

P. Papinius Statius

Thebaid and Achilleid


P. Papinius Statius

Volume I

Thebaid and Achilleid

Edited by

J. B. Hall in collaboration with A. L. Ritchie and
M. J. Edwards



CAMBRIDGE SCHOLARS PUBLISHING

P. Papinius Statius Volume I *Thebaid* and *Achilleid*, edited by J. B. Hall in collaboration with
A. L. Ritchie and M. J. Edwards

This book first published 2007 by

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

15 Angerton Gardens, Newcastle, NE5 2JA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2007 by J. B. Hall in collaboration with A. L. Ritchie and M. J. Edwards

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system,
or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or
otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN 1-84718-353-0; ISBN 13: 9781847183538

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I

General Introduction	vii
Bibliography	xiii
Conspectus Siglorum	xxxii
Text and Critical Apparatus	1
Index Nominum	401

General Introduction

The initial decision to produce a critical edition of the *Thebaid* was taken by JBH in the mid-1980s, but the avocation of other more pressing critical commitments meant that progress at first was slow and confined to a process of intermittent collation, as time and manuscripts became available, and sustained reading and re-reading of the text in the interests of critical improvements, if such could be found. In the early 1990s JBH joined forces with ALR and together, but independently, they proceeded to work on a translation of the *Thebaid* which should first and foremost make clear how they, after comparing notes, felt that the uppermost sense of the Latin text could be best expressed in English. Collation of manuscripts, meantime, was proceeding, and at a brisker pace, and it was decided to add to the *Thebaid* a new edition of the *Achilleid*, with its own companion translation. In the first years of the new millennium MJE was co-opted into the team. His technical expertise has been invaluable, and it is to him that the final presentation of the volumes owes its aesthetic execution. But, more than that, he has been as fully involved as his two fellow workers in reaching final decisions about the wording of the text and the translation, and all alike have scrutinised the contents of the third volume which offers a variety of epilegomena to accompany the editorial processes and conclusions.

It is not, we think, fanciful to see two distinct approaches to the business of editing classical texts. Both purportedly aim to restore the author, but their different ways suggest different definitions of the term author. Both properly fuss about the manuscripts and their testimony, and this is right because the manuscripts are our first stopping place on the way to the author. But they are not the last. And it is here that the two approaches part company. The favoured course for most editorial voyagers is to drop anchor at the last outpost of the manuscripts – let us call it the archetype – and look no further than this ultima Thule. But there are others who will seek to journey on. After all, they reason, this may be ultima Thule, but it is not the author. The author lies some hundreds of years further back, beyond the surges of ancient commercial copying establishments. The confusion is plain: the one group is happy to make the best of the manuscripts, with just the odd foray beyond them, and call the least offensive of their readings authorial; the other group, to which we belong, is not content with a *pis aller*. Statius was a popular author who wrote to be understood on a first hearing; and the endless

scrabbling with more or less unsatisfactory manuscript readings in an obstinate desire to squeeze some sense out of them is in our view a futile exercise. We must go with the flow of the sense, and we must not be content except with a text which makes immediate sense. Are we to suppose that the non-sense which still passes for the work of Statius is what drew contemporary audiences to come running when they heard that a recitation had been advertised?

In the introduction to their commentary on Horace *Odes* III (Oxford, 2004, xxix) R. G. M. Nisbet and Niall Rudd take D. R. Shackleton Bailey to task because he ‘offers interesting new proposals but is too ready to print them in his text’, and in his Bryn Mawr review of Shackleton Bailey’s new Loeb edition of the *Thebaid* and *Achilleid* (BMCR 2004.11.02) Paolo Asso similarly writes: ‘This is not to say that SB’s conjectures are uninteresting or that they do not facilitate our comprehension. Yet in the majority of the cases in which SB prints his conjectural text, it would have been better to restrict editorial intervention to mentioning the conjectures in the apparatus rather than printing them in the text, especially when the transmitted text is perfectly intelligible as is.’ Since very many more conjectures are printed in our text of the *Thebaid* and *Achilleid* than in Shackleton Bailey’s, it may not be inappropriate for us to comment on this line of criticism. Our position is quite straightforward. We do not print conjectures unless we believe them to be necessary, that is to say, unless we think that the text, however intelligible it may seem to some to be, is not what Statius left behind; and not to print conjectures when we deem them necessary seems to us to be an act of moral cowardice and dereliction of critical duty. In any case, for practical purposes, conjectures confined to the apparatus are left disregarded by most people; and not to remind people of their duty to think hard about what the editor deems necessary is another act of dereliction. So we repeat: we make conjectures to mend faults, and because we think that they do mend faults we print them in the text. The only conjectures, it may be added, which figure in our primary apparatus are conjectures which are printed or conjectures which have subsequently turned up as the readings of manuscripts (many of which may of course be ancient or medieval conjectures).

But even rejected conjectures may have their utility, if only that of drawing attention to an anomalous or obscure usage; and all scholars are entitled to know what conjectures have previously been made. Where, therefore, a conjecture does not get mentioned in the primary

apparatus underneath the text, it will be found in the secondary apparatus in volume three which, while offering additional testimony from the manuscripts, aspires to offer a complete register of conjectures made to date.

It is fashionable among purists, and those who regard themselves as the hard men of scholarship, to disparage the use of translations, particularly translations in the Loeb Classical Library series. Fashionable, and also, we contend, foolish. There is, for instance, so much to admire, and to be grateful for, in the Loeb translation of Manilius by George Goold; and the same may be said of so many of the new generation of Loeb translators. For the old translation of Statius by Mozley we have not much admiration, but we have found him endlessly helpful. Not, we add, where he is right, or right enough, but where he is wrong. His wrongness shows itself in two ways above all: when he gives what sense declares to be the right sense but that sense is not to be got from the Latin he prints; and when his translation passes silently over something in the Latin which defies translation. From these two kinds of error we have profited greatly in the search for the true reading, or the true conjecture.

The text which appears in the following pages owes nothing consciously to any previous edition for the way in which it is punctuated. Indeed, we have made a point of starting to punctuate with just the words in front of us and no marks of punctuation in sight. We commend this method to others as a procedure which works to advantage. Start by tinkering around with somebody else's punctuation, as even Housman is seen to do, and interpretation will get bogged down in niggling about the right place for a comma, or whether there should be a parenthesis here or not, and so on. Parentheses indeed above all must be signalled by the preceding context: if they are not, it will be wise to consider whether there really is a parenthesis. Our punctuation is also minimal, and designed to indicate the wider movement of a clause or period: if there is no need for internal punctuation – and where the writing is at its best this is always so – we give no internal punctuation. The reader will thus find greater freedom in articulating the limbs of an utterance according to the way s/he hears the words advance: our translation is designed accordingly to show how we hear the words forming their manifold associations of sense.

As we explain at appropriate length in the third volume, we have seen fit to edit on the basis of ten (in the later books eleven, and for one section twelve) primary manuscripts for the *Thebaid* and eight

for the *Achilleid*. A substantial entourage of attendant secondary manuscripts is brought in to reinforce or add to the testimony of the primary manuscripts. The primaries are listed and adduced in alphabetical sequence at all points, and this means that P (the Puteaneus) comes in the middle of the lists for the two poems. The reason for this, briefly now to anticipate the fuller discussion of the third volume, is that we do not regard P as having a claim to stand apart from the other manuscripts. To put it another way, we do not believe in the existence of a hypothetical ω standing over against a P enthroned in splendid isolation. As our apparatus makes abundantly clear, the number of places where P alone has the truth, whether in the *Thebaid* or the *Achilleid*, is much smaller than previous editors have known, and the affiliations of all the primary manuscripts with one another, P included, are so complex that it would be a fool's game to try to construct any kind of stemma. The best that can be done, and we do it, is to indicate frequencies – of agreement in error, of agreement in truth.

One manuscript, or rather tiny fragment of a manuscript, apart from P calls for particular mention now, and that is Par. lat. 13769 (p), which is dated by B. Bischoff to the second quarter of the ninth century. It is thus older than P by perhaps a couple of decades. But, where it is available, for *Thebaid* 6.239-416 (minus 309-310), it is not better than P: it does indeed share one or two rare true readings with P, but none of them alone with P. It was thanks to H. Anderson in his *The manuscripts of Statius* that we first got wind of the existence of this fragment, and our eagerness to see photographs of it may easily be imagined. So may our disappointment at the generally poor quality of the text which we saw in the photographs.

The principles according to which the apparatus criticus of this edition is organised are not dissimilar to those which informed JBH's apparatuses to Claudian and Ovid's *Tristia*. At all points the testimony of the primary manuscripts is given first where it needs to be given (there are places where the secondary apparatus alone is fit for the primary manuscripts' trivial mistakes) and all the primaries are accounted for, not infrequently by inferential subtraction from the full list which is repeated page by page in the running sigla. The terms *omnes mei* and *cett. mei* had already become so firmly embedded in the apparatus before ALR and MJE came into the enterprise that it was decided to leave them as they were. Secondary manuscripts, where they need to be mentioned, come after the primaries, if primaries have preceded, V (the Vienna fragment) being

counted as a honorary primary where it puts in an appearance. Only three secondary manuscripts normally attend the reading of the text, and only two a rejected reading; if there are others to be found in the secondary apparatus their existence is indicated by the symbol +. We have been always at pains to make sure that what needed to be said was said as clearly as possible; for it is important that the reader be able to see at a glance what the status of any particular reading is, whether the original reading or a correction or a variant. The frequency indeed of these three categories of status, we may add, will constantly be there to remind the reader of the complexity of the propagation.

We end, fittingly, with acknowledgements of help received. First and foremost, general thanks are due to all the librarians and their staff who have made available their resources or sent microfilms or xeroxes. In particular we desire to thank the staff of Duke Humfrey in Oxford, of the Rare Books and Manuscripts departments in the Cambridge University Library, of the Deansgate branch of the John Rylands Library in Manchester (who were so obliging in bringing incunables to JBH), and of the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. We are also very grateful to the late Canon Iain MacKenzie and Dr David Morrison of Worcester Cathedral Library for their kind welcome and assistance. Financial support for the purpose of buying microfilms was provided in the early stages by the Central Research Fund of the University of London and in the later stages by the Classics Department of Royal Holloway and Bedford New College. Friends and colleagues were generous of their time in verifying select readings of manuscripts at JBH's request: Dr C. W. Grocock in the British Library; Dr S. Hoffmann in the Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig; Professor R. Maltby in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France and the Universiteitsbibliotheek Leiden; Mr J. Michners in the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel; Professor G. Orlandi in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana in Milan; and Dr M. L. West in the Bodleian Library. Professor Orlandi also kindly made us a full collation of the fragment of text in Ambros. S 49 sup., which in his opinion is not of the tenth but of the twelfth century (perhaps *c.* 1200). Dr J. Haseldine found various listings of manuscripts on the internet. Professors E. J. Kenney and M. D. Reeve provided welcome information. JBH's former pupil the Very Reverend P. D. Eaton read through and commented on penultimate drafts of our work. To two people above all JBH and ALR desire to pay especial thanks. In the mid-1990s a series of conversations with JBH's old colleague and

friend Mr P. T. Eden gave rise to animated exchanges of views about conjectures and readings, and PTE's published papers have prompted much rethinking. Then, the late Professor W. S. Watt took a close interest in JBH's proposals for the text, and we have benefited constantly from his published discussions of passages and the unpublished adversaria which he was generous enough to send to JBH. For all the kindnesses we have mentioned above we are truly grateful.

As the edition was nearing completion, the deaths were announced of A. G. Lee, JBH's mentor in Cambridge, and D. R. Shackleton Bailey, one of whose final works was the new *Loeb Statius*. We salute the very different contributions to the study of the classics made by these two scholars, and we honour their memory.

JBH
ALR
MJE

BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography contains only items concerned wholly or in part with the text and the manuscripts

THEBAID

- Ahlberg, A. W., 'Ett Statius-fragment', *Eranos* 8 (1908) 144-150
- Alton, E. H., 'Notes on the *Thebaid* of Statius', *CQ* 17 (1923) 175-186
- Amar, J. A., edition produced together with N. E. Lemaire (Parisii, 1825-1830)
- Anderson, H., *The manuscripts of Statius* (H. Anderson, Washington, D.C., 2000)
- Anderson, W. B., 'Statius' *Thebaid*, Book II', *CQ* 18 (1924) 203-208
– notes on Statius, *Thebaid* II, summary of paper, *PCPhS* 178 (1941-1945) 10-12
- Aricò, G., 'Stazio, Tebaide, IV 665', *Aevum* 35 (1961) 273
– see under Traglia, A.
- Baehrens, E., 'Zu lateinischen Dichtern', *Neue Jahrb.* 129 (1884) 833-844
– conjectures in Kohlmann (1884)
- Barclaius, I., *Commentarii in Statii Thebaidem* (Mussiponti, 1601)
- Barreda, P-E., 'La *Tebaida* de Estacio en el manuscrito 148 del Archivo Capitular de Tortosa', *Habis* 23 (1992) 63-95
- Barthius, C., *Aduersariorum libri LX* (Francofurti, 1624)
– *P. Papinii Statii quae exstant...recensuit, et animaduersionibus locupletissimis illustrauit* (Cygneae, 1664)
- Behottius, C., collations in Tiliobroga (1600)
- Bell, Beaupré (1704-1745) conjectures in Garrod (1906)
- Bentleius, R., collations and conjectures in M. Haupt, *Opuscula* III (1875) 126-136, esp. 131ff.
- Beralduus, C., *P. Papinii Statii opera interpretatione et notis illustrauit C. Beralduus* (Lutetiae Parisiorum, 1685)
- Berlincourt, V., 'A propos des "conjectures" dans le texte de la *Thébaïde* de Stace: l'enseignement des premiers incunables', *MH* 63 (2006) 100-103
- Bernartius, I., *P. Statii Papinii opera quae extant Ioh. Bernartius ad libros ueteres recensuit & scholiis illustrauit* (Antuerpiae, 1595)

- Betts, G. G., 'Stattius Thebais I 72', *Mn.* 15 (1962) 44
- Bezzola, G., 'Un frammento di codice della Tebaide di Stazio', *Athenaeum* 18 (1940) 51-53
- Bindewald, K.W., *Stattius Werke im Versmass der Urschrift übersetzt, Thebais* (Stuttgart, 1868-1875). Only Books I-VIII
- Bitschofsky, R., 'Zu Stattius', *Fleckeisens Jahrb.* 121 (1880) 499-500 (resumé in *Bursians Jahresb.* 22 [Jahrgang 8, 1880, publ. 1882] 185)
- Borthwick, E. K., 'A note on boxing-gloves', *CR* n.s. 14 (1964) 142
- Bouquiaux-Simon, O., 'Un manuscrit de Stace à la Bibliothèque de l'Université de Liège (*Thébaïde*, X, 197-254)', *Latomus* 21 (1962) 839-847
- Boussard, J., 'Un manuscrit inédit de la *Thébaïde* de Stace', *REL* 14 (1936) 95-101
- 'Le classement des manuscrits de la *Thébaïde* de Stace', *REL* 30 (1952) 220-251
- Bower, E. W., 'Notes on Juvenal and Stattius', *CR* n.s. 8 (1958) 9-11
- Brakman, C., 'Ad Statium', *Mn.* 57 (1929) 251-262
- Brinkgreve, M. R. J., 'De locis nonnullis Statianis', *Mn.* 42 (1914) 104-109
- Brown, C. G., 'Where armies clash: Stattius, Thebaid 9.674', *RhM* n.f. 142 (1999) 321-326
- Burmans, P. (1668-1741) *Sylloges epistolarum a uiris illustribus scriptarum tomi quinque, collecti et digesti per Petrum Burmannum* (Leidae, 1727)
- conjectures in Kohlmann (1884)
- Bury, J. B., 'Some passages in the *Thebaid* of Stattius', *CR* 7 (1893) 302-303
- conjectures in Wilkins (1904)
- Caviglia, F., *P. Papinio Stazio. La Tebaide – libro I: introduzione, testo, traduzione e note* (Roma, 1973)
- Clausen, W., 'Stattius, Thebaid, 10, 299', *Philol.* 111 (1967) 146
- Clogan, P. M., 'An argument of Book I of Stattius' *Thebaid*', *Manuscripta* 7 (1963) 30-31
- 'Medieval glossed manuscripts of the *Thebaid*', *Manuscripta* 11 (1967) 102-112
- *The medieval Achilleid of Stattius edited with introduction, variant readings, and glosses* (Brill, Leiden, 1968)
- Cooke, J. P., 'Three notes on Stattius', *CP* 41 (1946) 102-105
- 'Notes on Stattius' *Thebais*', *CP* 41 (1946) 143-149

- Courtney, E., review of Williams (1972), *JRS* 63 (1973) 308-309
 – conjectures in Hill (1983)
- Crececius, W., ‘Ein Düsseldorfer Statusfragment’, *RhM* 32 (1877) 632-636
- Cruceus, E., *P. Papinii Statii opera...recensuit* (Parisiis, 1618)
 – *Siluarum P. Papinii Statii Frondatio siue Antidiatribes* (Parisiis, 1639)
- Damsté, P. H., ‘Ad Statii Thebaidem’, *Mn.* 36 (1908) 182
 – ‘Annotationes ad Statii Thebaidem’, *Mn.* 36 (1908) 353-396
 – ‘De uerbi mutandi usu apud P. Papinium Statium’, *Sertum Nabericum* (Leiden, 1908) 77-84
 – ‘Annotationes ad Statii Thebaidem’, *Mn.* 37 (1909) 77-111
- Deipser, B., *De P. Papinio Statio Vergilii et Ouidii imitatore. Accedit appendix critica...* (Diss. Argent. 5, 1881)
- Deiter, H., ‘Zu Statius’, *Philol.* 57 (1898) 343-344
- Delarue, F., ‘Sur deux passages de Stace’, *Orpheus* 15 (1968) 13-31
- Delz, J., ‘Vorläufige Bestattung’, *MH* 31 (1974) 42-45
 – ‘Nec tu diuinam Aeneida tempta. Textkritisches zu Valerius Flaccus, Statius, Silius Italicus’, *MH* 32 (1975) 155-172
 – ‘Apollo Musagetes in der “Thebais” des Statius’, *Hermes* 111 (1983) 381-384
 – ‘Zur Thebais des Statius’, *Mn.* 51 (1998) 594-597
- Dewar, M., ‘A note on Statius, *Thebaid* 9.120f.’, *CQ* 37 (1987) 533-535
 – *Statius, Thebaid IX, edited with an English translation and commentary* (Oxford, 1991)
- Deycks, F., lecture on Statius with observations on ‘codicis Thebaidos egregii aliquot fragmenta...sex...folia...apud nos membranacea...’ (Index Lectionum...in Academia Monasteriensi, 1865/1866)
- Dierschke, P., *De fide Prisciani in uersibus Vergilii Lucani Statii Iuuenalis examinata* (Diss. Gryphiae, 1913)
- Dilke, O. A. W., ‘The metrical treatment of proper names in Statius’, *CR* 63 (1949) 50-51
 – *Statius Achilleid edited with introduction, apparatus criticus and notes* (Cambridge, 1954)
 – ‘The value of the Puteaneus of Statius’, *Acta Classica* 5 (1962) 58-63
- Dilthey, K., conjectures in Mueller (1870)

- Dominik, W. J., 'Fama or Fata? A note on Statius, Theb. 10.835', *LCM* 19.5 & 6 (1994) 82-84
- Dowden, K., 'Noctes Statianae', *CQ* n.s. 29 (1979) 225-226
– observations in Hill (1983)
- Dubner, Fr., *P. Papinii Statii opera...edidit* (Lipsiae, 1837)
- Earle, M. L., 'Miscellanea Critica II: Statius' *Thebaid* 2, 294sq.', *CR* 10 (1896) 1-4, esp. 3-4
- Eden, P. T., 'Problems in Statius *Thebaid* X, XI and XII', *RFIC* 120 (1992) 313-317
– 'Problems in Statius *Thebaid* II-IV', *Mn.* 47 (1994) 231-233
– 'Problems in Statius *Thebaid* VII-X', *Mn.* 47 (1994) 233-235
– 'Adnotationes in P. Papini Stati *Thebaida*', *Mn.* 51 (1998) 78-84, 597-600
– 'Problems of text and interpretation in Statius', *Thebaid* I-VI', *CQ* n.s. 48 (1998) 320-324
– 'Problems of text and interpretation in Statius', *Thebaid* VII-XII', *CQ* n.s. 49 (1999) 332-336
– opinions and conjectures communicated to JBH in person and by letter
- Ellis, R., conjectures in Slack (1893) and Garrod (1906)
- Enk, P. J., 'Ad Statii Thebaidos librum primum adnotationes', *Mn.* 1 (1934) 214-216
- Erdmann, O., 'Collectanea', *Fleckeisens Jahrb.* 119 (1880) 832
– 'Zu Statius Thebais', *Bursians Jahresb.* 22 (Jahrgang 8, 1880, publ. 1882) 184
- Felgentreu, F., 'Zu Statius, Thebais 3, 324-36', *Philol.* 144 (2000) 149-151
- Flores, E., 'Interpretazioni staziane I', *Rend. Accad. Napoli* 39 (1964) 179-197
- Fortgens, H. W., *P. Papinii Statii de Opheltis funere carmen epicum, Thebaidos liber VI 1-295...* (Diss. Utrecht, Zutphen, 1934)
- Friesemannus, H., *Collectanea critica* (Amstelodami, 1786)
- Funaioli, G., 'Da un codice di Valenciennes', *SIFC* 21 (1915) 1-73
- Gärtner, Th., 'Statius *Theb.* 10, 909f. im Lichte spätantiker Imitationen', *MH* 58 (2001) 123-128
– 'Zum Text von Stat. *Theb.* IX 663f.', *Eikasmos* 12 (2001) 263-265
– 'Der Text der Statianischen Epen im Spiegel antiker Vorbilder und Imitationen', *Prometheus* 27 (2001) 233-249

- ‘Eine verkannte Geminatio: zum Text in Stat., Theb. X, 218’, *Latomus* 61 (2002) 446-447
- ‘Wer weint bei Stat. Theb. III 546?’, *Eikasmos* 15 (2004) 343-345
- Garrod, H. W., ‘The S. John’s College (Cambridge) MS. of *The Thebaid*’, *CR* 18 (1904) 38-42
- ‘Some emendations in Statius’ *Thebaid*’, *CR* 18 (1904) 300-301
- ‘Metrical stopgaps in Statius’ *Thebaid*’, *JP* 29 (1904) 253-262
- *P. Papini Statii Thebais et Achilleis recognouit* (Oxonii, 1906)
- review of Klotz (1908), *CR* 24 (1910) 25-26
- Gebhardus, I., *Crepundiorum seu iuuenilium curarum libri tres* (Hanouiae, 1615)
- Getty, R. J., ‘The Saint Germain MS of the *Thebaid* (Paris B.N. 13046)’, *CQ* 27 (1933) 129-139
- ‘Note on the *Turonensis*’, *CQ* 27 (1933) 139
- Geuartius, I. G., *P. Papinii Statii opera omnia* (Lugduni Bataurorum, 1616)
- conjectures in Kohlmann (1884)
- Gil, J., ‘Observaciones criticas a autores latinos’, *Emerita* 35 (1967) 105-108
- Gossage, A. J., ‘Statius, *Thebaid* v.593’, *CR* n.s. 12 (1962) 114-115
- Grasserus, I. I., *P. Papinii Statii opera* (Argentorati, 1609)
- Grat, F., ‘L’histoire des textes et les éditions critiques’, *Bibliothèque de l’Ecole des Chartes* 94 (1933) 296-309, at 298
- ‘Manuscrits des classiques latins en Espagne’, *Comptes rendus de l’Acad. des Inscriptions* 7, VII (1933) 324-325
- Gronouius, I. F., *In P. Papinii Statii Siluarum libros V diatribe* (Hagae-Comitis, 1637)
- *Obseruationum libri tres* (Lugduni Bataurorum, 1639, 1662²)
- *Obseruationum liber nouus* (Dauentriae, 1652)
- *P. Papinii Statii opera ex recensione et cum notis* (Amsterodami, 1653)
- Grotius, H., conjectures in Kohlmann (1884)
- Gruterus, I., in F. Hand, *Suspiciones in Statii Thebaidos librum I cum animaduersionibus F. Handii* (Ienae, 1851)
- Guietus, F., see under Marollius

- Håkanson, L. *Statius’ Siluae. Critical and exegetical remarks with some notes on the Thebaid* (Lund, 1969)
- *Statius’ Thebaid. Critical and exegetical remarks* (Lund, 1973)
- review of Hill (1983), *Gnomon* 56 (1984) 772-775

- Hall, J. B., 'Notes on Statius' Thebaid Books I and II', *ICS* 14 (1989) 227-241
- 'Notes on Statius' Thebaid Books III and IV', *ICS* 17.1 (1992) 57-77
- 'Notes on Statius' Thebaid Books V and VI', *ICS* 17.2 (1992) 287-299
- Harrison, E., summary of paper on *Theb.* 4.426, *PCPhS* 88 (1911) 5
- Harrison, S. J., 'The arms of Capaneus: Statius, *Thebaid* 4.165-77', *CQ* 42 (1992) 247-252
- Haupt, M., 'Analecta', *Hermes* 3 (1869) 335-346, at 345 (= *Opuscula* III, at 444)
- 'Beiträge zur berichtigung der gedichte des P. Papinius Statius' in *Opuscula* III (Lipsiae, 1876) 126-136
- 'Aduersaria', *ibid.* 642-643
- Heinsius, N., conjectures and observations in his editions of Claudian (1650, 1665²) and Ovid (1658-1661²) and in the four books of *adversaria (Aduersariorum libri IV...curante Petro Burmanno, iuniore*, Harlingae, 1742); also in Kohlmann (1884)
- Helm, R., *De P. Papinii Statii Thebaide* (Berlin, 1892)
- review of Klotz (1908), *BPhW* 29 (1909) 977-994
- 'Nachaugusteische nichtchristliche Dichter I. Statius', *Lustrum* 1 (1956) 272-299
- Heuvel, H., *Publii Papinii Statii Thebaidos liber primus... commentario...exegetico instructus* (Diss. Groningen, Zutphen, 1932)
- Hill, D. E., 'The manuscript tradition of the *Thebaid*', *CQ* n.s. 16 (1966) 333-346
- *P. Papini Statii Thebaidos libri XII* (Brill, Leiden, 1983, 1996²)
- review of Sweeney (1997), *CR* 50 (2000) 57-59
- Hine, H. M., review of Klotz-Klunnert (1973), *JRS* 67 (1977) 246
- Hoffmann, M., *Statius, Thebais 12, 312-463. Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (Göttingen, 1999)
- 'Statius, *Thebais* 5, 593', *RhM* n.f. 144 (2001) 111-112
- Housman, A. E., conjectures in Wilkins (1904)
- 'Greek nouns in Latin poetry from Lucretius to Juvenal', *JP* 31 (1910) 236-266 (= *CP* 2, 817-839)
- report of paper on a supposed anomaly of scansion in Statius, *PCPhS* 88 (1911) 12 (= *CP* 3, 1259)
- 'AIOS and EIOS in Latin poetry', *JP* 33 (1914) 54-75 (= *CP* 2, 887-902)

- ‘Notes on the *Thebais* of Statius’, *CQ* 27 (1933) 1-16, 65-73 (= *CP* 3, 1197-1222)
- Howard, C. L., ‘Notes on Statius’, *TAPA* 90 (1959) 117-130, at 123ff.
- Hudson-Williams, A., ‘Imitative echoes and textual criticism’, *CQ* n.s. 9 (1959) 61-72, at 66f.
- Hutchinson, G.O., conjecture in Parkes (2002)
- Huxley, H. H., ‘Statius *Thebaid* 10.935-9 and Claudian *Rapt. Pros.* 3.349-52’, *CP* 56 (1961) 253-254
- Imhof, A., *Emendata quaedam et obseruata in Statii Siluis* (Halaë, 1867)
- *Statius’ Lied von Theben* (Ilmenau, Leipzig, 1885 [Books I – VI] and 1889 [Books VII – XII])
- Jahnke, R., *Lactantii Placidi qui dicitur commentarios in Statii Thebaida et commentarium in Achilleida recensuit* (BT, Lipsiae, 1898)
- Jortin, J., *Miscellaneous observations upon authors, ancient and modern* (London, 1731-1732)
- and others, *Miscellaneae obseruationes...nunc a doctis uiris...continuatæ* (Amstelædami, 1732-1739)
- *Tracts, philological, critical, and miscellaneous*, 2 vols, ed. R. Jortin (London, 1790)
- Ker, A., ‘Notes on Statius’, *CQ* n.s. 3 (1953) 1-10, 175-182
- Klinnert, T. C., *P. Papini Stati Thebais. Edidit Alfredus Klotz. Editionem correctiorem curauit* (BT, Leipzig, 1973)
- Klotz, A., ‘Ad Stati Achilleida symbolæ criticæ’, *Philol.* 61 (1902) 292-310
- ‘Die Barthschen Statiushandschriften’, *RhM* 59 (1904) 373-390
- ‘Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Epen des Statius’, *Philol.* 63 (1904) 157-160
- ‘Probleme der Textgeschichte des Statius’, *Hermes* 40 (1905) 341-372
- review of Garrod (1906), *BPhW* 27 (1907) 590-595
- ‘Klassizismus und Archaismus. Stilistisches zu Statius’, *ALL* 15 (1908) 401-417
- ‘Incessare’, *ALL* 15 (1908) 484
- ‘Die Statiusscholien’, *ALL* 15 (1908) 485-525
- *P. Papini Stati Thebais. Edidit* (BT, Lipsiae, 1908)

- ‘Bruchstücke einer Statiushandschrift’, *Würzburger Jahrb. f. d. Altertumswiss.* 1 (1946) 153
- Koch, H. A., *Coniectaneorum in poetas Latinos pars altera: in Statium* (Progr. Gymn. Frankfurt a. O., 1865) 4-17
- Koestlin, H., ‘Besserungen und erläuterungen zu P. Papinius Statius’, *Philol.* 35 (1876) 493-533
- ‘Besserungen und erläuterungen zu P. Papinius Statius’, *Philol.* 37 (1877) 276-292
- ‘Lateinischer epiker. 4. Zu Statius’, *Philol.* 38 (1879) 40-62, at 61f.
- conjectures in Kohlmann (1884)
- Kohlmann, P., *P. Papinii Statii...Fasc. II. Thebais* (BT, Lipsiae, 1884)
- Kooten, T. van (1749-1813), conjectures in copy of Paris edition (1530), BL 1349.a.40.(1.)
- Kytzler, B., ‘Beobachtungen zum Prooemium der Thebais’, *Hermes* 88 (1960) 331-354
- Lachmann, K., *Kleinere Schriften zur classischen Philologie*, vol. 2 (Berlin, 1876) 47-50
- conjectures in Kohlmann (1884)
- Lawson, J. C., ‘The evocation of Darius (Aesch. *Persae* 607-93)’, *CQ* 28 (1934) 79-89
- Lee, G. M., ‘Statius, *Thebaid*, 9,6: *offensum uirtute*’, *Latomus* 24 (1965) 955
- Legras, L., *Les légendes thébaines en Grèce et à Rome. Étude sur la Thébaïde de Stace* (Paris, 1905)
- Lemaire, N. E., edition produced together with J. A. Amar (Parisiiis, 1825-1830)
- Lesueur, R., *Stace, Thébaïde*, 3 vols (Les Belles Lettres, Paris, 1990-1994)
- Liberman, G., ‘Textes à histoires: Virgile et Stace’, *MEFRA* 106 (1994) 2, 1137-1149 at 1143ff. (‘L’infortune de sept vers transmis dans la *Thébaïde* de Stace’)
- Lindembrog(ius), see under Tiliobroga
- Lipsius, I., *Electorum libri duo* (Antuerpiae, 1580)
- Madvig, I. N., *Aduersaria critica* II (Hauniae, 1873) 152-157
- Manitius, M., ‘Aus Dresdener Handschriften II. Scholien zu Statius Thebais’, *RhM* 57 (1902) 397-421
- ‘Handschriftliches zum Texte des Statius’, *RhM* 59 (1904) 588-596

- Marklandus, I., *Epistola critica ad eruditissimum uirum Franciscum Hare* (Cantabrigiae, 1723)
 – *P. Papinii Statii Siluarum libri quinque...* (Londini, 1728)
 – conjectures in copy of Gronouius' edition (1653), BL 1067.a.17
- Marollius (Marolles, M. de), *P. Statii Papinii. Thebaidos libri duodecim. Cum notis Francisci Guieti Andini, Io. Peyraredi nob. Aquitani, et aliorum. Opera ac studio Michaelis de Marolles* (Lutetiae Parisiorum, 1658)
- Mayer, R. G., 'Two notes on Latin poets', *PCPhS* n.s. 22 (1976) 56-59
 – review of Hill (1983), *CR* 35 (1985) 289-291
- Menkius (Menke, F. A.), conjectures in Kohlmann (1884)
- Meurig-Davies, E. L. B., 'Catullus and Statius: four notes', *CQ* 44 (1950) 31
- Meursius, I., *Exercitationum criticarum partes II...*(Lugduni Batauorum, 1599)
- Mitscherlich, C. W. (1760-1854), *Epistola critica in Apollodorum ad uirum illustrem Chr. Gottl. Heyne. Accedunt nonnulla in Statium et Catullum* (Goettingae, 1782)
- Modius, F., *Nouantiquae lectiones* (Francofurti, 1584), esp. *Ep.* 52
- Mozley, J. H., *Statius with an English translation*, 2 vols (LCL, London and Cambridge, Mass., 1928)
- Mueller, O., *Quaestiones Statianae* (Progr. Berolini, 1861)
 – 'Zu den Gedichten des P. Papinius Statius', *RhM* 18 (1863) 189-200
 – *P. Papini Stati Thebais...cum Scholiis recensuit* (Teubner, Lipsiae, 1870), vol. I only (*Thebaidos libri I-VI*)
 – *Electa Statiana* (Progr. Berolini, 1882)
 – 'Aus alten Handschriften des Statius', *Woch. f. kl. Phil.* 20 (1903) 192-197
- Mulder, H. M., *Publii Papinii Statii Thebaidos liber secundus... commentario exegetico aetheticoque instructus* (Diss. Groningen, Groningae, 1954)
- Nauke, Ae., *Observationes criticae et grammaticae in Publium Papinium Statium* (Diss. Vratislaviae, 1863)
- Newman, J. K., 'Poetarum Latinorum loci quattuor', *Latinitas* 17 (1969) 9-15
- Nisard, M., *Stace, Martial, Manilius etc. oeuvres complètes...* (Collection des auteurs latins..., Paris, 1884)

- Owen, S. G., ‘*Corpus Poetarum Latinorum* (Fasc. IV) edidit Iohannes Percival Postgate’, *CR* 19 (1905) 172-176
- Parkes, R. E., *A commentary on Statius, Thebaid 4.1-308* (DPhil Diss. Oxford, 2002)
- Pérez Gutiérrez, U., ‘Aportaciones del manuscrito 148 de Tortosa a la tradición manuscrita de la Tebaida’, *Durius* 6 (1978) 143-166
- Peyraredus, I. (c. 1590-1660), conjectures in Marollius (1658)
 – conjectures in Mueller (1870) and Kohlmann (1884)
- Phillimore, J. S., conjectures in Garrod (1906)
- Pollmann, K. F. L., *Statius, Thebaid 12: introduction, text, and commentary* (Schöningh, Paderborn, 2004)
- Postgate, J. P., ‘On Statius, *Thebaid* IX 501’, *CR* 18 (1904) 301
 – conjectures in Wilkins (1904)
- Poynton, J. B., ‘Two notes on the *Thebaid* of Statius’, *CR* 54 (1940) 13
 – ‘Two notes on Statius, *Thebaid*’, *CR* n.s. 3 (1953) 145
 – ‘Statius, *Thebaid*’, *CR* n.s. 13 (1963) 259-261
- Queck, G., *Publius Papinius Statius...Tom. II. Thebais* (BT, Lipsiae, 1854)
- Reeve, M. D., article on Statius in *Texts and transmission, a survey of the Latin Classics*, ed. L. D. Reynolds (Oxford, 1983) 394-397
- Ribbeck, O., ‘Varia’, *RhM* 45 (1890) 313-315, at 315
- Richards, H., ‘Varia Latina’, *CQ* 5 (1911) 102-103, at 102
- Rosati, G., review of Steiniger (2005), *BMCR* 2006.11.26
- Rossi, S., ‘Appunti critici’, *RFIC* 35 (1907) 336-337
- Rzach, A., ‘Eine Prager Statiushandschrift’, *Festschrift Theodor Gomperz* (Wien, 1902) 364-372
- Sandstroem, C. E., *Studia critica in P. Papinium Statium* (Upsaliae, 1878)
- Scaliger, I. I., conjectures in Kohlmann (1884)
- Schenkl, H., ‘Handschriftliches zu lateinischen Dichtern’, *WS* 8 (1886) 166-168
- Schetter, W., ‘Die Einheit des Prooemium zur Thebais des Statius’, *MH* 19 (1962) 204-217
 – review of Klinnert (1973), *Gnomon* 49 (1977) 803-809
- Schmitz, W., ‘Ein Düsseldorf Statiusfragment’, *RhM* 21 (1866) 438-443

- Schraderus, I., *Observationum liber* (Franequerae, 1761)
 – *Liber emendationum* (Leouardiae, 1776)
 – conjectures in M. Haupt, *Opuscula* III (Lipsiae, 1876) 126-138
- Schuster, M., ‘Bericht über die nachaugusteischen heidnischen Dichter... von 1915-1925’, *Bursians Jahresb.* 212 (1927) 131-144
- Scriuerius, P., conjectures in Kohlmann (1884)
- Semple, W. H., ‘Virgil, Georgics iii.116-17’, *CR* 60 (1946) 61-62
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R., ‘Notes on Statius’ *Thebaid*’, *MH* 40 (1983) 51-60
 – ‘On Statius’ *Thebaid*’, *HSCP* 100 (2000) 463-476
 – *Statius Thebaid and Achilleid*, 2 vols (LCL, Cambridge, Mass., and London, 2003)
- Slack, S. B., ‘On Statius *Theb.* X 527’, *CR* 7 (1893) 203-204
- Slater, D. A., ‘Conjectures’, *CR* 23 (1909) 248-249
 – conjectures in Garrod (1906)
- Smolenaars, J. J. L., *Statius Thebaid VII, a commentary* (Brill, Leiden, 1994)
- Snijder, H., *P. Papinius Statius Thebaid, a commentary on book III* (Amsterdam, 1968)
- Souter, A., ‘Garrod’s *Thebaid* and *Achilleid* of Statius’, *CQ* 1 (1907) 80-84
- Steiniger, J., *P. Papinius Statius, Thebais: Kommentar zu Buch 4, 1-344* (Stuttgart, 2005)
- Sweeney, R. D., *Prolegomena to an edition of the scholia to Statius* (*Mn. suppl.* 8, Brill, Leiden, 1969)
 – *Lactantii Placidi in Statii Thebaida commentum...recensuit* (BT, Stutgardiae et Lipsiae, 1997)
- Tiliobroga (Lindenbrog[ius]), Fr., *P. Papinii Surculi Statii opera quae extant...edidit* (Parisiis, 1600)
- Traglia, A., and Aricò, G., *Opere di Publio Papinio Stazio* (Torino, 1980)
- Unger, R., *P. Papinii Statii Ecloga ultima...accedunt de Statii locis controuersis coniectanea* (Nouae Strelitiae, 1868)
- Vahlen, J., *Opuscula academica* I (Leipzig, 1907) 110
- Valckenarius, L. K. (1715-1785), conjectures in Kohlmann (1884)
- Valpy, A. J., *P. Papinii Statii opera omnia ex editione Bipontina cum notis et interpretatione in usum Delphini...recensita*, 4 vols (London, 1824)

- Venini, P., *P. Papini Stati Thebaidos liber undecimus...*(Firenze, 1970)
- Veenhusen, I., *Publii Papinii Statii...Thebaidos lib. XII. Achilleidos lib. II* (Lugduni Bataurorum, 1671)
- Vessey, D. W. T. C., review of Håkanson (1969), *CP* 66 (1971) 273-276
- *Staius and the Thebaid* (Cambridge, 1973)
- Vollmer, F., ‘Textkritisches zu Staius’, *RhM* 51 (1896) 27-44
- *P. Papinii Statii Siluarum libri herausgegeben und erklärt* (Leipzig, 1898)
- Wakefield, G., *Silua critica* (Cantabrigiae, Londini, 1789-1795)
- conjectures in copy of Cruceus’ edition (1618), BL 654.b.15
- conjectures in Mueller (1870)
- Walker, W. S., *Corpus poetarum Latinorum edidit...* (London, 1828)
- Walter, F., ‘Zu lateinischen Dichtern. II.’, *WS* 45 (1926/27) 239-245, at 240
- Watt, W. S., ‘Notes on Latin epic poetry’, *BICS* 31 (1984) 153-170, at 158-162
- ‘Notes on Staius’ *Thebaid*’, *Eranos* 85 (1987) 49-54
- ‘Notes on the epic poems of Staius’, *CQ* n.s. 50 (2000) 516-525
- conjectures and interpretations communicated to JBH by letter
- Weber, C. F., *Commentatio de Statii codice Cassellano* (Marburg, 1853)
- Weber, W. E., *Corpus poetarum Latinorum edidit...*(Francofurti ad Moenum, 1833)
- Wernsdorf, J. C., *Museum criticum* (F. Stosch, Lemgouiae, 1774)
- Weyman, C., ‘Zu Properz, Ovid und Staius’, *Blätter f. Bayr. Gymnas.-Schulwesen* 34 (1898) 578
- Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, U. von, ‘Die sieben Thore Thebens’, *Hermes* 26 (1891) 191-242, at 212
- ‘Lesefrüchte’, *Hermes* 33 (1898) 513-533, at 513-514
- Wilkins, A. S., ‘Barth’s MSS. of the *Thebais* of Staius’, *CR* 10 (1896) 14-15
- ‘Jahnke’s *Lactantius on Staius*’, *CR* 13 (1899) 64-65
- *P. Papinius Staius, Thebaidos libri XII recogniti...*(Corpus poetarum Latinorum edidit Iohannes Perciual Postgate, tom. II, 308-385) (Londini, 1904)
- Williams, R. D., ‘The Worcester fragments of Staius’ *Thebaid*’, *CR* 61 (1947) 88-90
- ‘Two manuscripts of Staius’ *Thebaid*’, *CQ* 42 (1948) 105-112

- ‘The Vienna fragment of Statius’ *Thebaid*’, *RPh* 23 (1949) 151-153
 - ‘The local ablative in Statius’, *CQ* n.s. 1 (1951) 143-146
 - ‘Some passages in Statius’, *PCPhS* n.s. 1 (1951) 16-18
 - summary of paper on scansion of *deest* in *Proc. Class. Assoc.* 48 (1951) 32
 - *P. Papini Stati Thebaidos liber decimus* (Brill, Leiden, 1972)
 - Wiman, G., ‘Papiniana’, *Eranos* 35 (1937) 1-21
 - Wistrand, E., ‘Five critical notes’, *BICS* Suppl. 51 (1988) 162-165, at 164
 - Woestijne, P. van de, ‘Note sur un passage de Lactantius Placidus’, *Latomus* 5 (1946) 181-184
 - Wotke, C. (= K.), ‘Zur handschriftlichen Ueberlieferung der Thebais des Statius’, *Eranos Vindobonensis* (Vienna, 1893) 211-217
- Zander, C., conjectures in Håkanson (1973)

ACHILLEID

- Amar, J. A., edition produced together with N. E. Lemaire (Parisiiis, 1825-1830)
- Anderson, H., *The manuscripts of Statius* (H. Anderson, Washington, D.C., 2000)
- Angelis, V. de, ‘Magna questio preposita coram Dante et Domino Francisco Petrarca et Virgiliano’, *Studi Petrarqueschi* n.s. 1 (1984) 103-209
- ‘I commenti medievali alla *Tebaide* di Stazio: Anselmo di Laon, Goffredo Babione, Ilario d’Orléans’, in Mann, N. and Munk Olsen, B. (eds), *Medieval and Renaissance Scholarship* (Leiden, 1997) 75-136
- Aricò, G., see under Traglia, A.
- Arrighetti, G., ‘Il Codex Uniuersitatis Bruxellensis e l’Achilleide di Stazio’, *St. Class. Or.* 7 (1958) 100-105
- Baehrens, E., review of Kohlmann (1877), *Bursians Jahresb.* 10 (1877) 52-54
- Barthius, C., *P. Papinii Statii quae exstant ex recensione et cum animaduersionibus locupletis Casparis Barthii* (Cygneae, 1664)
- Beraldus, C., *P. Papinii Statii opera interpretatione et notis illustravit C. Beraldus* (Lutetiae Parisiorum, 1685)

- Bernartius, I., *P. Statii Papinii opera quae extant Ioh. Bernartius ad libros ueteres recensuit & scholiis illustrauit* (Antuerpiae, 1595)
- Bitschowsky, R., 'Zu Statius', *Fleckeisens Jahrb.* 121 (1880) 499-500 (resumé in *Bursians Jahresb.* 22 [Jahrgang 8, 1880, publ. 1882] 185)
- Brakman, C., 'Ad Statium', *Mn.* 57 (1929) 251-262
- Brinkgreve, M. R. J., *Statii Achilleis interpretatus est* (Rotterdam, 1913)
- 'De locis nonnullis Statianis', *Mn.* 42 (1914) 104-109
- Burmanning, P. (1668-1741) *Sylloges epistolarum a uiris illustribus scriptarum tomi quinque, collecti et digesti per Petrum Burmannum* (Leidae, 1727)
- Castiglioni, L., 'Analecta', *SIFC* 12 (1904) 279-318, at 279-293
- Clausen, W., 'Statius, Thebaid, 10, 299', *Philol.* 111 (1967) 146
- Clogan, P. M., 'A preliminary list of manuscripts of Statius' *Achilleid*', *Manuscripta* 8 (1964) 175-178
- *The medieval Achilleid of Statius edited with introduction, variant readings, and glosses* (Brill, Leiden, 1968)
- Cornelissen, J. J., 'Ad Statii Achilleidem', *Mn.* 7 (1879) 308-312
- Damsté, P. H., 'Ad Statii Achilleidem', *Mn.* 35 (1907) 130-142
- 'De uerbi mutandi usu apud P. Papinium Statium', *Sertum Nabericum* (Leiden, 1908) 77-84
- Deiter, H., 'Zu Statius' Achilleis I, 394', *Philol.* 43 (1884) 404
- 'Zu Statius', *Philol.* 57 (1898) 343-344
- Dilke, O. A. W., 'The Codex Etonensis of Statius' *Achilleid*', *CQ* 43 (1949) 45-46
- 'The metrical treatment of proper names in Statius', *CR* 63 (1949) 50-51
- *Statius Achilleid edited with introduction, apparatus criticus and notes* (Cambridge, 1954)
- 'A Paris Manuscript of Statius, Achilleid', *Latomus* 17 (1958) 708-711
- 'The value of the Puteaneus of Statius', *Acta Classica* 5 (1962) 58-63
- Dubner, Fr., *P. Papinii Statii opera...edidit* (Lipsiae, 1837)
- Flores, E., 'Interpretazioni staziane I', *Rend. Accad. Napoli* 39 (1964) 179-197

- Förster, R., 'Handschriften der Zamoyski'schen Bibliothek', *RhM* 55 (1900) 435-459, at 456-457
- Garrod, H. W., *P. Papini Stati Thebais et Achilleis recognouit* (Oxonii, 1906)
 – review of Brinkgreve (1913), *CR* 28 (1914) 67
- Goold, G. P., 'A transposition in Statius', *CR* n.s. 1 (1951) 71-73
- Gronouius, I. F., *In P. Papinii Statii Siluarum libros V diatribe* (Hagae-Comitis, 1637)
 – *Obseruationum libri tres* (Lugduni Batauorum, 1639, 1662²)
 – *Obseruationum liber nouus* (Dauentriae, 1652)
 – *P. Papinii Statii opera ex recensione et cum notis* (Amsterodami, 1653)
- Grosse, E., *Über eine Trierer Handschrift der Achilleis des Statius* (Progr. Gymn. Königsberg, 1866)
- Gustafsson, F. V., 'De Statii Achilleidos codice Monacensi', *Festschrift Johannes Vahlen* (Berlin, 1900) 491-496
- Hartmann, K., '2 Fragmente antiker Schriftsteller aus der Augsburger Stadtbibliothek', *BPhW* 27 (1907) 733-734
- Havet, L., 'Stace, *Achilléide*, 1, 102, 143', *RPhil* 6 (1882) 178
 – 'Stace, *Achill.* 1, 73', *RPhil* 7 (1883) 102
- Helm, R., review of Klotz (1902), *BPhW* 22 (1902) 972-974
 – review of Garrod (1906), *BPhW* 27 (1907) 590-595
 – review of Brinkgreve (1913), *BPhW* 35 (1915) 550-552
- Herrmann, L., review of Jannaccone (1950), *Latomus* 11 (1952) 222
- Heslin, P. J., 'The scansion of *Pharsalia* (Catullus 64.37; Statius, *Achilleid* 1.152; Calpurnius Siculus 4.101)', *CQ* n.s. 47 (1997) 588-593
- Hine, H. M., review of Marastoni (1974), *JRS* 67 (1977) 246-247
- Jahnke, R., *Lactantii Placidi qui dicitur commentarios in Statii Thebaida et commentarium in Achilleida recensuit* (BT, Lipsiae, 1898)
- Jannaccone, S., *P. Papinio Stazio, l'Achilleide, Testo critico e commento* (Firenze, 1950)
- Jortin, J., *Miscellaneous observations upon authors, ancient and modern* (London, 1731-1732)
- Ker, A., 'Notes on Statius', *CQ* n.s. 3 (1953) 1-10, 175-182
- Klotz, A., 'Thyrsa, Neut. plur.', *ALL* 12 (1902) 130

- *P. Papini Stati Achilleis edidit* (BT, Lipsiae, 1902; ed. altera 1926)
- ‘Ad Stati Achilleida symbolae criticae’, *Philol.* 61 (1902) 292-310
- ‘Die Barthschen Statiushandschriften’, *RhM* 59 (1904) 373-390
- ‘Probleme der Textgeschichte des Stätius’, *Hermes* 40 (1905) 341-372
- review of Garrod (1906), *BPhW* 27 (1907) 590-595
- ‘Klassizismus und Archaismus. Stilistisches zu Stätius’, *ALL* 15 (1908) 401-417
- Koch, H. A., *Coniectaneorum in poetas Latinos pars altera: in Statium* (Progr. Gymn. Frankfurt a. O., 1865) 4-17
- Koestlin, H., ‘Besserungen und erläuterungen zu P. Papinius Stätius’, *Philol.* 35 (1876) 493-533, at 532-533
- ‘Besserungen und erläuterungen zu P. Papinius Stätius’, *Philol.* 37 (1877) 276-292, at 288-289
- Kohlmann, P., ‘Die pariser handschriften der Achilleis des Stätius’, *Philol.* 34 (1876) 474-496
- ‘Zur Achilleis des Stätius’, *Philol.* 34 (1876) 569-571
- *Specimen nouae Achilleidos Stätii editionis* (I.1-396) (Emdae, 1877)
- *P. Papinii Stätii...Fasc. I. Achilleis* (BT, Lipsiae, 1879)

- Lemaire, N. E., edition produced together with J. A. Amar (Parisiis, 1825-1830)
- Lindembrog(ius), see under Tiliobroga

- Manitius, M., ‘Dresdener Scholien zu Stätius Achilleis’, *RhM* 59 (1904) 597-602
- Marastoni, A., *P. Papini Stati Achilleis* (BT, Leipzig, 1974)
- Mayer, H., ‘Ueber eine Berliner Handschrift der Achilleis des Stätius’, *Philol.* 51 (1892) 381-384
- Méheust, J., *Stace, Achilléide* (Les Belles Lettres, Paris, 1971)
- Menkius (Menke), F.A., *Observationes criticae in Stätii Achilleida* (Gottingae, 1814)
- Morel, W., ‘Stätius, *Achilleis*, II 142’, *CR* 55 (1941) 75
- Mozley, J. H., *Stätius with an English translation*, 2 vols (LCL, London and Cambridge, Mass., 1928)
- Mueller, O., *Quaestiones Stätianae* (Progr. Berolini, 1861)
- ‘Zu den Gedichten des P. Papinius Stätius’, *RhM* 18 (1863) 189-200
- *Electa Stätiana* (Progr. Berolini, 1882)

- Nauke, Ae., *Observationes criticae et grammaticae in Publum Papinium Statium* (Diss. Vratislaviae, 1863)
- Prinz, K., 'Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung der Achilleis des Statius', *Philol.* 79 (1924) 188-201
- Queck, G., *Publius Papinius Statius...Tom. I. Siluae. Achilleis* (BT, Lipsiae, 1854)
- Robertson, D. S., 'The food of Achilles', *CR* 54 (1940) 177-180
– 'Statius, *Achilleis*, ii 142', *CR* 56 (1942) 117
- Sandstroem, C. E., *Studia critica in P. Papinium Statium* (Upsaliae, 1878)
- Schenkl, C., 'De Statii Achilleidis codice Etonensi', *WS* 4 (1882) 96-101
- Schmidt, M. C. P., review of H. Blümner, *Technologie* II & III (1879, 1884), *Woch.f. kl. Phil.* 2 (1885) 1093-1100, at 1099
- Schraderus, I., *Observationum liber* (Franequerae, 1761)
– *Emendationum liber* (Leouardiae, 1776)
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R., *Statius Thebaid and Achilleid*, 2 vols (LCL, Cambridge, Mass., and London, 2003)
- Souter, A., review of Garrod (1906), *CQ* 1 (1907) 80-84
- Stegen, G., 'Notes de lecture 114. – Stace, *Achilléide*, II, 321', *Latomus* 21 (1962) 169
- Sweeney, R. D., *Prolegomena to an edition of the scholia to Statius* (*Mn. suppl.* 8, Brill, Leiden, 1969)
– *Anonymi in Statii Achilleida commentum...recensuit* (BT, Stuttgartiae et Lipsiae, 1997)
- Terzaghi, N., 'Il codice P e l'Achilleide di Stazio', *Boll. Com. Prep. Ed. Naz. Class. Gr. Lat., Suppl. Rend. Acc. Lincei* n.s. 4 (1956) 1-16
- Thomas, E., 'Notes de lecture 171. Statius, *Achilleid*, I.84-85', *Latomus* 24 (1965) 951-954
– 'Statius, *Achilleid*, I, 912-918', *Latomus* 25 (1966) 115-123
- Tiliobroga (Lindenbrog[ius]), Fr., *P. Papinii Surculi Statii opera quae extant...edidit* (Parisiis, 1600)
- Traglia, L., 'Osservazioni sul testo dell'*Achilleide* di Stazio', *RFIC* 97 (1969) 421-431
– and Aricò, G., *Opere di Publio Papinio Stazio* (Torino, 1980)

- Tranchant, H., 'Le Codex Uniuersitatis Bruxellensis', *Antiquité Classique* 3 (1934) 451-453
- Valpy, A. J., *P. Papinii Statii opera omnia ex editione Bipontina cum notis et interpretatione in usum Delphini...recensita*, 4 vols (London, 1824)
- Veenhusen, I., *Publii Papinii Statii...Thebaidos lib. XII. Achilleidos lib. II* (Lugduni Bataurorum, 1671)
- Vollmer, F., 'Textkritisches zu Statius', *RhM* 51 (1896) 27-44
- Walker, W. S., *Corpus poetarum Latinorum edidit...* (London, 1828)
- Walter, F., 'Zu lateinischen Dichtern. II.', *WS* 45 (1926/27) 239-245, at 240
- Watt, W. S., 'Notes on Latin epic poetry', *BICS* 31 (1984) 153-170, at 163
- 'Notes on the epic poems of Statius', *CQ* n.s. 50 (2000) 516-525, at 523-525
- Wessner, P., 'Lucan, Statius und Juvenal bei den römischen Grammatikern', *PhW* 49 (1929) 296-303, 328-335
- Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, U. von, *De tribus carminibus Latinis commentatio* (Gottingae, 189)
- Wilkins, A. S., review of Klotz (1902), *CR* 16 (1902) 471
- *P. Papinius Statius, Achilleis* (Corpus poetarum Latinorum edidit Iohannes Percival Postgate, tom. II, 420-429) (Londini, 1904)
- Williams, R. D., 'The local ablative in Statius', *CQ* n.s. 1 (1951) 143-146
- 'Some passages in Statius', *PCPhS* n.s. 1 (1951) 16-18
- Wotke, K. (= C.), 'Handschriftliche Beiträge zu Statius', *ZÖG* 42 (1891) 200-202