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PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My interest in the Roman mime originated in the early 1990s when, as a PhD student at the University of Glasgow, I studied under the supervision of P. G. Walsh the episodic novel of Petronius from a theatrical point of view (a revised version of my PhD Thesis appeared with the title *Theatrum Arbitri: Theatrical elements in the Satyrica of Petronius* (Leiden 1995)). During my analysis of theatricality in Petronius I realised how important to the author of the *Satyricon*, and to ancient novelists in general, mime was as a structural device, and how inadequate our primary sources were for an understanding of this unique theatrical form. Its significance can be seen both in the frequent exploitation of various mime-motifs by authors of widely divergent literary genres such as love-elegy, satire, and the novel, and in the prominent role mime played in the shaping of medieval and modern popular theatre.

What survives from the scripts of the Roman literary mime today comprises some 55 titles of plays, a number of literary fragments (not all of them considered to be genuine extracts) which amount to about 200 lines, and a collection of over 730 *sententiae*, some of which are attributed to the mimographer Publilius. It is far from certain that all of these one-line apophthegms, which lack a theatrical context and were composed in iambic or trochaic metres, were written by him. The length of the remaining mime-fragments, composed usually in *senarii* or *septenarii*, varies from one word to 27 lines. The fragments are cited mainly by grammarians and lexicographers on account of their linguistic features and their literary value. The overwhelming majority of these mime-fragments, 44 titles and about 150 lines, is currently attributed to the Roman knight and mimographer Decimus Laberius, a contemporary of Cicero and Caesar, both of whom Laberius is reported to have confronted in public. It is therefore unsurprising that Laberius’ work, which
almost eclipses in number all the other Latin mime-fragments put together, forms the foundation on which many of the generalisations made by scholars in relation to mime are based. However representative Laberius’ plays are of the Roman mime as a whole, any sweeping statements based on his fragments alone are potentially misleading, because they illuminate only to a small extent our understanding of the development of mime as a literary and theatrical phenomenon; for this reason his work needs to be complemented by careful consideration of the documentary evidence on the Greco-Roman mime. About 100 documents of material culture survive and shed light on the geographical expansion of this type of theatre and on the mechanics of the mime-profession with its acting specialisations, financial arrangements, and honourable rewards. These documents have been usefully edited, translated, and thoroughly commented on in the invaluable but unpublished PhD Thesis of R. L. Maxwell, The documentary evidence for ancient mime (Department of Classical Studies, University of Toronto 1993); a small number of literary and archaeological sources on mime is also included in E. Csapo and W. J. Slater, The context of ancient drama (Ann Arbor 1995) 369–78. The inscriptions on tombstones of mime-actors and mime-actresses, the graffiti on the walls of temples visited by mimes, the receipts of payment made out to mime-troupes, the dedicatory monuments set up to honour distinguished mime-players, and the visual images of scenes apparently pertaining to mime-plays should function as a salutary reminder that the fragments of the literary plays of Laberius and Publilius, as well as the titles and fragments of many other unspecified Roman mimographers, should be appropriately viewed as extracts of scripts destined for live performance.

However, in spite of its profound influence on the cultural and political spheres of classical and late antiquity, the literary Roman mime has been unduly neglected by modern scholars. The most recent critical edition (M. Bonaria, Romaní mimi (Rome 1965)), with a translation into Italian, and a brief commentary on the genre’s scanty remains, leaves a lot to be desired,
especially in linguistic analysis and in the discussion of the fragments as parts of theatrical scripts now lost. The only English monograph on mime as a literary and theatrical genre is more than half a century old (A. Nicoll, _Masks, mimes and miracles: Studies in the popular theatre_ (London, Sydney, and Bombay 1931)). E. Wüst’s concise entry on mime, in _RE_ xv.2.1727–64, is admittedly much more accurate and useful than H. Reich’s detailed but confusing monograph on the subject ( _Der Mimus_ (Berlin 1903)); but even Wüst’s scholarly contribution is outdated now. By the end of the twentieth century all the Greek mime-texts found in literary papyri had been re-edited and studied by D. L. Page ( _Select papyri_ III (Cambridge, Mass. and London 1950²)), H. Wiemken ( _Der griechische Mimus_ (Bremen 1972)), I. C. Cunningham ( _Herodae mimiambi cum appendice fragmentorum mimorum papyraceorum_ (Leipzig 1987)), and M. Andreassi ( _Mimi greci in Egitto_ (Bari 2001)), while many works on the literary history of the Roman mime and its influence (especially by L. Cicu, R. E. Fantham, and T. P. Wiseman) called for a re-examination of this theatrical form. Special mention should also be made of the unpublished PhD Thesis of P. E. Kehoe, _Studies in the Roman mime_ (University of Cincinnati 1969).

Despite these developments in the field of the Greco-Roman mime, there was no monograph that would offer an up-to-date introduction to the Roman mime and its main issues from a theatrical perspective, a new edition of Laberius’ literary fragments, their first-ever English translation, and a detailed commentary on them. This was a scholarly gap that needed immediate attention. Therefore, at one of the meetings of the Classical Association of Scotland (in Aberdeen), I suggested to W. S. Watt, who had by then retired from the Chair of Humanity in the University of Aberdeen, that he might produce a new critical edition of the mime-fragments. He responded jovially but firmly that, having edited Cicero’s letters, he would never undertake the edition of an author whose text was transmitted in fragments (he held the same opinion in a note sent to me on 28 July 1998). He then recommended, with a smile on his face,
that I embark on this task. I foolishly accepted the challenge immediately.

When I began the project, I was extremely ambitious in my demands, even though I had decided quite early on not to deal with the *sententiae* attributed to Publilius, both for reasons of space and because of the different problems inherent in an examination of these apophthegms, which had their own MSS tradition. But, setting the *sententiae* aside, I wanted in my project to cover everything in relation to mime and to solve all the problems associated with it. Now I see that I cannot account for all the stages of the development of the mime from an artless dramatic form into a fully-fledged theatrical genre which ousted the plays of Plautus and Terence from the Roman stage; nor can I provide definite answers to the questions posed by the interpretation of many mime-fragments. I have more often raised questions than answered them, and the reader ought not to be irritated that I use the verbs ‘may’ and ‘seem’ excessively. My aims in this volume were to offer a comprehensive as well as concise account of the development of the Roman mime, to consider why it occupied an undignified position in the literary and dramatic hierarchy of the Roman republican and early imperial eras, to situate the mimographer Decimus Laberius and his work within the relevant historical and literary context, to speculate (whenever possible) on the meaning of the mime-fragments from a theatrical perspective (an original approach to the study of this literary corpus), and to make available to a wide audience material that has never before been presented in English. I will be happy if scholars and students of Latin literature, language, and popular culture are alerted through my work to what we do not know about mime, and if I convey the message that most of our literary evidence is precarious, and needs to be treated with extreme caution. A lot of work remains to be done in order for us to understand fully the reciprocal influence of mime and other forms of Greco-Roman literary and material culture. This book is only a small contribution towards the achievement of this larger goal.
PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My researches on mime have been made possible with the award of both the Snell Visitorship for Martinmas Term 1999, which enabled me to spend my period of study leave at Balliol College, Oxford, and an Arts and Humanities Research Board grant for Candlemas Term 2000. I am grateful to the librarians of several colleges at Oxford (Balliol, Pembroke, Christ Church) and Cambridge (Clare, Trinity), as well as to the staff in the Bodleian Library (especially, Duke Humfrey) and the British Library, for dealing with my requests to see MSS and early editions of authors who cited mime-fragments. J. N. Adams at All Souls was generous both with his hospitality and with his feedback on an early draft of this book, while Anthony Esposito of the OED devoted a lot of his time to the scrutiny of the translation of Laberius’ fragments. Various aspects of the project were discussed with Mario Andreassi, Ilias Arnaoutoglou, Susanna Morton Braund, Peter Brown, Adrian Gratwick (who kindly allowed me to cite his unpublished translation of the lines Macrobius attributes to Laberius (= 90), and gave me invaluable guidance in matters of Latin orthography), Roger Green, Stephen Harrison, Leofranc Holford-Strevens, the late Harry Jocelyn, Matthew Leigh, the late Oliver Lyne, Eric Martin, Jonathan Powell, Michael Sharp, Niall Slater, William Slater, Friedrich Spoth, Catherine Steel, Peter Walsh, David West, and Peter Wiseman. I thank them all for their encouragement, guidance, and helpful comments. Michael Sharp, Elizabeth Hanlon, and Jodie Barnes at Cambridge University Press have been very efficient and supportive throughout the production of this volume, and Malcolm Todd was careful, alert, and effective as copy-editor; he helped greatly in improving the presentation of the material in the book and in correcting many infelicities in the commentary. I am especially grateful to Michael Reeve, whose vigorous criticism urged me to revise the layout of the text and to clear the apparatus criticus of readings and conjectures which need not be recorded. His acute observations saved me from many glaring errors and his opinion on the presentation of the material in the volume helped me to position the
commentary in an effective way. Many of the views that appear in the introduction and the commentary were originally aired in papers I gave at Cambridge, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Lampeter, Leeds, Manchester, Maynooth, Montreal, Munich, Newcastle, Nicosia, and Pretoria. The contribution of the audience of these meetings to my understanding of Roman mime and of Laberius’ work is gratefully acknowledged here, but any factual and interpretative errors are entirely my own. My twin brother, Stelios Panayotakis, kindly provided me with copies of works on the mime which were not easily accessible to me. My former colleague Douglas MacDowell gave me a lot of sensible advice and vigorous encouragement throughout the various stages of this long and frustrating project. He has also read the whole typescript and made various helpful suggestions. I thank him for his unfailing support during the past 19 years, and I dedicate this volume to him.
ABBREVIATIONS AND SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

1 ANCIENT AUTHORS

The abbreviations used for ancient authors and their texts can be obtained from Liddell and Scott’s *Greek–English lexicon*, revised by Jones (which I abbreviate to *LSJ*) and from the *Oxford Latin dictionary* (which I abbreviate to *OLD*). The following special points should be noted:

(i) Pl. = Plautus (not Plato);
(ii) L., fr. (or frs.), and edn = Laberius, fragment (or fragments), and edition, respectively;
(iii) reference to standard modern commentaries is made by the commentator’s name only (e.g. Camps on Prop. 1.1.2);
(iv) the frs. of Greek comic playwrights are cited according to the numeration of KA, *PCG*: so, for example, ‘Sophilus 3’ = fr. (*not* line) 3 of Sophilus’ extant plays in the edition of KA;
(v) the frs. of Roman playwrights other than Plautus and Terence are cited in the numeration of Ribbeck (see §5 (ix) below), unless otherwise indicated. For instance, ‘Pomponius 86’ = line (*not* fr.) 86 of Pomponius’ plays in Ribbeck’s third edn.

2 DATES

All three-figure and two-figure dates are BC unless otherwise indicated.

3 TITLES

Titles of mimes in bold style refer to the relevant note on them; e.g., *Aries* = see my comments on the title of the mime *Aries* attributed to L. Figures in bold style refer to my numbering of
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frs. attributed to L.; for example, \textit{fr. 1} = see my comments on fr. 1 of L. in this edn. A ‘n.’ added to a figure in bold type refers to a note in my commentary; for example, \textbf{in. inplastrum} = see my note on the word \textit{inplastrum} in fr. 1 of L. in this edn; \textit{fr. 10.n. gurdus} = see my note on the word \textit{gurdus} in line 2 of fr. 10 of L. in this edn. It must not be assumed that L. wrote the fr. concerned (whether it is a word or a line or a group of lines).

4 PERIODICALS AND REFERENCE WORKS

The abbreviations used for titles of periodicals can be found in the list printed in each of the recent volumes of \textit{L’Année Philologique}. The following reference works are cited by initials only:

\textit{ANRW} \textit{Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt} (Berlin and New York 1972–)

\textit{CAF} \textit{Comicorum Atticorum fragmenta}, ed. T. Kock (Leipzig 1880–1888)

\textit{CCSL} \textit{Corpus Christianorum series Latina} (Turnholt 1954–)

\textit{CGF} \textit{Comicorum Graecorum fragmenta}, ed. G. Kaibel (Berlin 1899)


\textit{CIL} \textit{Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum} (Berlin 1893–)

\textit{CSEL} \textit{Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum} (Vienna 1866–)

\textit{DS} C. Daremberg and E. Saglio, \textit{Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines} (Paris 1877–1919)

\textit{EM} A. Ernout and A. Meillet, \textit{Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine} (Paris 1959 [vol. i], 1960 [vol. ii])
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**EphEp**  Ephemeris epigraphica: Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum (Rome and Berlin 1872–1913)

**FGrH**  Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, ed. F. Jacoby (Berlin 1923–1959)

**GL**  Grammatici Latini (Leipzig 1857–1880)

**Gramm. Rom. Fr.**  Grammaticae Romanae Fragmenta, ed. H. Funaioli (Leipzig 1907)


**IG**  Inscriptiones Graecae (Berlin 1873–)

**IGRR**  Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes, ed. R. Cagnat et al. (Paris 1911–1927)

**ILLRP**  Inscriptiones Latinae liberae rei publicae, ed. A. Degrassi (Florence 1965² (vol. 1), 1963 (vol. 2))

**ILS**  Inscriptiones Latinae selectae, ed. H. Dessau (Berlin 1892–1916)

**KA**  see PCG

**KS**  R. Kühner, C. Stegmann, and A. Thierfelder, Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache (Leverkusen 1955³)

**LHS**  M. Leumann, J. B. Hofmann, and A. Szantyr, Lateinische Grammatik, i: Lateinische Laut- und Formen-lehre (Munich 1977⁵); ii: Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik (Munich 1965; repr. 1972)

**LS**  C. Lewis and C. Short, A Latin dictionary (Oxford 1880)


**ML**  W. Meyer-Lübke, Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch (Heidelberg 1935³)

**NH**  R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, eds., A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book I (Oxford
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1970); and A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book II (Oxford 1978)

NW F. Neue and C. Wagener, Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache (Leipzig 1902)


ORF Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta, ed. H. Malcovati (Turin 1955)

PCG Poetae Comici Graeci, eds. R. Kassel and C. Austin (Berlin 1983–)

PG Patrologia Graeca (Paris 1857–)

PL Patrologia Latina (Paris 1844–)

RE Paulys Real-encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, eds. G. Wissowa et al. (Stuttgart 1893–Munich 1978)

TGL Thesaurus Graecae linguae (Paris 1831–1865)

TrGF Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta, ed. A. Nauck (Leipzig 1856)

TLL Thesaurus linguae Latinae (Leipzig 1900–)

WH A. Walde and J. B. Hofmann, Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch (Heidelberg 1938–1954)

5 EDITIONS

In the apparatus criticus and in the commentary the abbreviation ed. princ. is used to designate the first edn of Charisius (Naples 1532), Diomedes (Venice c. 1475), Gellius (Rome 1469), Macrobius (Venice 1472), and Nonius (?Milan 1471).

I cite by the editor’s name the following editions:

(i) Charisius: Putschius (Basle 1605); Barwick (Leipzig 1964)
(ii) Diomedes: Keil (Leipzig 1857)
(iii) Fronto: Mai (Milan 1815); van den Hout² (Leipzig 1988)
(iv) Gellius: de Quaietis (Venice 1493); Beroaldus (Bologna 1503); Aldobrandus (Florence 1513); Egnatius (Venice 1515); Cratander (Basle 1519); Ascensius (Paris 1524);
ABBREVIATIONS AND SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Mosellanus (Paris 1536); J. F. Gronovius (Leiden 1687); Hertz (Berlin 1883–1885); Marshall (Oxford 1990²)

(v) John the Lydian: Fuss (Leiden 1812); Bekker (Bonn 1837); Wünsch (Leipzig 1903)

(vi) Macrobius: Camerarius (Basle 1535); Ianus (Leipzig 1852)

(vii) Nonius: Laetus (Rome 1475); Bentinus (Venice 1527); Iunius (Antwerp 1565); Mercerus (Paris 1583¹, Sedani 1614²); Gothofredus (Paris 1586); Gerlach and Roth (Basle 1842); Quicherat (Paris 1872); L. Mueller (Leipzig 1888); Onions (Oxford 1895); Lindsay (Leipzig 1903)

(viii) Priscian: Hertz (Leipzig 1855).

Similarly, I refer only by editor’s name to the following editions of comic frs. which include frs. of L.:

(ix) Bonaria (Genoa 1955–1956¹, Rome 1965²); Bothe (Halberstadt 1824¹, 1834²); Burmannus (Amsterdam 1759); Crinitus (Paris 1510, Lyon 1561); Maittaire (London 1713); Meyerus (Leipzig 1833); Orelli (Leipzig 1822); Pitheous (Paris 1590¹, Lyon 1596²); Ribbeck (Leipzig 1855¹, 1873², 1898³); Stephanus (Geneva 1564); Zell (Stuttgart 1829); Ziegler (Göttingen 1788).

(x) Aldina = the Aldine edn of Nonius (Venice 1513) and Corpus = Corpus omnium veterum poetarum Latinorum (Geneva 1603¹, 1627², 1640³).

The following editions are cited by date of publication only:

(xi) Macrobius: Brescia 1501, Paris 1524
Nonius: Venice 1476, Parma 1480, Paris 1511

The emendations of Salmasius found in Bothe’s edn of L. are cited in the apparatus criticus as ‘Salmasius’ without further details; the same method of reference applies to the conjectures of Buecheler, Gesner, and Schraderus (which are cited from Ribbeck’s edn of L.); Baehrens, Damsté, Jordan, and Skutsch
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(from Marshall’s edn of Gellius); Buttmann, Cornelissen, Heindorf, Hildebrand, Klussmann, and Novák (from van den Hout’s second edn of Fronto); Fleckeisen, Klotz, and Lambeceius (from Hertz’s edn of Gellius); Studemund, and Marquardt and Mau (from Bonaria’s edn of L.); Heinsius and Lambinus (from Burmannus’ edn of L.); Oudendorpius (from Meyerus’ edn of L.); Anon. Bern. [= Anonymus Bernensis] (from Hertz’s edn of Priscian); and Gifanius (from Mercerus’ edn of Nonius). Scioptius’ conjectures are cited from Gronovius’ edn of Gellius (Leiden 1706), rev. by J. L. Conradi (Leipzig 1762). Turnebus’ are cited from Thysius’ and Oiselius’ edn of Gellius (Leiden 1666). Falsterus’ are cited from Valpy’s edn of Gellius (London 1824). Gulielmus’ are cited from Pontanus’ edn of Macrobius (Leiden 1628²). Guietus’ are cited from Carilli Note (see below). Rhenanus’ are cited from Gerlo’s edn of Tertullian, De Pallio, CCSL II (Turnholt 1954). Gratwick’s unpublished emendation in fr. 90 originates from a research seminar he delivered in Glasgow in 1999. I list here abbreviations which appear in the apparatus criticus and may cause doubt.


Fabricius [for fr. 8] Bibliotheca latina I (Leipzig 1773) 476–7; [for frs. 49(b), 65, 87] cited from Barwick’s edn of Charisius [see §5 (i) above].

Fruterius [for frs. 9, 50(b)] RhM 33 (1878) 245; [for fr. 90] cited from Burmannus’ edn of L. [see §5 (ix) above].

Haupt [for fr. 6] cited from Barwick’s edn of Charisius [see §5 (i) above]; [for fr. 39]
ABBREVIATIONS AND SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Heracles

Heracles [for fr. 24] *Die Sprache des Petronius und die Glossen* (Leipzig 1899) 8; [for fr. 72] cited from van den Hout’s second edn of Fronto [see § 5 (iii) above]

Lachmann

Lachmann [for fr. 58] *In T. Lucretii Cari de rerum natura libros commentarius* (Berlin 1850) 140; [for fr. 60] cited from Ribbeck’s edn of L. [see § 5 (ix) above]

Leo

Leo [for fr. 15] *Analecta Plautina de figuris sermonis II* (Göttingen 1898) 10; [for fr. 17(b)] *Hermes* 48 (1913) 147

Scaliger [Jos.]

Scaliger [Jos.] [for frs. 8, 21, 26, 31, 38, 48, 56(b)] cited from the *marginalia* in Iunius’ edn of Nonius [see § 5 (vii) above]; [for frs. 84, 93] *Catalecta Virgili et aliorum poëtarum Latinorum veterum poetamia* (Leiden 1617); [for fr. 20] cited from Thysius’ and Oiselius’ edn of Gellius (Leiden 1666); [for fr. 80] cited from A. Gerlo’s edn of Tertullian, *De Pallio, CCSL ii* (Turnholt 1954); [for fr. 90] cited from Burmannus’ edn of L. [see § 5 (ix) above]

Wase


In the *apparatus criticus* I also record the conjectures of the following scholars which appeared not in editions of ancient authors but in the following books and periodicals:

Brakman

C. Brakman, *Mnemosyne* 1 (1934) 149

Brock

A. Brock, *Quaestionum grammaticarum capita duo* (Dorpat 1897) 152

Carassa

M. V. Carassa, *Dioniso 8* (1940) 168

Carrion


Dziatzko

K. Dziatzko, *RhM* 33 (1878) 94–114
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Froehner W. Froehner, *Philologus* 71 (1912) 164–5
Keulen B. Keulen, *Mnemosyne* 48 (1920) 192
Leopardus P. Leopardus, ‘Emendationes et miscellanea’, in J. Gruterus, ed., *Lampas sive Fax artium liberalium* iii (Frankfurt 1602)
Lipsius I. Lipsius, *Opera omnia quae ad criticam proprie spectant* (Antwerp 1585)
Luchs A. Luchs, ‘Quaestiones metricae’, in G. Studemund, ed., *Studia in priscos scriptores Latinos collata* (Berlin 1873) 70
Muretus M. A. Muretus, *Variae lectiones* (Leiden 1586)
Palmerius J. Palmerius, *Spicilegiorum commentarius primus* (Frankfurt 1580)
Passeratius J. Passeratius, *Coniecturarum liber* (Paris 1612)
Perottus N. Perottus, *Cornucopiae sive linguae Latinae commentarii* (Venice 1513)
Schneidewin F. G. Schneidewin, *RhM* 2 (1843) 636–8
Valmaggi L. Valmaggi, *BFC* 19 (1913) 205–6
Wagner C. Wagner, *De Plauti Aulularia* (Bonn 1864)
Woelfflin E. Woelfflin, *Archiv für lat. Lexik.* 6 (1889) 457
Zicàri M. Zicàri, *Hermes* 91 (1963) 125

6 SELECT MODERN BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following list is not a complete bibliography, but it includes books and articles for which abbreviated references are used throughout this book. Details of works cited only once or twice are given in the introduction and the commentary. The book by R. Webb, *Demons and dancers: Performance in late antiquity* (Cambridge, Mass. and London 2008), appeared too late for me to take it into account in my discussion of mime and elite culture.

Adams J. N. Adams
*Bilingualism and the Latin language* (Cambridge 2003)
### ABBREVIATIONS AND SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/Title</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pelagonius</strong></td>
<td><em>Pelagonius and Latin veterinary terminology in the Roman empire</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Leiden 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocabulary</strong></td>
<td><em>The Latin sexual vocabulary</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(London 1982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Andreassi Mimi</strong></td>
<td>M. Andreassi, <em>Mimi greci in Egitto: Charition e Moicheutria</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Bari 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arnott Alexis</strong></td>
<td>W. G. Arnott, <em>Alexis: The fragments</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Cambridge 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bacherler Wörter</strong></td>
<td>M. Bacherler, ‘Die griechischen Wörter in Roms Atellane und Mimus und die Frage der etruskischen Heimat der Atellane’, <em>BBG</em> (1928) 162–70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barsby</strong></td>
<td>J. Barsby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bacchides</strong></td>
<td><em>Plautus: Bacchides</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Warminster 1986)</td>
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ADDENDUM

At the stage of reading the proofs I obtained copies of two important volumes on Latin grammar and syntax: W. D. C. de Melo, *The early Latin verb system: Archaic forms in Plautus, Terence, and beyond* (Oxford 2007); D. Langslow, ed., *Jacob Wackernagel. Lectures on syntax: With special reference to Greek, Latin, and Germanic* (Oxford 2009). I have not been able to include references to these works in my commentary. During the same period I was made aware of a series of ‘Princeton/Stanford working papers in Classics’, which were published in 2008 at <http://www.princeton.edu/~pswpc/papers/authorAL/kaster/kaster.html>. They contain collations of the MSS of Macrobius’ *Saturnalia* by R. A. Kaster, who is currently preparing a new edition of this text for the OCT series. I revised all my sections on Macrobius’ text in accordance with Kaster’s excellent research. The titles of the papers and their version numbers are as follows: ‘A collation of British Library Cotton Vit. C. III and Vatican Palatinus latinus 886 (Macrobius “Saturnalia”), version 060803; ‘Four manuscripts of Macrobius “Saturnalia”, version 060804; ‘A collation of Cambridge Corpus Christi College 71 (Macrobius “Saturnalia”), version 060805; ‘A neglected witness to Macrobius “Saturnalia”, version 060806; and ‘The medieval tradition of Macrobius “Saturnalia”, version 120801, which contains a revised stemma of the MSS of the Saturnalia.