. Recte fuit hoc nomen eius proprium, qui per omnia scripta sua non solum tamquam in urtice litterarum, sed in morum dignitate stetit et eminentia uirtutum. Cognominabatur etiam Pamphilius, a Pamphino, folio uitis, quia sicut pamphilius sui densitate uitem circumteget et uestit, sic iste poeta totum opus suum variis arborum ornamentis et maxime comparisonum uenustate compagnat. Appellabatur preterea Surculus ad modum tenere uirgule pulullantis ab arbore, quia in omnibus que scripsit pre nimmia stilu elegantia recens semper et nouus apparuit.

Hec de auctore et ipsius uocabulis. Materia huius libri gesta sunt Achillis, que omnia quidem Statius a primeua etate usque ad eius obiturum scribere proposuit, sed morte preuentus opus inceptit, non expleuit. Intentio Stacii in hoc opere fuit ipsum Achillem uelut exemplar ciibus Romanis uelle proponere, | quatuis dum eiusdem facta legerent, etiam magnam|ni>tatem discrent imitari. Modus uel ordo scribendi quadrupartitus est. Est enim propositorius, est inuocatorius, est excusatorius, est narratorius. Primo loco proponit unde uelit agere, videlicet ab hoc uersu, "Magnanimum Eacidem" usque ad hunc uersum, "Tu modo si ueteres". Deinceps inuocat Phebum deum Musarum et poetarum, uidelicit ab hoc uersu, "Tu modo si

(continued)
uteremus" usque ad hunc uersum, "At tu quem primum". Dein
exclusat se apud Domicianum imperatorem ab eodem uersu usque ad illum,
"Sulerat Ebalio". Exinde uero usque ad finem totius operis seriem
narrationis exequitur. Utilitas legentium in hoc opere est ad exemplum et
imitationem tanti iuuenis uicium torporis abicere et effeminiati cordis habitu
conscissio in castris uirtutum fortiter militare. Cum enim dicit Salomon,
"melior est patiens uiori fort et qui dominatur animo suo expugnatorum urbium",
patet profecto quia sicut est milicia armorum, ita est et milicia morum. In
milicia armorum decertatur uiribus corporis; in milicia morum contenditur
uiribus mentis. Igitur preter emulationem corporalis militie, que plurima est in
hoc libro, etiam spiritualis milicie doctrinalia sunt gesta Achillis. De similibus
etiam idem iudicium et ut Simmacus ait, "Familiae sibi est omne quod simile
est". Siquidem nichil est unde potius ad fastigia uirtutum animus assurgat
quan eorum qui uiriliter egerunt frequentata memoria. Dum alterum recolit
quis iam egisse quod ipse intendit, nec diffidit uires sibi defuturas, per quas
alterum iam meminit fuisse uictorem. Causa suspesti operis hec est: Homerus
quondam librum Achilleidos ediderat sed breuem et particolarem. Quia plura
ipsius facta digna relatu omiserat, ad supplementum ergo quod ille minus dixerat
iste huic operi potius quam alteri instabat, proposition habens omnia facta
ipsius militari plenius enarrare. Quod enim morte preuentus implere non
potuit. Cvi parti philosophie supponitur ideamus. Ethice procul dubio
subponitur. Tres enim sunt partes philosophie: phisica id est naturale, a phisis
Greco, quod est natura; logica, id est rationalis a logos quod est ratio uel
sermo; ethica id est moralis ab ethis quod est mos uel mores. Prime parti
philosophie, id est phisice, subponuntur omnes libri de quadriviio,
uideictet astrologici, geometrici, arismetici, musici, et omnes libri Galeni uel
Ypocratis uel aliorum quorumlibet de arte medicinae et omnes libri
quorumcumque auctorum de naturis rerum, bestiuarum, uuiuim, lapiidum,
herbarum, et arborum, ipsius etiam terre, ut Georgica Virgili. Secunde parti
philosophie id est logice supponuntur omnes libri de triuio, uideictet
grammatica, rethorica, dialectica, et omnes libri legum et canonom et omnes
libri in quibus agitur de ratione rerum aut uerborum. Tertie parti philosophie,
id est ethice, supponuntur in primis omnes libri diiine pagine et omnes libri
historici de rebus gestis siue ecclesiasticli siue seculares, etiam hi qui fabulose
scripti sunt, ut carmina poetarum. Et ut breuiter dicam, omnes omnino libri in
quibus aliquo modo de moribus agitur, siue per fugam uiciorum, siue per
electionem uirtutum. Legimus enim bona ut imitemur, legimus mala ut
caueamus, quia non potest uitari malum nisi cognitum. Ergo et hic liber Stati
merito subponitur ethice, id est morali parti. Agit enim de moribus

(continued)
multipliciter: agit de affectu maternae pietatis in Thetide, de magisterio sedula eruditionis in Chironae, de culpando adulterio in raptu Helene, de zelo iustae ulationis in Menelao et Agamemnone, de malo prescriptionis et preceptationis in Prothesilao militae, de consilio et prudentia in Ulyxe, de animositate et fiducia in Diomedae, de honore regis mansuetudinis in Licomedae, de tituloeuercedundie puellaris in Deidamiae virgine, de virili animi constantiae in iam reperto et mutato Achille. Titulus talis est: Pampini Surculi Statii liber Achilleidos incipit. Sunt autem eiusdem libri quinque distinctiones, quas thomos vocat, a Greco thomos, quod est disiusio, et sunt idem thomi seu libelli longe breuiores quam in Thebidea, ne populus audiens recitantem prolixitate grauaretur. Quid autem unusquisque thomos in se continet, subscripti verso breuiter intimabunt:

Panditur istorum breuitas succincta librorum de primo:
Primus deducit Thetidem [Chironis ad antra]
de secundo:
Induit Eacidem muliebri ueste [secundus]
de tercio:
Tercius arma parat Daniae et querit [Achillem]
de qua[rto]:
Quartus feminine Pelidem nudat amictu
de q[uinto]:
Quintus narratam sua facta ab du[x Achillem]

13 armis...legibus] cf. Cicero, Pro Plancio 36.87: Sed erat non iure, non legibus, non discipientem decretandum... armis fuit, armis inquam fuit dimicandum.

33 Ach. 1.1
34 ibid. 1.8
35-6 ibid. 1.8
36 ibid. 1.14
38 ibid. 1.20
42 Prov. 16.32
47-8 Simmachus, Ep. 1.43.2

25 pre] pro L 72 electionum L
2.2.4. The *Universitatis bruxellensis accessus* (Appendix A, sigg. Bb et Bl)

The idea of Statius *doctor* giving us lessons to imitate is similarly expressed in an *accessus* that had a much wider circulation, particularly in the thirteenth century, but is fully extant in only two manuscripts, one at the Université de Bruxelles, without shelf mark, and the other in Leiden, Bibliothek der Rijksuniversiteit, Gronov. lat. 143.\(^{119}\) What is important in this *accessus* the adaptation of ideas from the Lincoln *accessus* to the more traditional ideas we saw in the København *accessus*.

After a brief note on the *materia;\(^ {120}\) we find an *intentio* that is, in essence, a paraphrase of the *intentio* in the København *accessus*. Here, the *intentio* reads (2-4):

> Intentio sua est dehortari quemlibet ne contraire velit diuine dispositions, quod conabat [sic] facere Thetis.

Statius is seen as a *praecceptor*, but a second *intentio* (which follows this statement) portrays him as a teacher, especially for youths. Just as Homer and Virgil gave us models of virtue, Statius gives us, in the *Thebaid*, an anti-exemplum in the form of Etheocles and Polynices (4-9):  

> Alter intentio sua est cum in Homero exemplum datum sit sapientie per Vixem, in Virgilio exemplum pietatis in homines et religiosis in deos per Eneam, cum etiam iste autore maiori opere suo exemplum det iuuenibus per Pollinicum et Ethioclem (omnia exempla enim sunt ad imitandum uel dehortandum).\(^ {121}\)...

This last detail establishes Statius’ interest in educating children. Therefore, the *accessus* continues, Statius wrote the *Achilleid* to teach people how to raise children:

> ...inde hoc libro puerilis uite instructionem instruit per Achilem a Chirone nutriment.

---

\(^{119}\)The Leiden witness appends the *accessus* to the end of a simple *accessus* based on the *7 circumstantiae* in a Ps.-Augustine schema (see above, p. 6).

\(^{120}\)The Leiden witness begins with the *intentio*.

\(^{121}\)These last few words resemble 72-3 of the Lincoln College 27 *accessus*: "Legimus enim bona ut imitemur, legimus mala ut caeuseum, quia non potest uitar malum nisi cognitum."
The third *intentio* states that Statius wrote the *Achilleid* to refine his poetic abilities for the greater poetic task that lay ahead (9-11):

*Alter intentio sua est animum suum exercere ut facta Domitiani imperatoris, sicut rogauerat, posset digne describere.*

This detail reflects the close association between the poet and the emperor that we saw in the *accessus* in Firenze, BML, Plut. 24, sin. 12, and is likely based on *Ach.* 1.17-19.

The *finalis causa* of the work, which this and many *accessus* link to the *utilitas* and *intentio*, is simply a restatement of the *intentiones* given above, that we not impede fate and that we learn to educate children through the example of Achilles (15-17):

*Consequimur autem hanc utilitatem ut non obstemus divino dispositioni, uel consequimus puerilis utile erudicionem exemplo Achillis.*

Lastly, the work belongs to ethical philosophy (as is normal for epic works), or logical philosophy, "*qua rethorice loquitur totaliter*" (19-20). This stresses the other half of Statius' background: in addition to a teacher, he was also a rhetorician, and this emphasis often influenced criticism of his works.

The *accessus* is extant in two manuscripts, B and L, which have some minor differences in wording at points. Although I favor the B readings in my edition, those in L were clearly not anomalous. The fifteenth-century commentary in Vaticano, Pal. lat. 1695, for example, borrows heavily from this *accessus*, but the two witnesses of the text, the Vatican manuscript and the now lost manuscript Strasbourg, Bibliothèque universitaire, C. VIII.33, preserve the readings of B and L respectively.\(^\text{122}\)

---

\(^{122}\)In Appendix A, these are represented by the sigla Ps and Pv.
Materia St: in hoc opere principaliter sunt Thetis et Achilles.
Secundaria eius materia Vixes et Diomedes. Intentio sua est dehortari
quemlibet nec contraire velit divini dispositioni, quod conabat [sic] facere
Thetis. Aliter intention sua est cum in Homero exemplum datum sit
sapientie per Vixem, cum in Virgilio datum sit exemplum pietatis in
hominis et religionis in deos per Eneam, cum etiam iste aut in maiori
opere suo exemplum det iuuenibus per Polliniciem et Ethioleum (omnia enim
exempla aut ad imitandum aut ad dehortandum data sunt), in hoc libro
puerilis vite erudicionem instruit per Achilem a Chirone nutritum. Aliter
intentio sua est animum suum exercere vt facta Domitian imperatoris, sicut
rogatus erat ab eo, posset digne describere. Domitianus et Titus filii erant
Vespassiani. Mortuo autem Domitianu, uel secundum quosdam
Statio, facta eius non sunt scripta, nec Achilleis perfecta est. Finalis
causa sequitur intentionem, quia vitilas circa intentionem <uersatur>.
Consequimur autem hanc utilitatem ut non obstemus divinie
dispositioni vel consequimur puerilis uite eruditionem exemplo
Achillis. Vel consequimur ingenii exercitum exemplo autors. Ethice
suponitur quia ad morum honestatem spectat, vel etiam suponitur
phisice, quia de naturalibus etiam loquitur. Vel etiam suponitur
loyce quia theloric loquitur totaliter.
More quoque aliorum opus suum in tria diuidit, in
propositionem, inuocationem, et narrationem. Miscet autem
propositionem et inuocationem.

1 materia...Diomedes (2)] materia eius est principaliter Thetis et Achilles secundaria uero
Uixes et Diomedes post est (23) pos. L
2 intentio...dehortari] intention autem Stacii est in hoc opere dehortari L
5 ut cum aliqui sint in aduersitate sapientia cam euadant post Uixem add. L
8 aut ad...sunt] sunt ad imitandum uel deortandum B

Text 2.6: The Universitatis bruxellensis accessus to the Achilleid (Appendix A, sigg. Bb
et B1)
Text 2.6 (continued)

12 mortuo...est (13) Mortuus est autem Uespelianus (sic) et remanserunt inscripta eius gesta L
14 sequitur...uersatur] est utilitas et respicit ad singulas intentiones L
21 in propositionem...narrationem (22)] prefationem siue proimium, invocacionem, et Musam inuocat L

__________________________

2.3. Conclusion

By the end of the twelfth century, *accessus* began to become established as a genre, and two cornerstones to criticism on the *Achilleid* in the Middle Ages had been laid. First, Statius was seen foremost as *doctus* and a *doctor* or *praeeceptor*, whether morally or rhetorically, and this idea will predominate in all later interpretations of the poet and his works. Second, the *Achilleid* took on the physical shape it would have in the following centuries: as de Angelis has shown, by this time, it had been divided into five books, and scholars began to widely recognize that the poem was incomplete.

---

CHAPTER 3

THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

3.1. The Thebaid

The most noteworthy development in the accessus to the Thebaid in the thirteenth century is the sudden appearance of new details concerning Statius’ life: first, that he studied at Burdigala (Bordeaux) and Narbo (Narbonne); and second, that his mother was named Agilina. To de Angelis, these were sure evidence of a second, competing biographical tradition that has not been transmitted to us. I find her solution questionable. The so-called In principio accessus, which is the only independent source for these details, is, with five witnesses, one of our best transmitted accessus to Statius. The manuscripts themselves, moreover, show us that two recensions of the text were present already in the beginning of the thirteenth century. So there was, from the beginning, already a good deal of scholarly activity on the accessus. Now, as we saw above, the biographical information available to Statian scholars was thin, especially in comparison to the information about other authors, and the most used aspect of his biography was his role as a teacher. We would expect, then, that if a second tradition existed in which more details about Statius’ own education and upbringing were available, this information would be interpolated into some of these accessus. This is, however,

---

124 de Angelis 1984.161 n. 106
125 The only evidence for a tradition that de Angelis could find is that of Petrarch (Laurea occidens 341-6), who preserves Narbo and Bordeaux as the places of Statius’ education. See de Angelis 1997.109. I see no evidence for excluding the In principio accessus as a source for Petrarchs’ comment. The vita Statii in Firenze, BML, Plut 53.15 (XV s ex.) adds some details: “Operam doctrinis optimis sed principaliter eloquenti dedit. Apud Gallos rhétoricon docuit atque in foro causas complures easdemque multa cum laude egit. Multum quidem in dicendo et metro et prosa hic potuit.” However, this
not the case. The details taken from de Angelis’ supposed "other" tradition are markedly thin, providing us only with the names of the cities where Statius studied and his mother’s name, without any elaboration or explanation whatsoever. Likewise, before the end of the fifteenth century, these details are only found in the *In principio accessus* and in other *accessus* that are themselves descended from the *In principio accessus*.

A close look at these two "new" details shows, actually, that neither is particularly astounding. First of all, they reflect a growing interest in Statius’ background in this century, corresponding to the oft unstated *circumstantiae, ubi et quando quid studuit*, and *a quibus originem duxit*. That this interest arises rather suddenly in the thirteenth century is by no means surprising. Statius’ sudden appearance in schools and the wild proliferation of his texts attest to his popularity, and along with this popularity comes, naturally, some accretions to his biography. But the origin of these details remains in question.

The association of Tolosa with Burdigala and Narbo is easily answered. In Ausonius’ *Commemoratio professorum Burdigalensium*, we see a frequently occurring link between the three cities, such that all of Ausonius’ professors from Tolosa taught in Narbo and Burdigala. In 4.17, for example, a certain Exuperius, who was born and raised at Tolosa, became a *rhetor* in Narbo and then in Burdigala. Likewise in 4.19, Sedatus, also a *rhetor* from Tolosa, studied at Narbo and Rome (*Narbonem ac Romam nobilitat studiis*, 12), and eventually came to Burdigala.

---

126 We find notes on Statius’ education in the following *accessus* (thirteenth century) the Freiburg *accessus* edited below, Leiden, Gronov. 143 and Lips. 36; Wolfenbuttel, 228 Gud. lat. 40; and the *In principio accessus* edited below, (fourteenth century) Padova, Biblioteca del Seminario Vescovile, 56 and Wolfenbuttel, cod. Guelf. 146 Gud. lat. 20; (fifteenth century) Vaticano, Reg. lat. 1375 and Archivio di S. Pietro 15.

127 These details and their sparcity may be ultimately derived from the example of Servius, who named the cities where Virgil studied, with little elaboration (*ad Aen. 1 præf. 5-7*).

It seems likely to me that the author of this *accessus*, taking Servius as his model and noting from his reading of Ausonius the close academic association among the three cities, assumed that the same was the case with Statius. The only reason that Statius is reported to have studied at Burdigala and did not teach there is because Jerome-Eusebius' *Chronica* and the pre-existing scholarly tradition state that Statius taught at Tolosa.\(^{129}\)

This is more likely than de Angelis' attempts to see a lost tradition.\(^{130}\)

More problematic is the emphasis on Statius' family that we see in this century. As important a role as the family played in the *vitae* of most other authors, it seems to have had little importance for Statian scholars.

We find but two details about the poet's family here, that his father was named Papinius,\(^{131}\) and that his mother was *Agilina*,\(^{132}\) a name which is a *hapax legomenon*, being found, to my knowledge, only in the Statius biography. She, like her husband, is present in the *accessus* in name only, without details of how the two raised their poet-son; thus, her name does not seem to have its origin in some allegorical explanation. So, the name must arise from some other source.

---

\(^{129}\) We might note as well that Burdigala (through Ausonius) was famous for its universities and that at Narbo after the tenth century there was a famous Jewish university; there was never a reputable university at Tolosa. However, Virgilius Maro, the grammaticus, provides further evidence for the association of Tolosa with learning. He himself suggests that he came from Gaul (e.g. Ep. 3.8.4.203); according to Abbé Floracensis, he came from Tolosa; as the passage that Abbé cites is not part of Virgilius' extant works, its validity is difficult to prove (see A. Mai, *Classicorum auctorum e uaticinis codicibus editorum tomus V* [Vaticano, 1833], p. 349). Still, Virgilius' works flourished mostly in Aquitania and England (see A. Ernault, *De Virgilii Marone, Thesis facultati litterarum Parisiens* [Paris, 1886], p. 11), so his association with a Gallic tradition is plausible.

\(^{130}\) I should note that these details are lacking in the earliest witness of the *accessus*, that in København, Fab. 29.\(^{20}\) However, as that witness seems to be greatly re-written, we can take its testimony only as a suggestion.

\(^{131}\) This provides us with no problem. In several traditions, Statius' name Papinius (with various spelling variants) is explained as being derived from his father.

\(^{132}\) The actual name of Statius' mother is not transmitted, and this has led several scholars, among whom Pomponius Laetus (whose commentary is in Vaticano, Vat. lat. 3279), to preserve *Agilina*. In one instance, (Durham, N.C., Special Collections Library, Duke University, Latin ms. no. 90 [XV s. ex.]) we find the note: "*Plurique matrem eius Adam Gellinamuisse peribent.*" This likely stems from a confusion with *Agilina*, which the author, on the grounds of its unfamiliarity, sought to correct.
I find five possibilities for the origin of her name. First, that it was simply invented; second, that it was taken from a source that listed some Statius with his mother’s name (and perhaps his place of study) only, without mention of who he was or what he did; third, that there was a reference to a Statius Agyllinus\textsuperscript{133} or Statius de Agillina\textsuperscript{134} that has not been transmitted to us; or fourth, that her name arose from some confusion with Aquitania.\textsuperscript{135} None of these answers the question satisfactorily, and all present varying degrees of unlikelihood.\textsuperscript{136}

The fifth, and most likely possibility, is that the name arises from a confusion with Acilia, Lucan’s mother. A likely source for this confusion is the shorter version of the so-called Xicchonian Life:\textsuperscript{137}

\begin{center}
\textit{Lucanus patre Mella uiro non ignobili, matre uero Acilia uiragine natus est}
\end{center}

which bears a marked similarity to the \textit{In principio accessus} (15-6):

\begin{center}
nobili patre, scilicet Papinio, matre uero Agilina.\textsuperscript{138}
\end{center}

Still, whatever the source of these new details may be, it is important to note that they remain markedly sparse, and suggest that, in the case of Statius, the work was much more important than the man.

\textsuperscript{133}Agyllinus (the adjectival form of Agylla, the ancient name for Caere) occurs in the Aeneid (7.652 and 8.478, \textit{inter al.}), Martianus Capella (6.642), Silius Italicus (5.17, although the \textit{Punica} was mostly unknown before Poggio’s re-discovery), \textit{et al.}

\textsuperscript{134}Agillina as a variant for Agylla is attested in one manuscript of Servius, Vaticano, Reg. lat. 1674 (ad Aen. 10.183).

\textsuperscript{135}Cf. \textit{genere Aquitanus} in the Freiburg accessus (below, p. 82).

\textsuperscript{136}I lean against the first two possibilities because Agilina is such an uncommon name, occurring neither in the \textit{PRR}, the \textit{PRÉ}, nor the \textit{CIL}. The possibility that scholars had some inscription or short biography is also unlikely, as I can find no instance of a similar inscription or biography in medieval literature.


\textsuperscript{138}This relationship was first noted by R. Sabbadini, ("Giovanni Colonna biografo e bibliografo del sec. XIV," \textit{Atti della reale Accademia di Torino} 46 [1910-11], 846; cf. \textit{Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne’ secoli XIV e XV}, vol. 2, Biblioteca storica del Rinascimento, n.s. 4 [Firenze, 1914 (1967)], p. 55). De Angelis 1997.102 is uncomfortable with this explanation and notes, "la fonte di queste affermazioni mi è ancora ignota." The texts are so similar, that I have no doubt as to its origin.
3.1.1. The *In principio accessus* (Appendix A, sig. I; cf. In)\(^{139}\)

The most widely transmitted *accessus* to the *Thebaid* in the thirteenth-century (transmitted in 6 manuscripts, three of which are of French or English origin) is the lengthy *Glose super Statium Thebaidos* that precedes a commentary extant in various forms in at least 15 manuscripts. The Berlin and Leipzig witnesses provide us with possible authors. The former manuscript contains Anselm of Laon’s commentaries to Lucan and Virgil’s *opera*; in the library catalog, Rose attributed all of the commentaries to Anselm,\(^{140}\) but as there is no attribution at the beginning of the Statius commentary, it could simply be the case that a scribe added a different Statius commentary in an attempt to collect commentaries to the Latin epics. In the Leipzig manuscript, the title of the commentary reads, *Glose Statii Thebaidos Alberti*.\(^{141}\) In any case, the commentary is mostly a glossary to the *Thebaid* filled in with centos and extracts taken from the Lucan and Ovid commentaries of Arnulf of Orléans.

The *accessus* (and the commentary that accompanies it) is extant in a longer and a shorter version. Since the two differ only in wording and not in sources or interpretation, it seems to be the case that the shorter version is a recension of the longer one and not that the longer one is an expansion of the shorter. Since our oldest witness of the commentary, the Leipzig witness (end of the twelfth century), transmits the shorter version, this recension was made at an early age. Further, the earliest witness of the *accessus*, that in

\(^{139}\)I am borrowing the name from D. Anderson’s attempts at classifying the commentary that follows the *accessus*. See his “Boccaccio’s Gloses on Statius,” *Studi sul Boccaccio* 22 (1994) 3-134. See also de Angelis 1997.

\(^{140}\)V. Rose, *Verzeichniss der lateinischen Handschriften*, vol. 2,3, Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin, 13 (Berlin, 1905), pp. 1304-8 [1306-8]

\(^{141}\)There is a mark between *Thebaidos* and *Alberti* that D. Anderson interpreted as an *et*. I believe that the mark is the remnant of an initial-stroke from the parent manuscript, since I can find no parallel title in any other commentary. The identity of this *Albertus* is still a question. A guess is that it refers to *Albertus*, the third Vatican mythographer (see C. Landi, “Di un commento medievale inedito della *Tebaid* di Stazio,” *Atti e memorie del R. Accademia di scienze, lettere ed arti in Padova*,” 30 [1914] 326-8); some scholar, noting the relationship between the two texts, likely made the attribution.
København (twelfth century), transmits a heavily abbreviated text and preserves readings found in both the longer and the shorter versions; for example in lines 63-7, the longer version (BFN) reads: 142

*quid contigerit illis duobus pessimis fratribus, scilicet Ethiocli et Polinici, qui tarta regni cupiditate exarserunt quod se mutuis uulneribus interfecerunt, isti a consimili scelere desistant (abstineant F)*

and the shorter (LU):

*huius rei exitu, isti a simili scelere se abstineant.*

In the København witness (℅), we find:

*quid inde duobus fratribus contigerit, fratres isti a simili errore abstineant.*

However, ℏ also preserves several readings that are not transmitted in either version, such as *cuiuslibet* for *uniuscuiusque* (1), and as such provides us with an interesting problem.

Many of the variants in ℏ that are not found in the other manuscripts are attested in later re-writings of this accessus (for example, the fifteenth-century manuscript Vaticano, Reg. lat. 1375, 140r-141r, which begins "*In principio cuiuslibet auctoris et maxime hystoriographi, quinque sunt inquirenda...*". ℏ, then, appears to be both an intermediary between the two versions and also a re-writing of the accessus with affinities to the parents of F and B. 143 The testimony of ℏ is thus at best ancillary, and cannot be used as more than a support for readings found in the other manuscripts.

The *In principio accessus* itself adheres to Servius in form, and expands his catalog to ten *circumstantiae*: *uita poete, titulus operis, qualitas carminis, intentio scribentis, modus tractandi, materia, finalis causa, quo genere stili utatur, quem actorem imitetur, and cui parti philosophie supponatur*. The *uita* is then subdivided to include

---

142 I have underlined the words in common with the København witness.
143 It is for this reason that I use a fracture letter to designate it.
questions about Statius’ character, origin, and education (a quibus originem duxerit, quibus exitterit moribus, unde sit natus, quando et ubi studuerit, 11-4).\(^{144}\)

The details given as to Statius’ origo, natio, and educatio are scanty, as I noted above. What receives the greatest weight are the unexpressed question, quando and a lengthy catalog of Statius’ mores. The circumstantia quando is answered by the sentence, studuit autem tempore Vespasiani et Titi filii eius, peruenitque ad imperium Domitiani, qui minor Titus dictus est (18-9), which is only slightly modified from the Quaeritur accessus (q.v. 2-4), the only noteworthy alteration being studuit in the place of fuit frueisse.

The catalog of mores provides us with a succinct view of the judgment to Statius in that century (19-24):

> Fuit autem morum honestate preditus, acris intelligentie, tenacis memorie, clarus ingenio, doctus eloquio, liberalium artium scientia feliciter eruditus. Fuit adeo nimie facundie ut de eo meminerit Iuuenalis....

The parallels with the Quaeritur accessus are apparent, both in the repetition of the assessments, clarus ingenio and doctus eloquio, and in the rephrasing of the line, cuius Iuuenalis sic meminit dicens, (Quaeritur accessus, 8), but we also see a continued emphasis on Statius as doctus and doctor. Here, he is endowed with a strong moral character (he is firmus contra uiciu et fortune biformes euenus, 40-1), as well as with wisdom and a keen memory; he is modest, and, most importantly, he is well versed in the liberal arts. Juvenal’s assessment is then repeated, here with some variants unattested in the standard editions of Juvenal.

The accessus goes on to tell us, after a discussion of Statius’ popularity, that he was the most popular and favorite poet, second to Virgil.\(^{145}\) This is followed by a

---

\(^{144}\)We find the same expanded catalog in the fifteenth-century accessus to Ovid’s Ars in Napoli, BNC, V D.52, which begins similarly: “In principio huius auctoris, cuius iama propter operum diversitatem late circumserunt est, quatuor inquirenda sunt, scilicet unde duxit originem, quibus parentibus ortum habuerit, ubi et quando studuit et quomodo uixerit...” (Ghisalberti 1947.58-59).

\(^{145}\)The R version reads preter Virgilium. This may actually be a misunderstanding of the abbreviation ρΠ (post) resulting in ρΙ.
confusing assessment which has some textual problems. In the shorter recension, the text reads (28-37):

\[ Vnde \ et \ dictus \ est \ Cursulus \ quia \ secundum \ inter \ poetas \ locum \ tenuit \ et \ sauorem \ populi \ obtinuit \ et \ ultimus \ apud \ Romam \ declamavit. \ Satira \ enim \ non \ solebat \ recitari. \]

The longer recension reads (28-37):

\[ Vnde \ etiam \ sortitus \ est \ hoc \ nomen \ Sursulus \ quasi \ Surculus, \ id \ est, \ sursum \ canens, \ eo \ quod \ post \ Virgilium \ inter \ ceteros \ poetas \ principatum \ obtinuit \ et \ popularem \ adeptus \ est \ sauorem. \ Nemo \ enim \ post \ eum \ declamavit, \ [sed \ opponitur \ quod \ lauenalis \ et \ multi \ ali \ post \ eum \ fuerunt. \ Ergo \ multi \ post \ eum \ declamauerunt. \ Non \ sequitur.] \ Satira \ enim \ non \ solebat \ recitari. \]

Based on the shorter recension and on its contradictory nature, the passage *sed opponitur* through *non sequitur* is likely an interpolation, and I have thus bracketed it. However, if we remove this passage, we are left with the verbs *declamare* and *recitari* linked by *enim*. Grammatically, this would suggest an equation between the two verbs, which is unparalleled and stylistically awkward. Further, it is only the last phrase, *Satira...recitari*, that has parallels in other *accessus*; but based on these parallels, there must be a lacuna before the phrase. The *accessus* in London, Royal, 15.A.XXIX, for example,\(^{147}\) notes that Statius is among the *Simplicium poetarum* (39). An interpolated note explains this (39-40):

\[ Quod \ autem \ simpliciter \ sit \ poeta \ patet. \ Non \ enim \ est \ satiricus, \ nec \ historiographus, \ nec \ comicus \ et \ cetera. \]

Likewise, the *accessus* to Lucan edited by Huygens (pp. 39-44), says that Lucan "*est etiam historicus et tamen satyricus*" (146-7); Arnulf of Orléans counters this last opinion and gives us a better view of the concept (*Accessus in Lucanum* 4.6).\(^{148}\)

---

\(^{146}\) This passage is not transmitted in the S witness.

\(^{147}\) I treat this *accessus* further below, p. 84.

\(^{148}\) This *accessus* is discussed in depth in B. Marti, *Arnulfii aurelianensis Glossule super Lucanum*, Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, 18 (Rome, 1958), pp. XXXVII-XXVIII.
Sicut Iuvenalis purus est satiricus, Terencius purus comedus, 
Horacius in odis purus liricus, non est iste poeta purus, sed poeta et 
historiographicus. Nam historiam suam prosequitur et nichil fingit, 
unde poeta non simpliciter dicitur, sed poeta et historiographicus. 
Nam si aliquid ficticii inducit, non ex sua parte sed ex aliorum hoc 
inducit, apponit enim uel ut perhibent, uel ut ducunt, uel ut 
memorant.

Both of these interpretations of Lucan are rare in the accessus to Lucan; most of the 
scholars argued that Lucan was not poeticus, but historicus.\textsuperscript{149} This idea may be behind 
the assignation historiographi (1) here in our accessus.

What I suspect is occurring in our passage is that with the phrase 
nemo...declamauit, the scribe wished to explain Statius’ rhetorical abilities; this may 
originally have been a marginal note to docuit (17) or to historiographi (1). The last 
phrase, satira...recitari, is probably part of a discussion of his popularem fauorem, and is 
likely dependent on some lacuna after fauorem (32). We should remember, however, that 
in medieval traditions, Juvenal first delivered speeches (declamauit) and then moved to 
writing satire.\textsuperscript{150}

The interpretation of the Thebaid begins at line 56 with a discussion of the 
intentio. The first intentio is a repetition of the intentio that we saw in abundance in the 
twelfth century, that Statius wished to keep the imperial brothers from squabbling. But 
here, the author advances on his predecessors and explains why this cannot be the case. 
First, Titus was already dead when Statius began his epic (ll. 79-80); second, there is no 
point at which Statius directly advises or chastises the brothers (l. 80).

\textsuperscript{149}See E.M. Sanford, "Lucan and his Roman critics," CP 26 (1931) 233-57. The locus classicus of 
the debate is in Isidorus, Etymologiae 8.7.10: "Officium autem poetae in eo est ut ea, quae verum gesta 
sunt, in alias species obliquus figurationibus cum decore aliquo conversa transducatur. Unde et Lucanus 
ideo in numero postarum non ponitur, quia videtur historias compositisse, non poema."

\textsuperscript{150}Vita Juvenalis (in P. Wessner, ed., Scholia in Juvenalem vetustiora [Leipzig, 1931], p. 1.3-4): 
"...ad medium fere aetatem declamavit...."
The second, and more likely intentio is that Statius, after hearing of the rewards poets were receiving at Rome, came to the city and, after long considering a theme, decided that he would bring back the long-forgotten myth of Thebes. This is an important step in interpretation, as the poem takes on a less political and rather a more individual context, that is, Statius does not write so much for the emperor, but for all readers; likewise, the work takes on a relevance for the "modern" reader.

There are, later in the accessus, two intentiones (here labelled fines), the first of which is "Ethiociis et Poliniciis bellum describere" (94), that is, to tell the story. The second intentio, here labeled the finis ad quem tendit or finalis causa (103), is again more geared toward the private reader, "ne tale aggrediamur officium per quod simile incurramus periculum" (104-6). These are essentially the same as the first intentio, in which Titus and Domitian were urged not to engage in fraternal warfare, but here adapted more to the individual reader.

The final noteworthy aspect of this accessus is the attribution of the poem to political philosophy, not just the usual ethical genre. As political philosophy is explained as "scientia que ad regnum civitatum est necessaria" (114), it is likely that the author had some sort of "mirror for princes" in mind, but that is difficult to prove, as this is the only instance of such an attribution.

The manuscripts of this accessus are divided into two families, the first, which is descended from the α hyperarchetype, preserves the order of the questiones (for the most

---

151 This detail may be partially based on Thebaid 1.3-4: "Pierius menti calor incidit, unde iubetis ire, deae" or on 12.811, "o mihi bissexos nullum vigilata per annos".

152 Cf. the twelfth-century Bern-Burney accessus (above, p. 33) ll. 19-20.

153 Another version of a poet coming to Rome is found in the accessus in the P commentary to Juvenal (Lofstedt 217.7-13): "Juvenalis iste natus de Aquitanie opido tempore Neronis Romam venit, vidensque Faridem pantherinum ita famiariem imperator, ut nihil unquam nisi eius natus ageret... ad satiram scribendum se transulit."

154 Cf. the accessus-fragment in Zürich, Rh. 53 (XII s.), Intentio eius dissuadere fraternum odio ne tale incurramus periculum; cf. as well Arnulf of Orléans, Glosule super Lucanum, 3.15-8: uiso quid contigerit utrique de ciuili bello... causamus nobis a bello consimili.
part), throughout the text. The β family, on the other hand, places the *quo genere stili utatur* after the *qualitas carminis*. This second family is the poorer and seems to represent attempts at re-writing or, in the case of the hypoarchetype γ, heavy abbreviation.

There are two possible stemma, based on the relation of F. We can either see F as a descendant from both α and β, thus:

![Figure 3.1: Possible Stemma of the *In principio accessus*](image)

or as an intermediary between Ω and the β families:

![Figure 3.2: Stemma of the *in principio accessus*](image)

---

155 The *circumstantiae* are listed in the order *vita, titulus, qualitas, intentio, modus, materia, finalis causa, stilus, imitatio, and philosophia*. They are answered in the order *vita, titulus, qualitas, intentio, materia, finalis causa* (note that it is the shorter version that preserves this reading; the longer reads *finis*), *stilus, philosophia*, and *imitatio*.
Glose super Statium Thebaidos

**BFNÑ**


**LU**

*Que uita poete, titular operis, qualitas carminis, intentio scribentis, modus tractandi, materia, finalis causa, cui partii philosophie supponatur uideamus*

15 *Legitur itaque auctor iste ciuis Tholosanus extitisse, nobili patre, scilicet Papinio, matre uero Agilia. Burdeali et Nerbone studuit et in Gallia retkoricam celeberrime docuit. Tandem Romam se transtulit, ubi hoc opus compossuit. Studuit autem tempore Uespasiae et Titi filii eius, peruenitque usque ad imperium Domitiani, qui minor Titus dictus est. Fuit*

**BFNÑ**

*igitur morum honestate preditus,*

**LU**

*autem uite honeste*

(continued)

**Text 3.1: The *In principio accessus* to the *Thebaid* (Appendix A, sig. I; cf. In)**
Text 3.1 (continued)

acris intelligentie, tenacis memorie, clarus ingenio, doctus eloquio,

BFN\textsuperscript{\textregistered} \qquad \textbf{LU}

liberalium artium scientia feliciter eruditus. Fuit adeo nimie facundie ut de eo meminerit Iuuenalis, dicens: adeo ut cuius meminerit Iuuenalis:

25 Curritur ad uocem iocundam et carmen amice Thibaidos letam Stacius cum fecerit urbem, promisitque diem.

BFN\textsuperscript{\textregistered} \qquad \textbf{U}

Vnde etiam sortitus est hoc nomen

Vnde et dictus est
Cursulus quia secundum inter poetas locum tenuit et fauorem populi obtinuit

LU

et ultimus apud Romam declamavit.

Satira enim non solebat recitari.
Huius libri talis est titulus: Surculi Papinii Stacii Thibaidos liber primus incipit. Surculus ut prediximus dictus est quasi sursum canens, et est agnomen.

Papinii dictus est a patre et est cognomen, Stacius uero proprium nomen a statu uite sue sic dictus est. Erat enim firmus contra uicina et fortune biformes eventus, neque enim ea blandi cent efferebatur uel contumaci tonante tristis habebatur. Thibais Thebaidos femininum est patronicum nomen Thebani historie. Bene dicitur primus quia sequitur secundus. Sunt enim duodecim libri.

Liber dicitur quasi liberans a curis, uel liberum et expertem curarum expetens, vnde Iuuenalis:

Quis locus ingenio nisi cum se carmine solo
Vexaudit et dominis Cirre Niseque feruntur
Pectora nostra duas non admitencia curas?

Unde finxerunt philosophi duos deos esse poetarum, Bacum et Apollinem.

(continued)
Per Apollinem, sapientiam; per Bacum immuetur temporalium sufficienciam. "Incipit" et iam dicit quia nichil premiserat. Queritur quare tot nomina in titulo apponuntur. Respondemus ut per ea auctore commendato opus reddatur autenticum.

Qualitas carminis est metrum heroicum, et est metrum continens tam diuinam quam humanas personas, uera falsis admiscens.

Intentio Stacci in hoc opere est Thebanam describere historiam, cuius intentionis diuerse a diuersis cause assignantur. Quidam enim dicunt quod mortuo Uespasiano, filii eius Titus et Domitianus in tantam regni cupiditatem exarserunt ut fratermale odio incurrerent. Ad quorum dehortationem auctor iste Thebanam proposit e describere historiam et secundum hanc causam talis erit huius intentionis utilitas, ut uiso

BFNŚ

quid contigerit illis duobus pessimis fratribus, scilicet Ethioci et Polinici, qui tanta regni cupiditate exarserunt quod se mutuis uulneribus interfecerunt, isti a consimili scelere desistant. Verum qui hoc dicunt ex Suetonio hoc habere uidentur, qui in libro De duodecim Cesaribus inter cetera de Tito dicit, fratrem suum Domicianum insidiari uite sue desistere nolentem, exercitus aduersus se excitantem, tamen noluisse, cum posset occidere, neque seponere, neque in minori honore quam cepisset habere; sepe autem rogare ut apud se mutua dilectione teneretur, sequat sucesseorem suum in regno promittere. Alii uero considerantes

LU

huius rei exitu,

isti a simili scelere se abstineant. Et qui hoc dicunt ex Suetonio De duodecim Cesaribus hoc habere uidentur, qui de Tito dicit quod ei frater suus insidias moliri solebat.

Et similiter alii dicunt

80 quia Tito iam mortuo et Domiciano iam regnum adepto, Stacius hoc opus incepit, et ita nullum esse dehortationis locum, hanc premissa causam intentionis assignat, dicentes quia cum tempore Domiciani (continued)
Romanam undique poetas confluere
Staciurn audierat, ibique ad maximos honores proelii, tandem Romam uenit et qualiter populo Romano et imperatoris placere posset diu apud se excogitauit.
Denique animum suum aplicuit ut Thebanam historiam pre nimia annorum ueturitate iam pene dependitam describendo ad memoriam reuocaret, sicque imperatoris et populo Romano placeret.

Intentio auctoris est Ethioclis et Poliniciis bellum describere cum utriusque partis fautonibus. Modus tractandi tripartitus est:
quia nunc historiam tangit, nunc figmento subseruit poetico, nunc scripto utitur allegorico.
Materia est Ethioclis et Polinices et acies utriusque confecete, vel, ut uerbis auctoris utamur, "Oedipode confusa domus", scilicet crudelis Edipus, matri Ioacis corrutor, Laï patris interfector; Ethioclis et Polinices, ceci patris contemtones, qui regni cupiditate cecati <se> mutuis uulneribus ceciderunt.

Ethice supponitur per politicam, quia nobis informat morum doctrinan. Ethice autem due sunt partes, economica, qua proprie dispensamus famile (economicus enim dispensator interpretatur), <et politica>. Politica est scientia que ad regnum ciuitatum est
Text 3.1 (continued)

necessaria (polis enim ciuitas interpretatur).

BFNUŚ

115 Quem auctorem imitetur ipse docet in fine, vbi dicit, "Vive precor nec tu duinam Eneida tempta, sed longe sequere et uestigia semper adora." Per hoc innuens se imitari Virgilium,

120 optimum Latinorum. Scribit autem ad laudem Domitianì imperatoris, non quia Thebana historia ad eum quicquam pertineat, sed dicit se in hoc opere suum preauere ingenium ut postmodum ad fortia eius facta describenda ualeat sufficer. Dicit itaque, "Tempus erit cum laurigero tua fortior oesto facta canam".

L

Imtitatur autem Virgilium, unde in fine, "precor uine" et cetera.

Scribit autem ad laudem Domitianì non quia hec ad eum pertinet historia,

sed ut ingenium suum peracuat et acutius reddat in sua facta describenda vnde "Tempus erit" et cetera.

130 Item in opere Achilleidos ad ipsum promisit dicens, "Magnusque tibi preludit Achilles". Sed quod et hic et ibi promiserat morte preuentus exibere non potuit.

Auctor iste Thebanam scripturam historiam more aliorum recte scribentium proponit, inuocat, narrat. Proponit ubi dicit "Fraternal naces" et cetera. Invocat ubi diuinum implorat auxilium, ut ibi, "Unde iubetis ire dee". Narrat ubi lectionem suam inchoat ibi scilicet, "Impia iam merita scrutatus lumina dextra" et cetera.

His iam decursis que extrinsecus erant dicenda, ad litteram exponendum accedamus.

2 Seruius| ad Aen. 1.praef.1-3
15 nobili...Aquilina (16) cf. vitam Lucani Xiechonianam contractam, Lucanus patre Mella uiro non ignobili, mater uero Acilia uiragine natus est (ed. Hummel, Nova bibliotheca 1.153-6; et C. F. Weber, Vitae M. Annaei Lucani collectae III, Indices lectionum... in Academia Marburgensi, 1858], p. 17)
16 Burdegaldi...studuit] cf. Servius ad Aen. 1.praef. 6-7: nam et Cremonae et Mediolani et Neapoli studuit.
25-7 Juv. Sat. 7.82-4

(continued)
Text 3.1 (continued)

30 post...obtinuit (31)] cf. Huguccio Pisanus, s.v. sursum
47-9 Juv. Sat. 7.63-5
50-1 cf. schol. B in Juv. (ed. Löfstedt 110), ad 7.63: In Cirra colitur Apollo, per quem
designatur sapiencia; in Nisa Bachum, per quem notatur sufficiencia.
62 uiso...consimilis (63)] cf. Arnulfi Aurelianensis accessum in Lucanum, 3.15-8: uiso quid
contigerit utrique de viili bello, uidelicet et Pompeio capite truncari, Cesari...
perforari, caueamus nobis a bello consimilis.
71-8 Suet. Titus 9.3, rectus
98 Theb. 1.17
102 uisis...periculum (105)] cf. Zürich, Rh. 53 (XII s.), intentio eius dissuadere
fratrum odium ne tale incurramus periculum.
102 uiso...caueamus (104)] cf. Arnulfi Aurelianensis Glosule, loc. cit.
106 tria...grandiloquum] Servius ad Aen. 1. praef. 82-3
116-8 Theb. 12.816-7
126-8 Theb. 1.32-3
129-30 Ach. 1.19
133 Theb. 1.1
134 Theb. 1.3-4
135 Theb. 1.46

65 intentio] uel nutrire ingenium suum in hac (?) nostra ut fortior sit ad facta Domitiani
describenda. add. marg. N (cf. accessum in Vaticano, Reg. lat. 1375, 21-2)
68 materia] uel Thebana historia. Utilitas est notitia (fabularum, del.) ystorie; ethice
supponitur uel morali scientie. Omnes enim auctores spectant ad mores. add.
marg. N (cf. accessum in Vaticano, Reg. lat. 1375, 23-5)
133 proponit] ubi materiam suam prelibat add. sup. lin. N (cf. inter al., Vat. lat. 1663, ll.
18-9)
134 narrat] ubi materiam suam incipit explanare add. sup. lin. N (cf. ibid.)

Inscr. L : Super Stacium Thebaidos N : Glose Statti Thebaidos Alberti Liber Primus
Incipit L : Stacius thebaidos R : om. BF 1 cuislibet R 2 ut...testatur om. R
hec...iudicantur (3) ista sunt inquirenda R 3 dilligenter investiganda (inquirenda B) BF
iudicantur] sunt F operis] auctoris U 4 qualitas carminis om. B R 5 tractandi]
materiei F materia om. U 6 uideamus om. U 7 utitur...imitatur B 9 quodlibet R
eo...exequamur (10) pro posse suo ordine prosequamur R 13 circa...studuerit om. R
11 digna queri F 12 duxit FN 13 moribus extiterit BF 13 vnde...natus post
perhibemus (11) pos. F quando] quid N quando...studuerit (14)] vbi et quando
studuerit post duxerit (12) pos. F studuit N 15 itaque om. BLU quod post itaque

(continued)
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et...metrum om. LU et...admissens] quod conuenit historiographis R. heroicum post
a diuersis om. LU ac uarie post diusere add. R. assignatur cause BLURR
quidam...quod (44) om. LU dictum enim quidam R. enim om. B 59 enim post
mortuo add. U filius R. filii post Dominianus pos. L eius om. L Titus et Domitius
post Uespasiano pos. L regni imperii F : uel imperii add. sup. lin. R. 60 cupiditatem
post tantam (59) pos. B exsererunt cupiditatem LU ut] quod N iam post ut add. F
fraternal] serale F : etiam horribile R. quorum] cuius LURR : quam rem N
BFLU : scriptit R et...utilitas (62) om. LURR 62 erit] est post utilitas pos. B 63 qui
B contigerit...desistit (67)] inde duobus fratibus contigerit, fratres isti a simili errore
abstinent R. pessimis om. B 64 scilicet...Politicimi om. B Ethiciori scilicet F ex
post qui add. F 65 imperii BF exsererunt cupiditate B exsererunt quod om. F
66 sese BF uulneribus post interfecerunt (interfecer F) pos. BF et post interfecerunt
verum...promittere (78) om. R. se abstinent] absterrenunt U 68 hoc2 om. BF
uidentur habere FN 69 scripto post cesaribus add. U hec U uidentur] dicere L
70 de...dicit] de tito et domiciano agit, de tito B 71 Domicianum ante fratrem pos. B
insidiari post sue (72) pos. B 72 nolentem desistere B exercitum B 73 excitatem
suscitat F nomiisse tamen BF 74 com N cum posset] eum post fe S
neque...neque (75)] nec...nec B 76 se om. N mutua apud se B 77 delactione F
78 successorem suum] suum fere successorem BF 79 ali aliter dicunt R. similia LU
80 quia...assignant (82) om. R. iam1 om. BFLU et om. U regnum imperium BF
regnun adepto] regnante LU opus hoc F 81 incohauit LU : composuit B et ita|
itaque BF et...assignant (82]) nota quod non stat prima sententia U : sed quod Statius
prima sententia L dehortacionis locum esse B premissam B 82 intencionis causam
F dicentes] dicunt ergo LU : dicunt etiam R. cum] in BFN imperatoris post
Domicianus add. BF 83 Romam...audierat] Staciis uident poetas romanum vadique
confluentes R : Romanum undique confluer poetas audierat Staciis B Rome U
confluere om. L. Staciis om. F (add. marg, man. rec.) 84 et ibi R. itaque BF eos
post ibique add. F maximas prouehi dignitates R 85 eos post honores add. N ipse
post tandem add. BF (et ipse R) habendum L. 86 quomodo B romano populo R
et...repet. N. et imperatori : om. B R principis] populi U expetens L. 87 possit
F diu om. R. excogitatum N demum R 88 animum...deperditam (90)] ad
thebanam historiam describendam per vetustatem pene disperditam animum applicit R
appulit BF suum...hane (90)] et ad hanc precipue appulit U 89 pro(uel) persimia F
scribendum L 90 iam ante preminia (89) pos. B et eam ante describendo add. R
describendo om. B populo post describendo add. R (et?) ante ad add. N
91 sicque] et...romano (92) om. R.

(continued)
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Text 3.1 (continued)

3.1.2. The Freiburg *accessus* (Appendix A, sig. F)

With the exception of the *In principio accessus*, the remaining *accessus* of the thirteenth century are extant in one or two manuscripts only, but represent the same interest in Statius' origin that I mentioned above.

One of the more interesting and problematic of these *accessus* is that found in Freiburg, Universitätsbibliothek, HS 375. Here the biography is essentially the same as we saw in the *In principio accessus*: as a child, Statius was well-versed in all of the arts (*omnia arcium peritus industria*, 3-4). He then decided to go to Rome, here in the hope of furthering his education. Once he noted the fame that the poets receive, he decided to study poetry and was then either asked or persuaded by the emperor to write the *Thebaid*. The problem with this *accessus* lies in its explanation of Statius' origin.

Statius, the *accessus* informs us, is an Aquitanian (*genere Aquitanus*, 1), born into the noble ranks of the city of Tolosa, which is a city on the west coast of *Lugdunensis Gallie* (2-3). Again, this confusion might suggest the presence of a second, poorly-represented tradition, but I believe that that is not the case. Tolosa was certainly not in Aquitania during Statius' life (although Burdigala was), but both Tolosa and Burdigala were in Aquitania after the tenth century AD. However, neither of these cities, and certainly not Narbo, was in Gallia Lugdunensis.

I suspect that the scribe made a series of geographical mistakes. The *accessus* is labeled *Vita Stacii Tolonensis*, which would suggest that the author confused Tolosa with Tullum (modern Toul). During the thirteenth century, Toul was in the Kingdom of the Lotharii, but during Statius' lifetime, was a part of Gallia Lugdunensis.\(^{156}\) It is unclear how the scribe, who was French, made this error; we have, however, seen similar confusion before, namely in the twelfth-century Bern-Burney *accessus* (above, p. 33).

\(^{156}\) Alternately, it may be the case that the scribe confused Tolosa's vicinity to Lugdunum Convenarum (modern Saint-Bertrand) with the provence of Gallia Lugdunensis.
There are two likely explanations for the placement of Tolosa "ad occidentalem plagam sita." The author either made the error of adding Burdigala's geographical position to the muddle, or made the massive error of confusing Tolosa and Tullum with Telo (modern Toulon on the Côte d'Azur) and then, thinking Telo was in Gallia Lugdunensis, placed it on the Atlantic. Whatever the case may be, I believe that the author simply tried to adapt what little information about Statius there was to his or her confused view of historical Gaul.
Vita Stacii Tolonensis

Stacius Papinius Surculus genere Aquitanus nobili exortus prosapia inter primos ciuitum Tolosane vrbis. Est autem hec ciuitas Lugdunensis Gallie ad occidentalem plagam sita. Hic itaque ab ipsis ut ita dicam puerilibus annis omnium arcium peritus industria, apud plurimos eiusdem prouincie urbes rethoricam celeberrime docuit. Postea uero (nisi modicus) aptus desiderio uisendi studia, Romanorum urbe adire maturauit; ea namque tempestate Uespasianum Romani imperii monarchiam regere videbat. Dicitur autem iste philosophus tam diu inter Romam annos commorari, vsque ad imperium Domiciani fratris Tyti, qui etiam Tytus iunior dictus est. Considerans enim Romanorum proceres poetarum ad primum delec<nt>ari carminibus, sese omnino ad poetriam transtulit. Iussus ergo uel pocius crebris supra taxati imperatoris precibus exoratus, Thebanorum Grecorumque bella duodecim libellis per totidem annos describere studuit, quem codicem de Thebanorum gestis Thebais feminino genere, sicut Eneis et THESEIS, nominan[s] insticuit. Hunc etiam uisse clarum ingenio, doctum eloquio Iuvenalis famosissimus poeta carmine suo testatur dicens:

Currit ad uocem iocundam et carmen amice
Thebaidos letam Stacius cum fecerit urbem
Promisitque diem tanta dulcedine captos

Afficit ille animos, tantaque libidine uulgi
Auditur, sed cum fregit subsellia uersum
Esurit intactam Paridi in uendat Agauem.

Stacius autem dictus est nomine, Papinius uero cognomine, Surculus quippe quasi sursum canens.

15-24 cf. Quaeritur accessum, 7-18
17-22 Iuvenalis, Sat. 7.82-6
22 in uendat cf. Kraków, Muzeum Narodowe, Biblioteka Czartoryskich, 1876 II (XII-XIII s.), p. 215

6 uespasianus F 11 prime F 24 quia quasi subp. F

Text 3.2: The Freiburg accessus to the Thebaid (Appendix A, sig. F)
3.1.3. The *accessus* in London, BL, Royal, 15.A.XXIX (Appendix A, sig. R)

The *In principio accessus* presented us with the picture of Statius as a man of proper morals and of outstanding education. Both of these ideas achieve their widest expansion in the thirteenth century in an *accessus* that is found on a small scrap of parchment that forms the fourth folio of London, BL, Royal 15.A.XXIX.

In this *accessus*, Statius is first and foremost described as a *uir scientie* (5); the name *Surculus*, likewise, is explained as "*quasi surculus a surgendo, quia surgebat et crescebat in sua sapientia*” (11-2). The allegory of his name continues, further explaining *Surculus* as some sort of a root on which one stubs one’s toe,\(^{159}\) which the author explains as meaning that he is difficult to imitate (*Ita iste erat offendiculum emulari*, 13). The name Papinius is next explained as being derived from a supposedly Greek word, *pape*.\(^{160}\) Finally, the name Statius is explained as "*quasi stans dictus est ... stando enim in summò cacumine philosophie fuit*” (23-4). This is a common allegory that we first saw in the early-twelfth-century Oxford, Lincoln College 27 *accessus* (above, p. 51, lines 18-20). We also find it briefly mentioned in London, BL, Addit. 17408\(^{161}\) and Sankt-Florian, XI.587.\(^{162}\)

Two *intentiones* for the *Thebaïd* are given, one more intrinsic and textually-based, the other extrinsic and based on an interpretation of the text. In the first instance, Statius "*intendit ... comouere homines ad castitatem et concordium in probando eorum incesta scelerâ*” (24-6); in the second, Statius sought to describe "*bellum quod Ethiocoles et Polinices inter se gesserunt*” (32-3). That is, Statius intended to write a specific story, and also had a moral motivation.

\(^{159}\) The definition of *surculus* as a sort of root is a stretch from any of the standard lexical entries, and I have been unable to find a parallel etymology.

\(^{160}\) The etymology is also found in the Bern-Burney *accessus*, l. 46-7; see p. 31.

\(^{161}\) *Stacius dictus est a stando nam sitit in scientia maxima*.

\(^{162}\) *Dicitur Stacius quasi stans in bonis moribus quia bene morigatus fuerât*. 

83
Stacius iste tempore Uespasiani imperatoris dicitur fuisset, qui cum duos filios haberet, Titum scilicet et Domicianum, cum altero eorum Iudeam uerit. Dicitur etiam peruenisse usque ad imperium iunioris fratri, Domiciani scilicet, qui etiam Titus dictus est. Fuit equidem uir scientiae, nobilis genere, Tolosensis, quae ciuitas est Gallie, et in Gallia celeberrime didicit et docuit retoricam. A Domiciano quippe rogatus est ut de se scriberet, sed cum nichil dignum scriptu uideret, transtubit se ad aliam materiam, scilicet Thebanam historiam, faciens prologum excusatorium in quo honeste se excusat. Titulus talis est:


(continued)
Text 3.3 (continued)

40 patet. Non enim est satiricus, nec historiographus, nec comicus et cetera) *** in propositionem uero ostendit docilitatem principaliter, secundario atentionem, licet ubicumque unum at aliud. Invocatione autem reddit nos beniuolos, ubi dicit, ’Unde iubetis’ et cetera. Quicumque enim invocat se humiliat. Ex humilitate autem ipsa beneuolentia procedit.
45 Ad quam partem philosophie liber iste spectet satis patet, id est ad ethicam.

__________________________________________________________

12 Surculus...truncii cf. Huguccio Pisanus, s.v. sursum: unde hic surus, -ri, truncus qui remanet post abscisionem arboris.
14 pape...mirabilis cf. Remigius, Expositionem de celebratione misse (Migne, PL 101, col. 1257d; Bernensis-Burneius accessus, 46-7 (supra, 33)
39 simpliciter...historiographus (40) cf. Prisciani Partitiones Aeneidos 1.3 (GLK 3.459.23-4); cf. Arnulfi Aurelianensis Accessum in Lucanum, 4.4
41 docilitatem...beniuolos (43) cf. accessum in Disticha Catonis quem ed. Huygens (p. 21-2, ll. 16-7): premittit itaque prologum in quo nos attentos, dociles, beniuolos fieri desiderat.
43 Theb. 1.3

__________________________________________________________

15 Statius ex suaitus L 18 cognitio L 27 pacis L 41 ante in lacuna, continens tria facit, proponit, invocat, et narrat uel simile 45 spectet ex spectat
3.2. The *Achilleid* in the Thirteenth Century

In contrast to the small number of *accessus* to the *Thebaid* transmitted in thirteenth-century manuscripts, those to the *Achilleid* are more numerous, including three well-transmitted *accessus*. Still, in spite of this abundance, none of these *accessus* equals the broad advances made by the scholars on the *Thebaid* during the same century, and while re-writings and adaptations abound, the actual biography and interpretation of Statius make no advancement over the scholarship of the twelfth century. What we do find in these *accessus* is a growing distinction between the audiences of the *Thebaid* and *Achilleid*. In the *In principio accessus*, the author (in three of the manuscripts) referred to Statius as *historiographus*. In contrast, our first *accessus* to the *Achilleid* refers to Statius as *precipuus* (or, in the Escorial witness, *primus et principalis*) *inter libros scolasticos*. The driving force behind scholarship to the *Achilleid* in this century is not so much the interpretation of the poem (that was cemented in the previous century), but an increasing emphasis on the *Achilleid* as a school text. What we find, then, are more general *accessus* that include more scholastic information. Unfortunately, this results in longer *accessus* that have more to do with literature in general than they do with the *Achilleid* itself. A good example of this type is the *accessus* found in El Escorial, Real Biblioteca, f. III. 11, Leiden, Gronov. 66, and Wolfenbüttel, 292.2 Gud. lat., which I shall refer to as the Gronov. 66 *accessus*.

3.2.1. The Gronov. 66 *accessus* (Appendix A, sigg. G et E)

The beginning of this *accessus* bears a marked similarity to that of the *In principio accessus* (cf. above, p. 71, l. 1-3):

*In principio huius auctoris, qui est precipuus inter libros scolasticos,*

---

163 In addition to the late-twelfth-century *In principio accessus* (above, p. 70) and *accessus* directly related to it, he is also referred to as *istoriografus* in Kraków, Muzeum Narodowe, Biblioteka Czartoryskich, 1876 II (XII-XIII s.), p. 216.
Aside from the immediate change from *historiographus* to *precipius inter libros scolasticos*, the major difference between the two *accessus* is the absence of the rubrics *uita poete* and *intentio scribentis* that played so prominent a role in the *In principio accessus*; the adaptation of the list of *circumstantiae* reflects this more general approach to the *Achilleid*.

The Gronov. 66 *accessus* is, at heart, a very brief discussion of the text, filled in and rounded out by a lengthy series of literary lists: in 7-12, the author lists the *tres stili scribendi* (6-12); tells of Achilles' genealogy (within a discussion of the myth of Peleus, combined with a lengthy discussion of the names *Amphitrides* and *Theis*) (14-25); he then continues with a discussion of the *titulus* (26-32; cf. 13), which is followed by an explanation of the *duo ordines scribendi* (33-44). These lists are all only loosely connected to the text at hand, and reflect, in my opinion, an introduction to literature in general more than to the text of the *Achilleid*.

The most worthwhile development in this *accessus* occurs in the *pars philosophiae*. Now, as we see in other *accessus*, fictional literature is usually relegated to the *ethica pars philosophiae*.\(^{164}\) There are, of course, occasional instances where a scholar will find some other reason why the poem is labeled *ethica*;\(^{165}\) in this case, the scholar applies the *Achilleid* to the *ethica pars* because of its implied didactic nature (69-72):

> *Ethice id est morali scientie subponitur, nam intentio sua est ut nos per uirtues Achillis informet ad uirtutes et doceat nos uitare desidiam et torporem.*

There is one more feature of this *accessus* that is worth noting. When we peel the grammatical lists and the other superfluous information away, the *accessus* is rather thin.

---


\(^{165}\) Cf. the early-twelfth-century *accessus* in Oxford, Lincoln College, lat. 27 (above, p. 51), ll. 56 ff.
As a result, an interpolating hand in the Escorial witness has expanded the *accessus*, taking material from the twelfth-century *Universitatis bruxellensis accessus* (above, p. 56), from the parent of the *accessus* in Vaticanno, Pal. lat. 1695,\(^{166}\) and from a common *periocha*\(^{167}\) to fill out the information. As we shall see below, re-writing and borrowing will be an important aspect of *accessus* to the *Achilleid* in this and the later centuries.

\(^{166}\)See above, p. 55. The Pal. lat. 1695 *accessus* itself is based on the original version of the Gronov. 66 *accessus* (cf. its incipit, "Donicianus quidam Romanus imperator," with line 47), as well as on the *Universitatis bruxellensis accessus*, from which it preserves many passages that are not transmitted in the Gronov. 66 *accessus*. It is difficult to say, then, whether the Escorial witness of our text influenced the author of the Pal. lat. 1695 *accessus* or *vice versa*.

\(^{167}\)This *periocha* is found in an *accessus* in Paris, BnF, lat. 8559 (XIII s.), the København *accessus* (XII s. ex.) (above, p. 46), Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Lips. 36 (XIII/XIV s.), Düsseldorf, Landes- und Stadtbibliothek, K2: F.50 (XIV s.), *inter alia*.

88
In principio huius auctoris, qui est precipuus inter libros scolasticos, plura sunt inquienda, scilicet titulus operis, materia carminis, qualitas metri, quo stilo auctor utatur, cui parti philosophiye supponatur. Titulus operis talis est: Incipit Statius Achilleidos, id est Staciús de historia Achilles. Nomen itaque istius auctoris Statius est. Qui Statius doctissimus poetarum in libris suis ita solebat uti grandiloquous stilo, id est, difficili modo scribendi. Nam tres sunt stili, id est modi scribendi, scilicet humilis, mediocris, grandiloquous. Humilis stilo utitur Virgilius in Bucolicis, mediocris in Georgicis, grandiloquos in Eneide. Hoc itaque stilo usus est autur iste. Et dicitur grandiloquos quasi grandia loquens, siue pro eo quod habet difficilem modum scribendi; siue quod de grandibus personis, id est, de personatis tractatum habeat. Sic itaque intelligendum est hoc nomen Statius Achilleidos.


(continued)
Text 3.4 (continued)

facta est, ut in Statio Thebaidos et in Sedulio et in Aratore. Artificialis autem ordo est quando ea que primo describi debeant ad tempus differuntur, et postmodum apte introductur, ut in Eneide et in hoc libro Stacii, nam in hoc libro primo describitur qualiter Achilles a matre deliberato consilio translatus sit timore Troiani belli in insulam Chiro in aulaem Licomedi. Postea in fine apte et competenter aduentitur de infantia ipsius Achilles, ipso Achille per ordinem referentia Vlixii et sociis suis uirtutes et facta sue infantiae. Et scienud ipsum Statium morte preuentum hoc opus consumare non potuisse. Causa quare Statius hunc librum conscrisit talis est: Domitianus quidam imperator Romanus uidens hunc Statium doctum esse poemat. roguit ipsum sua facta uelle describere, *sciens quod librum Thebaidos bene scripsit*. Sed quia idem Domitianus nichil dignum memoria exercuerat, iste Statius callide se excusavit, dicens se non presumere facta tanti principis describere, *neque suo ingenio confidens*, rogauitque ipsum Domitianum ut licentiam sibi daret describere prius facta Achillis *ut in talu preludio suum animum acueret* et sic ingenio suo in hoc opere preceptato dicebat se postmodum laudes Domitiani describere, sicut in hoc uersiculo demonstratur: "Magnisque tibi preludii Achilles." *Et sic Statius hunc librum nomine Achilleidos componere cepit, unde historia facta sunt de Achille.

Materia carminis est uirtus Achillis et Thetidis. Qualitas metri est sicut solet fieri in heroico carmine, uersus tantum exametri. Stilo uititur utiam diximus grandiloquio. *Intentio sua est dehortari quemlibet ne contrarie uelit dispositioni fatorum, cui nitebatur Thetis contrahire*. Vel *intentio eius est animum suum ad exercitia reddere in hoc libro ut facta Domitianis regis, sicut rogatus fuit ab eo, digne possit describere. Domitianus et Titus filii erant Vespasiani. Mortuo vero Domitiano, facta eius inscripta manserunt. Utilitas est ne diuine dispositioni contrahire nitanur, uel utilitas puellis est eruditio et bone discipline exercitatio. Ethice id est morali scientie subponitur, nam intentio sua est ut nos per uirtutes Achillis inuenem ad uirtutes et doceat nos uitar desidiam et torporem.

Pandet itaque istis premissis, nunc ad prolegum libri transeamus. *Prolegum facti in hoc in quo proponit de quo tractaturus sit; invocat suam Musam et Apollinem; excusat se erga Domitianum* (continued)
quae facta sua non inceperit scribere. Liber iste in V volumina
distinguitur. In primo legitur de sollicitudine Thetidis, in secundo de
absconsione Achillis, in terto de aquisitione Grecom, in quarto de
inventione Achillis, in quinto de eductione eius in Troiam ubi perit.
His nusis ad litteram accedamus. Iste itaque auctor more aliorum
poetarum primo proponit, postea invocat, deinde narrat. Proponit ubi
dicit "Magnanimum", invocat ubi dicit "Tu modo", narrat ubi dicit
"solverat" et cetera.

7 nam...Eneide (9)] cf. Servius ad Aen. 1 praef. 81-3
20-1 Ovid, Met. 1. 14
23-4 Met. 2. 509
49 sciens...scripserit] accessus in Pal. lat. 1695, l. 3
52 non...ingenio] ibid., l. 3
57 Ach. 1. 19
62 intentio...contrahire (64)] Accessus universitatis bruxellensis, ll. 2-4
64 vel...mansurunt (67)] ibid., ll. 19-23
68 utilitas...exercitatio (69)] cf. ibid., ll. 25-6
76-9 cf. periocham in Paris, BnF, lat. 8559 (XIII s.), Köbenhavn accessu, Leiden,
Bibliothek der Rijksunisveriteit, Lips. 36 (XIII/XIV s.), Düsseldorf, Landes-
und Stadtbibliothek, K2: F. 50 (XIV s.), inter al.

1 precipuus] primus et principalis E 2 scilicet om. L S (?) post operis habet E
3 stilu] titulu W 4 Stacius post id est om. E id...Achillis (5) om. W 5 istius] huius
L : om. W est Statius W Statius (post qui) om. W in post qui Statius subparax. E
6 ita om. E uti om. L 7 stili...modi] modi et stili W scribentium L scilicet om.
EL 8 el om. W 9 autem post grandiloquio add. L 10 quod post siue add. E
11 habet] habeant post modum pos. W difficilem habet L loquendi uel scribendi E
12 id est] seu W uiiris post personatis add. L 13 id est post Achilleodos add. E fuit
filius EW 14 fuit filius EW fuit post frater om. W 14 Thetidem in coniugium (15)
W 16 compulsus L 17 magni EL 18 Amphitrites L id...ab (19)] et dicitur W
19 amb] an L -ris post tero add. L et...Amphitrides om. W 20 circunterit...
circumit W mandum om. EL id est] uel W hoc...amphibrydes] et W
Hoc...Achillis (32) om. E 21 autem post hoc add. W ponitur om. L 22 post]
pontitur L om. W sillabam om. W hec Thetis om. W 23 dixit...canam om. W
24 filiam Thetis EW 25 hec Thetis om. W primam...coripit] prima corripit W

(continued)
3.2.2. Re-writings of the Københavnb* accessus (Appendix A, sigg. RI and VI)

Although the Universitatis bruxellensis accessus shows indirect evidence of wide influence,¹⁶⁸ the major source for interpretation of the Achilleid between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries was the twelfth-century Københavnb* accessus (above, p. 46). The difference between the usage of the two traditions is an important one. The Bruxelles tradition, as is the case in the example we have just seen, tends to be present more through interpolation; the Københavnb* accessus, on the other hand, was much more prominent, and tends to be either transmitted whole (or in large portions) or re-written. The accessus in Vaticano, Vat. lat. 1663, and that in Vaticano, Reg. lat. 1556,¹⁶⁹ represent this second aspect of the reception of the Københavnb* accessus. The verbal similarities among the three accessus show this interrelation:

¹⁶⁸See above, p. 55.
¹⁶⁹The accessus is also transmitted in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ms. Canon Class. Lat. 72 (dated 1274), 19v; and Paris, BnF, lat. 8207 (XIV s.), 83ra.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reg. lat. 1556</th>
<th>Vat. lat. 1663</th>
<th>Københavnv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: <em>in principio huius libri</em></td>
<td>1: <em>In principio huius libri</em></td>
<td>1: <em>in principio huius auctoris</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2: <em>que sit materia operis, que sit auctoris intetio in hoc opere, que sit libri utilitas, quis sit titulus.</em></td>
<td>1-2: <em>que sit materia huius operis, que sit auctoris intetio in hoc opere, que sit libri utilitas.</em></td>
<td>1-2: <em>intetio scribentis, materia, vitilitas, titulus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5: <em>materia huius operis est Achilles... Achilis facta virtuosa describere,</em></td>
<td>2-3: <em>Achilis facta virtuosa describere,</em></td>
<td>5: <em>materia eius est Achilis et eius forcia facta</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>supplendo que minus dicta sunt ab Homero</em></td>
<td><em>supplendo ea que minus dicta sunt ab Homero</em></td>
<td>4: <em>supplendo ea que minus ab eo dicta sunt</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Comparison of the texts of the *accessus* in Reg. lat. 1556, Vat. lat. 1663, and the København *accessus*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-10: <em>Actor iste tractaturus Achilleidem, id est historiam de Achille.</em></td>
<td>14: <em>Actor iste tractaturus Achilleydem, i.e. historiam de Achille.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10: <em>more aliorum poetarum, tria facit</em></td>
<td>14-5: <em>more aliorum poetarum, tria facit</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-6: <em>Est autem proponere materiam de qua tractandum est breuiter explicare. Inuocare est diuinit auxilium implorare, narrare est materiam suam explanare. His dictis, ad litteram accedendum est</em></td>
<td>16-9: <em>Est autem proponere materiam de qua tractandum est breuiter explicare. Inuocare est diuinit auxilium implorare, narrare est materiam suam explanare. His visis, ad litteram accedendum est.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Vaticano, Vat. lat. 1663 *accessus* is actually a great deal more complicated than this collation shows. Vaticano, Reg. lat. 1556 contains three *accessus*, the first beginning *Actor iste Staciuis de Tolosa ciuitate extitit...*, the second beginning *In principio huius libri considerandum est...* (which is the re-writing of the Kobenhavn *accessus* that we have just treated), and the third beginning *In principio huius actoris quattuor sunt inquirenda...* (the Kobenhavn *accessus*). Vaticano, Vat. lat. 1663 contains

---

170This *accessus* bears some relation to the second *accessus* to the *Thebaid* in Bürgerbibliothek, Cod. 528 (XII s.).
two *accessus*, the same *Actor iste...*, and then one beginning *In principio huius libri...* (which is collated in the chart above). This second *accessus* is actually a medley of the last two *accessus* in Vaticano, Reg. lat. 1556 (or its parent). It seems likely to me that the scribe of Vaticano, Vat. lat. 1663 saw the two *accessus* in Vat. lat. 1556 and, noting similarities, tried to make one "pure" *accessus* out of them.
Glose Stacii parui

In principio huius libri considerandum est que sit materia operis, quae sit auctoris intentio in hoc opere, que sit libri utilitas, quis sit titulus. Materia huius operis est Achilles. Intentio auctoris est in hoc opere Achillis facta uirtuosa describere, supplendo que minus dicta sunt ab Homero. Utilitas est ne fatis amplius inutiliter obuiae tempus, cum Thetidem eis obuendo nichil profectione nouimus. Titulus talis est: Stacii liber Achilleidos primus incipit, et bene dictur primus quia sequitur secundus. Sunt enim IIII, secundum quosdam, secundum alios V. Actor iste tractaturus Achilleidem, id est historiam de Achille, more aliorum actorum, tria facit: proponit, dicens "Magnaminum Eacidem," inuocat his uerbis, "Tu modo si ueterem," narrat dicens, "Souterat Oebalio". Est autem proponere materiam de qua tractandum est breuiter explicare. Inuocare est diuinum auxilium implorare.

Narrare est materiam suam explanare. His dictis, ad litteram accedendum est.

1-16] cf. København accessus


Text 3.5: The Reg. lat. 1556 accessus to the Achilleid (Appendix A, sig. RI)

3 Achillis...secundus (7)] Vaticanum, Reg. lat. 1556, ll. 4-7
7 in...Troiam (10)] ibid., ll. 13-16
10 titulus...Enea (13)] ibid., ll. 17-21
14 Actor...Oebatio (16)] ibid., ll. 9-13, rectius
16 Est...est (19)] ibid., ll. 13-16
19 a...incipit (20)] cf. Arnulf Aurelianensis Accessum in Lukanum 5.34

Text 3.6: The Vat. lat. 1663 accessus to the Achilleid (Appendix A, sig. VI)
3.2.3. The *accessus* in Wolfenbüttel, cod. Guelf. 13.10 Aug. 4° (Appendix A, sig. W)

Only at the end of the thirteenth century do *accessus* to the *Achilleid* slowly begin to show advancement over their predecessors. We see this in two traditions: Paris, BnF, lat. 8559 (see below, p. 134) and Wolfenbüttel, cod. Guelf. 13.10 Aug. 4°. The former is heavily rooted in tradition, but also demonstrates a growing interest in reconciling Statius’ disjunct social and political roles. Here, the scholar resolves the problem by introducing the *duplex utilitas*, that is, the *utilitas* that is both *communis* and *privata* (36-44):

*Communis ne fatis obstire te temptemus, cum Thetis eis obstire,*
*que dea erat, non potuit. Privata ut ingenium suum per hunc tractatum*
*posset auere ad nobilia facta Domiciani discribenda, ut posset per*
*hoc favorem ipsius impetrare.*

However, this concept, which is further expanded in manuscripts of the fourteenth century, is the only advancement in this *accessus*.

A fuller example of the slow development of ideas at the end of the thirteenth century is the *accessus* found in Wolfenbüttel, cod. Guelf. 13.10 Aug. 4° (dated 1276), London, BL, Addit. 10090 (XIV s.), and Stuttgart, Wurttembergische Landesbibliothek, Poet. et phil. 4° 34 (XIV s.). This *accessus* begins with five *circumstantiae*: *quis actor,*
*que materia, que scribentis intentio, que utilitas,* and *quis titulus* (2-3). The *circumstantiae* are similar to those of the roughly-contemporary Gronov. lat. 66 *accessus* (above, p. 89), with the important addition of the authorial element that was missing there.

This *vita* of the author provides us with the traditional life that we found in the *Achilleid* traditions up to this point. Statius, who was *in poëtica scientia ... commendaissimus* (4-5),¹⁷¹ was asked by Domitian to write the emperor’s achievements.¹⁷² This *accessus* then breaks with the tradition and expands on an idea we

---

¹⁷¹Cf. the assessment *doctissimus poetarum* (Gronov. 66 [thirteenth century; above, p. 89], ll. 5-6)
¹⁷²Cf. the interpolations in the fourteenth-century Escorial manuscript to the Gronov. 66 *accessus* (above, p. 89, ll. 47-9): *Dominianus quidam imperator Romanus uidens hunc Statium doctum esse poetam, rogavit ipsum sua facta uelle describere, [scient quod librum Thebaidos bene scripsit].
saw in the previous century, that Statius wrote the *Achilleid* as a preparation for writing Domitian's *res gestae.* Here, the scholar writes that Statius, after completing the *Thebaid,* ceased writing poetry (*cum iam quasi hebetare sciret suum ingenium, eoquo iamdiu post compilationem Thebaidos a studio cessauisset,* 7-9). This last detail is most likely taken from a literal reading of *veterem* (*Ach.* 1.8) and *te longo necdum fidente paratu* (1.18). Thereafter, the manuscript conforms to earlier developments, including the typical *utilitas,* that we concede to fate.

The manuscripts are represented by two major families, based on other aspects of the texts, or three families, based on their readings. The Wolfenbüttel and London witnesses are both followed by the same mythological preface to the *Achilleid,* which is wanting in the Stuttgart witness. The textual differences among the manuscripts, which are not great, come as a result of stylistic changes by later hands. I have added a dotted line between *λ* and *S,* as it is not apparent whether the similarities between *L* and *S* (cf. lines 28 and 31) are a result of a single parent or whether the stylistic changes in the two manuscripts were made independently.

![Stemma of the Guelf](image)

**Figure 3.3:** Stemma of the Guelf: 13.10 *accessus*

---

173Cf. the late-twelfth-century *Universitatis bruxellensis accessus* (above, p. 56), ll. 19-21: *Altera intentio sua est animum suum exercere et facta Domitiani imperatoris, sicut rogauerat, posse digna describere.*
In presentis libri primordio sunt hæc quinque specialiter inquirenda, scilicet quis actor, que materia, que scribentis intentio, que utilitas, quis titulus. Actor siquidem istius operis fuit Staciuss, qui in tempore Domiciani Romanorum principis in poetica scientia fuit commendatissimus, unde post commendabilem Thebaïdos editionem rogavit eum Domicianus ut ipsius gesta describeret. Ipse uero se diffidens tante materie posse sufficere cum iam quasi hebetatum sciret suum ingenium, eo quod iamdiu post compilationem Thebaïdos a studio cessauisset, et ne tum tanti domini uideretur preces contemptnere, presens opus suscepit agendum, suum in hoc opere preacuere volens ingenium, ut sic ad ulteriorem materiam, que erat describere Domiciani gesta egregia, consequenter facilius se transferret, quod ipse testatur in prohemio petens a Domiciano ueniam dicens "At tu quem" et cetera.

Sequitur ibi:

te longo necdum fidente paratu
Molinmur magnusque tibi preludit Achilles.

Patet itaque quod Achilles et ipsius egregia gesta sunt subiectum siue materia actoris in hoc opere. Intentio uersatur circa materiam. Intendit enim actor Achillis gesta describere et supplerre quicquid Homerus de illo dimisit intactum, quod ostendit in prologo dicens:

quamquam acta uiri multum inclita cantu
Meonio sed plura uacant nos ire per ommem,
Sic amor est, heroa uelis ...
ne in Hectorne tracto
Sistere sed tota iuuenem deducere Troia.

Sed sciendum est quod morte preuentus propositum non inpleuit, sed opus suum dimisit incompletum. Vtilitas huius operis est ut uiso quod uelle fatis resistere nichil Thetidi profuit, contra fata

(continued)
nichil attemptemus. Est enim fatum diuina dispositio temporalium euentuim.

Titulus libri talis est: Stacii Achilleidos primus liber incipit.
Bene dicit primus, sunt enim quattuor distinctiones in hoc opere, uel
ut plerisque placet, sunt quinque et sic vnam in duas diuidunt, et
notandum quod Achilles est proprium nomen illius de quo hic agitur.
Achilleis uero dicitur historia de ipso facta et est patrononomicum
feminimum a genituiuo isto, Achillus, formatum per interpositionem -e-
Ut uero se conformet actor ceteris poetis, morem poeticum observando
opus suum in tria diuidit; proponit enim cum de quo tractaturus
est ostendit, ut ibi, "Magnarimum Eacidem" et cetera. Inuocat ibi, "Tu
modo" et cetera. Narrat materiam suam persequens in hec uerba,
"Solutet" et cetera. A propositio ergo incipiens per prosopopeiam Musam
suam alloquitur ita dicens "diua refer" et cetera.

14 Ach. 1.14
16-7 Ach. 1.18-9
23-7 Ach. 1.3-5, 6-7
41 Ach. 1.1
41-2 Ach. 1.8
43 Ach. 1.20
44 Ach. 1.3

1 principio L 2 quis om. S 7 et post sufficere add. W 8 quasi] quod L hebetare
L 9 et om. LS tum] tamen S 12 alteriorem mss. gesta Domiciani W fort. rectius
14 ut post ueniam add. L dicem om. S 17 Achilles...actoris (19)] toris S 18 gesta
Thetidi W profuerit S 31 attemptemus] accipit tenuis L 33 liber primus LS
34 dicit om. LS sunt post opere pos. W 36 Achille S 37 uero] autem LS
38 genituiuo] gōo (pro Greco?) W Achilles S 39 morem L 40 suum opus LS cum
om. L tractatus L: tractatus e tractatus W 41 ut post inuocat add. W
42 prosequens S 43 et cetera om. L ergo] igitur W 44 alloitur W ita om. L
diua refer om. L
3.3. Conclusion

We see the beginnings of a new critical approach to the *Thebaid* in this century. The poem takes on a more moral and individual, and a less political aspect. We see a greater emphasis on *Statius doctor*, that is, Statius the teacher as seeking to instruct us.\(^{174}\) If it is right to interpret the note *offendiculum emulari* (in the London, BL, Royal 15.A.XXIX *accessus*, line 13) and the earlier note that Statius was *tenacis memorie* (in the *In principio accessus*, above p. 71, l. 21) in this regard, we also see an increasing emphasis on Statius’ works as texts to be imitated.

What we see in the approaches to the *Achilleid* in this century is less interesting than what we see in the *accessus* to the *Thebaid*. In the *Achilleid*, instead of focusing on Statius the author, we see that the *accessus* themselves tend to be re-writings of earlier *accessus*, mostly of the *Universitarian bruxellensis* and København *accessus*. Those *accessus* that provide degrees of development reflect more Statius’ role in the schoolroom.

The reason for the difference between the two approaches likely has something to do with the different audiences of Statius’ texts. The *Thebaid* *accessus* often refer to him as an *auctor historiographus*, while those to the *Achilleid* treat him as a morally didactic poet. Now, the roots for Statius as a didactic poet were present from the very beginning, when the Firenze, BML, Plut. 24 sin. 12 *accessus* said that Statius wrote his poem to solve an academic or philosophical debate. Thus, little adaptation to the previously existing criticism was needed. The historiographical approach to the *Thebaid*, however, was new, and scholars wrote new *accessus* with this interpretation as a focal point; influenced by the other *accessus* of their age, these scholars felt at liberty to expand on aspects of the *accessus*, including the author’s biography.

---

\(^{174}\) In the previous centuries, we may remember, Statius was noted only for his intelligence.
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CHAPTER 4

FROM THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY
TO THE DISCOVERY OF THE SILVÆ

In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, accessus to Statius began to reach their most advanced state. In addition to some 40 individual accessus transmitted from these centuries, we have at least twenty mythological introductions, prologues, and compendia, all of which reflect keener scholastic attitudes than we have seen in the previous centuries. These newer attitudes, which were likely influenced by the scholarly attitudes of Petrarch and Dante (see above, p. 21), provided greater freedom to expand on the previous traditions. Of course, this "break" must be taken in context.\textsuperscript{175} Accessus to Statius (perhaps owing to the dearth of information available), were always more conservative and much less prone to allegory than the accessus to other poets.\textsuperscript{176} What we see, then, is that while the core information about Statius’ biography and works remains the same, accessus pay much more attention to interpretation of the texts, possibly with an eye toward the school student. These new developments are centered about two key aspects: detailed plot summaries\textsuperscript{177} and conscious criticism of other interpretations of the poems.

\textsuperscript{175}Dante and Petrarch, despite their new attitudes, held closely to the accessus scheme. See Curtius, p. 357.

\textsuperscript{176}Compare, for example, the lengthy discussions that accompanied etymologies to Ovid’s and Virgil’s names (among others, Oeum dividens and virga, respectively). See F. Ghisalberti, “Mediaeval Biographies of Ovid,” Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 9-10 (1946-7) 10-59 and W. Suerbaum “Von der «Vita Vergiliana» über die «Accessus Vergiliani» zum Zauberer Vergilius,” ANRW 2.31.2 (1981) 1156-1262.

\textsuperscript{177}We also find several lengthy compendia to Statius’ works in this century, the most famous of which is that of Laurentius Campanus (Laurent de Premierfait). See C. Jeudy and Y.-F. Riou, “L’Achilléide de Stace au moyen âge: Abrégés et arguments,” RILL 4 (1974) 143-80 and C. Jeudy and C. Bozzolo, “Stace et Laurent de Premierfait,” IMU 22 (1979) 413-447.
4.1. The *Thebaid*

Whether or not I am correct in connecting these new approaches to Dante and Petrarch, Dante played one of the greatest and most puzzling roles in the history of Statia biography. In *Purgatorio* 21-2, Dante and Virgil meet Statius, who has just been freed from a thousand years of punishment and is about to ascend into Paradise; in recounting his life, Statius explains that he was a Christian, but for fear of punishment kept his Christianity a secret. Since the re-discovery of the *Silvae*, scholars have noted Dante’s error, but there is little early evidence as to why Dante made this claim. The earliest

---

178 This often with great vehemence. Gevarvius (*Stattii Opera*, Leiden, 1616) stresses what he calls "graviissimus doctorum error" (p. 3), including the "error Dantis" (pp. 9-10).

179 In the scholia to Dante, there is little explanation. J. de Seravalle’s commentary to the *Divina commedia* (in London, BL, Egerton 2629, [XIV s.]) 214r-v) notes that Titus and Vespasian "sunt utores de morte Christi," but they are not in the list of Christian emperors that follows. The description of Statius only tells us "in cuius imperii tempore iste Statius oriundus de Tholosana ciuitate, qui fuit poeta magnus... propter sua opera coronatus," which is obviously indebted to the *Quaeritor-accessus*. The passage in the commentary in London, BL, Egerton 943 (XIV s.) (101r-v) reads: "Titus fuit filius Vespasiani imperatoris, qui cum liberatus foris, lusit ludus dissergis in vindictam mortis Christi... [Statius] poeta fuit et fuit de Tholosa et venuit Roman et ibi meruit coronari mirto.... Ornabantur enim capita poetarum antiquitatis ex mortella et ista Luis umbra fuit Statiius poeta... Dicit Statius quod tractatur de gestibus Thebe et postea de Achille, set obit ante quam expleret tractare de Achille. Ideo dicit "macadi in uia cola seconda soma," id est obit tractando de Achille.

Benvenuto da Imola relates only that Statius "fu da Tolosa e fu nel tempo dello aduenimento di Cristo e fu un grande poeta" (*Comentum super D. Aldighierii Comediam*, ed. G.F. Lacaita [Firenze, 1887], *ad loc.*). It is only in the mid-thirteenth-century commentary of Filippo Villani (ed. G. Cognoni, *Il commento al primo cantico dell’ Inferno* [Città di Castello, 1896], p. 41) that we find acceptance of Dante’s claim: "Statium Christianum poetam symamque Virgilii," but again without explanation (on Statius as the *sima* Virgilii, see de Angelis 1983 167-8, and nn. 119 and 121).

explanation that we have is that of Politian in his commentary to the *Silvae* that he used for his lectures in Florence (1480-1),\(^{180}\) now Firenze, BNC, Magl. Cl.VII. 973 (Cesarini Martinelli 7.28-33).\(^{181}\)

*Nam et in patriae ratione rhetoris ipsius nomine deceptus est et ad religionem Christianam ipsi applicandam versiculo, ut arbitror, quodam ex Thebaide Statii adductus est, in quo Tiresias:* <4.516-7>

"Et triplexis, inquit, mundi summum, quem scire nefandum est, illum — sed taceo: prohibet tranquilla senectus."

The equation between this passage from the *Thebaid* and the "unknowable God" of Judaism is also found in Pomponius Laetus' commentary to the *Thebaid* (now Vaticano, Vat. lat. 3279), ad 4.516-7.\(^{182}\)

*Hoc nomen sanctissimum et toti antiquitati nomen incognitum nobis aperuit Paulus apostolus cum ait <Philipp. 2.10>, "in nomine Iesu omne genu flectatur celestium, terrestrium et infernorum," hoc est <Theb. 5.516> "summum triplicis mundi".... In omnibus templis erat ara in medio sine simulachro, in quo sacrificabatur tanto numine licet incognito. Hoc est et illud quod erat in arcis ludeorum, quod nemi<nn> intebat scire.*
Most modern scholars, without knowing of Politian’s argument, also draw our attention to
Christian or Christianizing elements and ideals in Statius’ poems or in his life and
attitudes. Still others find his love of Virgil as a key. As attractive and widespread

183 W.R. Hardie (“Virgil, Statius, and Dante,” JRS 6 [1916] 1-12) argues that because of the Christian
outlook of his poem, it was easy to assume that Statius was a Christian, much as Virgil, because of the
magical (or at least clairvoyant) aspect of his works, could be assumed to have been a magician. Hardie
then searches Statius’ epics for any details that could appear Christian, and as such is largely fantastic and
badly flawed, not least because the ideals that permeate Statius’ epic are by no means different from those
of his contemporaries and do not explain why Statius alone was seen as Christian. S. Mariotti (above, n.
182), finds Christian motives in Canepeus’ impety (especially his proclamation at 3.661: “Primus in orbe
deo factis mori”), Apollo’s lament of his own impotence against Destiny (9.653 ff.), and the Altar of
Mercy (12.481 ff.). R.L. Martinez (Dante, Statius, and the earthly city, diss. U. California Santa Cruz
[1977], cf. DA 38 [1978] 670a-670b) sees a Christian cosmography in Statius’ works, mostly influenced
by Theb. 4.514, which he argues might have influenced the medieval mind. B. Kytler (“Die Darstellung
von Ehe und Familie in den episichen und lyrischen Dictungen des Statius,” Vox 5 [1985] 63-74) argues
that Dante was influenced by the view of the family and society that Statius describes, but this argument
rests entirely on passages from the Silvae which, of course, Dante could not have known.

184 “Dante invece rappresenta qui la fede armata della Ragione che move alla conquista delle verità
eterne, la fede illuminata doposecoli di lotte del pensiero, la fede affidata dal discorso della mente non
più soltanto dall’ impulso del cuore” (Schiavo, Giuseppe, Stazio nel Purgatorio: Contributo agli studi
danteschi [Firenze, 1902], p. 41). That is, it is sapientia (exemplified by Statius), when bound with faith,
293-305) argues that Statius embodies poetic intuition, which is secondary to revelation; however, Statius
shows this inspiration only in the Silvae—in the Thebaid, he depicts himself as working toilously hard.
There is also the suggestion of W.W. Vernon (Readings of the Purgatorio of Dante, Chiefly Based on the
Commentary of Benvenuto da Imola [London: Macmillan, 1897], vol. 2, p. 188; this interpretation is
Vernon’s own and is not found in Benvenuto’s commentary), that Dante chose Statius because “it is
known that he lived in the greatest poverty and want; which one would not think would happen to a man
of such distinction in the city (Naples) in which he taught rhetoric, unless he had fallen into the fault of
great extravagance.” This is unlikely not because of the confusion between Naples and Toulouse but
also because this poverty (which is attested only in the Silvae) was not widely in medieval criticism (our
only source is Petrus de Caneflis de Parma’s Prohemium to the Achilleid [transmitted in Berkeley, CA,
Ms. UCB 145 (XIV s. ex.)]: “Statius fuit paulerimus, vnde Juvenalis, ‘Exurit intactam Paridi nisi
uendat Agauen’). There is also the view of A. Grafa (Roma nella memoria [Torino, 1882], pp. 318-20)
that “il Tolosano sarebbe stato un santo, un martire sotto il grande persecutore Domiziano,” but any hint
of Domitian having persecuted Statius is absent from the medieval tradition (the only mention we have of
Domitian bringing about Statius’ death is in the Lives of Statius in Firenze, BML, Plut. 53.15 (XV s. ex.)
and by Petrus Crinitus [ed. prince. 1515, Strasbourg: M. Schurer, Achillesidios libri duo, iem vita autoris e
Petro Crinito]. The former, after mentioning Domitian’s preoccupation with killing flies [see Suet. Dom.
3.1], notes, “poeta eiat eodem ipso transfiusus insano ac tyrannino [sic] ac crudeliter interfectus.” Cринitus
responds to this thus: “Neque inclinat animus ut verum esse existimem, quod a quibusdam scribatur, suisse illum stylo prceaeulio occisum a Caesare Domitiano.”

185 D. A. Slater (The Silvae of Statius [Oxford, 1908], p. 14), suggested that the medieval student may
have imagined a meeting between Paul and Statius at Virgil’s tomb (that Paul was in Rome in the early
spring of 61 was deduced by J.B. Lightfoot, St. Paul’s Epistle to the Philippians [London, 18792], p. 2.
This is of course unlikely as a source for Statius’ Christianity, as the association between Statius and
Naples was not made before the re-discovery of the Silvae. We also might compare Secundianus,
these interpretations are, we should note that they are all achieved by fallacious logic. It is not difficult to search through a text looking for a specific interpretation; that is, after all, what allegory is.\textsuperscript{186} The only sure evidence we can have is external evidence for a popular belief in Statius’ Christianity. Unfortunately, outside of Dante, there is very little, and scholars have come to argue for some lost medieval tradition which proclaimed (or at least suggested) Statius’ Christianity. So, V. Zabughin\textsuperscript{187} and (later) S. Mariotti argue that Pomponius Laetus’ note ”dipenda da precedente tradizione scolastica,”\textsuperscript{188} which has not been transmitted to us. However, the problem with this argument is how an interpretive belief which was widely held in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Florence would not be transmitted to us.

One solution to this is that of L. Constans, who argues that there was a lay tradition in which Statius was a Christian, but it was ignored by the more serious (clerical) scholars.\textsuperscript{189} I find this unlikely, since, in \textit{accessus} to other authors it is common to mix serious scholarship with preposterous vulgar interpretations.\textsuperscript{190} Further, we often find prominent scholars (or clerics) agreeing with even the most absurd beliefs.\textsuperscript{191} Still, as the


\textsuperscript{187}above, note 182, p. 216

\textsuperscript{188}above, note 182, p. 153 [75], n. 2


\textsuperscript{190}An abundance of apocryphal stories about Virgil have been transmitted to us, including Alexander Neckham’s palace, the \textit{Virgilius Dolopathus}, and Virgil and the tower. See D. Comparetti, \textit{Virgilio nel Medio evo}, vol. 2 (Firenze, 1981 [1941]), pp. 70-119.

\textsuperscript{191}For example, Roger Bacon (1214-c. 1291) noted in his \textit{Opus maius} that he was very happy to discover that the pagan Ovid had been converted to Christianity. See D.M. Robathan, \textit{The Pseudo-Ovidian De Vetula} (Amsterdam, 1968), p. 1 and n. 4.
scholars of Statius were always more conservative, it is possible that this was one cause for the separation.

Two other medieval sources for Statius' Christianity have been put forth in this century as evidence of this lost scholarly tradition, Giovanni Calonna's De viris illustribus\textsuperscript{192} and Francisco de Fiano's defense of the Classics, Contra ridiculos oblocutores et fellitos detractores poetarum.\textsuperscript{193} Taking Calonna first, the vita of Statius in his De viris illustribus only dubiously relates to our problem. The vita itself is largely related to the In principio accessus and nowhere alleges Statius' Christianity directly. However, there are two versions of the text. In one family, including the Vatican witness, the authors are listed alphabetically and there is no mention of Statius' conversion. However, in the other family, represented by the Venetian witness, the text is divided into two sections, Christian and pagan, and Statius is included among the Christians.

Although the Venetian witness gives no reason for Statius' inclusion, Sabbadini found evidence implicit in the list of Statius' personal traits:

\begin{quote}
Mirum honestate preditus, viciis instanter restitit coluitque indefesse virtutes.
\end{quote}

These virtues are hardly original.\textsuperscript{194}

Calonna's testimony for Statius' Christianity is further weakened when we compare the vita of Statius with that of Seneca (whom Calonna calls "Seneca noster"). In the latter life, Calonna goes to great lengths to cite as many Christianizing lines in

\textsuperscript{192}S. L. Forte, "John Calonna O.P. Life and Writings," Archivium Fratrum Praedicatorum 20 (1950) 269-414 [402-6], R. Sabbadini, Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XV, vol. 2, Biblioteca storica del Rinascimento, n.s. 4 (Firenze, 1914 [1967]), p. 55; and W.B. Ross, Jr., "Giovanni Colonna, Histona at Avignon," Speculum 45 (1970) 533-63. The text is transmitted in two versions, the first in Venezia, BNM, Lat. X. 58 (XIV s.) and the second in Bologna, BU, cod. 296 (491) (XIV s.) and Vaticano, Barb. lat. 2351 (XV s.) (the manuscript Roma, Casanatense, MS. 2396 [XXVIII s.] is a copy of the Venetian ms.); I have been unable to examine any of these manuscripts personally, and must rely on Sabbadini's and Ross' interpretations.

\textsuperscript{193}Ibid., p. 268; see also A. Altamura, "Una testimonianza medievale sul criptocristianesimo di Stazio ed di Claudiano," GIG 3 (1950) 81-2 (both with transcriptional errors). The text is transmitted in Vaticano, Ottob. lat. 1438 (XY s. in.), ff. 132v-147r.

\textsuperscript{194}The note is simply taken from ll. 20 and 40-1 of the In principio accessus (above, p. 70).
Seneca’s works as he can, assembling some ten quotations that have some verbal or moral similarity to the Bible or New Testament. He is also careful to properly cite and critically judge his sources (including the apocryphical correspondence with Paul, which he somewhat discounts). We find neither of these aspects in the *vita* of Statius, and I conclude that if Calonna actually made the attribution, it was likely made only on the basis of Dante.

The second source, Franciscus de Fiano, is a bit more specific. The passage on Statius reads (141r):

*Quid Statius natione Tolosanus quem aliquis Narbonensem voluit? Siquidem Domitianus, Titi Vespasiani germanico fratre imperante, qui Christianorum inexorabilis persecutor fuit; eum clam, metu principis in Christianos omnium suppliciorum generibus sequentis, Christi tenentem fidem et, si non aque uel sanguinis, baptismo quidem flaminis legimus fuisse respersum.*

Sabbadini used the word “*legimus*” in the last line to argue for a written tradition which has not been transmitted, but the doubt that Franciscus has at the end of the passage (“*si non aque uel sanguinis*”) leads me to believe that he did not actually have a source at hand. A comparison of this passage with Franciscus’ treatment of Ovid will demonstrate this point: (139v-140r):

*Quid Naso in libello a posteris ut quorundam fide dignorum tradit auctoritas in ipsius invenio sepulcro, cui Vetula titulum dedit? Ibi enim Christum precernens futurum, tempusque magnalium ac mirificorum ipsius instare, que se auidum describere inuit, faetut tanta misteria [cf. 3.756 R; 3.755 K] suo non esse ingenio perua <3.757-8 R; 3.756-7 K>:

*nisi postquam uenerit ille
De celo celi plene secreta revolvens.*


---

195 See Ross (above, note 192), pp. 542-3.
197 Sabbadini (above, n. 192), p. 268: “Sicché la notizia della Cristianità di Stazio gli dev’essere venuta da una tradizione allora viva.”
Here, in contrast to the Statius passage, Franciscus gives us specific evidence and quotes his source: in the Statius passage, he does not, and we can argue that if he had a source for Statius' baptism, he would have quoted it. The word "legitum", then, is either a deliberate falsification on his part or a historical note as to how baptism was performed in the early church.

Now, what Sabbadini and Aitamura missed in discussing this text is Franciscus' aim: he sought to justify the Classics not as being good literature, but as being harbingers of and witnesses to Christ; it was in his interest, then, to emphasize the Christian aspects of his subjects. Where he had data, he happily provided it; where he did not, he seems purely to have invented it or to have stretched it. The immediate source of his data, then, appears to be Dante again.

We are left then where we began. We have several theories as to why Dante saw Statius as a "closet" Christian, but no specific evidence. What evidence we do have seems to contradict the claim of many scholars that there was a now lost tradition: had there been such a tradition, either Franciscus or Calonna would have mentioned it. Still, we can not be sure until more evidence is available.

---

198The manuscripts edited by Robathan (above, n. 191) and P. Klopopch (Pseudo-Ovidius de Vetula, Mittellateinische Studien und Texte, 2 [Leiden, 1967]) all read Illum; Christum is likely an interpolated gloss.

199On Christianity in the De Vetula, see Robathan, ibid., p. 5. On the attribution of the poem to Ovid, see her pp. 1-3.

200This is purely my own hypothesis, as I cannot find a source for this. Sabbadini (above, n. 192, p. 268) tries to make a connection between flaminis and πνεύματος (which he suggests might be "Io Spirito Santo"), but this is purely speculation.

201On this aspect of medieval biography, especially in Giovanni Calonna’s writings, see Ross (above, note 192) 540 and 542-3.

202Franciscus also claims the Christianity of Virgil (the source being the fourth Eclogue) and Claudian (following Petrarch).
4.1.1. The *accessus* in Firenze, BNC, II.II.55 (Appendix A, sig. Fi)

Before the end of the fifteenth century,\(^{203}\) Dante appears in but one *accessus* to Statius, Firenze, BNC, II.II.55. This *accessus* is unique among Statian scholarship, in that it is the only *accessus* that follows the Aristotelian schema for the work, that is, the four *causae*, *efficiens*, *materialis*, *formalis*, and *finalis*.\(^{204}\) Under the rubric of the *causa efficiens* is the author. Here, as we saw in the *accessus* in London, Royal 15.A.XXIX (thirteenth-century; above, p. 84), Statius’ name is derived from the verb *sto*: "*quia bene in scientia stetit*" (2-3). Perhaps on the basis of this *scientia*, the *accessus* then notes Statius’ Christianity (3-6):

*et est dictus inter poetas Christicolas et ita est causa: quia Dantes ipsum ponit in Purgatorio, quia erat antiquus et multa uiderat et erat vir bonus et optimus et ideo Cristicola\(^{205}\) appellabatur.*

This is an interesting statement. The author of the *accessus* simultaneously tells us that Statius is considered a Christian poet, and then gives the reasons why Dante fallaciously thought he was a Christian: simply because of age and experience,\(^{206}\) and, moreover, because he was a "good" and "best" man.\(^{207}\) Still, Dante is expressly stated as the authority behind Statius’ Christianity. That the author then impugns this attestation suggests that he saw Dante as the ultimate source for Statius’ Christianity and gives no indication of a lost tradition outside of Dante. Up to this point, this *accessus* seems to

---

203 The *accessus* in Firenze, BML, Plut. 53.15 (XV s. ex.) mentions the attribution without comment: "Locat hunc Statium inter prodigos Florentinums poetae Dantes." In the end of the sixteenth century, a student (Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Augiense 159 [Papier], dated 1614, 189r) labelled *Thebaid* 1.582-6 as "*De Christo nato*" and followed them with the note, "*qīn i.iv. pag. 138*." I have been unable to find out to what this citation refers.

204 See above, p. 6. The *accessus* in Wroclaw, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, IV.Q.64 (dated 1374) also divides the *circumstantiae* into *causae*, but then rejects this in favor of a more Servian scheme.

205 The manuscript reads here *Cristicolas*. I believe this stems from a repetition from line 7. It could also be *Cristicolans*, from an otherwise unattested verb, *cristicolo*, -are, or a *faux* Graecism.

206 The meaning of *multa uiderat* here is unclear. Two possibilities are that Statius saw much and was thus wise, or that he saw much and, thereby, witnessed the infancy of Christianity.

207 *Optimus* is equally puzzling. The word could mean noble (*for optimus as optimæx*, see Gregory of Tours, *Hist*, 4.9), or, what is more likely, it could mean that he was most excellent (of character) (cf. Martianus Capella 4: "Optimitas... summæ bonitas"), but this redundancy is awkward.
support Schiavo’s theory that Statius represented Christian ideals; but before we jump to a conclusion, we need to look at this *accessus* in context.

In other *accessus*, the catalogue of Statius’ virtues is admittedly vague, but not as vague as it is here. Instead of citing Statius’ *scientia, boni mores*,\(^{208}\) or even the moral *utilitas* and *intento* usually given to his works, the author of this *accessus* gives four qualities (*antiquus, multum siderat, bonus, and optimus*), none of which is particularly superlative and none of which is particularly Christian or was used to distinguish pagans from Christians.\(^{209}\) It seems likely to me that the author of the *accessus* had no idea whatsoever as to why Dante included Statius in his *Purgatorio*.

This lack of detail as to why Statius was Christian provides evidence against Constans’ theory of a lost vulgar tradition; if there had been a tradition that Statius was a Christian, we would certainly have heard about it here, perhaps even pejoratively.\(^{210}\) However, I should quickly note that this is our only pre-fifteenth century *accessus* that mentions Statius’ Christianity or even Dante for that matter, and this conclusion should be taken with a great deal of caution.

After discussing Statius’ Christianity, the *accessus* continues the explanation of Statius’ names that we saw in the London, BL, Royal 15.A.XXIX *accessus* (above, p. 84): he was named Papinius because of his father and Surculus is derived from the verb

---

\(^{208}\) Cf. the catalog of *circumstantiae* in the late-twelfth-century *In principio accessus* (above, p. 70, ll. 20-4): *morum honestae priditius, acris intelligientie, tenacis memorie, clarus ingenio, doctus eloquio, liberalium artium scientia feliciter eruditus*.

\(^{209}\) No modern lexicon suggests particularly Christian aspects of these traits. We might compare the unnamed poem of Reinfrit von Braunschweig (see Comparetti [above, n. 190], p. 95) *Littera Verein*, in which a Virgil’s Christianity is argued on the basis of his having been *plenus virtute*. An anecdoté in the life of St. Cadoc provides us with two other “Christianizing virtues.” While speaking with St. Gildas, Cadoc expresses his distress that Virgil, “the author of this book that I love so well and that brings me such great pleasure, is perhaps in pain and suffering.” Later, Cadoc meditates on “how God deals with those who sing in this world as the angels sing in heaven.” See W.J. Rees, ed., *Lives of Cambro-British Saints* (London, 1853), p. 8; and B.M. Peebles, “The Ad Maronis Mausoleum: Petrarch’s Virgil and Two Fifteenth-Century Manuscripts,” in C. Henderson, Jr., ed., *Classical, Medieval, and Renaissance Studies in Honour of B. L. Ullman*, vol. 2 (Roma, 1964), pp. 197-8.

\(^{210}\) The manuscript, I should note, was likely written in Toscana.
surgo, with further reference to Huguccio of Pisa. The *causa formalis* is not expanded upon in the *accessus* (an interpolating hand has added the note "forma tractatus est d...").

The author of the *accessus* then discusses the *intentiones* of the poem. Now, it is not uncommon in this century to divide the rubric *intento* into *privata* and *communis*, but here, the *intento* is divided into three parts: *propria* (which is akin to *privata*), *specialis*, and *communis*, all of which serve the same goal, "ut sibi gloriam aquireret" (13). The author then explains this by means of a quote from Dante, demonstrating a link between the quest for fame and the desire to help others.

Next, the *accessus* gives the *modus tractandi* of the work, "est in stilo trayco, quia in illo stilo includuntur autores" (15). The note is tantalizingly brief, and the meaning of the second clause is not quite clear, and it may be the case that the author’s thought is broken off by a lacuna. If it is not, then the author had in mind some sort of separation between *autores* and *tragoedi*.

The *accessus* ends with an abbreviation of the typical division of the text into *propositio*, *invocatio*, and *narratio*, with the addition of a syncopation of the *attentos*, *beniuolos*, and *dociles* motif that we saw in London, BL, Royal 15.A.XXIX, and in several other *accessus*.

---

211 The passage in Huguccio reads, "Speculus ille dictus est quasi sursum cenens, quia post Virgillum inter ceteros poetas principatum obtinuit" (München, Clm. 14056). See above, n. 70.

212 The end of the note has been worn away, it likely read "uituisio libri."

213 Cf. the *accessus* in Firenze, BML, Plut. 38.10 (which I shall treat below).

214 This is a common motif in *accessus* in the fourteenth century. Cf. the *accessus* to Sallust, BC in Berkeley, CA, UCB 85 (XIV s. ex.) (35r): "Communis intentio omnium auctorum est acquirere gloriam et famam" and the Carpentras *accessus*, treated below, which uses a quotation from Ovid (A.A. 3.403) to prove the same point.

215 The citation appears to be a paraphrase of *Monarchia* 3.2.1: nam sine prefixa principio ... laborare qui prodest?.

216 The author makes no attempts to show this as evidence for Statius’ Christianity.

217 There is an indirect precedent for this. Isidore (*Etymologiae* 8.7) defines tragedy as "Tragici ... res publicas et regum historias" and then goes on to argue that Lucan is not a poet, "quia videtur historiam compositisse." It is possible that this *accessus* had an equation between *poeta* and *author* in mind that was contrary to Isidore’s critical exclusion, but that is by no means sure. See above, n. 149.
Causa efficiens fuit Statius Surculus Papirius Tolosanus siue Narbonensis, de quo scribit Iuvenalis. Statius potest dici a sto quia bene in scientia stetit, et est dictus inter poetas Cristicolas et ita est causa: quia Dantes ipsum ponit in Purgatorio, quia erat antiquus et multa uiderat et erat vir bonus et optimus et ideo Cristicola appellabatur. Est vero dictus Papirius a predecessori; Surculus dicitur a surgo, -is quia surculi sunt ramuli et secundum Huguiccionem dicitur quasi sursum canens, quia post Virgilium ipse fuit secundus in poetica describenda et Rome suum hoc opus composuit. Causa materialis huius libri videlicet dicitur Thebais a Thebis, quia Thebarum mat[er]iam dicit. Thebais est nomen patronom[i]cum. Causa formalis est forma tr[ac]tatus et tractandi. Causa finalis potest esse propria et specialis et [com]munis, ut sibi gloriand quiereret, secundum quod dicit Dantes:

Omnium qui laborant est vt prosint alis.

Et est in stilo trayco, quia in illo stil[o] includuntur autores ***. Supponitur morali philosophie quia de moribus hominum dicit.

Iste liber primus diuiditur in tria quia primo proponit, secundo inuocat ipsius Musas, tertio narrat et exequitur. Secunda, "Unde iubetis", tertia "Impia". Proponens facit auditores dociles et intendit dicere de bellis duorum fratrum.

2 Juv., Sat. 7.82-6
7 surgo] cf. accessum in London, Royal i5.A.XXIX, 11
8 dicitur...describenda (9)] Huguicio Pisanus, s.v. sursum
12 causa...tractandi] cf. accessus in Achilleidem in Wien, 3114, l. 25
15 cf. Monarchia 3.2.1: nam sine prefixo principio ... laborare quid prodest? et Convivio 4.30.2: ciascuno buono fabricatore, ne la fine del suo lavoro, quello nobilitare e abbellire dee in quanto puote.
19 Theb. 1.3
20 Theb. 1.46

(continued)

Text 4.1: The Firenze, BNC, II.II.55 accessus to the Thebaid (Appendix A, sig. Fi)
2 Statius add. sup. lin. F 5 Cristicolas F 9 in...describenda add. sup. lin. F 12
forma tractatus est d<iusio libri> post tractandi add. man. alt. F 13 est post munus eras.
F 14 alii post vt eras. F ita cum tres sint sili post autores add. man. alt. F
16 lacuna post autores mihi videtur 18-21 in marg. sin. F
4.1.2. The *accessus* in Vaticano, Reg. lat. 1375 (Appendix A, sig. RI)

The Firenze, BNC, II.II.55 *accessus* is, however, somewhat of an aberration, in that its style and content are original. More typically, *accessus* to Statius in this century tend to follow the pattern of scholarship that we saw in the previous century, that is, the re-writing of other, older *accessus*. These *accessus* either transmit an *accessus* from a much earlier and outmoded scholastic tradition or present a syncopation of some previous *accessus* (usually from the thirteenth century) with attempts to modernize it. A good example of the second technique is the *accessus* in Vaticano, Reg. lat. 1375, which rewrites the *In principio accessus*. The following chart shows the relationship between the two manuscripts.
Reg. lat. 1375

1: In principio cuiuslibet autors et maxime hystoriographi

4-6: Tholosa oriundus, patre Papinio, matre Agein genitus. Narbone et Burdegalii diu studuit. Postea vero apud Galliam rethoricam docuit

6-7: Videns igitur poetas et hystoriographos per carmina sua Rome ad magnos honores prouehi Romam venit et animum suum studio applicuit...

12-18: nutrire ingenium suum et preacuere descripto Thebanum bellum, et eo descripto ingeniisque suo in hoc subtiliato promisit se descripturum Domitiani gesta, vtne ait "Tempus erit cum laurigero tuo fortior oestro facta canam, nunc tendo chelum." Id vero promittit in principio Achilleidis vtbi ait "Magnusque tibi promittat Achilles." Quod autem promisit morte preuentus non soluit, quia eo libro non pertractato obiit

20-1: Materia in hoc opere est "Oedipode confusa domus," siue Thebays

In principio

1: In principio uniuscuiusque actoris historiographi

15-7: Legitur auctor iste ciuis Tholosanu fuisse, nobili patre, scilicet Papinio, matre uero Agilina. Burdegalii et Nerbone studuit et in Gallia rethoricam celeberrime docuit

83-8: Romam vndique poetas confluere Stacius audierat, ibique ad maximos honores prouehi, tandem Romam uenit et qualiter populo Romano et imperatori placere posset diu apud se excogitauit. Denique animum suum aplicuit...

124-31: preacuere ingenium ut postmodum ad foria eius facta describendaualeat sufficiere. Dicit itaque, "Tempus erit cum laurigero tua fortior oestro facta canam." Item in opere Achilleidos ad ipsum promisit dicens, "Magnusque tibi pruduit Achilles." Sed quod et hie et ibi promiserat morte preuentus exibere non potuit

68-9: Materia est Ethioicles et Polinices et acies utriusque confecte, vel, ut uerbis actoris utamur, "Oedipode confusa domus"

Table 4.1: Comparison of the accessus in Reg. lat. 1375 and the In principio accessus
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What is noteworthy about this *accessus* is what it adds to its parent *accessus*. The first 22 lines of Reg. lat. 1375 are a syncopation of the *In principio*, but thereafter, this *accessus* breaks from its tradition, changing the *utilitas*, title, and the explanation of the *pars philosophiae*. A glance at the first and last of these shows us the differing approach that this *accessus* takes.

In the *In principio accessus*, the *utilitas* and *pars philosophiae* reflect the *accessus*’ general view of Statius as a didactic poet. Here, however, the *utilitas* is changed to a more traditional approach, "*actoris preacuatio ingenii, lectorisque Thebane hystorie notitia*" (23-4), which is ultimately derived from the *In principio accessus*.\footnote{218}{Cf. the late-twelfth-century *In principio accessus* (above, p. 70). ll. 56 and 89-92.}

The difference between the two *accessus* is best demonstrated by the explanations of the *pars philosophiae*. Whereas the parent *accessus* again took the dogmatic view of the text,\footnote{219}{*Nobis informat morum doctrinam*, 111} here the *ethice partii* is rather simply and ignorantly stated: "*quia omnes auctores finaliter tractant propter mores*" (24-5). Another instance of this simplified approach is the treatment of Statius’ name. While the *In principio accessus* went into great detail to give us allegories for Statius’ name (lines 38-42), here the number of names is simply attributed to Statius’ nobility,\footnote{220}{The idea that the plurality of names reflected Roman nobility is also found in the *accessus* to Ovid’s *Ex Ponto* attributed to Fulco of Orléans: "eiisdem sunt nomina quia antiquitus nobiles multa habebant nomina" (Roy-Coulson, nr. 359; ed. Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling* [München, 1986], pp. 226-7). Similarly, in the *accessus* to the B commentary to Juvenal (Löfstedt 4), we find the note, *"persona clara et illustris multis vult devotari nominibus."
\footnote{221}{On this etymology, see above, n. 69.}} without explanation other than the traditional etymology of *surculus*-*sursum canens* (l. 27).\footnote{221}{On this etymology, see above, n. 69.}


(continued)
Text 4.2 (continued)

1 in...hystoriographi] *In principio accessus*, 1
4 patre...docuit (6)] cf. *ibid.* 8-9
6 videns...applicuit (7)] cf. *ibid.* 60-3
12 ingenium...obit (18)] cf. *ibid.* 87-91
14-15 *Ach.* 1.32-3
17 *Ach.* 1.19, *rectius*
20 materia...domus] cf. *In principio accessus*, 68-9
20 *Theb.* 1.17
23 historie philosophie (24)] cf. nota marg. in N ad *In principio accessum*, 68
26 papinius...canens (27)] *In principio accessus*, 38-9
28 omnes...nobilitas (30)] cf. accessum ad Ovidii, *Ex Ponto*, forte Fulconis Orleanensis:
   eiusdem sunt nomina quia antiquitus nobiles multa habebant nomina (Roy-
   226-7)
38 a...incipit] cf. Arnulfii Aurelianensis Accessum in Lucanum, 5.34

9 imperatorum (?) V  37 prepositione V
4.1.3. The Olomouc accessus (Appendix A, sig. O)

Another example of the re-adaptation of accessus is the short accessus in Olomouc, Státní vědecká knihovna, M.1.167, which is a rare instance of an accessus to one of Statius’ poems re-writing an accessus to the other poem, in this case an accessus to the Achilleid in Wien, cod. 13685 (dated 1477-9). Again, a chart shows their relationship:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Olomouc</th>
<th>Wien 13685</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Causa suscepti operis huius librorum duodecim est</td>
<td>15-6: Causa suscepti operis: qui ipsum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10: Domicianus frater Titi, filius Vespasiani. Mortuo enim patre, Titus</td>
<td>16-24: Titus et Domicianus filii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iudeam et Domicianus Romam obtinuit. Deinde defuncto Tito, Domicianus</td>
<td>Uespasiani fuerunt. Quo mortuo, Titus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solus regnuit. Homo scelestus et ferox. Hic uidens Stacium et in numero</td>
<td>Iudeam, Domicianus uero Romam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poetrarum nullum ei esse secundum, rogavit eum ut gesta sua describeret.</td>
<td>obtinuit. Mortuo autem Tito, solus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status autem uidens Domicianum paucum memoria dignum fecisse, facere</td>
<td>Domicianus regnuit, qui malus et scelestus fuit. Hic videns Stacium in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noluit. Sed ne tanti principis precibus videretur contraire, simulans</td>
<td>numero poetrarum eximium,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se velle eius consentire precibus, dixit se velle peracuere et preexercere ingenium in materia humiliori et faciliiori, videlicet in materia prius de Achille</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rogavit eum ut gesta sua describeret. Stacius autem uidens Domicianum nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>memoria dignum fecisse, facere noluit. Sed ne uidetur eius precibus contraire,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simulans se ei consentire, dixit se uelle ingenium peracuere in materia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humiliori et faciliiori, videlicet in materia de Achille.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Comparison of the Olomouc and Wien 13685 accessus

The Olomouc accessus then adds the brief note (10-14):

Suscepit Achilleidem librum, scilicet de vita puercie Achillis, in cuius principio dicit. "Magnusque tibi preludit Achilles." Scrispit etiam
These last lines are too similar to too many *accessus* to pinpoint a definite source, and were most likely appended to the *accessus* to adapt it to its new context.

---

222 This phrase, which I have obelized, is probably a note that the two poems have been listed out of order, but I am unable to arrive at a neat emendation.

---

1 causa...operis] accessus in Wien, ÖNB, cod. 13685, 15
2 mortuo...Achille (10)] ibid., 17-24
12 Ach. 1.119
13-14 Theb. 1.32-3

1 Titus post est eras. O  12 A (pro Achilleidem?) post eciam eras. O

Text 4.3: The Olomouc accessus to the Thebaid (Appendix A, sig. O)
4.2. Accessus to the Achilleid in the Fourteenth Century

The non-authorial accessus to the Achilleid represent trends similar to what we have seen in the Thebaid so far, with, however, one difference. While the re-writings in the accessus to the Thebaid tend more toward syncopation, those to the Achilleid tend much more toward expansion, seeming to react against the poverty of interpretation of the poem that we have seen in the previous centuries. A good example of this tendency is the late fourteenth-century accessus found in Carpentras, Bibliothèque municipale, 369 and in a printed edition preserved only in Wolfenbüttel, cod. Guelf. 65 Aug. 20.\textsuperscript{223}

4.2.1. The Carpentras accessus (Appendix A, sig. C)

The accessus, as de Angelis pointed out,\textsuperscript{224} is based to no small degree on the accessus in Firenze, BML, Plut. 24 sin. 12, but it is also heavily indebted to the Hoc ex ordine compendium\textsuperscript{225} and to the Quaeritur accessus. How the accessus extracts from the two accessus will demonstrate an integral aspect of the accessus tradition to the Achilleid in this century.

The bulk of the Carpentras accessus comes either directly or indirectly from the accessus in BML, Plut. 24 sin. 12. Now, from the perspective of the fourteenth-century scholar, there are several problems with that accessus: it discusses only the questions unde, quid, ubi, and quare; it places Statius' birth in Thebes; and, outside of the fiction of Domitian's controversia, it does not discuss the origin, style, or completeness of the poem, all of which had become important questions by this time.

The author first corrected the central problem with the Plut. 24 sin. 12 accessus by adding information from the Quaeritur accessus (1-4), correcting the answers to the

\textsuperscript{223}The edition, which is now bound in a manuscript, lacks any printing details. See Sweeney 113 and J. C. Dommerich, Ad P. Papinii Statii Achilleida ex membraeis Bibliothecae suae anecdota (Wolfenbüttel, 1758).
\textsuperscript{224}de Angelis 1984,165
\textsuperscript{225}ed. Jeudy-Riou 161-8
questions *unde et quando*. He then added information from the *Hoc ex ordine compendium* to correct other earlier information as well as give answers to the more contemporary questions of *ubi* (1), *quem auctorem imitetur* (9-13), the *qualitas* (12-5), the *materia* (16-8), the *intentio* (21-5), and *cui parti philosophie supponatur* (29-31). It seems likely that some scholar in the fourteenth century was attracted to the Plut. 24 sin. 12 *accessus*, whether because of its *mythos* or simply because of its antiquity, and added material from other antique *accessus* (the thirteenth-century *Hoc ex ordine* is the earliest *compendium* to the *Achilleid*) to fill in the required information.

The Carpentras *accessus* also re-writes the periocha that we find in its parent, with the result that the two texts appear only loosely related, as the following chart shows.226

---

226 In the following chart, underlined words are words shared by the two *accessus*. 126
Carpentras


Plut. 24 sin. 12

Presagium enim fuerat quod si aliquis deorum Thetidem uxorem acciperet, ex ea filium nasciturum qui eum de regno expelleret. Vnde dii perterritae noluerunt eam accipere. Ipsa uero videns nullum deorum eam accipere uelle, terreno homini se contunxit. Cuius nuptiis omnes dii et dee interuenerunt. Discordia uero, que non affuit, pomum aureum inter lunonem et Paladem et Uenerem proiecisse dicitur, in quo scriptum erat "pulcriori debetur". Unde, quia litigium erat inter illas, Carphatus uates pro pomo

magnum fore nasciturum Thetidi predestinavit, quod malum filius qui ex ea nascetur uindicaret, postremo inde uitam amitteret. Quod Thetis minime tradidit oblioni. Nuptiis peractis, adiuere

Paridem qui Uenerem pulcriorem asseruit, quia Elenam uxorem Menelai sibi promiserat.

(continued)

Table 4.3: Comparison of the Carpentras accessus and the Plut. 24. sin. 12 accessus
Table 4.3 (continued)

59-77 Nato itaque Achille ex Thetide, id
timens quod Protheus dixit, filium suum
ad Chyronem detulit nutriendum,
obsecrando ut illum diligenter esse
enutrit. Cum itaque Paris in Greciam
pergeret, Thetis sentiens illos per mare
naugare, timens predictionem Prothei,
ad Neptunum porrexit, implorans ut
naues illas mergeret, ne perierit filius
eius. Et quia Neptunus concedere non
potuit, quia sic fatatum erat, Thetis ipsa
ad Chyronem gemebunda porrexit et
casum timoris expressit, et filium ab eo
susceptit et ad regiam Licomedis in
insulam Schiros perduxit et in habitu
muliebri induit, asserens eundem
sororem esse Achillis, et quod inter
filias suas ipsum custodiret. Interim
Paris rapuit in Citharea insula prope
Amicas, cunctaem Menelai, Helenam
Menelai uxorem, ex quo Menelaus et
Agamemnon omnes Greciae principes
convoacuerunt ut tale dedecus
ulciscantur et collectis undequaque
presidiis erga Troiam pergunt,

et petentibus omnibus ut inveniatur
Achilles, ad Apollinis mitunt oraculum,
ubinam posset repperiri Achilles.
Responsum est eum repperiri posse in
Schiros insula inter filias Licomedis
regis in habitu muliebri, prout Calcas
augur previdit.

Puer nato, Thetis fatis resistere cupiens
illum

Chironi detulit, deprecans ut eum
nutriat atque studiose conservet.
Exinde Paris iuit pro Helena et rapuit
eam. Thetis uero uidens illum eam
deferentem
adiuit Neptunum ut sibi licenciam daret
obruendi nauem suam, quia mortis filii
sui causa erat. Quod quia Neptunus
non sibi concessit,

filium suum Chironi abstulit, eunque

femineo more uestiens ad Licomedem
regem Schiros detulit ut inter filias suas
illum nutriret atque custodiret.

Interea Menelaus suum suique regni
dedecus uindicare cupiens Troiam
armata manu porrexit.

Vaticinatum autem fuerat quod
numquam sine Achille ciuitas caperetur.
Quocirca omnes unanimiter preces ad
Apolinem fuderunt ut eis quo in loco
Achilles absconditus fuerat pateficeret.
Qui cre Calcantis inter Licomedis filias
illum muliebria indumenta deferentem
esse patefecit.

The Carpentras accessus omits only one detail from the myth transmitted in the
Plut. 24 sin. 12 version, the statement that it was fated that without Achilles, the war
could not be won (26) and only substantially changes one detail, how Thetis’ mate was

128
chosen (in Plut. 24 sin. 12, she chooses him herself [10-11], in the Carpentras version, Jove chooses one for her [45-6]). The other details that are new in this accessus are only of a glossary nature (e.g. scilicet Protheus deus marinus, 43).

The most substantial change made in the Carpentras accessus is its language. As we saw above, one of the reasons for the inclusion of the material from the Hoc ex ordine compendium was to accommodate the new accessus requirements, specifically the inclusion of the materia and intentio. He also included the actual words materia and intentio, and in so doing made the accessus technically more modern. Likewise, in the summary of the poem I have just discussed, we see the addition of terminology found in other contemporary accessus, the most prominent among these being habitu muliebri (27 [where the Carpentras accessus reads habitu puellari], 64 and 72). The muliebria indumenta that we find in the Plut. 24 sin. 12 accessus (29) is only found there in the accessus to Statius;\footnote{The word indumenta occurs in connection with Statius only in the plot summary in Assisi, Biblioteca comunale del Sacro Convento di S. Francesco, 309 (XV s.).} habitus, however, whether accompanied by muliebris or (more commonly) femineus, is found in six other accessus, only one of which can be dated prior to the fourteenth century.\footnote{In the twelfth century, we have the accessus in Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, 1495. In the fourteenth, the accessus in Padova, Biblioteca del Seminario Vescovile, Ms. 56, and Venezia, Zan. Lat. 541 (which also occurs in two other witnesses). In the fifteenth century, we have the accessus in London, BL, Harley 2693; Assisi, Biblioteca comunale del Sacro Convento di S. Francesco, 309; and Paris, BnF, n.a.l. 166 (dated 1477).} The case is the same with insulam Schiros (l. 63)\footnote{This occurs in several periochae and in the accessus in Escorial, El, Real Biblioteca, ms. f.III.11 (XIV s.) (three witnesses). It also occurs in the accessus in Praha, Národní Knihovna Česka Republiky, XXIII.D.180 (XV s.), but that accessus is a re-writing of the Carpentras accessus.}.

The relationship between the two witnesses of this accessus is somewhat puzzling. The two are remarkably close, showing only a few variants (most of which, such as the insertion of et at lines 33 and 53, are the result of stylistic adaptations). The only major variants, outside of a few typographical errors, is the reading of scilicet at line 16.\footnote{The different readings at l. 44 (filium nasciturum maiorem C. filius nasciturus esset maior W) is also a probable adaptation, but we cannot be sure.}
While the reading in C is clear, W has two subpunctus, indicating that the editor could not read what was in the original. Were it not for this difference, we could argue that W was a direct copy of C; however, we must now suppose the existence of a second manuscript. This is more likely than it may seem. Although we have only one manuscript of the accessus and commentary, there is much evidence that the accessus at least was widely known. As I shall discuss below, the Carpentras accessus will have a great deal of influence in the following centuries, especially in the age of the printed book; however, these later editions favor the readings of the Carpentras manuscript over those of the Wolfenbüttel edition,\textsuperscript{231} so we can at least argue that the Wolfenbüttel edition was not important in the later tradition of the accessus.

![Stemma of the Carpentras accessus](image)

Figure 4.1: Stemma of the Carpentras accessus

\textsuperscript{231}E.g., in the accessus in Vaticano, Ottob. lat. 1261 (below, p. 160), line 139 reads \textit{nasciturum maiorem} (see our present accessus, line 44).
Magnanimum Eacidem et cetera: Statius hic fuit de Tholosa ciuitate, que in Gallia est, in qua rhetoricae celeberrime docuit. Floruit enim maximo ingenio tempore inceptoris Vespasiani et peruenit ad tempora Domitianii, fratris Titi, qui et minor Titus appellatus est. Qui Romam se transferens et plurimos poetas intuens in arte poetica glorie et fame titulis premiorturn pollere muneribus, se ad artem poeticam transtulit, et Thebanam historiam iam longeu temporis nube obductam et ab omnibus iam elapsam memoria elegantissimo stilo sine inuentione nouauit, et fecit iuuencere senescentem. Imitatus Virgillii nobilium principem poetarum et usque adeo eum imitatus est quod aliqui eum Virgilli simiam uocent. Vnde ipse in fine operis opus Virgillii gloriouse extollit, suum librum alloquens, "O mihi bissenos" et cetera. Quantum autem fuerit huius fulmen eloquentie Iuuenalis testatur:

Curritur ad uocem iocundam et carmen amice

Thebaydos, letam dum fecit Stacius vrbem.

Materia huius libri, scilicet Statii, Thetis et Achilles, quem usque ad Troiam perducit, aliqua gesta eius in sue primordio iuuentutis enumerans ut in fine libri patet. Nam gesta eius apud Troiam Homerus Grece facundie elegantissimo carmine docuit, ut autor ipse narrat, ubi dicit in principio,

Quamquam acta uiri nimis inclita cantu Meonio, et cetera

Intentio est ut in arte poetica se exercens, adeptam iam famam libri Thebaidos eternam posteris faciat, que est potissima omnium poetarum intentio, ut testatur Ouidius,

Quid petitur sacris tantum nisi fama poetis?
Hoc precium certe summa laboris habet.

Et sic intentio est tractare de historia Achilis, quomodo Thetis mater Achillis eum a Chiron abstulit et ad regiam Licomedis in Schiros insulam tulit in habitu puellari et in tractando hoc tale negotium ostendit Thetidem resistere violentem fatis. Causa intentionis autoris est talis, quod nullus uoluntati deorum resistere presumat. Et sic

(continued)
ethyce parti philosophie supponitur, quia loquitur de moribus et
subtiliter tractat quid honestum, quid utile sit.

Statii titulus est Statii Papinii Suriici Achilleydos liber primus.

Que causa mouerit autorem principaliter ad hoc opus: est sciendum
quod postquam Thebaydem composit, in qua per annos XII
inuigilauit, Romam uenit et ibi coronatus est et ab imperatore
Domitianus honorificissime susceptus. Demum in aula imperatoris
questio talis fuit proposita, utrum ea que predestinata sunt possint
euiteri uel ne. Ad quam questionem soluendum, Statius a Domitiano
imperatore invitatus est, et eam soluere uolens, hunc libellum
composit, ostendendo qualiter Thetis fatis resistere uoluit et nequiiuit.
Presagationem enim fuerat quod si aliquis deorum Thetidem in uxorem
acipieret, ex eo filium nasciturum eo maiorem patre. Vnde dii
perterriti eam accipere noluerunt. Sed Jupiter prouidit quod Pelleus
eius nepos eam susciperet in uxorem, et sic terreno hominum nupta fuit.
Et in eius nuptias die deaque omnes conuenerunt. Discordia uero
da, quia ad nuptias inuitata non fuit, pomum aureum clam in nuptiis
inter Iunonem, Palladem et Ueuerem proiecit, cui inscriptum erat
"pulcrior debetur". Ob quod litigium inter eas maximum exortum
est. Vates quidam Carphatus, scilicet Protheus deus marinus,
Theidi dixit ex illo pomo maximum periculum nasciturum et quod
filius qui ex ea nasciturus erat id malum uindicaret, postremo inde
uitam amitteret. Vnde Thetis huic predictionis fatalis memorem anxia
semper fuit. Exactis quoque nuptiis, hoc litigium terminandum
prolatum est ad Paridem, qui sententiam pro Venere tuli, quoniam
ipsa amore omnium mulierum sibi despondit (Pallas sapientiam,
Iuno potentiam et dominium, sed amorem quibus alius promissis
preposuit). Nato itaque Achille ex Thetide, id timens quod
Protheus dixit, filium suum ad Chryonem detulit nutriendum,
obsecrando ut illum diligentissime enutriret. Cum itaque Paris in
Greciam pergeret, Thetis sentiens illos per mare navigare, timens
predictionem Prothei, ad Neptunum porrect, implorans ut naues
illas mergeret, ne periret filius eius. Et quia Neptunus concedere
non potuit, quia sic fatatum erat, Thetis ipsa ad Chryonem
gemebunda porrect et casum timoris expressit, et filium ab eo
suscepit et ad regiam Liconem in insulam Schiros perduxit et in
habitu mulierbi induit, asserens eundem sororem esse Achillis, et
quod inter filias suas ipsum custodiret. Interim Paris rapuit in
Citharea insula prope Amias, ciuitatem Menelai, Helenam Menelai

(continued)
uxorem. Ex quo Menelaus et Agamemnon omnes Grecie principes conuocauerunt ut tale dedecus uliscantur et collectis undequeque presidiis erga Troiam pergunt, et petentibus omnibus ut inueniatur Achilles, ad Apollinis mittunt oraculum, ubinam posset repperiri Achilles. Responsum est eum repperiri posse in Schiros insula inter filias Licomedis regis in habitu muliebri, prout Calcas augur predidixit.

1 Statius...est (4)] cf. Queritur accessum, l. 1-4
4 Romam...poetarum (10)] Hoc ex ordine compendium, 161.8-13
10 aliqui...cetera (12)] ibid., 15-8
12 quantum...vrbem (15)] ibid., 22-5
12 Theb. 12.811
14-5 Juvenalis, Sat. 7.82-3
21 Ach. 1.3-4
22 est...habet (26)] Hoc ex ordine compendium, 162.6-12
25-6 Ovidius, A.A. 3.403-4
27 intentio...historia] cf. Arnulfi Aurelianensis Accessuum in Lucanum, 3.14
31 et sic...sit (33)] cf. Hoc ex ordine compendium, 162.17-9
37 Romam...susceptus (38)] cf. Plut. 24 sin. 12 accessus, ll. 2-3
38 demum...noluerunt (45)] ibid. 3-10
46 terreno...tulit (56)] ibid. 10-7
64 mergeret...fatatum (65)] cf. Ach. 1.80-1
72 dedecus] Plut. 24 sin. 12 accessus, l. 25
4.2.2. The *accessus* in Firenze, BML, Plut. 38.10 (Appendix A, sigg. Pr et Pu)

A less intricate, but more detailed instance of the re-writing typical of this century is the *accessus* found in Firenze, BML, Plut. 38.10 (dated 1394) and London, BL, Addit. 10095 (XV s.). This *accessus* is a combination of borrowing and re-writing of Paris, BnF, lat. 8559 (XIII s.).

The first eleven lines of the re-written version copy directly from the parent and begin with a short explanation of why Statius chose his present material (corresponding to the unstated question, *quare*), which is likely related to the source for the *accessus* in Wolfenbüttel, cod. Guelf. 228 Gud. lat., 232 and then poses the four *circumstantiae* of the present work, *que materia, que intentio, que utilitas, and quis libri titulus* (8-9). The *accessus* as it stands in the Paris example is likely original, 233 but as the three extant manuscripts represent three recensions, 234 any statement as to the original state of the text must be made cautiously. In any case, it is the manuscript in Firenze that is the most important at present.

---

232 Verbal similarities include *consumasse* (3) = *consumauit* (W, 7) and *leviori opusculo* (5) = *leviori materia* (W, 24).

233 In the Paris and London exemplars, it is followed by a commentary (albeit only fragmentary in the Paris witness) which has some 11 witnesses. The London exemplar, which omits such details as the *titulus*, is likely a partial syncopation.

234 The manuscript in London, as I said, is likely a syncopation; that in Firenze is an expansion.
The manuscript in Firenze makes three large re-writings and one lengthy addition to the text, all of which are descended from the (interpolated) twelfth-century København accessus, particularly through the π family (see above, p. 46). The only additions that are not related to the København tradition are lines 32-4 (which correct the claim of the Paris witness, that Homer’s work was incomplete because of his own death), and lines 37-40 (which expand the notions of the utilitas privata, and the fama aspect of authorship235). It appears, then, that the author of the Firenze witness sought only to add information or alternate points of view that were not present in his or her original,236 and chose an older tradition of scholarship to the poem as a source.

235 Cf. the accessus in Vaticano, Reg. lat. 1556 (XIII s., extant in two witnesses; see above, p. 97) and the Carpentras accessus (XIV s.), ll. 22-6 (cf. above, p. 114). In Sankt-Florian, XI.58 (XIII s.), the accessus states, privata (sc. utilitas), quia voluit placere Romanis.

236 He does not delete any information in the original (with the possible exception of the note on Homer’s death), and all of the additions are introduced by uel.
In principio huius auctoris notandum est quod Domitianus imperator Romanus Vespasiani filius, uidens Statium opus Thebaidos feliciter consumasse, ipsum rogavit Statium quatenus sua fortia facta describeret. Statius uero de actis tanti ducis describendis se diffidens sufficere, aliquo leuiori opusculo suum uoluit preacuere ingenium. Vnde datis sibi indutiis a Domitiano, hoc opus Achilleidos aggressus est. In cuius principio quattuor sunt inquirenda, scilicet que materia, que intentio, que utilitas, quis libri titulus. De hiis ergo propositis ordinem uideamus.

Materia uero actoris est virtus Achillis et acta. Intentio est fortia facta Achillis describere,

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
P & F \\
\text{nec sistere in Hectore distracto,} & \text{in Hectore tracto more Omerico} \\
\text{sicut ait in textu, "nec in} & \text{desistere, sed supplingea facta istius} \\
\text{Hectore tracto sistere, sed} & \text{Achillis, quamuis ab Omero dicta sunt,} \\
\text{iuuuenem tota deducere Troia."} & \text{preterea plene de omnibus factis eius} \\
& \text{tractare.}
\end{array}
\]

\textit{Uel intentio eius est agere non de illis bellis tantum que egit Achilles circa Troiam, sed quomodo Chiron eum nutriuit et quo modo mater eius, scilicet Thetis, tuit eum in aula Licomedis regis et abscondit. Quod fecit auctor hac intentione, ut retrahat nos ab hac intentione, scilicet ne uelimus res<se>tere predestinacioni deorum, sicut Thetis uoluit facere. Quia cum cognouisset quod filium suum, scilicet Achilles, in bello Troiano fata predestinuissent mortiurum, volens predestinationem fatorum obuiare, filium suum frustra recondidit, qui postea a Grecis inuentus est et ad Troiam} (continued)

Text 4.5: The Plut. 38.10 \textit{accessus} to the Achilleid (Appendix A, sigg. Pr et Pu)

30

Ibi uero Homeru preuentus morte suum opus terminauit

Ibi uero stetit Omerus et suum tractatum terminauit, quod inquit Statius dicens, "Nec in Hectore tracto sistere".

35

Vtilitas autem potest esse daplex, scilicet communis et priuata. Communis, ne fatis obsistere temptemus, cum

P
Thetis eis obsistere, que dea erat, non potuit.

F
Thetidem eis obuiare uolentem nihil profecisse uidemus. Priuata, ut fauorem Domitiani imperatoris Romani per nobilia sua scripta posset acquirere. Vel fuit priuata in hoc ut ingenium suum per hoc tractatum posset acquire ad uersificandum facta Domitiani nobiliter describenda et ut posset per hoc opus fauorem acquirere et impetrare.

40

Priuata
ut ingenium suum per hunc tractatum posset acuere ad nobilia facta Domitiani describenda

45

ut posset per hoc fauorem ipsius impetrare.

Titulus talis est: Stattii Achilleidos liber primus incipit. Bene dicit primus quia sequitur secundus.
Sunt enim quinque libri. In primo

equivoc sollicitudinem matris de

morte filii descript. In

diuisio constat ex matris sollicitudine de morte

secundo filii absconsionem. In

Achilles quam presciebat. Secunda de

tertio inquisitionem Grecorum. In

asconsione. Tertia de inquisitione

quarto inuentionem Achilis per

Grecorum. Quarta de inuentione.

Ulixem. In quinto adductionem

eius ad Troiam

Quinta de eius tractu, id est ductu apud

Troiam per Ulixem

et in hoc opus istud terminatur, quia auctor morte preuentus

non potuit quod uoluit adimplere. Proposuerat enim dicere ea

quae prelibata suant et omnia que egerat ipse Achilles aput Troiam,

unde id in prologo, "Sed tota iuuenem deducere Troia".

Secundum enim alios, quattuor sunt libri, sed duos

ultimos in unum copulant et coniungunt. Achilleis, Achilleidos

declinatur, et capitur hic pro istoria et est pronomem femineum ab

Achille, quemadmoehum Eneidos ab Enea uiro et cetera. More aliorum

poetarum bene scribentium, tria facit: proponit, iuucat, et narrat.

Propositionem includit in inuocatione prima, quia ibi ostendit de quo

tractatus sit. Est enim eius triplex iuucatio. Primo enim iuucat

suam Musam, secundo Apollinem, tertio Domitianum, excusando se

erga eum. Iuucat enim Musam ubi dicit "Musa refer". Iuucat

Apollinem ubi dicit "Tu modo si ueteres" et cetera. Iuucat Domitianum

ubi dicit "At tu quem longe" et cetera. Narrat ubi dicit "Solverat

Ebalio classem de littore pastor" et cetera. A propositione narrat ubi dicit

"Magnanimum Eacudem."

---

5 leuiori opusculo] cf. accessum in cod. Guelf. 228 gud. lat. 24: leuiori materia
17 uel...proficeret (27)] København accessus, ll. 5-12
27 materia...pretermisit (30)] cf. Wolfenbüttel, cod. Guelf. 13.10 Aug. 40, ll. 17-23
32 (F) ibi...sistere (34)] cf. København accessus, ll. 3-4
33-4 Aeh. 1.6-7
36 (F) Thetidem...uidemus (37)] ibid. 17 (cf. ms. P)
60 Aeh. 1.7
69 Aeh. 1.3, rectius

(continued)
Text 4.5 (continued)

70 Ach. 1.8
71 Ach. 1.14
71-2 Ach. 1.20
73 Ach. 1.1

4.2.3. The *accessus* of Thomas Walsingham (Appendix A, sig. Wa)

We also have, beginning in this century, *accessus* that are attributable or attributed to an author.\textsuperscript{237} Despite their authority\textsuperscript{238} these *accessus* do not show us the major advancements we would hope for; they are, in effect, attempts at vast re-writing and reveal the same limitations as their non-authorial counterparts. As we have seen since the beginning of our investigation, there simply was not enough information about Statius to allow a scholar to break from tradition. An example of one scholar’s attempt is the collection of *accessus* in London, BL, Harley 2693 that is attributed to Thomas Walsingham.\textsuperscript{239}

The manuscript contains quite a good deal of Statius material. On 1r-40v, there is a paraphrasis of Lactantius Placidus’ commentary to *Thebaid* 1-8, which is followed (on 41r-45v) by a separate commentary to *Thebaid* 1-4.\textsuperscript{240} Later in the manuscript, on 131r-

\textsuperscript{237}The absence of authoritative *accessus* before this century is something of an anomaly, and may be a result of the stagnant nature of Statian scholarship that I discuss in my conclusion to this chapter. The *accessus* traditions to Virgil and Ovid, on the other hand, have been attributed to named scholars almost from the beginning. Among others, three of the earliest authors of *accessus* to Ovid’s works are Arnulf, William, and Fulco of Orléans and Giovanni dei Virgilio (twelfth to fourteenth centuries) (see W. Engelbrecht, ”*Bursarii Ovidianorum* - ein Ovid-Kommentar des Wilhelm von Orleans [um 1200]”, *Mittelalterliches Jahrbuch* 26 (1991) 357-58; F.T. Coulson, ”New Manuscript Evidence for Sources of the *Accessus* of Arnoul d’Orléans to the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid,” *Manuscripta* 30 (1986) 103-107; and F. Ghisalberti, ”Arnoflo d’Orléans. Un cultore di Ovidio nel secolo XII,” *Memorie del Reale Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere* 24 (1932) 157-234 and ”Giovanni del Virgilio espositore delle *Metamorfosi*,” *Gior nale dantesco* 34 (1933) 1-110 Giovani di Virgilio was active in scholarship to Statius as well (see d’Angelis 1984, *passim*), but apparently did not write an *accessus*. In the case of Virgil, outside of Donatus and Servius, there were *accessus* by Probus and Focas, all of which are edited by Brunner; see G. Brugnoli and R. Scarcia, ”Osservazione sulla Vita Proibiana di Virgilio,” *StudUrb* 39 (1965), which discusses the relations among the four.

The only names associated with pre-*Silvae* *accessus* are those of Petrus de Canefis de Parma (Berkeley, CA, MS UCB 145; see above, note 184), Thomas Walsingham (see below, p. 143), Francesco Filelfo (Modena, Biblioteca Estense universitaria, Est. lat. 331 [a F 8, 15] [XV s.]; see below, p. 145), Petrus Crintius (see above, n. 184), and Martinus a S. Benedicto (Paris, BNF, lat. 5137 [XIII s.], which is a re-writing of the *In principio* commentary).

\textsuperscript{239}I am using the term here literally.


\textsuperscript{240}On both of these commentaries, see Sweeney 21.
202v, is Thomas Walsingham's *Prohemia poetarum*, which contains two *accessus* to the *Thebaid*, one to the *Achilleid*, and two mythological prologues to the *Thebaid*.\(^{241}\)

The first *accessus* to Statius is to the *Achilleid* and shows immediately one methodological difference, specifically, the number of sources used. Here, Walsingham used four sources: the late-thirteenth-century *accessus* in Wolfenbüttel, cod. Guelf. 13.10 Aug. 40(above, p. 101), the fourteenth-century *Casualis eventus accessus*, the interpolations in the fourteenth-century Escorial witness of the Gronov. 66 *accessus* (above, p. 89), and a prominent group of periochae,\(^{242}\) but the citations from each source are extremely brief.\(^{243}\)

---

\(^{241}\)I believe that only the first *accessus* to the *Achilleid* and *Thebaid* (145v-146v) are by Walsingham. The later *accessus* are too different in form and content to have been by the same author, and I imagine that they were added because of the thinness of the original *Thebaid accessus* or out of an interest in collecting Statius commentaries in the manuscript. It could also be that Walsingham wrote several treatises on Statius. The Statius *accessus* are not treated in the studies of F.T. Cabral (*The Prohemia Poetarum of Thomas Walsingham and the Accessus ad Auctores* [PhD Dissertation, Univ. of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1974]) or A.G. Rigg (*"Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies [1]."* *MS* 39 [1977] 281-330).

\(^{242}\)Represented by Paris, BnF, lat. 8559, the København *accessus*, the commentary in Escorial, EI, Real Biblioteca, ms. f. III.11, the *accessus* in Düsseldorf K2:F.50, and the *accessus* in Leiden, Lips. 36.

\(^{243}\)The *accessus* to the *Thebaid* are not as well developed as those to the *Achilleid*. The first *Thebaid accessus* (146v-146v) is simply a plot summary, as is the third (168r). The second *accessus* (168r) is an abbreviation of the *Quoeritur accessus*, and the fourth is simply a common historical note on Titus and Domitian, explaining why Statius chose his material.
Walsingham hails back to an older estimation of Statius, calling him *commendatissimus* (*accessus* since the thirteenth century have refrained from simple praise of this sort), and echoes the older tradition that Statius was earnest in his desire to write the *Achilleid* to sharpen his wits. What is novel in this *accessus* is the *circumstantiae* that Walsingham has chosen: *causa materialis* (12) and *ordo* (13). The bulk of the *accessus* is not spent answering these (only lines 13-17 do that), but in explaining why Statius chose his material (1-11) and in summarizing the plot (18-32). As a whole, then, the *accessus* seems somewhat anachronistic. The only anomalous aspect of it is the note that Book 1 begins at 1.20. We find this separation in only a few other manuscripts, and in such cases, we usually see the first nineteen lines of the poem labelled as the prologue.

---

244 Kiel, Universitätsbibliothek, KB B 45 (XV s.) and Kraków, Muzeum Narodowe, Biblioteka Czartoryskich, 1876 II (XII-XIII s.). Some manuscripts, such as Vaticano, Città del, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Barb. lat. 33 (XIV s. ex./XV s. in.), have periochae that designate 1.20 as beginning the first chapter.
Stacius poeta commendatissimus, cuius nomen propter commendabilem edicionem libri Thebaidos inter principum Thebanorum nomina litteris aureis scriptum fuit, floruit temporibus Domiciani imperatoris. Iste Domicianus rogauit Stacium ut componeret librum de gestis suis. Ipse autem non audebat satisfacere voluntati Cesaris, donec ingenium suum prius exercuisset in aliis quibusque gestis. Excusavitque se penes Cesarem, quod oportuit eum primo experiri ingeniurn suum in gestis Achillis, cuius probitatem extollere cupiebat. Scripsit ergo librum Achilleidos, qui sic incipit,

Magnanimum Eacidem, formidatamque tonanti
Progeniem.

Causa materialis igitur huius libri est vita Achillis. Causa formalis est modus et ordo tractandi. Ordo duplex est, ordo naturalis et ordo artificialis. Ordo naturalis est quando res narratur sicut gesta fuit. Ordo artificialis est quando res narratur non sicut res est, sed per poemata.

Primo suo capitulo presentis libri vitur pro prologo in quo ponit ea de quibus intendit agere, silicet de illis rebus vel factis que gessit Achilles antequam veniret ad Troiam, quomodo silicet nutriuiit eum Chyron et qualiter mater sua eum abscondit in aula Lichomedi regis.

Iste liber dniaditur in quinque libellis. In primo agit qualiter Chiron centaurus nutriuiit Achillem. In secundo de sollicitudine matris sue Thetidis, qualiter filium suum transformare duxit et habitu suo | mutato in habitum femineum illum Lichomedi commendavit.

Et ex post porruxit ad litus maris et ascendit excelsam rupem vt terram eligeret cu filium suum committeret, ne Greci ducerent eum ad Troiam. Iterum ostendit postea ludos puellarum quos fecera<n> ad honorem Palladis, et decessum Thetidis ab illa patria. In tertio agit de absencia filii. In quarto de inquisicione Grecorum. In quinto de inducione ad Troiam. In sexto debuit fecisse de inducione ad Capadociam, sed deficit propter mortem auctoris. Incipit autem primus liber sic,

Sohearat Ebalio classem de litore pastor
Dardanus.

(continued)

Text 4.6: Accessus to the Achilleid, from Thomas Walsingham, Prohemium poetarum (Appendix A, sig. Wa)
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Text 4.6 (continued)

1 commendatissimus...Thébaidos (2)] accessus in Wolfenbüttel, cod. Guelf. 13.10 Aug. 4°, ll. 5-6
3 iste...suis (4)] cf. ibid., l. 7
10-11 Ach. 1-2
12 causa...tractandi (13)] Casuæ euentus accessus, ll. 188-9
12 ordo...est (16)] cf. accessum in Escorial, ms. f.III.11 ll. 34-8
21 in...Troiam (30)] periocha quae inuenitur in Paris, BnF, lat. 8559 et al.
33-4 Ach. 1.20-1

5 e post donec eras. L
4.2.4. The *accessus* of Francesco Filefo (appendix A, sig. Ff)

We see a similarly broad adaptation in the *accessus* of Francesco Filefo\(^{245}\) (preserved in Modena, Biblioteca Estense universitaria, Est. lat. 331 [α F 8, 15] [XV s.]), but we also find a wider interest in academic problems with the poem.

Based on its incipit, this *accessus* appears to embody a much more scholarly approach, harking back to Servius (1-4):

*Sicul dicit Servius in commentario Virgili, in exponendis auctoribus non nulla prius consideranda esse, videlicet vita poete, titulus libri, scribentis intentio, qualitas carminis, numerus librorum, et poete materia.*

However, in spite of Filefo’s scholarly tone, the *accessus* has little new information; indeed, outside of the many tangents that have very little to do with Statius, his *accessus* is at heart a careful rephrasing of the Carpentras *accessus*. A few selections will show the degree to which Filefo altered his original.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Filefo</th>
<th>Carpentras</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17-8: <em>Qui, uidens Romanos in voluminibus summam poetrarum delectationem habere, tunc cepit describere</em></td>
<td>5-6: <em>plurimos poetas intuens in arte poetica glorie et fame titulis premiorum pollere muneribus, se ad artem poeticae transit illi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20: <em>Secundum aliquos, in illo simia Virgilii fuit</em></td>
<td>10-11: <em>aliqui eum Virgilii simiam uocent</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
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Table 4.4 (continued)

40-1: possit sicut docti uiri apud posteros phamam ac laudes sibi comparare  
22-4: adeptam iam famam libri Thebaidos eternam posteris faciat, que est potissima omnium poetarum intentio

From these parallels we note two aspects of Filelfo’s version: it is much more succinct than its original, and avoids hyperbole (e.g., potissima at line 23).

There are only a few details in the interpretation of the poem that cannot be derived from the Carpentras accessus. The first of these is the second intentio (ll. 41-2): ut excitaret adolescentes alios laudibus Achilli ad virtutem,

which is, in turn, derived from the accessus in Escorial, El, Real Biblioteca, ms. f.III.11, ll. 70-2:

\[\text{intentio sua est ut nos per uirtutes Achilli informet ad uirtutes, et doceat nos utare desidiam et torporem.}\]

The second detail is the explanation of the duplex invocatio to Apollo and Donitian at ll. 68-9:

\[\text{invocationem quoque duplicem facit Statius, unanim ad deum Apollinem, alteram ad imperatorem Romanum}\]

which is related to the accessus in Düsseldorf, K2:F.50 (18-9):

\[\text{sciendum est quod dupliciter facit invocationem, scilicet ad Apollinem et ad Domicianum imperatorem.}\]

The third added detail is the discussion as to whether the poem is complete (24-6). This discussion is found in several other accessus,\(^{246}\) such as the accessus in Wolfenbüttel, cod. Guelf. 13.10 Aug. 4\(^{9}\) (above, p. 101), but the passage is so re-written that a clear source cannot be assigned. Such is also the case with the last detail not derived from the Carpentras accessus, the discussion of the number of books, which, for the first time,

\(^{246}\)See de Angelis 1984.168 n. 121
notes Priscian as a source for the division of the *Achilleid* into two books, rather than five (35-9).

The *accessus* is a bit disappointing. One would hope that a scholar of Filelfo’s stature could end the stalemate of Statian scholarship in this age, but we see no evidence of his “dynamismo intelletuale,” and no evidence of Filelfo’s own wisdom in the actual interpretation of the text; indeed, the only scholarly additions are of tangential material.

But even here, Filelfo is not at his best. In the discussion of the Year of the Four Emperors (ll. 10-11), for example, he curiously reverses the order of Vitellius and Otho. In the discussion of Homer (ll. 51-59), he describes the *Iliad* as “*bella contra Troiam facta in honorem Acchillis seu Helene*” (54), which, considering Filelfo’s repute as a scholar of Greek, is surprisingly off-base. Further, his expanded discussion of the *tres artes* (ll. 66-74) ends, oddly, with a translation of the opening of the *Odyssey*. That Filelfo did not transmit the Greek is astonishing enough, but he also used Horace’s translation of the passage (*Ars* 141-2, without citation), and not his own.

---

247 This is the judgement of R. Bianchi (“Note di Francesco Filelfo al «De natura deorum», al «De oratore» e all’ «Eneide» negli appunti di un notaio senese,” in *Francesco Filelfo nel quinto centenario della morte*… [above, n. 245], 325-368 [328]); she contrasts this quality with the stagnant scholarship in Siena (“l’umanesimo senese rifluì in una fase di ristagno e di emarginazione,” p. 328). See also V. Fera, “Itinerari filologici di Francesco Filelfo,” *ibid.*, 89-135, esp. 91-3.

248 The spelling “Acchilles” is strange for a scholar who fought so bitterly for the proper spelling and transliteration of Greek words. See R. Ruboli, “Spunti filologici dall’ epistolario del Filelfo,” in *Francesco Filelfo nel quinto centenario della morte*… [above, n. 245], 137-62 (151-2). The spelling could stem from a mis-transcription of a Gothic or fractura original, where “Ac” (אכ) would be transcribed “Acc”.

249 On Filelfo’s adaptations of Homer in his own poetry, see G. Albanese, “Le raccolte poetiche latine di Francesco Filelfo,” in *Francesco Filelfo nel quinto centenario della morte*… (above, n. 245) 389-458 [414]. For examples of his insistence on transmitting the Greek, see M. Cortesi, “Aspetti linguistici della cultura graeca di Francesco Filelfo,” *ibid.*, 163-206. The usage of Greek in the commentary that follows the *accessus* is equally atypical. For example, the Greek for *Euhues* (*Ach. 1.166, f. 17vb*) is given as *Ευλος* [sic], which is supposedly derived *ευς* (*bonum [†]*) and *λος* [sic] (*filius*). This etymology is not derived from a Greek source (e.g. Sophocles, *OJ 211*), but rather from Pseudacron (*Scholia in Horatium Velutiorda*, ed. O. Keller [Leipzig, 1902]), ad *Od. 2.11.17*. The mistranscription of *Ευλος* seems to be derived from the same source: all of the manuscripts of Pseudacron’s commentary transmit *υιος* as *hivos*, *hyos*, or *chias*; that is, without the upsilon. The author of our commentary to the *Achilleid* further compensated for the missing aspiration in the Greek by adding a lambda. (In all fairness, this could be a scribal error, but since the etymology and the absence of the upsilon derive from the same source, I find that solution doubtful.)
If this *accessus* is actually by Filelfo, it shows us the major problem in Statian scholarship in his day. Filelfo, it seems, was content to add no critical judgement of his sources, or even of the text. Further, we see no attempt to modernize or contemporize the previous tradition. All that we see, outside of the desire to refine and improve the tone of his model, is a desire to compose a "complete" *accessus*; that is, to compile all the information that was at hand.

\[250\] I am casting my own doubt here. The only other discussion of this text (de Angelis 1985.168 n. 121) occupies itself only with Filelfo's division of the poem into two books, and does not note any problems with the scholarship of the text.
Commentum Statii Achilleidos editum sub doctissimo uiro Francischo Fidello, et in primis, de vita ipsius poe
e

icud dicit Seruius in commentario Virgillii, in exponendis auctoribus non nulla prius consideranda esse, videlicet vita poete, titulus libri, scribentis intentio, qualitas carminis, numerus librorum, et poete materia.


Titulus operis est Statii Surculi Tholosaini Papinii primus liber incipit. Dicitur enim titulus quia tutatur operis editorem.

Statii nomen proprium, Surculi familie nomen, Tolosani a ciuitate Tolosa, Papinii patris sui nomen, Achilleidos, qui<\>tractatur de Achille. Dicitur "Achilleis" secundum quod Virgilius etiam in libri descriptions "Eneis" usus est. Et est sciendum secundum declinationem Graecam formatum Acchileys, Acchilei, Achilleis.

Numerus librorum: in duos tantum diuidit, in primum et secundum. Secundus uero finem non habet, ut dixi Nichilominus

Text 4.7: Pseudo-Filelfo’s accessus to the Achilleid (Appendix A, sig. Ff)
Text 4.7 (continued)

aliqui indocti in v libros diuidere audent, quod nullo modo
Priscianus posse fieri probat, quod hunc textum nisi in primo et
secundo allegaret. Intentionem auctoris duplicem fuisse facile
cognoscere possimus. Harum altera est ut possit sicut docti uiri apud
posteriores phamam ac laudes sibi comparare. Altera ut excitaret
adolescentes alios laudibus Achillis ad virtutem.
    Qualitas carminis: ut breui colloquio extrinsecum
explanationem absoluam, herroicam siue exame trum est carmen.
45 Heroes enim dicuntur qui sunt plus quam homines, minus quam dei,
ut Theseus et Achillies. In hoc autem genere metri gesta heroum
desribuntur et in eo Homerus semper versatus est. Vnde Oratius,

     Res geste regumque ducum<que> et tristia
Bella, quo scribi possint numero monstravit Homerus.

50 Exametrum dicitur eo quod habeat sex pedes, ab εξ sex, et μετροσ mensura.
    Materia huius voluminis est de Achille tractare, et est
sciendum Homerum duo uolumina edidisse, vnum Odisssephs
nominatum, in quo facta scripsit Ulixis, alterum Illiados et ibi tractat
bella contra Troiam facta in honorem Achillis seu Helene. Opus
illud in 48 libros diuisum est, quod Virgilius in XII transtulit,
nam quem admodum in Homericco opere Hector et Achillis
ad inuicem bella conserunt, ita in Virgilio Eneas et Turnus. Pre lia
7rb de Achille in nono anno describere incepit, proceditque usque ad
Hectoris mortem. Statius hec animaduertens dicit se uelle ab
infantia Achillis incipere nec solum manere in interfectione
Hectoris, ut Homerus perfecit.
    Hiis itaque diligenter inquisitis, paulatim potero litteram
exponere. Igitur etiam notandum est tres esse poeticas partes,
propositio, per quam proponunt de quibus siue rebus
65 tractaturi, quam omnes sequuntur poete, vt Virgilius, "Arma
uironque cano", Lucanus,

    Bella per Emathios plus quam ciuilia campos
Lasque datum sceleri canimus, populumque potentem;

inuocationem quoque duplicem facit Statius, unam ad deum
70 Apollinem, alteram ad imperatorem Romanum; narratio dein
per quam incipit tractare quo modo res sit gesta. Primo

(continued)
uidetur facere secundum Homerum qui similiter inuocat et proponit,

Dic mihi, musa, uirum, capte post tempora Troie,
qui mores hominum multorum uidet et vrbes, et cetera.

1 Servius, ad Aen. 1.praef.1
17 qui...describere (18)] cf. Carpentras accessum, 5-7
19 secundum...fuīt (20)] cf. ibid. 10-11
25-6 Ach. 1.7
38 videlicet Inst. Gramm. 7.65 (GLK 2.342.5-6)
40 possit...comparare (41)] cf. Carpentras accessum, 22-4
41 posteros] cf. Petrum de Caneflis de Parma, Prohemium in Achilleidem (Berkeley, CA, Ms. UCB 145), 76
41 ut...virtutem (42)] cf. accessum in Escorial f.III.11, ll. 70-2
48-9 Ars 73-4
65-6 Aen. 1.1
67-8 BC 1.1-2
69 inuocationem...Romanum (70)] cf. accessum in Düsseldorf, K2:F.49, ll. 18-9
74-5 Horatius, Ars 141-2

3 lib<ri> post qualitas eras. M 6 familie M 18 describere M 57 prelia...mortem (59)] fort. nota ad lin. 54 58 usque] videlicet M 71 g (pro igitur?) post gesta eras. M
CHAPTER 5

CRITICISM AFTER THE REDISCOVERY OF THE *SILVAE*

After discovering Statius' *Silvae*, Manilius' *Astronomica*, and Silius Italicus in 1417 or '18, Poggio sent his copy of the manuscript to Niccolò Niccoli. Despite Poggio's frequent requests that he return the volume, Niccoli held on to the manuscript at least until the '30s, likely in the hope of completing his own commentary. The diffusion of the poems was, thus, slower than that of the other newly-discovered texts, such as the works of Tacitus. This is, at least, the conclusion of de Angelis. It is, in fact, very difficult to tell when knowledge of the *Silvae* became wide-spread, for the simple reason that the scholars of Statius' other poems did not realize the importance of the new texts and did not see the need to separate it from the previous scholarly tradition; rather, the

251 Poggio's copy of the manuscript, less Silius, is now Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, ms. 3678. On the fortune of this manuscript, see E. Courtney's introduction in his edition, *Statii Silvae* (Oxford, 1991).

252 Now Vaticano, Vat. lat. 6835; the prohemium is also transmitted in Vaticano, Vat. lat. 6526. See G. Mercati, *Per la cronologia della vita e degli scritti di Niccolò Perotti*, Studi e Testi 44 (1925) 136-8. (G. Abbamonte is currently working on the commentary at the Warburg Institute.) Niccoli worked on his commentary for unusually long time; for comparison, he published publish his edition of Valerius Flaccus in 1429, thirteen years after Poggio discovered it.


254 De Angelis 180 n. 143. She bases this statement on the commentaries of Sozomeno in 1430 (London, BL, Harley 4869) and Sicco Polention's notes in 1437 (see R. Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' scoli XIV e XV*, vol. 1 [Firenze, 1905], pp. 28-29, 33, 185; and vol. 2 [Firenze, 1914], p. 186), which show no knowledge of the discovery of the new poems. By the end of the fifteenth century, however, they were widely known, even outside of Statian scholarship (cf. the *Vita Lucani* in the Venezia, 1477 edition, which cites *Silv.* 2.7.23, 1.1.81-6, and 2.7.58-9 [Weber 3.20]).
first *accessus* that mention the poems sought to incorporate the poems to the old traditions.²⁵⁵

5.1. The Vaticano, Ottob. lat. 1261 *accessus* (Appendix A, sig. Ol)

A good example of this tendency is the *accessus* to the *Achilleid* in Vaticano, Ottob. lat. 1261 (dated 1435), which re-writes the Carpentras *accessus* by adding details from the *Silvae*. But, as simple as that may sound, this *accessus* actually presents us with several major problems. This *accessus* is found in two manuscripts, Vaticano, Ottob. lat. 1261 and a sixteenth-century *codex descriptus*, Ottob. lat. 2027,²⁵⁶ and is transmitted anonymously.²⁵⁷ In spite of its thin pattern of transmission, the text was heavily used and re-written in the following centuries. The *De Achilleide* of Franciscus Maturantius (*editio princeps* Roma, 1475); Domitius Calderinus’ commentary to the *Achilleid* (*editio princeps* Roma, A. Pannartz, 1475); Ioannes Britishus Brixeus’ *Interpretatio in Achilleida Statii* (Brixiae: Iacobum Britannicum, 1485); and the *vita Statii* in Gyraldus’ *De poetarum historia dialogus*, Book 4 (ca. 1535), are at least heavily indebted to it. Indeed, Maturantius²⁵⁸ treatise, which is extant in at least two versions,²⁵⁹ is so similar, that I consider it only a re-writing of this *accessus*.

These printed editions present us with another problem. The *accessus* in Vaticano, Ottob. lat. 1261 has occasional interlinear and marginal notes and corrections.²⁶⁰ The printed editions preserve the non-corrected version of the text for the most part, but also

²⁵⁵It is worth noting that *accessus* to the *Thebaid* drop off heavily in number in the end of the fifteenth century. I have found only a few examples that mention the *Silvae*, while I have found several for the *Achilleid*.

²⁵⁶This was first noted by Sweeney 44.

²⁵⁷I have been unable to find a similar hand in the study of A. de la Mare, *The Handwriting of Italian Humanists* (Oxford, 1973).

²⁵⁸Francesco Maturánzio of Perugia, 1443–1518

²⁵⁹There is a shorter version that is found, *inter al.*, in the 1651 London edition (ed. Thomas Stephens), and seems to be the results of a later recension.

²⁶⁰Vaticano, Ottob. lat. 2027 favors the corrections over the original errors.
transmit some of the interpolated material.\textsuperscript{261} The following chart shows some of the relationships among the manuscript and the printed commentaries.\textsuperscript{262}

\textsuperscript{261}Cf. the note \textit{inexpergiscibili somno} (l. 21), which is interpolated, and favored by the later editions.
\textsuperscript{262}I do not reproduce the entire text of the printed editions. Underlined words are direct quotations; italicized words are taken out of sequence for the purpose of clarity; bracketed words are interpolations by the later hand.
P. Statius Papinius ortus fuit patre P. Statio Papinius libertini generis homine, matre uero Agelina, cuius fuit Neapolitanus... Ipse enim pater utraque doctus lingua, omnia filii studia fuit quoad uixit. Qui post suum a Sellis Epiri oppido migrationem ad extremum usque diem antiquorum scriptorum enarrationem professus est magno patritiorum adolescentium convuentu et maxime apud Domitianum gratiosus, a quo quidem et auro et corona donatus. Abiit ut pote grato et principe et discipulo in preceptorem. Is genus suum egestate et inopia obscuratum primus propria nominis celebritate ita clarum reddidit, ut duae patriæ, Sellæ et Epiri oppidum et Neapolis Campaniæ ciuitas suum ciuem esse contendant.

Publius Papinius Statius, P. Papinii Statii Pater, 
ex Agelina uxore
utraque lingua eruditus,
ad nouissimum usque diem
professus est; et summo honore
apud Domitianum habitus.

Nam auro & corona ab eo donatus est, digno principe erga praecipue munere. Genus suum propter inopiam obliteratum, primus celebritate nominis celebre reddidit: adeoque claruit, ut quod Homero, ei contigerit. Duae enim urbes, Sellæ Epiorum, & Neapolis Campanorum, de eius natali solo certarunt.

Natus Statius libertini generis homine.

Table 5.1: Comparison of the *accessus* in Ottob. lat. 1261 with those of Franciscus Maturantius and Ioannes Britanneus
Table 5.1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hic demum senex lethargo interit.</th>
<th>senex inexpurgiscibili somni uitio perit.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Lethargus et ueternus is traditur esse morbus qui vulgo sobetia dicitur, cum quis inexpurgiscibili\textsuperscript{262} somno corripitur]</td>
<td>Vxorem Claudiam uiadum duxit in urbe filiam Claudii Apollinaris.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoris impatiens, Claudiam Claudii Apollinaris filiam viduam in vrbe duxit vxorem.</td>
<td>Claudiam Claudii Apollinaris filiam duxit uxor, amoris impatiens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neapolim se recepit prope iam senex Thebaide prius edita,</td>
<td>Thebaida &amp; Achilleidem optime de sé meriti imperatoris nomine consecravit: &amp; Thebaida quidem, ut ipse ait, multa cruciatum Lima: ac Junii Maximi uiri eloquentissimi iudicio publicavit. Caesar Domitianus Albæ, eadem qua patrem prius corona insigniuit, bisque auro donavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patris et amicorum iudicio, in primisque Junii Maximi viri disertissimi et Domitianum dedicata, a quo Albæ corona fuerat insignitus, et bis auro donatus, quemadmodum prius fuerat pater liberaliter acceptus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{262}This word is unattested in the standard lexica. The only occurrences I have found are in this context, with specific reference to Statius' father.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scripsit idem V Syluarum libris in quibus assentatur imperator et amicis blanditur. Imperatoris aetem animo ad avaritiam, rapinamque conuerso, rerum etiam necessariarum egenus, in patriam reuersus, monitum annum iam agens (ex interit) circiter L, relicta (ex superstite) filia et obscuris nepotibus.</th>
<th>scripsit Syluarum libros quinque, in quibus fortunam &amp; amicos poeta cognosci.</th>
<th>dum Syluas, quo opere imperator &amp; amicis blanditur, scribit.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achillis aetatem scribere orsus;</td>
<td>morte interceptus est ubi etiam rerum necessarium egens mortem obiit,</td>
<td>superstite filia et nepotibus obscuris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most important aspects of this *accessus* for our present study are its relationship to the Carpentras *accessus* and how its author used the *Silvae*. The tension between the older *accessus* and the *Silvae* is apparent from the very beginning (1-2):

*P. Statius Papinius ortus fuit patre P. Statio Papinio libertinii generis homine, matre novo Agelina, cius fuit Neapolitanus.*

The author of this *accessus*, who apparently knew several other *accessus* to Statius, used the Carpentras *accessus* as a basis to change only the information that was contrary to that in the *Silvae*, adding some information from Servius. The reason for this is that the author saw only two errors with the previous tradition, Statius’ birthplace and when he wrote, both of which he attributed to confusion with Jerome’s Statius Ursulus (120-3). The author, then, only corrected the glaringly wrong aspects of the tradition and perpetuated some non-evident errors, including the name of Statius’ mother (2) and the fact that he wrote the *Thebaid* before coming to Rome (131-2); further, he retains the fictive *intentio* (i.e. the *questio* in Domitian’s court, 133) and *qualitas* of the poem (58ff.), which are found in the Carpentras *accessus*.

The details that are added show an increased interest in Statius’ personal life. From the *Silvae*, the author took the name of Statius’ wife (26-8, from *Silv. 3.praef.* 22), which falls under the category of *vita*; his Alban success and Capitoline loss (23-5, from *Silv. 3.5.28-31*), which fall under the category of *modus tractandi*; and his friendship with Crispinus (l. 147, from *Silv. 3.2*), under the rubric of *quibus auxiliis*. What is most interesting in these additions are the beginnings of a new interpretation of Domitian.

---

264He shows direct knowledge of the fourteenth-century Carpentras (above, p. 131), the late-twelfth-century København *accessus* (above, 46), and the *accessus* in Venezia, BnM, Lat. XII.61 (XV s. ex.) (not edited in this study; *sig.* Ve in Appendix A), and indirect knowledge of the Oxford, Lincoln College 27 (XII in.) (above, p. 51), Thomas Walsingham (XV s.), and the *In principio accessus* (XII s. ex.) (above, p. 70).

265The *titulus* (54-7) and *stitus scribendi* (58-63) are taken from the Servian *accessus* (see p. 1).

266The author of this *accessus*, like Politian, Perotti, and Gervatius in their commentaries, is vituperative and hastens to find as many faults with previous scholars as possible. It is worth noting that the discrepancy between Jerome’s date and the date preferred by the *Quaeritur accessus* never really caused much dispute before the discovery of the *Silvae*. 158
Although the emperor retains the image of the philosopher-king (arising from the tale of his court), the author of this *accessus* adds the note that Statius (who seems here to retain his moral character), because of the emperor’s increased vices, returns to Naples (50-3).²⁶⁷

What we see, then, in this *accessus*, is a curious, intentional mixture of details from the old and new traditions,²⁶⁸ including Dante.²⁶⁹ The author did not wish to break fully from the previous tradition (or did not think it necessary), although he does make an issue of the errors that have been committed before, especially, as is often the case with the late humanists, those of Dante.

---
²⁶⁷This information ultimately derives from *Silv.* 3.5, combined with information from Juvenal 7.86 (cf. line 52: *necessarium egens*). Statius’ problems with the Domitian become a sort of a *topos* in later criticism, with one example being the tradition mentioned by Crinitus that Statius was murdered by Domitian (above, n. 184).
²⁶⁸It is not until the commentaries of Politian and Perotti that scholars begin to realize that the entire medieval view of Statius’ biography was false.
²⁶⁹The text in ll. 102-107 is taken from a very good manuscript and has no errors that aid us in tracing the manuscript tradition of the quote. In lines 118-128, we might note the mock deferentiality to Dante that the author shows in criticizing Dante for his error: "*sed parcant obsecro nobis eius manes*" (121).
P. Statii Papinii Vita

P. Statius Papinius ortus fuit patre P. Statue Papinio libertini generis homine, matre uero Agelina, cuius fuit Neapolitanus, ad poeticaen ab inuenite pueritia patris cura et eruditione formatus. Ipse enim pater utraque doctus lingua, omnia filii studia fouit quod quidem. Qui post suam a Sellis Epiri oppido migrationem: ad extremum usque diem antiquorum scriptorum enarrationem professus est magni

patriciorum adolescentium conuenia et maxime apud Domitianum gratiosus, a quo quidem et auro et corona donatus. Abiit ut pote grato et principe et discipulo in praecipit. Is genus suum egestate et inopia obscuratum primus propria nominis celebritate ita clarum reddidit, ut duæ patriæ, Selle Epirotarum et Neapolis Campaniæ ciuitas suum ciem esse contendant, quemadmodum de Homero hoc distichon legimus apud Gellium:

id est, sep<tem> v<rbes> c<ontendunt> d<e> s<tirpe>
I<lliis?> H<omeri>, S<myrna>, R<hodus>, C<olophon>,
S<alamin>, I<os>, A<rgos>, A<thenæ>. Hic demum senex

lethargo interit. Lethargus et ueterus is traditur esse morbus qui vulgo sobetia dicitur, cum quis inexpressibili somno corripitur.

Ipse uero Papinius filius admodum iuuenis Neapoliprima

posuit rudimenta ludis quinquennalibus. Mox Romæ quinquatribus

Albanis ter de poetis coronam meruit. In certamine Capitilio antea

uictus ruborem et confusionem etate et occupationibus excusat.

Amoribus impatiens, Claudiam Claudii Apollinaris filiam viduam in

vrbe duxit vxorem, ex qua filiam susceptam adultamque quoniam rei

familiaris tenuitate collocare et maritare non potesset, Neapolim se

receptit prope iam senex Thebaide prius edita, patris et amicorum

iudicium, in primisque iunii Maximi vin disertissimi, et Domitiano

consecrata, a quo Albæ corona fuerat insignitus, et bis auro donatus,

quemadmodum prius fuerat pater liberaliter acceptus. In eadem uero

Thebaide, quam ipse ait se multa cruciasssse lima, imitatus est

(continued)
Text 5.1 (continued)

Maronem principem poetarum, atque ita est imitatus ut a nonnullis
Virgili simius dicus sit. Hinc ipse in calce eiusmodem operis Æneida
laudibus effereas, Thebaidem sic suam alloquitur:

O mihi bissenos multum uigilata per annos
Thebai

et paulo infra:

Viue precor, nec tu d<iuinam> Æ<neidem> t<emta> s<ed>
I<onge> s<equere> et v<estigia> s<emper> a<dora>

Hoc idem etiam in libello ad Marcellum scripto sic ipse ingenua fatetur:

tenues ignauo poliice chordas
Pulso Maroneique sedens in margine templi
Sumo animum et magni tumulis accanto magistri.

Quantum autem hius extiterit flumen eloquentiae uuenalis ostendit,
quamuis satyrice, cum ait:

Curriat ad uocem iuucundam et carmen amici
Thebaidos, lebam dum fecit Statius vrbem.

Scripsit idem v Sylvaniae libros in quibus assentiatur imperatori et
amicis blanditur. Imperatoris autem animo ad auaritiam rapinamque
converso, rerum etiam necessarium egenus, in patriam reuersus,
interit, supersit filia et obscuris nepotibus.
Titulus huius operis est Achilleis, deriuatu nomen ab Achille ut ab
Ænea Æneis, a Theseo Theseis, vt illud quod diximus "Nec tu diuinam
Æneida temta" et item illud:

Vexit toties rauci Theseide Cordi.

De carminis qualitate nulla hic dubitatio. Patet enim metrum esse
heroicum. Actus uero est mixtus, ubi et poeta loquitur et alios
inducit loquentes. Est autem carmen heroicum quod et epicum
dicitur diuinorum rerum et heroicorum humanorumque
comprehensio, nam constat ex diuinis humanisque | personis

7v

(continued)
continens aera cum fictis actis et si poeta hic noster omnibus in
scriptis suis grandis est et resonans, in haec ipsa tantum Achilleide ita
surgit ut hic multo sublimius ferri uideatur quam quo potuerit tota
Thebaide peruenire, nam Achillem teste Pausania historiographo
diligentissimo in Acta Sciron insula expugnasse uerum est. Thetim
uero matrem Achillis, filium in Sciron translatum Lycomedique regi
pro filia in puellari habitu commendatum inter illius uirgines
occultasse constat esse compositum. Licet Polignotus pictor
elegantissimus hanc fabulam pinxerit et ea pictura eiusdem Pausaniç
tempore uideretur. Sed quia fatorum ius est inuioile, inuentus est
ab Vlysse, ad Troiam professus est, et in eçde Apollinis Smynthei ut
infra dicemus Paride arcum intendente, pede vulneratus interiit. Stilus
uero est grandiloquus, qui constat alto sermone magnisque sententiis.
Scimus enim tria esse genera dicendi, humile, medium,
grandiloquum.

Intentio Papinii hic est, primo ut in poetica se exercens,
adeptam iam famam ex Thebaide æternam posteris faciat, quam
potissimam poetarum intentionem esse sic Ouidius perhibet:

Quid petitur sacrís nisi tantum fama poetis?
Hoc uotum nostri summa laboris habet.

Deinde ut Achillis educationem apud Chironem ab ineunte pueritia
scribere exorsus, omnia dicturus esset quæ ille a prima gessit etate,
propter qua quod multa Homerus intacta præterii, nisi morte præventus
fuisset. Ea enim dumtaxat absoluit quæ illi in Scyro insula occultato
contigere. Illuc enim Thetis ipsius Achillis mater eum a Chirone
ablata ad Licomedis regiam transtulit sub habitu puellari pro sorore
suæ latentem, eidem regi Licomedi commendavit. Quam quidem rem
tractans, poeta significat Thetidem uoluisse fatis resistere. Hinc
authori nostro causa intentionis ea est ut doceat neminem debere
uoluntati decem repugnare. Arque ita suum poema ethicç subiicit
philosophiç. Moraliter enim agit tractaque subtiliter quid honestum
et quid vitæ sit.

De numero librorum ea est questio et contentio, vt quidam
dicant hoc opus in v esse diuisum libros, sed propter qua quod Achilles
ab Vlysse inuentus narrat tantum qua disciplina sub Chirone centauro
fuerit enutritus, ex quo apparat duos tantummodo esse libros, ac ne
secundum quidem perfectum esse.

Dantes etiam Florentinus poeta doctissimus quamuis
uernaculus ita testatur in Purgatorio eum sic loquentem inducens:
Text 5.1 (continued)

Tanto fu dolce el mio vocale spirto
Che Tolosano ad se me trasse Roma
Doue mortai le tempie ornar di myrto.

Statio di la lagente ancor mi noma
Cantai de Thebe e poi del grande Achille
Ma caddi in via colla secunda soma.

Sunt tamen qui unum dumtaxat esse existiment et opus perfectum
esse, quoniam propter illud,

Patere hoc sudare parumper
Pulvere

tum etiam quia cum in fine dicat "scit cetera mater," uidetur in
compendium conferre narrationis proximitatem vt Terencius propter
longum actum ait:

Intus desp<ondebitur>
Intus transigi siquid est quod restat,

et quod etiam uidetur nolle alius quam latebras Achillis describere
cum cetera Hom<erus> antea scrisisset. Quatenus autem Dantes
ipse in his uersibus Tolosam Galliae oppidum Statio poetæ nostro
patriam assignat, videtur (ut a uero contra mendacium stemus) non
nihil aberrare, sed parcant obscero nobis eius manes, nam eti forte
legerat apud Eusebium Neronis temporibus Statium Surculum
Tolosanum rhetoricen in Gallia docuisse, non debuit tamen ad hunc
Statium Papiniun id transferre. Hic enim non rhetoricen docuit,
sed poetice gloria floruit, non Nerone sed Domitianus imperatore,
cui in hoc opere et in duobus aliis sepulcis assentatur. Præterea,
Parthenopen non Tolosam sibi patriam celebrat in multis Sylvarum
locis.

Causam uero qua poeta precipue appulerit aximum ad hoc
opus scribendum haec fuisse non nulli tradunt, qued Thebaide
completa, in qua per annos XII se inuigilasse fatetur, Romam cum
uenisset, a Domitianus imperatore et coronatus ut diximus et
honorificissime susceps est. Quumque in imperatoris aula hoc
quesitum fuisset utram ea quæ prædestinata sunt possint necne
euitari, ad quam soluendam fuerat a Domitianus subinuittatus.
Decreuit Papiniun hanc ut questionem solueret hunc librum

(continued)
Text 5.1 (continued)

conficere, quo doceret quemadmodum Thetis uoluit fatiis resistere, sed non potuit, propertia quod prudictum fuerat si quis deorum Thetidem vxorem duceret, ex eo et illa filium nasciturum esse patrem maiorem. Sic enim fuerat Protheus vaticinatus ut est apud Ovidium in undecimo Meta<morphosum>:

Concipe mater eris iuuenis qui fortibus armis
Acta patris vincet, maiorque vocabitur illo.

Quo quidem uaticinato, dii perterriri eam ducere recusaret, sed in primis illa Juppiter quanuis eius amore captus abstinuit prouidique ut Peleo Εας filio nuptam daretur, unde Achilles est ortus.

Meditatus itaque Papinius Achilis etatem uitumque describere, complexus est animo suo Crispium Vectii Bolani filium, quem legimus præstantissimum re militari adolescentem fuisse. Alii poetam hunc suspicantur animo concepisse non Crispium sed iuuenem quemdam potius Siracusanum, quippe quem Philostratus testatur adeo charum fuisse Domiciano ut imperatoris lingua et mens dicetur. Ego tamen poetam exprimere Crispum maluisse contenederim, propertia quod eum celebrat eo libello qui inscribitur "Protrepticon ad Crispum" ubi eiam meminit huius operis quum ait:

(cur<eos>que per o<mes> te meus absentem
circumspectat Achilles.

Ceterum Domitiano de se optime merito hoc opus dicavit ut primum Thbaidios, ac post propositionem et invocationem, petit ab ipso imperatore sibi ignosci quod non assumperit potius eius res gestas suo poema celebrandas, quia se illis imparem ait. Licet fateatur se cuperem id præstare, verum tamen nonquam audere tantam rem agredi, sed hae Sylua scribenda prius de Achille se ait uti quodam ueluti præudio et quasi pregustatione dum experitut sit non idoneus ad describendas res ab ipso prince gestas.

Nunc superest ut ad contextus explanationem transeamus in qua veterem more interpretum et quid nos et quid alii sentiant quantum memoria suppetet referemus; diuus enim Hieronymus in epistula ad Pammachium et Marcellam pro se contra Rufinum docet interpretis officium esse multorum sententias replicare dicereque hunc locum quidam sic edisserunt, alii sic interpretantur, alii sensum

(continued)
suum et intelligentiam his testimoniis et hac nituntur ratione
firmare, vt prudens lector uel auditor cum diversas explanationes
legerit audierite iudicet quid uerius sit et quasi bonus trapezita
adulterinę monetus pecuniam reprobet ueramque teneat.

2 matre...Agelina] In principio accessus, l 8
14-6 Epigr. in Gell. 3.11
26 amoris impieniens] cf. Servius ad Aen. 1.praef. 10: impieniens libidinis
33 multa...lima] Silv. 4.7.26
33 imitatus...biseno (37)] Carpentrás accessus, 9-12
42 quantum...vrbem (45)] Carpentrás 12-5
37-8 Theb. 12.811-12
40-1 ibid. 12.816-17
43-5 Silv. 4.4.55
54 Titulus...codri (57)] cf. Servius ad Aen. 1.praef. 75-6
55-6 Theb. 12.816
57 Juvenalis, Sat. 1.2, rectius
58 patet...fictis (63)] cf. Servius ad Aen. 1.praef. 77-9; cf. Venezia, Lat. XII.61, ll. 35-6
66 Pausanias 1.22.6
67 Thetim...compositum (70)] cf. Servius ad Aen. 1.praef. 79-81; cf. Venezia, Lat.
XII.61, ll. 35-9
71 cf. Pausanias 1.22.6
72 inuentus...interit (74)] cf. Kobenhavn accessus, l. 11
74 stilus...grandilocuuum (77)] cf. Servius ad Aen. 1.praef. 81-3; cf. Venezia, Lat. XII.61,
39-40
78 intentio...habet (82)] Carpentrás 22-6
81-2 Ovidius, A.A. 3.403-4
84 etate...præcentus (85)] cf. Oxford, Linc. Coll. 27, ll. 27-8
88 habitu puellari] Carpentrás 29
89 Licomedi commendavit] Thomas Walsingham (146r), l. 21
92 ethicę...sit (94)] Carpentrás 32-3
102-7 Dante, Purg. 21.88-93 (l. 91 rectius, sed var. lectiones inuenire non possum)
110-11 Ach. 1.17-8
112 ibid. 2.167
115-6 Terentius, An. 980-1
122-3 Eusebius-Hieronymus, Chronica, Olymp. 210 (PL 19.542)
130 quod...maiores (139)] Carpentrás 36-44
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Text 5.1 (continued)

142-3 Ovidius, Met. 11.222-3
144 dii...daretur (156)] cf. Carpentras 44-6
148 complexus...animo] cf. Silv. 5.3.100
149 cf. Silv. 5.2.8-11
152-3 Philostratus, Vita Apollonii 7.36: δομετιανοῦ δὲ νοῦς τε καὶ γλώττα.
155 Silv. 5.2
157-8 ibid. 5.2.162-3
165 cf. Ach. 1.18-9
169 Hieronymus, Apologia contra Rufinum 1.6.10-13 (CCL 79.6)

Epiorotaram] et Epiri oppidum V ante et add. man. rec. sup. lin.: Tolosa Galliç V
20 lethargus...corruptur (21)] add. man. rec. marg. V 29 prope add. man. rec. sup. lin.
man. rec. V 64 factis...interit (74)] add. marg. man. text. V 67 Thetim ex
Euadem(?)] V 68 Achille V 84 etate] etate post prima eras. V 85 ab post nisi eras.
V 99 etiam add. sup. lin. V 105 la ante gente eras. V 108 sunt...scripsisset
V tradunt e tradit V 131 qua add. sup. lin. V 132 et post uenisset eras. V
136 decreuit...soleret post euitari (l. 134) pos. V 139 ex illa post ex eo add. sup. lin.
man. rec. V 140 ut...Meta. (141) add. sup. lin. man. rec. V 145 quamuis...captus
1add. sup. lin. man. rec. V nepotique suo post filio add. sup. lin. man. rec. V 146 cuius
exemplo ostendit poeta non homines modo sed deos etiam fatali necessitate subiunctos
esse post ortus add. sup. lin. man. rec. V 147 et post etatem eras. V 148 Vectii]
Versi corr. sup. lin. man. rec. V 149 alii...Achilles (157) add. marg. man. rec. V
157 cuneosque per omnes add. sup. lin. V 164 scribendi V 167 mun...transeamus
add. in lac. man. rec. 173 rationē V 174 uel auditor post lector add. sup. lin. man.
rec. V audieritue post legerit add. sup. lin. man. rec. V
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5.2. The Wien, ÖNB, cod. 3114 accessus (Appendix A, sig. V)

The author of the accessus we have just treated is quite exceptional among Statius scholars, not only for his knowledge of Greek, but also for knowledge of other accessus. (I will discuss these aspects of this accessus further below.) The more typical accessus in late manuscripts show only indirect knowledge of the Silvae. A good example of this is the brief accessus in Wien, ÖNB, cod. 3114 (dated 1481).

There are actually two accessus in this manuscript of the Achilleid, the first of which is loosely based on the Quaeritur accessus; the second is a representative of a fifteenth-century German tradition, which shows no knowledge of the Silvae.\(^\text{270}\) It is the first that we shall treat here.

The accessus begins with a re-statement of the Quaeritur accessus, with a minor correction: Statius is now Neapolitanus (1-2). There then follows a typical catalog of virtues, including the familiar doctus eloquio and the note that he was insigni morum urbanitate conspicuus (which we saw in the In principio accessus to the Thebaid). This accessus then lists the typical intentiones of the Thebaid (namely, that Statius sought to prevent the imperial brothers from fighting) and of the Achilleid (that he sought to sharpen his poetical abilities), but does not mention the Silvae. The author then adds a new allegory to Statius’ name Sursulæ, deriving it from a frons nouellos (12-13):

\[
\text{Quidam autem dicunt Sursulæ, quoniam surculus frons est nouelles.}\quad \text{271} \quad \text{Ergo et ipse excreuit inter alios poetas; quasi iterum nouelly suo evo non successivae, excrecebat in succis.}\quad \text{272}
\]

\(^{270}\)The accessus seems to be descended from the same original as Augsburg, Staats- und Stadtbibliothek, 4º Cod. 21 (25v-26v) and Kraków, Biblioteca Jagiellońska, 525 III (111r) re-write (Au and Kr respectively in Appendix A). The accessus in Olomouc, Státní vědecká knihovna, M.1.167 (above, p. 124), is related to the Wien version, and may represent a Bohemian tradition; see O and V in Appendix A (below, pp. 179 ff.).

\(^{271}\)The form is a hyper-correction of the genitive nouellae (a newly-planted vine). Novelly on the following line is likely a hyper-correction of the nominative nouellae.

\(^{272}\)This last sentence ought to be translated, "Therefore he rose up among the other poets; just like a vine planted again in its life, not having been cut back, he grew forth from the sap. The adjective successivus is a variant for subsicivus."
To the author, the validity of the name *Surculus* does not come into question. However, the author does realize the problem with claiming Tolosa as Statius' homeland. The confusion, he goes on to explain, stems from confusion with Caecilius Statius, the comic poet and contemporary of Ennius who, according to this *accessus*, came from Gaul.²⁷³

This text shows one of the most prominent trends that we find in Statian scholarship before the development of the printed book. The *Silvae* are specifically mentioned in only a handful of *accessus* to Statius, and outside of the major commentaries and extremely learned accessus, such as the one that headed this chapter, most authors are content only to change the notes about Statius' homeland, without realizing that much more was critically at stake. We see again that Statius' biography was seen as comparatively unimportant. Here, for example, even though evidence concerning his personal life was available, this scholar chose not to use it (other than to correct the most glaring error). It is, rather, the style and the rhetorical and moral aspect of the poems which were of greatest interest. Why this was the case is unclear, but I suspect that the scholarship reflected the work at hand. Statius, unlike Ovid, Virgil, and Lucan, is neither personally, nor contemporaneously, nor locally associated with his epic poems.²⁷⁴ Thus, his personality did not have an impact on the interpretation of his poems and was not of interest. It was not until the availability of a personal text that scholars started to interest themselves in Statius' personality, and since Niccoli retained Poggio's manuscript for so long, the new developments in Statian criticism would be an affair for scholars on the printed page.

²⁷³ The source of this is undoubtedly Volcacius Sedigitus (1.5), who claimed that the poet came from Cisalpine Gaul. Jerome (chron. a. Abr. 1839, taken from Suetonius) claims that he was an Insubrian, likely having been born in Milan. A. Gellius (4.20.12 and 13) claims that he was a slave. Politian also suggests Caecilius Statius as a possible source of the confusion. See his *Vita Statii* in L. Martinelli Cesarini, 8.9-12.

²⁷⁴ It is only for thirty lines in the *Thebaid* and *Achillid* that Statius narrates personally. Still, we can compare the reception of Lucan. Although he was only briefly present in his epic as well, medieval scholars used his contemporaneity to involve him personally in his epic. Cf. the note in Vaticano, Vat. 168
Stacius Neapolitanus tempore Vespesiani imperatoris fuisse dicitur et
ad Domiciani filii sui tempora vsque peruenisse. Homo quid fuit
ortu et ingenio non degener. Doctus eloquio et insigni morum
urbanitate conspicuus, priusquam Thebaedium scriberet ad

5 instructionem Tyti et Domiciani fratum ne de imperio dissiderent,
ad examinandum et exercendum ingenium suum, hoc opus
aggreditur, nam sibi Achilleiden, i.e. hystoriam de Achille
assumpsit ut ad animositatem et virtutes eos cohortetur. Est ergo
tytulus Stacii Pampinii Sursuli liber Achilleidum incipit. Stacius

10 proprium nomen, Pampinius cognomen, Sursulus uero agnomen,
quasi sursum canens. Quidam autem dicunt Sursulus quoniam surculus
frons est nouelles. <Ei> go et ipse excereit inter alios poetas; quasi
iterum nouelie suo ueo non successiue, excresciaet in succis. Scilicet
et alter Stacii Grecus et poeta fuerat tempore Ennii poete quem

15 Tolonensem vocant Gallicum fuisse ayunt, plerumque igitur ab
ignorantius nomina confunduntur eorum. Hic in omnibus
operibus suis honestis et artificiose prohemii<ss> vsus est ut per hoc
auditores excet ad materiam preelectam antepondo eis de quo in
opere suo tota sit dicturus. Cum exordii auditorum beneuolentia,
docilitas et attencio conpara<ntur, ut habet.

---

1 tempore...peruenisse (2) cf. Queritur accessus, ll. 1-2
3 doctus eloquio] cf. Queritur accessum, 1. 7 et In principio accessum 19-21: Fuit autem
morum honestate peditus...doctus eloquio.
8 animositatem) cf. Linc. 27, 79 (sed de Diomede)

2 sua W 4 Thebaedium W 5 institucionem W

Text 5.2: The Wien 3114 accessus to the Achilleid (Appendix A, sig. V)

lat. 9964 (XIV s.), "Et debes ea que autor canit in laudes Neronis exponere in vituperium" (E.M.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

Statius was a Mannerist poet in the full definition of the word: he created his poem out of material he had copied, emulated, and borrowed. It was the advent of the Romantic age that spelled his doom. As an author, he lacked "individuality" because he copied;\(^\text{275}\) he lacked "personality" because he separated himself from his poems; he lacked "Latinity" because his Latin was not that of the "golden" age;\(^\text{276}\) and what is most important, he lacked "applicability" because he did not respond to the problems of his times.\(^\text{277}\) The question arises, then, as to why he was so popular in the Middle Ages.

\(^{275}\)Cf. the debate between F. Delarue ("Sur deux passages de Stace," Orpheus 15 [1968] 13-31) and P. Venini ("Stazio poeta doctus?" RIL 103 [1969] 461-476), in which Delarue finds Statius erudite, but Venini impugns him for adhering too closely to his predecessors and lacking originality. In 1834, J. Nisard argued that Statius was "un versificateur erudite et non un poète" (see Constans [above, n. 189], p. 147).

\(^{276}\)The division of Latin literature into epochs was first made by J.C. Scaliger (Poetices [ed. princ. Lyon, 1561, repr. Stuttgart, 1964], Book 7, "Hypercriticus", p. 325aD, p. 295). At the same time, Scaliger distanced Statius from the wilting aspects of his "aetas tertia" (see pp. 324bB-325aD; his phrase is "deuergens paulatim efflorescit"). The "faults" of Statius' Latin was the final outcome of the famous debate between Gronovius and Crueces in the mid-seventeenth century. In 1637, J.F. Gronovius wrote his Diatribe Statiana (at Lyon), reacting to the heavy corrections Crueces made, particularly to the Silvae, in the 1620 re-print of his (Paris) 1616 edition (which had some corrections). Crueces responded in 1639 with his Aniidiatribe (in Paris), in which he argued (without our modern comprehension of the tradition) that the text, in its transmission, must have been badly distorted by ignorant scribes. The following year, Gronovius, who would deem Crueces' response not worthy of reading, put forth the explanation (among many others) that Statius stretched Latin to the greatest extent that one could without breaking it; his Latin was not "bad" per se, but was certainly not to be emulated. This was the last heated scholarly debate on any aspect of Statius' poems.

\(^{277}\)Statius is often criticized, even today, for his praise of Domitian. His silence as to Domitian's wickedness (as attested by Tacitus and Pliny the Younger) does not appose the Romantic view that the artist, endowed with some higher knowledge, should seek to correct society's wrongs without fear of life or limb. Cf. Bernartius' dissonce with Statius "qui tam serulitier Domitiano, monstro non homini, aduletur" (cf. E. Crueces, ed., Stati Opera [Paris: Th. Blaise, 1618], p. 11). Scholars in manuscript
This question is very difficult to answer, since the manuscripts afford as very little
evidence. Certainly, Statius does provide us with several moral exempla: in the Thebaid,
he offers examples to children to avoid fraternal anger,278 or an example to the emperor to
avoid fraternal wars;279 and in the Achilleid, an example to the Romans to raise their
children and avoid weakness and effeminacy,280 to obey divine will,281 or to properly
behave with one’s teacher/mother or son/student.282 However Statius was by no means
the only poet in whom morality could be found.

There was also the fact that Statius imitated Virgil, much as Virgil himself imitated
other authors,283 that Juvenal extolled him so highly, and that Servius used him so
frequently in his commentary.284 It is possible that Statius was read for this purpose,
although that would not explain the long "Dark Age" of the transmission of Statius
manuscripts between the fifth and tenth centuries.

accessus seem not to have worried about this issue; indeed, Statius is often put in the position of
chastizing the emperor (this, of course, without the view of him as the poeta adulator that we have from
the Silvae). Many late humanists, however, seeking to redeem Statius, said that he wrote the Achilleid to
avoid the emperor’s wrath (as was the case in the London, Royal 15.a.XXIX accessus) (cf. the note of
Grafferi [ed. 1609]: "Cum Pappius noster Domitianus imperatoris non vulgariter esset familiaris, saepius
de rebus aetatis gestis, poema aliquod illustrare destinavit, unde ut viriam suam, antiquorum poetarum
more, periculum faceret, perfectam Achillis historiam contexere aggreditur"). The best treatment of
Statius’ praise of Domitian is in A. Hardie, Statius and the Silvae: Poets, patrons, and epideixis in the
Greco-Roman world. ARCA 9 (1983), passim.
278inter alios, Universitas bruxellensis accessus, l. 17; see above, p. 56.
279inter alios, the Bern-Burney accessus, ll. 9-11; see above, p. 33.
280Oxford, Lincoln College 27, ll. 9-11 and 39-41; see above, p. 51.
281inter alios, Kobenhavn accessus, ll. 16-17; see above, p. 46
282inter alios, Antwerp, Musaeum Plantin-Moretus, M.85, ll. 9-11 and Düsseldorf, UB, K2:F50, l. 9.
283Paris, BnF, lat. 3173, f. 92r: "Virgilius iste in diversis operibus suus diversos imitatur auctores"
(see B. Hauréau’s notes to G. Paris, “Additions et corrections,” Histoire littéraire de la France 29 [1885],
570). Many other authors were seen as imitating Virgil. An accessus to Martianus Capella reads,
"Maronem emulatur. Sicut enim apud illum dicitur Eneas per infernos comite Sibilla usque ad Anchiseom,
ita et hic Mercurius per mundi regiones virtute comite ad Iovem” (H.J. Westra, The Commentary on
Martianus Capella’s De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii attributed to Bernardus Silvestris, Studies and
Texts, 80 [Toronto, 1986], p. 47, ll. 114-7).
284See YCS...
We could also argue that Statius was read allegorically, but that these interpretations have not been transmitted to us. However, this does not seem to be the case. As Sanford discovered in her survey of glosses of Lucan, the glosses that we find for classical authors suggest that they were read mostly for rhetorical reasons. Thus, most of the manuscripts contain marginal rhetorical finding guides, such as "Co" or "Co\(\tilde{\text{s}}\)," a shortening for comparatio. In Statius, a few manuscripts actually enumerate these comparationes. As I said above, Statius was a teacher of rhetoric, and the presence of these and the utilitas we occasionally find in accessus suggest that the greatest reason why he was read was to learn rhetorical techniques to imitate. Still, there must have been more than this one aspect that made Statius attractive.

---

285 This would, at first glance, seem to agree with Minnis' assessment, that "pagan poets were being read allegorically or 'moralised'" (6).

286 The only transmitted allegorical commentary is that of Fulgentius (in Paris, BnF, lat. 3012 and Bern, Burgerbibliothek, 141.323), edited by R. Helm, "Anecdota Fulgentianum," RhM 52 (1897) 177-186; R. Helm, Fulgentiani Opera (Leipzig, Teubner, 1898); and R. Sweeney (Leipzig, forthcoming).

The only other allegorical interpretation I have found is in Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Ashburnham 1032 (XIV s. ex.), which argues that the return of Mercury at the beginning of the second Book is akin to the return of the soul. I have been unable to examine Vibo Valentia, Biblioteca dei Conti Capitolbi, 42, which reportedly contains a "Allegorizzazione o dilucidazione sull' Achilleide di Stazio" (see Mazzatinti, 7.205; P. Kristeller, Iter Italicum 2.301; and V. Capitolbi, Opusculi Vari [Napoli, 1849], 3.187-9).


288 The explicit Centum et octuaginta septem totius libri comparationes annumerantur is found in Firenze, BML, Plut. 91 inf. 10 (XV s.) and Vaticano, Pal. lat. 1696 (XII s. in.).

289 Zürich, Zentralbibliothek. Rh. 53 (above, p. 27).

290 Cf. the note that Statius was an offendi\(\text{c}l\)\(\text{u}\)\(\text{m}\) emuli\(\text{a}\)ri in London, Royal 15.A.XXIX (XIII s.) (above, p. 84, 1. 13). Cf as well the judgment of J.C. Scaliger ("Hypercritis\(\text{c}\)\(\text{i}\)\(\text{u}\)s" [above, n. 276], p. 325aD): "figuris frequentior et officiorum, habitu\(\text{u}\)\(\text{i}\)\(\text{n}\)um, animorum prudentior distributor et castigation\(\text{i}\)\(\text{n}\)um author sententiar\(\text{i}\)\(\text{u}\)r\(\text{a}\)m."

This same conclusion, though about ancient literature in general, is the supposedly new critical discovery of S. Reynolds (Medieval Reading: Grammar, Rhetoric and the Classical Text [Cambridge, 1996]). This aspect of medieval readership has been known and demonstrated at least since Sanford's study of Lucan.
The *Achilleid* was certainly the most read of Statius' works. Aeneas Silvius (*De puertos educandis*, 27) attests to the importance of this work in the school. Indeed, the *Achilleid* was always read more as a school text (or so the accessus suggest) and the accessus offer us three fundamental reasons why it was read: first, it was short and manageable (and for whatever reason considerably easier Latin than that of the *Thebaid*), second it was a good complement to the so-called *Liber catonianus*; and third, it offered lessons in raising children.

The *Thebaid*, on the other hand, only played a popular role before the twelfth century. It is possible that the poem had only an abstract applicability: it had a contemporary intentio, to teach the imperial brothers a lesson, but, at the same time, it was not involved enough in its time to tell later readers more about that period in Roman history. Statius, moreover, is seen in the poem as a poeta historiographus, and an oft-cited intentio is to rescue the story of the *Thebaid* from oblivion. What we see most often in accessus is that one read the poem to learn beautiful sententiae and to learn from and about the myth. Readership of the poem seems always to have been more scholarly and interpretation of the poem, which avoided allegory, was cemented at an early age (indeed, the number of accessus to the the *Thebaid* trails off after the thirteenth century, while those of the *Achilleid* increase two- to three-fold), and it seems the poem was only read in the Middle Ages for its story, its sententiae, and its exempla.

One final accessus, actually the *vita Statii* of Petrus Candidus Decembrius from his *Historia peregrina*, Book 3, will illustrate the virtues of the poet.

---

291 See above, n. 44.
292 M.D. Reeve ("Statius: *Achilleid*" in L. Reynolds, ed., *Texts and Transmission* [Oxford, 1983] 396), on the basis of M. Boas ("De librorum Catonianorum hestoria atque compositione," *Mnemosyne* 42 [1914] 17-46), inter al., notes that the text was added "for its mythological and moral content." The latter of these is suggested by our accessus to the poem, the former seems to be the case only for the *Thebaid*.
293 Cf., inter aliam, the In principio accessus (above, p. 70, ll. 62-3).
This short *vita* offers us no new details on Statius, his life, or interpretation of the work (the only novelty is that in what appears to be the autograph [Firenze, Ricc. 907]), a second hand notes that Statius was Neapolitan, not Gallic), and is simply a stringing together of praises and previous plot interpretations. Statius is called *disertissimus* and *dignus* (11 and 10), while his work is *subtilem* and *diligentem* (6). He is praised not for originality or creativity, but for copying. He copied and re-made (*effingat*, 2) Virgil, and did not hesitate to imitate the best poets of both languages (11-3), and he wrote works that are *melliflua* and *iocundae sententiae*.


295 J. C. Scaliger repeats this judgement in his *Hypercriticus* (above, n. 276), p. 325aD: "At prorecto heroicorum poetarum, si Phoeneum [i.e. Vergilium] illum nostrum eximas, tum Latinorum tum etiam Graecorum facile princeps; nam et meliores versus facit quam Homerus."
Statius Papinianus poeta meo iudicio disertissimus et qui Uirgilius non emuletur modo sed effingat, ex Gallia oriundus, a Domitiano imperatore ad scribendum exhortatus. Ut illius ignauiam effugeret, primum duodecim Thebanë historiæ libros ueluti imperatoris uirtutibus alludens, edidit recitauitque. Demum de Achillis uita quasi Homeri Iliadam expressurus unicum subtilem tamen et diligentem emitit librum, quem eruditi quidam Graecorum more in phures sed breuiiores distinctere libros, ut quæ non solum Uirgilius singulari opere coniunxisset, sed quæ separatim Homerus ediderat duplici uideretur uolumine comprehendere. Dignum itaque nobis usus est Plerumque sertis atque choreis, qui tantos uates utraque excellentes lingua mellifluo carmine iocundisique sententiis non dubitauerit imitari.

2 Gallia] nota marginalis in F addita: Errasti, nam Neapolitanus fuit, ipse de se in Siluis ad Rutilium Gallicum scribens ita ait: "At te nascentem gremio mea prima recept Parthenope, dulcique solo tu gloria nostro reptasti" etc. <Sil. 1.2.260-2>

Text 6.1: Vita Statti (from Petrus Candidus Decembrius' Lives of the Poets [Historia peregrina, Book 3])

We can, however, say much more about the attitudes of medieval scholars to his texts. First and foremost, interpretation of Statius was always conservative. With the exception of the eleventh-century Firenze, BML, Plut. 24, sin. 12 accessus (above, p. 39), we see very little allegory and a stubborn refusal to give into fiction. Scholars were always careful to extract information only from Statius' own words, granted that their interpretations led to some extraordinary "facts".

296 The text is also extant in London, British Library, Harley 2587 (XV s.) and Milano, Archivio Storico Civico e Biblioteca Trivulziana, Codice Trivulziano 817 (XV s.).
It was this conservative attitude, combined with the unavailability of new information, that led to the sterility of the *accessus* after the thirteenth century; before the proliferation of the *Silvae* in the 1470s, the only advancements were on stylistic grounds, as scholars adapted their information to new questions and approaches.\textsuperscript{297} It is only later on the printed page that scholars begin to let their imagination take flights of fancy, inspired by the abundant details available from the *Silvae*.\textsuperscript{298}

This conservative core suggests an important aspect of criticism and the composition of *accessus*, specifically that medieval scholars sought first of all to find a scholarly interpretation of the poem. Allegory and moralization, on the other hand, despite Minnis’ claim that they were important aspects of medieval scholarship,\textsuperscript{299} do not seem to be a part of general medieval reading.

We have seen, in these twenty-five *accessus*, distinctive patterns of development. In our first *accessus*, the *Quaeritur accessus*, we saw the careful, conservative development of an authorial biography. Knowing their limitations, the scholars who created and used that *accessus* drew their results only from verifiable facts and sources. In the twelfth century, after a short lull in activity, this caution persisted as scholars adapted the formal rigor of the *Quaeritur accessus* to the questions that were being asked in the newly-developing genre of the *accessus*, and the *accessus* began to fill-out.

It is in the thirteenth century and the beginning of the fourteenth that the *accessus* to Statius reached their pinnacle, in which the previously existing data on the author was adapted to Statius’ new surroundings. Statius existed in that century in two different environments: the classroom, where his *Achilleid* was intended as a tool for imitation; and

\textsuperscript{297}I should note here the reluctance with scholars to one of Statius’ poems borrowed from scholarship to the other poem (Appendix A [pp. 179 ff.] makes that clear). This may have been due to conservatism or simply to a lack of communication between the scholarly traditions of the two poems. If the second is the case, that would support the difference between the readers of the two poems as I suggested in my treatment of the word "*historiographus*" in the *In principio accessus* (above, p. 66).

\textsuperscript{298}Cf. the story that Domitian himself murdered Statius, above, note 184.

\textsuperscript{299}See Minnis 6.
among more advanced scholars, where his *Thebaid* was seen as a history and he as a teacher of stories, in this case with a moral back-ground. In this role, he was not so much to be imitated as to be obeyed. Statius was the *poeta doctus* as well as the the *poeta doctor*.

After the thirteenth century, scholarship on Statius began to stagnate. *Accessus* in this time tend to simply re-write pre-existing *accessus*, based on five models: for the *Achilleid*, scholars relied heavily on the *Universitas bruxellensis* and *København accessus* from the twelfth-century and on the Carpentras *accessus*; for the *Thebaid*, they relied either on the *Quaeritur accessus* or on the partially-derivative *In principio accessus*. If the jejune *accessus* attributed to Filelfo that we saw in the fourteenth century is authentic, then we see the severe limitations even the best scholars had when dealing with *accessus* to Statius: in such a scholarly-conservative atmosphere and without new information, new development was impossible.

It was the rediscovery of the *Silvae* that freed the humanist scholars. These poems, which were in no small degree autobiographical, contained the data that scholars needed to make the requisite advancements in Statian scholarship. At first, scholars did not realize the full importance of these poems, and simply adapted the information to the older traditions. As scholars came to realize the difference between the information in the *Silvae* and that in the older *accessus* traditions, they began to re-cast their *accessus*. As we saw in the Ottob. lat. 1261 *accessus*, this entailed a re-casting of the form of the *accessus* to Statius, and possibly of *accessus* in general: the author eliminated major parts of the traditional *accessus* form, including the the catalogue of *circumstantiae*. By doing this, he effectively separated himself completely from the roots of medieval *accessus*: Servius. Practically, he does not need to arrogate Servius' authority; his own authority is based on something more important and newer: a knowledge of Greek. He stresses this aspect of his scholarship, quoting Greek almost at the beginning of his text, on line 14.
That is something we have seen nowhere else in the *accessus* to Statius, and it is typical something that we will see in scholars from the sixteenth century down through our own, as authority is finally derived more from reason than from tradition. However, with this reason will come a new set of problems. With the information in the *Silvae*, scholars were able to do much more with the text, both for better and for worse. Scholars in the following centuries, freed from the conservatism that controlled criticism of Statius for so long, would (finally) turn to imaginative and allegorical interpretation of the texts;\textsuperscript{300} at the same time, we find the beginning of a new assessment of Statius’ style, his poems, and his life, this time with a philological basis.

\textsuperscript{300}One example of this is the story of Domitian killing Statius that Crinitus’ cites (above, p. 107).
APPENDIX A

STEMMA OF ACCESSUS

The following two charts show demonstrable relationships between individual accessus and accessus-traditions. Full lines show visible relationships, dotted lines show probable relationships or minor similarities. Descendancy is shown by the vertical angie of the connecting line. Horizontal lines show relationships among contemporary manuscripts without a clear precedence. I have added a number of accessus that are not edited in this collection in order to make stemmata more clear at places. Sigla in parentheses represent accessus to the other poem.

Sigla:

Thebaïd

λ= the parent of the marginal notes in In
B= the Bern-Burley accessus (above, p. 33)
Br= the accessus in London, BL, Royal 15.C.X (not edited here; see above, n. 84)
C= the accessus in Cambridge, UL, li.3.13 (not edited here)
Cz= the accessus in Krakow, Muzeum Narodowe, Biblioteka Czartoryskich, 1876 II (not edited here; see above, p. 82 and nn. 163 and 244)
F= the Freiburg accessus (above, p. 82)
Fi= the accessus in Firenze, BNC, II.11.55 (above, p. 115)
I= the In principio accessus (above, p. 70)
In= the marginal notes in the London witness of I
O= the Olomouc accessus (above, p. 124)
P= the *accessus* in Paris, lat. 13046 (not edited here; see above, n. 84)
Q= the *Quaeritur accessus* (above, p. 25)
R= the *accessus* in London, Royal 15.A.XXIX (above, p. 84)
Rl= the *accessus* in Vaticano, Reg. lat. 1375 (above, p. 120)
Z= the *accessus* in Zürich, Rh. 53 (above, p. 27)

*Achilleid:*

α= the parent of Pv and Ps
β= the parent of Bl and Bb
γ= the parent of Ve
κ1 and κ2= the two parent that were interpolated into the København *accessus* (ω and Ω; see above, p. 46)
ρ= the parent of Kr
υ= the parent of Au

A= the *accessus* in Antwerp M.85 (not edited here; see above, n. 282)
Au= the Augsburg (Staats- und Stadtbibliothek, 4º Cod. 21) witness of Kr (not edited here; see above, n. 270)
Bb= The Bruxelles witness of the *Universitatis bruxellensis accessus* (above, p. 56)
Bl= The Leiden witness of the *Universitatis bruxellensis accessus* (above, p. 56)
C= the Carpentras *accessus* (above, p. 131)
Ce= the *Casualis eventus accessus* (not edited here; see above, pp. 6 and 141)
D= the *accessus* in Düsseldorf K2:F.50 (only partially edited here; see above, p. 146)
E= the interpolations in Escorial witness of G
Ff= the *accessus* of Francesco Filelfo (above, p. 145)
Fm= the *accessus* of Franciscus Maturantius (only partially edited here; see above, p. 155)
G= the Gronov. 66 *accessus* (above, p. 89)
H= the *Hoc ex ordine compendium* (not edited here; see above, p. 125)
Ib= the *accessus* of Iohannes Britannicus (only partially edited here; see above, p. 155)
K= the København *accessus* (above, p. 46)
Kr= the *accessus* in Kraków, Biblioteca Jagellońska, 525 III (not edited here; see above, n. 270)
L= the Lincoln College *accessus* (above, p. 50)
Ol= the Ottob. lat. 1261 *accessus* (above, p. 160)
P= the Plut. 24 sin. 12 *accessus* (above, p. 38)
Pr= the Paris witness of Pu
Ps= the Strasbourg witness Pv (not edited here; see above, p. 54)
Pu= the Plut. 38.10 *accessus* (above, p. 136)
Pv= the *accessus* in Pal. lat. 1695 (not edited here; see above, p. 54)
Rl= the *accessus* in Reg. Lat. 1556 (above, p. 97)
V= the *accessus* in Wien 3114 (above, p. 169)
Ve= the *accessus* in Venezia, lat. XII.61 (not edited here; see above, n. 263)
Vl= the *accessus* in Vat. Lat. 1663 (above, p. 98)
W= the Guelf. 13.10 Aug. 4° *accessus* (above, p. 101)
Wa= the *accessus* of Thomas Walsingham (above, p. 143)
Wi= the *accessus* in Wien 13685 (only partially edited here; see above, p. 122)
Wz= the *accessus* in Warszawa, Biblioteka Narodowa, BOZ Cim 50 (not edited here)
Figure 5: Stemma of *accessus* to the *Thebaid*
Figure 6: Stemma of accessus to the Achilleid
APPENDIX B

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

*Accessus* are listed in an approximated chronological order by an abbreviated title with their page number in parentheses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century</th>
<th><em>Accessus</em> to the <em>Thebaid</em></th>
<th><em>Accessus</em> to the <em>Achilleid</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td><em>Quaeritur</em> (25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII in.</td>
<td>Zürich (27)</td>
<td>Lincoln College (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Bern-Burney accessus (32)</td>
<td>Plut. 24 sin. 12 (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>København (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII ex.</td>
<td><em>In principio</em> (70)</td>
<td><em>Univ. Bruxellensis</em> (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII in.</td>
<td>Freiburg (82)</td>
<td>Reg. lat. 1556 (97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plut. 38.10 (F) (136)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Royal 15.A.XXIX (84)</td>
<td>Gronov. 66 (89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guelf. 13.10 (101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII ex.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vat. lat. 1663 (98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV in.</td>
<td>Firenze, BNC, II.II.55 (115)</td>
<td>Carpentras (131)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Chronological Table

(continued)
Table 6 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XIV ex.</th>
<th>Plut. 38.10 (136)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td>Reg. lat. 1375 (120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV ex.</td>
<td>Olomouc (124)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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