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ABSTRACT

This dissertation surveys and analyzes the development of the Greek and Latin paraklausithuron (paraclausithyron) from its earliest origins through to Horace, but omits detailed discussion of Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid. It examines not only true paraklausithura, the actual songs or speeches of excluded lovers at their beloveds' doors, but also paraklausithuric situations, where reference is made to a paraklausithuron or to a situation in which a paraklausithuron can easily be presumed to have been sung or said.

The survey occupies Chapters 2 and 3 and shows that the paraklausithuron was more popular and pervasive than has been previously recognized. In Chapter 2, paraklausithuric passages are identified in early Greek lyric; it is suggested that Gnesippus was a possible major early influence on the development of the literary paraklausithuron; paraklausithuric parodies are found as early as Aristophanes. Other authors discussed in depth include Euripides and Theocritus. Chapter 3 surveys the paraklausithuron from Plautus through Lucretius, Catullus, and Horace. Throughout, the occurrence and manipulation of topoi are noted and discussed briefly. For the more important topoi, cross-listings are given for occurrences in other paraklausithura.
Chapter 1 analyses and defines what is meant by the word "paraklausithuron", supports its utility against the word "komos", states this paper's definitions of "genre" and "topoi", and discusses the connection between the paraklausithuron and the komos.

The survey of the genre before Latin elegy is followed in Chapter 4 by an analysis of several of the most prominent aspects of the relationship between paraklausithura before and in Latin elegy. The identity and status of the paraklausithuric beloved is discussed first, followed by some of the possible religious implications of Greek versus Roman paraklausithura. Finally, by using primary sources from other cultures of antiquity, it is shown that the continued popularity of the paraklausithuron is due to the paraklausithuric situation's essential grounding in reality.

Appendix 1 provides a listing, with texts, of paraklausithuric passages after Latin elegy. Appendix 2 contains a word list extracted from the texts presented in Chapters 2 and 3, and Appendix 1.
To Alison
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INTRODUCTION

The need for further study of the paraklausithuron may not be evident at first. It does, however, exist. The prominence of the paraklausithuron in Latin elegy and its position among the central genres of classical love poetry creates room for such a study. This dissertation will provide a thorough examination of the paraklausithuron before Latin elegy as background work for future research on the paraklausithuron in Latin elegy itself. Highly popular genres at any time are best understood and appreciated when based on a solid knowledge of their previous incarnations. This study aims to provide that knowledge.

This dissertation will survey and analyse the development of the Greek and Latin paraklausithuron and its principal component topoi from its earliest identifiable origins, probably in Alcaeus, through to its final occurrences before Latin elegy in Horace.¹ It will examine not only true paraklausithura—the actual songs or speeches of excluded lovers at their beloveds' doors—but also what can be called

¹Abbreviations will follow the OLD, LSJ, Lewis and Short 1879 (for authors not included in LSJ), and Lampe 1961. Minor deviations from those works may occur for the sake of greater clarity.
paraklausithuric passages or situations. In these, reference is made to a paraklausithuron or to a situation in which a paraklausithuron can easily be presumed to have been sung or said. For example, while Ovid *Am.* 1.6 is a true paraklausithuron, *Ars* 2.521 ff. is a description of a paraklausithuric situation. Such a study of both true paraklausithura and paraklausithuric situations has not been done before. Moreover, a number of passages which could be deliberately manipulating, playing with, or alluding to the paraklausithuric situation in general will also be identified and discussed. It is only through consideration of such paraklausithuric passages that a true overview of the state of the paraklausithuron before Latin elegy can be achieved. No previous survey of the paraklausithuron has cast its net as widely and with so narrow a mesh. The inclusiveness of this examination is one of its major reasons for being.

---

2 *Ars* 2.521 ff.: "dicta erit isse foras, quam tu fortasse uidere est: / isse foras et te falsa uidere puta. / clausa tibi fuerit promissa ianua nocte: / perfer et inmunda ponere corpus humo. / 525 forsitan et uultu mendax ancilla superbo / dicit 'quid nostras obsidet iste fores?' / postibus et durae supplex blandire puellae / et capiti demptas in fore pone rosas."

3 Canter 1919 is a breezy survey of some of the more important occurrences of the paraklausithuron, but has little to say. He relies much on de la Ville de Mirmont 1909, which is similar, but lacks the depth and the insight of Burck 1966, who provides an excellent discussion of the overall genre and some of its most significant examples. He focuses more on Latin elegy than earlier literature. Garte 1924 is the most complete survey of the genre through Latin elegy, but his focus is greatly narrowed by his definition
The survey will, in general, be chronological in order to gain a better idea of the actual development of the genre. Some familiarity with the basic topoi and situations of the paraklausithuron will be presumed in the reader in order to avoid extensive argumentation or documentation for the most common of topoi right at the beginning. Passages which have not previously been identified as paraklausithuric, or whose identification as such may reasonably be doubted, will have their topoi compared to those of more readily recognizable paraklausithura.

The occurrence and manipulation of topoi will be noted and discussed briefly. For the more important topoi of the paraklausithuron as that which is actually sung and so neglects more passages of importance than he examines. For what he does discuss, he is reliable and useful. Pasquali 1964 on Horace Carm. 3.10 also provides a useful overview of the genre. Copley 1942 is too speculative in parts, with some decent opinions, some less useful. Copley 1956 is an erratic survey of the genre which slights the Greek examples to focus on the Latin. It is useful as an overview, but in its details too unreliable. Cairns 1972 and his subsequent articles on the komos present a formidable and perceptive corpus of work connected with the paraklausithuron. His focus is, however, on Latin elegy and he does not deal with many earlier examples except as citations for comparison of topoi. Yardley 1978 is the best overall discussion of the religious parody aspects of the paraklausithuron. Finally, Nisbet-Hubbard 1970, 289 ff. on Hor. Carm. 1.25, Fedeli 1980 on Book 1 of Propertius, Murgatroyd 1980 on Book 1 of Tibullus and 1994 on Book 2, and McKeown 1987-, vol. 2, on Book 1 of the Amores, all contain excellent discussions of individual paraklausithura and their relationship to the genre as a whole. Together they are the most useful tool yet for the study of the paraklausithuron.
cross-listings will be given for occurrences in other paraklausithura. These listings will attempt to be thorough for paraklausithura before Latin elegy, although references to elegiac and post-elegiac paraklausithura will be representative rather than complete. At other times, when the topoi are more a matter of vocabulary than concepts, reference will be made to Appendix 2. It should be noted that this dissertation is in no way intended to be a thorough commentary or analysis of all important aspects of every passage discussed. The focus will remain on the paraklausithuron, and issues and problems tangential to it will not, as a general rule, be discussed. Similarly, much secondary scholarship on these passages will have to be by-passed in order for each of the large number of paraklausithuric situations to be discussed and their significant uses of topoi to be noted. Texts will be given in almost all cases and it is hoped that the convenience of their presence will make up for the extended length of this dissertation.

The survey will occupy Chapters 2 and 3. It will show that the paraklausithuron and the paraklausithuric situation are more popular and pervasive than has been previously recognized. In Chapter 2 paraklausithuric passages will be identified in early Greek lyric; an essentially unrecognized yet possible major early influence on the development of the literary paraklausithuron will be
suggested; paraklausithuric parodies complete with extensive manipulation of topoi will be found as early as Aristophanes. In general, extensive use of the paraklausithuric situation will be found to have thrived in Greek literature before the time of Plautus. Chapter 3 will survey the paraklausithuron from Plautus through Horace. It will include the identification of more parodies in Plautus and discussion of the generally neglected Greek paraklausithuric verse of the second century, both in fragmentary poems from papyri and in epigram. Furthermore, possible paraklausithuric references will be found in Cicero, and the great flowering of paraklausithura in the late Republic will be discussed extensively, while still following the restrictions to the scope of this dissertation which were stated above.

Before the survey can take place, terminology and definitions will have to be established. Chapter 1 will analyse and define what is meant by "paraklausithuron", support its utility against the word "komos", state this dissertation's definitions of "genre" and "topoi", and discuss the connection between the paraklausithuron and the komos.

The survey of the genre before Latin elegy will be followed in Chapter 4 by an analysis of several of the most prominent aspects of the relationship between the pre-elegiac and elegiac paraklausithuron. The identity and status of the paraklausithuric beloved will be discussed
first. Then some of the possible religious implications of paraklausithura will be analysed. Finally it will be shown that the continued popularity of the paraklausithuron is because of to the paraklausithuric situation's essential grounding in reality. To this end, some parallel passages from Egyptian, Assyrian, and Jewish sources will be cited.

Two appendices will follow. Appendix 1 will provide a listing, with texts, of paraklausithuric passages after Latin elegy in order to illustrate the extent of the continued existence of the genre. In order to help the examination of topoi and vocabulary, Appendix 2 will contain a word list extracted from the texts presented in Chapters 2 and 3, and Appendix 1. Less clearly paraklausithuric passages will not be included in these lists. Furthermore, the word lists will have been discretely edited to remove the least relevant vocabulary (mainly articles, particles, conjunctions, forms of the verb "to be", and such) and to save space greatly.
CHAPTER 1

ΠΑΡΑΚΛΑΥΣΙΘΥΡΟΝ, ΚΩΜΟΣ, AND GENRE

Παρακλαυσίθυρον or κώμος?

There are several fundamental problems that must be faced in a study of the παρακλαυσίθυρον (paraklausithuron).¹ The first is the meaning of the word itself. While there is general agreement on the broad sense of the word, explicit definitions or implicit perceptions of its meaning vary widely. The fact that it is a relatively late hapax legomenon has also led to some debate on its usefulness, as opposed to other terms for what are generally called paraklausithura. The second problem is that it is more difficult to produce a definition of a genre (as the paraklausithuron will be called tentatively) than of a single word whose occurrences can be examined carefully to define the limits of the word's meaning. To examine occurrences of a genre to find out its essential elements one must already have an idea of what that genre is in order to find those occur-

¹Most Greek words will be transliterated as closely as possible to the original, following the general guidelines in the Chicago Manual of Style with the exception that long vowels will not be marked. I shall not italicize words such as paraklausithuron and komos because they seem to have been fairly well adopted into English critical terminology, like idyll, epyllion, and eclogue.
rences. The dangers of circular reasoning are very present. Finally, there is the question of whether the paraklausi-
thuron is a genre, a motif, a topos, or even anything more than a recognizable concept. All these problems are closely connected and must be dealt with together.

Τὸ παρακλασῖθυρον occurs only once in classical literature, in Plutarch Mor. 753 B (the "Dialogue on love"), and is used of an older woman being in love with a younger man:

"Εράται γὰρ αὐτοῦ μὴ Δία καὶ κάθεται· τῆς οὖν ὁ κωλύων ἐστὶ κωμάζειν ἔπλ θύρας, ζηδεῖν τὸ παρακλασίθυρον, ἀναθεῖν τὰ εἰκόνια, παγκρατίζειν πρὸς τοὺς ἀντερσατάς; ταῦτα γὰρ ἐρωτικά· καὶ καθελθὼ τὰς ὀψίς καὶ παυσάθω τρυφώσα, σχῆμα λαβώσα τῶν τοῦ πάθους οἰκεῖων. εἰ δὲ αλαχύνεται καὶ σωφρονεῖ, κασμίως οἶκοι καθήσω περιμένουσα τοὺς μνωμένους καὶ σπουδάζοντας."

With this to work from, LSJ produced the following definition: "lover's complaint sung at his mistress' door, serenade." Frisk (1973, 3:167) is similar: "Klagelied vor der (verschlossenen) Tür der Geliebten." Maas (1893-, 1202) defines it simply as "Ständchen," Lamer (1893-, 1296) suggests that ζηδεῖν τὸ παρακλασίθυρον can mean "ein Ständchen bringen," and Headlam-Knox (1922, 83) suggests much the same: "They would beg to be admitted, singing a serenade παρακλασίθυρον...." Copley (1942, 96) defines it as "the lament of the shut-out lover" while Burck (1966, 244) is more detailed: "... das Motiv des vor der Tür des geliebten Mädchens oder des geliebten Knaben mit einem Liede Einlaß
heischenden, aber nicht erhörten Liebhabers, das Motiv des vergeblichen Ständchens...." ² One side-benefit to *hapax legomena* is that any definition offered for one can fairly readily be checked.

If one presumes that τὸ παρακλαυσίθυρον is not something extremely specific that only a wanton woman would sing after a komos to a desired male—not an excessively adventurous presumption—one can begin to make other generalizations from the context. One immediately notices from comparing the definitions from *LSJ* and Frisk with Plutarch *Mor.* 753 B that both imagine the lover as male and the beloved as female, the reverse of the situation in the *Moria.* Even though the example is deliberately ridiculous and one can safely presume that males could ἱδεῖν τὸ παρακλαυσίθυρον, the "his mistress"/ "der Geliebten" are unnecessarily narrow. Burck's broader definition is preferable here. The paraklausithuron is something that someone "in love" would "sing" after having made a komos to the doors of a desired "beloved". Common sense would then seem to dictate the general contents of the paraklausithuron. It would be expected to help incline the beloved favourably towards the lover and could, therefore, contain such things as boasts about the lover's virtues, but would most likely focus on some expli-

²This is simply a sampling of the more explicit definitions.
cist expression of amatory interest and praise of the beloved. It would almost certainly also contain a request for what could perhaps most conveniently, if slightly euphemistically, be called "a date".

Several of the definitions quoted view an element of complaint as being integral to the paraklausithuron. This clearly arises from the probable etymology of the word. Frisk (1973, 3.167) suggests it is an "Univerbierung von κλαύσις (κλαύω) und θύρα mit παρα-" and most others who have touched upon the subject agree.\(^3\) That the word implies an element of complaint is clear from κλαύω, even if η κλαύσις is almost as rare as το παρακλαυσίθυρον itself (LSJ s.v.). It is then likely that a paraklausithuron was expected to have a certain plaintive tone. The range of definitions of κλαύω given in LSJ leaves open the cause of such complaint. It certainly could be because of some reluctance on the part of the addressee of the paraklausithuron to look favourably

---

\(^3\)See Otis 1958, 196: "... the etymology seems clearly to indicate a lament beside or before a door"; and Yardley 1978, 19: "It refers to the complaint of the lover made, as the word's etymology and the surviving examples of such songs indicate, at the door of the beloved...." See also Hendrickson 1925, 304. Canter 1919, 356 n. 11 suggests that the -κλαυσι- might be from κλειω, something that Luck 1957 196 simply labels "unmöglichen". Nonetheless, Canter is surely right in recognizing the very unusual nature of the compound. Canter's opinion that κλειω could be the verb lead him to suggest, implausibly, that "it may be that a disdainful mistress was called η παρακλαυσίθυρος, 'the-lock-the-door-in-your-face-girl,' and then a ditty sung by the locked-out lover might well be a παρακλαυσίθυρον μέλος, i.e. 'a song to a door-locking mistress.'"
upon the lover's suit, but it could also simply be a result of the lover suffering from the proverbial pains and fires of love, voiced before there was any sign of rejection by the beloved--just as the English word "serenade" and the German "Ständchen" have no implications of rejection. Furthermore, again discounting the deliberate outrageousness of the woman's behaviour, there is nothing in the context which implies that such a request would not be successful. Therefore, while the paraklausithuron clearly is intended to win the lover access to the beloved, it is not clear that it implies that such access has already been explicitly denied.

There is further evidence to be gained from the παρα-. While we lack an example of the word *παρακλάθσις, we have two occurrences of παρακλάω. It is used in the Scholia on Ar. V. 977: κυνζόμενα: Παρακλάοντα. ὡς ἐπὶ κυνῶν δὲ εἴπε. κυνζηθμὸς γάρ λέγεται ποιά τις ἐπὶ κυνῶν φωνή. The comparison with a dog whining or whimpering supports there being a certain plaintiveness implicit in παρακλάοντα.
We also have one other occurrence of παρακλαίω, not cited in LSJ, from a paraklausithuric epigram by Rufinus (A.P. 5.103):  

Μέχρι τίνος, Προδόκη, παρακλαύσομαι; ἄχρι τίνος σε γονάσσομαι, στερεῇ, μηδὲν ἀκουόμενος; ἢδη καὶ λευκαὶ σοὶ ἐπισκειρτῶσιν ἐθείραι, καὶ τάχα μοι ἀώσεις ὡς Ἑκάβη Πριάμῳ.

The tone of the epigram fits with the scholiast’s gloss. One can conclude, then, that it is legitimate to see the paraklausithuron as indicating a certain element of complaint. As Luck (1957, 342) put it: "Ein echtes P. ist wohl immer ein bißchen wehleidig und schweigt in Gefühlen."

One of the word’s component parts remains: -θυρον. This is clearly from the Greek *θυρ root found in θύρα, indicating that τὸ παρακλαυσίθυρο is a substantive formed from an adjective along the lines of τὸ ἐγκώμιον from ἐγκώμιος. It does not seem necessary to understand implicitly a noun like μέλος or ἄσµα with it, as Canter (1919, 357), Luck (1957, 342), and Garte (1924, 3) argue, although such a word was probably understood originally with τὸ ἐγκώμιον and could also have been with τὸ παρακλαυσίθυρο, if it was a much older word than

---

5 Luck 1957, 340 has also noticed both of these. The text is from Paton 1916-18. However, epigrams from the A.P. will usually be quoted according to Gow-Page 1965 or 1968. Paton will be used only for epigrams not in Gow-Page.
Plutarch. If Plutarch coined the word he could simply have been thinking of parallels like τὸ ἐγκώμιον or τὸ ἐπικη-δειν. Other parallels would be the θυροκοπικόν and κρουσίθυρον cited as types of αύλησις at Ath. 14.618 c (Trypho fr. 109, Velsen):

αύλησις α' εἰς τὸ δπει οἰόμασίας, ὡς φησι Τρύφων ἐν δευτέρῳ ὁνομασίας άλλες κἀκεῖς, βουκολικός, γίγγας, τετράκωμος, ἐπιφαλλός, ἱσχεῖς, καλλινικός, πολεμικός, ἡδύκωμος, Σικυννοτύρβη, θυροκοπικόν (τὸ α' αὐτὸ καὶ κρουσίθυρον), κυριακός, μόθων. τάτα δὲ πάντα μετ' ὀρχήσεως ἤφελτο.

κρουσίθυρον even provides a very similar construction to παρακλασίθυρον, although ἡ κρουσίς is significantly more common than ἡ κλαθίς.

There remains the problem of putting the component parts of the word together. What does *παρακλασίς*/παρακλαίω + θύρα mean? Our only two occurrences of παρακλαίω are intransitive, but there are many Greek verbs with both transitive and intransitive uses. Παρά, whatever case it governs, has a basic sense of "by, near, alongside of" and most verbs compounded with παρα- retain that sense. So παρακλαίω could be expected to have a connotation of proximity: "to complain nearby" and could be intransitive or take some form of an object. A survey of verbs compounded with

---

6 Athenaeus will be quoted from Gulick 1927-41, unless indicated otherwise.
7 See Goodwin 1894, 259; Smyth 1956, 381; see LSJ s.v., G.
παρα- listed in LSJ reveals an approximately even division between those governing the accusative or dative case. Normally in compounds combining a verb and a noun one expects the noun to come first—e.g. λειόβολέω, νομοθετέω, λογογρα-φέω—but again κρουσίθυρον offers a ready parallel to τὸ παρακλαυσίθυρον. Furthermore it is possibly relevant that "compounds of which the first part is the stem of a verb are chiefly poetic" (Goodwin 1894, 192). Working from analogy with θυροχωπίκον and κρουσίθυρον, which must mean, respectively, something like a "door-knock" dance and a "door-rattle" dance, one would expect τὸ παρακλαυσίθυρον to be indeed a type of complaint by a door. It is therefore in essence not just any "Ständchen" or love-song.

Before settling on a definition of τὸ παρακλαυσίθυρον, the verb that governs it in Plutarch should be considered: ἀείθεσιν. It is most easily translated as "sing", but encompasses a wide range of vocalizations from what we could call singing to recitation (LSJ s.v.). Contrary to some suggestions, it does not imply that, to Plutarch, the

---

8 It has been suggested to me by Dr. Robert Develin that the sense could be closer to "complaint directed at the door", which is certainly possible, but again παρα- is more likely to have the sense of "beside" than "at", as LSJ (s.v.) make clear: "Prep. c. gen., dat., and acc., prop. beside...." The former cannot be ruled out, but the latter is the safer assumption.
paraklausithuron was something exclusively lyric. In the passage from Plutarch, the woman has come to the doors in a komos (κωμάζειν ἐπὶ θύρας) and, of course, the connections between komoi and drunkenness and between drunkenness and singing in turn were well-established. But while ξάδει is used most commonly of actual singing, it can be used of non-lyric poetic metres (Hom. Il. 1.1 μὴν ἔξεις) and of spells and charms (LSJ cites P. Mag. Lond. 47.43 and also see P. Mag. 6.47), which were probably chanted. The verb itself does not seem to be applicable to prosaic speech and

9 Garte 1924, 3 takes this stance: "Re uera omnia paraclusithyra carminibus expressa sunt." This leads him to conclude that, for example, neither Theoc. 3 nor the various paraklausithuric epigrams in the A.P. are real paraklausithuric because their metres "ad cantandum apta non erant" (13, 23). However, elegiacs can be, and were, sung: see Edmonds 1931, 1:1.

10 The association between komoi/komasts and drunkenness is very common, especially since symposia were regularly followed by komoi and most komoi followed eating and drinking of some kind. For Plutarch alone, see Alc. 4.5, 22.2, Alex. 17.5, 38.1 ff., Ant. 9.3, Caes. 41.3, Dem. 20.3, Pyrrh. 13.3-5, Sull. 13.3, and Mor. 128 D, 596 C-D, 710 C. Dionysus was the god of the κύμος (as Nonnos makes clear nearly ad nauseam), and even had the cult title κωμαστῆς (see, for example, Ar. Nu. 605 and the Scholia ad loc.: ΄Η μετὰ μέθης ἱδαῖα γίνονται: ὁ τοῦ κύμους καὶ τὰ συμπόσια ποιῶν). See also below in the general discussion of the meaning of κύμος/κωμάζειν. That wine makes a person sing was proverbial: Hom. Od. 14.463-6; Ath. 2.40 a (Simon. fr. 647) Σιμονίδης τῶν αὐτῶν ἄρχην τίθενσι ωκεν καὶ μουσικής; and Men. Mis. 165-8 ὥσπερ πολυτίμητοι θεοί, ἐπὶ πάσιν ἔτι ὡς, τοῦτο δὲ τὸ τοῦ λόγου, / πᾶνων δικαιοίς ἤσεν ἀνθρώπων.... Ἀξίων and its compounds are common in Greek paraklausithura and amatory komoi, cf. Plu. Mor. 455 B: ὁλον ἐπικωμάσας καὶ ἰσαί καὶ στεφανύσας θύραν.

makes it fairly clear that Plutarch imagined τὸ παρακλαυσίθυρον to be in some form of verse.\(^{12}\) This seems to suggest that those definitions that specify an element of song as being essential to the definition of the paraklausithuron, including the German ones that gloss it with "Ständchen," usually implying an actual song, are being too narrow. Nonetheless, to avoid an increasing accumulation of alternatives such as "verse/song" and "recited/sung", "song", and "sung" can be used acceptably of the paraklausithuron while keeping in mind that they have to be used in a broad sense.

Therefore, the general sense of the definitions offered above can be confirmed, if not some of the specific details. Τὸ παρακλαυσίθυρον could be broadly, and very prosaically, defined as the plaintive entreaty of the lover to the beloved, sung or recited at or near the beloved's door. Such a definition is a useful starting place.

Clearly some people who have written on the paraklausithuron have had no such definition in mind. Copley (1942, 96), for example, offers a very broad interpretation, viewing the paraklausithuron as both the song of the lover and a depiction of the situation surrounding it:

The ancient paraklausithyron, the lament of the shut-out lover, is based invariably on a stock dramatic scene:

\(^{12}\)It should be noted that Greek lyric poetry was not always sung—it could be recited: see Campbell 1982, xxiv and Edmonds 1945, 3:656. Hendrickson 1925, 296 suggests that something that was spoken may be called a paraklausithuron: "In a context therefore such as this ἐπὶ θύρας κωμάζειν is to sing or speak the παρακλαυσίθυρον."
the lover, intoxicated and wearing a garland, comes to the door of his beloved, which he finds shut against him. To the girl within, or sometimes to the door itself, he sings his song, begging for pity, pleading for admission, sometimes cursing the girl for her obstinacy and himself for his folly. It does him no good; the door remains closed. He flings down his garland or hangs it on the doorway, and then himself lies down on the doorstep to await the coming of dawn...\textsuperscript{13}

Otis (1958, 196) notices the logical inconsistency in this:

I am not fully satisfied by Copley's rather loose use of the term, paraclausithyron. Is it, in short, a motif, story, theme, or the actual song? He says it is the song, but also insists (rightly I think) that it is essentially a 'motif, theme or story rather than a form' (p. 1), like, \textit{e.g.}, pastoral, comedy, lyric, elegy, epigram, etc. ... Plutarch probably meant by paraclausithyron something much narrower than a motif or a general episode. There may well have been, in other words, a true 'door song' and perhaps the so-called \textit{Alexandrian Erotic Fragment} is one. But, in this strict sense, the door scenes in comedy or in epigram are not true paraclausithyra.

Others have clearly had very broad definitions in mind: de la Ville de Mirmont (1909, 578) identifies Cat. 67 as a paraklausithuron; Shipton (1985) concludes that part of Cat. 68 is one; Hughes (1992) discovers one in Cic. \textit{Phil.} 2.76-8; and Copley (1956, 57) says of Horace \textit{Carm.} 3.26 that "if the paraclausithyron may be loosely defined as the song of the \textit{exclusus amator}, then this ode is a paraclausithyron in a very real sense, for Horace wrote it because he was shut out."\textsuperscript{14} None of these passages could, under any of the defi-

\textsuperscript{13}Copley at least once (1942, 101) uses "paraclausithyron" to refer to the whole paraklausithuristic situation.

\textsuperscript{14}Kenney 1958, 49 calls this "a process of reasoning which I cannot follow."
nitions offered above, be considered a paraklausithuron. Such problems perhaps arise from the author's attempting a generalization about what a paraklausithuron is from various passages commonly identified as paraklausithura. The dangers of circular reasoning are obvious. Hence it is necessary to have some definition of a paraklausithuron to begin with, and to start with the source for the word itself.

However, exclusively using a narrow definition creates problems of its own. As noted above, Garte throughout his work uses the narrowest definition and even denies anything that could not actually be sung status as a true paraklausithuron. Furthermore, studying only true paraklausithura would mean ignoring anything that seems to make a simple reference to a paraklausithuron. This would rule out passages like the one from Plutarch's Mor., from which τὸ παρακλαυσιθυρον comes, or something like Ov. Fast. 4.107-12, which makes a very clear reference to the situation of the exclusus amator:

    prima feros habitus homini detraxit: ab illa uenerunt cultus mundaque cura sui.  
    primus amans carmen uigilatum nocte negata   
    dicitur ad clausas concinuisse fores,  
    eloquiumque fuit duram exorare puellam,  
    proque sua causa quisque disertus erat.15

On an even larger scale, this could lead some to decide that any of the elegies of Tibullus that are commonly identified

15The text is from Frazer-Goold 1989.
as paraklausithura--1.2, 1.5, and 2.6--but whose settings have been the subject of some dispute, are not actually paraklausithura.\textsuperscript{16} Such passages could legitimately be ignored, but it does not seem desirable to neglect such a potentially rich source of information when examining the paraklausithuron.

So, while the definition of τὸ παρακλασθυρον offered above--the plaintive entreaty of the lover to the beloved, sung or recited at or near the beloved's door--could be useful in helping to avoid some of the looser interpretations of what a paraklausithuron is, it is perhaps nonetheless an excessively narrow definiton on which to base a study of what the paraklausithuron is usually viewed as encompassing. Therefore this study will concern itself not only with what could be called true paraklausithura, but also with what will be called the paraklausithuric situation--references to paraklausithura and to situations in which one could reasonably expect paraklausithura to be sung, as well as passages where an author seems to be deliberately playing with paraklausithura or paraklausithuric situations and topoi. The basic definition of τὸ παρακλασθυρον will have to be kept in mind as a guide to whether such passages can be called paraklausithuric.

\textsuperscript{16}For the question of whether any of these are actually sung at Delia's or Nemesis' door, see Murgatroyd 1980, \textit{ad loc.} and 1994, \textit{ad loc.}
As one could predict from the problems some have had with defining "paraklausithuron", several authors have suggested that the word itself could be dispensed with. Despite using the word regularly, Copley (1942, 97; cf. 1956, 4) asserts of the paraklausithuric situation that

the word used by the ancients themselves to designate it is not παρακλαυσίθυρον, for that term is used only for the song, and only by Plutarch, but rather κώμος, together with the corresponding verbs κωμάζειν and ἐπικωμάζειν....

He prefers to call the paraklausithuron the "κώμος-song" (1942, 97). Hendrickson (1925, 301) also favours the word κώμος, commenting that

in ... modern discussion ... παρακλαυσίθυρον has assumed a generic value of designation which belongs to it neither by abstract right nor by usage. It is so far as I know cited from a single source ... and can never have been in frequent use.

But the major advocate of using "komos" in place of "paraklausithuron" is Francis Cairns (1972, 6): "komos, often incorrectly termed paraklausithyron (the song and actions of a lover who is usually excluded)...." In a later article (1992, 65 n. 2) in response to Yardley (1978, 19 n. 1) he says that

Yardley ... (apparently received favorably by Fedeli...), attempting to revive the use of 'paraclusithyron' for this song (as opposed to the overall activity, i.e. komos) does not establish the utility, let alone the historical validity, of this term.

Despite the suggestion that seems to be implicit in the phrase "attempting to revive"—that "paraklausithuron" had fallen out of use by 1978—this was not the case, and it has
continued to be used despite Cairns's and others' advocacy of "komos". The desire to use "komos" is easily understood when one considers that many clearly paraklausithuric situations contain κῶμος, κωμάζειν or a related term.\textsuperscript{17} This difference of opinion may seem like a minor matter but deserves some attention.

Part of the disagreement comes from the indiscriminate use of the word "paraklausithuron" to apply not only to the paraklausithuron itself but also the whole paraklausithuric situation. In that sense much of the criticism leveled above is justified: for example, it is perfectly correct to say that the the whole situation of the excluded lover seeking admission to the beloved was not called a paraklausithuron. Indeed τὸ παρακλαυσίθυρον clearly was not in common use in the classical period, but the word comes from a learned classical author and a viable definition for it can be established. If one keeps in mind that paraklausithura and paraklausithuric situations are not the same thing, then the word can be used effectively. That τὸ παρακλαυσίθυρον occurs only the one time, in Plutarch, is no reason to reject it. The fact that diffamatio does not occur in any of the authors included in the OLD has not deterred Copley (1949, 245; 1956, 47, and passim) or even Nisbet-Hubbard

\textsuperscript{17}See later in this chapter and Appendix 2.
(1970, 291) from using it.\textsuperscript{18} Similarly, Cairns accepts many of the terms that occur in Menander Rhetor, such as ἀπευκτικός or προσευκτικός of hymns (341.22 Russell-Wilson) or ὁ γενεθλιακός (412.2), and that are no more common than τὸ παρακλαυσθεῖρον.\textsuperscript{19} Τὸ παρακλαυσθεῖρον exists and serves a useful purpose.

That usefulness can be seen when one examines κόμος as the proposed alternative. While "paraklausithuron" suffers from its single occurrence, the commonness of komos poses problems of its own. There are close to 1200 occurrences of κόμος/κωμάζειν and their various compounds in the authors on the TLG CD-ROM.\textsuperscript{20} LSJ gives an idea of the range of the uses of ὁ κόμος alone:

\begin{itemize}
\item revel, carousel, merry-making,... especially in honour of gods,...
\item 2. concrete, band of revellers,... esp. of the procession which celebrated a victor in games...;
\item generally, rout, band,... band of hunters... of maidens... of doves.... II. the ode sung at one of these festive processions....\textsuperscript{21}
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{18} Although Kenney 1958, 49, in his review of Copley 1959, objects to the term: "The canon of ancient literary genres is enriched by two newcomers, the diffamatio and the lupanar song."

\textsuperscript{19} ὁ γενεθλιακός does not occur in LSJ and Menander Rhet. is the only author cited for both ἀπευκτικός and προσευκτικός.

\textsuperscript{20} This is not an exact count but is based on an estimate from a search for the -κωμ- root, adjusted by an estimate of the number of results not related to κόμος/κωμάζειν.

\textsuperscript{21} For more detailed discussion of κόμος, see Minyard 1976, which is flawed but useful, and Lamer 1893-.. See also below in Chapter 1.
Cairns (1992, 76) himself notes the wide scope of meanings contained in κώμος:

the ancient komos was a broad institution and genre, of which the erotic komos was only one subclass. The word komos could designate first many religious and secular activities with a processional element, ranging from rituals of gods to celebrations in honour of heroes and men. Again komos could refer in a more specialized sense to the komastic activities of the lover (or party-goer), and of groups of such erotic or symposiastic komasts, activities which led to their admission, or exclusion, as Copley has described so well. Finally of course a group, including a choric group, participating in komastic activities, religious or secular, might itself be described as a komos, i.e., a group of komasts.


This is not to say that epinician komoi were always respectable or orderly: Const. VII Porphyr. de sent. Boissevain 323.29 ff. (based on D.S. 16.87.1-2), ὁσιοτέσσαρες ὑμεῖς ὡς παρὰ πόλεις ἐλλιπότοις πολὺν ἐμφανισάμενος ἀκρατοῦ, καὶ μετὰ τῶν φιλῶν τὸν ἐπιστήκον ἀγὼν κώμον, ἐβάδιζεν ὑθρίζων διὰ λόγων τὰς τῶν ἀκληροῦντων ἀνατυχίας.

For an analysis of κώμος/κωμάζειν in Pindar, see Minyard 1976, 76 ff., Lefkowitz 1991, Morgan 1993, and LSJ. For more on the meaning of κώμος and κωμάζειν, see below.
phrase komos-song does not immediately distinguish the amatory context from the epinician ode—-a komos-song could be any song sung in any komos. Much other confusion can be envisioned. As the quotation from LSJ shows, κώμος is used often of general riotous partying, not necessarily of the komos-procession. So any drinking song or skolion sung in such a revel would then be a komos-song. But even if one restricted the term komos-song to that which was sung during a drunken, non-epinician komos-procession, there is no implication that such a song is addressed to a beloved any more than today's student pub-crawlers inevitably end up singing praises of their loved ones rather than their beloved sports teams or even their university. Therefore, to keep the sense of komos absolutely clear when using it as Cairns and Copley do, one should properly refer to amatory komoi and amatory komos-songs, terms which are no more convenient than "paraklausithuron" or "paraklausithuric situation".

However, the desire to use "komos" is also easily understood when one considers that many clearly paraklausithuric situations contain κώμος, κωμάζειν or a related term, and most can be presumed to have been preceded by something at least vaguely resembling a κώμος. Nonetheless the fact that, in turn, most occurrences of κώμος/κωμάζειν are not clearly connected with paraklausithuric situations indicates
that one can reasonably prefer the narrower implications of the word paraklausithuron. Therefore, it can be argued that "paraklausithuron" and its immediately recognizable connotations make it preferable to "komos" when discussing the situation of the lover seeking admission to the beloved.

Finally, it must be asked whether the paraklausithuron and the paraklausithuric situation should be called a genre, topos, motif or something else. It is probably not necessary to say that virtually all the scholars who have handled the paraklausithuron have treated it as an at least moderately coherent motif or topos. But doubts have been voiced. In response to Copley's statement that it is "a motif, theme or story rather than a form" (1956, 1), Kenney (1958, 49) comments:

Even so, did ancient writers think of it as a theme to be consciously used and developed, as is stated and implied through the book?... That the thing existed is undeniable, but were the poets more conscious of it than they were of the many other facets of love?...

Of course, even if ancient authors did not consciously view the paraklausithuric situation as a genre or topos "to be consciously used and developed", that should not necessarily prevent study of "the thing" itself. Most finer points of morphology and syntax are not deliberately manipulated by the writers who use them, yet they can be profitably studied to show the changes in a language over time. A study of the paraklausithuric situation in classical literature, even if
there were no deliberate manipulation of the situation, could still be worthwhile as something akin to a lexicographical exercise, inquiring how the situation is depicted, when, and by whom. But it does seem reasonable to view the paraklausithuric situation as something more than that. Perhaps Kenney's views have changed in the light of Cairns's work on the paraklausithuron/komos, which can reasonably be claimed to have proven that the paraklausithuric situation can be viewed as what he calls a genre of content.²⁴

Cairns (1972, 6) asserts that the komos is a genre in the sense of a "classification in terms of content." Another example of this is the propemptikon (the farewell to the departing traveller). He contrasts these with "genres in terms of form" such as "epic, lyric, elegy, or epistle." There can be no real objection to using genre in this sense, for even the genres of form cited by Cairns often can also be defined by their content. An epic is, for example, recognizable as much by its subject matter, such as "heroic combat, divine interventions, extended similes, and so forth"

²⁴See Cairns 1972, 1975, 1977, 1979, and 1992. It seems fair to give Cairns the credit for this since he was the first to view explicitly the paraklausithuron/komos in terms of genre. This is not to slight the many others who have in their work on the paraklausithuron or individual paraklausithura and paraklausithuric situations further proven the coherence of the paraklausithuron as a genre. For some more modern examples, see Yardley 1978 and 1979, Watson 1982, Murgatroyd 1980 on Tib. 1.2, 1.5, and 1994 on 2.6, and McKeown 1987- on Ov. Am. 1.6.
(Conte 1986, 13), as by its form. Although it might seem to be an absurd comparison between large and small to say that both epic and the paraklausithuron are genres, the comparison becomes more palatable if one remembers that individual lyric poems or epistles can be as short as any paraklausithuron.

Each of these genres has "a set of primary or logically necessary elements which in combination distinguish that genre from every other genre" (Cairns 1972, 6). One could call this set of elements the genre's code (Conte 1986, 11 ff.). Cairns's description of the komastic code fits well with the definition for paraklausithuron which was reached above:

The primary elements of a komos are a lover, a beloved, and the lover's attempts to come to the beloved, plus an appropriate setting. These primary elements will be present in every example of the genre, either explicitly or implicitly (1972, 6).

Genres in turn contain "secondary elements" called topoi:

These topoi are the smallest divisions of the material of any genre useful for analytic purposes. Their usefulness lies in the fact that they are the commonplaces which recur in different forms in different examples of the same genre. They help, in combination with the primary elements, to identify a generic example. But the primary elements are the only final arbiters of generic identity since any particular individual topos (secondary element) can be found in several different genres (1972, 6).

This study will accept that a paraklausithuron is essentially the plaintive entreaty of the lover to the beloved, sung, or recited at or near the beloved's door. It
also will concern itself with any reference to a paraklausi-
thuric situation--a situation in which one could very rea-
sonably expect a paraklausithuron to be sung, such as an
explicit mention of a lover being excluded at a beloved's
door--and also passages where an author seems to be deliber-
ately playing with paraklausithuric situations and topoi. It
will also, as the need arises, discuss passages, not in
themselves paraklausithuric, that seem to have relevance to
the paraklausithuron. It will accept that the paraklausithu-
ron, and its general surrounding situation, is, in Cairns's
sense, a genre. It will refer to the basic paraklausithuric
code in determining what can and cannot be called paraklau-
sithuric, and will call the components of that code topoi.

Κῶμος and κωμάζειν

As was noted above, κῶμος and κωμάζειν are rela-
tively common in paraklausithuric contexts. The Greek word
list of Appendix 2 has some thirty occurrences of κωμάζειν
or a κωμάζειν compound and some fifty containing κῶμος or a
κῶμος compound. Because of the frequency with which κῶμος/
kωμάζειν will occur throughout this study it is worthwhile
to examine in more depth its range of meanings.

The entry from LSJ for κῶμος has been quoted above.
The entry for κωμάζω is similar:

revel, make merry,... go in festal procession ... take part in religious procession.... II. esp. celebrate a κῶμος in honour of the victor at at the games,... 2. c. dat. pers., approach with a κῶμος, sing in his honour,... 3. c. acc. pers., honour or celebrate him in
or with the κῶμος,... III. break in upon in the manner of revellers, serenade, of lovers... generally, burst in....

Frisk (1973, 2:62) is comparable:

'Umzug bezecheter Jugend, dionysischer Festzug und Festgesang, Festgelage' (nachhom.)... σύγκωμος 'Genosse eines κ.' (att.; eher Rückbildung aus συγ-κωμάτω)... κωμάζω 'an einem κῶμος teilnehmen, zechen' (nachhom.) mit κωμάσια 'festlicher Aufzug', κωμαστής 'Zecher, Teilnehmer eines Festzugs' (att., Pap.)....

The TLG and Passow (1970) do not differ much. All agree that the most basic meaning of κῶμος/κωμάζειν entails a sense of "procession", no doubt connected with the probable origin of the komos in Dionysiac worship or celebration. There is also a strong element of general revelry and all include an element of song.

The ancient lexicographers and scholiasts offer a similar range of meanings. The Etymologicum Magnum stresses the dance and processional element and associates the komos

\[\text{25}\] Κῶμος/κωμάζειν is very common in the Church Fathers, picking up, no doubt, on its biblical occurrences: Ep. Rom. 13:13, Ep. Gal. 5.21, 1 Ep. Pet. 4.3 in the NT and Wi. 14.23, 2 Ma. 6.4 in the LXX. But by then its definition has narrowed considerably. See Thayer 1977, 367, s.v. κῶμος: "a revel, carousal, i.e. in the Grk. writ. prop. a nocturnal and riotous procession of half-drunken and frolicsome fellows who after supper parade through the streets with torches and music in honor of Bacchus or some other deity, and sing and play before the houses of their male and female friends; hence used generally of feasts and drinking-parties that are protracted till late at night and indulge in revelry...." Arndt-Gingrich 1952, 462, s.v. κῶμος, have a similar definition: "orig. a festal procession in honor of Dionysus, then a joyous meal or banquet, in the NT... only in a bad sense excessive feasting,... w. μέθας... carousing, revelry.... Likew. w. πότοι...."
with sleep and departing from the symposium in order to sleep:

Kωμάζειν, τὸ ποιῶς ὄρχησθαι ... παρὰ τὸ κῷ τὸ κοιμάματε ἐμφάνιει γὰρ τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ δειπνοῦ καὶ τῆς μέθης, ἐπὶ τοῦ κοιμήθηναι βασίζειν. ἦστεν οὖν κώμος ὁ καιρός, ὁ ἀπὸ τῶν δειπνῶν πρὸς ὑπνοῦ κολῆν. Κωμάζειν, κυρίως τὸ ἐπικοιμάσθαι καὶ βασίζειν. ἦστεν οὖν κώμος ὁ καιρός. τὸ δὲ κώμος ἐκ τοῦ κωμάζω, τὸ ἐπὶ τοῦ κοιμάσθαι βασίζειν.

Hesychius and Photius give greater prominence to the song element, but dance is also important, as are drink and the general wantonness of ύβρίζειν. They seem to be using the same definition in part: Hesychius (s.v.), κωμάζειν κώμον ἢ (δράμα) ἥσει. ύβρίζει μετὰ μέθης; Photius (s.v.), κωμάζειν κώμον ἢ δράμα ἥσει, ύβριζει...... κώμοι· ψαλ· ἢ ὀρχήσεις μετὰ μέθης.... κώμοι· εἴδος ὀρχήσεως. Elsewhere Hesychius glosses παιάνας (s.v.) with κώμους. εὐφημίας, ψάς, υμνους εἰς θεόν.

Song is also part of the glosses from the Scholia in Aeschinon 149 (on Or. 1.65): κώμοις] κώμος ἢ μετ’ οἶνου ψηθ; the Scholia Platonica, 573 d (= Suid. κ.2272) κώμοι· ψαλ· ἢ ὀρχήσεις μετὰ μέθης; the Scholia on Ar. Nub. 606: κωμαστής Διόνυσος] ὃ μετὰ μέθης ψαλ γίνονται; and the Scholia in Theocritum 3.1:

Κωμάζω τὸ ἐρωτάκεις ἔρχομαι καὶ φοιτῶ μετὰ ἀνέσεως· κώμος γὰρ κυρίως ὁ υμνὸς, ως καὶ Πυθαρός, ἢ θησαύρα λύρα, φησὶ πολλαχοῦ. ... Ἄλλως. Κωμάζω: Τὸ κωμάζειν λέγεται ἐπὶ τῶν κατὰ νύκτα εἰς τὰς ἐρωμένας ἀπερχομένων· ως Ἄριστοφάνης ἐν Πλούτῳ (1040).

The other Suidas (Adler) entries stress dance, music, and drink:

2265 Κώμος: ὡς μέθην. καὶ ὀρχησμός. λέγεται ὅς καὶ ὁ στενὸς τόπος. σημαίνει ὅς καὶ τὸ κολῆμα. 2266 Κώμος ἐστὶ μεθυστικὸς σύλος, ἐγχρονίζοντος οἴνου ἔρεθείζων τὴν
These entries indicate that the ancient lexicographers and scholiasts considered κώμος/κωμάζειν to have a primary element of movement--dance or procession, with which would go music--and also a strong element of song, usually accompanied by drunkenness and sometimes by offensive or boorish behaviour.\(^{26}\)

\(^{26}\) Although we are not concerned here with various κωμάζειν compounds like ἐπικωμάζειν and ἐλασκωμάζειν, the directional sense of κωμάζειν comes across even more in these compounds. See Hsch. epsilon. 1108 <ἐλεσκώμασιν>: ἐλεήλθεν; 3683 <ἐξεκώμασα>: ἐξεπόρνευσαν; and 4379 <ἐπικώμασα>: ἐπεδήμησαν, ἐπῆλθεν, ἐν μεταφορᾷ τοῦ <κώμου>, ὁ ἐστὶν ἐνθούσιωτος πλήθους. Ἐπικωμάζειν and ἐλασκωμάζειν often seem to have negative connotations. This is evident in Ar. Achar. 982 (διας ἐπὶ πάντα ἄγαθα ἔχοντας ἐπικωμάσας) but becomes particularly apparent in later writers, again especially Christian ones, probably from its connection with κώμος. See Lyc. Alex. 1351-2, 1355 Αθήνης δὲ χήροι, Τρόλοις ἐκλελούπτες καὶ χίλιοι τε .../.../... 1355 "Αγγέλων ἀφάντιτως ἐλασκώμασαν; Ign. Tars. [Sp.] 4.2.2.1 τοσούτων καθὼς ἐσμός ἐλασκώμασεν; Aristid. 27.353 (Dindorf, = "The Sacred Tales" 5) Ἀλπεντου δέ τινω ἀνθρώπινου περὶ τοῦ κρόνου τοῦτον ἐλασκώμασαν τοῖς τινὶς πόλει καὶ τῶν τοιούτων ἔτην οὖς ἄγαθελαντος...; Clem. raed. 2.12.118.4 'Ο δέ πολυτέματος μαραγρίτης ὑπερφυῆς τῇ γυναικωνίτιδι ἐλεσκώμασεν; Ath. 6.231 d - ε συληθεύτως δ' αὖ παντοθεν ἐρέσθι ὡς τῶν ὅψων τράγων ἐπέλαμψε παρὰ τοῖς Ἐλληνισίν ὁ χρυσός, ελασκώμασε δὲ καὶ ὁ ἄργυρος; Lib. Or. 13.12 καὶ τῆς ἄχλυσις ἀπολλαγές ἀληθεῖαι μὲν ἄντελαβες ἄγνοιας, τὸ δὲ γινόμενον τοῦ ἱματίου, τοῦς δὲ παλαιοὺς ἐρχομένας ἀντὶ τοῦ νεωτέρος κακῶς εἰσκωμάσατος; Bas. Spir. 30.77 (216A) 'Αναρχία δὲ τῆς δεινῆς ἀπὸ τῆς φιλαρχίας ταύτης τοῖς λαοῖς ἐπεκώμασεν; Thdt. er. 147.26 f. ἦ περιάται κρατύνειν τὴν ἄνθρωπον ἐλασκώμασαν αἴρεσιν; Gr. Nyss. mort. 9 διὰ τοῦτο ἦ τε πλεονεξία πλεῖστος τοῖς πολῖσιν τῇ ἄνθρωπιν ζῷῃ εἰσεκώμασαν, καὶ ἦ μαλακία καὶ ὁ τύφος καὶ ἡ χαυτοτοίχη καὶ ἡ πολυευθυγορία ἀσώτια καὶ τὰ τοιαύτα; Chriss. orph. 1 (MPG 47.328.54, 56-7) ἀλλά τις πονηρός δαίμων ... εἰς τὰς τῶν ἄνθρωπων εἰσεκώμασε φύλαξ. John Chrysostom is particularly fond of εἰσκωμάζειν.
Yet, despite this, there seems good reason to believe that an element of song is not necessarily part of the basic meaning of the word except in so far as the komos procession/dance/revel would usually be accompanied by song of some kind or the komos band would sing songs or odes or hymns. For example, the *Scholia in Theocritum* gloss the κωμάσδω in Theocritus 3.1 first with ἔρχομαι before saying that it is properly a δύμος, for which Pindar is cited. And Hesychius' gloss on παλᾶνας belongs to a similar ritual context. But it is possible that κώμος/κωμάζειν in Pindar never means anything so clearly simple as "song/sing". For example, Huntingford (1821, s.v.) in his lexicon to Pindar gives the basic sense of κωμάζειν as "epulas solennes cum hymnis et tripudiis agito" and κώμος as "epulum solenne et hilare".

Lamer (1893–, 1286 ff.), in the most thorough discussion of κώμος/κωμάζειν before Minyard (1976), argues the same while stressing the processional/dance element. He defines κώμος as "Umzug nach dem Symposium" or "die beim und durch das Trinken entstehende Fröhlichkeit und den fröhlichen Umzug der Trunkenen." He goes on to reject the suggestion that κώμος can be simply a symposium or banquet. It sometimes seems to mean a general carouse—"Gelage"—but for the main loci offered for such a definition the sense of "procession" is equally acceptable, rendering a firm definition there impossible: "Umzug nach dem Gelage liegt ... in einer
ganzen Reihe von Stellen ganz unmißverständlich vor" (1287). Lamer notes how often κώμος/κωμάζειν occurs in conjunction with, usually after, words denoting drinking and concludes that it is advisable to take these loci as indicating two separate activities, that in such examples κωμάζειν "viel-mehr heißen...: zu zechen und trinkend von einer Gruppe zur andern zu ziehen" (1288). Finally, κώμος is often transferred to a crowd of companions, but these are primarily in a procession, not symposium. Lamer calls κωμαστής "völlig klar" (1289). He offers the tentative conclusion (1289):

b) κ. = συμπόσιον scheint nur an zwei Stellen unzweifelhaft zu sein; diese können jedoch auch anders erklärt werden.... c) κ. = συμπόσιον oder = Umzug findet sich öfter; d) κ. = Umzug, besonders als 'fröhlicher lär- mender Umzug Betrunkener' ist an vielen Stellen sicher. Daraus folgt doch wohl, daß man als Hauptbedeutung 'Umzug' nehmen und also auch die unter c) fallenden Stellen so deuten muß.

He then notes (1289) that κώμος can signify

Musik, Gesang, Tanz usw. ... aber diese Einzelbedeu-
tungen sind von κ. = Umzug abzuleiten, bei dem ja dies alles auch eine Rolle spielt, nicht von κ. = Gelage. Wo aber κ. dies letztere zu bedeuten scheint, da überwiegt doch über den Begriff des Trinkens der dionysischer Fröhlichkeit, das Kennzeichen des Umzugs.

In its more religious or ceremonial loci the processional element remains dominant and something like "Festfeier" is its most likely sense. He draws a comparison (1292) with the Egyptian use of κωμαστής "als offizieller Terminus für einem Teilnehmer an religiösen Prozessionen" and, of course, the encomium: "Von dem. κ., in dem man siegreiche Wettkämpfer
unter Lobgesängen heimgeleitete, leitet man ἐγ-κώμιον 'Lob (beim κ.)'."

Minyard (1976, 76-128, and ff.) concerns herself more with the formal religious/ritual uses of κώμος/κωμάζειν, particularly in Pindar. She conclusively demonstrates (esp. 86 ff.) that the closest semantic match for κώμος/κωμάζειν is χορός/χορεύειν, indicating the pre-eminence of the procession/dance element. As one might expect, κώμος/κωμάζειν is concentrated in the clearly epinician/encomiastic odes (120 f.). She asserts (127) that "the komos, then, is a species of choros.... these texts ... are texts of komoi, but are not themselves komoi...." This conclusion seems applicable to most occurrences of κώμος/κωμάζειν in religious/ritual contexts.

Minyard makes a distinction between two main uses of κώμος/κωμάζειν. The Pindaric occurrences fit what she calls "Group 1", while those from a sympotic context belong to "Group 2". This second category of κώμος/κωμάζειν is what could broadly be translated by "revel". In this second category as a rule "the word κώμος cannot act grammatically as the subject of its verb form ... or as the internal object of that verb.... Instead it is found in expressions of the type κωμασταὶ κωμάζουσι ἐν κώμῃ" (189). This category (189-90)

includes (1) the phrase ἐπὶ κώμον, in all cases but one, with a verb either overtly denoting or implicitly ex-
pressing the idea of motion reinforced sometimes by a localizing prepositional phrase; (2) the use of κωμάζειν as the main verb in which the idea of purpose is expressed in the verb form and the idea of motion in a localizing prepositional phrase adjoined to the verb; (3) the use of κωμάζειν as the second term in a two-part predicate entailing the notion of going somewhere for some purpose; (4) the use of the derivative κωμαστής in which purpose is implied by the expression of function or purpose in the derived form and the idea of motion by the expression in a predicate of the subject identified by the term of agency (κωμαστής)....

Minyard disagrees (208-10) with Lamer over his firm assertion that even in these contexts κῶμος/κωμάζειν has the basic sense of a processional revel, even if there may be some sense of movement implied throughout the four categories quoted above. She asserts that (223): "while it is clear that the komos revel was not confined to an interior location, it is equally clear that an exterior location is not essential to the komos situation...." Such revelling could include both singing and dancing (210-11, 286). However, although she does note (305 f.) that in the later Roman and Byzantine occurrences there is an increasing tendency to view the components of dance and song separately, Minyard firmly concludes (286) that κωμάζειν "by no stretch of the imagination ... can ... refer specifically to ... a 'serenade'."

Therefore the presence of κῶμος/κωμάζειν in a passage can indicate a number of things. A religious or ceremonial procession, or the band performing such a procession,
could be meant. It could refer to a post-sympotic procession, revel, or dance, which could be accompanied by song. Moreover, a more static sympotic or post-prandial revel or party, usually involving dance and song, could also be meant. Certainly the post-sympotic procession could end up before the house of someone's beloved, but it is not guaranteed. Κώμος/κωμάζειν cannot by itself indicate a paraklausithuric vigil or serenade, and, unless there are some other clues, the presence of Κώμος/κωμάζειν does not provide enough evidence to label a passage as paraklausithuric.
CHAPTER 2
THE PARAKLAUSITHURON BEFORE PLAUTUS

Alcaeus to Gnesippus

Greek lyric is the obvious place in which to look for the earliest traces of paraklausithura. It is, unfortu-
nately, not very obliging. Alcaeus provides our earliest possible quotation from a paraklausithuron and scattered references to the paraklausithuric situation follow, but no developed, true paraklausithura have survived from before Aristophanes. Gnesippus, however, is possibly a major figure in the development of the literary paraklausithuron.

Alcaeus and earliest lyric

Alcaeus fr. 374 is widely cited as being our ear-
liest fragment from a paraklausithuron:

δέξαι μὲ κυμάσιοιτα, δέξαι, λισσομαι σε, λισσομαι.¹

¹All citations from Greek lyric will be from Camp-
bell 1982-93 unless stated otherwise. Alc. fr. 374 is cited by Hephaestion Ench. 5.2 and the Scholia on Ar. Pl. 302 as an example of the iambic tetrameter acatalectic. See: Garte 1924, 6; Copley 1956, 14; Bowra 1958, 377; Burck 1966, 246; Gow 1965, 2:65; Headlam-Knox 1922, 83; Nisbet-Hubbard 1970, 289; Yardley 1978, 19-20; McKeown 1987-, 2:121; and Cairns 1992, 71, and 1993, 107. Smyth 1963, 226 calls it "a serenade," as does Edmonds 1945, 3:656: "It is significant that Alcaeus begs his beloved to 'receive your serenader...' that is κῦμος-singer. When the symposium broke up, the guests went merrily through the streets and lovers sought their loves. This rout was called κῦμος. Whether the Love-
The reasons are easy to understand. Someone who is making a κώμος is earnestly requesting to be received by someone else. The request to be received is easy to see as being directed by a lover to his beloved: δέχεσθαι is used often in Greek paraklausithura and accipio/recipio is similarly common in Latin (see Appendix 2). The conjunction of δέχεσθαι and κώμος/κωμάζειν even occurs in two other clearly paraklausithuric passages (Mel. AP 12.85 [lines 1 and 7; G.-P. LXV] and 12.167 [lines 2 and 4; G.-P. CIX]) and one possibly paraklausithuric passage (Thgn. 1045-6). At Plato Smp. 212 c, Alcibiades and his fellow komasts ask to be admitted into the symposium:

... καὶ ἐξαίφνης τὴν αὐλειαν θύραν κρουομένην πολὺν ψόφον παρασχεῖν ὡς κωμάστων,... καὶ ἐπιστῆμαι ἐπὶ τὰς θύρας ἐστεφανωμένοιν αὐτῶν κιττοθ τε τινὶ στεφάνω δάσει καὶ λιν., καὶ ταῦτα ἔχοντα ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς πάνω πολλάς, καὶ ἔπειν: "Ἀνδρείς, χαίρετε: μεθύσατα ἄνδρα πάνω σφόδρα δέξασθε συμπότην, ἢ ἅπιωμεν...."  

Song was sung at the table like other Eulogies, or at the door of the beloved, depended on circumstances."

This brings up again the definition of κωμάζειν, for which, see Chapter 1. Contrary to LSJ, s.v. III, who favor the sense "serenade" here, it does seem likely that it refers to the komos revel/procession. It is not necessary to presume, as Garte 1924, 7 does, that if κωμάζω had a processional sense it would require an aorist participle in this context. The present tense can be explained as indicating that Alcaeus is speaking as he arrives at the beloved’s house (calling out to announce his imminent arrival), or even by the understandable idea that the komos can continue in one place, as the procession stops but the singing, dancing and general revelling carry on.

The text is from Dover 1980.
Moreover, repetition of λίτομαι (λισσόμαι) occurs in a para-
klausithuric epigram by Meleager (AP 5.165, G.-P. LI),
although in a hymnic address to Night: "Εν τόδε, παμμήτειρα
θεῶν, λίτομαι σε, φίλη Νύξ, / ναί λίτομαι κώμων σύμπλανε
πότνια Νύξ.

There are nonetheless some obstacles to a conclusive
attribution of Alcaeus fr. 374 to a paraklausithuric situa-
tion. 4 First, the conjunction of κώμος/κωμάζειν and δέχεσθαι
is more common in religious or ritual komastic situations:
e.g. Pi. O. 4.8, 6.98-9, 8.1-2, 13.29, P. 5.22, 6.18 - 20;
and Eur. Ba. 1172. Similarly λίσσομαι occurs with δέξαι in
Pindar Pae. 6.3 ff. 5 What is more, λίσσομαι is itself ele-
vated, particularly in early Greek where it is almost always

4 Cairns 1992, 71 n. 15 briefly discusses the problem
and concludes that "however the repeated δέξαι and λίσσομαι
suggest strong emotion, and the overall tone makes anything
but an erotic context most improbable...." But it seems hard
to prove an "overall" tone for seven words completely out of
context. Minyard 1976, 71 f. n. 15 discusses the fragment
briefly and argues that it is "possible to assign the
utterance to a discourse context quite different from the
one to which it is usually assigned...."

5 Προς Ὀλυμπίου Διός σε χρυ[σέ]α κλυτόμαντι Πυθοί / λίσσομαι χαρίτεσα - / σεμέννε τε καὶ σὺν Ἀφροδίτη / 5 ἐν ζαθέω
με δέξαι χρόνοι / αὐτέοιμον Περίδων προφάταιν. Λίσσομαι (the
first-person s.) is also the first word of O. 12, and occurs
in a prayer to Zeus). Cairns 1993, 107 also notes the con-
nection between the komos, δέχεσθαι and λίσσομαι. Another
occurrence of κώμος/κωμάζειν in an Epinician or Paean is at
Simonides fr. 519.2. For more on the connection between the
epinician and amatory komos, see Chapter 4.
used in contexts of prayer or supplication.\textsuperscript{6} And while, as Smyth (1963, 226) suggests, "the anaphora recalls folk-song," it could also be religious.\textsuperscript{7}

However, we know that Alcaeus’ verse can be divided into hymns, and stasistic, erotic, and convivial poems (Campbell 1982-93, 1:219 n. 2). It is perhaps easier to imagine fr. 374 fitting in among the erotic or convivial

\textsuperscript{6}The following is only a small sampling: Hom. Il. 1.14-15, 1.373-4, 1.500-04, 2.14-15, 5.357-9, Od. 2.68 ff., 4.328 ff., 6.141 ff.; Sappho fr. 1.2; Alcm. 5 fr. 2 col. ii; B. 5.100; S. Ant. 1230, E1. 1376 ff.; Tim. fr. 791.127; E. Andr. 529, Ba. 1344; A.R. 4.1053, and 4.1422.

\textsuperscript{7}While anaphora of names or pronouns in hymns or prayers is more common than that of verbs, the latter does occur. Some examples are: Archil. fr. 119.2 ff. (Edmonds) χαίρε Ἀνάξ Ἡράκλεες, / ... / ... / χαίρε Ἀνάξ Ἡράκλεες; Pratin. fr. 708.16 θριαμβοδιώραμβε κινδύσχατ' Ἀνάξ, / ἄκουε τάν ἐμαί Δύριον χορείαν; Carm. Pop. 882.1-2 (Campbell 1982-93, 5:266; a religious context): δέξαι τών ἄγαθῶν τόχων, / δέξαι τών υγείων; S. O.C. 242 ff.: ... ὡς ἐνοι, οἰκτίρασι, ὡς / πατρός ὑπέρ ἰτου μονοθ' ἄντομαι, / ἀντιμαί οὐκ ἄλασας προσσωμένα / 245 ὄμμα σὸν ὄμμασιν; E. Hipp. 61 ff.: ΧΩΡ. πότυνα πότυνα σεμνοτάτα, / Ζηνός γένεθλον, / χαίρε χαίρε μοι, ᾧ κάρα; Or. 176 ff.: πότυνα, πότυνα νύς, / ... / ἔρεβθην ἵλι, μόλε μόλε κατάπτερος; Ar. Lys. 1268 f. (in a prayer to Artemis): ὡς ἐξου ἵλι ἐξου ὡς / κυναγέ παρασέχε; Verg. A. 3.84 f. "Templa dei saxo uenerabar structa uetusto: / 85 'da propriam, Thymbraeae, domum; da moenia fessis...'; Corp. Tib. 3.10.1 ff. "huc ades, et tenerae morbos expelle puellae, / huc ades, intonsa Phoebe superbe comas"; Ov. Fast. 5.680 "et peragit solita fallere uoce preces: / 'abue praeteriti periuria temporis', inquit / 'abue praeteritae perfida uerba die....';"; Pont. 2.8.23 ff. "parce, uir immenso maior uirtutibus orbe, / iustaque uindictae suprime frena tuae. / parce, precor, saecli decus indebolile nostri...."
verse than among the stasiotic verse or even the hymns.  
Furthermore, it seems that much of Alcaeus' verse was written for convivial performance and that drinking, and even love, played a large part in it. Although the love poetry was less important than his convivial verse, the heightened emotion of the fragment fits better with it being addressed to some beloved than a participant in a party to which he wanted admission. Perhaps one further relevant piece of evidence comes from Hermesianax, who in his Leont. 3.48-50 (Powell 7) wrote:

\[ \text{σεβο} \ Αλκα\text{ος} \ δέ, \ πόσονς \ ανεδέξατο \ κώμος} \\
\text{σαμφώς,} \ \text{φορμα} \ ρεν\text{ιμερ} \ \text{v} \ \text{πόθον,}\]

\text{γυναίκες.}

Smyth (1963, 226) suggests that fr. 374 might have been the inspiration for this flight of fancy. No doubt he was helped

\[ ^{3}\text{According to Campbell 1982, 286 f. the hymns were "short poems composed in the spirit of the Homeric hymns rather for the pleasure of his friends than the greater glory of the gods." That seems to rule out the first-person involvement in a ritual Dionysiac komos that the fragment would seem to point to. We know of no epinicians by Alcaeus, which would be the other natural source for the δέχοται/κωμάζειν conjunction. Furthermore, Alcaeus "used the same metres for his hymns as for secular poetry" (\textit{ibid.}), which excludes the use of metre as a guideline for helping categorize the fragment.} \]

\[ ^{3}\text{See Campbell 1982, 287 and the references cited there.} \]

\[ ^{10}\text{Edmonds 1945, 3:630: "Among the remains of Alcaeus, besides the songs mentioned above, we find Hymns and War-Songs. All his forms, except the Hymns, were probably developments of the songs sung either at feasts or after the company had broken up and lovers sought their mistresses. Many were doubtless sung at table, some outside the loved one's door,--and some ... were sent as letters."} \]
by the mention of Sappho in Alc. fr. 384, in which "he speaks of her in terms of a divinity" (Campbell 1982, 287):
lóplοκ' ἀγνα μελιχόμεια Σάφοι.

If Alcaeus fr. 374 is paraklausithuric, several important things can be learned from it. First, that the paraklausithuric situation was known by the end of the seventh century, and a poet of even Alcaeus' social status would not shrink from casting himself as a komast seeking admission to his beloved. We can also make an educated guess about the gender of the beloved. We know that Alcaeus wrote paederastic verse and it was this that was best remembered. Finally, the elevated tone of the passage might be a deliberate attempt to use religious-sounding language to flatter or praise the beloved. This will, in various forms, become more common in later paraklausithura, particularly in Latin elegy.

---

11Fr. 368 mentions a χαρέντα Μένωνα. For his later reputation, see Hor. Carm. 1.32.10 ff. "canebat / ... Lycum nigris oculis nigroque / crine decorum," and Cicero N.D. 1.79, "fortis uir in sua re publica cognitus quae de iuuenum amore scribit Alcaeus!" That both Horace and Cicero use only a boy to exemplify Alcaeus' love poetry is particularly suggestive. See also Garte 1924, 6, who cites Crusius' article in RE 1.1502.

12See, among others, Weinreich 1929, 371 ff. on Pl. Curc. 1 ff.; Yardley 1978 and Watson 1982 on elegy in general; and McKeown 1987– on Ov. Am. 1.6. Possibly relevant for the tone of the line is the suggestion by A. Corlu in Recherches sur les mots relatifs à l'idée de prière d'Homère aux tragiques (Paris 1966), 304, cited in Verdenius 1987, 1:89 on Pl. O. 12.1 that: "εἴχομαι exprime ce à quoi l'on s'engage par un voeu ce qu'un demande par un voeu, en parlant de soi.... En revanche, λάσσομαι c'est exhorter quelqu'un à faire quelque chose par grâce." Admission, if it
Alcaeus was not the first important love poet. Alcman may have been considered the εὐρετής of love poetry, but even his older contemporary Archilochus seems to have written some, and his approximate contemporaries included Sappho, Solon, and Mimnermus, who was particularly noted for his love poetry.\textsuperscript{13} Most of the lyric poets also wrote convivial verse, and the classical Greek symposium seems to have been a fully-established custom by Alcaeus' time.\textsuperscript{14} is granted, will be completely the favour of the beloved.

\textsuperscript{13}On Alcman as the inventor of love poetry, see Suidas A.1289 (test. 1 in Campbell 1982-93, 2:336) and also Ath. 13.600 f., which also stresses his general licentiousness: 'Ἀλκιμάνα γεγονέναι τῶν ἐρωτικῶν μελῶν ἴγγεια καὶ ἠκούσαν πρῶτον μέλος ἀκόλουθον ἔντα καὶ περὶ τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ τὴν τοιαύτην Μοῦταν εἰς τὰς διατριβὰς... λέγει δὲ καὶ ύς τῆς Μεγαλοστράτης, οὐ μετρίως ἐρασθεῖς ποιητριάς μὲν ὁδηγητικῆς ἐνθυμημένης δὲ καὶ διὰ τὴν ὅμιλον τοὺς ἔραττας προσελώπας. For love, or at least sex, in Archilochus, see Campbell 1983, 4 ff. Stesichorus was considered in antiquity to have been a love poet (see Ath. 14.638 e = test. 33 Campbell; and Ath. 13.601 a = fr. 276 Campbell), but that seems not to have been the case. Campbell 1982, 255 suggests that it was probably the attribution to him of the spurious Rhaidine that caused the confusion. I shall follow Campbell's dating for all the lyric poets (1982-93; 1982; 1983). Hence Theognis (dated by West to c. 640-600) will be discussed after Anacreon.

\textsuperscript{14}This includes all the usual accoutrements of garlands, perfume, etc. They would usually take place at night. See Campbell 1983, 28 ff., and Murray 1993, 207 ff.: "it is clear that the aristocratic symposium was... the centre of social and cultural life." Alcm. fr. 19 seems to be our earliest reference to a symposium. However, it seems that the ancients thought Solon had a more moderate view of how a symposium should be: at Alexis fr. 9.8 ff. (K.-A.) Solon says τοῦτ' ἐσθ', ὃρᾶς, Ἐλληνικὸς / πότος, μετρίως χρώμενος ποιητρίας / 10 Ἀλέξεται γὰρ ἔρημε τι καὶ ἀνεβητὶ πρὸς αὐτοῦς ἄδεις. Solon fr. 26 (Edmonds) is less restrained: ἔργα δὲ Κυπρογενοῦς μὲν, μοι, Φίλα καὶ Διονύσου / καὶ Μοῦσας, δὲ τίθησι, ἀνάρασιν εὔφρωνας.
With symposia can be expected to come komoi.\textsuperscript{15} If post-symphotic komos-processions were an established custom by this time, and if Alc. fr. 374 is paraklausithuric, then it seems likely that the paraklausithuric situation would have arisen in at least some other poetry before Alcaeus.\textsuperscript{16}

Certainly there is abundant evidence for a sophisticated, involved, and strongly personal approach in the very ear-

\textsuperscript{15} The first lyric poet, however, with whom komoi become strongly associated is Anacreon. Our earliest occurrence of κώμος is in the h.Merc. (480-2 εὕκηλος μὲν ἐπείτα φέρειν εἰς δαίτα θάλειαν / καὶ χορὸν μερόντα καὶ ἐς φιλοκυσέα κώμον, / εὔφροσύνην νυκτὸς τε καὶ ἡματος). Alcm. fr. 174 may refer to one: ἄγ' αὖτ' ἐς οἶκον τὸν Κλεοσίππω. Hermesian. Leont. 3.35-9 (Powell 7) imagines Mimnermus participating in a komos: Μίμνερμος δὲ, τὸν ἡδύν δὲ ἐὕβετο πολλὸν ἄνατλας / ἡχον καὶ μαλακοῦ πνεῦμα ἀπὸ πενταμέτρου, / καὶ τοῦ μὲν Ναννοῦς, πολλὲς ἐπὶ πολλάκι λυτῇ / κημωθεὶς κώμοις ἐξε ςοῦν Ἐξαμύνῃ. The secular komos, coming usually after a symposium, was, of course, nocturnal. References to night, darkness, and torches are common in later mentions of komoi. Lamer 1893-, 1293 ff. surveys a number of depictions of komoi in Greek art, which usually show torches and lamps. Archil. fr. 124 b criticizes a certain Pericles for crashing symposia.

\textsuperscript{16} Edmonds 1945, 3:630 (quoted above) certainly suggests that komast regularly ended up before their beloveds' houses even at this early time. See also Edmonds 1931, 1:3, where he says that iambic and elegiac poetry before the sixth century was generally convivial and symphotic: "drinking songs, lampoons, songs of war and politics, songs of welcome or consolation, accounts of travel, moralisings, eulogies, love-songs,—sung or recited by the guests over the wine or else after the company had broken up and went revelling through the streets and lovers sought their mistresses."
liest love poetry.\textsuperscript{17} It seems unlikely that none of the
lyric poets before Alcaeus would never have sought admission
to a beloved in a komastic situation, would never have been
refused access to a beloved in any situation whatsoever,
would never have even imagined such a situation, and then
would never have once put such a situation into verse.\textsuperscript{18}

Before moving on to Anacreon one puzzling fragment
of Archilochus should be noted. Although Archilochus was
older than Alcaeus, the probability that paraclausithuric
situations were portrayed in poetry by Alcaeus' time raises
the possibility that fr. 127 (Edmonds) may belong to such a
context: \textit{θυρέων ἀπεστύπαζον}. This could belong to some of
his war poetry, but \textit{ἀποστύπαζω} ("I drive off with blows",
\textit{LSJ}) for which this is the sole citation in \textit{LSJ}, seems a
strange word for actual warfare when one considers that
στύπος, from which it must be derived, means "stem, stump,
block" (\textit{LSJ s.v.}). The "stump" root could possibly be ap-
plied to a spear, which we know Archilochus used (2), but
one would still expect a more traditional, epic word, for a
description of actual fighting. Campbell (1982, 139) notes

\textsuperscript{17}Campbell 1983, 4 ff. provides a valuable apprecia-
tion of the sophistication of early love lyrics. Cairns
1979, 214 ff. discusses this in connection with precedents
for Latin elegy, and see also Day 1972 and Luck 1969, among
others.

\textsuperscript{18}The social customs of the time would not rule out
paraclausithuric situations, either homosexual or hetero-
sexual (probably involving \textit{hetairai}): see, for example,
that "much of the language of Archilochus' poetry belongs to the epic tradition." Furthermore, we have no other first-person descriptions of fighting from Archilochus. We do, however, have military or Homeric imagery used by Archilochus of love and sex at 191, 193, and 196 (Campbell 1983, 5-6). It seems remotely possible that this fragment could refer to a fight with a rival before the doors of a beloved, where a walking-stick or staff would better fit the verb.\(^{19}\) Such fights are common in paraklausithuric contexts and fighting is also associated with komoi in general.\(^{20}\) Once

\(^{19}\) A chous (New York 3711.19) shows a nearly naked reveller, lyre over one shoulder, banging with his staff on a door that a woman is hurrying to answer (cited Keuls 1985, 67). Komasts carry sticks or staves on a cup by the Brygos Painter (Würzburg 479; ARV 372,32), a skyphos by the Brygos Painter (Louvre G 156; ARV 380,172), and a column krater (Harvard 60.346; ARV 563,8). Lamer 1893–, 1294 notes the presence of knotty sticks in hands of komasts on a number of vases. The phylax vase (fig. 83) shown in Pickard-Cambridge 1952, 213 depicts "some kind of reveller" with a staff in his right arm, and oinochoe hanging from his left, and on whose head there seems to be a garland. At Anacreont. 47 a reveller dances using a flask as a staff since his fennel-stick is useless. People knock on doors with staves at Pl. Prt. 310 A, and Plu. Arat. 17.4. At Stat. Silv. 1.2.48, the threshold is struck. At Leon. AP 7.67 (G.-P. LIX), Diogenes' only possessions are a flask, staff, cloak and wallet, and at Ar. Ec. 544-6 part of Praxagora's manly disguise is a staff that she bangs heavily on the ground as she walks.

\(^{20}\) For the fights of rivals, see Pratin. fr. 708.8; Ar. Eq. 727 ff., Plut. 1072 ff.; Lys. 3.6, 4.5 ff.; Is. 3.13 ("Pyrrhus"); Aristophr fr. 5.7 (K.-A., Ath. 6.238 b-c); Mel. AP 5.151 and 152 (G.-P. XXXIII and XXXIV); Hor. Serm. 1.2.66 f.; Carm. 3.14.26; Tib. 1.1.73-4; Prop. 1.16.5, 2.9.51-2, 2.19.5; Ov. Ars 3.71, Rem. 31 f., Met. 13.884 ff.; Plut. Mor. 753 B; Rufin. AP 5.41; Philostr. Ep. 29; Nemes. Ecl. 4.34 (a variation); Chrys. hom. in I Cor. 37 (MPG 61.318.43 ff); and Niceph. Greg. Byz. Hist. 8.1.3 (Schopen-Bekker 1.285). Also compare Prop. 4.8.47 ff.
again, the metre of fr. 127 offers no help.  

Among the younger lyric poets, Ibycus, Anacreon, Theognis, Hipponax, and Bacchylides all wrote love poetry. Convivial verse also continued to thrive, as did the symposium and komos. Anacreon was, of course, particularly concerned with love, but he also became strongly associated with the komos. In fr. 442 he compares Dionysus with himself: \( \text{kumázei tò òc évan dètí Día nusos}; \) and Dioscorides (AP 7.31.2; G.-P. XIX) calls Anacreon lord of the komos: \( \text{kúmou kal pásou kolpazne pánvυxlanos}. \)

21Campbell 1982, 138 notes on Archilochus' poems in general that "An important feature of the poems is that their metres are 'neutral in respect of ethos' (Maas, Greek Metre...)."

22Although there are no obvious traces of paraklau-sithuric situations in Hipponax, it is worth at least mentioning him simply as a plausible source for them. Campbell 1982, 373 f. succinctly says of his verse: "Almost all his poetry, so far as we can say, dealt with affairs of his private life... [and] his amatory adventures.... He seems deliberately to have lowered the tone of poetry.... his avoidance of eic and political themes in favour of everyday affairs, often sleazy or disreputable, all point to a new conception of the poet's function."

23For Anacreon's focus on love, and the importance of wine in his verse, see the summary in Campbell 1982, 314 f., and 1982-93, 2:4. Ancient testimonia on the matter include Simon. AP 7.24.5 f. (G.-P. III):  \( \text{ως δ' φιλάκρητος τε καὶ οἰνοβινης φιλόκυμος / παννυχίος κραύων τὴν φιλόπαιδα χέλυν (note the characterization of the lyre as "boyloving"); Antip. Sid. AP 7.26.5 and 7.27.2 (G.-P. XIV and XV); and Eugenes AP 16.308.3-4.

24The interpretation of fr. 442 is that of the scholiast who quotes it. Ath. 13.600 d cites the fifth century poet Critias, who presents a picture of Anacreon as an enthusiastic symposiast:  \( \text{τῶν δὲ γυναικῶν μελέων πλέξαιντα ποτ' ψάξει ἢ δῶν ἀνακρέννοιστα Τέως εἰς Ἑλλάδα ἀνήγεν, / συμποσίων ἑρέθίσμα, γυναικῶν ἦπερόπευμα, / αὐλῶν} \)
Anacreon to Pratinas

Anacreon fr. 373 provides our next possible paraklausithuric reference:

_ ήριστησα μὲν ἵππου λεπτοῦ μικρὸν ἀποκλάς,
  οἷοι δ' ἐξέπλακαν κάθοιν· νῦν δ' ἀβρὺς ἐρόεσαν
  ψάλλω πηκτίς ὑ' ἕλη κυμάζων ἡπακάλ ἀβρῆι.²⁵

Unfortunately, κυμάζων here is not by itself indication enough of the setting.²⁶ However, if Lamer's conclusions about the meaning of κῶμος cited in Chapter 1 are correct, then this is probably paraklausithuric, even though it is possible that the παιδί ἀβρῆι could be a hetaira accompanying Anacreon on a revel.²⁷ The πηκτίς is the standard instrument for lyric and is regularly associated with the

_ ἀντίπαλον, φιλοθέρτον, ἕδρον, ἄλυπον. / οὗ ποτὲ σου φιλόης
  γνησίως ταῖς αὐθεντικοῖς / ἐνί τι δὲ υἱὸν συμμετεχομένων
  κυκλάξας / παῖς διαστρέφοντας προσόπες ἐπὶ δέξια κυμάων, /
  πανυψιγάς θ' ἔρημῆς ἑκατόν ἀμφιέσποντο...

²⁵Campbell 1982-93, 2:67 notes that the text of the last words is uncertain and suggests it might be a proper name.

²⁶It could be processional, in which case the passage is likely paraklausithuric, or it could simply refer to participation in a static komos-revel. Campbell 1982-93, 2:67 translates the last line "I tenderly strike my lovely lyre in a serenade..." Hendrickson 1925, 296 is similar: "I strum my lute in serenade." Copley 1956, 14 suggests this might be paraklausithuric.

²⁷For some komoi with hetairai and music-girls in tow, see a cup by the Brygos Painter (Würzburg 479; ARV 372,32), a skyphos by the Brygos Painter (Louvre G 156; ARV 380,172), and a column krater (Harvard 60.346; ARV 563,8). See also many of the references below on the aulos and komos under Pratinas. The music girls usually play the aulos or such.
κῶμος. In addition, we know that he is drunk, that he would probably be garlanded, and that it is probably night, the standard time for post-symphotic komoi. These three elements can be presumed for most komoi unless there is evidence to the contrary. Furthermore, the beloved here is

Sappho was reportedly the first to use the πηκτίς (Ath. 14.635 e). See Campbell 1982-93, 1:ix: "... lyric in the strict sense ... was composed to be sung to the accompaniment of the lyre.... Alcaeus says the lyre plays a merry part in the symposium (70.3 f.), and the symposium must have provided the occasion for the performance of most of his poetry. The κιθάρα, 'lyre', is mentioned in his fragments in the context of wine and love. Anacreon twice has the verb φάλλω, 'I pluck the lyre strings', each time in the context of revelry (373, 374)." He also provides a number of both literary and visual references. Gulick 1927-41, 6:237 says that the lyre is mentioned by Anacreon more frequently than is the flute. For occurrences of πηκτίς in conjunction with κώμος/κωμάζεων, see: Mel. AP 5.175.7-8 (G.-P. LXX) καλεῖ σε γάρ ἡ φιλόκωμος / πηκτίς καὶ κροτάλων χειροτυπής πάταγος; Nicarch. AP 6.285.7 (G.-P. II) εἶλετο δὲ στεφάνους καὶ πηκτίδα καὶ μέτα κώμων; Marc. Arg. AP 9.270.1-4 (G.-P. XXVI): κωμάζω ... / ... / 4 πηκτίδα ...; Anacreont. 43.10-16; and Lucian DMar. 1.4 δόπε ἐκώμισε πρώην ἐπὶ σὲ ... ἡ πηκτίς ὀξα; ... ἐπὶ τῷ ἐρωτικῷ ἐκέλυψι χοματι (paraklausithura). The πηκτίς later became associated with the λύρα. The λύρα is also frequently associated with komos and paraklausithumon, but the κιθάρα is much less frequent, and the βάρβιτος does not occur at all (see Appendix 2).

They will be seen regularly throughout the rest of this dissertation, but also see Appendix 2. They are three of the most common topoi and an explicit listing of them seems unnecessary. For μέθη/μεθύεω in conjunction with κώμος/κωμάζεων, see below on E. CycI. For the garland, a listing of places where the garland is hung on or offered to the beloved’s door is given in Chapter 4. For garlands in paraklausithumon before Latin elegy, see Ar. Ec. 691 (inversion/paody), 1034 ff. (inversion), Eq. 729, Plut. 1041, 1088, V. 398-99; Pl. Smy. 212 c; Alex. fr. 119 (K.-A.); Asclep. AP 5.145 (G.-P. XII); Theoc. 2.121, 3.20 ff.; Pl. Am. 999, 1007; Frag. Gren. 25; Anon. AP 12.116.2 (G.-P. XXXIV); Mel. AP 5.191.7-8 (G.-P. LXXIII); and Hor. Carm. 3.14.17. Flowers are offered at Theoc. 11.56 f. and Lucr. 4.1178. See also Prop. 3.3.46, Ov. Am. 1.6.38, and Fast. 5.340. For more, see Murgatroyd 1980, 77; McKeown 1987-,
most likely female. It should be noted, however, that Anacreon seems to have divided his attentions between boys and women, and was known in later times as much for his paederastic love interests as for his heterosexual ones.  

One final Anacreontic passage of interest is fr. 498, from the Scholia on A.R. 1.788-9b:

καλῆς διὰ παστάδος· ... καλῆς δὲ ἦτοι δὴ παστάδα τα σιληκάματα ἢ ὑπὶ ἐρωτικά. τοιαῦτα γὰρ τὰ τῶν ἐρωτικῶν, ὡς καὶ Ἀνακρέων ἐπὶ ἐρωμένης φησὶν.


30 See the various testimonia in Campbell 1982-93, 2:41 ff. Anacreon's verse itself shows a similar division.
The quotation is lost, but if it referred to a female beloved's παστάς, door, or house in affectionate or flattering terms, it too could have been from a paraklausithuric context. The transference of affection from a beloved to the beloved's door, porch, vestibule, or house is common in Greek and Roman paraklausithuric situations.\footnote{Of course the door of the beloved receives much attention in the paraklausithurum. Many examples will follow. For houses, cf. Pl. Merc. 901-3 "CH. dic igitur, ubi illa est? EV. in nostris aedibus. CH. aedis probas, / si tu uera dicis; pulchre aedificatas arbitro," and Aristaenet. 2.14.7 ff.: δειν, οἱ φίλατε, μά τὸν φίλον Ἐρωτα τὸν ἐμόν τε καὶ σοι, χθές ἐπὶ τὸ σὸν ὁμάτιον εἰσελθείς θάττον ἡ βάσην ἐκλαύν ὡς ἥδον, κατηποτάμην τις ἀπλῆιται 10 τῶν ἀφροδισίων σῶν, καὶ τῶν ταλάντων ἐφαπτομένη τοὺς δακτύλους ἐφιλιόμεν ὑπερχάλαον καὶ μειδίωσα γλυφό. Hor. Carm. 1.30.3-4 mentions a "decoram / ... aedem" (and see Nisbet-Hubbard 1970, 346). For other examples of lovers being sentimental about their beloveds' possessions, see: Pl. Phd. 73 d ... ὅτι οἱ ἐρασταὶ, ὅτιν ἔλωσιν λύραν ἡ ἡμέραν ὧν καὶ ἐλθεῖ τοῖς τὰ παι- δικά αὐτῶν εἰσεβείς χρήσαν, πάσχουσι τούτοις ἐγνώσαν τὴν λύραν καὶ ἐν τῇ διαυλῳ ἔλαβον τὸ εἶδος τοῦ παιδίδις, οὐ ἢν ἡ λύρα; Dirae [Lydia] 104 ff. "Inuideo uobis, agri formosa prata, / 105 hoc formosa magis, mea quod formosa puella"; Ov. Ep. 19.31 f. (Hero kisses Leander's clothing) "quid referam, quotiens dem uestibus oscula, quas tu / Hellespontiaca ponis iturus aqua?"; Ov. Met. 8.35 ff. (Scylla) "uix sua, uix sanae virgo Niseia compos / mentis erat: felix iaculum, quod tangeret ille, / quaeque manu premeret, felicia frena uocabat"; Sen. On marriage, cited in Hier. Adu. Ionin. 1.49 = 318 D-319 A, mentions a man who so loved his wife that he wore her breast-band; and at Alciphr. 4.8.3 f. a man cherishes a garland a woman has thrown at him. \footnote{Apol]lodorus was in charge of dithyrambic circular choruses when Pindar was a boy—see Campbell 1982-93, 3:295.}
τούς ὑμνοὺς γράφας, which does not necessarily imply that the fragment was from a hymn, merely that Apollodorus was best-known for his hymns.

Theognis provides an interesting couplet of some relevance to the paraklausithuron (1045-6): ναὶ μὰ Δί', εἰ τίς τῶν σε καὶ ἐγκεκαλυμμένος εὔδει, / ἡμέτερον κώμον δέξεται ἄρπαλέως. A sleeping male, probably a youth, will gladly receive a komos in which Theognis is participating.33 Unfortunately the τῶν σε and ἡμέτερον raise several questions: to what group does the τίς belong, and who are Theognis’ companions: slaves, music-girls, or hetairoi? Or is ἡμέτερον a poetic plural, as it is at 1333 (cited below)? It is, however, possible that the komast is confiding his plans to a slave attendant or music-girl, or that he is going on the komos with friends. The δέξεται, however, indicates that the komos is processional, and the fact that the person repre-

33 The prominence of paederasty in his poetry makes the identification of the τίς with a boy likely. Theognis himself was no stranger to komoi: Εἰρήνη καὶ Πλωτος ἐχοι πόλιν, δφρα μετ' ἄλλων / κωμάζομι. κακοῦ δ' οὐκ ἔραμαι πολέμου (885-6); Οὐ δύναμαι φωνῇ λιγ' ἀειδόμεν ὅσπερ ἁπάνω/ καὶ γὰρ τὴν πρωτέρν μῦκτ' ἐπὶ κώμον ἔβην. / οὔπε καὶ τὸν αὐληθήν προφασίζομαι. ἀλλὰ μὲ γῆρυς / ἐκλείπει σοφίης οὐ ἐπιευάμενον (939-42); 'Εν δ' ἡ θη πάρα μὲν εὖν θηλική πάννυχοι εὔδειν / ὕμερτών ἔργων ἐπι ἐρων λέμενον, / 1065 ἐστὶ δὲ κωμάζοντα μετ' αὐληθήνος ἁείδειν. / οὔδέν τοι τούτων ἄλλ', ἐπὶ τερπνότερον / ἀνάρας οὐδὲ γυναῖξι. τί μοι πλούσιας τε καὶ αἰδώς; / τερπηλί νυκτὶ πάντα σὺν εὐφροσύνη (1063-8); οὔτε σε κωμάζειν ἀπεράκουεν οὔτε καλούμεν, / ἄργαλος παρεύω, καὶ φίλος εὐθ' ἄν ἀπῆς (1207-8); Ἡ πα', μὴ κώμαζε, γέροντι δὲ πείλεο μύθῳ. / οὔτοι κωμάζειν σύμφορον ἀνδρὶ νέῳ. (1351-2); and cf. 533-4 Χαίρω δ' ἐμπλυνω καὶ ὑπ' αὐληθήνος ἁείδων, / χαίρω δ' εὐθοδαγον χερῶ λύρην ὅχέων.
sented by τις is asleep indicates that this komos occurs at night and so is a post-sympotic komos procession. There is no indication that the komast is seeking admission to some other party, symposium, or static revel, and the fact that the person who is the object of the komos is imagined as sleeping would indicate that there would be no reason, such as obvious noise and music, for the komasts to presume that such a party was under way. If the person making the komos is to be received, he must make some request for admission. This couplet can therefore be called paraklausithuric and since admission will be achieved (unless it is merely an example of wishful thinking by the komast) it can be considered a reference to a successful paraklausithuron.

This is contrary to Copley (1956, 16-17) who seems to indicate that the lover in non-dramatic paraklausithuric situations is never admitted. He comments after examining several paraklausithuric epigrams from the AP that:

Two facts stand out in these examples. First, they are laments, songs of sorrow and disappointment; second ... they are placed at the end of the paraclusithyron incident.... We are to assume that the lover has come, knocked, and been refused admission. In point of fact, it is to the non-dramatic tradition of the paraclusithyron that we owe the familiar figure of the exclausus amator.... In the non-dramatic tradition, he is never admitted. If in some examples it is not actually stated that he has been rejected, this is because the story is not carried through to that point.
Various scholars have noted passages that seem to contradict Copley.\textsuperscript{34} Cairns (1977, 325 ff.) lists what he considers to be several successful komoi, including Prop. 1.3 and 2.29, Lucian \textit{Bis Acc.} 31, Alciphr. 1.6, Aristaenet. 2.19, Herod. 2, Tib. 1.1.73, Ov. \textit{Am.} 1.9.20, Ars 3.71, 567, and Hild. 4.17.3 f., where the komast achieves admission by violently breaking into the beloved’s house. He notes that admission also seems a clear alternative at Posid. \textit{AP} 5.213 (G.-P. IV), Mel. \textit{AP} 5.166 (G.-P. LII), and 5.191 (G.-P. LXXIII). His comments (\textit{ibid.}) on Copley’s observation are worth closer consideration:

The genre \textit{komos}, often termed inaccurately \textit{paraclausithyon} ... Copley’s title reveals his conviction that exclusion is an essential component of the genre. He does not attempt to deny that komastic admission sometimes occurs. But he tries to restrict it to drama and real life.... Since both the Propertian poems discussed in this dissertation [1.3 and 2.29] ... involve scenes inside the house of the beloved, it would seem, by Copley’s criterion, that they cannot be \textit{komos}.

Things are not as clear as they might seem at first glance. The first problem arises from Copley’s uncertainty about what he means by “\textit{paraclausithyon}” (see Chapter 1). He explicitly states (1956, 1) that “the \textit{paraclausithyon} is the song sung by the lover at his mistress’ door, after he has been refused admission to her house.” The \textit{paraclausithuron} therefore, to Copley, cannot contain the initial request

\textsuperscript{34} \textit{E.g.}, Yardley 1979, 158 on Prop. 1.16, and Shipton 1985, 519-20 on Cat. 68 (which Shipton sees, wrongly, as having \textit{paraclausithuristic} elements). Aristaenet. 2.19 also depicts a successful \textit{komos} and \textit{paraclausithuron}. 
for admission; the lover must already be an *exclusus amator* if he is to sing a paraklausithuron. If one accepts this reasoning, it should not be surprising that there are few examples where an *exclusus amator* is admitted—it would entail a major change of mind on the part of the beloved, something the static "snapshot" nature of most non-dramatic poetry could not depict. Drama, be it comedy or mime, is the natural medium in which to depict an ongoing, developing situation. Similarly, komasts who gain admission to their beloveds by violent means are not, therefore, really *exclusi amatores*.

Cairns in turn is misled by Copley’s occasional use of "komos" to refer to paraklausithura and paraklausithuric situations, and by his own assertion that the paraklausithuron is, in general, simply a form of komos. He seems to think that Copley means post-sympotic amatory processional komoi, komoi as Cairns, in essence, defines them. However, if one is simply referring to such komoi in general, with, quite correctly, no implications of exclusion being present in the definition of komos, then there is nothing surprising about the occasional admission. If komasts were never admitted, the amatory komos would have faded away after several centuries of failure. The identification, then, of Theognis 1045-6 as referring to a successful paraklausithuron is less problematic than it might seem at first.
Two passages in particular that are of some relevance to the social background of Theognis' time are worth noting here. In lines 457–60 (also cited at Theophil. fr. 6 [K.-A.]) he imagines young wives married to old husbands "slipping their moorings" at night to make for another man's "harbour":

Οὔτει σύμφορον ἔστι γυνὴ νέα ἀνδρὶ γέροντι,
οὐ γὰρ πηδαλίῳ πέλθεται ως ἄκατος,
οὔτ' ἀνευραῖ ἐξουσίων, ἀπορρήξασα δὲ δεσμά
πολλάκις ἐκ νυκτῶν ἄλλον ἔχει λιμένα.

Furthermore lines 579–82 clearly envisage sexual promiscuity and adultery:

<Α.> Ἐξαῖρω κακὸν ἄνδρα, καλυφαμένη δὲ πάρεμι
σμικρῆς δραμάδος κατάθον ἐξουσία νῦσσαν.
<Β.> Ἐξαῖρω δὲ γυναῖκα περὶδρομον, ἄνδρα τε μάργουν
δὲ τὴν ἀλλοτρίην βούλετ' ἄρουραν ἄροθν.

These are worth noting in passing for reassurance that it is not fanciful to imagine paraoklausitheric situations arising in the Megara of Theognis' time. Lines 1329–34 are also very interesting:

Σολ τε διδόντι τι καλὸν ἐμοὶ τ' οὖκ αἴσχρον ἐράντι
ἀιτεῖν ἄλλα γονέων λίσσομαι ἡμετέρων,
ἀνθεό μ', δὲ παλ <καλὲ>, σιδόμενος χάριν ἥ εῖ ποτέ καὶ σοῦ
ἕξεις Κυπαρισσοῦς δύρον λοστεφάνου
χρήσαν, καὶ ἐπ' ἄλλον ἐλεύσεσαι, ἀλλὰ σε δαίμων
δόῃ τῶν αὐτῶν ἀντιτυχεῖν ἐπέων.

Theognis is entreating a boy to grant him χάρις, a sexual favour. Noteworthy is the value terminology in καλός and αἴσχρος; the elevation and formality of λίσσομαι, which occurs in Alcaeus fr. 374, and seems to re-inforce the
flavour of χάρις (see above on Alcaeus fr. 374); the invocation of Aphrodite in Κυπρογενοῦς ... λοστεφάνου, which is also elevated; and finally the topos of the "threat- prophecy", where the lover prophesies or wishes that the beloved will one day be in the lover’s present position. These last two items will occur again regularly in later paraklausithuric situations.

Pratinas provides the next passage of note. Athenaeus 14.617 b-f mentions his anger at the increasing prominence of the auletēs who accompanied choruses. It was becoming a matter of the choruses singing in accompaniment to the auletēs instead of the auletēs accompanying the choruses. As evidence, he cites the following huporkhema (Pratinas fr. 708.1-9), in which a chorus, representing song, seems to rage against the intrusive αὐλός:

τίς ὁ θάρυβος δέ; τί τάδε τα χορεύματα;
τίς ὦβρις ὕπολευν ἐπὶ Διονυσιᾶς πολυπάταγα θυμέλαιν;
ἔμας ἐμὸς ὁ Βριμος, ἐμὲ δὲς κελαδεῖν, ἐμὲ δὲς παταγεῖν
ἀν’ ὅρεα σύμενον μετὰ Ναιάδων
οὐά τε κύκνου ἄνουντα ποικιλόππερον μέλος.

τάν ὀφοῦν κατέστασε Πιερις βασιλείαν· ὁ δ’ αὐλός

35 For the term, see Cairns 1972, 88. The beloved hoping or threatening that the beloved will one day be excluded in turn appears at Asclepi. AP 5.164 (G.-P. XIII); Call. AP 5.23 (G.-P. LXIII); Tib. 1.2.87 (directed at mocking bystander), 1.8.67 ff. (on behalf of Marathus to Pholoe, seems implicit—see Murgatroyd 1980, 254); Prop. 3.25.11 ff.; Ov. Ars 3.69 ff.; Strato AP 12.193; Philostr. Ep. 14; and Agath. AP 5.280 (seems implicit). Diosc. AP 12.14 (G.-P. IX) contains an inversion of this topos.

36 For Venus/Aphrodite, see Appendix 2 (also s.v. Κυπρ- and Cypr-). She is regularly prayed to, or invoked, in paraklausithura.
For the purpose of the paraklausithuron, lines 8-9 are most important. Here the chorus wishes that the aulos would be content to be commander only of the komos and "door-war fist-fights" of drunken youths. That the komasts are drunk is to be expected, and that they are youths is also not surprising.\textsuperscript{38} LSJ (s.v.) suggest that θυραμάχος

\textsuperscript{37}The text is from Campbell 1982-93, 3:320 f. The introductory material from Athenaeus is: Πρατίνας δὲ ὁ Θειοκάσιος αὐλητῶν καὶ χορευτῶν μισθοφόρων κατεχόντων τὰς ὀρχήστρας ἀγαπήτειν (Wilamowitz: ἀγαπάτειν τινας cod. A) ἐπὶ τοὺς αὐλητὰς μὴ συναυλεῖν τοῖς χοροῖς καθάπερ ἢν πάτριον ἀλλὰ τοὺς χοροὺς συνάθειν τοῖς σύληταις. ἐν σοὶ εἴχεν κατὰ τῶν ταύτα ποιούντων θυμὸν ὁ Πρατίνας ἐμφανίζει σιὰ τοῦτο τοῦ υπορχήματος. Campbell 1982-93, 3:321 n. 1 suggests a ὑπόρχημα was "perhaps a 'dance-song' for the chorus of a satyr-play." See also his discussion and references (1982, 403-4). Whether or not it was for a satyr-play, it seems to have accompanied dramatic or pantomimic action of some kind (LSJ s.v.). Campbell 1982, 403 suggests that it "was probably directed against Lasus of Hermione, who increased the importance of aulos in his dithyrambs...; in this case it will have been written not long after 500 B.C." Garrod 1920, however, dates it to c. 468 B.C. On the huporkhrema, see also Edmonds 1945, 3:659 f.

\textsuperscript{38}Such is the case with Alcibiades in Pl. Symp. The komast is typically young. Examples are numerous, but for a range of genres and dates, see: Ar. Ec. 689 ff., V. 1352 ff.; Men. Epit. 169 ff.; Theoc. 2.106 ff.; Mel. AP 12.23 (G.-P. XCIX); Liv. 3.13.1-2 "in iuuentutem grassantem in Subura incidisse," and 40.7.1 ff.; Ael. V.H. 13.1 ἢν δὲ ἄρα ὁ κώμος αὐτῶν ὁτε αὐλητρίδες ὁτε αὐτὰ ἄδηπον τὰ τῶν μειρακίων τῶν κατὰ πόλιν,...; Philostr. Im. 1.2; Lib. Decl. 25.2.16, 50.16, Prog. 10.7; Ast. Am. hom. 2.7.4 Τούτο δὲ τὸ φρόνημα οὐκ ἔστι δοῦλων ἀναμείνοντων τῶν κύριων, ἀλλὰ νέων δούλων, κυμάστων, ἀκολάστων; and Aristaenet. 1.27 and 2.19. Frisk 1973, 2:62 even makes the komasts' youth part of his definition of κώμος: "Umzug bezeichter Jugend, dionysischer Festzug und Festgesang, Festgelage." Komasts in art are also typically youthful—see the examples cited above for staves and walking-sticks.
means "assaulting doors" but when one considers that the
πυγμαχία usually means "boxing" or such, that bare fists are
not the best thing with which to assault a door, and that
the plurals πυγμαχίαις and νέων seems more likely to refer
to a group of youths than a series of individual youths, it
seems more probable that in this instance θυραμάχος would
mean something like "fighting at the door". This could only
be a reference to the topos of the fight between rivals
before the doors of the beloved (already noted in connection
with Archil. fr. 127). It is interesting that Pollux (4.99–
100) mentions a type of komastic orkheσis having fighting
and blows in association with the tetrakomos, "a triumphal
song and dance sacred to Heracles" (LSJ): ἤν δὲ καὶ κώμης
ελθος ὀρχήσεως καὶ τετράκωμος, Ἦρακλέους λερὰ καὶ πολεμικὴ.
ἤν δὲ [καὶ] κωμαστικὴ μάχην καὶ πληγὰς ἔχουσα. It seems
highly unlikely, however, that this was a mimetic perfor-
mance of the fighting of excluded komasts rather than some
military dance associated with the κώμη.

39 Of possible relevance to this is Lucian Salt. 10 f., which mentions a form of dance using mimetic fighting:
... εἰς ὀρχήσεων αὐτοῖς ἡ ἄγνωστα τελευτᾷ, καὶ αὐλητίς μὲν ἐν
τῷ μέσῳ κάθηται ἐπαυλῦν καὶ κτυπῶν τῷ ποδὶ, οἱ δὲ κατὰ
στοίχον ἄλληλοις ἐπόμενοι σχήματα παντοῖα ἐπιδεικνύονται πρὸς
ῥυθμοὺς ἐμβαίνουσ᾽, ἄρτι μὲν πολεμικά, μετ' ὀλίγον δὲ
χορευτικά, ἀ δίονυσῳ καὶ Ἀφροδίτης φίλη. 11 τοιαύτῳ καὶ τῷ
ἀσμα δὲ μεταξὺ ὀρχήσεων ξόουσιν Ἀφροδιτῆς ἐπίκλησις ἐστὶν
καὶ Ἐρώτων, ὡς συγκωμάξοιεν αὐτοῖς καὶ συνορχοῖντο.
We know from Athenaeus 14.618 c (Trypho fr. 109 Vel-sen) that this type of komos, mentioned alongside the tetrakomos and the hedukomos, was danced to the aulos:

\[\text{αὐλῆσεων} \; \text{δ᾿} \; \text{εἶσιν} \; \text{ἀνθροπαίαι}, \; \text{δ᾿} \; \text{φησι} \; \text{Τρόφων} \; \text{ἐν} \; \text{πεινέρῳ} \; \text{Ὀρθομασίων} \; \text{αὐδίς} \; \text{κύμος}, \; \text{βουκαλισμός}, \; \text{γλυρας}, \; \text{τετράκωμος}, \; \text{ἐπίφαλλος}, \; \text{χορεύς}, \; \text{καλλίνικος}, \; \text{πολεμικὸν}, \; \text{ηδύκωμος}, \; \text{Συκιωτύρβη}, \; \text{θυρακοπηκόν} \; (\text{τὸ} \; \text{δ᾿} \; \text{αὐτὸ} \; \text{kαὶ} \; \text{κρουσάζουν}), \; \text{kυτσμός}, \; \text{μόθων}. \; \text{ταῦτα} \; \text{δὲ} \; \text{πάντα} \; \text{μετ᾿} \; \text{ορχήσεως} \; \text{νύλετο} \; .
\]

The association between the aulos and komoi was very strong, and komasts clearly would often be accompanied on their revels by flute-girls.\(^4\) The komasts, of course, would probably not have played the aulos themselves, considering both the low regard in which it was held when compared with the lyre/kithara, and also the difficulty of singing while play-

---

\(^4\) For the aulos, flute-players, and flute-playing in direct association with κύμος/kωμάζειν, see: Hes. Sc. 270 ff.; Thgn. 939-42, 1063-8; Pl. O. 3.4-8; Schol. on Pl. O. 9.1 g-h (Drachmann 1:267-8) ἔθος δὲ ἢν κωμάζειν τὴν νύκτιν ἐσπέρας τοῖς νυκτόροις μετ᾿ αὐλητόθ. B. fr. 4.68 αὐλῶν τε καὶ κώμων μέλετων; Eur. Alc. 343 f.; X. Smp. 2.1 ff.; P1. Smp. 212 c-213 b, Thht. 173 c-d (σὺν αὐλητρίαις κύμαις); Theopomp. Hist. F.H.G. 1.323 (Ath. 10.435 c); Duris of Samos 70 (Jacoby FGrH 2.A = Plu. Alc. 32.2); Leon. AP 5.206 (G.-P. XLIII); D.S. 17.712.1-6; D.H. Esc. 8.1 (17.3); Plu. Alex. 57.1 ff., 67.1 ff., Ant. 26.1-3, Arat. 17.4-5, Mor. 654 E ff., 145.157.101, Pyrrh. 13.3-5; Philo Leg. 12, Spec. Leg. 2.193.32; Myrin. AP 6.254.7 (G.-P. II); D. Chr. 4.109, 33.14 f.; Lucian Bis Acc 17, Sali. 10, Vit. Auct. 12; S. E. M. 6.8; Clem. Al. Paed. 2.4.40; D.C. 9.39. 10; Ael. N.A. 1.50 καὶ αὐλῶν εἶ κωμαστὶς σὺν τῷ αὐλῷ θυρακοπεῖς, V.H. 13.1; Alciphr. 1.15, 4.16.1-3; Philostr. Im. 1.12.4, V.S. 20 (512-13); Or. Cels. 3.67; D.L. 7.13 (Zeno); Iamb. V.P. 25.112; Eus. p.e. 3.1.6; Epiph. haer. 2.286.2 ff.; Lib. Decl. 12.40-1, Prog. 29.10; Themist. Ep. 303 c-d; Chrys. hom. in I Cor. 12 (MPG 61.103.30-2), de Babyla 43.6-9, 104.12-14 (Schatkin); Synes. ep. 132.31-2; Nonn. D. 20.266 ff., 45.36-48; Anon. Pap. fr. 140 (Page 1941); Suid. κ.2266 Κύμοσ ἐστι μεθυστικὸς αὐλός; Const. VII Porphyry. de sent. Boissevain 432.6; and Niceph. Greg. Byz. Hist. 9.11.1 (Schopen-Bekker 1.447.6 ff.)
ing a wind instrument. Even epinician komoi, such as Pindar's, would sometimes be accompanied by the aulos.41

Some of the vocabulary in Pratinas fr. 708 should be noted briefly. θόρυβος (1) reminds us that komoi were, of course, often noisy.42 Komastic activity could easily get out of hand and was not necessarily totally harmless, as is indicated by ὀθρίς (2), which is often linked with komoi.43

41 See the references from Pindar in the previous note, and Verdenius 1987, 1:15.

42 For θόρυβος of symposia and the like, cf. also X. Cyr. 4.5.8; Pl. Smp. 223 b; D. Conon 5; Menander, Dysc. 901-2; Plu. Alex. 38.3, Pel. 11.2; Lucian D. Meretr. 2.3, V.H. 2.4 f.; and Ath. 14.613 a. θόρυβος and θορυβώδης are often used to refer to the noise of symposia and parties and are at least twice clearly linked with παροινία (line 8): Men. "Maxims" 242 θορύβος ὀχλώσεις φεύγε καὶ παροινίας and Lucian Symp. 22 ἐπὶ τοῖς συμπόσιοις θορύβους καὶ παροινίας.

43 This is most blatantly stated by Hesychius: κωμάζει· κώμον ἡ (δράμα) ξάδει. ὀθρίζει μετά μέθης. See also Lysias 3.22 ff.; Arist. Const. Nax. fr. 510 (Rose = Ath. 8.348 c); Eub. 93 (K.-A.); Plb. 10.26.3-5; D.S. 16.87.1-2; D.H. 10.7.3; Plu. Alex. 57.2, 67.3, Dem. 20.3, Mor. 552 B; Ph. Cherub. 92; Ael. V.H. 13.1; Lucian Bis. Acc. 17, Abd. 21; D.C. 9.39.7, Epit. 61.9.2-3; Lib. Prog. Frag. 50.4; Soph. Rh. Diar. Zetem. 366; Paul. Sil. AP 6.71; and Const. VII Porphyr. de uirt. et uit. Büttner-Wobst-Roos 1.183.24 ff., 2.124.5 ff, de sent. Boissevain 323.29 ff. Compare also Suid. κ.2268: Κωμάζει· ὀθρίζει, ἀσοῦρμοι, ἐπαλήματος. For some other references to fighting among komasts (not at people's doors etc.) or attacks on people by komasts, see Ar. Ach. 978 ff., V. 1322; Aeschin. Timarchus 65; Alex. fr. 107 (Ath. 8.362 c-d); Liv. 3.13.1-2; Lucian Abd. 21; Scholia on Oppian 1. 501; and Lib. Prog. 10.5. The verbs ἐπικωμάζει· ἐπικωμάζει and ἐπικωμαῖζει all regularly have connotations of violence or aggression. The general association of drunkeness and violence is too common to need citations. Παρομετέχει itself regularly has connotations of violence arising from excess drink and πάρομος occurs in a similar context to Pratin. fr. 708 at Anacreont. 42.13: στυγέω μάχας παρομονος.
Finally, the παροιμ- stem (παροιμων, 8) also regularly occurs in komastic contexts.\footnote{\textit{Plio. Pyrrh.} 13.5 ό δέ τούς ‘Ρωμιούς δεσιότες, ... τόν τε ό&omicron;μον ἑλοιδόρον εἰ φέρει πρώς ἐπικοινωνομένος ὀμίς ἁσελγὸς καὶ παροιμομένος, τόν τε Μέτωνα συστραφέντες ἔξεβαλον; \textit{Ph. Eubr.} 95 ... κατασκευή, περὶ δὲ χοροὺς ἔταν τέτετοι φρενοβλαβεῖς ἄδωσι καὶ ἐξάρχουσιν, οὐ παροίμων καὶ κωμαστικῶν σιλ έν ἐσθαλις καὶ ταλικής ἡδιστον μέλος, \textit{Cherub.} 92 ὄσεις ἄνεις ἔκεχεριλα μεθη παροιμία κόμοι χλιδήθρους θαρκαλαί πανυχλότες, ἀπεπελεῖς ἡδονα; \textit{Clem.} ραιξ. 2.4.40 ἀπεστὸς δὲ ἡμῖν τῆς λογικῆς εὐνυχίας στὸ κόμος, ἀλλὰ καὶ αἱ πανυχλότες αἱ μάταιοι ἐπὶ παροιμία κομβᾶσαι, 2.8.70 ἤτειστη δὲ καὶ τῶν στεφάνων ἡ χρήσις, κωμαστικὴ καὶ παροιμος; \textit{Hr. Prog. Frag.} 50.3 Ἀλλ’ ἐπειδή κωμάτων καὶ παροιμών εἰς τὴν πόλιν; \textit{Gr. Nyss.} res. 1 (Gebrhat 9.249.1-3) μὴ μέθασις καὶ κόμοις, μὴ χοροὶς καὶ παροιμίας, ἀλλὰ ταῖς θεσείδεσιν ἔννοιας; \textit{Chrys. Jud.} 8 (MPG 48.927.17 f.) ἔστι γάρ καὶ χωρὶς οἴνου μεθύειν, ἐστὶ καὶ νήφαντα παροίμειν καὶ ἐν ἀσωτία κινέζειν, \textit{hom. in Rom.} 24 (MPG 60.623.53-6), \textit{hom. in I Cor.} 28 (MPG 61.231.8-10) καὶ τού στίσματις μεταλαβόν, διε νηστείας σοι καίρος καὶ νήφεις, παροιμίας καὶ κωμάτες, \textit{de stud. praes.} 5 (MPG 63.487.52-4) Ἀν δὲ μέθη καὶ κρασίπλαθο προσέχει καὶ τὴν ἕμεραν δαπανή καὶ ἀναλίκη εἰς κόμοις καὶ παροιμίας, κηροῦ παντοῦ μαλακώτερον ὑπὸ τοῦ πάθους γινόμενος; \textit{and Ast. Am.} \textit{hom.} 10.9.2.1 ff. ἄνδρα γεωργον ἀμέλων καὶ φιλοίν, κωμαστικήν παροιμον. \footnote{This is also Alcm. fr. 24 and Stesich. fr. 33.}}

Gnesippus

Although no actual fragments from Gnesippus survive, he is of importance to the development of the paraklausithu-ron. Fragment 148 (K.-A., cited at Ath. 14.638 e) from Eupolis' \textit{Helots} provides the relevant information:
The passage seems fairly clear at first glance. Gnesippus wrote songs to be sung at night with which adulterers, using the *iambuke* or *trigonon*, would call out women. It seems reasonable to conclude that such songs were some form of *paraklausithuron*.46

Unless one is to believe that no one before Gnesippus had ever sung a serenade to a married woman (or any other woman with whom a relationship would be classified as *μολυσία*) at night, or composed such a serenade in verse, *ηθοπε* probably does not have the sense of "invent for the first time", but is more likely to mean simply "compose", or, at most, have some connotation that he was the first to write a number of such *δείγματα* having a certain generic coherence, containing new subject matter, or perhaps a new combination of subject matter and metre.47 Perhaps the songs

---

46 Headlam-Knox 1922, 83 and Yardley 1978, 19, n. 1 seem to be the only two writers on the *paraklausithuron* to have noticed this passage.

47 *Ηθοπε* could, possibly, indicate that Gnesippus was the first person known to Eupolis to have composed nocturnal songs for adulterers. This would, however, not necessarily rule out the actual existence of such songs before Gnesippus. See Nisbet-Hubbard 1970, 308 on claims of invention in literature. Objections might be raised that social conditions in Greece would have prevented any adulterous nocturnal serenades. However, laws are enacted to restrict possible or conceivable behaviour, not impossible or inconceivable behaviour. The existence in any society of laws against adultery means that adultery must, at least sometimes, occur. There is no more reason to suppose that ancient adultery laws completely prevented adultery than there is to believe that capital punishment for convicted murderers means states such as Texas, California, and Florida are free from homicides.
were a collection exploring the many possibilities of the situation of the adulterous serenade, gathered together under one title, much like the amatory letters of the later epistolographers.

There is much else of interest in these few lines. The adulterers actually sing songs, in accordance with the άςειν το ιππακλαυσιθυρων in Plu. Mor. 753 Ά-άςειν is only used of actual songs or odes. Άςειν (including its alternative forms) is not common in paraklausithuric situations, occurring only at Lucian DMar. 1.4 (in conjunction with πηκτίς: διότε έκώμασε πρόφην επι σέ... ή πηκτίς οία; ... επι τῷ έρωτικῷ έκέλυς άςηματι) and in the title of Aristaenetus 1.14 (πορνιδον πρός νέους άςημαν, ούκ αργυρίῳ προτρεπομένους αὐτήν), but other words for song and singing occur more frequently (Appendix 2). It might be relevant that Athenaeus, 14.639 a, citing Clearchus’s On Love Poetry, specifically mentions τά έρωτικά... άςηματα.48 The songs are

48 Κλέαρχος δὲ ἐν δευτέρῳ έρωτικών τὰ έρωτικά φησιν άςηματα καὶ τὰ Λοκρικά καλούμενα οὐδὲν τῶν Σαπφοῦς καὶ ‘Ανακρέοντος διαφέρειν. Ath. 15.697 β-ε (Carm. pop. 853, 1982-93, 4:240) cites an example of a Locrian song that is clearly adulterous: οὕτος γὰρ (sc. Οὐλπιανὸς) τὰς καπωριτέρας θάνατος ἀσπάζεται μάλλον τῶν ἐπουδασμένων, οὐλαὶ εἰς ναί Λοκρικαὶ καλούμεναι, μοιχικαὶ τινες τὴν φύσιν ὑπάρχουσι, ὡς καὶ ἦσεν: "Ὄ τι πάσχεις; μὴ προδίδῃς ἄτιμον, ἱκετεύω· / πρὶν καὶ μολεῖν κείνου ἀνέμετρον, / μὴ κακοῦ ζεν ἀλλοτρίῳ / μέγα ποιήσῃ / κατὰ καὶ ἔλθει τῶν δειλακράν. / 5 ἄμερα καὶ δὴ τὸ φῶς / δίὰ τὰς θυρίδας συκτεῖ εἰσοδημῇ;" τοιοῦτων γὰρ άςημάτων αὐτοῦ πᾶσα πλήρης ὁ θειικῇ...
nocturnal, which reflects the usual time of day of the para-
klausithurion and post-symphotic amatory komos.\textsuperscript{49}

The singers also accompany themselves on two dif-
ferent types of lyre--stringed instruments like the πηκτίς
mentioned in Anacr. fr. 373.\textsuperscript{50} That the men are actually
adulterers is clear from μοιχός, which almost never means
anything else (for μοιχός and its cognates in paraklausithu-

\textsuperscript{49}See Chapter 1 on the komos in general, and Appen-
dix 2 for night and the paraklausithurion. For νυκτερινός in
amatory contexts, see Duris, \textit{FHG} 2.475 (Ath. 12.542 d) ἦσα
δὲ καὶ πρὸς γυναικῶς ὑμιλάντα σιωπᾶμενα καὶ ἱερολάκων ἐρωτε
νυκτερινοῖ; Hermesian. \textit{Leont.} 3.63-69 (Powell 7) (of
Euripides) ... ὑπὸ σκαλίσκον τυπέντα / 65 τόξου νυκτερινός
οὐκ ἀπεθάνεθ' ὁδὸνας. / ἄλλα Μακηνών πάσας κατεγελαστὸ
λαύρας / ταγεινὸν; Phld. \textit{AP} 5.123 (G.-P. IX) νυκτερινὴ,
δίκερα, φιλοσάμωνυχε, φαῖνε, Σελήνῃ, / φαῖνε, δὴ εὐρήτην
βαλλομένη θυρίδων; Strat. \textit{AP} 12.250, of a komos: Νυκτερινή
ἐπίκωμος ἱών μετασφόρον ὄρην; and Lucian \textit{Icar.} 21 ἀλλά κἂν
τίνα ἰῶν αὐτῶν μοιχεύοντα ἢ κλέπτοντα ἢ ἄλλο τι τολμῆτα
νυκτερινώτατον....

\textsuperscript{50}The λαμβύκη is very rare--Ath. 14.636 b: φολινκες,
πηκτίδες, μαγάδιδες, σαμβύκαι, λαμβύκαι; τριγύνα, κλεψαμ-
βοὶ, σκυλάσφαλς, ἐνείχαρσθα. ἐν ὀς γὰρ, ἠσθι, τοὺς λάμβους
ἤδην λαμβύκας ἐκάλουν. The τριγύναν seems to be associated
mainly with symptotic and lowly contexts: S. fr. 241 (\textit{TGF}²)
calls it Phrygian and mentions it along with the \textit{pektis}:
πολὺς δὲ ἔρυξε τριγύνας ἀντισπαστά τε / Λυδίης ἐφυμελεῖ πηκτί-
δος συχροδῖα; Eup. fr. 88 (K.-A.) δὲ καλὼς μὲν τυμπανίδεις
/ καὶ διαφάλλεις τριγύνιοις / κάτω τὴν πολυμυνας / καὶ
πελεθείς ἄνω σκέλη; Pl. fr. 71.11 ff. (K.-A.) (a symptotic
context) ... κόκταμος δ᾽ ἐξοιλεῖται θύρατας. / αὐλοῦς δ᾽
ἐχουσά τις κορίσκω καρικόν μέλος τι / μελίζεται τοῖς
συμπόταις, κάλλην τριγύναν εἶδον / ἐχοῦσαν, εἶτ᾽ ἦγεν πρὸς
αὐτὸ μέλος Ἱψακὼν τι; and Lucian \textit{Lex.} 8-9 ἐπιμνημένοι δὲ
ἀμνοῖς καὶ ἢν ἄκραθεν ἤμεν. εἶτ᾽ ἐχοῖμενα βαχχάριδι
καὶ εἰσεκύλησε τις ἤμιν τὴν ποδοκύηπι καὶ τριγύνιστριαν.
It is also mentioned with the \textit{pektis} (they will both be for-
bidden) at Pl. \textit{R.} 3, 399 c-d: Ὑφὲ ἀρα, ἢν δ᾽ ἔγο, πολυφορίας γε
οὐδὲ πανορμοῦν ἢμεν δεῖσει ἐν ταῖς φῶς τε καὶ μέλεσιν. . . .
Τριγύνων ἄρα καὶ πηκτίδων καὶ πάντων
ἄρανων, [d] ὑπὲ πολύχορδα καὶ πολυφορία, ἡμιουργοὺς οὔ
θρεψομεν.
ra, see Appendix 2). As has been seen above, adultery was present in early Greek lyric, but most women of identifiable status in Greek paraklausithura seem to be hetairai of some kind (see below, Chapter 4). Moreover, paederasty plays an important role in Greek paraklausithura (see below, Chapter 4), but these songs seem to be exclusively heterosexual.

'Εκκαλείσθαι must mean the women are inside, so the lovers are not seeking admission. Instead, their beloveds will come out to them.

51 For the Greeks, adultery covered a wider range of activities than are usually encompassed in the word today. See Dover 1974, 209: "It was moikheia, 'adultery', to seduce the wife, widowed mother, unmarried daughter, sister or niece of a citizen; that much is clear from the law cited by D. xxiii 53-5."

52 For ἐκκαλέω in paraklausithura, see Appendix 2. For four possibly paraklausithricus contexts (not in Appendix 2), see: Ar. Ach. 402 ἐκκάλεσαν αὐτόν; Lys. 850 KI. πρὸς τῶν θεῶν νῦν ἐκκάλεσάν μοι Μυρρίνην. / Λυ. ἵδοι καλέσω ἵνα Μυρρίνην σοι; σ{Name} τίς εἶ; V. 217 ff. ΒΔ. ἴνα τῶν Διὸς ὡς γοῦν ἀνεστήκασθαι νῦν. / ὡς ἄποι μέσων μυκτῶν παρακαλῶ δὲν, / λύχνους ἔχουσα καὶ μινυρίζουσας μέλη / ἀρχαίομελεσάρως- / φυσικήρατα, / οίς ἐκκαλούνται τούτοις; 270 ff. ἄλλα μοι δόκει στάντας ἔνθαδ', διόρος, / δυσταχαίς αὐτὸν ἐκκαλεῖν, ἤν τί πισ ἄκουσάς / τούμοι μέλους ὑφ' ἡδωνίς ἥρπεται θύρας. Καλέω is also used of amatory invitations: Ar. Lys. 310 καὶ ἡ καλοδέστω τοὺς μοιχοὺς χαλέσαιν ἡ γυναικεῖα, / ἐμπιπτάναι χρῆ τὰς θύρας καὶ τῷ κατ' αὐτήν πιέσειν; Plu. Mor. 759 F ἐκδεχομένη καὶ καλοθάρα παροδεύεται παλλάκις.

53 Compare Thgn. 457-60 above. The request for the beloved to come out is relatively uncommon: Ar. Ec. 960 ff., Theoc. 11.63 f., Pl. Curc. 60 ff., Mil. 1248, Ov. Met. 13.838 ff., Ael. N.A. 9.66. Also compare Ar. Av. 201 ff., Pl. Stich. 733 ff. and Truc. 657 ff. The beloved coming out to the beloved is not common in paraklausithricus situations since it fits badly with the situation of the excluded lover, and the lover would naturally seek admission as a first choice. However, see Dioscor. AP 12.14 (G.-P. IX) (possibly not applicable); Cic. Catil. 1.26; Tib. 1.2.15 ff.; Lucian Bis Acc. 31; and Babr. 116. In Ar. V. 211 ff. and 398
It is worthwhile to examine Gnesippus' reputation. Although an ancient author's reputed character or personality was often completely derived from his writing, thereby providing no real evidence, there are enough contemporary references to Gnesippus to begin to develop a picture. He was known for his love songs, pleasant verse, and lasciviousness: Chionid. fr. 4 (K.-A. = Ath. 14.638 d); and Cleomenes test. 1: τούτ' οὖν μὰ Δία Γνήσιππος οὐδ' ὁ Κλεομένης / ἐν ἐννέα ἄν χορδάς κατεγελασάτο. Cratin. fr. 104 (K.-A.) seems to indicate that he had a somewhat jaded view of love: τίς ἄρ' ἔρωτα ἑ μοί ὕπατε ἔννοια πολλὴ χολή; / οἶομαι ἐσ' ἑ σκέψῃς μινόν εἶναι καὶ κενὰν. Athenaeus (14.638 d), introducing Chionid. fr. 4, calls him a παραψηφήγου τῆς Λαράς μούσης and says (639 a) that Teleclides (fr. 36, K.-A.) said that Gnesippus was often involved in adultery: Τηλεκλείσθης δὲ ἐν τοῖς Στερροῖς καὶ περὶ μοιχεῖας ἀναστρέφοντας φιλον καὶ τύον. Gnesippus seems to be the same person as ὁ Κλεομάχος mentioned as a contemporary of Sophocles and a

ff. Philocleon is trying to sneak out. Also see Ov. Ep. 18.53 ff., 93 ff., and Met. 4.85 ff., 93 ff., both of which have many paraklausithuric topoi. At Lucian DMeretr. 12 a lover sneaks out from the guard of his parents in order to visit a beloved meretrix. Also compare Phld. AP 5.120 (G.-P. VII), Tib. 1.8.65, 2.1.67 ff., Ov. Am. 2.12.1 ff., and 3.1.49 ff. Note the love spells designed to bring the woman to the man's house: PGM 4.2485 ff., 2735 ff., 2783-4 (Preissendanz 1973-4, 1:150). PDM 14.1083-69, 1070-77, 1090-6 are also for bringing girls out of houses (Betz 1992, 246 f.). PGM 36.70 says it καὶ παρθένους ἐκπηδάν ὄν ἄναθεν ποιεῖ.
producer of tragedies--see Cratin. fr. 17 (K.-A. = Ath. 14.638 f):

δς ουκ ἐδώκεσθι ἀπεδώκεσθι Σοφοκλέους ἔχον,
τῷ Κλεομάχου δ’, δὺ οὐκ ἰν ἡξίουν ἔγω
ἐμοὶ διδάσκετιν οὖς’ ἐν εἷς Ἀδώνια;


τις δὲ καὶ τραγῳδίας
ὁ Κλεομάχου διδάσκαλος
ημετ’ τῶν παρατελτῶν
ἐχων χορὸν λυσίατι τιλ-λουσίων μέλη ποιηρῶ.

All this seems to support Campbell's (1982–93, 1:39) suggested floruit of c. 450. This puts Gnesippus at a major turning point in Greek literature.

Comedies were first performed at Athens at the City Dionysia in 486 and then at the Lenaea, c. 440. Cratinus, the traditional inventor of comedy (Ar. Po. 1449b), was born c. 530. The 450s saw Cratinus' first comedies, and the early 420s Aristophanes' and Eupolis' earliest plays. As Eup. fr. 148 indicates, among certain parts of Athenian society literary tastes were changing: Alcman, Stesichorus, and Simonides, poets of roughly the three immediately preceding generations, are considered old-fashioned. On the other hand, Gnesippus "hier ... als weichlicher Neuerer den klassischen Lyriken entgegengestellt wird" (Maas 1893–, 1479). A similar attitude is shown at Ar. Nu. 1355 ff. Of course more

54Maas 1893–, 1479 f. supports this identification and suggests that he might also be the same as Νόθιππος, a tragic poet c. 430.
elevated literary fare, such as Aeschylus and Sophocles, remained popular, but alongside it could be found the vulgar, riotous, bitingly satirical, and often highly obscene humour (especially in Cratinus, next to whom Aristophanes seems repressed) of Old Comedy. Satyr plays were already well-established by the start of the fifth century. Certainly it appears that literature was accorded a new moral license. Among the surviving fragments of Greek lyric there is little to compare with the more outrageous sexual explicitness of comedy and satyr plays. Furthermore, clear references to adulterous behaviour are rare in earlier lyric, but become more common in Old Comedy. All this indicates a new market, as it were, for exactly Gnesippus’ type of poetry. Certainly adulterous paraklausithuric serenades, at least in literature, would probably not have aroused much negative response.

Gnesippus’ chronological position also raises one further possibility. When one considers the relative scarcity of clear paraklausithuric references before Gnesippus, again with the fragmentary nature of Greek lyric providing a major cautionary note, and what will be seen to be an increasing density of paraklausithuric situations after him, it is tempting to suggest that Gnesippus’ nocturnal songs might have had some influence on the popularity or commonness of the topos in later literature. Of course, there is every possibility that this pattern is simply because of the
seemingly greater moral leniency allowed literature by fifth-century audiences and that Gnesippus and his subject matter are also a result of that leniency. Nonetheless, the possibility remains that Gnesippus is the "missing link" for the development of the paraklausithuron as an identifiable literary genre.

Euripides and Lysias

Euripides’ *Cyclops* provides a possible paraklausithuric reference that has aroused some dispute. It comes in the context of a prolonged scene full of komastic elements and that context is worth examining. At 382 ff. Odysseus describes to the Chorus how Polyphemus made a large fire in his cave, laid out a couch of fir branches on the

---

55 Although the *Cyclops* probably was written after 411 (Seaforth 1984, 48 f.), it is being discussed before any of Aristophanes’ plays simply to stay within the chronological structure of this dissertation, which, as was noted earlier, will discuss works in the order of their authors’ dates rather than attempt to date individually every work mentioned. In the case of Euripides' *Cyclops*, this is at best merely a useful convenience, and the reader should keep in mind that it was written after all Aristophanes’ extant plays except for *Plutus*, *Ranae*, and *Ecclesiazusae*. It does not appear that there is enough to be gained from discussing the *Cyclops* in its correct chronological position within the plays of Aristophanes to outweigh the convenience of keeping all of Aristophanes’ plays together, particularly since there does not appear to be any specific borrowing from the *Cyclops* in Aristophanes, or borrowing from Aristophanic komoi or paraklausithuric parodies in the *Cyclops*. Furthermore, as will be argued at the end of the discussion of the *Cyclops*, it is readily conceivable that there were komoi in earlier satyr-plays, and so the *Cyclops* can be discussed before Aristophanes as a symbol of, if not as being representative of, earlier satyr-plays.
ground (387-8), milked his heifers to fill a ninety gallon κρατήρ (388), then, having brutally killed (388 ff.) and cooked (402 ff.) two of Odysseus' men, dined on them. Odysseus then recounts how ἐμπλήσας σκύφος / Μάρωνος αὐτῷ τοῦτε προσφερὼ πιεῖν (411-12). Polyphemus downs it, likes what he tastes, and Odysseus offers him ἄλλην ... κύλικα (421). With two cups of neat wine in him, he begins to sing (423 ff.):

καὶ δὴ πρὸς ὡθάς εἴρπτ· ἔγγο ἐπενεχέων
ἄλλην ἐπὶ ἄλλη σπλάγχνῳ ἐθέρματον ποτῷ.
ἄσει δὲ παρὰ κλαίουσι συναύτας ἐμοίς
ἀμοῦσ'; ἐπηχεῖ δ' ἀντρον. 425

It then should come as no surprise that at lines 445 f. Odysseus announces ἐπὶ κύμων ἐπειν πρὸς κασιγνήτους θέλει / Κύκλωσες ἡσθελε τῷ Βασίλει ποτῷ. Here Polyphemus is in accord with the tendency of rural komoi and serenades to take place during the daytime. 57 This would not fit with

---

56 The text is Diggle's, reprinted in Seaford 1984. Seaford (185) notes that these verses "represent a τόπος of satyric drama; cf. fr. 907; Trag. adesp. 418.5-6; Anon. on Heracles in E. Syll. (p. 575 Nauck) ἡσθελε καὶ ἐπιειν ἀῖσσον. In the prosatyrical A1c. the drunken singing of Herakles, warmed by wine (758 ...), contrasts with the laments of the servants for Alkestis (759-63 ...)." It is interesting that Thgn. 1041-2 (ἲπτωρ σὺν αὐλητῷ παρὰ κλαίουσι γελωτῖνες / πίεσαν, κεῖνου κήθεσι τερηθέμενοι) and E. A1c. 542 (αἰσχρόν παρὰ κλαίουσι θεούθα θεούτας ξένοις) both have παρὰ followed by a form of κλαίω.

57 Minyard 1976, 219-20 points out that, in fact, komoi can follow the drinking after any main meal, be it during the day or night. She cites this passage, the references to Hercules' komoi in the A1c., and Ar. Pl. 744 ff. There are many examples of daytime rural komoi and serenades in pastoral. See, for example, Theoc. 3, 5, 7, 11; Verg. Ec 2; Ov. Met. 13.740 ff.; Calp. Ec 3; and Nemes. 3.
Odysseus’ plans for blinding him, so he tells the cyclops\textsuperscript{58} that he should keep the wine to himself and not share it with the others, knowing that Polyphemus will soon fall asleep from its effects (451 ff.):

κόμου μὲν αὐτὸν τοῦτ’ ἀπαλλάξαι, λέγων
ὡς οὐ Κύκλωψι πῦμα χρῆ δῴηνα τὸδε,
μόνον δ’ ἔχοντα βίοτον ἡδέως ἄγειν.
ὅταν δ’ ὑπώσῃ Ῥαχχίλω τυικώμενος.

After further conversation between Odysseus and the chorus of satyrs, in which the plan for the blinding is discussed, the chorus announces Polyphemus’ entrance (488), and it is not a pretty sight:

σίγα σίγα. καὶ δὴ μεθύων
ἀχαρίν κέλαδον μουσιτόμενος
σκαῖρος ἀπώφος καὶ κλαυσυμενὸς
χωμὴν πετρίων ἔξω μελάθρων.
φέρε μιν κόμωις παιδεύσωμεν.
τῶν ἀπαλέωτοι.
πάντως μέλλει τυφλός εἶναι.
μάκαρ δαίτης εὔναξε
βοτρύων φίλαισι πηγαῖς
ἐπὶ κόμων ἐκπεπασθέλις
φίλων ἀνδρὶ ὑπαγαλλίων,
ἐπὶ δεσμοίς τε ἔξωνθυν
χλιδανᾶς ἔχων ἔταλρας
μυρόχριστος ὑπαρθοθ βο-
στρυχοῦσαν, αὐτῇ δὲ· θύραν τίς οἴει μοι;
KY. παπαῖς· πλέως μὲν ὁ ὅνοι,
γάνυμαι <δὲ> δαίτω ἔβα,
σκάφος ὀλκᾶς ἔτρες μειοθεῖς
ποτὲ σελίμα γαστρός ἀκρας.
ὑπάγει μ' ὁ φόρτος εὕρην
ἐπὶ κόμων ἱπρὸς ἱπαίς,
ἐπὶ Κύκλωπας ἀδελφοῦς.
φέρε μοι, ἐλευ, φέρρ', ἀσκόν ἐνδος μοι.
ΧΩ. καλὸν ἄμασαν δεδορκῷς
καλὸς ἐκπερῳ μελάθρων.
< ἦν> φιλεῖ τίς ἡμᾶς;

\textsuperscript{58} “Satyr” and “cyclops” will not be capitalized because they are species, not nationalities.
λύχνα δ' ἠμένει ὑσία σὸν
 κράςα κύωσ' τέρεινα νύμφα
 ὄροσερμὸν ἐσωθεν ἄντρων.
 στεφάνων δ' σὺ μία χροΐα
 περὶ σὸν κράςα τάχ' ἐξομιλήσει.

Polyphemus has had his meal, become drunk as if he were at a symposium, and started to sing. He has then, quite reasonably, developed the urge to go on a komos to his fellow cyclopes (ἐπὶ κύμων ἔρπεν πρὸς κασιγνήτους θέλει / Κύκλω-
πας, 445 f.), from which urge Odysseus has had to dissuade him (κύμων μὲν αὐτὸν τοῦτο ἀπαλλάξας, 451).\(^{59}\) He does, however, eventually leave his "rocky house" (πετρινων ... 
μελάθρων, 491), drunk (μεθύων, 488) and singing (μουσικό-
μευος, 489).\(^{60}\) The satyrs, not impressed by his singing

\(^{59}\) In this context κύμως followed by the πρὸς ...
Κύκλωπας must mean a komos-procession (as at 508-9 ἐπὶ κύμων ...
/ ἐπὶ Κύκλωπας). From λυχνε 556 it seems he is carrying a σκύφος. This urge of Polyphemus' has been foreshadowed at 167 ff., where Silenus says the man that is not happy after drinking is a total fool and then recounts the amorous visions and desires wine gives him.

\(^{60}\) Μεθύω/μέθη (also at line 538) and other words from the -μεθη- stem are exceptionally frequently linked with κύμως/κυμάξειν. A fairly complete listing (excluding the scholia and lexicographical entries cited in Chapter 1) is:
Ar. Ec. 689 ff.; Scholia on Ar. R. 218; Lys. frag. 17.2. (= D.H. "Demos." 11); Pl. Lg. 637 a, Smp. 212 c f.; Theopomp.
FHG 1.308 (Ath. 6.260 b-c), FHG 1.323 (Ath. 10.435 c); Duris
70 (FGH) = (Plu. Alc. 32.2) ἐκ μέθης ἐπικωμαζόμενος; Timae.
FHG i.224 (Ath. 6.250 a); Anon. AP 12.115 (G.-P. VI), 12.116
(G.-P. XXXIV); Orac. Sib. 8.118; Powell Lyr. Alex. Adesp. 3;
D.S. 17.106.1, 20.92.4; D.H. 10.7.3-4; Plu. Alc. 4.5, 22.2,
Alex. 17.5, 38.1 f., Ant. 9.3, Caes. 41.3, Dem. 20.3, Mor.
128 D, 596 C-D, 622 D ff., 710 C, Pyrr. 13.3; Ph. Moses
2.162, Husb. 37, Cherub. 92; J. B.J. 2.29; D.Chr. 4.109,
33.14 f.; S.E. M. 6.8; Lucian Bacch. 5, Luct. 13, Bis Acc.
16 (cf. 31) depicts Methé personified as a komast;
Anacreont. 43; Polyaeum. 2.2.7; Galen Ther. Meth. 1.1.2;
Scholia on Hermog. Stat. 259; Scholia on Opp. Hal. 1.501;
Clem. paed. 2.4.40; D.C. 9.39.10, 45.26.2, Epit. 61.4.3,
(this is, after all, his first komos), will teach him just
how to revel (μπω κώμος παιδεύσωμεν, 492).  

64.3.1; Alciphr. 4.10.1; Ath. 10.427 e-f; 10.438 d-e; 10.445
b; 14.621 c ο δέ μαγουδάς καλούμενος ... ποτὲ δὲ ἀνδρά
μεθύσοντα καὶ ἐπὶ κώμον παραγινόμενον πρὸς τὴν ἔφημένην;
Philostr. Im. 1.2, 1.25.2, V.A. 4.39, V.S. 20; Peirazomene
22 (Page 1970 fr. 79.); Tryph. I. 559-61; Iamb. VP 25, 112;
Eus. v.C. 1.7.1.4 ff.; Lib. Decl. 12.6, 12.16, 12.40,
28.1.24, Orat. 18.209, Prog. 4.6, 7.5, 10.5; Epiph. haer.
2.120.17 ff., 2.157.17 ff.; Them. 303 c-d; Sopat. Rh. Diair.
Zetem. 320, 442; Gr. Naz. or. 5 (MPG 35.708.41 f.), or. 38
(MPG 36.316.20 ff., 29-30), or. 35 (MPG 36.260.1 f.), or. 40
(MPG 36.412.46 ff.); Gr. Nyss. or. dom. 3 (Oehler 252.17
ff.), 5 (Oehler 304.21-24); Chrys. Jud. 4 (MPG 48.874.61-
64), 5 (MPG 48.883.10-14), 8 (MPG 48.915.40-42; 927.16-20),
hom. in Mt. 77 (78) (MPG 58.704.8-11), hom. in Ac. 36 (MPG
60.258.61-64), hom. in Rom. 24 (MPG 60.623.44-45, 53-56;
626.12), hom. in I Cor. 12 (MPG 61.103.30-32), 27 (MPG
61.231.23), hom. in I Tim. 13 (MPG 62 569.48-50), salt.
Herodiad. (MPG 59.524.20-21), nat. Chr. 2 (ascend. dom. in
templo, MPG 61.739.62-67), de Babyla 44.6, 74.13 f., 104.12-
14 (Schatkin), synax. incorp. 3.27-28, in sanct. Paul.
apost. Hom. 4.18.19-23; Synes. Ep. 32.16 f.; Thdt. Is.
2.5.12; Nonn. D. 12.383-386, 19.57-58 οὐδὲ Μέθης ἀπανευθε
δύνησομεν εἴπασώτευν, / οὐδὲ Μέθης ἀπανεύθεν ἐγὼ ποτὲ
κώμον ἔγερσόν, Paul. Sil. AP 6.71; Jo. D. hom. in sabbat. 38
(MPG 96.641.21-24), Artem. [Sp.] 10 (MPG 96.1261.11-14);
Phot. Bibl. 333 b; and Const. VII Porphyry. de uirt. et uit.
Böttner-Wobst-Roos 2.343.21 ff. and 2.357.13 f., de sent.
Boissævain 432.6 ff. Part of the reason for the frequency
of this combination is its occurrence Ep. Rom. 13:13 ὡς ἐν
ἡμέρα ἐναχθήσωμεν, μὴ κώμοις καὶ μέθαις, μὴ
κώμας καὶ ἀσελγείας, μὴ ἐρίω καὶ ἐτίλω; and Ep. Gal. 5:21
φθάνοι, μέθαις, κώμας καὶ τὰ ὁματία τούτοις, δὲ προλέγω ὅτι
καθὼς προσέλθων ὅτι οἳ τὰ τοιαύτα πράσσοντες βασιλεύειν
θεόν
οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν.

61 Seaford 1984, 196 suggests that here κώμος "seems
to mean 'revelling songs',..." and compares Ar. Th. 988-9
ἐγὼ δὲ κώμος σὲ [sc. Dionysus] ἄλοχοροις, μὲλισφ. However,
Lamer's and Minyard's belief (see Chapter 1) that komos
almost never means simply "song" means there is no reason to
reject a sense of "revellings"—i.e. the satyrs' dancing and
singing as a whole will instruct Polyphemus how to revel.
Ussher 1978, 132 suggests that the chorus' song "may well
have been accompanied by dancing and pantomimic action (i.e.
a hyporchema...)." Polyphemus must be trying to dance for
the first time, too: lines 123-4 explain how, being without
wine, the cyclopes τοι γὰρ ἄροι ὀλκοῦσιν χόνω.
The satyrs then sing a strophe, presumably the type of thing they think is appropriate to a komos—indeed it seems to have every right to be called a komos-song. It culminates in the question: Θῷραν τίς σαξέει μοι; (502). However the passage is highly problematical and has not been truly satisfactorily explained. The first problem is offered by line 497, where the precise meaning of κακον is

62 Seaford 1984, 195 notes the "simple monostrophic anacreontics κατά στίχον (cf. Anacr. 356, 395, 396...) with which the satyrs accompany the emergence (491) of Pol., and which are taken up (503-10) by Pol. himself." On the ends of the strophes at lines 501-2, 509-10, and 517-18 he quotes A.M. Dale as saying "The pure ionic dimeter as the penultimate phrase in anacreontics is characteristic of Anacreon himself" and cites line 395 for comparison. The simplicity of the metre and structure gives added realism and vigour to the song.

63 There is some dispute as to whether this is an actual request to open a door, or whether it is an explicit sexual double-entendre (although it could be both). Copley 1956, 6 n. 13 quotes, and rejects, Paley's 1880 commentary as suggesting that the question is "Apparently a cant phrase for τίς κακελεσαί μοι;" Ussher 1978, 134 says the question refers to both "admission to a mistress' house" and "admission to her favours" citing Ar. Ec. 990. Seaford 1984, 199 also allows both. For door imagery and sexual metaphor, add the very elaborate Eratosth. AP 5.242, and also see Trumbull 1906, 252 ff. Such a sense might be present, but it will be argued below that the actual request for admission is primary.

64 See Seaford 1984, 197 f. (who offers many options but commits himself to few of them), Ussher 1978, 129 f., and Rossi 1971 for an idea of the problems and textual difficulties.
indeterminable. The major problem here is if ἐπὶ κώμος ἐκπετασθεῖς indicates that the subject is participating in a static revel. It is

65 Κώμος here could be either a procession or a more static revel. When ἐπὶ κώμος is followed by another preposition indicating direction κώμος will usually have the sense of "procession", but by itself it could mean either. For ἐπὶ κώμος followed by another preposition, see 445 above, see Apollod. Car. fr. 5.21 (K.-A. = Ath. 7.280 d) ἐπὶ κώμος εἰς Κόρινθον, and Ath. 14.621 c ποτὲ δὲ ἄνδρα μεθύοντα καὶ ἐπὶ κώμος παραγωνόμενον πρὸς τὴν ἐρωμένην. Even Plu. Alex. 38.1 ff. seems to require this sense: ἔτυχε μὲν εἰς μέθην τινὰ καὶ παιδίαν τοῖς ἐκατέρω ἐχωμένοις διδωκός, ὡστε καὶ γύναια συμπλίκουσιν ἐπὶ κώμος ἥκοντα πρὸς τοὺς ἔραπτάς. Some occurrences of ἐπὶ κώμος by itself seem to favour a processional sense—see: Ar. P1. 1040, Antiph. fr. 197 (K.-A. = Ath. 6.243 c), D.S. 17.72.1-6, and Ath. 14.621 c. Some that appear to require a more general meaning of "revelry" are: Lys. fr. 17.2. (= D.H. "Demosthenes" 11); X. Smp. 2.1 ff.; Alex. fr. 112 (K.-A. = Ath. 8.362 c-d); Plu. Mor. 357 F, 624 C; Aristid. 8.54; and D.L. 2.138. Passages where the meaning of ἐπὶ κώμος is not clear are more common: Thgn. 939-42; D. Neaira 33; Axionic. fr. 2 (K.-A. = Ath. 6.244 f); Powell Lyr. Alex. Adesp. 3.7; D.S. 17.117.1-2; Ath. 8.348 f-349 a; D.L. 2.128, 7.13; Philostr. Im. 1.25.3, V.A. 4.39; Greg. Naz. or. 40 (MPG 36.393.4 f.); Const. VII Porphyri. de uirt. et uit. Büttnzer-Wobst-Roos 1.275.29 ff.; and Suid. κ.2266. While Seaford 1976, 189 believes that ἐπὶ κώμος usually refers to a stationary revel (cf. also 212, 220 f., and 275), Lamer 1983-, 1288 favours the processional sense.

58 LSJ, s.v. ἐκπετάνυμι, cites the line and suggests that it means "wholly given up to the revel". The suggestion would allow either a komos procession or general revelry. Seaford 1984, 197 proposes an explicit sailing metaphor to match that in the corresponding line of strophe b (although such a metaphor would probably be suggested by the verb even as LSJ translates it): "he proceeds to the κώμος with the wind in his sails as a result of the wine." Kovacs 1994, 115 is similar to Seaford: "... off to the revel, the well-beloved juice of the vine putting wind in his sails." The major problem with both these translations is that they have to give ἐκπετάνυμι a sense of movement that it otherwise does not seem to have by itself. There are other interpretations, none particularly convincing: see Seaford ad loc., and Ussher 1978, 133.
possible that he has actually arrived at, and is now part
of, a revel (taking the aorist aspect as clearly preceding
the ἀνάρ in line 502). Or he could have arrived at a place
where there was such a revel or where he will want to parti-
cipate in such a revel. Finally, similar options could be
offered except with κόμος being a komos-procession. Other
problems are the identity of the φλάον ἄναρ (498), how
the couch (499) fits in, what should be read for εὐανθίν
(499) and μυστήριτος λυσαρόν (501), and finally the actual
sense of θύραν τῆς οξεί μοι. However it is possible to pro-
duce a coherent reading, even if it remains speculative at
best. A laboured translation could be:

He is fortunate who shouts the Dionysiac cry of εὐοί, having been wholly given up to the komos-procession, supporting himself by embracing a dear friend, and having waiting for him on a bed a right flower of a

---

67 See Seaford 1984, 197-9; Ussher 1978, 133; and Rossi 1971, 18-19. They all suggest the possibility that the ἄναρ is a potential lover. Ussher: "'clasping in his arms ... as an ὑπαγκάλλωμα ('sleeping-partner', S. Tr. 540)." Rossi seems to think that part of the reason the man is μάκαρ (495) is that he has a choice of lovers and so twice the chance of being sexually gratified—which reminds one of Woody Allen’s comment about being envious of bi-sexuals because they have double the odds of getting a date for Saturday night. As has been seen, companions of various kinds are common in komoi but less so in paraklausithuric situations—see, among others: Pl. Smp. 212c; Men. Mis. A15 ff.; Theoc. 2.118; Pl. Cur. 2 ff.; Anon. 12.116.1 (G.-P. XXXIV); Val. Aed. 2.1; Hor. Carm. 3.7.30, 3.26.6 ff.; and Leon. AP 5.206 (G.-P. XLIII).
voluptuous hetaira, his anointed hair shining, he calls out: "Who will open the door for me?"\textsuperscript{68}

This then gives a clear reference to an amatory komos-procession of a drunken man, probably after a symposium in analogy with Polyphemus' present situation. Since he is drunk, he leans on a friend for support. Like any good komast, the lover's hair is anointed.\textsuperscript{69} He has an arrangement with a hetaira in the bloom of her beauty—she is waiting on her bed for him to return from his symposium. While it is, of course, more the norm for the beloved to fail to keep a date or appointment, there are occasional references to the beloved dutifully waiting for the lover to

\textsuperscript{68}I have used \textit{LSJ}'s suggestion for ἐκπετάσθείς, but interpreted κυμος as a procession rather than static revel; taken the ἄναρ as a friend, mainly because of the usual sense of the word as an adult male, which would not easily fit with it being a possible lover (see Seaford \textit{ad loc.} and Rossi 1971, 18-19); reasoned that if the ἄναρ is a friend, then the embrace is likely for support of the drunken man—this also helps support the processional sense of κυμος; accepted Dindorf's and Meineke's ἔρμυσισι γ' ἄνθος for 499 and Musgrave's μυρόχριστον λιπαράς (see Seaford 1984, 199) in 501; and taken ἔχων not as actually "holding" but rather something like "having as a lover" (\textit{LSJ} s.v., A.I.4). Kovacs 1994, 114 also prefers these last two readings.

\textsuperscript{69}See Nisbet-Hubbard 1978, 112 on Hor. \textit{Carm.} 1.4.9, where they offer λιπαρύν as the equivalent of \textit{nitidum}: "The word suggests ungents for the hair, which, together with garlands, were regular concomitants of a festivity." They offer for comparison \textit{Carm.} 2.7.7 f. "coronatus nitentis / malobathro Syrio capillos", \textit{Ep.} 1.14.32; Tib. 1.7.51 "illius et nitico stillent unguenta capillo"; Ov. \textit{Ep.} 21.166 "spis-saque de nitidis tergit amoma comis"; and Strato \textit{AP} 11.19.3 f. To which add Ov. \textit{Ars} 1.73 (paraclausithyrlic) and Antip. Sid. \textit{AP} 7.27 (G.-P. XV; on Anacreon). See also Appendix 2.
Since he has a woman waiting inside for him, all he has to do is call out for admission. This is no small part of why the man is μάχαρ (495). The picture is clearly meant to be a happy one, and so of course there must be easy admission. Nonetheless, as the question is imagined as coming from a drunken komast at his beloved's door, it can fairly be called paraklausithuric, even if the satyrs' song is not an actual paraklausithuron.

---

70 For the latter, see Men. Pk. 305, Prop. 1.3 and 2.29.11, Ov. Ep. 19. For appointments broken by the beloved, see Asclep. AP 5.150 (G.-P. X); Mel. AP 5.152 (G.-P. XXXIV); Tib. 1.8.63-4 and 2.6.49-50 (and Murgatroyd ad loc.); Prop. 2.17.1 ff.; Ov. Rem. 517 ff.; Aristaenet. 1.28.20 ff.; and Paul. Sil. AP 5.279.

71 Seaford 1984, 199 thinks it is more complicated.

72 Seaford 1984, 196 f. notes the religious/hymnic associations of this μάχαρ-αμός—see his references. Rossi 1971, 21 suggests there is religious parody here, but Seaford rightly observes that "intermediate between man and god, and separated from their god only by accident, the satyrs can on the whole take a far more crudely hedonistic view of bliss than the mystic initiate. For the earthly pleasures of the κυμος are essentially religious...." He also notes that ειλαξευν (495) is also religious, citing S. Ichn. 227, Ant. 1135, and E. Ba. 67, 1034.

73 Seaford 1984, 199 comes to the tentative conclusion that what the satyrs are really saying, in a subtle attempt to discourage Polyphemus from going on a komos, is "The question 'who will open the door for me?' is most pleasantly asked by someone who has a girl [and a man?] on the couch with him, not by somebody actually standing in the street outside the door." This would mean that the picture just described would have to refer to a static revel. However, the satyrs are not the most intelligent creatures, and it seems possible to take their song at face value. Copley 1956, 6 says that "the song of the Satyrs, however, is a paraklausithyron", that "499-502 are not meant to be taken literally, but are intended as a picture of love's delights." He avoids the interpretative difficulties that the passage offers by saying that if the singer "pictures
After the satyrs have sung their song, Polyphemus enters singing his, declaring that he is full of wine, and that his "load" of wine leads him out for a revel to his brother cyclopes, much as Odysseus reported him wanting to do at lines 445-56. He asks for the ἀσκόν (510), probably planning to take it with him, again as at 451 ff. 74 Then the satyrs sing again. Although the text of lines 511-15 is again problematic, the general sense seems moderately clear. 75 The satyrs announce or comment on Polyphemus' arrival from his cave and describe him in terms suitable to a contemporary komast: he comes out, fair to see, eyes flashing (the plural ὀμφασὶν [511] applied to a cyclops adds himself as actually having what he only hopes to have, he may be excused either on the grounds that he is drunk, or that he is allowing himself a degree of inconsistency ('poetic license') natural enough in a rude street ballad. If Euripides was indeed attempting here to reproduce such a ballad ... this very inconsistency, evidence of crude and careless composition, would serve to heighten the desired impression."

74 Quite understandably, komasts seem to have carried wine regularly with them on their reels. See Tib. 1.2 and Murgatroyd 1980, 70 ad loc., who cites the Scholia on Ar. Pl. 179 (τὰ πρόθυρα αὐτῆς ὄμως ἐρραμεν) and the opening scene of Pl. Cur.. To these add also Curt. 9.10.26 and Alciphr. 4.14.7. Komasts on vases often carry cups or such: "The symposion drinking party receives its classic expression in Archaic red figure. The setting may be outdoor, moving from house to house with cups, pipes and girls" (Boardman 1975, 218). Cf. also Keuls 1985, 174.

75 See again Ussher 1978, 135 f. and Seaford 1984, 201 f., with his apparatus criticus ad loc. Rossi 1971, 21 and Seaford 1984, 201 suggest that there is developed wedding imagery here.
to the humour), and proclaims, under the influence of the
wine (taking Diggle's suggested καλαδίν or understanding
some similar verb in the lacuna), that someone loves him.
This is surely to be understood as again referring to the
type of thing a komast setting out on a revel would say--
someone loves him and is waiting for him, or at least might
very well receive him. Lamps are mentioned, and the satyrs
are probably telling the cyclops that, since it is daytime,
he does not need any form of lighting for his komos.76
Finally a soft nymph is mentioned as being within a cave--
surely the waiting beloved in a suitably pastoral setting--
and a joke is made turning on the komast's garlands.77

That the satyrs' song did nothing to deter Polyphemus from his revel is clear in the following lines, where
Odysseus tries to persuade him to stay home. The cyclops at
531 once again suggests that he go share the wine with his
kin, but Odysseus once more suggests that he should keep the
drink to himself. This does not work and so at line 534
Odysseus argues that πυγμαξ ὁ κώμος λοιδορόν τ᾽ ἔριν

76For lamps, torches, and the like in paraklausithura-
ra, see Appendix 2. They were, of course, essentially a
necessity for any night-time travel and are often mentioned
in komastic contexts. Plu. Mor. 237 A says that the Spartans
after drinking in moderation at public meals went away
without torches and that they were not permitted to walk
with a light on any route but had to go bravely about in the
darkness.

77For garlands, see Appendix 2, esp. s.v. στεφ-,
corolla, and corona.
Polyphemus, confident in his strength and emboldened by the wine, replies (535) μεθώς μέν, ἕμπας δ' οὕτις ἀν ψάχσεις μου, and then declares in good Greek fashion that (537) ἡλίθιος δείς μὴ πιὼν κώμον φιλεῖ.⁷⁹

The Cyclops has been worth examining in such detail for several reasons. It makes Euripides the earliest author we know of to have composed an extended komastic dramatic scene, although it must be kept in mind that most of Aristophanes’ plays were written before the Cyclops. Nonetheless, satyr-plays, with their choruses of drunken satyrs, seem to be well-suited to komoi, and it is easily conceivable that elaborate komastic scenes existed in earlier satyr-plays. Whereas Aristophanes’ earliest play, the Banqueters, was

⁷⁸ See notes 20 and 43 above for the general violence of komasts and the fight before the door of the beloved. Ath. 2.36 b cites this line. For πυγμάς compare Pratin. fr. 708.8. For ἐρίς linked with komoi, see Chrys. catech. ad ill. 1.32.13-16 πάντα τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκὸς ἄτινα ἐστὶ φησίν μοιχεία, πορνεία, ἀκαθαρσία, ἀσέλγεια, εἰσωλατησία, φαρμακεία, ἐχθραί, ἐρίς, φθόνοι, μέθαι, κώμοι. This is clearly modelled on Ep. Gal. 5:19-21 but ἐρίς is Chrysostom’s addition. Pl. R. 500 b and Lib. Prog. 10.5 connect λοιόρροια with komoi.

⁷⁹ The bravery of the lover in the face of the dangers of the night is a common paraklausithuric topos: Asclep. AP 5.64 (G.-P. XI); Anon. AP 12.115 (G.-P. VI); Tib. 1.2.15 ff.; Ov. Am. 1.6.7 ff., 57 ff., 1.9.1 ff., Met. 4.96, 13.770 ff., and cf. Ep. 18.93 ff., 157 ff., 19.71 ff.; and [Quint.] Decl. Mai. 15.7. Also compare Tib. 1.1.75 ff., 2.6.11 ff.; Prop. 1.9.17 ff., 3.16.5 ff.; and Ov. Ars 2.233 ff. It was a commonplace that wine makes a person brave. For some non-paraklausithuric examples see B. fr. 20 B; Pl. Lg. 1, 645 D-E; Arist. Pr. 27.4; Hor. Ep. 1.5 12 ff.; Carm. 3.21.18 f.; Ov. Ars 1.229 ff.; Plut. Mor. 715 E-716 A; Anacreont. 56; and Ach. Tat. 2.10. See also Murgatroyd 1980, 78 and McKeown 1987-, 2:127, 130, and 153.
probably produced in 427, satyric drama seems to have originated in the late sixth century. Pratinas is said to have been the originator of satyric drama (Suid., s.v. Πρατίνας), and while "the statement is not above suspicion" (Seaford 1984, 13) the evidence does seem to suggest "that satyric drama evolved at this time" (ibid.). Furthermore, the fact that the komos and the paraokladithuron are associated here further confirms the close connection between the two. This connection has already been seen in earlier authors and is even more visible in Aristophanes.

There are, however, three passages of note that should be mentioned before moving on to Aristophanes. Lysias 3 ("Against Sinon") deals with an amatory rivalry over a boy. One of the rivals, Sinon, believing the boy is with the other, breaks into his house (6 ff.):

πυθόμενος γὰρ ὅτι τὸ μειράκιον ἦν παρ' ἐμοί, ἐλθὼν ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν τὴν ἐμὴν μῦκτον μεθύων, ἐκκόψας τὰς θύρας ἐλαύνθης εἰς τὴν γυναικεῖαν, ἐνδόθην σὺν τῇ ἀδελφὴς τῆς ἐμῆς καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν, αὐτὸς κρητικὸς βεβίωκα- σιν ὡστε καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν οἰκείων ὁρώμεναι αλαχώνοντες. Ιλισταρίτη πρῶτον ἢ τὸ ἢ τὸν ἢ πρῶτον ἢ πρῶτον ἡθέλθην ἀπελθεῖν, πρὶν αὐτὸν ἡγούμενοι δειμα πολεῖν οἱ παραγενόμενοι καὶ οὐ λέγουσιν ἐπὶ παῖδας κόρας καὶ οἱ ἐβολαὶς εἰς ἐαντία, ἐξήλασαν βίας καὶ τοσοῦτον ἐσέπθεσαν αὐτῷ μεταμελήσας τῶν ῥωμαίων, ὡστε ἐξενεμῶν ὁδὸ ἐξεπονούμενοι. 8 ἐκκαλέσας γὰρ ἐνδόθην, ἐπειδὴ τάχιστα ἐξῆλθον, εὐθὺς με τύποις ἐπεκείρησαν· ἐπειδὴ δὲ αὐτὸν ἠμισάμην, ἐκχεῖσθαι ἐβαλλέ μὲ λίθιος.

Compare also references to the same event at 23, 27, 29, and 46. Also notable in this context is Lysias 4.5 ff. ("On a
wound"), another instance of forced entry motivated by drink and lust:

οὐκ οὖν ἦλθον αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ ἀποκτενών ... καὶ βία εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν εἰσῆλθον. διὰ τὸ οὖν οὖκ ἀπέκτεινα, ὑποχείριον λαθὼν τὸ σῶμα ... [6] ἀλλ’ ἀστράκῳ φησί πληγῆσαι. καὶ τοι ἀνοχρὸν ἦπε ἐὰν ἐξηρηκεν, ὅτι οὐ πρόνοια γεγένηται. ἦ σοὶ γὰρ ἄν σὺτς ἠλθομεν ... ἀλλ’ οἶκοθεν ἔχοντες ἀν ἐβαδάζομεν. νῦν δὲ ὄμολογούμεθα πρὸς πάλαις καὶ συλληπτόντος καὶ μετ’ οἴνου ἔλθοντες. ὅτε πῶς ταῦτ’ ἐστὶ πρόνοια; ἢ ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ οἶμαι σύμφωνας. ἀλλ’ οὕτως ἑναστὼς τοῖς ἀλλοις ὑπερεοῦσας ἐστι, καὶ ἀμφότερα βαύλεται, τὸ τε ἀργύριον μὴ ἀποδοθέναι καὶ τὴν ἀνθρώπον ἔχειν. εἶτα ὅπως τῆς ἀνθρώπου παρεμεμένος ἀξίων ἔχειν λείαν καὶ πάροιχος ἔστιν, ἀνάγκη δὲ ἀμύνασθαι. ἢ δὲ τοτε μὲν ἐμὲ περὶ παλασθε ὅτε τούτων φησι ποιεῖλθαι, βουλομένη ὑπ’ ἄμφοτέρων ἔρθεθαι. καὶ ἐγὼ μὲν καὶ ἐξ ἀρχής ἐκόλουθον οἰκχών καὶ μὰν ἐτί ἔχω; ὅ δ’ εἰς τούτο βαρυδαίμων ἢκει ... ἐνεκα πάρυξις ἀνθρώπου, ἢν ἔξεστιν αὐτῷ ἀναμφισβητή- τως ἐχειν ἐμοὶ ἀπαδώτες τάργυριον.

Finally, Lysias fr. XVII.2 (Gernet-Bizos = D.H. Dem. 11) is worth mentioning:

τῶν μὲν γεγενημένων οὖθεν εἶπεν, ἔλεγε δ’ ὠς αὐτὸς μὲν δειπνῶν τοῖς, οὕτως δὲ μεθύων ἔλθοι, ἐκκόψας δὲ τὴν θύραν καὶ ἑαυτῆς κακὺς λέγοι αὐτὸν καὶ τὸν Ἀντιμαχον καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας αὐτῶν.

These passages are instructive for the rather surprising frequency with which it appears that an Athenian citizen, under the right circumstances, was willing to force entry into another’s house. That two of the occasions were motivated by love or lust gives more weight to the references, which will be seen later, to such violent assaults on brothels or houses of hetairai.80

80 For most of the references from before Latin elegy, and some select later ones, see: Ar. Lys. 249 ff., 310 ff., 428, V. 1254 f.; Is. Pyrrh. 13 f.; Antiph. fr. 193.6, 236.3 (K.-A.); Aristoph. fr. 5.5 (K.-A.); Men. Dyso. 60; Theoc. 2.128; Herod. 2.25 ff., 63; Pl. Am. 1048, Bac. 1119, Mil. 1250, Per. 569, Truc. 638 f.; Ter. Ad. 84 ff.,
Aristophanes

Aristophanes produced the first prolonged dramatic paraklausithuric scene we have and seems to have handled the situation several times throughout his career. In particular, lines 960 ff. of the Ecclesiazusae have been widely recognized as paraklausithuric.\(^{81}\) Although the Ecclesiazusae is among his later plays,\(^{82}\) there seems to be no particular benefit to be gained from a strict chronological survey of Aristophanes' plays, and the prominence of the Ecclesiazusae's paraklausithuric scene makes it a logical place to start.

The main paraklausithuric passage does not begin until line 947, but it is important first to put the scene

---

\(^{81}\) See de la Ville de Mirmont 1909, 576, who calls it the oldest paraklausithyron he knows of; Headlam-Knox 1922, 83; Garte 1924, 8; Haight 1950, 64: "perhaps the loveliest serenade in all ancient poetry. It is clearly a παρακλασιθυρον, a song outside a closed door"; Copley 1956, 7-8: "The earliest extant example of the dramatic paraklausithyron"; Bowra 1958, 377, in an article devoted to the passage: "In its contents and its setting the song has some resemblance to the παρακλασιθυρα,..."; Burck 1966, 246; and Henderson 1973, 52: "... the earliest surviving example of reasonable length of the motif in Greek literature." In addition, Leo 1900, 607; Nisbet-Hubbard 1970, 289; Murgatroyd 1980, 70; McKeown 1987-, 2:121; and Yardley 1978, 20, all consider it paraklausithuric. Canter 1919, 358 has his doubts, and Pasquali 1964, 420 is even more sure that it is not a paraklausithuron. Also see Ussher 1973. The text for all Aristophanes quoted is Hall-Geldart 1906-07.

\(^{82}\) Ussher 1973, xxv dates it to 393.
in its context. Praxagora at 673 describes the women’s intended changes to Athenian dining habits. Public meals for the men will be laid out in the courts and porticos and where people dine will be determined by lot. After the dinners and symposia (678 ff.), the men will leave and, like typical komasts, drunk, garlanded, and carrying torches, they will wander through the streets. As they go on their way, the free women of the new state will waylay the men (προσπίπτουσι, 694) and solicit them (δεύτερο παρ’ ἡμᾶς, 695), both in the street and from the upper windows of the women’s quarters (ἐξ ὑπερψιν, 698). This is our first reference in a komastic scene to upper story windows, which will be mentioned in many later paraklausithuric situations.

---

83 For μεθύω and its cognates in connection with komoi, see above, notes 44 and 60.

84 Ussher 1973, 175: “The women here (cf. 877) are free-born women standing on their rights: they are neither prostitutes (718) nor the bawds that (out of mischief) they pretend.”

85 Perhaps προσπίπτω also has supplicatory overtones here—although it is usually connected in such circumstances with an explicit mention of the knees of the supplicantus, it need not always be so: S. O.C. 1754 AN. ὁ τέκνῳ Αὐγής, προσπίπτομέν σοι. Cf. also O.C. 1157, El. 1380, Tr. 904; Ar. Eq. 30 f.; Plu. Mor. 257 D, and Agis and Cleom. 20.2.

86 For more on δεύτερο, see below on 947 ff.

87 Windows are either explicit or implied at Ar. Ec. 698, 949 ff.; Praxilla 754; Asclep. AP 5.153 (G.-P. III); Ter. Eun. 782 ff. (Thais must be at window or on roof); Lucil. 943; Dec. Lab. 141 ff., Hor. Carm. 1.25.1 f., 3.7.30 (possibly); Prop. 2.19.5, 3.20.29; Apul. Apol. 75; Lucian Bis Acc. 31; Babrius 116; and Aristaenetus. 2.14 (possibly). See also Appendix 2.
The women, older or less attractive, will praise the young beauties they have with them in order to attract a man who will have to service the former first:

ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἔσται τοῦτο παρ’ ἡμῖν· πάσι γὰρ ἄφθονα πάντα παρέξομεν, ἦσε μεθυσθεὶς αὐτῷ στεφάνῳ πᾶς τις ἁπείρων τὴν ὀδόν λαβὼν. αἰ δὲ γυναῖκες κατὰ τάς διόδους προσπίπτουσαι τοῖς ἀπὸ δεῖπνου τάσε λέξουσιν: "δεύρο παρ’ ἡμᾶς· ἐνθάδε μετράξτε ἐσθ’ ὑράκαν." "παρ’ ἔμοι δ’, ἐτέρα" φήσει τις ἰώθ’ ἐξ ὑπερψίας, "καὶ καλλίστῃ καὶ λευκοτάτῃ· πρότερον μέντοι δὲ καὶ καθεύδετεν αὐτῆς παρ’ ἔμοι." 690 695 700

This passage itself seems to parody the paraklausithuric situation. The scene imagined is a topsy-turvy version of reality. The komasts will not arrive and seek admission at the doors of various hetairai, but rather will be solicited by citizen women. If there is an inversion of the roles of the komasts and the women, then what the women are imagined as saying should be applicable to the men in reality. The older and less attractive women's praise of the virtues of the young women and their attempts to persuade the men to go inside with them can be seen as reflecting the komasts' praise of their beloveds and attempts to persuade the hetairai to receive them. Furthermore, the passage describes the general type of situation from which the specific paraklausithuric scene of lines 960 ff. will arise, and if these
lines are to be interpreted as a paraklausithuric parody, the correspondence will be all the greater.\textsuperscript{88}

A more obvious paraklausithuric reference follows almost immediately. A parallel is provided to the previous lines as Praxagora imagines the youths (μειρακλοις, 702) being intercepted by less attractive older men (φαυλότεροι, 702), who will take precedence over them when it comes to the young beauties. The youths will have to slake their lusts by masturbating in vestibules while the women are inside with the rivals:

\begin{quote}
τοῖς εὐπρεπέσιν δ' ἄκολουθοντες καὶ μειρακλοῖς οἱ φαυλότεροι
tοιάθ᾽ ἐροῦσιν: "πολ' θείς οὗτος;
πάντως οὐδὲν δράσεις ἔλθων:
τοῖς γὰρ σιμοῖς καὶ τοῖς αἰαχροῖς
ἐφήσισαι προτέροις βιωμέν,
ύμᾶς δὲ τέως θρία λαβόντας
διφόρου συκῆς
ἐν τοῖς προθύροις σέφεσθαι."
\end{quote}

Again, the paraklausithuric allusion seems clear. It is common in paraklausithuric situations that a lover will be excluded because his beloved already has someone with her.\textsuperscript{89}

\textsuperscript{88}No one writing specifically on the paraklausithuron seems to have noticed this passage.

\textsuperscript{89}Rivals in general play an important role in paraklausithura: Ar. Ec. 705 (rival inside), 1049 ff. (rival for lover), Eq. 725 ff. (competing rivals), 735 ff. (denigrate rivals), Plut. 1038 ff. (rich rival, Wealth); Schoi. on Plut. 179 (crowd of rivals outside); Theoc. 7.125 ff.; Ant. Lib. 39/Hermes. 2.3 (a crowd of rivals); Pl. Am. 1016, 1045 (rival inside), Truc. 711 ff. (rival within), Truc. 718 ff. (rich rival); Frag. Grenf. 46; Ter. Eun. 794 ff.; Mel. AP 5.180 ff. (G.-P. XXVI, rival inside), 5.185.3 ff. (G.-P. LI, wish harm to rival); Cic. Consil. fr. 10.3.1; Hor. Ep. 11.11 f. (rich rival), Carm. 3.7.9 ff., 3.10.15, Serm. 1.2.64 ff. (rival inside). Rivals play a role in Tib. 1.2
But while the usual cause of such an occurrence is the wealth of the rival, which triumphs over the lover’s youth and good looks, here the rivals owe their success to their age (older) and appearance (less handsome). The προθύρον in particular is very common in Greek paraklausithura (see Appendix 2), and even masturbation occurs in one other place, at Hor. Epod. 11.20 ff. (see the references ad loc. in Chapter 3).

The plan is put into effect, and at line 834 a herald calls the men to the public banquets. At line 877 the scene changes and an old woman and a girl are waiting for the men to return from dinner and drinking. The old woman is impatient—she has taken her stand at her door (ἐστηκα, 879, much like a prostitute), but is not quite free enough from social convention to appear fully outside (παρακύψασα, 884).\(^9\) She has done her best to make herself attractive by (the coniunx), 1.5.47 ff. (rich rival—see Murgatroyd 1980, 159 f.), and 2.6 (45 f., 51 f.—see Murgatroyd 1994, 236). Of course rivals occur wherever adultery is present, and most places where fortius amor occurs.

\(^9\) See Ussher 1973, 196: "... other passages—as well as the whole tenor of 877-83—suggest that she is speaking from the door. So, in particular, Pax 981 καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖναι παρακλίνασαι / τῇς αὐλείαις παρακύπτουσιν, cf. Theoc. 3.6. To appear there was immodest (992), thus Pax 979 ff., Lycurg. 40.... See also Th. 792, men’s anger at finding wives θύρασιν...." Compare Thphr. 28.3 "Slander", καὶ "αὐταὶ τὴν θύραν τὴν αὐλείαν ὑπακούουσιν." For parakύπτω in a paraklausithuric context, see Lucian Bis Acc. 31 καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ἐὑρίκαθ’ ἐκάστην ὅ τι τὴν νύκτα ὁ μὲν στενωπὸς ἢμῶν ἐνεπιμπλατε μεθυόντων ἔραστιν κωμαζότων ἐπ᾽ αὐτὴν καὶ κοπτόντων τὴν θύραν, ἐνών ὡς καὶ εἰσβιάζεθαι σὺν οὐδενί κάσῳ τολμώντων. αὐτὴ δὲ ἔγέλα καὶ ἔστε τοῖς ἀρμενοῖς καὶ τὰ πολλὰ ἢ παρέκπυτεν ἀπὸ τοῦ τέγους φάντων ἀκουόσα τραχέα τὴ φωνή.
putting on white make-up and a saffron dress (879-80, cf. κοσμουμένας, 721). She is singing to herself, and trying to act sexy in order to capture a passer-by (880-2). She even summons a Muse to bring song to her lips (882-3). The girl, also peering out from a building (ζ δ' ὅποσα βούλει καὶ παράκυψα ἱςπερ γαλη, 924), but from an upper floor window (961, as at 698), is not going to tolerate her rival. She will sing in rivalry with the old woman: ... καὶ προσάξεσθαι τιτα / ζουσι'. ἐγὼ δ' ἴν τοῦτο ὅρας ἀντάσσομαι (886-7). They then sing (to the aulos: σῦ δὲ / φιλοτάριον σύλητα τοὺς αὐλούχας λαβῶν, 890-1) competing songs, praising their own age groups and insulting each other.

ψάς τινας ἑρωτικάς ἣ καὶ παρανοίουσα τὰς θυρίδας ἐμὲ ὀλομένη λανθάνειν ἰςέλγανε καὶ ἑμοιχεύειν πρὸς αὐτῶν. See also P.Teb. 1.2d.9 [... π]αράκυψαν ἵκετω Κλευπατ[ρα. It seems to imply bending over: Lucian DMeretr. 12.

91 Compare also Nu. 51 f. (ἡ δ' σὰ μύρου κράκου καταγλωττισμάτω, / δαπάνης, λαφυμοῦ, Κυλιᾶδος, Γενετυλ- λόδος) and see Sommerstein 1982, ad loc.: "the reference being to the saffron-dyed dress ... which Athenian women wore on festive occasions or when they wished to make themselves particularly attractive (cf. Lys. 44 ff., 2199, 645; Th. 253; Ec. 879)...."

92 Παϊζω can mean sport amorously--cf. X. Smp. 9.2 (with πρὸς ἀλλήλους), and see LSJ s.v., I.5. Here it probably also has overtones of hunting: see Ussher 1973, 196.

93 Ussher 1973, 196 calls it a "parodied prologue to a ὑμνος κλητικος."
The girl's song at lines 911 ff. is may be quoted in full because it helps prepare for the paraklausithuric scene that follows:

σαλή τι ποτε πείσσομαι;
ούχ ἢ κεῖ μοῦταῖρος·
μόνη δ' αὐτοῦ λείπομ' ἢ
γάρ μοι μήτηρ ἀλλά.
βέβηκε· τι καὶ τάλλ' οὐδὲν μετὰ ταῦτα δει λέγειν· ἀλλ' ἡ μαί' ἱκετεύομαι, κά-
λει τόν 'Ὀρθαγόραν, δι' ὅπως
σαυτής κατάναι', ἀντιβολὼ σε.

It is a strange scene: the girl laments that her mother has gone out and her lover is not around. She then addresses the old woman as if she were her nurse, and entreats her in supplicatory language to fetch her lover. The nurse as go-

94 Dover 1974, 209 observes that such a situation might not be that unusual among the lower classes, where the women would have to leave their houses on errands etc., "but the varying practicability of continuous and effective segregation and supervision implies a difference between social classes and between town and country.... In poorer families there was more opportunity for boys and girls to carry on love-affairs; the song sung by the girl in Ar. Ec., while she awaits a lover, says provocatively (912), 'I'm left all alone here; my mother's away.'" See also Bowra 1958, 376 f.

95 It seems likely that the old woman is the object of the address: see Ussher 1973, 202. However, it is possible that the girl is singing the type of song that a girl in her position might sing, and so the old woman is not addressed.

The combination of ἱκετεύω and ἀντιβολέω seems very strong: D. Ἀρχέλαος 1.68 δέσμαι σθν ύμην, ἡ ἀνδρες δικασταί, καὶ ἤκετεν καὶ ἀντιβολῇ; Νεάρης 81 ἱκετεύω καὶ ἀντιβολῶν; Lys. 1.25 κάκειν στήσεις καὶ μεν ψυλλογές, ῥυθμοὺς δὲ καὶ ἱκέτειν μη σπάστω ταῦτα μεριάζομαι; 4.20 πρός σιν παλάμης καὶ γυναῖκας καὶ θείας τοῦ τόδε το σχοινεῖ ἐχθρόν ἰκετεύων ύμης καὶ ἀντιβολῇ, ἐλεήσατε με, καὶ μη περιλέιπτε ἐπὶ τούτων γενόμενον. Cf. also Ar. V. 556 and 560. Their cognate nouns occur together in a paraklausithurry context at Pl. Smr. 183 a ἱκετεύοντας τα καὶ ἀντιβολῆς ἐν τοῖς δεταῖς πολύμνοι, καὶ δρκώντας ὀμφόντις, καὶ κοιμήσεις ἐπὶ θύραις,
between is, of course, a common literary figure. She is, anyway, expecting her lover. The old woman is not impressed:

940 ἡδὲ τὸν ἀπ᾿ Ἰσωλίας / τρόπον τάλαντα κυνηγίας (918–9). After some more badinage between the two females, the girl’s lover finally appears (938), and the reciprocal serenade with its paraklausithuron begins:

940 NEANIAS. εἰδ’ ἔξην παρὰ τῇ νέᾳ καθεύδειν,
καὶ μὴ ἄσει πρότερον διασπορᾶς
ἀνάσιμου ἢ πρεβυτέρους;
οὐ γὰρ ἀνασχέτων τοῦτο γ’ ἐλευθέρω.

947 εἰδ’ ὁ θεοί λάβομι τὴν καλὴν μόνην,
ἐφ’ ἂν πεπωκός ἔρκομαι πάλαι ποθῶν.
NEANIAS. ἐξηπάτησα τὸ κατάρατον γράφαιον,
φρούδῃ γὰρ ἐστιν ολομένη μ’ ἐνδον μένειν.

950 ἄλλα οὔτοι γὰρ τῶν ὀφθαλμίοις μεμνημέθα.
ἀεύρο ὅ’ ὁ δεύρο ὅ’,
φίλον ἐμὸν, δεύρῳ μοι
πρόσελθέ καὶ ἑνευνως
τὴν εὐφρόνην ὅπως ἔσει.

955 πάνυ γὰρ τῆς ἐρως μὲ δονεὶ
tῶν ὀμάς βοστρύχων.
ἀτοπὸς ὅ’ ἐγκινῆται μοι τῖς
πόθοις, δεὶ μὲ διακυνίας ἔχει.

960 μέθες, ἱκνούμαι σ’, ἔρως,
καὶ πολίσων τὸν’ ἐς εὐνήν
τὴν ἐμὴν λεύσας.
NEANIAS. δεύρο ὅ’ ὁ δεύρο ὅ’,

καὶ ἔθελοντες δουλείας δουλεύειν οἷς οὐδ’ ἐν δοῦλον οὐδεῖς.
Ar. Th. 1158 f. uses ἱκετεύω of prayer, but it can sometimes be weaker (Nu. 696).

960 Perhaps the most famous example is Phaedra’s nurse in E. Hipp. and Sen. Phaed. See also Ov. Rem. 637–8 “et soror et mater ualeant et conscia nutrix, / et quisquis dominae pars erit uilla tuae”; Met. 14.702–3 “supplex ad limina uenit / et modo nutrici miserum confessus amorem”; and Fast. 3.675 ff. (Anna, newly-made nurse god,—684 "comanus"—acts, supposedly, as go-between for Mars and Minerva). Compare Met. 10.402 ff. on Myrrha, and Plutarch Mor. 310 F—311 A on Smyrna. Also compare the bribed nurse in Ant. Lib. 39.3 / Hermes. Leont. 2.
The youth first hopes that he will be able to sleep with his beloved without having to do the same with an old hag first. Then he wishes that he will find his girl alone (947). He is drunk (948) and so we may presume that he is one of the komasts envisaged at 678 ff. He is speaking as

---

97 The text is from Hall-Geldart 1906-7, but the attribution of speakers at 969 ff. follows Ussher 1973, 210-11. While the attribution of 969-72 to the girl keeps the form of the duet, the àνοιξαν that would then be said by the girl is a serious obstacle to this, pace Bowra 1958, 381. Its illogicality outweighs the tidiness of keeping the formal duet. See Ussher 1973, 210-11, ad loc.

98 Cf. Mel. AP 5.165.3 f., 5.191.5 (G.-P. LI and LXXII); and Posidipp. 5.213 (G.-P. IV).

99 Ussher 1973, 207 thinks--too subtly--that the lover has drunk because he thinks wine is an aphrodisiac. It seems more probable that he is drunk simply because that is the natural result of being at a symposium.
he approaches (ἐρχόμας, 948, like the speaker of Alcaeus 373). Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the whole passage is that the beloved is an active participant in it. The girl speaks from above—she is probably at a window in the women’s quarters. She declares that she has tricked the old woman who thinks she is safe inside and so has left. She notices her lover and calls out to him much as the woman was imagined doing at 695 (δεῦρο), but with the threefold repetition giving her song extra urgency. She flatters him, proclaims how strongly she loves him, and describes her pas-

100 Bowra 1958, 376 disagrees: "The Young Woman is either on the roof of a house or, less probably, looking through the window of an upstairs room."

101 The tone of the repeated δεῦρο is hard to determine. At Eq. 147 f. it occurs in a mock-religious context: ἦς μακάρις / ἀλαντοπώλα, δεῦρο δεῦρ', ἡ φίλτατε, / ἀνάβαινε, σωτὴρ τῷ πόλει καὶ μὴν φαινεῖς. At Lys. 1262 ff. it is found in a prayer to Artemis: ἀγρότερ' σποκοτόνε / μόλε δεῦρο, παρατεν σιά / ποτας σποιάτας, / 1265 ὡς συνέχες πολίν ἀμη χρόνον. / ... / 1269 ἦ δεῦρ' ἡλι δεῦρ', ἦ / κυναγέ παρασένε. In Nu. 1485 it merely conveys urgency: δεῦρο δεῦρ' ὅ Σανθία. Earlier, at Ec. 730 ff., Chremes is bringing out various household objects and marshalling them in the manner of a religious procession: χώρει σὺ δεῦρο κυναχύρα καλή καλάς / τῶν χρημάτων θύρας πρώτη τῶν ἕμων, / ὧς ἄν εντετριμένη κανηφορῆς, / πολλοὺς κάτω ἡ θυλάκους στρέψ′ ἐμους. / ... / 737 ... δεῦρ' ἢ θει κυμώτερα. / φέρε δεῦρο ταύτην τὴν ύδραν, ὑδραφόρε / ... Two hymns to Apollo from magical papyri (Preussendanz 1973-4, 2.244) offer similar repetition: Hymn 9.1 ff. Φοίβη, μαντοσύνασιν ἐπιρροθώς ἔρχεο χαίρων, / Λητοῦδα ἐκάεργε, ἀπότροπε, δεῦρ' ἄγε, δεῦρο. / δεῦρ' ἄγε θεσπίζων... Hymn 10.3 ff. Ἔλθε, μάκαρ Παιάν,... / /δεῦρ' ἐλθὼν μου,... / οὕτως ἅναξ μολὼς μόλε μοι... / /Φοίβη... Φοίβη "Ἀπόλλων, / 5 Λητοῦδα ἐκάεργε, θεόπροπε, δεῦρ' ἄγε, δεῦρο. / δεῦρ' ἄγε,... / κλείδι μεν....
sion, which, in its strength, is something new to her.\footnote{For praise of a beloved’s hair in a paraklausa-thuric context, see Philostr. Ep. 29. Compare E. Hipp. 82-3 f., Tib. 1.5.43 f., and Ov. Am. 1.1.20. Of course praise of the beloved’s beauty is standard in most developed paraklausithura. Βόστρυχος occurs only once in other paraklausithura: Paul. Sil. AP 6.71.3.}

She addresses Eros, praying that he will send her lover to her bed, a wish that does not have to imply some form of forced separation of the lovers.\footnote{For ἱκνέσμα in paraklausithura, see Theoc. 3.13, and Anon. AP 12.116.3 (G.-P. XXXIV). The εὐνὴ is mentioned at P.Mag. 4.2740 ff. (which will be discussed below) (Preisendanz 1973-4, 1:160) as part of a spell, but it is a woman who is imagined as longing for her lover’s bed: 2740 εἰ δὲ τιν’ ἄλλον εὖχουν ἐν κόλποις κατάκειται, / κεῖνον ἀπωσάσθω, ἐμὲ δ’ ἐν φρεσίν ἐν / - καταθέσω καὶ προλιπόθως τάχιστα / ἐπ’ ἐμοὶς προθύρωσι παρέστω, δάμνο / -μένη ψυχῇ ἐπ’ ἐμὴ φιλότητι καὶ εὐνὴ. Eros is not actually addressed in any other paraklausthuric passage, but Aphrodite/Venus is: Ar. Lys. 832-3; Theoc. 7.115 ff.; Posidipp. AP 12.131 (G.-P. VIII); Frag. Grenf. 12; Mel. AP 5.191.7 (G.-P. LXXIII, in writing); Horace Carm. 3.26.9; and Tib. 1.2.97.}

All these topoi can be found in other paraklausithuric situations, and are repeated in the lover’s song to her.

He calls her down to him, again with repetition of ἰκνέσμα, asking her to run down and open the door (961). If she does not, he will throw himself down on the ground and lie there.\footnote{The goatherd at Theoc. 3.52-4 does this: Ἀλγεῖω τὰν κεφαλάν, τιν δ’ οὗ μέλει. οὐκέτ’ ἄειδω, / κείσεβοις δὲ πεσόν, καὶ τοι λύκοι δὲ μ’ ἔσονται. / ὡς μέλι τοι γλυκύ τούτο κατά βρόχθων γένοιτο. The topos of the lover lying at his beloved’s door is exceptionally common—see Chapter 4. There are often supplicatory implications in the action—Fedeli 1980, 383 sees it here. The “threat” bothers Copley 1956, 7-8 and he suggests it might be present because it is “a mere convention of the song, since the girl has already openly invited him to enter.” However, the fickleness of the
praises her beauty, and addresses Aphrodite (966), asking her to be merciful, to have pity on him, and to send her to his bed. He then declares that he has had enough of his serenade, supplicates her again, asks her to open up and embrace him, mentions his love-pangs, and heaps extravagant praise on her, finally repeating (974-5) his request that she open up and receive him into her arms. The youth must knock on the girl’s door, for the old woman emerges from her house (976) claiming that he banged (ἤρατες, 977) on her door. She takes the torch the youth is carrying to mean that he is a komast seeking a woman.

A number of other features should be noted. The participation of the girl in the scene was mentioned above.

105 He wants to hold her in his bosom. Interestingly, κόλπος occurs only twice in other paraklausithuric passages, where the lover imagines the beloved with someone else: Mel. AP 5.185.5 (G.-P. LI), and P. Mag. 4.2740 (Preisendanz 1973-4, 1:160).

106 Πόνος for the toil of love occurs in or near paraklausithuric contexts at AP 5.280.1 (Agath.); 12.117.5 (Mel.); Charito 1.2; Men. Mis. A87; Pl. Phdr. 32 (252 a); and Plu. Mor. 759 D. Since some are only near paraklausithuric passages, they are not all in Appendix 2.

107 Ἀράσσω can, but need not necessarily, imply great vigour. It is used at Lucian DMeretr. 15 of a door being broken down and at Charito 1.3.4 of a man in great panic. At Theoc. 2.4-6 it is used of a lover knocking at his beloved’s door: ὃς μοι ἁδέσκειτος ἄφι ὁ τάλας οὐδὲ παῦς, / ἀδάν πέτατον τεθυάκαμες ἢ τοιοὶ εἰμές, / οὐδὲ θύρας ἀφάζειν ἀνάρσιος. See also Gow 1965, 2:38, ad loc.
Such a "duet" exists nowhere else in identifiable paraklau-
sithuric passages. In later paraklausithura, however, the
unwilling beloved is sometimes given a voice.\textsuperscript{108} Of course,
that the girl is willing has led some to deny that the pas-
sage can be called paraklausithuric.\textsuperscript{109} An element of \textit{furti-
uus amor}, common in the paraklausithuron, is provided by the
illegal nature of the two lovers' actions, since the girl
thinks the old woman has left the scene and the youth knows
of no potential obstacle to his success except for the girl.
Finally the possibility that the two songs are based to some
extent on popular song of the time should be noted.\textsuperscript{110} In

\textsuperscript{108}It is common in the Aristophanic parodies: Ar.
Eq. 728 ff., Lys. 370 ff., V. 316 ff.. See also Lyr. Alex.
Adesp. (P) 5.1 ff.; Lucian D\textit{Meretr.} 15 \textit{et al.;} Alciphrr.
4.10.1 ff.; and Aristaenet. 2.19 and 2.20.

\textsuperscript{109}Garte 1924, 11 argues this. A willing beloved
does not, however, contradict the definition established in
Chapter 1. Bowra 1958, 378–9 comments: "Though our song
recalls the structure of the formal love-duet and the matter
and situation of \textit{παρακλαυμέθυρα}, there is no reason to
think that it is derived from either.... The song in the
\textit{Ecclesiazusae} ... comes from a much lower order of things
and breathes a different air. It is not nearly so dignified
or so stylish or so graceful."

\textsuperscript{110}Copley 1956, 7–8 suggests this. Bowra 1958, 378
says that there is no reason to think the passage is derived
from a paraklausithuron or formal love-duet. Garte 1924, 11
finds a number of topoi not actually required by the context
that therefore indicate the songs had a source in popular
paraklausithura. However, I cannot see the threats that he
implies are present (except for the pathetic \textit{κηλούμαντι} in
962), nor do the proclamations of the lover's pains and
strength of his desires necessarily imply exclusion. One
would not presume that a person who, while waiting for din-
ner to be served, announced how hungry he was, expressed his
hope that the meal would be excellent, praised its smell and
said how eager he was to eat it, was actually therefore
going to be unable to physically get to the food. The words
particular, the refrain is characteristic of folk-song, and the loose metrical correspondence between the girl's and youth's songs might also indicate some popular influence on the passage.\textsuperscript{111} It does seem, however, too speculative to deduce that Aristophanes partly modelled the songs on popular non-literary paraklausithura of the time.

Before leaving the Ecclesiazusae, the aftermath of this scene should be examined briefly. The return of the old woman at 976 introduces fleetingly what can conveniently be called an exclusor, a person blocking the lover's access to his beloved.\textsuperscript{112} But the old woman is more than just an exclusor. It is possible to view her attempts to drag the unwilling youth into her home, with much argument and per-

\begin{flushleft}
of the lovers seem clearly to indicate their excitement at immiment sex.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{111}See Bowra 1958, 378 ff. and Ussher 1973, 208 ff. For the refrain in paraklausithura, see McKeown 1987-2, 2:136.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{112}For an old woman or nurse as custos, see: Pl. Curc. 76 (Leaena is "anus ... custos ianitrix"); Ter. Ph. 103 ff.; Tib. 1.3.83-4 "At tu casta precor manea; sanctique pudoris / adsideat custos sedula semper anus." (Murgatroyd 1980, 126 says she may be Delia's mother [1.6.67] or nurse [Prop. 4.3.41], and see also Fedeli 1980, 276); Sen. Rhet. Contr. 2.7.3 "Matrona, quae tua esse adversus sollicitatoris lasciuiam uoluit, prodeat in tantum ornata quantum ne inmunda sit; habeat comites eius aetatis quae inpudicum, si nihil aliud, in uerecundiam annorum mouere possit"; V. Fl. 5.356 ff.; Diotim. AP 5.105 (G.-P. I), Paul. Sil. AP 5.262 Φεθεθε θεοθεθε, καὶ τὸ λάλημα τὸ μελίχον ὅ φθόνος εἰργεῖ, / βλέμμα τε λαθρίδως φθεγγομένων βλέφαρων / ἱσταμένης δ' ἄγχιστα τεθήπαμεν δέμα γεραιῆς, 5.289; and Agath. AP 5.294.
\end{flushright}
suasion, as another deliberate inversion of the paraklausithuric situation. At lines 992-3 the inclusa amata is brought to mind by the old woman suggesting that the youth is surprised to find her outside: νῦν δὲ θαυμάζεις διὰ / θύρασί μ᾽ ἡδρεῖς. The youth finally seems to give up and at line 1030 starts describing what seem at first to be preparations for a romantic evening or even a wedding (Ussher 1973, 219), but turn out to be funeral arrangements. The old woman, however, misses the joke and asks for the garland that he has neglected to mention (στεφάνην 1034), hinting at another paraklausithuric topos—the attempts of the lover to get the beloved to accept his garland as a present (and, by implication, accept his advances). Furthermore, instead of the topos of the lover’s garland fading or falling apart, it is the old woman (διαπέρεσε θάσι 1036) who will crumble into pieces.\(^{113}\) The girl comes to the youth’s help at 1037, and thus the beloved becomes an ally to the lover in the attempt to overcome or circumvent the exclusor. Finally Aristophanes offers a further twist on the paraklausithuric situation by having, at 1049, a second old woman arrive and then at 1065 a third—each trying to get the youth for herself. Instead of rival lovers vying and fighting between themselves for

\(^{113}\) For comparisons of the beloved’s beauty to a fading garland or flowers, see Theoc. 7.120 ff.; [Theoc.] 23.28 ff.; Hor. Carm. 1.25.17 ff.; Ov. Ars 3.68 ff.; Marc. Arg. AP 5.118 (G.-P. XI); and Nemes. Ecl. 4.20 ff. Compare also Ov. Fast. 5.351 ff.
admission to a single beloved, there are now three old women each trying to drag off to their homes a single youth, until the third finally succeeds (οἴμοι κακοδαίμων ἐγγύς ἢ θυρας / ἐλκόμενός εἰμ', 1093-4).

The play has been worth discussing in detail because it offers the first full paraklausithuron we have, even if only the youth's song can actually be called a paraklausithuron as opposed to paraklausithuric. Lines 947 ff. offer many topoi that will become standard in future paraklausithura: the lover coming drunk from a symposium, garlanded with torch in hand, his expression of hope that he will find his beloved alone, the repeated mention of the gods, especially the gods of love, the calling out of the beloved (less common—see above on Gnesippus), the explicit request for the door to be opened, the "threat" to lie at the door if not admitted, explicit proclamations of the lover's passion and desire, praise of the beloved's attractions (usually in an attempt at captatio benevolentiae but here simply typical lover's enthusiasm), the request to various gods for mercy or success, general flattery of the beloved, and, finally, knocking and banging on the door. Furthermore, there is the subdued element of furtius amor, and the late introduction of the old woman exclusor. The play also offers two other passages that can be seen as parodying the paraklausithuric situation: 659 ff., with its explicit mention
of the excluded lover at 707 ff. and the inverted paraklausithuric situation of 976 ff.

The Acharnenses contains a brief scene that could refer to the paraklausithuric situation. At 395 ff. Dicaeopolis goes to Euripides' house and calls out for a slave. The slave answers and Dicaeopolis asks him to call Euripides out (ἐκκάλεσον 402—see note 52 above), but he refuses. Undeterred, Dicaeopolis bangs on the door (κόψω τὴν θύραν) and tries to call out Euripides. He uses an affectionate diminutive and asks Euripides to listen to him (ὑπάκουσον) now, if he ever listened before. In later paraklausithura the lover regularly reminds the beloved of past occasions on which she obliged him.\textsuperscript{114} Furthermore, he identifies himself by his deme and also by his name, again fitting in with the paraklausithuric lover's regular praise or defence of his ancestry or parentage.\textsuperscript{115} He praises Euripides, calling him thrice-blessed, and requests that he come out (albeit by using the ἐκκυκλεμα), a request that Euripides at first

\textsuperscript{114}See: Ar. Eq. 734 ff., 739 f., 741, Plut. 975 ff.; Men. Mis. A37 ff.; Theoc. 11.27; Pl. As. 127 ff., 177 ff., 204 ff., Men. 392 f. (inversion), Truc. 51 ff, 633 ff., 702 ff., 764 ff.; Hor. Carm. 3.10.13; Tib. 1.2.13 ff.; Prop. 1.16.37 ff. (to door); Ov. Am. 1.6.19 ff. (to "ianitor"), 3.11(A).17 ff. (not really paraklausithuric but some similarities), Ep. 10.141 (rich with paraklausithuric topoi); and Calp. Sic. Ec7. 3.76 ff. See also Murgatroyd 1980, 77 and McKeown 1987—, 2:134. This is also a typical prayer-formula.

\textsuperscript{115}For the lover mentioning his ancestry, see Pl. Men. 407 ff., Miles 1265 (the lover mentions the ancestry of the beloved); and Hor. Carm. 3.10.11 f.
denies. Finally he consents to appear but makes it clear that he will not actually come down (καταβαλεῖν).

ΔΙ. παί παί. ΚΗΦ. τίς οὖτος; ΔΙ. ένδον ἔστ'.

Εὐριπίδης; 395

... ΔΙ. οὐ τρισμεράρι' Εὐριπίδης, 400
δ' ὁ σουλος οὕτως σαφῆς ἀπεκρίνατο.
ἐκκάλεσον αὐτὸν. ΚΗ. ἄλλ' ἄδυνατον. ΔΙ. ἄλλ' ὅμως.
οὐ γὰρ ἄν ἀπέλθομι, ἄλλα καφῶ τὴν θύραν.
Εὐριπίδης, Εὐριπίδου,
ὑπάκουσον, εἴπερ πώποτ' ἀνθρώπων τινὶ. 405
Δικαιόπολις καλεῖ σε Χολλείδης, ἐγώ.
ΕΥΡ. ἄλλ' οὖ σχολῆ.
ΔΙ. ἄλλ' ἐκκυκλήθητ'. ΕΥΡ. ἄλλ' ἄδυνατον. ΔΙ. ἄλλ' ὅμως.
ΕΥΡ. ἄλλ' ἐκκυκλήσσωμαι· καταβαλεῖν οὖν σχολῆ.

At Equites 725 ff. Paphlagon/Cleon and the Sausage-Seller, his rival for control over Demos, arrive at Demos' house and try to lure him out.

ΚΛ. ὥ Δῆμου δεῦρ' ἔξελθε. Ἀλ. μὴ Δι', ὡ πάτερ 725
ἔξελθε δήτ'. ΚΛ. ὥ Δημίου ὡ διὰ φίλατον,
ἔξελθ', ἵν' εἰλήθ' σος περιυβρίζομαι.
ΔΗΜΟΣ. τίνες σοι βοῶντες; οὖκ ἄγιτ' ἀπὸ τῆς θύρας;
τῆν εἰρέσιων μου κατεσπαράζεστε. 730
τίς τ' Παφλαγῶν ἄδικες σε; ΚΛ. διὰ σε τύπτομαι
ὑπὸ τούτου καὶ τῶν μεαυλάχων. ΔΗ. τί; ΚΛ. 735
ὅτι φιλῶ σο' ὥ Δῆμ' ἔραστης τ' εἰμι σός.
ΔΗ. σο' εἰ τίς ἔτεν; ΑΛ. ἀντεραστής τοῦτοι,
ἐρῶ μάλιστ' σον βουλόμενος τέ σο' εἴ ποιεῖν,
ἄλλοι τὲ πολλοὶ καὶ καλοὶ τὲ κάγαθολι.

ἄλλ' οὖχ οὖλ' τ' ἐσμέν διὰ τούτοι. σο' γὰρ 740
ὁμοίος εἰ τοῖς παισὶ τοῖς ἐρωμένοις,
τοὺς μὲν καλοὺς τὲ κάγαθοις οὐ προσέχειμ,
σαυτὸν δὲ λυχνοπόλαι καὶ νευρορράφοις
καὶ σκυτάτοις καὶ βυσσαπώλαισιν σίδως.
ΚΛ. εἴ γὰρ ποιῇ πόνον άδημον. ΑΛ. εἰπέ νυν τί θέλω.

The rivals then mention past favours or services they have performed for Demos, and Paphlagon/Cleon calls on Demos to hold an assembly to discover which one he will love:

καὶ μὴν ποιήσας σάτικα μάλ' ἐκκλησίαν 746
The situation is clearly paraklausithuric, with Paphlagon/Cleon and the Sausage-Seller being the rival lovers for Demos' affection. They try to call him out using various terms of affection. Paphlagon’s suggestion that Demos come out so he can see how the Sausage-Seller is treating him brings to mind similar ploys in later paraklausithura.\textsuperscript{116}

There is clearly fighting between them, and shouting. The fact that the eiresione is damaged indicates that they have been banging on the door and this also brings in a mention of a wreath/garland. The rivals remind Demos of their past services.\textsuperscript{117} The Sausage-Seller praises his ancestry and appearance, and denigrates the status of his rival. The scene ends when Demos decides to choose between the lovers.

The Vespae provides a particularly prolonged development of the paraklausithuric motif. Xanthias at line 65 points out his master Bdelycleon sleeping on the roof and explains that he must do so in order to keep his own father, who has a strange disease, from going out:

\begin{quote}
εστιν γάρ ἡμῖν δέσποτης ἐκεῖνος
ἀνὴρ καθεύδων, ὁ μέγας, οὕτπο τοῦ τέγους.
οὗτος φυλάττει τὸν πατέρ' ἐπέταξε νῦν,
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{116}Cf. Theoc. 3.12, and Ov. Am. 1.6.17 ff., Met. 13.842. Also see McKeown 1987-, 2:132 f.

\textsuperscript{117}For εὖ ποιεῖν (734 and 741) in an amatory context, see also Lucian Merc. Cond. 7 προσμελισθῶσιν οὖν καὶ ὑπισχυοῦνται καὶ άεί εὖ ποιήσουσι καὶ χαρισθοῦντα καὶ ἐπιμελησοῦντα πολυτελῆς....
At lines 87 ff. he explains why:

In other words, Philocleon (whose name even proclaims his amatory character) acts like a love-struck youth, who is either sleepless because of his love or, when asleep, dreams of his beloved.¹¹⁸ Like many another lover he writes praises

¹¹⁸Of course the senex amator was viewed with disgust by both the Greeks and Romans. The figure is particularly common in Plautus. To the references given by Murgatroyd 1980, 96 and McKeown 1987-, 2:262, add Sen. Rhet. Contr. 2.6.4 "Senex amans, senex ebrius, circumdatus sertis et delibutus ungentis et in praeeritos annos se retro agens et validius in uoluptatis iam iuuenis exultans, nonne portentum est? Luxurious adulescens peccat; at senex luxuriosus insanit." Hence the ridiculousness of Philocleon's actions here, the chorus of old men later in the V. being Philocleon's suitors, and Nicobulus and Philoxenus in Pl. Bacch. (1163 "{Nic.} Tun, homo putide,
of his beloved on doors. He also arrives at the entrance of the law-courts long before dawn and sleeps there before the doors—clearly a paraklausithuric reference. He is

amator istac fieri aetate audes?”). Old age is to be understood as the reason for Horace not pursuing militium amoris in Carm. 3.26 and 3.14. Tib. 2.1.73-4 mentions an old man acting as an excluded lover: “hic dicere iussit / limen ad iratae uerba pudenda senem.” Such attitudes also strongly bear on the threat-prophecy where the beloved is threatened with becoming in the future an excluded lover. When that happens, when they will no longer be young enough to attract lovers of their own, they will be of an inappropriate age for such actions.

For another Aristophanic reference to amatory graffiti compare Ach. 144. Door-writing occurs in paraklausithuric contexts at [Theoc.] 23.45, Mel. AP 5.191.7 (G.-P. LXXIII); and Pl. Mer. 409. Mel. AP 12.23 (G.-P. XCIX) mentions what could be considered a form of door-writing. Ov. Am. 3.1.53 ff. has Elegy talk about being hung on doors: “a quotiens foribus duris infixa pependi, / non uerita a populo praetereunte legi!” Compare also Courtney 1995, no 92 (CLE 950 = CIL 4.5296), which is a paraklausithuric poem written near the door of a house; and CIL 4.1894 (quoting Prop. 4.5.47-8), 1893 (Ov. Am. 1.8.77 f.) and 1895 (Ars 1.475 ff.), all written near the same door.

MacDowell 1971, 146 comments: "τῇ κλούνι: 'The pillar' was evidently a feature of the law-courts. Perhaps each court had beside its entrance a pillar to which notices of the next day's cases were attached.” The jury system of Athens has some claim to be one of the defining characteristics of the Athenian democracy. The jury was certainly considered to represent the Athenian citizen body, and so by sleeping at the door of the law-courts, Philocleon is effectively sleeping at the door of Demos. Cf. also 124: ὁ δ' ἀνεφάνη κυράφως ἐπὶ τῇ κίγκλατι. The lover lying at his beloved's door is too common to be worth citing, however for possible or definite references to actual sleeping, see Ar. Lys. 281 f.; Plato Symp. 183a (cf. Aristaenet. 2.20.24 ἀστρώτους καὶ χαμαιπτεῖς κομψάσεις ἐπὶ θύρας ποιεῖσθαι), 203b; Call. AP 5.23 (G.-P. LXIII); Anon. AP 12.90.5 (G.-P. I); Prop. 1.16.22 (actual sleep); Ov. Rem. 508 (lying at threshold), Met. 14.709 f.; Philostr. Ep. 29 (actual sleep). At Philostr. Imag. 1.2 "Komos" is sleepy. For perceived etymological connections between κῶμος κωμάζειν and κῶμα, see Etym. Magn., s.v. Ἁρχήσεως, τὸ ποιῶς ὀρχεσθαι. ἔξι ὁ δὲ κῶμα εἰδος ὀρχήσεως, οἱ δὲ μέλους, παρὰ τὸ κῶμα
therefore kept under guard at home, like some other young lovers who are kept under guard to prevent them from visiting their beloveds.\textsuperscript{121} Despite his house arrest, Philocleon keeps managing to get out by escaping along the gutters. Many attempts are made to cure Philocleon of his love, reminiscent of similar mentions made in paraklausithura of the lover’s various attempts to renounce his love or get over his passion (see below).

In lines 143 ff., Philocleon appears, trying to escape by the chimney. But then at line 152 he is at the door, banging on it, trying to escape:

\begin{verbatim}
ΞΑ. οδε την θύραν ὥθει· ΒΔ. πεζέ νυν σφόδρα, εὐ̣ κάλορικάς· κἀ̣ χῶρ γὰρ ἐνταῦθ’ ἔρχομαι. καὶ τῆς κατακλήσις ἐπιμέλει, καὶ τοῦ μοχλοῦ φύλατθ’ ὅποις μὴ τῆν βάλανον ἐκτρώξεται. ΨI. τι ὑπάτη; οὐκ ἐκφήσετ’ ἐ μιαρώτατοι
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
κοιμάμαι· ἐμφαίνει γάρ τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑπόνου καὶ τῆς μέθης, ἐπὶ τοῦ κοιμηθεὶς βαδίζειν· ἔστιν οὖν κῦμος ὁ καὶρὸς, ὁ ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπόνων πρὸς ὑπόνοιν καλόν; Ἡδν. Schem. Hom. 111.1-5 Κωμᾶσθαι, κυρίως τὸ ἐπὶ τοῖς κοιμηθεὶς βαδίζειν. ἔστιν οὖν κῦμος ὁ καὶρὸς ὁ ἀπὸ ὑπόνου πρὸς ὑπόνοιν καλόν. ἐκ τούτου καὶ τὸ κωμάζειν τὸ ἐπὶ ὑπόνοιν βαδίζειν. τὸ δὲ κῦμος ἀπὸ τοῦ κοιμᾶμαι, ἐξ οὗ καὶ κώμη τὸ χωρίον, ἡ κοιμησθείη καὶ ἀνάπαυσις τῶν κύων. For prostration at the beloved’s door, see Chapter 4.
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{121} Of course, any time there is a guard on a beloved, it is to prevent the beloved from going out to the lover as much as it is to prevent the lover coming in. But sometimes the lover is specifically kept at home to stop him from going to his beloved. Cf. esp. Ter. An. 385 ff., and Lucian DMeretr. 12. Leander in Ov. Ep. 18 is under the watch of his parents, as are both Pyramus and Thisbe in Ov. Met. 4.55 ff., and also see Apul. Met. 6.11 for Cupid himself as an inclusus amator.
While this passage, despite the clear paraklausithuric reference at 105, cannot be called paraklausithuric, it does seem to play deliberately with the amatory topos of what could be called the *inclusus amator*. Philocleon's outrageous attempts to escape continue (ὅπως ἄν ὁ γέρων ἐκδοτός παρακύψη πάλιν, 178). He calls for help from his fellow jurymen and Cleon (ὢ ἐπικόκκιστα καὶ Κλέων ἀμύνατε, 197), prompting his son to order Xanthias to pile stones up in front of the door, shoot the bolt, and generally lock the door in any way possible:

ένδου κέκραχθ’ ἐκ τῆς θύρας κεκλημένης.

ἀθέτει σὺ πολλοὺς τῶν λίθων πρός τὴν θύραν,

καὶ τὴν βάλανον ἐμβαλλε πάλιν ἐς τὸν μοχλόν,

καὶ τῇ ὀδογῳ προσθεῖς τὸν ὅλων τὸν μέγαν ἀνύσας τι προσκύλλον.

The accumulation of various door parts is repeated in later paraklausithura.\(^{122}\)

\(^{122}\)The βάλανος is mentioned only in one other paraklausithuric passage: Eratosth. AP 5.242.4.

\(^{123}\)See Ar. V. 154-5 (parody), 199 f.; Pl. Am. 1026 ff., Bac. 1119, Cur. 148 ff., Per. 570 ff.; Lucret. 4.1177 ff.; Catul. 63.6; Hor. Epod. 11.21 f., Carm. 1.25.3-6; Prop. 1.16.42-3; Ov. Am. 1.6.73-4 (and McKeown 1987-, 2:160); Petron. 97; and Eratosth. AP 5.242. Note August. C.D. "tres deos isti posuerunt, Forculum foribus, Cardeam cardini, Limetinum limini," and Tertul. Ad Nat. 2.:5. Also see Frazer 1973, 2:90 and Papyrus Chester Beatty No. 1 (McCoy 1972, 61), cited in Chapter 4. For an excellent example of how important door parts could be to the Greeks, see Parm. fr. 1.24-39 (= S.E. M. 1.111-116): ἵπποι ταὶ μὲ φέρουσιν ὄσον τ’ ἐπὶ θυμὸς ἴκανοι / 25 πέμπον, ἐπεὶ μ’ ἐς ὀδὸν βῆσαν πολύφημον ἄγουσα / δάμωνος, .../ τῇ φερόμην: .../... κοῦραν ἵ ὀδὸν ἀγεμόνευν. /.../ 31... ὅτε σπερχολατο
But then at lines 211 ff. Philocleon is talked about
as something of a shut-in beloved:

ΣΩ, ὄγε νῦν, ἐπειδὴ τοιοῦτοι σεσοβήκαμεν,
κοῦκ ἔσθι ὡσπερ διαδόχοις ἐν ἡμᾶς ἑτὶ λάθοι,
τὶ σὺκ ἄπεκοιμηθήμεν ὄσον ὄσον στέλνη;
ΒΔ. ἄλλ' ὦ πόνηρ' ἡσύουιν ὀλγον ψιτέρον
οἱ ξυνοδισαίοι παρακαλοῦντες τοιοῦτοι
τὸν πατέρα....
νὴ τὸν Δί', ὁφε γοῦν ἀνεστήκασι νῦν,
ὡς ἀπὸ μέσων νυκτῶν παρακαλοῦσιν ἄει,
λυχνίων ἔχοντες καὶ μυρίζοντες μέλη
ἀρχαῖα μελισσίδων φυνεχῆματα,
οἷς ἐκκαλοῦνται τούτοιν....

215

220

His fellow jurors are in the habit of coming by in the middle
of the night carrying lamps, singing honey-sweet songs
with which they call Philocleon out (note παρακαλεῖν 215 and
218 and ἐκκαλέειν 221).\(^\text{124}\) Not much later the chorus arrives.

At this point we find out that the weather is bad: it has

\(^\text{124}\) For παρακαλεῖν of calling a beloved out in a
paraklausithurec reference, see Ael. N.A. 1.50. Sommerstein
1983, 163 on 220 notes: "Phrynicus, son of Polyphæmon (PA
15008, TrGF 3; to be distinguished from other men of the
same name mentioned in 1302 and elsewhere) was a tragic
dramatist, an older contemporary of Aeschylus.... Thus he
would be the favourite tragedian of old men who are repre-
sented as having fought in the Persian wars (1077-1101). He
was especially remembered for the sweetness of his lyrics
(cf. Birds 748-751)."
been raining, the ground is very muddy (248 ff., 250 ff.), and more rain will probably come soon along with a cold north wind (265).\textsuperscript{125} The past good times they have had with Philocleon are mentioned (266 ff.). The leader of the chorus, puzzled by Philocleon's absence, suggests they sing to call him outside (270 ff.):

\begin{quote}
... ἀλλὰ μοι δοκεῖ στάντας ἐνθάδε, δυνάμες ἡ θάνατος αὐτὰν ἐκκαλέν, ἢν τί πις ἀκοῦσας τούμου μέλους ὑφ' ἡθονής ἐρεῦνη θύρας εἰ.
τί ποτ' οὐ πρὸ θυρῶν φαίνετ' ἀρ' ἡμῖν ὁ γέρων οὐδ' ὑπακοῦει;
\end{quote}

Philocleon hears the chorus and emerges (probably from a window or the roof) to reply. Here we find applied to Philocleon in his new role of the shut-in beloved the topoi of the lover wasting away (τῆξομαι) and the lover's voice being heard through a crack or chink in the door (ὀπηκ/... ὑπακούων).\textsuperscript{126} Furtius amor is present because Philocleon must be quiet since he is under guard. Then, as many excluded lovers do in other paraklausithura, Philocleon invokes Zeus and expresses his desire to experience a  

\textsuperscript{125}For wind in paraklausithuric situations, see Ar. V. 265 ff.; Asclep. AP 5.167 (G.-P. XIV); Mel. 12.167.1 (G.-P. CIX); Hor. Ep. 11.16 f., Carm. 1.25.19-20, 3.7.2 and 5, 3.10.4 and 7; Tib. 1.2.7 f.; Prop. 1.16.24 and 34; and Ov. Am. 1.6.51 ff., Ep. 18.39 ff. See also McKeown 1987, 2:149 f. For bad weather in general, see below.

\textsuperscript{126}Cf. Prop. 1.16.27-8 "ο utinam trajecta caua mea uocula rima / percussas dominae uertat in auriculas!", 2.17.15-6 "nec licet in triuís sicca requiescere luna, / aut per rimosas mittere uerba fores," and Ov. Met. 4.65-6 "fissus erat tenui rima, quam duxerat olim, / cum fieret, paries domui communis utrique."
metamorphosis, but not so that he might reach his beloved
but rather in order to reach those serenading him outside
(316 ff.; see below on Theocritus 3):

φίλοι, τήκαμα μέν
πάλαι άιά τῆς ὅπης
ὥμεν ὑπακούον.
ἀλλὰ γὰρ σύχ σοίς τ' εἴμ' 320
ἀδειν. τί ποιήσω;
τηροῦμαί δ' ὑπὸ τῶν', ἔπει
βούλομαι γε πάλαι μεθ' ὑ-
μῶν ἐλθὼν ἐπὶ τούς καθι-
σκοὺς κακόν τι ποιήσαι.
ἀλλ' ὁ Ζεύς Ζεύς μέγα βρωτήσας
καὶ με ποιήσαν καπνὸν ἐξαλφήνς
....

The chorus replies by asking: τίς γὰρ ἐσθ' ὁ ταῦτα σ' ἐξεργα
κατοικήσω τῇ θύρᾳ (333-4)—ἀποκλείειν will become common
in future paraklausithura (see Appendix 2). Philocleon
explains what has happened and tells the chorus to be quiet
since his son/custos is sleeping (335-6). He and the chorus
then discuss various means of escape, during which it is
made clear that every crack in the house is shut up (352, ὅπη
again). Past times when Philocleon achieved similar deeds
are remembered (354 f.), the mention of which brings up the
topos of the excluded lover reminding the beloved of previ-
ous occasions when she admitted him, helped him sneak past
her custodes, or even snuck out to him.127 Similarly, Philo-
cleon recounts (356 ff.) how he once was free and happy and

127For the lover reminding the beloved of past good
times together, compare Theoc. 3.7 (form of); Pl. Asin. 169
ff.; Prop. 4.7.13 ff.; Ov. Ep. 5.17 ff., 10.51 ff., 15.135
ff.; Calp. Ecl. 3.51 ff.; and Nemes. 4.1 ff. The topos also
occurs at Ar. V. 266 ff. and Plut. 975 ff.
could go wherever he wanted. But now there are guards on the door: τῷ ἵκε δῇ ὁ πάντων ἐπὶ ταῖς θύραις (362).

Finally, Philocleon manages to chew through the nets and prepares to climb down by a rope. Before he does, however, he utters a prayer to Lycus reminiscent of prayers of various excluded lovers (389 ff.):

Ω Λύκε δέσποτα, γείτων ἡμών σου γὰρ οἶσπερ ἐγὼ κεχάρησαι, τοῖς δακρύσισιν τῶν φευγόντων ἄει καὶ τοῖς ὁλοφυμοῖς. ἡκάςας γοῦν ἔπιθες ὅλων ἔνταθ' ἵνα ταῦτ' ἀκροῖο, καθουλήθης μόνος ἡρώων παρὰ τὸν κλάσοντα καθῆθαι. ἑλέσσον καὶ σώσαν νυν τὸν σαυτόν πλησιόχωρον. καὶ μὴ ποτέ σου παρὰ τὰς κάννας οὐρῆσαι μηδ' ἀποπάρῳ.

The lover regularly attempts to enlist support of some deity by appealing to the deity's experience as a lover. The prayer also mentions suppliants' tears, bringing to mind the tears of the supplicatory lover. However Philocleon's escape attempt is detected and while he is climbing down Bdelycleon orders Xanthias to climb up and beat Philocleon back with the eiresione from the door (398-9): ΒΔ. ἀνάβαιν' ἀνύσας κατὰ τῆν ἐτέραν καὶ ταῖς φυλλάσσει παῖε, / ἢν πως πρύμνην


129 For example, Ov. Am. 1.6.53-4 (Boreas), 3.6.23 ff. (in a paraklausithuristic address to a river), and Ep. 19.129 ff. (to Neptune, in a loosely paraklausithuristic situation). Zeus is similarly invoked at Asclep. Π 5.167.6 (G.-P. XIV). For other examples, see below and McKeown 1987-, 2:149 f.
ἀνακρούσηται πληγεὶς ταῖς εἰρεσίωσις. This effectively brings the paraklausithic parody to a close by having the custos hit the enclosed beloved with the wreath/garland.\textsuperscript{130}

Before leaving the Vespaε one brief passage deserves mention. Bdelycleon invites his father to someone's house for a drinking-bout (διὰ καὶ μεθυσθήκας καὶ πατάξας καὶ βαλεῖ, καὶ ἀποτινεῖς Ἀργυρίου ἐκ κρασιάλης.\textsuperscript{131}) to which Philocleon replies:

\begin{quote}
κακῶν τὸ πίνειν ἀπὸ γάρ σοινο ὑγνεῖται καὶ θυροκοπεῖ η ἀρνητεῖ καὶ πατάξας καὶ βαλεῖ, καὶ ἀποτίνειν ἄργυριον ἐκ κρασιάλης.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{130} For the eiresione, see Lycurgus fr. 14.2a.2 - 17 (εἰρεσίωσις) κλάδου ἐλαίας καὶ δάφνης πρὸ τῶν οἰκείων τιθέμενοι, πλήρεις πολλῶν ὄρατων ἀναδεχόμενοι, τούτο δὲ λοιμοῦ γενομένῳ καὶ χρήσατος τοῦ θεοῦ ἑποίουν. ... ὁ ἀναλίθηναι τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι ἐμπροσθεν τῶν θυρῶν, εἰρεσίωσιν ὄνομάσαντας, ἀπαρχαὶ ποιησάμενοι... διὶ τὴν ἄφορίαν ἡμῶν τῆς καρδιάς λεκτερία ἡ παρὰ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τεθείσα ἑπαύσει. ... καὶ οὕτως οἱ πρόγονοι ἡμῶν λέγονται ἐκάστος κατὰ τὴν Ἰδαίαν θύραν θείας τὴν ἱκτερίαν τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι, τὴν νῦν εἰρεσίωσιν; 14.2b.9 πῦκνα γὰρ ἑθοισίν ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡ εἰρεσίωσιν ἀγεῖται; Ptol. Thes. 22.5 τῆς δὲ εἰρεσίωσιν ἐκφέρουσι κλάδου ἐλαίας ἐρυθρῆς μὲν ἀνεστεμένον, ὕσπερ τότε τήν λεκτερίαν, παντοδαπῶς δὲ ἀνάπλευροι καταργότατοι διὰ τὸ λῆξαι τὴν ἀφορίαν, ἐφιδοτες. "Εἰρεσίωσιν σύκα φέρει καὶ πῦκνας ἄρτους καὶ μέλι ἐν κοτύλῃ καὶ ἐλαίων ἀποφήθασαν / καὶ κόλπῳ εὐθέρου, ως ὁν μεθύσασα καθεύθη." It could take the form of a wreath and contain flowers: Alciph. 2.35.1 Εἰρεσίωσιν ἐξ ἄνωθεν πλέξασα ἑκεῖν ἐς ἔρμα φανδρίου τοῦ Ἀλκπεκήθησαν ταύτην ἀναθήσουσα.

\textsuperscript{131} For θυροκοπεῖν, see Antiph. fr. 236 (K.-A.) οὐδεὶς τὸ πατρώλα πιὸ γέρων κατεδόσκειν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ κατεμόρονει, οὐδὲ ἐλύσατο πορνίδαν, οὐδὲ θυροκοπῶν ἄφλεγν δίκην. / οὗτο τῷ γῆς σωφρονῶν οὐκ εὐτυχεῖ; and Trypho fr. 109 (Velsen = Ath. 14.618 c; for the full text, see below in Chapter 3): αὐλλήσών δ' εἶλην ὄνομασάι ... θυροκοπικόν (τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ καὶ κροσισθνού). ... Ael. N.A. 1.50 uses it in a clearly paraklausithic reference (see Appendix 1 for the text). It occurs in another comic writer--Diph. fr. 129 (K.-A.). Βάλλειν is common in paraklausithic situations--see Appendix 2. For κρασιάλη, see Lucian Bis Acc. 16 and 17, and Alciphro 4.10.2.
Sommerstein (1983, 230) suggests that "the picture conjured up is of drunken revellers trying to force their way into a party uninvited (cf. Pl. Smp. 212c)." It seems more likely, however, that this is another reference to the violent assault on the beloved's doors. Θυροκοπεῖν here must be an act worthy of a fine, and so must be stronger than mere knocking.\textsuperscript{132} While we have references to forced entry by lovers, there are very few references to people breaking down doors to get into a party--the passage from the Symposium cited by Sommerstein is not relevant: Alcibiades and his companions arrive with great noise, but they do not actually force their way inside.

In the Lysistrata the old women of Athens have seized the Acropolis. At line 245 Lysistrata tells Lampito that she and the other Athenian women will join the old women and help them close the gates against the men, who, even though they may resort to arms, will not have enough threats or fire to win over the women until they have agreed on terms. One must keep in mind that the women have also declared their sex-strike, adding a sexual motivation to the men's desire to regain control of the Acropolis:

\begin{quote}
καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀλλαξείς ταῖς ἐν πόλει
καὶ ἐνικῶμεν ἐξεγέρσαι τοὺς μοχλοὺς.
καὶ σὺν καὶ ἡμᾶς ἔμφασεν σεισθήσειν οἷον
τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐνθύσει; Λ. ὡς ὄλγον αὐτῶν μοι μέλει.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{132}MacDowell 1971, 294 concurs. However, Θυροκοπεῖν does not always have that implication. See below on Trypho fr. 109 (Velsen) and the references in the previous note.
A chorus of men arrives, bearing logs of olive and some source of fire. They plan to pile them up before the gates to burn down the doors, and perhaps a few women, too:

Some of the chorus remember a previous siege of the Acropolis, when Cleomenes of Sparta had seized it. That time, in maintenance of the siege, they had to sleep before its gates: ὁδὼς ἐπολιόρκησ' ἐγὼ τὸν ἄνδρ' ἐκείνου ὡμῶς / ἐφ' ἐπτακαίδεκ' ἄσπιδων πρὸς τὰς πύλας καθεύδων (281-2). Next, they prepare to attack the gates, blowing on the fire-pots, lighting their torches of vine-wood (ἄμπελου, 308) and

133 Πύλη can be used of house-doors. For it in a paraklausithuric context, see Iamb. V.P. 25.112. For amatory contexts, see Philostr. Ep. 56 (although siege imagery seems to be present) and Eratosth. AP 5.242.3. For μοχλ- in paraklausithuric situations, see Antiph. fr. 193.6 (K.-A. = Ath. 6.238 e) and Theoc. 2.127. Compare also Ar. V. 113 and 154. For ἄνωλ-, see Strat. AP 12.252.4 and Lucian Bis Acc. 29.
preparing to batter the gates. If the women resist the summons out (καλούντων, 310) they will fire the doors:

φῦ φῦ.
λοῦ λοῦ τοῦ καπνοῦ.
ὡς δεινῶν δῶνες Ἦράκλεις
προσπεσῶν μ᾽ ἐκ τῆς χύτρας

... τοι τὸ πῦρ ἐγρήγορεν θεῶν ἐκατὶ καὶ θῆ.
οδκουν ἄν, εἰ τῷ μὲν ἔχων θείμεσθα πρῶτον αὐτοῖς,
τῆς ἁμπέλου δὲ ἔς τὴν χύτραν τὸν φανῶν ἐγκατένευσες
ἀφανίτες ἐτι ἐς τὴν θύραν κρινόν ἐμπέσαμεν;
κὰν μὴ καλούντων τῶν μαχλοῦς καλῶσιν αἱ γυναῖκες,
ἔμπορησάναι χρή τὰς θύρας καὶ τῷ καπνῷ πιέσειν.
θώμεσά δὴ τὸ φόρτιον. ἕθεν τοῦ καπνοῦ βαβαίδει.

... ὁ δὲ ἔργον ἐστὶ χύτρα τῶν ἀνθρακίσκειν, ἐξεγείρειν,
τὴν λαμπάδα ἡμέραν ὅπως πρῶτος ἐμοὶ προσόλαμος,
ἀποφεύγα τὴν ἐνυγνασίον, τὸν τ᾽ ἐν πόλει γυναῖκῶν
του νῦν παρεστώτος θέσασθα τροπαῖον ἡμᾶς.

The women are prepared, however, with a good supply of water (334). At 370 ff. the two choruses argue back and forth, the men with their torches and the women with their jars of water at the ready:

ΧΩ. ΓΥ. σοφίμεθ', ἡμέλες θεόθατος τὴν κάλπιν ὧ 'Ῥοδίππη.
ΧΩ. ΓΕ. τι ὅ τι μεθ' ἐχθρὰ αὐθ' ὑδὴρ ἔχουσά
οὐκ 'ἀφικνοῦ;
ΧΩ. ΓΥ. τι δαί σὺ πῦρ ὧ τομβ', ἔχων; ὡς σαυτῶν
ἐμπυρέωσων;
ΧΩ. ΓΕ. ἐγὼ μὲν ὑπανή σπάν τὰς σὰς χόλας υφάσω.
ΧΩ. ΓΥ. ἐγὼ σὺ γ' ἔνα τὴν σὴν πυρᾶν τούτης κατασβέσαιμι.
ΧΩ. ΓΕ. τούμον δὺ πῦρ κατασβέσεις; ΧΩ. ΓΥ. τούργον τὰχ' αὐτὸ δειξεῖ. 375
ΧΩ. ΓΕ. οὐκ οἰκά σ' εἰ τῆς ὧς ἔχω τῇ λαμπάδι σταθεύσω.
ΧΩ. ΓΥ. εἰ δύμα μηγχάνεις ἔχων, λουτρόν (γ') ἐγὼ
παρέξω.

134See Hor. S. 2.7.89 ff., possibly Lucil. 943-4 (Marx 841-2), and possibly Pers. 5.166. Fiske 1918, 337 f. argues that in Persius 5 the doors are wet because of water poured down from above. Yardley 1979, 156 believes, more plausibly, that the reference is to the lover's tears.
Then at 387 a Magistrate appears, complaining about
the general wantonness of women (обр’ ἐξέλαμψε τῶν γυναικῶν ἢ
τρυφῆ). He attacks the men’s complicity in their wives’
immoral behaviour, thereby keeping sexual matters, and even
adultery, in the reader’s mind. Indignant at being locked-
out when he has come to get money to purchase oars, he
orders some soldiers to bring up crowbars to force open the
gates, eventually bringing out Lysistrata (421 ff.):

δε τε γ’ δὲν ἐγὼ πρόθυμος, ἐκπορίσας ὅπως
καπνὸς ἔσεσθαι, τάργυρίου γυνὶ δέον,
ὑπὸ τῶν γυναικῶν ἀποκέκλημαι ταῖς πυλαῖς.
ἀλλ’ οὐδὲν ἐργὸν ἐστάναι. φέρε τοὺς μοχλοὺς,
ὅπως ἄν αὐτὰς τῆς ύβρεως ἑγὼ σχέθω.

... 425

οὐχ ὑποβαλόντες τοὺς μοχλοὺς ὑπὸ τὰς πύλας
ἐντεῦθεν ἐκμοχλεύσετ’; ἐνθενεῦλ ὃ’ ἐγὼ
ἐνυσκεμομελέως. ΛΥ. μηδὲν ἐκμοχλεύετε.
ἐξέρχομαι γὰρ αὐτομάτη. τί θελ’ μοχλὸν;135

430

However, before moving on to more of the Lysistrata, it is
useful to compare another attack on a house, this one from
the Nubes. Strepsiades is talking to his slave Xanthias, and
the phrontisterion is the object of the attack (1483). The
almost excessive combination of fire and physical demolition
is particularly interesting:

ὄρθως παραίνεις οὐκ ἔναν δικορραφεῖν,
ἀλλ’ ὥς τάχιστ’ ἐμπικράναι τήν οἰκίαν
τῶν ἀδολεσχῶν. δεύρο δεύρ’ ἢ Ἀμβλεα,
κλιμακα λαβὼν ἔξελθε καὶ σιμνύην φέρων,

1485

135 Ἀποκλέειν occurs again at 487, and again the
Magistrate is speaking: ὃ τι βουλόμεναι τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν
ἀπεκλήσατε τοῖς μοχλοίςιν.
Later in the Lysistrata, with the women still in possession of the Acropolis and the men of Athens becoming less able to control their lusts, Myrrhine's husband Cinesias shows up at the gates, seeking his wife (831 ff.):

136 Copley 1956, 11 n. 11 has also suggested that this scene might be a paraklausithuric parody.
Cinesias is seen arriving, mad with lust. The women will try to inflame that desire even more. He complains of his tortuous love-pains, but he finds his beloved is under guard (847). Lysistrata either comes down or speaks from the wall and hints at the joys of future sex (855 f.). Cinesias repeatedly asks her to call out Myrrhine. Lysistrata, acting as a go-between, asks for a bribe, and Cinesias says he will give her everything he has. This is enough for her.\textsuperscript{137} Then, while Lysistrata has presumably gone inside, or down from the wall, to fetch Myrrhine, Cinesias laments how he has no joy or happiness since he has been without his wife, how he cries when he goes home (which brings to mind the tears of the excluded lover), and how life and former pleasures hold no allure--all topoi found in later paraklausithura.\textsuperscript{138}

\textsuperscript{137}For explicit bribery in order to get to the beloved, see Timocl. 25 (K.-A.), Ant. Lib. 39/Hermesian. 2.3, and Hor. Carm. 3.16.8 (of Danae). In later paraklausithura, money is regularly mentioned as the only way to win access to one’s beloved. This is connected with the extremely common topoi of the mercenary mistress.

\textsuperscript{138}For the tears of the lover, see: Ar. V. 390; Asclep. AP 5.145 (G.-P. XII, on a garland); Pl. Cur. 138; Anon. AP 12.116.2 (G.-P. XXXIV); Mel. AP 5.191.6 (G.-P. LXXIII, on a garland), 12.72.6 (G.-P. XCII, and bystander); Lucr. 4.1177; Hor. Carm. 3.7.1 and 8; Tib. 1.2.26 (but not really pertinent to the paraklausithuron); Prop. 1.16.4; Ov. Am. 1.4.61, 1.6.18, Rem. 37, Met. 14.708 (garlands wet), 734; Pers. 5.165 f. (possibly not tears); Martial 10.14.8; and Rufin. AP 5.43, 5.103. Cf. Alciphr. 4.9.1 (and ff.).
Myrrhine, however, refuses to come out, and a brief conversation ensues between the man outside and his beloved within:

ΜΥ. φιλῳ φιλῳ 'γνω ταύτου· ἀλλ' οὐ βούλεται 870
ὑπ' ἐμοῦ φιλεῖσθαι, σὺ σ' ἐμὲ ταυτί μη κάλει.
ΚΙ. ἐν γαλακτόν πυρρωτίσσει, τί ταῦτα δρᾶς;
κατάβηθι δεῦρο. ΜΥ. μά Δι' ἐγὼ μὲν σκότα' οὖ.
ΚΙ. ἐμοῦ καλοῦντος οὐ καταβῆσαι πυρρωτί;
ΜΥ. οὐ γὰρ δεόμενος οὐδὲν ἔκκολεὶς ἐμὲ. 875
ΚΙ. ἐγὼ οὐ δεόμενος; ἐπίτετριμμένος μὲν οὖν.

But Myrrhine's resistance has only inflamed her husband's passion. At 885 ff. he reflects that she looks more youthful and appealing than before, and that: χά συσκολάνει πρός ἐμὲ καὶ βρευνότα, / ταῦτ' αὖτα ἃς 'σθ' ἢ κάμ' ἐπιτρέπει τῷ πόθῳ (887-8). That exclusion inflames a lover's desire is a particularly common paraklausithuric topos.\(^{139}\)

\(^{139}\) For explicit connection of exclusion to increasing desire, see: Theoc. 6.32-3; Plu. Galba 19.5 καὶ γὰρ ἀποκλείσαι τὸν Νέρωνα λέγεται μὴ παρόντος τοῦ 'Ὀθώνος, εἶτε τῆς ἱδινῆς ἀφαίρον τὸ πλήσιμον, εἶτε ὡς φασιν ἐνιαίος, βαρυνομένη τοῦ Καλαρρος γάμον, ἐφαστῇ δὲ μὴ φεύγουσα χρήσται διὰ τὸ φιλακόλαστον; Ὀν. Ἀμ. 1.8.73 ff. "capitis modo finge dolorem, / et modo, quae causas praebat, Isis erit. / 75 mox recipe, ut nullum patiendi colligat usum, / nova relentescat saepe repulsus amor. / surda sit oranti tua ianua, laxa ferenti". 2.19.19 - 36 "tu quoque, quae nossos rapuisti nuper ocellos, / 20 saepe time insidians, saepe rogata nega, / et sine me ante tuos projectum in limine postis / longa pruinosa frigora nocte pati. / sic mihi durat amor longosque adolescit in annos: / hoc iuuat, haec animi sunt alimenta mei"; Ars 3.577 - 594 "omnia tradantur (portas reseruimus hosti) / et sit in infida prodizione fides. / quod datur ex facili, longum male nutrit amorem: / 580 mis- cenda est laetis rara repulsa iocis. / ante fores iaceat, / 'crudelis ianua' dicat / multaque summisse, multa minanter agat"; Mart. 4.29.5-6 "sic spoliatrixem commendat fastus amicam, / ianua nec iuuenem semper aperta tenet"; Alciphr.
The scene between Myrrha and Cinesias continues, but without any particularly original further development of the paraklausithuric situation. Of course, Cinesias never does have his burning lust quenched, and is left at 951 ff. turning his attention to another woman.  

Although not actually paraklausithuric, one passage from the *Thesmophoriazusae* can be noted briefly for some of the paraklausithuric topoi it contains. At 414 ff. a woman  

---

4.10.3; Aristaeus. 2.16.4 ff. θρόπη, Πάμφυλε, πρός ἐμέ, καὶ καλῶς, δότι 5 μὴ ἀπέκλεισα ἔλθόντα "ἐνθὸν ἐστραγχ" εἰπόθα, ἀλλ’ εἰς ἄχθωμεν ἀπροφασίστως. Ovid offers reverse advice to lovers at Rem. 519 "ianua forte patet: quamvis reuocabere, transi." Compare Pl. Smp. 184 a (οὕτω δὴ ὑπὸ ταύτης τῆς αἰτίας πρῶτον μὲν τὸ ἀλλακείθαν ταχύ σαλαχόν νεανίσται, ὡς χρόνος ἐγγένηται, δὲ δὴ δοκεῖ τὰ πολλὰ καλῶς βασανίζεσθαι, ἐπεὶ τοῦ ὑπὸ χρημάτων καὶ ὑπὸ πολιτικῶν δυνάμεων ἀλλόφας σαλαχόν) and see Dover 1974, 215. On the idea of that which is hard to obtain being more attractive, see Nisbet-Hubbard 1970, 369-70; Day 1972, 90; Hollis 1977, 142; and McKeown 1987-, 2:239 f.

---

140 One final scene from the *Lysistrata* deserves brief mention. At 1189 ff. the chorus announces a feast. They declare there is plenty of food to share and urge the poor to come to their houses, only to warn such people not to come too close to their doors and to beware of the guard-dog. ὡς Ἀγοράιοι show up, with torches, as if coming from a revel, and the θυρῶρος (following the attribution of speakers in Rogers 1926-27) is forced to keep them off: 1213 πρὸς γε μέντοι τὴν θύραν / προσαγορεῦν μὴ βασίζεσθε / τὴν ἐμὴν, ἀλλ’ / 1215 εὐλαβεῖσθαι τὴν κύς. / ἈΓΟΡΑΙΟΣ Α. ἄνοιγε τὴν θύραν. ΘΥΡΟΣ, παρασκεύασάν τι θέλεσιν; / ΑΓ. Α. οὕτως τι κάθησας; μὴν ἐγὼ τῇ λαμπάδι / ὑμᾶς κατακαῦσαι; πορτικόν τὸ χώριον. / ... / 1221 ΑΓ. Β. χήμεῖς γε μετὰ σοῦ ξυμπαλαταιπρής / σομίζειν. / ΘΥ. οὐκ ἄπιτε; κυκύσασθε τὰς τρίχας μακρά. This is worth noting for its clearly different tone when compared with the various paraklausithuric parodies cited above.
complains about how women in Athens are secluded and kept inside:

Mnesilochus, disguised as a woman, rises to relate a trick "she" has played on "her husband" (476 ff.):

Although clearly ridiculous, it brings up several points of interest. First, there is the parody of Athenian men's suspiciousness with regard to their wives' fidelity that brought about the strict separation of women that was the norm among at least better-off Athenians. Mnesilochus is recounting the Athenian male's nightmare-wife. She has been married only three days when she sneaks out to her long-time
lover when he comes scratching at the door (for the woman
sneaking out to her lover, see above on Gnesippus, note 54).
She easily dupes her husband by claiming to be sick. She
pours water on the hinges to reduce the noise the door will
make when opened--door noise and similar actions to silence
the door being recurrent topoi in later paraklausithura.¹⁴¹
She then goes out and meets her lover by a tree. Next she
claims that all women are virtual nymphomaniacs who will
have sex with any low-class labourer if there is no other
lover available. Finally, she recounts how another woman
smuggled out her lover, whom she had received into her hus-
band's house.¹⁴² All this strongly re-inforces the need for

¹⁴¹ For door noise, see Diosc. AP 12.14.3-4 (G.-P.
IX, possible); Pl. Cur. 20 ff., 94 f., 156 ff. (including
pouring water into the sockets); Hor. Carm. 1.25.5, 3.10.4;
Tib. 1.6.12 (with Murgatroyd 1980, 190) and 1.8.57; Prop.
1.16.27, 1.18.24; and Ov. Am. 1.6.49 ff. (and McKeown 1987–,
2:148). Compare Prop. 4.8.49 (Cynthia's arrival) and Lysias
1.9–10, and 17.

¹⁴² One wonders if Aristophanes knew of Lysias 1
("Against Eratosthenes"), which depicts a very similar
situation (Lysias was born c. 458 and the Thes. was written
c. 411). A young wife deceives her husband by sneaking down
at night to her lover. She uses various excuses, such as the
baby needing attention, to hide her behaviour. The noise of
the door almost gives the affair away: 14 ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἦν πρὸς
ἡμέραν, ἤκου ἐκέλητα καὶ τὴν θύραν ἀνέψευ. ἔρωτένου δὲ μου
τῇ ὑπὸ θύρα οὔκετε φοβοίειν... [17] ἀναμιμνησκόμενος δὲ δὲν
ἐν ἐκέλητῃ τῇ νυκτὶ ἐφοίτη ἡ μέταυλος θύρα καὶ ἡ αὐλαῖος, δὲ
ουδέποτε ἐγένετο. She is eventually caught with her lover in
her husband's house--an act of hubris on the lover's part
(4): ἤγονυα δὲ, δὲ ἀνδρεῖς, τούτῳ με δεῖν ἐπιδείξατι, ως
ἐμοίκυτην Ἐρατοστέους τὴν γυναῖκα τὴν ἐμὴν καὶ ἐκέληνην τις
ἀδέσποτος τοὺς παιδὸς τοὺς ἐμὸς ἤχωμεν καὶ ἐμὲ αὐτὸν
ὀβρισεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τὴν ἐμὴν εἰσιῶν. The husband kills
the lover, thus causing the prosecution. Cf. also Suid.
et.655.1-7 Ἡ ζύγου θύρα: τὸν ζύγου φησὶ Δήμων
ὀβολοστάτην ἐλλεῖ, ἀλλὰς δὲ τυφλὸν. ὑπονικομένης δὲ αὐτῷ
segregation of Athens' women.

One more incident of interest from Aristophanes occurs in the *Plutus*. At line 959 a wealthy old woman appears who has lost her mercenary young lover since he no longer needs her presents: ... ἢν μοι τι μειράκιον φίλον, / πενιχρόν μέν, ἄλλως δ' εὐπρόσωπον καὶ καλὸν / καὶ χρηστὸν (975-7). She tells her story to Chremylus, recounting how she would give her lover money for food and clothing (981 ff.) for himself and also for his sisters or mother.143 The youth in return showed signs of affection such as wearing the old woman's robe by which to remember her all the more (991 f.) and he would come daily to her door (1006-7): καὶ μὴν πρὸ τοῦ γ' ὀσμέραι νὴ τῷ θεῷ / ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν ἐβάλετεν αἷε τὴν ἐμῆν. The old woman goes on to relate how he would call her all sorts of endearments and was so jealous that he would beat her if another man so much as looked at her (1013 ff.: οὕτω σφόδρα ἡλότυπος ὁ νεανίσκος ἢν, 1016). Then she tells how he used to praise her beauty and appearance, and

---

143 The situation is the reverse of the usual found in comedy and the later amatory epistolographers, where the youth is constantly giving money and presents for his beloved hetaira and her family. See Lucian DMeretr. 14.2. Cf. Ov. Am. 1.8.91 "et soror et mater, nutrix quoque carpat amantem," and see McKeown 1987–, 2:247 f.
even smell. He vowed he would never leave her (1032: ἀλλ’ οὐδὲποτέ μὲ κύριαν ἀπολείψειν ἔφη.). Yet he has abandoned her. All these sentiments can, of course, be paralleled in later paraklausitthuric situations. As if on cue, the youth appears going on or to a komos, garlanded and carrying a torch. It is probable that the reader is supposed to understand that he has a new object for his attentions:

καὶ μὴν τὸ μεγάλου τοῦλ προσέρχεται,
οἴπερ πάλαι καθηγοροῦσα τυχχάνως.
ἔοικε δ’ ἐπὶ κύριαν βασίζειν. ΧΡ. φαινεῖται.

The youth comments on how the old woman has very suddenly got grey hair (1043) and is now wrinkled (1051). He moves his torch closer to her face to examine her (1052). The old woman complains and Chremylus comments that one spark could set her burning like a dried-up eiresione: ἔν γὰρ σύλην εἰς μόνος σπευθὴρ λάβῃ / οὐπερ παλαιάν εἰρεσίων καύσεται (1053-4). The old woman is depicted here almost as a personification of the paraklausitthuric topos of the fading garland being used to remind the reluctant beloved of the transitory nature of beauty. She makes a final attempt to retain the youth’s attentions, but he now rejects her because of her age. Her money will not help—bringing to mind the typical lover’s attacks on mercenary mistresses and rich rivals. Although the young lover has effectively come to her on a komos, she is not his actual destination. At
1088 the identity of the youth's new beloved is made known—he wants to offer his garlands to Wealth, who is inside Chremylus' house: ἀλλ' εἴσεθ' εἴσω· τῷ θεῷ γὰρ βούλομαι / ἐλθὼν ἁνασθὲναι τοὺς στεφάνους τούσδ' οὗς ἔχω. The passage is better called komastic than paraklausithuric, but it does use several prominent paraklausithuric topoi in an ingenious way.

If the passages that have been cited can indeed be viewed as deliberate manipulation of the paraklausithuric situation by Aristophanes, then we suddenly have a new mass of evidence for a hitherto unimagined popularity—or at least familiarity—of the genre in Athenian old comedy and classical Greek literature in general. Unfortunately we lack the evidence from other contemporary comic playwrights to help provide any confirmation of this—but surely Aristophanes would not have been the only author playing with the situation. There is, of course, some chance that the similarity of these examples to the paraklausithuric situation is, with the exception of the much less ambiguous scenes from the Ecclesiazusae, coincidental. Greek theatre's use of the houses or the facades of buildings for a backdrop makes scenes of inclusion or exclusion readily explicable. But there seems to be an extra dimension in these passages that makes the possibility of calling them paraklausithuric conceivable. Particularly important is the apparent depth of the manipulation of later popular paraklausithuric topoi in
scenes like that from the Vespoae. No similar density of
topoi is found until Latin elegy. This is partly explicable
by the fact that epigram, which, of course, cannot accom-
modate more than a few topoi, becomes the most common genre
for Greek paraklausithuric scenes. But it does raise the
possibility that paraklausithuric literature with depth and
complexity in its use of topoi comparable to the Latin
elegists was known to Aristophanes. And if this was the
case, it is tempting to suggest once again that Gnesippus
might have been the source for that literature.

Although not contemporary with Aristophanes, the
Scholia on Plutus 179 (39-50) are just as well discussed in
Aristophanes' wake. They comment on a mention of the famous
prostitute Lais:

η δὲ Λαῖς ἔπισημοτέρα γέγονε τής μητρός ἐν Κορίνθῳ.
υστερον δὲ καὶ αὕτη ἀπεδήμησεν εἰς Θεσσαλίαν, ἔνθα
Εὔροπλόχου τινὸς ἦ 'Αριστονίκου ἡράσθη, παρ' ὧν καὶ ἐβίωσε
τῶν λοιπῶν χρόνων. αὕτης δὲ πολλοὶ τῶν Θεταλῶν
ἡράσθησαν, καὶ τῷ ἔρωτι τὰ πράθυρα αὕτης οίνῳ ἔρρανον.
καὶ φασὶ, ὅτι ζηλοτυποῦσα αὐτὴ Θεταλαί γυναῖκες
ἐφόνευσαν αὐτὴν εὐλίανας χελὼναις τύπτουσαν ἐν τῷ λερῷ
tῆς 'Αφροδίτης.

The mention of the many Thessalians sprinkling her doorway
with wine is surely a paraklausithuric reference. The
topos is common and its other contexts make clear that the
only reason a person would sprinkle wine around a hetaira's
door would be because he was excluded.

144 Murgatroyd 1980, 71 agrees. For a rather less
pleasant offering at a person's door see Str. 14.5.14 (C
674-5): τις τοῦ ἐπιεικοῦς, εὔμυτον τὸ κοιλιάν ἔχων,
προσέρρανε πολὺ τῇ θύρᾳ καὶ τῇ τοίχῳ, νύκτωρ παριών τὴν
Plato

AP 6.1, which again refers to Lais, can be cited conveniently at this point. It is attributed to Plato, but is almost certainly the work of a Hellenistic poet. In it Lais dedicates a mirror to Aphrodite:

"Η σοβαράν γελάσασα καθ’ Ἑλλάδας, ἢ ποτ’ ἔραστον ἐσμον ἐπὶ προθύροις Λατίς ἔχουσα νέων,
τῇ Παλητό τῷ κάτωτρον. Ἐπει τοίνυν μὲν ὄρασαί σακτ ἐκέλω, οἷς δ’ ἦν πάρος οὐ δύναμαι."

It is worth noting how already prothuron is becoming an important word in Greek paraklausithuric situations. Moreover, the whole epigram brings to mind the "threat-prophecy" or carpe diem warning, where the excluded lover advises the beloved to admit him, since she will not always be able to attract lovers to her door.

The paraklausithuric situation, however, was known to the real Plato, who mentions it several times. Pausanias at Smp. 182 d ff. is explaining how the Athenians have a somewhat ambivalent attitude towards eros. Open eros that does not seek concealment is considered more dignified than furtive love, and the love of those of noble birth or character, regardless of their appearance, is highly esteemed. Lovers receive encouragement from all. Success in love brings glory, and failure shame. Therefore every sort of behaviour is tolerated in the lover, behaviour that would be greatly scorned in any other circumstance: for example, begging, praying, swearing oaths, sleeping at doorways and sub-
mitting to slavery unlike that of any slave. In a lover such actions are condoned because the pursuit of love is noble in itself:

ένθυμηθέντι γὰρ ὅτι λέγεται κάλλιον τὸ φανερὸς ἔρθαν τῷ λάθρᾳ, καὶ μάλιστα τῶν γενναίοτάτων καὶ ἀριστών, καὶ σιλάχιος ἄλλων ἔτι, καὶ ὅτι σὺ ἡ παρακέλευσις τῷ ἐρώτει παρὰ πάντων θαυμαστή, σὺ ὅσης τῆς αλαχρόντος ποιούμεθα, καὶ ἔλθαι τε καλὸν ὅσκελ εἴναι [ε] καὶ μὴ ἐλθεῖν αλαχρόν, καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἐπιχειρεῖν ἐλευθεροθάυματον ὁ νόμος δέσκει τῷ ἐραστῇ θαυμαστὰ ἐργαζόμενον ἑπαινεῖται, ἀλλ` τις τολμήσει ποιεῖν ἄλλη ὧτιον σωκέων καὶ [193 α] ἰλουόμενος διαπράξεσθαι πλὴν τοῦτον, [ὁ] [φιλοσοφιὰς] τὰ μέγιστα καρποῦτ` ἀν ωνεήσθω -- εἰ γὰρ ἢ χρήματα ἰλουόμενος παρὰ τοῦ λάβειν ἢ ἀρχὴν ἢρξαι ἢ τινά ἄλλον δυναμὶ ἐθέλοι ποιεῖν σιλάχι τοῦ ἐραστή πρὸς τὰ παιδικά, ἱκετείας τε καὶ ἀντιβολήσεις ἐν ταῖς δεσμαίοις ποιούμενοι, καὶ ὄρκους ὑμνύτες, καὶ κοιμάσσες ἐπὶ θύρας, καὶ ἐθέλοντες σοφεῖς σοφεῦναι ὡς σοφίς ἅν σοφίλος συνέμεν, ἐμποδίζοιτο ἢ ἢ πράττειν [πρὸς τὸν πάθειν καὶ θέλων καὶ ὑπὸ ἔχθρον, [β] τοῦ μὲν ὄνειδιόν τούτων κολακείας καὶ ἀνελεύθερας, τοῖς δὲ νοσθεόντες καὶ κοιμασάμενον ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, τῷ δ` ἐρώτει πάντα ταύτα ποιούμεθα χάρις ἑπείτη, καὶ δέσεται ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου ἄνευ ὀνείδους πράττειν, ὡς πάγκαλον τι πράγμα διαπραττομένων.\footnote{All quotations from Pl. Smp. use the text of Dover 1980.}

It is obvious that κοιμάσσες ἐπὶ θύρας (183 α) refers to the lover sleeping at his beloved's door.\footnote{See Dover 1980, 101: "lit. 'lyings-down-to-sleep at the doors' (sc. ποιούμενοι or κοιμάσσες; ...), i.e. in the doorway of the paidika." The passage has been noted for its use of seruitium amoris by Lyne 1979, 119 f. and Murgatroyd 1981, 590, and mentioned as paraklausithuric by the following: Copley 1942, 101; Cairns 1972, 146; Murgatroyd 1980, 145; McKeown 1987-, 2:122; Garte 1924, 6; Pasquali 1964, 420; and Headlam-Knox 1922, 83.} In connection with this, supplication (ἰκετεία), prayers (ἀντιβολήσεις), swearing oaths (ὄρκους ὑμνύτες) and seruitium amoris (δούλευσις δουλεύειν---cf. 219 ε)---all common paraklausithuric
topoi—are mentioned. It is particularly interesting that this type of behaviour on the part of an Athenian citizen and directed at a citizen youth (as the preceding context makes totally clear) is not considered shameful and does not need hiding. *Furtius amor* is expressly condemned. Moreover, the almost matter-of-fact way in which the whole situation is introduced implies that it was by no means an extraordinary event. It seems that *exclusive amatores* were by no means unusual sights in Greece—before either prostitutes’ or youths’ doors.

At *Smp.* 203 b Socrates recounts Diotima’s explanation of the origins of Eros. The gods were feasting on the day of Aphrodite’s birth and among them was Resource (Πόρος), the son of Metis. Poverty (Πενία) came to beg, standing at the door. Resource got drunk and went into the garden to sleep, where Poverty, hoping to help improve her condition by conceiving a child by Resource, had intercourse with him and conceived Eros. \(^{147}\) The story continues (203 c):

\[\text{διὸ δὴ καὶ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ἀκόλουθος καὶ θεράπων γέγονεν ὁ Ἐρως, γεννηθεὶς ἐν τοῖς ἑκεῖνης γενεσίλοις, καὶ ἄμα φύσει ἐρωτής ὅπερ τὸ καλὸν καὶ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης καλῆς οὐσίας. ἄτε οὖν Πόροι καὶ Πενίαις ὃς ὁ Ἐρως ἐν τοιαύτῃ τούτῃ καθέσιμον. πρῶτον μὲν πένης ἂεὶ ἔστι, καὶ πολλοὺς ἂεὶ ἀπαλός τε καὶ καλός, σοὶ σιν πολλοὶ ἄνωνται, ἄλλα σκληρὸς [d] καὶ σύκυμος καὶ ἀνυπόδητος καὶ ἄδοκος, χαμαπετής ἂεὶ ὅν καὶ ἄστρωτος, ἐπὶ θύρας καὶ ἐν ὀξός ὑπαίθριος κοιμώμενος, τὴν τῆς μητρὸς φύσιν ἐκχων, ἂεὶ ἐνδείᾳ σύνουκος. κατὰ δὲ αὐτὸν πατέρα ἐπίβουλος ἔστι.}\]

\(^{147}\) The story is popular with later writers: Origen *Cels.* 4.39, *Eus.* p.e. 12.11.2, and Themistius *Erot.* 162.c.7 ff.
The characterization of Eros is particularly interesting, for it fits the stereotypical excluded lover: poor, pained by exposure to the elements, and ἐπὶ θύραις καὶ ἐν ὀδοῖς ὑπαλθρικῶς κοιμώμενος....

This appears to be another unmistakable paraklausithuric reference. However Eros is also desirous of the beautiful and energetic, and is bold and clever in pursuing it—again like the typical paraklausithuric lover.

Even the arrival of Alcibiades later in the Symposium has a paraklausithuric flavour to it (212 c-213 b):

... καὶ ἔξαλφῃς τὴν στὴλεν θύραν κραυματέν πολὺν ψόφον παρασχέειν ὡς κωμαστὴν, καὶ αὐθετρίκας φυνῇ ἁκούειν. τὸν γὰρ Ἀγάθωνα, "παῖδες," φῶναι, [ὁ] οὐ σκέψεσθε; καὶ ἐάν μὲν τις τῶν ἐπιτηθεῖσιν ἦ, καλεῖτε· εἰ δὲ μὴ, λέγετε δὴ ὅτι οὐ πῶς ἔφη: ἀναστυγαθείς ἡδίν.

148 The "poverty" of the lover and his inability to pay for his beloved becomes a common paraklausithuric topos: Timoc. fr. 25 (K.-A.); Men. Mis. A92; Pl. As. 135 ff., Cur. 63 ff.; Hor. Epod. 11.11 f., S. 2.7.89 ff. Carm. 3.7.3 ff.; and Aristodem. FHG 3.310. The attack on the mercenary mistress goes along with this: Pl. As. 153 ff., 204 ff. (esp. 241 f.), Truc. 711 ff., 730 ff.; Hor. Carm. 3.16.8 (of Danae); Tib. 1.5.67 ff., 2.4.31 ff.; Prop. 2.16.1 ff., 4.5.47; and Ov. Rem. 299 ff., et al. Closely connected with this is the topos of the rich, and successful, rival: Ar. Pl. 1038 ff. (Wealth itself is the rival); Pl. As. 629 ff., Truc. 22 ff., 76 ff., 718 ff.; Hor. Epod. 11.11 f.; Tib. 1.5.59 ff., 2.4.21 ff.; Prop. 2.14.19 ff., 4.5.47 ff.; Ovid Am. 3.8.9 ff.; Lucian DMeretr. 14, 15; and Alciphrr. 4.9.3 ff., 4.11.1 ff. At [Quint.] Dec1. Mai. 15.13 the lover is actually a poor man.

149 It seems, however, to have escaped the notice of most major writers on the paraklausithuron.
A group of drunken komasts arrives (flute-girl in tow) and bangs loudly on the door, seeking admission. It turns out that Alcibiades is among them, very drunk, and wanting to be let in so he can offer his ivy garland, which is wound with ribbons, to Agathon in honour of the latter's victory as a tragic poet at the Lenaeae. 150 This komos is in essence a victory komos, arriving at the house of the victor with the

150 Aside from Alcibiades' statement that he is very drunk (μεθύοντα ἄνδρα πάνω σφόδρα 212 ε), there is also the slipping garland, which was considered a sign of drunkenness—see Asclep. AP 12.135.3-4 (G.-P. XVIII) καὶ γὰρ ἐδάκρυσεν καὶ ἐνύστασε, καὶ τι κατηφές / ἔβλεπε, χωρίς σφιγκθεὶς οὐκ ἔμενε στέφανος. Compare: Prop. 2.33b.36 ff.; Ov. Am. 1.6.37 f. (and Mckeown 1987-, 2:144); Verg. Ec. 6.16; and see Hollis 1977, 127 and Yardley 1978, 30.
intention of honouring him. Alcibiades briefly praises Agathon, as could be expected (τοῦ σοφώτατον καὶ καλλίστου). There could be a subtle erotic element in the καλλίστου, since Agathon was famous for his good looks and yet was also considered somewhat effeminate. Alcibiades is helped in, sits down next to Agathon, and crowns him. Later, when he notices Socrates, he requests some of the ribbons from Agathon, twists them into a garland, and also crowns Socrates (213 d-e). According to traditional Athenian usage, Socrates was Alcibiades' erastes, but intellectually and spiritually Socrates was also Alcibiades' eromenos. Both the epinician and amatory offerings of a garland are found here in close proximity to each other. This passage makes particularly clear the close connection between the komos and the paraklausithuric situation.\textsuperscript{151}

Isaeus and Theophrastus

Isaeus provides further evidence for the reality of the paraklausithuric situation in Athens.\textsuperscript{152} His Pyrrhus (3) 13-15 uses the fact that a woman was the object of komoi to argue that she must, therefore, be a hetaira:

\begin{quote}
'Ως μὲν ἡταίρα ἡ νῦν βουλομένη σῷ γυνῇ τοῦ ἡμετέρου θελοὺ, ἦν οὗτος ἐγενήσας ἐκείνη μεμαρτύρηκεν, ὑπὸ τῶν άλλων οἰκείων καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν γείτόνων τῶν ἐκείνου
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{151} The relationship between epinician and amatory komoi will be discussed in greater depth in Chapter 4.

\textsuperscript{152} Headlam-Knox 1922, 82 has also noticed the passage.
The woman was not only the object of komoi, but there were even fights (μάχας) in the street between her admirers, and other general ἀσέλγεια. This naturally drew the attention of neighbours. All this is strong proof of the woman's status as a ἡταιρά, for availability to all comers (15) is the mark of a ἡταιρά. The context seems to imply that men would only make komoi to women from whom they had some chance of gaining sexual satisfaction. It is particulary noteworthy to contrast this passage with Plato's indication above of the toleration of paraklausithuric actions directed at a citizen youth. Moreover, Isaeus makes a point of noting that the defence has not denied these events. For these arguments to have had rhetorical effect, the audience must, to some extent, have shared the assumption that such actions indeed have the implication that Isaeus has given them.

Theophrastus 27 ("Rejuvenation") makes a brief mention of a violent assault on a prostitute's door (9): καὶ
έρων εταίρας καὶ κριόνς προσβάλλων ταῖς θύραις πληγὰς εἰληφὼς ὑπ’ ἀντεραστοῦ δικάζεσθαι. If a lover has to resort to breaking down a door, he must be excluded and it seems safe to presume that no one would take such extreme action until an attempt at persuasion had failed. The mention of an ἀντεραστὴς explains such measures—a rival has the current favour of the beloved. Such references to violent assaults by lovers on someone’s house can be considered to be para-klausithuristic allusions. The fact that these actions are cited as examples of a rejuvenated old man indicates that they would usually have been performed by younger men.

**Middle Comedy**

Antiphanes brings us to Middle Comedy. Fr. 193 (193 Ἐ. = Αθ. 6.238 ε, from the Πρόγονοι) depicts a parasite boasting of his abilities:

```
τὸν τρόπον μὲν οἰσθάμω τὸν τύφος ὀφείλεσθαι, ἅλλα τοῖς ἄλλοις
tοιοῦτός εἰμί ὅτι τύππησθαί μῦδαν, τύπτειν κεραυνὸν, έκτυφλοῦν τιν’ ἀστραπή,
φέρειν τιν’ ἀρα βίοις, ἀποπυξαῖ βρόχος, τῇθρας μοχλεύειν σεισμός, εἰσπνῆσθαν ἀρχὴν;

... οὖν, φονεύειν, μαρτυρεῖν, ἂν ἔν μόναν

... τύχα τε εἰπών, ταῦτα ἀπροσκέπτως ποιεῖν
```

He is something of a thug for hire. One of his strengths is that he is a veritable earthquake when it comes to breaking down doors. This probably refers to the same situation as mentioned in Theophrastus 27—that is, in order to get to a reluctant ἑταίρα beloved. He would no doubt be helping some
well-off young lover. And while the other examples of violence could be for any number of reasons, in this context they could easily refer to fighting with rivals or pimps or others who might get in between a man and his beloved.$^{153}$

Fr. 236 (K.-A.) also makes mention of breaking down doors:

| οὐδὲς τὰ πατριὰ πω γέρων κατεδότοκεν, | άλλον οὐδὲ κατεμὼρανεν, οὐδὲ ἐλύσατο πορνίδον, οὐδὲ θυροκοπῶν δῆλεν σείμην. οὕτω τὸ γῆρας σωφρονοῦν οὐκ εὔτυχεῖ.$^{154}$
| A similar fragment from Timocles (25 K.-A. = Ath. 13.567 e) contains a poor man’s complaints about his lot: |

άλλον έγων’ ὁ ἀσυνυχης
φρύνης ἔρασθείς, ἧν ἂν ἐτι τὴν κάππαριν
συνέλεγεν οὐτω τ’ εἰχεν ἄσπερ ὑδε ἔχει,
πάμπολλ’ ἀναλλακτων ἐφ’ ἐκάστου τῆς θύρας
ἀπεκλειόμην.

The man knew the rich prostitute Phryne before she became wealthy. But now, although spending great amounts of money on people in her employ in order to buy access to her, he is shut out before her doors. Here are the topoi of the poor lover spending all he has in order to get access to his beloved, and bribery of the beloved’s doorkeeper or maid or slave. Furthermore, we have the first occurrence of ἀποκλειόμην.

$^{153}$ Εἰσπηδᾶν is used of breaking into houses at Aesch. Tim. 59 and J. BJ 6.3.

$^{154}$ This was mentioned in connection with θυροκοπῶν in Ar. V. 1253 ff. Fr. 197 (K.-A. = Ath. 6.243 c) also provides a good kōmos reference: ἐπὶ κῶμος δοκεῖ / ὑμεν ὧσπερ ἔχομεν. (B.) οὐκοῦν δαίδα καὶ / στέφανους λαβόντες.

Χαίρεσθών οὕτως εὖ / μεμάθηκε κοιμάσειν ἄδειπνος. Note that it is clearly unusual to go on, or to, a kōmos without garlands or torches and the implication that one would normally revel after dinner (hence the garlands from the symposium and the torches for the darkness).
εἰν (found in Ar. V. 335; see Appendix 2) in a clearly paraklausithuric context.

Aristophon fr. 5 (K.-A. = Ath. 6.238 b), is similar to Antiphanes fr. 193 above. Another parasite is praising his abilities:

ἄν τις ἐστι, πάρεμι πρῶτος, ὡστε ἕδη πάλαι

καλομέαν, σελεί τιν' ἄρα ἐκεῖ οὗσαν

καὶ παροιμαύτων, παλαιστὴν νόμισον Ἀργείων ἄραν.

προσβαλεῖν πρὸς οἰκίαν δεῖ, κρῖς ἀναβηναι τι πρὸς

κλημάκιον, ὑπομένειν πληγᾶς ἄκμαν,

κοινούλους πλάττειν δὲ Τελαμών' τόσος καλός πειράν

καπνός.

Again, he is skilled in assaulting houses, which must also be a reference to amatory exclusion, especially when one considers the mentions of a ladder, more fighting, and acting as a go-between (7 τούς καλῶς πειράν καπνός), which follow. For support of this interpretation it is worthwhile to consider Xenarchus fr. 4 (K.-A. = Ath. 13.569 a-b). A character condemns those who are fond of μεγαλομίσθους ἐπίθεσι καὶ τὰς ἠλευθέρας τῶν γυναικῶν, and praises common prostitutes. They are accessible, a customer can see what he is going to get, and there is no need for antics such as

155 The ladder would be for either the lover to climb in to his beloved via a window, or for his beloved to climb out. The comparison with smoke emphasizes the parasite's ability to penetrate even the most secure of houses—cf. Ar. V. 324. For using a ladder to get to one's beloved, see the vase paintings in Trenkner 1958, 129-30. One shows Zeus with a ladder, accompanied by Hermes carrying a torch, heading towards a woman looking out a window (Museo Gregoriano in Rome, Radermacher Zur Gesch. d. Kom. p. 20, Wüst Ἁλύσια. no. 1).
furtively climbing up a ladder, crawling in through the
smoke-hole in the roof, or being carried inside hidden in
straw (10-15):

μὴ κλίμακα στησάμενον εἰσάηανε λάβραι
μὴ δὲ ὅπης κάτωθεν εἰσάηανε στέγης
μηδ' ἐν ἀχύρουσιν εἰσενεχάηαι τέχνης
αὐταὶ βιάζονται γὰρ εἰσέλκουσι τε
τοὺς μὲν γέροντας δυτὰς ἐπικαλοῦμεναι
πατρίδια....

The final probable paraklausithuric reference from
Middle Comedy is Alexis fr. 114 (K.-A. = Ath. 15.678 c):
στεφάνους τε πολλοὺς κρεμαμένους μελισσίνους. This is pos-
sibly a reference to the lover hanging his garland on the
beloved’s door when refused admission.\(^{156}\) Three other defi-
nitely paraklausithuric passages have κρεμάνναι and στεφά-
νος: Asclep. AP 5.145.1 f. (G.-P. XII), Ἀὐτὸν μοι στέφανοι
παρὰ συκίλσι ταῦτα κρεμαστότ / μὴ μενετε; Mel. AP 5.191.5 f.
(G.-P. LXXIII):

ἐπὶ προθύρους μαρανθεῖς
δάκρυσιν ἐκήθων τοὺς ἱκέτας στεφάνους
ἐν τὰδ' ἐπιγράφας. "Κύπρι, σοι Μελέαγρος ὁ μύστης
σὺν κώμων στοργάς σκύλα ταῦτ' ἐκρέμασε";

and Rufin. AP 5.92.3, ἦν ποτὲ καὶ στεφάνους προθύρων ὑπὲρ
ἐκκρεμάσωμαι.

Menander

The works of Menander do not contain any developed
or unambiguous paraklausithuric scenes. However, the Dysko-

\(^{156}\) Edmonds 1957-61, 2.427 n. b, also suggests the
possibility. Of course, it could refer to any dedication or
offering of a garland.
Iōs provides a brief reference similar to those from Middle Comedy cited above. The parasite Chaireas is speaking to Sostratos (58 ff.):

παραλαμβάνει τις τῶν φίλων
ἐρών ἑταίρας. εὐθὺς ἀρπάσας φέρων,
μεθύω, κατακάω, λόγον ὅλως ὅπως ἀνέχομαι. 60
πρὶν ἐξετάσαι γάρ ἦτις ἡστί, δεί τυχεῖν.
τὸ μὲν βραδύνειν γάρ τὸν ἑρωτ' αὐξεῖ πολύ,
ἐν τῷ ταχέως δ' ἐνεστὶ παύσασθαι ταχύ.
γάρ οὖν λέγει τις καὶ κόρην ἐλευθέραν,
ἐξερος τις ἐμ' ἐνταύθα: πυνθάνομαι γένος, 65
βλού, τρόπους.

This helps to clarify further the ambiguity of the references above to attacking houses. In this case such actions are carried out in order to capture a patron’s beloved hetaira.¹⁵⁸ Fire is the preferred weapon.¹⁵⁹ Of course such actions are best facilitated by the artificial courage that being drunk provides.

There is a brief exclusion scene in the Samia when Chrysis is thrown out of Demeas’ house. Nikeratos comes across her crying in front of the house (405 ff.):

Νῦν ἄλλ', Ἡράκλεις, τί τότε; πρόσθε τῶν θυρῶν
ἐστηκε χρυσίς ἢδε κλάοις'· οὐ μὲν οὖν
ἄλλη, τι ποτὲ τὸ γεγονός; Χρ. ἐκβέβληκέ με
ὁ φίλος ὁ χρηστὸς σου. τί γάρ ἄλλο;

¹⁵⁷All quotations from Menander will follow the text of Sandbach 1990.

¹⁵⁸Gomme and Sandbach 1973, 145 "ἀρπάσας suggests carrying off a slave-hetaira from her owner, cf. Kol. 131, Ter. Ad. 90...."

¹⁵⁹For κατακάλειν of love cf. Lyr. Alex. Adesp. 8(c) (Powell): ὃ ἑρως ἑμέ ... κατακάλεκακεν, ... -καίομαι καταλελειμμένη, and Frag. Grenf. 24.
Κλάειν is common in paraklausithuric situations: see Appendix 2. 'Εκβάλλειν is used at Rufin, AP 5.41.1 and 5.43.1 of a hetaira thrown out by a jealous lover who found her with someone else. 'Ικμάλειν occurs only here in a paraklausithuric context, but other compounds of κλάειν (esp. ἀποκλάειν) are common. Κλάειν itself occurs only once, at Theoc. 6.32.

161McKeown 1987-, 2:121 and 123 has also noted this scene as possibly paraklausithuric. The text for the Misoumenos is presented in an appendix to Sandbach 1990, 351 ff., whose version supersedes that of Turner 1977.
Here is a man, in front of a house, pacing back and forth alone at night. He addresses Night—as some excluded lovers do—pointing out her connection to love and lovers.¹⁶²

Attempting to obtain the sympathy of the god, he then asks if she has ever seen a lover more wretched than himself.¹⁶³

The emphatic ἑμαυτοῦ in line 6 surely reflects his surprise at being an excluded lover in front of his own doors.¹⁶⁴

Then comes the surprise—he could actually be inside with

¹⁶² For more addresses to Night in paraklausithura see: Asclep. AP 5.164.1 ff. (G.-P. XIII); Frag. Gren. 11 ff. (stars and night); Bion Aposp. 11 (Hesper); and Mel. AP 5.165., 5.166, and 5.191 (stars and moon and Night; G.-P. LI, LII, and LXXIII). Some other addresses to Night can be found at E. Or. 174, 1495, E7. 54, and 887; Ar. Th. 1065; [Men.] Pap. Antinoopolis 15.4 (Sandbach 1990, 327); and Pl. Am. 277 and 546. Gomme and Sandbach 1973, 442 cite the Scholia on Ar. Th. 1065 for Euripides’ Andromeda beginning with an address to Night.

¹⁶³ Δυστυχής occurs of lovers in broadly paraklausithuran passages at Timocl. fr. 25.1 (K.-A.) and Alciphron 4.9.1.

¹⁶⁴ Gomme and Sandbach 1973, 443 note that "Apol-lonius quotes the line and explains that ἑμαυτοῦ is emphatic. A rejected lover outside someone else’s door is a familiar figure; Thrasonides stands outside his own.”
his beloved, over whom he has the rights of an owner (which is an inversion of the topos of the lover as the beloved's slave). He proclaims the strength of his love and mentions the madness of love, but instead of going inside he stays out in the cold, shivering—the bad weather the lover is forced to endure being a common paraklausithuric topos.\(^5\)

His slave Getas enters, also mentions the bad weather, and says that he's not made of solid oak—possibly a twist on the stereotypical hardness of the beloved or door.\(^6\) He tries to convince Thrasonides to go inside.

In the following lines we learn that Thrasonides has returned from a campaign and has brought back a female cap-

\(^5\)See Ar. V. 240 ff., 260 ff.; Men. Mis. A13, A53 ff.; Asclep. AP 5.64 (snow and hail); 167, 189 (G.-P. XI, XIV, and XLII); Anon. AP 12.115.1 ff. (G.-P. VI); Mel. AP 5.190.1 ff. (address waves, winds, sea); 12.167.1 ff. (G.-P. LXIV and CIX); Phld. AP 5.4 (address weather, including snow and hail); 5.120 (G.-P. I and VII); Val. Aed. 2.3 f.; Hor. Carm. 1.25.11 ff. (with Nisbet-Hubbard 1970, 296-7, 299-8); 3.7.6, 3.10.3, 10, 19-20, 3.26.10; Tib. 1.2.29 ff. (see Murgatroyd 1980, 81-2); Prop. 1.16.34 (seemingly negated by "at mea nocturno uerba cadunt Zephyro"), 2.17.15 f. (see Cairns 1975, 15-7); Ov. Am. 1.6.43 f., 51 ff., 1.9.15 (see McKeown 1987-), 2.145-6, 149 f., and 266); Ars 2.235 ff., Ep. 10.49, 133 ff., 18.1 ff., 37 ff. (address wind), et passim, 19.71 ff., et passim; Anacreont. 33; Mart. 10.82 (of clientage, but paraklausithuric); Nemes. EcI. 4.38 ff. (heat); and Philostr. 29. For the weather being good, see Theoc. 11.37 ff. and 45 ff.

tive, who treats him with ὅβρις—she is a hard, unyielding mistress. He in turn treats her with every kindness, regarding her almost as his wife, allowing her the run of the house, and giving her servants, jewellery and dresses. But she hates him:

(Γε.) τῇ δὲ τῷ λυπούμενον σ', (Θρ.) ἔλεε' ὅβριζομαι. A36
(Γε.) ὑπὸ τίνος; (Θρ.) ὑπὸ τῆς αἰχμαλώτου· πριάμενος
ἀτήν, περισθεὶς ἔλευθεραν, τῆς αἰκίας
δέσποιναν ἀποδέξας, θεραπάνας, χρυσὰ
[μάτια δοῦς, γυναῖκα νομίζας]—(Γε.) εἰτὰ τῇ
ἀτήν σ', ὅβριζε'; (Θρ.) καὶ λέγειν ἀλαχώνομαι
νυν'.
(Γε.) ἀλλ' ἀθώς ἔμοι φράσεν
(Θρ.) μισεῖν νέον] με μίσος.167

He goes on to recount the various ways in which he has attempted to elicit some sign of affection from her. For example, late on some rainy night he will say he has to go out to see someone, hoping in vain that she will show concern for him (raising the topoi of the beloved who has no concern for the lover’s suffering in the cold and rain):

(Θρ.) κέκραγα "παιδίσκη, βαδίσαι γάρ", φημὶ, "δεῖ
ἥδη με πρὸς τὼν δείν', ἐπείπας δυναμὲν τε.
πάσῃ δὲ γυνῇ δὴ τοῦτό γ' εἴποι, "τοῦ Διός
θυσίας, δ' τάλαν; τριψιον τυχά...

Thrasonides next recounts the type of things he says to her to win her over, such as asking for her heart, saying that if she neglects him he will become jealous, distressed, or insane: these implicitly represent the threats of the

167 Λυπέζεν (A36) occurs in only one other clearly paraklausithuristic passage: Theoc. 23.22. It can also be found at Ar. Pl. 1010.
excluded lover. Like the excluded lover who makes vows to the gods for his success, if she would call him φιλτάτος he himself would offer up sacrifices. Getas expresses his disbelief at this, pointing out that Thrasonides is reasonably good-looking, although he does not earn much as a soldier, thereby bringing up the appearance of the lover and his typical poverty. He then comments on the general wretchedness of women:

αὖτι 'στι· πρόσεχ' δ' φιλτάτ
παρορμμένης δέ[
φιλουκίλαν πόνου μανίαν[
τι δ' κακόδαιμον;
άλλ' έγων' δι φι[
κληθεὶς μόνον θύσαι μι πάσι τοῖς θεοῖς,
τι τούτ' ἀν έιη τό κακόν; οὐδὲ γάρ σφόδρ' έι[
άκρως άδός ἔστε γ' εἴπειν. άλλα σοι[
τό μικρὸν ἁμέλει τόθ στρατιωτικοῖ[
άλλ' δώλων ὑπεράστεοις· άλλα μὴν αγ[
της ἕλικας[
κακώς ἀπόλοιο· δεὶ τό πράγμ' εὑρεῖων [δ' τι[
έστιν ποτ' , αἰτίαν ἀναγκαίαν τιμα[
δεξίαι. (Γε.) μισρόν τό θυλόν έστι, δεσποτα.

Finally Getas says he is going inside (A103) for fear that Thrasonides’ pacing up and down might attract muggers, which is a variation of the common topos of the dangers of the night:

] ἀσαὶ νῦν, ὥραις, εἰδόταιοι[
] λυποδύτας μοι περιπατοῦν[
τι]ούτους τε φ[ε]ύγων ἐκλύτως[.

The passage as a whole seems to be paraklausithuric, and, like several of the examples from Aristophanes, shows a remarkably full range of common paraklausithuric topoi. Of course, any of the topos could be explained simply by the
fact that they are the type of things that one would expect to be mentioned given the exact circumstances of the scene. But the sheer accumulation of them seems to argue for deliberate manipulation of the paraklausithuric situation by Menander. The most effective touch is Thrasonides' self-exclusion, which is a clever way to elicit greater pity for Thrasonides. He is a thoroughly decent man, who will not force himself on his captive beloved because he wishes to have her genuine affection.

Finally, it seems possible to deduce the existence of one other paraklausithuric scene in Menander. Terence's *Eunuch* (46 ff.) contains a scene in which Phaedria complains about being shut out by his beloved and then called back. The scene will be examined in more detail later. However, the *Scholia* on Persius 5.161, which resembles this scene, say that Terence took the passage from Menander's *Eunuch*, which then would probably have had some similar paraklausithuric situation.

While this dissertation will generally avoid the highly complicated and frequently very controversial question of the sources for the plays of Plautus and Terence, the correspondence here is too strong to pass by.

The scene from the *Eunuch* is also quoted at Cic. N.D. 3.72. The reference to the *Scholia* is from Pease 1955-58, 1157. Before leaving Greek comedy, it is worth noting the excellent reference to a komos in Apollod. Car. fr. 5.19 ff. (K.-A. = Ath. 7.281 a) πλευρῆν Ἀθηναίους ἀπαυμάτας τοὺς μέχρι / ἐνων τριάκοντα, ἔξενας τοὺς ἥμερας / ἐπὶ καθέναν εἰς Κόρινθον ἡμέρας δέκα / στεφάνους ἀθηναίκος καὶ μῦρον πρὸ ἡμέρας. Note the drinking that precedes the komos, the garlands and myrrh as its accoutrements, and the destination of Corinth, a city famed for its prostitutes.
Between Menander and Theocritus

There is a small chronological gap between Menander and the next paraklausithuric passages from a group of roughly contemporary authors overlapping the fourth and third centuries B.C.: Asclepiades, Callimachus, Poseidippus, and Hermesianax. The first three of these provide the earliest paraklausithuric epigrams from the Anthologia Palatina and will be taken together.

Six paraklausithuric epigrams are attributed in the AP to Asclepiades. 5.64 (G.-P. XI) is more komastic than paraklausithuric, but there are many similar topoi:

$\text{Νείφε, χαλαζοβόλει, πολεί σκότος, σίθε, κεραύνου, πάντα τά πορφύρου πτώς ἐν χθονὶ σεῖε νεῖφ.'}$

$\text{メント τοι ποτε παύσομαι, ἢν ἐκ μ' ἀφῆς ἢν καὶ στίχως τούτων κελονα κωμάσομαι.}$

$\text{Στίχιν γὰρ μ' ὁ κρατῶν καὶ σοθ θεός, ὅ ποτε πεισθεῖς, 5}$

$\text{Ζεύς, ὁ θάλαμου χρυσῷς ἄδιας θαλάμων.}$

The epigram brings up in an elaborate (and unrealistic) manner the topoi of the bad weather faced by the lover/komast. The snow, hail, darkness etc. are addressed as obstacles that the lover must overcome to reach his beloved and their power over the lover is clearly indicated—they have the potential to kill him. This also indicates the bravery of the lover. At line 4 we find out that the lover will make a komos to his beloved (the epigram’s inclusion in book five

\[170\text{Unless indicated otherwise, epigrams from the AP follow the text of Gow–Page 1965, or 1968. This epigram is quoted at Suidas kappa.2255: Κωμάσομαι: ἀσελγός διατεθής-}$

$\text{σομι.] ἐν 'Επιγράμμασι· ἢν γὰρ με κτείνης, τότε παύσομαι.}
indicates that it is probably heterosexual), and we can presume that he is therefore drunk. The extreme weather might possibly indicate that he does not have a lit torch. Like many other komasts and excluded lovers, he is under the irresistible compulsion of love. Then Zeus is addressed, presumably in his role as sky-god, to try to win his favour or support.\textsuperscript{171} The lover reminds the god that he too has been the victim of love and cites Danaë as an example.\textsuperscript{172} This also introduces the topos of the primacy of love/Aphrodite/Eros over all the gods. The mention of Danaë indicates to the reader that the beloved who is the object of the komos is probably under some form of guard and the lover’s quest will most likely be futile. For the density of its topoi, this is an excellent introduction to the epigrammatic paraklausithuron.

\textsuperscript{171}For addresses to, or oaths by, Zeus/Jupiter, see Thgn. 1045; Ar. Ec. 1011, Eq. 725, V. 323; Asclep. AP 5.167 (G.-P. XIV); Pl. Am. 1021 ff., 1050 f.; Anon. AP 12.115.3 f. (G.-P. VI); Mel. AP 12.117.6 (G.-P. XIX); Phld. AP 5.4 (G.-P. I); Hor. Carm. 3.10.8; and Ov. Am. 1.6.15 ff. (assimilation of doorkeeper to Jupiter, see McKeown 1987–, 2:132), 2.1.17, and Met. 13.842 ff. He is also regularly mentioned as a lover or adulterer: Asclep. AP 5.64 (G.-P. XI); Prop. 1.13.29 ff.; Philostr. Im. 1.14.2; Prud. Symm. I 59 ff.; and Paul. Sil. AP 5.217. See also next note.

\textsuperscript{172}The idea of Zeus as a precedent for lovers goes back at least to Thgn. 1345. For the appeal to a god for help based on his experience as a lover (and variations on it), see Ar. V. 389 ff.; Men. Mis. A1 f.; AP 5.167 (Asclep.); Frag. Grenf. 11; Phld. AP 5.4 (G.-P. I); Mel. 5.191.1 (G.-P. LXXIII); Bion Aesp. 11.1 f.; and Ov. Am. 1.6.53–4. See McKeown 1987–, 2:149–50 and his examples, particularly Am. 3.6.19 ff., and Ep. 18.37 ff., 53 ff., \textit{et passim}. 
Asclepiades in AP 5.145 (G.-P. XII) introduces several new topoi:

Αὐτὸδ μοι στέφανοι παρὰ δικλίοι ταίσθε κρεμαστοί
μεμνετε μὴ προπετὼς φύλλα τιμασσόμενοι
οὐς ἀκρόβας, κατέβρεξα—κάτομβρα γὰρ δηματ’ ἐρώτων—
アルバム ἤταν οἰγομένης αὐτὸν ἔσθιε θύρης
στάξαι’ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς ἐμὸν ὑπόν ὡς αὐν ἡμείνοιν
5 ἡ ἱεννή γε κόμη τὰμὰ πὶν ἀκρυα.

Here for the first time is the address to the garland, the garland watered with the lover’s tears, and the garland passing on those tears to the beloved (by dripping on him in the morning). Furthermore, we have the first occurrence in a definite paraklausithuric context of the lover hanging his garland on the beloved’s door. The beloved in this case is a youth (αὐτῶν 4), his beauty implied by ἡ ἱεννή (6). This is, therefore, also our first clearly homosexual epigrammatic paraklausithuron. Finally, the fact that the lover has a garland indicates that he has come from a symposium (McKeown 1987-, 2:121).

In AP 5.153 (G.-P. III), a different moment from the lover’s entreaty at his beloved’s door is depicted:

Νικαρέτης τὸ πάθοςι βεβαμένον ἡδύ πρόσωπον
πυκνά δὲν ψηλῶν φαινόμενον θυρίδων
αὐχοραπαί Κλεοφύντος ἐπὶ προθύρωσι μάραναν
Κύπερ φίλη, γλυκεροῦ βλέμματος ἀστεραπαί.

Cleophon is standing before Nicaretē’s door and has persuaded her to actually look out and see him, something many excluded lovers attempt. She peers out from an upper-storey window and she is struck by the fire from his eyes. She is
probably a *hetaira*.\textsuperscript{173} The fact that eye contact has been made and that it is described in this manner makes it very probable that in fact Cleophon will be admitted—his para-
kleisithuron has been successful.\textsuperscript{174}

The lover in *AP* 5.164 (G.-P. XIII) is less successful. He has been summoned by his beloved only to be refused entrance when he arrives:

\begin{quote}
Νόε, σε γὰρ, οὐκ ἄλλην, μαρτυρομαι, οἶδα μ᾽ ὑβρίζει
Πυθιάς ἢ Νικοῦς οὖσα φιλεξαπάτις.
καθεῖς, οὐκ ἄλλητος, ἐλήλυθο σαλπιγγα
σολ μέμψετ' ἐξ' ἑρμίς στάσα παρὰ προθύροις.
\end{quote}

Here is another address to Night, who is called to witness the outrage (ὑβρίζει) the lover has suffered. His beloved is

\textsuperscript{173}Gow-Page 1965, 2:119: "the fact that Nicaretis is often to be seen at her window probably indicates that she is a hetaera, or at least not unduly modest." They also cite on ἀστεροσαλ S. fr. 474 τοίαν Πέλοψ ἤνγα θηρατῆριαν / ἔρωτος, ἀστεραῖη τιν' ὕμματων ἐχει, / ἔ ῥάλπεται μὲν αὐτὸς ἐξοπτὰ δ᾽ ἑμὲ. Also see Praxill. fr. 754 (Heph. 7.8): ὁ δὲ τὰς θυρίδας καλὸν ἐμβλέπωσα / παρθὲνε τὰν κεφαλὰν τὸ δ' ἔνερθε νύμφα—"it is tempting to take this as paraklausithu-
ric.

\textsuperscript{174}The request for the beloved to look out is com-
mon: Ar. Eq. 727; Asclep. *AP* 5.153 (G.-P. III; beloved does look out); Ant. Lib. 39/Hermesian. 2.5 (does look out at end); Theoc. 3.12 (at 3.39 the goatherd hopes she will); P.Teb. 1.1.2d.9; Hor. Carm. 3.7.30 (negated); Ov. Am. 1.6.17 f., Ep. 10.150, Met. 13.824 f., 838 f., 14.751 ff.; and Nemes. Ecl. 4.20. It is worth noting here that in erotic vase painting eye-contact seems usually to indicate an agreement between lover and beloved. Eye contact has remained important through modern times, cf. "That old black magic" ("... that same old witchcraft when your eyes meet mine...") or Modern Lovers' "Eyes" ("I'm in love with your eyes").
a *hetaira* (Niko is probably her procurer).\(^{175}\) It is worth paying particular attention to the fact that a prostitute has summoned someone who must be a regular customer, only to refuse him entry. The reason probably has to do with keeping his interest in her keen. Moreover, she regularly acts this way (φιλαξαμάτις). This makes clear that *hetairai* could be willful and act in ways that make them appear at first like respectable women. Treated in this way, the lover expresses his hope that one day she will be shut out in turn by him—what Cairns (1972, 88, *et al.*) calls a threat- prophecy. This is a common wish/threat of excluded lovers.\(^ {176}\)

Asclepiades *AP* 5.167 (G.-P. XIV) is problematic:

\[ 'Υετος ἦν καὶ νύξ καὶ τρίτον ἀλγος ἐρωτι
οἶνος καὶ βορέης ψυχρός, ἐγώ δὲ μόνος. \]

\(^{175}\) Gow-Page 1965, 2:125 suggest the same.

\(^{176}\) McKeown 1987–, 2:121 cites this epigram among a list of others—including Call. *AP* 5.23 (G.-P. LXIII); Asclep. *AP* 5.145, 167, 189 (G.-P. XII, XIV, XLII); Posidipp. *AP* 5.213 (G.-P. IV); and Call. *AP* 12.118 (G.-P. VIII)—as having a symposium for its starting point. This does not seem, however, clear here. While many paraklausithura do occur against a sympotic background, the lover in this epigram could as easily have been called (3) from home as from a symposium. For such threat- prophecies, see Ar. *Plut*. 1043 f., 1053-4; Theoc. 7.121, [Theoc.] 23.28 ff.; Hor. *Carm*. 1.25.1 ff., 17 ff.; Ov. *Ars* 3.58 ff.; *Nemes. Ecly*. 4.20 ff., 32 ff.; Rufin. *AP* 5.92 and 103; and Marc. *Arg. AP* 5.118. Cf. Hor. *Carm*. 31.14.25 ff. and 3.26, where Horace is an aging lover. Also see Nisbet-Hubbard 1970, 289 ff. There are several spells of attraction in the *PGM* that are supposed to bring the beloved to the lover’s door: 4.2490 ff. (Preisendanz 1973-4, 1.150): καὶ ἑκατώσεις αὐτήν ἀπὸ παντὸς / τόπου καὶ πάσης οἰκίας ἄρεν αὐτήν ἄθεο, / πρός ἐμέ, τὴν ἄδεια; and 4.2742 ff. (Preisendanz 1973-4, 1.160) καὶ προλιπώσα τάχιστα / ἐπ’ ἐμοῖς προθύρωσι παρέστω, ..., 2782 σπεῦδε τάχιστα, / ἡδο ἐπ’ ἐμαῖσι θύραισι παρέστω.
But even if one cannot solve the textual problems, several things are clear. The mention of rain, the night, love, wine, and the north wind seem to support a komastic/para-klausithuric context. Someone has been compelled by love of Moskhos to go out into the foul weather. There is either a wish that someone would have come somewhere or that someone would experience the same thing the speaker is—the latter would be some form of threat-prophecy. There is a reference to lying at doors and a complaint to Zeus, probably about the weather, in which an appeal is made to the god’s own experience of love.

The final epigram from Asclepiades, *AP* 5.189 (G.-P. XLII), is similar in set ting to 5.167. It is night, in stormy or wintry weather, and a lover wet from the rain passes back and forth by his beloved’s door. The beloved is ἄλαλης, implying that the lover has been deceived somehow—there is probably a rival inside with the beloved, and the lover might even have originally been summoned by his

---

177 I have adopted Paton’s (1916-18, 1.206 f.) ἵσχυεν. Ἀλ σὺ for line 3 in preference to Gow-Page’s (1965, 1:48) ἵσχυεν ἂν καὶ σὺ ..., and changed the punctuation after βεβρεγμένος from “." to “:”. Paton 1916-18, 1.208 calls the epigram “very obscure and probably corrupt” and Gow-Page 1965, 2:126 call it “corrupt and extremely obscure.”

178 For various possible solutions, see Gow-Page 1965, 2:126.
beloved. There is a final mention of Aphrodite and the fires of love:

Νῦξ μακρὴ καὶ χείμα, ἁμέσως δ' ἐπὶ Πλειάδα δύνει, 
κάγω πάρ προθύροις νέοσομαι υπόμενοι, 
τρωθεῖς τῆς δόλης ἓκείνης τῆς πάθης, σοῦ γὰρ ἔρωτα 
Κύπριος ἀνιπρόδ θ' ἐκ πυρὸς ἤκε βέλος.\footnote{Gow-Page 1965, 2:146 say χείμα is "more likely to mean stormy weather than winter." They interpret the reference to the Pleiades as meaning "about the time when the middle of the constellation is setting, midway in the setting of the Pleiads."}

It is interesting to note that 5.167 is the only one of Asclepiades' epigrams in which the beloved even possibly addressed: 5.64 addresses the weather and Zeus; 5.145 the garland; 5.153 simply depicts a moment in time as the lover and beloved make eye contact; 5.167 addresses Zeus and, probably, the beloved; and 5.189 contains no address at all. Short poems have room for a few topoi only, and a poem that is narrated rather than composed solely of direct quotation has significantly more flexibility for the introduction of what topoi can be made to fit the brief space. The two epigrams from Callimachus discussed immediately below are both purely direct quotation, but they are in a significant minority. A four line epigram that contained a lover’s address to a beloved would have to be extremely artificially condensed and constructed in order to give the reader as much information as a poem of similar length in which the poet speaks in the third person. Moreover, epigrams composed
completely of direct quotation could soon become repeti-
tive—there are only so many ways a lover can request admis-
sion to a beloved—whereas there is much greater artistic
flexibility in the narrative epigram. The varying degrees of
explicitness with which the paraklausithuric situation is
spelled out in these poems seem also to indicate that
readers would have been aware enough of the conventions of
the genre to fill in the situation mentally. Even if the
epigrams are not real examples of amatory persuasion, the
paraklausithuric situations contained in them are unmistake-
able. Similar characteristics, with certain exceptions, can
be seen in the epigrams of Callimachus and Poseidippus.

Callimachus AP 5.23 (G.-P. LXXIII, Pfeiffer 63) is
completely addressed to the beloved and is essentially one
long threat-prophecy:

Οὐτως ὑπνώσας, Κυνόπλου, ὡς ἔμε ποιεῖς
κομμάθαι ψυχραίς τοῖς ἄρα προθύροις:
οὕτως ὑπνώσας, ἀδηκωτή, ὡς τὸν ἑραστὴν
κομμάζεις, ἐλέου δ᾽ σὺν ἔναρ ἠντίσασα.
γείτονες ὀλκτέρουσι, σὺ δ᾽ ὑδατον ἐναρ. ἡ πολιτικὴ δὲ
αὐτίκ' ἀναμνήσει ταυτά σε πάντα κόμη.\(^{180}\)

\(^{180}\) The text is Gow-Page's, not Pfeiffer's. Gow-Page
1965, 2:214 comment: "The theme, which would not cause sur-
prise in Asclepiades ... or Posidippus ... is highly unex-
pected in C. ... and we retain them here though with no con-
fidence that they are C's. They are defended as his by F.
Zucker in Philol. 98.94." Pfeiffer 1949-53, 2:99 is inclined
to ascribe it to Rufinus: "Hoc de amore excluso epigramma,
quod in Blomfieldi editione propter cod. Pal. testimonium
ceteris Callimachi carminibus additum est, pro spuriio
to reiciendum esse suspicor: non tam ipsius argumenti causa (a
Callimacho certe alieni) quam totius dicendi coloris....
Deiudicare non audeo, an recte Rufino adresinatum sit hoc
epigr. in collectione Planudea; conferas tamen, quaeso, ad
rem ipsam Rufini epp. A.P. 5.92 (et 103), ad iusum uocabu-
The lover, sleeping at Conopion's doors, and therefore excluded, prays that she will one day be forced to do the same before her beloved's door. Found here for the first time is the transference of attributes from the beloved to the door—the doors are ψυχροῖς because Conopion is. This is also a form of semi-personification. There is a further explicit mention of the beloved's pitilessness, reinforced by the new topos of the pity felt for the lover by neighbours or witnesses to the lover's vigil.\textsuperscript{181} The lover also regularly wonders if the beloved is asleep.\textsuperscript{182} The final line contains another threat-prophecy: the beloved will age and become unattractive and then, unable to find a willing lover, will think of times like this.

lorum iterorum e.g. ... Totum carmen ceteris Rufini epp. in A.P. servatis paulum praestare mihi uidetur;..." Luck 1956, 225 ff., however, makes a convincing case for keeping the attribution to Callimachus.

\textsuperscript{181}For pitying or sympathetic witnesses, see Ant. Lib. 39.5/Hermesian. 2.5; Theoc. 3.31 ff., 11.61 f.; Mel. AP 12.72.5 (G.-P. XCII); and Hor. Carm. 3.7.1 ff. (Horace himself is the witness). Tib. 1.2.33 f. addresses a witness and asks him to be quiet. At Ov. Ep. 18.131 f., Leander speaks of the dolphins as witnesses. For the mocking bystander see: Theoc. 11.77; Mel. AP 12.23 (G.-P. XCIX); Hor. Carm. 1.25.1 ff. (Horace); Tib. 1.2.87 ff.; and Prop. 3.25.15 f. (Propercius addresses the mocker).

\textsuperscript{182}See: Thgn. 1045 (sleeping beloved); Men. Mis. A9 (people sleeping inside); Mel. AP 5.191.4 (LXXIII); P.Teb. 1.1.2d.18; Hor. Carm. 1.25.7 f. (wonders if beloved sleeps); Prop. 1.16.33; and Ov. Am. 1.6.45-6 (and see McKeown 1987-, 2:146). Compare also Mel. AP 5.152 (G.-P. XXXIV).
Callimachus AP 12.118 (G.-P. VIII, Pfeiffer 42) is surprisingly complex:

Εἰ μὲν ἐκὼν, 'Αρχίζων', ἐπεκώμασα, μυρλὰ μέμφου, εἷς δ' ἄκων ἤκω τὴν προσέτειλαν ἑα.
ἀκριτοὶς καὶ ἔρως μὺ ἡμάγκασαν, διὸ οἱ μὲν αὐτῶν ἐλλεῖν, ὁ δ' οὐκ ἐλα τὴν προσέτειλαν ἑαν.
ἐλθὼν δ' οὖκ ἐβόησα τίς ἡ τίνος ἄλλ' ἐφίλησα τὴν φλιῆν, εἷς τούτ' ἔστ' ἄδικημ' ἄδικ' ἐκ.183

The lover is addressing the beloved after his exclusion. The topos of the lover arriving on a komos is mentioned only to be denied: this lover did not come with music and revelry, but instead the irresistible compulsion of love (cf. 5.64 and 167) and wine dragged him.184 The element of unwillingness implies that his was a quiet, subdued arrival, deserving of the beloved’s forgiveness. The picture is slightly pathetic. Having arrived, he did not identify himself or shout out the name of his beloved but merely kissed the doorpost.185 The beloved is a youth, probably a citizen as


184 It seems more natural to take the εἷς plus aorist indicative in line 1 as meaning that he did not ἐπικωμάζεως. See Appendix 2 for ἐπικωμάζεως. For the compulsion of love and wine, see McKeown 1987-2:153, to which add Asclep. AP 5.64 (G.-P. XI). Gow-Page 1965, 2:163 note, among others, E. fr. 265 (Nauck) νοοῦ δ' ἄλος ἐκέστησε μ' ὁμολογῶ δὲ σε ἄδικεν, τὸ δ' ἄδικημ' ἐγένετ' οὐχ ἐκούσαν. For the compulsion of love, also compare Mel. AP 12.85 (G.-P. CXV) and Prop. 2.29A, where the poet is abducted by a gang of Cupids.

185 Cf. Theoc. 23.18 for a komast kissing the φλιᾶ, and see Chapter 4 for kissing other parts of the door or the beloved’s house. The gesture could be either simple affection for that which is connected with the beloved, or have overtones of actual worship. Fedeli 1981, 232 suggests that veneration and love are combined here.
in Plato *Smp.* 182 d ff., which helps explain why the lover could expect the restrained nature of his actions to be considered a good thing.\(^{186}\) The beloved's gender in this epigram is also interesting in the way it neatly illustrates the comfortable accommodation in the paraklausithuron of both heterosexual and homosexual love. One or, possibly, two (5.167) of Asclepiades' six epigrams were homosexual, and Callimachus wrote one of each. However, the two clearly homosexual epigrams are more pathetic in tone and emotionally involving than the heterosexual ones. This could reflect the relative importance in homosexual relationships of the lover being accepted for his own sake, rather than the more purely commercial relationship between male lover and *hetaira* beloved.\(^{187}\)


\(^{187}\) Dover 1989, 88 sums up the difference well: "So long as there were female slaves who had no say in how they were used and female prostitutes who needed to earn money for themselves or for their owners, a young Athenian male, especially if he was well-off, was not short of sexual outlets. Purchased sex, however, could never give him what he needed emotionally, the experience of being valued and welcomed for his own sake. Since girls of citizen family were protected by their families against contact with men, the seducer was necessarily directed towards his own sex." Williams 1968, 304 f., on Verg. *Ec.* 2, notes that homosexual poetry is often more introspective and "less concerned with the charms of the object than with the emotions of speaker."
One brief fragment from the Aetia (fr. 23.2 ff. Pfeiffer) is also worth mentioning as a possible paraklausithuric allusion

\[\text{οὶ ὁ μὲν ἐνθ' ἡράτο, σὺ δ' ὡς ἀλὸς ἥχος ἄκουει}
\text{Σελλὸς ἐνι Τιμάρλοις ὤφεσιν Ἰκαρίης,}
\text{ἡρῳθῶν ὡς μάχλα φιλάτωρος ὡτα πενιχροῦ...}\\

The reference to the insolent ears of youths not hearing a poor lover seems more likely to refer to a paraklausithuric situation, where the idea of hearing the voice of a lover has more impact, than to be a broad equivalent to "pay no attention to" or the like.

Posidippus provides a single paraklausithuric epigram (AP 12.131; G.-P. VIII), but one that praises a hetaira for not excluding lovers:

"Α Κύπρου, & τε Κύθηρα καλ & Μίλητον ἐποιχεῖς
καὶ καλὸν Συρηνῆς ὑποκρότου ἄπεδου,
ἐξείνας ἑλάσας Καλλιστῆς ἢ τὸν ἐρασίν
οὐδέποτε οἰκεῖν θεείν ἀπὸ προθύρων.\\

Instead of the frequent prayers of excluded lovers to various of the gods of love, someone, perhaps Callistion, offers a kletic prayer that Aphrodite might come favourably to her because she has never locked out a lover. The simple reference to such a paragon of amatory virtue has all the more impact because of the paraklausithuric allusion.

Hermesianax provides one brief possibly paraklausithuric reference and one of the longest Greek paraklausithuristic episodes we have. Leontion 3.48-50 (Powell 1925, 99) refers to Alcaeus singing, to the phorminx, of his desire
for Sappho: Λέσβιος Ἀλκαίος δὲ, πόσους ἀνεδέξατο κόμους / Ὑσποφώς φορμίζων ἱμερόεντα πόθον, / γυνώσκεις. Whether the passage is to be considered at least remotely paraklausithureic depends on what form the komoi are imagined to be. If they are komos-processions then there is likely the implication that Alcaeus went on komoi to Sappho, singing of his love for her, and, presumably, sought to be with her. If, however, the komoi are static, then there can be no paraklausithureic implication. The fact that the reference seems to have been adapted from Alcaeus fr. 374 argues for the former interpretation.

Antoninus Liberalis 39, from the second century A.D., recounts the story of a youth named Arcephon who was in love with a girl named Arsinoe. A marginal scholion attributes the story to the second book of Hermesianax’ Leontion.188 Although the wording is Antoninus Liberalis’, the story is Hermesianax’ and will therefore be given here, 3-4 being most relevant to the paraklausithuron:

'Αρκεοφῶν ὁ Μινυρίδου πόλεως μὲν ἦν Ἀλαμίνος τῆς ἐν Κύπρῳ, γονέων δὲ οὐκ ἐπιφανῶν (Ἱσαυ γὰρ ἐκ Ἰονίκης), χρῆσατο δὲ καὶ τῇ άλλῃ εὐδαιμονίᾳ πλείστον ὑπερήνευκεν. σῶτος λόγῳ τὴν θυγατέρα τῆς Νικοκρέωντος τοῦ Ἀλαμιλίνων βασιλέως ἠράθη. [2] γένος δ’ ἦν τὸ Νικοκρέωντος ἀπὸ Τέβυκρου τοῦ Εὐνελήτου Ἡλιου Ἀγάμεμνονι, παρ’ θ’ καὶ μάλλον ὁ 'Αρκεοφῶν ἐφετο τῷ γάμῳ τῆς παιδός, καὶ ὑπέσχετο πλεῖστα παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων μυστηρίασ ἀπολάβειν ἔδα. Νικοκρέων δ’ οὖχ ὑποδέχεται τῶν γάμων κατ’ αὐτῆς γένους τῶν 'Αρκεοφῶντος, δι’ αὐτῆς πατέρες ἦσαν

Arceophon sees and falls in love with Arsinoe and seeks her hand in marriage. However, while Arceophon is not poor, the distinction of his ancestry does not come close to Arsinoe’s noble blood. Having been rejected (οὐχ ὑποδέχεται 2) by her parents, he resorts to joining other youths (perhaps some of the μνηστήρες mentioned in 2) of the same age in vigils before Arsinoe’s palace/house (3): πολὺ χαλεπώτερος ἢν ὁ ἔρως καὶ νυκτὸς ἐπὶ τὰ οἰκία τῆς Ἀρσινόης ἐφοίτα καὶ διευκτέρευε μετὰ τῶν ἡλικιωτῶν. 189 Very strangely, we have an

189Δέχεσθαι is very common in Greek paraklausithura—see Appendix 2. Χαλεπός occurs in similar paraklaisithuric contexts at Charito 1.2.2 and Hld. 4.17.14. Ψιλότατι is more common and can be found in Appendix 2. Διανυκτερεύειν can be found at Alciph. 4.11.6. Copley 1956, 136, ignoring the vigils of 3, makes the puzzling observation that: “since Arceophon’s eventual suicide was accomplished by starvation rather than by hanging, it is unlikely that Hermesianax’ version ended in a paraclausithyron.” Indeed—if Arceophon had already been keeping vigil at Arsinoe’s door, and had then starved himself to death, which is a pre-condition for the metamorphosis of Arsinoe, Hermesianax’ version could
upper-class youth keeping nocturnal vigils before the ολυμπία of the daughter of the king of a Greek city, presumably hoping that some good will come from such behaviour. This is clearly a fantasy scene, but nonetheless a strange one in its social unreality, unless it genuinely does represent particular Cypriot social customs of the time. Like many other excluded lovers, he tries bribing some of his beloved's domestic servants, in this case the girl's nurse (again as in Ov. Met. 14). She takes to Arsinoe his proposal of a rendez-vous without the knowledge of her parents, an example of furtius amor. But the girl dutifully tells her parents—her actions indicating that she herself is not particularly receptive to Arcephon's suit—and the nurse is mutilated and thrown out of the house. This arouses the anger of Aphrodite—bringing to mind the lover's appeals to her or Eros/Amor for help or mercy. Arceophon actually carries out the locked-out lover's occasional suicide threat and starves himself to death, which also carries to an

hardly have ended in a paraklausithuron.

The extensive Phoenician influence on Cyprus means this could just be possible. The story of Iphis and Anaxarete at Ov. Met. 14.698 ff. is similar and probably either based on this story, or there is a common ancestor of the two. Copley 1956, 137 correctly notes the strangeness of the scene.
extreme the topos of the lover's thinness. This rouses from neighbours and townsmen the pity that Arsinoe and her family did not show. It is only as he is being cremated (κατακαλομενον—suggesting indirectly the fires of love often mentioned in paraklausithura) that Arsinoe finally looks out (ἐκκύψασα), although moved by ὅρπις not by the lover's pleas. It is interesting that this seems to be the action that finally arouses Aphrodite to action—she

---

191 For suicide threats, see Theoc. 3.25 ff., 53 ff., [Theoc.] 23.22 ff., 48 ff. (real); Pl. As. 606 ff., Miles 1241 f. (parody), Truc. 742; Livy Per. 89 (real); Prop. 2.14.27 (in oath), 2.17.12 ff.; Ov. Met. 14.716 ff.; Sen. Ep. 4.4 ("'Difficile est' inquis 'animum perducere ad con- temptionem animae.' Non uides quam ex friolis causis con- temnatur? Alius ante amicae fores laqueo pependit, alius se praecipitavit e tecto ne dominum stomachantem diutius audi- ret,..."); and Calp. Ecl. 3.86 ff. Some general thoughts of suicide because of love can be found at: Tib. 2.6.19 ff.; Ps.—Lucian Erotes 13; Longus 4.16; and [Quint.] Decl. Mai. 15.10. Ovid Met. 4.65 ff. ends with both the lovers' sui- cides. For the thinness of the lover, see McKeeown 1987—, 2:126. The topos occurs twice in Ar., at Lys. 876 and V. 316.

192 For ἐκκύπτειν cf. Ar. Th. 789 ff. of women peer- ing out the house: ἐλ κακὸν ἐσμὲν, τί γαμεῖ ημᾶς, εἰπερ ἄληθῶς κακὸν ἐσμὲν, / 790 κάπαγορεύτε μῆτ' ἐξελθεῖν μῆτ' ἐκκύψασαν ἀλλὰν, / ἀλλ' οὕτω πολλῆς σπουδή τὸ κακὸν βούλεσθε φυλάσσειν; and Ael. N.A. 15.12 of clams: καλ τὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπιν τῇ ἀνθρώπιν ἐκκύπτουσιν, ὡς ἐκ τῶν λῶν θαλάμων αὐτή νυκτὶ ἐφ' ἐν αὐτὶν. Note the comparison—like brides looking out of their thalamoi. For παρακόπτειν, see Appendix 2 and cf. Ar. Pax 978 ff.: δέξαι δὴτ', ὢ πολυτιμήτη, / νὴ Δία, καλ μὴ πολείς γ' ἀπερ αἰ / 980 μοιχεύσαι δρέσαι γυναῖκες. / καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖναι παρακλίνασαι / τῆς αὐλαίας παρακόπτουσιν, / καὶ τίς προσέχῃ τῶν νυμν ἀυτάτως, / ἀναχωροῦν.
turns Arsinoe to stone, making real the beloved's metaphorical hardness.\textsuperscript{193}

Leonidas of Tarentum brings us back to the epigram. AP 5.206 (G.-P. XLIII) is a dedicatory poem with a clear paraklausithuric reference:

\begin{quote}
Μηλὼ καὶ Σατυρὴ ταυήλικες, ‘Αντιγενελεῖσ�
παιᾶς, ταί Μουσέων εὐκολοὶ ἑργάτιδες,
Μηλὼ μὲν Μουσάς Πιμπηλάς τοῦς ταχυχελεῖς
αὐλοῦς καὶ ταύτην πῦξινον αὐλοδόκην,
ἤ φλερως Σατυρὴ δὲ τὸν ἑσπερὸν σύνυστήρων
σύγκωμον κηρὴ τευξαμένη δόνακα,
ἡδὰν συμβάινα, σὺν ᾧ πανεπόρφυρος ἢ
ἡγασεν αὐλείος ἑγκροτέουσα θύρας.
\end{quote}

Two music-girls, upon retirement, dedicate their instruments, αὐλοῖ and δόναξ (both types of pipes). Satyre is accustomed to playing at komet, for her δόναξ is σύγκωμος.

\textsuperscript{193}The beloved is often called hard or unyielding, with frequent comparisons to rock or iron—see note 167 above. For the worship of Aphrodite Parakuptousa and its connection with Cyprus, see Farnell 1896-1909, 2:652-3: "Other indirect but interesting evidence of a similar worship can be extracted from the legends given by Ovid, Plutarch, and Antoninus Liberalis, of the hard-hearted maiden in Cyprus, whom Plutarch calls by the impossible name 'Parakuptousa,' and whom divine retribution turned to stone because she looked unfeelingly on the corpse of her lover. But Ovid and Plutarch were both aware that the goddess herself was called by the same name in Cyprus, and the poet tells us that there was a statue in Cyprus representing the frozen petrified form. And when Plutarch goes on to say that a similar story was told in Crete about a maiden named Gorgo, who came to a like end, we have an easy clue to these romantic legends about callous young women with remarkable names;... Moreover, this worship must in some way have been combined or confused with another in which Aphrodite was known by the very different name of Παρακύπτουσα, 'the goddess who looks out of the corners of her eyes,' an epithet alluding to the sidelong glances of the lover. As usual, the epithets become detached and the stories about the maidens arise from them." See also Bömer 1969-86, 6:214 and his references.
In lines 7–8 we find out what type of komoi they were, for she has been waiting outside doors until dawn, playing her pipe and beating time. This is quite clearly a reference to a paraklausithuric situation, and she must be in the pay of an excluded lover whose songs and possibly dances she accompanies.\footnote{Gow–Page 1965, 2:354 interpret this correctly: "the sense required seems reasonably plain. In the κώμος ... the party, sometimes as here, accompanied by the flute-girls from the symposium, go to the house of a girl or youth, serenade her or him, and demand admission. Satyre had attended such parties to accompany the serenade even when they lasted until daybreak.... ἐγκροτέουσα αὐλ. θύρ. means that she is accompanying a θυροκοσικὸς." Contrast Paton 1916–18, 1:231.} This is one of the few explicit references to the excluded lover being accompanied by a music-girl.\footnote{For music and the komos, see Chapter 1 and notes 40 and 50 above. References to wind music accompanying serenades or komoi can probably be taken to indicate the presence of music-girls.}  

Athenæus 13.565 e quotes the third century author Antigonus of Carystus, who in turn is citing Zeno of Citium:  

\[\text{βουλόμενοι γὰρ ἐνδύεσθαι τὴν αὐτάρκειαν καὶ τὴν εὐτέλειαν εὔρισκεσθε ἐπὶ ταῖς τῆς φιλαργυρίας θύραις ὑπαρχόντως ζῶντες καὶ τριβωνάρια περιβαλλόμενοι ... καὶ κιναλίους καλοῦντες τοὺς ἢ μύρον προσβάλλοντας ἢ μικρῷ μαλακωτέραν ἡμιφιεσμένους ἐσθήτα.}\]

Although the criticism of "living sordidly at the doors of greed" could be a reference to beggars at the doors or gates of rich men, the following accusations of degeneracy could make the reference equally applicable to the paraklausithuric situation.
ric situation. And while beggars had little choice but to seek handouts from others, the self-imposed abasement and degradation of the excluded lover would make the insult all the more pointed.

Theocritus

Theocritus' third *Idyll* contains one of the best-known parklausithuric komoi in classical literature, but the paraklausithuric situation occurs a surprising number of times elsewhere in the Theocritean corpus.

Theocritus 2, the "Pharmakeutriai," depicts the attempts of Simaetha, seemingly a free woman of modest means, to win back by magic her beloved Delphis. The poem contains several clear paraklausithuric references, but also contains prominent, recurring door-imagery that helps reinforce their importance. Right at the beginning, Simaetha explains why she has concerns about Delphis' affection:

\[ \deltaς \muοι \omegaθεκατασιος \alpha\phi' \ θ \tauαλας \ ουδε \ ποθικει,\]
\[ \sigmaυδε' \ εγει \ ποτερον τεθνακαμες \ η \ ζου \ ειμες, \]
\[ \sigmaυδε \ θυρας \ θραξευ \ αναρσιος. \]  

\[ 196 \text{Beggars at doors were common. Perhaps the best-known example comes from } \textit{Eu.Luc.} 16:19-21: } \textit{"Ανθρωπος δε τις \ η\iota \ πλούσιος, καλ \ ευθειόπκετο παρθύραν καλ \ βύσσον ευφραινόμενος καθ' \ ημέραν λαμπρός. 20 πτωχός δε τις \ άνωμαλ \ λάταρος \ εβέβηλη \ προς τον \ πυλώνα \ αυτού \ εύλωκρόμενος 21 καλ }\textit{\ επιθυμών χαρτασθήναι \ απο \ των \ πιπητών }\textit{\ απο \ της }\textit{\ τραπέζης }\textit{\ του }\textit{\ πλουσίου \ άλλα καλ \ οι }\textit{\ κύνες }\textit{\ ερχόμενοι }\textit{\ ἐπέλειαχον τα }\textit{\ ἔλκη }\textit{\ αυτού.}\]

\[ 197 \text{Theocritus will be quoted from } \textit{Gow} \textit{1952b.} \]
Knocking on the door seems here to mean not much more than "visit" or such. She will, however, compel him by magic: νῦν δὲ νυλ ἐκ θυέων καταδήσωμαι (10). She addresses the moon as part of her rites: ἄλλα, Σελάνα, ἔφανε καλάν. Of course, in its connection with Hekate (invoked in line 12) the moon is a natural presence in such a magical context. But this also helps to set the scene—she is working her magic at night, which fits with the time of day she would expect Delphis to come to her. The night, the invocation to the moon, and the mention of door—knocking at line 6 might also bring to mind the paraklausithuron, helping prepare readers for the development of the paraklausithuric topos later in the poem.

Her spell continues (28-31):

ψς τοῦτον τὸν κηρᾶν ἕγω σὺν δαίμονι τάκῳ,
δὲ τάχοι θ’, Ἔρωτος ὁ Μόνος µυσίκα Δέλφις.
χώς δινεῖθ’ βδε ῥόμβος ὁ χάλκεος ἐξ Ἄφροσίτας,
ψς τήνος δινότο ποθ’ ἀμετέραισι θύασιν.

The topos of the thinness and wasting of the lover are mentioned immediately before what seems to be a paraklausithuric reference. While Simaetha wants Delphis to return to her, she also wishes him to be, at least transiently, 198Gow 1952b, 2:37-8 notes that "T. however uses singular and plural indifferently of Simaetha's door.... Herodas does the same of Battarus's (2.35, 63) and Apollonius has the plural of the door of Medea's room (3.845, 822)." On ἀραξεν he notes that it is usually used of "violent knocking (Eur. I.T. 308, Ar. Ecc. 977;... Hdas 2.63)," but that it is "here and at 160 plainly a mere synonym of κόπτειν, κρούειν, the common words."
excluded from her house as she thinks she has been excluded from his affections.

Doors are alluded to again at 33-34: τῷ δ', Ἀρτέμι, καὶ τὸν ἐν "Ἀίδα / κινήσας ἀδόμαντα καὶ εἶ τι περ ἀσφαλές ἄλλο..." This is clearly a reference to the proverbially unmoveable, often adamant, gates of the underworld. Since Hekate has the power to move those doors, she can move anything else (see Gow 1952b, 2:42). This is followed less than twenty lines later by another wish that Simaetha might see Delphis coming to her house, mad with love: ὃς καὶ Δέλφιν ἱδομι, καὶ ἐς τὸδε σώμα περάσαι / μανομένων ἱκελος λυπαρᾶς ἐκτοσθε παλαίστρας (50-1).

Then at lines 59 ff. doorways return, but this time for magical purposes:

θεσυλί, νῦν δὲ λαβοίσα τῷ τὰ θρόνα ταυθ' ὑπόμαξον τὰς τήν πρε ἔπετερον δὲς ἐτι καὶ νῦξ, [ἐκ θυμῷ θέτεμι. δὲς μὲν λόγον οὐδένα πατεῖ] καὶ λέγ' ἐπιτρύξοισα "τὰ Δέλφιδος ὀστία μάσσω". 62

Note that this is to be done at night. Although magic was often associated with doors in antiquity, there are few examples similar to this—most such magic involves charms at a person’s own doorway. The use of Delphis’ doorway must

199 For example, PGM 36.134 ff. is a love spell of attraction, which is executed at the spell-caster’s door (including anointing its sockets with a special mixture of myrrh and frankincense) in order to attract the beloved to it: Ἕπιον ἑλπιστήν, ὡς μείζον οὐδέν. λαβὼν ζιμυρίου / 136 καὶ λάβανον ἀρασενκων βάλε εἰς πωτήριον καὶ ἀρχὴν δέους, / καὶ τρίτη ὄρη τῆς νυκτάς βαλὼν εἰς τὸν στροφέαν σοι τῆς / θύρας λέγε τον λόγον ζ'.... / 147 καὶ ποιήσατε τὴν δείνα, ἢν ἔτεκεν ἢ δείγα, ἁγνυπείν, ἀροπα -τελθαί, πευκύσαν, διψώσαν, ὑπνον μὴ τυγχάνουσαν, ἔραθαί / ἐμόι τοῦ δείνα...
be because it is the closest Simaetha can get to him at the moment. There is also surely some sympathetic magic involved--she uses Delphis’ door to bring him to Simaetha’s. Thestylis, her maid, leaves and Simaetha is alone.

She then goes on to recount to the moon the story of her love, like the paraklausithuric lover confiding in the stars and moon that look down on him: φράζεο μεν τὸν ἐρωθ’ ἰθεν ἱκέτο, πότνα Σελάνα (69, repeated at 75, 81, 87, 93, 99, 105, 111, 117, 123, 129, and 135). From the moment she saw Delphis she fell sick with love, and was kept in bed with fever. Magic and charms failed to cure her (89-91).

Finally she sent Thestylis to fetch Delphis:

κηπεῖ κά νων ἐντα μάθης μόνων, ἄσυχα νεύσου, κελ’ ὅτι 'Ειμαίθα τι καλελ’ καὶ υφαγεο τεϊδε". Ὕς ἔφαμαν: ἡ Ἦνει καὶ ἔδαγε τὸν λιπαρόχρων εἷς ἐμα μύμμα Δέλιμν. ἔγω ἓν νων ὡς ἔνθηκα ἄρτι θύρας ὑπὲρ οὐδόν ἀμεμβόμενον ποῦλ κούφυ -- φράζεο μεν τὸν ἐρωθ’ ἰθεν ἱκέτο, πότνα Σελάνα -- ἐπώπια μὲν ἐφύθην χιὼν πλέον, ἕκ ἓτε μετώπω λόρως μεν κοιχόδεσκεν ἱσόν νοτλαισιν ἐέρσας.

ocrates σπλαγχνικῆ, ἐσὺ δὲ ἐλεη / 150 καὶ τὴν θηλυκὴν ἐαυτῆς φύσιν τῇ ἄρεσικη κολλῆση. / ἓν δὲ θέλη κοιμᾶσθαι, ὑποστρώ- σατε αὐτῆς σιττύβας ἀκῶν / -θυμας, ἔπι δὲ τῶν κατράφων σκόλο- πας, ἴνα μοι ἐπινεύση / ἐπὶ ἐταιρικῇ φιλίᾳ.

200Gow 1952b, 2:47: "φλιά is commonly the door-post, parastás. At Ap. Rh. 3.278 and in the LXX at Ex. 12.7, 22, 23, however, it means lintel; it is used at Il. 23.202 ... and in Et. M. to gloss βηλός, and by Suidas to gloss οὐδός, and that must be its meaning at Artem. On. 4.42; and at Pallad. Hist. Laus. 12.3 αἱ φλία τῆς θύρας καὶ αἱ παραστάσεις are respectively the horizontal and the vertical members of the door-frame. Seemingly therefore any of its four components may be called φλιά. Doors are a favourite place for magic of various kinds ... and all parts of them are used." For more on door-magic, see below.
οὐδὲ τι φωνῆσαι δυνάμαι.

Note the moment of pregnant expectation interrupted by the refrain, as Delphis steps on her threshold (104).²⁰¹

He enters, sits down on Simaetha’s bed and tells her that she barely beat him to making the first overture, for he was imminently going to come to her in full komastic revel:

"ἳ ῶα με, Σιμαῖθα, τόσον ἐφθάσασα, ὡσον ἐγὼ θην πρῶν ποτα τόν χαρεντα τράχων ἐφθάσασα θιλλίνων, ἐς τὸ τεῦν καλέσσα - τὸσε στέγος ἡ 'με πάρθην.

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ηνθον γάρ κεν ἐγὼ, ναὶ τὸν γλυκὸν ἤθουν 'Ερωτα, ἢ τρίτος ἢ τέταρτος ἐων φίλος αὐτικα νυκτός, μᾶλα μὲν ἐν κόλποις Διωγόσοι φυλάσσων, κρατὶ δ’ ἔχων λεύκαν, Ὕρακλέος λερόν ἔρνος, πάντοι πορφύρας περί ξύστρασιν ἐλικτάν.

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . καὶ κ’, εἰ μὲν μ’ ἐσέχθεςε, τάδ’ ἂς φίλα (καὶ γάρ ἐλαφρός καὶ καλὸς πάντες μετ’ ἡθέοις καλέμαι), εἰ δ’ ἠλλα μ’ ῥήττεε καὶ ἂθρα ἔκηκτο μοχλῷ, πάντως καὶ πελέκες καὶ λαμπάδες ἤθουν ἔφ’ ὑμέας."

Here is a finely developed picture of the lover going on a komos to a woman who has caught his interest.²⁰² He would have come at first night and so one may presume he would not

²⁰¹ There is some similarity to Catul. 68.70 ff.: "quod mea se molli candida diuas pedes / intulit et trito fulgentem in limine plantam / innixa arguta constituit soleam / coniugis ut quondam flagrans aduenit amore / Protesilaearn Laudamia domum."

²⁰² See the Scholia on 2.118: ἤθουν: ὁ ἤθου ἢ ἐγὼ πρῶτερον νυκτός, ἡ τρίτος, ἡ τέταρτος ὑπάρχων σοι προσφιλής· τουτέστιν, ἐπεκόμαισα ἂν σοι μετὰ τῶν τριῶν ἡ τετάρτων. -- ἤθουν γάρ ἢ ἐγὼ, νή τὸν γλυκὸν ἔρναι, ἢθουν φίλος ἢν, ἢ μετὰ ὑδας ἄλλους ἢ μετὰ τρεῖς, αὐτικα ἐπὶ τῆς νυκτός, ἤγουν κατὰ τὴν παροῦσαν νύκτα. -- ἤθουν, εἰ μὴ ἀπεστάλη ἡ δούλη πρὸς μὲ δηλωντι.
have been drinking for too long. Moreover, he would have had companions with him and would also have brought apples as a gift—probably *apophoreta* from a dinner—and been garlanded with poplar and ribbons.\(^{203}\) If she had received him, all would have been well. He praises his appearance and physical prowess, like many other komasts seeking admission, intimating that any sensible woman would receive him into her house (Cairns 1972, 210 notices this). There is a brief picture of the hoped-for joys of physical love, that is the kiss, but the topos of the wakefulness of the lover is also brought in at the same time. Then he relates how, if Simaetha had thought otherwise and rejected him and barred her door, he was prepared to attack it physically with torches and axes.\(^{204}\) It is worth noting that Simaetha seems to be a

\(^{203}\) For another komast bearing apples, see Prop. 1.3.24 ff. ("nunc furtiua caiuis poma dabam manibus: / 25 omniaque ingrato largiar munera somno, / munera de prono saepe uoluta sinu") and Cairns 1977 *ad loc.*, esp. 326 and note 3. Apples were, of course, a common love-gift. Gow 1952b, 2:57 notes that "the wreath described is of the type in which a spray of foliage has bands of wool or other material wound spirally about it in such a manner that wool and foliage alternate in transverse strips round the head." Garlands themselves were another form of *apophoreta*.

\(^{204}\) See also Gow 1952b, 2:57: "The torches, after lighting the κυμος to the house, will be used for burning away the lintel in which the pivot (στρόφιον) of the door is set: Hdas 2.63 ..., A.P. 12.252 ἐμπρήσω σε, θυρη ..., Ov. A.A. 3.567...." The possibility of violence as a last resort for Delphis contrasts strongly with Simaetha's helplessness and need to send a go-between to Delphis' house rather than go herself. Cairns 1977, 326 f. includes this among komoi where "success by admission is ... positively envisaged by the komast."
free woman who was previously sexually inexperienced, while Delphis' athletic lifestyle indicates that he is not poor (51, 124-5).\textsuperscript{205} This seems to allow the possibility of such komoi and violent assaults being directed against women other than hetairai. Moreover, by including the alternatives of acceptance or rejection the plea for admission is clearly implied. The passage as a whole is a masterly summary of the full range of the amatory komos.

However, Delphis seems to have another love:

\textend{quote}

Philista is a flute-girl and therefore probably saw Delphis at a symposium. He was pouring out neat wine to Eros, and

\textsuperscript{205}On the social status of Simaetha, Gow 1952b, 2:33 observes: "for festal occasions she must borrow finery from a friend (74). She is poor therefore, perhaps an orphan, presumably bourgeois; she is not a ἐταῖρα (41). Her position appears to be that of several young women in New Comedy. Her lover seems somewhat higher on the social scale...." Note that at line 41 she says Delphis did not make her his wife but left her ἀπάρθενον, which would seem to indicate that she certainly was not any form of prostitute. Gomme-Sandbach 1973, 145 suggest that she is "a free hetaira." For the lover mentioning his appearance, see Men. Mis. A93 f.; Theoc. 3.8 f., 11.30 ff.; Hor. Carm. 3.7.25 ff.; and Ov. Met. 13.846 ff.
presumably also drinking some. Perhaps most interesting is his expressed intent to go and to cover a house with garlands, clearly as a gesture of love in itself, for no indication is given that Delphis believes he will be excluded. This is almost immediately followed by one further door image right near the poem’s end. Simaetha threatens the absent Delphis with death if her spell does not work: τὰν Ἀτάον πύλαιν, ναὶ Μόλις, ἄραξε (160). If Delphis does not return and knock on her door, as at line 4, he will knock on death’s door instead.

Theocritus 2 not only contains a developed paraklausithuric situation, it also contains one possible other paraklausithuric reference and a number of other door images that reinforce these two passages. The door references have the effect of representing the relationship between Simaetha and Delphis by means of images of access and exclusion.

Theocritus 3 is obviously paraklausithuric and provides the first extended non-dramatic paraklausithuron proper we have (from line 6 on). The first words indicate

206 Gow 1952b, 2:60: "for unmixed wine in lover’s toasts, see 14.18, Call. Ep. 31, 43, A.P. 5.136, 137."

207 Gow 1952b, 2:64 f.: "In the present poem the goatherd sings a παρακλαυσιθυρον that extends, with asides, from 6 to 51, and, failing to obtain any response, announces a θυρωμὶ Ἑ (53)." There is, however, a strong mimic character to the poem, which is especially visible in the transition from lines 5 to 6. The idyll has been discussed and analysed well elsewhere and here needs only brief examination to note its salient topoi. See Gow 1952b ad loc.; Burck 1966, 247; Cairns 1972, 143 ff.; and Garte 1924, 12.
that the goatherd is going on a komos to his beloved:

Κωμάσω ποτὶ τὰν Ἀμαρυλλίδα,...

... "Ω χαρέεσσι ὁμήρων τοῦτό κατ' ἄντρον 6
παρκύπτοισα καλεῖς, τὸν ἑρωτόν; ἢ βά μὲ μισεῖς;
ἡ δὲ γέ τοι σιμός καταφαίνομαι ἐγνύθεν ἤμεν,
νύφα, καὶ ποιγένεις; ἀπάγεσαβι μὲ ποσεῖς.
ἡμῖδε τοι δέκα μάλα φέρω, τημύθε καθεῖλον
ζ ζ' ἔκελευ καθελεύν τό καὶ ἀβριον ἄλλα τοι οἰς.

It is daytime, for his goats need feeding and watering (1 ff.). As will be seen, rural komoi and serenades usually take place in the daytime. To follow his heart, he is

208 Κωμάσω plus a preposition indicating direction virtually never indicates anything else, as Gow 1952b, 2:64 realizes: "The word has various shades of meaning in Greek... but here means the sequel to a symposium, when the drinkers, garlanded from the feast, sallied forth into the streets with torches (and sometimes music) to visit friends.... The common objective of such expeditions was the house of a mistress." The author of the hypothesis from the Scholia has understood the situation, as indicated by his repeated use of ἐπικαμίας: 'Επιγράφεται το μέν εἰδώλλων τοῦτον ἀνόμος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑρωτόν, ἢ Ἀμαρυλλίς, ἀπὸ τῆς κόρης τῆς ἑρωμένης, ἢ Κωμαστῆς, ἢ τοῦ τοῦτον πράγματος. ἐπικαμίας γὰρ τῆς Ἀμαρυλλίδας, τοῦ ὀνόματος μὴ δηλουμένου εἰκάσειε ὅ' αὐτὴ τὶς ἐπικαμίας τὰτ ἄνω τῆς ἐπικαμίας του ἐναν.... πλανάται δὲ καὶ περὶ τοῦτος χρόνους. φέρει δὲ ὁ ἐπικαμίας μήλα καὶ στεφάνους τῆς Ἀμαρυλλίδας χάριν τοῦ προσδεχόμενος καὶ δὲ σοφῶς λόγου αὐτοῦν ἀξιολ. δὲ καὶ ἀνεθήμας τοῦ βλου καταλύει προσεχέται... το δὲ εἰδός ἐπικαμιαστικόν. The Scholia continue: Κωμάσω τὸ ἐρωτικάς ἐρμοί μετὰ ἀνέσεις... "Ελλως. Κωμάσω: Τὸ κωμάσω λέγεται ἐπὶ τῶν κατὰ νυκτὰς εἰς τὰς ἑρωμένας ἀπερχομένων. Gow 1952b, 2:65 is wrong, however, to interpret κωμάσων as "will go to serenade" rather than "will go in revel." See also Minyard 1976, 6 and 286-7.

209 See Theoc. 11, Verg. Ecl. 2, Ov. Met. 13.740 ff., and Nemes. Ecl. 4. Gow 1952b, 2:64 f. observes: "It should be noted that the κῶμος... belongs essentially to town life, that urban sparks in their cups may assail their mistresses' doors by methods ridiculously inapposite when applied by goatherds to Amaryllises who live in caves... The essence of the Idyll is... the transference of the custom to a rustic setting." The fact that the typical lover of the classical world was at least middle or upper-class also adds to the humour or at least incongruity of the pic-
neglecting his duties, a topos that will be seen in Theoc. 11, and re-occurs at Ov. Met. 13.779 ff.210 Some minor lapse of time must be presumed to occur before line 6 when the goatherd actually begins his paraklausithuron to Amaryllis.211 His first words flatter her (6). He wonders why she no longer peeks out of her cave/home at him and calls him in (6-7). He wonders if she hates him, and mentions his appearance, but to criticize (8-9) rather than praise it. He is dying from love (ἀπάγαγομαι με πονηρείς, 9)—this is also a suicide threat. He is bringing her presents—apples that she requested (10) and he promises her more tomorrow.

210 This is later greatly developed in the elegiac lover’s life of leisure and otium. Cf. also Verg. Ecl. 2.

211 McKeown 1979, 77, n. 30 notes the influence of mime: "Such a debt ... can be seen most clearly in Theocritus’ ... Idyll 3, which admits a change of scene between lines 5 and 6." See also Gow 1952b, 2:66: "The scene changes to the outside of Amaryllis’ cave. The bucolic idylls require elsewhere rather movements of the interlocutors about the stage than changes of scene...; here the opening lines indicate an intended absence of some time and distance." See also Williams 1968, 206, and Copley 1956: 15-16.
The poem's next section begins at line 12:

θάσαι μάν. θυμαλγές ἐμίν ἄχος. σὺ θείε γενοῖμαι
ἀ βομβίσθα μέλλοσα καὶ ἐς τεδν ἄντρον ἱκοῖμαι,
tὸν κισσόν διαθύς καὶ τὸν πτέρυγν ἄ τυ πυκάσθει.
νῦν ἔγνων τὸν Ἔρωτα νεκρός τίνως ἡ ἐρμαίνις
μαζὸν ἐθήλαζεν, ἀρμοῖ τὸ νῦν ἔτραφε μάτηρ,
ὅς με κατασμίωσιν καὶ ἐς ὀστίου ἄχοις ἔπειτε.
 oath καὶ ὁ ποθοῦσα, τὸ πάν λίθος, ὁ κυάνοφρο νῦμφα,
πρόσπυξαί με τὸν σιλάνον, ὃς τῇ φιλήσω.
Εὐστά καὶ ἐν κενεσθαι φιλήσασι ἀδέα τέρψεις.
τὸν στέφον τίλαοι με καὶ αὐτίκα λεπτά ποπεῖς,
τὸν τοὶ ἔγων, Ἄμαρουλλὶς θλὰ, κισσότο φυλάσσω,
ἄμπλεξας καλύκεσαι καὶ εὐδόμοις σελύνοις.

He tries to get her look out (θάσαι, 12), moved by pity for
the misery he is in. Next, he wishes he could undergo a
metamorphosis in order to reach her (12 ff.). But this is
not in order to overcome the hardness of the door, since
Amaryllis' cave is closed with highly permeable ivy and
ferns. It is at this point that we realize that the goatherd
is as much self-excluded as shut-out by Amaryllis, but his
willingness not to force himself on her creates some sym-
pathy for him. Lines 15 ff. combine the typical complaint

212 For the lover wishing for a metamorphosis in
order to get to the beloved, see Ar. V. 323 ff. (smoke),
Theoc. 11.54 f., and Ov. Ep. 18.49 ff. Zeus was a good model
for the lover gaining success by changing his form—also see
below on Ter. Eun.

213 For this detail seems humorous rather than
pathetic.
of love's cruelty and the topos of the fires of love. But the nature of the criticism of love is more similar to the type of accusation levelled against the beloved (ἠ ρα λατ-νας, 15). The goatherd truly knows love for the first time: νῦν ἐγγών τὸν Ἐρωτα (15). Lines 18 f. combine further praise of the beloved with the topos of the beloved's hardness, usually achieved by some comparison with iron or, as here, stone. This is immediately followed by another request for her to come out or for him to be admitted (19). The joys of physical love are mentioned (19 f.). Line 20 mentions his garland for the first time. This also relates to the traditional offering of the garland to the beloved with the presumption that acceptance of the gift implies acceptance of the lover—by threatening to destroy it, the goatherd shows that he thinks he will not be received by Amaryllis.

At line 24 the tone changes somewhat:

ομοί ἐγών, τι πάθω, τι ὁ δύσσομος; σὸν ὑπακούεις.
τὰν βαίταν ἀπόδυς ἐς κυμάτα την ἀλεύματι,

.......

214 For comparing the beloved to a wild animal cf. [Theoc.] 23.19, Pl. Ba. 1121 ff., and Hor. Carm. 3.10.18. At Pl. As. 145 f. the custos is the object of such a comparison. The fires of love are, of course, an extremely common topos in amatory writing. Some paraklausithuric examples are: Asclep. AP 5.189 (G.-P. XLII); Ant. Lib. 39/Hermesian. 2.5; Theoc. 3.15 ff., 11.15 and 52 ff., [Theoc.] 23.16; Pl. Cur. 53 ff.; Ter. Eun. 72 and 85; Frag. Grenf. 15 f., 24 f.; Mel. AP 5.160.3 f., 12.85.7 (G.-P. XXVI, CXV); Val. Aed. 2.2; and Hor. Carm. 1.25.13, 3.7.11 f.


216 Garte 1924, 40 seems to imply the same.
The goatherd wonders what will happen to him and thinks that Amaryllis is not listening (24). An explicit threat of suicide—he will jump off a cliff—comes next. Then he explains (28-30) how some rustic divination has indicated that his love is not returned—divination and magic sometimes occur in Latin elegiac paraklausithura.²¹⁷ There is then mention of a sympathetic third party advising him against his obsession (31-3). But he returns to trying to win Amaryllis' favour with presents, by mentioning a goat with two kids he has, only to try to arouse her jealousy by the classic trick of gift-denial, where a gift is mentioned only for a threat to be made that it will go to some other more interested

party. The more interested party is here, of course, a rival to Amaryllis.\textsuperscript{218}

An omen—a twitch of his eye (37)—gives him some hope. He then reclines against a tree to sing:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Άλλεται ὀφθαλμός μεν ὁ δεξιός. ἄρα γ' ἐσεύω
αὐτάν; ἄφεωμαι ποτὶ τὰν πίτυν ἔδ' ἀπακλίνθεις,
καὶ κέ μ' ἱώς ποτίς, ἔπει ὁὐκ ἄσαμαντίνα ἐστίν. \hfill 40
'Ἡπομένης, ὅκα δὴ τὰν παρθένου θελε γάμαι,
μᾶλ' ἐν χερσὶν ἐλών ὄρφον ἄνυεν. ἃ δ' Ἄταλάντα
ὡς ἔδεν ὡς ἐμάνη, ὡς ἐς βαθὺν ἀλατ' ἔρωτα.
τὰν ἄγελαιν χῦ μάντις ἀπ' Ὠθρους ὄγιε Μελάμπους
ἐς Πύλον. ἃ δὴ Βλαντός ἐν ἀγκαλίασιν ἐκλύθη
μάτηρ ἄ χαρεσσα περίφρονος Ἀλφεσίβολας. \hfill 45
τὰν δὲ καλὰν Κυθέρειαν ἐν ἄρεσι μῆλα νομεὺων
οὐχ ὁτὺς "Οὖν ὡς ἐπὶ πλέον ὤγαγε λύσσας
ὡς τ' αὐθεὸς φίλημαν νυν ἀτερ μαχαί τῇ τῇ.
ζαλωτὸς μὲν ἐμὴν ὅ τιν ἄτροπον ὤν ὄλων
'Ενδομίλων. ζαλὸ δὲ, φίλα γύναι, Ἰασίωνα,
δὲ τόσαιν ἐκύρησεν, ὃς' οὐ πενεμεῖσθε, βέβαλοι. \hfill 50
\end{quote}

He hopes this will make Amaryllis look out (ποτίς 39) since she is οὐκ ἄσαμαντίνα, bringing up again the hardness of the beloved. He then begins his song, which contains the mythological exempla often used by lovers to persuade their beloveds to yield.\textsuperscript{219} The exempla also have the effect of deifying Amaryllis—she is first implicitly compared to Atalanta and Peiro, then Aphrodite, Selene, and Demeter.

\textsuperscript{218}For the lover mentioning a rival for his affections, see Theoc. 11.76 ff., and compare Ar. Lys. 951 ff.

\textsuperscript{219}The examples are both to the point and deeply misunderstood by the goatherd. For example, Hippomenes won Atalanta by means of apples and one glance (ὡς ἔδεν 42)—but of course the apples were golden, not real. Adonis might have been a shepherd, but he also died. And as Gow notes 1952b, 2:74 "Endymion profited little from his infatuation of the goddess."
The poem ends (52 ff.) with the lover's pain and suffering (a headache), and a final threat to lie down before her cave:220

'Αλγέω τὰν κεφαλάν, τιν δ' οὐ μέλει. οὐκετ' ἀείδω, κείσεμαι δὲ πεσόν, καὶ τοι λύκοι δέ μ' ἔδονταί. ὥς μέλι τοι γλυκὸ τοῦτο κατὰ βρόχοιο γένοιτο.

There he will eventually die when wolves come and eat him, which makes reference to the topoi of the dangers facing the excluded lover. The goatherd finally hopes that by this he may, at last, please Amaryllis.

It is worth noting how Theocritus holds this all together. There are implied pauses and subsequent changes of argument at the ends of line 11, 23, and 36—each time the goatherd has offered Amaryllis a different present and presumably waits for some response.221 There is a similar pause at the end of his song, after which he gives in to despair and announces his θυραυλία. This gives the serenade greater realism than a sixty-line torrent of words would have, and the implied pauses help accommodate changes in tone that help to keep the reader more interested.222

220 Gow 1952b, 2:75: "The song ceases and the goatherd announces a θυραυλία."

221 Williams 1968, 206: "Throughout the rest of the poem ... the reader is simply required to imagine a pause and empty silence at appropriate points--indicating that Amaryllis takes no notice." Cf. Copley 1956, 17.

222 A similar pattern will be seen in later, long paraklausithura, most notably Ov. Am. 1.6. Tib. 1.2 also contains many changes of mood and tone, although without the implied pauses--see Vretska 1955, 39-40. Also compare Hor. Carm. 3.10.1 ff.
Idyll 7 also contains a brief paraklausithuric scene. Simichidas sings about his friend Aratus (98-127):

"Ωρατος δ' ο τα πάντα φιλατιτατος ἀνέρι τήν παιδεία υπὸ σπλάγχνοις ἔχει πόθου. οἶδεν "Ἀριστεῖς,...

ὡς ἐκ παιδείας "Ἀρατος ὧπι ὁστίλων ἀλθεῖ ἔρωτι. τὸν μοι, Πάν, "Ὅμολος ἐρατῶν πέδου δάκτε λέλογας, ἀκλήτων τήνοιο φίλας ἐς χειρας ἐρέσαις, εἶτ' ἐστ' ἀρα θελίνος ὁ μαλαθάκος ἐπτε τίς ἄλλος. κελ μὲν ταῦτ' ἔροις, οἳ Πάν φίλε,...

εἰ δ' ἄλλως νεύοις,...

... 109

... 115

... 120

... 125

The song starts by declaring that Aratus is in love with a boy, whose name we later learn is Philinus. At 103, Simichidas calls on Pan, in proper fashion, to bring either Philinus or some other boy to Aratus. This is followed

See Cairns 1972, 201 ff., who provides his own list of topoi similar to the following.

Cairns 1972, 203 f. thinks Simichidas "speaks vicariously on behalf of the komast."

See Cairns 1972, 203: "The prayers to Pan and the Cupids to bring Aratus' beloved to him are also topical in that they are substitutes for the normal pleas of the lover to the beloved. But such prayers to gods for help or explicit prayers to gods of love to make the beloved return the lover's affections are topoi in themselves."
(106-14) by a series of curses on Pan should he not do so. \(^{228}\) Then Simichidas prays to the "Ερωτεύονται διὸ υἱόν Ὀξύας that Aratus' love will be reciprocated by Philinus (115-119). \(^{227}\) This is followed by a carpe diem warning, a topos often connected with a threat-prophecy, entwined with the beloved's beauty: unnamed women sigh over Philinus' beauty but note that he is maturing quickly (121).

It is only at this point that the paraklausithurric reference arises as Simichidas suggests to Aratus that

\(^{228}\) Cairns 1972, 204 sees komastic topoi in the curses: "the threats to Pan, should he not act on behalf of Aratus the lover, reflect in exaggeratedly humorous terms and so amplify the commonplace sufferings of unsuccessful komastic lovers. Pan is threatened with stripes (106 ff.), biting and scratching (109-10), sleeping rough on nettles, that is, sleeplessness (110), excessive cold (111-12), and excessive heat (113-14). These are fit punishments for a god who neglects the komastic sufferings of Aratus -- the heat of love (102), his rough nights at the door and weary feet (122-3), the chill of dawn (124)." The sleeplessness and cold, often suffered by the lover, seem plausible, but the leap from hot weather to the fires of love seems too tenuous, and he proposes no alternatives for the beatings, biting, and scratchings--unless these refer to fights with the rivals or beloved. If all the curses do not have paraklausithurric relevance, it seems unlikely that only two of them would.

\(^{227}\) Gow 1952b, 2:161 seems to imply that the wish is not for reciprocal love but that "the meaning is no doubt make Philinus himself the victim of an unrequited passion ... and the idea of ὁ ἐρωτεύονται διὸ υἱόν becoming in his turn ὁ ἐρωτεύον is common." For the excluded lover wishing/praying for his love to be reciprocated, see Men. Mis. A88-9; Theoc. 7.115 ff.; Ter. Eun. 91 ff.; Frag. Grenf. 39 f., 52; Hor. Carm. 3.26.11 f.; and Tib. 1.2.63 "Non ego, totus abesset amor, sed mutuus esset, / orabam." For other occurrences, see Murgatroyd 1980, 90.
μηκέτι τοι φρουρέωμες ἐπὶ προθύροις ... / μηδὲ πόδας τρίβωμες.\textsuperscript{228} The two of them have been keeping vigil at their beloveds' doors.\textsuperscript{229} It should be made clear, however, that the context of the song indicates that this is not an actual paraklausithuron—for the song is not being sung at Philinus' door. It is instead a song about an excluded lover.\textsuperscript{230}

\\textsuperscript{228}Cairns 1972, 203 f. gives significant weight to the fact that Simichidas, not Aratus, voices this thought: "As well as having a substitute speaker, the komos also exemplifies reaction. This takes the form of change of mind on the part of the vicarious speaker that leads him to an exhortation that both vicarious speaker and logical speaker should together abandon the komos. Speaker-variation is employed so that the change of mind can be put in the mouth of Simichidas in order to imply that Aratus himself has not necessarily abandoned his love of Philinus."

\textsuperscript{229}It is possible that Aratus alone has been waiting at Philinus' door. The plurals are slightly puzzling. They could be explained as applying to both of them, but in a general way—Simichidas is saying "let us both stop acting at various times as excluded lovers...", indicating that he has had a similar experience. See also Gow 1952b, 2:162: "Simichidas represents Aratus as practising θυραυλα... at Philinus' door and advises him to abandon the siege to his rival. The plurals (φρουρέωμες, τρίβωμες, ἐμαυ) apparently indicate that he is attended on these vigils by Simichidas. But it seems improbable that the friends who accompany the lover on the κηδεμός (2.119) would carry complaisance so far as to spend the night on the doorstep with him... The language of 122-4 ... seems to indicate quite literally a sleepless night spent pacing to and fro before the locked door. It is possible however that the θυραυλα... is metaphorically meant, and that Simichidas is indicating rather the mental than the physical distress caused to Aratus by his passion. If that be so, the plural, which will indicate his friend's sympathetic participation in the trouble, is easier to understand." Cairns 1972, 201 seems to take the plurals at face value.

\textsuperscript{230}Cairns 1979, 158 seems to imply otherwise: "Aratus the lover and Simichidas his friend are outside the door of a beautiful boy, Philinus."
Next, a cock is mentioned, which occurs in only one other paraklausithuron (Ov. Am. 1.6.66). Simichidas suggests that Aratus leave Philinus, and the pain he causes, to his rival. This is also, in effect, an attack on that rival. Finally a witch—the saga of later paraklausithura—and her charms are mentioned as a way to avoid a similar experience in the future. This could also be a reference to the renuntiatio amoris. This passage is a good example of delayed identification, in which the genre is not made clear until near the end of the song, forcing the reader to re-evaluate quickly what has gone before.

---

231 See Lucian Gall. 3 on the origins of the cock and its connection to furtive love: άς Ἀλεκτρων τις νεανίσκος φίλος γένοιτο τῷ Ἄρει καὶ συμπίνα τῷ ἠθῷ καὶ συγκυσάζοι καὶ καλωσάθη τῶν ἔρωτικῶν· εἴποτε γυνα ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀφροδίτεων μοιχεύσων ὁ Ἀρες, ἐπάγεορος καὶ τῶν Ἀλεκτρωνά, καὶ ἐπειδῆπερ τῶν Ἡλίου μάλιστα υφεράτο, μη κατιδών ἐξειπο πρὸς τὸν Ἡφαίστου, ἐξα πρὸς ταῖς θάραις ἀπολείπειν δεῖ τῶν νεανίσκων μνύσοντα ὑπὸ τὸν ἱερό άναξοι τὸ Ἡλίος, εἰτά ποτε κατακαμηθήσει τῶν Ἀλεκτρωνά καὶ προδοθῆναι τὴν φρουράν ἄκουσα.

232 See Cairns 1972, 203 and 1979, 158. The rival helps explain why Aratus' suit has been unsuccessful.

233 Cairns 1972, 203 considers the witch to be an established komastic topos. See Tib. 1.5.47 ff., with Murgatroyd 1980, 177 f., and also Copley 1956, 100 f.

234 For the renuntiatio amoris, see Theoc. 7.126, 11.72 ff.; Ter. Eun. 49 ff., 65 ff.; and Hor. Ep. 11.17 f., Carm. 3.10.19 f., and 3.26.1 ff. Cf. attempts to cure love in Ar. V. 118 ff. At Anon. AP 12.90 (L. G.-P.) the lover has ceased to love.

235 For more on delayed identification and this poem in particular, see Cairns 1979, 158.
Idyll 11 presents a different type of paraklausethron, albeit one without door or threshold.\textsuperscript{236} The poem begins from the premise that the Muses are the only φάρμακον (1) for love, and Theocritus offers Polyphemus as an example of this:

Οὐδὲν ποτόν ἔρωτα πεφύκει φάρμακον ἄλλον, 
Νικία, οὐτ' ἐγχριστον, ἐμίν δοκεῖ, οὐτ' ἐπίπαστον, 
ἡ ταλ Πιερίδες· κοῦφον ἐκ τοῦ τοῦτο καὶ ἀδύ 
γίνετ' ἔπ' ἄνθρώποις, εὑρεῖν δ' οὐ βρδίων ἐστι.  
γινώσκειν δ' οἶμαι τι καλῶς λατρῶν ἐόντα  
kai ταῖς ἔννεα ὥθε πεφιλήμενον ἔξωχα Μοῖσις,  
οὕτω γοῦν ἱδίστα ἀίδιν' ὁ Κύκλωπ ὁ παρ' ἄμβην, 
ἔρχεται Πολύφαμος, δὲ κρατοῦ τὰς Παλαιὰς,  
ἄρτι γενειάδων περὶ τὰ στόμα τὰς κρατάφως τε.  
κρατοῦ δ' οὐ μάλιστα οὐδὲ βρδίων οὐδὲ κυκλωνιώς,  
ἄλλ' ὁρθαίς μανίσαις, ἀγείτο πέτα πάρεγα.  
pολλάκι ταὶ διες ποτὶ τυόλιν αὕτη ἀπήνθον  
χλωράς ἐκ βοτάνας· δ' δὲ τὰν Παλαιὰν ἀεὶ ἀδών  
αὐτῶς ἐπ' ἀείνος κατεσκέπασα φυκοσάσσα,  
ἐξ ἀσόβης, ἔχοστον ἕχων ὑποκάρδιον ἕλκος,  
Κύπριδος ἐκ μεγάλας τὸ οἷς ἤπατι πάθει βέλεμνον.  
ἄλλα τὸ φάρμακον εὑρε, καθεξόμενος δ' ἐπι πέτρας  
ψηλᾶς ἐς πόντων ὅρθιν ἀεὶς τοιαῦτα.  

He is a young (9-10) lover, just getting a beard. His love is a madness (11), not a mere matter of sentimental love-tokens such as apples, roses or locks of hair. Like the goatherd of Idyll 3, he neglects his duties and work to pursue his love (12 ff.). Burnt by the fires of love (15) and wounded at heart by the arrows of love (16) he wanders from dawn to dusk along the seashore singing of his love Galatea. Again, the rural komos/serenade is set during the daytime

\textsuperscript{236} See Cairns 1972, 145 ff. and Du Quesnay 1979, 45, 48-50, 212 n. 98-104, who note most of the topoi mentioned below. Cairns also notes parallels in the topoi with Id. 3.
and begins, rather than ends, at dawn. The sea must be understood as Galatea’s home, since she is a Nereid, and the shore is therefore the closest Polyphemus can get to her—it is, in effect, the threshold of Galatea’s world. Sitting on a rock (17), he looks towards the sea (ἐς πόντον ὄρῳν, 18) and sings. The rock is described as ὑψηλᾶς (18), reversing the usual physical relationship between the lover on the street and the beloved in the house, presumably more often than not in an upper room.

The cyclops’ song starts at line 19:

"Ω λευκά Γαλάτεια, τι τὸν φιλέοντι ἀποβάλλῃ,
λευκότερα πακτάς ποτιθέν, ἀπαλωτέρα ἀρνός,
μόσχω γαυρωτέρα, φιαρωτέρα ὑμάξας; 20
φοῖνις ο’ αθά’ οὕτως ὁκκὰ γλυκὰς ὅποιος ἔχῃ με,
σε’ εὐθὺς ἰοῦσ’ ὁκκὰ γλυκὰς ὅποιος ἀνή με,
φεύγεις ο’ ὅπερ δι’ ὅπιον ὄρϊκον ἄθροισα; 25
ἣραθνη μὲν ἔγγυε τεοὶς, κόρη, ἄνικα πρᾶτον ἔμεθε
ἐμ’ σὺν ματρὶ θέλοια’ ὑάκλυθνα φύλλα
ἐξ δρέας ὀρέσσωσθαι, ἐγὼ ο’ ὀδὸν ἀγεμόνευσων.
παύσασθαι ο’ ἔσιῶν τι καὶ ὅστορον οὔ γ’ ἔτι πα νῦν
ἐκ τῆς ὁμοῦ ἄλλασμα. τὶ ν’ οὐ μέλει, ὦ μὰ ἄι οὐδέν.
γνώσκω, καρόνα ἐγὼ, τίνος οἴνεια φεύγεις.
οὐνεκα μοι ἐλάστα μὲν ὀθρὺς ἐτ’ παντὶ μετῆνε
ἐξ ὑτὸς τέτατα ποτὶ ὅστερον ὃς μιὰ μακρά,
εἰς ο’ ὁθομλὸ νῆστε, πλατεῖα δὲ βίς ἐπὶ χειλεῖ.

アルバム τοιοῦτον ἐὼν βοτὰ χίλλα βάσκω,
κηκ τούτων τὸ κράτισον ἀμελομένου γάλα πιέω.
τυρὸς ο’ οὕτοι με’ οὔτ’ ἐν ὑπέρι οὔτ’ ἐν ὑπέρω,
οὐ χειμῶνος ἄκρων ταρσοὶ ο’ ὑπεραχές αἰεῖ.
συρισάεν δ’ ὃς οὕτως ἐπισταμαὶ βαὶ Ἰκυλῶν,
τιν’ τὸ φίλον γυλκυμολοῦ, ὑμὴ κηραυνὸν ἀείδων
πολλάκι νυκτὸς ἀφρ. τράφω δὲ τοῖς ἐνδεκα νεβρῶς,
πάσας μανυφόρως, καὶ σκύμωλο τέσσαρας ἄρκτων.

アルバム φιλέων ποθ’ ἄμε, καὶ ἐξεῖς οὐδὲν ἐλασθαν,
τὸν γλυκάν δὲ θάλασσαν ἔστι ποτὶ χέριον ὀρθεῖν’
ἀδόν ἐν τάνυμ χάρῳ ἐρύν τὰν νύκτα διαμιᾶς.
ἐντὸς ἀφάνοι σημείω, ἐντὸς ῥαδίων κυπάρισσοι,
ἐπὶ μέλας κασάς, ἔστ’ ἀμπελοὺς ἵππακαρπας,
ἐπὶ ψυχρὸν ὀδῷ, τὸ μοι ἀ πολυδέκατος άτινα
λευκᾶς ἐκ χιόνος ποτὸν ἀμβρώσιον προητίπ.
τίς καὶ τάδε θάλασσαν ἐχεῖν καὶ κύμαθ’ ἔλοιπο;
αὶ δὲ τοῖς αἄτος ἐγνὸ δοκέω λασιώτερος ἠμέν,
He asks why she rejects his lover (τί τὸν φιλέουτ᾽ ἀποβάλλῃ) and praises her appearance (19-21). Lines 22 ff. are puzzling. Polyphemus seems to indicate that Galatea comes (φοιτᾷ) to look at him when he is asleep, but he seems uncertain himself. It seems most probable that it is to be interpreted as a reference to his dreams, which he has trouble distinguishing from reality. As such, it can be seen as an equivalent to some expression of hope or success.\textsuperscript{237} He recounts the start of his love (he saw Galatea picking flowers, which is similar to the commonplace that the lover sees his beloved when she is in a procession or festival). This is also an opportunity to recount a past service he has performed (27). At 29 he again declares his love, contrasting it with Galatea’s complete disregard for him. Then he describes his own appearance (30-3), but instead of praising it, he does so to explain why Galatea is not attracted to him. Next he praises his wealth (34-7) and his talents (35-piping). Furthermore, in case she has not noticed (since sound does not penetrate the ocean particularly easily) he tells her that he often sings to her late at night. This brings up the typical wakefulness of the lover and also the

\textsuperscript{237}Cairns 1972, 145 suggests that Polyphemus is dreaming. Dover 1971, 176 says that Galatea only comes onto land while Polyphemus is asleep. Du Quesnay 1979, 46 agrees with Cairns saying that Polyphemus “is naively incapable of distinguishing the dream visions of the absent beloved from reality.”
lover's nocturnal serenade--Polyphemus is so madly in love he keeps vigil in both the day and night. He then moves on to list the presents he can offer her (40-1), followed, similarly to *Idyll 3*, with a request for Galatea to come out (42-3) and spend the night with him (44). While the lover usually seeks admission, sometimes the beloved is requested to come out, which is the only option here (see note 53 above). This in turn leads back to Polyphemus' wealth, as he describes his home and its attractions (45-51).

With no response to this forthcoming, he tries another tack:

καλόμενος δ' ὑπὸ τεχνί τὸν ψυχὰν ἀνεχολίμαν καὶ τὸν ἐν’ ἄφθαλμον, τῷ μοι γλυκερώτερον οὐδέν. ὅμοι, δὲν ὑπὸ ἔτεκεν μ’ ἀ μάτηρ βράγχι’ ἔχοντα, ὡς κατέδων ποτὶ τὸν καὶ τὸν χέρα τεθεὶς ἔφλεψα, ἂν μὴ τὸ στόμα λῆς, ἐφερον ὅ τε τοῦ ἡ κρίνα λευκά ἢ μάκων ἢ παιδί πεταγόμεν’ ἔχοιςαν. ἄλλα τὰ μὲν θέρεος, τὰ δὲ γινεται ἐν χειμώνι, ὅτ’ σο καὶ τοι τάθα φέρειν ἃμα πάντ’ ἔσυνάθην. νῦν μᾶν, ὡ κόρισαν, νῦν αὐτικα μεῖν γε μαθεῖμαι, σαί καὶ τοῖς σὺν ναὶ πλέων ἐξενος δ’ ἄφικησαι, ὡς εἰδὼ τὸ πον’ ἀδ’ κατοικεῖν τὸν μυθὸν ὧμιμι. ἐξενθοις, Γαλάτεια, καὶ ἐξεμουσα λάθοισ, ὅσπερ ἔγυ νῦν νῦ δέκα καθήμενος, σέκα α’ ἀπευθεῖν. ποιμάλλειν δ’ ἐθέλαις σὺν ἐμὶ ἃμα καὶ γάλ’ ἀμέλειον καὶ τυρόν πάξαι τᾶμισων ὄμελειαν ἐνεία, ἀ μάτηρ ἀσικεῖς με μόνα, καὶ μέμφομαι σάθ’ ὀσιομὲν πήποχ’ ὅλως ποτὶ τῶν φιλων εἰπεν ὑπέρ μευ, καὶ ταῦτ’ ἀμαρ ἐπ’ ἀμαρ ὀρείφα με λεπτύνομα. φασὶ τῶν κεφαλῶν καὶ τῶς πόδας ἀμφοτέρως μεν σφόσσειν, ὡς άνιαθ’ ἐπεὶ κηρύν ἀνιάμα.

His soul burns and he would undergo anything, including having his eye burnt, if she would love him (52-3)—elsewhere the lover offers himself up for physical trials or
punishment by the beloved. Then we find a variation on the 
metamorphosis-for-love topos, as he wishes he had been born 
with gills, so he could go to Galatea (54 f.). He would then 
be able to kiss her (the hoped-for joys of physical love) or 
just bring her flowers (equivalent to the garland). The 
sympathetic bystander is brought in with the mention of the 
stranger from whom he might learn to swim (61 f.). This is 
followed by another request that she come out to him (63). 
Then he invites her again to share his life with him and 
imagines their happy rustic life together. He next blames 
his mother for his troubles, since she has not intervened 
with Galatea on his behalf, making her a go-between figure. 
He will punish his mother by telling her of his physical 
pains, something the lover usually does to the beloved.

All this having failed, he upbraids and tries, in a 
prolonged renuntiatio amoris, to convince himself that his 
life is good:

\[ \text{Ω Κύκλωψ Κύκλωψ, παῦ μικράς φρένας ἐκπεπότασαι; } \\
\text{α' θείων ταλάρων τε πλέκοις καὶ θαλλόν ἀμάσας } \\
\text{ταῖς ἄρισταις φέροις, τάχα καὶ πολὺ μᾶλλον ἔχοις νῦν. } \\
\text{τὰν παρεολάν ἀμέλυς τι τόν φεύγοντα ἀλάκης; } \\
\text{εὔρησεὶς Γαλάτειαν ζῶις καὶ καλλίου ἄλλαν. } \\
\text{πολλά συμπαίσον ἐμὲ κόραι τὰν νῦκτα κέλουσι, } \\
\text{κινάλεοντι σε πάσαι, ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὰς ὑπακοῦσιν. } \\
\text{ἄθλον δι' ἐν τῷ γὰρ κηρών τις φαίνομαι ἡμῖν.} \]

\[ 238 \text{Of course, whether Galatea would wish to be } \\
\text{kissed by a cyclops with gills, and how the flowers would } \\
\text{withstand prolonged submersion in salt water does not enter } \\
\text{his mind. For the hoped-for joys of physical contact, see } \\
\text{Ar. Ec. 93 ff., 971 and 974, Lys. 855 ff.; and Theoc. 2.126, } \\
\text{[Theoc.] 23.38 ff. At Frag. Grenf. 5, the speaker remembers } \\
\text{past physical joys.} \]
Οὔτω τοι Πολύφαμος ἐποίμασεν τὸν Ἕρωτα
μουσαλάων, βὰς δὲ δίδυ' ἢ εἰ χρυσὸν ἔδωκεν.

He mentions a potential rival to Galatea, but to help support his own resolve, not to provoke Galatea’s jealousy as is usual.\(^{239}\) However, the ending of the poem is ambiguous and leaves the reader in some doubt as to whether the cyclops will not be back again the next day.\(^{240}\)

In connection with this idyll, it is worth noting

Idyll 6.21 ff., where Damoitas, singing in the persona of Polyphemus, depicts a very different moment in the relationship of the cyclops and Galatea:

\[\text{εἴσον, μα] τὸν Πάνα, τὸ ποιμνίου ἄνικ' ἔβαλλε,}
\[καὶ μ' ἔλαθ', οὐ τὸν ἐμόν τὸν ἔνα γλυκόν,...}
\[...}... .................................................. 25
\[ἀλλ' καὶ αὐτός ἐγὼ κυλίζων πάλιν οὐ ποθόμην,}
\[ἀλλ' ἄλλων τινὰ φαμί γυναῖκ' ἔχειν. ὡ δ' ἄλοιπα}
\[ξαλοῖ μ', ὃ Παιάν, καὶ τάκεται, ἐκ δὲ θάλασσας}
\[αἰσθεῖ ταπαίνοισα ποτ' ἄντρα τε καὶ ποτὶ ποίμας.}

\(^{239}\text{Gow 1952b, 2:220 observes on κιχλίζων: "of wanton or lascivious laughter." Clem. Al. Paed. 196 P. ἢ δὲ ἐκμελής τοῦ προσώπου ἐκλίσεις εἰ μὲν ἐπὶ γυναικῶν γίνοιτο κιχλισμὸς προσαγορεύεται, γέλως δὲ ἔστι πονηρικὸς, Α.Β.}}
\(^{240}\text{271.30 κιχλισμὸς: πονηρικὸς γέλως πολὺς καὶ ἄκοσμος, AP 5.245 κιχλίζοις κρεμμέτισσα γάμου προκέλευθον λείασα. See Blaydes on Ar. Nub. 983, Headlam on Hdas 7.123." See also Ph. Sacrif.}}
\(^{21}\text{21 ἢ μὲν ὡς προσέρχεται πόρνης καὶ χαμαίτης τὴν τρόπον τεθρυμμένη, κεκλαμένη τῷ βασίλειον ὑπὸ τρυφῆς τῆς ἄγα καὶ κυλίζοις, σαλεύσα τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ, οἷς τὰς τῶν νέων ἀγκυροῦντες ψυχάς, θράσεις μετ' ἀνασχυντός ἐμβλέπουσα, τὸν σύχενα ἐπαίρουσα, ... σεσαρῶμεν καὶ κιχλίζουσα, ... μέρους εὐθυδεσίων ἀποπνεοῦσα, τὴν ἀγοράν οἰκίαν νομίζουσα, τρισίδες σοφάς, χίττει γυναῖκον κάλλους τὸ νόσον μεταθίκουσα.}}

\(^{240}\text{There is no agreement among scholars whether Polyphemus is successful in controlling or curing his love. See: Erbse 1965; Holtsmark 1966, 253-9; Spofford 1959, 34 f.; Brooke 1971, 78-9; Cairns 1972, 147; Schmiel 1975, 32-3; Miles 1977, 143-5; DuQuesnay 1979, 46-7; Gross 1985, 145-8; and Hutchinson 1988, 180.}
It is almost as if Polyphemus' song in *Idyll 11* won the Nereid's attentions. His claims that another girl has his affections (26) have made her jealous. She is now melting with love (τάχεται 27), and peers from the sea towards the land (27-8). Polyphemus' dog growling at her brings to mind the guard-dog of other paraklausithura. He thinks that Galatea might now send him a messenger (32), no doubt with a proposition. But then he will have his revenge and shut his doors to her! Galatea will, in turn, be an excluded lover.

To conclude with Polyphemus, it should be noted that it is possible that there were earlier similar treatments of his love for Galatea that might have contained a scene similar to *Idyll 11*. Philoxenus of Cythera's dithyramb *Cyclops* or Galatea, probably written not long before 388, is the earliest work we can say with certainty presents the love of Polyphemus for Galatea. There are a number of features of what we know about the story that indicate Philoxenus might have written a serenade similar to what Theocritus has given us.\(^\text{241}\)

\(^{241}\) See Philox. fr. 818 (Campbell = Synes. ep. 121) (Odysseus speaking to Polyphemus, promises to win over Galatea for him): αὐτὴν ἑκείνην ἀποφανῶ σοι ἰδίῳ πολλαῖς ἱμυχείς γενομένην ἄγωγον, καὶ δείησαι σοι καὶ ἀντιβολήσει, σὺ δὲ ἀκριβῶς καὶ κατειρμήσῃ,... ἐτί δὲ κάλλιον εἶ καὶ στεφάνων παρασκευάσατο κιττοῦ τε καὶ μίλακος, οἷς σαυτὸν τε καὶ τὰ παιδικὰ ἀναδόχασιο. Odysseus uses such arguments to
story. Hermesianax also probably wrote about Polyphemus’ love for Galatea, and a fragment from book 1 of the Leontion seems to refer to the cyclops looking out to sea: Δερκομένος πρὸς κόμα, μόνη δὲ οἱ ἐφλέγετο γλῆν (Powell 1). Callimachus, too, wrote a Galatea, one fragment from which (378 Pfeiffer) seems to depict Polyphemus trying to convince Galatea of the attractions of the land over the sea. This would probably have come from a serenade. Moreover, Bion Ἀσπό. 16 also seems to have a similar scene to Idyll 11:

Αὕτις ἐγὼν βασιεύμα εἰμὲν ὅθεν ἐς τὸ κάταντες τὴν πόλιν ἑαυτόν τε καὶ ἁμών φωνήσων, λισάμενος Γαλάτειαν ἀπηνέα· τὰς δὲ γλυκελας ἐπιλάθας υποτίω μέχρι γήραςος οὐκ ἀπολειψό.

It seems likely, therefore, that the Theocritean version of Polyphemus’ paraklausithuric seashore serenade to Galatea had both precedents and imitations, some of which might have been similarly paraklausithuric.

try to persuade Polyphemus to "open the door" of his cave and let him out: ἀλλὰ τί διαστριβής; οὐκ ἐγχειρεῖς ήσιν τῇ θύρᾳ. The Schol. on Ar. Pl. 290 ff. (Philox. fr. 819) say Philoxenus introduced Polyphemus playing the kithara, and repeats the assertion again after saying that Philoxenus portrayed the love of Polyphemus for Galatea, implying that the kithara has some connection with this love interest—no doubt to accompany a serenade. Ath. 13.564 e-f (Philox. fr. 821) quotes some of Polyphemus’ praise of Galatea’s beauty: ὁ καλλιπρόσωπος χρυσεοβάτερυχε [Γαλάτεια] / χαριτόφωνε θάλος Ἑρώτων. Philoxenus also wrote a dithyramb called Κωμαστής (fr. 825).

242 Cf. [Bion] 2.1-3: [ΜΥΡΣΩΝ] Ἄρις νῦ τί μοι, Λυκίδα, ἕκαστον μέλος ἀδῗ λιγάτειν, / μερόν γυνικύθωμον ἐρωτικόν, οἶον ὁ Κύκλωψ / δεισεν Πολύφαμος ἐτ' ἡὼν νύ <τὰ> Γαλατείᾳ.
The pseudo-Theocritean *Idyll 23* tells of a man's (ἀνήρ 1) love for an arrogant youth (ἐφάβω 1), which eventually leads to both their deaths. The first eighteen lines set the scene:

'Aνήρ τις πολύφιλτρος ἀπηνέας ἦταν ἐφάβω, τάν μορφάν ἄγαθα τόν δέ τρόπον οὐκέθ' ὁμοίω· μίας τὸν φιλέοντα καὶ οὐδὲ ἐν ἄμερον εἴχε, καθώς ἦταν τὸν Ἑρωτα τίς ἦν θεός, ἀλλά τάξι
χεραί κρατεῖ, χώς πικρά βέλη ποτικάρδια βάλλειν. 5
πάντα δέ κάν μύθοις καὶ ἐν προσδοκίαις ἀπειρῆς,
οὐδὲ τι τῶν πυρῶν παραμύθιον, οὐκ ἀμάργυμα
χεῖλεσα, οὐκ δασών λυπαρὸν σέλας, οὐ δόσα μάλων,
οὐ λόγος, οὐχὶ φίλαμα, τὸ κούφηξε τὸν ἔρωτα.
οῖα σὲ θῆρ ὕλατος ὑποπτεύησαι κυναγὼς,
οὕτως ἔποιεὶ ποτὶ τῶν βροτῶν ἡ ἄγρια δ' αὐτῷ
χείλεα καὶ κήραι δεινῶν ἐπέπεσεν εἰλεχν ἀνάγκαιν ἡ.
τὰ δὲ χολὰ τὸ πρόσωπον ἀμείβετο, φεύγει δ' ἀπὸ χρώς
θρινὴν ὑπὸ τὸς ὀργῶς ἐπικείμενον, ἀλλὰ καὶ οὕτως
ἐκ καλὸς· ἔξ ὀργᾶς δ' ἔρεθιζετο μᾶλλον ἔραστας. 15
λοισθεῖον οὐκ ἐκεῖκε τόσαν φλόγα τὰς Κυθέρειας,
ἀλλ' ἐνθών ἐκλαεὶ ποτὶ στυγνοῖς μελάθροις,
καὶ κύσε τῶν φιλῶν, οὕτω δ' ἀντέλλετο φωνή.

The first fifteen lines are totally dedicated to an elaborate description of the beloved's cruel arrogance arising from his considerable beauty and his complete invulnerability to love. Line 15 mentions the topos of the beloved's arrogance and resistance only inflaming the lover's passion. Driven to despair by the fires of love (16) the man goes and

---

243 See Garte 1924, 19 f.; Copley 1956, 18 ff.; Gow 1952b, 2:408 ff.; and Burck 1966, 248. On the authorship, see Gow (ibid.): "the poem is plainly not by him.... Reminiscences of Bion are more conspicuous ... and Wilamowitz assigned it to a date a little later than Bion. The moral with which it concludes ... seems to be borrowed from Moschus."
laments (ἐκλαίε) at the youth’s hateful house.\textsuperscript{244} Just as
the beloved’s door is often described by an adjective more
properly applied to the beloved, here his house is semi-
personified by the adjective στυγνός. Then, as a few other
excluded lovers do, he kisses the door, or at least part of
it: καὶ κύσε τὰν φλάν (18), and begins his lament.\textsuperscript{245}

Lament is the proper way to describe the paraklausithuron he sings, for there is no request for admission or
attempt to win over the beloved—this lover knows there is
no hope of that:\textsuperscript{246}

"ἐγριε παί καὶ στυγνέ, κακὰς ἀνάθρεμμα λεινας,
λάνε παί καὶ ἐρυτος ἀνάξει, δύρα τοι ἦνθουν
λοσία τασα φέρων, τὸν ἐμὸν βρόχου, σφικτέι γάρ σε,
καὶ τελω λυπεῖν ποι' ἀρέμνεος, ἀλλὰ βασίζω
ἐνεβα το μεν κατέκρινας, ὅπῃ λόγος ἦμεν ἀτερπέων
ἐνυν τοῖς ἐρωτι τὸ φάρμακον, ἐνεβα τὸ λάθος,
ἀλλὰ καὶ ἢν ὅλον αὐτὸ λαβῶν ποτὶ χείλος ἀμέλεω,

\textsuperscript{244} Note the similarity between ἐκλαίε ποτὶ στυγνοῖς
και μελάθροις and paraklæi̇w.

\textsuperscript{245} Cf. Call. AP 12.118 (G.-P. VIII, Pfeiffer 43),
above, and Lucr. 4.1179, below. For kissing the pfe, see
also Chapter 4.

\textsuperscript{246} Gow 1952b, 2:408 puzzlingly observes: "the senti-
ment is sloppy, and embodied in an address to the boy who,
ex hypothesi, cannot hear it." First, it is not at all clear
that the boy cannot hear the man. Second, if addressing a
beloved who cannot hear the lover makes sloppy sentiment,
then Prop. 1.17, 1.18, Verg. Ec7. 2, and many other fine
works of poetry must also be sloppy. For addresses to an
absent beloved in a paraklausithuric context, see Ov. Met.
13.750 ff., and Nemes. 4.14 ff. Such an address occurs also
in Ov. Ep. 10, which is rich with paraklausithuric topos.
Murgatroyd 1994, 238, on Tib. 2.6, comments: "2.6 is also
more dismal (with its frequent allusion to and imagery of
death) and more radical (in the kinds of appeal used) than
the earlier Tibullian pieces, more so in fact than any sur-
viving paraclusithyron apart from Theocritus (?) Id. 23."
οὗτος σβέσω τοὺς έμοι πάθους. ἄρτι δὲ καλρειν τοῦτοι τεσσάροις προθύρωσις ἐπιβάλλομαι. οἷδα τοῦ μέλλον. καὶ τὸ ῥὁδὸν καλὸν ἔστι, καὶ ὁ χρόνος αὐτὸ μαραίνει. καὶ τὸ ἤνοι καλὸν ἔστιν ἐν εἰρακ, καὶ ταχύ γνηρᾷ.

[λευκῶν τὸ κρίνον ἔστι, μαραίνεται ἀνίκα πληκτεί. 

ἀς ἐκ χιὼν λευκά, καὶ τάκεται ἀνίκα τοῖοι ἡμῖν.

καὶ κάλλος καλὸν ἔστι τὸ παισκόν, ἀλλ' ὅλγον ἰζὶ.

phasis τοῦς ἀλετοῦς ὅπαιναι καὶ τὸ φιλάσεις,

ἀνίκα τῷ κράσιαν ὅπείομενος ἀλμυρὰ κλαύσεις.

ἀλλὰ τῷ, παῖ, καὶ τοῦτο πανώστατον ἀδύ τι ἔρχον. 

ὅποταν ἐξενθών ἀρταμένοιν ἐν προθύρῳς 

τοῖς τεσσάριν ἔος τὸν τλάμονα, μὴ με παρένθης, 

σταιῖ δὲ καὶ βραχύ κλάθον, ἐπισπείας δὲ τὸ δάκρυ 

λύσων τάς σχολίων με καὶ ἁρφής ἐκ βρέχων 

εἰς τοῦ κρύφων με, τὸ δ' ἂν πύματον με φιλάσον.

καὶ νεκρῷ χάρμασι τε κέλλεα, μὴ με φοβαίως

οὐ δύναμαι τι εἰν τι σε. ἀπαλλάξεις με φιλάσας,

χώμα δὲ μοι κολλάνον δ' μεν κρύψει τοῦ ἐρωτα,

κην ἀπίλις, τόδε μοι τρές ἐπάσων. Ἂς φίλε, κελςιτ.'

ἂν δὲ δέλθεις, καὶ τοῦτο. ἄλλος δὲ μοι ἄλθεθ, ἐταλρος.'

γράψων καὶ τόδε γράμμα τὸ σοῖς τοῖχοις χαράσαν.

τοῦτον ἔρως ἐκτείνεις. ἄδοιπός, μὴ παροδώς, 

ἀλλὰ στάς τόδε λέξον. ἀπεύνα εἴξεν ἐταλρον.'

He begins by cursing the youth's cruelty and hardness, making the usual comparison with wild animals and stone. He has brought with him a noose for a present--death will bring him oblivion and rest. He has come to the youth's door (προθύρως 27) this one last time and, ironically, it gives him pleasure.247 Lines 28–34 are an extended threat-prophecy. First is the topos of the aging beloved losing his beauty, of which flowers are used as an example. This brings to mind

---

247 See Gow 1952b, 2:411 on ἀρτι ... ἐπιβάλλομαι: "supposing it to mean now at least I begin to take pleasure in your doorway (because I shall now find oblivion for my troubles there...). Most have wished to translate I bid your door farewell, and, failing to extract this from ἐπιβάλλομαι, have accepted Reiske's ἐπιβάλλομαι: but this injunction, suitable to a lover who renounces his suit, does not seem appropriate to one who is about to hang himself at the door addressed." The "now at least" would mean that the man had been there before.
the similar role the garland often plays in paraklausithura. Then comes the reversed situation of the beloved one day feeling love and finding himself in the lover’s current position (κλάσεις at 32 picks up ἐκλασε in 17). All the man wants is some posthumous pity from the boy (35 ff.). Just as the lover has wept before the youth’s door, he wants the youth to weep over his lover’s body before his own door. His tears will be a libation. Then the lover will get the physical contact he longs for--the joys of physical love in another form. He will even receive a kiss from his beloved (42). The song ends with the man’s epitaph (47-8), which will proclaim that he died of love. But there is a final twist--the man has written his epitaph on the beloved’s wall, presumably near the door (48).

Finally, the man hangs himself, making a reality the excluded lover’s threats to commit suicide. This is the first suicide at the doors of the beloved. While it is tempting to view this also as a variation on the lover hanging up his garland on the beloved’s door, the lack of an explicit association here between the two topoi makes that seem unlikely. Almost as if on cue, the youth comes out,

---


but is not moved and does not shed a single tear. He heads off to the palaestra, thereby offending ( démarche) Eros (compare Aphrodite's anger with Arsinoe in Hermesian. 2):

"Ωδ' εἶπὼν λίθον εἶλεν τ' ἐρεισάμενος δ' ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀχρι μέσων ὀδόν τ' φοβερὸν λίθον, ἀπετε' ἀπ' αὐτῷ 50 τὰν λεπτὰν σχοινίδα, βρόχον δ' ἐπὶ σελλε τραχήλῳ, τὰν ἑδραν δ' ἐκύλισεν ὑπὲκ ποδὸς ἢδ' ἐκπαίδεσθη νεκρὸς. δ' ἀπ' ἀπ' χεῖρα θύρας καὶ τὸν νεκρὸν εἶδεν αὐλείας λέςας ἀρταμένον, οὐδ' ἐλυγίχθη τὰν ψυχὴν, οὐ κλαίσε νέον φόνον, ὄλλ' ἐπὶ νεκρῷ 55 εἶματα πάντ' ἐμίανεν ἐφαβικά, βαίνε δ' ἐς ἡλικὼς γυμνασίων, καὶ ἡκηλία φίλων ἐπεμαλέτο λουτρών, καὶ ποτὶ τὸν θεὸν ἴνηθε τὸν δηρίσε..." 250

The youth is killed when a statue of Eros falls on him, thus avenging the dead man.251

Therefore, while pastoral might not be obvious fertile territory for the paraklausithuric situation, the Theocritean corpus, when compared with any other single author, provides the greatest density of paraklausithuric passages yet seen. Three poems are either in their entirety or principally paraklausithura, while two others contain

250 For the textual difficulties of 49-50, see Gow 1952b, 2:413. He observes that the description of the man's method of suicide as it stands "is meaningless, and the stone... can hardly require to be lent against the wall. Moreover if αὐτῷ or αὔτών is correct... we require a noun to which the pronoun can be referred, since his rope is plainly not attached either to the threshold or to the stone on which he stands... the ms. αὐλὰς is hardly credible, for the suicide hanged himself from some part of the door, not from the wall of the αὐλή... but perhaps it is sufficient to write αὐλείας [sc. θύρας...] ἀρταμένον."

251 This brings to mind Arsinoe's metamorphosis into a statue, but the comparison can not be pursued too far.
significant occurrences of the situation, and one a brief mention. It is becoming very clear that the paraklausithuric situation was regarded as a versatile and attractive background against which to explore unrequited love.

Herodas and Dioscorides

Herodas, a contemporary of Theocritus, provides a paraklausithuric reference in his second mime. While the mimic nature of Theocritus Id. 2 and 3 was noted above, this is the only definite paraklausithuric reference from what is generally considered true mime. A pimp, Battaros, is in court, addressing ἄνδρες δικαιοτα (1) in a complaint against a ship's captain named Thales. Thales tried to abduct at night one of Battalos' hetairai (24 ff.):

βίν τιν' ἔξει τῶν ἐμῶν ἐμ' οὖ πείσας,
καὶ ταῦτα μυκτός, οίχετ' ἡμῖν ἡ ἀλεωρή
tῆς πόλιος, ἄνδρες, καὶ ἔτει ς εμμύνεσθε,
tὴν αὐτονμίην ὑμέων θαλῆς λύσει.253

This is just the type of behaviour he would expect from a foreigner such as Thales (34 ff.):

οὔδεις πολίτης ἥλθοσεν οὐδ' ἔλθεν
πρὸς τάς θύρας μεν νυκτός οὖδ' ἔχων ἅγιας
τὴν αὐτικὴν υφίσταν οὐδὲ τῶν πορνῶν
βίν λαβῶν οίχωκεν· ἀλλ' ὁ δρύξ οἶδος,
ὁ νῦν θαλῆς ἔως, πρόσθε σ', ἄνδρες, Ἀρτιμίης,
ἀπαντα ταῦτ' ἔπρεπε καὶ ἐπηδέσθη
ὁτε νόμον οὔτε προστάτην οὔτ' ἄρχοντα. 253

252 Of course, for detailed analysis of the mime, see Headlam-Knox 1922.

253 The text is from Cunningham 1993. The dots under letters have, however, been omitted.
Once again an attack on a brothel or such is exemplified by the torches the lover would have used to burn away the hinges or pivots at the top and bottom of the door.  

Batarrus requests that the applicable law be read, which states that if a freeman assaults a slave-girl he is to pay τὸ τίμμα / διπλοῦν (47-8). He goes on to cite the penalty Thales faces and repeats the details of the attack (48 ff.):

... ταῦτα ἔγραψε Χαιρώνης,

... ἢν θύρην ὑπὲρθυραμοῦ κόψῃ,

μυνήν τιμήτω, φησί', ἢν δὲ πῦξ ἄλοιπης,

αὔλην πάλι μυνὴν. ἢν δὲ τὰ ὀλικῆ ἐμπρήσῃ

ἡ δροῦς ὑπέρθυρσα, χιλίας τὸ τίμμα

ἐνειμε, κἂν βλάψῃ τι, διπλόου τίμειν.

... τῶν ἑπλήγην, ἢ θύρη καθήρακαται

τῆς οἶκης μεν, τῆς τελείω τρίτην μισθῶν,

τὰ ὑπέρθυρα ὑποτ. δεύο, Μυρτάλη, καὶ σῦ.

νόμιζε τοῦτος ὅδε ὁρῆς ὑικάζοντας

πατέρας ἀδελφοῦς ἐμβλέπειν, ὁρῆτ' ἄνορτες,

τὰ τίμματ' αὐτῆς καὶ κάτωθεν κάψωθεν

ὡς λέει ταῦτα ἐξιλλεν ἐναγής σῶτος,

ὅτ' εἰλεκνεν αὐτήν καβιάζετ'....

This valuably raises the issue of legal redress for such actions. Clearly fines and penalties could be levied against the perpetrators, but the matter of enforcement and

---

See Headlam-Knox 1922, 92 on line 65: "τὰ ὑπέρθυρα: the structure above the door...; the lintel or architrave or both. It contained the sockets (στροφεῖς) in which turned the upper pivots (στροφιγγ.ες) of the door (sch. Hom. 7.90, Eust. 1570.30). To force an entrance, the easiest method was to remove the whole of the θύρη, whether by cutting it away ἔκκοπτεσεν Lys. 97.1, Polyb. 4.3.10, or, as here, by burning the lintel and so releasing it from the sockets."
eventual conviction is something very different. As line 15 makes clear, a metic such as the pimp would need a pro-
states (γυνώσετ' οἷς προστάτα [π τ]εθύρημα..) to stand for him in court, something that one suspects many men would be unwilling to do, when one considers the poor reputation of pimps. At Athens the standard fine of double the cost of the damage would not have been a serious deterrent to many, although the one thousand drachma fine for arson or trespass might sometimes have been. Nonetheless, the mime provides another example for the continuing popularity of the topos of the violent assault on a brothel or hetaira's house, something that very likely reflected at least a distorted reality.

255 Headlam-Knox 1922, 88 f.: "The law alleged by Battaros must be taken, as the author meant it, for a piece of humorous absurdity. But there is one thing which may be noticed: Herodas represents the action as a δίκη δικαιότος, with fixed penalties; whereas at Athens the amount of pecuniary compensation was left for the plaintiff to claim and for the judges to decide.... On the other hand it was a peculiarity of the code of Zaleukos... that in his laws the various penalties were fixed.... In the laws of Andania... double the value of a runaway slave was the penalty to be paid for offering illegal assistance, and double the damage done was the penalty fixed in general at Athens for ἄδικη-μοσα τά εἰς ἄργυρου λόγον ἄνδρανα...."

256 See Headlam-Knox 1922, xxxviii: "antiquity, as may be supposed, had only one verdict as to the character of our hero--of all professions his is the worst: lenones... turpissimos et ultimae professionis homines says Lampridius Heliogab. 20,... Pl. Poen. 89,... Philonid. fr. 5. Aristotle 1121b 33... and he is generally given with the τελωνεῖς the lowest and most dishonourable place among these: Theophr. Char. 6, Lucian 1.471, Dio Chrys. l.c. 2.414 ... Hermogen. 3.74 (Walz)."
Herodas’ first mime also contains a passage of interest:

... ἀθικτος ἐς Κυθηρίνα σφηνίς,
λέων σε καθόδυ τῆς Μίσης ἐκῴμην
tὰ σπλάγχνα ἐρωτὶ καρδήν ἀνοιαστηθεῖς,
καὶ μεν ὀδύτης οὔτε ἔπ' ἡμέρῃ λείπει
tὸ σῶμα, [τέ]κνον, ἀλλὰ μὲν κατακλαζεῖ
kαὶ ταταλ[ε]ῖει καὶ ποθένω ἀποθνῄσκει.

The picture could easily be paraklausithuric if the lover were not actually in the go-between’s house. The remembrance of the first time the lover saw the beloved, the effect of love described as, albeit typically, a sting or arrow or the like, the waiting at the house day and night, and the topos of dying from love are all common enough in paraklausithura.

So while the passage is not paraklausithuric, it is useful to be reminded that such actions are typical of lovers in general, and only arise in paraklausithuric situations because paraklausithura are, above all, concerned with love.

The only other possible paraklausithuric reference in Greek from before Plautus comes from Dioscorides AP 12.14 (G.-P. IX):

Δημόφιλος τοιοῦτος φιλήμασιν εἶ πρὸς ἔραστὰς
χρῆσται ἀκμαίνη, Κύπρι, καθ’ ἡλικίνη
ὡς ἐμὲ νῦν ἐφιληθεὶς ὁ νῆπιος, οὐκέτι νῦκτιν
ᾗνχα τῇ κείνου μητρὶ μενεῖ πρόθυρα.

It is possible that this could refer to the noise of a door opening— that is, either lovers being let in to Demophilus or Demophilus sneaking out to them— but πρόθυρα, which usually means the vestibule before the doors and not the
doors themselves, seems to indicate rather that the noise will be made by komasts seeking admission to Demophilus.²⁵⁷ The mention that this will happen when Demophilus is older could be an intentional inversion of the threat-prophecy that the beloved will one day become an excluded lover. The latter is the logical next step for an attractive youth or woman, just as being the object of excluded lovers' attentions is the logical next step for a highly attractive boy who is still too young to be an eromenos.

²⁵⁷ Gow-Page 1965, 2:242 also interpret this as komastic. They observantly note that "Since D. says μητρὶ not πατρὶ she is perhaps a widow since at night her husband might be expected to be at home."
CHAPTER 3
FROM PLAUTUS TO HORACE

Plautus

Plautus is our earliest source for a Latin paraclausithuron. As did Aristophanes and Menander, he handled the theme several times. Best-known is the opening scene from the Curculio, but paraclausithuric passages occur in the Mercator, Persa, Amphitruo, Asinaria, Bacchides, Menaechmi, Miles, and the Truculentus.

The Curculio's opening two scenes show the arrival of a lover, Phaedromus, at the door of a leno's house, where his beloved is kept, and his eventually successful attempt to meet briefly with his beloved.1 While there is no real exclusion, since Phaedromus arrives and fairly quickly sum-

1Although it is not among his earliest plays, the general attention given to the Curculio makes it a reasonable place to start. Duckworth 1994, 52 dates it to sometime in the 190s. The Curculio has been much-discussed, and the following pages will make no effort to provide a survey of major scholarship on the passage, deal with any problems not directly relevant to the paraclausithuron or even attempt to recognize all discussion of those individual problems. For more on the opening scenes, see Leo 1900, 607 ff.; Garte 1924, 45 ff., 66 ff.; Hendrickson 1925, 292 ff.; Weinreich 1929, 200 ff.; Copley 1942, 101 ff.; Haight 1950, 85 ff.; Copley 1956, 9 ff., 28 ff.; Fraenkel 1960, 97 ff.; Burck 1966, 251 f.; Watson 1982, 99 ff.; and Duckworth 1994, 116 ff.
mons out the custos, whom he persuades to bring out his beloved, the scene nonetheless deserves examination. The nature of Phaedromus’ attempts to gain access to his beloved are enough for the passage to be called paraklausithuric.

The first lines of the Curculio set the scene. Phaedromus enters accompanied by his slave Palinurus and a pompa carrying various provisions:

{Pa.} quo ted hoc noctis dicam proficisci foras cum istoc ornatu cumque hac pompa, Phaedrome?
{Ph.} quo Venu’ Cupidoque imperat, suadet Amor:
si media nox est siue est prima uespera,
si statu’, condictus cum hoste intercedit dies,
tamen est eundum quo imperant ingratiis. 5
{Pa.} at tandem, tandem--{Ph.} tandem es odiosus mihi.
{Pa.} istuc quidem nec bellum est nec memorabile:
tute tibi puer es, laetus luces cereum.
{Ph.} egon apicularum congestum opera non feram, 10
ex dulci oriundum melculo dulci meo?²

He is on something of a komos with troop in tow, it is night, and he is under the compulsion of love. He has a candle instead of a torch, and there is a mention of servitiun amoris (9, although he is acting as his own slave, it is because he is in love that he does so). He is headed to the house of Cappadox, a pimp, which has a special door:

{Ph.} huic proxumum illud ostiumst oculissimum. 15
salue, ualuiuin? {Pa.} ostium occlusissimum,
caruitne febris te heri uel nudiustertius
et heri cenauistine? {Ph.} deridesne me?
{Pa.} quid tu ergo, insane, rogitas ualeatne ostium?
{Ph.} bellissimum hercle uidi et taciturnissimum, 20
numquam ullam uerbum muttit: quom aperitur tacet,
quom illa noctu clanculum ad me exit, tacet.

²Unless otherwise indicated, all quotations from Plautus will follow Lindsay 1904-5.
This is the first address to a door in any paraklausithuric passage we have, and it is combined with an unprecedented vivid personification of the door itself. Phaedromus talks to it solicitously as if it were his beloved. The common topos of the lover regarding with affection some possession or object connected with his beloved has been noted above (see Chapter 2, note 31). And we have seen two instances where a lover has kissed the door of the beloved (Call. AP 12.118 [G.-P. VIII, Pfeiffer 42]; [Theoc.] 23.18), but they are of a completely different degree of intensity and elaborateness. Palinurus evidently understands Phaedromus' "salve, valuistin," for he then carries the solicitousness,

3 More will be said below about the door-address and also the personification of the door. Plautus personifies doors with varying degrees of vividness at As. 386, Mer. 830 ff., Mos. 818 ff., Ps. 605 ff., Rud. 414 St. 312, 324 ff., Truc. 350-4, 638. Cf. Garte 1924, 46; Yardley 1987, 183-5; Burck 1966, 251; and Copley 1956, 35-6: "The first and most obvious innovation is the personification of the door, which is treated throughout as if it were a living being ... leads directly to a further innovation ... that the lover's plea for admission is addressed, not, as in the Greek examples, to the beloved, but to the door itself." Fraenkel 1960, 23, 95 ff., and esp. 97 f., discusses Plautus' tendency to personify inanimate objects, but notes that such personification also occurs in Greek comedy etc., and suggests that the personification of the door was even traditional by Plautus' time. However, Plautus carries the idea further than is usual, which is particularly noticeable later in the "pessuli" song at 150 ff. See also Leo 1900, 607, who suggests that the personified door comes from New Comedy. Such Plautine fondness for personification can be seen in this scene at lines 40 and 100 ff.
and personification, to an absurd degree. The personification is continued in the explanation of why Phaedromus regards the door so highly—it is an ally in his love affair: it opens quietly and furtively for his beloved, never making a noise, so that she may sneak out to him. This also introduces an element of furtius us amor. The personification, and eventual near deification, of the door will continue throughout the scene.

The secrecy prompts Palinurus to wonder if Phaedromus is up to some adulterous deeds (23 ff.). Phaedromus is quick to make clear that he is not, and a discussion follows about the dangers of adultery, involving several castration jokes. Phaedromus' beloved does not belong to any of the forbidden categories:

[[Pa.]] dum ted apstineas nupta, uidua, uirgine, iuuentute et pueris liberis, ama quidstubet.  
[Ph.] lenonis hae sunt aedes. [Pa.] male istis euenat.  
[Ph.] qui? [Pa.] quia scelestam seruitutem servuunt. 40

4Cf. Otis 1958, 197: "But the difference, it seems to me, is obviously not in the fact of address to an inanimate object but in its elaboration and feeling: the door is not merely apostrophized but treated as a person."

5Of course the noise of the door as it opened was a common indicator of entrances in comedy. It is easy to assemble quickly a host (incomplete) of references for Plautus alone: Mil. 154 f., 328 f., 410, 985, 1376 f., Mos. 506 f., 1062, Per. 404, Poen. 603 ff., 741, Ps. 130 f., Bac. 234, 610 f., 798, 1058, Capt. 108 f., Cas. 161, 434 f., 813, and 835 f. They are as common in Menander, see Frost 1988. See also Duckworth 1994, 116, and Murgatroyd 1980, 76 on Tib. 1.2.9-10, and his references there: Plin. Nat. 16.210; Thphr. H.P. 5.3.5, 5.5.4; and Seru. A. 1.449.
Further personification of the door is present in the image of the door as a slave (40). The element of *furtiuus amor* arises because the pimp has an *ancillula* (43) and:

```
[Ph.] eam uolt meretricem facere. ea me deperit, ego autem cum illa facere nolo mutuom. {Pa.} quid ita? {Ph.} quia proprium facio: amo pariter simul.

{Pa.} malu' clandestinus est amor, damnumst merum. {Ph.} est hercle ita ut tu dicis. {Pa.} iamne ea fert iugum? 50

{Ph.} tam a me pudica est quasi soror mea sit, nisi si est osculando quippiam inpudicior. {Pa.} semper tu scito, flamma fumo est proxima; fumo comburi nil potest, flamma potest. qui e nuce nuculeum esse uolt, frangit nucem: qui uolt cubare, pandit saltum sauiis. {Ph.} at illa est pudica neque dum cubitat cum uiris. {Pa.} credam, pudor si quoiquam lenoni siet. {Ph.} immo ut illam censes? ut quaeque illi occasiost, surrupere se ad me, ubi sauium oppegit, fugit. 60 id eo fit, quia hic leno, <hic qui> aegrotus incubat in Aesculapi fano, is me excruciat. {Pa.} quid est? {Ph.} alias me poscit pro illa triginta minas, alias talentum magnum; neque quicquam queo aequi bonique ab eo impetrare....
```

This is a new background to the paraklausithuron. The beloved is a *meretrix*, but one who returns the lover’s affections. Secrecy is necessary because the beloved’s pimp is demanding more than the lover can pay. Phaedromus’ beloved has often sneaked out to him in the past, a topos that will be seen regularly in later paraklausithura.6

---

6 Copley 1956, 40 is quite correct when he notes the appeal of this situation: "By transferring the blame for the lover’s exclusion from the girl to the door, the *leno*, and the duenna, Plautus has given Planesium an impeccably correct moral position.... the paraklausithyron motif ... is changed to put her in the right."
At line 71 Venus is introduced, along with the topos of the lover vowing offerings to a god in return for amatory success: "nunc ara Veneris haec est ante horunc fores; / me inferre Veneri uouii iaientaculum." Phaedromus orders a slave to hand a bowl to him (75), which the reader thinks must be for a libation at the altar. But it is not:

... {Ph.} iam scies.  75
anus hic solet cubare custos ianitrix,
nomen Leaenae est, multibiba atque merobiba.
{Pa.} quasi tu lagoenam dicas, ubi uinum Chium
solet esse. {Ph.} quid opust uerbis? uinosissuma est;
eaque extemplo ubi <ubi> ego uino has conspersi fores,80
de odore adesse me scit, aperit ilico.
{Pa.} eine hic cum uino sinus furtur?

For the first time, a definite custos figure is present
(Lysistrata was a form of one at Ar. Lys. 861 ff., as was the old woman at Ec. 976): a ianitrix (76) who clearly must be overcome or persuaded for the lovers to be able to meet.\(^7\)

Here is also the topos of the lover sprinkling wine at his beloved's door (seen before in the Scholia on Ar. Plutus 179), but turned to a practical purpose. It is worthwhile to note that, considering the considerable fondness that comic writers and Plautus in particular had for raucous door-

\(^7\)Of course such a figure could have been present in Plautus' model--see below in the concluding observations on the Curculio.
knocking scenes, the secrecy and quietness of this scene itself would have attracted the audience's attention.  

In connection with luring Leaena out, the personification of the door continues (87 ff.):

{Ph.} sequere hac, Palinure, me ad fores, fi mi opsequens.
{Pa.} ita faciam. {Ph.} agite bibite, festiuae fores; potate, fite mini uolentes propitiae.
{Pa.} uoltisne olius pulpamentum capparim? 90
{Ph.} exsuscitae uostram huc custodem mihi.

Again, the door is addressed, but this time in a religious manner.  
Instead of merely asking for the door to be opened,  

---

8 Cf. Pl. Am. 1019 ff., As. 381 ff., Mos. 506-19, 898-903, 933 ff., 988-90, Rud. 412-5, Capt. 830-9, Bac. 578 ff., St. 308-27, et al. Also see Duckworth 1994, 116 f. Frost 1988, 9 notes the popularity of knocking in Old Comedy and the fact that knocking itself quickly gained comic associations. For Menander, he notes particularly "the ham-fisted approaches made to Knemon at Dysk. 458 and 498 ... and also at Epitr. 1075 where Smikrines' indignant knocking leads into his comic discomfiture." Furthermore "only once in the extant comedies is knocking successfully carried out in a serious scene (Aspis 499) where the door is, apparently, immediately answered at the first knock."

9 See Burck 1966, 251 on 88 f.: "Das ist typisch italischer, typisch altrömischer Gebetsstil." Cf. Cato Agr. 141. McKeown 1987-, 2:131 on Ov. Am. 1.6.15-16 notes that the alliteration of t and p "has an archaic liturgical color:... see on 1.4.27 f." For such alliteration, see also Weinreich 1929, 376, 378-9, and 380. Compare also Kleinknecht 1937, 158 f. Weinreich 1929, 371-88 discusses the scene and concludes that much of the scene from lines 71 ff. is a parody of Dionysiac para-tragic ritual. Certain aspects of his argument seem excessively subtle, but the overall conclusion is quite convincing and helps explain the religious tone of Leaena's address to the wine and Phaedromus' reaction. Of course, this is intimately connected with the association of doors opening to provide epiphanies of gods, which is the main focus (200 ff.) of Weinreich's work. Copley 1942, 102 first concedes that there is a parody of religious ritual in the Cur. but then goes on to say (ibid., n. 43) that "such parody would have been con-
the lover pours the wine at or on the door and asks the door to open itself and send the custos out.\textsuperscript{10} It works, because they hear the door opening, which prompts Phaedromus to praise further the door and its hinges, which in turn leads Palinurus to suggest that Phaedromus kiss it, as other excluded lovers sometimes do:\textsuperscript{11}

\textit{... {Ph.}} sine.
uiden ut aperiuntur aedes festiuisumae?
num muttit cardo? est lepidus. {Pa.} quin das sauium?
{Ph.} tace, occultus lumen et uocem. {Pa.} licet. 95

Leaena enters (96), sniffing around, and begins to address and praise first the wine (99 ff.) and then the bowl with religious-sounding language (the anaphora of "tu" in 102 ff.), as if they were her own beloveds. This nicely reflects the relative importance of the door to Phaedromus and the

sidered in bad taste." Although the subject of the personification and deification of the door will be discussed later, it is worth noting that such a treatment for an inanimate object has its precedents, for example, the address to the λύχνος at the start of Ar. \textit{Ec.} is clearly hymnic/religious—see Fraenkel 1960, 95 and n. 2. A notable later example is Hor. \textit{Carm.} 3.21.

\textsuperscript{10}Compare \textit{PGM} 36.312-20: "Ἀνοίξεις θύρας, λαβὼν πρωτοτόκον κριοῦ ὄμφαλον / μὴ πεσόν χαμαλ, ξυμφώνας ἔχε καλ, ὅτε βούλῃ / ἀνοίξαι, πρὸςφέρε τοῖς κλήστοις λέγων τὸν λόγον τοῦτον, καὶ ἀνοίγεις εὐθέως. ἔστι δὲ ὁ λόγος: / 315 ... ἀνοίγητι, / ἀνοίγητι, κλήστοι, ὅτε ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡμερος ο μέγας / ... υἷς τοῦ Ὀσίρεως καὶ τῆς Ἰσίδος. / βούλομαι δὲ φυγεῖν τὸν ἄθεον Τυφώνα, ἡπ ἡπ, ταχὺ / 320 ταχύ.

\textsuperscript{11}For more on kissing the door, see Chapter 4. Cf. also Yardley 1978, 26, who cites Lucr. 4.1179, Tib. 1.2.84, Arn. \textit{Adv. Nat.} 1.49, and \textit{Cur.} 88-9, and asks with regard to this line: "Can it be that Palinurus' \textit{quin das sauium} at 94 is a sarcastic piece of encouragement for Phaedromus to take his religious veneration of the door even further?"
wine to the ianitrix. While Phaedromus and Palinurus observe her, the latter comments that she ought to be a dog, thus bringing in a mention of the guard-dog that often bothers the excluded lover.

A long conversation between Phaedromus and Leaena follows (104 ff.), incidental to the general paraklausithuric situation except for developing the topos of the custos who can be bribed to help the lover. The continued religious language and formulae, especially at 115 ff., should also be noted. Leaena also makes a small libation to Venus at the altar nearby, no doubt because she brings lovers like Phaedromus, and again raises the topos of the lover's vows to Venus/Aphrodite for success (123 ff.): "Venus, de paullo paullulum hoc tibi dabo hau lubenter. / nam tibi amantes propitiantes unum dant potantes / omnes." It is, of course, neat wine she pours, and drinks (128). At line 133, now that Leaena has received her bribe, Phaedromus returns to the more usual form of the excluded lover, and begins to complain about his wretchedness and misery. Leaena is moved, tells Phaedromus not to cry, as many excluded lovers do, and departs inside, with Phaedromus promising her even greater rewards. This prompts Palinurus to comment again on his master's poverty (132 ff.):

... {Ph.} anus, audi.  
hoc uolo scire te: perditus sum miser.  
{Le.} at pol ego oppido seruata.
sed quid est? quid lubet perditum dicere
te esse? [Ph.] quia id quod amo careo.
[Le.] Phaedrome mi, ne plora, amabo.
tu me curato ne sitiam, ego tibi quod amas iam huc
adducam.--
{Ph.} tibine ego, si fidem seruas mecum, uineam pro
aurea statua statuam,
quae tuo gutturi sit monumentum.
qui me in terra aeque fortunatus erit, si illa ad me
bitet,
Palinure? [Pa.] edepol qui amat, si eget, adficitur
misera aerumna.

However, seemingly uncertain about Leaena's trust-
worthiness, Phaedromus takes extra action (145 ff.):12

{Ph.} quid si adeam ad fores atque occentem? [Pa.] si
lubet, neque uoto neque iubeo,
quando ego te uideo immutatis moribus esse, ere, atque
ingenio.
{Ph.} pessuli, heus pessuli, uos saluto lubens,
uos amo, uos uolo, uos peto atque obsacro,
gerite amanti mihi morem, amoenissumi,
fite caussa mea ludii barbari,
sussilite, obsacro, et mittite istanc foras,
quae mihi misero amanti ebitit sanguinem.
hoc uide ut dormiunt pessuli pessum
nec mea gratia commouent se ocius!
re spicio, nihil meam uos gratiam facere.
st tace, tace! [Pa.] taceo hercle equidem. [Ph.] sentio
sonitum.
tandem edepol mihi morigeri pessuli fiunt.

Whereas Phaedromus earlier addressed the door, here he sings

12This seems the best explanation for why Phaedromus
would sing his song to the pessuli when Leaena had already
gone inside to fetch Planesium. Copley 1956, 153 n. 3 is
right on this: "But instead of reappearing at once with
Planesium, she was gone some time.... Phaedromus then may
have decided that she had tricked him, and so turned to the
doors with a second request for admission."
to it (occentem), or really just its bolts. The language is amatory, religious, and magical. The amatory language

13The song itself is in cretics, and was sung: see Beare 1964, 226 who notes, that its context consists of metres generally considered to be lyrical, such as the anapaests of the preceding dialogue of P. and Ph. and the glyconics and dochmiacs of the following lines, one of which is even whispered. Duckworth 1994, 362 notes that while the plays of Plautus have an average of 3 cantica, this is the only one in the Curiulio. It does, however, start at 96, giving less prominence to the pessuli song within it. Copley 1956, 30-1 makes several bizarre observations on the song: "And what does Phaedromus sing? Not the lament of the shut-out lover... He comes out, instead, with an old native folk song, an Italian 'Mother Goose rhyme' to the door bolts, only slightly changed to fit Greek metre and the circumstances of the plot.... The song, like most such, was doubtless in Saturnian metre, and traces of that metre are not difficult to find in Plautus' cretic version." Kenney 1958, 49 has particular difficulty with the last statement.

Much has been made of occentare, which, however, need not mean here anything more than the OLD's (s.v. 1) "To sing at or to", or even "in the direction of" (OLD s.v. "ob" 1). There is no reason to see implications of magic in the verb itself, as some have done such as Weinreich 1929, 393. See particularly Brecht 1893, 1752 ff.; but also Fraenkel 1925, 187 ff.; Beare 1964, 226; Crook 1967, 251 f.; Copley 1956, 30; and Hendrickson 1925, 292 ff., who concludes (304) that "in occentare ostium the noun is not the object of the verbal element cantare, but of the compounded preposition. The door is not 'sung' or charmed to open ... but the song or noise is produced at or before the door." The verb is found two other times in Plautus at Mer. 408 and Per. 569, both in connection with doors. The passages will be discussed below.

14Particularly noteworthy is the same anaphora of the second-person pronoun seen above at 102 ff. This is called by Norden 1913, 143 ff. the Du-Stil der Prädikation and is common in prayers to gods. For the song as magic, see Weinreich 1929, 391-4. His conclusions in general are surely correct, even if he gives too much weight to occentare. Note particularly 392: "mit anderen Worten, die ludii barbari sollen als Medizinmänner magisch helfen, so wie etwa die ludiones mit Tanz und Flötenspiel seinerzeit die Pest aus Rom heraustreiben sollten (Hermes 51, 392). Die ludii barbari sind m. E. nicht nur eine kühne Metapher, sondern ein ganz dem Milieu der Komödie angepaßter Ersatz für die sonst in Zaubererspruch angerufenen Helfer. [Lines 149-52]...
and the mention of the lover's misery provide a connection with the usual song of the excluded lover. Furthermore, at line 153, when the tone changes from pleading and flattering to insulting, we find a trace of the "figura subitae mutationis" (Vretska 1955, 26) that was seen above in Theocritus 3 and 11.\textsuperscript{15} Finally, Phaedromus gets his wish, and Leana leads Planesium out through the opened door (which is not totally silent: "sentio sonum," 156):

\begin{quote}
\{Le.\} placide egredere et sonitum prohibe forium et crepitum cardinum,
ne quae hic agimus eru' percipiat fieri, mea Planesium.
mane, suffundam aqulam. \{Pa.\} uiden ut anus tremula
medicinam facit? 160
eapse merum condidicit bibere, foribus dat aquam quam
bibant.
\end{quote}

Further mention is made of the need for secrecy and quiet in order for the pimp not to discover what is going on. To silence the door, Leaena pours water into the sockets (159), a trick that is used elsewhere.\textsuperscript{16} With that, Phaedromus and

\begin{quote}
\textit{ist also meiner Meinung nach ein individuell umgestaltetes, der Komödie angepaßtes, grotesk-italisch säkularisiertes carmen magicum, wie Plautus solche aus dem Volksglauben, nicht aus einer νέα kennen mochte.}\textsuperscript{15}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{15}Yardley 1987, 183 notes this as the first appearance in Latin. See also Murgatroyd 1980, 75-6. Garte 1924, 88 suggests that Plautus might have got this from new comedy.

\textsuperscript{16}This must have been only into the bottom sockets, which would have been the noisiest anyway since they, unlike the top ones, bore the whole weight of the door. See Ar. Th. 487 f. mentioned above. For the design of the Roman door, see Smith 1848, 1.624 f.; Nisbet-Hubbard 1970, 294; and Page 1957, 247.
Planesium are again fleetingly united, and the paraklaussithuric portion of the play ends.\textsuperscript{17}

Since this scene contains so many notable features, a summary and a few general observations are in order. Plautus has provided the first explicit personification we have of the house-door in a komastic/paraklaussithuric context. Accompanying this is the first address to the door in such a context. Moreover, a further paraklaussithuric novelty is the explicit religious language and action throughout the passage, particularly in the addresses to the door. This raises the issue of Plautine innovation and borrowing, about which, although the subject is too complicated to discuss in any depth here, several general conclusions can be made. The first is that there is every possibility that Plautus' Greek model contained some broadly similar paraklaussithuric scene,

\textsuperscript{17}Copley 1956, 9 f. gives more weight to Planesium's appearance than it deserves: "In the Curculio, as in the Ecclesiazusae, the lover is not rejected.... In both plays, this is a dramatic necessity, for if the door had remained closed the plot could not have been developed along the desired lines...." Of course Plautus could have made the plot develop along any lines he wanted, including having an unsuccessful paraklaussithuric incident here—a single exclusion does not imply inevitable future exclusions. Copley (\textit{ibid.}) also says that "The appearance of the girl herself in this scene is unparalleled in any extant example of the paraclausithyron, and is typical of the freedom with which the drama treated it." Kenney 1958, 49 rightly has trouble with this statement, but if the Aristophanic scenes cited above are paraklaussithuric parody, it is also completely inaccurate.
thus adding another paraklausithuron to New Comedy.\textsuperscript{18} The original could even have included many of the topoi found in the Curculio, such as personification of the door. We have seen in earlier paraklausithuric references topoi such as kissing the door and sprinkling about of wine. It is generally agreed, however, that the extent of the personification of the door and the religious parody associated with it is probably because of Plautus. But what cannot be concluded from this is that such features come from some "Italian" native door-song, or that they either do, or do not, derive from a paraklausithuric model used by Plautus.\textsuperscript{19} The fact that such topoi appear in Plautus for the first time does not mean that they were invented by Plautus. But wherever

\textsuperscript{18} Fraenkel 1960, 99-100 and Weinreich 1929, 371 ff. both conclude that the Greek original had some similar scene. Certainly there is no reason why the general situation of the lover who is separated from his beloved, soon-to-be *hetaira/meretrix*, because of his inability to pay her pimp's required price, should not have been found in a New Comedy original. Nor is there any reason to suggest that the original could not have contained some similar scene involving the bribery and persuasion of the beloved's *custos*. There might even have been a rival--perhaps a soldier--who had already made a downpayment on the beloved: see Fantham 1965, 84 ff.

\textsuperscript{19} Copley 1956, 28 argues for the native door-song: "There seems to be only one way to explain this ... to assume that the Italians already had a native song at the shut door that played a significant part in their folk literature." Kenney 1958, 49 rightly objects to this conclusion. Furthermore, the "Italian" label implies a unified culture in the Italian peninsula that did not exist at Plautus' time. More will be said on the general issue of innovation in, and the comparative development of, Roman versus Greek paraklausithura below. Cf. also Yardley 1978, 21 f.
they came from, they become more common in paraklausithuric situations after Plautus, and so credit must be given to him for the probable popularization of these topoi.

There is no particular advantage to examining Plautus' paraklausithuric passages in chronological order, and the mention of occentare in Cur. 145 makes it convenient to discuss first the two other passages containing that verb, Mer. 404 ff. and Per. 564 ff. Of these, the Mercator is probably the earlier (Duckworth 1994, 52) and will be discussed first.

In the Mercator, Charinus, a young man, has bought and brought home from a trading voyage a beautiful young maidservant, whom he tells his father Demipho he intends to give to his mother as a present. His father, however, thinks that she is far too attractive to be a suitable maidservant (395: "quia--<quia> non nostra formam habet dignam domo."). At lines 405 ff. he explains in more detail the troubles the maid would cause:

...{De.} quia illa forma matrem familias flagitium sit sei sequatur; quando incedat per uias, contemplent, conscipiant omnes, nutent, nictent, sibilent, uellicent, uocent, molesti sint; occentent ostium: ipleantur elegeorum meae fores carbonibus. atque, ut nunc sunt maledicentes homines, uxori meae 410 mihique objectent lenocinium facere. nam quid eost opus? {Ch.} hercle qui tu recte dicis, et tibi | adsentior. sed quid illa nunc fiet? {De.} recte. ego emero matri tuae ancillam uiraginem aliquam non malam, forma mala, ut matrem addeceet familias, aut Syram aut Aegyptiam: 415 ea molet, coquet, conficiet pensum, pinsetur flagro,
neque propter eam quicquam eveniet nostris foribus flagiti.

The meaning seems quite clear. A beautiful maid would attract the attention of men who would solicit her, and go so far as to sing love songs before the door of the house, and even write elegiac verses on the doors themselves. Such actions would constitute an outrage, the ὑθρις that is found so often in connection with κὐρος/κυμάτεςιν. As a result of these attentions, it would be presumed that the maid was really a meretrix and that, therefore, Demipho and his wife were procurers. Compare Isaeus 3.13 ff. with this

20 For more on occentare, see immediately above. The evidence that has led some people to interpret it otherwise includes: Cicero de Rep. 4.12 (Aug. C.D. 2.9): "Nostrae ... XII Tabulae cum perpaucas res capite sanxissent, in his hand quoque sanciendam putauerunt: 'Si quis occentauisset siue carmen condidisset, quod infamiam faceret flagitium alteri"; to which must be compared Cornutus ad Pers. Sat. 1.137: "Cautum est 'ut fustibus feriretur' conuiciium fecerit dicimus"; and Festus 196.12: 'Occentassit' antiqui dicebant quod nunc conuiciium fecerit dicimus." Hendrickson 1925 provides an excellent discussion prompted by Usener (Itali- ische Volksjustiz), who concluded that occentent was equi- valent to conuiciuim facere and represented a protest by the community against Demipho. See especially 297-8 where he analyses this passage from the Mercator, coming to the same conclusions offered above. Cf. Enk 1966, 88: "'they would serenade the house'; haec uerba recte interpretatus est ur doctus G.L. Hendrickson." Also, see Rothstein 1966, 100; Copley 1956, 155 n. 43; de la Ville de Mirmont 1909, 589; and others.

21 For such writing on doors, see Chapter 2, note 119, and cf. Theoc. 23.48; Mel. AP 5.191.5-7, 12.23.2-3 (G.- P. LXXII, XCIX); Prop. 1.16.10; and Ov. Am. 3.1.53-4.

22 See Chapter 1, note 43, for the connection. The OLD is wrong to put the flagitium of 417 under its first entry: "1. (app.) A public demonstration of disapproval outside a person's house."
for the insult such actions would offer to a respectable household. This is perhaps the best argument for at least early Roman developed paraklausithuric situations being presumed to be directed at the dwellings of *meretrices* or the like rather than those of respectable persons. Finally, the matter-of-fact way in which the situation is mentioned, without exaggerated comic development, seems to indicate that such a reaction can be taken as a real possibility.

*Per.* 564 ff. contains a similar idea. The pimp Dordalus is talking with his slave Toxilus about buying the girl of the title, the daughter of the parasite Saturio:

{Do.} edepol qui quom hanc magi' contempto, magi' placet. {To.} si hanc emeris, di inmortales, nullus leno te alter erit opulentior. 565 euortes tuo arbitratu homines fundis, familiis; cum optumis uiris rem habebis, gratiam cupient tuam: uenient ad te comissatum. {Do.} at ego intro mitti uotuero. {To.} at enim illi noctu occentabunt ostium, exurent fores: proin tu tibi iubeas concludi aedis foribus ferreis, 570 ferreas aedis commutes, limina indas ferrea, ferream seram atque anellum; ne sis ferro parseris:

---

23 Again, see Hendrickson 1925, 298-9: "Here again Usener saw a threat of public protest against the pander by honest citizens ... and seems to have overlooked the obvious implication that the threatened demonstration and violence would be rather for the purpose of gaining possession of the girl. Again it is the familiar situation of drunken gal- lants...." The passage is cited by Rothstein 1966, 98; McKeown 1987, 2:152; and Copley 1956, 40, 155 n. 43. Several authors, for example, McKeown and de la Ville de Mirmont, mention one of these passages and not the other.
ferreas tute tibi impingi iubeas crassas compedis.  

With a girl like Saturio's daughter the pimp will have so much business he will have to turn away customers, who will then turn up at night (presumably after drinking parties) and sing before his door. Knowing that they will not be admitted, Toxilus presumes that they will follow up their songs with violent attempts to enter the pimp's establishment using the common method of burning down the door. The situation must be essentially the same one envisaged in the earlier comedic references to amatory violent assaults on buildings. Therefore Toxilus advises Dordalus to steel himself, as it were. The clear first choice of steel/iron for reinforcing the door helps explain later Latin use of ferreus and its cognates for the door and the resistent beloved (see Appendix 2). Of course, since Dordalus is a pimp, he will not have much recourse against such assaults.

Six other of Plautus' plays contain scenes that have some justification to be called paraklausithuric: Amphitruo, Asinaria, Bacchides, Menaechmi, Miles, and Truculentus. These are, for the most part, subtler evocations of the paraklausithuric situation, although less disguised than Aristophanes' paraklausithuric parodies.

24 Comissatum (568) does not mean that the customers will arrive in komoi, but that they will come in order to revel or party. Comissor, comissatio, comissator and their single "s" equivalents are, of course, not strict equivalents to κύμος/κυμάζεως, but are essentially restricted to the static komos. See Hendrickson 1925, 302.
The Amphitruo provides one of Plautus' most complicated paraklausithuric scenes. Jupiter in the guise of Amphitryon has sent Alcmena inside Amphitryon's house and will soon join her. In an appropriately hymnic fashion, he summons his son Mercury, who has assumed the form of Sosia, Amphitryon's slave, and tells him to keep the real Amphitryon out of the house while he himself is inside with Alcmena (976 ff.):

\[\text{nunc tu, duine Sosia, hoc fac adsies,}\\ \text{(audis quae dico, tam etsi praeens non ades),}\\ \text{face Amphitruonom aduenientem ab aedibus}\\ \text{ut abigas; quouis pacto fac commentu' sis.}\\ \text{uolo deludi illunc, dum cum hac usuraria}\\ \text{uxore nunc mihi morigero. haec curata sint}\\ \text{fac sis, proinde adeo ut uelle med intellegis,}\\ \text{atque ut ministres mihi, mihi quom sacruficem.}\]

Mercury arrives, a classic Plautine seruus currens. He explains that he is a good son to his father:

\[\text{pater uocat me, eum sequor, eius dicto imperio sum}\\ \text{audiens;}\\ \text{ut filium bonum patri esse oportet, itidem ego sum}\\ \text{patri.}\\ \text{amanti subparasitor, hortor, adsto, admoneo, gaudeo.}\\ \text{si quid patri uolupest, uoluptas ea mi multo maxumast.}\\ \text{amat: sapit; recte facit, animo quando opsequitur}\\ \text{suol, 995}\\ \text{quod omnis homines facere oportet, dum id modo fiat}\\ \text{bomo.}\]

\[25 Adesse is common in kletic prayers: Tib. 3.3.33; Ov. Fast. 5.183, Rem. 75, Tr. 1.10.46; Sen. Med. 13; Prud. Peristeph. 5.545, c. Symm. II 6341, et al. Fac plus the subjunctive can be religious—see Appel 1909, 132 f. The general picture of Jupiter/Zeus as adulterer with Mercury/Hermes abetting him brings to mind the vase painting illustrated in Trenkner 1958, 130, which depicts Zeus as a komast carrying a ladder towards a window in which a woman can be seen, accompanied by Hermes carrying a torch. See above on Aristopho fr. 4.}\]
nunc Amphitruonem uolt deludi meus pater: faxo probe
iam hic deludetur, spectatores, uobis inspectantibus.
capiam coronam mi in caput, adsimulabo me esse ebrium;
atque illuc susum escendero: inde optume aspellam
uirum 1000
de supero, quom hoc accesserit; faciam ut sit madidus
sobrius.
deinde illi actutum sufferet suo' seruos poenas Sosia:
eum fecisse ille hodie arguet quae ego fecero hic. quid
<id> mea?
meo me aequomst morigerum patri, eius studio seruire
addecet.
sed eccum Amphitruonem, aduenit; iam ille hic deludetur
probe, 1005
siquidem uos uoltis auscultando operam dare.
ibo intro, ornatum capiam qui potis decet;
dein susum ascendam in tectum, ut illum hinc prohibeam.

Thus the joke is set up. Mercury, will keep Amphitryon out
of his own house while Jupiter, Amphitryon's rival, is
inside with Alcmena, Amphitryon's wife. However, Alcmena is
totally free from moral blame for she believes she is with
her husband (cf. Duckworth 1994, 283). Amphitryon will be
excluded from his wife by his own slave, while his wife is
inside with: Amphitryon himself. What is more, Amphitryon is
not the drunken komast or reveller--it is the excusor Mer-
cury/ Sosia who is drunk and wearing a garland (999, 1007)
and is furthermore in the common upper-storey position of
the beloved. He hints that he will, at some point, pour down
water on Amphitryon, making a pun on the lover's typical
drunkenness ("faciam ut sit madidus sobrius," 1001). In the following scene Amphitryon arrives, intending to confront his wife over her suspected stuprum but finds the doors locked. He, knocks, calls out, knocks even more vigorously, and then has to face the drunken Mercury, who defends the doors from the abuse they have been given. Amphitryon threatens Mercury, whom he thinks is his slave Sosia, with violence. He suspects Alcmena has a lover inside with her. Mercury, on the other hand, has a container of water ready to pour down on Amphitryon (lines 1001, 1034 and fr. V), a topos that occurs elsewhere. Lines 1015 ff., and frs. V and XI follow. Particularly to be noted is the density of door vocabulary, which will become common in Latin paraklau-sithuric situations:

nunc domum ibo atque ex uxore hanc rem pergam exquirere, quis fuerit quem propter corpus suum stupri compleuerit. nam me, quam illam quaestionem inquisitam hodie amittere mortuum satiust. sed aedis occluserunt. eugepae, pariter hoc fit atque ut alia facta sunt. feriam fores. aperite hoc. heus, ecquis hic est? ecquis hoc aperit ostium? 1020

{M.} quis ad fores est? {A.} ego sum. {M.} quid "ego sum". {A.} ita loquor. {M.} tibi Iuppiter

---

26 On madidus and madeo, see Murgatroyd 1994, 220-1 on Tib. 2.5.87-8: "madidus baccho ... Madidus meaning 'drunk' before here occurred only at Plaut. Amph. 1001, As. 859, and Aul. 573; it appears here first with a word for wine in the ablative.... So too madeo = 'be drunk' is found before T. only at Plaut. Cas. 246, Most. 331, Pseud. 1297, Truc. 855, and Lucr. 3.479 ... and made facio is not used of inebriation until Ovid A.A. 3.765." It is worth noting the apparently negative tone of the adjective at As. 859, although it is more neutral at Aul. 573.

27 See Chapter 2, note 134, on Ar. Lys. and below on Lucil. 943.
dique omnes irati certo sunt, qui sic frangas forest.

{A.} quo modo? {M.} eo modo, ut profecto uiuas aetatem miser.

{A.} Sosia. {M.} ita: sum Sosia, nisi me esse oblivum existumas.

quid nunc uis? {A.} sceleste, at etiam quid uelim, id tu me rogas? 1025

{M.} ita, rogo. paene ecfregisti, fatue, foribus cardines.
an fores censebas nobis publicitus praebierir?
quid me aspectas, stolide? quid nunc uis tibi? aut quis tu es homo?

{A.} uerbero, etiam quis ego sim me rogitas, ulmorum Acheruns?
quem pol ego hodie ob istaec dicta faciam feruentem
flagris. 1030

{M.} prodigum te fuisse oportet olim in adulescentia.
{A.} quidum? {M.} quia senecta aetate a me mendicas
malum.

{A.} cum cruciatu tuo istaec hodie, uerna, uerba funditas.

{M.} sacrufico ego tibi. {A.} qui? {M.} quia enim te
macto infortunio.

Fr. V {{(M.)}} ne tu postules matulam unam tibi aquai
infundi in caput.
Fr. XI {{(A.)}} quid minitas te facturum, si istas
pupilissem fores?

The text after line 1034 is very fragmentary, but
there is something of an epilogue to this scene at 1039 ff.,
where Amphitryon is again alone in front of his house, with
Jupiter again inside. Amphitryon presumes that Thessalian
witchcraft is the cause of all the trouble, prefiguring the
more prominent role of the witch-figure in later paraklausis-
thura. He finally decides, thinking his rival is inside
again, to break into the house and kill everyone he finds,
since they all have complicity in the adultery. At the same
time, he proclaims his willingness to defy even Jupiter:
... [A.] perii miser.

quid ego? * * quem aduocati iam atque amici

numquam edepol me inultus istic ludificabit, quisquis

deserunt? 1040

iam ad regem recta me ducam resque ut facta est eloquar.
est;
gro illum ulciscar hodie Thessalum uenificum,

ego pol illum uelciscar hodie Thessalum uenificum,

qui perurose perturbuit familiae mentem meae.
sed ubi illest? intro edepol abiit, credo ad uxorem

meam. 1045

qui me Thebis alter uiuit miserior? quid nunc agam,
quem omnes mortales ignorant et ludificant ut lubet?
certumst, intro rumpam in aedibus: ubi quemque hominem

apexero,
si ancillam seu servum siue uxorem siue adulterum

siue patrem siue auum uidebo, obtruncabo in aedibus. 1050

neque me Iuppiter neque di omnes id prohibetum, si

volent,

quin sic faciam ut constitui. pergam in aedis nunciam.28

However, Amphitryon is felled by the thunderclap from Jupi-
ter's appearance to help Alcmena in her childbirth (1072

ff.):

[[Br.]] sed quid hoc? quis hic est senex, qui ante aedis

nostras sic iacet?

numquam hunc percussit Iuppiter?

credo edepol, nam, pro Iuppiter, sepultust quasi sit

mortuos.

ibo et cognoscam, quisquis est. Amphitruo hic quidem

<est> eru' meus. 1075

Like many an excluded lover, Amphitryon ends his attempt to

gain entrance to the house by lying in front of it. It is

---

28This is probably a good place to note one other

passage from Plautus in which an excluded lover of a sort

threatens general slaughter: at Cist. 519 ff. Alcesimarchus

speaks to the Iena Melaenio: "enim uero ita me Iuppiter /

520 itaque me Iuno itaque Ianus ita—quid dicam nescio. /

iam scio. immo, mulier, audi, meam ut scias sententiam. / di

me omnes, magni minutique et etiam patellarii / faxint ne

ego <dem uiue> uiuos sauium Selenio, / nisi ego teque tuam-

que filiam meque hodie optruncauero, / 525 poste autem cum

primo luci cris nisi ambo occidero, / et equidem hercle nisi

pedatu tertio omnis ecflxero, / nisi tu illam remittis ad

me. dixi quae uolui. uale."
also tempting to see here a precedent for the assimilation of the doorkeeper to Jupiter that will be found in Ovid Am. 1.6, but there is not enough evidence to make such a conjecture anything more than highly speculative.\textsuperscript{29} The mere presence of Jupiter as a rival also might remind the reader of the excluded lover’s appeal to Zeus for help or mercy in earlier paraklausithura. Finally, it should be pointed out that here, as will be the case in the Asinaria and elsewhere in Plautus, the beloved is blameless for the lover’s exclusion.

The Asinaria contains an extended scene in which Argyrippus has been thrown out of the lina Clearata’s house. He first laments his fate and addresses the lina, who is unseen within the house:

\begin{verbatim}
{Arg.} sicine hoc fit? foras aedibus me eici?
promerenti optume hocin preti redditur?
bene merenti mala es, male merenti bona es;
at malo cum tuo, nam iam ex hoc loco
ibo ego ad trisuiros uostraque ibi nomina
favo erunt, capiti' te perdam ego et filiam,
perlecebrae, permites, adulescentum exitium.
nam mare hau est mare, uos mare accerrumum;
nam in mari repperi, hic elaui bonis.

ingrata atque inrita esse omnia intellego
quae dedi et quod bene feci, at posthac tibi
male quod potero facere faciam, meritoque id faciam tuo.
ego pol te redigam eodem unde orta es, ad egestatis
terminos,

go epeol te faciam ut quae sis nunc et quae fueris

scias. 140
quae priu' quam istam adii atque amans ego animum meum
isti dedi,
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{29}Compare Plu. Alc. 16.1 and the picture on his shield of Eros wielding a thunderbolt: \textit{ἀσπίδας} τε \textit{διαχρύσου ροζίσιν ... ἕχουσαν ... Ἔρωτα κεραυνοφόρον.}
sordido uitam oblectabas pane in pannis inopia,
ataque ea si erant, magnas habebas omnibus dis gratias;
eadem nunc, cum est melius, me, cuius opera est, ignoras
mala.
reddam ego te ex fera fame mansuetem, me specta modo.145
nam isti quid suscenseam ipsi? nihil est, nihil quicquam
meret;
tuo facit iussu, tuo imperio paret: mater tu, eadem era
es.
te ego ulciscar, te ego ut digna es perdam atque ut de
me meres.
at scelestast uiden ut ne id quidem, me dignum esse
existumat
quem adeat, quem conloquatur quoique irato supplicet?150

The lover, standing before his beloved's house, addresses
her lena, who is the lover's exclusor. He threatens her with
the tres uiri, insults her, compares the wildness of her and
his beloved to the sea, pleads his poverty, reminds her of
the multitudinous past services and favours he has done her,
and presents he has given to her. He threatens her with a
return to poverty, and calls her a wild beast. He does not,
however, blame his beloved, prefiguring the general unwill-
ingness of the elegiac lover to blame his beloved for his
exclusion. Finally Cleareta leaves the house, and the fol-
lowing scene essentially reiterates the arguments made by
Argyrippus, developing the themes of the mercenary and
manipulative mistress or lena (153 ff., 204 ff., and 215
ff.), the past joys the lover and beloved experienced
together (169 f.), and the gifts, presents, and payments to
the beloved's household (177 ff., 204 ff.). There is no need
to quote it all, but three passages deserve to be cited. At
156 Cleareta tells Agryrippus that "fixus hic apud nos est animus tuo' clauo Cupidinis". This is certainly an image of fixity (OLD s.v. 1d) and surely contains a joke in that he has been pierced by a nail rather than one of Cupid's arrows (cf. Tib. 2.1.71), but the "hic" could refer to the doorway in which Cleareta is standing, and the line then could present an image of Agryrippus being fixed firmly to the door. There is also explicit personification of the beloved's house at 207--"tum mi aedes quoque arridebant quom ad te ueniebam, tuae"--and near-personification of the doors at 241-2: "port[it]orum simillumae sunt ianuae lenoniae: / si adfers, tum patent, si non est quod des, aedes non patent."

Finally, Agryrippus, unable to win over Cleareta, will try something else (245-6): "nunc pergam ad forum atque experiar opibus, omni copia, / supplicabo, exobsecrabo ut quemque amicum uidero." His prayers and supplications will not be directed towards the intransigent Iena or his helpless beloved, but towards friends who can do him some good.\(^{30}\)

\(^{30}\)There is strong similarity between much of Agryrippus' complaints and similar themes in elegy. Yardley 1987, 186 notes that "One can go further and suggest that since a number of the parallels between Am. 1.6 and Plautus are concentrated in the Asinaria, [note 45: "Am. 1.6.74 = Asin. 386; Am. 1.6.64 = Asin. 298; Am. 1.6.46 = Asin. 629." ] this was one of the plays Ovid had in mind when he composed the poem." Murgatroyd 1980, 176 cites the attack on the Iena in lines 127 ff. in connection with a similar, if more elaborate, attack at Tib. 1.5.47-58. McKeown 1987-, 2:241 on Ov. Am. 1.8.77-78 ("surda sit oranti tua ianua, laxa ferenti; / audiat exclusi uerba receptus amans") and Murgatroyd 1994, 144-6 on Tib. 2.4.31-4 cite for comparison, among others, lines 241 ff.
Later in the play Argyrippus is again barred from access to his beloved Philaenium: "{Li.} homo hercle hinc exclusust foras" (596); "hinc med amantem ex aedibus eiecit huius mater" (632). As he says farewell to Philaenium,\(^\text{31}\) he (606 f.) announces his intention to either kill himself or die from unrequited love.\(^\text{32}\)

The Bacchides contains a very clever inverted paraklausithuron. Nicobulus and Philoxenus arrive at the house of the two Bacchides determined to retrieve their sons (1116 ff.):

... {Ph.} ei mihi, disperii.
\[\text{[Ni.]}\] quid dubitamus pultare atque huc euocare ambos foras?
\[\text{[Ph.]}\] hau moror. \[\text{[Ni.]}\] heus Bacchis, iube sis actum aperi foris,

\(^{31}\)Duckworth 1994, 279 observes that "Plautus has seldom portrayed with more sentiment the devotion of lover and sweetheart than in the farewell scene of Argyrippus and Philaenium."

\(^{32}\)Lines 381-94 deserve mention for one of the best door-knocking scenes in Plautus, and for the elaborate door-knocking vocabulary, as well as the personification of the door in consueras at 386 (see Yardley 1987, 183): "\{Me.\} ut demonstratae sunt mihi, hasce aedis esse oportet / Demaenetus ubi dicitur habitare. i, puere, pulta / atque atriensem Sauream, si est intus, euocato huc. / \{Li.\} quis nostras sic frangit fores? ohe, inquam, si quid audis. / 385 \{Me.\} nemo etiam tetigit. sanun es? \{Li.\} at censebam attigisse / propterea, huc quia habebas iter. nolo ego fores consueras / meas a te uerberarier. sane ego sum amicus nostris. / \{Me.\} pol haud periculum est, cardines ne foribus ecfringantur, / si \[\text{[Li.]}\] istoc exemplo omnibus qui quaeunt respondebis. / 390 \{Li.\} ita haec morata est ianua: extemplo ianitorem / clamat, procul si quem uidet ire ad se caitironem. / sed quid uenis? quid quaeritas? \{Me.\} Demaenetum uolebam. / \{Li.\} si sit domi, dicam tibi. \{Me.\} quid eiius atriensis? / \{Li.\} nihilo mage intus est...."
 nisi mauoltis fores et postes comminui securibus.
  {Ba.} quis sonitu ac tumultu tanto nominat me atque
        pultat aedis?  1120
  {Ni.} ego atque hic. {Ba.} quid hoc est negoti nam,
        amabo?
  quis has huc oui admegit? {Ni.} oui nos uocant pes-
          sumae. {Sor.} pastor harum
  dormit, quom haec eunt [sic] a pecu balitantes.
  {Ba.} at pol nitent, hau sordidae uidentur ambae.
  {Sor.} attonsae hae quidem ambae usque sunt.  1125

The mention of the axes, and the threat of a violent assault
on the doors of a prostitute's house, set up the inverted
paraklausithuric situation that follows.\footnote{33} \textit{Nitent} (1124)
helps to develop the situation, for lovers traditionally
were dressed up from the dinner that usually preceded the
komos, and having one's hair anointed was a standard part of
such grooming.\footnote{34} The old men are to be seen as pseudo-
komasts. Having threatened such action, they are surprised
when the two Bacchides actually emerge from the house--
presumably because such threats usually did not work. Under-
standably a \textit{meretrix} would not be inclined to accomodate a
drunken komast making violent threats at her door. The two
old men demand that their sons be produced and threaten more
violence if they are not (1146 ff.):

  [Ni.] et praeter eos agnos meus est istic clam mordax
canis:

\footnote{33}McKeown 1987-, 2:152 cites line 1118 in passing in
his discussion of Ov. \textit{Am.} 1.6.57-8, as does Headlam-Knox
1922, 83, on Herod. 2.

\footnote{34}Cf. Tib. 1.7.51-2 "illius et nitido stillent
unguenta capillo / et capite et collo mollia serta gerat," and Ov. \textit{Ars} 1.733 f. "arguat et macies animum, nec turpe
putaris / palliolum nitidis imposuisse comis." See Nisbet-
Hubbard 1970, 66 on Hor. \textit{Carm.} 1.4.9
qui nisi nobis producuntur iam atque emittuntur foras, arietes truces nos erimus, iam in uos incursabimus.

The Bacchides devise the cunning plan of trying to lure the old men inside (1152): "ego ad hunc iratum adgreder. possumu' nos hos intro inlicere huc." The rest of the play is taken up by the Bacchides' eventually successful attempts to lure the men inside, with various blandishments (note exor-are at 1170, 1176 bis, 1177, 1199, 1200), flatteries, and promises of physical pleasures. The men resist, even threatening violence—not if they are not admitted, but rather if the women do not leave them alone (1172 ff.). Even past payments made to the prostitutes are mentioned (1182). Finally, overcome, the men announce their servitiwm amoris (1206): "ducite nos quo lubet tamquam quidem addictos." The scene is broadly reminiscent of the similar inverted paraklausithuric parody in Aristophanes' Ecclesiazusae.

A similar scene occurs in the Menaechmi, where Erotium, thinking Menaechmus Sosicles is Menaechmus, tries to lure him inside. She enters from her house at line 351 explicitly telling her servants within that the door is to be left open. She orders them to prepare the conuivium. She then approaches Menaechmus S. (351 ff.):

\[
\begin{align*}
[E.] & \text{sine fores sic, abi, nolo operiri.} & 351 \\
\ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots \\
\text{sed ubi ille est quem coquo ante aedis esse ait? atque} & \text{eccum uideo,} & 357 \\
\text{qui mihi est usui et plurimum prodest.} & \text{item hinc ultrro fit, ut meret, potissimus nostrae domi} & \text{ut sit;}
\end{align*}
\]
Erotium invokes Venus for having blessed her with a lover like Menaechmus (370 f.): "quia po1 te unum ex omnibus / Venu' me uoluit magnificare neque id haud inmerito tuo."

Menaechmus S., in an aside to Messenio, suggests that Erotium is insane, mad or drunk—all states in which the excluded lover is often found (373 ff.): "certo haec mulier aut insana aut ebria est, Messenio, / quae hominem ignotum compellet me tam familiariter." In the following lines, Erotium makes repeated suggestions that Menaechmus S. step inside: "heia! delicias facis. / mi Menaechme, quin, amabo, is intro? hic tibi erit rectius" (381 f.); "eamus intro, ut prandeamus" (387); "†iam, amabo, desinet ludos facere atque i hac mecum semul" (405); and "eamus intro." (431). She even reminds Menaechmus S. of past gifts he gave her: "scilicet ... quom pallam mihi / detulisti quam ab uxore tua surrupsisti" (392 f.). In an inversion of the topos of the lover proclaiming his ancestry in order to convince his beloved that he is a worthy lover, Erotium identifies Menaechmus and his parentage, listing Syracuse's recent rulers while she is at it (407 ff.). As Menaechmus S. begins to yield, his slave
Messenio becomes something of an *exclusor* and tries to deter him: "periisti, si intrassis intra limen" (416). Nonetheless, Menaechmus S. realizes there is no real reason not to take advantage of the apparently "non sana" (390) woman and finally enters her house.

In the *Miles*, the *meretrix* Acroteleutium is talking with her maid Milphidippa, pretending that she is madly in love with Pyrgopolynices, who is off to one side of the stage with the slave Palaestrio. The two women are in front of Pyrgopolynices’ house, where they suppose the soldier is. Acroteleutium first declares how she offers thanks to Venus, and begs and entreats her for success in winning Pyrgopolynices’ affections. Milphidippa replies that he scorns all other women but for Acroteleutium, to which Acroteleutium voices her concerns that that scorn might turn on her once he has seen her (1228 ff.):

{Ac.} Veneri pol habeo gratiam, eandemque et oro et quae
ut eiius mihi sit copia quem amo quemque expetess
benignusque erga me ut siet, quod cupiam ne
grauetur. 1230

{Mi.} spero ita futurum, quamquam illum multae sibi
expetessunt:
ille illas spernit segregat ab se omnis, extra te unam.
{Ac.} ergo iste metus me macerat, quod ille fastidi-
osust,
ne oculi eiius sententiam mutent, ubi uiderit me,
atque eiius elegantia meam extemplo speciem spernat.1235
{Mi.} non faciet, *modo* bonum animum habe. {Ph.} ut
ipsa se contemnнт!
{Ac.} metuo, ne praedicatio tua nunc meam formam
exsuperet. 1240
{Mi.} istuc curaui, ut opinione illius pulchrior sis.
This provides the lover's oaths and vows to Venus/Aphrodite for future success, the arrogance and fickleness of the beloved (in the concern that he might change his mind), and the lover's mention of his/her own appearance. Acroteleutium goes on to describe what she will do if Pyrgopolynices does scorn her (1239 ff.):

\[\text{[Ac.]} \text{ si pol me nolet ducere uxorem, genua amplectar atque obsecrabo; alio modo, si non quibo impetrare, 1240 consciscam letum: uiuere sine illo scio me non posse. [Py.]} \text{ prohibendum mortem mulier i uideo. adibon? [Pa.] minime;}
\]

\[\text{nam tu te uilem feceris, si te ultro largiere: sine ultro ueniat; quareritet, desideret, exspectet sine: perdere istam gloriam uis quam habes? caue sis faxis. 1245 nam nulli mortali scio optigisse hoc nisi duobus, tibi et Phaoni Lesbio, tam mulier se ut amaret. [Ac.]} \text{ eo intro, an tu illunc euoca foras, mea Mil-phihippa. [Mi.] immo opperiamur dum exeat aliquis. [Ac.]} \text{ durare nequeo, quin eam intro. [Mi.] occlusae sunt fores. [Ac.]} \text{ ecfringam. [Mi.]} \text{ sana non est]. 1250 [Ac.]} \text{ si amauit umquam aut si parem sapientiam [hic] habet ac formam, per amorem si quid fecero, clementi <hic> animo ignoscet. [Pa.]} \text{ ut, quaeo, amore perditast tuo misera! [Py.]} \text{ mutuom fit. [Pa.]} \text{ tace, ne audiat. [Mi.]} \text{ quid astitisti obstupida? [Ac.]} \text{ quia non est intus quem ego uolo. [Mi.]} \text{ qui scis? [Ac.]} \text{ scio de olefactu; 1255 nam odore nasum sentiat, si intus sit. [Pa.]} \text{ hariolatur. [Py.]} \text{ quia me amat, propertea Venus fecit eam ut diuinaret.}
\]

Acroteleutium will supplicate and entreat (1239, religious language) Pyrgopolynices, and, if that does not work, she will kill herself. Pyrgopolynices wants to inter-
vene, but Palinurus tells him to let Acroteleutium come to him. Lines 1246-7 bring in a form of mythological exemplum by the comparison with Phaon and Sappho and once again the lover's appearance is mentioned. At 1249 Acroteleutium tells Milphidippa to call out Pyrgopolynices, but when Milphidippa mentions that the doors are closed (1250), Acroteleutium says she will break them down--she will do for Pyrgopolynes what lovers such as Pyrgopolynices are supposed to do for beautiful meretrices like herself. Then there is praise of the beloved's beauty, but with the unusual idea that the beloved will be merciful and forgive the lover's actions. However, before knocking on the door (1254), Acroteleutium stops and realizes that Pyrgopolynices is not inside, because she can smell him (1255), which introduces the divination topos. Finally, she sees her beloved, the equivalent of making eye contact, and almost collapses (1262 ff.). There is mention of love at first sight (1264) as well as the beloved's ancestry (from Venus, 1265). Next Acroteleutium approaches Pyrgopolynices, as Milphidippa proclaims to the soldier that "ut iussisti, / eram meam eduxi foras" (1267-8). The paraklausithuric scene ends with the lover and beloved united. The greatest source of amusement in the scene is the picture of the meretrix playing the part of a

---

35 The only other example of a woman forcing a door occurs at Sen. Nat. 4 A, Pref. 6. Two other notable female komasts/excluded lovers are to be found in the Frag. Gren. and Plu. Mor. 753 B.
crazed, and married, exclusa amatrix willing to break down
the door of her beloved to get at him. Furthermore, the
actions she is contemplating are technically unnecessary,
for her fears that Pyrgopolynices will reject her are not
founded. Finally, that the whole scene is a sham designed to
play to Pyrgopolynices’ arrogance adds further point to the
exclusa amatrix figure—such a thing is highly improbable,
but Pyrgopolynices believes that a woman could be driven to
take such actions for him.

Finally, the Truculentus contains references to the
situation of the excluded lover throughout, and there are
two passages that can be called paraklausithuric. Since the
theme of the poor lover unable to gain access to a beloved
meretrix figures so strongly in the play, a brief survey of
its occurrences is in order. The play opens with Diniarchus
in front of the house of his beloved Phronesium (76). For
seventy-five lines he attacks the mercenary ways of meretrices
and their great skill at keeping men attracted to
them, despite the lovers’ large payout in gifts and the
meretrices’ small payout in access and favours.\footnote{Duckworth 1994, 258 quite rightly notes that Phronesium is the least sympathetic meretrix in Plautus.}
He mentions how youths have to keep their affairs secret from
their parents and relatives (57 ff.):

\begin{verbatim}
atque haec celamus nos clam magna industria,
quom rem fidenque nosque nosmet perdimus,
\end{verbatim}
At lines 76 ff. we find out that he used to hold a high position among Phronesium's lovers, but that he has been supplanted by a rich soldier. Then at line 93 the door to Phronesium's house opens and the maid Astaphium enters. A discussion ensues in which Diniarchus complains about his maltreatment at Phronesium's hands and reminds Astaphium of how he was once highly regarded by her and her mistress. When he mentions that he still has some land and houses left, Astaphium's tone changes (175 ff.):

> qur, opsecro, ergo ante ostium pro ignoto alienoque astas?
> <i> intro, haud alienus tu quidem es; nam ecstor
> neminem hodie mage amat corde atque animo suo, si quidem habes fundum atque aedis.

After further blandishments from Astaphium, including an assertion that Diniarchus is indeed the only man Phronesium loves (185), Diniarchus eventually enters the house. The passage cannot be called paraklausithuric except in as much as it portrays a lover who desires to be with his beloved. Although Diniarchus is in a way excluded, there are not enough other topoi present, including important ones such as a request for admission. However, it gives some idea of the prominence that could be given in Plautus and, probably New Comedy, to the general situation of the poor lover.

Later in the play, the soldier Stratophanes finds himself locked out by Phronesium, but again the situation is
not developed. He mentions gifts he has given her and even asserts that he could easily smash the house’s ankle-bones (638)—a phrase that in effect personifies the house. But it is not clear that he actually even tries to re-enter before deciding that he will play hard-to-get and try to win over Phronesium that way (633 ff.):

> quid mihi futurum est, quo duae ancillae dolent, quibus te donau? iamne abiisti? em sic datur! quo pacto excludi, quae so, potui planius, quam exclusus nunc sum? pulcre ludificor. sine. quantillo mi opere nunc persuaderi potest, ut ego hisc’ suffringam talos totis aedibus. num quippiam harum immutat mores mulierum? postquam filiolum peperit, animos sustulit. nunc quasi mi dicat: "nec te iubeo neque uoto intro ire in aedis." at ego nolo, non eo. ego faxo dicat me in diebus pauculis crudum uirum esse. sequere me hac. uerbum sat est.

The scene has every right to be called paraklausithuric, but in light of the lover’s willingness to go along with the exclusion, even the implication of violence against the house leaves a subdued impression.

Then, at line 699, Diniarchus enters praising Venus because report has it that Phronesium has received his latest presents and is favourably impressed. Furthermore, the soldier is now out of favour. However, he has handed over all he has to Phronesium:

> neque gnatust neque progignetur neque potest reperirier quo! ego nunc <aut> dictum aut factum melius quam Veneri uelim. 700 di magni, ut ego <laete> laetus sum et laetitia differor! ita ad me magna nuntiauit Cyamus hodie gaudia: mea dona deamata acceptaque habita esse apud Phronesium; quem hoc iam uolup est, tum illuc nimium magnae mellinae mihi,
He sees Astaphium enter from Phronesium's house, and overhears her talking to Phronesium within about Phronesium's new prey, the youth Strabax. While Phronesium is inside with him, Astaphium will guard the door and not admit anyone:

promemienesstatem tuam amanti, ut gaudeat quem perdis.
egohic interim restitrix praesidebo,
istic dum sic faciat domum ad te exagogam;
nec quemquam interim istoc ad uos, qui sit odio intro mittam: tu perge, ut lubet, ludo in istoc.

Aware that there is a rival inside with Phronesium, Diniarchus confronts Astaphium. He first demands to know the rival's identity (718 ff.). Astaphium tells him and makes his status clear—a richer rival is in favour now, and Diniarchus is shut out despite his recent payment and past gifts. She even uses a mythological exemplum to try to persuade him to accept the situation:

---

37 A rich rival occurs in paraklausithura, but it is not a particularly common paraklausithuric topos, whereas the relative "poverty" of the lover is very common throughout all amatory literature, see Chapter 1, note 147 (on Pl. Smp.). The rich rival was present—in a way—in Ar. Pl. 1038 ff., where Wealth itself was the rival for the attentions of the youth who had rejected the less-rich old woman. The situation is clearer at Hor. Ep. 11.11 f. and recurs at Tib. 1.5.47. Murgatroyd 1980, 160 f. finds the latter to be the first occurrence of the rich rival in a paraklausithuron, but, of course, that is a true paraklausithuron and the passages mentioned here are merely paraklausithuric. At Ov. Am. 3.8.1-8, Ovid is excluded because of his relative poverty, although his poems are admitted. Related to this are pas-
slices summam nunc habet hic apud nos, nunc is est fundus nouos.
animo bono male <rem> gerit. {Di.} perit hercle; ego idem
bona perdidi, mala repperi, [factus] sum extumus a uobis.
{As.} stultus es qui facta infecta facere uerbis
postules. 730
Theti' quoque etiam lamentando pausam fecit filio.
{Di.} non ego nunc intro ad uos mittar? {As.} quidum
quam miles magis?
{Di.} quia enim plus dedi. {As.} plus enim es intro
missus quom dadas:
sine uicissim qui dant [operam] ob illud quod dant
operis utier.
litteras didicisti: quando scis, sine alios discere. 735

Diniarchus proclaims that he would rather die than accept
that his payments have been wasted (742). At line 751 Asta-
phium turns to go inside, but Diniarchus will not let her--
he tries to restrain her and asks several times for admis-
sion--(751 ff.):

{[As.]} bene uale. {Di.} resiste. {As.} omitte. {Di.}
sine eam intro. {As.} ad te quidem.
{Di.} immo istoc ad uos <uolo> ire. {As.} non potest,
nimium petis.
{Di.} sine experiri--{As.} immo opperire. uis est
experirier.
{Di.} dic me adesse. {As.} abi, occupataet. res itast,
ne frustra sis.
{Di.} redin an non redis? {As.} uocat me quae in me
potest plus quam potes. 755
{Di.} uno uerbo--{As.} eloquere. {Di.} mittin me intro?
{As.} mendax es, abi.
unum aiebas, tria iam dixti uerba, atque <ea> mendacia.

sages like Theoc. 11.34 ff. and 45 ff., and Ov. Met. 13.810
ff., in which Polyphemus absurdly lists his assets in an
attempt to win over a Nereid who has no need of material
wealth.
With Astaphium gone he is left alone yelling threats before the closed door, but finally he concludes that they will do no good (758 ff.):

[Di.] abiit intro, exclusit. egon ut haec mihi patiar fieri?
iam hercle ego tibi, inlecebra, ludos faciam clamore in uia,
quae aduorsum legem accepisti a plurimis pecuniam; 760
iam hercle apud nouos [omnis] magistratus faxo erit nomen tuum,
postid ego te manum inicium quadrupuli, uenefica,
suppostrix puerum. ego edepol <i>iam</i> tua probra aperibo omnia.
nihil me <prohibet>, perdidi omne quod fuit: fio
impudens,
nec mi adeost tantillum pensi iam quos capiam calceos. 765
sed quid ego hic clamo? quid si me iubiet intro mittier?
conceptis me non facturum uerbis iurem, si uelit.
nugae sunt. si stimulos pugnis caedis, manibus plus dolet.
de nihilo nihil est irasci, quae te non flocci facit.

The paraklausithuric elements in the scene are clear enough.

Therefore, the paraklausithuric situation is more common in Plautus than has previously been recognized. Not only are there several unmistakable paraklausithuric passages, there are also paraklausithuric parodies, usually inverted paraklausithuric situations, of the kind seen before in Aristophanes. There was surely no other source of paraklausithuric verse in Latin before Plautus, which probably explains the similarities that will be seen between Plautus and later Latin paraklausithura.\(^38\) Furthermore, the likelihood that at least some of these scenes were based on

\(^38\) For more on the connection between elegy and comedy, see Yardley 1987.
their respective plays' New Comedy models can lead one to conclude with some degree of certainty that there were more paraklausithuric situations in New Comedy than the fragments we now have indicate.

Terence

There are no paraklausithuric situations definitely datable to the period between Plautus and Terence and so it seems to be convenient to examine Terence immediately after Plautus.\(^{39}\) In Terence, paraklausithuric situations or references can be found in the *Eunuch* and *Adelphoe*.\(^{40}\) The *Eunuch* in particular contains a virtuoso elaboration of the topos of the violent assault on the house of a beloved *meretrix*. Before examining that scene brief mention should be made of the opening of Act 1.

At line 46 the young lover Phaedria enters, complaining to his slave Parmeno about the fickleness of his beloved, Thais. She shut him out the other day but now calls him back:

\[
\text{Quidigiturfaciam?non eam ne nunc quidem}
\text{quom accersorultr?an potiusita me comparem}
\]

\(^{39}\)However, the *Frag. Gren.* might, for example, date from any time after 176--see below. It will be discussed after Terence along with other fragmentary anonymous komastic and paraklausithuric scenes from the second century.

\(^{40}\)The plays will be discussed in the order of Martin's 1976, 11 chronology: *Eunuch* (161) first, then *Adelphoe* (160).
non perpeti meretricum contumelias?
exclusit; reuocat: redeam? non si me obsecret.\footnote{All quotations from Terence will follow the text of Kauer-Lindsay 1926. These lines are quoted by Cic. N.D. 3.72: "quid leuitates comicae parumne semper in ratione ursosantur? parumne subtiliter disputat ille in Eunuchc: 'quid igitur faciam?'..." They are also imitated at Hor. S. 2.3.262 ff., and Pers. 5.171 ff. Pease 1920-23, 1157 cites the Scholia on Pers. 5.161 as saying that Terence took the passage from Menander's Eunuchus.}

Parmeno's following words bring to mind many of the topoi surrounding later exclusions of lovers, particularly in Latin elegy: the ideas that the lover will not accept such treatment again (the renuntiatio amoris); that by playing hard-to-get himself he will break down the resistance of his beloved;\footnote{Cf. Pl. Truc. 633-44. Ov. Rem. 505 advises the excluded lover not to act like one if he wishes to get over his love. Polyphemus at Theoc. 6.32 contemplates his chance to exclude his beloved Galatea in turn, when she comes to him, because she now has a rival for his attentions. However, indifference did not always soften a beloved: in Alciphro 4.10.1-3 it leads a hetaira to resolve to shut a lover out next time he comes in order to let him know he cannot take her for granted.} that the beloved by sometimes excluding lovers can inflame their passions and keep them interested,\footnote{The idea is particularly common in Latin elegy, cf. Ov. Am. 1.8.69 ff., Ars 3.595 ff., Prop. 2.14.19 ff. et al. For the general idea that obstacles help maintain passion, and that which is hard to obtain is more attractive, see the references at Nisbet-Hubbard 1970, 369-70; Day 1972, 90; Hollis 1977, 142; and McKeown 1987-, 2:239. Also, see below for more on the topos. A particularly interesting historical example can be found at Tac. Ann. 13.46 and Plu. Galba 19.2-3.} and also the associated fickleness of the beloved in sometimes admitting and sometimes excluding a lover; that the lover is
almost completely at the mercy of the beloved, as exemplified by the fact that a single forced tear can break down the lover's resolve to abandon his beloved; and the idea of love's fires burning the lover (50 ff.):

[Pa.] siquidem hercle possis, nil prius neque fortius.  
uerum si incipies neque pertendes gnauiiter 
atque, ubi pati non poterit', quom nemo expetet, 
inflecta pace ultero ad eam uenies indicans 
te amore et ferre non posse: actumst, ilicet, 
peristi: eludet ubi te uictum sensorit.  
55

proin tu, dum est tempus, etiam atque etiam cogita, 
er: quae res in se neque consilium neque modum 
habet illum, eam consilio regere non potes.  
in amore haec omnia insunt uitia: inuiariae, 
suspiciones, inimicitiae, indutiae,  
bellum, pax rursum: incerta haec si tu postules 
ratione certa facere, nihil plus agas 
quam si des operam ut cum ratione insanias.  
et quod nunc tute tecum iratus cogitas 
"eget illam, quae illum, quae me, quae non...! sine 
modo,  
65

mori me malim: sentiet qui uir siem": 
haec uerba una mehercle falsa lacrimula 
quam oculos terendo misere uix ui expresserit, 
restinguet, et te ultero accusabit, et dabis 
ultero supplicium. [Ph.] o indignum facinu'! nunc ego  
et illam scelestam esse et me miserum sentio: 
et taeet et amore ardeo, et prudens sciens, 
uiuos uidensque pereo, nec quid agam scio.

Thais enters not long after ("sed ecca<m> ipsa egreditur," 79), concerned about the pain she caused Phaedria by shutting him out. In the following scene, the lovers are reconciled as a repentant Thais explains why she had to exclude Phaedria. The repeated mentions of exclusion and admission reinforce the impact on Phaedria of Thais' actions and Phaedria's subjection to his beloved. Several common para-
klausithuric topoi are present: the lover's fear of the beloved, the fires of love combined with the image of the
beloved as a flame, and the lover's wish that his love would be equally reciprocated by the beloved:


Thais' explanation of why she had to exclude Phaedria does not fully convince him (158-9: "nempe omnia haec nunc uerba huc redeunt denique: / ego excludor, ille--recipitur") but nonetheless he accepts the situation.

Later in the play, the soldier Thraaso, who gave Pamphila as payment for three days of exclusive access to Thais, arrives at Thais' house, accompanied by slaves, in order to get Pamphila back and punish Thais. In an elaborate military parody, Thraaso martial his troops and prepares to attack the house (771 ff.):""

The absence of torches is puzzling—the only specific tool mentioned is the uectis (774—cf. Hor. Carm. 3.26.7.). Perhaps this is a subtle joke about Thrasio's skill in siege warfare. Thais and Chremes appear, probably at an upper-storey window or on the roof. They have barred the door. There is more talk of attack from Thraso's camp, but the soldier decides to negotiate first. Then we learn that not only is Thraso demanding back his payment of the girl, but that he is also jealous because of his suspicions that Thais had admitted a rival when she was under exclusive contract to him (783 ff.):

[Ch.] uiden tu, Thais, quam hic rem agit? nimirum consilium illud rectumst de oculendis aedibus. [Th.] sane quod tibi nunc uir uideatur esse hic, nebulo
magnus est: 785 ne metuas. [Thr.] quid uidetur? [Gn.] fundam tibi nunc
nimi' uellem dari,

Thraso is successfully warned off by the likelihood that Pamphila is actually a free woman whom he would not dare to treat as he was intending to. The threatened attack on a meretrix's house, in order to gain possession of a girl, with the mentions of payments/gifts and jealousy over a rival, seem to justify calling this scene paraklausithuric.

The Adelphoe has no scenes that are truly paraklausithuric, but a violent assault on a mistress' house is the

---

45Cf. Ter. Ph. 111 ff., where access to the free, but poor, girl with whom Antipho has fallen in love is denied to him by an old woman on hand to help with the funeral of the girl's mother: "[Ge.] scin quam? quo euadat uide. / postridie ad anum recta pergit: obsecret / ut sibi eiu' faciat copiam. illa enim se negat / neque eum aequom facere ait: illam ciuem esse Atticam, / 115 bonam bonis prognatam: si uxorem uelit, / lege id licere facere: sin aliter, negat."
starting point for the play.46 At line 84 ff. Demea is com-
plaining to Micio about his son Aeschinus' behaviour:

{De.} quid ille fecerit? quem neque pudet quicquam neque metuit quemquam neque legem putat 85
tenere se ullam. nam illa quae ante(h)ac facta sunt omitt: modo qui d i u a n n a u t ? {M i .} quidnam id est? {De.} fores effregit atque in aedis inruit alienas; ipsum dominum atque omnem familiar mulcavit usque ad mortem; eripuit mulierem 90
quam amabat: clamant omnes indignisse factum esse. hoc aduenienti quot mihi, Micio, dixere! in orest omni populo....

While the prologue (8-9) says that in the Greek original of Diphilus "adulescens est qui lenoni eripit / meretrixem," Demea's vocabulary here is decidedly ambiguous and inclines towards magnifying the outrageousness of the deed.47 Alienus would imply the house of another citizen, dominus regularly means "the master of a household" (OLD s.v. 1), and mulier, although not ruling out a slave or meretrix, is ambiguous and would not immediately bring to mind a person of non-


47 Martin 1976, 116: "In Demea's account a direct reference to the social status of the victims is avoided by the use of the words alienas, dominum, mulierem; Don. on 90.3 says 'omnia magno colore et accusatorie dicta sunt et hoc maxime, quod "lenonem" et "meretrixem" non dixit, contentus facti atrocitate personarumque uilitatem reticens.' Of course, the woman's status makes all the difference, as is made clear at 724-5 "[Demea] ah stulte, tu de psaltria me somnias / agere: hoc peccatum in uirginemst ciuem."
citizen status. Of course the reason for the abduction of
the psaltria is that Ctesipho cannot afford to buy her. How-
ever, the public talk that such actions arouse means that
the assault on the doors is essentially incompatible with
any type of furtius amor.

Violent assaults on beloveds' doors are then men-
tioned twice more, in a matter-of-fact way, by Micio (100
ff. and 117 ff.):

48 Pl. Mil. 652 "neque ego umquam alienum scortum
subigo in conuiio”; 1168 "ne ille mox vereatur intro ire
in alienam domum”; As. 756 “alienum | hominem | intro mittat
neminem”; Ter. Hec. 658 of an adulterous woman "nunc quom
eius alienum esse animum a me sentiam”; Eu. 588-9 “deum sese
in hominem conuortisse atque in alienas tegulas / uenisse
clanculum per inpluerium fucum factum mulieri”; Cic. Cael. 42
"ne spoliet alienam, ne effundat patrimonium, ne faenore
trucidetur, ne incurrat in alterius domum atque familiam”;
49 "si quae non nupta mulier domum suam patefecerit omnium
cupiditati palpamque sese in meretricia uita conlocari,
uirorum alienissimorum conuiuis uti instituerit”; Hor.
Serm. 2.7.46 "te coniunx aliena capit”; Sen. De breu. 12.1
"quos aut in sua uides turba speciosius elidi aut in aliena
contemptius, quos officia domibus suis euocant, ut alienis
foribus inidiant”; Apul. Met. 4.30 "per alienas domos nocte
discurrens et omnium matrinonia corruppens impune’”; Quint.
Inst. 7.3.10 "Adulterium (est) cum aliena uxore domi coire:
an et in lupanari?”; Gaius Inst. 1.91 “si qua mulier ciuis
Romana praegnas ex senatus consulto Claudiano ancilla facta
sit ob id quod alieno servuo inuito et denuntiante domino
eius <coierit>”; 3.209 "Qui res alienas rapit, tenetur etiam
furti. quis enim magis alienam rem inuito domino contractat
quam qui ui rapit?”; Just. dig. 47.10.23 “(Paulus, libro
quarto ad Edictum) Quin in domum alienan inuito domino
inotrioret, quamuis in ius uocat, actionem iniuriarum in eum
competere Ofilius ait”; and 48.6.11.pr.1 ff. “Paulus libro
quinto sententiarum. Hi, qui aedes alienas aut uillas
expilauerint effragerint expugnauerint, si quid in turba cum
telis fecerint, capite puniuntur.”

49 However, we learn at 327-8 that there was no real
attempt at secrecy: "{Ge.} amare occipit aliam. {So.} uae
miserae mihi! / {Ge.} neque id occulte fert, ab lenone ipsus
eripuit palam.”
Such actions are excusable in the young, and even Micio would have acted so, had he been able to afford it: fores effregit is a natural consequence to excludetur foras. 

Before we leave Terence, a few general observations can be made. First, there is again the possibility that all

these scenes in both the *Eunuchus* and *Adelphoe* had parallels in their Greek New Comedy models. It is also interesting to note the relative rarity of depictions of, or references to, the paraklausithuric situation in Terence when compared to Plautus. The difference probably lies in the more restrained humour of Terence, combined with his tendency to make his various *meretrices* sympathetic characters—and sympathetic *meretrices* cannot be excluding their lovers too frequently. Terence's door vocabulary is also extremely restrained in comparison with Plautus': *foris* is the only word he uses for the door in the passages quoted above and nowhere does he list or accumulate other words for doors or parts of doors as Plautus does. In its use of door vocabulary, Latin elegy is closer to Plautus than to Terence, perhaps reflecting these poets' relative influence on the elegiac paraklausithura. Terence also has few extended door-scenes compared with Plautus, scenes which center around people at or in a door and in which the door plays an important part (usually by virtue of its being knocked or beaten on).\(^1\) There is,

\(^1\)What constitutes such a scene is a moderately subjective judgement, but the only two scenes in Ter. which seem comparable to those in Pl. are *Ad*. 632 ff. and 777 ff., which, when combined with the paraklausithuric references in the *Ad.*, make one wonder how much of the scenes is Terentian and how much Menandrian. Compare Pl. *Am.* 263 ff., *As*. 381 ff., *Bac.* 577 ff., *Mos.* 444-522, 673 ff., 817 ff., 933 ff., *Capt.* 830 ff., *Mer.* 909 ff., *St*. 307-29, and *Truc.* 245 ff., 350 ff. See also Barsby 1986, 146: "Knocking on doors is a feature of ancient comedy, being the obvious way to summon characters from the stage houses: but the boisterous kind of knocking implied here is something especially developed by Plautus.... The repeated calls for attention can be paral-
furthermore, no clear personification of the door in Terence nor are there any door-addresses, again suggesting that the occurrence of these topoi in later Latin writers and elegy is perhaps more because of Plautus than to any special Roman affection for the door itself.\textsuperscript{52}

\textbf{Fragmentary Greek verse from the second century}

The Greek paraklausithuron returns with the \textit{Fragmentum Grenfelliæanum} (Powell 1925, \textit{Lyr. Alex. Adesp. 1}), also known as "The Alexandrian Erotic Fragment". Although it means departing slightly from chronological order, it is perhaps sensible to examine as a unit the other possibly komastic and paraklausithuric Greek fragmentary works from the later second century B.C.: Powell \textit{Lyr. Alex. Adesp. 5} (the "Marisæum Melos"), \textit{Lyr. Alex. Adesp. 3} ("Κωμαστής"), and Tebtunis Papyrus 1.1.2d.

The \textit{Fragmentum Grenfelliæanum} has rightly received much attention, principally as being a paraklausithuron with

\textit{leîled in Menander} (\textit{Dysk. 459-66}), but in general both Menander and Terence play the convention down (\textit{Man. Asp. 499 f., Epit. 1075-8, Mis. 206 f, Ter. Ad. 632-7}); Terence indeed often avoids any mention of knocking in such situations (\textit{Eu. 469 f., 530, Ph. 152}; cf. \textit{Hau. 410}).\textsuperscript{52}

\textsuperscript{52}More will be said on this in Chapter 4 in connection with door-addresses and personification.
a female speaker/lover.\textsuperscript{53} In lines 1-10 the woman starts by recounting the beginnings of the love affair, its mutual passion, and how Aphrodite helped in it. She then moves swiftly to cursing her lover, to whom she attributes traitorous intent from the beginning. She was under the compulsion of love then and still does not disown her love:\textsuperscript{54}

\begin{quote}
'Εξ ἀφικτέρων γέγονεν αἵρεσις·
ἐτευγκαλέσα· τῆς φιλίας Κύπρις
ἐστ' ἀνάδοχος· ἀδυνή μ' ἔχει,
ὅταν ἀναμνήσθω
ὡς κατεφίλει· πιθούλως μέλλων
με καταλυμάνειν
ἀκαταστασίας εὐρέτης
χώ τὴν φιλίαν ἐκτικώς.
"Ελαβέ μ' ἔρως
ὅσι ἀπαναίνομαι.
\end{quote}

She next addresses the stars and Night, using a religious-sounding formula for the latter and calling her the partner of her love.\textsuperscript{55} She asks them to help her by escorting her to

\textsuperscript{53}See the references in Powell 1925, 179; also Gaselee 1916, 374 ff.; Garte 1924, 51 f.; Copley 1956, 20 ff.; and Burck 1966, 247 f. The fragment was found on the back of a contract dated 173 B.C. See Gaselee 1916, 374: "palaeographical considerations forbid it to be regarded as written later than the end of the second century B.C."

\textsuperscript{54}The text follows Powell 1925, 177 f.

\textsuperscript{55}For the address to Night, stars, the moon, and the like, see below, and on Men. Mıs. For πότινα Νῦξ cf. E. Or. 174 (πότινα πότινα νῦξ) and Theoc. 18.25. Πότινα is a common title for goddesses: Hom. I. 1.357 τοῦ δ' ἔχλυς πότινα μήτηρ; 6.264 μῆ μοι σινὸν ἄειρε μελίφρονα, πότινα μῆτερ; 6.305-7 πότινα 'Ἀθηναίη; 15.83 πότινα Ἡρη; h. Cér. 492 πότινα ... ἄνδαλ ἄναισσα; P. N. 3.1 θ' πότινα Μοῦσα, μάτερ ἄμετέρα λίσσομαι; 8.1 "Ὡρα πότινα, καρύνε Ἀφροδίτας / ἀμπροσαίνων φιλοτάτων; P. 4.213 πότινα δ' ἀειτάτων βελέων; S. Ει. 111 ὁ χόνιν Ἐρήμη καὶ πότινι' Ἀρά; E. Hec. 444 ff. αὔρα, πότινας ἀνα; HeracL. 105 πότινα γὰρ Δίκα; Ἡρρ. 61 πότινα πότινα σεμνοτάτα; Ar. Ra. 337 ᾿πό τόνι πολυπλημπε Δήμητρος κόρη; Pax 1055 ᾿bios πότινι' Ἐλρήνη φίλη; Theoc. 2.43 and 164;
her lover. The topoi of *seruitium amoris*, the fires of love (which can light her way themselves),\(^5\) and the continued attack on the faithlessness and pride of the beloved follow:

"Ἀστρα φίλα καὶ πότνια Νῦς συμερθά μοι
παράπεμψον ἔτι με νῦν πρὸς ὃν ἴν Κύπρις
ἐκότον ἀγεί με χῶ
πολύς Ἐρως παραλαβῶν.
Συνοδηγόν ἔχω το πολὺ πῦρ
τούν τῇ ψυχῇ μου καλόμενον.
Ταύτα μ' ἀδικεῖ, ταὐτά μ' ἀδικαί.
ὁ φιεναπάτης,
ὁ πρὸ τοῦ μέγα φρονῦν, ἵπαλ ό τὴν Κύπριν οὐ
φάμενος εἰναὶ μοι τοῦ ῥαν σιλέαν,
οὐκ ἴνεικε νῦν
τὴν τυχοῦσαν ἀδικήν.†

It is hard to decide whether she continues to talk to herself in lines 23-4 or whether she addresses her lover. Either way, the topoi of the madness, jealousy and abandonment of the lover, and once again the fires of love, are mentioned. But then she seems to call out to her lover to throw her his garlands (seemingly indicating that she suspects he is inside either participating in a symposium or static komos, or is with a rival).\(^5\) This is an inversion of


\(^5\) Cf. Anon. *AP* 12.116.3-4 (G.-P. XXXIV) ἔστι δ' ἄουρ

\(^5\) The address could be to a companion, probably a slave, but it would be strange that the companion would be carrying a garland, and that the garland would be much comfort to her unless it had come from her beloved at some time. Powell 1925, 180 on these lines cites Scott who suggests that the beloved is the addressee. Cf. Garte 1924, 55 who also thinks the beloved is addressed. Murgatroyd 1980, 73 thinks the addressee is a slave.
the usual situation of the lover trying to get the beloved to accept a garland and might also be equivalent to the request for the beloved to look out, for the lover would have to do so in order to throw the garlands to her. The topos of seruitium amoris then returns prominently when the woman addresses her lover as κύριε and expresses her readiness to serve (δουλεύειν—cf. Pl. Smp. 183 a) him. There is an explicit request for admission, a clear mention of her exclusion, and further mention of her hatred, and madness again:

Μέλλω μαίνεσθαι· ζῆλος γὰρ μ’ ἔχει, καὶ κατακαίομαι καταλελειμμένη.
Αὐτὸ δὲ τούτο μοι τοὺς στεφάνους βάλε, σὺς μεμοιωμένη χρωτισθομαί.
Κύριε, μὴ μ’ ἀφῆς ἀποκεκλειμένην·
δέξαι μ’· εὐθοκῶ ζηλῶ δουλεύειν.
Ἐπιμανῶς ἐρῶν μέγαν ἔχει πόνον,
ζηλοτυπεῖν γὰρ δεῖ, στέγειν, καρτερεῖν.

She then becomes more angry and implicitly threatens the lover by reminding him of her potential to hate. She mentions that she sleeps alone while he is with rivals. But then her tone changes again and she asks for reconciliation, suggesting that their friends might help (a completely new topos):

Γνῶσχ’ ὅτι θυμών ἀνάκητον έχω,
ὅταν ἐρίς λάβῃ με· μαίνομαι.

[58] Cf. Anon. AP 5.26.1-2, Εἰς τε σε ... / ... εἷδον, ἄνασσα. The Latin equivalent would be dominus.
el μονοκοιτήσω, 
σοῦ δὲ χρωτίζεσθαι, ἀποτρέχεις.
Νῦν δ᾿ ἂν ὀργισθόμεν, εὐθὺ δὲι 
καὶ διαλύσθαι.
Οὐχὶ δὲ καὶ τοῦτο φίλους ἔχομεν
οἳ κρινούσι τις ἀθύελ:

Most unfortunately, the text badly deteriorates at this point. She declares that she continues to love (ἐρω), calls him lord repeatedly (ἐρω, 48, 51, and 60), possibly mentions his having a rival (Κολτσασν, ἦς ἔχεις, 46), mentions again his rejection of her (πῶς μὲ ἄ[φις, 49], perhaps reminds him that he was her first lover (πρῶτος μ’ ἔπει[ασάς, 50), suggests they marry (ἀνασώμεθα, 52), makes more mention of jealousy and slavery (Ἐγὼ δὲ μέλλω ἔλλου τω /
55 σου...; cf. 28), rebukes herself for her foolishness (ἐνδοχασα νηπία, 60), again mentions her abandonment ([καταλελεί]μένη[ην], 61; cf. 24), and finally she says something about talking and her soul (λελάλη[ηκ’ ἐγὼ πε]ρ ἔμην ὧν [ψυχήν, 62).

Several features are particularly notable. First is the very obviously rough style and variable metrics.59 This

59 For the metrical difficulties and question of how much of the poem is prose and how much verse, see Powell 1925, 179: "Metrum in maximam partem Dochmiacum liberius; nonnunquam Dochmii sumunt formam Chroiambicam... aut concioncti sunt Anapaestis...; Creticii apparent..., Paeones,... Lecythium...; Iambi...." Powell also suggests that the poem might have been written down from memory, which might explain the metrical difficulties. See also Gaselee 1916, 374; Garte 1924, 51; and Burck 1966, 247, who comments "Schlicht is die Sprache auch dieses Liedes, aber sein Rhythmus in Klagedochmien wild und leidenschaftlich." Duckworth 1994, 376, for example, doubts that it really is in dochmiacs, and Grenfell (cited in Gaselee 1916, 374) thought it was poetic prose. Dochmiacs were often used in tragedy
is no elevated literary product—the popularity of the para-
klausithuric theme clearly extended to the less literate
sectors of society. 60 Next, the female narrator/lover is
very uncommon—the only other female komast in an unambigu-
ously paraklausithuric passage is the subject of the Plut-
arch passage that gives us the word παρακλαυσθέρουν (Mor.
753 A). 61 Also, the dramatic development of the passage
indicates that it was probably some form of mime—first the
woman is talking to herself, then she addresses the stars
and night, indicating that she is heading for her lover’s
home (one presumes that if she was before it, she would have
addressed her lover from the beginning), and finally she
arrives and speaks to her lover. 62 The poem has a desperate
tone with the repetition of the topoi of the lover’s madness

for grief or excitement: Goodwin 1894, 368.

60 Perhaps it even was more common there but the more
transitory nature of "literature" from such sources makes it
hard to judge.

61 Although there are women in other paraklausithuric
contexts, cf. especially Courtney 1995, 98, no. 92 (= CIL
950 = CIL 4.5296).

62 See among others McKeown 1979, 77 and cf. Williams
1968, 205: "it is clear that a woman speaks (or sings) a
soliloquy: in the first section she describes her passion
and the fickleness of her love; the second section is a
prayer to the stars and night (it is clear, therefore, that
she is going to her lover); the third section is addressed
to her lover (or his closed door) and asks for reconcilia-

topos and her *seruitium amoris*. Pronounced praise of the lover is missing, which emphasizes the woman’s anger and desperation. The sudden changes of tone, from recrimination to requests for reconciliation, also emphasize the woman’s distress.

The "Marisaem Melos" (*Lyr. Alex. Adesp. 5*, Powell 1925, 184) has been identified as komastic several times and so deserves brief mention:

<Συνή.> Ὁψ ἐξω τῇ σοι πάθω ἡ τῇ χαρᾶσμαί. Κάτα κείμαι μεθ' ἐτέρου, σε μέγα φιλοῦσα; Ἄλλα μα τὴν Ἀφροδίτην μέγα τῇ χαίρω δί<τ>τ<ι> ττ<ι> τοῖς θεομάτιοιν ἐνέχυρα κείταί. Ἀνήρ. Ἄλλε εὖω μὲν ἀποτρέχω, σοι δὲ κατὰλ<ε>λπῶ εὐρυχυρῆν πολλῆν. Συ. Πρόσω δι<τ>τ<ι> βούλη. Μὴ κροῦε τὸν τοῖχον, ψόφος ἐγγίνεται, ἄλλα διὰ τῶν θυρῶν νεόμα σ' ικ<ν>εῖταί.

63 However, the repetitiveness of the topoi begins to seem more incompetent than emotionally effective. Burck 1966, 247 disagrees: "Ein Ausschnitt aus dem Leben wird hier festgehalten... ein Menschenschicksal zerbricht hier, ein Mädchen wird zu Boden geschlagen, und jeder fühlt, daß es nimmer wieder aufstehen wird." McKeown 1987-, 2:136, on the refrain in Ov. Am. 1.6, notes that "One might compare the repetitious nature of the ideas and language in the komastic Grenfell Fragment."

64 This has been seen above. See Yardley 1978, 28 on Tib. 1.2, and the other examples cited there, including the Frag. Gren.

65 Reynolds 1946, 77: "The wall-song in Marissa, which was composed in the middle of the second century B.C., does indicate a situation in which a woman is trying to keep her lover’s presence outside the house from the knowledge of another man with whom she is consorting inside. But this latter may not be her husband;... έτέρου in the line κάτα κείμαι μεθ’ έτέρου σε μέγα φιλοῦσα; seems to argue against such an inference." Cf. also McKeown 1979, 77. Luck 1959, 338 disagrees. Ussher 1973, 208 suggests that there is some resemblance between the final lines and Ar. Ec. 952 ff., but that does not seem particularly clear.
It is, unfortunately, very difficult to figure out exactly what is happening. The element of secrecy in the last two lines seems to indicate an adulterous situation, and the κροθε τῶν τοίχων (7) seems to imply that the man is somehow striking the wall either out of anger or a desire to get to the woman, but there is not enough evidence to call it either komastic or paraklausithuric.

The later Κωμαστής (Powell Lyr. Alex. Adesp. 3) also should be discussed briefly even if it is komastic rather than paraklausithuric. Again, the text is corrupt, and appears to lack an ending:

A. Ἅρμων γέγονεν, μεθύων κατὰ τρόπον [εὐθ]υμῶν πρόσεχε, πρόσεχε.
B. ................ ν, Ναῖς άμρόσφυροι, ............. ὑπὸ γὰρ τῶν πολλῶν προπόσεων βασικεύων ἄ[λλομαί].
A. ἕεθ, τλῆμαν.
B. ἐπὶ δὲ τινα κάμον ὀπλιζόμαι τραβάμα φίλης ἔχω τι παρά Κύπριος ἄνθισαν. Ἔρως μὲ ἐλαβ' ὁ γόνης: εἰς τὴν γυνὴν μου ἐλεπεϊ-σών [ποιεῖ] με παραφρονεῖν. 5
A. παροινεῖς ἄρα: σαυτοῦ κράτει, μή τι πάθος.
B. έα μὲ ὀρμᾶν καλ μή με περίσσα: ὄμολον φίλειν ἐράν· καλ ὁ γόνης ἄντιβιστά. οὐ πάντως ἄλλως τὸ Παφίας φιλούμεν καὶ] ἐν ἀκρήτῳ μᾶλλον; ἄνακεκακκε με ὁ θεός ὁ θρόμιος ὤμοι καὶ Ἐρως, ὁ γάρ ἀντι- 10
A. σχέτιν [ἀνάμας].

It is from an Egyptian ostracon and has been dated to c. 100 B.C. It is also known as P. Sorb. inv. 2223. For early editors, see Powell 1925, 182. There is some doubt whether it is actually verse. The text is from Powell 1925, 181 f. See also Page 1970, 332-3 no. 74, who thinks it is a fragment of a mime, as do Mckeown 1979, 77, and Copley 1956, 11 ff. Cairns 1972, 203 f. mentions the fragment, but he is, of course, concerned with the komos, not the paraklausithur-ron. Copley 1956, 12 suggests, extremely hypothetically, that the request for admission was lost.
There are clearly two speakers, one very drunk (speaker "B"), and a companion who is sober, or at least more sober than the other (speaker "A"). "B" is carried away by his wine and the drinking of toasts (4), which means he has been to a symposium (3-5). He is ready to go on a komos (7), and announces that he has been wounded by Aphrodite, siezed by Love, and driven mad. Παρούσα is mentioned (11), indicating the potential violence in the man (see above). "A" tries to restrain him, but "B" is happy with his love, a far cry from the usual paraklausithuric complaint. Bromios and Eros have kindled the fires of love in his heart. The topoi common in paraklausithuric situations are clear, and the start of an amatory komos is probably portrayed. "B" will surely end up at his beloved's doors and, if one considers his apparent condition, probably be rejected.

For wine and love combined as a motivator, see the references in McKeown 1987-, 2:153 (on Ov. Am. 1.6.59-60). Some of the more notable examples he cites are: Ov. Fast. 4.597 "factum ... excusat amore"; Trag. Adesp. 570 Kannicht-Snell οἴκος μ' ἔπεισε; D. 21.38 προφάσεις, μὲθην, ἔρωτα, ἄγνοιαν; Call. AP 12.118.1 ff. (G.-P. VIII); Pl. AuL. 745, Bac. 88, Cur. 1 ff.; Ter. Ad. 470 "persuasit nox amor uinum adulescentia"; [Cic.] Rhet. Her. 2.24 "uinum aut amorem aut iracundiam"; Prop. 1.3.13 f., and [Quint.] Decl. 309.4 "scitis quam multa faciat error, quam multa permisceat fortuna, cum praesertim ad haec accesserit et obscuritas noctis et paulo liberior usus meri."
P. Teb. 1.1.2d is more probably paraklausithuric, but is also very fragmentary and there is no general agreement about any of the more important details.  

[.................]πω κυρία τ[.] [. ]  
[.................]ν φιλών  
[.................]ς μη σχελν ετ[  
[...........][...]. ... ακις μονοκ[ο] [τ[  
[.......]. ν μενε[.]α[.]ες  
[.... π]αρακυψον ικετώ κλευπατ[ρα  
[.......]. υν τουσπηλτριώμεν δοκ[  
[.......] τα μεσασμον αδυ[ματον] μη μου τ[  
πυ[.] περιπελευκας μετα [  
.......................  
ερω μαινομαι καταγιαι εμ[  
κρο(υσον) τας θυρας ις μη μεγα φωνι τ . [ 
[  
εξαναστατουμαι και π[  
[  
δος μοι τον τριβω(να) και ...[  
κυριε καθευσις κα[.] [...]. ...[  
εγυ δε στρεφομαι και ...[  
μεθυνυ ερχεται ο μεγα .. [ 
[  
ο κελες σου γεμι καλι καλι [ 

The sense is by no means clear and nothing can be gained by any attempt to reconstruct the passage.  

Gow (1965, 2:33) comments on the passage:  

---  

68 The text is from Grenfell–Hunt–Smyly 1902, 1:1:8–9. I omit the dots under individual letters. Again, this is slightly out of chronological order, being dated to c. 100 B.C. (ibid.).  

69 Grenfell–Hunt–Smyly 1902, 1:1:6: “fragment (d) appears to contain part of a dialogue, which may, as Blass suggests, come from a mime; but the sense is hardly recoverable.” That does not deter Copley 1958, 12–13: “In this fragment the reference to a procession through the streets is missing, but this is probably because of the fact that the first part of the mime has been lost.” Kenney 1958, 49 disapproves. McKeown 1979, 77 and Burck 1966, 246 also think it is mimic. Cairns 1979, 166 ff. believes there are two speakers, a komast and an attendant.
In p. Teb. p. 8 is a scrap of another παρακλαυσίθυρον in which a woman, apparently attended by a slave, also seeks admittance at a lover's house, but too little remains for the work to be judged.

Copley (1942, 105), however, has a different interpretation:

This mutilated papyrus reveals very clearly a rudimentary paraclausithyron-scene that terminates in the drunken sleep of the protagonist.... there are two characters, one a seaman and demonstrably very drunk. The other appears to be his slave or attendant.

To elaborate, the κυρία in 4 could be the female beloved of a male lover, Aphrodite, or even the excluded lover if she is female and if there is a second speaker, a slave or attendant, who could be talking about his or her mistress. The uncertain Κλευματ[ρα in 9 could conceivably be either the female lover (excluded lovers and komasts often refer to themselves by name) or the beloved of a male lover. There is no evidence for who might be requesting the cloak in line 17, or who the κυρίε (18) is--the sailor addressed by his attendant as Copley thinks, or the male beloved addressed by the lover. Garte (1924, 58) thinks the beloved is a boy. Nevertheless, some general observations can be made on topoi that are not affected by context: line 4 could indicate a female lover or could contain an address to a goddess; in 7 the lover probably refers to sleeping alone; the beloved is asked to look out at 9 (παρακλαυψων); the image of the shipwrecked lover could be present in 14, and the madness of the lover definitely is; there is a mention of knocking on the door in 15 and μη μεγά φωνε is possibly a
reference to *furtius amor*; the lover could be requesting a cloak at 17, either from a slave, because of the cold or because he or she intends to lie down on it, or from the beloved, in which case it would be a past gift the lover wanted returned or some memento of the beloved; at 18 the lover could have fallen asleep or could be voicing her or his concern that the beloved is asleep (a common enough paraklausithuric topos—see below); someone is distressed in 19 (*στρέφομαι* could certainly apply to a distraught lover); and the lover is probably drunk (20). Despite these uncertainties, the fragment usefully indicates the continued popularity of the paraklausithuric situation in mime, or mimic literature, and one cannot doubt that there were many more than these examples.70

Polybius, Lucilius, Sextus Tertulianus and Bion

Leaving comedy and mime, we come to Polybius, who provides our earliest reference for an identifiable, real komastic excluded lover, as opposed to the unidentifiable lovers cited mentioned in Plato’s *Symposium* or in Isaeus 3. Polybius (10.26.3-5) tells us that Philip V of Macedon grew increasingly wanton until:

οὗ γὰρ ἐτὶ τὰς χήρας ἑπείρα γυναῖκας οὐδὲ τὰς ὑπάναρους ἤρκετο μοιχεῖν, ἀλλ’ ἐκ προστάγματος ἢν αὐτῆς φανεῖν,

The situation is the reverse of the normal komastic order of events, in which the lover makes the komos to the beloved and then requests admission. Here Philip sends for the women first, and, when they decline his invitation, he insults them by making komoi to their houses, where, one presumes, further requests for admission would follow. Again, the insulting nature of such actions when directed against a free woman should be noted.\footnote{This passage seems to have escaped the notice of writers on the paraklausithuron/komos.}

Lucilius also seems to have portrayed comedic sieges of a person's house, motivated by an amatory rivalry. Fragments 793, 793, 795, and 796-7 mention a broken trust, someone stealing herself or himself away from a man, hinges being broken, and a chance for someone to save his skin.\footnote{Compare the revels of Antiochus Epiphanes in Polyb. fr. 26.1 (cited Ath. 10.439 a): Πολύβιος ... καλεῖ αὐτὸν Ἐπιμανῆ καὶ οὐκ Ἐπιφάνη διὰ τὰς πρᾶξεις... εἰ δὲ καὶ τῶν νεωτέρων, φησίν, αἰσθανότα τινὰς συνεισφορμένους ὑποσχῆτο, παρὴν μετὰ κεραίου καὶ συμφωνίας, ὥστε τοὺς πολλοὺς διὰ τὸ παράδοξον ἀνισταμένους φεύγειν. See also Polyb. 26.1.4.}

\footnote{The text is from Warmington 1935-40, 3:256 ff. The equivalent lines from Marx are: 780, 781, 773, and 771-2. Warmington's reconstruction of the exact details of the scene seems excessively speculative: "The aggressor seems to hunt out a faithless wife and the scene may be modelled on an episode from a Greek play of the 'New Comedy'." It is unlikely that New Comedy would have portrayed an adulterous wife in such a situation and the plot behind the fragments}
uitam ac fortunas cui concrediderim meas.

utrum anno an horno tete abstuleris a uiro.

Malo hercle uestro, confectores cardinum.

orationem facere compendi potes;

salue, dum saluo in tergo et tergino licet.

Fragments 937, 938-9, 942, 943-4, 945, 946, and 947 also seem to be possibly paraklausithuric:74

quod thynno capto cobium excludunt foras.

pluteos ex scutis tectaque et testudines reddet

demo hos ancipites ferro effringat cardines.

uecte atque ancipiti ferro effringam cardines.

... vas ex fenestris in caput

deiciam, qui prope ad ostium aspirauerint.

Gnatho, quid actum est? depilati omnes sumus

ciaede ostium, Gnato, urge. restant. periuimus.

crus lapide? nihil est. credam, si te offenderit

If they are paraklausithuric, fragment 937 would then refer to one lover excluded in favour of a "bigger fish",75 938-9 the defensive preparations of the besieged house, 941 and 942 the attack on the door (complete with uectis and ferr-rum),76 943-4 a vase, which probably contained water, being

is probably closer to Menander’s Perikeiromene.

74 See Warmington 1935-40, 3:300 ff. McKeown 1987-, 2:152 (on Ov. Am. 1.6.57-8) cites 942 f. The corresponding numbers in Marx’s edition are: Warmington 937 = Marx 938,

938-9 = 837-8, 942 = 839, 943-4 = 841-2, 945 = 845, 946 = 843, and 947 = 844.


76 Cf. Pl. Am. 1026 “Ita, rogo. paene effregisti, fatue, foribus cardines,” and As. 388 “cardines ne foribus effringantur.”
thrown down from windows onto the attackers (945), 946 a renewed assault on the door, and 947 more resistance.

Sextus Turpilius also mentions the attack on the beloved's doors: "Nemo umquam uidit ebrium ire inter diu / Neque turbam facere neque fores exurgere" ("Thrasyleon" II.199-200; Ribbeck 1871, 2:109).

Bion Aposp. 11 offers many topoi in common with the paraklausithuric epigrams, Theocritus, and the Frag. Gren.:

"Εσπερε, τάς ἐρατὰς χαρύσεοι φασι τ' Ἀφρογενελας, "Εσπερε, κυνεῖς λερόν, φίλε, νυκτὸς έγκυλα, τάσσον ἀφαυρότερος μή νας δοσιν ἔξοχος έστρων, χαίρε, φίλος, καὶ μοι ποτὶ ποιμένα κώμον ἄγωνι ἀντὶ σελανίας το δίδου φάσο, ήνεκα τίνα σάμησον ἀρχομένα τάχιον δύεν. οὐκ ἐπὶ φράων Ἐρχομαι οὖδ' ἵνα νυκτὸς ὁδοπορέοντας ἐνοχλέω, ἀλλ' ἔραως καλὸν δὲ γ' ἐρασσαμένῳ συναρέσθαι.

Hesperus is addressed in a hymnic style instead of Night. 78

An explicit connection to Aphrodite is stated, much like the

Νῦξ συνερώσα μοι in line 11 of the Frag. Gren., and similar

---


78 The text is from Gow 1952a. Most notable is the repetition of the vocative each time followed by appositi- 

 })

The repetition of the vocative each time followed by appositi- 

})

}
appeals to a god based on their personal experience of love. He is asked, as the moon and stars are sometimes, to give the komast light, for the moon has set. The speaker explicitly announces that he is going on a komos (4), not for robbery or mugging, which brings to mind the common paraklausithuric topos of the dangers of the night (but almost always the dangers of the city at night, not the countryside) and also the lover's proclamations of harmlessness. Finally there is an actual appeal to Hesperus to help him, with the argument that it is a good thing to help a lover. The announcement of the komos and the mention of love indicate that the speaker will arrive at someone's house and request admission. But even if the passage is not truly paraklausithuric it is interesting to note the use of these topoi in association with a purely komastic situation. Passages such as this and the "Marisaeum Melos" indicate again that many topoi associated with the paraklausithuron are simply that--topoi that occur with the paraklausithuron but are not actually of the paraklausithuron.

Meleager and Anonymous Late Hellenistic Epigrams

Meleager begins several paraklausithuric epigrams with similar addresses to Night or the stars. AP 5.165 (G.-P. LI) begins with a sacral address to Night:79

79Note the repetition of Νόξ, each time with a different epithet, the earnest repetition of Λύτομας, and the solemn παμφώτευμα θεόν, which could also be considered the equivalent of the standard hymnic citing of the god's
Again, Night is the companion of the lover on his komos. But this time, for the first time in a paraklausithuric poem, we find an explicit attack on the rival in the wish that he might fall asleep (which brings to mind the mention of Endymion in Theoc. 3.50). As has been seen before, the epigram takes place before the lover has made his request for admission, but the request is clearly intended.

The text for all Meleager’s epigrams from the AP will follow Gow-Page 1965.

The epigram’s potential paraklausithuric nature is strong enough for Garte 1924, 37 ff. to discuss it. It is interesting to compare this epigram with Mel. AP 5.166 (G.-P. LII), which Cairns 1977, 328 considers komastic. It too contains the address to night, mention of the lamp (also addressed), and the poet’s wondering if his beloved is alone, but it surely takes place when the poet is lying awake at home. First, the explicit mention that his longing is keeping him awake would seem to imply that he is at home—if he were making a komos to Heliodora, then the mention of wakefulness would not be apposite at this time in the komos, for he has likely not had a chance to try to get to sleep, presuming the komos occurred, as usual, after a symposium. Second, that the poet addresses Night rather than the girl herself in his desire to know if she is alone seems to argue against the epigram actually being spoken en route to the beloved or at her door—either he will find out or be able to address his beloved soon enough. Finally, the request for the lamp to guard her also does not seem to fit if the lover’s arrival were imminent: Ἄν νῦς, ὦ Φιλάργυρονς ἔμοι πόθος Ἡλιοδόρας / καὶ ἤκολομον δραματὶ κυστά 

dákryxhē; / ἄρα μένει στοργῆς ἔμα λείψανα, καὶ τὸ φίλημα / 


μημάσονον ψυχρὰ θάλπετ’ ἐν ςκύλιᾳ; / 5 ἄρα γ’ ἔχει 


σύγκοιτα τὰ ἀκάυμα, κάμον δεῖξον / ψυχαπάτην στέρνοις 


ἀμφιβαλόντα φίλες; / ἢ νέος ἄλλος ἔρως, νέα παγάνια; μήποτε, 


λύχνε, / ταῦτ’ ἐσίδης, εἰς δ’ ἐς παρέδωκα φύλαξ.
AP 5.191 (G.-P. LXXIII) is unusually dense in topos:

"Ἀστρα καὶ ἡ φιλέρωσι καλὸν φαινουσα Σελήνη
cal Νὺξ καὶ κύμων σύμπλανον ὁργάνοιν,
ἀρά γε τὴν φιλάσωτον ἔτ' ἐν κοιταίσιν ἄνθρήσων
ἀγρυπνον λύχνυ πόλλ’ ἀποκλασμένην.
ἡ τιν' ἔχει σύγκοιτον; ἐπὶ προθύροις μαρανθείς
ἄκρυσιν ἐκδήσας τοὺς ἱκέτας στεφάνους
ἐν τὸδ' ἐπιγράφις, "Κύπρι, σοὶ Μελέαγρος ὁ μύστης
σῶν κύμων στοργῆς σκύλα τάδ' ἐκρέμασε." 81

The stars and Selene, which light the lover's way, are
invoked, as are Night and the lover's unidentified musical
instrument, the fellow-wanderer of the poet's revels (as was
Night in 5.165.2 above). 82 He wonders if he will see his
beloved, lying awake and crying (presumably because she has
been jilted by a lover) or if she has a rival within. 83 If
the former is the case, he can probably expect to be admit-

81 The text is from Gow-Page 1965, but with their
suggested (2:648) emendation of ἀποκλασμένην in line 4:
"ἀποκλασμένην: if she is still 'awake in bed', she is either
waiting for a lover or already enjoying one; in both cases
the lamp will be kept alight ... ἀποκλασμένην. The latter
is palaeographically easy ... and makes a suitable contrast
with what follows: 'is she alone and complaining that she
has no lover, or has she one already?'

82 Cf. again Frag. Gren. 11 ἀστρα φίλα καὶ πότινα νῦξ
συνερθά μοι. Gow-Page 1965, 2:644 think the ὁργάνοιν is a
musical instrument, as does Garte 1924, 34. The moon should
be bright for lovers or witches, cf. Theoc. 2.10 f., and the
dull moon at Sen. Med. 787 ff.

83 Cairns 1972, 87 sees an implicit threat-prophecy
in this. Copley 1956, 4 misses the implied conditional sense
of 5 ff.: "At this point we are to imagine that he knocks at
the door. He receives no answer: 'Has she someone with her?'
Apparently she has, for the lover gives up in despair,
throws himself down to weep on her threshold." Cf. 169 n. 7.
ted, but in the latter case, he will hang his garlands, which have been wilted by the abundant salty tears shed on them, on her door.\textsuperscript{84}

There is some confusion of imagery in lines 6-9 with the combination of ἱκέτας and σκυλακα. First, the garlands are called suppliant instead of the lover, seeming to recall the branches or garlands proffered by the suppliant seeking mercy.\textsuperscript{85} Yet the poet then goes on to call the garlands σκυλακα, which usually refers to spoils, the arms in particular, taken from a defeated enemy and then dedicated by the victor to a god (LSJ s.v.). That enemy, of course, did not himself hang up the spoils taken from him—he was usually too dead to do so. Therefore the σκυλακα must mean, by extension, offerings proffered by a surrendering enemy rather than true spoils of war. This would then imply that the lover was some form of captive of Aphrodite, or a servus Amoris.\textsuperscript{86} Probably implicit in the garlands being hung on the beloved's door is some idea that the beloved's house is almost a temple of Aphrodite (as Garte 1924, 35 realizes).

\textsuperscript{84}Cairns 1977, 326 and 328 cites this among those komoi where admission seems a clear possibility.

\textsuperscript{85}For more on supplication in paraklausithura, see Chapter 4.

\textsuperscript{86}Cairns 1977, 349 sees implications here that the lover is a suppliant prisoner, rather than just a suppliant.
Finally, the lover will add a dedicatory inscription, as at 12.23 below, probably written on the door.\(^{87}\)

Less certainly paraklausithuric is AP 5.160 (G.-P. XXVI):

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Δημώ λευκοπάρεις, σὲ μὲν τὶς ἔχων ὑπόχρωςα}
\text{τέρπεται, ἢ ἐὰν ἑμι λὺν στενάξῃ κρασὶα.}
\text{εἴ ὅσα σε σαββατικὸς κατέχει πόθος, ὥμεν ἀθάμα.
}
\text{ἔστι καὶ ἐν ψυχρῷς σάββασι θερμῶς ἐρως.}
\end{align*}\]

The lover appears to be outside the beloved’s house. He addresses her, praising her beauty in passing, but knows that there is a rival within. He makes a brief attack on the rival, but the final mention of the fires of love seems almost to excuse the whole incident.

Meleager also wrote four paederastic paraklausithuric epigrams: AP 12.23, 72, 85, and 167 (G.-P. XCIX, XCI, CXV, and CIX). AP 12.23 provides a delightful twist on the idea of the spoils of love, but this time it is not the garland but the lover himself who is the spoils fastened at the door of the beloved, rather as Iphis will be in Ov. \textit{Met.}

\(^{87}\)It is not absolutely clear that the writing will be on the door. Dedicatory offerings regularly had a plaque or tablet affixed to them on which the inscription was written. Sometimes the writing was on the offering itself, see \textit{LSJ s.v. σκῦλον}: "σκῦλα γράφειν to write one’s name on \textit{arms gained as spoils}, which were then dedicated to a deity." However, since it would be hard to write on a garland, and since the lover probably was not carrying with him something he could use as a plaque, the inscription is probably written on the door. Yardley 1979, 156 and Fedeli 1980, 377-8, on Prop. 1.16.9-16, both take it this way.
Furthermore, it introduces the topos of the mocking by-stander or witness to the komos/paraklausithuron, but here it is the lover himself who was formerly that mocker of ill-starred lovers' komoi:

"Ὑπερήθην ὑπὸ πρόσεθεν ἐγὼ ποτὲ τοῖς δυσέρωσι κώμοις ἠθέων πολλάκις ἐγγελάσας· καὶ μ’ ἐπὶ σοὶ ὅ πτανός Ἐρως προθύρωσε, Μυθοκρ., στήσεν ἐπιναγόν, "σκῦλ’ ἀπὸ Συφροσύνης"."

All Meleager's epigrams so far have had the author as the lover or komast, but in AP 12.72 (G.-P. XCII) it is someone else, and Meleager is the pitying bystander:

"Ἡν μὲν γυλικὸς ἀράβος. ὃ δ’ ἐν προθύρωσιν ἄπυνος Δάμις ἀποφύγει πνεύμα τὸ λειψάνον ἔτι σχέτλίος, Ἡράκλειτον ἐδύων. ἔστη γὰρ ὕπ’ αὐγάς ὀφθαλμῶν, βληθεὶς κηρὸς ἐς ἀνθρακίαν. ἀλλὰ μοι ἐγρεύω, Δάμι δυσσάμμορος. καῦτος Ἐρωτος ἔλκος ἐχων ἐπὶ σοίς δάκρυσι δακρυχέω.

The lover has lain at his beloved boy's door until dawn, sleepless. He has been virtually dying from love since he was burnt by the rays from Heraclitus' eyes--an idea that combines the topos of the lover recounting the beginnings of his love, the fires of love, and eye contact with the beloved. Meleager tries to rouse him by showing that he is

88 Again, the inscription is probably written on the door itself. See Chapter 2, note 119; Chapter 3, note 21; and above on Mel. AP 5.191.

89 This will occur in later paraklausithura. Cf. Murgatroyd 1980, 95 on Tib. 1.2.87-96: "For the example of the loveless laughor in love, cf. Hom. Hymn 5.45 ff., AP 5.234 (Paulus S.), 12.23, 101 (Meleager), Propertius 1.7, 1.9."
not the only person to bear Love's wounds. Finally there is a mention of both lovers' tears.

AP 12.85 (G.-P CXV) is particularly interesting in the way it combines the request to be admitted to one's beloved and the request to join a symposium:

Oινοπόται, δέξασθε τὸν ἐκ πελάγεως ἁμα πάντων καὶ κλώσας προφυγόντες ἐν χθανὶ δ' ἀλλύμενον. ἄρτι γὰρ ἐκ νηδὸς με μόνον πόδα θέντι ἑπὶ γαίαν ἀγρεύσας ἔλκει τῷ ὄ βιας Ἡρως ἐνθάδ' ὅπου τὸν παλίδα διαστέλων ἐνόησα, αὐτομάτοις δ' ἄκων ποσαὶ ταχὺς φέρομαι. κυμάως δ' οὐκ οἶμοι ὑπὸ φέρνα πῦρ ὅ νερ γεμίσθεις, ἀλλὰ Φίλω, Ἐξείνοι, βαίνων ἑπαρκέσατε, ἄρκέσατι, ὃ ἐξείνοι, καὶ Ἐξείνοι πρὸς Ἡρώς δέξασθ' ἀλλύμενον τὸν Φιλὸν ἱκέτην.

The lover asks to be received into a symposium (for the repetition of δέχομαι cf. Alc. fr. 374). He has left the sea (probably the sea of love), and avoided the dangers of the land that face the komast (7). He nonetheless is dying from love, for as he disembarked, violent Eros dragged him after a boy, who would seem to have gone in to where the οἰνοπόται are. His feet co-operated with Eros, bearing him along of their own accord. This abduction by love has been seen before in one form in AP 12.23, and will recur in Prop. 2.29A. The speaker is making a komos, but inflamed by the fires of love, not wine—the usual topos of the drunkenness of the lover is mentioned by means of a denial of the topos. He calls the drinkers ἕξοντες several times to strengthen

---

90 Gow-Page 1965, 2:657 say 5 ἔγρεω ... δαυλόμορος is "Homerian vocabulary, a rarity in M.; here for ironic-satirical effect."
their obligation to receive him. The epigram ends with a final appeal for admission, a repetition of the dying-for-love topos, and the image of the lover as suppliant.

The storm-tossed sailor on the seas of love returns in AP 12.167 (G.-P. CIX), requesting admission to the beloved’s harbour:

Χειμέριον μὲν πνεύμα, φέρει ἐπὶ σοὶ σοί με, Μυᾶκε, ἄρπαστόν κύμας ὑ γλυκύδακρυς Ἕρως. Χειμαλνεῖ δὲ βαρὺς πνεύσας Πόθας. ἀλλὰ μ’ ἐς ὅρμον ἥξεκα τὸν ναύτην Κύπριδος ἐν πελάγει.

Again, the lover makes a komos to his beloved compelled by Eros. The common komastic bad weather is emphasized by the repetition of the χειμ-/πνευ- conjunction. The emphasis on the bad weather also stresses the lover’s dedication to his beloved.91

Meleager makes a passing reference to the anointing of the beloved’s door with unguent in AP 5.198 (G.-P. XXIV):

Οὐ πλάκαμον Τιμόθε, οὐ σάνδαλον Ἡλλοδύρας, οὐ τὸ μυρόδρατον Δημαρίου πρόθυρον, οὐ τρυφερὸν μελόσμα βοῦπλας Ἀντικλείας, οὐ τοὺς ἀρτιθαλέις Δωροθέας στεφάνους, οὐκέτι σοι φαρέτρη 5 πτερόεντας ὑμιτοῦς κρύπτει, Ἕρως. ἐν ἐμοὶ πάντα γὰρ ἐστι βέλη.

Line 6 makes it clear that Meleager is in love with each of these girls. Each one is represented by a single attribute:

91See Garte 1924, 39, who finds this epigram particularly artful.
hair, a sandal, a smile, garlands, and, in line 2, a myrrh-sprinkled doorway.\textsuperscript{92}

Two other epigrams of Meleager, which depict the beginning of an amatory komos, also deserve brief mention. In \textit{AP} 12.117 (G.-P. XIX) the poet debates with himself (it is just possible, however, that the speakers are two separate people) about going on a komos.\textsuperscript{93} There are two mentions of a torch or lamp being lit, drunkenness, and Zeus' experience as a lover, which is connected with the idea of the primacy of Eros over all the gods, and an address to the lover's \textit{thumos}:

\begin{quote}
Βεθλήσθω κύβος. ἂπτε τορεύσομαι. -- Ἀνδρὶ τόλμασον, οἰνοβαρές, τίνι ἔχεις θρονίτιδα; -- Κωμάσομαι, κωμάσομαι. -- Ποιλ, θυμέ, τρέπη; -- Τί σ' Ἕρωι λογισμός; ἂπτε τάξος. -- Ποῦ σ' ἡ πρόσθε λόγων μελέτη; -- Ἕρωιφος σφοδρὸς ὁ πολὺς πάνος. εὼν μόνον ὀλίσθη τοὐθ', ὅτι καὶ Ζηνὸς λήμα καθεῖλεν Ἕρωι.\textsuperscript{94}
\end{quote}

\textit{AP} 5.190 (G.-P. LXIV) combines the komos with the shipwrecked lover, and contains, instead of an address to the moon or stars, one to the metaphorical waves and winds:

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{92}The appearance of unguent, which was, of course, oil-based, at \textit{Lucr.} 4.1178-9 would perhaps have puzzled Copley 1956, 44 f. less if he had been aware of this epigram and Charito 1.3.2. See below in Chapter 4 for more on anointing doorways.

\textsuperscript{93}It is interesting to note that this occurs third in a series of five komastic epigrams, indicating a certain generic awareness on the part of the editor of Strato's "Musa puerilis." Gow-Page 1965, 2:618 note that "the influence of Mime is obvious."

\textsuperscript{94}I have incorporated Gow-Page's (1965, 2:618) preferred reading of τόλμα in line 1, instead of τόλμαν.
The lover is once again not in control of himself (3). His beloved is presumably represented by Scylla—dangerous but preferable to the storm of emotions he is experiencing.

These epigrams are notable for a number of reasons. Most obvious is their number—the various opportunities that the paraklausithuric situation offered for exploring the experience of love clearly appealed to Meleager. They contain a wide range of moods from the pain of AP 12.23 and 12.85 to the kindly sympathy of 12.72. He incorporates a great variety of topoi and shows a clear fondness for those of the garland being offered and of the sailor on the sea of love. Furthermore, his vocabulary is interesting, particularly in his exclusive use of πρόθυρον for the beloved's door and the frequent occurrence of κώμος vocabulary, indicating the continued connection that has been noted between the paraklausithuron and komos.

Three anonymous Hellenistic epigrams from book twelve of the AP also involve the paraklausithuric situati-

---

95 Garte 1924, 40: "Veritas et simplicitas carminum Asclepiadis desideratur apud Meleagrum. Cum Asclepiadis carmina nuda et candida essent, Meleagri sunt nimia arte facta, qua ex re Meleagrum praeceptis rhetoricis nimis com-motum esse facile intellegitur."
tion: 90, 115 and 116 (G.-P. I, VI, and XXXIV). 96 12.90

seems to mention two different paraklausithuric exclusions:

Οὐκετέ ἔρως, πεπάλαικα πόθοις τρισάνε, εἶς μὲν ἐταίρης,
εῖς δὲ μὲ παρθενικής, εϊς δὲ μ’ ἐκαυσε νέου,
καὶ κατὰ πᾶν ἡλυχηκα. γεγυμασμαῖ μὲν ἐταίρης
πελθων τὰς ἐχθρὰς οὐδέν ἐχοιτι θύρας:
ἐστρωμαὶ δὲ κόρης ἐπὶ παστάδος αἰεῖν ἄυμνος,
ἐν τι ποθενότατον παῖδι φίλημα διδοῦς:
οἶμοι, πῶς εἴπω πῦρ τὰ τριτῶν; ἐκ γὰρ ἐκεῖνου
βλέψματα καὶ κενεὰς ἐλπίδας οῖδα μόνον.

In lines 3-4 the lover, having no money and despite his best
efforts (ゲγυμασμαῖ seems to imply that the matter greatly
exercised him), fails to persuade a hetaira’s doors to open.
The implicit personification of the doors in ἐχθρὰς is par-
ticular noteworthy. Whether line 5 mentions another exclu-
sion or not is uncertain and hinges on the meaning of πασ-
tάδος, which could be the girl’s bedroom or a porch or
portico of the house. Gow-Page (1965, 2:561) are fairly
certain that the lover is not with the girl:

It is evident that the man cannot spend the night in the
girl’s bedroom, still less (as Paton supposed) on her
bed, and παστάδοs must be some sort of porch outside the
house or room.... As in 4, the man is apparently con-
demned to a form of θυραυλία though somewhat nearer here
than there to the object of his desires.

96 They all seem to be relatively late. One other
late Hellenistic epigram, Phid. AP 5.120 (G.-P. VII), is
worth brief mention for a different use of the bad weather
topos. But this time it is a woman sneaking out from her
σύμφωνος (not necessarily a husband) to be with a lover: καὶ
νυκτὸς μεσάνς τὸν ἐμὸν κλέψας σύμφωνον / ἰλθὼν καὶ πυκνὴν
τεγγομένη φωκάδι / τοῦ νεκ’ ἐν ὀπρήκτοις καθήμεθα, κοβχὶ
λαξέωντες / εὔδροι ὡς οὐδὲν τοῖς φιλέουσι θέμις. Again the
topos of the bad weather is used to indicate implicitly the
strength of the lover’s passion.
The present tenses in 5 and 6 still offer some difficulty, but they could indicate that this relationship is ongoing. If lines 5-6 do then refer "to a form of θυραυλία," it is particularly interesting for being associated with a κόρη.

AP 12.115 (G.-P. VI) is more straightforward, and is also more komastic than paraklausithuric:

"Ακρητον μανίν ἔπιον· μεθύων μέγα μύθοις
 ὑπλοσμαί πολλήν εἰς ὅδεν ἀφρόσυναν.
 κμασάμιν· τί δέ μοι βρουντέων μέλει; τί κεραυνῶν;
 ἡν βάλλη, τὸν ἐρωθ' ὃπλον ἄτρωτον ἐχω.

A lover, mad with drink and drunk with words is therefore armed for a komos to his beloved. Again, one can deduce from his words that he will not be admitted. The lover does not fear the thunder and lightning of the storm he is facing for he is protected by love.\(^97\) Moreover, since the thunder and lightning are attributes of Zeus, there is implicit defiance of him.\(^8\)

\(^97\)This is one of the earliest occurrences of the topos of the lover protected by love. The bravery of lover occurs earlier at Asclep. AP 5.64 (G.-P. XI), Pl. Smp. 203b, and Arist. E.E. 1229 A, and can be found later in Phld. AP 5.25 (G.-P. III). Posidipp. AP 5.213 (G.-P. IV) has Eros escorting the lover through danger, but that is somewhat different from the idea that the lover's love itself will protect him. See Murgatroyd 1980, 81 (on Tib. 1.2.27-8 and 29-30) and McKeown 1987-, 2:128 (on Ov. Am. 1.6.9-14). It is certainly in effect at Hor. Carm. 1.22: "Horace's ode starts with the proposition that the pure in heart need no weapons even when travelling through the most dangerous country.... He is applying to himself, not without amusement, the elegists' commonplace that the lover is a sacred person under divine protection;..." (Nisbet-Hubbard 1970, 262 f.).

\(^8\)Cf. the assimilation of the ianitor to Jupiter in Ov. Am. 1.6.16 (and see McKeown 1987-, 2:132 ad loc.) and Polyphemus' defiance of Jupiter in Met. 13.761 and 857-8.
AP 12.116 (G.-P. XXXIV) also depicts the start of a komos, but with several interesting variations on standard toposi:

Κωμάσομαι, μεθύω γάρ ὅλος μέγας· παῖ, λαβέ τοῦτον τοῦ στέφανον τοῦ ἐμοῖς δάκρυσι λουόμενον.
μακρὴν δ’ οὐχὶ μάτην ὄδυν ἔσομαι· ἔστι δ’ ἀψίλ
καὶ σκότος, ἀλλὰ μέγας φανός ἐμοὶ Θεμίσων.

As usual, the lover is drunk. Somewhat strangely, he offers his garland, which is already wet with his tears, to an attendant. This could simply be because the lover is very drunk and so, typically, his garland is inconveniently drooping down, or it could be because he presumes he will be admitted and so will not need the garland as a gift. The tears are presumably tears of love motivated by the lover’s absence from his beloved.99 Since his beloved will shine out like a beacon to guide the lover’s way, the lover will certainly not need a torch.100

99 The emotional drinker prone to crying is certainly a common enough modern figure. Murgatroyd 1980, 173 suggests that it is the wine causing his tears. McKeown 1987–, 2:132 seems to suggest that this epigram is paraklausithuric.

100 See Gow-Page 1965, 2:576 on line 4: “it is not quite plain whether he means that the boy is a beam towards which to steer or a torch to guide his footsteps. The former seems the more natural figure, but the latter is somewhatfavoured by such references to lovers as Frag. Gren. 15 συνοδηγον ἐξω το πολυ πῦρ / τοῦν τῆς φυχῆ μου καίμενον,
Prop. 3.16.16 ‘ipse Amor accenas praecutit ante faces’.” A good comparison for the passage at hand is Ov. Ep. 18.85, and 155 f. Compare the use of “mea lux” for the beloved in Latin elegy. For a Greek equivalent, see Plu. Mor. 705 C. The beloved can be compared to the sun: Pl. Men. 180 ff., Mel. AP 12.59 (G.-P. C), and Alciphro 4.16.1. For a later use of “light” as an endearment, see Wagner Götterdämmerung prologue: “[Sieg.] Heil dir Brünhilde, prangender Stern! / Heil, strahlende Liebe! / {Brun.} Heil dir, Siegfried,
Val. Aedituus, Dec. Laberius, Trypho, and Aristodemus

Valerius Aedituus fr. 2 is a Latin komastic epigram very similar to those from the Anthologia Palatina. It is quoted at Aulus Gellius 19.9.12:

quid faculam praefers, Phileros, qua est nil opus nobis? ibimus sic, lucet pectore flamma satis.
istanc <aut> potis est uis saeua extingueru uenti aut imber caelo concitus praecipitans;
at contra hunc ignem Veneris, nisi si Venus ipsa, nullast quae possit uis alia opprimere.

An attendant slave is addressed and asked why he carries a torch, for the fire in the lover's heart will light the way (cf. Frag. Gren. 15-16). Such flames cannot be quenched by the wind and heavy rain. Only Venus has the power to put out her own fires. It is clear that this is the start of an amatory komos and admission will be requested at its end.

siegender Licht! / Heil, strahlendes Leben!

101 See Wright 1975, 152 and Courtney 1993, 70-2. He is generally given a floruit of c. 100 B.C.

102 The text is from Courtney 1993, 70.

103 Courtney 1993, 72 notes the similarity of Anon. AP 9.15 (= FGE, p. 315) which he says is "not later than the first century AD, when it appears in a papyrus and is imitated at Pompeii." Cf. CLE 48 (= CIL iv.1941): "tu qui lucernam cognitas accendere / cal[ens] adest os." See also Headlam-Knox 1922 on Herodas 1.38.

104 Cf. the various statements of the supreme power of love, even over the gods: Asclep. AP 5.64 (G.-P. XI) and Mel. AP 12.117 (G.-P. XIX). Cf. also Ovid Met. 13.758-9 "pro! quanta potentia regni / est, Venus alma, tui!" The topos is very common throughout classical literature. Among many others, see: Alc. fr. 327; Anacr. fr. 505; Soph. Ant. 781 ff., Trach. 441 ff.; X. Smp. 8.1; Plato Smp. throughout; Aristopho fr. 11 (K.-A. = Ath. 12.563 b); Men. Heros fr. 2 (209 Kock); A.R. 3.91; Corinna fr. 654; Caecil. p. 3. 238-42 (Ribbeck 259-63 = Cic. Tusc. 4.32.68); Mel. AP 12.101 (G.-P.
A fragment from a mime by Decimus Laberius (141-3, Ribbeck) could make a possible reference to lovers' sometime habit of throwing pebbles at beloveds' windows in order to let their presence be known: "uxorem tuam / et meam nowercam consequari lapidibus / a populo uideo." This could refer to an attack, with stones on the woman, but stoning as a punishment seems to have been very rare in Rome. It could also, however, refer to the same situation described at Horace Carm. 1.25.1, "Parcius iunctas quatiunt fenestras / iactibus crebris iuuenes proterui." Consector can mean "seek after" (OLD s.v. 2a) as well as attack and populo could be a degrading exaggeration ("every man and his dog") of the popularity of the woman. Porphyrio on Carm. 1.25 pr. 2 ff. is helpful: "Iuuenes, qui olim frequentius fenestras tuas lapidibus incessebeant, ut excitata somno ianuas aperire." Porphyrio uses lapidibus, as does Decimus Laberius, and incesso is even more suggestive of aggression than is consector. There seems, then, to be good reason to label this fragment paraklausithuric.

The first century grammarian Trypho has already been mentioned above in connection with Pratinas, but deserves some further discussion. Fr. 109 (Velsen), quoted at Athene-
naeus 14.618 c, lists different forms of ἀδλησίς, all accompanied by dancing:

αὐλήσεων δ’ εἶλαν δυσμασίαν, ὡς φησί Τρόφων ἐν δευτέρω ὁνομασίαν ἀλλ’ ἱμός, βουκαλισμός, γλυγγας, τετράκωμος, ἐπιφαλλος, χορείας, καλλινικος, πολεμικόν, ἡδύκωμος, ξεισυνάφρη, θυροκοπικόν (το δ’ αὐτό καὶ κρουσάθρον), κυμαμός, μόθων. ταῦτα δὲ πάντα μετ’ ὀρχήσεως ηὐλεῖτο. 106

Athenaeus goes on to mention various forms of ψηθή, such as the ἱμαῖς, a “mill-song” sung while people ground. This seems to imply that the dancing accompanying the listed forms of ἀδλησίς could have been, at least in the cases of the θυροκοπικόν/ κρουσάθρον, mimic, and represented the types of actions implied in their names. 107 To this passage can be compared the list of strange dances, some, to judge from their names, mimic, at Athenaeus 14.629 f–630 a:

105 See Chapter 2, note 4, for the aulos and the komos.

106 Eustat. on Hom. Ι. 21.280, 55 ff. is based on this: ... καὶ ὅτι Λύμβος ὁ αὐλὸς ἐκαλεῖτο παρά τοῖς ποιηταῖς, ἐπὶ Λύμβος νομάς τις τὴν αὐλητικὴν πρῶτος ἔβρε, καὶ ὅτι αὐλήσεων δυσμασίαν, ὡς ὁ Ἀθήναιος ἐκτίθεται, κῶμος, ἐπιφαλλος, χορείας, καλλινικος, πολεμικον, ἡδύκωμος, σκυινυοτρήβη, θυροκοπικόν, τὸ καὶ κρουσάθρον, κυμαμός, μόθων. The passage has been noted by many writers on the paraklausithuron or komos: Hendrickson 1925, 301 f.; Gow 1965, 2:64 f.; Headlam-Knox 1922, 83; Luck 1959, 342; Minyard 1976, 11 n. 13, 226 n. 12; and Yardley 1978, 19.

107 As was noted above, Pollux (Onom. 4.99–100) mentions a type of komastic orkhēsis having fighting and blows in association with the tetrakosmos, which seems to have been a form of “triumphal song and dance sacred to Heracles” (LSJ): ἦν δὲ καὶ κῶμος εἰδὼς ὀρχήσεως καὶ τετράκωμος, Ἱσσακέλους λεπρὰ καὶ πολεμικῆ. ἦν δὲ [καὶ] κωματική μάχη καὶ πληγῶς ἔχουσα.... Also of possible relevance to this is Lucian Salt. 10 f., quoted in Chapter 2, note 39.
... ἔγεις καὶ μακτρισμός ἀπόκλιμος τε καὶ σοβάς, ἐτι δὲ μορφοσμός καὶ γλαυξ καὶ λέων ἀλφίτης τε ἕκχυσις καὶ χρέων ἀποκοπή καὶ στοιχέα καὶ πυρρίχη. μετ' αὐλῶν δ', ὄρχυντα τὴν τοῦ κελευστοῦ καὶ τὴν καλουμένην πινακίδα, σχήματα δὲ ἐστὶν ὥρχησεως εἰςφασμός, καλαθίακος, καλλαβίδες, σκψφ, σκψπευμα... θερμαύστρις, ἐκατερίδες, σκοπός, χελρ καταπηνήτης, χελρ σιμί, ἀποσίλασμος, ἕύλου παράληψις, ἑπαγκωνικός, καλαθίακος, στράβιλος.

The fragment from Trypho inconveniently raises many unanswerable questions. What exactly the κῶμος dance would have represented brings up again the definition of κῶμος itself. It could have depicted, or been in someway associated with, the different types of processional komos—amatory or epinician—or the static komos. The τετράκωμος has been mentioned immediately above and has almost certainly nothing to do with the amatory komos (compare again Poll. Onom. 4.99-100).138 The dance that appears most relevant to the paraklausithuron is the θυροκοπικόν/κρουσίθυρον. Some discussion of θυροκοπεῖν was made above on Aristophanes V. 1252 ff., but the full range of evidence needs brief examination, especially because of the existence of such statements such as Hendrickson's (1925, 301) unsupported observation that the

θυροκοπικόν, κρουσίθυρον, παρακλαυσίθυρον (ξωματα) are sister-products of the nocturnal κῶμος, but their dispositions and natures are not the same. The first two

---

138See also Pickard-Cambridge 1952, 44 f.: "Contests of κῶμοι are attested for the τετράκωμοι, a group of four demes south-west of Athens, [note 8: "I.G. ii(2).3103 (330-329 B.C.)... cf. ibid. 3102, 2830."] but their common cult was that of Herakles,... parallel contest appears at Acharnai, with no clue to the deity honoured."
are impatient, petulant, and end in violence; the last is plaintive and entreating;

or Gow's (1965, 2:64) on the κωμος:

The common objective of such expeditions was the house of a mistress, before which the lover, accompanied or unaccompanied by his friends, would sing a serenade begging for admission, and beat upon the doors and shutters to attract attention. The serenade was called παρακλαυσίμθυρον and also, from the accompaniment mentioned, θυροκοπικόν and κρουσίθυρον;

or Headlam-Knox's (1922, 83) on the παρακλαυσίθυρον: "This kind of lyric had other names, which require explanation, θυροκοπικόν,... Κρουσίθυρον...."

The first thing that must be made clear is that there is no indication at all that the θυροκοπικόν or κρουσίθυρον were types of ἀσίμα, song or lyric. Trypho fr. 109 makes clear that they are types of σάλησις—flute-playing—which accompanied dancing. There is no evidence that the song of the excluded lover was ever called by either name. Hesychius (s.v.) says of κρουσίθυρον: μέλος τι οὕτως ἐκαλείτο. This is the only occurrence of the word among all the works on the TLG CD-ROM aside from Trypho fr. 109 and the comment of Eustathius based upon it. Of course, μέλος refers more often to a tune or music than to the verbal content of songs. It is hard to prove a negative, but fortunately the words themselves were not common and so their usage can be quickly determined. The Lexica Segueriana (Bekk. Anecd. 42.31) gloss θυροκοπεῖν with ἐπικωμάζειν (cf. Headlam-Knox 1922, 83). This is acceptable in as much as the several
occurrences of ὑποκοπεῖν which refer to violent assaults on doors could be presumed to have been connected with the komos, but the connection is not common. There are only four examples of ὑποκοπ- that are clearly or probably komastic or paraklausithuric. On the other hand, there are seventeen occurrences outside the lexicographers and scholiasts that are not. Finally, Herodian (Epim., Boissonade 61.2)

109 See: Ar. V. 1253 ff. κακῶν τὸ πάντως ἀπὸ γὰρ οἷον γλυκέται, ήμετέρῳ καὶ πατάξαι καὶ βαπτεῖν, καὶ πᾶν ἄποιτις ἄργυριον ἐκ κρατάλης; Ae1. N. A. 1.50 ἢν δὲ φασι καὶ ὁ ἐξεις σκοτεινός καὶ ἐκεῖνος ἐς μιξίν αἵματι πρῶς τὴν θάλατταν, καὶ οἷον εἰ κυμαστής σὺν τῇ αὐθὴν ὑποκοπεῖ, οὕτω τοι καὶ ἐκεῖνος σωρίας τὴν ἐρωμένην παρακάλεις, and Lib. Prog. 10.7 σωθ' ἡμιτονικῆς ὁ γεωργὸς ἐπὶ κύριος φέρεται οὐδὲ ἐδειπνηκὼς ἐπὶ τὸ ὑποκοπεῖν οὐδ' ὕδρεις. Antiph. fr. 236 (K.-A.) suggests that it is something old men do not do, and the mention of the παρυλίας in the same line means it is probably related to the attack on the beloved’s house. There is, however, no mention of the komos, although again one can usually presume such a background to most paraklausithuric situations: οὐδὲς τὰ πατριωτικαὶ πνέυματα κατεδόθοκε, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ κατεμφανεῖν, οὐδ' ἐλύσατο παρυλίας, οὐδὲ ὑποκοπεῖν φίλειν ἄλκην; / οὕτω τὸ γήρας σωφρονοῦν οὐκ εὐτυχεῖς.

110 See: A. A. 1195 KA. ἡ ψυχομάτιστης εἴμι ὑποκοπός φλέσών; Diph. 129 (K.-A.) ὑποκοπεῖν καὶ ὑποκοπεῖα, quoted by Headlam-Knox in support of ὑποκοπεῖν meaning ἐπικωμάζειν, clearly indicates no such thing; Plu. Mor. 828 F (on money lenders) ἡμέρας ἐπὶ θύρας, ἄποκλειοντας, καὶ οἷοι μενενείς, ἐπιστηθηκότας καὶ ὑποκοποῦντα, and cf. 503 A; Ae1. N.A. 4.12 (on partridge hatching): αὐτός δὲ ἐκεῖνος ὁ πικρὸς ὑποκοπηθεῖτε διακρούσας τὰ ὠν... and 15.16 (on young vipers eating their way out of the womb): θεόφραστος ὁ θησάμην τοῦ ἐκείνου τοῦ βρέφος δεισδελέειν τῆς μηρὸς τὴν γαστέρα, ὕσπερ ὡς ἡ τοῖς ὑποκοποῦτα; Lib. Or. 11.47.1-5 ὃς ὁ προσέχων καὶ τῆς τῆς γῆς, τῶν νεῶν ἐκμαίνει, νῦν ὃ δὲ, ἀνήθησαν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄρας παρὰ τοὺς ἐνοικούντας άλγος δὴ τινας καὶ προσέχων ταῖς ὑποκοπίς τε ἐκρύμενοι καὶ ἐρωμεῖν περὶ τῆς Ἰωάννης; Lib. Prog. 12.5.1.1 ff. and Or. 11.47 use it of breaking into a place, but not in an amatory context; Chrys. frag. in Job. (MPG 64.564.4-6) (a gloss on Job 2:3) οὗ προσεῖται δὲ μόνον, ἀλλ' καὶ πλακνύμει. καὶ δουλευόντας δουλεῖαν ἕνην καὶ καίνην... καὶ πάντας διάσκοιται τὰ ἡμά κακά,
glosses θυροκοπεῖ with οτι την θύραν κρύθην and Suidas (s.v.) for θυροκόπος simply says ὀ την θύραν κόπτων.

Therefore, while the θυροκοπικόν and κροσθυρον mentioned by Trypho could possibly be related to the para-klausithuric situation, they need not be. More than just lovers or komasts could break into houses, and the dances that the listed kinds of ἀλαγαζόντως accompanied could have represented farcical knocking scenes like those in Plautus. The possibility that, in the first century B.C., mimic dances existed and portrayed the attempts of lovers to get to their beloveds must be kept in mind, but it is no more than a possibility.

Another first century Greek reference to a para-klausithuric assault on a door comes from Aristodemus FHG 3.310 (cited at Ath. 13.585 a):

'Ἀριστοδήμος δ' ἐν ἑυτέρῳ Γελοίων Ἀπομνημονευμάτων ... ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν θυγατέρα τῆς Γναθαλίνης πτωχῶν ἐρασών κυματίζοντας καὶ ἀπειλοῦντας κατασκάφειν τὴν οἰκίαν ἐνημοχείναι γὰρ δικέλλας καὶ ἄμας, 'ει ταῦτ' εἰχε'.
The lovers are, as might be expected, drunk, and poor.

Aristodemus is the last possible Greek paraklausithuric reference until Philo Judaeus and the epigrams of the first century A.D. The rest of the first century B.C. belongs to the Romans, principally the elegists, but Cicero, Lucretius, Catullus, Horace and Livy all provide further relevant evidence.

Cicero and Livy

A philosophical fragment from Cicero (Consil. fr. 10.3.1), preserved in Boethius' De Inst. Mus. 1.1, mentions a well-known story involving Pythagoras:

Sed ut aliqua similitudine adductus maximis minima conferam, ut cum uinolenti adolescentes tibiarum etiam cantu, ut fit, instincti mulieris pudicae fores frangerent, admonuisse tibicinam, ut spondeum caneret, Pythagoras dicitur. Quod cum illa fecisset, tarditate modorum et gravitate canentis illorum furentem petulantiam consedisse.

The story is also told at Sextus Empiricus 6.4.8 and Iamblichus Υ.Ρ. 112. Each version is slightly different, but it is particularly notable in Cicero's that the woman is de-

---

111 This would have taken place the in third century. See also Copley 1956, 23. Machon (333 ff. Gow) tells of Gnathaina getting five minae from a foreign soldier for one night with her daughter Gnathainion. Ath. 13.584 c also recounts two men fighting over Gnathaina: νεανίσκων δὲ τινων παρὰ πότον ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς τυπιότων ἑαυτοὺς ἔφη πρὸς τὸν ἤττωμεν.

112 McKeown 1987-, 2:152 has noticed this.
scribed as "pudica." This certainly indicates that she was not a _meretrix_, and the fact that there is no mention of the doors belonging to a master or owner seems to suggest that she was not servile. Also notable is Cicero's parenthetical comment "ut fit," which implies not only that such scenes were still common enough in Cicero's time, but also that, by the time of the late Republic, it was conceivable that such actions could be directed at respectable women.

At Philippic 2.45 the boy Antony is the excluded lover of his _erastes_ Curio:

Nemo umquam puer emptus libidinis causa tam fuit in domini potestate quam tu in Curionis. Quotiens te pater eius domu sua eiecit, quotiens custodes posuit, ne limen intrares! cum tu tamen nocte socia, hortante libidine, cogente mercede per tegulas demitterere. Quae flagitia domus illa diutius ferre non potuit.

Instead of the _erastes_ being kept from the _eromenos_, it is the prostituted _eromenos_ whom the _erastes_' father is trying to keep out, even to the extent of posting guards. Night is the lover's ally and lust drives the boy on. However, rather than being sneaked in by the door or window, Antony is let down through the impluvium.  

---

113 Cf. Xenarch. fr. 4 (K.-A.) discussed above; Ter. _Eu._ 588-9 "deum se se in hominem conuortisse atque in alienas tegulas /uenisse clanculum per inpluvium fucum factum mulier-
_eri_"; and Suidas et al. 655.1-7 ('`H di'nu thura: > tov di'nu fhsi/ D/hmwn o/theta/t/nu einai, allws de t/uf/lon. Upavai/mon/nu de/ a/tu/ tis tov t/ama/le/nu thura/ katta/keu/nu tais/nu, h`n ouk `an tijs h`nuze m/ h/fo/nu po/na/sas. `Eivous de le/nu, ws moiheu-
/mon/nu a/tu/ tis gynai/ku/nu, t/n a/dlu/n thura/ e/ri
/ga/nu `ou ws m/ di'nu h/fo/nu anog/nu/nu. T/`is de kata tov st/eg/nu de/xom/nu tis m/oi/n, kl/eu/nu/nu tois ge/le/on/nu epi t/n m/n/n h/nu/dnu t/nu t/phi/l/te
nu, t/n di'nu thura/ e/nu/nu le/nu.
Cicero seems to insult Catiline similarly at Catil. 1.26:

hic tu qua laetitia perfruere, quibus gaudiis exsultabis, quanta in uoluptate bacchabere, cum in tanto numero tuorum neque audies uirum bonum quemquam neque uidebis! ad huius uitae studium meditati illi sunt qui feruntur labores tui, iacere humi non solum ad obsidendum stuprum uerum etiam ad facinus obeundum, uigilare non solum insidiantem somno maritorum uerum etiam bonis otiosorum. habes ubi ostentes tuam illam praeclamaram patientiam famis, frigoris, inopiae uerum omnium quibus te breui tempore confectum esse senties.

Catiline has experience lying on the ground in order to commit stuprum, staying awake in order to deceive sleeping husbands, and experience at enduring hunger and cold, which, in conjunction with the previous two accusations, seems to imply that Catiline had experience as an excluded lover.\textsuperscript{114}

Livy will be discussed at this point in order that Lucretius, Catullus, and Horace may be examined in series. Perioch. 89 mentions a particularly unfortunate, but real, excluded husband:

Mutilus, unus ex proscriptis, clam capite adoperto ad posticias aedes Bastiae uxoris cum accessisset, admissus

\textsuperscript{114}See iaceo, humus, uigil- and insidia in Appendix 2. McKeown 1987-2, 2:269 cites Catil. 1.26 in connection with Ov. Am. 1.9.25-6 ("maritorum somnis utuntur amantes"), but does not indicate whether he thinks it is paraklausithuric. Before leaving Cicero it should be noted again that he quotes Ter. Eu. 46 ff. at N.D. 3.72: "quid leuitates comicae parumne semper in ratione uersantur? parumne subtiliter disputat ille in Eunicho: 'quid igitur faciam?... exclusit, reuocat; redeam? non si me obsecret'." Hughes 1992, 215 ff. finds a "paraklausithyron" at Phil. 2.76-8, but his arguments are unconvincing. The episode is, indeed, in Griffin's 1986, 41 words "precisely in the ethos of elegy," but there is no exclusion nor are there any other paraklausithuristic topoi.
non est, quia illum proscriptum diceret; itaque ipse se transfodit et sanguine suo fores uxoris respersit.

The arrival with head covered, the actual occurrence of the suicide at the wife’s door, and the explicit mention of the doors being sprinkled with his blood could be intended to evoke a picture of an *exclusus amator*.\textsuperscript{115}

**Lucretius and Catullus**

It is fair to say that Lucretius marks the beginning of the great flowering of the paraklausithuron that took

\textsuperscript{115} For the lover covering his head, cf. Ov. *Ars* 1.733-4, Hor. S. 2.7.55, and Philostr. *Im.* 1.2. For an important non-amatory komos in Liv. see 40.7.1 ff. “conuiuium eo die sodalium, qui simul decurrerant, uterque habuit, cum uocatus ad cenam ab 2 Demetrio Perseus negasset... 4 ad has excipiendas uoces speculator ex conuuiis Persei missus cum incautior obuersaretur, exceptus a iuuenibus 5 forte triclinio egressis male mulcatur. huius rei ignarus Demetrius ‘quin comisatum’ inquit ‘ad fratrem imus et iram eius, si qua ex certamine resi des, simplicitate et hilaritate nostra lenimus?’ 6 omnes ire se conclamarunt praeter eos, qui speculatoris ab se pulsati praesentem ultionem metuebant. cum eos quoque Demetrius trahe ret, ferrum ueste abdiderunt, quo se tutari, si qua uis fieret, possent. 7 nihil occulti esse in intestina discordia potest. utraque domus speculatorum et proditorum plena erat. praecucurrit index ad Persea, ferro succinctos nuntians cum Demetrio quattuor adolescentes uenire. 8 et si causa apparebat — nam ab iis pulsatum conuiuam suum audierat, infamandae rei causa ianuam obserari iubet, et ex parte superiore aedium uersisque in uiam fenestris comisatores, tamquam ad caedem 9 suam uenientes, adiu ianuae arcet. Demetrius per uinum, quod excluderetur, paulisper uociferatus in conuiuium redit, totius rei ignarus.” The aftermath of the komos is described at 40.9.7-13.8. Moreover, 3.13.1-2 tells of riotous youths revelling through the Subura in 461 B.C.: “M. Voliscius Fictor ... testis extititerat se, haud multo post quam pestilentia in urbe fuerat, in iuuentutem grassantem in Subura incidisse. ibi rixam natam esse fratremque suum maiorem natu, necdum ex morbo satis ualidum, pugno ictum ab Caesone cecidisse.”
place in the late first century B.C. In book four of *de Rerum Natura*, in the context of a broad attack on romantic love, Lucretius mentions the paraklausithuric situation (4.1171 ff.):

sed tamen esto iam quantous oris honore, 
cui Veneris membris uis omnibus exoriatur: 
nempe aliae quoque sunt; nempe hac sine uiximus ante; 
nempe eadem facit, et scimus facere omnia turpi, 
et miseram taetris se suffit odoribus ipsa 1175 
quam famulae longe fugitant furtimque cachinnant. 
at lacrimans exclusus amator limina saepe 
floribus et sertis operit postisque superbos 
unguit amaracino et foribus miser oscula figit; 
quem si iam admissum uenientem offenderit aura 1180 
una modo, causas abeundi quaerat honestas, 
et meditata diu cadat alte sumpta querella 
stultitiaque ibi se damnet, tribuisse quod illi 
plus uideat quam mortali concedere par est.

Here (1177 ff.) is a concise summary of a developed paraklausithuric situation, albeit greatly exaggerated: the lover is tearful, he often covers the threshold with flowers and garlands, anoints the doorposts with marjoram unguent or

---

\[116\] The text of Lucretius will follow Bailey 1922. With Lucretius and the Latin poets of the first century B.C. we come to the most studied and documented paraklausithuric references. As was stated in the introduction, it is beyond the scope of this dissertation to examine in detail every single one of the paraklausithuric passages that will be mentioned from now through to the end of the dissertation. The significant work that has already been produced on many of these passages render concentrated re-analysis unnecessary. Major interpretative points will, of course, be mentioned, but the focus will be almost exclusively on what topoi occur and notable ways in which they are varied or manipulated.
perfume, and kisses the doors.\textsuperscript{117} It has often been noted that Lucretius seems to present this scene as if it were an episode from real life.\textsuperscript{118} The description of the "amator"

\textsuperscript{117}Limina is probably a poetic plural, despite Meister 1925, 231, who thinks that the plural, at least in the Augustan poets, usually has wider implications: "ist 'limina' meistens anderes als das prosaische 'limen': Es bezeichnet den Türrahmen, die Tür, den Eingang, oder auch das genannte Gebäude (fast stets Palast oder Tempel). Ich vermuthet, daß ursprünglich 'limina' im pluralischen Sinn als Ober- und Unter-schwellen verstanden worden ist, als 'limen superum' und 'limen inferum'." However, in note 4 (\textit{ibid.}) he allows that it may sometimes mean simply the threshold, citing, among others, Catul. 63.65 ("mihi ianuae frequentes, mihi limina tepida") and Hor. \textit{Epod.} 11.21 ("ad non amicos heu mihi postis et heu limina dura quibus lumbos et infregi latus"). Cf. the frequency of the plural use of \textit{προθύρα} in Appendix 2.

\textsuperscript{118}More will be said in Chapter 4 on the reality of the paraklausithuron. The main statement to this effect comes from Copley 1956, 45 f.: "This much is certain, that Lucretius did not think of the paraclausthyron as nothing but a literary fiction. A vigorous opponent of all kinds of folly, he most certainly would never have made himself ridiculous by attacking with all the scorn of which he was capable something that was only a foolish fancy of the poets and had no counterpart in real life." Otis 1958, 197 disagrees slightly: "More important is his [Copley's] categorical certainty ... that Lucretius is describing actual scenes from real life.... Here it seems to me that Copley gravely underrates the very wide gap between the conventions of literature (low or high) and the actuality of human existence.... And can a critic (even if he be a philosopher) not satirize such literature without 'making himself ridiculous'?... In fact, this whole section of Lucretius' fourth book seems to me to be clearly dealing with a literary or popular convention about love, and not with what love really is...." Yardley 1978, 24 f. agrees with Copley, as does Lyne 1980, 307 n. 14: "Lucretius was powered by a desire to reform \textit{life}. It is not in his interest to tilt at windmills, at mere literary \textit{topoi}. His description may be in some measure a caricature, but it would need to have basic plausibility for the satire to be effective." Lucretius would hardly mock a purely literary \textit{topos} with no resonance in reality. McKeown 1979, 82 n. 27, also suggests that the model for Lucretius' episode might have been literary, especially mime, but notes that this does not disprove that such
as "exclusus" neatly summarises the basic situation.\(^{119}\) The lover's tears are conventional, as is the leaving of the garland, usually hung up, at the beloved's door. The "floribus" are probably either taken from garlands, are garlands themselves, or are in hendiadys with "sertis."\(^{120}\) The door-

actions occurred in reality: "Lucretius' source could have been the contemporary theatre for, if komastic mimes were staged in Rome, the komast could have been familiar to Lucretius and his audience equally well from stage performances as from real life. Lucretius often illustrates his arguments with exempla taken from the theatre; notice especially lines 978-83 of this same book. The imagery at line 1186, uitae post scaen ia, perhaps strengthens the possibility that he is thinking here of the theatre.... Certainly, although I consider the importance of this passage as evidence for the existence of komoi in real life in Rome to have been exaggerated, I should not wish to argue that a debt to mime ... excludes or even significantly diminishes the possibility that Lucretius is also reflecting reality." As Dr. Richard Burgess has observed, life does tend to imitate art, and if there had been no reality behind the paraklausithuron originally, there very likely would have been by the first century B.C.

\(^{119}\) It occurs elsewhere only at Hor. S. 2.3.259-60 "amator / exclusus qui distat" and [Quint.] Decl. 15.7 "nec exclusus ante lupanarium fores posterum diem perugil amat or expecto." Cf. Frag. Gren. 27, ἀποκεκλειμένη.

\(^{120}\) They could be a new element—only Polyphemus in Theoc. 11.56 f. has previously offered his beloved actual flowers rather than garlands. This could be an exaggeration by Lucretius—the lover would naturally be wearing a garland from the symposium, but flowers are something he would have to go out of his way to get. Garlands often contain flowers and are often described as flowery—cf. Catul. 63.66 "floridis corcillis" (cited below); Tib. 1.2.14 "cum posti florida serta darem"; and Apul. Apol. 9 [402-5] "florea serta." Cf. also Ov. Ars 2.528 "capiti demptas in foree pone rosas," and 3.72 "sparsae nec inuenias limina mane rosa," where the rosa are probably either standing for garlands or are flowers plucked from garlands. A similar expression occurs at Curt. 9.10.26: "uriae redimita floribus coronisque." There was apparently some disagreement as to whether flowers should be used in sympotic garlands—see Plu. Mor. 645 D (Q. Conv. 3.1), ἐν χρηστέον ἀνθίνοις στεφάνοις παρὰ πότον.
posts are semi-personified by "superbos," something which has been seen before in Greek paraklausithura.\textsuperscript{121} For the anointing and kissing of the door see Chapter 4. Both of these actions have been seen, probably correctly, as having religious implications, as well as being simply indicative of the lover’s sentimentality.\textsuperscript{122} If they are deliberately religious, then they provide the first identifiable example since Plautus of religious actions directed at the door. The unguent and garlands also indicate that the lover has prob-

\textsuperscript{121} Call. \textit{AP} 5.23 (G.-P. LXIII) ψυχρος ... προθυρος, and Anon. \textit{AP} 12.90.5 (G.-P. I) ἐχθρας ... θύρας. This is the first occurrence of \textit{superb}- in a Latin paraklausithuric context.

\textsuperscript{122} More will be said on this below under the discussion of the religious implications of the paraklausithuron. On the anointing, compare Otis 1958, 197: "This seems to me nothing but another expression of the lover’s extravagance (he also kisses the door and covers it with garlands)." See also Yardley 1978, 26; Fedeli 1980, 396 on Prop. 1.16.42 f.; and Luck 1959, 338. Copley 1956, 45 thinks the unguent might have served another purpose: "If on the other hand, the unguent were smeared not on the \textit{postis} but on the \textit{cardines}, the reason for so doing is at once apparent: to keep the hinges from creaking if ... the door should be opened ... then his version of the paraclausithyron includes the element of \textit{furtius amor}..." However, Lucretius was quite capable of saying hinges if he had meant hinges, and there seems to be no reason to adopt Copley’s suggestion——cf. Otis 1958, 197. Copley 1956, 46 f. uses his discovery of \textit{furtius amor} in the passage to help argue that Lucretius was thinking of a specifically Roman model because he asserts, incorrectly (see Chapter 4), that \textit{furtius amor} plays no part in Greek paraklausithura. Even if that were the case, there is no reason to presume that because surviving Greek models lack a topos, that topos was never present in any Greek model.
ably come from a symposium or such (cf. Lucr. 4.1131 ff.):

eximia ueste et uictu conuiuiia, ludi,
pocula crebra, unguenta coronae serta parantur,
nequiquam, quoniam medio de fonte leporum
surgit amari aliquid quod in ipsis floribus angat.

We also find the listing of door parts (*limina, postis, foribus, 1177-9*) that was particularly common in Plautus and will be seen again in Latin elegy. It is interesting to note that here admission seems a distinct possibility ("quem si iam ammissum," 1180).

Catullus, surprisingly, seems not to have written a developed paraklausithurum.\(^{123}\) Poem 32 makes a brief mention of exclusion:

---

\(^{123}\) Catul. 67 will be discussed below. Quotations from Catullus will follow Mynors 1956. It should be noted that Shipton 1985, 506 ff. sees a disguised komos in 68.51 ff. The komastic topoi he finds to support his argument seem to be widely separated and too disguised for the proposal to be probable. And even if there is a disguised komos, it is certainly not paraklausithuric. The possibility should be mentioned that the seemingly incomplete poem 60 might have come from a paraklausithuric situation: "Num te leaena montibus Libyntinis / aut Scylla latrans infima inguinum parte / tam mente dura procreauit ac taetra, / ut supplicis uocem in nouissimo casu / 5 contemptam haberes, ah nimis fero corde?" Such elaborate criticism of a person's hardness and pitilessness would certainly fit, as would the "supplicis uocem" (see Appendix 2). There are, of course, many other possible situations to which it could belong. One is entitled to wonder why, when Horace and the elegiac poets make more use of the paraklausithuric situation, Catullus did not. It is perhaps a facile and easy escape, but the main reason would seem to be Catullus' character. While traces of *seruitium amoris* can be found in Catullus (he calls Lesbia *domina* at 68.68 and 156 and *era* in 68.136), he never develops the topos—see Lyne 1979, 120 f., 296 n. 23, and Murgatroyd 1980, 161. As intense as Catullus' feelings for Lesbia seem to have been, he seems too urbane and suave to put himself in such a degrading position for her, let alone for any other passing fancy. Perhaps he was also simply too successful a lover. Of course, this does not rule out the use of
Amabo, mea dulcis Ipsitilla, meae deliciae, mei lepores, iube ad te ueniam meridiatum, et si iusseris, illud adiuuato, ne quis liminis obseret tabellam, neu tibi lubeat foras abire, sed domi manetas paresque nobis nouem continuas fututiones.

Lines 4-5 mention the relatively uncommon situation of the lover, who has been summoned by his beloved, actually being denied entry when he arrives.\textsuperscript{124} The phrase "liminis ... tabellam" is unparalleled, but otherwise the scene is undistinguished.\textsuperscript{125}

Of more interest is 63.62 ff., where Attis laments his emasculated state:

\begin{quote}
quod enim genus figuraest, ego non quod obierim?
egro, ego puber, ego adulescens, ego ephebus, ego puer,
\end{quote}

the topos in invective against someone else, and its absence in such invective is also puzzling.

\textsuperscript{124}See Asclep. AP 5.164 (G.-P. XIII), Ovid Rem. 505 ff., and Nemes. Ec\(i\). 4.9.

\textsuperscript{125}OLD 1 s.v. "tabella" says "i.e. door-panel," but that seems to fit badly with "liminis": "the door-panel of your threshold" seems very strange. Perhaps Ipsitilla has a wooden threshold--see Nisbet-Hubbard 1970, 294: "the ancient threshold was not simply an imaginary line but a block of wood." Copley 1956, 51 f. somehow believes that this is "most certainly one of Catullus' many experiments with the vulgar street song." It is in connection with this poem that Copley 1956, 52 first prefers the term "lupanar song" of paraklausithura that deal with "the relationship of the prostitute and her patrons." Such a distinction and label seem completely unnecessary, especially since, as has been seen above, the paraklausithuron is as often, if not more so, concerned with prostitutes and their customers as "lover and lady,... wife and adulterer" (\textit{ibid.} 51 f.). Most of the topoi remain the same, whoever the addressee of the song is. Otis 1958, 195 receives the idea more favourably.
ego gymnasi fui flos, ego eram decus olei:
mihi ianuae frequentes, mihi limina tepida,
mihi floridis corollis redimita domus erat,
linquendum ubi esset orto mihi Sole cubiculum.
egno nunc deum ministra et Cybeles famula ferar?

As a handsome and athletic youth he attracted the attentions
of many admirers, who came to his doors.\textsuperscript{126} The threshold,
which would be cold from the night air, is "tepida," that
is, it has been slightly warmed by people lying or sitting
on it.\textsuperscript{127} And, in an exaggerated description, his house
rather than the door alone has been encircled with gar-
lands.\textsuperscript{128} This is also one of the few mentions in Latin of
homosexual paraklausithuric situations, but, of course, the
context of the poem is purely Greek.\textsuperscript{129}

\textsuperscript{126}Quinn 1976, 294 believes \textit{iанuae} is plural
"because Attis is recalling a way of life—all those occa-
sions on which there were crowds waiting at the door—but
also no doubt to balance \textit{limina}." This avoids explaining
"limina," however.

\textsuperscript{127}Quinn 1976, 294 is exactly correct on this. Cf.
Prop. 1.16.22, "tepido limine," where Fedeli 1980, 385 f.,
and Butler and Barber 1964, 178 take "tepido" as meaning
"chill" or such. Rothstein 1966, 101 thinks it is warm from
the lover's body. On "limina," see above on Lucr. 4.1177.

\textsuperscript{128}This is reminiscent of Theoc. 2.153 καὶ φῶτο οἶ
στεφάνωσι τὰ ὀψίν σοι πυκνέσσειν. \textit{Corolla} is unusual in
paraklausithura, occurring elsewhere only at Prop. 1.16.7.
But then the word itself is not common, see the \textit{OLD} s.v.

\textsuperscript{129}Henderson 1973, 53 n. 12 is wrong to say: "Only
Catullus c. 63, 65-67 offers a surviving example in Latin
literature of a homosexual situation in a paraklausithyron;
several Greek examples have survived." Consider the Cic.
\textit{Phil.} 2.45 above. Cf. Copley 1956, 158 f., n. 27: "There is
an additional reference ... in Catullus (63.65-67) which
suggests that a 'pure Greek' version of the theme may also
have been current:... it is the sole instance in Roman para-
clausithyra of a reference to boy-love, a theme common in
the Greek versions."
Finally, a brief mention should be made of poem 67, which has attracted much attention in discussion of the paraklausithuron, and has even been called paraklausithuric by some.\footnote{For suggestions that the poem is paraklausithuric, see de la Ville de Mirmont 1909, 578: "Catulle profite des ombres de la nuit pour venir vers la maison d'une femme qui a, dit-on, mal tourné.... Le poète s'adresse en termes pleins d'une politesse ironique à la porte dont il sollicite quelques renseignements précis"; Luck 1969, 58 "a blend of the \textit{paraclausithyon} (the 'serenade of the shut-out lover') and a satire"; Leroy 1969, 223; Murgatroyd 1980, 73; and Davis 1981, 2475 n. 45. Canter 1919, 362 does not appear to think it is paraklausithuric, but seems to agree with de la Ville de Mirmont in its setting: "Taking advantage of night's shadows Catullus comes to the house of this young matron whose conduct, rumor says, has forfeited the house's hitherto good name." For specific statements that 67 is not paraklausithuric, see Garte 1924, 68 and Copley 1956, 49: "The poem itself is not a \textit{paraclausithyon}; at the most, if the interlocutor himself is a disappointed suitor of the unfaithful wife--a supposition for which the poem offers no proof or even suggestion, but which ... remains a bare possibility--it might be considered an attack on the door motivated by the suitor's exclusion." However, Copley 1956, 47, only two pages before the previous quotation, seems to imply that he considers it partly paraklausithuric: "Turning now to Catullus, we find evidence of a different but parallel development of the \textit{paraclausithyon} on a lower level, that of the lampoon, or \textit{diffamatio}."}
poem. No one of the authors cited above who believe that the poem is paraklausithuric explicitly states his reasons for doing so, and therefore it is hard to argue the point. Probably, the religious/hymnic address to the door brings to mind Plautus' *Curculio* and the use of similar language in later paraklausithura. But a door-address, even a hymnic one, on its own is not enough to indicate a paraklausithurion.\(^{131}\) A person standing around in front of a door might seem to imply that the interlocutor is an excluded lover, but he could also be a mere passer-by who knows the door's household, a visitor, or a client. The fact that a conversation with a door is actually depicted casts a certain unreality about the poem and perhaps removes it from strict logic, so that the speaker does not need a specific reason to be there. Of course, if he were a lover waiting for admission, the poem would be more pointed: the woman's disreputable behaviour continues. However, if he were truly an excluded lover, then, while the vigil itself would be insulting to the woman, the woman herself, at least in this

\(^{131}\) See below in Chapter 4 on the address to the door and related issues. Wiseman 1969, 22 finds the address reminiscent of the epithalamium: "Catullus' address to the house-door itself is in terms more appropriate to a bride. The first two lines could have come straight from a marriage-poem.... The joke lies in the unexpected *ianua* at the beginning of the third line, but the marriage idea is carried on four lines later, 'postquam es porrecto facta marita sene.'" And see his note 5. See Yardley 1978, 24-5 for details of the *Gebetsparodie* in the opening lines.
instance, would not be tainted by the lover's admission.

Even if it is not paraklausithuric, Catullus 67 still has some relevance to the paraklausithuron. In its religious/hymnic address to the door it serves as a link between Plautus and Latin elegy, where similar religious language and ritual actions occur in paraklausithuric contexts. As has often been noted, the poem continues the developed personification of the door that was seen in Plautus' Curculio, with a major leap forward in that the door actually talks. There can be little doubt that Prop. 1.16 was influenced by this. The door is given a distinct personality, somewhat similar to that of the door in Prop. 1.16--it tries to defend itself (9 ff.) against blame for the actions of the mistress of the house and reports her bad behaviour. However, the detail with which it recounts the problems of the household make the door seem more like, in Quinn's 1976, 369) words, "a garrulous, gossip-loving slave" than a earnest custos. Nonetheless, the idea that a door could be to blame for failing to guard its mistress must

132 See Copley 1956, 117; Solmsen 1962, 82 and refs.; Burck 1966, 253; and Fedeli 1980, ad loc. Yardley 1978, 25 f. suggests the possible influence but also notes that a "more likely hypothesis ... is that both are working within a Roman tradition, for such 'deification' of the door is present also in Lucretius and earlier in Plautus (but is absent from any Greek komastic poem)." Even if both poets were working within such a tradition, it still seems likely that Catullus' poem showed Propertius the potential of the talking door as a device around which to build a poem and was at least the immediate spark for Prop. 1.16.
surely be directly related—not necessarily as a model, however—to the personification and attention given to the door in Latin elegy, where it, as much as any person, is viewed as the obstacle to the excluded lover.

**Horace**

Horace touches upon the paraklausithurron more frequently than Catullus does. It can be found from his earliest work in the *Epodes* through the third book of the *Carmina*. The frequency with which he handles it indicates well the continued hold of the excluded lover on the imagination of writers dealing in any way with love. Horace uses most major topoi seen both in earlier paraklausithuric situations and the works of the contemporary Latin elegists.

In *Epode* 11 Horace addresses a friend, Pettius, and tells him of his latest experience of love.\(^{133}\) He remembers an affair which ended three years earlier (5 ff.):

\[\text{hic tertius December, ex quo destiti}
\]
\[\text{Inachia furere, siluis honorem decutit.}
\]
\[\text{heu me, per Vrbem nam pudet tanti mali—}
\]
\[\text{fabula quanta fui! conuiuiorum et paenitet,}
\]
\[\text{in quis amantem languor et silentium}
\]
\[\text{arguit et latere petitus imo spiritus.}
\]
\[\text{"contrane lucrum nil valere candidum}
\]
\[\text{pauperis ingenium?" querebar applorans tibi,}
\]
\[\text{simul calentis inuerecundus deus}
\]

\(^{133}\)See Copley 1942, 103; Copley 1956, 52 ff.; Lyne 1979, 122 (who thinks that the poem was written in the late 30s); and Mankin 1995, 196 ff. Otis 1958, 200 observes that "We can actually see in Horace's *Epode* 11 a fusion of personal and conventional amatory themes." All Horace will be quoted from Wickham-Garrod 1912. The text of the longer excerpts from the *Carmina* will not be provided.
feruidiore mero arcana promorat loco.
'quodsi meis inaestuet praecordiis
libera bilis, ut haec ingrata uentis diuidat
fomenta uuinus nil malum leuantia,
desinet imparibus certare summotus pudor.'
ubi haec seuerus te palam laudaueram,
iussus abire domum ferebar incerto pede
ad non amicos heu mihi postis et heu
limina dura, quibus lumbos et infregi latus.
nunc gloriants quamlibet mulierculam
uncere mollitie amor Lycisci me tenet.

He once loved a woman, Inachia. The affair was well-known around town. At parties, his tongue loosened by wine, he would complain to Pettius about his amatory difficulties: he had a rich rival for Inachia's favours. He would renounce his love, and be hidden by Pettius to "abire domum," presumably instead of going to visit Inachia after the symposium. However, he nonetheless would totter off to Inachia's door and end up lying down there. Here Horace presents several major paraklausithuric topoi—the lover leaves a symposium or conuiuivium, drunk, and heads for his beloved's door. The renuntiatio amoris precedes rather than concludes the lover's vigil. He is not admitted because he has a rich rival for her favours (11-12), who is presumably inside with the beloved. There is some listing of door parts, with

134 Gow 1965, 2:255 on Theoc. 14.41-2 cites line 20 and seems to imply that the "incerto" refers more to passion or frenzy than drunkenness. Copley 1956, 52 and Mankin 1995, 203 think it indicates drunkenness.

135 For the rich rival, cf. Ar. Pl. 1038 ff. and Pl. Truc. 718 ff. Of course the rich rival of the lover is common throughout comedy. Mankin 1995, 202 comments: "If it ["certare"] has its usual meaning of 'compete with' (= aemulor), then the impares would seem to be H.'s 'rivals' ... , who are his 'inferiors' in ingenium, if not in
both "postis" and "limina" mentioned. The doorposts are semi-personified by the "non amicos," much as they were in Lucretius 4.1178 ("postisque superbos"). The "dura" modifying "limina" could mean simply "hard," which thresholds were, but might also have connotations of stubbornness or pitilessness as the adjective often has in elegy. "Lumbos et infregi latus" (22) seems to be a double-entendre, implying both that Horace lay down at the threshold which, being hard, hurt his loins and sides, and that while lying there he resorted to masturbation to assuage his lust. Furthermore, several other topoi commonly associated with the para-klausithuron are mentioned, although they are not part of lucrum...."

136 Note again the plural "limina" and see above on Lucr. 1177. Howell 1968, 134 in his excellent article on "postis" thinks that the sense "leaves" is preferable here.

137 This is the first occurrence of "durus" in a Latin para-klausithuric context (outside of elegy)--see Appendix 2. See Fedeli 1980, 383 on Prop. 1.16.18 "Durus è un termine tecnico, usato in riferimento alla porta." Mankin 1995, 203, argues that "the epithets are 'transferred' from Inachia."

138 See Lyne 1979, 121 f. "I would stress that there is a lot of humour to it; it seems in fact something of a parody of the attitudes and actions of Augustan Elegy. That is clear in Horace's treatment of the 'exclusus amator' (20 ff.), a crudely funny version in which the excluded lover exhausts himself in masturbation in the doorway instead of romantically singing a serenade." Mankin 1995, 203, agrees (and does not cite Lyne): "H. may be describing an obscene act (... cf. Ar. EccI. 707-9), a 'logical extreme' of the kisses placed on the door by the lover in Lucretius ... and elsewhere."
the actual paraklausithuric scene: "languor" (9) is very similar to the lover's thinness and paleness in that all are physical symptoms of the wasting power of love; 12-13 refer to the shamelessness of the lover, who is usually drunk; lines 16-17 mention his "fomenta," instead of the lover's words, being cast to the winds; 139 and, finally, lines 16 and 25-6 refer to *seruitium amoris* (Lyne 1979, 121 f.).

In S. 1.2, Horace makes brief mention of a real, or at least rumoured, adulterous excluded lover (64 ff.):

Villius in Fausta Sullae gener, hoc miser uno nomine deceptus, poenas dedit usque superque quam satis est, pugnis caesus ferroque petitus, exclusus fore, cum Longarenus foret intus.

There is no development of the situation. The background to the incident, however, is most interesting. 140 The adulterous Villius, whose affair with Sulla's daughter Fausta was so regular that he is mockingly called "gener," is attacked, assaulted with a sword, and excluded while a rival is inside. The joke seems to be in "Longarenus." One expects that the "pugnis caesus ferroque petitus / exclusus fore" refers to an attack by Milo, Fausta's husband, who catches and punishes, but not too severely, the adulterous Villius. But it


turns out that Villius has been fighting with another of Fausta’s lovers.\textsuperscript{141} So even among the \textit{de facto} nobility in Rome a married woman could have several lovers fighting over her. Finally, "exclusus" implies that Villius at least sought admission.

S. 1.4.45 ff. briefly refers to the situation of the day-time komast:

\begin{quote}

idcirco quidam comoedia necne poema
esse quaesiuere, quod acer spiritus ac uis
nec uerbis nec rebus inste, nisi quod pede certo
differt sermoni, sermo merus. "at pater ardens
saeuit, quod meretrice nepos insanus amica
filius uxorem grandi cum dote recuset,
ebrius et, magnum quod dedecus, ambulet ante
nctem cum facibus."
\end{quote}

The scene is clearly based on an unknown comedy. Since the komos regularly ended up at some beloved’s doors and there is mention of a "meretrice ... amica" (49), the passage should be noted.\textsuperscript{142} The komast has been drinking during the

\textsuperscript{141}Copley 1956, 60 views it slightly differently: "Villius is one of the lovers of Fausta, wife of Milo, and has been caught waiting for admission at her locked door and beaten for his pains.... he also suffers the humiliation of learning that while he was playing the \textit{exclusus amator} another lover, Longarenus, was engaged with the lady indoors." Porphyrio \textit{ad loc.} is somewhat confused (see Rudd 1982, 132): "'Villius' pro Annio dixit. Annius autem Milo
maritus fuit Faustae Cornellii Syllae filiae, qui a familia
Longarenia adulteri uxoris suae rediens a cena ante ades
suas, ne adulterum reprehenderet, pugnis caesus est et ferro
perterritus; quem ait nulla alia re in hanc iniuriam ac con-
tumeliam recidisse, quam quod magnae nobilitatis uxorem
habere affectauerit."

\textsuperscript{142}Copley 1956, 54 is more certain that this refers to a paraklausithuron.
day, and even though it is not yet dark he carries torches
with him. He is also mad with love.\textsuperscript{143}

\textit{S. 2.3.258 ff.} quotes Terence’s \textit{Eunuchus} (46 ff.):

\begin{verbatim}
porrigis irato puero cum poma, recusat;
"sume, catelle": negat; si non des, optet. amator
exclusus qui distat, agit ubi secum, eat an non, 260
quo rediturus erat non accessitus, et haeret
inuisis foribus? "nec nunc, cum me uocet ultro,
accedam? an potius mediter finire dolores?
exclusit; reuocat: redeam? non, si obsecret." ecce
serruos, non paulo sapientior "o ere, quae res 265
nec modum habet neque consilium, ratione modoque
tractari non uult. in amore haec sunt mala, bellum,
pax rursum: haec siquis tempestatis prope ritu
mobilia et caeca fluitantia sorte laboret
reddere certa sibi, nihilio plus explicit ac si
insanire paret certa ratione modoque."
\end{verbatim}

Little needs to be said about the passage. However, Horace’s
use of "amator / exclusus" (259-60) is noteworthy and per-
haps indicates that he drew at least some generic connection
(beyond the "exclusit" from \textit{Eu}. 49) between Phaedria’s situ-
at\underline{a}tion in the \textit{Eunuchus} and the actions of the lover in Lucre-

\textsuperscript{143}\textit{S. 2.3.250 ff.} mentions Polemon, a famous day-
time komast: "si puerilius his ratio esse euincet amare, /
nec quicquam differre utrumne in puluere, trimus / quale
prius, ludas opus an meretricis amore / sollicitus piores;
quaeque faciasne quod olim / mutatus Polemon? ponas insignia
morbi, / 255 fasciolas, cubital, focialia, potus ut ille /
dicitur ex collo furtim carpsisse coronas, / postquam est
impransi correptus uoce magistri?" Note how the gariands
are the symbol of his frivolity. Cf. Porphyr. \textit{ad loc.} who adds
the plausible detail that Polemon was also perfumed:
"Polemon fuit Atheniensis iuuenis luxuriosus et perditus.
Qui cum comisabundus incederet per urbem, audisse fertur e
proximo Xenocratis uocem disputantis. Deinde introisse ad
deridendum, ut erat coronatus unguentatus<que>. Quo uiso
senex perseueravit, et inuectus in luxuria\textit{m} coegit
Polemonem paenitere sui et coronas abicerem sumptoque
philosophi habitu tantus uir postea fuit, ut dignus
existimatus sit, qui <Xeno>crati succederet."
tius. Of course it also indicates the continued familiarity in the late Republic with earlier Roman comedy.

S. 2.7.89 ff. provides another seemingly comic picture of the excluded lover (cf. Pers. 5.161 ff.):

... quinque talenta poscit te mulier, uexat foribusque repulsus perfundit gelida, rursus uocat: eripe turpi colla iugo: "liber, liber sum" dic age. non quis; urget enim dominus mentem non lenis et acris subiectat lasso stimulos uersatque negantem.

The outright demand for a fixed sum of money seems to imply that the woman is a prostitute of some kind, clearly an expensive one, rather than a simply mercenary mistress. The way the fickleness of the meretrix is described is reminiscent of Terence's Eu. 46 ff. The water is clearly a comic element (Ar. Lys. 334 ff.; Pl. Am. 1001, 1034, fr. V; and Lucil. fr. 945). Finally, the whole incident is clearly an example of servitium amoris.\textsuperscript{144}

\textsuperscript{144} S. 2.7 also contains an excellent depiction of an adulterous adventure (53 ff.): "tu cum proiectis insignibus, anulo equestri / Romanoque habitu, prodis ex iudice Dama / 55 turpis odoratum caput obscurante lacerna, / non es quod simulas? metuens inducetis atque / altercante libidinibus tremis ossa pauore. / quid refert, uri uirgis, ferroque necari / auctoratus eas, an turpi clausus in arca, / 60 quo te demisit peccati conscia erilis, / contractum genibus tangas caput? est nee marito / matronae peccantis in ambo iusta potestas? / in corruptorem uel iustior? illa tamen se / non habitu mutat loco pecatue superne. / 65 cum te formidet mulier neque credat amanti, / ibis sub furcam prudens dominoque furenti / committes rem omnem et uitam et cum corpore famam." Note the lover's disguise, his hooded cloak (55), the perfume (presumably on his hair), the dangers of being caught, the maid's complicity, the hiding of the lover, etc. The spirit of comedy, or at least mine, seems to be strongly present—see McKeown 1979, 74 f. and Reynolds 1946, 78 f. This is what faces the adulterous exclusus amator when he is admitted. Cf. also the misfor-
The *Carmina* provide a number of important paraklau-
sithuric passages. *Carm.* 1.25, 3.7, 3.9, 3.10, 3.14, 3.15,
3.16, and 3.26 all refer to paraklauisithuric situations of
differing complexity and with a rich variation of topoi.

*Carm.* 1.25 ("Parcius iunctas") portrays a partly
fulfilled threat-prophecy. Horace addresses Lydia, a pro-
stitute who presumably some time in the past scorned him
while he was an excluded lover at her door. Now she is
less frequently kept awake by wanton youths throwing pebbles
at her shutters to get her attention (1-3). Instead of
excluded lovers clinging to her threshold, her door, which
formerly moved easily on its hinges, does so (3-4). This
brings up by negation the typical mention of the door's
noise as it opens, as well as implicit personification of

1 tunes of the lover in S. 1.2.37 ff.

145 For more on the poem see: Garte 1924, 68 f.;
Copley 1956, 58 ff.; Shorey 1960, 212 f.; Burck 1966, 254;
Nisbet-Hubbard 1970, 289 ff.; Cairns 1972, 85 ff.; and
Henderson 1973. Many of the following points have been made
by them.

146 Henderson 1973, 55 thinks she is a *meretrix*, and
Nisbet-Hubbard 1970 on lines 9 and 10 imply as much. Quinn
1984, 169 f. thinks she is married, and takes "moechos" in 9
as actual adulterers. See Porphyr. ad loc.: "ode in mere-
tricem rapacem, sed iam uetulam, et merito ab amatoribus
passuram, quae fecerat, scripta est; sensus autem: Iuuenes,
qui olim frequentius fenestras tuas lapidibus incessebant,
ut excitata somno ianuas aperire, iam te neglegere incipi-
unt, et idcirco haec rarius faciunt."

147 This is reading the standard "iactibus" in line
2. She clearly lives in the upper-storey—see Nisbet-Hubbard
the *meretrix's* compliant door.\textsuperscript{148} Less and less does she hear lovers complaining that, or wondering if, she is sleeping while they are dying from love, night after night, all night long (7-8).\textsuperscript{149} But the threat-prophecy does not end there—Horace predicts things will continue to get worse for Lydia. She will become an alley-lurking *scortum* (9-10), weeping over the arrogance of lovers, just as lovers once lurked around her house, weeping over her arrogance. She will suffer from the cold north-wind on moonless nights (11-12), warmed only by the fires of her lust dancing around her wounded heart (13-15).\textsuperscript{150} Furthermore, she will be under the irresistible compulsion of her lust, as mares were supposed to be (14).\textsuperscript{151} She will grieve that youths prefer green ivy

\textsuperscript{148} In contrast to the typical "durus" or "dif-ficilis" applied to door or beloved—see Appendix 2. See also Nisbet-Hubbard 1970, *ad loc.* Henderson 1973, 55 f. wonders about this: "Can there be any question of an *exclusus amator* when so many lovers are admitted that the hinges have worn smooth?" The answer is clearly "yes," since as long as one lover is inside, any other potential clients must be excluded. She could also be high-priced, with enough richer customers to keep her busy but a fee high enough to keep many other potential lovers outside. Also, the "*somnus adimunt" might indicate the main reason—even prostitutes have to sleep. There are many possibilities.

\textsuperscript{149} For the problems of "longas ... noctes" see Nisbet-Hubbard 1970, 295. It is probably a reference to the topos of the night seeming particularly long to the excluded lover and implicitly an inversion of the shortness of the night in the eyes of the successful lover.

\textsuperscript{150} For the "interlunia" see Cairns 1975, 15-17.

\textsuperscript{151} See Nisbet-Hubbard 1970 *ad loc.* and Quinn 1984, 170.
and dark myrtle to the withered leaves they cast to the wind (17-20). These last lines are clearly referring to the standard topos of threat-prophecies and carpe diem warnings in which the beloved’s beauty is compared to the fading garland. Finally, the leaves being consigned to the wind are reminiscent of the topos of the lover’s words being carried away by the wind. It is especially worth noting how Horace incorporates all these paraklausithuric topoi in what is not actually a paraklausithuron—although it does contain a very brief complaint at the door in 7-8. The poet no longer loves, or is no longer interested in, Lydia and now plays the role of a mocking by-stander, albeit a not totally disinterested one.

_Carm._ 3.7 ("Quid fles, Asterie") very subtly incorporates the paraklausithuric situation on several

---

152Henderson 1973, 59 is puzzled by the general situation and lack of exclusion on Horace’s part. Cairns 1972, 88 thinks Horace still wants admission: "The frequent omissions of some of the primary elements in komoi suggest that this is what is happening in Horace _Odes_ 1.25. Horace intended his readers to gather from the emphasis on komastic situations that he is standing outside Lydia’s house and saying ‘You don’t have many customers coming to you as it is and you will have to go out and look for them when you grow even older,’ with the implication ‘therefore admit me now’... Since no other hypothesis gives Horace a reason for saying what he says to Lydia, it may be presumed that he is speaking on his own behalf and that the komastic emphasis within the threat-prophecy is meant to convey to the reader that the whole ode is a komos." This, could, however, be an example of the “gloating over fulfillment” genre that Cairns finds elsewhere, combined with a paraklausithuron.
levels. Horace addresses a certain Asterie, who is crying for her absent "iuuenem" (4) Gyges. He is abroad, being tempted by his hostess. Asterie also has another problem, for her neighbour Enipeus is wooing her (29 ff.):

\[
\text{prima nocte domum claude neque in uias sub cantu querulae despice tibiae, et te saepe uocanti duram difficilis mane.}
\]

This is the poem's obvious paraklausithuric reference. Since Enipeus comes to Asterie "prima nocte" he is probably not coming from a symposium/conuuium. But he serenades her with flute music, which indicates that he most likely has a music-girl along with him. Asterie has resisted his attentions, remaining "difficilis" (32), and so he, typically,

---

153 See Copley 1956, 64-8; Cairns 1972, 209 ff. (who calls this an "inverse komos"; Henderson 1973, 60-1; and Williams 1969, 68 ff. Williams 1968, 296 is half-hearted in his praise of the poem: "he addresses a girl, Asterie, whose lover, Gyges, has been caught by winter storms on the far side of the Adriatic.... yet, in spite of the names, Asterie is imagined as living in Rome, and Horace warns her not to pay too much heed to her neighbour: he is called Enipeus.... This is a pleasing poem, but it would be negligible were its range not so notably increased by the imaginary world in which its figures move, taking in both the Greek and Roman worlds."

154 Copley 1956, 66 at first thinks Asterie and Gyges are married but later (102) seems not so sure: "the true marital status of the 'husband' and 'wife' becomes obscure." Williams 1968, 296 does not: "he addresses a girl, Asterie, whose lover, Gyges...." Copley 1956, 102, who seems to regard almost any poem with a hint of adultery in it as a diffamatio, finds himself in a corner when talking about this poem: "With the combination of diffamatio and conventional paraclausithyron, as in Horace's two odes, 3.10 and 3.7, two important changes take place. The defamatory character of the diffamatio is gone...."
calls her "dura" (32). Horace advises her to maintain this stance and not make the mistake of looking out ("neque in uias / ... despice," 29-30) at her suitor. Enipeus is athletic (25 ff.) and presumably handsome. This is equivalent to the common topos of the lover's mention of his own appearance. Here Horace is again a bystander--concerned for Asterie and advising her to remain faithful to Gyges, but not, apparently, personally involved in the poem.

There is, however, still more. The explicit paraklausithuric reference at the end of the poem invites reinterpretation of what has gone before, at which point Gyges

155 Otis's 1958, 195 observation that "Odes 3.10 and 7 make the lady's custos her husband" is very puzzling.

156 "Despice" itself probably indicates that Asterie sleeps upstairs, as usual--see Nisbet-Hubbard 1970, 292. Cairns 1972, 209 agrees. This is the sole occurrence of the word in Horace. Of course, its other meaning of "despise" makes it doubly appropriate. Cf. Porphyry. ad loc.: "Belle, quasi Gyges uexpertino tempore ad fenestram Asteries tibi-cinem adhibere soleat, ut illa cupiditate audiendi per fenestram despiceret, atque ita cupidam uidendi sui ac sollicitam de se dare." Note the similarity of detail between this passage and Carm. 1.25, and also the "difficilis" here (32) and "facilis" at 1.25.5.

157 See also Cairns 1972, 210: "the connexion between athletics and good looks being commonplace in antiquity...."

158 Cairns 1972, 209 ff. sees Horace speaking as a substitute for Enipeus, which seems unlikely.
is found to be an *inclusus amator*. He is separated from Asterie, kept at Oricum by the winter winds. He spends sleepless nights, cold and crying. As has been seen many times, cold and windy weather are common paraklausithuric topoi, the lover is often sleepless when at his beloved’s door, and he also often cries. Furthermore, Asterie has a rival for Gyges. His hostess, Chloe, probably a married woman, sends him messengers, saying how she burns with love for him. She uses threatening mythological *exempia* to persuade him to yield to her entreaties. Chloe herself is "fallax" (20), more commonly a characteristic of the beloved. Gyges, however, like the typical paraklausithuric beloved or beloved’s door, is deafer than rock to her entreaties.

---

159 Cairns 1972, 201 ff., esp. 208 ff. cites this poem as an example of delayed identification. He seems to overstate his case here, however, for there is only one real paraklausithuric situation in the poem, and that is at the end. The earlier part of the poem uses paraklausithuric topoi, but it is not actually "komastic" and so no actual delayed identification can take place. It is not like Tib. 2.6, which is a paraklausithuronic, but does not start to be revealed as such until line 11. Cf. Cairns 1977, 332 n. 2.

160 For the sleepless lover, see Murgatroyd 1980, 251.

161 For the deafness of the beloved, the door, and other similar uses, see Phld. AP 5.107.5-6 (G.-P. V); Hor. Epod. 17.53-7 "*quid obseratis auribus fundis preces?* / non saxa nudis surdiora nauitis / Neptunus alto tundit hibernus salo."; Prop. 4.5.47 f. "*ianitor ad dantis uigile: si pulset inanis, / surdus in obductam somniet usque seram,*" 4.8.47-8 "*cantabant surdo, nudabant pectora caeco: / Lanuuii ad portas, ei mihi, solus eram,*" 4.11.6 "*nempe tuas lacrimas litora surda bibent*"; Ov. Am. 1.6.54 "*huc ades et surdas flameae tunde fores,*" 1.8.77 "*surda sit oranti tua ianua, laxa ferenti,*" Ep. 7.27, Rem. 597 "*Perfide Demophoon!*" surdas clamabat ad undas," Met. 13.804 "*surdior aequoribus*";
The interweaving of the topoi is clever: Asterie weeps for her absent lover much as the excluded lover himself does, while her lover is both an excluded lover (from Asterie) and the besieged beloved (by Chloe). But he is not a poor lover: he will return from his voyage rich (3-4). Finally, the whole poem is satisfying in its depiction of the mutual fidelity of Asterie and Gyges, which contrasts strongly with the one-sided love of the typical paraklausithuron.

Carm. 3.10 ("Extremum Tanain") is Horace's only developed true paraklausithuron and the first Roman one to survive since Plautus:182


On the entreaties, see Cairns 1972, 210: "The messenger tells Gyges that Chloe is in love with him and on fire for him, attempts his virtue in a thousand ways, and uses myths to persuade him to be unfaithful to Asterie and to yield to Chloe (13 ff.). This included komos omits much of the komastic situation and relies upon the proximity of the overall example to clarify its generic identity in the eyes of the reader."

Extremum Tanain si biberes, Lyce, saevo nupta uiro, me tamen asperas porrectum ante foris obicere incolis plorares Aquilonibus.

audis quo strepitu ianua, quo nemus inter pulchra satum tecta remugiat uentis et positas ut glaciet nives puro numine Iuppiter?

ingratam Veneri pone superbiam, ne currente retro funis eat rota. non te Penelopen difficilem procis Tyrrenenus genuit pares.

o quamuis neque te munera nec preces nec tinctus uiola pallor amantium nec uir Pieria paelice saucius curuat, supplicibus tuis

parcas, nec rigida mollior aesculo nec Mauris animum mitior anguibus: non hoc semper erit liminis aut aquae caelestis patiens latus.

The poem begins with an attack on the beloved’s cruelty, which incorporates the topos of the bad weather (here very cold and windy) that often besets the excluded lover. Horace (if he is the speaker) is stretched out (3) before Lyce’s doors, which are semi-personified by the adjective

163 Of course the name Lyce (“wolf”) itself implies cruelty. The fact that she is more merciless than a Scythian indicates that she is cruel indeed. Quinn 1984, 263 suggests that the Scythian reference might also be intended to bring to mind the Scythian’s “domestic virtue..., praised by H. in 3.24.17-24.” Shorey 1960, 354 notes that the Scythians punished adultery with death.
"asperas." Lyce, however, is married (2).\textsuperscript{164} Lines 5-8 develop the topos of the bad weather, while also making the first mention of the winds actually battering the door (which will re-occur at Ov. Am. 1.6.53 f.). This brings in the standard topos of the noise of the door—it is creaking, but not because it is being opened. The house is no mean one—the trees indicate the estate of a well-off man and Lyce’s respectable social status.\textsuperscript{165} Lines 7-8 ("... positas ut glaciet nives / puro numine Iuppiter?") emphasize the cold and also make Jupiter in effect a witness to Horace’s vigil. At line 9 Lyce is told to abandon her "superbia," which is equivalent to a request for admission. An implicit threat is present in the mention of "ingratam Veneri" (9)—Venus could cruelly punish a beloved’s "superbia" or ὑβρις (cf. [Theoc.] 23 and Ant. Lib. 39/Hermesian. 2)—and the image of line 10. Horace reinforces his message with an

\textsuperscript{164}Copley 1956, 63 f. therefore categorizes it as a diffamatio and so thinks the poem is somehow intended to defame someone. But because "the diffamatio moves in the world of gossip and slander ... and the truth or falsity of its accusations is a matter of little concern" then "the identity of Lyce and of her husband is quite immaterial; it does not matter whether she is a Roman matrona ... or a liberta married to one of her own social class."

\textsuperscript{165}Garte 1924, 70 the woman is "honestioris loci." Cf. Canter 1919, 362 and Williams 1969, 78. Griffin 1985, 124 thinks that she is not that respectable: "Lyce is no better than she should be, clearly, with her luxurious Etruscan background; this chaste Penelope act is transparent, and the poet deftly undermines the all too familiar motif of the exclusus amator who will stay at the beloved’s door all night. The irony of all that again colours her rejection of amorous offerings: she is a professional."
appropriate mythological comparison, but here it says what Lyce is not, instead of the more usual use of such comparisons to praise the beloved's beauty. "Difficilis" (11) is once again used of a woman resistant to lovers. Lyce's parentage is also mentioned (12). There are the standard mentions of gifts and prayers (13), as well as the lover's paleness and physical miseries (implicit in the fact that he is turning blue from the cold). "Amantium" in line 13 indicates that Horace is not her only admirer. Horace next tries to arouse Lyce's jealousy (15), but instead of mentioning a potential rival for his affections, he mentions a rival for her husband's, a rival her husband is deeply in love with ("saucius" 15). The husband seems to be abroad.

Horace is a supplicant lover (16), adding weight to the

\[166\text{It is not clear whether lines 10-11 are saying "Your parents were not Etruscan nor did they beget you a Penelope" or "Your Etruscan parents did not beget you...." Williams 1969, 78 takes the latter view, noting that the Etruscans were "proverbially rich, luxurious, and lax in morals, so that she cannot play the part of Odysseus' wife." Kiessling 1960, 307; Shorey 1960, 355; and Griffin 1985, 124 agree. Quinn 1984, 263 takes the former view: "... nor are you the daughter of a Tuscan father" (i.e., of aristocratic birth, cf. 3.29.1).}\]

\[167\text{For "munera" and "preces" in close conjunction in an amatory context, cf. Ov. Am. 2.3.17-8: "aptius ut fuerit precibus temptasse, rogamus, / dum bene ponendi munera tempus habes." See also Sen. Med. 845-7 "Ite, ite, nati, matris infaustae genus, / placate uobis munere et multa prece / dominam ac nouercam."}\]

\[168\text{As Williams 1969, 78 n. 2 notes. However, it is just possible that his "paelex" is of Macedonian birth and is in Rome.}\]
"preces" of 13 and raising the possibility that lines 13-17 are deliberately religious-sounding.\(^{169}\) He returns to attacking her cruelty and hardness (17-18) by means of traditional comparisons with wood (oak) and snakes. Finally he utters the last threat he possibly can, an implicit *renuntiation amoris*—he will not always endure lying at her threshold in the rain.\(^{170}\) Of further interest are the many changes of tone: the poem starts with criticism of the beloved’s cruelty, moves to an attempt to gain her sympathy, then comes the warning about her arrogance, another attempt

\(^{169}\) The vocative "o" is, of course, common in prayers (Nisbet-Hubbard 1970, 120). "Munera" are often offerings to gods (*OLD* s.v. 3) and "preces" are obvious. "Curuare" seems not to be used anywhere of persuading a god, but its near-equivalent "flectare" regularly is: Tib. 2.5.4; Verg. *Aen.* 2.689, 6.376, 12.46; Ov. *Ars* 1.44, *Ep.* 18.64, *Met.* 1.377-80 "atque ita 'si precibus' dixerunt 'numina iustis / uitca remollescent, si flecitur ira deorum...'", 11.400, *Tr.* 2.573; Sen. *Herc.* F. 569-71 "Immites potuit flectere cantibus / 570 umbrarum dominos et prece supplici / Orpheus"; and Prud. *Cath.* 3.5. "Curuare" is also surely intended to emphasize Lyce's hardness—she will not bend. "Supplex" also suggests, of course, the typical attitude of a person in prayer to a god. Finally, "parcere" is also common in prayers: Liv. 25.25.6 "legati eo ab Tycha et Neapoli cum infulis et uelamentis uenerunt, precantes ut caedibus et ab incendiis parceretur"; Hor. *Carm.* 2.19.7 f., 4.1.2; Sen. *Med.* 595; *Stat.* *Silv.* 1.2.269 f.; *Juv.* 1 6.172; and V. *Fl.* 4.475, 6.307. Furthermore, alliteration, particularly of "p" and "t," is often associated with prayers: see above on Pl. *Cur.* 88 ff.; Appel 1909, 160 ff.; Nisbet-Hubbard 1970, 261; Cary-Willcock 1976, 188; Yardley 1978, 25; Watson 1982, 97 f.; Barsby 1986, 166; Fitch 1987, 380; and McKeown 1987-, 2:131. For the supplicant lover see Yardley 1979, 156. Cairns 1977, 344 n. 3 is probably wrong in seeing Horace as a supplicant prisoner.

\(^{170}\) McKeown 1987-, 2:158 finds a certain "urbane detachment" in this conclusion.
to gain sympathy (the gifts and physical suffering of 13 f.), an attempt to incite her jealousy, more criticism of her cruelty, and a final threat/renuntiatio amoris.¹⁷¹

A brief mention of exclusion by a meretrix occurs in Carm. 3.14.17 ff. ("Herculis rito"). Horace is preparing to celebrate Augustus' return from Spain and victory over the Cantabri:

i pete unguentum, puer, et coronas
et cadum Marsi memorem duelli,
Spartacum si qua potuit uagantem
fallere testa.

dic et argutae properet Neaerae
murreum nodo cohibere crinem;
si per inuisum mora ianitorem
fiet, abito.

lenit albescens animos capillus
litium et rixae cupidos proteruæ;
non ego hoc ferrem calidus iuuenta
consule Planco.

Horace bids a slave to fetch the necessities for a party: unguent, garlands, wine, and a music-girl (she will sing--"argutae" 21).¹⁷² From the order of the items one presumes that when the slave reaches Neaera's dwelling to fetch her he will be carrying the unguent, garlands and wine. She is to hurry and get herself fixed up for the party. Horace


¹⁷²Nisbet-Hubbard 1970, 421 note that "The address to an attendant slave was a common and natural device in Greek sympotic lyric and epigram."
emphasizes her hair— it is the colour of myrrh, but "mur-
reus" seems also able to mean "full of myrrh" (OLD s.v.).
But if a "ianitor" is in the way, the slave is to depart.173
"Inuisum" (cf. Carm. 2.14.23 "inuisas cupressos" and S.
2.3.262 "inuisis foribus") could indicate that a "ianitor"
was a regular and familiar obstacle to the lover. In the old
days, when Horace was younger, he would not have been so
accepting—he would have fought ("litium et rixae," 26) over
Neaera's business. Whether it is the the "ianitor" or a
rival he would have fought is unclear and probably does not
matter.174 What matters is that Horace is aging—instead of
the more common paraklausathuric topos of the beloved growing
old and getting grey hair—and is no longer fit for fight-
ing, for either love or country.175

173 Porphyr. ad loc. glosses "ianitor" with "ostiar-
ius"—the latter word does not occur in any paraklausathuric
passages.

174 Williams 1969, 93 thinks the rival has bribed the
"ianitor ... to bar access to her." But the "ianitor" might
simply be doing the job Neaera has set him by refusing any-
one admission while she is with someone else.

175 As Williams 1969, 93 points out, Plancus was con-
sul in 42 B.C., the year Horace fought at Philippi. Of
course, the typical lover in classical literature was young.
See "iuuenis," "puer" and the μεροθ- root in Appendix 2.
Cic. Cael. 42 notes the license given to youth: "detur ali-
qui ludus aetati; sit adulescentia liberior; non omnia
uoluptatibus denegentur; non semper superet uera illa et
derecta ratio; uincat aliquando cupiditas uoluptasque
rationem, dum modo illa in hoc genere praescriptio moder-
atioque teneatur. parcat iuuentus pudicitiae suae, ne
spoliet alienam, ne effundat patrimonium, ne faenore
trucidetur, ne incurrat in alterius domum atque familiam, ne
probrum castis, labem integris, infamiam bonis inferat, ne
quem ui terreat, ne intersit insidiis, scelere careat." The
Carm. 3.15 briefly mentions a woman who is portrayed as an aggressive komast:176

Vxor pauperis Ibyci,
tandem nequitiae fige modum tuae
famosisque laboribus.
maturo propior desine funeri

inter ludere uirgines
et stellis nebulae spargere candidis.
non, si quid Pholoe satis,
et te, Chli, decet: filia rectius

expugnat iuuenum domos,
pulso Thyias uti concita tympano.
iliam cogit amor Nothi
lasciuae similem ludere capreae:

telae prope nobilem
tonsae Luceriam, non citharae decent
nec flos purpureus rosae
nec poti uetulam faece tenus cadi.

The poem attacks a mature woman who will not act her age, but still lives a convivial life—exemplified by the lyre, roses and wine (14-16). Her daughter, Pholoe, assaults men's houses, like a crazed Bacchante.177 Chloris, by implication

ancients' attitudes towards the old lover have been noted above (Chapter 2, note 118), but for an explicit mention of the idea in connection with militium amoris cf. Ov. Am. 1.9.4 "turpe senex miles, turpe senilis amor" and McKeown 1987-, 2:261 f., ad loc.

176See Williams 1968, 296; 1969, 97; and Henderson 1973, 61-2. The passage seems to have been missed by most writers on the paraklausithuron.

177Williams 1969, 97: "Pholoe assaults the doors of young men." Shorey 1960, 368 says she "storms, in the revel or comus." For women komasts and excluded lovers, see Chapter 4. "Expugnat" is military in tone.
="rectius" 8), acts similarly. Once again, if an assault is necessary, the women must be excluded.

Carm. 3.26 also alludes to the violent assault on the beloved's doors:178

Vixi puellis nuper idoneus et militaui non sine gloria; nunc arma defunctumque bello barbiton hic paries habebit,

laeuom marinae qui Veneris latus custodit. hic, hic ponite lucida funalia et uectis et arcus oppositis foribus minacis.

o quae beatam diua tenes Cyprum et Memphin carentem Sithonia niue, regina, sublimi flagello tange Chloen semel arrogantem.

It is generally agreed that the poem takes as its starting point the type of dedicatory epigram in which a person, upon retirement, offers up the tools of his trade to the appropriate deity.179 Of course the humour comes in the fact that Horace's experience of love is as a miles amoris and the offerings are not the typical symbols of the life of love-- unguents, garlands, and cups--but lyre, torches, crowbars and bows. The lyre is for serenading, and the other items are clearly for the violent assault on the house should the


179 Copley 1956, 57 disagrees. Furthermore he concludes that "If the paraclausithyron may be loosely defined as the song of the exclusus amator, then this ode is a paraclausithyron in a very real sense, for Horace wrote it because he was shut out." Quinn 1984, 287 thinks it takes place at Chloe's doors.
serenade not work. Horace ends the poem with a prayer to Venus to touch Chloe with her whip. Whatever the exact meaning of this request, the prayer to Venus/Aphrodite or Amor/Eros to either punish or unbend the beloved is a standard paraklausathuric topos. Furthermore, Williams has pointed

180 Porphyr. ad loc. comments: "Haec instrumenta amoris intellegi uult." "Arcus" has puzzled many—see Henderson 1973, 65 f.: "But the presence of arcus is inexplicable unless one assumes the ambiguity: soldier's weapons = lover's weapons, and that Horace is exaggerating the literary convention to show it up as ludicrous." Williams 1968, 206 sums up the problem well: "The bows have given great trouble to commentators: some have simply emended them to a more convenient weapon, others have pictured pieces of siege artillery, still others have explained that the bows were used—rather unsportingly—to shoot the doorkeeper. But the bows are simply part of the humorous, exaggerated portrait; they naturally figured among the long-range weapons of real assault troops." Copley 1956, 160 n. 38 understandably suggests that "perhaps the arcus was some kind of prying instrument."

181 Whether or not the poem is a genuine retirement epigram affects the interpretation of the final line. Williams 1969, 133 thinks the poem combines the retirement epigram and the "dedicatory epigram where the dedicant is not retiring but asking for greater success—he is to be imagined as dedicating, not his actual tools, but pictures or replicas of them.... retirement is the last thing he wants—what he wants is greater success." However, the retirement might be real, but merely a retirement from militium amoris. This then makes the final request to Venus clearer: Horace is retiring from the violent pursuit of sex (cf. 3.14.25 ff.) and now prays, since he will not have the option of breaking in on Chloe, that Venus make Chloe love Horace in return. Excluded lovers regularly make such prayers. However, the meaning of the last clause is vague. Horace could want Venus to punish Chloe, once, for her intransigence or punish her for this one example of intransigence. "Tange" seems a bit weak for this meaning, but it could be deliberate—Horace wants her punished, but not too much. Murgatroyd 1981, 599 cites this passage among examples of "beating and flogging." It could mean "make her fall in love," but then one has to determine whether this in turn means "let her know just once what it is like to be in love," which could be a form of threat-prophecy, or "make
out how the "Sithonia niue" (10) in the prayer to Venus indicates Chloe's "chilly home no less than her chilly treatment of the poet."\textsuperscript{182} Thus the beloved's cruelty is combined with the topos of the bad weather experienced by the lover. The final word, "arrogantem" (12), emphasizes Chloe's hubristic defiance of love.

Two other odes refer briefly to lovers' exclusion. At \textit{Carm.} 3.9.17 ff. ("Donec gratus eram tibi") a speaker addresses Lydia, his former beloved:

\begin{verbatim}
quid si prisca redit Venus
diductosque iugo cogit aeneo,
si flava excutitur Chloe
reiectaeque patet ianua Lydiae?
\end{verbatim}

The reunion with Lydia is exemplified by two images: the yoke of love and an open door. Then in \textit{Carm.} 3.16 the example of Danae is used to argue that gold, that is bribery, can overcome any obstacles (cf. Henderson 1973, 64):

\begin{verbatim}
Inclusam Danaen turris aenea
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{182}That is, presuming that the Chloe here is the same one mentioned in 3.9.9. If she is, there is further pointedness in that Chloe in that poem seems to be a music-girl of some sort, and so in this poem she is unlikely to be a chaste beloved, but merely one who has rejected Horace's advances.

...
Horace explicitly states that Danae was "inclusam" in order to keep her from "nocturnis ... adulteris." The accumulation of defences in the first stanza underlines the effort to protect her: bronze tower, sturdy doors, guard-dogs, and grim watches. Doors, guards of some kind, and, to a lesser extent, dogs, are all common obstacles to the excluded lover. But Jupiter and Venus can overcome any guard placed on a woman. Horace interprets the gold into which Jupiter was supposed to have turned himself as real gold. This readily brings to mind the common paraklausithuric

\[\text{\textsuperscript{183}}\text{For dogs, see Theoc. 6.29; Tib. 2.4.33; Prop. 3.16.17, 4.5.73; Ov. Am. 2.19.40; Antip. Thess. AP 5.30.4 (G.-P. VI); and Eratosth. AP 5.242.8. See also Murgatroyd 1980, 195.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{184}}\text{For such an interpretation of the Danae myth, see Asclep. AP 5.64 (G.-P. XI); Antip. Thess. AP 5.30 and 31 (G.-P. VI, CXII); Parmen. AP 5.33 (G.-P. I); Prop. 2.20.10 ff., 2.32.59; Ov. Am. 2.19.27, 3.4.21 f., 3.8.29 ff., Ars 3.415; Bassus AP 5.125 (G.-P. I); Strato AP 12.239; Philostr. Ep. 35, 38, 46; Tiberianus fr. 3.7 (Courtney); Servasius 2.5-8; August. C.D. 7.12, Con. 1.26; Rut. Nam. De redit. 1.357-60; and Paul. Sil. AP 5.217. In Claud. in Eutr. 1.82 f. a successful pander is described as being able to entice out Danae: "ille uel aerata Danaën in turre latentem / eliceret." The myth is an inspiration to youths in love at Men. Sam. 589 ff. and Ter. Eu. 584 ff.}\]
topos that money can buy access and it is only the poor lover who is excluded.

Horace provides us with the last important paraklau-sithuric references in Latin poetry outside of Augustan elegy. However, at the risk of being excessively speculative, other possible sources from the later Republic and early Principate for such passages should also be considered. Dabbling in poetry was an accepted upper-class Roman pursuit, and there is no shortage of poets in the one hundred years before elegy. Gellius 19.9.10, the source for the epigram from Valerius Aedituus examined above, provides fragments from two other senators who wrote some amatory verse, Porcius Licinus and Lutatius Catulus (cos. 102). Courtney (1993, 75) is worth quoting on Catulus:

Pliny, Ep. 5.3.5 mentions him in a list of distinguished men who wrote uersiculi parum seueri. While he was obviously not a professional poet, the willingness of a member of the highest Roman aristocracy to toss off imitations of Hellenistic sentimental erotic poetry (homosexual at that) is a new phenomenon in Roman culture.

Gellius, Propertius, Ovid, and Pliny together provide the names of fifteen other poets from the later Republic who wrote amatory or risqué verse: Anser (Prop. 2.34.83-4), C. Licinius Macer Caluus (Prop. 2.34.90-1, Ov. Tr. 2.431-2), Valerius Cato (Ov. Tr. 2.436), C. Heluius Cinna (Ov. Tr. 2.435-6), Cornificius Gallus (Ov. Tr. 2.436), Q. Hortensius Hortalus (Ov. Tr. 2.441; Plin. Ep. 5.3.5), Laeuuius (Gell.
19.7.2), Memmius (Ov. Tr. 2.433-4), Cornelius Nepos (Plin. Ep. 5.3.5), C. Asinius Pollo (Plin. Ep. 5.3.5), Q. Mucius Scaevola (Plin. Ep. 5.3.6), Servius (Ov. Tr. 2.441), Sisenna (Ov. Tr. 2.443), Ticidas (Ov. Tr. 2.433-4, 437-8), and Varro of Atax (Prop. 2.34.85-6, Ov. Tr. 2.439-40).\textsuperscript{185} Cicero was not above such poetry (Plin. Ep. 5.3.5), and even Augustus wrote invective and naughty verse (Suet. Aug. 85.2, Plin. Ep. 5.3.5, Macr. 2.4.21). Of course, there was also C. Cornelius Gallus. Furthermore, there can be little doubt about the popularity of mime in the late Republic (see McKeown 1979 and Reynolds 1946). When one considers the clear continued popularity of the komos and paraklausithuric situation, there can be little reason to doubt that at least some of these writers touched on the theme.

\textsuperscript{185}See the discussions in Luck 1969, 49 ff. and Courtney 1993 on specific poets.
CHAPTER 4
THE BELOVED, THE DOOR, AND THE REALITY OF THE
PARAKLAUSITHURIC SITUATION

Several general issues relating to the paraklausithuron deserve further discussion. First is the matter of the depiction of the beloved in the pre-elegiac versus the elegiac paraklausithuron. Second is the relative treatment of the door in Greek versus Latin paraklausithura. Third is the general relationship and debt of the Latin paraklausithuron to the Greek. Closely connected with the third is the fourth and final issue, the necessity of confronting and attempting to explain the popularity of the paraklausithuric situation in classical literature.

The beloved

A paraclausithyron or komos needs a beloved—the person for whom one would sleep outside on a hard doorstep. The beloved varies throughout Greek and Latin paraklausithura. One of the most obvious distinctions is gender, that is between heterosexual and homosexual or paederastic paraklausithura. But within heterosexual paraklausithura the beloved can be a hetaira/meretrix; a free, married woman; or something in between. The importance of these distinctions
becomes clear when attempts are made to use them to categorize paraklausithura.

Copley (1955) is the main advocate of such distinctions. For example, he (158 f. n. 27) proposes that Catullus 63.65-7 "suggests that a 'pure Greek' version of the theme may also have been current:... it is the sole instance in Roman paraclausitheyns of a reference to boy-love, a theme common in the Greek versions." Similarly, noting the element of furtius amor in the opening scenes of Plautus' Curculio (38) he comments that "this theme does not figure at all in the Greek non-dramatic paraclausitheyns, and in point of fact figures only rarely in Greek love poetry in general..." Furthermore, he gives such prominence to the matter of the status of the beloved that he categorises paraklausithura according to that status: "At the end of the Republic it existed in three fairly distinct forms, the conventional, literary type, the diffamatio type, and the lupanar song" (52). It seems that the main criterion for assigning a paraclausithuron to the "conventional literary type", as opposed to the "lupanar" song, is that the former "is the setting for love and affection" (51) -- despite the fact that most paraklausithura before Latin elegy are addressed to a hetaira/meretrix -- while the latter pertains to "the world of the venal prostitute" (51). Anything adulterous seems to qualify
as a "diffamatio type".¹ It will be argued in the following
pages that such distinctions are not necessarily valid or
useful.

The division between heterosexual and paederastic/
homosexual paraklausithura is easily dealt with. A clear
majority of the paraklausithuric situations before Latin
elegy in which a man is the probable lover, and all those
with female lovers, are heterosexual. There are no paeder-
astic paraklausithuric passages in Latin elegy, but among
pre-elegiac passages the following are clearly paederastic:
Thgn. 1046; Asclep. AP 5.145 and 167 (G.-P. XII and XIV);
Theoc. 7.98 ff., [Theoc.] 23.1; Call. AP 12.118 (G.-P. VIII,
Pfeiffer 42); Mel. AP 12.23, 72, 85, and 165 (G.-P. XCIX,
XCI, CXV, and XCVIII); and Catullus 63.65. Anon. AP 12.115
and 116 (G.-P. VI and XXIV) are probably also paederastic,
but it is not actually indicated in the text itself. Fur-
thermore, homosexuality is common in the parodies in Aristo-
phanes: the Vespae in effect becomes homosexual once the
chorus arrives at line 330 and Wealth, who is an old man, is
wooed by a handsome youth in the Plutus. Similarly, Aristo-
phanes' Eq. 742 ff. is incongruous in that Paphlagon/Cleon
and the Sausage-Seller are competing for the attentions of
Demos, who is definitely not a boy. In contrast, a greater

¹Luck 1957, 338 and Kenney 1958, 49 both have diffi-
culty with these distinctions, as well as the division of
paraklausithura into dramatic and non-dramatic types.
number of pre-elegiac paraklausithura are heterosexual rather than paederastic, and so it cannot be said that the presence of a paederastic love interest makes a paraklausithuric situation "pure Greek." It should also be noted that furtiuus amor is missing from all of the paederastic Greek paraklausithura.²

The status of the beloved

A much more vexing question is the social status of the female beloved in pre-elegiac and elegiac paraklausithura. This is closely related to the issue of furtiuus amor and its place in Greek versus Latin paraklausithura. Coppley's assertion quoted above on the relative importance of furtiuus amor in Greek and Latin literature is modified in a footnote where he does grant that (156 n. 49) "it is of course widespread in Greek literature" although he again asserts that "it is not at all common in Greek love-poetry

²Cf. Dover 1974, 215: "Public attitudes to the lover and his boy in fourth-century Athens seem to have been remarkably similar (Pl. Smp. 182A-185C) to modern attitudes to pre-marital heterosexual relationships. While the homosexual lover had no need to conceal his desire, and it was possible for him to boast to his friends of its attainment (Pl. Phdr. 232A), the boy whom he pursued was expected to resist seduction and had to bear reproaches if it was known that his resistance was overcome. It seems to have been felt that the boy who yielded had assimilated himself to a hetaira (Aiskhines i 111, 131, 167, 185),... and that he had been worsted in a contest with his seducer."
as such...."3 Drawing a firm division between love-poetry and other amatory literature sounds somewhat like special pleading, especially when one considers that it was the occurrence of the topos not in a Latin "non-dramatic paracleausithuron" but in Roman comedy--based on Greek models--that was his starting-point. Once again it should be pointed out that the fragmentary nature of much of the corpus of Greek love poetry, as well as of Greek comedy, makes comparisons between the genres extremely difficult. On the other hand, the relative abundance of Greek epigram in contrast leads it to be given more weight than perhaps it should have when discussing Greek love poetry as a whole. However, it is true that among existing, clearly identifiable paraklausithura, furtius amor does play a greater part

---

3 Consider the encouragement of furtius amor in Sparta: Plut. Lyca 15.3 'Εγάμουν δὲ δὲ άρπάγης, οὐ μικρας οὐδὲ ἀφραγάς πρὸς γάμον, ἄλλα καὶ ἀκμαζόμενα καὶ πεπειρωμένα. τὴν δὲ ἄρπαζεν ἡ νυμφεύτρια καλομένη παραλαβοῦσα, τὴν μὲν κεφαλὴν ἐν χρια περιέκειν, Ἰμταλὴ δὲ ἄνδρεις καὶ ὑποθήμασιν ἑυκενώσασα κατέκλυσεν ἐπὶ στιβάδα μάτης ἄνευ φωτός. ο δὲ νυφίς οὐ μεθύνων οὐδὲ ἀπαθήμενος, ἄλλο λῆψιν, ὡσπερ δὲ, ἀδελφικαὶ ἐν τοῖς φιλετίοις, παρεισελθών ἔλυε τὴν Ζώνην καὶ 4 μετήνευκεν ἄραμενος ἐπὶ τὴν κλίνην. συνδιατρίβας δὲ χρόνον ὡς πολύν ἀπῆλς κοσμὶς ὑπερ εἰλθεῖ τὸ πρότερον..., καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν οὕτως ἔπραττε... πρὸς δὲ τὴν νύμφην κρύφα μετ' ἐυλαβείας φοιτῶν, αἰσχυνόμενος καὶ διδοικός μὴ τις σάθοιτο τὴν εὐθέων, ἡμα καὶ τὴς νύμφης ἐπετεχνομένης καὶ συνεπορούσης ὅπως ἄν ἐν καρπῷ καὶ λαυθάνωτες ἀλλήλοις συμπορειντο. 5 καὶ τούτο ἔπραττον οὐκ ὅλων χρόνον, ἀλλ' ὡστε καὶ παῖδας γενέσθαι ἐνόοις πρὶν ἐς ἡμέραν θεᾶσθαι τὰς ἔατον γυναῖκας. ἢ δὲ ταυταὶ σύνοδος οὐ μόνον ἐγκρατείας καὶ συφροσύνης ἄσκησις ἦν, ἀλλὰ τότε τε σώματι γονιμός καὶ τῇ φιλέσει ἄεὶ κοινοὺς καὶ προσφάτους ἤγεν ἐπὶ τὴν κοιμωνίαν, οὐ διακορρέτες οὐδ' εξιτῆλλους ταῖς ἀνέδοις κοιμωνίαις, ἀλλ' ἄεὶ τι λείψανον καὶ ὑπέκκαμα πόθου καὶ χάριτος ἐναπολειπόντας ἀλλήλοις.
in Latin examples than in Greek ones. Yardley (1978, 22) states this clearly:

Even a casual perusal of Latin elegiac paraclausithyra and of Horace Odes 3.10 will reveal that furtivus amor is given a prominence far greater than it receives in the Greek examples. The reason is quite obvious. The girl in the Greek komastic situation is almost inevitably a hetaira and a free agent who can admit or exclude lovers as she wishes. In elegy the situation is different, because a husband and the triangular relationship involving him with the poet and the girl are embodied in the elegiac tradition (dating perhaps from Catullus’ Lesbia poems), and any genre of poem introduced to elegy will naturally be made to conform to its conventions. In the background of Roman elegy—whether in “real life” or not—turks the vir who has a legal claim to the poet’s girl. Hence the necessity for secrecy.

Nonetheless, the matter does seem to allow some doubt. To begin with, the status of the beloved is much clearer in paraklausithyra before Latin elegy than in Latin elegy. In a fair number of passages it is clearly indicated that the beloved is some form of hetaira or slave: the Scholia on Ar. Pl. 179; Eur. Cyc. 500; Is. 3.13 ff. (supposedly free but more likely hetaira); Timocl. fr. 25; Men. Dysc. 59; Herod. 2.25 ff.; Pl. As. 127 ff., Truc. 633 ff., Mer. 411, Cur. 43 ff. (ostensibly slave but really free); Ter. Ad. 84 ff., Eu. 46 ff.; Hor. S. 1.2.64 ff., 1.4.49, 2.7.89 ff., Carm. 1.25.1 ff.; and Aristodem. FHG 3.310. Far fewer clearly or probably free or married women are shown: Eup. fr. 148 (K.-A. = Ath. 14.638 e); Ar. Ec. 678 ff., Lys. 245 ff.; Ant. Lib. 2.3/Hermesian. 39; Theoc. 2.118 ff.; Plb.
10.26.3-5; Anon. AP 12.90 (G.-P. I); Laber. fr. 141 ff.;
Cic. Catil. 1.26, Consil. fr. 10.3.1; and Hor. Carm. 3.7,
3.10. Several other passages have beloveds who are not
slaves or prostitutes, but these are oddities: in Pl. Am.
1008 ff., it is the husband's wife (Alcmena); in Theoc. 11,
a Nereid; in Theoc. 3, a young rustic maiden; in Liv. Per.
89, it is also the lover's wife; and in Hor. Carm. 3.16, it
is Danae. The parodic situation from Aristophanes' Lys. also
easily fits among the latter.

Several things stand out. The first is the predomi-
nance of hetairai/meretrices in comedy, as might be expec-
ted. The second is that in all areas identifiably or proba-
bly married or free women are much less likely than a woman
acting as some form of a hetaira or meretrix to be the
object of an excluded lover's attentions. Of course, this is
only the case in the sources that actually have survived. It
is possible that adulterous situations were more common in
Greek sources than the evidence might indicate, particularly
in the riotous atmosphere of Old Comedy.4 Eupolis fr. 148

4 "Adulterous" here, of course, is broader than the
modern sense of the word. It not only included all citizen
women but also a citizen male's concubine--see Pomeroy 1975,
91: "Some men lived with concubines in a more or less perma-
nent union. When a man lived with a concubine, she was con-
sidered his sexual property in much the same way as a legiti-
mate wife. The rape or seduction of a concubine drew the
same penalties as offenses committed against a legitimate
wife." Also, see the quotation from Dover 1974, 209 cited
above, Chapter 2, note 51.
and Aristophanes Ec. 678 ff. are particularly suggestive.\footnote{5}

It is also worthwhile to remember that the songs of Gnepip-putus were composed for μουςολ.

Furthermore, some generalizations can also be made. It is safe to assume that among Greek paraklausithuric pas-sages, where the status of the beloved is not made clear, the beloved is a hetaira of some kind, or at least a non-citizen woman. It is very hard to generalize about all of the Greek-speaking world over some seven hundred years, but adultery was viewed extremely seriously in the Greek world in almost all places and at all times, not only in Athens.\footnote{6}

Of course the greater segregation of women in classical Athens makes any sources coming from that time and period even less likely to refer to adulterous affairs.\footnote{7} We have

---

\footnote{5}{One should keep in mind that the girl in the Eccle-siazusae is probably not of the highest social status. See Bowra 1958, 376: "It probably belonged to a low social level, at least so far as the woman was concerned, and indeed could hardly have been otherwise in a society where respectable young women were expected to observe a strict decorum."

\footnote{6}{See Dover 1974, 209 ff. and Pomeroy 1975, 58 ff., 81 f., 86 ff.

\footnote{7}{For a sampling of explicit statements about the penalties for adultery and condemnation of adultery, most from classical or Hellenistic Greece, see: Ar. P7. 168; Lys. 1, 13.68; X. Hier. 3.3, Mem. 2.1.5; Is. 8.44; Aeschin. Tim. 183 ff.; Arist. Ath. 57.3; D. Aristocrates 53, Neaera 41, 64 ff., 85 f.; Xenarch. fr. 4; Men. Dysc. 289 ff. (with Gomme-Sandbach 1973, 182), fr. 366, Pk. 494 ff., Sam. 717-718; Plb. 2.56.15; Anon. AP 9.520. (G.-P. LX); D.S. 12.21.1 f.; Plu. Sol. 23.1 ff.; V. Max. 6.5.3; Paus. 9.36.7-8; and Agath. AP 5.302.}
seen how, in Athens, the mere direction of a komos to a woman was enough to impune her status (Is. 3.13 ff.). Two later non-Athenian, examples showing a similar attitude are Apuleius Apol. 75:

multus honos auribus praefandus est domus eius tota lenonia, tota familia contaminata: ipse propidiosus, uxor lupa, filii similes: prorsus diebus ac noctibus ludibrio iuuentutis ianua calcibus propulsata, fenestrae canticis circumstrepitae, triclinium comisatoribus inquietum, cubiculum adulteris peruvium; neque enim uilli ad introeundum metus est, nisi qui pretium marito non attulit. Ita ei lecti sui contumelia uectigalis est;

and Charito 1.3.2, where failed suitors attempting to tarnish the reputation of a married woman pretend that they have been on a komos to her while her husband has been absent. Moreover, the violent assault on a beloved's doors would also usually be directed against non-citizens, or at least not carried out in a rivalry over a married citizen woman. \footnote{However, perhaps this was not the attitude among all Greeks—cf. Stob. Anth. 3.2.18 (Hense): ἕλληνος ἐρωτόμενος ὑπὸ Βυζαντίων τι ἀδικηθεὶς πολυρκεῖ αὐτὸς, εὐθείᾳ ἐξῄεσεν ἐλναῖ καὶ ὀμολογεῖ τῇ ἐξ ἐκ τῶν καλῶν γυναικῶν τούς ἐπικωμάζοντας ἔρωτη διὰ τῆ ἐπιφωνάζουσιν. The problem here is the flexibility of γυνῆ. Cf. Nic. Greg. Byz. Hist. 8.1.3 (Schopen-Bekker 1.285), the full text of which is given at the end of Appendix 1.}

\footnote{Of course, the examples from Lysias indicate that such forced entries could happen to a citizen's house, but in both of those cases it is notable that the love-interest motivating the assault is not a citizen woman. See also on Lysias and Herodas 2 above. The later Romans were more tolerant of such actions directed against prostitutes: Just. dig. 47.2.39 "Ulpianus libro quadragensimo primo ad Sabinum. Uerum est, si meretricem alienam ancillam rapuit quis uel celaut, furtum non esse: nec enim factum quaeritur, sed causa faciendi: causa autem faciendi libido fuit, non fur-tum. et ideo etiam eum, qui fores meretricis effregit}
When one considers all this, it seems probable that paraklausithuric passages involving non-citizen women would have been the norm, and that if a poet was going to deliberately diverge from that norm, there would be some indication in the text itself to indicate that divergence. Without such indication, then, it can be concluded that a strong majority of pre-elegiac paraklausithuric situations were not in any way adulterous.

Rome was a different matter, but again for pre-elegiac times it seems safe to make a similar statement. While there is more evidence for adultery among the upper classes in first century B.C. Rome than there is for classical Athens, it was still severely proscribed in law.\footnote{Although it is unfortunately almost impossible to determine the reality of adultery laws in the period before Augustus, it is clear that adultery was a serious, if generally private, matter. See, above all, Treggiari 1991, 262-319, 507-8; Rawson 1986, 32 ff.; Pomeroy 1975, 150 ff., 160 f.; Dixon 1986, 112 f.; Lilja 1965, 34 ff.; and Crook 1984, 51 ff., 101 f.} Of course reality does not always conform to the desires of lawmakers, but much the same argument can be made for Rome as for the Greek world above. For example, it is clear that several of Horace's paraklausithuric passages have an adulterous theme:

libidinis causa, et fures non ab eo inducti, sed alias ingressi meretricis res egesserunt, furti non teneri. an tamen uel Fabia teneatur, qui sub pressit scortum libidinis causa? et non puto teneri, et ita etiam ex facto, cum incidisset, dixi: hic enim turpius facit, quam qui subripit, sed secum facti ignominiam compensat, certe fur non est.
terous background. There are either clear statements or identifiable clues in these passages that make such an identification possible. The absence of any such statements or clues in the other passages, where the woman’s status is otherwise indeterminable, can be taken to indicate the woman’s status as something other than a Roman citizen protected by laws on adultery and *stuprum*.

It is very hard to make a comparison with Latin elegiac paraklausithura. Of course, the status of the elegiac beloved herself is much-debated, with no clear

11It is interesting that only one of these (Carm. 3.10) is actually written in the first person.

12For the whole issue of the various forms of marriage in Rome, see Treggiari 1991, chap. 2, esp. 37-52. Pages 51 f. are worth quoting: "There are two other unions which moderns regard as quasi-marital, but which do not enter into the thinking of the Roman jurists in this area. These are concubinatus and contubernium. In iniustum matrimonium each member of the pair intended a marital relationship, but because of some incapacity the union was not fully valid in Roman law. But in concubinatus at least one of the couple, the man, did not intend marriage.... Upper class men are attested by literary and juristic sources as having concubines of lower social status either when they were relatively young and unready for marriage, like Augustine, or after the death of a wife who had given them enough children, like Vespasian. Concubines were chosen precisely because they were socially ineligible for marriage.... To put the situation as briefly as possible, in Roman concubinage affectio maritalis, the reciprocal attitude of regarding the other as a wife or husband, was lacking. If both began to regard the other as a coniunx, then the relationship became *matrimonium*, as long as there was no legal disqualification." Also, see Lilja 1965, 34 ff. (especially her reference to Syme’s *Roman Revolution* 445 ff.), and Crook 1984, 51 ff. and 101 f. Theoretically a woman could have a series of husbands, which helps explain some of the confusion over words such as *uir* and *maritus*. 
resolution seeming possible.\textsuperscript{13} Griffin (1985, 27 f.) offers a simple statement of the problem:

As for the question, so vehemently discussed, of the social status of the girls in these poems, what are we to say? For some Cynthia is obviously a meretrix; for others, a married woman. Or perhaps she behaved like a meretrix without being one. Did she come from a noble family, or was she a libertina, or a foreigner? Or is the question not yet decided? Or does it not really matter?\textsuperscript{14}

He goes on to argue attractively that there are no simple solutions.\textsuperscript{15} Two tentative but good suggestions of how to

\textsuperscript{13}See Treggiari 1991, 301-9 for a particularly good discussion. She offers a tentative conclusion at 307: "This review of the evidence of love poetry suggests that, apart from encounters with boys, music-girls, and such, the poets portray the ups and downs of relatively long-term affairs with two classes of women, citizens of relatively high status who are married, and semi-professional women for whom 'courtesan' is a convenient term. Their lovers called them their amicae or puellae, avoiding the legalistic and derogatory word meretrix." Cf. also 422-3, as well as Lilja 1965, 37 ff.; Lyne 1980, 274 f.; McKeown 1987-, 1:19, 27, 85 f.; Murgatroyd 1980, 7 f.; Williams 1968, 496 ff., 528-42, 560 f.; and Yardley 1978, 22.

\textsuperscript{14}References for each of these statements, amusingly complicating the issue further, are given by Griffin.

\textsuperscript{15}Griffin 1985, 27 f.: "Surely the trouble is that the alternatives are too narrowly conceived and too sharply opposed. The demi-monde did not contain only professionals of low extraction, although it did include them. It also contained amateurs like Catullus' Lesbia, and quasi-amateurs like Praecia the influential mistress of Cethegus, and noble debauchees like Sulla's daughter Fausta and (unless she was framed) Augustus' daughter Julia. There will also have been many women of less clear-cut status, the 'camp-followers of marriage'. This was a great age of divorce, and some divorcées will have swelled the ranks of the available. So will widows, and grass-widows, and dowryless girls who failed to marry, or whose marriages broke down. The illegitimate, too, will sometimes have lived in this way, and women who had once enjoyed the halfway status of concubina but later lost it. Between libertinae and prostitutes, between actresses and meretrices, even between some professionals and some
handle the issue are offered by McKeown and Hollis. McKeown (1979, 76) makes the following observation on the "conceptual framework of the whole world of the love-elegist":

It is generally agreed that this world is not drawn true to real life. If that were the case, there would not be any confusion about the social and marital status of the elegiac puella. In fact, however, the uir is sometimes portrayed as her husband, with legal rights over her, but, at other times, he is portrayed as merely the lover who, for the moment, is most in favour with a high-class prostitute. If, on the other hand, the elegist's world is an artificial, literary, world, such inconsistencies are less important and more explicable. The elegist casts himself and his puella in roles familiar from the genres which are his models.

Hollis (1977, xv f.) observes much the same thing:

In straight Latin love-elegy (e.g. Propertius) the status of the heroine can be said to fluctuate; at one moment she resembles a Greek-style hetaira..., at the next a Roman lady of some social standing. This variation partly reflects the different sources from which Latin love-elegy drew, such as Greek New Comedy, Mime, and epigram.

It is completely beyond the scope of this thesis to cover such a broad topic and it will be conceded that no general solution is available other than the broad conclusions of McKeown and Hollis above. This does, however, have an impact on any broad statements about the status of the beloved in Latin elegy in comparison with earlier paraklausithuric situations. If the status varies, then the individual occurrences themselves have to be examined.

matronae, the dividing line cannot have been so easy to draw as in theory, perhaps, it should have been."
There is, unfortunately, rarely enough evidence provided in any single poem or paraklausithuric passage to make a firm conclusion about the beloved’s status, and even when there is, if McKeown and Hollis are correct, one cannot extrapolate beyond that individual poem or passage to the other paraklausithuric situations from that same author. For example, Propertius 1.16 offers little to go on. The woman lives in a house with a long and seemingly distinguished history (1 ff.; see Little 1972). The door of the house is, at least in its own view, "nobilis" (10). It is unlikely that a prostitute or higher class meretrix would be living in such a distinguished house, even though old houses are not always valuable or in wealthy neighbourhoods. The "preces" (20) that Propertius offers are "furiuus", indicating a fear of detection by some person. But that person’s identity is beyond knowing.\(^{16}\) It could be a husband, another

\(^{16}\) Copley 1956, 119 sees this as hinting at an element of furtius amor. However, furtius occurs only four times in Prop.: 1.3.24, here, 3.13.33, and 4.5.71. The last is not in an amatory context, and none of the others are clearly in connection with adultery. Tib. 1.2, which is possibly adulterous (see below), uses furtim twice (10 "neu furtim uerso cardine aperta sores", and 19 "illa docet molli furtim derepere lecto) and furtum once (34 obuia: celari uult sua furta Venus"). Furtim in Ov. Am. and Ars seems to occur mainly in adulterous contexts: Am. 1.4.52, 64 and 2.19.39 (all are almost certainly adulterous, but see below for 1.4) and Ars 1.619 (very indefinite). See also Ep. 17.261 (Paris and Helen) but also 19.56. Furtius is harder to pin down: Am. 1.4.18 (adulterous), 11.3 (hard to tell), 2.2.15 (probably adulterous), 2.8.8 (not), Ars 1.275 (probably not), 2.246 (probably), 730 (probably), and 3.640 (hard to tell).
lover, a customer who has purchased exclusive access to her, or a *leno*.\(^\text{17}\) Cynthia is within, in bed with a man (33), but unfortunately no specific word is used for him. However, whatever the exact meaning of lines 11-12, they must broadly mean that Cynthia is a woman of at least moderately respectable "fama" and so is probably not a freedwoman. There is also no mention of a *lena* or *leno* or any elements of the code normally associated with prostitutes and *meretricies*. But it is hard to argue from silence.\(^\text{18}\) No other of Propertius' parkalausithuric situations are clearly adulterous.

Tibullus 1.2 gives us more evidence. Above all there is the mention of a "dominus"\(^\text{19}\) (7: "ianua difficilis domini

\(^{17}\) Compare Horace S. 1.2.64 ff. Pimps were no doubt no less cruel in Roman times than today. The torches (8) would be evidence of the lover/lovers' vigil/vigils but would not necessarily show that a lover was admitted. Similarly, the verses on the door could bring ill-repute, as at Pl. *Mer.* 409 ff. They would hardly disgrace in modern eyes the dorr of a brothel or *meretrix* door, but to the door itself they would still be insulting. See also Yardley (1979, 157) "The point the door is making is that now it is beset at night by komasts, and this of itself is sufficient evidence of the house's lack of respectability."

\(^{18}\) As does Lilja 1965, 39: "However, Cynthia was probably unmarried, because the singularly jealous poet never mentions a husband." See Williams 1968 529, who draws a parallel with Catullus, who only twice mentions Lesbia's *uir* at 88.143 and 86.1. Also see McKeown 1987-, 1:71: "In particular, it is not possible to draw conclusions about significant omissions of topoi or about their ordering."

\(^{19}\) Some read *dominae*, for just criticism of which, see Murgatroyd 1980, 301 f.: "since to describe Delia as *difficilis* would not agree with the attitude to her in the rest of the poem and would hardly be fair (at 5 and 15 T. says that she is under guard, and her fear of the *coniunx* at 41 makes it likely that he has put her under guard, while one would expect a few lines complaining of her cruelty, if
te uerberet imber") and a "coniunx" (41: "nec tamen huic credet coniunx tuus"). These references, combined with the mention of the "custos" (5 "nam posita est nostrae custodia saeua puellae", and 15 "tu quoque ne timide custodes, Delia, falle") seem to point to Delia being in some form of marriage.\(^{20}\) In contrast, Delia does not appear to be married in

\(^{20}\) Coniunx at 1.6.15 and 33 seems to be used in the context of marriage. However, see Murgatroyd 1980, 7-8, where he observes that "coniunx does not invariably mean 'husband': at Catull. 64.123 and 182 ... and at Ov. Her. 9.118 ... the word is applied to lovers who are merely potential husbands; at Ov. Am. 1.10.2 ... the term is applied to husband and lover". However, since marriage in ancient Greece was not nearly as formal as today--at least in Athens, marriage simply was cohabitation, συνοείν--and since Helen did live as wife with Paris for ten years, Ovid might actually mean that both men were in effect her husbands. He argues that at 1.2 and 1.6.15 coniunx could simply mean "man in possession." Murgatroyd also observes that "the 'right' to place a guard on Delia (and to grant T. that position) ... was hardly confined to husband (cf. e.g. Ov. A.A. 3.613 ff.)." In this context he notes maritus does not always mean 'husband' (citing Verg. Aen. 4.35) and so could possibly be used like coniunx to mean 'man in possession'. But see McKeown 1987-, 1:27 on maritus, uxor, and adulter. It cannot, however, be shown that in Book 1 of Tib. coniunx means anything other than "husband," which is, despite objections, almost always its meaning: see Pichon 1966, s.v., and OLD 1 s.v. Lilja 1965, 38 finds coniunx a more definite term than uir. Coniunx occurs only in Tib. in Book 1: 1.2.43, 1.4.74, 1.6.15, 1.6.33. Coniunx is also used only once (2.8.29 of Briseis) out of eleven times by Prop. for someone other than a husband or wife (1.15.15, 21, 1.19.7, 2.6.3, 2.28B.33, 2.28C.48, 3.12.16, 23, 3.22.42, 4.3.49). Williams 1968, 536 and Yardley 1978, 22 n. 9 think Delia is married here, as does Copley 1956, 92 ff., although his reasoning at 101 is a bit circular. Williams 1969, 537 cites perhaps the best argument for believing Delia was married: Ovid imagines her as married at Tr. 2.457-66. Although this reference can be viewed as special pleading by Ovid in an attempt to make Tibullus as much like himself as possible.
1.5. The mentions in that poem of the *diuus amator* and *lena* (47), and the fact that the major obstacle to Tibullus' reception is money (67 f.) argue against Delia being respec-tably married.\footnote{Although the issue of money is hard to pin down; Williams 1968, 530 notes the problem of 2.16, where Cynthia could be a prostitute, or it could just be Propertius using the mercenary mistress topos.} Also, it is unlikely that Tibullus would imagine taking Delia off into the country to live with him (21 ff.) and not mention the husband, if one existed, as an obstacle to this idyllic life. Nemesis in 2.6 is insub-stantial, but there is the mention of a *lena*, Phryne, in lines 44 f.\footnote{22 Treggiari 1991, 305 comments: "On the other hand, the elegists also immortalized their passions for their social inferiors, women like Lycoris and (probably) Neme-sis." See Williams 1968, 537: "scarcely anything can be said. She is a shadowy background for conventional motifs. ... Clearly no conclusion about her social status is pos-sible from this evidence."}

Finally, Ovid is very vague about Corinna.\footnote{23 This might be because she did not really exist. See, among others, Luck 1969, 155 and Barsby 1973, 15. McKeown 1987-, 1:19 believes that "we do not know whether or not she existed nor what status Ovid portrays her as having." He observes (1:22) that Corinna is named only in 1.5.9, 1.11.5, 2.6, 2.8, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13 *bis*, 2.17 *bis*, 2.19, 3.1, 3.7, and 3.12.} There are, nonetheless, hints about her status in *Am*. 1.6. Lines 19-20 ("certe ego, cum posita stares ad uerbera ueste, / ad dominam pro te uerba tremente tuli") indicate that Corinna had some authority over the *ianitor*, authority that a mere-
trix would not have over her procurer's ianitor, although she might have such authority over her husband's.\textsuperscript{24} Similarly, the fact that Ovid can virtually promise the ianitor his freedom if he admits Ovid (25 ff.) indicates that Corinna, rather than someone else, has primary control over the ianitor. So the ianitor is most probably Corinna's.\textsuperscript{25} The fact that there is a ianitor only indicates that Corinna is probably not a poor scortum: since the ianitor was the lowest of the household slaves and was often unsuitable for other jobs, one could probably be purchased for a low sum.\textsuperscript{26} There is little else to work with, as is the case elsewhere

\textsuperscript{24}McKeown 1987–, 2:134 seems to imply that the authority is primarily Corinna's.

\textsuperscript{25}Although it is possible that Ovid might have in mind buying the ianitor and manumitting him, or that Corinna might have her husband wrapped firmly enough around her finger to be able to persuade him to free the ianitor, it seems most likely that Ovid is hinting that, if he either becomes happily attached to Corinna or if he becomes the effective master of the house, he will see to it that the ianitor is freed.

\textsuperscript{26}For the status of the ianitor, see McKeown 1987–, 2:122–3 with his references. It is interesting that Ianus at Fasti 1.139 chooses to call himself "caelestis ianitor". At Ars 2.259 the ianitor is called a "plebs". He also appears at 3.587, again in a paraclausithyric context. In Prop. 4.5.47 (his sole reference to a ianitor), the woman who owns one ("ianitor ad dantes uigilet: si pulset inanis, surdus in obductam somnius usque seram") seems to be a meretrix or at least a freedwoman, although the reference to "maritos" at 15 is puzzling. Tib. has one reference to a ianitor, at 1.1.56 ("et sedeo duras ianitor ante fores"). The line is meant to show his degraded status. Antip. Thess. AP 5.30.3 (G.-P. VI) mentions a ἡταίρα as an obstacle to someone who is not bringing money, and the beloved is most likely a hetaira, as are most in AP 5. Erotium in the Men. of Plautus has a ianitor (573): "ecquis hic est ianitor? / aperite atque Erotium aliquis euocate ante ostium".
with Corinna. There is only one paraclausithuric situation in Ovid that is clearly adulterous—2.19.6 ff.\textsuperscript{27} \textit{Met.} 14.698 ff., Ovid’s next most important paraclausithuron after \textit{Am.} 1.6, is decidedly not adulterous, although the beloved is of a noble and respectable family.

It therefore does not seem possible to conclude with any certainty that elegiac paraclausithuric situations are significantly more likely to be adulterous than pre-elegiac paraclausithura. Of the five most prominent true paraclausithura in elegy (seven if \textit{Met.} 13.778 ff. and 14.698 ff. are included), based on the internal evidence of the poems, only one (Prop. 1.16) is probably adulterous, and only one other (Tib. 1.2) has a significant chance of being so.

\textit{Furtius am\textit{or}}

\textit{Furtius am\textit{or}} is easier to quantify since it is generally clear whether some element of secrecy or surreptitiousness is present in a given poem. It should be noted that the presence alone of the topos does not indicate the beloved’s status—secrecy could be necessary to protect the

\textsuperscript{27}Am. 1.4, which has a paraclausithyric episode at 61 ff., is perhaps more suggestive of adultery than 2.19.6. See McKeown 1987, 2:77 f. who says “It is not certain, however, that the relationship is adulterous.... To consider Corinna a freedwoman and unmarried seems to accord best with such little information as Ovid gives elsewhere....” For the mistress being married here, see Yardley 1978, 22 n. 9. Williams 1968, 531 concludes that “a particular social reality cannot be established here.”
beloved from husband, jealous uir, parent, or cruel leno or owner.²⁸ A clearly discernible element of furtius amor is present in few pre-elegiac paraklausithura: Ar. Ec. 948 ff., V. 316 ff.; Plautus Cur. 20 ff., 48 ff.; Lyr. Alex. Adesp. 5.7-8; P.Teb. 1.1.2d.15; Cic. Phil. 2.45, and Hor. Carm. 3.16.1 ff.²⁹ However, there is some form of custos figure or guard standing between the lover and beloved in Ar. Ec. 976 ff., Lys. 835 ff. (esp. 861 ff.); Ant. Lib. 39/Hermesian. 2 (the parents); Pl. Am. 1001 ff., As. 127 ff., 145 ff., Cur. 61 ff., 104 ff., 157 ff., Men. 416 ff., Truc. 711 ff.; Cic. Phil. 2.45; and Hor. Carm. 3.16.6. Nonetheless, in most of these passages there is not an element of secrecy—the custos must be overcome, but attempts to do so can be blatant and manifest.

The topos is, not surprisingly, more prominent in Latin elegiac paraklausithuric situations.³⁰ It is, however, ²⁸For parents, see not only the passages from Ovid cited below, but also Stat. Silv. 1.2.33 ff., the epithalamium for Stella and Violentilla. "Lex / aut pudor" seems more likely to refer to pre-marital sex (stuprum) than adultery itself: "pone o dulcis suspiria uates, / pone: tua est, licet expositum per limen aperto / 35 ire redire gradu: iam nusquam ianitor aut lex / aut pudor. amplexu tandem satiare petito / (contigit!) et duras pariter reminiscere noctes."

²⁹It is more common elsewhere in Greek comedy and verse.

³⁰That is, clear furtius amor in direct association with paraklausithuric references. Ovid’s use of the topos is particularly hard to quantify since he has a fondness for accumulating topoi or mentioning a number of them in close proximity. Of course, furtius amor is prominent throughout elegiac poetry and it is not surprising to find it in para-
not even close to ubiquitous. Some element of furtiveness is present in Prop. 1.16, as well as 2.9.41 f.: "sidera sunt testes et matutina pruina / et furtim misero ianua aperta mihi."\textsuperscript{31} Tib. 1.2 gives more prominence to \textit{furtius amor}. It is explicitly mentioned at 1.5.71 ff., but does not play a significant role in the rest of the poem (see Musurillo 1970):

Non frustra quidam iam nunc in limine perstat

\textsuperscript{31}It is worth considering, however, that the reference to "furtius ... praces" in line 20 might indicate that Propertius desires to keep his prayers, and the door's co-operation, hidden from Cynthia. The other paraklausithuric topoi in the poem (the "nocturnis potorum saucia rixis" [5], "pulsata ... saepe" [6], "non desunt turpes pendere corollae" [7], and "iacere faces" [8]), and also the religious rituals of 41 ff., all seem at odds with secrecy. There would be no shortage of witnesses—slave, neighbour, or parasite (see Alciphro 3.26.2)—who could report the lover's vigil to the husband, \textit{uir}, or \textit{leno}. If, however, this is Cynthia's house, and it is in the Subura, where she lives in 4.7.13 ff. ("iamne tibi exciderant uigilacis furta Suburae / et mea nocturnis trita fenestra dolis?"); this might diminish the chance of having a neighbour at least report such nocturnal goings-on to whoever is in control of Cynthia. For the Subura, cf. Liv. 3.13.1 ff.; Hor. \textit{Ep.} 5.57 ff. "... senem, quod omnes rideant, adulterum / latrent Suburanae canes / nardo perunctum, quale non perfectius / 60 meae laborarint manus."; Pers. 5.32 f.; Mart. 2.17, 5.22, 6.66, 9.37, 11.45 (see Kay 1985, 166 ff. \textit{ad loc.}), 61, 12.18, 21, \textit{et al.}; and Juv. 3.5 and 5.105. See also Bradley 1987, 117 and note 25 \textit{ad loc.}: "The number of slaves who functioned as prostitutes appears to have been great, though the information available is mainly anecdotal; nonetheless rules on the registration and taxing of prostitutes, and the notoriety of an area such as the Subura in Rome itself must be taken to indicate widespread profiteering at the expense of slaves in no position to choose the nature of their work...."
sedulus ac crebro prospicit ac refugit,
et simulat transire domum, mox deinde recurrit,
solus et ante ipsas excreat usque fores.
Nescio quid furtiuus amor parat. 75

The topos does not actually play a major role in Ovid's
paraklausithuric passages and has no part in Ovid *Am. 1.6*.
There could be brief allusions to it in lines 7 and, per-
haps, 2-3, but the setting of the poem, which has Ovid
pleading with the *ianitor* and even threatening violence in
57 ff., is at odds with, and greatly overpowers, the element
of furtiveness. *Am. 2.12.1* seems to refer definitely to *furt-
iuus amor*:

    Ite triumphales circum mea tempora laurus!
    uicimus: in nostro est ecce Corinna sinu,
    quam uir, quam custos, quam ianua firma (tot hostes!) seruabant, ne qua posset ab arte capi!

*Am. 2.19.37 ff.* also suggests a certain element of secrecy,
but the fact that Ovid is addressing Corinna's *uīr* again
effectively negates the topos:

    at tu, formosae nimium secure puellae,
    incipe iam prima claudere nocte forem;
    incipe, quis totiens furtim tua limina pulset,
    quae rerere, quid late rent nocte silente canes,

Similarly contradictory is *Am. 3.1.49 ff.*, where Elegy tells
of teaching Corinna how to evade her *custos*. But this is
followed by a mention of poetry being hung on her door to be
read by passers-by, an action not exactly in harmony with
secrecy:

    per me decepto didicit custode Corinna
    liminis astricti sollicitare fidem
    delabique toro tunica uelata soluta
    atque impercussos nocte mouere pedes.
uei quotiens foribus duris infixa pependi
non ulerita a populo praetereunte legi!

It is missing from Ovid's other paraklausithuric refer-
ences.\textsuperscript{32} Perhaps part of the reason for the puzzling and
apparently contradictory references to the topos in Ovid,
aside from the possibility of his work being purely literary
and essentially unreal, is its congeniality to Ovid's per-
sonality. He states several times that danger and secrecy
appeal to him and so he can be forgiven for mentioning the
topos when it suits him, regardless of logic.\textsuperscript{33}

It can therefore be seen that Copley (1956, 38, 63)
is right in asserting that \textit{furtiuus amor} is a more important
feature of the Latin paraklausithuron than it is of the
Greek, but it is not overwhelmingly so and certainly cannot
be said to be a defining feature of the Roman paraklausithu-
ron.

\textsuperscript{32}\textit{Furtius amor} is present in two other situations
with paraklausithuric elements: \textit{Ep.} 18 and 19 (Hero and
Leander) and \textit{Met.} 4.55 (Pyramus and Thisbe). In both of
these, the affair is being kept secret from the lovers' parents.

\textsuperscript{33}See \textit{Am.} 2.19.1 ff.: "Si tibi non opus est servata,
stulte, puella, / at mihi fac serues, quo magis ipse uelim!
/ quod licet, ingratum est; quod non licet acrius urit"; and
\textit{Ars} 3.595 ff.: "tum bene fortis equus reserato carcere cur-
rit, / cum, quos praetereat quosque sequatur, habet. / quam-
libet extinctos iniuria suscitat ignes: / en, ego confiteor
non nisi laesus amo. / causa tamen nimium non sit manifesta
doloris, / 600 pluraque sollicitus, quam sciet, esse putet.
/ incitat et ficti tristis custodia serui / et nimium duri
cura molesta uiri: / quae uenit ex tuto, minus est accepta
uoluptas; / ut sis liberior Thaide, finge metus."
The door

Of course the paraklausithuric situation must involve some kind of separation of the beloved from the lover, which is usually represented by a door. One difference that has often been asserted as existing between Greek and Roman paraklausithura is the relative prominence of the door in the latter. For example, Copley (1956, 126) comments that "the door was in a very real sense the life of the paraklausithuron". Earlier (36) he says:

This is not to say that all Roman paraclausithyra are addressed to the door, for they are not; nevertheless, in every Roman paraclausithyron, and in virtually every Roman reference to it, the door plays a prominent and distinctive part. Fores, ianua, limen: these are the key-words; to the Romans, the paraclausithyron from beginning to end is the door song.\(^\text{34}\)

These statements have been broadly supported by others.\(^\text{35}\)

Others have observed that the door-address is "a Latin feature of the παρακλαυσθέντη" (Murgatroyd 1980, 75) or "a Roman feature within the komos" (Cairns 1972, 230). Although these assertions are true, they do, however, require some examination.

\(^{34}\)Copley's statement that "fores, ianua, limen: these are the key-words" is puzzling. This is true so long as it does not imply, as it seems to, that the door was not of equal importance in Greek paraklausithura. Most clearly paraklausithuric situations in Greek contain a reference to the door, which is how most of them are identifiable as paraklausithura. Πρόθυρον and θύρα are the most common words and have prominence in Greek paraklausithura similar to that of fores, ianua, and limen in Latin one. See Appendix 2.

\(^{35}\)Yardley 1979, 158-9; Burck 1966, 250; and Otis 1958, 197, for example.
The address to, and personification of, the door

First, while there are no door-addresses in Greek paraklausithura before Strato AP 12.252 in the second century A.D., there are eight Latin paraklausithuric passages where such addresses take place or are implied. The earliest is Pl. Cur. 16 ff., 147 ff. Next comes Prop. 1.16.17 ff., which was probably influenced by Catul. 67. The bulk of 1.16 is addressed to the door, and, of course, the whole poem is narrated by the door. Tib. 1.2.7-14 contains an address to Delia’s door, but it is only eight lines out of ninety-eight. Ov. Am. 1.6 concludes with Ovid briefly bidding farewell to the door (73-4), but once again the address, which occupies only two lines out of seventy-four, is not particularly prominent. Four other paraklausithuric passages in Ovid also refer to door addresses: Ov. Ars 2.527 (“postibus et durae supplex blandire puellae”), 3.581 (“ante fores iaceat, ‘crudelis ianua!’ dicat”), Rem. 35 f. (“et modo blanditias rigidò, modo iurgia, posti / dicat et exclusus flebile cantet amans”), and 507 (“nec dic blanditias, nec fac conuicia posti”). Furthermore, the Pyramus and Thisbe episode of Met. 4.65 ff., which has paraklausithuric elements, contains an address to the wall that divides the

36 Ἐμπρῆσαν σε, θύρη, τῇ λαμπάδι, καὶ τὸν ἐνοικοῦν / συμφλέξας μεθὸν, εὐθὺς ἀπειμί φυγάς, / καὶ πλάσας Ἀδριανὸν ἑπ’ οἶνοπα πόντον ἀλήτης / φωλήσω γε θύραις νυκτὸς ἀναγο- / μέναις.
young lovers (73 "'inuide' dicebant 'paries, quid amantibus obstas?'"; see Perraud 1987).

It is clear, however, that these passages do not represent a majority of Latin paraklausithuric scenes. Neither Tib. 1.5 nor 2.6 contain an address to the door, nor is there one in Horace. In addition, more occurrences of the situation in Ovid do not contain door-addresses, or references to them, than do: 1.4.6 ff., 1.8.77 f., 1.9.7ff., 2.1.17 ff., 2.9.46, 2.12.3 f., 2.19.6 ff., 3.1.53 f., 3.1.9 ff., Ars 1.735 ff., 2.233 ff., 2.521 ff., 3.68 ff., 3.455 f., 3.567 ff., Fasti 4.107 ff., 5.339 ff., 13.750, 14.698, Rem. 304, Rem. 677, and Met. 14.698 ff. Of course, the settings of Met. 13.750 ff. and Theoc. 11 rule out any door-addresses. It must also be kept in mind that the addresses to the door in Plautus' Curculio could have come from its Greek model. So, while the address to the door is certainly more common in Latin paraklausithuric situations, and in true paraklausithura in particular, it is clearly not prominent enough to be considered a defining characteristic.\(^{37}\)

\(^{37}\)In fact, door addresses cannot be said to be particularly Roman. Cf. the swallow song from Hom. Epigr. 15 = Pseudo-Herod. Vit. Hom. 462-82 (= Suidas Vit. Hom. 176-95); B. Epinic. 1.13-4; E. H.F. 523-4, Ion 1613; Call. Ap. 1 ff.; PGM 4.1115 ff., 13.327 ff., 13.1064 ff., 36.312 ff., (315 ... ἄνοιγθε, / ἄνοιγθε, κλαεῖστρον, ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁρὸς ὧ μέγας). The occurrences in the magical papyri are particularly interesting, for they are all, appropriately enough, in spells for opening doors. Be that as it may, the fact that door-addresses were not unknown to the Greeks, who addressed many different kinds of inanimate objects, makes it very possible that it is simply the fragmentary condition of so much earlier Greek literature that has deprived us of
Similarly, personification of the door is much less common in Greek than in Latin paraklausithuric contexts. It can be found only at Call. AP 5.23 (G.-P. LXIII) ψυχροίς ... προθύροις, and Anon. AP 12.90.5 (G.-P. I): πελών τὰς ἐχθραῖς οὐδὲν ἔχουν τὸ θύρας. [Theoc.] 23.17 comes close: ἀλλ’ ἐνθῶν ἔκλαιε πολί στυγνοίσι μελάθροις. Latin examples occur at

any examples of Greek paraklausithuric door-addresses. Compare the frequency of addresses to buildings and houses in Greek tragedy: A. Ch. 49 f., 963 f.; S. Etl. 110; E. Alc. 1, 568 f., Ba. 1024 f., Hec. 619 f., Hel. 1165, Or. 356 f., Ph. 1341 f., Tr. 1317 f., et al. For other Latin examples, cf. Pl. Mer. 830 f., 901; Nov. Atell. 49-50 [Ribbeck] "Limem superum, quod mei misero saepe confregit caput, / inferum autem, digitos omnis ubi ego defregi meos"; Enn. scen. 101-5 (Ribbeck 81-5); Gracc. trag. 1 (Prisc. GL 2.206K) "O grata cardo, regium egressum indicans"; Courtney 1995 77 (CLE 957 = CIL 4.2487) addresses a wall; Ven. Fort. Misc. 6.7 "De Gelesuintha" (PL 88.218 C; = G.6.105 ff. Leo) "crudelis portae, quae me laxastis euntem, / clauibus oppositis nec uetustis iter, / antea uos geminas adamas petra una ligas set / quam daret huc uillam ianua pansa uiam." Also note Liv. 38.43 where people are described as adoring, praying to, and supplicating a temple’s walls and posts: "parietes postesque nudatos, quos adores, ad quos precentur et supplicent, Ambraciensis supresses." McKay 1967, 194 most attractively suggests that, perhaps, Catul. 61.76 should read "Claustra pandite, ianuae."

The personification of the door was discussed above in connection with Plautus’ Curculio. As was noted there, the door was personified by the Greeks, but without the elaboration found in some Roman examples. It is commonly noted (e.g., Fraenkel 1960, 99 n. 1) as going back to Ar. Pl. 1097 ff. (τίς ἔσθ’ ὁ κόπτων τὴν θύραν; τοιτί τι ἢ; / οὐδές ἐστε ὑπεκλ. ἄλλα ὑπεκλ. τὸ θύριον / ὕψην γέμενον ἄλλως κλευσις;.) but Leo 1900, 607 f. cites Solon 4.28 (αὖλεοι δ’ έτ’ ἐπεσέπειν οὐκ ἐκέλουσι θύραι), Ar. Ach. 127 (τούς δὲ ἐξενίσειν οὐδέποτε γ’ ἐξεοις θύρα), E. Alc. 566 (τάδ’ οὐκ ἐπισταται μέλαθρ’ ἀπωθεῖν οὐθ’ ἀτιμάζειν έξους), and And. 923 (ὑς ἄλκοοι δ’ γε ἐρωτείν έλασεν ἐνθέειν ἐκχοντες ούκε με). He also notes that the first four deal with admission of strangers: "die Aristophaneschodien erklären: παρομία ἐπι τῶν πολλοῦ έξους ἀποδεχομένως... Das sind keine Metaphern des Moments, sondern eine durch Jahrhunderte behende volkstümliche Belebung der Thür mit Bezug auf ihre im Verkehr der
Pl. As. 207 ff., 241 f., Cur. 16 ff., 40 ff. et al., Truc. 638 f. (house); Lucr. 4.1171 ff.; Catul. 67.1 ff.; Hor. Epod. 11.21 "non amicos heu mihi postis," Carm. 3.10.2 f., 3.26.8; Prop. 1.10.16 "tardas possum aperire fores," 1.18.24 "tacitae fores," 3.25.9-10 "limina iam nostris ualeant lacrimantia uerbis, / 10 nec tamen irata ianua fracta manu"; Tib. 2.2.73-4 "nulla exclusura dolentes / ianua" (see Murgatroyd 1994: 119), 2.4.31 "hinc clauim ianua sensit," 2.6.12 "excutiunt clausae fortia uerba fores" (see Murgatroyd 1994, 237); and Ov. Am. 1.6.2 "difficilem moto cardine pande forem," 17 "immitia claustra," 54 "surdas ... fores", 58 "tecta superba petam," 73 "uoque quoque, crudeles rigido cum limine postes / duraque conserva ligna, ualete, fores,"39 2.1.20 ff. "clausa tuo maius ianua fulmen habet. / blanditias elegosque leues, mea tela, resumpsi; / molliertun

Menschen wichtigste Function." Rothstein 1902, 445 plausibly suggests that the address to the door in Greek paraklausthura could have stood beside the address to the beloved from the very beginning. This brings one back again to the Greeks' fairly common habit of addressing inanimate objects.

39McKeown 1987–, 2:124 also includes "roboribus duris" (28), "o foribus durior ipse tuis" (62), and "dura ... limina" (68): "All of these epithets, to a greater or lesser extent, endow the door with human characteristics, much in the spirit of Prop. 1.16." He compares Juv. 4.63 "facili patuerunt cardine valuae" and Hor. Carm. 1.25.4 ff. "ianua... / quae prius multum faciles mouebat / cardines"). Durus, however, seems to mean physical hardness more often than emotional or mental hardness, making it difficult to argue that a secondary meaning should be preferred when the primary meaning could very naturally also be applied.
duras lenia uerba fores," Met. 4.73 "'inuide' dicebant
'paries, quid amantibus obstas?','" and 14.710 "tristisque
serae conniccia fecit."40

These examples of personification are not, however,
particularly strong or striking. Otis (1958, 197) observes
that:

We actually have, as Copley admits, a poem of Strato
(AP, 12.252) where the door is distinctly addressed in
one phrase. Clearly this is different from the long and
explicit address to the door in the Curculio. The dif-
ference, it seems to me, is obviously not in the fact of
address to an inanimate object but in its elaboration
and feeling: the door is not merely apostrophized but

---

40 For examples elsewhere in Latin, see Verg. Aen.
8.196 "foribusque adfixa superbis," 8.721-2 "aptatque super-
bis / postibus," G. 2.461 "foribus domus alta superbis";
Hor. Carm. 4.15.7-8 "derepta Parthorum superbis / postibus";
Sen. Suas. 1.4 "caligo nauigantem tibi uidetur admirere,
quae prospectinentem excludit?" (cited by Murgatroyd 1994,
119); Prop. 2.31.12 ff. "et ualuae, Libyci nobile dentis
opus; / altera dejectos Parnasi uertice Gallos, / altera
maerebat funera Tantalidos.; Ov. Pont. 1.7.54 "non est cur
tua me ianua nosse neget.;" Met. 4.486 "limine constiterat:
postes tremuisse feruntur / Aeolii pallorque fores infecit
cernas / solque locum fugit"; 8.173 "ianua difficilis;"
Sen. Ep. 4.10 "non est necesse superbis adsidere liminibus,"
Her. F. 164-6 "[Chorus].../ ille superbos aditus regum /
durasque fores expres somni / colit"; Col. Re Rust. 1 Pref.
10 "foribus ingratis;" Laus Pis. 118-19 "rara domus tenuem
non aspernatur amicum"; Stat. Theb. 2.223 "... foribus cum
inmissa superbis"; Juv. 3.275 "nocte patent uigiles te
praeterente fenestrae"; Mart. 1.70.13 "ne metuas fastus
limenque superbum," 10.20.(19).12-3 "non tuo disertam /
pulses ebria ianuam;" and Prud. Peristeph. 5.311 "seruare
feralem domum," Symm. I 65 "nunc foribus surdis" (paraklau-
sithuric). Also compare Aen. 2.487 f. "penitusque cauae
plangoribus aedes / femineis ululant" (and see Austin 1964,
190 f. ad loc.), and Cic. Pis. 21 "cum ... templa gemerent,
tecta urbis ipsa ligerent" (with Nisbet 1961, 82: "for the
attrition to buildings of human emotions cf. # 52, leg.
agr. 2.9, Sest. 53, Marc. 10, off. 2.29, Plin. paneg. 50.4,
paneg. Lat. 11(3).11.3.").
treated as a person. The apostrophe is not per se specifically Roman: the personalization of the door is.

There is simply nothing in any Greek paraklausithuron to match the extended song to, and personification of, the door in Plautus' *Curculio*, or the talking door of Prop. 1.16. As Burck (1966, 250) notes:

Nie aber wird sie personifiziert wie die Tür bei Pro-
perz. Und dazu paßt es, daß auch die übrige griechische
Dichtung eine Belebung der Tür selten kennt, ja daß eine
weiter durchgeführte Personifikation ihr, so weit ich
sehe, ganz fehlt.

Furthermore, there are no real parallels in Greek paraklaus-
sithura to the religious forms of the address to the door in
Prop. 1.16 and Tib. 1.2.7-14. 41 There is in these passages a
religious elevation of the door beyond anything seen before
in a paraklausithuric context. Nevertheless, these two poems
are atypical and cannot be considered truly representative
of Latin paraklausithura.

---

41 See particularly Yardley 1978 and 1979, but also
for Prop. 1.16, see Butler and Barber 1964, 179; Due 1981-
82; Fedeli 1980, 396; Fedeli 1981, 232; MacKay 1956; Roth-
stein 1986, 105 f.; Witke 1969; Burck 1966, 244; et al. The
address to the *ianitor* in Ov. Am. 1.6 is also religious, but
that is a slightly different matter from the door—see again
Yardley 1978; Yardley 1979; Watson 1982; and McKeown 1987-
2:123 ff. In the case of the *ianitor* one has to wonder if it
is not a matter of Ovid playing with the "Roman ... tradi-
tion of formulaic religious language in the supplicatory
address to the door" (Yardley 1978, 32) but rather applying
such language to the *ianitor* instead of to the beloved.
Yardley goes on to examine Met. 13.778 ff., where similar
language is used of Galatea, but here Polyphemus' complete
and abject submission to Galatea is so extreme that it is
very possible that there is no intended manipulation of the
deification of the door rather than simply deification of
the beloved.
Religious associations of the door in paraklausithura

Certain religious details are visible in earlier paraklausithura.\(^42\) Kissing a door, such as occurs at Prop. 1.16.42, Lucr. 4.1178, and is suggested at Pl. Cur. 94 ("Quin das sauium?") has been identified as a religious action.\(^43\) However, the kissing of parts of the door occurs elsewhere. One good example is the visit of Prusias of Bithynia to the senate (Plb. 30.18.4–6; D.C. 20.69.1/Zon. 9.24; D.S. 31.15.3). Livy 45.46.20 makes it clear that the gesture had religious implications, although it is connected here with prostration: "Romae quoque, cum ueniret in curiam, 

\(^{42}\) The following pages will suggest that Copley 1942, 102 may have been wrong when he commented that "as far as Greek paraclausithyra are concerned, there is little evidence that the lover imagined himself as performing a quasi-ritual before the door; the nearest he ever comes to this is to proclaim himself a votive offering to the gods of love, a declaration which is no more than a poetic conceit."

\(^{43}\) See Yardley 1978, 23 and his examples, including Tib. 1.2.83; Murgatroyd 1980, 94; Appel 1909, 199; MacCulloch 1911, 847 col. i; and Trumbull 1906, 11, 123; et al. Also see the references in the previous note. Kissing statues was a standard form of veneration, e.g. Charito 1.1.7 and 8.8.15. The hearth could be kissed: Ov. Tr. 1.3.43 ff. "illa etiam ante Lares passis adstrata capillis / con-tigit extinctos ore tremente focos, / 45 multaque in auersos effudit uerba Penates / pro deplorato non ualitura uiro." It continues today—consider the Lenten practice among some Catholics of kissing the crucifix. Kissing the earth could possibly have been religious: Ov. Met. 13.420 ff. "Troia, uale! rapimur' clamant, dant oscula terrae / Troades et patriae fumantia tecta relinquunt." However, Otis 1958, 197 has his doubts "In discussing Lucretius,... I can hardly follow his [Copley] reading of furtive love into the three-line passage on the ground that Lucretius' lover anoints the doors with unguent. This seems to me nothing but another expression of the lover's extravagance (he also kisses the door and covers it with garlands)."
summisisset se et osculo limen curiae contigisset et deos
seruatores suos senatum appellasse...." Also compare Juv.
6.47-8, where "adora" must mean kiss: "Tarpeium limen adora
/pronus."\(^4^4\) Kissing of the door also occurs in two earlier
paraklausithuric passages: Call. AP 12.1:8 (G.-P. VIII,
Pfeiffer 42) and [Theoc.] 23.18.\(^4^5\) It is even more developed
in Aristaenet. 2.14.5 ff.:

\[\text{μάτην ἐπέκαθισαν οἱ βασικαί οὐν ἡμῖν τῆς φιλλας, καὶ ἐς
κενὸν αὐτὸς ἀπέβη τῆς ἐπιβουλής ὃ σκοπός. Ὁδεν, ἡ
φίλτατε, μά τὸν φίλλον ἑρμοτα τὸν ἐμὸν τοις καὶ σοιν, χήθες
ἐπὶ τὸ σὸν ἰσώδιον εἰςιοῦσα θάττον ἢ βάδην ἐκλάσαν ὧφ
ἡδονῆς, κατισπαζήσαν τοις ἀπλήσατος 10 τὸν ἄφοβιον
οἶκον, καὶ τοὺς τοκχων ἐφαπτομένη τοὺς δακτύλους ἐφίλον
ὑπερχαίρουσα καὶ μεισιώσα γλυκὺ.}\]

It is not clear that religious implications can be ruled out
in any of these examples.

However, the kissing of a door or one of its parts
is also not always explicitly religious and often seems to be

\(^{4^4}\) See Courtney 1980, 268, who also cites Ov. Met.
1.375 "procumbit uterque / pronus humi gelidique pauens
dedit oscula saxo."

\(^{4^5}\) See also Gow 1965, 2:410 ad loc. Yardley 1978, 26
n. 18 notes these examples but says that the gesture in them
"has no religious significance." However, if the gesture can
be religious, then it could be so here, even though it
occurs by itself with no other religious actions or lan-
guage. If it was a widely recognized gesture of veneration
or worship, it would not need elaboration. Cairns 1972, 123
comments: "In the komos one topos is that the lover kisses
his beloved's door or door-post."
associated with emotional departures or arrivals.\(^46\) The door could also have been kissed as an affectionate gesture because of its association with the beloved. In X. Cyr.

6.4.9 ff. a woman kisses the carriage in which her husband sits, since she cannot kiss him:

\[\text{Taot' eiliw katar tais thuras to ou armatelou di paytov anebainen epil to arma. 10 epel de anabanto autou katexelase ton di flow o uphunoxos, ouk exousia h pandeia pws an eti allws aposasito auton, katexilase ton di flow.}\]

At Ov. Met. 4.71 ff. Pyramus and Thisbe not only address the wall that separates them but also kiss it, since they too cannot kiss each other:

\[\text{saepe, ubi constiterant hinc Thisbe, Pyramus illinc, inque uices fuerat captatus anhelitus oris, "inuide" dicebat "paries, quid amantibus obstas? quantum erat, ut sineres toto nos corpore iungi aut, hoc si nimium est, uel ad oscula danda pateres? 75}\]

\(^{46}\text{For example: A.R. 4.26-7 kuse se }\delta^{'}\text{ en te lexox kai dixlidas }\alpha^{'}\text{ mphetemva / stamouss, kai toixw }\varepsilon\text{ epaphisso; Verg. Aen. 3.349 ff. "procedo et paruam Troiam simulataque magnis / 350 Pergama et arantem Xanthi cognomine rium / agnosco, Scaeaque amplerator limina portae; / nec non et Teucris sociis simul urbe fruentur"; V.Fl. 2.168 "oscula iamque toris atque oscula postibus ipsis"; and Rut. Nam. de red. 1.43-6 "crebra relinquentis infigimus oscula portis: / inuiti superant limina sacra pedes. / 45 oramus ueniam lacrimis et laude hitamus, / in quantum fletus currere uerba sinit." Ogle 1911, 264 notes that "one of the precepts of Pythagoras was that the doors should be kissed fondly by those who enter or depart" and cites in note 3 "Mullach, Fr. Ph. Gr. 1, p.510; cf. Herod. 2.121 of a similar Egyptian custom." Cf. Alcestis kissing and addressing her bed as she is about to leave it forever, E. Alc. 175 ff.: kapeita thanamos epideseusa kai lexox / enntath a eli anakruse kal lexene tade / "ow lektro, euvsa perheuei elus egy / koreyma ti ek tousa anephe ... / xatp an gev ekheirmo sou ... / ... / 183 kunei de prospitunousa, pan de hemis / ophthamoske ditei plhmuri. / ... / 186 steixe proouthis epideseusa demel, / kai polla thanlów eixido epestra phi / karrifi aytin abthi es koitn palin.}\]
nec sumus ingrati: tibi nos debere fatemur, quod datus est verbis ad amicas transitus auris.

talia diversa nequiquam sede locuti
sub noctem dixere "uale" partique dedere oscula quisque suae non peruenientia contra.⁴⁷

Furthermore, the kissing of something either belonging to one's beloved or something that could carry the kiss to one's beloved is common enough in classical literature.⁴⁸

At Lucr. 4.1178, however, the kissing of the door is combined with anointing, and such a combination does seem undoubtedly religious. In Prop. 1.6, in contrast, the reference to kissing the door cannot be said definitely to carry the same significance. Lines 39-40 refer to the lover's vigil, and 43-44 to past religious offerings and veneration of the door. But the mention of the "oscula" in the couplet occupying lines 41-2 along with the "novo ... carmina uersu" may simply be mentioning past gifts--songs and kisses. If

⁴⁷ This could, of course, be because of the substitution of the wall for a door, with the wall being treated as one would expect the door to be. But the address and the gesture seems natural enough--like a lover today kissing one hand and holding it up to a window on the other side of which is his or her beloved.

⁴⁸ Cups are an example: Mel. AP 5.171 (G.-P. XXXV), Ach. Tat. 4.17.1, Philostr. Ep. 33, Leont. AP 5.295, and Agath. AP 5.261. See Gow 1950 on Theoc. 7.70. At Plu. Ant. 85.1 Cleopatra kisses the urn containing Antony's ashes. Cf. also Prop. 4.3.30 "si qua relict a iacent, osculor arma tua." At Ov. Fast. 3.563-4 Anna kisses Dido's ashes. In Charito, Callirhoë kisses a picture of Chaireas at 1.14.9; Chaireas kisses a letter he has written to Callirhoe at 4.4.8; Persian men kiss the chariot in which Callirhoe is 5.3.10; and Dionysius kisses Callirhoe's name written in a letter, at 8.5.13.
kissing a door is only sometimes religious, then it may not be in this particular instance.

The anointing of the door at Lucr. 4.1178-9 has only one parallel in a paraklausithuric context: Mel. AP 5.198.2 (G.-P. XXIV). The gesture was clearly religious to the Greeks as well as to the Romans. It is referred to at Hom. Od. 3.406 ff.:

\[\text{\textquotedblleft} \alpha\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\ ' \eta\rho\lambda\eta\gamma\varepsilon\eta\epsilon\alpha\ \phi\alpha\nu\eta\ \rho\delta\sigma\delta\acute{a}\kappa\tau\upsilon\upsilon\alpha\varsigma\ \prime\prime\varsigma\; \iota\omicron\varsigma\ \pi\omega\pi\eta\iota\varsigma\ \tau\acute{e}\nu\varphi\iota\ \iota\tau\omicron\varsigma\alpha\varsigma\ \sigma\rho\omicron\ \varepsilon\iota\zeta\varsigma\iota\varsigma\ \iota\pi\varepsilon\ \iota\varepsilon\omega\sigma\tau\omicron\omicron\varsigma\ \lambda\beta\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\iota\omicron\varsigma\nu\iota\varsigma.\text{\textquotedblright}\]

\[49\] See Yardley 1978, 26 for Roman references for anointing religious objects and anointing in ritual contexts.

\[50\] Burkert 1985, 72 comments: "When grave stelae are anointed and garlanded, they may be taken as representatives of the dead who, like the living, are anointed and wreathed for the festival. But oil is also poured over special stones in special places without anthropomorphic associations.... Stones glistening with oil stand at crossroads; whoever it was that had made libation there, the superstitious man at least is careful to demonstrate his veneration for these stones. In this case it is obviously simply a matter of demarcation, of fixing a centre or point of orientation. Whoever pours out oil here assures himself of the spatial order of things; any stranger who passes by recognizes from the glistening that other men have established their order here." A lover might anoint his beloved's door as a way to leave a more permanent mark than an easily-removed garland or torch—Burkert 1979, 42: "In other civilizations, stones are smeared with butter or grease. One might say that oil libation is a ceremony of anointing, performed on stones imagined as gods by primitive man.... It is a fact that stains of oil on a stone remain visible for quite a long time." Cf. PGM 36.134 ff., quoted above (Chapter 2, note 50) on Theocritus 2. It is a love-charm of attraction and involves anointing one's own door's sockets with a mixture of myrrh and frankincense. PGM 2.149 ff. describes a purification ritual as part of another spell for revelation. It involves writing on a door, the doorposts, and lintel and anointing the door with goat's blood. In other words, the gesture could conceivably be magical rather than religious.
For anointing in combination with prostration/kissing, also compare Thphr. Char. 16.5 ("Superstition"):

καὶ τῶν λιπαρῶν λίθων τῶν ἐν ταῖς τριθάλαις παρίων ἐκ τῆς λιπτοῦσας ἐλαιοῦ καταχείν καὶ ἐπὶ γόνατα πεσῶν καὶ προσκυνήσας ἀπαλλάττεσθαι.

There is a later mention of sprinkling about perfume in a komastic context at Charito 1.3.2:

Ἐν δὲ τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ φανερῶς μὲν οὐδεὶς ἐτόλμησεν ἐπικυμάσαι, κρύφα δὲ καὶ ἀδήλως ἐπελθόντες σημεῖα κῶμοι ἦσαν καὶ κατέλησαν. Ἐστεφάνωσαν τὰ πρόθυρα, μύροις ἔρραναν, οἴνου πλῆν ἐποίησαν, ἄθαθας ἔρριψαν ἡμικαύστους.

It is interesting to note that, while anointing is more clearly religious than the kissing of the door, it occurs in only one Roman and one Greek paraklausithuric situation.51

51 On the Anthesteria the doors of houses were "freshly painted with pitch" (Burkert 1985, 238). This is probably what is referred to in Aeschrio Lyr. fr. 10.1 καὶ πίσαν ἐφθῆ, ἦν θύρας μυρίζοντα. For more on anointing of doors with various substances, including oil and blood, see Trumbull 1906, 14 ff. et al.; MacCulloch 1911, 846 f.; Ogle 1911, 254 f.; and for more on the Roman wedding ritual, see Treggiari 1991, 167–8. Cf. Plin. Nat. 28.49 "cardinibus ostiorum acetum adfusis lutum fronti inlitum capitis dolorem sedare, item laqueum suspensusi circumdatum temporibus." Also see Ex. 12:22 ff. "Take a bunch of hyssop and dip it in the blood which is in the basin, and touch the lintel and the two doorposts with the blood which is in the basin; and none of you shall go out of the door of his house until the morning. 23 For the LORD will pass through to slay the Egyptians; and when he sees the blood on the lintel and on the two doorposts, the LORD will pass over the door, and will not allow the destroyer to enter your houses to slay you.” The door vocabulary in the LXX version is worth noting: 22 λήψεσθε δὲ δεσμὴν υασώμου καὶ βάψαντες ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ παρὰ τὴν θύραν καθέξιτε τῆς φλιᾶς καὶ ἐπ’ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν σταθμῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος.
It is even possible that the several mentions of wine being sprinkled around the doorway are religious. It has been suggested that such was the case at Pl. Cur. 88-9. As was noted above, the Scholia on Ar. Pl. 179 (39-50) mention the famous prostitute Lais: αὕτης δὲ πολλοὶ τῶν Θετταλῶν ἥρασθησαν, καὶ τῷ ἔρωτι τὰ πρόθυρα αὕτης οἶνῳ ἔρραμον. The passage from Charito quoted immediately above (1.3.2) also must refer to the pouring or spilling of wine when it says the komasts οἶνον πηλὸν ἐποίησαν. It is interesting to compare with this the description at 1.1.13 ff. (with which compare Saph. fr. 44) of the celebration in the city after the betrothalth of Chaireas and Callirhoe is announced:

παρῆσαν δὲ καὶ αἱ γυναικεῖς αἱ Συρρακουσίων ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν νυμφαγωγοῦσαν. ὑμέναιος ἦσε τὸ κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν πόλιν. μεσαί δὲ αἱ βύμαι στεφάνων, λαμπάδων· ἔρραμε τὰ πρόθυρα οἶνῳ καὶ μύροις....

This could simply be from celebratory komoi pouring out of the houses into their porches, where they liberally splash about wine and perfume, but it sounds much more like some deliberate action. Libations were a standard way of making an offering almost anywhere, and while there are no obvious references to libations of wine being made directly to doors or thresholds in Greece or Rome, there is no reason to suppose that they were not.52

52 On libations in general as a means of offering, see Burkert 1979, 41 ff.: "Libation, ceremoniously pouring out liquids, plays an overwhelming role throughout Near Eastern and Mediterranean religion;... Usually libation is, without any question, taken to be some 'offering,'...." He cites an interesting series of libations from a Hittite
Other actions seen in earlier paraklausithura may also have religious significance. The lover has often been seen to lie down before the doors of the beloved: Ar. Lys. 281 f., and V. 104; Pl. Smp. 183a, 203b; Asclep. AP 5.167 (G.-P. XIV); Theoc. 3.53 f.; Call. AP 5.23 (G.-P. LXIII, Pfeiffer 63); and Anon. AP 12.90 (G.-P. I).\textsuperscript{53} As was seen in connection with the kissing of doors/thresholds/steps above, lying down or prostrating oneself in supplication before the doors of a shrine or temple was a typical religious act.\textsuperscript{54} A text: "'once for the hearth, once for the shields, once for the window, once for the window bolt, once beside the window,' and so on. There is no mention of gods or spirits. The crucial limits of the palace are marked and, as it were, sealed, in a ritual averting, for example, a thunder-storm." See also Burkert 1985, 77 f. For various types of libations at doorways, see Ogle 1911, 268 and MacCulloch 1911, 847 col. ii. Curt. 9.10.25 describing Alexander's intended Bacchic triumph includes the following in his preparations: "Vicos, per quos iter erat, floribus coronisque sterni iubet, liminis adem creterras uino repletas et alia eximiae magnitudinis usas disponi." Sprinkling water at the threshold was a purificatory action: Ov. Fast. 6.155 ff.

\textsuperscript{53} For Latin examples, see Pl. Am. 1072 ff.; Cic. Catil. 1.26; Catul. 63.65; and Hor. Epod. 11.21 f., Carm. 1.25.3 f., 3.10.3 and 20. Compare Tib. 2.4.22; Prop. 1.16.23, 2.6.1, 2.14.31 f.; Ov. Am. 2.19.19 ff., Ars 2.238 ff., 3.580 ff.; Mart. 10.14; and August. Con. 1.19. Copley 1942, 102 is technically correct to state that "prostration forms no part of either Greek or Roman cult" but it was clearly one form of veneration and was a common suppliant pose.

\textsuperscript{54} Several of the examples cited for kissing doors combine the action with prostration. For prostration alone, see, among many others, S. OT 19 ff, τὸ δ' ἄλλο φίλου ἐξε- στεμένον / 20 ἄγορατοι θακεί, πρὸς τε Παλλάς δυσπλοῖς / νυστοῖ, ἐπὶ Ἰσημυνοῦ τε μανετάι σπαδώι. / ... / 31 θεοῡ τι μέν νυν ὃθ' ἱσούμενον α' ἐγὼ / οὐδ' οἷς παῖς έπ' ἐδύμεσθ' ἐφαστοί; E. Hēracl. 31; D.S. 31.15.3; Liv. 7.21.5-6, 45.46.20; Stat. Silv. 5.1.161 ff., Theb. 10.49-59, 65-9
particularly good example comes from Stat. Theb. 9.602 ff. Atalanta, in the morning, purifies herself in a stream and heads for Diana's shrine. She stands on the threshold and prays:

\[
\text{ergo ut in amne nefas merso ter crine piauit}
\text{uerbaque sollicitas matrum solantia curas}
\text{addidit, armatae ruit ad delubra Dianae}
\text{ror e sub Eoo, notasque ex ordine siluas}
\text{et quercum gauisa uidet. tunc limine diuæ}
\text{astitit et tali nequiquâm uoce precatur:}
\text{'uirgo potens nemorum, cuius non mollia signa...'
}
\]

By the time she has finished her prayer, she is prostrate (635 ff.):

\[
\ldots \text{dixit, fletuque soluto}
\text{aspicit et niueae saxum maduisse Dianæ.}
\text{illam diuæ ferox etiamnum in limine sacro}
\text{expositam et gelidas uerrentem crinibus aras}
\text{linquit...}
\]

She is later described by Diana (9.722-3): "'et nunc illa meas ingerem plangit ad aras / inuidiam surdasque fores et limina lassat.'" She is lying down on the threshold, crying, wearying the deaf doors and threshold with her prayers. The

(with tears); Juv. 6.47 ff.; and Polyaen. Strat. 8.51.1.3 ff. For a number of cross-cultural examples, see MacCulloch 1911, 847 ff. Cf. Jd. 19:27 f. "And her master rose up in the morning, and when he opened the doors of the house and went out to go on his way, behold, there was his concubine lying at the door of the house, with her hands on the threshold."
similarity to many paraklausithura is clear.\textsuperscript{55} Another supplication scene with paraklausithuric overtones occurs at Lucan 2.28-37:

\textbf{... cultus matrona priores deposing maestaeque tenent delubra cateruae: hae lacrimis sparsere deos, hae pectora duro adflixeret solo, lacerasque in limine sacro attonitae fudere comas uotisque uocari adsueta crebris feriunt ululatibus aures. nec cunctae summii templo iacueret Tonantis: diuisere deos, et nullis defuit aris inuidiam factura pares. quarum una madentis scissa genas, planctu liuentis atra lacertos...\textsuperscript{56}}

Moreover, while the suppliant is usually described as carrying a suppliant branch (κλάδος or λεκτηρία), gar-

\textsuperscript{55}Supplication could take place at anyone's threshold. A. Ch. 560 ff. is particularly suggestive, with the mention of the doorkeeper and the public shame that comes from not admitting a suppliant: [OP.] \ldots ξέως γάρ εἰκώς, παντελῆ σαγήν ἔχων, / ἥξις σὺν ἀνδρὶ τῷ ἐφ᾽ ἐρκείους πῦλας / Πυλᾶς, ξένος τε καὶ ὁρώξενος σῶμαν. / ᾿αιδῷ δὲ φωνὴ ᾧσιν Παρνησίᾳ, / γλῶσσης ἀυτῆς Φωκίδος μιμουμένω. / 565 καὶ δὴ υφηρέτων οὕτως ἄν φαίλορ θρενί / σᾶς ἐξείπτεται, ἐπειδὴ δάμους δώματοι κακοῦς. / μενοῦμεν οὕτως ὡστ᾽ ἐπεικάζειν τινὰ / σῶμας παραστέρχοντα καὶ τάδ᾽ ἔννεπεν. / "τὶ δὴ πύλαισι τῶν ἱκέτην ἀπελευρεῖτα / 570 Ἀγαθοῖς, ἐλπιθεὶς οὐδὲν ἐννήμους 

\textsuperscript{56}Fantham 1992, 85 comments on the similarity: "While both harsh ground and threshold suggest the elegiac tradition of the excluded and suppliant lover, their function is simply to contrast the women's hardship with their soft and indoor world."
lands are also used. The importance of the supplicatory ritual in the Greek world makes it seem very possible that the figure of a garlanded person lying before a doorway would have evoked associations with supplication. If that is true, then it could also be the case that the idea of a lover lying at his beloved’s door, garlanded, was at times viewed as a deliberately supplicatory act by the lover directed towards the beloved. Since supplication implied an abject submission of the supplicant to the supplicandus, a certain element of servitium amoris is possibly also present in such scenes, as well as a possible deification of the beloved.

In fact, supplicatory language is used in several pre-elegiac Greek paraklausithuric situations: Ar. Ec. 970 f. (Ὁ λκετεύω / ἀνοίξω, ἀπάζω με); Plato Smp. 183 a (λκετελας τε καὶ ἀντιβολήσεις ἐν ταῖς δεήσεις πολούμενοι, καὶ ὄρκους ὁμνύτες, καὶ κοιμήσεις ἐπὶ θύραις); P. Teb. 1.1.2d.9 ([... π]αρακυψον λκετω Κλευπατ[ρα]); Mel. AP

57 Köchling 1914, 16 even goes so far as to describe the λκετηρία as being either branch or garland. A κλάδος could be small enough to use in a garland: E. Alc. 759 στέφει δὲ κράτα μυρσίνης κλάδοις. For garlands, see A. Ch. 1034 ff.; S. OT 911-13; E. Heracl. 70 ff., 123 ff., Andr. 891 ff., Alc. 171 f.; and D. Meidias 51-2. In Hld. 9.11 a group of suppliants also carry torches: ἄθροισαντες οὖν πᾶσαν ἡλικίαν, καὶ κλάδους εἰς λκετηρίαν ἀναλαβόντες, κηροὺς τε καὶ δόμας ἀψάμενοι. Hor. Carm. 3.14.8 mentions "suppliance uita" by itself.

58 See especially Gould 1973, but also Burkert 1979, 43 ff.
12.85.10 (G.-P. CXV) (δέξασθ’ ὀλλύμενον τὸν φίλας ἴκτην), 5.191.6 (G.-P. LXXIII) (ἄκρυσιν ἐκάθεσα τοὺς ἴκτας στεφάνους); and Rufin. AP 5.103 (Μέχρι τίνος, Προδίκη, παρακλάουσι; ἄχρι τίνος σε / γουνάσσομαι, στερεή, μηδὲν ἀκουόμενος. Alc. fr. 374 (λίσσομαι σε λίσσομαι), while not supplicatory, is still religious.59 As might be expected, supplicatory language can also be found in later Greek paraklausithura.60

Supplicatory language is not noticeably more common in Latin paraklausithura. Plautus does not use it, although Terence does: Eu. 811 f. “iam haec tibi aderit supplicans / ultro.”61 It occurs in the possibly paraklausithuric Catul. 60.4–5 (“ut supplicis uocem in nouissimo casu / 5 contemptam haberes, a nimis fero corde?”) and only once in Horace, at

59 For λίσσομαι cf. Bion Aropos. 16.1–3 Αὔταρ ἐγὼν βασείμαι εἰμί ὅδεν ἐς τὸ κάταντες / τίνο ποτὲ φάμαθον τε καὶ ἀνόνα ψιθυρίζων, / λίσσομαι Γαλάτειαν ἀπηνέα.

60 See: Paul. Sil. AP 5.256 Δικλίδας ἀμφιτάναξεν ἐμοὶς Γαλάτεια προσώποις / ἐσπερος, ὑβριστὴν μῦθον ἐπευξήμενη. / "Ὑβρις ἔρωτας ἔλυε." μάτην δέ μύθος ὄλαται. / ὑβρις ἐμὴν ἐρέθει μάλλον ἐρωμανήν. / 5 ὅμωσα γάρ λυκάβαντα μένειν ἀπανεύθεν ἐκείνης. / θεός ἁγιώτατες ἐπὸς ἐβην; Philostr. Ep. 39; and Aristaen. 2.20.1 ff. Νέος ἐρωτικὸς, δνομα λύκων, ἀνήνυτα προσκαρτέρων καὶ θυραυλών γυναίκι μέμφεται δεινῶς ἀπειθοῦση: δὲ μὲν γὰρ ἱκετεύων... [23 ff.] ἀστρώτοις καὶ χαμαμπετεῖς κομήτησες ἐπὶ θύραις ποιεῖσθε, καὶ λυπαρῶς ἱκέτευετε 25 μόνου ῥήματος τυχέλι ἀκιντότες, καὶ σφερύντες κατόμυσθε τοὺς θεοὺς, ἐπ᾽ ἄκρον τοῦ χελλοὺς ἐχοντες τὸν ώρκον.

61 Cf. Pers. 5.171–4 “nunc ferus et uiolens; at, si uocet, haut mora dicas / quidnam igitur faciam? nec nunc, cum arcessat et ultro / supplicet, accedam?” si totus et integer illinc / exieras, nec nunc’.
Carm. 3.10.15 f.: "supplicibus tuis / parcas." It is present in Prop. 1.16.1-4, and 13-14:

Quae fueram magnis olim patefacta triumphis,
ianua Tarpeiae nota pudicitiae;
cuius inaurati celebrarunt limina currus,
captorum lacrimis umida supplicibus;
... . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
haec inter grauibus cogor deflere querelis,
supplicis a longis tristior excubiis. 13

Tib. 1.2.13-14 ("Te meminisse decet, quae plurima uoce
peregi / supplice, cum posti florida serta darem") is reinforced later in the poem at lines 83 ff.:

non ego, si merui, dubitem procumbere templis
et dare sacratis oscula liminibus,
non ego tellurem genibus perrepere supplex 
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et miserum sancto tundere poste caput.

Ovid uses the topos as well, but not frequently. See Ars

2.525 ff.:

forsitan et uultu mendax ancilla superbo
dicet 'quid nostras obsidet iste fores?'
postibus et dureae supplex blandire puellae,
et capiti demptas in fore pone rosas;

Met. 13.855 ff.:

... tantum miserere precesque
supplicis exaudi! tibi enim succumbimus uni,
quiue Iouem et caelum sperno et penetrabile fulmen,
Nerei, te uereor, tua fulmine saevior ira est;

and Met. 14.702: "uincere non potuit, supplex ad limina
uenit." 63

62 As was noted above, this passage seems to use
deliberately religious formulae directed at the beloved.

63 Liv. 38.43 is interesting in the way in which it
makes the temple the object of prayers and supplication:
"parietes postesque nudatos, quos adorent, ad quos precentur
et supplicent, Ambraciensibus superesse...."
Another action with possible religious connotations occurs when the lover hangs his garland on, or places it at, his beloved's door. This occurs in earlier Greek paraklausithura at Alexis fr. 114 (possibly; K.-A. = Ath. 15.678 c); Asclep. AP 5.145 (G.-P. XII; the garlands are called ἱκέτας στεφάνους [6] and they are described as σκῦλα [8]); Theocritus 2.153; and Mel. AP 5.191 (G.-P. LXXIII). There are wreaths on the door in three of the Aristophanic parodies:

64 For hanging garlands on doors and making offerings of garlands at doors or similar locations, see Köchling 1914, 20 ff., 35 ff., 62 ff.; MacCulloch 1911, 849 col. ii f.; Ogle 1911, 263, 267-271; 1913, 293-4; Crook 1914-40, 2.1:160 ff.; Frazer 1973, 2.228-233, 3.36 f.; Courtney 1980, 268, 271 f., 287, 365; Blech 1982, 66 [on the paraklausithuron], 275 ff., 295 ff.; Treggiari 1991, 163; Fantham 1992, 145; and TLL 7.2.1405.5 ff. Smith 1848, 1:627 s.v. "Janua" summarises the range of circumstances: "The DONARIA offered to the gods were suspended not only from the ANTAE, but likewise from the door-posts and lintels of their temples. ...Victors in the games suspended their crowns at the door of a temple. (Pind. Nem. v.53.) In like manner persons fixed to the jambs and lintels of their own doors the spoils which they had taken in battle.... Also garlands and wreaths of flowers were suspended over the doors of temples in connection with the performance of religious rites, or the expression of public thanksgiving...." The multitudinous uses for garlands in the classical world make separating any one particular use from others of similar appearance or context next to impossible. The Church Fathers latched on to garlands at doors as a generally bad thing, indicating the pagan religious associations of the action: Greg. Naz. or. 38 (MPG 36.316.20-1) "Εσται δὲ τούτο πῦς; Μὴ πρόθυρα στεφανώσωμεν, μὴ χοροὺς συστησώμεθα, μὴ κοσμήσωμεν ἄγνιας, μὴ ὀφθαλμόν ἐστίσώμεθα; and Chrys. Kal. (MPG 48.957.13 f.) Μὴ τὴν θάρσον τῆς οἰκίας στεφανώσεις, ἀλλὰ τοιαύτην ἐπίδειξαν πολίτειαν, pent. 2 (MPG 50.467.61 ff.) Διὸ παρακαλῶ πρὸς 468 ἀξίαν τῶν σεθυμένων ἡμῶν ἁγαθῶν, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐστράτευμε, οὐ τὴν πόλιν στεφανοῦσε, ἀλλὰ τὰς ψυχὰς καλλωπίσοντες· οὐ κοσμοῦντες τὴν ἁγορὰν παραπετάσμασιν, ἀλλὰ φαινοῦντες τὴν ψυχὴν τοῖς τῆς ἁρετῆς περιβολαῖοις....
Ec. 1034, Eq. 729, and Pl. 1088. In pre-elegiac Latin paraphrase, garlands are offered to the beloved's door only at Lucr. 4.1177 f. and Catul. 63.66 (as in Theoc. 2, it is the house that is, through a common metonymy, described as garlanded: "mihi floridis corollis redimita domus erat"). The topos becomes more common in elegy, mainly in Ovid.\(^6^5\) Propertius mentions it once, at 1.16.5-8:

\[
\begin{align*}
nunc ego, nocturnis potorum saucia rixis, 
pulsata indignis saepe queror manibus, 
et mihi non desunt turpes pendere corollae 
semper et exclusis signa iacere faces.
\end{align*}
\]

Compare the garlanded grove of the Bona Dea in Prop. 4.9.27: "deusia puniceae uelabant limina uittae."\(^6^6\) A garlanded door or threshold is mentioned only once in Tibullus, at 1.2.13-14: "Te meminisse decet, quae plurima uoce peregi / supplice, cum posti florida serta darem."\(^6^7\) At Ov. Am. 1.6.67-

\(^6^5\)See Murgatroyd 1980, 77; McKeown 1987-, 2:158; and Fedeli 1980, 374.

\(^6^6\)Anderson 1964 quite correctly identified the passage as a paraklausithuric parody; see also Cairns 1992. Compare also Prop. 1.3.21-2, where Prop. puts his garland on the sleeping Cynthia: "et modo soluebam nostra de fronte corollas / ponebamque tuis, Cynthia, temporibus."

\(^6^7\)But compare Tib. 1.2.79 ff.: "num Veneris magnae uiolauui numina uerbo, / 80 et mea nunc poenas inpia lingua luit? / num feror incestus sedes adiisse deorum / sertaque de sanctis deripuisse focis?" See Murgatroyd 1980, 94: "T. probably means the theft of garlands to provide gifts for Delia or (cf. 14) to be hung on her door."
70 the garland itself is also addressed (seen before in 
Asclep. AP 5.145 [G.-P. XII]):

\[
\text{at tu, non laetis detracta corona capillis,} \\
\text{dura super tot limina nocte iace;} \\
\text{tu dominae, cum te proiectam mane uidebit,} \\
\text{temporis absumpsi tam male testis eris.} 
\]

Ars 2.527-8, like Tib. 1.2.13-14, combines the offering of the garland with supplication: "postibus et durae supplex blandire puellae, / et capiti demptas in fore pone rosas."
See also Ars 3.71-2 ("nec tua frangetur nocturna ianua rixa, / sparsa nec inuenies limina mane rosa") and Rem. 31-2 ("effice nocturna frangatur ianua rixa, / et tegat ornatas multa corona fores"). The topos occurs twice in the Iphis and Anaxarete episode of Met. 14.698 ff., first at 707 ff. "interdum madidas lacrimarum rore coronas / postibus inten- 
dit posuitque in limine duro" and then it re-appears when Iphis hangs himself (733 ff.):

\[
\text{dixit, et ad postes ornatos saepe coronis} \\
\text{umentes oculos et pallida brachia tollens,} \\
\text{cum foribus laquei reliquat unicae summis,} \\
\text{haec tibi serta placent, crudelis et impia!" dixit} \\
\text{inseruitque caput, sed tum quoque versus ad illam,} \\
\text{atque onus infelix elisa fauce pependit.} 
\]

This has some resemblance to Mel. AP 12.23 (G.-P. XCIX), where the lover is fixed by Eros at the doors of his beloved (2-3): καὶ μ’ ἐπὶ σοῖς ὁ πτανὸς Ἐρως προθήρασι Μυτακε, / 
στήσειν ἐπιγράψας "Σκύλ᾽ ἀπὸ Σωφροσύνης."

\footnote{68See also Ov. Am. 2.12.1-2 "ite triumphales circum mea tempora laurus! / uicimus."}
The topos is not noticeably more common in later paraklausithura, occurring only at Charito 1.3.1 ff.; Rufin. AP 5.92, and Paul. Sil. AP 5.281 and 6.71. However the action is referred to at Plu. Mor. 455 B:

σι μὲν γάρ ἐρωτικαὶ πράξεις, οἷς ἐπικωμᾶσαι καὶ ἅμαι καὶ στεφανωθαι τοὺς θύραν, ἐξουσίως ἀμωσυκτῶς κουφίσμοιν ὅσ′ ἁχαρί οὐδ᾽ ἠμουσίων.⁶⁹

Furthermore, Athenaeus explicitly discusses the question of why lovers garland their beloveds’ doors (15.669 d: διὰ τι oι ἐρωτικαὶ στεφανωθί τὰς τῶν ἐρωμένων θύρας). It is clear that this question did not have any obvious answer (ibid.):

σον οὖν ἐστίν, δο κουσΜIκοτε, τὴν χιλιέτη μοι ταύτην ξήτησιν ἀπολύσασθαι, Δημόκριτε.... It is not until 670 d that the first solution is offered:

στεφανωθίν δὲ τὰς τῶν ἐρωμένων θύρας ἢτοι τιμῆς χάριν, καθαπερεῖ τινὸς θεοῦ τὰ πρόθυρα, ἢ οὐ τοις ἐρωμένοις ἀλλὰ τῇ Ἐρωτι παοῖμενοι τὴν τῶν στεφάνων ἀνάθεσιν, ὡς τοῦ μὲν Ἐρωτι οὐκ ἑρμηνου ἄγαλμα, τοῦτον δὲ ναὸν οὐκ ἡ τὴν οἰκήσιμον στεφανωθίν. διὰ ταύτα δὲ καὶ θύσισιν ἔννοι εὴπὶ ταῖς τῶν ἐρωμένων θύρας.

This might seem at first excessively contrived, but it fits with Asclep. AP 5.145 (G.-P. XII). Furthermore, the mention of making sacrifice at the doors also supports the possibly religious connotations of making libations, whether of oil or wine, at the beloved’s door. A different answer immedi-

⁶⁹Plutarch then quotes Call. AP 12.118.5-6 (G.-P. VIII; Pfeiffer 43). At Mor. 753 A-B, he mentions the garlanded of pictures of a beloved immediately after the mention of singing the paraklausithuron: Ἐραται γὰρ αὐτὸν ηῷ δίκα καὶ κάτα τίς οὖν ὁ κωλόν ἐστὶ κυμάζειν ἐπὶ θύρας, ἄδειν τὸ παρακλαυσθορον, ἀναδειν τὰ εἰκόνια....
ately follows (670 e), but one that again relates the action to offering spoils to a victor:


These are the only two answers offered, but they suggest that it is possible that the action of the lover offering his garland to his beloved’s door had religious connotations. It should also be stated unambiguously that in this, as in all of the religious details discussed above, there is an understandable corollary that if the beloved’s house is treated like a temple, then the beloved who lives there must be a god, and if the beloved is regarded as a god, then the house must be a temple.

The amatory komos and the epinician komos

Before leaving the topic of religious implications in the paraklausithuron, there are several other passages of note that are possibly relevant. First, Euripides’ Hippolytus makes it clear that amatory connotations could be present in the ritual offering of a garland at a shrine. At lines 51 ff., Aphrodite is speaking and announces the arrival of Hippolytus and a komos-band at Artemis’ temple. They have come from the hunt and have presumably been successful. The komos is, therefore, partly epinician. In typical hymnic fashion they praise Artemis’ ancestry, identify
her abode, and summon her. They also twice unambiguously praise her beauty (64, 71-2). Hippolytus himself is bearing a garland as an offering, a garland he was woven himself and the virtues of which he is careful to praise. He asks Artemis to accept the garland from his hand, and states that he alone of mortals has the honour of being with her, talking with her, and hearing her voice:

[ΑΠ'] Ἀλλ' εἰσορῶ γὰρ τόνδε παῦσα θησέως στείχοντα θήρας μόχθου ἐκκλεοιπτα, Ἰππόλυτον, ἔξω τῶνδε βήσομαι τόπων. πολὺς δ' ἄμι αὐτῷ προσπόλων ὑπισθέους κὼμος ἄλλακεν, "Ἀρτεμίῳ τιμᾶν θεὰν ὑμοίσιν: οὐ γὰρ οἶδ' ἀνεψυγένας πύλας Ἀιδευ....

ΤΩΝ ΔΙΩΣ ΟΥΡΑΝΙΑΝ
"Ἀρτεμίῳ, καὶ μελόρεσθα. ΧΟΡ. πάτνια πάτνια σεμνοτάτα, Ζημός γένεσθαι, καθαρέ καθαρε μοι, ἦ κόρα γατουσ ἀρτεμίῳ καὶ δίος, καλλίστα πολύ παρθένων, ᾧ μέγαν κατ' οὐρανόν καλλίστα εὐπάτερες σὺ—

ΛΑΝ, Ζημός πολύχρυσον οἶκον. καθαρέ μοι, ἦ καλλίστα καλλίστα τῶν κατ' Ὀλυμπον.

ΤΩΝ. σοὶ τόνδε πλεκτὸν στέφανον ἐξ ἀκηράτου λειμώνος, ἦ δέσποινα, κοσμήσας φέρω, ἔνθα οὕτω ποιμὴν ἀξιοῖ φέρβειν βοτα σὺτ' ἠθεῖ πω σίδηρος, ἀλλ' ἄκηρατον μέλλασα λειμῶν' ἕρινῃ διέρχεται;

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 82

Ἀλλ' ἦ φίλη δέσποινα, χρυσάεις κόμης ἀνάσιμα δέξαι χειρὸς εὐσεβείς ὁπο. μόνη γάρ ἢστι τοὐτ' ἐμοὶ γέρας βρατών. σοὶ καὶ ἐξενεμι καὶ λόγοις σ' ἀμελεβμαι, κλών μὲν συνδής, θεμα δ' σοὶ όρον τὸ σόν.

The passage is clearly religious and is probably an accurate depiction of the arrival of a komos at a temple in Euripi-
des' day. But there are also strong similarities with the amatory komos, suggesting that contamination of the amatory komos by the religious komos was a definite possibility.\textsuperscript{71}

As was noted above, the fact that the komos in the \textit{Hippolytus} is returning from the hunt seems to indicate that it is at least partly epinician. This inevitably leads back to Pindar's epinician komoi.\textsuperscript{72} Cairns (1992) discusses Prop. 4.9 in connection with the komos, particularly Pi. \textit{Pae}. 6, and the general relationship between the amatory and ceremonial komos is worth considering further.\textsuperscript{73} As Bowra (1964, 168 f.) observes:

\textsuperscript{70}Compare E. \textit{Ba}. 1167 \textit{δέχεσθε κύμον εὐλογ θεό}.

\textsuperscript{71}It is possible that this is an anomalous passage, and that the similarities to the amatory komos are because Euripides is intentionally portraying \textit{Hippolytus} as Artemis' "lover."

\textsuperscript{72}A list of references for κυμος/κυμάζειν compounds in Pindar was given in chapter 1 and need not be repeated here. As was noted in chapter 1, there were many occasions on which komos processions took place, usually religious and celebratory. The focus here on its epinician version is principally because of the excellent evidence Pindar offers, but also because of the epinician element in \textit{Hippolytus}. While other celebratory or religious komastic contexts might also offer information of relevance, the broader implications of the komos itself are too expansive to be discussed here, as are the possible connections between the ἐγκώμιον and amatory komos-song/paraklausithuron.

\textsuperscript{73}See Cairns 1992, 70: "Pindar's sixth \textit{Paean} ... is, like Propertius 4.9.21ff., a komos, in the broader ancient sense in which 'komos' could refer to a range of religious and secular activities involving a processional element.... Again, as will emerge, \textit{Paean} 6 even has, \textit{qua komos}, erotic overtones. In its opening lines (1-6) its speaker, a performing chorus of νεότ, having come to Delphi, uses the technical language of the komast to beg Delphi for admission: Πρὸς Ὀλυμπίου Διὸς σε, ἄρν[σέ]α / κλυτόμαντι Πυθοῖ,
This is why Pindar sometimes uses language which belongs to love. When he ends *Olympian* 10 with a comparison between Hagesidamus and Ganymedes, and specifically mentions Aphrodite, he may not himself be in love but he expects other to be, and the compliment is sincere, emphatic, and relevant. The Greek admiration for physical beauty, especially in sturdy and healthy young men, was all the more powerful because it had a strong erotic element, and of this Pindar was well aware, since he sometimes felt in in himself, as we see from the opening lines of *Pythian* 6..., and he hints at similar feelings in more general language in *Paeon* 6,... The thought that a young victor invites love adds not only to his glory but to his enviable pre-eminence, and gives a special thrill in the celebration of his success.

The request for the komos to be received, which was discussed above in connection with Alc. fr. 374, is common in Pindar. Its occurrences are worth noting, for cumulatively they make a significant impression: O. 4.10-12, addressed to Zeus, 'Ολυμπιονίκαν / δέξαι χαρίτων θ' ἔκατι

λίσσομαι χαρίτεσ- / σὺν τε καὶ σὺν 'Αφροδίτα, / 5 εὖ σαθέω μὲ δέξαι χρόνυ / δαοίδου Πιερίδων προφάταν,' He later (71 f.) on line 6 observes that "... the phrase δαοίδον Πιερίδων προφάταν (6), may carry further komastic implications, by hinting at the music and singing which was a constant concomitant of all komoi, and notably of erotic komoi. The first may also point to the erotic interest which the performing chorus of νεών would have aroused in the original spectators; and it might additionally suggest the companions, human and/or divine, who often accompany the komastic lover." That the background to even the epinician komos was sympotic helps the associations--see Morgan 1993, 11 ff. and Minyard 1976, 233 ff.

74 See especially Minyard 1976, 78 ff., 95 ff., but also Morgan 1993 and Heath 1988. The circumstances and nature of the performance of the Pindaric epinician is complicated and the following ignores most of the identifiable problems to focus simply on the vocabulary of receiving.

75 All quotations from Pindar follow Bowra 1942.
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tόνδε κώμον, / χρονιώτατον φάσις ευρυσθενέων ἀρετῶν; O. 6.98–9, το Hieron of Syracuse, σὺν δὲ φιλοφροσύναις εὐπράτοις
Ἀγνίστα δέξατο κώμον / οἶκοθεν οἶκαθ' ἀπὸ Στυμβαλίων
τειχέων ποτυμισμένον; O. 8.1–2, 10 ask Olympia and the
precinct of Pisa to receive the garland-bearing komos: Μάτερ
ὦ χρυσοστεφάνων ἄθλων Σύλυμπια, / δέσποιν' ἀλαθείας...
/ 10 τόνδε κώμον καὶ στεφαναφόριαν δέξας; O. 13.26 ff. men-
tions garlands again in connection with the komos: Ζεθ
πάτερ, / ... / 29 δέξαστε οἱ στεφάνων ἐγκώμιον τεθμὸν, τὸν
ἀγεῖ πεσίνων ἐκ Πίσας; as does P. 8.18–20, addressed to
Apollo, ὃς εὐμνεῖ μνῶν / Ξενάρκειον ἔδετο Κλραβαν ἐστεφα-
νωμένον / 20 υἱὸν πολι αἰενασσίδι Δωρίεδ τε κώμης. Three of
the odes cited are addressed to a god, one to the city of
Olympia, and one to Hieron of Syracuse. P. 8, which twice
mentions a komos (18–20, 70–1), asks Peace to receive a
Pythian-victorious honour (1 ff.): Ψιλάρον Ἦσυχα, Δίκας /
ὦ μεγιστόπολις θύγατερ, / βουλᾶν τε καὶ πολέμων / ἐχοίσα
κλαίσας ὑπερτάτας / 5 Πυθιόνικον τιμᾶν Ἀριστομένει δέκευ.
P. 12.1 ff. asks the city of Acragas to receive a garland
from Pytho:

Ἀλέω σε, φιλάγαλαι, καλλίστα βροτεῖν πολίων,
θερσεφόνας ἐδος, ὀ τ' ἀχθαίς ἐπί μηλαβότου
ναίεις Ἀκράγαντος ἐθερματόν κολύναν, ὡ ἀνα,
ξλαος ἀθανάτων ἀνδρῶν τε σὺν εὐμνείᾳ
δέξαστε στεφάνωμα τόδ' ἐκ Πυθώνος....

N. 11.1 ff. addresses Hestia in a similar manner, asking her
to receive Aristagoras: Παλ Ρέας, ὃ τε προταινεῖα λέλογχας,
Ἑστία, / ... / εὖ μὲν Ἀρισταγόραν δέξαστε τεθν ἐς θάλαμον, /
A variation on 

dékesθαι occurs at 0. 14.13-16 where looking upon the komos 
implies acceptance:

<Δ> πότιν' Ἀγλαῖα
φιλησίμολτε τ' Ἐδροσώνα, θεών κρατίστου
παίδες, ἐπακούσας νῦν, θαλά τε
ἔρασίμολπε, ἵδοισα τόνδε κόμον ἐπ' εὐμενεί τύχα
κόφα βιβώντα....

Furthermore, dékesθαι is commonly used in Pindar for winning 
a victory, which is usually symbolized by a garland. See, 
for example, P. 1.100, where the victor στέφανον ὑψίστον 
δέσκεω; 5.22, where Arcesilaus δέσεξαί τόνδε κόμον ἀνέρων;
9.123, πολλά μὲν κείνοι δίκοι / φύλλ' ἑπὶ καὶ στεφάνους; / 
pολλὰ δὲ πρόσθεν πτερὰ δέξατο νικᾶν; and I. 3.11, ἐν 
βάσσανων Ἰσιθυοῦ δέξαμένης στεφάνους τὰ δὲ....

Finally, mention should be made again of Plato, Smp.
212 d-213 b. As was noted in the discussion in Chapter 2 on 
the Symposium, the amatory garlanding of Socrates is com-
bined with the epinician komos and its arrival and request

---

76 E. fr. 453 (Nauck) (cited at Plb. 12.26.5) can 
perhaps be compared with this: εἰρήνα βαθύπλωτε καλ / 
καλλίστα μακάρων θεών, / τὸλος μοι σέθεν ὡς χρονίζεις, / 
σέβομαι δὲ μὴ πρὶν πόνοις / 5 ὑπερβάλλῃ με γήρας, / πρὶν σὰν 
χαρίζασαν προσίζειν ὤραν / καὶ καλλιχόρους ἄσις / 
φιλοστεφάνους τε κόμους. / ζῆλοι μοι, πότινα, πάλιν. Philost. 
Im. 2.12.1 has an amusing picture of bees making a komos to 
the house of the baby Pindar’s father: τι δὲ ἐν ἄστει;
κυμάζουσιν ἐπὶ τὰς τοῦ Δαιφάντου θύρας -- γέγονε δὲ ἡ 
Πυθαροτός... -- πλάτειν κάκι υπνίοι αὐτὸν, τυ' ἐμμελης ἡ 
καὶ ἐμμοῦσας ἢ....

77 Cf. E. 8.62 ff. νικᾶ στεφαναφοριαν / ὁλαν παρ' 
Ἀλφειοῦ ἰδέθροις τελέσας / κασάλωντος σέθεν· ἀλλ' ἐπάειδε / 
καλλυνικον ψάδαν ἐμὴ χορῷ.
to be received into the symposium in order to garland the victorious Agathon:

... καὶ ἐπιστῆναι ἐπὶ τὰς θύρας [θ] ἐστεφανυμένον αὐτὸν κιττοῦ τέ τινι στεφάνῳ δασσεῖ καὶ ἵππον, καὶ ταῦτα ἔχοντα ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς πάνω πολλάς, καὶ εἶπεν· "Ἀνδρέας,
χαίρετε· μεθύοντα ἄνδρα πάνιν σφόντα δέξασθε συμπότην, ἡ ἁπέλαμεν ἀναδύσαντες μόνον Ἦλιος Ἐγάθωνα, ἐφ' ἠπερ ἠλθόμενον;
... [213 a] ἀλλὰ καθίζεσθαι παρὰ τὸν Ἦλιον [b] ἐν μέσῳ Σωκράτους τε καὶ ἐκεῖνου· παραχωρήσῃ γὰρ τὸν
Σωκράτη χρή ἐκείνου καταθέντος, παρακαθέομεν δὲ αὐτὸν
ἀσπάζεσθαι τε τὸν Ἦλιον καὶ ἀναδείξαι.

The relevance of the epinician komos to the amatory komos seems clear. It is very possible that the similarity would have struck an ancient Greek or Roman, and that, in fact, when a lover in a paraklausthuristic situation has arrived at his beloved’s door on a komos and asked for himself or his garland to be received, or even to be looked upon with that action’s implication of acceptance, he is deliberately being cast in an epinician mold. The reasons for this are not hard to see. While Pindar’s odes are, ostensibly, to honour victors at games, they are essentially religious. Similarly, Hippolytus and his komos honour Artemis with hymns (54-5 Ἀρτεμίν τιμῶν θεάν / δμοιοσιν).

The victory song of the komos, as Morgan (1993, 5) notes, “is specifically called an ἐγκώμιον μέλος (e.g. O7. 2.47, 78 Compare Cairns 1992, 87: "... the apparent presence within the introductory religious komos of Paean 6 of allusions to the erotic komos would itself indicate that the boundaries were not rigid; and if such erotic elements could already be part of a religious komos in Pindar’s day, then Propertius’ use of the exclusus amator theme in 4.9 may be more than humorous."
Nem. 1.7), or an ἐπικώμιος ὤμος (Nem. 8.50)." Elsewhere, Pindar regularly refers to ὤμος. Furthermore, the odes were usually sung before a temple, shrine, or the house of the victor, who, even though far from a god, through his victory was shown at least to have the favour of the gods. 

---

79 See O. 6.27 χρή τούνων πύλας ὄμων ἀναπτυνάμεν σύνταξις; 9.48, ἄνθεσα δ' ὄμων; P. 3.63 ff. καὶ τι εἰ / φλέτρων ἐν θυμῷ μελιγύρωσιν ὄμωι / ἀμέτρως τίθεν; 6.7 ἐτοίμος ὄμων / ἡσαυρός; I. 2.3 f. ρύμφα παιδέως ἐτάξεων μελιγύρωσιν ὄμωσις; / ὀστίς ἐνν καλὸς εἶχεν Ἀφροδίτης / ...; 3.7-8 εὐκλέων δ' ἔργων ἁπναὶ κρημνὲς ἐνν ὑμήση τῶν ἐκλόγων, / χρή δ' κωμάζοντι ὁγαναῖς χαρίτεσσιν βαστάσας; 5.62 f. λάμψιν οἱ στέφανου, φέρε δ' εὐμαλλον µῖτραν, / καὶ πετρεοῦσα νεόν σύμπεσόν ὄμων; and 7.20 f. κωμάζει ἐσπείρεν ἄνθισεν συν ὄμως / καὶ Στράβιάδα. Cf. Lucian Icar. 27 ἡσαν ἡμῖν καὶ τὴν πρῶτην ψήν τῶν ὄμων τῶν Πινδάρου; and the Scholia on Theoc. 3.1 (Düber) -- Κωμάζω τὸ ἐρωτικὸς ἔρχομαι καὶ φοιτῶ μετὰ ἀνέσεως. κῶμος γὰρ κυρίως ὁ ὄμος, ὡς καὶ Πινδάρος, ἢ θηβαλά λύρα, ψαλὶ πολλαχοῦ. Of course, as Minyard 1976, 140 notes, "Ὅμος is not solely applied to εὐχαὶ πρὸς θεοῦ; it is a song of praise and a song in praise of men as well as gods."

80 See Minyard 1976, 166: "One of the most tantalizing images appearing in Pindar is that signified by the word πρόθυρον (e.g., Pi. O. 6.1; N. 5.53; I. 8.2). It seems to suggest, and the komoi of the Alcestis do not deny, that komoi danced before the prothura, a setting perhaps preserved in the scene building of the Attic theatre and consistent with the idea of the processional chorus making entrances and exits." Also see Verdenius 1987, 1:12 on O. 3: "it is true that the chorus probably took part in the procession, but the performance of the ode took place in front of the temple"; and Lefkowitz 1991, 203 "I have suggested that most, if not all, might have been sung as solos in the context of a komos... The ode might be sung after the komos of the victor's friends, including the poet, had arrived in a procession at a place where it was 'received', either at a temple or a shrine (e.g. O. 5, P. 5, P. 8) or at the house of the patron who commissioned the song, whether it was the victor himself (O. 1, N. 1) or his sponsor or father (e.g. N. 7, I. 8)." To the above examples also add P. 3 (78, κοθρᾶς παρ' ἔρνην πρόθυρον μέλποντας), and N. 1 (19 ff., ἐσταίν δ' ἐπ' αὐθέντις θύρας / 20 ἀνέρος φιλοξενου καλὰ μελπομενος). See also Heath 1988, 189-90.
The requests for acceptance are often directed at gods, or cities personified as near-deities.\footnote{Even when they are not, they are never directed at persons of less than eminent status, cf. Hieron of Syracuse O. 98-9. And, of course, the Greeks considered a man to be closest to the divine at times such as when he was victorious in one of the major games: see especially Bowra 1964, 171 ff.}

If the amatory komastic situation described immediately above makes deliberate use of the epinician komos, it is surely in order to elevate the beloved to the status of a hero, if not a god. Moreover, if that is the case, it is a further example of how the Greeks as well as the Romans associate religious actions and language with the paraklausithuric situation.

The origins, reality, and popularity of the paraklausithuron

Finally, since this dissertation has so far discussed paraklausithura from two cultures and languages, the general question of the broad relationship of the Latin to the Greek paraklausithuron should be considered briefly. Closely connected to this is the question of the reality of the paraklausithuric situation in the classical world and the issue of the obvious popularity that it had throughout nearly a millenium.

As was argued above, the paraklausithuron may have existed as far back in Greek literature as Alcaeus. Furthermore, the classical Greek symposium seems to have been a
fully-established custom by Alcaeus' time, and with it came the komos in its many forms. There can be little doubt that post-symphotic komos processions existed in Alcaeus' time, and these must, at least some of the time, have ended up before either brothels or the houses of hetairai. There can also be no reason to suppose that such incidents never made their way into early lyric. This brings one to the inevitable conclusion that the paraklausithuric situation was, at least in its origins, grounded in reality. The paraklausithuron itself must then have had its origins in the drunken songs of revelling komasts, and either the songs or speeches of persuasion uttered by such komasts before the abodes of women or boys who, for whatever reasons, did not wish to accept their overtures. It is to this extent that the paraklausithura seen in Greek and Roman literature can be said to have had its origins in what is generally called "folk-song."

\[82\] It is, as has been noted above, not hard to see reasons for the rejection of such customers.

\[83\] I put quotation marks around folk-song because it generally implies a level of composition and organization still above everyday speech or reality. See Copley 1956, 4: "Although no direct evidence is available, it is to be presumed that the paraclausithyron began as a street ballad or folk song." While Copley's frequent use of the phrase "street ballad" is unfortunate, he is surely correct in this, and Kenney 1958, 49, despite being devastatingly to the point in most of his criticisms of Copley, is wrong to include this among his "selection from the farrago of surprise, assumption, and bad logic which passes for argument" in Copley. Cf. Leo 1900, 608; Nisbet-Hubbard 1970, 290: "Our ode also has affinities with the type of poem conveniently known as paraclausithyron.... though it had its origins in
The custom is not hard to understand and probably would have been similar over most of classical Greece. A young Athenian adult male from the sixth century would spend an evening drinking at a symposium, perhaps with music-girls or prostitutes in attendance. Songs would be sung, at least some of which would have erotic content. Wine would be drunk out of cups which might have been decorated with art ranging from the erotic to pornographic. Finally, with wine fanning the fires of lust, he would leave the symposium, perhaps with companions. There can be no reason to believe that under such circumstances a komos never made its way to somewhere that the man suspected his sexual desires could be satisfied. This could, of course, have been a hetaira's house, a brothel, the house of a beloved boy,

folk-song, it became as conventional an exercise as serenade in opera"; Burck 1966, 250: "Im Streben nach Variation, nach eigenwertigen Neuprägungen wird man die Grundtendenz des gesamten Schaffens zu sehen haben: in die Lyrik, ins Drama, in den ernsten und heiteren Minus, in die bukolische Dichtung, in die Epigrammatik wird das volkstäumliche Motiv aufgenommen und dabei dem Charakter des Genos entsprechend umgeformt"; and Yardley 1978, 20 "The genre no doubt emerged from the folk song and has its roots in Greek social behaviour, in 'real life'. After a symposium young men would--like Alcibiades in Plato's Symposium ... roam the streets in disorderly fashion on a komos, going to the houses of friends or, sometimes, trying to gain admission to the house of a girl or favourite boy"; and Bowra 1958, 380 on the duet from Ar. Ec.: "The song combines obviously popular elements with others which are more pretentious and more sophisticated, and this combination is perhaps due to such a song having its first origins in a tour of the streets."
or, later, the man’s mistress. The Greek and Roman world’s lack of modern telecommunications would have meant that there would have been no convenient way for the man to find out ahead of time if he was welcome, if no such rendezvous had been arranged. He could have sent a slave with a message, but the man could have been at his beloved’s in half the time it would have taken a slave to get there and return with the beloved’s answer. Someone eager for sexual gratification, or a more sentimental lover desirous of seeing or hearing the voice of his beloved, would not have found using a messenger an appealing possibility. So it is fully understandable that the man would head off to his destination without admission being a certainty. Once there, he would have to request admission, which could only be achieved by knocking on the door or, more probably—according to Greek and Roman comedy—shouting out for the door to be answered. Hence if it were not answered, or if a refusal came from the other side, it is natural that the man would often then try to persuade the beloved to admit him. Perhaps if he had taken some music-girls with him, or even was carrying a lyre from the symposium, the man might actually sing to his beloved. Nonetheless, whatever form that persuasion took, it could rightly be considered the ultimate ancestor of every
classical literary paraklausithuron.\textsuperscript{84}

Furthermore, while the details might vary, there can
be little doubt that young Roman men, at least in later
times, would also have undergone a similar experience on
occasion. Although early Roman law was clearly very strict
when it came to adultery or the behaviour of married women,
there is little reason to believe that the actions of youths
in the middle Republic were much more restricted than they
were in sixth or fifth-century Athens.\textsuperscript{85} Livy 3.13.1-2 tells

\textsuperscript{84}As Copley 1942, 101 has rightly noted, much that
is associated with the paraklausithuron can be traced back
to reality. For example, the drunken komast might very well
succumb to the late hour and lie down to sleep when refused
admission.

\textsuperscript{85}The Twelve Tables does seem to have prohibited
drinking and garlands in connection with funerals (Table X).
Cato the Elder himself was fond of his drink: Cic. \textit{Tusc.}
4.2.3, \textit{de sen.} 13.45, 14.46 (cf. Plu. \textit{Cato mai.} 21, 25);
Hor. \textit{Carm.} 3.21.11 "narratur et prisci Catonis / saepe mero
caluisse virtus"; and Mart. 2.89.5. Cato preferred that
young men visit prostitutes to interfering with respectable
women: see Hor. \textit{S.} 1.2.31 ff. "quidam notus homo cum exiret
fornice, \textquoteleft macte / uirtute esto\textquoteright inquit sententia dia Cato-
nis, / \textquoteleft nam simul ac uenas inflauit taetra libido, / huc
iuuenes aequum est descendere, non alienas / 35 permolere
uxores\textquoteright "; and the \textit{Schol. ad loc.} "cum uidisset hominem
honestum e fornicae exeuntem, laudavit ... postea cum fre-
quentius eum exeuntem de eodem lupanari uidisset, dixit:
Adolescens, ego te laudavi tamquam hoc interdum uenires, non
tamquam hic habitares." Cf. Aug. \textit{Serm.} 153.6 "quis enim ad
iudicem ductus est quia meretricis lupanar intrauit?" Also
compare Cic. \textit{Cael.} 47-8 and Austin 1960, 110. The laws of
the day seem to have conditioned men's sexual adventures, so
long as respectable women were not involved--cf. Gel.
10.23.5 "De iure autem occidenti ita scriptum: \textquoteleft In adulterio
uxorem tuam siprehendisses, sine iudicio impune necares;
illa te, si adulterares siue tu adulterarere, digito non
aueret contingere, neque ius est.'\textquoteright There were even boy
prostitutes in Rome in Cato's day: Plb. 31.25; Cic. \textit{de sen.}
42, \textit{de vir.} 111. 47.4; Liv. 39.42-3; and Plu. \textit{Cato mai.} 17.1
ff., \textit{Flam.} 18-19.
the story of M. Volscius Fictor's unfortunate encounter with
a group of youths rioting through the Subura—in 461 B.C.:

premebat reum praeter uolgatam inuidiam crimen unum,
quod M. Volscius Fictor, qui ante al'quot annos tribunus
plebis fuerat, testis exstiterat se, haud multo post
quam pestilentia in urbe fuerat, in uuentutem grassan-
tem in Subura incidisse. ibi rixam natam esse fratremque
suum maiorem natu, necdum ex morbo satis ualidum, pugno
ictum ab Caesone cecidisse; semianiem inter manus domum
ablatum, mortuumque inde arbitrari, nec sibi rem exsequi
tam atrocem per consules superiorum annorum licuisse.

It is easy to presume that these youths had at least been
drinking. It seems probable, therfore, that there were at
least occasional real-life paraklausithura also being sung
in Rome before Greek literary and cultural influences became
increasingly assimilated in the second century.

Yet, for example, Copley (1956, 32) seems to imply
that the Romans adopted the Greek paraklausithuron. He finds
in Phaedromus' song at Pl. Cur. 147 ff. traces of

the native Italian song to the shut door for which we
have been seeking.... This was the song of which the
Italians were reminded when they first heard the Greek
paraklausithuron; this it was that struck them as famil-
lar and congenial. What more natural, then, than that
they should have seized on it and imitated it....

Canter (1919, 361) is more explicit: "It is doubtless
through Hellenistic influence that the custom of the lover's
lament at the closed door passes into Latin literature." It
seems just as probable that when the Romans first encoun-
tered the literary Greek paraklausithuron they recognized
its content and background in their own similar experienc-
ces.\textsuperscript{86} No native Italian song to the door need be postulated except the native Italian paraklausithuron sung or recited before the door of a beloved. This is not to deny Greek influence on the literary Latin paraklausithuron, or indeed on what has been called the Roman life of love. As Griffin has eloquently shown, it is very easy for literary models to become social reality.\textsuperscript{87} It is simply much easier to explain the continued occurrence in Latin literature of the paraklausithuric situation if the custom already existed in Rome, and, in fact, continued to exist there.

Passing from theory to fact, despite the many doubts expressed about the reality of the paraklausithuric situation, there is abundant evidence that it existed in Greece

\textsuperscript{86}Copley 1956, 44 later acknowledges that paraklausithura must have existed in Italy, but does not make anything of the fact.

\textsuperscript{87}Griffin 1985, 2–3: "The procedure here adopted in opposition to this view is as follows. First, evidence is summarily assembled to show that Roman life, and particularly the life of luxury and pleasure, was so strongly Hellenistic in colouring and material that no simple division into 'Greek' and 'Roman' elements is possible.... Secondly, it will be argued that another and related distinction is also, in any simple form, unsound: that between 'literature' and 'life'. For not only does literature reflect, at whatever remove and with whatever stylisation, the experiences of life, but also in its turn it affects actual behaviour; and can do so with great force. The existence of a given pattern of conduct influences the conception which people have of the ways in which it is possible to behave or to live."
and Rome throughout antiquity.\textsuperscript{88} Lucr. 4.1174 ff. has already been cited as possible evidence for the reality of the paraklausithuron. However, better evidence exists. For fourth century Athens there is Plato's \textit{Smp.} 183 a. Surely the same kind of arguments made about Lucr. 4.1174 f. can be made here—if the actions of the lover recounted there were patently unreal there would simply be no point in describing them. The three references from Lysias discussed above help support the ongoing reality of even the violent and forced entry of komasts into people's houses. If people in fifth-century Athens would be willing to risk a violent entry in another citizen's house, then surely it would not be any less likely that someone would be willing to do to the same to a brothel or \textit{hetaira}'s dwelling. If the stories about

\textsuperscript{88}The doubters include: Barsby 1973, 8-9, 11 n. 1; Veyne 1988, 37 f., 53; and Boucher 1965, 422, quoted approvingly by Yardley 1978, 21. Compare, for example, Nisbet-Hubbard 1970, 289: "... one must not assume that Asclepiades or Propertius really lay about on doorsteps." On the other hand, again see Griffin 1985, 1: "The Augustan poets raise in an acute form the question of the relationship between experience and convention, between individual life and inherited forms of expression.... some influential modern writers ... distinguish on the one hand 'Greek' or 'Hellenistic' elements, which are 'unreal' or 'imaginary', from 'Roman' ones which are 'real'.... My argument will be that this view is over-schematic and makes a distinction false, in this form, to the poets and to their society"; and 15: "We return now to the life of love and its presentation in poetry. Influential voices say that poetical treatment is quite separate from real life; the argument here advanced is that it is not." Also see Lyne 1980, 247: "There is excellent reason to believe ... that a nocturnal witness in contemporary Rome would have descried the occasional \textit{exclusus amator} garlanded and singing songs outside his mistress' door."
Pythagoras' encounter with the komast about to attack his beloved's (or rival's, depending on the version) door are correct, then there is also a sixth-century example. However, even if they are not real incidents, they indicate a belief that such actions would be at least remotely conceivable at that time. Is. 3.13-14 also describes real komoi and fighting among rivals outside the house of a woman, although the lovers' actions are taken to indicate that the woman is a hetaira rather than someone eligible for legal marriage. Further evidence for Greece is provided by the two citations from Polybius, as well as the story about Gnathaina from Aristodemus. Finally, Plu. Alc. 4.5, also shows a form of aggressive komos:

'Εςύχασε [sc. Ἀνυτοὺς] μὲν γὰρ ἐρῶν τοῦ Ἀλκιβιάδου, ἔνοικος δὲ τινας ἐστιν ἐκάλεις κάκελουν ἐπὶ τὸ δείπνον. ὁ δὲ τὴν μὲν κλήσας ἀπείπασε, μεθυσθεὶς δ' οὖκ οἷοι μετὰ τῶν ἐταῖρων ἐκώμασε πρὸς τὸν "Ανυτοῦν, καὶ τας θύρας ἐπιτάσας τοῦ ἀνδρὸς καὶ θεασάμενος ἀργυρῶν ἐκπυμάτων καὶ χρυσῶν πληρεῖς τὰς τραπέζας, ἐκέλευσε τοὺς παλάς τὰ ἱμάτια λαβόντας οἴκακες κομίζειν πρὸς αὐτὸν....

Even better evidence is available from Roman sources, both Latin and Greek. Gel. 4.14 tells the story of A. Hostilius Mancinus, a curule aedile of the middle second century B.C., who goes on a drunken revel to a prostitute's house, is rejected, attempts to force his way in, and

---

89 See Sex. Emp. M. 6.8; Iambi. V.P. 25.112 (both quoted in Appendix 2); and Cic. Consil. fr. 10.3.1.

90 The texts for authors not included in the main body of this dissertation will be found in Appendix 1.
is driven off by stones. 91 For the later republic, there is Cic. Phil. 2.45 and the young Antony’s adventures as an excluded lover. Philo at Husb. 37 and Cherub. 92 also attacks lovers’ vigils, again something he would hardly bother to do if they were purely literary. Seneca twice (Nat. 4 A, Pref. 6, and Ep. 4.4) raises in all seriousness the image of an excluded lover. Plu. Mor. 455 B also seriously states that lovers’ actions—such as making revels and singing and garlanding doors—bring some relief to their distress. Of course there is also Mor. 753 B, the source for τὸ παρακάλουσθρον, which again seems serious in its mention of the female excluded lover. Plutarch mentions the para-klausithuric situation twice more, at Mor. 759 B and 772 E-F, and riotous komoi at 128 D and 784 A. At Galba 19.2-3 he tells how Poppaea used to shut out Nero regularly, even when Otho was not home, in order to keep his interest in her keen. The younger Pliny in a touching letter to his wife (Ep. 7.5) compares himself to an excluded lover. Apol. Apol. 75 describes a scene similar to Is. 3.13 ff. 92 Athenaeus (15.669 d) wonders why lovers garland their beloveds’ doors, and also mentions Alcibiades revelling to prostitutes’ doors (13.574 d Ἀλκιβιάδης δὲ ... ἐπὶ τὰς τῶν ἔταιρών θύρας

91 See also Lyne 1980, 307 n. 14.

92 Also cited in support of the basic reality of the situation by both Yardley 1978, 21 and Lyne 1980, 307 n. 14.
ἐκώμαζεν, ἀπολλιπὼν τὰς Λακαίνας καὶ τὰς Ἄττικάς.). Just. dig. 47.2.39 pr. 1 states that "et ideo etiam eum, qui fores meretricis effregit libinis causa, et fures non ab eo inducti, sed alias ingressi meretricis res egessentur, furti non teneri." Chrys. hom. 37 (on 1 Cor. 14:34; MPG 61.316.43 ff.) asks what could be more disgraceful than a typical excluded lover. And, finally, from the fourteenth century, there is Nic. Greg. 8.1.3 (Schopen-Bekker 1.285) and the komos of and subsequent violent attack by the Emperor Andronicus III Palaeologus on a rival for the affection of a woman: ... νῦκτωρ ἐκώμαζε πρὸς γυναῖκα τινα γένει μὲν τῶν σῦκ ἀσῆμων, τὸν δὲ τρόπον ἔταλαν....

It can safely be concluded that there was at least some continued reality to the paraklausithuric situation throughout the classical period, a reality that surely helped perpetuate the genre. It does not seem sufficient to say with Williams (1968, 546) on Tib. 1.2 that "the theme is elaborated in a way that makes any question about real experience quite irrelevant." The fact that the paraklausithuric situation clearly was a reality known both to the authors who handled it and their audiences helps us come slightly closer to appreciating those audiences' reactions to encounters with the genre. Even that small piece of information is welcome.

Finally it is worth noting that the paraklausithuron was not something especially Greek or Roman. As was stated
above, the basic background to the Greek paraklausithuron is easily comprehensible. There is no reason to expect that other cultures or societies would not produce something similar. The desire of a lover to be with, to see, to hear, his beloved is universal. While the paraklausithuric situation continues to occur throughout medieval literature and into modern times, these occurrences could, just possibly, all be ultimately derived from classical models. However, paraklausithuric verse totally removed from Greek or Roman influence can be found in other ancient cultures.\footnote{For some other cross-cultural comparisons, see Hatto 1965, 109, 178 no. 89, 179 no. 95, 491 ff. nos. 303-308 (sixteenth-century Dutch, all clearly paraklausithuric and most are true paraklausithura), and 607-8 no. 371 (nineteenth-century Polish). There are also many examples of lover's serenades, assignations (lovers sneaking in or beloveds sneaking out), and particular paraklausithuric topoi including addresses to the Night and stars, evading guards, garlands, etc. These have been cited by Henderson 1973, 52, who also refers to the Song of Solomon.}

Ancient Egypt has passed on a number of poems similar to Greek and Roman paraklausithura. Consider, for example, Papyrus Chester Beatty No. 1 (c. 1160 B.C.), poem 47:

I passed by her house in the darkness.
When I knocked, no one opened the door.
A fine night for our doorkeeper!
Open, oh door!
Bolt, you're my fate,
And my lucky spirit!
Once inside, I'll sacrifice an ox for you.
Oh bolt, don't exert your power (against me)!
Let a long-horned ox be slaughtered for the bolt,
A short-horned one for the hinges,
A wild goose for the threshold,
And some fat for the key.
But all the choice parts of our ox
Belong to the carpenter's apprentice;
Let him make us a door out of grass,
And a bolt out of papyrus reeds!
Then, any time a lover arrives,
He'll find her house open.
He'll find the beds equipped with linen sheets,
And there'll be a pretty girl in one of them.⁹⁴

In another, (Papyrus Harris 500 = British Museum No. 10, 060; c. 1330 B.C.; McCoy 1972, 15; cf. Fowler 1994, 9) the lover finds his beloved's door open wide, and wishes to be her doorkeeper:

At the villa of my beloved
By the gate in the center of the house,
The doors are flung wide,
And the bolts are all undone.
But my lady is furious.
Now if I were only her doorkeeper
I'd make her rage at me;
Just to hear that angry voice
I'd play the frightened child.

A poem from Papyrus Harris 500 (McCoy 1972, 23; cf. Fowler 1994, 23) has the beloved watching her door for the arrival of a message from her lover:

My face is turned to watch the outer door,
To see if my beloved's coming to visit me.
My eyes search the road, my ears are alert,
And I await Pamehy.
For the love I bear him is really all that matters;
For him my heart refuses to be still.
But will a messenger arrive,
One swift of foot,
Who hurries back and forth,
To tell me I'm not wanted?
Will you say: 'I've found another:
One more pleasing to my sight.'?
But why should the intrigue of a rival

⁹⁴Translation and date McCoy 1972, 61. Fowler 1994, 74 differs in details, but the address to the door and its parts is common to both. All the following have been checked against Fowler for major divergences in the translation.
Make such a stranger out of me?

Another from Papyrus Chester Beatty (No. 1; McCoy 1972, 50; cf. Fowler 1994, 63) has a woman happy to see and be seen by her beloved as she walks past his home:

    I just happened to be passing his house,  
    And I found the door open,                
    There stood my lover, near his mother,    
    And his sisters and brothers were with him. 
    How he captivates the hearts             
    Of all who walk this way.                
    Such a fine lad, ...                     
    A lover of such excellent qualities.     
    He looked at me as I walked by,           
    And I cherished it                       
    With a happy heart: the thought          
    That my beloved had seen me.

Another from the same source seems to use military imagery as well as arguing for the efficacy of at least some love poetry (McCoy 1972, 55; cf. Fowler 1994, 68 which has notable differences):

    If you carry these (poems?) into your lady’s house,  
    And storm her dwelling place,                       
    You’ll make a shambles of her bower,                
    And her mistress will kill her!                     
    But if you ply her with song and dance,             
    Bring presents of wine and beer,                    
    And muddle her senses,                              
    You can enjoy her that same night.                  
    ’Take me in your arms!' she'll say,                 
    And at daybreak you can do it again.

Compare the element of *furtius amor* in the poem which immediately follows it (McCoy 1972, 56; cf. Fowler 1994, 69):

    If you bring them in through your lady’s window,   
    While you’re quite alone, nobody else near,        
    You’ll get what you want from her festive place,   
    Even while the shutters rattle.                     
    No heavenly breeze can dispel it:                    
    It will carry its perfume to you
Like an intoxicating aroma
That inebriates everyone near it.

While only the first one can properly be called paraklaussithuric, the similarities in the latter to many topoi seen in connection with the paraklaussithuric situation are a useful remedy for being overly diligent in ascribing similarities between Greek and Latin paraklaussithura to direct rather than broader generic influence moulded in turn by reality and similarity of experience.

Even Gilgamesh is once portrayed as an excluded lover (Gilgamesh Tablet X, col. i). In the following, Siduri is a manifestation of Ishtar, one of whose major spheres of influence was love and sexual activity.95

Siduri the Barmaid, who dwells at the lip of the sea
and sits ...

... . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
Gilgamesh made his way to her ...

dressed in skins ...

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
The barmaid looked into the distance.

She talked to her heart, said these words --

she took counsel with herself --

"Possibly this one is a killer.
Where is he headed ...?"

Seeing him, the Barmaid barred her door.

Her gate she closed; she shot [the bolt].

And he, Gilgamesh, at hearing her,

lifted his pointed staff, set [himself before the door].

Gilgamesh spoke to her, to the Barmaid.

"Barmaid, what do you see [that you bar your door]?"

Your gate you shut. You've shot the bolt.

95 For the association of Siduri with Ishtar, and for the translation that follows, see Gardner and Maier 1984, 209-11. Ishtar as a goddess of love was even more capricious and ill-tempered than Aphrodite, and was also more strongly associated with prostitutes, who accompanied her when she came to earth.
I will smash down your door, [break the gate down] ..."

The Barmaid says to him, to Gilgamesh: "Why is your strength wasted, your face sunken? Why has evil fortune entered your heart, done in your looks? There is sorrow in your belly. Your face is like that of a man who has gone on a long journey. Your face is weathered by cold and heat because you roam the wilderness in search of a wind-puff."

Gilgamesh spoke to her, to the Barmaid.
"Barmaid, it is not that my strength is wasted, my face sunken, not that evil fortune has entered my heart, done in my looks. It is not the sorrow in my belly, ...
... but because of my friend, companion, ...
Enkidu, friend, loved-one,...

Gilgamesh is wasted and thin from losing his beloved friend Enkidu, not over desire for Siduri. The mention of his face being weathered by cold and heat also brings to mind the bad weather that so often besets the Greek and Roman lover.

\[96\] Before leaving Gilgamesh, *Gilgamesh Tablet VII*, col. ii (Gardner-Maier 1984, 170-1) is worth noting for a particularly good door-address: "Enkidu ... lifted [his eyes]; / 37 to the door he speaks, as to a man: / 38 'Door of the woods, empty of understanding -- / power of hearing which you do not have -- / 40 at twenty leagues away I admired your good wood, / even before I saw the lofty cedars ... / Nothing compares with your wood [in all the land]. / Your height is six dozen cubits, your breadth, two dozen ... / your doorpost, your hinges below and above -- / 45 your door-maker has made you in the holy city of Nippur. / Had I known, door, that it would come to this, and this, the beauty of [your structure], / 48 I would have raised your mouth [higher], I would have ... / 49 I would have set a reed frame on [you].'" Gardner-Maier 1984, 171 comment: "The most coherent part of the column is an address to a door, as if it were human (line 37). The door is usually taken as the gate of the cedar forest, which had paralyzed Enkidu at his approach to it. The term in line 38 ... does not contain the usual word for 'forest' in *Gilgamesh*, and is, perhaps, 'door
The Song of Solomon is similar in tone to the Egyptian love lyrics.\textsuperscript{97} It is, of course, not a coherent unity but seems more like a collection of lyrics loosely linked together. Paraklausithuric situations are discernible in several places in the song. At 2:8-14 the beloved speaks, describing how her lover arrives, peers through the windows and calls her out:

\begin{quote}
The voice of my beloved!  
Behold, he comes,  
leaping upon the mountains,  
bounding over the hills.  

My beloved is like a gazelle,  
or a young stag.  
Behold, there he stands  
behind our wall,  
gazing in at the windows,  
looking through the lattice.  

My beloved speaks and says to me:  
"Arise, my love, my fair one,  
and come away;  

for lo, the winter is past,  
the rain is over and gone.  

The flowers appear on the earth,  
the time of singing has come,
\end{quote}

of the woods’ or even ‘door of wood.’ There is no question that the excellence and beauty of the wood is described by Enkidu....”

\textsuperscript{97}It is a notoriously difficult book, but fortunately the interpretative questions it raises are not relevant here. It should, however, be noted that the love portrayed in it is not adulterous or merely sexual, but clearly is of a deeper kind. The probable date of compilation, sometime around 450-400 B.C., seems to rule out the possibility of any extensive contamination from Greek sources: Reese 1993, 708. For the relationship between the Song of Solomon and Egyptian love lyrics, see Fox 1985.
and the voice of the turtledove
is heard in our land.

The fig tree puts forth its figs,
and the vines are in blossom;
they give forth fragrance.
Arise, my love, my fair one,
and come away.

O my dove, in the clefts of the rock,
in the covert of the cliff,
let me see your face,
let me hear your voice,
for your voice is sweet,
and your face is comely.

At 3:1-4 the woman goes out in search of her lover:

Upon my bed by night
    I sought him whom my soul loves;
I sought him, but found him not;
    I called him, but he gave no answer.

    "I will rise now and go about the city,
in the streets and in the squares;
I will seek him whom my soul loves."
    I sought him, but found him not.

The watchmen found me,
as they went about in the city.
"Have you seen him whom my soul loves?"

Scarcely had I passed them,
    when I found him whom my soul loves.
I held him, and would not let him go
    until I had brought him into my mother's house,
    and into the chamber of her that conceived me.

Later the lover comes to his beloved, knocks, asks to be admitted, and complains that he is wet from the dew. The beloved is persuaded to open up, but when she does, her lover is gone. She goes in search of him, and is mugged by the night-watch. She finally addresses some by-standers, asking for their help (5:2-8):
I slept, but my heart was awake.
Hark! my beloved is knocking.
"Open to me, my sister, my love,
my dove, my perfect one;
for my head is wet with dew,
my locks with the drops of the night."

I had put off my garment,
how could I put it on?
I had bathed my feet,
how could I soil them?

My beloved put his hand to the latch,
and my heart was thrilled within me.

I arose to open to my beloved,
and my hands dripped with myrrh,
my fingers with liquid myrrh,
upon the handles of the bolt.

I opened to my beloved,
but my beloved had turned and gone.
My soul failed me when he spoke.
I sought him, but found him not;
I called him, but he gave no answer.

The watchmen found me,
as they went about in the city;
they beat me, they wounded me,
they took away my mantle,
those watchmen of the walls.

I adjure you, O daughters of Jerusalem,
if you find my beloved,
that you tell him
I am sick with love.

The similarity to Greek and Latin paraklausithura needs no elaboration.\(^{98}\)

\(^{98}\) Also consider 4:12 and 15-16 with its address to the wind: "A garden locked is my sister, my bride, a garden locked, a fountain sealed.... 15 a garden fountain, a well of living water, and flowing streams from Lebanon. 16 Awake, O north wind, and come, O south wind! Blow upon my garden, let its fragrance be wafted abroad. Let my beloved come to his garden, and eat its choicest fruits." Furthermore, there is the comparison of the virgin girl with a wall and door, 8:8-9: "We have a little sister, and she has no breasts. What shall we do for our sister, on the day when
It now seems perfectly clear that there is no reason to consider the basic paraklausithuric situation to be a Greek invention, or even something uniquely Greek and Roman. Indeed, it seems that at least part of the reason for the continued existence of the paraklausithuron throughout the classical era and later was its basic underlying reality, a reality that made it an appealing subject for writers and, particularly, love poets.

---

she is spoken for? 9 If she is a wall, we will build upon her a battlement of silver; but if she is a door, we will enclose her with boards of cedar."
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APPENDIX 1

AFTER ELEGY

The continued popularity of the paraklausithuric situation after Latin elegy has rarely been commented on. Some have even denied its continued existence (Canter 1919, 365): "After Ovid's Amores Latin literature yields no example of the lover's song, nor even a mention of one in many cases where we should expect such mention." ¹ It does, however, continue to occur in poetry and prose with great regularity through to the end of late antiquity. What follows is a survey of many of these passages. It makes no claims to be complete, even within individual authors. It is merely hoped that the evidence presented here will indicate the extent of the continued interest in the paraklausithuric situation.

¹ Caner supports his statement by being excessively literal and discounting references to the paraklausithuric situation. For example, he goes on (366) to talk about Sen. Ep. 1.4.4. By the later first century A.D. it seems a false distinction to completely separate Greek from Latin literature. For the most part, a truly Graeco-Roman culture had been established. Also compare Copley (1956, 27) on Chariton: "It is on this note that the Greek paraclausithyron, to all intents and purposes, comes to its end, for although later examples exist, they show no further development." Later (140) Copley mentions several post-elegiac examples of the genre, but considers them not worth discussing because "they add nothing to the story of the paraclausithyron." He concludes that "for all practical purposes, the theme died with Ovid."
The many excellent and developed komos-scenes dating from after elegy will be ignored here and only those passages that are most clearly paraklausithuric will be given.

Seneca the Elder in Contr. 10.1.13 refers to a controversia of Bassus Iulius which dealt with a pimp most ingeniously killing ten youths who had attacked his brothel:

Memini illum declamantem [declarasse] controversiam de lenone, qui decem iuuenibus denuntiavit ne in lupanar accederent, et foueam igne repletam terra superiecta obruit, in quam adulescentibus lapsis et consumptis accusatur rei publicae laesae.

Although greatly out of chronological order, two rhetoricians from the second century can be mentioned here in connection with this. Hermogenes Stat. 6 (135-6) mentions a similar controversia:

Kal πρῶτον γε ἀναστάτως ἐλάσσο τὸ μονομερές, ἢ τὰ τῶν λόγων μὴ ἐκατέρθεν λαχυρά, οἷον πορνοβοσκάς δέκα νέους κυμάζοντας ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ ὄργυμα ποιήσας ὑποδέξάμενος ἀπέκτεινε καὶ φέυγει φόνου;

as does Calpurnius Flaccus Decl. 5:

Iuuenes frequenter ad lupanar ueniebant, cum his leno frequenter denuntiasset, ne accederent, foueam fecit et compleuit ignibus. adulescentes cum uenissent, exuisti sunt. accusatur a parentibus eorum leno laesae rei publicae.

Philo Judaeus twice refers to the paraklausithuric situation as if it were a reality:

On Husbandry 37: γαστριμαργίας τοιών ή ὁπαθὸς ἐκ φύσεως ἀκολουθεῖ συνουσίας ἡδονῆ μανήν ἐκτόπον καὶ οὐσιον ἀνεπιληχεῖ καὶ λύτην ἀργαλευτάτην ἐπιφέρουσα. ὅταν γὰρ ὑπὸ ὀσφοφάγας καὶ ἀχράτου καὶ πολλῆς μεθῆς ἀνθρώποις πλεσθῶσις, οὐκέτι κρατεῖν ἑαυτῶν οὐκ χρείαται, πρὸς δὲ τὰς ἐρωτικὰς μίξεις ἐπειγόμενοι κυμάζουσι καὶ θυραυλοῦσι,
On the Cherubim 92: πάσης ἑορτῆς τε καὶ πανηγύρεως τῶν παρ᾽ ἡμῖν τὰ θεαμαστὰ καὶ περιμάχητα ἄργα ταῦτα: ἄδεια ἀνεσίς ἐκεχερία μέθη παροινία κῦμας χλιδὴ βρόφης θυραυλίαι πανυχλίδες, ἀπρεπεῖς ἥδοναι, μεθημερινοὶ γάμοι, βιασταται ὤβρεις, ἀσκήσεις ἀκρασίας, ἀφρασύνης μελέται, ἐπιπτεσθέεσσες αλαχρόν, φθορὰ παντελῆς τοῦ καλοῦ, νυκτερισμένα πρὸς ἀπλήστους ἐπιθυμίας, ὅπως ἐν ἡμέρᾳ, ὀπότε καίρος ἐγρηγόρευε, φίλεως ἔργων ἐναλλαγή.

Aulus Gellius 4.14.1-6 refers to Ateius Capito’s coniectaneorum, which contained the story of Hostilius Mancinus, a real komast who tried to break into the house of a prostitute, who in turn defended herself by throwing stones at him. Note that he came on a komos, wearing a garland. The meretrix did not think it would be advantageous to admit him. The apparently factual nature of the incident as well as the tribunes’ judgement on Mancinus’ actions are worth noting:

Cum librum IX Atei Captionis coniectaneorum legeremus, qui inscriptus est de iudiciis publicis, decretum tribunorum usum est grauitatis antiquae plenum. 2 Propertiae id meminimus, idque ob hanc causam et in hanc sententiam scriptum est: Aulus Hostilius Mancinus aedilis curulis fuit. 3 Is Maniliae meretrici diem ad populum dixit, quod e tabulato eius nostru lapide ictus esset, uulnusque ex eo lapide ostendebat. 4 Manilia ad tribunos plebi provocauit. 5 Apud eos dixit comessatorem Mancinum aedem suas uenisse; eum sibi recipere non fuisset e re sua, sed cum ui inrumperet, lapidibus depulsas. 6 Tribuni decreuerunt aedilem ex eo loco iure deiectum, quo cum uenire cum corollario non decuisset; propertea, ne cum populo aedilis aget intercesserunt.

Seneca the Younger provides three references for the paraklausithuric situation. Ep. 4.4 refers to a man hanging himself before the doors of his mistress:
"Difficile est"' inquis "animum perducere ad contemp
tionem animae." Non uides, quam ex friuolis causis con-
temnatur? Alius ante amicae fores laqueo peependit, alius
se praecipitauit e tecto, ne dominum stomachantem diu-
tius audiret.

Ep. 51.12, on Baiae, mentions the nocturnal fights of sere-
naders:

Habitaturum tu putas umquam fuisse illic M. Catonem, ut
praenauigantes adulteras dinumeraret et tot genera cum-
barum uariis coloribus picta et fluuitantem toto lacu
rosam, ut audiret canentium nocturna conuicia? nonne
ille manere intra uallum maluisset, quod in unam noctem
manu sua ipse duxisset? Quidni mallet, quisquis uir est,
somnum suum classico quam symphonia rumpi?

Nat. 4 A, Pref. 6 gives a picture of a woman pushing
against, and then breaking down, a door:

Plurimum adulator, cum deprehensus est, proficit; plus
etiamnunc, si obiurugatus est, si erubuit. Futuros
multos in persona tua Plancos cogita..... Crispus Pas-
sienus ... saepe dicebat adulationi nos non claudere
ostium, sed operire, et quidem sic quemadmodum opponi
amicae solet, quae, si impuls, grata est; gratior, si
effregit.

Calpurnius Siculus' third eclogue actually contains
what can reasonably be called a paraklausithuron. Lycidas
and Phyllis have quarreled over the attention Phyllis has
given to Mopsus. Lycidas has struck Phyllis and she has fled
to stay with Alcippe. Lycidas is afraid that he will be
rejected by her. Iollas offers to write down (carve on bark)
whatever "carmen" Lycidas dictates and take it to Phyllis.
The song that follows has many paraklausithural topoi:

\[ \text{L} \] Has tibi, Phylli, preces iam pallidus, hos tibi
cantus
dat Lycidas, quos nocte miser modulatur acerba,
dum flet et excluso disperdit lumina somno.
non sic destricta marcescit turdus oliua,
non lepus, extremas legulus cum sustulit uuas,
ut Lycidas domina sine Phyllide tabidus erro.
te sine, uae miserо, mihi lilia nigra uidentur
nec sapiunt fontes et acescunt uina bibenti.
at si tu ueniaes, et candidа lilia fient
et sapiunt fontes et dulcia uina bibentur.
ille ego sum Lycidas, quo te cantante solebas
dicere felicem, cui dulcia saepe dediti
oscula nec medios dubitasti rumpere cantus
atque inter calamos errantia labra petisti.
a dolor! et post haec placuit tibi torrida Mopsi
uxor et carmen iners et acerbae stridor auenae?
quem sequeris? quem, Phylli, fugis? formosior illo
dicor, et hoc ipsum mihi tu iurare solebas.
sum quoque diuitior: certauerit ille tot haedos
pascere quo nostri numerantur uespere tauri.
quid tibi quae nosti referam? scis, optima Phylli,
quam numero saeuis sicquet bucula multcris
et quam multa suos suspendat ad ubera natos.
seд mihi nec gracilis sine te fiscella salicto
textur et nullo tremuere coagula lacte.
quod si dura times etiam nunc uerbera, Phylli,
tradiimus ecce manus: licet illae uimates torto,
si libet et lenta post tergum uite domentur,
ut mala nocturni religauit brachia Mopsi
Tityrus et furem medio suspendit ouli.
acipe, ne dubites; meruit manus utraque poenas.
his tamen, his isdem manibus tibi saepe palumbes,
saepe etiam leporem decepta matre pauentem
misimus in gremium; per me tibi lilia prima
contigerunt primaque rosae: uixdum bene florem
degustarat apis, tu cinebare coronis.
aurea sed forsan mendax tibi munerea iactat,
qui metere occidua ferales nocte lupinos
dicitur et cuncto pensare legumine panem:
qu si bи tunc felix, tunc fortunatus habetur,
uilia cum subigit manualibus hordea saxis.
quod si turpis amor precibus, quod abominor, istis
obstiterit, laqueum miseri nectemus ab illa
ilice, quae nostros primum uiolauit amores.
hi tamen ante mala figentur in arbore versus:
"credere, pastores, leuibus nolite puellas;
Phyllida Mopsus habet, Lycidan habet ultima rerum."

Finally, after the song is dictated, the picture becomes
clear—Iollas will actually sing the song to Phyllis, and
Lycidas will hide off in the shrubbery, watching. Since the
song will be sung to the estranged beloved, it is a parak-
lausithuron, albeit once removed from the excluded lover himself:

Nunc age, si quicquam miseris succurris, Iolla,
perfer et exora modulato Phyllida cantu.
ipse procul stabo uel acuta carice tectus
uei propius latitans uicina saepe sub horti.
(I) Iimbus: et ueniet, nisi me praesagia fallunt.
nam bonus a dextro fecit mihi Tityrus omen,
qui uenit inuenta non irritus ecce iuuenca.

What is more, the returning heifer at the end indicates that Lycidas' appeal for reunion with Phyllis will be successful. This is another successful non-dramatic paraklausithuron.

Two poems of paraklausithuric character from Pompeii have survived. The first, Courtney (1995) no. 91 (CLE 949 = CIL 4.1837), was written on a wall, and line 4 seems to imply that it was written by a woman:

si potes et non uis, cur gaudia differs
spemque foues et cras usque redire iubes?
er]go coge mori quem sine te uiuere cogis:
munus erit certe non cruciasse boni.
quod spes eripuit, spes certe redd[i]t amanti.

Courtney (1995) no. 92 (CLE 950 = CIL 4.5296) was written on the doorway of the so-called "doctor's house":

o utinam liceat collo complexa tenere
braciola et teneris ; oscula ferre label(1)is.
i nunc, uentis tua gaudia, pupula, crede ;
crede mihi, leuis est natura uiorum.
saepe ego cu(m) media ; uigilarem perdita nocte
haec mecum medita(n)s: 'multos ; Fortuna quos supstulit alte,
hos modo proiectos subito ; praecipitesque premit;
sic Venus ut subito coiunxit ; corpora amantum,
diuuidit lux, et se ;
paries quid ama

It, too, appears to have been written by a woman.
Antipater of Thessalonica and Marcus Argentarius

provide one paraklausithuric epigram each. Antipater AP 5.30 (G.-P. VI) deals with the power of money:

Πάντα καλὲς τὸ γε μὴν χρυσὴν ὅτι τὴν Ἀφροδίτην ἔξοχα καὶ πάντων εἶτεν ὁ Μαιομένης. ἢν μὲν γὰρ τὸ χάραγμα φέρης, φίλος, οὐτε θυρωρὸς ἐν ποσίν οὐτε κύνν ἐν προθύροις δέδεται, ἢν δὲ ἑτέρῳς ἔλθης, καὶ ὁ Κέρβερος. ὃ πλεονέκται τὸλ πλοῦτον πεινὴν ὡς ἀδικεῖτε μόνοιτ.

Marc. Arg. AP 9.270 (G.-P. XXVI) is more komastic than paraklausithuric, but a serenade seems imminent:

κωμάξω χρυσειον ἐς ἐσπερίων χόρδων δαστρῶν λεύσσων, τοῦτ᾽ ἀλλων λαξ ἐβάρυνα δρόμῳ. στέφας δ᾽ ἀνθόβολον κρατᾶς τρίχα τὴν κελαδείνην πηκτόδα μουσικόλοις χερσίν ἐπηρέξας. καλ τάδε ὅρων εὐκασμον ἐξω βλέν. οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτὸς 5 κόσμος ἀνευθε λύρης ἐπέτει καὶ στεφάνου.

Anacreontea 33.1-13 has Eros himself as an excluded lover of a sort:

μεσονυκτίως ποτ᾽ ὕματι, στρέφετ' ἤνυκ "Ἀρκτος ἢν κατὰ χεῖρα τὴν Βοώτου, μερόπων δὲ φύλα πάντα κέσται κόπη δαφέντα, τότ᾽ "Ερως ἐπιστάθηκε μεν θυρέων ἔκοπτ᾽ ὄχιας. "τὶς" ἐφη "θύρας ἀράσσει κατὰ μὲν σχίας ὀνείρους;" ὁ δ᾽ "Ερως "ἀνοίγε" φησίν. "βρέφος εἰμι, μὴ φάβησαι, βρέχομαι δὲ κάσαλλον κατὰ νύκτα πεπλάνημαι." 10

Josephus BJ 6.3 (195), in talking of the famine in Jerusalem, describes people breaking into houses for food as "battering against the doors like drunken men":

πίστις δ᾽ ἀπορίας οὐδὲ τοῖς θυμίσκουσιν ἢν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἐκπέμπεται ὁ ληστὰς διηρεῖμων, μὴ τίς ὑπὸ κόλπων ἔχων τρόφην σχήματο τὸν θάνατον αὐτῷ. οἱ δ᾽ ὑπ᾽ ἐνδέειας κεχηροτες ὀπερ λυσάντες κόμις ἐσφάλλοντο, καὶ παρε-
Persius 5.161 ff. describes a paraklaussithuric scene based on Menander’s *Eunuch*:

'Daue, cito, hoc credas iubeo, finire dolores praeteritos meditor' (crudum Chaerestratus unguem adrodens ait haec). 'an siccis dedecus obstem cognatis? an rem patriam rumore sinistro limen ad obscenum frangam, dum Chrysidis udas 165 ebrius ante fores extincta cum face canto?' 'euge, puer, sapias, dis depellentibus agnam percute.' 'sed censen plorabit, Daue, relictam? nugaris. solea, puer, obiurgabere rubra, ne trepidare uelis atque artos rodere casses.

In Petronius 97 Ascytlos, looking for his runaway slave Giton, breaks down the door of Encolpius' room, with the help of a "uiator":

interim Ascytlos ut pererrauit omnes cum uiatore cellas, uenit ad meam, et hoc quidem plenirem spem conceptit, quo diligentius oppressulatus inuenit fores. publicus uero servus insertans commissuris securem clausuram firmitatem laxauit. ego ad genua Ascylty procubui et per memoriam amicitiae perchere societatem misericordium petii ut saltem ostenderet fratrem. immo ut fidem habentem fictae preces, 'scio te' inquam 'Ascylto, ad occidendum me uenisse. quo enim securem attulisti? itaque satia iracundiam tuam: praebeo ecce ceruicem, funde sanguinem, quem sub praetextu quaeestionis petisti.' amolitur Ascytlos inuidiam et se uero nihil aliud quam fugitium suum dixit quaerere, mortem nec hominis concupisse nec supplicis, utique eius quem post fatalem rixam habuisset carissimum.

Martial 10.14(13) contains an unambiguous paraklaussithuric reference:

Cum cathedrata litos portet tibi raeda ministros et Libys in longo pulvere sudet eques, strataque non unas tingant triclinia Baias et Thetis unguento palleat uncta tuo, candida Setini rumpant crystalla trientes, dormiat in pluma nec meliore Venus: 5 ad nocturna iaces fastosae limina moechae
et madet heu! lacrimis ianua surda tuis, 
urere nec miserum cessant suspiria pectus. 
uis dicam male sit cur tibi, Cotta? bene est. 10

At 4.29, in the context of arguing that rare things are more valued, he observes that (5-6) "sic spoliatrixem commendat fastus amicam, / ianua nec iuuenem semper aperta tenet."

However, several other times he uses language strongly suggestive of the paraeklausithuron in contexts applying to clientage. In 5.6.1-12 he addresses the Muses asking them to tell their friend Parthenenius to admit his book within the inner apartments of Domitian's palace:

Si non est graue nec nimis molestum, 
Musae, Parthenenium rogante uestrum: 
sic te serior et beata quondam 
saluo Caesare finiat senectus 
et sis inuidia fauente felix, 
sic Burrus cito sentiat parentem: 
admittas timidam breuemeque chartam 
intra limina sanctioris aulae. 
nosti temporae tu Iouis sereni, 
cum fulget placido suoque uultu, 
quo nil supplicibus solet negare. 
non est quod metuas preces iniquas.... 5 10

In 10.58 he addresses Faustinus, complaining about wasting time waiting around thresholds (11 ff.):

sed non solus amat qui nocte dieque frequentat limina nec uatem talia damna decent. 
per ueneranda mihi Musarum sacra, per omnes iuro deos: et non officiosus amo.

However, most clearly paraeklausithuric is 10.82:

Si quid nostra tuis adicit uexatio rebus, 
mane uel a media nocte togatus ero 
stridentesque feram flatus Aquilonis iniqui 
et patiar nimbos excipiamque nuues. 
sed si non fias quadrante beatior uno 
peri gemitus nostros ingenuaque cruces, 
parece, precor, fesso vanoque remitte labores,
qui tibi non prosunt et mihi, Galle, nocent.

Dio Chrysostom 33.6 f. depicts a strange picture of sick men gathering together to ἐπικωμάζειν a doctor:

ό δ' ἀληθῆς λατρῶς οὐκ ἔστι τοιοῦτος σύνεκτος οὕτως οὕτως ἀναλέγεται τοῖς δυτικοῖς δευμένοις. πάθεν; ἀλλὰ προσέταξε τί δει ποιεῖν, καὶ φαγεῖν βουλόμενον ἢ πιεῖν ἐκώλυσε, καὶ λαβὼν ἔτεμεν ἀφεστικός τι ἡ τοῦ σώματος. ἦσαν οὖν εἰ συνελθόντες οἱ κάμινοι εἷς εἰς τὸν λατρῶν ἐπεκώμαζον καὶ κυῳνίζεσθαι ἔξεσθαι, οὐκ οὖν αὐτοῖς κατ' ἔλεος τὸ πρᾶγμα ἀπήντησεν, ἀλλ' ἵσως ἡγανάκτου πρὸς τὴν ὑποσχήν, τούτῳ μοι πεπονθέναι σοφοθίαν οἱ πάλαι εἰμίνωντες ἐπὶ τὸν τοιοῦτον καὶ λέγειν κελεύσομεν, ἀνευστι οὖν ὅτι τῶν τῆς ἀληθείας δυτικών λόγων, ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τόι καὶ προσηνέκας ἀκούσασθαι προσδοκώντες.

Statius, Silvae 1.2.31 ff., in the epithalamium for Stella and Violentilla, addresses the groom:

tu tamen attonitus, quamvis data copia tanta noctis, adhuc optas permissaque numine dextro uota paues. pone o dulcis suspiria uates, pone: tua est. licet expositum per limen aperto ire redire gradu: iam nusquam iamitor aut lex aut pudor. amplexu tandem satiare petito (contigit) et duras pariter reminiscere noctes.

Similar mention is made at 194 ff.:

his mulcet dictis tacitaeque inspirat honorem conubii. redeunt animo iam dona precesque 195 et lacrimae uigilesque uiri prope limina questus Asteris et uatis totam cantata per Vrbem, Asteris ante dapes, nocte Asteris, Asteris ortu, quantum non clamatus Hylas. iamque aspera coepit flectere corda libens et iam sibi dura uideri. 200

Plutarch at Galba 19.4 talks about Poppaea shutting out Nero even when Otho was not home in order to keep his love keen:

ἀλλὰ τὴν γε Ποππαίαν προμοιχεύσας τῷ Νέρωνι, καὶ διαφθείρας ταῖς εἰς ἐκεῖνον ἐπιλείπεις, ἔπειτα ἀποστήματι τοῦ ἀνδρός, ἐλθούσας δὲ παρ' αὐτῶν ὡς γαμητῆς οὐκ ἡγάμα μετέχων, ἀλλ' ἕχασα λεγείσας, οὐδὲ αὐτῆς ἄρχομεν, ὡς φασι, τῇ ἐπολυτίπῃ τῆς Ποππαίας. 5 καὶ γὰρ ἁπαξλείπα τῶν Νέρωνα λέγεται μὴ παρῶντος τοῦ Ὄθωνος, εἶτε τῆς
ηδονής ἀφαιροῦσα τὸ πλῆσιμον, εἴτε, ὡς φασίν ἔχωσιν, 
βερυκομένη τῶν Κάλασαρος γάμου, ἔραστὴ δὲ μὴ φεύγουσα 
χρῆσαι διὰ τὸ φιλακόλαστον.

At Mor. 455 B ("On the control of anger") he mentions the 
alleviation that garlanding a beloved's door brings:

αἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐρωτικαὶ πράξεις, οἶνον ἔπικουμάσαι καὶ ἤσσαι 
καὶ στεφανύσαι θύραν, ἔχουσιν ἄμωσγὴς καὶ κοψισμὸν ὕπε 
ἄχριν ὑδατοποιήσων.

Mor. 753 A-B, the source for τὸ παρακλαυσίθυρον, tells the 
story of the boy Bacchon being pursued by an older widow:

Ἐραται γὰρ αὐτοῦ ὡς Δία καὶ κάτει: τίς οὖν ὁ κωλυν 
ἐστι κυμάζειν ἐπὶ θύρας, θείει τὸ παρακλαυσίθυρον, 
ἀνασεῖν τὰ εἰκόνια, παγκρατιάζειν πρὸς τῶν ἀντεραστάς; 
τάυτα γὰρ ἐρωτικά· καὶ καθεῖσθω τὰς ὀφρὺς καὶ παυσάσθω 
τρυφώσα, σχήμα λαβοῦσα τῶν τοῦ πάθους οἰκείων. εἶ δὲ 
αἰσχοῦται καὶ σφόνευζα, κοσμίως οἴκοι καθήσων περιμένα 
ουσα τοὺς μιμήσους καὶ σπουδάζοντας. ἔρας δὲ φασκοῦσαν 
γυναῖκα φυγεῖν τίς ἂν ἔχοι καὶ βδελυκθείη, μὴ γε λάβοι 
γάμον ποιησάμενος ἄρχην τὴν τοιαύτην ἀκραίαν.

At Mor. 759 B Plutarch talks of erotic madness:

τὴν ὅ ἐρωτικὴν μανῆν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθαφαμένην ἀλήθε 
καὶ διακαύσασαι οὐ μοιάζα τίς οὐκ ἐπικεφθῆς καὶ 
τόπου μεταβολή καθιστήσῃ· ἀλλὰ καὶ παρόντες ἔρας καὶ 
πάντες παύση καὶ μεθ’ ἡμέραν διάκουσαι καὶ νύκτωρ 
θύραυλος, καὶ νήφοντες καλόθην τοὺς καλοὺς καὶ 
πλευτές θάνουσι.

He seems to use paraklausithuric imagery at Mor. 713 C:

... οὕτω φαλτηρίου φυγής καὶ αὐλοῦ καθ’ ἑαυτὴν τὰ ὅτα 
κατούσας μὴ ὑπακούσων, ἢν ὅ ἐπηταὶ μετὰ λόγου καὶ 
ψῆς ἑστίασας ἐκ καὶ τέρπουσα τὸν ἐν ἡμῖν λόγου, 
εἰσάγωμεν....

A violent komos gone tragically wrong is recounted at Mor. 
772 E-F:

toúτου δὴ τοῦ Μελίσαου υἱὸς Ἀκταίῳ γίνεται, κάλλιστος 
kαὶ σφραγιστατός τῶν ὁμήλισσων, οὐ πλεῖστοι μὲν ἐγένευτο 
ἔραστι, διαφερόντως ὁ Ἀρχίας, γένους μὲν ὃν τῶν Ἡρακλείδων, 
pλούτῳ δὲ καὶ τῇ Ἀλλῆ ὄνομα, λαμπρότατος 
κορυφθῶν. ἐπεὶ δὲ πείθεις, οὐκ ἡδόνα τῶν παλάτο, ἐγών 
βιάσασθαι καὶ συναρπάσαι τὸ μειράκιον· ἐπεκώμασεν οὖν
Although not paraklausithuric, Meton of Tarentum’s revel in Pyrr. 13.3-5 (cf. Dion. Hal. Exc. 19.8), and the violent komos in Alex. 38.1 ff. are worth noting. Finally, the possibility should be noted that, in the scenes before Cleopatra’s tomb at Ant. 77.1-3 and 78.3-4, Plutarch seems to play with some paraklausithuric topoi (as does Dio Cassius in his version of the incident at 51.10.7-9).

Pliny the younger in a letter to his wife Calpurnia (7.5) describes himself, in her absence, acting like an excluded lover in her absence:

Incredibile est, quanto desiderio tui tenear. In causa amor primum, deinde quod non consueuimus abesse. Inde est quod magnam partem noctium in imagine tua vigil exigo, inde quod interdiu, quibus horis te uisere solebam, ad diaetam tuam ipsi me, ut uerissime dicatur, pedes ducunt; quod denique aeger et maestus ac similis excluso a uacuo limine recedo.

Juvenal 9.76-7 seems to refer to a paraklausithuric situation, but in this case it is the husband who is locked out:

...
Suetonius Otho 3.1-2 describes Nero as an excluded lover, shut out by Poppaea’s husband Otho. Of particular note is the mingling of threats and and prayers that is so typical of the paraklausithuron itself:

item Poppaeam Sabinam tunc adhuc amicam eius, abductam marito demandatamque interim sibi, nuptiarum specie recepit nec corrupisse contentus adeo dilexit, ut ne riualem quidem Neronem aquo tulerit animo 2 creditur certe non modo missos ad acessendam non recepisse, sed ipsum etiam exclusisse quondam pro foribus astantem miscentemque frustra minas et preces ac depositum reposcentem. quare diducto matrimonio sepositus est per cau sam legationis in Lusitaniam. et satis usum, ne poena acrior minum omnem diuulgaret, qui tamen sic quoque hoc disticho enotuit: cur Otho mentito sit, quaeritis, exul honore? uxoris moechus coeperat esse suae.

It also seems like Suetonius may be deliberately evoking the paraklausithuric situation in Galba 4.3:

Sumpata uirili toga somniauit Fortunam dicentem, stare se ante fores defessam et nisi oicius recuperet, cuicumque obuio praedae futuram. utque euigiluit, aperto atrio simulacrum aeneum deae cubitali maius iuxta limen inuenit idque gremio suo Tusculum, ubi aestiuare consueverat, auxet et in parte aedium consecratum menstruis deinceps supplicationibus et perugilio anniversario culuit.

Strato, AP 12.252, provides the first door-address in a Greek paraklausithuron. The poet threatens the door, and its owner, with burning:

'Εμπρήσω σε, θύρη, τῇ λαμπάδι, καὶ τὸν ἔνοικον συμφλέξας μεθ’ χωμον, εὔθυς ἀπεμίθ φυγάς, καὶ πλύσας Ἀδριανοῦ ἐν’ ὀλυσσα πόντον ἀλῆτης φιλήσω γε θυραίς νυκτὸς ἀνοιγομέναις.

12.193 contains a threat-prophecy to a reluctant youth:

Οὐδὲ ἐμυρναις Νεμέσεις ὥ τι σοι πιλέγουσιν, Ἀρτεμίσιρ, νοεῖς· "Μηδὲν ὑπὲρ τοῦ μέτρου." ἄλλ’ οὕτως υπέρταστα καὶ ἄψεια κούφε πρόποντα θυμώθη φθέγγαι, πάνθε ὑποκρινόμενος. μυπαθής τούτων, ὑπερήφανε· καὶ σὺ φιλήσεις,
καὶ κυμψήσεις τὴν Ἀπακλειομένην.

In 12.250 a komast finds a boy standing at a door, not shut up inside. The topos of lovers’ oaths is also mentioned:

Νυκτερεύην ἐπίκωμος λῶν μετασέρπουν ἄρην ἀριστεύς θυρέτροις ἐδρον ἐφεστάτα, ύλον Ἀριστοδίκου τοῦ γείτονος. διὸ περιπλεχθεῖς ἔξεφλουν ὅρκοις πολλὰ χαρίζομεν. μὴ δὲ αὐτῷ τί φέρων ὡρησομαι; οὔτ' ἀπάτης γὰρ ἀξίος, Ἔσπερῆς οὔτ' ἐπιστρεφεῖαι.

Lucian makes several paraklausathuric references in his Bis Acc. At 29 Oratory is speaking about Polemon:

πῶς σὺν σοῦ ἄχριστος σῶτος καὶ ἔνοχος τοῖς περὶ τῆς κακώσεως νόμοις, δὲ τὴν μὲν νάρη γαμητὴν παρ' ἥς τοσαῦτα ἐλήφθη καὶ οἵ ἐνυποκρίσεις ἐστὶν σῶτος ἀτίμως ἀπέλιπεν, ... ἄλλ' ἐγὼ μὲν ἀντέχω τοσοῦτον μηνιστενόντως, καὶ κόπουσιν αὐτοίς τὴν υθὺν καὶ τού νόμον ἐπιβομμένοις μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ οὗτοι ἀνολύγας οὗτοι ὑποκούειν βούλομαι. ὅρα γὰρ αὐτούς ὠδὲν πλέον τῆς βοῆς κοινωνεῖας. σῶτος δὲ ὁδὲ σῶτος ἐπιστρεφέται πρὸς ἐμὲ, ἄλλα πρὸς τὸν ἔρωμον βλέπει....

The paraklausathuric situation is even more developed at 31, where "The Syrian" who married Oratory explains why he left her:

Ἐγὼ γὰρ ὁ ὅρια ταύτην οὐκέτι σῳδρομοῦσαν οὐδὲ μένουσαν ἐπὶ τοῦ κοψιθήματος αὐτῆς ποιεῖ ἐσχαματισμένην αὐτὴν ὁ Παλαινεῖς ἐκέλευς ἦγαγετο, κοσμουμένην δὲ καὶ τὰς τρίχας εὐθεῖας εἰς τὸ ἐταυρικὸν καὶ φυκὸν ἐνυφέβομένην καὶ τῷ θαλαμῷ ὑποραφόμενην, ὑπώπτευον εὐθὺς καὶ παρεφύλατον ὅποι τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν φέρει, καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ἔδω καὶ ὧν ἐκάστην δὲ τὴν νύκτα ὁ μὲν στενωπὸς ἢ μὲν ἐνεπιμπλατο μεθυόντων ἐραστῶν κυριακῶν ἐπὶ αὐτὴν καὶ κοπτῶντων τὴν υθὺν, ἐνώπιον δὲ καὶ εἰσβιάσασθαι σὺν οὖσιν κόσμῳ τοιμώτων. αὐτὴ δὲ ἐγέλα καὶ ἦξετο τοῖς ὀφριμένοις καὶ τὰ πολλὰ ἦ παρέκκυπτεν ὀπὸ τοῦ τέγους ὀφόντων ἀκούσα τραχέα τῇ φωνῇ ὧδας τινας ἐρωτικὰς καὶ παρανοοῦσα τὰς θυρίδας ἔμε ἀλμένην λανθάνειν ἴσχυλαν καὶ ἐμαυξεύετο πρὸς αὐτῶν. ὅπερ ἐγὼ μὴ φέρων γράψασθαι μὲν αὐτὴν μειχείας οὔκ ἔσκλιμας, ἐν γειτόνων δὲ αἰσχροι τῇ Διαλογίᾳ προσελθὼν ἥξιον καταδεχθήματι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.
Earlier, at 7, Justice is speaking, but it is hard to tell whether she is talking like a client or an excluded lover.

If the latter, then she is another female lover/komast:

... ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν πραγμάτων μηδὲ τὸ παράπαν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν παραδέχεσθαι, ἀλλὰ δήλους εἶναι ἀποκλειστὰς ἢν ἀφίκω-

As could be expected, the DMeretr. makes a number of references to paraklausithuric situations. At 8.2-3 (300-1) a prostitute talks about a money-lender, Demophantus, who is in love with her. She cites as evidence for the shallowness of his love the fact that he never laments at her door at all hours. When she eventually takes in a rival and shuts the money-lender out, he flares up with passion and waits at her doors until he can first assault her and then buy exclusive access to her. Here is also a rare mention of the lover’s wife, who, not surprisingly, does not like this arrangement:

καὶ δὲ, ὥς Χρυσή, ἐπιπλαίμνυν τινα ἔρωτα οὕτω ὑποστένων οὕτω διακρόνων οὕτω ἄφω γοργογνώμενος ἐπὶ τὰς θύρας, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸ μόνον συνεκάθευκε μοι ἐνειπε, καὶ τοῦτο ὅλα μακροθ. 3. ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐλθόντα ποτὲ ἀπέκλεισα—Καλλίδης γὰρ ὁ γραφεύς ἐνδόν ἢν δέκα δραχμὰς πεπομφώς—τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἀπήλθε μοι λοιπογιάμενος ὅπερ δὲ πολλαὶ μὲν ὅμηλθον ἠμέραι, ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ προσέμετπον, ὁ Καλλίδης δὲ ἐνδόν ἢν, ὑποθερμωδόμενος ἤδη τότε ὁ Δημόφαντος καὶ αὐτὸς ἀναφλέγεται ὡς τὸ πράγμα καὶ ἐπιστάς ποτὲ ἀνεψυ-

At 12.1 f. (310-11) a prostitute, Joessa, addresses her lover Lysias, saying how she deserves his scorn since she
never locked him out but was always too accessible:

Later (3-4; 313-4) Lysias describes to Pythias how he found Joessa and another man together. His father, disapproving of the relationship, had shut him inside and instructed the doorkeeper not to let his son out. But Lysias explains how he sneaked out, made his way to Joessa’s house, and crept in, having easily circumvented the shut door, only to find her with a rival:

In 14.1 a sailor named Dorio complains to Myrtale about being excluded (he keeps a tearful all-night vigil) now that he has been drained dry by the prostitute.
οταν μυκτών φιλεταί καὶ μόνος ἔσην ἐστὶ καὶ πανυχιζεται, καὶ κυεῖν ἤς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

In chapters 2 and 3 he recounts all the presents and money he has given her. Finally, number 15 tells of a jealous soldier’s exclusion and subsequent violent reaction as he breaks into his beloved prostitute’s house:

1. ΠΑΡΘΕΝΙΣ ὁ στρατιώτης ὁ Αἰτωλός ὁ μέγας ὁ Κροκάλης ἐρώτησε με αὐλόθησαν αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀντεραστὸν αὐτοῦ Γόργου μεμιασμένην καὶ τοὺς τε αὐλοθήσεις συνέγραψε καὶ τὴν προσέμερον μεταξὺ δεινονότων ἀνέτρεψε καὶ τὸν κρατῆρα ἐξέχειν ἐπεσαπάσας. τὸν μὲν γὰρ ἄργολον ἐκέλευς τὸν Γόργου απὸ τοῦ συμπόσιον κατασκάπας τῶν τριτῶν ἔπαινον περιστάντας αὐτὸς τῷ στρατιώτῃς-Δεινόμαχος... ΚΟΧΛΙΣ 2. Ἡμάνη ὁ ἀνθρωπος ἡ μέθνης τις ἢ καὶ παροινία τὸ πράγμα; ΠΑΡΘΕΝΙΣ Ζηλοτυπία τις, ὁ Κροκάλη καὶ ἔρως ἐκποιος. ἡ Κροκάλη δὲ, οἶμαι ὅσον τάλαντα αἰτήσας, εἰ βούλεται μόνος ἔχειν αὐτήν, ἐπεὶ μὴ ἐξελθοῦ ὁ Δεινόμαχος, ἐκέλευς μὲν ἀπεκλείουν ἥκουν προσαράξασα γε αὐτῷ τὰς θύρας, ὡς ἐλέγετο, τὸν Γόργου δὲ ὁμοία τις γερμωνὸν ἐθυπέραν ἐκ πολλῶν ἐρωτῶν καὶ χρηστῶν ἀνθρωπον προσεμείνη ἔπνευ μετ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ παρέλαβεν αὐλόθησαν αὐτοῖς... ἡ Κροκάλη δὲ ἐκρότηε, καὶ πάντα τὴν ἡδὲ ἐν τοσούτῳ δὲ κτύπῳ ἐκούσε ταῦτα καὶ ψῆλα καὶ ἀθλείας ἡδέστο, καὶ μετὰ μικρῶν ἐπεισόδους δοὺν ὁποῖαν νεανίσκοι μάλα καρτερό καὶ τὸ Μεγαρεύς ἐν αὐτός. εὐθὺς οὖν ἀνέτραπτων πάντα καὶ τὸ Γόργος, ἄσπερ ἐφη, ἐπαίτετο καὶ ἐπατέετο χαμαλ κείμενος. ἡ Κροκαλὴ δὲ συκὸ σφίγω διὸς ἐφη ὑπεκφυγοῦσα παρὰ τὴν γείτονα θεσπιλάδα... ΚΟΧΛΙΣ 3.

In Musc.Enc. 10 the metamorphosis of the girl Muia comes about because she was a rival of Selene for Endymion.

She kept waking him by making komoi and singing to him, which makes her another female komast:

... λάλον μένοι γε καὶ στυμύλου καὶ ψυκῆς, καὶ ἀντερασθῆσαι γε τῇ Σελήνῃ κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ ἄμφοτερας τοῦ Ἐνδυμίωνος. εἰτ’ ἐπειδὴ κοιμήμενον τὸ μειράκιον συνεχὲς ἐπηγεῖερεν ἐρεσχηλόθθα καὶ ἄσυνα καὶ κυμάσουσα ἐπ’ αὐτῶν, τὸν μὲν ἄγανκτησαι, τὴν δὲ Σελήνην ὀργισθέεσσαν εἰς τὸ τοῦ τὴν Μυλαν μεταβαλεῖν’.
DMar. 1.4 (290) has Doris and Galatea talking about Polyphemus, and seems to indicating that Theocritus' and Ovid's portrayals of the cyclops' serenades were viewed as komastic: ὅποτε ἐκώμασε πρόην ἐπὶ σέ ... ἡ πηκτὶς οἷα; ... ἐπὶ τῇ ἐρωτικῇ ἑκείνῃ ᾤσματι.

There are two clear paraklausithuristic references in Charito. At 1.2.2-3, Callirhoe's suitors are distressed at being rejected and put aside their rivalry. It is interesting to compare this passage with Ant. Lib. 39/Hermesian. 2 and Ovid's Iphis and Anaxarete episode, where paraklausithuristic vigils are employed in the pursuit of a free woman's hand in marriage:

... ἐπεὶ δὲ παρευσκόμησεν ἡμᾶς ὁ μηδὲν ὑπὲρ γάμου πανήγυρας, οὐ φέρω τὴν ὑβρίν. 3. ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐτάθημεν αὐλεοῖς θύραις προσαγρυπνοῦντες καὶ κολακεύοντες τίτθας καὶ θεραπανίδας καὶ δώρα πέμποντες τροφῶς. πάσον χρόνον δεδουλεύκαμεν; καὶ, τὸ πάντων χαλεπώτατον, ὡς ἀντεραστάς ἀλλήλους ἐμισήσαμεν.

Later, at 1.3.1 ff., the suitors leave signs of komastic revelry in front of Callirhoe's house in order to tarnish her reputation:

'Ἔσπερα μὲν ἢν, ... ὁ δὲ Χαίρεας ἄκουσας, καίτοι φιλοπάτωρ ὄν, ὡς ἐλυπηθη πλέον δὲ ἐμελλεν ἀπελεύσεσθαι μόνος· οὐ γὰρ οἷον τε ἢν ἐξάγειν ἤδη τὴν κόρην. 2. ἐν δὲ τῇ νυκτὶ ταῦτῃ φανερὸς μὲν οὖν ὁδεῖς ἐγκλησαν ἐπικωμάσαι, κρύφα δὲ καὶ ἀδήλως ἐπελθόντες σημεῖα κόμου [ἣν καὶ] κατέλειπον· ἐστεφάνωσαν τὰ πρόθυρα, μύροις ἔρραναν, οἷον πηλὸν ἐποιήσαν, δόξας ἔρρισαν ἡμικάστους. 3. Διέλαιψεν ἡμέρα, καὶ πάς ὁ παριῶν εἰςήκε κοινῷ τινι πολυπραγμοσύνῃ πάθει. Χαίρεας δὲ ... ἔσπεραν πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα. ίαῦν δὲ τῶν ἄχλων πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἐποίμησεν· ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐμαθεὶ τὴν αἰτίαν, ἐνθουσιῶν εἰστρέχει.
It is interesting to note also that Chaireas' reaction seems to imply that komoi such as this happen with encouragement from the beloved. Furthermore, there must be two different types of vigil here—a more restrained kind which the suitors used and a more riotous kind which would tarnish the beloved's reputation.

Babrius 116 recounts a successful paraklausithuron involving a married woman (although complications do arise). Note how the serenade attracts the woman's attention, but it is only when she looks out and sees how handsome the youth is that she decides to accept his suit (1-14):

Νυκτὸς μεσούσης ἤδε παῖς τις εὐφῶς, γυνὴ δ᾿ ἀκούει τοῦθε, κάθεναστάσα
θυρίδων προκύπτει, καὶ βλέπουσα τὸν παῖδα
λαμπρῆς σελήνης ἐν φάει καλὸν λίθην,
tὸν ἀνδρὶ ἐαυτῆς καταλειπόδα κοιμᾶθαι
κάτω μελαθρῶν ἠλθε, καὶ θύρης ἐξ
ἐλθόντα ἐποίησεν τὴν προσωπικὴν πλήρη.
ὡνὴ δὲ ταύτης ἔκαυστατ' ἐξαλφῆς
ζητῶν ὅποιοτι, κούκι λάθον ὅμοιον,
μηδέν χανῶν τε καύτος ἠλθεν εἰς ὅμοιον
καὶ τῇ συνεύρῃ φησὶ "μηδέν ἐκπλήσσομαι,
tὸν παῖδα δ᾿ ἡμῶν πελασον ἐν ὅμοιοις εἴδειν.
Ἀπολ. 9, first quotes a poem to a boy, then comments that his verses were criticized as being the product of a wanton reveller, written about garlands and songs. This seems to be a paraklausithuric reference and so the text of the poem, therefore, can be regarded as the type of thing that would be found in a paraklausithuron:

"florea sarta, meum mel, et haec tibi carmina dono.
carmina dono tibi, serta tuo genio,
carmina, uti, Critia, lux haec optata canatur,
quae bis septeno uere tibi remeat, sertam autem, ut laeto tibi tempora uernent, aetatis florem floribus ut deores. tu mihi des contra pro uerno flore tuum uer, ut nostra exsuperes munera muneribus; pro impexis sertis complexum corpore redde, proque rosis oris sauria purpurea. quod si animam inspires donaci, iam carmina nostra cedent uicta tuo dulciloquo calamo."

Habes crimen meum, Maxime, quasi improbi comisatoris de sertis et canticis compositum.

At 75, paraklausithuric activity at a man’s house is evidence of its lack of respectability:

multus honos auribus praefandus est domus eius tota lenonia, tota familia contaminata: ipsepropodiosus, uxor lupa, filii similis: prorsus diebus ac noctibus ludibrio iuuentutis ianua calcibus propulsata, fenestrae canticis circumstrepitiae, triclinium comisatoribus inquietum, cubiculum adulteris perium; neque enim ulla ad introendum metus est, nisi qui pretium marito non attulit. Ita ei lecti sui contumelia uectigalis est.

Appian BC 3.6 seems to portray Octavian as an excluded lover at Antony’s doors. If this is the case, it is surely mocking:

"0 δε Καίσαρ και πρὸς οὕτως ἔχοντας ἔκτρεχε σὺν ὅργῃ μανώλει καὶ ἐβδό αὐτὸς ἐπιβουλεύεσθαι πρὸς Ἀντωνίου ἐς τὴν παρὰ τῷ δήμῳ φίλιαν ἐτὶ οἱ μόνην οὐδαν. ἐπὶ τὰς θύρας τοῦ Ἀντωνίου δραμὼν τὰ αὐτὰ ἐβδό καὶ θεώς ἐμαρτύρετο καὶ ἀράς ἴσατο πᾶσας καὶ ἐς ὁδην ἔλθεν προκαλείτο. οὐδενὸς δὲ προϊόντος, ἐν τοῖς φίλοις, ἐφη, "ἄχρομαι τοῖς σοῖς κρύνηναι," καὶ εἰπὼν ἐπέτρεψεν ἐσω. κωποθεῖς δὲ αὐθες ὑμίζε καὶ ἔλοιθοντο αὐτῶ καὶ τοὺς περὶ θύρας ἤγακτες κυλύοντι τὸν Ἀντωνίου ἐλεγχθῆναι. ἀπὸ τῶν δήμου ἐμαρτύρετο, ἐὰ τι πάθοι, πρὸς Ἀντωνίου δολοφονεῖται.

Aelian NA 1.50 depicts the viper as a komast calling the moray out of the ocean:

... ἥκη δὲ φασι καὶ ὁ ἔχως σιλθῆσας καὶ ἐκεῖνος ἐς μίξειν ἀφίκηται πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ στὸν κύμασθες σὺν τῷ αὐλῷ θυροκοπεῖ, οὕτω τοι καὶ ἐκεῖνος συρίσας τὴν ἐφυμένην παρακαλεῖ, καὶ αὐτὴ πρόεισι, τῆς φύσεως τά
In addition, at 9.13 the frog’s croak is called komastic:

... μιξεως δε άφροσισεως συνηθη δε βατοσχος άφιηγε προς την θηλειαν βοηθης τησ, ως έρασθην ύδην τυπα κωμαστικην, καλ κεκλητη ήδε ή βοη ολολυγων, ως φασιν.

In VH 13.1 two centaurs, Hylaios and Roikos, go on a komos to Atalanta, who defends herself with deadly force:

Καλ οι ποτε οι την θηλην ολκοθηντες, μεσουσης της μυκαος, έραστοι θρασεις καλ κωμασται βαρυτατοι, έκμασαν δυο των Κενταυρων, Άλαλος τε καλ Ροικος. ήν δε αρα ο καμος αυτων οθε αυλητριδες οθε αυτα ήθην τα των μεροκλων των κατα πολυν, άλλα πεθανε ην ήσαν, καλ 

As might be expected, Alciphro Ep. 4 ("Letters of Prostitutes") regularly mentions the paraklausithuretic situation. 4.8.1-2 contains the complaint of a lover who regularly goes to his beloved's doors to lament and pester her maids as they come and go with messages. Drinking brings him no relief, only mockery:

Ει μεν ήσοιην σοι τινα φερειν ή ψιλητημαι προς τινας των διαλεγομενων στει το πολλακις ήμιστε επι τας θυρας φαιτων και τοις πεμπονιοις προς τους εστηκετερους ήμιν θεραπαινηθιοις αποσθρεσαθι, ουκ όλογως ήμιν εντυπως.
Ταθεί μέντοι, καλτοί πολλών οίδα πράγμα ἀσύμφορον ἐμαυτῇ, ὁμώς με διακείμενοι ὡς ὄλγοι τῶν ἐνυγχανόντων σοι νῦν ἡ ἀμεληθέντες τῶν σιατεθέντων. καλτοὶ γε ὑπὸ τῶν ἄκρατων ἔσεσθαι μοι παρηγόρημα ἐν παρ' Ἐθνονυμίαν τρίτην ἐσπέραν πολλῶν τῶν ἐνυψηλότητῶν ὡς δὴ τὰς παρὰ τὴν νύκτα ψυχίσας διωσάμενος. τὸ δὲ ἐκεῖ ἐναντίως ἔσχεν. ἀνερρίπτει γὰρ μου τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ὅτε κλαίοντά με καὶ βρυχώμενου ἔλεεῖσθαι μὲν παρὰ τοῖς ἐπεικεστέροις, γέλωτα δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις παρέχειν....

The prostitute replies that she wishes that her house could be nourished on tears, but she needs money, clothing and the like (4.9.1): 'Ἐθνονυμίαν μὲν ὑπὸ δακρύων οίκλαιν ἐταίρας τρέφεσθαι. λαμπρῶς γὰρ ἂν ἔπραττον ἀφθόνων τοῦτων ἀπολαύοισα παρὰ σοῦ. νῦν δὲ δεῖ κρυσὶον ἡμῶν, λιματίων, κόσμου, θεραπανικών.

4.10 is a letter from a prostitute with a regular client who is beginning to take her for granted since she has been too accomodating. She decides that the only thing to do is to shut him out (2-3):

dochεῖ δὲ μοι μᾶλλον ὑπὸ τοῦτων τετυφύσασθαι καὶ ὑπερευρευθῶν ἡμῖν. λοιπῶν σοὶ ἀποκλείειν, καὶ ἐλθὼν ποτὲ πρὸς ἡμᾶς κοιμηθάσσεις (ἐάν δὴ κυνήσαι ποτὲ ἐκεῖνην βουλθεῖτ), διώσασθαι. εἴωθε γὰρ ἡ βαρύτης τῆς ἀμελείσθαι καταβάλλεσθαι.

Another reference to excluding a lover is made at 4.17.5:

εἰς ἐκείνου τοῦ χρόνου πάντα μοι τάγματα πέμπων οὐ διαλέοιπεν, ἐσθήτα, χρυσία, θεραπαίνας θεράποντας Ἰνδάς Ἰνδαίς.... ἀλλὰ τὰ μικρότατα προλαμβάνει τὰς υἱες, ἵνα μὴ ἐσθής θάσος με γεναθμένως. τοιοῦτον σοὶ ἐραστὴν ἀπόκλεισον φησι "καὶ μὴ προσίτω σοι," ποιοις δοκεῖς αὐτῶν ἀποκαλὸν οὐδόμασιν.

In 4.11 a prostitute is praised by a lover for rejecting a richer rival in order to remain in bed with him (4-5):

Οἴσθα τὸν Μήδειον ἐκείνου τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς Συρίας δευρίν κατάρατα μεθ’ ὅς τὰς θεραπαίνας καὶ παρασκευῆς ἐσάβει, εὐνοοῦχους ὑπισχυμένους καὶ θεραπαίνας καὶ κόσμου τινὰ
One of the letters of parasites (3.5) also refers to a komos for the purpose of fetching, or abducting if necessary, a prostitute:

"Ithi, labwn tin sýri nga kal tâ kýmbala híke perî prótnyn 

philakí nên tís yuñtós épí tón xrysóu sneuphôn épí tón 

ánnoy, énva symbeleíyn hímu éxésta kai tó énte ther érno apo 

ekírou labó寻i. Klyményn tín étairan ambpeliv para tón 

neóplouton, 2 tón òrrippídpón tón Aléwna. diakáwí dé 

autí ths oútos érra polv oix o hroños, kai dapanáthai óuk 

ólyga máthyn. ãsthrményn gar tón érwta ekkekaményn tóu 

melaskei, thrístetai kai suvexás akkleyetai, ... o futwn 

éautyn épiówsey, el mú tó chríon prós tóis árguríos 

lábboi. òra ouk kai bía tóutyn, el svnítws auviténceto 

hímu, ápofán. óvó de vnt Hale érrwmén táksta autín 

kai ákousan ápásxmen. 3 òrrippídpís de el toúto aútoito 

toðrón épiyvnoi tís ãmetéras ágyvulás....

Most paraklausithuristic references from Athenaeus have been cited under their actual authors. However, there are several other passages of note. At 13.574 d Athenaeus talks of Alcibiades, saying how he used to leave married women to go in komoi to the doors of prostitutes:

'Alkibídês de ó kalós, efí o tís tów kumikón éph. 

' Alkibídês tón ábrón, è gei kai òseol, | òn h Lásedalimn 

móiçon épithúmei labélyn," úpó tís "Àngidos ágapiômenos 

yvnikós, épí tás tów étairilwv òuras ékýmazewn, ápolwv 

tás lasakína kai tás 'Attikás.

Later at 14.621 c he mentions the magodist, among whose repertoire is the komast:

ó de mágwos kaloúmenos týmpana éxhe kai kýmbala kai 

pánta tás perí autón énýmata yunaikeita. symnésetai te 

cal pánnta polite tás ëxh kósmou, úppokrínómenos potè mún 

gyvnikas kai moixos kai màstrpouos, potè de àndra 

meðónta kai épí kúmou paraginómenon prós tón érmènyn.
Rufinus provides four paraklausithuric epigrams—all heterosexual—in the AP. In 5.41, a prostitute who has been beaten and thrown out by a man who found her with a rival is advised by a lexa to bolt the door when she is with someone:

Τίς γυμνήν οὖθεν σε καὶ ἔξεβαλεν καὶ ἐδειρεν;  
τίς ψυχήν λιθίνην εἶχε, καὶ οὐκ ἔβλεπε;  
μοιχῶν ἰαυξὶ θύρηκεν ἀκαίρως κεῖνος ἐσελθὼν.  
γυνόμενον πᾶσι τοῦτο ποουσί, τέκνον.  
πλὴν ἀπὸ μῦν, δταν δ ἓ τις ἕσω, κεῖνος δ’ δταν ἔξω, 5  
tὸ πρόθυρον σφῆνου, μὴ πάλι ταῦτα πάθης.

5.43 is similar:

Ἐκβάλλει γυμνήν τις, ἐπήν εὐρη ποτὲ μοιχῶν,  
ὡς μὴ μοιχεύσας, ὡς ἀπὸ πυθαγόρου;  
ἐπτα, τέκνον, κλαίοντα κατατρίψεις τὸ πρόσωπον,  
καὶ παραργώσεις μαυρομένου προθύρους;  
ἐκμαξάσ, μὴ κλαίε, τέκνον: χεὶρήσωμεν ἀλλαν, 5  
tὸν μὴ καὶ τὸ βλέπειν εἰδότα καὶ τὸ δέρειν.

In 5.92 the speaker calls on wrinkles and old age to come to the arrogant Rhodope and unbend her. She ungratefully grinds under her foot garlands the man hangs on her door:

Ὑψωται 'Ροδόπη τῷ κάλλει· κὴν ποτὲ "χαλέ"  
eἶπω, ταῖς σοφαρσῖς ὑφάσκοις ἡπάσσατο.  
ἄπω ποτὲ καὶ στεφάνους προθύρων ὑπὲρ ἐχερέμασσαι,  
ἀργισθείσα πατεὶ τοῖς σοφαρσῖς ίχνεσιν. 5  
ὦ ῥυτίδες, καὶ γῆρας ἄνηλες, ἔλθευε βάσσου,  
σπεύσατε· κἂν ύμείς πείσατε τὴν 'Ροδόπην.

Finally, 5.103 addresses the beloved in an actual paraklausithuron, complete with threat-prophecy about approaching old age. The occurrence of paraklausalein (1) is particularly notable, as is the supplicatory language of gounássamai (2):

Μέχρι τίνος, Προδίκη, παρακλαύσαμαί; ἄχρι τίνος σε  
γουνάσσαμαί, στερή, μηδὲν ἄκουόμενος;  
ἡδὴ καὶ λευκαί σοι ἐπισκιρτῶι ἔθειραι,  
kαὶ τάχα μοι ὅσεις ὡς Ἑκάβη Πριάμῳ.
Two of the major declamations attributed to Quintilian deal with the case of a prostitute who gave a particularly persistent, but poor, customer a hate-potion. At 14.3-4 the lover relates how he started waiting around prostitutes' doors, pale and wasting away:

Siue enim, iudices, pro communium quae ad corrumpendas expugnandasque mentes excogitant ingenia meretricum, placuit experimentum, et in me temptatum est, quantum quis amare, quantum quis posset odisse, seu mulier omnibus exposita mortalibus uanitatem fastidio mei despectuque captavit, et fama inde quaesita est, ut a solis uideretur amari debere diuitus, non eram profecto, qui paulo ante; patiebar iam tunc haustus affec-
tus. quod scortorum foribus haerebam, quod, si istis creditis, pallore deformis, macie notabilis paupertatem in lupanarium obsequia transtuleram, inde ueniebant, unde nunc quod excandesco, quod fremo. 4 numquam hoc tantum meretrix scit, quemadmodum non ametur.

More references are made to the man's vigils at 15.3 ff., including mention of the dangers of the streets (7), the poverty of the lover and how he is excluded while paying customers are inside (10), and his abuse of his more successful rivals (13):

3 ... adiuuit deinde quod dederat, imperauit sibi, ne quas admitteret amplius preces, ne querecis adssistentis, ne lacrimis moueretur exclusit;

7 ... bibi medicamentum crudele, saeuum: desii pauper amare meretricem! iamiam non inquietis noctibus uagus uilissimi cuiusque perditis patior ictus, nec exclusus ante lupanarium fores posterum diem pervigil amator expecto. postum nauigare, colere terras, sufficio militiae, redditus mihi est animus, quo fierem maritus, quo senectuti liberisque prospicerem;

10 ... totos infelix dies lupanarium foribus impendes, ut quando prostituta pauperi uacet, et contentione numerantium dilatus, exclusus otium meretricis expectas. negatur tibi complexus: indignatione persequeris; con-
tingit uero: felicitate corrupperis. spem gaudia parant, aduersa contentionem; ex utraque fortuna desideria
coalescunt. nobis crede, qui uidimus: quis tibi, iuuenis, fuit corporis habitus, quis pallor, quam miserabilis, quam pudenda tristitia! quotiens tu uenenum bibere uoluisti!; and

13 ... improbius pauperes amant. sic tumultuabaris admissus, sic moras, sic impedimenta ferre non poteras. maledicebas populo, conuticiabaris intrantibus.

Philostratus is particularly rich in paraklausi-thuric references. Ep. 29 makes a general mention of the situation, complete with fighting with rivals:

ἀμέλει πρὶν ἔρωτα ἐς γῆν καταστῆναι μόνον τὸν ἥλιον ἥπιστατο ἢ ψυχὴ καλὸν καὶ τοῦτο αὐτῆς τὸ θέαμα καὶ θαῦμα ἢ, γενναμένη δὲ ὄρας ἀνθρωπινής ἐκ μὲν τῆς σπουδῆς ἐκείνης κατέπεσεν, ἐς δὲ θητεῖαν ὑπήρχην πικρὰν, ἢς ἔργα θυραυλλαὶ καὶ χαμακοτίας καὶ ή πρὸς θάλπας καὶ ξεμάνα ἀντίταξις καὶ "ν μ’ ἀνάειρ’ ἢ ἔγν σὲ̂ πρὸς τὸν ἀντεραστὴν μάχη..."

Ep. 14 contains a threat-prophecy to a boy in which it is hoped the speaker will one day see the boy an excluded lover:

Χαῖρε κἂν μὴ θέλῃς, χαῖρε κἂν μὴ γράφῃς, ἀλλοις καλέ, ἔμοι δὲ ύπερήφανε. οὐκ ἦσον δὲ ἄλλος καὶ πέτρας καὶ Συγός. ταχέως σε θεασάμην γενείων καὶ παρὰ ἀλλοτρίας θύρας καθήμενον. ναὶ Ἐρως, ναὶ Νέμεσις ἀξίζεις θεοί καὶ στρεφόμενοι.

28 develops the image of the lover as exile seeking refuge with the beloved:

Τὴν καλὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ τρόπου δὲ τῶν ἐραστῶν ποιεῖται τὸν κατάλογον, οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους, καὶ γὰρ εἶναι ἐπιεικῆς ὀνομάζει γενέσθαι καὶ πολίτης κακός,... ὁ δὲ εἴναι ἐξικε τοῖς ἀξιότατοι θεοὶ "Ηλίῳ καὶ ἀνέμους καὶ ἄστροις καὶ Ἐρωτι, ὦ ν κακὸς πτηνὸς γενόμενος εἴρη ἔληθα κινηθεὶς προφάσως κρείσσον. μὴ μου τὴν ἱκεσίαν υπερέθες... ή μετ' ἀλλήλων ἐκείσα ἀπέλθημεν... εἰ τες ἀποκλείει καὶ εἴναι πῦρ οὐκ εὐναίσθας θέλοντα ἀλλὰ τὸ καθῆμεν σβήσας; μὴ λακώνιζε, ὦ γύναι, μηδὲ μιμοῦ τὸν λυκόδρομον. ἐγνησίαν ἔρως οὐκ ἔχει.

In turn, 39 makes much of the lover's supplication:
56 applies the vocabulary of exclusion to a lover’s eyes:

'Απέκλειεν σοι τὰ δείκτα. πῦς σοι; εἴπωι. ώς οἱ πολιορκούμενοι τὰς πύλας. καὶ οὐ τὴν φρουράν λαθῶν ἐνδον εἶ. λέγε, τίς σε ἑσηγαγεν.

The Imagines also contain paraklausithuric references. In 1.12 a woman is beset by suitors. Her arrogance has spurred them on, and they press their suits before her house on the Bosporus. They are, however, not in the street but on the water:

4 ... ἡ δὲ ἐφεξῆς οἰκία, χαρεῖς τι γύναιον ἔξελησθάς τοῦ ἄτεχος δι᾽ ὅψιν νέων. ἀρπάσεθαι γὰρ αὐτὸ ἔφασαν καὶ ἀφείσας ἐκώμαζαν καὶ ὀφοὺς ἐπείρουν. ἢ δὲ σίμαι κομψόν τι ἐσ αὐτοῦς ἔχουσα κυῖει τὰ μεταόρκα καὶ δέθρο ὑπεξελθοῦσα οἰκεῖ τὴν ἔχουραν ταύτην οἰκίαν ... ἐς τούτο ἤκουσαν τὸ φρουρόν οὐδὲ ὅς ἀπολελοίσασαν αὐτὴν οἱ ἑρώτες, ἀλλ’ ὁ μὲν κυναρόφρουρον ... ὁ δὲ ἄλλος ἄλλο τι τῶν ποικίλων ἀκατίων ἐμβεβηκὼς πλεῖ, κώμας αὐτῇ, καλοὶ τε καὶ ἑστεφασμένοι. καὶ ὁ μὲν σύλλει, ὁ δὲ κρατεῖν φησίν, ὁ δὲ ἕσει σίμαι, στεφάνωσι δὲ ἀναρρητοῦσι καὶ φιλήματα. καὶ οὐδὲ ἔρέτουσι, ἀλλ’ ἐπέκουσι τὴν εἰσαίαν καὶ ἔφορμίζονται τῷ κρημνῷ. τὸ δὲ γύναιον ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας οἶνον ἐκ περιπηθῆς ὡρὰ ταῦτά καὶ γελά κατὰ τὸ κώμου, χλιόδασα εἰς τοὺς ἑρώτες ώς οὐ πλεῖν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ νεῖν ἀναγκασθοῦσα.

1.2 is on Κώμος. It is not actually paraklausithuric, but the great elaboration in the description brings in many towpoi often seen in paraklausithuron and so seems to be worth some consideration. In the first part Komos is stationed at the doors of a wedding chamber. He is a youth and is sleeping because of drink:
Philostratus goes on to mention how Komos’ head is drooped forward as he sleeps, and suggests that youths should not go revelling except with their heads covered. He describes how everything is well-lit from the torch, and gives details of Komos’ garland—it is made of roses, and they are wet with dew:

3. πρόσωπα δὲ ὁφείλεται μὲν παρὰ τῶν ζωγράφων τοῖς ἐν ὥραι καὶ τυφλόστουσι γε ἄνευ τούτων αἱ γραφαὶ, τὰ δὲ Κόμως σημεῖα δὲ τῶν προσώπων γενεικτῆς καὶ ἐκλάτη τὴν ἄπο τῆς κεφαλῆς σκίας· κελεύεις δὲ σκία γῆς ἀπαρακάλπτους καταβαίνει τοὺς ἐν ἡλικία τούτους. τὰ δὲ λατά τοῦ σώματος ὅμορκος θάνατος πάντα περίλαμποντος αὐτὰ τοῦ λαμπάδιον...

4. ὁ στέφανος δὲ τῶν ρόδων ἐπαυελείωθα μὲν, ...ἐπαυελείωθα γὰρ καὶ κυμοῖς, ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄνθεον εἰσκορμάς. τῷ μέγας ὁ θὸς—Ἀλλη ἐπαυελείωθα· ἐπαινεῖν χρή τὸ χαῖνον τοῦ στέφανου καὶ ἄμαρλον· ἐπαινεῖν καὶ τὸ ἐνδύσον τῶν ρόδων καὶ φημὶ γεγράφησαι αὐτὰ μετὰ τῆς ὅμης.

In 5 musical instruments are mentioned, as well as more torches, laughter, women accompanying the revel, transvestism on the part of both genders, running around, fading garlands, and clapping:

5. τῷ λαυπὸν τοῦ κώμου; τῷ δὲ ἄλλο γε ἡ ὁι κυματος; ἡ ὁ θυρίση σε κράτη καὶ θρώς ἐναυλος καὶ ἀφή
Finally, in Im. 14, Philostratus describes Semele and calls Zeus a komast: 2. πυρὸς νεφέλη περισχοῦσα τὰς θήβας εἰς τὴν τοῦ Κάσθου στέγην ῥήγυντας κυμάσατος ἐπὶ τὴν Σεμέλην τοῦ Δίας.

Two paraklausithuric references come from Philostratus' Vitae Sophistorum. At 485, Philip of Macedon talks with Leon of Byzantium (this is repeated in a slightly different form at Stob. Anth. 3.2.18):

Λέων δὲ ὁ Βυζάντιος ... Φιλίππη μὲν γὰρ στρατεύοντι ἐπὶ Βυζάντιος προσπαντῆσαι ἐπὶ μοι, ὁ Φιλίππης, ἐφὴ "τι παθὼν πολέμου ἄρχεις;" τοῦ δὲ εἰσπέτας ἡ πατρίς ἡ ση καλλιστή πόλεως ὁδὸν ὑπηγάγετο με ἐρᾶν αὐτῆς καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐπὶ θύρας τῶν ἐμαυτοῦ παιδικῶν ἦκυ, ὑπολαβὼν ὁ Λέων "οὐ φοίτησίν," ἐφὴ "μετὰ ἐξείρθην ἐπὶ τὰς των παιδικῶν θύρας οἱ δεῖοι τοῦ ἀντερθάθαι, οὐ γὰρ πολεμικῶν ὁργάνων, ἀλλὰ μουσικῶν οἱ ἔρωτες δέονται.

Then at 567 the vocabulary of amatory admission is used of a person welcoming pleasures into his house:

... Ἀριστοκλῆς ὁ ἐκ τοῦ Περγάμου,... δὲ ἐφιλοσόφει χρόνων συχνιστῶς ὁδῶν καὶ τραχύς τὸ εἶδος καὶ δυσπνῆς τὴν ἐσθήτα, ἠρμυνε καὶ τῶν συχνῶν ἀπετρίψατο, ἡσύχας τε, ὑπόσχει λυρῶν τε καὶ συλλῶν καὶ ἑφυνίας εἶλα, πάσας ἑσπηγάγετο ἐπὶ τὴν διάταν, ὑπερ ἐπὶ θύρας αὐτῆς ἕκοιμασα.
Although its text will not be given here, there is some reason to regard Nemesianus Ec. 4 as paraklausithuric. It bears strong resemblance to the serenades in Vergil's Eclogues and most of its ideas are taken from there. However, the two rustics' beloveds are addressed directly throughout the poem, many of the topoi can be paralleled in paraklausithura, and at line 46 one of the beloveds is directly told to come and be with the singer.

In Longus 3.5, Daphnis, under the pretence of fowling, but hoping to see Chloe, lurks around the myrtle trees and ivy bush in front of Dryas' cottage. While there is no request for admission, there is at least the vigil. Later, at 4.16, Gnatho who is in love with Daphnis tries to get his master's help with his suit by threatening to go and kill himself before Daphnis' door: ἐμαυτῷ ἀποκενὺ πρὸ τῶν Δάφνιδος θυρῶν· σὺ δὲ ὑκέτι καλέσεις Γυαθωμάριον, ὥσπερ εἰὼθεις παλίζων ἅει.

A defixio from North Africa, dating to the third century A.D. is interesting for its intent to bring a man to a woman’s door to entreat and beg her for marriage (Gager 1992: 113 f., no. 36). Note the beloved and lover’s parentage, the madness of love, the sleeplessness of the lover, and the seruitium amoris:

I invoke you daimonion spirit ... go away to Urbanus, to whom Urbana gave birth, and bring him to Domitiana, to whom Candida gave birth, (so that) loving, frantic, and sleepless with love and desire for her, he may beg her to return to his house and become his wife.... I invoke you,... to bring Urbanus, to whom Urbana gave birth,
and unite him with Domitiana, to whom Candida gave birth, loving, tormented, and sleepless with desire and love for her, so that he may take her into his house as his wife.... to bring Urbanus, to whom Urbana gave birth, and unite him as husband with Domitiana, to whom Candida gave birth, loving her, sleepless with desire for her, begging for her, and asking that she return to his house and become his wife.... [115] Bring Urbanus, ... and unite him with Domitiana,... loving, frantic, tormented with love, passion, and desire for Domitiana, whom Candida bore; unite them in marriage and as spouses in love for all time of their lives. Make him as her obedient slave, so that he will desire no other woman or maiden apart from Domitiana alone.

In Heliodorus 4.17.3-5 the lover Theagenes abducts his beloved Chariclea, with her co-operation, arriving at her house with friends in a komos:

Καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐξῆς τοιάδε ἐγινετο· ἐπειδὴ μέσαι νῦκτες ὑπὸ τὴν πόλιν ἐβάπτισαν, ἐνσπλάθος κυρίας ἔκανεν τῇς Χαρίκλειας κατελάβας, ἐστρατήγησεν δὲ θεαγενῆς τῶν ἑρωτικῶν τούτων πόλεμον εἰς λόχον ἀπὸ τῆς ποιμήν τοὺς ἐφήβους συντάξας. 4 Οὶ δὲ μέγα τι καὶ ἄθροι ἐμβασμάτωσαν καὶ φούτη τῶν ασπίδων τοὺς κατὰ μικρὸν αἰσθομένοις ἐμβολοτίσαντες ὑπὸ λαμπάσσων ἡμίμαντος εἰσῆλθαν εἰς τὸ συμάτιον, τὴν στίλειαν, οὐ χαλεπὰς ἐκραχλώσαντες, ἀτε τῶν κλαίρων εἰς θάλασσαν δυναμοῦ ἐπιβεβολευμένων, καὶ τὴν Χαρίκλειαν εὐπρεπῆ καὶ ἀπαντα προείδουσαν καὶ τὴν βιαν ἐκοῦσαν ὑφισταμένην ἀνασάλαξαν οὐκ ὅλης τῶν ἐπίπλων ἀλλὰ κατὰ βούλησιν ἡ τῇ κόρῃ, συνεκφοράσαντες. 5 Καὶ ἐπειδὴ τῆς οἰκίας εἰς τὸν κατὰ βαρύν τινα πάταγον ἐκ τῶν ἀσπίδων ἐπικυπτοῦντες διὰ πάσης ἐχώρους τῆς πόλεως εἰς ἀφράστων τῇ δείξας τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας ἐμβαλάντες ἀπὸ νυκτὸς τε ἄριστος φοβερότερος δοκεῖν προελεφθάνες καὶ τοῦ Παρνασσοῦ πρὸς τὴν βοήν ὑπάχαλκον αὐτοῦς συνεπηχώντος· καὶ οἱ μὲν οὕτω τοὺς δελφοὺς διεξήλθον ἐπάλληλον τι Χαρίκλειαν καὶ συνεχές ἀναφθηγόμενοι.

Juvenecus in his Libri Evang. 4.220-226 (PL 19.299) paraphrases Matthew 25:10-12 (the end of the parable of the ten virgins):

Adueniunt brutae sero post tempore segnes, et sponsi pulsare fores, et limina clausa nequicquam ingeminant, precibusque ingrata frequentant, ut liceat miseris penetrare in limina laeta.
illlas non comitum sponsi cognoscere quisquam, non ipse sponsus uoluit. uigilate timentes, aduentus uobis quod est non certior hora.

When compared with the Vulgate version, it appears that Juvencus has tried to make the scene slightly paraklausitic:

10 dum autem irent emere venit sponsus et quae paratae erant intraverunt cum eo ad nuptias et clausa est ianua 11 novissime veniunt et reliquae virgines dicentes domine domine aperi nobis 12 at ille respondens ait amen dico vobis nescio vos.

Iamblichus VP 25 (112) tells the same story noted above on Cicero Consil. fr. 10.3 and Sextus Empiricus M. 6.8. Pythagoras encounters a drunken youth who is about to light a rival's door on fire. The philosopher tells the youth's aulutes to play a spondaic tune and so succeeds in quelling the komast's anger:

λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἔργων Πυθαγόρας μὲν σπονδέλικη ποτὲ μέλει δὲ τὸν αὐλητὸν κατασβέσαι τὸν Ταυρομενίτου μειρακίου μεθοδοτὸς τὴν λύσαν, νῦκτωρ ἐπικυμάζοντος ἐρωμένη παρὰ ἀντεραστοῦ πυλῶν, ἐμπιθανάτι μέλλοντας. ἐξήπτετο γὰρ καὶ ἀνεξωπερεῖτο ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἐρύγους αὐλήματος.

Ausonius Epigr. 23 relates the conversation with Venus of a man who is in love with two girls. After he rejects with various excuses her advice to win them by presents, promises, and oaths by the gods, she suggests that he keep vigil at their doors (to which the man responds that he is afraid of the dangers of the night), that he write elegiac verse, and then that he break down their doors (to which the man says he is afraid of the penalty):

"Suasisti, Venus, ecce, duas dyseros ut amarem. odit utraque: aliud da modo consilium."
"Vince datis ambas." "Cupio: uerum arta domi res."
"Pelllice promissis." "Nulla fides inopi."
"Antestare deos." "Nec fas mihi fallere diuos."
"Peruigila ante fores." "Nocte capi metuo."
"Scribe elegos." "Nequeo, Musarum et Apollinis expers."
"Frangere fores." "Poenas iudicium metuo."
"Stulte, ab amore mori pateris: non uis ob amorem?"
"Malo miser duci, quam miser atque reus."
"Suasi, quod potui: tu alos modo consule." "Dic quos?"
"Quod sibi suaserunt, Phaedra et Elissa dabunt,
quod Canace Phyllisque et fastidita Phaoni."
"Hoc das consilium? tale datur miseris."

Themistius in his Erotikos twice refers to the paraklausithuric situation:

162.c.7-d.5 ... ταῦτα καὶ νῦν σοι ἐν τῇ συλλόγῳ οὐκ ἀποκρύψαται, ὡς ἀκατάσχορος ἔφη γενέτεις καὶ ἐπεσκέψατο τὴν μορφήν καὶ τὴν φύσιν τοῦ Ἐρωτός, ὅτι οὐκ οἷς τοῖς πολλοῖς ὁκεῖτο τοιοῦτος καὶ τῇ ὑπό έστι, νεός καὶ ἀπαλός καὶ ἀμφότερος, [d.1] ἄλλα τοιούτῳ σκληρός καὶ σύχρονος καὶ θυραυλός ἐπὶ θύρας καὶ ἐν ὑπαίθρῳ τὰ πολλὰ καὶ ἐν ὅδες ἀλητῶμενος καὶ ἐπεθυμητὴς ἐπὶ τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ ἄγαθον, καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις, σύντονος, θηρευτής, δειμνὸς πλέκων μηχανᾶς ἐπὶ τῇ θήρᾳ, καὶ ἐπὶ φρόνιμος καὶ ἐπὶ φιλοσοφῶν; and

163.b.2-d.2 οὕτι γὰρ ὁδὸν ἐμαυτῷ συνήθειν μακράν σῶστε πορελαίν σύντονον οὕτω ὑπαίθρων διαίταν σῶστε θυραυλώσιν σῶστε σκληρόν ταῖς καὶ σύχρονοις ὑπομερίς σῶστε μηχανᾶς ἐπὶ τῇ θήρᾳ πεπλεγμένας τοῦ κάλλους, ἀλλ’ ἐπεθυμητῆς μὲν τῆς ἐρωτικῆς μελέτης οὐ φαῦλον ἐμαυτόν ἡπιστάμην, ἀγωνισμὸς δὲ σύκετο καὶ ἀδοφόρον. [c.1] Νῦν δέ, ἢ μεγάλε, ἀφρόνοι μοι ἀπίθανεν ἀπαντάτα μάλιστα καὶ ταλαγένες, καὶ πλείστων ὑπὲρ καταλέγεις, ἀφρόμοι λαδόρομος σχεδόν τῷ ἥλιῳ ἀπὸ Τιγρητοῦ εἰς Ὀκεανοῦ, πόρος σύντονος, πτήσεις καρπαμπικτῆς, καὶ οἴνον ποτε θελὴν τοῦ Ἐρωτα φῆς, ἡμέραι ἐπὶ ταῖς νυξὶν ἀκολυθεῖς. καρπαμπικτῆς καὶ θυραυλάς διῆγαιν ἐν ταῖς ὅδες καὶ ἐν τοῖς ύπαίθροις ἀστρωτοῖς καὶ ἀνυψότοις, οὕτω τῆς ἐχὼν ποτὲ ἀπεπλήθησθιν [d.1] οὕτω ἀπείλου, ως ἀπορῶν κατερρῆν, καὶ ἀνεβίων πολλάκις τῇ ἐνδέλει καὶ τῇ ἐλπίδι.

Both times the lover’s vigil seems to be mentioned in all seriousness.
As was mentioned in Chapter 4, John Chrysostom makes
a strong attack on the behaviour of excluded lovers (hom. in
1 Cor. 37, MPG 61.318.43 ff.):

Παραγάγωμεν εἰς μέσον ἀνθρωπον οὕτω διακείμενον, πόρνης
ἐρώτα, καὶ ὑπὸ ἐπιθυμίας ἄτοπου κρατούμενον, καὶ τάτε
ὁφήμεθα τὸν γέλωτα τούτον. Τί γάρ ἄν γένοιτο αἰσχρότερον
τοῦ θυραυλούντος πρὸ τῶν πορνικῶν ἀερβήματι, καὶ
βαπτιζομένους παρὰ πόρνης γυναικῶς, καὶ κλαούντος καὶ
ἀνυπομένου, καὶ τὴν ἐκείνην κατασταυρώσας ἠρώταν; Εἶ δὲ
βούλεις καὶ τὴν ξημαίαν ἱδεῖς, ἐννοεῖς μοι τῶν χρησάτων τὴν
δεμάνην, τοὺς περὶ τῶν ἑσκάτων κυστίων, τῶν πρὸς τοὺς
ἀντεραστάς πόλεμον, τὰ τραύματα, τὰς πληγὰς τὰς ἐκ τῶν
τοιούτων παρατάξεων.

Claudian In Eutr. 1.77-97 attacks the eunuch
Eutropius as being something of an unsurpassed leno, who
could have gotten to even Danae. In the course of this, he
refers to Lais and the lovers at her doors:

... Sic fatus acutum
adgreditur lenonis opus, nec segnis ad artem
mens erat officiique capax omnesque pudoris
hauserat insidias. custodia nulla tuendo 80
fida toro; null poterant excludere uectes:
ille uel aerata Danaen in turre latentem
eliceret. fletus domini fingebat amantis,
indomitasque mora, pretio lenibat auaras
lasciusaque ioci; non blandior ullus euntis
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ancillae tetigisse latus leuiterque reductis
vestibus occulto crimen mandasse susurro
nec furtis quaesisse locum nec fraude reperta
cautior elusi fremitus uitare mariti.
haud alter iuuenum flammis Ephyreia Lais
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e gemino ditata mari; cum sertà refudit
canities, iam turba procax noctisque recedit
ambitus et raro pulsatur ianua tactu,
seque reformidat speculo damnante senectus;
stat tamen atque alias succingit lena ministras
95
dilectumque diu quamuis longaeua lupanar
circuit et retinet mores, quod perdidit aetas.

Prudentius Symm. I 59-68 and 74-78 mentions Zeus’
adulteries. The Danae legend is referred to in 65 ff., where
the mention of deaf doors, bar, and bolt are clearly meant
to lead the reader to think of Zeus as an excluded lover:

mox patre deterior siluosi habitator Olympi
Iuppiter incesta spurcavit labe Lacaenas,
nunc boue subuectam rapiens ad crimen amatam,
nunc tener ac pluma leuior blandosque susurros
in morem recinens suave inmorientis oloris,
capta quibus uolucrem uriguncula ferret amorem,
nunc foribus surdis, sera quas uel pessulus artis
firmarat cuneis, per tectum diues amator
imbricibus ruptis undantis desuper auri
infundens pluuiam gremio excipientis amicae,

quodque novu ingenio uersutus Iuppiter astus
multiplices variosque dolos texebat, ut illum,
uertere cum uellet pellem faciemque, putarent
esse bouem, praedari aquilam, concumbere cyncum,
et nummos fieri et gremium penetrare puellae.

Augustine at Con. 1.19 seems to refer to himself as
a lover on the threshold of the ways of luxury:

Horum ego puer morum in limine iacebam miser, et huius
harenæ palaestra erat illa, ubi magis timebam barbarismum
facere, quam cauebam, si facerem, non facientibus
inuidere.

Fortunantianus (Halm 1863: 90.22-6) mentions a
violent attack on a prostitute’s house:

Cum de uoluntate quaeritur, quem ad modum fit? ut:
‘luxuriosus adulescens nocte a meretrici domo expulsus
cereum ardentem ante fores meretricis abiecit; domus
arrit: agit cum eo, ut restitus.’ Hic enim et de pe-
sona et de facto constat, sed tantummodo quaeritur, qua
id fecerit uoluntate.

Sopater Diair. Zetem. 365-366 concerns a prostitute
who made revel to her customer’s house when his father had
tied him up to keep him from going to visit her. The
prostitute’s lover tried to free himself and was strangled
in the process:
Eρώτα τις ἐταίρας τὸν υλὸν ἔδησεν· ἀπεκώμασεν αὐτῇ ἢ ἐταίρα. Ῥήσας ἐκείνος τὰ δεσμὰ ἀπῆγεστο· καὶ κρίνει ὁ πατὴρ τὴν ἐταίραν αἵτις θανάτου.

Regular mention of the prostitute's komos is made throughout:


Aristaenetus Ep. 1.14 is the reply of a prostitute to youths who are trying to win her by means of music, rather than with money and presents (the line numbers are from Mazal 1971):

1 Οὖτε αὐλὸς ἐταίραν οὐδὲ προτρέπειν οὔτε λύρα τις ἐφέλκεται πόρως ἀργυροῦ χωρίς: κέρδει μόνον δοῦλευσιν, οὐ διεγόρητα μελψάτοις. τὸ αὐθὴν, ὃ νέα, διαφεύγωσε τὰς γυνάους ἐμφυσέως τῇ σύριγγῃ; οὐδὲν ὑμᾶς οὕρησε τὰ ἱ κιθαρίσματα: τὰ πράγματα παρέχετε ταῖς χορᾶσις; τὸ δὲ καὶ ἄνθρωποι ἐπηθησί: ὡς ἐπιθυμεῖς, δὲ παρθενε, γενέθαις γυνῃ; μέχρι τός παρθένους καὶ κόρη, τὰ τῶν ἁγίων ὑμῶνα; ἣ ταῦτα μὲν ἱκὴ ποιντὰς ὡς ἀνάργυρον οὐδὲν ταῖς ἐταίρασις ἐστὶ πιθανόν, ὧπεθε καὶ μὲ βασιλείας 10 ἐξακολούθου ἐρωτικῶν ἀγωμαστὸν παθεῖ καὶ παντελῶς ἁμάρτησεν Ἀφροδίτης, καὶ προχειρότερον ἔλεεν ὃ λύκος λιπαρὰν ἄρνα καθεύδουσαν.

Ep. 1.27 deals with a woman's reaction to a lover's unwanted attentions and contains several paraklausithuric references and topoi:

Νέου τινὸς ἕξεπτηθὴς διὰ γυναικὸς παριότος ἐσπέρας ἔφη τις ἡλικία πρὸς ἐκείνην παρισταμένη πλησίον, ἀμα νύτιοςσα τῷ ἀγκόλυτῳ· "πρὸς τῆς Ἀφροδίτης, ὃ φίλη, σὲ παθῆν οὕτοι προσάδω παρέρχεται καὶ μορφής οὐκ ἄφιες ἔχων. ὡς ἐπιπάρυφον τὸ θερίστρου καὶ ποικίλου ταῖς ἀπὸ κερκίδας γραφῶς, ὡς εὔμοος τὴν φωνὴν. ἔσκε μοι καὶ περὶ καλὴν
ασχολείται τήν κάμην· ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῦτο γέ τοῦ ἔρωτος Ἰάκων καὶ μάλα μέντοι καλὸν, τὸ σφόδρα πείθειν τοὺς ἔρωτας ἐπιμελής ἄγαν διακοσμεῖται, καὶ έλι πρότερον 10 ἀτεχνῶς ἐστὶν κατημέλουν.... ἃ μισῶ γοῦν ἔραστήν παρευδοκίμειν εὐμορφίᾳ τὴν ἐρωμένην ἀξιόντα, οἴσμεν τὲ κάλλος ὑπὲρ κάλλους χαριζέσθαι, μέγιστον ἀντὶ βραχέας.... 40 παράμενε προσάθων, ἐπαγρυπνῶν, μηδὲν διανύων, μόνον δὲ κλωὴν ὑμνήμονας ἐκ τοῦ πόδου, ἐνθα, φασὶν, ἀνεμος οὐτε μένειν οὔτε πλεῖν ἐξ.

Ep. 2.16 is from a prostitute to a lover whom she has lost through being too accessible. Her main mistake was not locking him out sometimes when he came to her:

Ἐμὲ ἔχεις ποιήσας περιφρονείς καὶ περὶ ἐλαχίστου ποιῆ, ἐμὲ τὸν ἑρωτᾶν ὑπότας ἐχεὶς καὶ πάρεδρον ἴδουν, καὶ πολλάκις τὴν ἤμητέραν οὐκ’ ὡς οὐδὲ ἴδων ποτὲ παρέχας. θρύστη, Παμφηλ, πρός ἐμὲ, καὶ καλῶς, ὅτι οὐ καθαρέις ἐλθόντα “ἐκδόν ἔτερος” εἰπόσα, ἀλλ’ εἰς ἐδεχόμενη ἀποφαίνετο, τότε δὲ σιν σε καλόμενον εἶδον καὶ ἀνεμονευότα, ἐγὼ διέξθειρά σε ὑπεραγαπώσα καὶ τούτῳ διερροφίξουσα.

In Ep. 2.19 a woman talks to her maid about a man’s attentions. The woman first wonders if the maid heard komasts contending for her at her door late the previous night. The maid confirms this and mentions a particular handsome youth who has approached her to help him get through to the woman:

“Ορα, πρὸς Διός, ὅπως γυνὴ τὶς ἡρέμα προστέπει μοιστροπόν αὐτῆς γενέσθαι τὴν δοῦλην. ἔφη γάρ· “ὁ φαυτασίαν εἰδὼν, ὁ παιδισκή, καθ’ ἄτομον, οἰα φιλεῖ, ὁ πρὸ θυρών ἀκόμα νέων κυρίασθαι ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ ἄχων εἰς ἵλαρι πάντων ἄωρι νύκτωρ, οὐκ ἄναρ, ἀλλ’ ἄπαρ. ἔλευθεροι γάρ οἱ στενωοὶ· παῖζοιν καὶ γελάντα καὶ ἄειν τῇ χελώνῃ ἐξέπτωτο. νὴ τὰς Μοῦσας, εὐστόμω μὴν, ἵνα καὶ Σειρῆνες γυναικείας μοιστροῦσας φωνῆν.” “Ἄληθι”, φησιν ἡ παῖς. “ἀκόμας, ὧν κεκτήτης· σὲ γὰρ τὰς νέας καταβαστραχοὺς ἔτι ἐν ἄπαλη τῇ 10 ὑπηνύν πάλαι ποθεῖ, Ἰπποδάλλης μὲν δύναμα, Ἰκανοῦ δὲ καὶ ἄπο μόνον τὸ κάλλως γυνώσκεσθαι. καὶ πολλάκις μοι διειλεκταῖ περὶ σοῦ, καὶ βούλομαι”, ἔφη, “τὴν σὴν δέσποιναν προσεπελεί, ἀλλ’ ἐδεσθεῖν προσαγγείλαι τὸν λόγον”
The woman tells the maid to tell the youth to come again and serenade her the next night. If she finds him attractive, she will oblige him. He does, she does, and the affair is happily resolved:

αὐτίκα γαὖν ἢ κεκτημένη τὴν θεράπαιναν ἐπανήρετο· ἐπὶ δὲ βούλημα ἤκουσας, ὑπέλαβες· "νυκτὸς ἐφη, "παρίστων πάλιν προσέρχομαι· καὶ ἐρωτικός μοι ὅσκολον, χαριστέοις τῇ μειρακίᾳ. ἂν δὲν, ἐφάνει τὴν κεφαλὴν ἄνδρας ἀνθίζει, ἐμμελείται ἐστον ἐκρίθη καλός, καὶ ἄλλης συναπέλαυς 20 ἄφως οὐ μόνον στέρνων ἁρμόζοντες, ἀλλὰ καὶ φιλήμασιν ἐπισυνάπτοντες τὰς ψυχὰς· τοῦτο γὰρ φιλήμα τὸν θυσίαν ἔγνωσεν, καὶ τοῦτο ἐστιν ὃ βούλεται· σπεύδουσιν αἱ ψυχαὶ σὺν τοῖς σταυρίασι πρὸς ἄλλης καὶ περὶ τὰ χείλη συναυτώσιν, καὶ ἡ μίξεις αὕτη γλυκεῖα γίνεται τῶν ψυχῶν.

Ep. 2.20 contains the dialogue of a woman and her suitor. He is continually pursuing her and camping out (θηραπαίνει, 2) at her house. He is described as entreating ten thousand times such things as lovers say to their beloved, appealing to the woman's pity, proclaiming his pain, and praising himself. She is not impressed, they argue some more and finally the last half of the epistle contains her rebuttal to his entreaties, in which there is another reference to the man's vigils (23-4):

Νέος ἐρωτικός, ὅσμα λύκων, ἀνήμενος προσκαρτερῶν καὶ θυραμάλων γυναικὶ μέφεται δεινῶς ἁπαθώς· δὲ μὲν γὰρ ἱκτεύουσι ἔφασες ταῦτα ὅτι τὰ μυριόλεκτα καὶ συνήθη πρὸς τὰ παιδικὰ τοὺς ἔρωταν, "οὐκ ἐπικαυτηπή πρὸς ἔλεον ὀρθά ὅμως 5 μειράκια; οὐ δυσαλγεῖς μοι παθοῦντι; ἔξε με κατὰ κράτος ἐλεύθετα τὸν πάσι καὶ πάσαις ἀνάλωτον". ἦ δὲ τὴν ἀπὸ Σκυθῶν διὰ ἰδεῖν ἐρεί. "ἐμοὶ προσαλαλῶν εἰς πῦρ ἔλνεις, γύρωθεν φόβας, σπέγγῳ πάτταλον κρούεις, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν ἀμηχάνων ποιεῖς." τέλος ἔξε ἀπορίας ὁ νεανίσκος 10 ἐξωργίαζον, καὶ ἀναφλέξοντες τῇ θυμῷ τὸν λαμόν ὁγκοῦμενος ἐφόσον τε καὶ τραχύτατα διελοιθόρετο τῷ ποθησμένῳ. "ὡς φιλόπνευκος", εἶπεν, "ὁπάρχεις καὶ λαῖς γυνῆ, ὡς ἀτεράμων, ὅ γε καὶ θεό. τρομοκράτων σοὶ πῦς ἔπληθε ψυχῆ αὐτὴ ἐπέχεθε μᾶλλον θηρίον". ἦ δὲ τῇ λαίῃ κεφρὶ βραχύ τὴν
This epistle is particularly notable for the extended voice it gives to the beloved.

Macedonius Consul brings us back to the epigram. In AP 5.229 a herdsman complains of his beloved's hard heart, because she is not moved to pity by his long tearful vigils:

Τὴν Νιδρήν κλαίουσαν λαδὺ ποτε βουκόλος ἄνηρ δάκρυσεν, εἰ λείβειν δάκρυαν ὅπειρα λίθος·
 αὐτάρ ἐπε στενάγοντα τόσας κατὰ νυκτάς ὁμίλησεν ἐνμονὸς Ἑὔππης ὑπὸ ἐλέαιρη λίθος.
 αὔτιος ἄφων ῥήμασιν ἔρως, ὄχετη πόνος ἀνύς
 τῇ Νιδρῆς τεκέων, αὐτάρ ἐμοὶ παθέων.

Agathias Scholasticus AP 5.280 depicts a lover talking to his beloved, wondering if she is ill or asleep. He utters a threat-prophecy and warns her about Aphrodite's attitudes towards the arrogant:

ἲὴ ρά γε καὶ σύ, ἔλλογμα, φέρεις πόνον; ἢ ρά καὶ αὐτῆ
 κάμνεις, αὐλαλοίς ὀμμασί τηκομένη;
Although not paraklausithuric, another epigram from
Agathias, *AP* 5.294, deserves mention for its developed
furtius amor, as a lover sneaks in to his beloved and
manages to fulfill his desires despite the anus custos
sleeping next to her.

Paulus Silentarius provides five paraklausithuric
epigrams. At *AP* 6.71 a man dedicates various spoils of love
to Lais at her door:

Σοι τα λιποστεφάνων διατιλματα μυρία φύλλων,
σοι τα νοσπλήκτον κλαστα κύπελλα μέθης,
βδότρυχα σοι τα μύραισι δεδεμένα, τηδε κοινη
σκύλα ποδοβλήκτον κέλται 'Αναξαγόρα,
σοι τάδε, λαίς, ἀπαντα· παρὰ πρεθόροις γάρ ὁ δειλὸς
toιςκε διον ἀκρῆβας πολλάκι παννυχίας,
οὐκ ἐπος, οὐ χαρέσσαν ὑπόσχεσων, οὐδὲ μελιχρῆς
ἐλπίδοις ὑβριστὴν μύθον ἐπεσπάσθω,
φεῦ φεῦ, γυνοταχῆς ὡς λιπὸν τάδε σύμβολα κώμων,
μέμφεται ἀστρέπτον κάλλει θηλυτέρης.

5.217 again uses the myth of Danae to criticize mercenary
mistresses:

Χρυσός ὁ ἅφαστοι διέτμαγεν ἄμμα καρελας
Ζεύς, διαδῆς Δανάς χαλκελάτους θαλάμους,
φαμί λέγειν τὸν μύθον ἐγώ τάδε· "Χάλκησα νική
tεῖχες καὶ δεσμοὺς χρυσός ὁ πανδαιμόνιον,
χρυσός δὲ λουσς ρυτήρας, ἄλας κληρίδας ἐλέγχει,
χρυσός ἐπιγνάμπετε τὰς σοβαραβλεφάρους.
καὶ Δανάς ἐλύσωσεν ὄσε φρένα, μὴ τις ἔραστης
λισσάθω Παφία, ἄργυριον παρέχων.

5.242 combines furtius amor with a listing of door parts,
which also provides an extended double-entendre:

'Ὡς εἶδον Μελίτην, ἄχρος μ' ἔλε· καὶ γὰρ ἀκοιτης
κελνη ἐφώμαρτει. τοιλ δ' ἐλεξα τρέμων.
"Τοῦ σοῦ ἀνακρούσαι δύναμει πυλεῶνος ὀχήσας,
πυκνὸς ὀμφαλός ὑπετέρης τὴν βάλανον χαλάσας,
καὶ δισαῦρον προθύρων πλαδαρῆν κρηπίδα περήσαι,
ἀκρὸν ἐπιβλήτως μεσσόθι πηξάμενος;
ὁ δὲ λέγει γελάσασα, καὶ ἀνέρα λοξὴν ὀδοὺς.
"Τῶν προθύρων ἄπεκου, μὴ σε κῶν ὀλέσῃ."

5.256 is mainly about exclusion inflaming a lover’s desire.

The description of the lover as a suppliant is particularly
noteworthy:

Δικλῶς ἀμφετίναξεν ἐμός Γαλάτεια προσώποις
ἐπερασα, ὑβριστὴν μῦθον ἐπενεβάμενη.
"Τοῦρις ἔρωτας ἐξεσε." μάτηι δὲ μῦθος ἀλλατι.
ὑβρις ἐρήθει μᾶλλον ἐρωμανίη.
ἀμοίσα γὰρ λυκάβαντα μένειν ἀπάνευθεν ἐκέληνς.
ὁ πόποι. ὅλη ἱκέτης πρώτος εὐθύς ἔβην.

In 5.281 a man is drenched with water from above as he hangs
a wreath on his beloved’s door, but he does not mind because
the water carried her kisses from the jug:

Χθείσα μοι Ἐρμώνασσα φιλακρήτους μετὰ κώμους
ατέμμασαν σύλεις ἀμφιπλέκω τοῦρας,
ἐκ κυλίκων ἐπέχεων βάσω. ἀμάθυνε δὲ χάλτην,
ἡν μᾶλλος ἐς τρισάχην πλέξαμεν ἀμφιλύκη.
ἐφελέξθην δ' ἔτι μᾶλλον ὑφ’ βάστος. ἐκ γὰρ ἐκέληνς
λάθριον ἐξει κύλις πῦρ γλυκερῶν στομάτων.

An anonymous late epigram from the AP bring us to
the end of late antiquity. 9.621 contrasts prostitutes with
virgins and married women, noting that she who makes her
living with her body will have crowds of lovers at her door:

"Οσσαίς θηλυτέραις ἐστὶν πόθος (ἐστι δὲ πάσαις),
ἐθηρ' ἵτε, φαιδρότερης τευνεόμεναι χάριτος.
χή μὲν ἐχουσά πόσων, τέρψει πόσων. ὡδ' ἔτι κοῦρη
ὄτρυνεις πλεύσας ἐδοξα πορεῖν λεχέων.
ὁ δὲ φέρουσα πόρους ἀπὸ σώματι, ἐσμὸν ἐραστῶν
ἐξει ἐπὶ προθύρωις, ἐνθάδε λιοσαμένη.
Finally, although much outside the main focus of this paper, a story about the early fourteenth century Byzantine emperor Andronicus III Palaeologus, from Nicephorus Gregorius' *Byzantina Historia* 8.1.3 (Schopen-Bekker 1.285.12 ff.), is interesting enough to be included. The emperor one night goes in a komos to a woman not obscure in breeding, but meretricious in behaviour. But she has both a lover and beloved in the person of a certain Adonis. Jealous, Andronicus brings archers with him on another night and sets an ambush at the woman's house. Unfortunately, his brother comes looking for him and is mistaken for the rival:

Καὶ ἵνα συνεπὶ παραθέμαι τὰ πλείστα, νύκτωρ ἐκώμαζε πρὸς γυναικά τινα γένει μὲν τῶν οὐκ ἄσημων, τὸν δὲ τρόπον ἑταίρων, ταύτης ἀραστῆς ἦν καὶ ἐρώμενος καὶ Ἀδώνις ἄλλος τῶν ἐν ἡλικίᾳ τις καὶ ὅρα διαπρεπῶν. ὁ δ’ ἦν καὶ ζηλοτυπίας τις πυραπολούσα τὴν Ἄνδρωνίκου τοῦ βασιλέως ψυχῆν τοιούτας καὶ ξειφηφόρους ἤναγκαζε προλοχίσειν περὶ τὴν τῆς ἑταίρης οἰκίαν, ἐν μιᾷ τοῖνυν περὶ μέσας που νύκτας τῶν βασιλέως ζητῶν ὁ ἄδελφος καὶ δεσπότης ἔτυχεν ἀπὸ ταυτικότου συμβάδι στόμων οὕτως παριέναι περὶ τὴν τῆς ἑταιρής οἰκίαν. ὃς οἱ τοῦ βασιλέως σκόποι θεσαμήναι σπουδῆς προσελάτουντα καὶ μή γνώντες διὰ τὸ σκότος διὰ τούτος εἶναι, ἀλλὰ τὸν τῆς ἑταιρίδος ὑποτεθάνατες εἶναι ἐρώμενον.
### APPENDIX 2

**WCRDL LISTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΑΒΡΗ</td>
<td>Anac. 373.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΑΒΡΟΣ</td>
<td>Lucian D. Meretr. 14.4; Them. 013.162.c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΑΒΡΟΣ</td>
<td>Anac. 373.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΑΓΑΣ</td>
<td>Theoc. 3.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΑΓΑΟΣ</td>
<td>Lucian Bis Acc. 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΑΓΑΘΟΙΣ</td>
<td>Pl. Smp. 203 b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΑΓΑΘΟΝ</td>
<td>Alciph. 4.9.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΑΓΑΘΩ</td>
<td>Theoc. 23.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΑΓΑΜΕΝΟΝ</td>
<td>Ant. Lib. 39.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΑΓΑΝΑΚΤΗΣΑΙ</td>
<td>Lucian Musc. 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΑΓΑΝΘΟΣ</td>
<td>Aristaen. Ep. 2.20.25ff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΑΓΓΕΙ</td>
<td>Theoc. 3.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΑΓΓΕΙ</td>
<td>Fr. Gren. 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΑΓΓΕΙΟ</td>
<td>Theoc. 11.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΑΓΓΕΑ</td>
<td>Theoc. 3.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΑΓΓΕΛΟΥΝ</td>
<td>Theoc. 11.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ</td>
<td>Philostr. Ep. 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ</td>
<td>Theoc. 3.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΑΓΓΕΛΟν</td>
<td>Aristaen. Ep. 1.27.1ff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΑΓΓΟΝΑ</td>
<td>Lucian D. Meretr. 14.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΑΓΓΟΝΑ</td>
<td>Prat. 708.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **ΑΔΗΑΜΟΣ** | Chariton 1.3.2 |
- **ΑΔΗΜΟΝΟ** | Alciph. 4.9.2 |
- **ΑΔΙΚΕΙ** | Fr. Gren. 17; 40; Theoc. 11.67 |
- **ΑΔΙΚΗΘΕΙΣ** | Stob. Anth. 3.2.18 |
- **ΑΔΙΚΗΜ** | A.P. 12.118.6 |
- **ΑΔΙΚΗΝ** | Fr. Gren. 22 |
- **ΑΔΙΚΟ** | A.P. 12.118.6 |
- **ΑΔΙΚΩΤΑΘ** | A.P. 5.23.3; Cal- Epigr. 64.3 |
- **ΑΔΙΟΝ** | Theoc. 11.44 |
- **ΑΔΩΝΕΣ** | Aristaen. Ep. 1.14.5ff |
- **ΑΔΩΝΟΣ** | Lucian Bis Acc. 31 |
- **ΑΔΟΥΣΑ** | Lucian Musc. 10 |
- **ΑΔΟΥΣΙ** | Plu. Mor. 759 B |
- **ΑΔΡΙΑΝΟΝ** | A.P. 12.252.3 |
- **ΑΔΥ** | Theoc. 11.3; 11.62; 23.35 |
- **ΑΔΩΝΙΑ** | Ath. 14.638 |
- **ΑΔΙΔΙΕ** | Theoc. 11.18 |
- **ΑΔΙΔΕΙΝ** | Ath. 14.638 d |
- **ΑΔΙΔΩ** | Theoc. 3.52 |
ΑΕΙΔΩΝ [2]
Theoc. 11.13; 11.39
ΑΕΙΣΜΑΤΩΝ [2]
Ath. 14.638 d; 14.638 e
ΑΘΑΝΑΤΑ [1]
Philostr. Ep. 29
ΑΘΑΙΑ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 16
ΑΘΑΙΑΣ [1]
Aristaen. Ep. 2.20.30ff
ΑΘΑΙΟΝ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 17
ΑΘΑΙΟΣ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 17
ΑΘΑΟΣ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.2.4
ΑΘΛΩΣ [1]
Theoc. 23.56
ΑΙΘΕΔΕΑΣ [1]
Theoc. 11.24
ΑΠΡΔΕΩ [1]
A.P. 5.191.3
ΑΡΦΟΝ [1]
Hello. 4.17
ΑΙΑΙ [1]
Theoc. 7.121
ΑΙΓΑ [1]
Theoc. 3.34
ΑΙΓΑΕ [1]
Theoc. 3.3
ΑΙΓΩΜΕΝΟΣ [1]
Plu. Gal. 19.2
ΑΙΩΥΣ [2]
Lucian Bis Acc. 17; Philostr. Ep. 39
ΑΙΕ [2]
A.P. 5.64.1; Theoc. 3.12
ΑΙΘΕΟΙΗ [1]
Theoc. 2.125
ΑΙΟΝΙΟΣ [1]
Theoc. 11.14
ΑΙΜΟΛΟΝ [1]
Theoc. 3.19
ΑΙΡΕΙΣ [1]
Fr. Gren. 1
ΑΙΣΘΕΝΟΣ [1]
Fr. Gren. 53
ΑΙΣΘΕΝΟΜΕΝΟΣ [1]
Hello. 4.17
Lucian D. Meretr. 12.311

AMMIN [1] Theoc. 7.126

AMOYZON [1]

Plu. Mor. 455 B

AMTIKAOΣ [1] Θεοκ. 11.46

AMTIKAOΣ [1] Theoc. 3.23


AMMYNOYAI [1] Arist. Ἐπ. 2.20.15ff

AMΦETINASEN [1] A. P. 5.256.1

AMΦΙΘΕΗ [1] Theoc. 23.39

AMΦΙΛΑΚΗ [1] A. P. 5.281.4

AMΦΙΝΕΚΟΝΤΩ [1] A. P. 5.281.2


AMΦΙΤΕΡΟΥ [1] Φρ. Γρεν. 1

AMΦΙΤΕΡΟΣ [1] Theoc. 11.70


AMΦΕΓΕΝΘΩΣ [1] Plu. Mor. 455 B

ANABNAY [1] Aristoph. 5.5

ANAPKAZOUΣΑ [1] Phil. Ἐμ. 1.12.4


ANAKΗ [1]

Ar. Ec. 969

ANAKΩΝη [1] Isaeus Pyrr. 15

ANAKΩΝΘ [1] Plu. Mor. 753 B

ANAKΘΟΧΟΣ [1] Fr. Gren. 3

ANΑΙΠ [1] Philostr. Ἐρ. 29

ANΑΘΡΕΜΜΗ [1] Theoc. 23.19

ANΑΚΑΛΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ [2] Const. VII 002.2.124.5; Polyb. 10.26.4

ANΑΚΛΕΚΩΝ [1] Αθ. 13.567 e

ANΑΚΛΗΣ [1] Arist. Ἐπ. 2.20.5ff

ANΑΜΗΛΑΙ [2] A. P. 5.236; Cal. Epigr. 64.6

ANΑΜΗΘΩ [1] Fr. Gren. 4

ANΑΣΙΕ [1] Theoc. 23.20

ANΑΣΙΕΠΑΜΕΝΟΝ [1] Lucian Bis Acc. 17

ANΑΣΙΝ [1] Philostr. Ἐπ. 39


ANΑΣΙΣΩΥΣΙΝ [1] Helio. 4.17

ANΑΣΠΙΝΤΟΥΣΙ [1] Phil. Ἐμ. 1.12.4

ANΑΣΤΗΘΩΝ [1] Philostr. Ἐρ. 39


ANΑΣΘΑΛΑΝΤΙΑΣ [1] Lucian D. Meretr. 14.4


ANΑΣΘΕΡΜΕΝΟΝ [1] Helio. 4.17

ANΑΣΘΕΤΕΤΑΙ [1] Lucian D. Meretr. 8.3


ANΑΣΘΕΣΘΕΙΣ [1] Arist. Ἐπ. 2.20.10ff

ANΑΣΘΕΤΙΣΙΟΝ [1] Ar. Ec. 979

ANΑΣΤΑΘΓΩΡΑ [1] A. P. 6.71.4

ANΑΣΚΑ [1] Theoc. 11.40

ANΑΡΠ [1] Babrius 116.5

ANΑΡΠΑΣΑΣΑΜΕΝΗ [1] Lucian Bis Acc. 16

ANΑΡΠΑΣΩΝ [1] Lucian Bis Acc. 16

ANΑΡΠΑΣ [2] Const. VII 002.2.124.5; Polyb. 10.26.4

ANΑΡΡΕΙΟΣ [1] Pl. Smp. 203 b

ANΑΡΡΕΝ [1] Herodas 2.26

ANΑΡΠ [1] Philostr. Ἐμ. 1.2.5

ANΑΡΠΗΣΩΝ [1] Philostr. Ἐμ. 1.2.5

ANΑΡΡΟΣ [2] Lucian D. Meretr. 115.3; Plu. Gal. 19.4

ANΑΡΡΩΝ [3] Isaeus Pyrr. 14;

Phil. Ἐμ. 1.2.5; Plu. Mor. 766 b

ANΕΓΡΟΜΕΝΟΣ [1] Lucian Bis Acc. 17

ANΕΑΣΑΕΣΑΤΟ [1] Hermesianax 3.48

ANΕΣΑΙΝΤΗΠΕΙΤΟ [1] Iamb. V. P. 25.112

ANΕΣΕΥΘΕΡΙΑΣ [1] Pl. Smp. 183 b

ANΕΜΩΣ [1] Arist. Ἐπ. 1.27.40

ANΕΝΗΨ [1] Lucian Bis Acc. 17

ANΕΣΗ [1] Philostr. Ἐρ. 39

ANΕΣΠΙΣΕΣΟΝ [1] Philo Husb. 37

ANΕΡΡΙΠΠΙΣ [1] Alciph. 4.8.2

ANΕΣΙΣ [1]
Philo Cherub. 92
ANETETΡΑΤΟΣ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr. 15.2
ANEXΟΙΜΑΝ [1]
Theoc. 11.52
ANΕΧΟΜΑΙ [1]
Men. Dysc. 60
ANΕΧΕΜΕΝΗΝ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr. 8.3
ANΕΓΕΝ [1]
Chariton 1.3.4
ANΗ [1]
Theoc. 11.23
ANΗΝΥΤΑ [1]
Aristae. Ep. 2.20.1ff
ANΗΡ [3]
A. P. 5.229.1;
Lucian D. Meretr. 14.1; Theoc. 23.1
ANΕΚΑΚΟΜΕΝΟΣ [1]
Plu. Mor. 772 F
ANΕΚΑΚΟΝΤΩΝ [1]
Plu. Mor. 772 F
ANΕΙΟΝ [2]
Philostr. Im.
1.2.4; 1.2.5
ANΗΡΟΙ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.2.5
ANΗΙΑΣ [1]
2.19.15
ANΟΣ [1]
Theoc. 7.121
ANΡΑΚΗΝ [1]
A. P. 12.72.4
ANΡΟΤΕ [1]
Alciph. 4.9.3
ANΡΟΤΗΝΗΣ [1]
Philostr. Ep. 29
ANΡΟΤΟΙ [2]
Isaeus Pyrr. 17;
Philo Husb. 37
ANΡΟΤΟΙΣ [3]
2.20.15ff;
Philostr. Im. 1.2.1
; Theoc. 11.4
ANΡΟΤΟΝ [3]
ΑΠΑΓΕΙΝ [1]
Plu. Mor. 772 F
ΑΠΑΓΑΣΘΑΙ [1]
Theoc. 3.9
ΑΠΑΛΑΝ [1]
Theoc. 11.57
ΑΠΑΛΗ [1]
Aristae. Ep. 2.19.5ff
ΑΠΑΛΑΣΕΙΣ [1]
Theoc. 23.42
ΑΠΑΛΟΝ [2]
Lucian Bis Acc. 17; Philostr. Im. 1.2.4
ΑΠΑΛΟΣ [3]
Philostr. Im. 1.2.2; Pl. Smp. 203 b; Them. 013.162.c
ΑΠΑΛΟΣΤΕΡΑ [1]
Theoc. 11.20
ΑΠΑΝΑΙΝΟΜΑΙ [1]
Fr. Gren. 10
ΑΠΑΝΕΥΘΗΝ [1]
A.P. 5.256.5
ΑΠΑΝΤΑ [3]
A.P. 6.71.5; Helio. 4.17; Lucian D. Meretr. 8.3
ΑΠΑΝΤΑΣ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr. 8.3
ΑΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΥΠΤΟΥΣ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.2.3
ΑΠΑΣ [1]
Alciph. 4.9.1
ΑΠΑΘΑΓΙΑΖΕΙΣΘΑΙ [1]
Aristae. Ep. 2.20.20ff
ΑΠΕΙΘΩΥΣ [1]
Aristae. Ep. 2.20.1ff
ΑΠΕΙΘΟΥΜΩΝ [1]
Ath. 13.585
ΑΠΕΙΗΜΙ [1]
A.P. 12.252.2
ΑΠΕΙΣΙΝ [1]
Ar. Ec. 692
ΑΠΕΚΑΕΙΟΜΗΝ [1]
Ath. 13.567 e
ΑΠΕΚΑΕΙΣΑ [2]
Aristae. Ep. 2.16.5ff; Lucian D. Meretr. 8.3
ΑΠΕΚΑΕΙΕΙΝ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr. 15.2
ΑΠΕΚΑΕΙΕΙΣΘΑΙ [1]
Chariton 1.3.1
ΑΠΕΚΑΕΙΘΕΝ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 29
ΑΠΕΚΑΕΙΘΩΝ [1]
Theoc. 11.64
ΑΠΕΡΘΟΛΟΜΑΙ [1]
A.P. 5.213.1
ΑΠΕΡΘΟΛΟΛΑΤΕ [1]
Theoc. 13.585
ΑΠΕΡΘΟΛΩΦ [1]
Chariton 1.3.6
ΑΠΕΡΘΟΥΝ [1]
Plu. Mor. 772 F
ΑΠΕΡΘΩΕ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr. 8.3
ΑΠΗΘΕΙΑ [1]
Theoc. 23.48
ΑΠΗΘΕΘΩΝ [1]
Theoc. 23.1
ΑΠΗΘΘΟΝ [1]
Theoc. 11.12
ΑΠΗΘΘΗΣΕ [1]
Ael. VH 13.1 (156.1)
ΑΠΙΘΕ [1]
Theoc. 23.44
ΑΠΙΘΘΑΝΑ [1]
Alciph. 4.9.3
ΑΠΙΘΘΗ [1]
Aristae. Ep. 2.20.35ff
ΑΠΙΘΘΟΙ [1]
Theoc. 7.120
ΑΠΙΘΘΕΙΝ [1]
Chariton 1.3.4
ΑΠΙΘΘΑΛΑ [1]
A.P. 5.191.4; Theoc. 11.19
ΑΠΙΘΘΡΕΘΘΑΙ [1]
Alciph. 4.8.1
ΑΠΙΘΘΑΝΟΙΜ [1]
Ar. Ec. 977
ΑΠΙΘΘΗΣΚΕΙ [1]
Ant. Lib. 39.5
ΑΠΟΔΕΙΧΕΙΝ [1]
Alciph. 4.17.5; Ant. Lib. 39.2
ΑΠΟΙΚΘΕΙΜΕΝΟΝ [1]
Fr. Gren. 27
ΑΠΟΙΚΘΑΣ [1]
Anac. 373.1
ΑΠΟΙΚΘΑΣΑΝΤΕΣ [1]
Ael. VH 13.1 (155.10)
ΑΠΟΙΚΘΑΙ [1]
Philostr. Ep. 28
ΑΠΟΙΚΘΑΙΣ [1]
Alciph. 4.10.3; Xen. Mem. 3.11.10
ΑΠΟΙΚΘΑΙΣ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr. 14.1
ΑΠΟΙΚΘΑΙΟΜΑΙ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr. 14.1
ΑΠΟΙΚΘΑΙΟΜΕΝΟΝ [1]
A.P. 12.193.6
ΑΠΟΙΚΘΑΙΣ [1]
Plu. Gal. 19.5
ΑΠΟΙΚΘΑΙΣ [1]
Alciph. 4.17.5
ΑΠΟΙΚΘΑΙΘΕΙΣ [1]
Theoc. 3.38
ΑΠΟΙΚΘΕΝΘΩ [1]
Longus 4.16
ΑΠΟΙΚΘΕΝΟΥΣΑ [1]
Alciph. 4.9.1
ΑΠΟΙΚΘΘΓΙΑΝ [1]
Chariton 1.3.7
ΑΠΟΙΚΘΙΣΣΕΙΝ [1]
Aristae. Ep. 2.20.30ff
ΑΠΟΙΚΘΣΘΑΙ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.2.4
ΑΠΟΙΚΘΝΗΜΕΝΟΝ ΤΑΙΝ [1]
Ath. 13.585
ΑΠΟΙΚΘΝΗΜΕΝΟΝ ΤΑΙΝ [1]
Plu. Mor. 759 B
ΑΠΟΙΚΘΝΗΜΕΝΟΝ ΤΑΙΝ [1]
Aristae. Ep. 2.20.25ff
ΑΠΟΙΚΘΝΗΜΕΝΟΝ ΤΑΙΝ [1]
Antiphanes 195.5
ΑΠΟΙΚΘΝΗΜΕΝΟΝ ΤΑΙΝ [1]
Pl. Smp. 203 b
ΑΠΟΙΚΘΝΗΜΕΝΟΝ ΤΑΙΝ [1]
Άρισταν. Επ. 2.20.5ff; Θεοκ. 7.121
Απόρομήνου [1]  
Βερόθθαν [1]  
Πλ. Γαλ. 19.4  
Αρτφιμοντής [1]  
Αντ. Λιβ. 39.4  
Αρτφινήν [1]  
Αρ. Βεσπ. 1255  
Αρτφιεξείς [1]  
Fr. Γρεν. 36  
Αστηκτιθαινομένο [1]  
Πιλοστρ. Ιμ. 1.2.2
Άριστοδώμος [1]  
Θεοκ. 13.585  
Άριστος [1]  
Πλ. Σμπ. 182 δ  
Άρκεοφών [3]  
Αντ. Λιβ. 39.1; 39.2; 39.5  
Άρκεοφωντί [1]  
Αντ. Λιβ. 39.3  
Άρκεοφωντος [2]  
Αντ. Λιβ. 39.2; 39.6  
Άρκεσατ [1]  
A. Π. 12.85.9  
Άρκις [1]  
Αντίφανες 195.6  
Άρκτων [1]  
Θεοκ. 11.41  
Άρμοζοντής [1]  
Άρισταν. Επ. 2.19.20  
Φωνα [1]  
Άρισταν. Επ. 1.14.10  
Φωνας [1]  
Άρισταν. Επ. 2.20.5ff  
Άρνεσι [1]  
Θεοκ. 11.74  
Άρνης [1]  
Θεοκ. 11.20  
Άρσαί [1]  
Πλ. Σμπ. 183 α  
Άρναδώς [1]  
Θεογ. 1046  
Άρναδες [1]  
Men. Φυσικ. 59  
Άρναδες [1]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 16  
Άρναιαθαιν [1]  
Πιλοστρ. Ιμ. 1.12.4  
Άρναις [1]  
A. Π. 12.167.2  
Άρναθεοντάς [1]  
Χεν. Μεμ. 3.11.10  
Άρναθεον [1]  
Άρναθος [1]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 17  
Πιλοστρ. Ιμ. 1.2.2  
Αντ. Λιβ. 39.3  
Αρταμένον [2]  
Θεοκ. 23.36; 23.54  
Αρτις [1]  
Άρισταν. Επ. 2.20.30ff  
Άρχαια [1]  
Alciph. 4.9.2  
Άρχαιοι [1]  
Ath. 14.638 δ  
Άρχεις [1]  
Πιλοστρ. Β.Σ. 485  
Άρχη [1]  
Πιλοστρ. Ιμ. 1.2.2  
Άρχην [2]  
Πλ. Σμπ. 183 α;  
Πλ. Μορ. 753 B  
Άρχης [1]  
Lucian D. Μερετρ. 12.311  
Άρχιας [1]  
Πλ. Μορ. 772 E  
Άρχιν [1]  
A. Π. 12.118.1  
Άρχο [1]  
Lucian D. Μερετρ. 14.3  
Άσαί [1]  
Πλ. Μορ. 455 B  
Άσαγιαθειαν [3]  
Const. VII  
002.2.124.5; Isaeeus  
Πυρρ. 13; Πολυβ. 10.26.5  
Άσαγμαι [1]  
Θεοκ. 3.38  
Άσαμαί [1]  
Lucian D. Μαρ. 1.4  
Άσανος [1]  
Χεν. Μεμ. 3.11.10  
Άσπαζοι [2]  
Ar. Εκ. 971; 974  
Άσπαζον [2]  
Helio. 4.17 (2)  
Άσπαζος [1]  
Πιλοστρ. Ιμ. 1.12.4  
Άστεροπαι [1]  
A. Π. 5.153.4  
Άσταρα [2]  
A. Π. 5.191.1; Fr.  
Γρεν. 11
ΑΣΤΡΕΠΤΟΥ [1]  
A.P. 6.71.10  
ΑΣΤΡΡΥΟΤΟΣ [1]  
Pl. Smp. 203 b  
ΑΣΤΡΡΥΟΥΣ [1]  
2.20.20ff  
ΑΣΥΜΦΟΡΟΝ [1]  
Alciph. 4.8.1  
ΑΣΥΧΙΑ [1]  
Theoc. 7.126  
ΑΣΧΟΛΑΕΙΣΘΑΙ [1]  
1.27.5ff  
ΑΤΑΚΤΕΙΝ [1]  
Philostr. Im. 1.2.5  
ΑΤΑΚΤΟΣ [1]  
Philostr. Im. 1.2.5  
ΑΤΑΛΑΝΤΗ [1]  
Theoc. 3.41  
ΑΤΑΛΑΝΤΗΣ [1]  
Ael. VH 13.1  
(155.1)  
ΑΤΑΙΡΗΣ [1]  
Theoc. 23.6  
ΑΤΕΡ [1]  
Theoc. 3.48  
ΑΤΕΡΑΜΩΝ [1]  
2.20.10ff  
ΑΤΕΡΘΕΩΝ [1]  
Theoc. 23.23  
ΑΤΕΧΝΩΣ [1]  
1.27.10ff  
ΑΤΙΜΩΣ [1]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 29  
ΑΤΙΣ [1]  
Theoc. 7.127  
ΑΤΙΝ [1]  
Philostr. Im. 1.2.2  
ΑΤΟΜΟΣ [1]  
Ar. Ec. 956  
ΑΤΟΜΟΥ [1]  
J. Chrys. Hom. 37  
ΑΤΡΟΦΟΝ [1]  
Theoc. 3.49  
ΑΤΡΥΤΟΣ [1]  
A.P. 12.115.4  
ΑΤΤΙΚΟΣ [1]  
Alciph. 4.17.5  
ΑΤΥΧΗΣ [1]  
Fr. Gren. 51  
ΑΥΓΑΣ [1]  
A.P. 12.72.3  
ΑΥΘΥ [1]  
Theoc. 11.22  
ΑΥΑΓ [1]  
Philostr. Im.  
1.12.4  
ΑΥΑΕΙΑΣ [2]  
A.P. 5.281.2;  
Theoc. 23.54  
ΑΥΑΕΙΟΣ [2]  
A.P. 5.206.8;  
Chariton 1.2.3  
ΑΥΑΕΙΩΝ [1]  
Helio. 4.17  
ΑΥΑΕΙΟΣ [1]  
Lucian D. Meretr.  
15.2  
ΑΥΑΗΜΑΤΟΣ [1]  
Iamb. V.P.  
25.112  
ΑΥΑΗΜΥΤΟΥ  
Iamb. V.P. 25.112  
ΑΥΑΗΜΥΤΙΔΑ [2]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 17;  
D. Meretr. 14.4  
ΑΥΑΗΜΥΤΙΔΕΣ [1]  
Ael. VH 13.1  
(155.10)  
ΑΥΑΗΜΥΤΙΚΗΝ [1]  
A.P. 5.206.4  
ΑΥΑΟΣ [2]  
1.14.1; Prat. 708.6  
ΑΥΑΟΥ [2]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 17;  
Plu. Mor. 713 c  
ΑΥΑΟΥΣ [1]  
A.P. 5.206.4  
ΑΥΑΣ [1]  
Ael. N.A. 1.50  
ΑΥΑΣΗ [1]  
Men. Dysc. 62  
ΑΥΑΣ [1]  
Lucian D. Meretr.  
14.1  
ΑΥΡΙΟΝ [1]  
Theoc. 3.11  
ΑΥΡΩΠΙΖΩΝ [1]  
Lucian D. Meretr.  
14.4  
ΑΥΤΟΑΥΡΗΝ [1]  
A.P. 12.85.6  
ΑΥΤΟΜΑΧΗΝ [1]  
Alciph. 4.9.2  
ΑΥΤΟΜΑΤΟΣ [2]  
Pl. Smp. 203 b;  
Theoc. 013.162.d  
ΑΥΤΟΜΑΤΗΝ [1]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 16  
ΑΥΠΟΔΕΙΧΑ [1]  
Plu. Gal. 19.5  
ΑΥΠΟΔΕΙΞΑ [1]  
Philostr. Im.  
1.12.4  
ΑΥΠΟΔΕΙΣΕ [1]  
PGM 4.2735  
ΑΥΠΟΔΕΙΣΑ [2]  
Ael. VH 13.1  
(155.20); Chariton  
1.3.6  
ΑΥΠΟΔΗΣΤΟ [1]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 17  
ΑΥΠΟΔΗΣΤΟΙ [1]  
Philostr. Im. 1.2.5  
ΑΥΠΟΔΗΣΘΑ [3]  
A.P. 5.64.3; Fr.  
Gren. 27; 49  
ΑΥΠΟΔΟΘΩΝ [1]  
Alciph. 4.9.1  
ΑΥΠΟΔΗΣΘΕΣ [1]  
2.19.5ff  
ΑΥΠΟΔΗΣΘΕΣ [1]  
Ael. N.A. 9.13  
ΑΥΠΟΔΗΣΘΕΣ [1]  
Pl. Smp. 203 b  
ΑΥΠΟΔΗΣΤΟ [1]  
Theoc. 11.42  
ΑΥΠΟΔΗΣΘΑΙ [1]  
Theoc. 11.61  
ΑΥΠΟΔΗΣΤΩΝ [1]  
Lucian D. Meretr.  
14.3  
ΑΥΠΟΔΗΣΘΑΙ [1]  
Ael. N.A. 9.13
BORENE [1]  
A.P. 5.167.2

BOSEKE [1]  
Theoc. 3.3

BOKI [1]  
Theoc. 11.34

BOSTRYXIA [1]  
A.P. 6.71.3

BOSTRYXON [1]  
Ar. Ec. 955

BOTA [1]  
Theoc. 11.34

BOTANAES [1]  
Theoc. 11.13

BOUKOLOES [1]  
Ath. 14.638 e

BOUKOLO [1]  
A.P. 5.229.1

BOYAI [2]  
Alciph. 4.9.3; J. Chrys. Hom. 37

BOYAIETAI [2]  
Aristea. Ep. 2.19.20; Lucian D. Meretr. 15.2

BOYAIHEIN [1]  
Alciph. 4.10.3

BOYALMA [1]  
Aristea. Ep. 2.19.15

BOYAHEIN [1]  
Helio. 4.17

BOYALMAI [3]  
Ar. Ec. 964; Aristea. Ep. 2.19.10; Lucian Bis Acc. 29;

BOYALMENOS [2]  
Pl. Smp. 183 a (2)

BOYALMENY [1]  
Isaues Pyrr. 15

BOYALMENO [2]  
Isaues Pyrr. 13; 16

BOYALXVI [1]  
Theoc. 11.54

BOYAXEIA [1]  
Philostr. Im. 1.2.1

BOYAXNEIN [1]  
Men. Dysc. 62

BOYMONE [1]  
Philo Husb. 37

BOYXEIAE [1]  
Philostr. Ep. 29

BOXHEOS [1]  
Aristea. Ep. 1.27.15

BOXAX [2]  
Aristea. Ep. 2.20.10ff; Theoc. 23.38

BOXMIOS [1]  
Prat. 708.3

BOXON [1]  
A.P. 12.115.3

BOXOXIO [1]  
Theoc. 3.54

BOXOXON [2]  
Theoc. 23.21; 23.51

BOXOOS [1]  
Antiphanes 195.5

BOXOXMON [1]  
Alciph. 4.8.2

BOXOXMONOS [1]  
Philostr. V.S. 485

BOXOXMYE [1]  
Philostr. V.S. 485

BOXOXYION [1]  
Stob. Anth. 3.2.18

BOXON [1]  
Theoc. 11.62

BOXMON [2]  
Philostr. Ep. 39 (2)

BOX [1]  
Theoc. 11.79

BOXIAN [1]  
A.P. 12.85.3

BOXA [1]  
Theoc. 11.65

BOXA [1]  
Theoc. 11.35

BOXAKDES [1]  
Philostr. Ep. 39

BOXATEIA [3]  
A.P. 5.256.1; Theoc. 11.19; 11.63

BOXATEIAN [2]  
Theoc. 11.13; 11.76

BOXATEIAE [1]  
Theoc. 11.8

BOXIAI [1]  
Theoc. 3.40

BOXITA [1]  
Isaues Pyrr. 14

GAMETES [1]  
Isaues Pyrr. 14 

GAMETH [1]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 29

GAMETES [1]  
Plu. Gal. 19.4

GAMON [4]  
Ant. Lib. 39.3; 39.5; Men. Dysc. 64; Plu. Gal. 19.5

GAMOS [2]  
Ant. Lib. 39.2; Plu. Mor. 753 B

GAMOS [1]  
Men. Sam. 414

GAMON [1]  
Ael. VH 13.1 (155.15)

GANON [1]  
Ant. Lib. 39.2

GAPEPAKATAIA [1]  
Philo Husb. 37

GAPOTEPA [1]  
Theoc. 11.21

GETAMOXENAI [1]  
Chariton 1.3.6

GETONEN [3]  
Chariton 1.3.4; Fr. Gren. 1; Pl. Smp. 203 b

GETONESAN [1]  
Helio. 4.17

GETONOS [1]  
Men. Sam. 407

GETONOTAI [1]  
Chariton 1.3.5

GETPAITAII [1]  
Philostr. Im. 1.2.1

GETPAITAI [1]  
Philostr. Im. 1.2.4

GETPAITAI [1]  
A.P. 12.90.3

GEITONA [1]  
Lucian D. Meretr. 14.4

GEITONAI [1]  
A.P. 5.23.5; Cal. lim. Epigr. 64.5

GEITONAI [3]  
Isaues Pyrr. 13; Lucian Bis Acc. 31; Plu. Mor. 772 F
ΓΕΔΑ [1]  
Philostr. Im.  
1.12.4  
ΓΕΛΑΝ [1]  
2.19.5  
ΓΕΛΑΣΑΕΑ [1]  
A. P. 6.1.1  
ΓΕΛΙΩΝ [1]  
Ath. 13.585  
ΓΕΛΩΣ [2]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 17; Philostr. Im. 1.2.5  
ΓΕΛΩΤΑ [2]  
Alciph. 4.8.2  
J. Chrys. Hom. 37  
ΓΕΜΙΔΕΩΣ [1]  
A. P. 12.85.7  
ΓΕΝΕΒΑΙΟΙΣ [1]  
Pl. Smp. 203 b  
ΓΕΝΕΙΑΔΩΝ [1]  
Theoc. 11.9  
ΓΕΝΕΙΠΤΑ [1]  
Philostr. Ep. 14  
ΓΕΝΕΘΟΙ [2]  
1.14.5; 2.19.1  
ΓΕΝΝΑΙΟΤΑΩΝ [1]  
Pl. Smp. 182 d  
ΓΕΝΝΗΘΕΩΣ [1]  
Pl. Smp. 203 b  
ΓΕΝΟΙΜΑΝ [1]  
Theoc. 3.12  
ΓΕΝΟΙΤΟ [4]  
Alciph. 4.9.2; J. Chrys. Hom. 37; Lucian D. Meretr.  
14.4; Theoc. 3.54  
ΓΕΝΟΣ [1]  
Ant. Lib. 39.2  
ΓΕΝΟΥΣ [1]  
Plu. Mor. 772 E  
ΓΕΡΩΝ [1]  
Antiphanes fr. 239.1  
ΓΕΥΣΑΜΕΝΗ [1]  
Philostr. Ep. 29  
ΓΗ [1]  
2.20.10ff  
ΓΗΝ [2]  
Ant. Lib. 39.6; Philostr. Ep. 29  
ΓΗΡΑ [1]  
Theoc. 23.29  
ΓΗΡΑΣ [1]  
Antiphanes fr. 239.4  
ΓΗΘΕΘΑΙ [1]  
Isaeus Pyrr. 13  
ΓΗΘΕΘΑΙ [2]  
Ar. Vesp. 1253; Philostr. Ep. 29  
ΓΙΝΕΤΙ [1]  
Theoc. 11.4  
ΓΙΝΕΤΑΙ [3]  
2.19.20; Plu. Mor. 772 E; Theoc. 11.58  
ΓΙΝΟΜΕΝΟΙ [1]  
Plu. Mor. 766 b  
ΓΙΝΩΣΚΕΙΝ [1]  
Theoc. 11.5  
ΓΙΝΩΣΚΕΘΑΙ [1]  
2.19.10  
ΓΙΝΩΣΚΩ [1]  
Theoc. 11.30  
ΓΙΝΩΣΘΕΤΩ [1]  
Fr. Gren. 33  
ΓΑΛΑΚΤΟΝ [1]  
Theoc. 11.43  
ΓΑΛΩΚΕΙΑ [1]  
2.19.20  
ΓΑΛΑΚΤΙΑΝ [1]  
2.19.5  
ΓΑΛΑΚΤΙΟΥ [1]  
A. P. 5.153.4  
ΓΑΛΑΚΤΙΟΝ [1]  
A. P. 5.281.6  
ΓΑΛΑΚΤΙΟΝ ΘΕΩΝ [1]  
Theoc. 11.53  
ΓΑΛΥΚΩ [1]  
Theoc. 3.54  
ΓΑΛΥΚΔΑΚΡΥΣ [1]  
A. P. 12.167.2  
ΓΑΛΥΚΔΑΚΡΥΤΟΣ [1]  
Theoc. 11.46  
ΓΑΛΥΚΩΜΑΛΩΝ [1]  
Theoc. 11.39  
ΓΑΛΥΚΥΝ [2]  
PGM 4.2736; Theoc. 2.118  
ΓΑΛΥΚΥΣ [3]  
A. P. 12.72.1;  
Theoc. 11.22; 11.23  
ΓΑΛΩΣΑΝ [1]  
Ant. Lib. 39.4  
ΓΑΛΩΤΑ [1]  
2.20.15ff  
ΓΑΛΩΘΙΝΑ [1]  
Ath. 13.585  
ΓΑΛΩΘΙΝΗ [1]  
Ath. 13.585  
ΓΑΛΩΘΥΣ [1]  
1.14.1ff  
ΓΑΛΩΤΗΝΑΡΙΟΝ [1]  
Longus 4.16  
ΓΑΛΩΤΗΝΙΟΝ [2]  
Ath. 14.638 d;  
14.638 e  
ΓΑΛΩΤΗΝΙΟΥ [1]  
Ath. 14.638 d  
ΓΑΛΟΠΙΣΑΑ [1]  
Ael. VH 13.1  
(155.20)  
ΓΟΝΕ [1]  
Pl. Smp. 203 b  
ΓΟΝΑΙ [1]  
Philostr. Im. 1.2.2  
ΓΟΝΑΣ [1]  
Ant. Lib. 39.4  
ΓΟΝΕΩΝ [2]  
Ant. Lib. 39.1  
Lib. 39.3  
ΓΟΡΓΟΣ [1]  
Lucian D. Meretr. 15.2  
ΓΟΥΝΑΘΟΜΑΙ [1]  
A. P. 5.103.2  
ΓΡΑΔΙΟΝ [1]  
Ar. Ec. 949  
ΓΡΑΙΑ [1]  
Theoc. 7.126  
ΓΡΑΜΜΑ [1]  
Theoc. 23.46  
ΓΡΑΦΑΙ [1]  
Philostr. Im. 1.2.3  
ΓΡΑΦΑΙΣ [1]  
1.27.5
Aristaeus. Ep. 2.20.1ff
ΔΕΙΟΝΟΜΑΧΟΣ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr. 15.2
ΔΕΙΤΤΑ [1]
Ar. Ec. 694
ΔΕΙΤΤΑΙ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.2.5
ΔΕΚΑ [2]
Lucian D. Meretr. 8.3; Theoc. 3.10
ΔΕΚΑΚΙΣ [1]
A. P. 5.118.1
ΔΕΚΑΝΩΝΑ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr. 14.4
ΔΕΚΑΦΩΣ [1]
Theoc. 2.29
ΔΕΚΑΦΩΥΣ [1]
Helio. 4.17
ΔΕΜΝΙΑ [1]
Theoc. 6.33
ΔΕΝΑΡΑ [1]
Ael. VH 13.1 (155.15)
ΔΕΣΑΙ [6]
Alc. 374 (2); Alciph. 4.17.9; A. P. 5.118.2; 12.167.4; Fr. Gren. 28
ΔΕΣΑΣΘ [1]
A. P. 12.85.10
ΔΕΣΑΣΘΕ [1]
A. P. 12.85.1
ΔΕΣΙΤΑΙ [1]
Theoc. 1046
ΔΕΣΙΑ [3]
Philostr. Im. 1.2.2 (2); 1.2.5
ΔΕΣΙΑΝ [1]
Aristae. Ep. 2.20.15ff
ΔΕΣΙΟΣ [1]
Theoc. 3.37
ΔΕΣΙΟΥ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr. 14.3
ΔΕΣΩΜΑΙ [1]
Alicph. 4.17.9
ΔΕΣΩΜΕΝΟΣ [1]
Ar. Ec. 978
ΔΕΣΩΝ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 16
ΔΕΣΩΝΤΑΙ [1]
Philostr. V.S. 485
ΔΕΣΩΝΘΑΙ [1]
A. P. 5.43.6
ΔΕΣΩΝΘΑΙΝΑ [1]
Alciph. 4.9.3
ΔΕΣΩΝΘΑΙΝΑΝ [1]
Aristae. Ep. 2.19.10ff
ΔΕΣΩΝΘΕΣ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr. 14.1
ΔΕΣΩΝΘΟ [8]
Ar. Ec. 695; 952 (3); 960 (2); Philostr. Im. 1.12.4; Plu. Mor. 766 b
ΔΕΣΩΝΘΟΣ [2]
Ael. VH 13.1 (155.20); A. P. 5.165.6
ΔΕΣΩΝΘΥ [1]
Ath. 13.585
ΔΕΣΩΝΘΥΑΙ [1]
Ar. Ec. 709
ΔΕΣΩΝΘΥΑΙ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.2.1
ΔΕΣΩΝΤΑΙ [1]
Theoc. 11.79
ΔΕΣΩΝΤΟΙ [1]
A. P. 5.198.2
ΔΕΣΩΝΟΝ [1]
Ael. VH 13.1 (155.10)
ΔΕΣΩΝΟΝΤΟΣ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr. 8.3
ΔΕΣΩΝΤΟΣ [1]
Ael. VH 13.1 (155.10)
ΔΕΣΩΝΗ [3]
Ar. Pl. 1008; Theoc. 11.29; Theog. 1045
ΔΕΣΩΝΗ [1]
Plu. Mor. 753 A
ΔΙΑΒΡΟΧΟΣ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 17
ΔΙΑΓ' [2]
Theoc. 11.7; 11.81
ΔΙΑΔΥΣ [1]
Theoc. 3.14
ΔΙΑΘΕΣ [1]
A. P. 5.64.4
ΔΙΑΚΑΤΣΑΣΩΝ [1]
Plu. Mor. 759 B
ΔΙΑΚΕΙΜΕΝΟΝ [2]
Alciph. 4.8.1; J. Chrys. Hom. 37
ΔΙΑΚΑΙΝΑΙΑΣ [1]
Ar. Ec. 957
ΔΙΑΚΩΜΕΝΕΙΘΑΙ [1]
Aristae. Ep. 1.27.5ff
ΔΙΑΙΔΕΥΘΕΣ [1]
Alciph. 4.9.3
ΔΙΑΙΔΕΥΘΕΝ [1]
Alciph. 4.8.1
ΔΙΑΙΔΕΥΘΕΝ [1]
Chariton 1.3.7
ΔΙΑΙΔΟΣ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 31
ΔΙΑΙΔΕΥΘΕΤΑΙ [1]
Fr. Gren. 38
ΔΙΑΙΔΥΝΩΝ [1]
Aristae. Ep. 1.27.40
ΔΙΑΙΛΕΙΣ [1]
Theoc. 11.44
ΔΙΑΙΛΕΙΘΕΤΑΙ [1]
Alciph. 4.17.5
ΔΙΑΙΛΕΙΘΕΝΤΕΣ [1]
Ael. VH 13.1 (155.15)
ΔΙΑΠΑΣΑΘΟΙ [1]
Pl. Smp. 183 a
ΔΙΑΠΑΣΣΟΜΕΝΟΝ [1]
Pl. Smp. 183 b
ΔΙΑΠΡΗΘΕΝ [1]
ΔΙΑΠΡΗΣΙΧΟΝ [1]
A. P. 12.85.5
ΔΙΑΠΡΗΣΟΙ [1]
Alciph. 4.8.2
ΔΙΑΤΑΜΑΤΑ [1]
A. P. 6.71.1
ΔΙΑΤΡΗΘΕΙΣΑ [1]
Ael. VH 13.1
(155.20)
ΔΙΑΦΕΡΟΝΤΟΣ [1]
Plu. Mor. 772 E
ΔΙΑΦΕΡΕΙΝ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.2.2
ΔΙΑΦΕΡΕΙΡΑΣ [1]
Plu. Gal. 19.4
ΔΙΑΦΟΡΟΥ [1]
Fr. Gren. 55
ΔΙΑΣΚΕΙΝ [1]
Ath. 14.638 f
ΔΙΑΣΙΖ [1]
Theoc. 7.124
ΔΙΑΣΤΥ [2]
Alciph. 4.9.3; A.P. 12.90.6
ΔΙΑΣΤΑΤΟΚΩΝ [1]
Theoc. 3.34
ΔΙΑΣΩ [1]
Alciph. 4.9.4
ΔΙΒΛΗΕΚΤΑΙ [1]
Aristaeon. Ep. 2.19.10 ff
ΔΙΒΛΛΝΩΝ [1]
Chariton 1.3.3
ΔΙΒΛΩΝΟΠΕΙΤΟ [1]
Aristaeon. Ep. 2.20.10 ff
ΔΙΒΛΩΝΩΝΙΖΟΥΣΑ [1]
Aristaeon. Ep. 2.16.5 ff
ΔΙΒΛΩΝΟΤΕΡΕΥΣ [1]
Ant. Lib. 39.3
ΔΙΒΛΩΣ [1]
Helio. 4.17
ΔΙΒΛΩΣΙΑ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 17
ΔΙΒΛΩΣΙΕ [1]
Polyb. 10.26.4
ΔΙΒΛΩΣΙΕΝ [1]
Const. VII 002.2.124.5
ΔΙΒΛΩΣΙΡ [1]
Plu. Mor. 772 F
ΔΙΒΛΩΣΙΡΙΑ [1]
Aristaeon. Ep. 2.16.5 ff
ΔΙΒΛΩΣΙΡΙΕ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 17
ΔΙΒΛΩΣ [1]

Lucian D. Meretr. 8.3
ΔΙΗΘΩΙΣΜΕΝΟΣ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 16
ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ [1]
Theoc. 23.63
ΔΙΚΑΙΩΜΑΤΙΚΑΙ [1]
Theophrastus 27.9
ΔΙΚΑΙΩΝ [1]
Plu. Mor. 766 b
ΔΙΚΕΙΛΔΑΣ [1]
Ath. 13.585
ΔΙΚΗΝ [1]
Antiphanes fr. 239.3
ΔΙΚΑΙΔΑΣ [1]
A.P. 5.256.1
ΔΙΚΑΙΟΠΟΙΩΝ [1]
A.P. 5.145.1
ΔΙΜΩΝΑΙ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr. 14.4
ΔΙΜΕΙΘΥ [1]
Theoc. 2.30
ΔΙΝΟΙΤΟ [1]
Theoc. 2.31
ΔΙΟΝΟΣ [1]
A.r. Ec. 693
ΔΙΟΙΚΗΣΕ [1]
Alciph. 4.9.1
ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΑΔΑ [1]
Prat. 708.2
ΔΙΟΣ [4]
A.P. 5.213.2;
Aristaeon. Ep. 2.19.1; Philostr. Im. 1.14.2; Pl. Smp. 203 b
ΔΙΟΣΚΟΡΟΠ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr. 14.4
ΔΙΟΦΟΡΟΥ [1]
Ar. Ec. 708
ΔΙΩΚΕΙΣ [1]
Theoc. 11.75
ΔΙΩΚΗΣΜΕΝΑ [1]
Ael. N.A. 1.50
ΔΙΩΚΟΥΣ [1]
Plu. Mor. 759 B
ΔΙΩΚΩΝ [1]
Pl. Smp. 182 e
ΔΙΩΝΥΣΙΟΙ [1]

Theoc. 2.120
ΔΙΩΓΗΣ [1]
Philostr. Ep. 39
ΔΙΩΓΗΣΑΙ [1]
Alciph. 4.10.3
ΔΙΩΓΗΣΜΕΝΟΣ [1]
Alciph. 4.8.2
ΔΟΚΕΙ [3]
Pl. Smp. 182 d;
Theem. 013.162.c;
Theoc. 11.2
ΔΟΚΕΙΝ [1]
Helio. 4.17
ΔΟΚΕΙΕ [1]
Alciph. 4.17.5
ΔΟΚΩ [1]
Theoc. 11.50
ΔΟΚΟΙΗ [1]
Aristaeon. Ep. 2.19.15 ff
ΔΟΚΟΥΣΑ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.2.2
ΔΟΛΗΣ [1]
A.P. 5.189.3
ΔΟΜΟΙΩ [1]
Babrius 116.12
ΔΟΜΟΝ [1]
Babrius 116.9
ΔΟΝΑΚΑ [1]
A.P. 5.206.6
ΔΟΝΕΙ [1]
Ar. Ec. 954
ΔΟΣ ΑΝ [1]
J. Chrys. Hom. 37
ΔΟΥΑ [1]
Fr. Gren. 55
ΔΟΥΑΕΙΑΣ [1]
Pl. Smp. 183 a
ΔΟΥΑΕΙΝ [1]
Fr. Gren. 28
ΔΟΥΑΕΙΝ [1]
Pl. Smp. 183 a
ΔΟΥΑΕΙΜΟΝ [1]
ΔΟΥΛΗΝ [1]
Aristaeon. Ep. 2.19.1
ΔΟΥΛΟΣ [1]
Pl. Smp. 183 a
ΔΟΥΛΩΝ [1]
Lib. Or. 46.31.1
ΔΟΥΜ [1]
Helio. 4.17
ΔΟΥΣ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr. 8.3
ΔΡΑΝ [1]
Babrius 116.14
ΔΡΑΠΕΣΤΕΥΟΝΤΕΣ [1]
Plu. Mor. 766 b
ΔΡΑΣΕΙΣ [1]
Ar. Ec. 704
ΔΡΑΧΜΑΣ [2]
Lucian D. Meretr. 8.3; 14.3
ΔΡΑΧΜΗΝ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr. 14.3
ΔΡΕΨΑΣΑΙ [1]
Theoec. 11.27
ΔΡΙΜΕΙΑΝ [1]
Theoec. 11.66
ΔΡΟΜΟΝ [1]
Theoec. 3.41
ΔΡΟΜΟI [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.2.5
ΔΡΥΜΟI [1]
Theoec. 3.16
ΔΡΥΟΙ [1]
Theoec. 11.51
ΔΡΟΜΕΝΟΙ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 31
ΔΡΝΑΙΤΟ [1]
Ant. Lib. 39.3
ΔΡΝΑΜΑΙ [2]
Theoec. 11.29; 23.42
ΔΡΝΑΜΑΝ [1]
Theoec. 2.108
ΔΡΝΑΜΕΙ [1]
Plu. Mor. 772 F
ΔΡΝΑΜΕΝΟΙ [1]
Chariton 1.3.4
ΔΡΝΑΜΙΝ [1]
Pl. Smp. 183 a
ΔΡΝΑΝΤΑΙ [1]
Philo Husb. 37
ΔΡΝΑΘΘΑΙ [1]
Alciph. 4.9.4
ΔΡΝΑΝΤΑΙ [1]
Aristaen. Ep. 2.19.20
ΔΡΝΕΙ [1]
A. P. 5.189.1
ΔΡΝΗΘΩΣΙΝ [1]
Philo Husb. 37
ΔΩ [4]
Ael. WH 13.1
(155.5); Lucian D. Meretr. 14.3 (2);
15.2
ΔΡΘΑΜΟΡΕ [1]
A. P. 12.72.5
ΔΡΣΡΙ [1]
A. P. 12.23.1
ΔΡΣΝΕΙΡΑ [1]
Plu. Mor. 766 b
ΔΡΣΝΟΟ [1]
Theoec. 3.24
ΔΡΣΝΥΧΕΙ [1]
Alciph. 4.9.2
ΔΡΣΝΥΧΗ [1]
Ath. 13.567 e
ΔΡΜΑΤΑ [1]
Theoec. 2.153
ΔΡΜΑΤΙΟΙ [1]
Plu. Mor. 766 b
ΔΡΜΑΤΙΟΝ [1]
Philostr. Im.
1.12.4
ΔΡΣΕΙ [2]
Philostr. Ep. 29
A. P. 5.103.4
ΔΡΣΩ [1]
Theoec. 3.36
EA [3]
A. P. 12.118.2;
1.27.40; Theoec.
11.43
EΑΝ [3]
Alciph. 4.9.5;
4.10.3; A. P.
12.118.4; Philostr.
Ep. 39
EBΑΙΖΕΙΝ [1]
Ar. Pl. 1007
EBΑΙΖΙΟΝ [1]
Helio. 4.17
EBΥΝ [1]
A. P. 5.256.6
ΕΒΟΑ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 17
ΕΒΟΘΕΙΑ [2]
A. P. 5.167.5;
12.118.5
ΕΒΟΙΛΟΜΗΝ [1]
Alciph. 4.9.1
ΕΓΕΑ [1]
A. P. 12.23.2
ΕΓΕΒΥΘΕΙΙΑ [1]
Isaeus Pyrr. 16
ΕΓΕΥΘΕΙ [2]
Isaeus Pyrr. 13; 16
ΕΓΕΘΘΕΙ [1]
Theoec. 3.8
ΕΓΕΑΑ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 31
ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ [1]
Pl. Smp. 203 b
ΕΓΕΝΟΜΗΝ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr.
14.1
ΕΓΕΝΟΝΤΟ [1]
Plu. Mor. 772 E
ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ [1]
Helio. 4.17
ΕΓΚΑΛΟΥΘΕΙΣ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr.
12.311
ΕΓΚΕΙΤΑΙ [1]
Ar. Ec. 956
ΕΓΚΕΚΑΛΥΜΜΕΝΟΣ [1]
Theoeg. 1045
ΕΓΚΡΟΤΕΟΥΣ [1]
A. P. 5.206.8
ΕΓΝ [1]
Plu. Mor. 772 F
ΕΓΝΟ [1]
Theoec. 3.15
ΕΓΡΕΟ [2]
A. P. 5.118.2;
12.72.5
ΕΓΧΡΙΣΤΟΝ [1]
Theoec. 11.2
ΕΓΣΕΙΣΕΙΝ [1]
2.19.10
ΕΓΣΕΙΘΝΗΑΝ [1]
Pl. Smp. 203 b
ΕΓΣΕΞΕΘΕ [1]
Theoec. 2.124
ΕΙΣΩ [1]  
Babrius 116.9  
ΕΙΤ’ [1]  
Lucian Musc. 10  
ΕΙΧΕ [2]  
A. P. 5.281.6;  
Theoc. 23.3  
ΕΙΧΕΘ’ [1]  
Ath. 13.585  
ΕΙΧΕΝ [5]  
Ath. 13.567 e;  
Lucian Bis Acc. 16;  
D. Meretr. 8.3;  
Theoc. 23.12; 23.48  
ΕΙΧΕΣΟ [1]  
Theoc. 2.127  
ΕΙΝΘΑ [1]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 17  
ΕΙΝΘΕ [1]  
Alicipn. 4.10.3  
ΕΙΝΘΕ ΕΙ [1]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 16  
ΕΙΝΘΕ ΤΕ [1]  
Longus 4.16  
ΕΙΝΘΟΣ [1]  
Philost. Im. 1.2.2  
ΕΚΑΒΗ [1]  
A. P. 5.103.4  
ΕΚΑΔΕΙ [2]  
Const. VII  
002.2.124.5; Polyb. 10.26.3  
ΕΚΑΣΘΗΝ [1]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 31  
ΕΚΑΣΤΟΙ [1]  
Ath. 13.567 e  
ΕΚΑΣΤΕ [1]  
A. P. 12.90.2  
ΕΚΑΣΤΕΙ [1]  
A. P. 5.43.1  
ΕΚΒΕΒΑΗΚΈ [1]  
Men. Sam. 407  
ΕΚΗΣΩ [1]  
A. P. 5.191.6  
ΕΚΑΙΛΑΣΚΕΤΕ [1]  
Aristaen. Ep. 2.20.20ff  
ΕΚΑΣΤΟΝ [2]  
Fr. Gren. 13;  
Lucian Bis Acc. 17  
ΕΚΕΙΤΟ [1]  
Ael. VH 13.1  
(155.20)  
ΕΚΕΛΕΥ [1]  
Theoc. 3.11  
ΕΚΕΚΕΙΡΙΑ [1]  
Philo Cherub. 92  
ΕΚΗΛΑ [1]  
Theoc. 23.57  
ΕΚΚΑΛΑΘΙΘΑΙ [2]  
Ath. 14.638 d;  
14.638 e  
ΕΚΚΕΙΜΕΝΟ [1]  
Philost. Im. 1.2.2  
ΕΚΚΕΚΑΒΗΚΈ [1]  
Men. Sam. 416  
ΕΚΚΑΙΝΟΙ [1]  
Philost. Im. 1.2.2  
ΕΚΚΥΡΩΣΑ [1]  
Ant. Lib. 39.6  
ΕΚΛΑΕΝ [1]  
Lucian D. Meretr. 8.3  
ΕΚΛΑΙΕ [2]  
Chariton 1.3.4;  
Theoc. 23.17  
ΕΚΛΑΙΝΗ [1]  
Theoc. 3.44  
ΕΚΜΑΙΝΕΙΣ [1]  
Ar. Ec. 966  
ΕΚΜΑΣΑΙ [1]  
A. P. 5.43.5  
ΕΚΜΗΝΑΙΜΙ [1]  
Lucian D. Meretr. 8.3  
ΕΚΜΟΧΛΕΥΣΑΝΤΕΣ [1]  
Helio. 4.17  
ΕΚΜΟΙΣΩΝ [1]  
Lucian D. Meretr. 14.1  
ΕΚΟΥΣΑΝ [1]  
Helio. 4.17  
ΕΚΟΥΣΑΝΣΑΙ [1]  
Theoc. 11.72  
ΕΚΟΥΣΟΥΣΟΥ [1]  
Babrius 116.11  
ΕΚΡΑΜΑΣΕΝ [1]  
A. P. 5.191.8  
ΕΚΡΑΜΑΣΘΗ [1]  
Theoc. 23.52  
ΕΚΡΙΘ [1]  
Aristaen. Ep. 2.19.15  
ΕΚΡΙΤΕΙ [1]  
Lucian D. Meretr. 15.2  
ΕΚΤΕΙΝΕΝ [2]  
Theoc. 23.47; 23.60  
ΕΚΤΙΚΟΣ [1]  
Fr. Gren. 8  
ΕΚΤΟΜΟΝ [1]  
Philo Husb. 37  
ΕΚΤΟΜΟΣ [1]  
Lucian D. Meretr. 15.2  
ΕΚΣΟΣ [1]  
Helio. 4.17  
ΕΚΥΣΕ [1]  
Pl. Smp. 203 b  
ΕΚΥΚΑΣΩΝ [1]  
Ael. VH 13.1  
(155.20)  
ΕΚΥΛΙΣΕΝ [1]  
Theoc. 23.52  
ΕΚΥΣΕΝ [1]  
Theoc. 3.51  
ΕΚΣΟΡΑΝ [1]  
Ar. Pl. 1008  
ΕΚΩΜΑΖΕΝ [1]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 16  
ΕΚΩΜΑΖΩΝ [1]  
Philost. Im. 1.12.4  
ΕΚΩΜΑΖΑΝ [1]  
Ael. VH 13.1  
(155.5)  
ΕΚΩΜΑΣΕ [1]  
Lucian D. Mar. 1.4  
ΕΚΩΜΑΣΕΝ [2]  
Chariton 1.3.6;  
Lucian Bis Acc. 16  
ΕΚΩΝ [2]  
Ant. Lib. 39.5; A. P. 12.118.1  
ΕΛΑΘΕ [1]  
Fr. Gren. 9  
ΕΛΑΘΕΝ [1]  
Ael. VH 13.1  
(155.15)  
ΕΛΑΣΕΝ [1]  
Theoc. 11.42  
ΕΛΑΦΡΟΣ [1]  
Theoc. 2.124  
ΕΛΑΧΙΣΤΟΥ [1]
Const. VII
002.2.124.5; Polyb. 10.26.5
ENAYAΩΣ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.2.5
ENAYAΣ [1]
Philostr. Ep. 28
ENAEΙA [1]
Pl. Smp. 203 b
ENAEΙΑΝ [1]
Ant. Lib. 39.5
ENAEΙΑΦΥΤΙΘ [1]
Theoc. 3.36
ENAOΝ [6]
Aristae. Ep. 2.16.5ff; Ar. Ec. 950; Lucian D. Meretr. 8.3 (2); 12.310; 14.1
ENAOΣΟΕ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 29
ENAOΣΟΝ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.2.4
ENAYMIΩΝ [2]
A.P. 5.165.6;
Theoc. 3.50
ENAYNAI [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.2.5
ENΕΙΣΑ [1]
Theoc. 11.66
ENΕΚΕΝ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr. 14.3
ENΕΜΕΙΣΕΕΝ [1]
Ant. Lib. 39.4
ENΕΝΤΙΜΜΑΤΑ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 31
ENΕΣΤΙ [1]
Men. Dsc. 63
ENΕΨΩΡΗΛΩΜΗΝ [1]
Alciph. 4.8.2
ENΕΨΥΡΑ [1]
Ath. 13.585
ENΗΝΟΞΕΝΑΙ [1]
Ath. 13.585
ENΘΑ [3]
Aristae. Ep. 1.27.40; Theoc. 23.23; 23.24
ENΘΑΙ [1]
A.P. 12.85.5
ENΘΑΕ [1]
Ar. Ec. 696
ENΘΩΟΥΙΟΝ [1]
Chariton 1.3.3
ENΘΩΜΙΣΕΝΤΙ [1]
Pl. Smp. 182 d
ENΘΩΝ [2]
Theoc. 11.73; 23.17
ENΘΙΑΥΟΝ [1]
Alciph. 4.9.2
ENΘΙΩ [1]
Plu. Gal. 19.5
ENΘΙΟΣ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr. 8.2
ENΘΙΟΝ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 31
ENΘΩΝΕΙ [1]
J. Chrys. Hom. 37
ENΝΥΑΛΙΩΝ [1]
Helic. 4.17
ENΘΘΗΑ [1]
A.P. 12.85.5
ENΘΙΚΩΝ [1]
A.P. 12.252.1
ENΘΘΙΚΟΥΝΤΕΣ [1]
Helic. 4.17
ENΘΘΑΣΕ [1]
Helic. 4.17
ENΘΘΟΣ [1]
Isaues Pyrr. 15
ENΘΘΟΣ [1]
Fr. Gren. 60
ENΘΘΟΣ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 29
ENΘΘΕΘΕΝ [1]
Alciph. 4.9.1
ENΘΘΙΟΔΟΣΜΗΝ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 31
ENΘΘΙΟΘΕ [1]
Alciph. 4.8.1
ENΘΘΙΟΘΩΝΤΑ [1]
Xen. Mem. 3.11.10
ENΘΘΙΟΘΝΟΤΟΝ [1]
Alciph. 4.8.1
ENΘΘΙΟΘΝΟΙΣΑ [1]
Alciph. 4.9.2
ENΘΘΙΩΠΙΖΩ [2]
Const. VII
002.2.124.5; Polyb. 10.26.3
ENΘΘΙΩΠΕΙΝ [1]
Chariton 1.3.1
ESAIΟΗΝΗ [1]
Babrius 116.8
ESΑΜΑΡΡΙΠΕΙΝ [1]
Isaues Pyrr. 17
ESΑΝΙΘΩΤΑΤ [1]
Babrius 116.8
ESΑΠΑΤΑΝ [1]
ESΑΨΑΝΤΕΣ [1]
Ael. Vh 13.1 (155.10)
ESΕΙ [1]
A.P. 9.621.6
ESΕΙΣ [1]
Theoc. 11.42
ESΕΛΑΝΘΒΟΣ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.12.4
ESΕΝΘΗΟΙΣ [1]
Theoc. 11.63
ESΕΝΘΗΟΙΣΑ [1]
Theoc. 11.63
ESΕΝΘΩΝ [1]
Theoc. 23.36
ESΕΝΘΩΝ [1]
Anac. 373.2
ESΕΝΘΩΝΘΑΕΣ [1]
Aristae. Ep. 1.27.1
ESΕΝΘΩΝΘΑΝ [1]
Ael. Vh 13.1 (155.10)
ESΕΘΕΙΝ [1]
Aristae. Ep. 2.19.5
ESΕΘΕΔΑΙ [1]
Men. Dsc. 61
ESΕΘΑΘΑΝ [1]
Ant. Lib. 39.4
ESΕΘΑΘΕΑ [1]
Ar. Ec. 949
ESΕΘΕΛΤΕΤΟ [1]
Iamb. V.P. 25.112
ESΕΘΕ [1]
Helio. 4.17
ESΕΘΕΔΑΣ [1]
Them. 013.162 c
ESΕΘΕΙ [1]
Isaues Pyrr. 14
ESΕΘΕΙΑ [1]
Pl. Smp. 182 e
ΕΣΩ [1]  
Babrius 116.6  
ΕΣΩΘΕΝ [1]  
Men. Sam. 416  
ΕΣΩΤΡΙΘΘ [1]  
2.20.5ff  
ΕΩΚΕ [2]  
1.27.40; Philostr.  
Im. 1.2.2  
ΕΟΝΤΑ [1]  
Theoc. 11.5  
ΕΠΑΤΗΝ [1]  
Theoc. 2.110  
ΕΠΑΓΩΜΕΝΟΣ [1]  
Plu. Mor. 772 F  
ΕΠΑΓΡΥΠΝΟΝ [1]  
1.27.40  
ΕΠΑΙΕΤΟ [1]  
Lucian D. Meretr.  
15.2  
ΕΠΑΙΝΕΙΝ [1]  
Philostr. Im. 1.2.4  
ΕΠΑΙΝΕΙΣΘΑΙ [1]  
Pl. Smp. 182 e  
ΕΠΑΙΝΕΙΣΘΩ [1]  
Philostr. Im. 1.2.4  
ΕΠΑΙΝΩ [1]  
Philostr. Im. 1.2.4  
ΕΠΑΦΑΗΔΙΑΝ [1]  
Helio. 4.17  
ΕΠΑΜΥΝΑΙ [1]  
Ael. VH 13.1  
(155.25)  
ΕΠΑΝΗΡΕΤΟ [1]  
2.19.10  
ΕΠΑΡΚΕΣΑΤΕ [1]  
A.P. 12.85.8  
ΕΠΑΤΕΙΤΟ [1]  
Lucian D. Meretr.  
15.2  
ΕΠΑΤΕΙΩΝ [1]  
Theoc. 23.44  
ΕΠΑΒΑΛΛΕ [1]  
Theoc. 23.51  
ΕΠΑΘΥΜΕΘΕΝ [1]  
Ant. Lib. 39.6  
ΕΠΑΙΓΟΜΕΝΟΙ [1]  
Philo Husb. 37  
ΕΠΕΙΠΑ [2]  
Const. VII  
002.2.124.5; Polyb.  
10.26.3  
ΕΠΕΙΡΑΘΗ [1]  
Ant. Lib. 39.3  
ΕΠΕΙΡΑΜΑΣ [1]  
Fr. Gren. 50  
ΕΠΕΙΡΑΤΟ [2]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 17;  
Plu. Mor. 772 F  
ΕΠΕΙΡΩΝ [1]  
Philostr. Im.  
1.12.4  
ΕΠΕΙΣΕΝ [1]  
Plu. Gal. 19.4  
ΕΠΕΙΣΕΤΕΣΩΝ [1]  
Lucian D. Meretr.  
15.2  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΕΘΑΝ [1]  
Isaues Pyrr. 17  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΕΣΩΝ [1]  
Men. Sam. 415  
ΕΠΕΙΣΠΑΜΟΝΤΩΝ [1]  
Plu. Mor. 772 F  
ΕΠΕΙΣΜΑΣΑ [1]  
A.P. 12.118.1  
ΕΠΕΙΣΜΑΣΕΝ [1]  
Plu. Mor. 772 F  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΟΥ [1]  
Chariton 1.3.5  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΟΙ [1]  
PGM 4.2738  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΩΝΤΕΣ [1]  
Chariton 1.3.2  
ΕΠΕΙΣΜΑΕΙΤΟ [1]  
Theoc. 23.57  
ΕΠΕΙΣΜΕΝΤΕ [1]  
Theoc. 23.61  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΕΘΑΝ [1]  
Ant. Lib. 39.5  
ΕΠΕΙΣΚΘΩ [1]  
Them. 013.162.c  
ΕΠΕΙΣΜΑΤΕ [1]  
A.P. 6.71.8  
ΕΠΕΙΤΙ [1]  
Pl. Smp. 183 b  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΕΜΕΝΗ [1]  
A.P. 5.256.2  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΕΙΤΟ [1]  
Theoc. 2.152  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΕΥΝ [1]  
A.P. 5.281.3  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΟΥΣΙ [1]  
Philostr. Im.  
1.12.4  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΩΝ [1]  
Philostr. Im. 1.2.2  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΗΠΕΝ [1]  
Lucian Musc. 10  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΕΙ [1]  
Ael. VH 13.1  
(155.20)  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΕΣΘΕ [1]  
Herodas 2.39  
ΕΠΕΙΣΗΝ [1]  
A.P. 5.43.1  
ΕΠΕΙΣΤΑΙ [1]  
Plu. Mor. 713 c  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΑΛΑΜΟΙ [1]  
Theoc. 23.27  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΕΒΟΥΛΕΥΜΕΝΟΝ [1]  
Helio. 4.17  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΕΒΟΥΛΕΥΣΑ [1]  
Pl. Smp. 203 b  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΕΒΟΥΛΗ [1]  
Ael. VH 13.1  
(155.15)  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΕΒΟΥΛΟΣ [1]  
Pl. Smp. 203 b  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΕΒΟΥΛΟΣ [1]  
Fr. Gren. 5  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΕΒΟΥΛΗΝ [1]  
Lucian D. Meretr.  
12.311  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΕΒΟΥΛΟΝΙΟΝ [1]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 29  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΕΒΑΣ [2]  
A.P. 5.191.7;  
12.23.4  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΕΒΟΥΝΤΕΣ [1]  
Helio. 4.17  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΕΠΕΡΟΣ [1]  
Alciph. 4.8.2  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΥΜΕΙΣ [1]  
1.14.5  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΥΜΕΝΑΝΤΕΣ [1]  
Isaues Pyrr. 17  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΥΜΗΤΗΡ [1]  
Pl. Smp. 203 b  
ΕΠΕΙΣΘΥΜΙΑΝ [2]  
Ael. N.A. 1.50;  
Alciph. 4.8.2
ΕΠΙΘΥΜΙΑΣ [1]  
J. Chrys. Hom. 37
ΕΠΙΚΑΜΠΗΣ [1]  
2.20.1ff
ΕΠΙΚΑΙΝΑΣΑ [1]  
2.20.15ff
ΕΠΙΚΡΟΤΟΥΝΤΕΣ [1]  
Ael. VH 13.1  
(155.15)
ΕΠΙΚΣΜΑΖΟΝΤΑΣ [1]  
Stob. Anth. 3.2.18
ΕΠΙΚΣΜΑΖΟΝΤΟΣ [1]  
Iamb. V.P. 25.112
ΕΠΙΚΣΜΑΖΟΥΣΙΝ [1]  
Stob. Anth. 3.2.18
ΕΠΙΚΣΜΑΣΑΙ [2]  
Chariton 1.3.2;  
Plu. Mor. 455 B
ΕΠΙΜΑΝΟΣ [1]  
Fr. Gren. 29
ΕΠΙΜΕΛΟΜΕΝΟΝ [1]  
Xen. Mem. 3.11.10
ΕΠΙΜΕΛΕΙ [1]  
1.27.5ff
ΕΠΙΝΕΥΕ [1]  
Philostr. Ep. 39
ΕΠΙΝΟΟΥΣΑ [1]  
Chariton 1.3.5
ΕΠΙΟΝ [1]  
A.P. 12.115.1
ΕΠΙΠΑΣΤΩΝ [1]  
Theoc. 11.2
ΕΠΙΠΕΔΟΥΝ [1]  
Chariton 1.3.4
ΕΠΙΠΕΔΟΝ [1]  
Lucian D. Meretr.  
14.3
ΕΠΙΠΕΘΩΝ [1]  
Helio. 4.17
ΕΠΙΠΟΛΑΙΩΝ [1]  
Lucian D. Meretr.  
8.2
ΕΠΙΣΚΕΒΑΘΑΙ [1]  
Xen. Mem. 3.11.10
ΕΠΙΣΚΕΒΑΘΑΙ [1]  
Isaeeus Pyrr. 14
ΕΠΙΣΚΙΡΘΕΙΝ [1]  
A.P. 5.103.3
ΕΠΙΣΤΕΙΣΑΣ [1]  
Theoc. 23.38
ΕΠΙΣΤΙΜΑΙ [1]  
Theoc. 11.38
ΕΠΙΣΤΈΑ [2]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 17;  
D. Meretr. 8.3
ΕΠΙΣΤΕΨΕΩΣΤΑΙ [1]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 29
ΕΠΙΣΥΝΑΛΛΟΝΤΕΣ [1]  
2.19.20
ΕΠΙΣΤΑΣΑ [1]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 17
ΕΠΙΣΤΑΣΙΕΣ [1]  
Lib. Or. 46.31.1
ΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΕΙ [1]  
2.20.15ff
ΕΠΙΣΥΩΧΟΝΤΩΝ [1]  
Isaeeus Pyrr. 14
ΕΠΙΨΩΝ [1]  
Ant. Lib. 39.1
ΕΠΙΣΘΕΡΩΥΣΑ [1]  
Philo Husb. 37
ΕΠΙΣΘΕΡΟΙΖΟΙΑ [1]  
Theoc. 7.127
ΕΠΙΣΘΕΡΙΕΙΝ [1]  
Pl. Smp. 182 e
ΕΠΙΣΘΗΜΗ [1]  
Herodas 2.63
ΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΗ [3]  
Chariton 1.3.2  
Ant. Lib. 39.6
ΕΠΙΣΤΙΜΗ [1]  
Theoc. 11.80
ΕΠΙΣΤΙΜΗ [1]  
Philostr. Ep. 29
ΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΗΣ [1]  
A.P. 12.131.1
ΕΠΗΣ [1]  
A.P. 6.71.7
ΕΠΙΡΑΤΩΝ [1]  
Alciph. 4.9.1
ΕΠΙΡΗΣΩΣ [1]  
Herodas 2.39
ΕΠΙΣΩΛ [1]  
Plu. Mor. 759 B
ΕΡΑΘΥΜΕΙ [1]  
Babrius 116.14
ΕΡΑΘΥΜΕΙ [1]  
A.P. 5.167.6; Fr.  
Gren. 29; Philostr.  
V.S. 485; Pl. Smp.  
182 d; Plu. Mor.  
753 B
ΕΡΑΣΜΕΙ [1]  
Ath. 13.567 e
ΕΡΑΣΜΗ [3]  
Ael. VH 13.1  
(155.5); Pl. Smp.  
183 a; Plu. Mor.  
772 E
ΕΡΑΣΜΗ [3]  
Chariton 1.3.6;  
Lucian D. Meretr.  
12.311; Theoc.  
23.15
ΕΡΑΣΜΗ [2]  
Pl. Smp. 182 e;  
Plu. Gal. 19.5
ΕΡΑΣΤΗΝ [9]  
Ael. M.A. 9.13;  
Alciph. 4.9.4 (2);  
4.17.5; A.P.  
5.23.3; 12.131.3;  
1.27.15ff; Callim.  
Epigr. 64.3; Lucian  
D. Meretr. 14.1
ΕΡΑΣΤΗ [1]  
Pl. Smp. 203 b
ΕΡΑΣΤΡΙΑΣ [1]  
2.20.30ff
ΕΡΑΣΤΡΙΑΣ [5]  
Alciph. 4.9.2; A.P.  
6.1.1; 9.621.5;  
Ath. 13.585; Lucian  
Bis Acc. 31
ΕΡΑΣΤΡΙΑΣ [1]  
Plu. Mor. 753 A
ΕΡΓΑ [2]  
Philostr. Ep. 29;  
Pl. Smp. 182 e
ΕΡΓΑΣΖΟΜΕΝΩ [1]  
Pl. Smp. 182 e
ΕΡΓΑΣΖΟΜΕΝΩ [1]  
A.P. 5.206.2
ΕΡΓΩΝ [2]
Ant. Lib. 39.3; 39.4
ΕΡΓΟΥ [1]
Philostr. Ep. 29
ΕΡΓΩ [1]
Iamb. V.P. 25.112
ΕΡΓΩΘΕΙ [1]
A.P. 5.256.4
ΕΡΓΩΘΕΙΖΟΤΟ [1]
Theoc. 23.15
ΕΡΓΕΙ [1]
Aristae. Ep. 2.20.5ff
ΕΡΓΕΙΣΑΜΕΝΟΣ [1]
Theoc. 23.49
ΕΡΕΙΧΗΑΟΥΣΑ [1]
Lucian Musc. 10
ΕΡΕΙΤΤΟΥΣΙΝ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.12.4
ΕΡΗΘΑΙΚΙΣ [1]
Theoc. 3.35
ΕΡΙΣ [1]
Fr. Gren. 34
ΕΡΧΕΝΑΣΣΑ [1]
A.P. 5.281.1
ΕΡΝΟΣ [2]
Ar. Ec. 973a; Theoc. 2.121
ΕΡΟΞΕΝΑΝ [1]
Anac. 373.2
ΕΡΟΥΣΙΝ [1]
Ar. Ec. 703
ΕΡΡΑΙΝΟΝ [1]
Sch. Ar. Pl. 179
ΕΡΡΑΝΑΝ [1]
Chariton 1.3.2
ΕΡΡΙΖΩΣΕΝ [1]
Ant. Lib. 39.6
ΕΡΡΙΘΘΩ [1]
A.P. 12.117.5
ΕΡΡΙΘΘΕΝ [1]
Chariton 1.3.2
ΕΡΡΙΘΣΑ [1]
Theoc. 11.57
ΕΡΡΙΘΣΕ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.2.2
ΕΡΡΥΚΟΙ [1]
Theoc. 7.127
ΕΡΧΕΤΑΙ [1]
P. Teb. 20
ΕΡΧΟΜΑΙ [1]
Ar. Ec. 948
ΕΡΧΟΝΤΑΙ [1]
Isaeeus Pyrr. 14
ΕΡΩ [1]
A.P. 12.90.1
ΕΡΩΘ [1]
A.P. 12.115.4
ΕΡΩΜΑΝΗΝ [1]
A.P. 5.256.4
ΕΡΩΜΑΝΕΑΣ [1]
Aristae. Ep. 2.20.25ff
ΕΡΩΜΗ [1]
Iamb. V.P. 25.112
ΕΡΩΜΗΝ [3]
Ael. N.A. 1.50; Alci.eph. 4.9.3; Aristae. Ep.
ΕΡΩΜΟΝ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 29
ΕΡΩΜΟΝΟΣ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr. 14.1
ΕΡΩΝ [3]
Ar. Pl. 1009; Men. Dysc. 59; Theophr. 27.9
ΕΡΩΝΤΑ [1]
J. Chrys. Hom. 37
ΕΡΩΝΤΑΣ [2]
Aristae. Ep. 1.27.5ff; Philostr. Im. 1.12.4
ΕΡΩΝΤΕΣ [2]
Philostr. Im. 1.12.4; V.S. 485
ΕΡΩΝΤΩ [2]
Pl. Smp. 182 d; 183 b
ΕΡΩΝΤΩΝ [1]
A.P. 5.145.3
ΕΡΩΣ [9]
Ant. Lib. 39.3; A.P. 5.229.5; 12.116.3; Ar. Ec. 954; Fr. Gren. 9; 32; Lucian D. Meretr. 15.2;
Philostr. Ep. 28; Theoc. 23.47
ΕΡΩΣ [10]
A.P. 12.23.3;
12.85.4; 12.117.6;
12.167.2; Ar. Ec. 58; 967; Fr. Gren. 14; Philostr. Ep. 14; Pl. Smp. 203 b
(2)
ΕΡΟΣΑΝ [1]
Aristae. Ep. 2.16.1ff
ΕΡΟΣΗ [2]
Pl. Mor. 759 B; Theoc. 23.24
ΕΡΟΣΙΝ [2]
Aristae. Ep. 2.20.1ff; Chariton 1.3.7
ΕΡΟΣΤ [1]
Men. Dysc. 62
ΕΡΟΣΤΑ [12]
A.P. 5.189.3; Lucian D. Meretr. 8.2; Philostr. Ep. 29; Pl. Smp. 203 b; Theoc. 2.118; 3.15; 3.42; 11.1; 11.80;
23.4; 23.3; 23.43
ΕΡΟΤΑΣ [1]
A.P. 5.256.3
ΕΡΟΤΗ [4]
A.P. 5.167.1;
5.213.4; 12.117.3;
Sch. Ar. Pl. 179
ΕΡΟΤΙΚΑ [1]
Pl. Mor. 753 B
ΕΡΟΤΙΚΑΙ [1]
Pl. Mor. 455 B
ΕΡΟΤΙΚΑΣ [2]
Lucian Bis Acc. 31; Philo Hub. 37
ΕΡΟΤΙΧΗΝ [1]
Pl. Mor. 759 B
ΕΡΟΤΙΚΟΝ [1]
Helio. 4.17
ΕΡΟΤΙΚΟΣ [2]
Aristae. Ep. 2.19.15ff; 2.20.1ff
ΕΡΟΤΙΚΩ [1]
Lucian D. Mar. 1.4
ΕΡΟΤΙΚΩΝ [2]
1.14.10ff; Plu.
Mor. 766 b

Eρτος [7]
A. P. 12.72.5;
12.85.9; Aristaeon.
Ep. 1.27.5ff; Them.
013.162.c; Theoc.
2.29; 2.151; 23.20

Eρτυαον [1]
Theoc. 3.7

Eρτυθ [1]
Stob. Anth. 3.2.18

Ερτυμενος [1]
Stob. Anth. 3.2.18

Εσεναι [1]
Alciph. 4.8.2

Εσι [2]
Ar. Ec. 696; Prat.
708.7

Εσιτα [1]
Lucian D. Meretr.
8.3

Ειαον [2]
Theoc. 2.112; 11.28

Εμον [2]
A. P. 6.1.2; 9.621.5

Ενεπα [1]
Chariton 1.3.1

Ενεπαν [2]
Alciph. 4.8.2; Lucian Bis Acc. 16

Ενεπας [1]
1.27.1ff

Ενεπον [1]
A. P. 5.206.5

Ενεπος [1]
A. P. 5.255.2

Ενευδε [1]
Chariton 1.3.3

Ενευδαον [1]
Ael. VH 13.1
(155.15)

Ενεφανειμον [1]
Philostr. Im.
1.12.4

Ενεφανεμονος [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 17

Ενεφαςαν [1]
Chariton 1.3.2

Ενθ [1]

A. P. 12.72.3

Ενθακα [1]
Lucian D. Meretr.
14.1

Ενθακε [1]
Men. Sam. 406

Ενθεαντο [1]
Philostr. Ep. 39

Ενθεα [1]
Plu. Mor. 713 c

Ενθαρθει [1]
Helio. 4.17

Ενθομαι [1]
A. P. 12.90.5

Ενθατον [1]
J. Chrys. Hom. 37

Ενηκ [1]
Alciph. 4.8.2

Ενθομαθεμενη [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 31

Ενίαπ [2]
Isaebus Pyrr. 13; 15

Ενιαπαιε [2]
1.14.5ff; Lucian
Bis Acc. 17

Ενιαπαν [1]
1.14.1ff

Ενιαπαι [3]
Alciph. 4.9.1; Men. Dysc. 59;
Theophrastus 27.9

Ενιαπη [2]
A. P. 12.90.1;
12.90.3

Ενιαπικον [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 31

Ενιαποι [1]
Theoc. 23.48

Ενιαπος [1]
Theoc. 23.45

Ενιαπον [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 17

Ενιαομεν [1]
Chariton 1.2.3

Ενεκ [1]
Theoc. 11.54

Ενεχωθ [1]
2.20.10ff

Ενθ [1]

Lucian D. Meretr.
14.4

Ενοπαμεην [1]
Chariton 1.3.2

Ενταθη [1]
Theoc. 3.16

Εντυγχανετο [1]
Ant. Lib. 39.3

Εντυτταν [1]
Lucian D. Meretr.
8.3

Εντυξ [1]
Ael. VH 13.1
(155.20)

Εντυχον [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 17

Εντιαμονια [1]
Ant. Lib. 39.1

Εντιαμονιζοντες [1]
Lib. Or. 46.31.1

Εντιαρι [1]
Theoc. 1045

Εντιαιν [1]
Labius 116.12

Εντοκα [1]
Fr. Gren. 28

Εντον [1]
Theoc. 2.126

Εντοεις [1]
Stob. Anth. 3.2.18

Εντοετιοσεν [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 31

Εντοη [1]
Fr. Gren. 37

Εντογη [8]
Alciph. 4.17.5;
A. P. 5.256.6;
12.252.2; Lucian
Bis Acc. 31; D.
Meretr. 12.311;
15.2; Men. Dysc.
59; Theoc. 11.23

Εντοπη [1]
A. P. 5.229.4

Εντορκε [1]
Ael. VH 13.1
(155.20)

Εντοκαλοι [2]
A. P. 5.206.2;
Chariton 1.3.7

Εντομενετεροις [1]
Alciph. 4.9.4
ΕΥΜΟΡΦΙΑ [1]  
1.27.15ff  
ΕΥΜΟΥΣΩΣ [1]  
1.27.5ff  
ΕΥΝΗ [2]  
ΠΡΩ. 4.2744;  
Philost. Im. 1.2.1  
ΕΥΝΗ [2]  
Ar. Ec. 959; 968  
ΕΥΝΟΙΑ [1]  
Philost. Ep. 29  
ΕΥΝΟΥΝ [1]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 16  
ΕΥΘΥΜΟΣΙ [1]  
Theoc. 3.23  
ΕΥΘΥΡΩΝ [1]  
1.27.5ff  
ΕΥΘΡΕΤΕΙΝ [1]  
Ar. Ec. 702a  
ΕΥΦΕ [3]  
Ath. 14.638 d;  
14.638 e; Theoc.  
11.17  
ΕΥΦΕΙΝ [1]  
Theoc. 11.4  
ΕΥΦΕΤΗΣ [1]  
Fr. Gren. 7  
ΕΥΡΗ [1]  
A. P. 5.43.1  
ΕΥΡΗΚΑΣ [1]  
Lucian D. Meretr.  
14.1  
ΕΥΡΗΚΕΙΣ [1]  
Theoc. 11.76  
ΕΥΡΗΝ [1]  
Lucian D. Meretr.  
14.4  
ΕΥΣΤΟΜΟΣ [1]  
2.19.5ff  
ΕΥΣΤΡΕΨΗ [2]  
Helio. 4.17; Men.  
Sam. 414  
ΕΥΣΥΧΕΙ [1]  
Antiphanes fr.  
239.4  
ΕΥΣΥΧΕΣΤΕΡΟΥΣ [1]  
A. P. 20.48.1  
ΕΥΘΡΟΝΗ [1]  
Ar. Ec. 954  
ΕΥΘΡΟΝΗ [1]  
Alicp. 4.8.2  
ΕΥΘΡΩΝΗ [1]  
Babrius 116.1  
ΕΥΘΘΑΙ ΑΣ [1]  
Phil. Sap. 203 b  
ΕΘΑΒΙΚΑ [1]  
Theoc. 23.56  
ΕΘΑΒΩΝ [1]  
Theoc. 23.60  
ΕΘΑΒΩ [1]  
Theoc. 23.1  
ΕΘΑΝ [1]  
2.19.15ff  
ΕΘΑΡΜΟΤΕΕΘΘΑΙ [1]  
Philost. Im. 1.2.5  
ΕΘΑΣΑΝ [1]  
Philost. Im.  
1.12.4  
ΕΘΑΣΕ [1]  
2.20.1ff  
ΕΘΑΣΕΚΑΙ [1]  
1.14.1ff  
ΕΘΑΣΩ [1]  
Philost. Im.  
1.12.4  
ΕΘΙΠΟΝ [1]  
Theoc. 11.55  
ΕΘΩΣΘΚΕΝ [1]  
Philost. Im. 1.2.1  
ΕΘΩ [6]  
1.27.1ff; 2.19.1ff;  
2.19.10ff; 2.19.15;  
Philost. V.S. 485 (2)  
ΕΘΗΒΟΣ [1]  
Philost. Im.  
1.2.2ff  
ΕΘΗΒΟΥΣ [1]  
Helio. 4.17  
ΕΘΗΜΕΡΑ [1]  
2.20.30ff  
ΕΘΗΜΕΡΟΥΣ [1]  
Philost. Ep. 29  
ΕΘΗΝ [1]  
Lucian D. Meretr.  
15.2  
ΕΘΗΝ [1]  
Stob. Anth. 3.2.18  
ΕΘΗΣ [1]  
1.14.5ff  
ΕΘΩΑΣΘΚΑΙ [1]  
Theoc. 2.114  
ΕΘΩΑΣΘΚΑΙ [1]  
Theoc. 2.115  
ΕΘΗΣ [1]  
Ant. Lib. 39.2  
ΕΘΗΑΕΘ [3]  
A. P. 12.118.5;  
Theoc. 2.126; 11.55  
ΕΘΗΣΘΘΗΝ [1]  
A. P. 5.281.5  
ΕΘΗΝΙΘΘΗΝ [1]  
Theoc. 23.61  
ΕΘΗΙΘ [1]  
Ant. Lib. 39.3  
ΕΘΘΙΘ [1]  
Theoc. 2.155  
ΕΘΘΕΘΘΕΘ [1]  
Theoc. 23.62  
ΕΘΘΟΜΙΘΣΘΝΘ [1]  
Philost. Im.  
1.12.4  
ΕΘΘΕΘΘΕΘΘΘΘΘ [1]  
Theoc. 23.59  
ΕΘΘΘΑ [1]  
2.20.10ff  
ΕΘΘΕ [1]  
2.20.5ff  
ΕΘΘΘΘ [9]  
Alicp. 4.9.4; Ath.  
13.567 e; A. P.  
5.191.5; 5.213.1;  
Ar. Ec. 957; Fr.  
Gren. 3; 23; 29;  
Philost. Ep. 28  
ΕΘΘΘΘ [2]  
Lucian D. Meretr.  
15.2; Theoc. 11.49  
ΕΘΘΕΘ [2]  
A. P. 12.117.2;  
2.16.1ff  
ΕΘΘ [1]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alciphi. 4.8.1; Aristaen. Ep. 2.16.1ff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἩΔΥΝΑΤΟ [1]</td>
<td>Plu. <em>Mor.</em> 772 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἩΔΥΝΕΥΤΕ [1]</td>
<td>A. P. 5.118.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΕ [1]</td>
<td>Theoc. 2.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΕΘΕΛΕ [2]</td>
<td>Chariton 1.3.4; Theoc. 3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΗΙΣΕΩΝ [1]</td>
<td>A. P. 12.23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΚΕ [2]</td>
<td>Alciphi. 4.9.5; A. P. 5.189.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΚΕΙ [1]</td>
<td>Philostr. <em>Im.</em> 1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΚΕΝ [1]</td>
<td>Lucian <em>Bis Acc.</em> 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΚΟ [1]</td>
<td><em>PGM</em> 4.2756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΚΟΝΤΑ [1]</td>
<td>Lucian <em>D. Meretr.</em> 15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΚΟΥΕΤΟ [1]</td>
<td>Lucian <em>D. Meretr.</em> 15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΚΟΥΕΤΑΝ [1]</td>
<td>Philostr. <em>Im.</em> 1.12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΛΘΕ [1]</td>
<td>Babrius 116.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΛΘΟΝ [1]</td>
<td>A. P. 5.213.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΛΙΑΚΙΑ [1]</td>
<td>Philostr. <em>Im.</em> 1.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΛΙΚΙΗΣ [1]</td>
<td>A. P. 5.118.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΛΙΩΝ [1]</td>
<td>A. P. 5.165.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΛΩΘΕΝ [1]</td>
<td>Herodas 2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΛΩΘΕΣ [1]</td>
<td>A. P. 5.187.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΜΕΝ [4]</td>
<td>Theoc. 3.8; 11.50; 11.79; 23.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΜΕΡΑ [2]</td>
<td>Ant. <em>Lib.</em> 39.5; Chariton 1.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΜΕΡΑΙ [1]</td>
<td>Lucian <em>D. Meretr.</em> 8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΜΕΡΑΝ [3]</td>
<td>Alciphi. 4.9.4; Lucian <em>Bis Acc.</em> 16; Plu. <em>Mor.</em> 759 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΜΕΡΑΣ [1]</td>
<td>Alciphi. 4.17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΜΕΡΕΠΟΝ [1]</td>
<td>Theoc. 1046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΜΕΡΕΠΟΥ [1]</td>
<td>Isaeeus <em>Pyrr.</em> 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΜΕΡΕΡΑΙ [1]</td>
<td>Isaeeus <em>Pyrr.</em> 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΜΕΡΕΤΟΥ [1]</td>
<td>Chariton 1.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΜΗΝΕΝΑΙΣ [1]</td>
<td>Helio. 4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΜΗΝΕΙΑΣ [1]</td>
<td>Lucian <em>D. Meretr.</em> 12.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΝΑΙΚΑΣΑ [1]</td>
<td>Lucian <em>Bis Acc.</em> 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΝΗΝΚΕ [1]</td>
<td>Fr. <em>Gren.</em> 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΝΗΝΚΕ [1]</td>
<td>Theoc. 23.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΝΗΘΟΣ [1]</td>
<td>Theoc. 23.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΝΗΘΕΣ [1]</td>
<td>Theoc. 11.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΝΘΟΝ [4]</td>
<td>Theoc. 2.118 (2); 2.128; 23.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΝΙΑΣ [2]</td>
<td>A. P. 12.117.1; Theoc. 3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΝΙΑΣΑΣ [2]</td>
<td>A. P. 5.23.4; Cal-lim. <em>Epigr.</em> 64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΣΕΙ [1]</td>
<td>Theoc. 23.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΣΙΘΕΑΝ [1]</td>
<td>Isaeeus <em>Pyrr.</em> 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΣΙΘΕΙ [1]</td>
<td>Theoc. 11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΣΙΘΕΙΑΙ [1]</td>
<td>Lucian <em>D. Meretr.</em> 8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΠΑΚΑΕΙΩΝ [1]</td>
<td>Plu. <em>Mor.</em> 772 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΠΑΚΛΕΟΣ [1]</td>
<td>Theoc. 2.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΠΑΚΛΟΘΗ [1]</td>
<td>Theoc. 11.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΗΠΑΚΛΟΘΕΘΑΝ [1]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ΚΑΔΩΝ [1]  
Anac. 373.2
ΚΑΕΣ [1]  
Plu. Gal. 19.5
ΚΑΛΑΣ [1]  
Theoc. 23.19
ΚΑΚΑΣ [1]  
Babrius 116.13
ΚΑΚΑΣΩΝ [1]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 16
ΚΑΚΟΔΑΜΩΝ [1]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 16
ΚΑΚΟΙ [1]  
Ael. VH 13.1
(155.15)
ΚΑΚΩΝ [2]  
Ar. Vesp. 1253; Theoc. 23.60
ΚΑΚΩΣ [1]  
Philostr. Ep. 39
ΚΑΚΩΣΩΝ [1]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 29
ΚΑΛΑ [2]  
Theoc. 6.33; 7.127
ΚΑΛΑ [1]  
Theoc. 3.46
ΚΑΛΑΣ [1]  
Philostr. Ep. 14
ΚΑΛΑΙ [1]  
Aristae. Ep. 1.20; 20.35ff
ΚΑΛΑΙΣ [1]  
Theoc. 2.116
ΚΑΛΑΙΣΩΝ [1]  
Aristae. Ep. 2.125
ΚΑΛΑΙΣΩΝ [1]  
Chariton 1.3.4
ΚΑΛΑΙΣΩΝ [1]  
Theoc. 11.64
ΚΑΛΑΙΣΩΝ [1]  
Aristae. Ep. 2.125
κελεσισ [1]  
Plu. Mor. 753 B
ΚΑΛΑΣ [1]  
Plu. Mor. 759 B
ΚΑΛΑΣ [1]  
Plu. Mor. 759 B
ΚΑΛΑΣ [1]  
Plu. Mor. 759 B
ΚΑΛΑΣ [1]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 29
Ρ. Πειρ. 18
ΚΑΛΑΣ [1]  
Philostr. Ep. 1.20; 20.35ff
κελεσισ [1]  
Plu. Mor. 753 B
κελεσισ [1]  
Plu. Mor. 759 B
κελεσισ [1]  
Plu. Mor. 759 B
κελεσισ [1]  
Aristae. Ep. 2.0.125; 2.3.2.18
κελεσισ [1]  
Aristae. Ep. 1.27.55ff; Stob. Anth. 1.27.55ff; Stob. Anth. 3.2.18
κελεσισ [1]  
Pl. Smp. 203 b
κελεσισ [1]  
Pl. Smp. 182 d
κελεσισ [1]  
A. P. 6.71.10
κελεσισ [1]  
Lucian D. Meretr. 8.3 (2)
κελεσισ [1]  
Theoc. 11.52
κελεσισ [1]  
Theoc. 23.33
κελεσισ [1]  
Philostr. Im. 1.2.1
κελεσισ [1]  
Plu. Mor. 759 B
ΚΕΙΤΑΙ [1]
A. P. 6. 71. 4
ΚΕΚΑΛΕΙΜΕΝΟΝ [1]
Chariton 1. 3. 4
ΚΕΚΑΛΗΤΑΙ [1]
Ael. N. A. 9. 13
ΚΕΚΤΗΜΕΝΗ [2]
Aristaen. Ep. 2. 19. 5ff; 2. 19. 10ff
ΚΕΛΑΔΕΙΝ [1]
Prat. 708. 3
ΚΕΛΕΥΣΕΙ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1. 2. 3
ΚΕΛΟΝΤΑΙ [1]
Theoc. 11. 77
ΚΕΝΕΑΣ [1]
A. P. 12. 90. 8
ΚΕΝΕΩΣΙΙ [1]
Theoc. 3. 20
ΚΕΝΗΣ [1]
Aristaen. Ep. 2. 20. 35ff
ΚΕΝΤΑΥΡΟΝ [1]
Ael. VH 13. 1
(155. 5)
ΚΕΡΑΙΝΟΥ [1]
A. P. 5. 64. 1
ΚΕΡΑΙΝΩΝ [1]
A. P. 12. 115. 3
ΚΕΡΑΕΙ [1]
ΚΕΡΚΙΔΟΣ [1]
Aristaen. Ep. 1. 27. 5ff
ΚΕΦΑΛΑΙΕΣ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1. 2. 5
ΚΕΦΑΛΑΝ [2]
Theoc. 3. 52; 11. 70
ΚΕΦΑΛΗΝ [3]
Alciph. 4. 9. 2; Aristaen. Ep. 2. 19. 15ff; Lucian Bis Acc. 16
ΚΕΦΑΛΗΣ [3]
A. P. 5. 145. 5; PGM 4. 2735; Philostr. Im. 1. 2. 3
ΚΕΦΑΛΕΥΣΕΙΝ [1]
Ant. Lib. 39. 6
ΚΗΜΑΥΤΟΝ [1]
Theoc. 11. 39
ΚΗΜΟΝ [1]
Pl. Smp. 203 b
ΚΗΡΟΝ [1]
Theoc. 2. 28
ΚΗΡΟΣ [1]
A. P. 12. 72. 4
ΚΗΡΙ [1]
A. P. 5. 206. 6
ΚΘΑΡΙΣΜΑΤΑ [1]
Aristaen. Ep. 1. 14. 5ff
ΚΙΚΙΝΝΟΣ [1]
Theoc. 11. 10
ΚΙΝΑΛΥΟΣ [1]
J. Chrys. Hom. 37
ΚΙΣΣΟΥ [1]
Theoc. 3. 22
ΚΙΣΣΩΝ [1]
Theoc. 3. 14
ΚΙΣΣΟΣ [1]
Theoc. 11. 46
ΚΙΧΑΙΩΝΤΙ [1]
Theoc. 11. 78
ΚΑΛΑΟΥΣ [1]
Ael. VH 13. 1
(155. 10)
ΚΑΛΑΕΙΝ [3]
Alciph. 4. 9. 4 (2); Philostr. Ep. 39
ΚΑΛΑΙ [1]
A. P. 5. 43. 5
ΚΑΛΑΟΝΤΑ [1]
Alciph. 4. 8. 2
ΚΑΛΑΟΝΤΟΣ [1]
J. Chrys. Hom. 37
ΚΑΛΑΟΥΣΑ [1]
A. P. 5. 43. 3
ΚΑΛΑΟΥΣΑΝ [1]
A. P. 5. 229. 1
ΚΑΛΙΩ [1]
Chariton 1. 3. 5
ΚΑΛΙΩ [1]
Theoc. 6. 32
ΚΑΛΙΟΥΤ [1]
Men. Sam. 406
ΚΑΛΕΣΤΑ [1]
A. P. 6. 71. 2
ΚΑΛΗΤΑΙ [1]
Aristaen. Ep. 2. 20. 15ff
ΚΑΛΥΣΕ [1]
Theoc. 23. 55
ΚΑΛΥΣΕΙΣ [1]
Theoc. 23. 34
ΚΑΛΥΣΤΟΝ [1]
Theoc. 23. 38
ΚΑΛΩΝ [1]
Alciph. 4. 9. 5
ΚΑΛΙΘΡΩΝ [1]
Helio. 4. 17
ΚΑΛΙΟΜΑΧΟΥ [1]
Ath. 14. 638 f
ΚΑΛΙΟΦΩΝΤΟΣ [1]
A. P. 5. 153. 3
ΚΑΛΗΘΕΙΣ [1]
A. P. 5. 164. 3
ΚΑΛΙΜΑΚΙΟΝ [1]
Aristophan 5. 6
ΚΑΙΝΘΡΙ [1]
Theoc. 2. 113
ΚΑΛΥΣΙΩΝΟΝ [1]
Aristaen. Ep. 1. 27. 40ff
ΚΑΛΙΜΠΑΣ [1]
A. P. 12. 85. 2
ΚΑΛΙΜΠΩΝ [1]
A. P. 5. 213. 3
ΚΗΝΗΜΗ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1. 2. 2
ΚΙΝΩΣΕΙ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1. 12. 4
ΚΙΝΣΑΙ [1]
Alciph. 4. 10. 3
ΚΟΙΑΝΝΟΝ [1]
Theoc. 23. 43
ΚΟΙΑΝ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1. 2. 5
ΚΟΙΜΑΘΑΙ [3]
A. P. 5. 23. 2; Babrius 116. 5; Cal- lim. Epigr. 64. 2
ΚΟΙΜΑΘΩ [1]
A. P. 5. 165. 5
ΚΟΙΜΗΘΕΙΝ [1]
Lib. Or. 46. 31. 1
ΚΟΙΜΗΘΗΣΟΜΕΝΟΣ [1]
Alciph. 4. 10. 3
ΚΟΙΜΗΣΕΙΣ [2]
Aristaen. Ep. 2. 20. 20ff; Pl. Smp. 183 a
ΚΟΙΜΙΖΕΙΣ [2]
MAKRA [1]  
Theoc. 11.32
MAKRHI [1]  
A.P. 5.189.1
MAKRHN [1]  
A.P. 12.116.3
MAKPOY [1]  
Lucian D. Meretr. 8.2
MAKΩN [1]  
Theoc. 11.57
MAA [1]  
Theoc. 3.41
MAAA [6]  
Ael. VH 13.1  
(155.20); Aristaen. Ep. 1.27.5ff;  
Lucian D. Meretr. 15.2; Philostr. Im. 1.2.1; Theoc. 2.120; 3.10
MAAΘAKOIΣ [1]  
Athen. 14.638 d
MAAΣIΣTA [3]  
Lucian D. Meretr. 14.4; Philostr. Im. 1.2.5; Pl. Smp. 182 d
MAAΣΩN [8]  
A.P. 5.256.4;  
5.281.5; Ant. Lib. 39.2; Aristaen. Ep. 2.20.10ff;  
2.20.15ff; Lucian Bis Acc. 17; Theoc. 11.74; 23.15
MAAΩΣIΣ [1]  
Theoc. 11.10
MAAΩN [1]  
Theoc. 23.8
MAANOΞEI [1]  
Aristae. Ep. 2.20.20ff
MANIΛIΣ [1]  
Theoc. 11.11
MANIAN [2]  
Philo Husb. 37; Plu. Mor. 759 B
MANTHN [1]  
A.P. 12.115.1
MANNXΩΦΙΣ [1]  
Theoc. 11.41
MANTΣIΣ [1]  
Theoc. 3.43
MAPAINΕI [1]  
Theoc. 23.28
MAPAINΕTAI [1]  
Theoc. 23.30
MAPAINOMΕΝΩΝ [1]  
A.P. 5.118.3
MAPAINΟΥΧΑΝ [1]  
Philostr. Im. 1.2.5
MAPANAN [1]  
A.P. 5.153.3
MAPANΘΕΙΣ [1]  
A.P. 5.191.5
MAPΕΥΑΝ [1]  
Plu. Mor. 713 d
MAPΤΥΡΙΑΣ [1]  
Isaues Pyrr. 15
MAPΤΥΡΟΜΑΙ [1]  
A.P. 5.164.1
MAPΤΡΟΠΟΝ [1]  
Aristae. Ep. 2.19.1ff
MATHN [3]  
A.P. 5.256.3;  
MATP [4]  
Theoc. 3.16; 3.45;  
11.54; 11.67
MAXΛΣ [1]  
Theoc. 11.26
MAXH [1]  
Isaues Pyrr. 13
MATH [1]  
Philostr. Ep. 29
META [5]  
A.P. 12.115.1;  
12.116.1; Fr. Gren. 19; Helio. 4.17; P. Teb. 15
METΑΛΔΛΣ [1]  
Theoc. 11.16
METΑΛΔΛΥΧΕΙΣ [1]  
Aristae. Ep. 2.20.30ff
METΑΛΗ [1]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 29
METΑΡΕΥΣ [1]  
Lucian D. Meretr. 15.2
METΑΣ [2]  
A.P. 12.116.4;  
Philostr. Im. 1.2.4
METΕΣΤΑ [2]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 16;  
Pl. Smp. 183 a
METΙΣΤΟΝ [1]  
Aristae. Ep. 1.27.15ff
MEΘ [2]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 16;  
Plu. Mor. 759 B
MEΘΕΣ [2]  
Ar. Ec. 958; 967
MEΘΗ [2]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 17;  
Philo Cherub. 92
MEΘΗΝ [1]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 17
MEΘΗΣ [3]  
A.P. 5.71.2; Lucian  
Bis Acc. 16; Philo Husb. 37
MEΘΥΕΙΝ [1]  
Philostr. Im. 1.2.2
MEΘΥΟΝΤΟΣ [1]  
Iamb. V.P. 25.112
MEΘΥΟΝΤΩΝ [1]  
Lucian Bis Acc. 31
MEΘΥΣΘΕΙΣ [2]  
Ar. Ec. 691; Pl. Smp. 203 b
MEΘΥΟ [2]  
A.P. 12.116.1; Men.  
Dysc. 60
MEΘΥΩ [5]  
A.P. 5.213.3;  
12.115.1; 12.252.2;  
Lucian Bis Acc. 16;  
P. Teb. 20
MEΠΑΚΙΑ [1]  
Philostr. Im. 1.12.4
MEΠΑΚΙΟΙΣ [1]  
Ar. Ec. 702b
MEΠΑΚΙΩΝ [3]  
Aristae. Ep. 2.20.1ff; Lucian  
Musc. 10; Plu. Mor. 772 F
MEΠΑΚΙΟΥ [1]  
Iamb. V.P. 25.112
MEΠΑΚΙΩ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr. 14.3

MITHIAEE [1]
Pl. Smp. 203 b

MITHRI [2]
A.P. 12.14.3;
Lucian D. Meretr. 14.3

MITHROS [4]
Alciph. 4.9.4;
Lucian D. Meretr. 12.311 (2); Pl.
Smp. 203 b

MIXANAE [1]
Pl. Smp. 203 b

MIKRON [7]
Alciph. 4.9.3;
Anac. 373.1; A.P. 5.213.2; Helio.
4.17; Lucian Bis Acc. 17 (2); D.
Merontr. 15.2

MIKTETON [1]
A.P. 12.131.1

MIMETAE [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.2.5

MINNET [1]
A.P. 5.145.2

MINOY [1]
Philostr. Ep. 28

MINNYRIOU [1]
Ant. Lib. 39.1

MISEIS [1]
Philo Husb. 37

MISES [1]
Ael. N.A. 9.13

MIN [1]
Ael. N.A. 1.50

MISEI [1]
Aristaen. Ep. 2.19.20ff

MISEI [1]
Theoc. 23.3

MISEI [1]
Theoc. 3.7

MISEYENTEE [1]
Theoc. 23.63

MICEASA [1]
Ant. Lib. 39.6

MIETON [1]
Herodas 2.64

MISEY [1]

MISEME [1]
Lucian D. Meretr. 14.3

MISEME [1]
Ath. 13.585

MISIOMATA [1]
Lucian D. Meretr. 14.4

MISISMATIA [1]
Alciph. 4.9.2

MISOY [1]
Aristaen. Ep. 1.27.15ff

MISOY [1]
Theoc. 23.62

MISICN [1]
Ant. Lib. 39.2

MINHMA [1]
Philostr. Ep. 29

MNEMHMA [1]
Philostr. Ep. 29

MHNHMK [1]
2.17.40ff; 2.19.20;
2.20.15ff; Ar. Pl.
1008; Lucian Bis Acc. 16; D. Meretr.
8.2; 15.2;
Philostr. Ep. 29;
Im. 1.12.4;
Prat. 708.8; Theoc.
2.126

MONO [4]
A.P. 5.167.2;
Chariton 1.3.1;
Lucian D. Meretr. 8.3; 14.1

MONOY [2]
Aristaen. Ep. 2.19.10ff;
2.20.25ff

MOPHAN [1]
Theoc. 23.2

MOPHON [1]
Them. 013.162.1

MORPHIE [1]
Aristaen. Ep. 1.27.1ff

MOXIO [1]
A.P. 5.167.3

MOXIO [1]
Theoc. 11.21

MOYEA [1]
Plu. Mor. 759 B

MOYIAE [1]
A.P. 5.206.3

MOYIAE [1]
Aristaen. Ep. 2.19.5ff

MOYECN [1]
A.P. 5.206.2
MOYΣΗ [2]
Ar. Ec. 973b; Ath. 14.638 d
MOYΣΙΚΟΝ [1]
Philostr. V.S. 485
MOYΣΙΣΑΙΩΝ [1]
Theoc. 11.81
MOXΛΕΥΕΙΝ [1]
Antiphanes 195.6
MOXΛΩ [1]
Theoc. 2.127
MΣΘΗΣΑΤΟ [1]
Theoc. 2.154
MΥΘΟΙΣ [1]
A.P. 12.115.1
MΥΘΟΙΣΙ [1]
Theoc. 23.6
MΥΣΟΝ [3]
A.P. 5.256.2;
6.71.8; Theoc. 2.113
MΥΘΟΣ [1]
A.P. 5.256.3
MΥΙΑΝ [1]
Lucian Musc. 10
MΥΙΣΕ [2]
A.P. 12.23.3;
12.167.1
MΥΝΔΙΟΣ [1]
Theoc. 2.29
MΥΠΙΑ [2]
A.P. 6.71.1;
12.118.1
MΥΡΙΟΛΕΙΚΑ [1]
2.20.1ff
MΥΡΟΙΣ [1]
Chariton 1.3.2
MΥΡΟΙΣΙ [1]
A.P. 6.71.3
MΥΡΟΝ [2]
Alciph. 4.9.2; A.P. 5.118.1
MΥΡΟΠΑΝΤΟΝ [1]
A.P. 5.198.2
MΥΡΡΙΝΟΥΝΤΙ [1]
Alciph. 4.9.2
MΥΡΤΑΛΗ [2]
Lucian D. Meretr.
14.1; 14.3
MΥΣΑΤΤΟΜΕΝΟΙ [1]
2.20.30ff
MΥΣΘΗΣ [1]
A.P. 5.191.7
NAI [6]
A.P. 5.165.2;
2.19.15ff;
Philostr. Ep. 14
(2); Theoc. 2.118;
Theoc. 1045
NAII [1]
Theoc. 11.81
NΛΙΑΔΩΝ [1]
Prat. 708.4
NAMA [1]
Theoc. 23.61
NΑΡΚΑΙΩΝ [1]
Theoc. 7.124
NΕΩ [1]
Theoc. 6.33
NΑΥΛΘΝ [1]
A.P. 12.167.4
NΑΥΤΗΣ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr.
14.3
NΑΥΤΟΥ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr.
14.3
NΕΑΝΙΣΚΟΙ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr.
15.2
NΕΑΝΙΣΚΟΣ [1]
2.20.5ff
NΕΒΡΟΣ [1]
Theoc. 11.40
NΕΙΝ [2]
Philostr. Im.
1.12.4; Theoc.
11.60
NΕΙΘΕ [1]
A.P. 5.64.1
NΕΚΡΟΝ [1]
Theoc. 23.53
NΕΚΡΟΣ [1]
Theoc. 23.53
NΕΚΡΟΣ [2]
Theoc. 23.41; 23.55
NΕΚΤΑΡΟΣ [1]
Pl. Smp. 203 b
NΕΜΕΣΙΣ [1]
NHΘΕΙΝ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 16
NHΘΟΝΤΑ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 16
NHΘΟΝΤΕΣ [1]
Plu. Mor. 759 B
NHΘΩΝ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 17
NIΚΑΡΕΤΗΣ [1]
A.P. 5.153.1
NIΚΙΑ [1]
Theoc. 11.2
NIΚΟΚΡΕΟΝΤΟΣ [2]
Ant. Lib. 39.1; 39.2
NIΚΟΚΡΕΩΝ [1]
Ant. Lib. 39.2
NIΚΟΥΣ [1]
A.P. 5.164.2
NIΘΒΗ [1]
A.P. 5.229.6
NIΘΒΙΝ [1]
A.P. 5.229.1
NΙΘΕΩΜΑΙ [1]
A.P. 5.189.2
ΝΟΜΕΥΩΝ [1]
Theoc. 3.46
ΝΟΜΙΚΑΤΕ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 17
ΝΟΜΟΣ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 29
ΝΟΜΟΣ [1]
Pl. Smp. 182 e
ΝΟΜΟΥ [1]
Pl. Smp. 183 b
ΝΟΜΩ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 29
ΝΟΜΩΝΙΚΤΟΥ [1]
A.P. 6.71.2
ΝΟΣΘΙΝ [1]
Theoc. 7.127
ΝΟΤΙΑΙΕΙΝ [1]
Theoc. 2.107
ΝΟΥΘΕΤΟΥΝΤΩΝ [1]
Pl. Smp. 183 b
ΝΟΥΣ [1]
Alexis 114
ΝΥΚΤΑ [4]
Alciph. 4.8.2;
Lucian Bis Acc. 31;
Theoc. 11.44; 11.77
ΝΥΚΤΕΡΙΝ [2]
Ath. 14.638 d;
14.638 e
ΝΥΚΤΕΣ [1]
Helio. 4.17
ΝΥΚΤΙ [2]
Chariton 1.3.2;
Philostr. Im. 1.2.1
ΝΥΚΤΟΣ [11]
Ael. VH 13.1
(155.5); Alciph.
4.9.4; A.P.
5.229.3; 12.252.4;
Ant. Lib. 39.3;
Babrius 116.1;
Helio. 4.17;
Herodas 2.25; 2.35;
Theoc. 2.119; 11.40
ΝΥΚΤΟΝ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr.
14.1
ΝΥΚΤΟΡ [4]
A.P. 12.14.2;
2.19.5ff; Iamb.
V.P. 25.112; Plu.
Mor. 759 B
ΝΥΜΦΑ [2]
Theoc. 3.9; 3.19
ΝΥΜΦΙΟΥΣ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.2.1
ΝΥΣ [9]
A.P. 5.164.1;
5.165.1; 5.165.2;
5.167.1; 5.189.1;
5.191.2; Fr. Gren.
11; Philostr. Ep.
29; Im. 1.2.1
ΝΥΤΤΟΥΣΑ [1]
1.27.1ff
ΝΓΝ [1]
Theoc. 11.74
ΣΑΙΝΕΙΣ [1]
2.20.5ff
ΣΑΝΘΗ [1]
A.P. 5.145.6
ΣΑΝΘΟΙΣ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.2.4
ΣΕΙΝΑ [1]
Theoc. 2.154
ΣΕΙΝΟΙ [2]
A.P. 12.85.8;
12.85.9
ΣΕΝΑΣΙΑΣΙΑΝ [1]
Philostr. Ep. 28
ΣΕΝΙΟΥ [1]
A.P. 12.85.9
ΣΕΝΙΟΣ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 17
ΣΕΝΟΝ [1]
Philostr. Ep. 28
ΣΕΝΟΣ [1]
Theoc. 11.61
ΣΙΘΩΝ [1]
Philostr. V.S. 485
ΣΙΑΑ [1]
Theoc. 11.51
ΣΥΜΑΘΟΝΙ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.2.5
ΣΥΝΕΑΟΝΤΟΣ [1]
Ant. Lib. 39.2
ΣΥΝΕΥΝΟΣ [1]
Ar. Ec. 953
ΣΥΝΩΝ [1]
Theoc. 23.24
ΟΒΟΑΟΤΕ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr.
14.3
ΟΡΚΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ [1]
2.20.10ff
ΟΩΙΤΟΠΕ [1]
Theoc. 23.47
ΟΩΙΣ [1]
Pl. Smp. 203 b
ΟΩΝ [3]
A.P. 12.115.2;
12.116.3; Theoc.
11.27
ΟΩΝΤΑΣ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr.
14.4
ΟΨΥΝΑ [1]
Fr. Gren. 17
ΟΨΥΝΗ [1]
Fr. Gren. 3
ΟΨΥΨΟΜΕΝΟΥ [1]
J. Chrys. Hom. 37
ΟΒΕΝ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.2.2
ΟΨΟΥΣ [1]
Theoc. 3.43
ΟΨΩΝΑ [1]
ΟΑΒΙΟΥΣ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.2.1
ΟΑΗΣ [2]
Alciphr. 4.9.4;
Lucian Bis Acc. 17
ΟΑΙΤΑ [1]
Helio. 4.17
ΟΑΙΓΑΣ [1]
Alciphr. 4.17.9
ΟΑΙΓΙΟΙ [1]
Alciphr. 4.8.1
ΟΑΙΓΟΝ [1]
Theoc. 23.32
ΟΑΛΑΥΜΕΝΟΝ [2]
A.P. 12.85.2;
12.85.10
ΟΑΛΑΥΤΙΟΝ [1]
Ael. N.A. 9.13
ΟΑΛΩ [1]
Theoc. 23.25
ΟΑΟΣ [1]
A.P. 12.116.1
ΟΑΟΥΣ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr. 8.3
ΟΜΑΙΛΟΝ [1]
Plu. Mor. 772 E
ΟΜΙΧΑΗΝ [1]
A.P. 5.229.3
ΟΜΑΣΕΙΝ [1]
Alciphr. 4.9.4
ΟΜΜΑΤΙ [1]
A.P. 5.145.3
ΟΜΜΑΤΑ [1]
Theoc. 2.112
ΟΜΝΥΝΤΕΣ [1]
Pl. Sap. 183 a
ΟΜΟΙΑΝ [1]
Ael. N.A. 1.50
ΟΜΟΙΟΝ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr. 14.4
ΟΜΟΙΟΥΣ [1]
Stob. Anth. 3.2.18
ΟΜΟΙΟ [1]
Theoc. 23.2
ΟΜΟΡΟΝ [1]
Ael. VH 13.1
(155.5)
ΟΜΟΣΘ [1]
Theoc. 6.32
ΟΜΦΑΚΙΟΣ [1]
Theoc. 11.21
ΟΜΟΓΣ [1]
Chariton 1.3.1
ΟΝΑΙΟ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr.
14.4
ΟΝΑΠ [5]
A.P. 5.23.4;
5.23.5; Aristaeon.
Ep. 2.19.5; Callim.
Epigr. 64.4; 64.5
ΟΝΕΙΑΗ [1]
Pl. Sap. 183 a
ΟΝΕΙΑΙΖΟΝΤΩΝ [1]
Pl. Sap. 183 b
ΟΝΕΙΟΥΣ [1]
Pl. Sap. 183 b
ΟΝΕΙΟΣΕΙ [1]
1.14.1ff
ΟΝΟΜΑ [2]
2.19.10ff; 2.20.1ff
ΟΝΟΜΑΣΙΝ [1]
Alciphr. 4.17.5
ΟΝΟΜΑΤΑ [1]
1.14.5ff
ΟΝΟΣ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr.
14.4
ΟΝΤΑ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 17
ΟΝΤΗ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr.
14.4; Them.
013.162.c
ΟΣΕΙΣ [1]
Philostr. Ep. 14
ΟΣΟΝ [1]
Theoc. 23.50
ΟΣΟΣ [1]
Philo Husb. 37
ΟΣΩΝΙΑ [1]
Theoc. 23.33
ΟΣΘ [1]
Theoc. 23.23
ΟΣΩΚΙΟΣ [1]
Ael. VH 13.1
(155.15)
ΟΣΩΝ [1]
A.P. 12.115.4
ΟΤΟΙ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 31
ΟΤΟΙΟΝ [1]
2.20.15ff
ΟΤΟΤΑΝ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr.
14.4
ΟΤΟΥΣΙΩΝ [1]
Babrius 116.9
ΟΤΟΤΑΝ [1]
Theoc. 23.36
ΟΤΟΥΣ [1]
Herodas 2.65
ΟΤΟΥΣΕΑΝΟΣ [1]
Theoc. 23.34
ΟΤΟΥΣΩΜΟΘΑ [1]
Fr. Gren. 52
ΟΤΟΜΑ [1]
Theoc. 11.36
ΟΤΩ [2]
2.19.1ff; Philostr.
Im. 1.12.4
ΟΤΩΝ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.2.5
ΟΤΩΣ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr.
14.4
ΟΤΩΣΑΙ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.2.5
ΟΤΩΣΑΝΙΟΝ [1]
A.P. 5.191.2
ΟΤΩΣΑΝΩΝ [1]
Philostr. V.S. 485
ΟΤΩΣ [2]
Theoc. 23.14; 23.15
ΟΤΩΝ [2]
Ael. VH 13.1
(156.1); Chariton
13.4
ΟΤΩΣΕΙΣΕΝ [1]
Lucian Musc. 10
ΟΤΩΣΕΟΜΕΝ [1]
Fr. Gren. 37
ΟΤΩΣΑΝΩΣ [1]
Phrat. 708.4
ΟΤΩΣ [1]
Theoc. 11.27
ΟΤΩΣΩΣ [1]
Theoc. 11.69
ΟΤΩΣΕΘΕΙΝ [1]
ΠΑΛΙΝ [3]
2.19.15ff; Lucian
D. Meretr. 14.3;
Plu. Mor. 766 B
ΠΑΜΜΗΣΙΕΡΑ [1]
A. P. 5.165.1
ΠΑΜΠΑΛΑ [1]
Ath. 13.567 e
ΠΑΜΦΙΔΗ [1]
2.16.1ff
ΠΑΝ [2]
A. P. 12.90.3;
Theoc. 3.18
ΠΑΝΔΕΡΩΝΙΟΣ [1]
A. P. 5.206.7
ΠΑΝΝΥΧΙΔΕΣ [1]
Philo Cherub. 92
ΠΑΝΝΥΧΙΖΕΤΑΙ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr.
14.1
ΠΑΝΝΥΧΙΣΙ [1]
A. P. 6.71.6
ΠΑΝΤΕΛΟΣ [1]
1.14.10ff
ΠΑΝΤΕΣΤΑΤΟΝ [1]
Theoc. 23.35
ΠΑΣΑΙ [1]
Theoc. 11.66
ΠΑΣΑΣ [1]
Theoc. 2.112
ΠΑΣΚ [1]
Theoc. 11.16
ΠΑΡΑΓΩΓΟΜΕΝ [1]
J. Chrys. Hom. 37
ΠΑΡΑΓΕΤΑΙ [1]
Ath. 13.567 e
ΠΑΡΑΓΩΓΟΜΕΝΟΣ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr.
8.2
ΠΑΡΑΓΩΓΕΙΝ [1]
2.20.15ff
ΠΑΡΑΙΤΕΙΤΑΙ [1]
Philost. Im. 1.2.5
ΠΑΡΑΚΑΘΜΕΝΗ [1]
Alciph. 4.9.3
ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΕΙ [1]
Ael. N.A. 1.50
ΠΑΡΑΚΕΛΕΥΣΙΣ [1]
Pl. Ssp. 182 d
ΠΑΡΑΚΛΑΥΣΘΥΡΟΝ [1]
Plu. Mor. 753 B
ΠΑΡΑΚΛΑΥΤΟΜΑΙ [1]
A. P. 5.103.1
ΠΑΡΑΜΑΘΩΝ [1]
Fr. Gren. 14
ΠΑΡΑΝΑΜΒΑΝΕΙ [1]
Men. Dysc. 58
ΠΑΡΑΘΟΙΚΑΜΕΝΟΝ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr.
12.310
ΠΑΡΑΜΕΝΕ [1]
1.27.40ff
ΠΑΡΑΜΥΘΙΟΝ [1]
Theoc. 23.7
ΠΑΡΑΝΟΙΓΩΥΣΑ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 31
ΠΑΡΑΝΟΜΙΑΝ [2]
Const. VII
002.2.124.5; Polyb.
10.26.5
ΠΑΡΑΠΕΘΜΑΜΕΝΗ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr.
12.311
ΠΑΡΑΠΕΘΜΗ [1]
Fr. Gren. 12
ΠΑΡΑΡΙΓΩΞΕΙΣ [1]
A. P. 5.43.4
ΠΑΡΑΘΥΟΥΣΑ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 17
ΠΑΡΑΣΤΑΣΙΟΝ [1]
J. Chrys. Hom. 37
ΠΑΡΑΦΕΡΕΙ [1]
Philost. Im. 1.2.2
ΠΑΡΑΡΩΝ [1]
2.16.1ff
ΠΑΡΕΙΑΝ [1]
2.20.10ff
ΠΑΡΕΙΗ [1]
Theoc. 7.126
ΠΑΡΕΚΥΤΤΕΝ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 31
ΠΑΡΕΝΘΥΣ [1]
Theoc. 23.37
ΠΑΡΕΙΣΙΖΑΝ [1]
Theoc. 11.75
ΠΑΡΕΠΤΑ [1]
Theoc. 11.11
ΠΑΡΕΡΧΕΣΤΑΙ [1]
1.27.1
ΠΑΡΕΡΧΗ [1]
2.16.1ff
ΠΑΡΕΣΤΩ [2]
PGM 4.2743; 4.2784
ΠΑΡΕΥΔΟΚΙΜΕΙΝ [1]
1.27.15ff
ΠΑΡΕΥΛΑΤΤΟΝ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 31
ΠΑΡΕΧΕΙΝ [1]
Alciph. 4.8.2
ΠΑΡΕΧΕΤΕ [1]
1.14.5ff
ΠΑΡΕΙΓΕΝ [1]
Babrius 116.13
ΠΑΡΕΙΓΟΘΜΑ [1]
Alciph. 4.8.2
ΠΑΡΕΙΜΕΝ [1]
Theoc. 2.116
ΠΑΡΕΝΕ [1]
1.14.5ff
ΠΑΡΕΝΤΙΚΗΣ [1]
A. P. 12.90.2
ΠΑΡΕΘΝΟΝ [2]
Ael. VH 13.1
(155.10); Theoc.
3.40
ΠΑΡΕΘΝΟΣ [1]
1.14.5ff
ΠΑΡΙΟΝΤΟΣ [1]
1.27.1ff
ΠΑΡΙΣΤΑΜΕΝΗ [1]
1.27.1ff
ΠΑΡΙΤΟ [1]
2.19.15ff
ΠΑΡΙΩΝ [1]
Chariton 1.3.3
ΠΑΡΚΥΤΟΙΣΙΑ [1]
Theoc. 3.7
ΠΑΡΝΑΣΣΟΥ [1]
Hiero. 4.17
ΠΑΡΟΔΕΥΣΗ [1]
Theoc. 23.47

ΠΑΡΟΙΝΙΑ [1]

Philo Cherub. 92

ΠΑΡΟΙΝΙΩΝ [1]

Prat. 708.8

ΠΑΡΟΝΤΕΣ [1]

Plu. Mor. 759 B

ΠΑΡΟΝΤΟΣ [2]

Lucian Bis Acc. 17;

Pl. Gal. 19.5

ΠΑΣΤΑΔΟΣ [1]

A.P. 12.90.5

ΠΑΣΑΓΕΙΝ [1]

Prat. 708.3

ΠΑΣΑΓΩΝ [1]

Helio. 4.17

ΠΑΣΑΓΑΙ [1]

Ar. Vesp. 1254

ΠΑΣΕΡΑ [2]

Lucian D. Meretr. 12.311; Pl. Smp.

203 b

ΠΑΣΕΡΕΣ [1]

Ant. Lib. 39.2

ΠΑΤΗΡ [1]

Philostr. Ep. 29

ΠΑΤΡΙ [1]

Lucian D. Meretr. 14.4

ΠΑΤΡΙΔΟΣ [1]

Philostr. Ep. 39

ΠΑΤΡΙΛ [1]

Philostr. V.S. 485

ΠΑΤΡΟΣ [2]

Alciph. 4.9.4; Plu.

Mor. 772 F

ΠΑΤΡΟΥ [1]

Antiphanes fr. 239.1

ΠΑΤΡΟΥΛ [1]

Chariton 1.3.6

ΠΑΤΡΟΥΝ [1]

Alciph. 4.9.2

ΠΑΤΤΑΛΟΝ [1]

Aristaeae Ep. 2.20.51ff

ΠΑΤΤΕΣΘΑΙ [2]

Men. Dysc. 63;

Theoc. 11.28

ΠΑΤΤΕΣΘΩ [1]

Plu. Mor. 753 B

ΠΑΤΕΜΑΙ [1]

A.P. 5.64.3

ΠΑΘΗ [1]

A.P. 6.1.3

ΠΑΧΩΝ [1]

Theoc. 23.31

ΠΕΙΘΕΙ [1]

Ant. Lib. 39.3

ΠΕΙΘΕΙΝ [2]

Aristaeae Ep.

1.27.5ff; Plu. Mor.

772 F

ΠΕΙΘΩΝ [1]

A.P. 12.90.4

ΠΕΙΝΗΣΩ [1]

Alciph. 4.9.3

ΠΕΙΡΑΝ [1]

Aristophon 5.7

ΠΕΙΡΟΝΤΑ [1]

Plu. Gal. 19.3

ΠΕΙΡΑΣ [1]

Herodas 2.24

ΠΕΙΡΟΘΕΙΣ [1]

A.P. 5.64.5

ΠΕΙΡΩΝ [1]

Chariton 116.12

ΠΕΙΡΑΕΙ [1]

A.P. 12.167.4

ΠΕΙΡΑΕΙΔΥΣ [1]

A.P. 12.85.1

ΠΕΙΡΑΣΚΕΙ [1]

Aristaeae Ep.

2.128

ΠΕΙΡΕΙ [1]

Alciph. 4.9.4

ΠΕΙΡΙΜΟΜΕΝΟΙ [1]

Alciph. 4.8.1

ΠΕΙΡΟΜΟΝΗΣ [1]

Chariton 1.2.3

ΠΕΙΡΟΣ [1]

Ant. Lib. 39.3

ΠΕΙΝΗΣ [2]

Lucian D. Meretr.

14.1; Pl. Smp.

203 b

ΠΕΙΝΙΑ [2]

Pl. Smp. 203 b (2)

ΠΕΙΝΙΑΣ [1]

Pl. Smp. 203 b

ΠΕΝΘΗΚΟΝ ΤΑ [1]

Lucian D. Meretr.

14.4

ΠΕΝΘΗΚΟΡΟΣ [1]

Theoc. 7.120

ΠΕΝΘΟΛΑΙΧΑ [1]

A.P. 12.90.1

ΠΕΝΘΟΤΕΖ [1]

Alciph. 4.9.3

ΠΕΝΘΟΙΚΗΣ [1]

Ath. 14.638 d

ΠΕΝΘΟΜΙΣΟ [1]

Lucian D. Meretr.

8.3

ΠΕΝΩΚΟΣ [1]

Ar. Ec. 948

ΠΕΡΙΒΑΛΛΟΜΕΝΗ [1]

Alciph. 4.9.2

ΠΕΡΙΠΕΡΗΝΥ [1]

Lucian D. Meretr.

8.3

ΠΕΡΙΣΕΙΝΑΣ [1]

Lucian Bis Acc. 16

ΠΕΡΙΓΕΝΑΙ [1]

Lucian Bis Acc. 17

ΠΕΡΙΓΕΝΕΝΟ [1]

Theoc. 23.14

ΠΕΡΙΛΑΜΠΟΝΤΟΣ [1]

Philostr. Im. 1.2.3

ΠΕΡΙΜΟΙΟΥΣΑ [1]

Plu. Mor. 753 B

ΠΕΡΙΜΕΣΚΕΙΝ [1]

Aristaeae Ep.

2.20.31ff

ΠΕΡΙΠΛΑΝΟΜΕΝΑ [1]

Aristaeae Ep.

2.20.15ff

ΠΕΡΙΠΟΘΗΤΟΙΣ [1]

Aristaeae Ep.

2.20.30ff

ΠΕΡΙΠΡΗΣΑΜΕΝΟΣ [1]

Chariton 1.3.4

ΠΕΡΙΣΧΟΥΣΑ [1]

Philostr. Im.

1.14.2

ΠΕΡΙΦΕΝΕΙΣ [1]

Aristaeae Ep.

2.16.lff

ΠΕΡΙΦΕΝΟΣ [1]

Theoc. 3.45

ΠΕΡΙΓΩΝΗΣ [1]

Philostr. Im.

1.12.4

ΠΕΣΩΝ [1]

Theoc. 3.53

ΠΕΣΡΑΣ [2]
Philost. Ep. 14; Theoc. 11.17
WEYKA [1]
Ael. VH 13.1 (155.10)
WEYSEISO [1]
Theoc. 3.51
WEYIAHME [1]
Theoc. 3.3
WEYKAI [1]
Theoc. 11.1
WEYKOTA [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 17
WEHAE [1]
Chariton 1.3.6
WIKTI [1]
Anac. 373.3
WIKTI [1]
Lucian D. Mar. 1.4
WIAON [1]
Chariton 1.3.2
WIKS IN [1]
Theoc. 11.68
WIKSEDE [1]
Theoc. 11.3
WIKSIE [1]
Prat. 708.6
WIKSEIN [1]
Philo Husb. 37
WIH [1]
A. P. 5.145.6
WIKBON [1]
WIKPA [1]
Theoc. 23.5
WIKPAN [1]
Philostr. Ep. 29
WIMPAHSE [1]
A. P. 5.206.3
WINEIN [2]
Ar. Vesp. 1253; Lucian Bis Acc. 16
WIONTESE [1]
Plu. Mor. 759 B
WIO [1]
Theoc. 11.35
WIPTEI [1]
Theoc. 23.30
WITSEIIEIN [1]
Chariton 1.3.4
WISTON [1]
WITYIN [1]
Theoc. 3.38
WITYION [1]
Ael. VH 13.1 (155.10)
WITATONE [1]
Theoc. 11.57
WITATEIA [1]
Theoc. 11.33
WITATTEI [1]
Aristophon 5.7
WAEI [1]
Philostr. Imp. 1.12.4
WAEIADIA [1]
A. P. 5.189.1
WAEIN [2]
Aristaen. Ep. 1.27.40ff;
Philostr. Imp. 1.12.4
WAEIST [2]
Ant. Lib. 39.2; 39.3
WAEISTO [1]
Plu. Mor. 772 E
WAEISTON [1]
Ant. Lib. 39.1
WAEKSO [1]
Theoc. 11.73
WAEKSON [1]
Pl. Smp. 203 b
WAEKSEMEN [1]
A. P. 5.281.4
WAEON [5]
A. P. 5.167.3;
Chariton 1.3.1;
Lucian Bis Acc. 29;
Theoc. 2.106; 3.47
WAEON [1]
Theoc. 11.61
WAHGA [1]
Theophrastus 27.9
WAHGA [2]
Aristophon 5.6; J. Chrys. Hom. 37
WAHGOE [1]
Plu. Mor. 772 E
WAHKTIESEAI [1]
Ar. Ec. 964
WAIN [2]
Aristaen. Ep. 2.20.15ff; Pl. Smp. 183 a
WAPRH [1]
Babrius 116.7
WAHEIAKONTHA [1]
Isaevs Pyrr. 15
WAHEION [1]
Aristaen. Ep. 1.27.1ff
WAHEMION [1]
Plu. Gal. 19.5
WAHTSEI [1]
Philostr. Imp. 1.2.5
WAHTTONEHAI [1]
Philostr. Imp. 1.2.5
WAHTTSEI [1]
Plu. Mor. 772 E
WAHSA [1]
A. P. 12.252.3
WANAYMA [2]
A. P. 12.72.2;
12.167.1
WANEZTE [1]
A. P. 12.167.3
WADIE [1]
A. P. 12.85.3
WADAS [3]
Ant. Lib. 39.6;
Theoc. 7.123; 11.70
WADIN [1]
Lucian D. Meretr. 14.3
WADOR [1]
Theoc. 23.52
WAEHSEI [2]
Theoc. 3.9; 3.21
WADIE [2]
Theoc. 2.31; 11.42
WADIEI [1]
Aristaen. Ep. 2.19.5ff
WADIEFONHATON [1]
A. P. 12.30.6
WADIEITE [1]
Aristaen. Ep. 2.20.20ff
WADHIEEN [2]
Alciph. 4.9.3; Ar. Ec. 976
WADHIOHATOY [1]
A. P. 6.71.4
ΠΘΟΙΣ [1]
A.P. 12.90.1
ΠΘΟΙΣΙ [1]
A.P. 5.153.1
ΠΘΩΝ [3]
Aristae. Ep. 2.20.25ff;
Hermesianax 3.49;
Theoc. 23.26
ΠΘΟΡΕΥΣΑ [1]
Theoc. 3.18
ΠΘΟΟ [3]
A.P. 12.167.3;
Aristae. Ep. 2.20.25ff; Ar. Ec. 956
ΠΘΟΥ [1]
Aristae. Ep. 1.27.40ff
ΠΘΟΥΜΕΝΗ [1]
Aristae. Ep. 2.20.10ff
ΠΘΟΥΝΤΙ [1]
Aristae. Ep. 2.20.5ff
ΠΘΟΥΣΑΝ [1]
Aristae. Ep. 2.16.1ff
ΠΘΟΥΣΙ [1]
Plu. Mor. 759 B
ΠΘΟΥΣΙΝ [1]
Aristae. Ep. 2.20.25ff
ΠΘΩ [1]
A.P. 5.189.3
ΠΘΩΝ [2]
Aristae. Ep. 1.27.1ff; Ar. Ec. 948
ΠΘΕΙ [1]
A.P. 5.64.1
ΠΘΕΙΝ [4]
Lucian Bis Acc. 17;
Men. Sam. 414; Pl. Smp. 182 e; 183 a
ΠΘΕΙΣ [3]
A.P. 5.23.1;
Aristae. Ep. 2.20.5ff; Callim. Epigr. 64.1
ΠΘΕΙΣΘΕ [1]
Aristae. Ep. 2.20.20ff
ΠΘΗ [1]
Aristae. Ep. 2.16.1ff
ΠΘΗΜΑΤΑ [2]
Ath. 14.638 e;
Philostr. Ep. 29
ΠΘΗΜΕΝΟΣ [1]
Plu. Mor. 753 B
ΠΘΗΣ [1]
Ath. 14.638 d
ΠΘΗΣΘΕΙ [1]
Pl. Smp. 203 b
ΠΘΗΣΘΕΙΣ [1]
Aristae. Ep. 2.20.30ff
ΠΘΗΣΩΝ [2]
Ar. Ec. 959; 968
ΠΘΙΚΛΩΝ [1]
Aristae. Ep. 1.27.5ff
ΠΘΙΚΛΟΠΤΕΡΩΝ [1]
Prat. 708.5
ΠΘΙΚΛΩΝ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.12.4
ΠΘΙΜΑΙΝΕΙΝ [1]
Theoc. 11.65
ΠΘΙΟΣ [1]
Alciphr. 4.17.5
ΠΘΙΟΥΜΕΝΟΙ [1]
Pl. Smp. 183 a
ΠΘΙΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ [2]
Const. VII 002.2.124.5; Polyb. 10.26.4
ΠΘΙΟΥΝΤΙ [2]
Pl. Smp. 182 d; 183 b
ΠΘΙΟΥΝ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr. 12.311
ΠΘΙΩΝ [1]
Alciphr. 4.8.1
ΠΘΙΩΝΘΩΝΘΕΙΝ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.12.4
ΠΘΙΩΝΘΕΙΝ [1]
Philostr. V.S. 485
ΠΘΙΩΝΘΕΙΝ [1]
Ael. VH 13.1
(155.25)
ΠΘΙΩΝΟΝ [2]
Helio. 4.17; J. Chrys. Hsm. 37
ΠΘΙΩΝΟΥ [1]
Philostr. V.S. 485
ΠΘΙΩΝΩΝΑ [3]
Lucian Bis Acc. 16 (2): 17
ΠΘΙΩΝΩΝ [1]
Philostr. V.S. 485
ΠΘΙΩΝΩΣ [3]
Ant. Lib. 39.1;
Helio. 4.17; Lucian Bis Acc. 17
ΠΘΩΝ [2]
A.P. 5.23.5; Cal- lim. Epigr. 64.5
ΠΘΩΝ [2]
Ael. VH 13.1
(155.10); Helio. 4.17
ΠΘΩΝ [1]
Theoc. 11.24
ΠΘΩΝΟΡΧΕΙ [1]
Stob. Anth. 3.2.18
ΠΘΩΝΟΣ [1]
Herodas 2.26
ΠΘΩΝΑΙ [1]
Ant. Lib. 39.5
ΠΘΩΝΗ [1]
Herodas 2.34
ΠΘΩΝΗΝΑΡΕΙΟΣ [1]
Theoc. 11.47
ΠΘΩΝΗΝΑΡΕΙΟΣ [1]
Prat. 708.2
ΠΘΩΝΗΝΑΡΕΙΟΝ [1]
Chariton 1.3.3
ΠΘΩΝΗΝΑΡΕΙΟΝ [2]
Theoc. 11.8; 11.80
ΠΘΩΝΗΝΑΡΕΙΟΝ [1]
Theoc. 23.1
ΠΘΩΝΗΣ [1]
Helio. 4.17
ΠΘΩΝΟΝ [1]
Fr. Gren. 29
ΠΘΩΝΟΣ [1]
A.P. 12.117.5
ΠΘΩΝΟΣ [2]
Ar. Ec. 972; 975
ΠΘΩΝΟΣ [3]
ΠΡΟΣΑΔΩΝΙΟΝ [1] Aristaeon. Ep. 1.27.1ff; 1.27.40ff; 2.19.15ff
ΠΡΟΣΑΙΘΘΕΟΥΣΑ [1] Pl. Smp. 203 b
ΠΡΟΣΑΡΑΣΑΛΑ [1] Lucian D. Meretr. 15.2
ΠΡΟΣΑΛΕΙΝ [1] Aristophon 5.5
ΠΡΟΣΑΛΔΕΠ [1] Philostr. Im. 1.2.5
ΠΡΟΣΑΛΔΩΝ [2] Philostr. Im. 1.2.2; Theophrastus 27.9
ΠΡΟΣΑΛΕΤΟΥΣΑ [1] Lucian D. Meretr. 12.311
ΠΡΟΣΑΛΚΟΤΙΑΙ [1] Chariton 1.3.7
ΠΡΟΣΑΔΟΧΑΣ [1] Ar. Ec. 980
ΠΡΟΣΑΙΑΘΕΙΟΤΕΣ [1] Helio. 4.17
ΠΡΟΣΑΘΕ [1] Ar. Ec. 953
ΠΡΟΣΑΘΩΝ [1] Lucian Bis Acc. 31
ΠΡΟΣΑΘΙΜΙΟΝ [1] Lucian D. Meretr. 8.3
ΠΡΟΣΑΝΕΤΕΣ [1] Ant. Lib. 39.4
ΠΡΟΣΑΙΜΕΝΗ [1] Lucian D. Meretr. 12.311
ΠΡΟΣΑΙΤΟ [1] Alciph. 4.17.5
ΠΡΟΣΑΚΑΘΗ [1] Fr. Gren. 31
ΠΡΟΣΑΛΑΛΩΝ [1] Aristaeon. Ep. 2.20.5ff
ΠΡΟΣΑΔΩΝΙΕΙΝ [1] Theoc. 23.6
ΠΡΟΣΑΛΩΝΙΩΝ [2] Const. VII 002.2.124.5; Polyb. 10.26.3
ΠΡΟΣΑΙΣΠΙΤΟΥΣΑΙ [1] Ar. Ec. 694
ΠΡΟΣΑΙΣΠΙΤΤΥΣΑΙ [1] Theoc. 3.19
ΠΡΟΣΑΙΣΠΙΤΤΥΤΗΜΑΤΟΣ [2] Const. VII 002.2.124.5; Polyb. 10.26.3
ΠΡΟΣΑΙΣΠΙΤΣΕΙΝ [1] Lucian Bis Acc. 16
ΠΡΟΣΑΒΑ [1] Philostr. Im. 1.2.3
ΠΡΟΣΑΒΑΛΟΙ [1] A.P. 5.256.1
ΠΡΟΣΑΒΑΝ [5] A.P. 5.43.3; 5.153.1; Ar. Ec. 973b; Philostr. Im. 1.2.2; Theoc. 23.13
ΠΡΟΣΑΒΑΝΙΟΥ [1] Philostr. Im. 1.2.3
ΠΡΟΣΑΒΕΡΙΩΣ [1] Ar. Ec. 706
ΠΡΟΣΑΒΕΡΩΝ [3] Aristaeon. Ep. 1.27.5ff; 2.20.25ff; Ar. Ec. 700
ΠΡΟΣΑΒΕΣΕΙΝ [2] Const. VII 002.2.124.5; Polyb. 10.26.4
ΠΡΟΣΑΙΘΘΕΝΤ [1] A.P. 12.85.2
ΠΡΟΣΑΙΘΘΕΡΩΣ [2] Const. VII 002.2.124.5; Polyb. 10.26.3
ΠΡΟΣΑΙΘΘΙΟΣ [1] A.P. 5.256.6
ΠΡΟΣΑΙΘΘΟΝ [1] Theoc. 3.14
ΠΡΟΣΑΙΘΘΟΥΣ [1] Ar. Ec. 965
ΠΡΟΣΑΙΘΘΟΥΣ [1] Prat. 708.8
ΠΡΟΣΑΙΘΘΟΥΣ [2] Iamb. V.P. 25.112
ΠΡΟΣΑΙΘΘΟΥΣ [2] Iamb. V.P. 25.112
ΠΡΟΣΑΙΘΘΟΥΣ [1] A.P. 5.43.2
ΠΡΟΣΑΙΘΘΟΥΣ [2] A.P. 5.164.2; 5.213.1
ΠΡΟΣΑΙΘΘΟΥΣ [1] Theoc. 2.153
ΠΡΟΣΑΙΘΘΟΥΣ [1] Theoc. 3.14
ΠΡΟΣΑΙΘΘΟΥΣ [1] Theoc. 3.44
ΠΡΟΣΑΙΘΘΟΥΣ [1] Iamb. V.P. 25.112
ΠΡΟΣΑΙΘΘΟΥΣ [1] Theoc. 23.40
ΠΡΟΣΑΙΘΘΟΥΣ [1] Chariton 1.3.4
ΠΡΟΣΑΙΘΘΟΥΣ [1] Herodas 2.63
A. P. 6.1.1
ΣΩΦΙΑΣ [1]
A. P. 12.117.5
ΣΩΦΙΣΤΗΣ [1]
Pl. Smp. 203 b
ΣΩΦΩΚΛΕΙ [1]
Ath. 14.638 f
ΣΠΑΝΙΩΣ [1]
2.19.15 ff
ΣΠΕΝΝΑΟΝΝΣ [1]
2.19.20 ff
ΣΠΕΝΝΟΣ [1]
2.19.20 ff
ΣΠΕΝΝΩΣ [1]
2.19.20 ff
ΣΠΕΝΝΠΟΣ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 31
ΣΠΕΡΓΓΕΣ [1]
Theoc. 23.63
ΣΠΕΡΓΓΗ [1]
A. P. 5.103.2
ΣΠΕΡΝΑ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.2.2
ΣΠΕΡΝΟΝ [1]
2.19.20 ff
ΣΠΕΡΝΩ [1]
2.19.20 ff
ΣΠΕΡΡΟΠΟΣ [1]
Ath. 14.639 a
ΣΠΕΤΑ [1]
Alexis 114
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΑ [1]
Aliciph. 4.9.4
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΩΝΙ [2]
A. P. 5.145.1
Philostr. Im. 1.2.5
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΙΩΣ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 16
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΝ [1]
Theoc. 2.153
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΝ [3]
A. P. 5.118.2; A. P.
12.116.2; Theoc.
3.21
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΝ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.2.4
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΥ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.2.4
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΥΣ [6]
A. P. 5.191.6; Ael.
VH 13.1 (155.15);
Fr. Gren. 25;
Lucian Bis Acc. 16;
17; Philostr. Im.
1.12.4
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΣ [1]
Ar. Ec. 691
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΝ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 17
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΝΑΙ [1]
Plu. Mor. 455 B
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΙ [1]
P. Teb. 19
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΝ [4]
A. P. 12.23.4
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΝ [4]
Ath. 14.638 d
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΝ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.2.5
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΝ [3]
Theoc. 2.126; 11.9;
11.56
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΝ [2]
A. P. 5.281.6;
2.19.20 ff
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΝ [1]
Theoc. 6.33
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΝ [1]
Philostr. V.S. 485
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΝ [1]
Prat. 708.9
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΝ [2]
Philostr. Ep. 14;
Plu. Mor. 766 B
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΝ [1]
Theoc. 23.19
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΝ [1]
Theoc. 23.17
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΝ [1]
Philostr. Ep. 14
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΝ [1]
Lucian D. Meretr.
14.4
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΝ [1]
Chariton 1.3.6
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΝ [1]
A. P. 5.191.5
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΝ [1]
A. P. 5.206.6
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΝ [1]
Lucian Bis Acc. 17
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΝ [1]
Philostr. Im. 1.2.5
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΝ [1]
Ar. Ec. 708
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΝ [1]
A. P. 6.71.9
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΝ [1]
A. P. 5.118.4
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΝ [1]
Prat. 708.4
ΣΠΕΤΑΝΟΝ [1]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΝΗΘΗ [2]</td>
<td>11.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΝΗΘΗ</td>
<td>Aristae. Ep. 2.20.1ff; Chariton 1.3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΝΗΘΗ</td>
<td>Isaeus Pyrr. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΝΗΘΗ</td>
<td>Lucian Bis Acc. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΝΗΘΗ</td>
<td>Philo Husb. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΝΗΘΗ</td>
<td>Lucian Bis Acc. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΝΗΘΗ</td>
<td>Lucian D. Meretr. 14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΝΗΘΗ</td>
<td>A. P. 5.206.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΝΗΘΗ</td>
<td>Theoc. 23.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΟΙΝΙΔ [1]</td>
<td>Theoc. 23.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΜΑ [3]</td>
<td>Philostr. Ep. 29; Im. 1.2.1; 1.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΜΑ [1]</td>
<td>Plu. Mor. 753 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΜΑ [1]</td>
<td>Plu. Mor. 772 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΜΑ [3]</td>
<td>Antiphanes fr. 239.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΜΑ [1]</td>
<td>Lucian Bis Acc. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΜΑ [1]</td>
<td>A. P. 12.23.4; Lucian Bis Acc. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΜΑ [1]</td>
<td>Theoc. 23.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΜΑ [1]</td>
<td>Theoc. 2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΜΑ [1]</td>
<td>Theoc. 2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΜΑ [1]</td>
<td>Alciph. 4.9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΜΑ [1]</td>
<td>Lucian D. Meretr. 15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΜΑ [1]</td>
<td>Lucian D. Meretr. 8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΜΑ [1]</td>
<td>Theoc. 11.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΜΑ [1]</td>
<td>Theoc. 11.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΜΑ [1]</td>
<td>Iamb. V. P. 25.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΜΑ [1]</td>
<td>Alciph. 4.9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΜΑ [1]</td>
<td>Alciph. 4.9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΝΗΘΗ [1]</td>
<td>Philostr. Im. 1.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΝΗΘΗ</td>
<td>Α. Π. 5.165.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΝΗΘΗ [1]</td>
<td>Α. Π. 5.191.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΝΗΘΗ [1]</td>
<td>Α. Π. 12.252.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΝΗΘΗ [1]</td>
<td>Lucian Bis Acc. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΝΗΘΗ [1]</td>
<td>Alciph. 4.9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΝΗΘΗ [1]</td>
<td>Alciph. 4.9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΝΗΘΗ</td>
<td>Lucian Bis Acc. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΝΗΘΗ</td>
<td>Alciph. W H 13.1 (155.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΝΗΘΗ</td>
<td>PGM 4.2758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin Term</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claud. Eutr. 1.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tib. 1.5.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tib. 1.2.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMVNT [1]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hor. Carm. 1.25.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADIT [1]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ov. Am. 1.6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADIVMENTI [1]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ter. Ph. 105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADIVNGERE [1]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hor. S. 2.3.247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADIVVAT [1]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tib. 1.2.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADIVVATO [1]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catull. 32.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMETI [1]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMIRANTE [1]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop. 2.17.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMIREE [1]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop. 2.17.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMISSVS [1]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livy Per. 89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMITTAS [1]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop. 1.16.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop. 2.17.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cic. Phil. fr. 10.3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hor. Epod. 11.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADPOSETA [1]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. Ad. 88; Am. 1018; 1048; 1052; 1072; Per. 570; 571; Prop. 2.6.1; Ter. Eu. 773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. Cur. 169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hor. Carm. 3.7.26; 3.7.27; Plaut. Cur. 141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ov. Am. 1.8.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AESCVLO [1]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.19.33; M. 14.715; Plaut. Cur. 165; Prop. 2.17.1; Tib. 1.8.61
AMANTES [7]
Ov. Am. 1.9.25; 2.19.5; Ars 3.69; Plaut. Cur. 126; Prop. 2.14.19; Tib. 1.8.71; 2.4.39
AMANTI [1]
Ov. Rem. 677; Plaut. Cur. 149; 152
AMANTIBVS [1]
Ov. M. 4.73
AMANTIS [7]
Claud. Eutr. 1.83; Ov. Am. 1.6.41; 1.9.28; Ars 3.454; Prop. 1.10.15; 1.16.46; 3.3.47
AMANTIVM [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.14
AMANTVM [2]
CLE 950.8; Sex. Turp. 202 (R)
AMARACINO [1]
Lucr. 4.1179
AMARAS [1]
Prop. 2.17.3
AMARE [6]
Hor. S. 2.3.250; Ov. Am. 2.19.46; Rem. 501; Plaut. Cur. 28; [Quint.]
Decl. Mai. 15.7; Ter. Ph. 111
AMAREM [1]
Auson. Ep. 23.1
AMARI [3]
Ov. Am. 1.8.71; Ars 3.585; Rem. 305
AMARO [1]
Ov. Ars 3.583
AMARVNT [1]
Tib. 2.3.69
AMARVS [1]
Prop. 2.19.6
AMAS [4]
Ov. Ars 1.738; M. 13.861; Plaut. Cur. 31; 139
AMAT [5]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.3; Ov. Fast. 5.345; Plaut. Cur. 142; 170; Ter. Ad. 118
AMATO [1]
Plaut. Cur. 31
AMATOR [6]
Hor. S. 2.3.259; Lucr. 4.1177; Ov. Am. 3.11.13; Ars 3.591; Prud. Symm. 1.66; [Quint.]
Decl. Mai. 15.7
AMATUREM [1]
Ter. Eu. 794
AMBAS [1]
Auson. Ep. 23.3
AMBITVS [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.93
AMBO [3]
Ov. Am. 1.9.7; Ep. 10.57 (2)
AMBOS [2]
Ov. Ep. 10.51; Plaut. Ba. 1117
AMENTIA [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.249
AMES [1]
Plaut. Cur. 29
AMET [1]
Prop. 3.20.30
AMICA [3]
Ov. Am. 1.6.45; 2.1.17; Ars 2.531
AMICAES [5]
Ov. Am. 1.9.19; Fast. 5.339; Prud. Symm. 1.68; Sen. Ep. 4.4; QNat. 4 A pr. 6
AMICAM [1]
Mart. 4.29.5
AMICAS [1]
Ov. M. 4.77
AMICI [1]
Plaut. Am. 1040
AMICITIAE [1]
Petron. 97
AMICORVM [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.25
AMICOS [2]
Hor. Epod. 11.21; Tib. 1.5.65
AMICTA [1]
Catull. 63.70
AMITTERE [1]
Plaut. Am. 1017
AMMISSVM [1]
Lucr. 4.1180
AMNE [1]
Ov. M. 13.801
AMO [3]
Plaut. Cur. 48; 137; 148
AMONISSVM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 149
AMOR [34]
Hor. Epod. 11.24; Carm. 1.25.13; Ov. Am. 1.6.5; 1.6.13; 1.6.34; 1.6.37; 1.6.59; 1.6.60; 1.8.71; 1.8.72; 1.8.76; 1.9.4; 2.19.23; 2.19.25; Ars 2.233; 3.588; 3.594; M. 13.756; 13.762; 13.768; Rem. 39; 503; Plaut. Cur. 3; 49; 97; Pliny Ep. 7.5; Prop. 2.25.17; Tib. 1.2.4; 1.2.63; 1.5.60; 1.5.75; 2.3.71; 2.4.38; 2.6.15
AMORE [9]
Auson. Ep. 23.9; Hor. Epod. 11.2; 11.3; S. 2.3.252; 2.3.267; Ov. Ars 1.736; 3.571; Tib. 1.2.27; 1.2.75
AMOREM [5]
Auson. Ep. 23.9; Ov. Ars 3.579; M. 14.703; 13.744; Prud. Symm. 1.64
AMORES [5]
Ov. Ars 2.639; M. 13.737; Prop. 1.16.19; Tib. 1.2.59; 1.2.89
AMORIS [7]
Ov. Am. 2.19.52; 3.1.43; Ars 2.242; 2.248; 3.559; M. 14.722; Prop. 3.20.30
AMPLECTI [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.11
AMPLEXV [3]
Juv. 9.75; Ov. Am. 3.8.12; Stat. S. 1.2.36
ANAXARETE [1]
Ov. M. 14.718
ANAXARETEN [1]
Ov. M. 14.699
ANAXARETES [1]
Ov. M. 14.750
ANCILLA [2]
Ov. Am. 2.19.41; Ars 2.525
ANCILLAE [2]
Claud. Eutr. 1.86; Ov. Am. 3.1.56
ANCILLAM [2]
Plaut. Am. 1049; Tib. 1.2.94
ANCILLVLA [1]
Plaut. Cur. 43
ANCIPITES [1]
Lucilius 939
ANCIPITI [1]
Lucilius 942
ANELLM [1]
Plaut. Per. 572
ANGIORTV [1]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.10
ANGVES [1]
Ov. Am. 2.1.25
ANGVIVBS [2]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.18; Ov. Ars 3.77
ANGVSTO [1]
Tib. 1.5.63
ANHELITVS [1]
Ov. M. 4.72
ANIMAM [1]
Apul. Ap. 9
ANIMI [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.24
ANIMO [1]
Stat. S. 1.2.195
ANIMOS [2]
Hor. Carm. 3.14.25; Ov. Am. 1.9.5
ANIMOSA [1]
Ov. Am. 3.1.35
ANIMOSEO [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.51
ANIMVM [3]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.18; Ov. Ars 1.733; 2.250
ANIMVS [2]
[Quint.] Decr. Mai. 15.7; Ter. Eu. 816
ANNI [1]
Ov. Ars 3.62
ANNOS [2]
Ov. Am. 2.19.23; Ars 3.61
ANNSA [1]
Ov. M. 13.799
ANTEVMIS [1]
Ov. M. 13.783
ANTESTARE [1]
Ausz. Ep. 23.5
ANTIQVAE [1]
Aul. Gell. 4.14.1
ANTRA [2]
Ov. M. 13.777; 13.811
ANTRIS [1]
Ov. M. 13.822
ANTORVM [1]
Ov. M. 13.763
ANV [1]
Plaut. Cur. 111
ANVM [2]
Plaut. Cur. 114; Ter. Ph. 112
ANVS [8]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.9; Ov. Ars 3.70; Plaut. Cur. 76; 110; 122; 133; 160; Prop. 3.25.16
ANXIA [1]
Tib. 2.6.53
ANXIVS [1]
Tib. 1.2.25
APER [1]
Catull. 63.72
APERIRE [2]
Ov. M. 14.739; Prop. 1.10.16
APERIRI [1]
Plaut. Ba. 1118
APERIT [2]
Plaut. Am. 1020; 81
APERITE [1]
Plaut. Am. 1020
APERIVTR [1]
Plaut. Cur. 21
APERIVNTVR [1]
Plaut. Cur. 93
APERTA [4]
Mart. 4.29.6; Ov. Ars 3.456; Prop. 2.9.42; Tib. 1.2.10
APERTE [1]
Tib. 2.3.71
APERTO [2]
Ov. Ars 2.245; Stat. S. 1.2.34
APICVLRVM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 10
APOLLINIS [1]
Ausz. Ed. 23.7
APPELLANDAM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 114
APPETET [1]
Ov. Ars 3.568
APTA [4]
Ov. Am. 1.6.6; 1.9.14; Fast. 5.334; M. 13.783
AQVA [7]
Ov. Am. 1.6.26; 2.1.26; 3.1.58; M. 13.767; Prop. 3.3.52; Tib. 1.2.30; 1.5.76
AQVAE [6]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.19; Ov. Ars 3.62; Fast. 5.342; M. 13.841; Plaut. Am. Fr. 5; Tib. 1.2.78
AQVAM [4]
Ov. Am. 2.19.32; Plaut. Cur. 161; Tib. 2.4.42; 2.6.8
AQUILIO [1] Prop. 3.7.71
AQUILONIBVS [1] Hor. Carm. 3.10.4
ARA [1] Plaut. Cur. 71
ARBITRATV [1] Plaut. Per. 566
ARBORE [1] Ov. Am. 2.19.31
ARCANA [1] Hor. Epod. 11.14
ARCESSIVS [1] Hor. S. 2.3.261
ARCV [1] Tib. 2.1.69
ARDENTEM [1] Fortun. 1.12
ARDOR [1] Hor. Epod. 11.27
ARENTEI [1] Prop. 2.17.6
ARGENTO [2] Plaut. Cur. 144; Tib. 1.2.69
ARGVAT [1] Ov. Ars 1.733
ARGVIT [1] Hor. Epod. 11.10
ARGVMENTA [1] Juv. 9.85
ARGVTA [1] Prop. 1.16.16
ARGVTAE [1] Hor. Carm. 3.14.21
ARIADEAE [1] Ov. Fast. 5.346
ARIDAS [1] Hor. Carm. 1.25.19
ARMA [5] Hor. Carm. 3.26.3; Ov. Am. 1.6.30; 1.6.39; 1.9.26; Tib. 1.2.66
ARMENTA [1] Tib. 2.1.67
ARROGANTIS [1] Hor. Carm. 1.25.9
ARTA [2] Auson. Ep. 23.3; Tib. 1.2.95
ARTE [5] Ov. Am. 2.12.4; Fast. 5.338; Rem. 34; 512; Prop. 3.3.50
ARTEM [1] Claud. Eutr. 1.78
ARTES [5] Ov. Am. 3.8.1; Ars 3.594; Fast. 4.113; Rem. 29; Tib. 1.8.61
ARTIS [1] Prud. Symm. 1.65
ARTOS [1] Pers. 5.170
ASCYLTII [1] Petron. 97
ASCYLTOS [1] Petron. 97
ASPECTAS [1] Plaut. Am. 1028
ASPERA [1] Stat. S. 1.2.199
ASPERAS [1] Hor. Carm. 3.10.2
ASPEXERO [1] Plaut. Am. 1048
ASPICE [1] Ov. Am. 1.6.17
ASPIRAVERINT [1] Lucilius 944
ASTERIE [1] Hor. Carm. 3.7.1
ASTERIS [4] Stat. S. 1.2.197; 1.2.198; 1.2.198
ATTENVANT [1] Ov. Ars 1.735
ATTICAM [2] Ter. Eu. 805; Ph. 114
ATTICE [1] Ov. Am. 1.9.2
AVARA [2] Ov. Am. 3.8.22; Rem. 302
AVARAE [1] Tib. 2.4.35
AVARAS [1] Claud. Eutr. 1.84
AVARITER [1] Plaut. Cur. 128
AVARITIAE [1] Tib. 2.4.29
AVDACES [1] Tib. 2.1.72
AVDENNDVM [1] Tib. 1.2.16
AVDI [1] Plaut. Cur. 133
AVDIAT [1] Ov. Am. 1.8.78
AVDIN [1]
Ter. Eu. 809
AVDIREM [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.11
AVDIRET [1]
AVDIS [3]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.6; Ov. Am. 3.10.5; Ov. Ar. 3.7.27
AVDIT [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.22
AVDITA [1]
Ov. M. 13.788
AVTERERE [1]
Ov. M. 14.756
AVVIDOS [1]
Ov. Rem. 38
AVLVS [1]
Aul. Gall. 4.14.2
AVOM [1]
Plaut. Am. 1050
AVRA [4]
Lucr. 4.1180; Ov. Am. 1.6.52; M. 13.807; Prop. 1.16.24
AVRE [2]
Ov. Am. 1.6.42; Prop. 2.25.18
AVREÀ [1]
Plaut. Cur. 140
AVRES [2]
Catull. 63.75; Ov. M. 14.749
AVREVS [1]
Ov. Rem. 39
AVRI [1]
Prud. Symm. 1.67
AVRIBVS [2]
AVRICVLAS [1]
Prop. 1.16.28
AVRIS [1]
Ov. M. 4.77
AVRO [3]
Ov. Am. 3.8.3; M. 13.813; Tib. 1.2.69
AVRORA [1]
Ov. M. 4.81
AVRVM [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.15
AVSTERS [1]
Prop. 3.3.50
AVTVMNALIA [1]
Ov. M. 13.816
AVXILIO [1]
Ov. Ar. 3.79
AXES [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.65
BACCHANTE [1]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.11
BACCHIS [1]
Plaut. Ba. 1118
BACCHO [2]
Ov. Fast. 5.345; Tib. 1.2.3
BACCHVS [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.345
BACVLI [1]
Ov. M. 13.782
BAIAS [1]
Mart. 10.14.3
BARATHRMV [1]
Plaut. Cur. 123
BARBA [1]
Ov. M. 13.850
BARBAM [1]
Ov. M. 13.766
BARBARA [1]
Ov. Am. 3.1.58
BARBARI [1]
Plaut. Cur. 150
BARBARIA [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.4
BARBATVM [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.249
BARBITON [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.26.4
BASTIAE [1]
Liv. Per. 89
BEATAM [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.26.9
BEATVM [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.3
BELLA [2]
Ov. Am. 1.9.6; Tib. 1.10.53
BELLARE [1]
Tib. 1.1.53
BELLEPHONTAE [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.15
BELLES [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.28
BELLISSVMV [1]
Plaut. Cur. 20
BELLO [2]
Hor. Carm. 3.26.3; Ov. Am. 1.9.3
BELLMV [2]
Hor. S. 2.3.267; Plaut. Cur. 8
BENE [1]
Ov. Am. 3.4.5
BIBANT [1]
Plaut. Cur. 161
BIBATVR [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.26
BIBENDA [1]
Ov. M. 13.829
BIBERE [1]
Plaut. Cur. 161
BIBESES [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.1
BIBES [1]
Plaut. Cur. 121
BIBI [1]
[Quint.] Decim. Mai. 15.7
BIBUT [1]
Plaut. Cur. 132
BIBITE [1]
Plaut. Cur. 88
BIBVNTVR [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.342
BILIS [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.16
BITET [1]
Plaut. Cur. 141
BLANDA [1]
Tib. 1.2.22
BLANDIOR [2]
Claud. Eutr. 1.85; Ov. Am. 1.6.15
BLANDIRE [1]
Ov. Ar. 2.527
BLANDIS [1]
Ov. M. 14.707
BLANDITIA [1]
Prop. 1.16.16
BLANDITIAE [1]
Ov. Am. 1.4.66
BLANDITIAS [4]
CANTIBVS [1]
CANTICIS [2]
Apul. Ap. 9; 75
CANTO [2]
Ov. Am. 3.8.24; Pers. 5.166
CANTVS [3]
Cic. Phil. fr. 10.3.1; Hor. Carm. 3.7.30; Tib. 1.2.45
CAPTVS [1]
Tib. 1.2.53
CAPAX [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.79
CAPER [1]
Ov. M. 13.832
CAPI [2]
Auson. Ep. 23.6; Ov. Am. 2.12.4
CAPITATVS [1]
Ov. M. 4.72
CAPTIONIS [1]
Aul. Gell. 4.14.1
CAPTO [2]
Lucilius 937; Tib. 1.2.68
CAPTORVM [1]
Prop. 1.16.4
CAPTOS [1]
Ov. Am. 1.8.70
CAPTVS [2]
Ov. Ars 3.591; M. 13.762
CAPVT [10]
Lucilius 943; Ov. Am. 3.8.13; Ars 3.76; M. 13.838; 14.737; Plaut. Am. fr. 5; Prop. 2.14.22; Ter. Eu. 803; Tib. 1.2.86; 1.8.72
CARAE [1]
Tib. 1.2.93
CARBONIVIBVS [1]
Plaut. Mer. 409
CARCERE [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.64
CARDINE [3]
Ov. Am. 1.6.2; 1.6.49; Tib. 1.2.10
CARDINES [4]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.6; Lucilius 939; 942; Plaut. Am. 1026
CARDINIBVS [1]
Prop. 1.16.26
CARDINVMB [2]
Lucilius 795; Plaut. Cur. 158
CARDO [1]
Plaut. Cur. 94
CARCANT [1]
Ov. Rem. 509
CARENDVM [1]
Ov. M. 14.725
CARENTEM [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.26.10
CAREO [1]
Plaut. Cur. 137
CARERE [2]
Ov. Ars 2.249; Tib. 1.2.84
CARET [1]
Ov. Am. 2.12.6
CARIAM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 67
CARINAE [1]
Ov. M. 13.769
CARINAS [1]
Ov. M. 13.731
CARISSIMA [1]
Ov. M. 13.747
CARMEN [3]
Ov. Am. 3.8.2; 3.8.24; Fast. 4.109
CARMINA [8]
Apul. Ap. 9 (4); Ov. Am. 2.1.23; 3.1.39; Prop. 1.16.16; 1.16.41
CARMINE [3]
Ov. Am. 2.1.25; 2.1.28; Tib. 1.2.44
CARMINIBVS [3]
Ov. Am. 2.1.27; Prop. 1.16.10; Tib. 1.2.54
CARPAT [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.32
CARPIT [1]
Ov. Ars 3.79
CARPISSE [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.256
CARPTVS [1]
Ov. Ars 3.80
CARVIT [1]
Plaut. Cur. 17
CARVS [1]
Prop. 1.4.22
CASA [1]
Ov. Ars 2.240
CASAS [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.247
CASIA [1]
Plaut. Cur. 103
CASSES [1]
Pers. 5.170
CASTA [2]
Ov. Am. 3.4.3 (2)
CASTANAEAE [1]
Ov. M. 13.819
CASTO [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.15
CASTRA [4]
Ov. Am. 1.9.1;
3.8.26; Tib. 1.2.68; 2.6.9
CASTRIS [2]
Ov. Ars 2.236;
3.559
CATELLE [1]
Hcr. S. 2.3.259
CATENA [2]
Ov. Am. 1.6.1;
1.6.25
CATENAE [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.47
CATERVAS [3]
Ov. Am. 1.9.27;
Tib. 1.2.47; 1.2.67
CATHEDRATA [1]
Mart. 10.14.1
CATVLOS [1]
Ov. M. 13.836
CAVA [1]
Prop. 1.16.27
CAVE [3]
Hcr. Carm. 3.7.24;
Ov. Am. 1.8.72;
Ter. Eu. 799
CAVEBO [1]
Prop. 2.17.17
CAVETO [1]
Tib. 1.2.87
CAVIT [1]
Ter. Eu. 782
CAVSA [8]
Cic. Phil. 2.45;
Ov. Ars 3.570;
Fast. 4.112; 5.350;
Plaut. Cur. 150;
Pliny Ep. 7.5;
Prop. 1.16.35; Tib. 2.4.37
CAVSABITVR [1]
Ov. Am. 1.9.13
CAVSAM [3]
Aul. Gell. 4.14.2;
Ov. Ars 2.247; M. 13.748
CAVSAS [3]
Lucr. 4.1181; Ov. Am. 1.8.74; Tib. 2.4.29
CAVTE [1]
Plaut. Cur. 32
CAVITIOR [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.89
CAVTO [1]
Ov. Rem. 34
CECIDERE [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.354
CECROPIDES [1]
Ov. Ars 3.457
CEDENT [1]
Apul. Ap. 9
CEDO [2]
Plaut. Cur. 75;
Ter. Eu. 776
CELARE [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.43
CELARI [1]
Tib. 1.2.34
CELEBRARVNT [1]
Prop. 1.16.3
CELEBRET [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.349
CELERI [2]
Tib. 1.2.70; 1.5.70
CELLAS [1]
Petron. 97
CENAVISTI [1]
Plaut. Cur. 18
CENSEBAS [1]
Plaut. Am. 1027
CENEN [1]
Pers. 5.168
CENSEO [2]
Plaut. Cur. 70; 114
CENSES [1]
Plaut. Cur. 23
CENSV [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.9
CENTVM [2]
Ov. Ars 2.636; M. 13.784
CENTVRIOST [1]
Ter. Eu. 776
CERAS [1]
Ov. M. 13.818
CERVERM [2]
Fortun. 1.12;
Plaut. Cur. 9
CERNE [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.19
CERNET [1]
Tib. 1.2.57
CERTA [3]
Hor. S. 2.3.270;
2.3.271; Ov. Am. 1.9.29
CERTARE [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.18
CERTE [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.19
CERTI [1]
Ov. Ars 2.248
CERTO [1]
Plaut. Am. 1022
CERTVMST [1]
Plaut. Am. 1048
CERVA [1]
Catull. 63.72
CERVO [1]
Ov. M. 13.806
CERVOS [1]
Ov. Ars 3.78
CESSANT [2]
Mart. 10.14.9; Ov. M. 13.769
CESSERE [1]
Ov. Am. 2.1.27
CESSIT [1]
Ov. Ars 3.56
CETERA [2]
Juv. 9.70; Tib. 1.2.57
CHAERESTRATVS [1]
Pers. 5.162
CHALYBE [1]
Prop. 1.16.30
CHARYBDIS [1]
Ov. M. 13.730
CHIVM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 78
CHLOEN [2]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.10;
3.26.12
CHLORI [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.15.8
CHOROM [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.352
CHRYSIDIS [1]
Pers. 5.165
CICATRICES [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.19
CILICVM [1]
Tib. 1.2.67
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ov. Ars 3.74</td>
<td>Prop. 1.16.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLMVARVM [1]</td>
<td>COMPLEBANT [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ov. M. 13.833</td>
<td>Prop. 2.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLMIVIBVS [1]</td>
<td>COMPLEVERIT [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catull. 63.71</td>
<td>Plaut. Am. 1016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ov. M. 13.844</td>
<td>CLE 950.1; Ov. Am. 3.11.11; M. 14.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ov. Ars 3.76; Fast. 5.340</td>
<td>Ov. M. 13.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hor. Epod. 11.28</td>
<td>Apul. Ap. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tib. 1.2.92</td>
<td>Ov. M. 13.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. Cur. 54</td>
<td>Ov. Ars 3.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ov. Am. 3.1.44; Prop. 3.16.20; Tib. 1.5.63</td>
<td>Prop. 1.3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ov. Am. 1.6.38; Ars 1.734</td>
<td>Ov. Fast. 5.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apul. Ap. 9</td>
<td>Lucr. 4.1184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMISSATVM [1]</td>
<td>CONCEPT [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. Per. 568</td>
<td>Petron. 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMITATVS [1]</td>
<td>CONCESSA [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ov. Am. 1.6.33</td>
<td>Prop. 1.16.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMWENDAT [1]</td>
<td>CONESSI [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mart. 4.29.5</td>
<td>Ov. Am. 2.19.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMINVI [1]</td>
<td>CONCHA [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. Ba. 1119</td>
<td>Tib. 2.4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMISSVRIS [1]</td>
<td>CONCHIS [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petron. 97</td>
<td>Ov. M. 13.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ter. Ad. 118</td>
<td>Tib. 1.2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. Cur. 154</td>
<td>Ov. Fast. 4.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMVTES [1]</td>
<td>CONCITA [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. Per. 571</td>
<td>Hor. Carm. 3.15.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ov. M. 13.784</td>
<td>Val. Aed. fr. 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPAREM [1]</td>
<td>CONCLUDVS [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ter. Eu. 47</td>
<td>Plaut. Per. 570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMFEDIS [1]</td>
<td>CONCVSSAE [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. Per. 573</td>
<td>Ov. Am. 1.6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPESCERE [1]</td>
<td>CONDAR [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. Cur. 5</td>
<td>Prop. 3.7.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONDICTVS [1]</td>
<td>CONSEISSE [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut. Cur. 616</td>
<td>Cic. Phil. fr. 10.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSERVAE [1]</td>
<td>CONSERVAE [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ov. Am. 1.6.74</td>
<td>Ov. Am. 1.6.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSILIA [1]</td>
<td>Hor. Epod. 11.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSILIVM [4]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Auston. Ep. 23.2; 23.14; Hor. S. 2.3.266; Ter. Eu. 784

CONSECTIO [1]
OV. M. 13.104

CONSPERSI [1]
Plaut. Cur. 80

CONSPICIAN [1]
Plaut. Mer. 407

CONSPICUNDVS [1]
Tib. 1.2.70

CONSPICITW [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.26

CONSTANTI [1]
OV. Am. 1.4.70

CONSTANTIS [1]
OV. Car. 3.7.4

CONSTAT [1]
Fortun. 1.12

CONSTET [1]
OV. Am. 1.3.72

CONSTITERANT [1]
OV. M. 4.71

CONSTITERAT [1]
OV. M. 3.54

CONSTITVI [1]
Plaut. Am. 1052

CONSVIMVS [1]
Pliny Ep. 7.5

CONSVLE [2]
Auston. Ep. 23.11; Hor. Carm. 3.14.28

CONSVMPSTI [1]
OV. Am. 1.6.61

CONSVMPSTI [1]
Prop. 1.3.37

CONTAMINATA [1]
AP. Ap. 75

CONTEMNI [1]
OV. Fast. 5.354

CONTEMNITE [1]
Prop. 2.14.19

CONTEMPLANT [1]
Plaut. Mer. 407

CONTEMPOR [1]
OV. M. 13.761

CONTEMPTVS [2]
OV. M. 13.859; Prop. 2.25.19

CONTENTA [1]
OV. Rem. 301

CONTENVS [1]
OV. Rem. 37

CONTENTXVS [1]
Tib. 1.2.69

CONTIGNIT [2]
OV. Ars 2.638; Stat. S. 1.2.37

CONTINGENT [1]
OV. M. 13.832

CONTINGERE [1]
OV. Am. 3.8.17

CONTINVAD [1]
OV. Ars 3.82

CONTRA [7]

CONTVLERIM [1]
OV. Am. 3.1.39

CONTVMELIA [1]
Apul. Ap. 75

CONTVMELIAE [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.26

CONTVMELIAM [1]
Ter. Eu. 771

CONTVMELIAS [1]
Ter. Eu. 48

CONVADATV [1]
Plaut. Cur. 162

CONVBII [1]
Stat. S. 1.2.195

CONVENIT [2]
OV. Am. 1.9.3; 3.8.15

CONVENIVNT [1]
OV. Ars 3.586

CONVICIA [3]
OV. M. 14.710; Rem. 507; Sen. Ep. 51.12

CONVIVA [1]
OV. Fast. 5.337

CONVIVORVM [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.8

CONVOCAT [1]
Tib. 1.2.50

COPIA [2]
OV. M. 13.863; Tib. 2.3.77

COPIAM [1]
Ter. Ph. 113

CORAM [2]
Ter. Eu. 794; Tib. 1.2.21

CORDA [1]
Stat. S. 1.2.200

CORINNA [2]
OV. Am. 2.12.2; 3.1.49

CORNA [1]
OV. M. 13.816

CORNIVVS [1]
OV. Am. 2.19.29

CORNVA [2]
OV. Am. 2.1.23; Ars 3.78

CORNVM [1]
Ter. Eu. 775

COROLLAE [1]
Prop. 1.16.7

COROLLARIO [1]
Aul. Gei. 1.4.14.6

COROLLIS [1]
Catull. 63.66

CORONA [4]
OV. Am. 1.6.38; 1.6.67; Ars 3.68; Rem. 32

CORONAM [2]
OV. Fast. 5.345; Sex. Turp. 201 (R)

CORONAS [2]
Hor. S. 2.3.256; Juv. 9.85

CORONATA [1]
OV. Fast. 5.341

CORONATOS [1]
Prop. 3.3.47

CORONIS [2]
OV. Fast. 5.335; M. 14.733

CORPORA [6]
CLE 950.8; OV. Ars 1.73; 3.73; M. 13.847; Tib. 1.2.25a; 2.3.76

CORPORE [9]
14.754; Prop. 1.3.34
1.5.22
CORPVS [7]
Ov. Am. 1.6.5;
3.4.5; 3.4.7;
3.11.10; Ars 2.524;
Plaut. Am. 1016;
Prop. 2.17.13
CORREPTVS [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.257
CORMVPAS [1]
Prop. 2.4.3
CORMVPERE [1]
Prop. 1.8.21
COTHVRNATAS [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.348
COTHVRNO [1]
Ov. Am. 3.1.45
CRAS [2]
Ov. Am. 1.4.70;
Tib. 2.6.20
CRASSAS [1]
Plaut. Per. 573
CRATAEIDE [1]
Ov. M. 13.749
CREATVS [1]
Ov. M. 14.699
CREBRIS [1]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.2
CREBRO [1]
Tib. 1.5.72
CREDAM [2]
Plaut. Cur. 58;
Tib. 1.2.59
CREDas [1]
Pers. 5.161
CREDAT [1]
Ov. Am. 1.8.71
CREDE [4]
CLE 950.3; 950.4;
Ov. Am. 1.9.2; Ter. Ad. 101
CREDERE [2]
Ov. Ars 3.457; Tib. 1.2.55
CREDET [1]
Tib. 1.2.41
CREDI [1]
Ov. Ars 2.638
CRVDELES [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.73
CRVBITVM [1]
Prop. 1.3.34
CVPIAM [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.35
CVPIDO [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.11
CVPIT [1]
Ov. Ars 2.638
CVSTODE [1]
Ov. Am. 3.4.1
CVSTODIR [1]
Ov. Am. 3.4.6
CVSTODVM [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.7
CVSTOS [2]
Ov. Am. 2.12.3; Ars 2.635
CREDERIS [1]
Ov. M. 13.825
CREDIN [1]
Ter. Eu. 812
CREDITE [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.347
CREDITIS [1]
[Quint.] Decl. Mai. 14.3
CREDUM [3]
Plaut. Am. 1045;
Cur. 132; Tib. 1.8.66
CREDVLA [1]
Tib. 2.6.19
CREDVLM [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.13
CREPITVM [2]
Plaut. Cur. 158;
Prop. 2.4.4
CRETVS [1]
Ov. M. 13.750
CRIMEN [3]
Apul. Ap. 9; Claud. Eutr. 1.87; Ov. Ars 3.454
CRIMINE [1]
Ov. Rem. 37
CRINIMIBVS [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.14
CRINEM [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.14.22
CRITIA [1]
Apul. Ap. 9
CROCINVM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 103
CRVDELE [1]
[Quint.] Decl. Mai. 15.7
CRVDELIA [1]
Ov. M. 14.728
CRVDELIOR [1]
Prop. 1.16.17
CRVDELIS [2]
Ov. Ars 3.581; M. 14.736
CRVDVM [1]
Pers. 5.162
CRVENTA [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.16
CRVENTVS [1]
Ov. Rem. 28
CRVORIS [1]
Ov. M. 13.768
CRVIRIBVS [1]
Ov. M. 13.826
CRYSTALLA [1]
Mart. 10.14.5
CVBARE [1]
Plaut. Cur. 56
CVCICVLVM [2]
Apul. Ap. 75;
Catull. 63.67
CVBILAL [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.255
CVBITARE [1]
Plaut. Cur. 76
CVBITAT [1]
Plaut. Cur. 57
CVPPIAM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 25
CVLPA [3]
Ov. Am. 1.8.80 (2);
Prop. 2.14.31
CVLTVS [1]
Ov. Fast. 4.108
CVMB [1]
Ov. Ars 3.584
CNATVS [1]
Ov. M. 13.778
CVNEIS [1]
Prud. Symm. 1.66
CVPPIAM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 171
CVPIDA [1]
Plaut. Cur. 100
CVPIDAM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 97
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CVPIDIS [2]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tib. 1.1.76; 1.8.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVPIDO [4]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ov. Am. 1.9.1; 3.1.41; Plaut. Cur. 3; Tib. 2.1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVPIDOS [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hor. Carm. 3.14.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVPIDV [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tib. 1.8.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVPIEBAT [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ter. Ph. 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVPIENT [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Plaut. Per. 567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVPIES [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tib. 1.8.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVPIO [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Auson. Ep. 23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVPIT [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ov. Am. 2.19.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVPIVNT [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ter. Eu. 813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRA [6]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ov. Am. 2.19.43; 3.1.41; Ars 1.736; Fast. 4.108; M. 13.764; Prop. 2.25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRONIS [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cic. Phil. 2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRIS [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tib. 2.6.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRO [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tib. 1.1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRENTE [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hor. Carm. 3.10.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRRVS [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prop. 1.16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRVAT [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hor. Carm. 3.10.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRLIS [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aul. Gel. 4.14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVSTODE [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ov. Am. 3.1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVSTODEM [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Plaut. Cur. 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVSTODES [4]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cic. Phil. 2.45; Ov. M. 4.85; Tib. 1.2.15; 2.1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVSTODIA [4]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Claud. Eutr. 1.80; Tib. 1.2.5; 1.8.55; 2.4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVSTODIT [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hor. Carm. 3.26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVSTODVM [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ov. Am. 1.9.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVSTOS [4]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ov. Am. 3.1.55; Plaut. Cur. 76; Tib. 2.3.73; 2.4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYBELES [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Catull. 63.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYNTHIVS [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ov. Ars 2.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYPRVM [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hor. Carm. 3.26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DABIS [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ov. Am. 1.4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DABITVR [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ter. Ad. 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAMNANTE [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Claud. Eutr. 1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAMNET [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lucr. 4.1183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANA [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ov. Am. 2.19.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANAE [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ov. Am. 2.19.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANAEN [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Claud. Eutr. 1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANDA [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ov. M. 4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANTIS [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prop. 4.5.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAPES [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stat. S. 1.2.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARE [2]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ter. Eu. 793; Tib. 1.2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAREM [2]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ov. Am. 2.19.50; Tib. 1.2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARI [2]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ov. Am. 3.8.28; Ter. Eu. 786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT [5]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ov. Am. 1.6.42; Rem. 306; Plaut. Cur. 161; Tib. 2.4.26; 2.4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATA [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ov. Ars 3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATIS [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Auson. Ep. 23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATO [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ov. Am. 1.4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATVM [1]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hor. Carm. 3.7.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATVS [1]  
Ov. M. 4.77

DEAE [1]  
Ov. Am. 3.1.44

DEAM [2]  
Ov. Fast. 5.334; M. 13.747

DEAS [1]  
Ov. Fast. 5.348

DEBERE [1]  
Ov. M. 4.76

DEBITA [1]  
Prop. 1.16.44

DECEMBER [1]  
Hor. Epod. 11.5

DECENT [2]  
Ov. Ars 3.571; M. 13.850

DECEPTAE [1]  
Ov. Ars 3.454

DECEPTO [1]  
Ov. Am. 3.1.49

DECEPTVM [1]  
Ov. Rem. 501

DECEPTVS [1]  
Hor. S. 1.2.65

DECET [8]  
Hor. Carm. 3.15.8; 
Ov. Ars 2.241; 
Fast. 5.347; Ter. 
Eu. 789; 814; Tib. 
1.1.53; 1.2.13; 
1.2.28

DECIDERAT [1]  
Ov. Rem. 502

DECIDIT [1]  
Tib. 1.2.30

DECIMO [1]  
Prop. 2.17.12

DECORES [1]  
Apuu. Ap. 9

DECORI [1]  
Ov. M. 3.849

DECRETVM [1]  
Aul. Gell. 4.14.1

DECREVEREVTN [1]  
Aul. Gell. 4.14.6

DECVISSET [1]  
Aul. Gell. 4.14.6

DECVIT [2]  
Ov. Am. 1.6.63; Ars 
2.241

DECVS [1]  
Catull. 63.64

DECVTIT [1]  
Hor. Epod. 11.6

DEDECECT [1]  
Ov. Ars 2.530

DEDECVS [1]  
Pers. 5.163

DEDERE [2]  
Ov. Am. 1.6.50; M. 
4.79

DEDERIS [1]  
Ov. Am. 1.8.81

DEDI [1]  
Prop. 1.16.42

DEDICET [1]  
Hor. Carm. 1.25.20

DEDIMVS [1]  
Juuv. 9.86

DEDISCTIVVR [1]  
Ov. Rem. 503

DEDISSE [3]  
Ov. Am. 1.4.70; M. 
14.740; Tib. 1.8.70

DEDIT [6]  
Hor. S. 1.2.65; 
Ov. Am. 1.6.6; Ars 
3.54; M. 14.707; 
Tib. 1.8.56; 2.4.35

DEDITA [1]  
Tib. 1.2.97

DEDITVS [1]  
Juuv. 9.71

DEDVCET [1]  
Tib. 1.5.65

DEDVCITE [1]  
Ov. Am. 3.8.27

DEDVCVTNT [1]  
Ov. Am. 2.1.23

DEDVXI [1]  
Prop. 1.16.41

DEERVNT [1]  
Ov. M. 13.819

DEFENDERE [1]  
Prop. 1.16.9

DEFLERE [1]  
Prop. 1.16.13

DEFORMIS [1]  
[Quint.] Decl. Mai. 
14.3

DEFVNCVTVM [1]  
Hor. Carm. 3.26.3

DEGRAVAT [1]  
Ov. M. 13.777

DEICIVNT [1]  
Lucilius 944

DEJECTVM [1]  
Aul. Gell. 4.14.6

DEINDE [2]  
Pliny Ep. 7.5; Tib. 
1.5.73

DEIS [1]  
Ov. Rem. 678

DELABERE [1]  
Ov. Ars 2.245

DELABI [1]  
Ov. Am. 3.1.51

DELATVS [1]  
Ov. M. 13.770

DELECTET [1]  
Hor. S. 2.3.249

DELIA [4]  
Tib. 1.1.57; 
1.2.15; 1.2.31; 
1.2.71

DELICIAE [1]  
Ov. M. 13.831

DELICIS [1]  
Ov. Fast. 5.334

DELICTA [1]  
Prop. 2.4.1

DELIVVISSE [2]  
Ov. Am. 3.1.56; Ars 
2.240

DELIVDAT [1]  
Ov. Am. 2.19.33

DEMENTIA [1]  
Tib. 1.2.11

DEMER [1]  
Ov. M. 13.805

DEMITERE [1]  
Ov. Am. 1.6.35

DEMITTERERE [1]  
Cic. Phil. 2.45

DEMPISISTIS [1]  
Ov. M. 14.732

DEMPTAGS [1]  
Ov. Ars 2.528

DEMPTO [1]  
Ov. Am. 3.4.3

DEMPTVS [1]  
Ov. M. 13.833

DENATAT [1]  
Hor. Carm. 3.7.28
DICERET [1]
Livy Per. 89
DICES [1]
Plaut. Cur. 133
DICET [1]
Ov. Ars 2.526
DICI [2]
Auson. Ep. 23.10;
Plaut. Cur. 124
DICIS [1]
Plaut. Cur. 50
DICITVR [6]
Cic. Phil. fr.
10.3.1; Hor. S.
2.3.256; Ov. Fast.
4.110; Pliny Ep.
7.5; Tib. 1.2.51;
2.1.68
DICO [2]
Plaut. Cur. 133;
Ter. Eu. 805
DICTA [2]
Ov. Ars 2.521; M.
13.788
DICTIS [3]
Ov. M. 13.739;
Stat. S. 1.2.194;
Tib. 1.2.54
DIDICIT [1]
Ov. Am. 3.1.49
DIE [1]
Prop. 2.17.12
DIEBVS [1]
Apul. Ap. 75
DIEM [3]
Aul. Gell. 4.14.3;
[Quint.] Decl. Mai.
15.7; Tib. 1.8.78
DIES [2]
Plaut. Cur. 5; Ter.
Eu. 793
DIFFEROR [1]
Prop. 1.16.47
DIFFERRE [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.251
DIFFICILE [1]
Prop. 2.17.8
DIFFICILEM [2]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.11;
Ov. Am. 1.6.2
DIFFICILI [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.350
DIFFICILIS [2]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.32;
Tib. 1.2.7
DIGITI [1]
Tib. 1.2.32
DIGNA [3]
Ov. Am. 2.12.5;
Rem. 38; Tib.
2.6.43
DIGNATA [1]
Ov. Am. 3.1.37
DIGNOSCERE [1]
Ov. M. 13.835
DIGNVS [2]
Ov. Am. 1.6.64;
Prop. 1.13.34
DILECTVM [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.96
DILIGENTVS [1]
Petron. 97
DILIGIT [1]
Ov. Rem. 305
DIMICET [1]
Ov. Rem. 27
DIMINVAM [1]
Ter. Eu. 803
DIMITO [1]
Ter. Eu. 814
DIRA [1]
Tib. 2.6.17
DIRAS [1]
Tib. 2.6.53
DIRIMI [1]
Juv. 9.79
DIS [4]
Ov. M. 13.761;
Pers. 5.167; Plaut.
Cur. 168; Ter. Ad.
121
DISCEDIMVS [1]
Ov. Ep. 10.57
DISCEDITE [1]
Ov. Ars 2.233
DISCERE [1]
Prop. 1.5.20
DISCIDIT [1]
Ter. Ad. 120
DISCITE [2]
Ov. Am. 3.8.25; Ars
3.455
DISERTVS [1]
Ov. Fast. 4.112
DISPERII [1]
Plaut. Ba. 1116
DISPLICET [1]
Tib. 1.8.75
DISSILVNT [1]
Ov. Am. 2.1.25
DISSIMVLES [1]
Juv. 9.70
DISTAT [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.260
DISTENTVM [1]
Ov. M. 13.826
DITATA [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.91
DITES [1]
Tib. 1.1.78
DIV [6]
Claud. Eutr. 1.96;
Lucr. 4.1182; Ov.
Am. 2.19.33;
2.19.49; M. 14.701;
Sex. Turp. 199 (R)
DIVA [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.26.9
DIVERSA [1]
Ov. M. 4.78
DIVERSAS [1]
Prop. 1.3.31
DIVERSOS [1]
Prop. 1.10.15
DIVES [2]
Ov. Am. 3.8.9;
Prud. Symm. 1.66
DIVI [1]
Tib. 1.8.69
DIVIDAR [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.36
DIVIDAT [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.16
DIVIDIT [1]
CLE 950.9
DIVOS [1]
Auson. Ep. 23.5
DIVTIVS [1]
Cic. Phil. 2.45
DIVVLSA [1]
Ov. M. 13.865
DIXERA [1]
Ov. M. 4.79
DIXERIT [1]
Ov. Rem. 505
DIXI [1]
Plaut. Am. 1040; 1052; Cur. 88; 124; Ter. Eu. 46; 801
FACIAS [4]
Hor. S. 2.3.253;
Plaut. Cur. 36;
Ter. Eu. 802; 807
FACIAT [3]
Ov. Am. 2.19.6;
Ter. Eu. 790; Ph. 113
FACIES [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.31
FACIET [1]
Ov. Ars 3.458
FACILE [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.31
FACILES [1]
Ov. M. 13.831
FACILI [1]
Ov. Ars 3.579
FACILIS [1]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.5
FACINVVS [4]
Ov. Am. 1.6.22;
Plaut. Cur. 24;
Tib. 2.4.21; 2.4.25
FACIO [1]
Plaut. Cur. 48
FACIS [2]
Ov. M. 13.741;
Plaut. Cur. 24
FACIT [6]
Lucr. 4.1174; Ov. Am. 1.8.82; 3.4.4;
(2); Ars 3.57;
Plaut. Cur. 160
FACITE [1]
Ov. M. 14.731
FACIVNT [2]
Ov. Ars 3.78; 3.81
FACTA [9]
Ov. Am. 1.6.18;
2.19.28; 2.19.30;
M. 14.729; 14.745;
Plaut. Am. 1019;
1042; Prop.
3.25.16; Tib.
2.6.10
FACTIS [1]
Ov. M. 14.714
FACTITAVIT [1]
Ter. Eu. 783
FACTO [1]
Fortun. 1.12
FACTVM [1]
Ov. M. 14.740
FACTVRV [1]
Plaut. Cur. 75
FACTVRVM [1]
Plaut. Am. fr. 11
FACVLAM [2]
Au. Gell. 19.9.12;
Val. Aed. fr. 2.1
FAENA [1]
Ov. Ars 3.573
FALCE [1]
Ov. M. 13.766
FALLACI [1]
Ov. Ars 3.456
FALLACIOR [1]
Ov. M. 13.799
FALLAT [1]
Prop. 2.17.6
FALLAX [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.20
FALLE [1]
Tib. 1.2.15
FALLERE [4]
Auson. Ep. 23.5;
Ov. M. 4.85; Tib.
1.2.53; 1.8.56
FALLERIS [1]
Ov. M. 13.774
FALLIMVR [2]
Ov. Am. 1.6.49;
1.6.51
FALLIT [1]
Tib. 1.8.63
FALLOR [1]
Ov. Am. 3.1.34
FALSA [1]
Ov. Ars 2.522
FALSIS [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.14
FAMA [2]
Ov. Ars 3.453; M. 14.728
FAMAE [3]
Juv. 9.86; Ov. M. 14.732; Prop.
1.16.11
FAMEM [1]
Tib. 1.1.78
FAMILIA [1]
Apul. Ap. 75
FAMILIAE [1]
Plaut. Am. 1044
FAMILIAM [1]
Ter. Ad. 89
FAMILIAS [1]
Plaut. Mer. 405
FAMILIIS [1]
Plaut. Per. 566
FAMVLA [1]
Catull. 63.68
FAMVLAE [1]
Lucr. 4.1176
FAMVLI [1]
Ov. M. 14.741
FANIS [1]
Tib. 2.4.23
FANO [1]
Plaut. Cur. 62
FANVM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 14
FAS [2]
Auson. Ep. 23.5;
Tib. 2.3.74
FASCIOLOS [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.255
FASSAS [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.22
FASTIDIA [1]
Tib. 1.8.69
FASTIDIT [1]
Ov. Rem. 305
FASTIDITA [1]
Auson. Ep. 23.13
FASTOSAE [1]
Mart. 4.10.14.7
FASTVS [5]
Mart. 4.29.5; Ov.
Ars 2.241; Rem.
511; Prop. 3.25.15;
Tib. 1.8.75
FATA [2]
Ov. Am. 1.6.14;
Tib. 1.5.69
FATEBERE [1]
Ov. M. 14.723
FATEMVR [1]
Ov. M. 4.76
FATETVR [1]
Prop. 2.25.19
FATVE [1]
Tib. 1.8.68
FESSI [1]
Tib. 1.2.2
FESSVS [1]
Ov. M. 13.777
FESTIVAE [1]
Plaut. Cur. 88
FESTIVISSVMAE [1]
Plaut. Cur. 93
FETA [1]
Ov. M. 13.803
FETVRA [1]
Ov. M. 13.827
FETVS [1]
Ov. M. 13.820
FI [1]
Plaut. Cur. 87
FIANT [1]
Ter. Ad. 122
FIAT [2]
Plaut. Cur. 41;
Tib. 1.2.33
FICTA [2]
Ov. M. 13.734; Tib. 1.8.74
FICTAE [1]
Petron. 97
FIDA [2]
Claud. Eutr. 1.81;
Ov. M. 13.748
FIDE [2]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.4;
Ov. Ars 2.640
FIDEM [5]
Ov. Am. 3.1.50;
Patron. 97; Plaut. Cur. 140; Prop. 2.17.18; Ter. Eu. 790
FIDES [2]
Auson. Ep. 23.4;
Ov. Ars 3.578
FIDICINAM [1]
Ter. Ph. 109
FIDVS [1]
Tib. 1.5.63
FIEREM [1]
[Quint.] Decl. Mai. 15.7
FIERI [2]
Plaut. Cur. 159;
Ter. Eu. 779
FIES [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.12
FIET [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.14.24
FIGIT [1]
Lucr. 4.1179
FIGVRAEST [1]
Catull. 63.62
FILIA [2]
Hor. Carm. 3.15.8;
Juv. 9.83
FILII [1]
Apul. Ap. 75
FILIOVLS [1]
Juv. 9.83
FINDIT [1]
Tib. 1.2.45
FINE [2]
Ov. Am. 1.9.10; M. 13.755
FINGE [1]
Ov. Am. 1.8.73
FINGEBAT [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.83
FINGERERE [2]
Ov. Rem. 504; Tib. 1.2.92
FINGIT [1]
Tib. 2.6.51
FINGO [1]
Tib. 1.8.65
FINIRE [2]
Hor. S. 2.3.263;
Pers. 5.161
FINIS [2]
Ov. Am. 2.19.52;
Prop. 1.16.21
FINISSEM [1]
Tib. 2.6.19
FIRMA [2]
Ov. Am. 2.12.3;
Tib. 1.2.6
FIRMARAT [1]
Prud. Symm. 1.66
FISTVLA [1]
Ov. M. 13.784
FIT [8]
Cic. Phil. fr.
10.3.1; Fortun.
1.12; Ov. Ars
1.736; Rem. 30;
Plaut. Am. 1019;
Cur. 61; 121; Prop.
3.16.20
FITE [2]
Plaut. Cur. 89; 150
FIVNT [1]
Plaut. Cur. 157
FIXA [1]
Prop. 1.3.34
FIXISSE [1]
Tib. 2.1.71
FIXO [1]
Tib. 1.2.18
FIXVS [1]
Tib. 1.5.62
FLAGELLO [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.26.11
FLAGITIA [1]
Cic. Phil. 2.45
FLAGITIVM [2]
Plaut. Mer. 406;
Ter. Ad. 101
FLAGRANS [1]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.13
FLAMINE [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.54
FLAMMA [4]
AuL. Gell. 19.9.12;
Plaut. Cur. 53; 54;
Val. Aed. fr. 2.2
FLAMMAE [1]
Tib. 2.4.42
FLAMMIS [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.90
FLAVENTIA [1]
Ov. M. 13.848
FLEBILE [1]
Ov. Rem. 36
FLEBILIS [2]
Ov. M. 14.748; Tib. 2.4.22
FLEBIS [1]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.10
FLEBIT [1]
Prop. 2.17.18
FLECTERE [2]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.25;
Stat. S. 1.2.200
FLENDI [1]
Ov. Ars 3.570
FLENTI [1]
Prop. 3.20.29
FLES [1]
FVNIIS [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.10
FVNVS [1]
Ov. M. 14.751
FVRARI [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.45
FVRIFICER [1]
Ter. Eu. 798
FVRENTEM [1]
Cic. Phil. fr. 10.3.1
FVRERE [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.6
FVRIARE [1]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.14
FVROREM [1]
Ov. M. 14.701
FVRTA [2]
Ov. Ars 2.640; Tib. 1.2.34
FVRTI [1]
Ter. Eu. 809
FVRTIM [11]
Hor. S. 2.3.256; Lucr. 4.1176; Ov. Am. 1.4.64; 2.19.39; Rem. 33; Prop. 2.9.42; Tib. 1.2.10; 1.2.19; 1.5.65; 2.1.75; 2.6.45
FVRTIS [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.88
FVRTIVA [1]
Tib. 1.8.57
FVRTIVAS [2]
Ov. Ars 2.246; Prop. 1.16.20
FVRTIVVS [1]
Tib. 1.5.75
FVRVM [1]
Ter. Eu. 776
GALATEA [6]
GALEA [1]
Tib. 2.6.8
GALEAM [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.13
GAVDE [1]
Ov. M. 14.721
GAVDEAT [1]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.18
GAVDES [1]
Juv. 9.84
GAVDIA [2]
CLE 950.3; Tib. 2.3.72
GAVDIVM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 106
GELV [1]
Prop. 1.16.24
GEMINA [1]
Ov. M. 14.725
GEMINO [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.91
GEMINOS [1]
Ov. M. 13.834
GEMMATAS [1]
Ov. Rem. 39
GENAS [1]
Ov. Ars 3.568
GENER [1]
Hor. S. 1.2.64
GENERE [1]
Plaut. Cur. 23
GENEROsa [1]
Ov. M. 13.818
GENEROSAM [1]
Ov. M. 14.698
GENIBVS [1]
Tib. 1.2.85
GENIO [1]
Apul. Ap. 9
GENITOR [1]
Ov. M. 13.854
GENVA [1]
Petron. 97
GENVIT [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.12
GENVS [2]
Catull. 63.62; Ov. M. 13.740
GERENS [1]
Ov. M. 13.733
GERIS [1]
Ov. M. 13.773
GERITE [1]
Plaut. Cur. 149
GESTIT [1]
Tib. 2.1.72
GLACIE [1]
Ov. M. 13.795
GLACIET [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.7
GLADIIIS [1]
Ov. Rem. 27
GLADIOS [1]
Ov. Ars 3.589
GLANS [1]
Tib. 2.3.69
GLORIA [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.26.2
GLORIANTIS [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.23
GNATHO [1]
Ter. Eu. 771
GNATO [1]
Lucilius 946
GRAIBVS [1]
Prop. 1.16.42
GRADIENS [1]
Ov. M. 13.776
GRADV [2]
Propc. 2.4.6; Stat. S. 1.2.35
GRACVM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 120
GRAECIA [1]
Prop. 2.6.2
GRANINE [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.26
GRANA [1]
Ov. Ars 3.54
GRANDE [1]
Tib. 2.4.33
GRANDIOREM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 120
GRANDIS [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.4
GRATA [2]
Ov. Ars 3.68; Sen. QNat. 4 A pr. 6
GRATIA [5]
Mart. 4.29.3; Ov. Am. 1.6.21; Fast. 5.344; Plaut. Cur. 154; Ter. Ad. 121
GRATIAM [2]
Plaut. Cur. 155; Per. 567
GRATIOR [3]
Ov. Am. 2.19.30; M. 13.793; Sen. QNat. 4 A pr. 6

GRATIS [1]
Ov. Am. 1.8.72
GRATISSIMA [1]
Ov. M. 13.736
GRATO [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.23
GRATVS [1]
Ov. M. 14.723
GRAVANTIA [1]
Ov. M. 13.812
GRAVE [1]
Prop. 1.5.19
GRAVES [2]
Hor. Epod. 11.26; Ov. Am. 1.9.19
GRAVI [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.2
GRAVIVS [2]
Ov. Am. 3.1.35; Prop. 1.16.13
GRAVIVS [1]
Ov. Am. 3.1.36
GRAVITATE [1]
Cic. Phil. Fr. 10.3.1
GRAVITATIS [1]
Aul. Gell. 4.14.1
GREMINIO [2]
Ov. M. 13.787; Prud. Symm. 1.68
GVTTVRI [2]
Plaut. Cur. 106; 140a
GYGEN [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.5
GYMNASI [1]
Catull. 63.64
HABE [1]
Ov. Rem. 510
HABEAT [1]
Ter. Eu. 800
HABEBIS [1]
Plaut. Per. 567
HABEBIT [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.25.4
HABENDA [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.348
HABENT [2]
Ov. Ars 3.454; Fast. 5.340
HABEO [1]
Plaut. Cur. 98
HABERE [6]
Ov. Am. 3.8.2; 3.8.4; Ars 3.592; Prop. 1.3.40; 2.17.2; Tib. 1.2.65
HABERENT [1]
Petron. 97
HABERI [1]
Ov. Am. 1.8.51
HABES [5]
Apul. Ap. 9; Juv. 9.87; Ov. Am. 1.6.16; 3.1.60; Ars 2.242
HABET [8]
Hor. S. 2.3.266; Ov. Am. 1.9.1; 2.1.20; 3.8.20; Rem. 301; 306; Plaut. Cur. 112; Tib. 2.1.70
HABILIS [1]
Ov. Am. 1.9.3
HABITAT [2]
Plaut. Cur. 33; 44
HABIVS [1]
Ov. Fast. 4.107
HABIVSSE [1]
Tib. 2.3.70
HABIVSSET [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.27
HABIVIT [1]
Prop. 2.14.22
HAEDI [1]
Ov. M. 13.828
HAEDIS [1]
Ov. M. 14.711
HAEDO [1]
Ov. M. 13.791
HAEREBAI [1]
[Quint.] Decl. Mai. 14.3
HAERET [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.261
HAESTI [1]
Ov. M. 14.756
HAND [1]
Aul. Gell. 4.14.2
HARENAS [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.45
HARVINDINE [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.248
HARVINDINIVS [1]
Ov. M. 13.784
HASTA [1]
Ov. Rem. 27
HAVSERAT [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.80
HAVSI [1]
Ov. M. 13.787
HEBETES [1]
Ov. Ars 3.589
HECATES [1]
Tib. 1.2.52
HEDERA [1]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.17
HERBAS [2]
Ov. M. 4.82; Tib. 1.2.51
HERBIS [1]
Tib. 1.2.60
HERCLE [7]
Aul. Gell. 19.9.12; Lucilius 795; Plaut. Cur. 20; 50; 129; 132; 156
HEREDITATES [1]
Plaut. Cur. 127
HERI [2]
Plaut. Cur. 17; 18
HIBERNAE [2]
Mart. 4.29.4; Tib. 1.2.29
HIBERNIS [1]
Ov. M. 13.793
HIEMIS [1]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.19
HIEMS [2]
Ov. Ars 2.235; M. 13.812
HIPPOLYTEN [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.18
HIRSVTAM [1]
Ov. M. 13.766
HIRTAE [1]
Ov. M. 13.850
HISTORIAS [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.20
HOMERE [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.28
HOMINEM [3]
Ov. Am. 3.8.21; Plaut. Am. 1048; Ter. Eu. 802
HOMINES [2]
Plaut. Mer. 410; Per. 566
HOMINI [1]
Ov. Fast. 4.107
HOMO [5]
Plaut. Am. 1028; Cur. 122; 167; 170; Ter. Eu. 804
HONESTAS [1]
Lucr. 4.1181
HONORE [1]
Lucr. 4.1171
HONOREM [3]
Hor. Epod. 11.6; Ov. Am. 1.6.71; Stat. S. 1.2.194
HONOS [1]
Apul. Ap. 75
HORA [1]
Ov. Ars 3.64
HORAS [1]
Ov. Am. 1.4.59
HORIS [1]
Pliny Ep. 7.5
HORRENDSVS [1]
Ov. M. 13.760
HORRENT [1]
Ov. M. 13.846
HORRIDA [2]
Ter. Ph. 106; Tib. 2.3.76
HORTANTE [1]
Cic. Phil. 2.45
HORTO [1]
Ov. M. 13.797
HOSPITAE [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.8
HOSPITE [1]
Ov. M. 13.760
HOSTE [2]
Ov. Am. 1.9.18; Plaut. Cur. 5
HOSTES [2]
Ov. Am. 1.9.17; 2.12.3
HOSTI [2]
Ov. Am. 1.6.31; Ars 3.577
HOSTIA [1]
Tib. 1.2.62
HOSTIBVS [2]
Ov. Am. 1.9.26; 3.11.16
HOSTILES [1]
Tib. 1.1.54
HOSTILIVS [1]
Aul. GeII. 4.14.2
HVMANOS [1]
Prop. 1.16.25
HVMILES [1]
Ov. Am. 2.12.7
HVMILI [1]
Ov. M. 14.699
HVMO [4]
Ov. Am. 3.11.10; Ars 2.238; 2.524; Tib. 1.2.74
HYDRO [1]
Ov. M. 13.804
HYLAS [1]
Stat. S. 1.2.199
IA [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.68
IACEAM [2]
Prop. 2.14.32; Tib. 2.4.22
IACEAT [1]
Ov. Ars 3.581
IACEBIS [2]
Ov. Ars 2.238; 3.70
IACENTEM [1]
Prop. 1.16.23
IACENTES [1]
Tib. 2.1.75
IACERE [8]
Ov. Am. 1.9.30; 3.8.12; Rem. 304; Prop. 1.16.8; 2.17.13
IACES [1]
Mart. 10.14.7
IACET [2]
Plaut. Am. 1072; Prop. 1.16.33
IACTA [1]
Ov. Ars 3.78
IACTIBVS [1]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.2
IACVIT [1]
Prop. 2.6.2
IANITOR [6]
Ov. Am. 1.6.1; 1.6.27; Tib. 1.1.56; Ov. Ars 3.587; Prop. 4.5.47; Stat. S. 1.2.35
IANITOREM [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.14.23
IANITRIX [1]
Plaut. Cur. 76
IANVA [37]
Apul. Ap. 75; Claud. Eutr. 1.93; Hor. Carm. 1.25.4; 3.10.5; Mart. 4.29.6; 10.14.8; Ov. Am. 1.6.3; 1.6.18; 1.6.28; 1.6.51; 1.8.77; 2.1.20; 2.12.3; 3.1.46; 3.8.7; Ars 2.244; 2.523; 3.71; 3.456; 3.581; M. 14.740; Rem. 31; 506; Prop. 1.16.2; 1.16.17; 1.16.36; 2.9.42; 2.16.6; 2.23.12; 3.25.10; Tib. 1.2.6; 1.2.7; 1.2.9; 1.5.68; 1.8.76; 2.3.74; 2.4.31
IANVAE [1]
Catull. 63.65
IBAT [3]
Ov. M. 13.737; 14.748; Prop. 2.4.6
IBI [1]
Lucr. 4.1183
IBIVS [2]
Aul. GeII. 19.9.12; Val. Aed. fr. 2.2
IBIT [1]
Ov. Am. 1.9.11
ICARI [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.21
ICTA [1]
Ov. M. 14.739
ICTIVS [2]
Aul. Gell. 4.14.3;
[Quint.] Decr. Mai.
15.7
IDAE [1]
Catull. 63.70
IDONEVS [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.26.1
IECVR [1]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.15
IEIENTACVLO [1]
Plaut. Cur. 73
IEIENTACVLM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 72
IGNAVE [1]
Ter. Eu. 777
IGNEM [2]
Aul. Gell. 19.9.12;
Val. Aed. fr. 2.5
IGNES [1]
Ov. M. 4.81
IGNI [2]
Ov. Am. 1.6.57; M.
13.802
IGNIBVS [3]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.11;
Ov. Ars 3.567;
3.573
IGNIS [3]
Ov. M. 13.867;
14.712; Tib. 2.4.40
IGNORANT [1]
Plaut. Am. 1047
IGNOSCAS [2]
Ov. Am. 2.1.19;
Tib. 1.2.12
IMBER [4]
Aul. Gell. 19.9.12;
Tib. 1.2.7; 1.2.30;
Val. Aed. fr. 2.4
IMBRE [1]
Ov. Am. 1.9.16
IMBREM [1]
Ov. Ars 2.237
IMBRICIBVS [1]
Prud. Symm. 1.67
IMITANTIA [1]
Ov. M. 13.818
IMMENSA [1]
Ov. M. 13.768
IMMERITA [1]
Prop. 2.25.18
IMMERITOS [1]
Prop. 2.4.3
IMMITIE [1]
Ov. M. 13.740
IMMITIA [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.17
IMMISSIBVS [1]
Ov. M. 14.714
IMMITIOR [1]
Ov. M. 13.804
IMMITIS [1]
Ov. M. 13.759
IMMOBILIOR [1]
Ov. M. 13.801
IMMORTEALES [1]
Plaut. Per. 565
IMMVTATIS [1]
Plaut. Cur. 146
IMO [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.10
IMPARIBVS [1]
Ov. Am. 3.1.37
IMPATIENS [1]
Ov. M. 14.716
IMPEDEIRE [1]
Ov. M. 13.745
IMPERANT [1]
Plaut. Cur. 6
IMPERAT [1]
Plaut. Cur. 3
IMPERATOR [1]
Plaut. Cur. 115
IMPERATORIS [1]
Ter. Eu. 778
IMPERCVSSOS [1]
Ov. Am. 3.1.52
IMPERIO [1]
Tib. 1.2.8
IMPERVVM [1]
Tib. 2.3.79
IMPETRARE [1]
Plaut. Cur. 65
IMPIA [2]
Ov. M. 14.736;
Prop. 2.17.13
IMPINGI [1]
Plaut. Per. 573
IMPLEANTVR [1]
Plaut. Cur. 24; 144
IMCETO [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.20
INCEDAS [1]
Tib. 1.2.81
INCEDAT [1]
Plaut. Mer. 406
INCENDIA [1]
Tib. 2.4.41
INCEPTAS [2]
Plaut. Cur. 24; 144
INCERTO [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.20
INCESTVS [1]
Tib. 1.2.81
INCINCTIS [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.337
INCINGERE [1]
Ov. M. 14.720

INGEPE [2]
Ov. Am. 2.19.38; 2.19.39

INCIPIET [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.48

INCIPIS [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.48

INCLUDET [1]
Ov. Am. 1.4.61

INGOLS [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.3

INCREDIBILE [1]
Plin. Ep. 7.5

INCREPITANTE [1]
Prop. 3.25.14

INCVBAT [1]
Plaut. Cur. 61

INCVLTA [1]
Tib. 1.2.74

INCVMO [1]
Ov. Ep. 10.55

INDAS [1]
Plaut. Per. 571

INDICET [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.22

INDIGNIS [1]
Prop. 1.16.6

INDIGNSSVME [1]
Ter. Ad. 91

INDIGNVM [2]
Ov. Am. 1.6.1; Plaut. Cur. 23

INDCETO [1]
Tib. 2.1.69

INDOMITAS [2]
Clud. Eutr. 1.84; Tib. 2.1.68

INDOMITIS [1]
Ov. M. 13.798

INDVCTO [1]

INDVLOGENTIA [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.35

INERS [3]
Ov. Ars 3.60; Prop. 3.7.72; Tib. 1.1.58

INERTES [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.25

INERTIA [1]
Tib. 1.2.23

INESSSET [1]
Ter. Ph. 108

INEST [1]
Ov. Ars 2.236

INFAMIS [2]
Prop. 1.16.9; Tib. 2.4.38

INFECTAS [1]
Prop. 2.17.2

INFELIX [2]
Ov. M. 14.738; Tib. 1.2.4

INFERAS [1]
Tib. 1.2.47

INFERRIS [1]
Plaut. Cur. 72

INFESTAT [1]
Ov. M. 14.731

INFESTOS [1]
Ov. Am. 1.9.17

INFIDA [1]
Ov. Ars 3.578

INFIRMITATEM [1]
Petron. 97

INFIAX [1]
Ov. Am. 3.1.53

INFREGI [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.22

INFVDNENS [1]
Prud. Symm. 1.68

INFVDNI [1]
Plaut. Am. fr. 5

INGENIO [3]
Ov. Am. 2.1.18; 3.4.2; Plaut. Cur. 146

INGENIOSVS [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.8

INGENIVM [4]
Hor. Epod. 11.12; Ov. Am. 3.8.3; Ars 3.57; Ter. Eu. 812

INGENTI [1]
Ov. M. 13.776

INGENTIS [1]
Ov. M. 13.852

INGENVAS [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.1

INGENVOS [1]
Ov. Ars 2.530

INGENVVM [1]
Ov. Am. 3.11.10

INGRATA [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.16

INGRATAM [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.9

INGRATE [1]
Ju. 9.82

INGRATI [1]
Ov. M. 4.76

INGRATIIS [1]
Plaut. Cur. 6

INGVRGITAT [1]
Plaut. Cur. 128

INHAERET [1]
Ov. Ars 3.561

INJECTA [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.336

INIIT [1]
Ov. M. 14.752

INIMICVM [1]
Ter. Eu. 802

INIVRIA [1]
Prop. 1.3.35

INIVRIV [1]
Plaut. Cur. 65

INMERITO [1]
Tib. 1.6.72

INMORIENTIS [1]
Prud. Symm. 1.63

INMVNDI [1]
Ov. Ars 2.524

INOFFENSOS [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.8

INOPI [1]
Auson. Ep. 23.4

INPAR [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.248

INPARIBYS [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.18

INPIA [1]
Tib. 1.2.80

INPRANSI [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.257

INPRVNDENS [1]
Tib. 1.2.37

INPVLERIT [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.14

INQVAM [1]
Ter. Eu. 809

INQVIETIS [1]
[Quint.] Dec. Mai. 15.7

INQVIETVM [1]
LACERTIS [2]
Ov. Am. 3.8.11;
Tib. 1.2.73
LACERTO [1]
Prop. 1.16.33
LACRIMAE [2]
Ov. M. 13.745;
Stat. S. 1.2.196
LACRIMANS [1]
Lucr. 4.1177
LACRIMARE [1]
Tib. 1.8.67
LACRIMARVM [1]
Ov. M. 14.708
LACRIMAS [1]
Tib. 1.8.73
LACRIMIS [9]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.8;
Mart. 10.14.8; Ov.
Am. 1.4.61; 1.6.18;
Ep. 10.55; Rem. 37;
Prop. 1.16.4;
1.16.32; Tib.
2.6.43
LACRIMO萨 [1]
Ov. M. 14.746
LACRVMAE [1]
Ter. Ph. 107
LACTA [1]
Ov. M. 13.796
LACTE [1]
Tib. 1.2.48
LAEDIT [1]
Tib. 1.2.31
LAESA [1]
Ov. Am. 1.8.79
LAESIT [1]
Prop. 1.16.37
LAESO [1]
Ov. Am. 1.8.79
LAESVS [2]
Ov. M. 13.867;
Prop. 2.25.20
LAETA [2]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.17;
Ov. Ars 2.247
LAETI [1]
Tib. 2.4.41
LAETIS [2]
Ov. Am. 1.6.67; Ars
3.580
LAETO [1]
Apul. Ap. 9
LAETOS [1]
Ov. M. 14.719
LAETVS [1]
Tib. 1.2.87
LAeva [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.15
LAEVOM [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.26.5
LAEVVM [1]
Ov. M. 13.730
LAGOENAM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 78
LAIDOS [1]
Prop. 2.6.1
LAIS [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.90
LANA [1]
Ov. M. 13.849
LANGVERE [2]
Ov. Rem. 511; Tib.
2.6.49
LANGVIDVS [1]
Prop. 1.3.38
LANGVOR [1]
Hor. Erod. 11.9
LANIGERAE [1]
Ov. M. 13.781
LANVGINE [1]
Ov. M. 13.754
LAPIDE [2]
Aul. Gell. 4.14.3
(2)
LAPIDIBVS [2]
Aul. Gell. 4.14.5;
Decimus Laberius
142
LAPSE [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.38
LAQVEI [1]
Ov. M. 14.735
LAQVEO [1]
Sen. Ep. 4.4
LAQVEOS [2]
Ov. Ars 3.591; Rem.
502
LARES [1]
Ov. Rem. 302
LASCIVAS [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.85
LASCIVI [1]
Ov. M. 3.1.43
LASCIVIA [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.331
LASCIVIOR [1]
Ov. M. 13.791
LASSVS [1]
Ov. Am. 3.11.13
LATENTEM [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.82
LATERE [2]
Hor. Erod. 11.10;
Tib. 1.5.62
LATET [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.336
LATITANS [1]
Ov. M. 13.786
LATRATIBVS [1]
Ov. M. 13.806
LATRENT [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.40
LATVERE [1]
Ov. Fast. 4.114
LATVS [11]
Claud. Eutr. 1.86;
Hor. Erod. 11.22;
Carm. 3.10.20;
3.26.5; Ov. Am.
1.6.4; 3.8.14;
3.11.14; M. 13.730;
13.779; 14.710;
Rem. 508
LAVDARE [1]
Ov. M. 14.722
LAVDARI [1]
Tib. 1.1.57
LAVDATO [2]
Ov. Am. 3.8.7; M.
13.802
LAVDAVERAM [1]
Hor. Erod. 11.19
LAVDAVIT [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.7
LAVDIGVS [1]
Ov. M. 13.824
LAVRV [1]
Ov. M. 14.720
LAVRVS [1]
Ov. Am. 2.12.1
LAVTVS [1]
Plaut. Cur. 9
LAXA [2]
Ov. Am. 1.8.77;
3.1.46
Ov. Am. 1.4.62; 1.6.23; 3.4.7; 3.8.6; Ars 3.61; Plaut. Cur. 95; 170; Prop. 1.16.29; 1.16.30; 2.17.7; 2.17.15; Stat. S. 1.2.34; Tib. 1.2.67; 1.5.76; 2.6.16

LICVIT [2] Ov. Am. 3.8.6; M. 13.744

LIGNA [1] Ov. Am. 1.6.74


LIMEN [9] Cic. Phil. 2.45; Hor. Carm. 1.25.4; Ov. Am. 1.9.19; Fast. 5.339; Rem. 677; Pers. 5.165; Prop. 3.3.47; Stat. S. 1.2.34; Tib. 2.1.74

LIMINA [16] Catull. 63.65; Hor. Epod. 11.22; Lucr. 4.1177; Mart. 10.14.7; Ov. Am. 1.6.64; 1.6.68; 2.19.39; Ov. Ars 3.72; M. 14.702; 14.742; Plaut. Per. 571; Prop. 1.16.3; 2.7.9; Stat. S. 1.2.196; Tib. 1.2.17; 2.6.13

LIMINE [12] Ov. Am. 1.6.73; 2.19.21; M. 14.709; Rem. 508; Pliny Eph. 7.5; Prop. 1.4.22; 1.8.22; 1.13.34; 1.16.22; 2.25.17; Tib. 1.5.71; 2.6.47

LIMINIBVS [1] Tib. 1.2.84

LIMINIS [4] Catull. 32.5; Hor. Carm. 3.10.19; Ov. Am. 3.1.50; Tib. 2.4.32; LIMIS [1] Ov. Am. 3.1.33


LINGVAE [1] Prop. 1.16.37

LINQVENDVM [1] Catull. 63.67

LINTER [1] Tib. 1.5.76


LIQVIDA [1] Tib. 1.5.76


LIQVOR [1] Prop. 2.17.6


LITORE [1] Ov. Am. 2.19.45


LOCA [1] Catull. 63.70

LOCAS [1] Plaut. Cur. 25


LOCVTO [1] Tib. 2.6.11

LONGA [8] Hor. S. 2.3.248; Ov. Am. 1.6.25; 1.9.9; 2.19.22; Ars 2.235; M. 13.790; Prop. 1.3.37; 1.16.39


LONGAM [1] Hor. Epod. 11.28

LONGARENVS [1] Hor. S. 1.2.67

LONGAS [1] Hor. Carm. 1.25.7

LONGE [3] Lucr. 4.1176; Ov. Am. 1.6.52; Plaut. Cur. 119


LONGOS [1] Ov. Am. 2.19.23


LONGVS [1] Ov. Am. 1.6.5

LOQVACES [2] Tib. 1.2.21; 2.6.43

LOQVAX [1] Tib. 1.2.39


LOQVI [1] Tib. 2.6.18

LOQVOR [2] Plaut. Am. 1021; Tib. 2.6.11

LVBENS [1] Plaut. Cur. 147


LVBET [6]
Plaut. Am. 1047; Cur. 38; 131 (2); 136; 145
LVBVIT [1]
Ter. Eu. 796
LVCE [1]
Ov. M. 14.725
LVCES [1]
Plaut. Cur. 9
LVDET [2]
Aul. Gell. 19.9.12; Val. Aed. fr. 2.2
LVGIDA [2]
Hor. Carm. 3.26.6; Tib. 2.4.30
LVCDIOR [1]
Ov. M. 13.795
LVCFER [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.65
LVCRVM [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.11
LVCTATVS [1]
Ov. M. 14.701
LVCTVS [1]
Ov. M. 13.744
LVCVS [1]
Ov. M. 13.845
LVDAS [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.252
LVDUBAT [1]
Tib. 1.8.71
LVDERE [2]
Hor. S. 2.3.248; Ov. M. 13.834
LVDIBRIO [1]
Apul. Ap. 75
LVDIFICABIT [1]
Plaut. Am. 1041
LVDIFICANT [1]
Plaut. Am. 1047
LVDII [1]
Plaut. Cur. 150
LVDIS [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.332
LVDITE [1]
Ov. Ars 3.62
LVDOE [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.349
LVGEAT [1]
Tib. 2.4.43
LVIT [1]
Tib. 1.2.80
LVMBOS [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.22
LVREN [4]
Ov. M. 13.772; 13.851; Plaut. Cur. 95; 119
LVMINA [4]
Ov. M. 14.728; Tib. 1.2.2; 1.2.36; 1.8.68
LVMINIBVS [3]
Prop. 1.3.32; 2.7.10; Tib. 1.2.33
LVNIA [3]
Prop. 1.3.31; 1.3.32; 2.17.15
LVNAE [1]
Ov. Am. 2.1.23
LVNA [1]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.12
LVPA [1]
Apul. Ap. 75
LVPANAR [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.96
LVPANARIVM [1]
[Quint.] Dec. Mai. 15.7
LVRIDA [1]
Ov. M. 14.747
LVSISET [1]
Tib. 1.2.89
LVSIT [1]
Prop. 2.6.4
LVSTRAVIT [1]
Tib. 1.2.61
LVX [3]
Apul. Ap. 9; CLE 950.9; Ov. Rem. 509
LVXVRIA [1]
Prop. 1.16.12
LVXVRIOSVS [1]
Fortun. 1.12
LYCE [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.1
LYCISCUS [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.24
LYDIA [1]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.8
LYMPHE [1]
Prop. 3.3.51
MACIE [1]
[Quint.] Decl. Mai. 14.3
MACIES [1]
Ov. Ars 1.733
MADENTIA [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.55
MADET [1]
Marti. 10.14.8
MADIDAS [1]
Ov. M. 14.708
MADIDIS [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.38
MAENAS [1]
Catull. 63.69
MAESTAS [1]
Tib. 2.4.44
MAESTVS [2]
Ov. Am. 1.4.61; Pliny Ep. 7.5
MAGE [1]
Ter. Ph. 104
MAGICO [2]
Tib. 1.2.42; 1.2.47
MAGICOS [1]
Tib. 1.2.62
MAGIS [6]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.11; 1.25.18; Plaut. Cur. 112; 168; 171; Prop. 2.14.19
MAJISTRI [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.257
MAGNA [4]
Ov. Fast. 5.351; M. 13.751; Tib. 2.6.11 (2)
MAGNACAE [1]
Tib. 1.2.79
MAGNAM [1]
Pliny Ep. 7.5
MAGNASSAM [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.18
MAGNI [2]
Ov. M. 13.761; Plaut. Cur. 167
MAGNIFICAE [1]
Tib. 2.6.11
MAGNIS [1]
Prop. 1.16.1
MAGNO [2]
Ov. Am. 2.19.32; Ars 1.736
MAGNVVM [2]  
Plaut. Cur. 64; 144

MAGNVS [2]  
Ov. M. 13.852; Ter. Eu. 785

MAIOR [5]  
Mart. 4.29.3; Ov. Fast. 5.331; Ep. 10.58; M. 13.752; 13.842

MAIVS [1]  
Ov. Am. 2.1.20

MALA [5]  
Hor. S. 2.3.267; Ov. Ars 3.453; Tib. 1.2.11; 1.2.87; 2.6.19

MALAS [3]  
Ov. M. 13.754; Tib. 1.2.51; 2.4.31

MALE [12]  
Mart. 10.14.10; Ov. Am. 1.6.41; 1.8.70; 3.8.15; Ars 3.579; Plaut. Cur. 39; 124 (2); 164; 169; Ter. Ad. 100; E. 774

MALEDICAS [1]  
Ter. Eu. 799

MALEDICENTES [1]  
Plaut. Merc. 410

MALEDICTA [1]  
Ov. Ars 2.533

MALI [1]  
Hor. Epod. 11.7

MALIGNA [1]  
Ov. Am. 1.4.66

MALIS [2]  
Tib. 1.8.64; 2.4.36

MALO [2]  
Auson. Ep. 23.10; Lucullius 795

MALVERIT [1]  
Tib. 1.2.66

MALVVM [3]  
Hor. Epod. 11.17; Ter. Eu. 780; Tib. 2.4.25

MALVS [1]  
Plaut. Cur. 49

MANANTE [1]  
Ov. Ep. 10.55

MANCINVVM [1]  
Aul. Gel. 11. 4.14.5

MANCINVNS [1]  
Aul. Gel. 11. 4.14.2

MANDASSE [1]  
Claud. Eutr. 1.87

MANE [5]  
Hor. Carm. 3.7.32; Ov. Am. 1.6.69; Ars 3.72; Plaut. Cur. 160; Ter. Eu. 788

MANTENT [1]  
Ov. Ars 3.564

MANERET [1]  
Juv. 9.72

MANES [1]  
Tib. 1.2.45

MANET [1]  
Tib. 1.8.77

MANIBVS [4]  
Ov. M. 13.815; Prop. 1.16.6; 1.16.44; Tib. 1.2.92

MANILIA [1]  
Aul. Gel. 11. 4.14.4

MANILIAE [1]  
Aul. Gel. 11. 4.14.3

MANIPVLVS [1]  
Ter. Eu. 776

MANSVRI [1]  
Ov. Ars 2.242

MANV [2]  
Prop. 3.25.10; Tib. 1.5.68

MANVS [10]  
Ov. Am. 1.6.14; 1.9.27; 3.8.15; 3.8.22; Prop. 2.17.2; 2.17.14; Tib. 1.5.64; 2.1.70; 2.1.78; 2.4.26

MARATHVS [1]  
Tib. 1.8.71

MARE [1]  
Plaut. Cur. 86

MARI [4]  
Claud. Eutr. 1.91; Tib. 1.1.53; 1.2.40; 2.4.30

MARINAEE [1]  
Hor. Carm. 3.26.5

MARITI [1]  
Claud. Eutr. 1.89

MARITO [2]  
Apul. Ap. 75; Ov. Am. 2.19.51

MARITORVM [1]  
Ov. Am. 1.9.25

MARITVS [2]  
Prop. 2.7.9; [Quint.] Decl. Mai. 15.7

MARMOREO [1]  
Ov. M. 13.746

MALS [1]  
Ov. Am. 1.9.29

MARTIA [1]  
Tib. 1.2.68

MARTIO [1]  
Hor. Carm. 3.7.26

MATER [1]  
Ov. Am. 3.1.43

MATERIA [1]  
Ov. Am. 3.1.42

MATERIAM [1]  
Ov. Am. 2.19.44

MATERNAS [1]  
Ov. Rem. 29

MATRE [1]  
Ov. Am. 1.6.11

MATREM [1]  
Ov. Am. fr. 5

MATRES [1]  
Hor. Carm. 1.25.14

MATRIS [2]  
Ov. M. 13.751; 14.742

MATRVM [1]  
Ov. M. 14.745

MATVLAM [1]  
Plaut. Am. fr. 5

MATVRA [1]  
Ov. M. 13.795

MATVRARE [1]  
Hor. Carm. 3.7.16

MATVINA [1]  
Prop. 2.9.41

MATVTINIS [1]  
Prop. 1.16.45

MAVIS [1]  
Ter. Eu. 796

MAVOLTIS [1]
METIRIS [1]
Juv. 9.71
METV [2]
Ov. Am. 1.6.60; 3.4.3
METVAMVS [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.5
METVAS [1]
Ter. Eu. 786
METVEBAT [1]
Ter. Ph. 118
METVO [2]
Auson. Ep. 23.6; 23.8
METVS [1]
Apul. Ap. 75
MIGRABAT [1]
Juv. 9.76
MILES [6]
Ov. Am. 1.9.4; 1.9.15; Ars 3.565; Ter. Eu. 806; Tib. 2.6.7; 1.1.75
MILITAT [2]
Ov. Am. 1.9.1; 1.9.2
MILITAVI [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.26.2
MILITE [1]
Ov. Am. 1.9.5
MILITAE [2]
Ov. Ars 2.233; [Quint.] Decl. Mai. 15.7
MILITIBVS [2]
Ov. Am. 1.6.33; Tib. 2.6.7
MILITIS [2]
Ov. Am. 1.9.9; 1.9.28
MILITVM [1]
Ter. Eu. 778
MILLE [2]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.12; Ov. Fast. 4.113
MINACIS [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.26.8
MINANTER [1]
Ov. Ars 3.582
MINAS [3]
Plaut. Cur. 63; Prop. 2.25.18; Tib. 2.6.50
MINIS [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.61
MINISTERIO [1]
Tib. 1.2.42
MINISTRA [1]
Catull. 63.68
MINISTRAS [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.95
MINISTRIS [1]
Ov. M. 14.705
MINISTROS [1]
Mart. 10.14.1
MINITABAS [1]
Plaut. Am. fr. 11
MINOR [1]
Ov. M. 13.827
MINVS [5]
Aul. Gel. 19.9.12; Hor. Carm. 1.25.6 (2); Ov. Am. 1.4.68; Prop. 2.17.10
MIRABAR [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.10
MIRABERE [1]
Prop. 1.5.21
MISCEAT [1]
Ov. M. 13.866
MISCENDRA [1]
Ov. Ars 3.580
MISER [7]
Auson. Ep. 23.10 (2); Hor. S. 1.2.64; Lucr. 4.1179; Plaut. Am. 1.1239; 1039; Cur. 134
MISERA [1]
Plaut. Cur. 142
MISERABLE [1]
Ov. M. 14.751
MISERABILIS [1]
Ov. Ars 1.737
MISERAM [4]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.10; Lucr. 4.1179; Ov. Am. 3.1.56; Prop. 1.3.40
MISERARVM [1]
Ov. M. 14.745
MISERATA [1]
Prop. 1.16.25
MISERERE [1]
Ov. M. 13.855
MISERET [1]
Ter. Eu. 802
MISERI [1]
Ov. Am. 1.9.28
MISERIARVM [1]
Petron. 97
MISERIOR [1]
Plaut. Am. 1046
MISERIS [1]
Auson. Ep. 23.14
MISERO [2]
Plaut. Cur. 152; Prop. 2.9.42
MISERORVM [1]
Ov. M. 14.744
MISEROS [3]
Ov. Am. 1.6.33; Tib. 1.2.69; 1.8.71
MISERVM [9]
Matt. 10.14.9; Ov. Am. 1.4.59; Ars 3.73; M. 14.703; Tib. 1.2.66; 2.3.78; 2.6.17; 2.6.45
MISI [1]
Plaut. Cur. 67
MISIT [1]
Ov. Rem. 302
MISSA [1]
Tib. 1.2.8
MITIOR [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.18
MITIS [1]
Tib. 2.3.72
MITAS [1]
Juv. 9.70
MITTE [1]
Ov. Am. 1.9.9
MITERE [1]
Prop. 2.17.16
MITII [1]
Plaut. Per. 568
MITIS [1]
Ov. Am. 3.1.57
MITITAE [1]
Plaut. Cur. 151
MITTITVR [1]
Ov. Am. 1.9.17
MIXTAS [1]
Ov. Am. 1.9.16
MIXTVS [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.343
MOBILIA [1]
Hors. S. 2.3.269
MOBILIOR [1]
Ov. M. 13.794
MODERABILE [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.59
MOBILI [1]
Sex. Turp. 201 (R)
MODICA [1]
Plaut. Cur. 110
MODICVM [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.37
MODIS [3]
Hors. Carm. 3.7.12;
Juvv. 9.73; Tib. 2.6.52
MODORVM [1]
Cic. Phil. fr. 10.3.1
MODVM [2]
Fortun. 1.12; Hors. S. 2.3.266
MOECHA [1]
Mart. 10.14.7
MOECHOS [1]
Hors. Carm. 1.25.9
MOLESTA [1]
Ter. Ad. 122
MOLESTI [1]
Plaut. Merc. 408
MOLIRE [1]
Ov. M. 14.719
MOLITVR [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.65
MOLLE [1]
Ov. M. 14.710
MOLLES [1]
Tib. 1.2.96
MOLLI [3]
Prop. 1.3.34; Tib. 1.2.19; 1.2.56
MOLLIA [2]
Ov. Fast. 5.340; M. 13.816
MOLLIBVS [2]
Hor. Epod. 11.4;
Ov. Ars 2.236
MOLLIERVNT [1]
Ov. Am. 2.1.22
MOLLIOR [2]
Hors. Carm. 3.10.17;
Ov. M. 13.796
MOLLIS [1]
Tib. 1.2.74
MOLLITIA [1]
Hors. Epod. 11.24
MOLLITIES [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.18
MONENTEM [1]
Ov. M. 13.775
MONEO [1]
Tib. 1.8.69
MONET [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.353
MONITIS [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.34
MONSTRAT [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.8
MONTANIS [1]
Ov. Ars 3.574
MONT [2]
Prop. 2.17.8; Tib. 1.2.72
MONTES [2]
Ov. Am. 1.9.11; M. 13.785
MONTIBVS [1]
Ov. M. 13.836
MONTIS [1]
Ov. M. 13.810
MONVI [1]
Ov. M. 1.4.59
MONVMENTVM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 140a
MORA [4]
Claud. Eutr. 1.84;
Hors. Carm. 3.14.23;
Ov. Am. 1.6.13;
Tib. 1.8.74
MORAS [2]
Ov. M. 13.808;
Prop. 1.16.40
MORATA [2]
Ov. Am. 1.8.82;
Prop. 2.4.6
MORATVRIS [1]
Prop. 1.3.32
MORB [1]
Hors. S. 2.3.254
MORDEAT [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.43
MORE [1]
Ov. Ars 3.62
MOREM [2]
Plaut. Cur. 149;
Prud. Symm. 1.63
MORES [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.97
MORI [2]
Auson. Ep. 23.9;
Ter. Eu. 772
MORIBVS [1]
Plaut. Cur. 146
MORIGERI [1]
Plaut. Cur. 157
MORIOR [2]
Ov. M. 14.721; Tib. 2.6.51
MORIOR [1]
Plaut. Ba. 1118
MORS [1]
Tib. 2.4.43
MORICALIS [1]
Plaut. Am. 1047
MORTALI [1]
Lucr. 4.1184
MORTALIA [1]
Ov. M. 14.729
MORTEM [1]
Ter. Ad. 90
MORTIS [1]
Ov. Rem. 37
MORTVMON [1]
Plaut. Am. 1018
MORTVS [1]
Prop. 2.14.32
MOS [1]
Tib. 2.3.74
MOTA [2]
Ov. M. 14.751;
Prop. 1.16.20
MOTAE [1]
Ov. Fast. 4.113
MOTO [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.2
MOTV [1]
Ov. M. 14.739
MOVEARE [1]
Prop. 2.17.5
Hor. S. 2.3.259;  
Ter. Ph. 113; 116;  
Tib. 2.6.48  

NEGATA [1]  
Ov. Fast. 4.109  
NEGAVIT [1]  
Prop. 2.14.20  
NEDES [1]  
Ov. Am. 1.9.30  
NEGET [1]  
Tib. 1.2.38  
NEGO [1]  
Tib. 2.3.80  
NEMINI [1]  
Plaut. Cur. 26  
NEMO [5]  
Cic. Phil. 2.45;  
Lucilius 939;  
Plaut. Cur. 33; 35;  
Sex. Turp. 199 (R)  
NEMORIVAGVS [1]  
Catull. 63.72  
NEMVS [1]  
Hor. Carm. 3.10.5  
NEQVEO [1]  
Auson. Ep. 23.7  
NEQVIQVAM [3]  
Ov. Am. 1.6.27; M. 4.78; Prop. 2.4.5  
NEQVIS [1]  
Catull. 32.5  
NEREI [1]  
Ov. M. 13.858  
NEREIS [1]  
Ov. M. 13.749  
NEREV [1]  
Ov. M. 13.742  
NESCIA [1]  
Prop. 1.16.20  
NESCIO [5]  
Ov. Am. 3.11.11; M. 13.844; Plaut. Cur. 69; 129; Tib. 1.5.75  
NESCIRE [1]  
Ter. Ph. 117  
NESCIS [2]  
Ov. Am. 3.8.13;  
Ter. Eu. 799  
NESCIVS [1]  
Tib. 1.8.72  
NICTENT [1]  
Plaut. Merc. 407  
NIDVS [1]  
Ov. M. 13.833  
NIGRO [1]  
Ov. M. 13.817  
NIMO [1]  
Ov. Am. 1.9.11  
NIMI [1]  
Ter. Eu. 786  
NIMIRVM [1]  
Ter. Eu. 784  
NIMIS [1]  
Hor. Carm. 3.7.14  
NIMIVM [4]  
Ov. Am. 1.6.15;  
2.19.25; 2.19.37;  
M. 4.75  
NITENT [1]  
Ov. Am. 1.8.51  
NITIDA [1]  
Ov. M. 14.720  
NITIDIS [1]  
Ov. Ars 1.734  
NITIDO [1]  
Ov. Ars 3.74  
NITIDVM [1]  
Ov. M. 13.838  
NIVEAM [1]  
Tib. 2.4.28  
NIVEI [1]  
Ov. M. 13.789  
NIVEO [1]  
Tib. 1.5.66  
NIVEOS [1]  
Ov. Am. 2.1.24  
NIVES [4]  
Hor. Carm. 3.10.7;  
Ov. Am. 1.9.12;  
1.9.16; Tib. 1.2.50  
NIVEM [1]  
Ov. M. 13.829  
NIXA [2]  
Prop. 1.16.33;  
1.16.42  
NOBILIS [1]  
Prop. 1.16.10  
NOCENT [1]  
Tib. 1.2.29  
NOCT [3]  
Ov. Am. 2.19.26;  
2.19.35; Tib. 2.6.44  
NOCTE [25]  
Auson. Ep. 23.6;  
Cic. Phil. 2.45;  
CLE 950.5; Fortun. 1.12; Hor. Carm. 3.7.29; Juv. 9.76;  
Ov. Am. 1.4.60;  
1.4.61; 1.6.13;  
1.6.68; 2.19.22;  
2.19.38; 2.19.40;  
3.1.52; Ars 2.523;  
70; Fast. 4.109;  
M. 4.84; Rem. 505;  
Prop. 2.16.6;  
3.20.29; Stat. S. 1.2.198; Tib. 1.2.24; 1.2.61;  
1.8.59  
NOCTEM [4]  
Ov. Am. 1.4.69;  
1.6.9; M. 4.79;  
Prop. 2.17.1  
NOCTES [9]  
Hor. Carm. 1.25.7;  
Ov. Am. 1.8.73; Ars 1.735; Rem. 306;  
Prop. 1.3.39;  
1.16.9; 1.16.23;  
2.17.4; Stat. S. 1.2.37  
NOCTIBVS [2]  
Apul. Ap. 75;  
[Quint.] Decl. Mai. 15.7  
NOCTIS [12]  
Claud. Eutr. 1.92;  
Hor. Carm. 3.7.7;  
Ov. Am. 1.6.24;  
1.6.32; 1.6.40;  
1.6.44; 1.6.48;  
1.6.56; 1.9.15;  
Plaut. Cur. 1;  
Prop. 1.3.37; Tib. 1.2.29  
NOCTIVM [1]  
Pliny Ep. 7.5  
NOCTV [3]  
Aul. Gall. 4.14.3;  
Plaut. Cur. 22;  
Per. 569  
NOCTVRNA [4]
Marti. 10.14.7; Ov. Ars 3.71; Rem. 31; Sen. Ep. 51.12
NOTCVRNAE [1]
Prop. 3.3.48
NOTCVRNIS [1]
Prop. 1.16.5
NOTCVRNO [1]
Prop. 1.16.34
NOTCVRNOS [1]
Ov. M. 4.81
NOCVIT [2]
Ov. Am. 1.8.71; Tib. 2.3.70
NODO [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.14.22
NOLDI [1]
Plaut. Cur. 132
NOLIS [1]
Ter. Eu. 813
NOLLEM [1]
Ov. M. 13.863
NOLO [2]
Plaut. Cur. 47; 124
NOLVNT [1]
Ter. Eu. 813
NOMEN [2]
Plaut. Cur. 77; Tib. 1.2.35
NOMINA [1]
Ov. Ars 3.453
NOMINAT [1]
Plaut. Ba. 1120
NOMINE [1]
Hor. S. 1.2.65
NOMINIS [1]
Ov. Ars 2.637
NORIS [1]
Ov. M. 13.808
NORIT [1]
Ov. Ars 3.561
NOSSE [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.346
NOSSET [1]
Ov. Ars 2.250
NOSTRAE [1]
Prop. 1.5.19
NOSTRO [1]
Prop. 1.3.35
NOSTRVMM [1]
Prop. 1.5.21
NOTA [2]
Prop. 1.16.2; Tib. 1.8.57
NOTABILIS [1]
[Quint.] Decl. Mai. 14.3
NOTAVI [1]
Ov. M. 13.788
NOTIS [2]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.5; Tib. 1.2.22
NOTVS [1]
Ov. Ars 3.559
NOVA [2]
Catull. 63.75; Tib. 1.2.17
NOVAS [1]
Ov. M. 13.818
NOVELLA [1]
Ov. Ars 3.560
NOVERAM [1]
Ter. Eu. 778
NOVERCAM [1]
Decimus Laberius 142
NOVI [2]
Ov. M. 13.840; Ter. Eu. 812
NOVISSIMA [1]
Ov. M. 14.717
NOVO [1]
Prop. 1.16.41
NOVOS [1]
Tib. 1.2.1
NOX [7]
Ov. Am. 1.6.59; 3.8.28; Ars 2.235; Plaut. Cur. 4; Tib. 1.2.76; 1.8.64; 2.6.49
NVBE [1]
Ov. Ars 2.237
NVBILA [1]
Tib. 1.2.49
NVECE [1]
Plaut. Cur. 55
NVCHEM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 55
NVCVLEVM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 55
NVD [1]
Ov. Ars 2.238
NVDIVSTERTIVS [1]
Plaut. Cur. 17
NVDV [1]
Ter. Ph. 106
NVGARIS [1]
Pers. 5.169
NVM [2]
Ov. Ars 3.55; Fast. 5.333
NVMERARE [1]
Ov. M. 13.824
NVMERIS [1]
Ov. Am. 3.1.37
NVMINA [1]
Tib. 1.2.79
NVMINE [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.8
NVNCA [1]
Plaut. Am. 1052
NVNTIA [2]
Catull. 63.75; Ov. M. 14.726
NVNTIAT [1]
Tib. 2.6.50
NVNTIVS [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.8
NVNTE [2]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.2; Plaut. Cur. 37
NVENT [1]
Plaut. Merc. 407
NVTRICEM [1]
Ter. Eu. 808
NVTRICI [1]
Ov. M. 14.703
NVTRIT [1]
Ov. Ars 3.579
NVTVS [1]
Tib. 1.2.21
NYMPHA [1]
Ov. M. 13.750
NYMPHAS [1]
Ov. M. 13.736
NYMPS [1]
Ov. M. 13.736
OBDE [1]
Ov. Ars 2.636
OBDVCTAM [1]
Prop. 4.5.48
OBEST [1]
Ov. Ars 2.532
OBICERE [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.3
OBJECTENT [1]  
Plaut. Merc. 411  

OBGETVST [1]  
Plaut. Cur. 96  

OBIERIM [1]  
Catull. 63.62  

OBIRGABERE [1]  
Pers. 5.169  

OBIRGAT [1]  
Plaut. Cur. 171  

OBLIQVVM [1]  
Ov. Am. 1.6.4  

OBLITVM [1]  
Plaut. Am. 1024  

OBLITVS [1]  
Ov. M. 13.763  

OBLOOVERYE [1]  
Plaut. Cur. 41  

OBLOQVI [1]  

Plaut. Cur. 42  

OBORTIS [1]  
Ov. Am. 1.4.61  

OBPOSITA [1]  

Tib. 1.8.76  

OBREPERE [1]  

Tib. 1.8.59  

OBRVIT [1]  

Ov. Am. 3.1.40  

OBRVTA [1]  

Ov. Ars 3.584  

OBSERNIS [1]  

Prop. 1.18.10  

OBSERNVM [1]  
Pers. 5.165  

OBSCVRA [1]  

Tib. 1.2.24  

OBSECRAT [1]  

Ter. Ph. 112  

OBSECRET [2]  

Hor. S. 2.3.264;  

Ter. Eu. 49  

OBSECRD [3]  

Plaut. Cur. 120;  

148; 151  

OBSECVST [1]  

Plaut. Cur. 105  

OBSECVNENS [1]  

Plaut. Cur. 87  

OBSERET [1]  

Catull. 32.5  

OBSESIS [1]  

Ov. Am. 1.6.29  

OBSIDET [2]  

Ov. Am. 1.9.20; Ars  

2.526  

OBSTAS [1]  

Ov. M. 4.73  

OBSTEM [1]  

Pers. 5.163  

OBSTREPT [1]  

Prop. 1.16.45  

OBTYRCAOB [1]  

Plaut. Am. 1050  

OBYA [1]  

Tib. 1.2.34  

OBYVIS [1]  

Ov. Am. 1.6.39  

OBYMRAT [1]  

Ov. M. 13.845  

OCCASIOST [1]  

Plaut. Cur. 23  

OCCENTABVNT [1]  

Plaut. Per. 569  

OCCENTEM [1]  

Plaut. Cur. 145  

OCCENTENT [1]  

Plaut. Merc. 408  

OCCSPI [1]  

Plaut. Cur. 43  

OCCIDERAT [1]  

Ov. M. 14.742  

OCCVDNDENS [1]  

Ter. Eu. 784  

OCCVMDNRO [1]  

Plaut. Am. 1018  

OCCVLDISSIMVM [1]  

Plaut. Cur. 16  

OCCVLAT [1]  

Tib. 1.2.37  

OCCVLEMVNS [1]  

Plaut. Cur. 95  

OCCVLISIS [1]  

Prop. 1.16.44  

OCCVLOT [3]  

Claud. Eutr. 1.87;  

Ter. Eu. 787; Tib.  

2.6.46  

OCCVLOTOS [1]  

Tib. 1.5.65  

OCCVPAT [1]  

Ov. M. 14.757  

OCCVPE [1]  

Tib. 1.2.2  

OCCVRRAT [1]  

Tib. 1.2.25a  

OCELIS [1]  

Ov. Am. 3.1.33  

OCELLOS [3]  

Ov. Am. 2.19.19;  

Prop. 1.3.33;  

1.16.31  

OCIVS [1]  

Plaut. Cur. 154  

OCTONIS [1]  

Ov. M. 13.753  

OCVLI [1]  

Ov. M. 14.754  

OCVLISSIME [1]  

Plaut. Cur. 122  

OCVLISSIMMV [1]  

Plaut. Cur. 15  

OCVLOS [4]  

Ov. M. 14.734; Am.  

1.9.18; Ter. Eu.  

794; Tib. 2.6.43  

ODERVNT [1]  

Tib. 1.8.69  

ODIOSE [1]  

Ov. Ars 2.635  

ODIOSYS [1]  

Plaut. Cur. 45  

ODIT [2]  

AUSON. EP. 23.2;  

Tib. 1.8.75  

ODIVM [1]  

Ov. M. 13.756  

ODOR [1]  

Plaut. Cur. 101  

ODORE [1]  

Plaut. Cur. 81  

ODORIBVS [1]  

Lucr. 4.1175  

OFFENDERIT [1]  

Lucr. 4.1180  

OFFICI [1]  

Claud. Eutr. 1.79  

OFFICIHM [1]  

Ov. Am. 1.9.9  

OLEI [1]  

Catull. 63.64  

OLIVAS [1]  

Plaut. Cur. 90  

OLORS [1]  

Prud. Symm. 1.63  

OLYMPI [1]  

Ov. M. 13.761
OrmisI [1]  
Ov. Am. 2.1.17
Omnia [2]  
Ov. Am. 1.6.61;  
3.4.7
Omnibvs [1]  
Ov. Am. 3.4.8
Onvs [3]  
Ov. Ars 3.56; M.  
14.738; Prop.  
2.17.8
Opaca [1]  
Ov. M. 13.777
Opera [1]  
Plaut. Cur. 10
Operire [1]  
Sen. QNat. 4 A pr.  
6
Operit [1]  
Lucr. 4.1178
Opes [3]  
Tib. 1.1.77;  
2.1.73; 2.4.40
Oporet [3]  
Plaut. Cur. 26;  
Prop. 2.4.1; 3.7.72
OppEgit [1]  
Plaut. Cur. 60
OppessylatAs [1]  
Petron. 97
Oppida [1]  
Ov. Am. 2.12.7
Oppido [1]  
Plaut. Cur. 135
OpponerE [1]  
Juv. 9.86
Opponi [1]  
Sen. QNat. 4 A pr.  
6
Opposta [1]  
Ov. Ars 2.244
OppositIS [1]  
Hor. Carm. 3.26.8
Opprimere [2]  
Aul. Gell. 19.9.12;  
Val. Aed. fr. 2.6
Optas [1]  
Ov. Am. 1.6.23
Optata [1]  
Apul. Ap. 9
Optet [1]  
Hor. S. 2.3.259
Optimis [1]  
Plaut. Per. 567
Opto [1]  
Ov. Am. 1.4.67
Oplentior [1]  
Plaut. Per. 565
Opvs [8]  
Aul. Gell. 19.9.12;  
Claud. Eutr. 1.78;  
Hor. S. 2.3.252;  
Ov. Am. 1.6.66;  
1.9.28; Rem. 40;  
Plaut. Merc. 411;  
Val. Aed. fr. 2.1
Opvst [1]  
Plaut. Cur. 79
Ora [2]  
Ov. M. 13.733;  
Prop. 3.3.52
Orabam [1]  
Tib. 1.2.64
Orantem [1]  
Ov. Am. 1.6.27
oranti [1]  
Ov. Am. 1.8.77
OraVit [1]  
Ov. M. 14.704
Orba [1]  
Ov. Rem. 30
Orbe [2]  
Tib. 1.2.50; 1.5.70
Orbis [1]  
Ov. M. 13.853
Ore [3]  
Ov. Ars 3.74; 587;  
Prop. 2.17.6
OricVM [1]  
Hor. Carm. 3.7.5
OrietrVr [1]  
Prop. 2.19.5
Oris [3]  
4.1171; Ov. M. 4.72
Orithyiae [1]  
Ov. Am. 1.6.53
Orivndvm [1]  
Plaut. Cur. 11
Ornatas [1]  
Ov. Rem. 32
Ornatos [1]  
Ov. M. 14.733
OrnatV [1]  
Plaut. Cur. 2
Orto [1]  
Catull. 63.67
Ortv [1]  
Stat. S. 1.2.198
Os [1]  
Ter. Eu. 806
Oscvla [10]  
CLE 950.2; Lucr.  
4.1179; Ov. Am.  
1.4.63; 1.4.63; Ars  
2.534; M. 4.75;  
4.80; Prop. 1.16.42;  
Tib. 1.2.84; 1.8.58
Oscvlando [1]  
Plaut. Cur. 52
Ossa [1]  
Tib. 1.2.46
Ossivbs [1]  
Ov. M. 14.700
Ostendam [1]  
Ter. Eu. 808
Ostendebat [1]  
Aul. Gell. 4.14.3
Ostenderet [1]  
Petron. 97
Ostivm [8]  
Lucilius 944; 946;  
Plaut. Am. 1020;  
Cur. 16; 19; Merc.  
408; Per. 569; Sen.  
QNat. 4 A pr. 6
Ostivmst [1]  
Plaut. Cur. 15
Ovem [1]  
Tib. 2.4.28
Ovivbs [1]  
Ov. M. 13.849
Ovivibs [2]  
Ov. M. 13.827; 13.828
Pace [1]  
Ov. Am. 1.6.30
Pacta [1]  
Ov. Rem. 505
Paena [1]  
Ov. M. 14.720
Paelse [1]  
Hor. Carm. 3.10.15
Paenitet [2]
Catull. 63.73; Hor. Epod. 11.8
PALLEAT [1]
Mart. 10.14.4
PALLIDA [1]
Ov. M. 14.734
PALLIOLVM [1]
Ov. Ars 1.734
PALLOR [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.14
PALLORE [2]
Ov. M. 14.755;
[Quint.] Decl. Mai. 14.3
PALLOREM [1]
Prop. 1.5.21
PAMPHILAM [1]
Ter. Eu. 796
PANDE [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.2
PANDIT [1]
Plaut. Cur. 56
PARANDA [1]
Tib. 2.4.21
PARASITVM [2]
Plaut. Cur. 67; 143
PARAT [1]
Tib. 1.5.75
PARATIOR [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.57
PARCAS [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.17
PARCE [2]
Ov. Ars 2.639; Tib.
1.2.97
PARCERE [1]
Prop. 1.16.11
PARCES [1]
Tib. 2.6.7
PARCITE [2]
Ov. Ars 3.457; Tib.
1.2.33
PARCIVS [2]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.1;
Ov. Am. 1.8.69
PARENTS [3]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.12;
Ov. Am. 2.19.28;
Rem. 30
PARENTIS [1]
Juv. 9.87
PARENTVM [1]
Ov. M. 14.744
PARET [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.271
PARIES [3]
CLE 950.10; Hor.
Carm. 3.25.4; Ov.
M. 4.73
PARITER [2]
Ov. Am. 2.19.5 (2)
PARSERIS [1]
Plaut. Per. 572
PARTAS [1]
Tib. 2.4.40
PARTI [1]
Ov. M. 4.79
PARTITA [1]
Ov. Ars 3.593
PARTO [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.9
PARTVS [1]
Ov. Ars 3.81
PARVA [1]
Ov. Ars 2.240
PARVE [1]
Ov. M. 13.833
PARVIS [1]
Ov. Am. 2.12.7
PARVM [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.22
PARVO [2]
Ov. Am. 1.6.3; M.
4.83
PASCAS [1]
Ov. M. 14.728
PASCERE [1]
Tib. 1.2.72
PASSA [1]
Ov. Rem. 304
PASSV [2]
Ov. M. 13.776; Ter.
Ph. 106
PASTORIA [1]
Ov. M. 13.785
PASTVS [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.10
PATEAS [1]
Tib. 1.2.9
PATEFACTA [1]
Prop. 1.16.1
PATEFECIT [1]
Prop. 1.3.33
PATEFIANT [1]
Prop. 3.20.29
PATENS [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.25
PATER [4]
Cic. Phil. 2.45;
Juv. 9.86; Ov. M.
13.742; 14.742
PATERE [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.352
PATERES [1]
Ov. M. 4.75
PATERIS [2]
Auson. Ep. 23.9;
Ov. Am. 2.19.51
PATESCIT [1]
Tib. 1.5.67
PATET [1]
Prop. 2.16.6
PATI [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.22
PATIARE [2]
Prop. 1.16.39;
3.25.15
PATIATVR [1]
Ov. Ars 3.585
PATIENDA [3]
Ov. Am. 2.19.51;
3.1.43; Ars 3.566
PATIENDI [1]
Ov. Am. 1.8.75
PATIENS [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.20
PATIENTIOR [2]
Ov. M. 13.859;
Prop. 1.16.29
PATINIS [1]
Ter. Eu. 816
PATIOR [1]
[Quint.] Decl. Mai.
15.7
PATITVR [1]
Prop. 1.16.15
PATREM [2]
Plaut. Am. 1050;
Ter. Ph. 118
PATRIAM [1]
Pers. 5.164
PATRIS [1]
Ov. M. 13.751
PATVLIS [1]
Ov. M. 14.752
PAVES [1]
Stat. S. 1.2.33
PAVISSE [1]
Ov. Ars 2.239
PAVONE [1]
Ov. M. 13.802
PAVPER [5]
[Quint.] Decl. Mai. 15.7; Tib. 1.5.61 (2); 1.5.63; 1.5.65
PAVPERIS [2]
Hor. Epod. 11.12;
Ov. M. 13.824
PAVPERTATEM [1]
[Quint.] Decl. Mai. 14.3
PAX [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.268
PECCARE [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.19
PECCASSE [2]
Prop. 2.25.19; Tib. 1.6.71
PECORVM [1]
Ov. M. 13.763
PECTENODAS [1]
Ov. M. 13.738
PECTIS [1]
Ov. M. 13.765
PECTORE [5]
Aul. Gel. 19.9.12;
Ov. Ars 3.56; M. 13.869; 14.758;
Val. Aed. fr. 2.2
PECTORIS [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.18
PECTVS [1]
Mart. 10.14.9
PECVDRES [2]
Ov. M. 13.781; Tib. 2.1.71
PECVS [3]
Ov. M. 13.821;
13.824; Tib. 1.2.72
PEDE [4]
Hor. Epod. 11.20;
Ov. Ars 3.65; Prop. 2.4.4; Tib. 1.5.66
PEDEM [2]
Tib. 1.2.20; 1.2.48
PEDES [7]
Ov. Am. 1.6.8;
3.1.52; Ars 2.534;
M. 13.783; 14.756;
Pliny Ep. 7.5; Tib. 1.8.66
PEDIIBVS [2]
Prop. 2.25.20; Tib. 2.1.77
PEDIVM [2]
Ov. M. 14.739; Tib. 1.2.35
PELAGI [2]
Ov. M. 13.736 (2)
PELEA [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.17
PELLE [1]
Ov. Ars 3.77
PELLICE [1]
A uson. Ep. 23.4
PENDENTIA [1]
Ov. M. 13.810
PENDERE [1]
Prop. 1.16.7
PENELOPEN [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.11
PENETRABILE [1]
Ov. M. 13.857
PENICVLO [1]
Ter. Eu. 777
PENITVS [1]
Prop. 1.16.17
PEPENDI [1]
Ov. Am. 3.1.53
PEPENEDIT [2]
Ov. M. 14.738; Sen. Ep. 4.4
PEPVLISSEM [1]
Plaut. Am. fr. 11
PERAGVNTVR [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.341
PERCEPERAT [1]
Ov. M. 14.700
PERCIPIAT [1]
Plaut. Cur. 159
PERCVS [1]
Prop. 1.16.28
PERCVSSIT [1]
Plaut. Am. 1073
PERCVSSVM [2]
Hor. Epod. 11.2;
Tib. 1.2.3
PERCVTE [1]
Pers. 5.168
PERCVTIENDA [1]
Tib. 1.5.68
PERDAT [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.41
PERDERE [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.16
PERDIDIT [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.97
PERDITA [2]
CLE 950.5; Tib. 2.6.51
PERDITOS [1]
[Quint.] Decl. Mai. 15.7
PERDIVM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 136
PERDIVTS [1]
Plaut. Cur. 134
PERDOMVISSE [2]
Tib. 1.2.52; 2.1.72
PERDVCAS [1]
Prop. 1.3.39
PEREANT [1]
Prop. 2.23.12
PEREAT [1]
Tib. 2.4.27
PEREGI [1]
Tib. 1.2.13
PEREGIT [1]
Ov. M. 14.745
PERERRVAT [1]
Petron. 97
PEREVNE [1]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.7
PERFER [1]
Ov. Ars 2.524
PERFERET [1]
Ov. Am. 1.9.16
PERFICE [1]
Ov. Rem. 40
PERFIDA [3]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.13;
Prop. 1.16.43; Tib. 1.8.63
PERFIDE [2]
Juv. 9.82; Ov. Ep. 10.58
PERFRACTAS [1]
Tib. 1.10.54
PERFVSA [1]
Prop. 2.4.5
PERGAM [2]
Ov. Fast. 4.113; M. 13.764
PLACENT [1]
Ov. M. 14.736
PLACIDAE [1]
Tib. 1.2.78
PLACIDE [1]
Plaut. Cur. 158
PLACVERE [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.5
PLACVISSE [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.345
PLACVIT [1]
Ov. M. 13.841
PLANCO [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.14.28
PLANGORIS [1]
Ov. M. 14.749
PLANTA [1]
Prop. 2.4.6
PLANVM [1]
Ov. Ars 2.243
PLATANO [1]
Ov. M. 13.794
PLEBEIO [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.352
PLEBI [1]
Aul. Gel. 4.14.4
PLENA [2]
Prop. 1.16.23; Tib. 1.5.68
PLENIOREM [1]
Petron. 97
PLENIS [1]
Plaut. Cur. 128
PLENVM [1]
Aul. Gel. 4.14.1
PLORA [1]
Plaut. Cur. 138
POLORBIT [1]
Pers. 5.168
POLORANTE [1]
Juv. 9.77
POLORARES [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.4
PLORES [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.253
PLOSTELLO [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.247
PLVET [1]
Plaut. Cur. 132
PLVMA [3]
Mart. 10.14.6; Ov. M. 13.849; Prud. Symm. 1.62
PLVMAE [1]
Tib. 1.2.77
PLVMIS [1]
Ov. M. 13.796
PLVRIMA [2]
Ov. M. 13.844; Tib. 1.2.13
PLVTEOS [1]
Lucilius 938
PLVVIAM [1]
Prud. Symm. 1.68
POENA [1]
Tib. 1.8.77
POENAS [3]
Auson. Ep. 23.8; Hor. S. 1.2.65; Tib. 1.2.80
POLEMON [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.254
POLICE [1]
Ov. M. 13.746
POLICITA [1]
Tib. 1.2.42
POLICITVS [1]
Juv. 9.74
POLYEME [1]
Ov. M. 13.765
POLYHEMION [1]
Ov. M. 13.772
POMA [2]
Hor. S. 2.3.258; Ov. M. 13.812
POMIS [1]
Mart. 4.29.3
POMPA [2]
Ov. M. 14.749; Plaut. Cur. 2
PONAS [2]
Hor. S. 2.3.254; Juv. 9.81
PONAT [1]
Tib. 1.2.68
PONDERE [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.6
PONE [5]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.9; Ov. Ars 2.528; Rem. 508; Stat. S. 1.2.33; 1.2.34
PONERE [3]
Ov. Am. 3.11.10; Ars 2.524; Tib. 1.2.20
PONES [1]
Plaut. Cur. 73
PONET [1]
Ov. Rem. 511
PONITE [2]
Hor. Carm. 3.26.6; Ov. Ars 3.589
PONTO [1]
Ov. M. 13.838
PONTVM [1]
Ov. M. 13.778
POPVLO [1]
Ov. Am. 3.1.54
POPVLM [1]
Aul. Gel. 4.14.3
POPVLS [2]
Plaut. Cur. 29; Prop. 2.6.4
PORRECTVM [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.3
PORRIGIS [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.258
PORTABAT [1]
Ov. M. 14.747
PORTAE [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.29
PORTANS [1]
Tib. 2.6.46
PORTARE [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.13
PORTAS [2]
Ov. Am. 1.9.20; Ars 3.577
PORTES [1]
Ter. Eu. 777
PORTET [2]
Mart. 10.14.1; Tib. 2.6.8
POSCIT [1]
Plaut. Cur. 63
POSITA [3]
Ov. Am. 1.6.19; M. 13.783; Tib. 1.2.5
POSITAS [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.7
POSITVM [1]
Prop. 2.14.22
POSTE [6]
Ov. Am. 1.6.24; 1.6.32; 1.6.40; 1.6.48; 1.6.56; Tib. 1.2.86

POSTES [7]
Ov. Am. 1.6.49; 1.6.73; Ars 3.567; M. 14.733; Plaut. Ba. 1119; Tib. 1.1.73; 1.2.31

POSTI [4]
Ov. Am. 2.1.27; Rem. 35; 507; Tib. 1.2.14

POSTIBVS [3]
Ov. Ars 2.527; 2.636; M. 14.709

POSTICIAS [1]
Livy Per. 89

POSTIS [5]
Hor. Epod. 11.21; Lucr. 4.1178; Ov. Am. 2.19.21; Prop. 1.16.15; 1.16.43

POSTYLES [1]
Plaut. Am. fr. 5

POTANTES [1]
Plaut. Cur. 126

POTARE [1]
Ter. Ad. 102

POTATE [1]
Plaut. Cur. 89

POTENTIA [1]
Ov. M. 13.758

POTESTATE [1]
Cic. Phil. 2.45

POTET [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.32

POTIARE [1]
Ov. Ars 1.737

POTIONEM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 118

POTIOR [1]
Tib. 1.5.69

POTIS [2]
Aul. Gell. 19.9.12; Val. Aed. fr. 2.3

POTTITVR [1]
Plaut. Cur. 170

POTIVS [3]
Hor. S. 2.3.263; Plaut. Cur. 124; Ter. Eu. 47

POTORVM [1]
Prop. 1.16.5

POTVS [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.255

PRAEBAT [1]
Ov. Am. 1.8.74

PRAEBBAT [1]
Tib. 2.3.71

PRAEBERIER [1]
Plaut. Am. 1027

PRAEBET [1]
Ov. M. 13.738

PRAEBVIT [1]
Ov. M. 13.782

PRAECEPS [1]
Ov. Ars 2.245

PRAECEPTA [2]
Ov. Ars 3.57; Tib. 1.5.59

PRAECIPITANS [2]
Aul. Gell. 19.9.12; Val. Aed. fr. 2.4

PRAECIPITES [1]
CLE 950.7

PRAECIPVE [1]
Ov. M. 13.805

PRAECIPVO [1]
Ov. Am. 2.12.5

PRAECLVSAS [1]
Prop. 2.5.22

PRAECORDII [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.15

PRAECVRENS [1]
Prop. 1.3.31

PRAEDA [2]
Ov. Am. 2.12.6; Ars 3.560

PRAEDAS [1]
Tib. 1.2.66

PRAEDICAS [1]
Plaut. Cur. 111

PRAEFANDVS [1]
Apul. Ap. 75

PRAEFERAT [1]
Tib. 1.1.54

PRAEFERS [3]

PRAEVERTVR [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.10

PRAEMIA [1]
Tib. 1.2.26

PRAEMONIO [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.47

PRAESENS [2]
Ov. M. 13.825; 14.727

PRAESENTIBVS [1]
Plaut. Cur. 31

PRAESENTIOR [1]
Ov. M. 13.757

PRAESTO [1]
Tib. 1.5.61

PRAETEMPTAT [1]
Tib. 2.1.77

PRAETEREVNTE [1]
Ov. Am. 3.1.54

PRAETERIT [2]
Ov. Ars 3.63; 3.64

PRAETERITOS [1]
Pers. 5.162

PRATIS [1]
Ov. M. 13.790

PRECARI [2]
Ov. M. 14.730; Tib. 2.6.17

PRECES [5]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.13; Ov. M. 13.855; Petron. 97; Prop. 1.16.20; Stat. S. 1.2.195

PRECIBVS [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.61

PRECOR [4]
Ov. Am. 1.6.3; Tib. 1.2.12; 2.3.74; 2.6.53

PREMIS [1]
Ov. Am. 3.1.36

PREMIT [1]
CLE 950.7

PRESSIMVS [1]
Ov. Ep. 10.56

PRESSVRVS [1]
Ov. Am. 1.9.13

PRETI [1]
Plaut. Cur. 167

PRETIO [3]
Claud. Eutr. 1.84; Juv. 9.71; Tib. 2.4.39
PRETIOSIVS [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.3
PRETVM [4]
Apul. Ap. 75; Mart. 4.29.4; Ov. Am. 1.8.69; Tib. 2.4.33
PRIDEM [1]
Ov. M. 14.758
PRIMO [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.43
PRINCIPIA [1]
Terr. Eu. 781
PRINCPIIO [1]
Terr. Eu. 805
PROBRO [1]
Plaut. Cur. 29
PROCAX [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.92
PROCERIOR [1]
Ov. M. 13.790
PROCI [1]
Ov. M. 13.735
PROCIS [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.11
PROCVBVI [1]
Petron. 97
PROCVL [3]
Ov. M. 13.787; Terr. Eu. 787; Tib. 1.1.76
PROCVMBERE [1]
Tib. 1.2.83
PRODIESE [1]
Prop. 2.14.19
PRODEST [2]
Tib. 1.2.76; 1.8.70
PRODIDIT [1]
Ov. M. 14.741
PRODIRET [1]
Ov. Am. 3.11.13
PRODITA [1]
Prop. 2.7.10
PRODITIOE [1]
Ov. Ars 3.578
PROETVM [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.13
PROFECTO [1]
Plaut. Am. 1023
PROFESSIS [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.351
PROFICISCI [1]
Plaut. Cur. 1
PROFITEMVR [1]
Ov. Ars 2.639
PROFVERIT [1]
Ov. Am. 2.1.29
PROFVISIS [1]
Ov. Ep. 10.55
PROFVS [1]
Plaut. Cur. 104
PROGNATAM [1]
Terr. Ph. 115
PROHIBE [1]
Plaut. Cur. 158
PROHIBES [1]
Terr. Eu. 808
PROHIBEO [1]
Terr. Eu. 809
PROHIBEBVNT [1]
Plaut. Am. 1051
PROHIBENT [1]
Tib. 2.4.34
PROHIBET [2]
Plaut. Cur. 33; 35
PROECTAM [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.69
PROECTOS [1]
CLE 950.7
PROEICTVM [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.21
PROELCIT [1]
Plaut. Cur. 97
PROLVE [1]
Plaut. Cur. 124
PROMENET [2]
Ov. M. 13.778; 13.845
PROMISSA [2]
Ov. Ars 2.523; Tib. 2.6.49
PROMISSIS [2]
Auson. Ep. 23.4; Prop. 2.17.1
PROMITTIT [1]
Tib. 1.8.63
PROMGRAT [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.14
PRONAS [1]
Tib. 1.6.72
PROPE [4]
Hor. S. 2.3.268; Lucilius 944; Stat. S. 1.2.196; Tib. 1.2.36
PROPENSV [1]
Ov. M. 14.706
PROPERE [1]
Plaut. Cur. 123
PROPERET [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.14.21
PROPIIAE [1]
Plaut. Cur. 89
PROPIIANTES [1]
Plaut. Cur. 126
PROPOSITVM [1]
Ov. Rem. 40
PROPRIM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 48
PROPRITERA [1]
Aul. Gell. 4.14.2
PROPVDSVS [1]
Apul. Ap. 75
PROVLSATA [1]
Apul. Ap. 75
PROPIARI [1]
Tib. 1.6.72
PROSVS [1]
Apul. Ap. 75
PROSCRIPTS [1]
Livy Per. 89
PROSCRIPTVM [1]
Livy Per. 89
PROSEQUVAR [1]
Ov. Am. 1.4.62
PROSIT [1]
Ov. Am. 1.4.59
PROSPERETAT [1]
Ov. M. 14.753
PROSPICEREM [1]
[Quint.] Decl. Mai. 15.7
PROSPICIT [1]
Tib. 1.5.72
PROSYVNT [2]
Ov. Am. 1.6.30; Tib. 1.8.61
PROTERVAE [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.14.26
PROTERVI [1]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.2
PROVENI [1]
Ov. Am. 3.1.44
PROVOCAVIT [1]
Aul. Gel. 4.14.4
PROXIMA [1]
Plaut. Cur. 53
PROXVMVM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 15
PRVINA [1]
Prop. 2.9.41
PRVINOSA [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.22
PRVINOSAS [1]
Ov. M. 4.82
PRVINOSOS [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.65
PRVNA [1]
Ov. M. 13.817
PVBER [1]
Catull. 63.63
PVSES [1]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.17
PVSLICA [1]
Plaut. Cur. 35
PVSLICIS [1]
Aul. Gel. 4.14.1
PVSLICITVS [1]
Plaut. Am. 1027
PVSLICYS [1]
Patron. 97
PVDENDA [1]
Tib. 2.1.74
PVDET [2]
Hor. Epod. 11.7;
Tib. 1.1.74
PVDICA [2]
Plaut. Cur. 51; 57
PVDICAES [2]
Cic. Phil. fr.
10.3.1; Plaut. Cur.
25
PVDICAM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 26
PVDICITIAES [1]
Prop. 1.16.2
PVDOR [5]
Hor. Epod. 11.18;
Ov. Am. 3.11.16;
Ov. Ars 3.58;
Plaut. Cur. 58;
Stat. S. 1.2.36
PVDORE [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.60
PVDORIS [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.79
PVDOB [1]
Tib. 1.2.93
PVDELLA [8]
Ov. Am. 1.9.6;
2.12.8; Ars 2.249;
Prop. 2.14.23; Tib.
1.2.18; 1.8.62;
2.1.76; 2.6.44
PVDELLAE [15]
Hor. Epod. 11.27;
Ov. Am. 1.6.63;
2.19.37; 3.4.1; Ars
2.527; 2.533;
2.635; 3.57; 3.569;
Rem. 33; Prop.
1.5.19; Tib.
1.1.55; 1.2.5;
1.2.93; 2.6.9
PVDELLAM [5]
Ov. Fast. 4.111;
Am. 1.9.9; 2.19.47;
Juv. 9.74; Tib.
2.6.49
PVDELLAS [2]
Prop. 3.3.49; Tib.
2.1.71
PVDELLIS [3]
Hor. Epod. 11.4;
Carm. 3.26.1; Tib.
2.4.29
PVDERE [7]
Catull. 63.63; Cil.
Phil. 2.45; Pers.
5.187; 5.169;
Plaut. Cur. 9; Tib.
1.2.95; 1.8.67
PVDERE [1]
Plaut. Cur. 75
PVERT [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.28
PVERTILIVS [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.250
PVHERIS [2]
Hor. Epod. 11.4;
Plaut. Cur. 38
PVHERO [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.258
PVHEROS [1]
Ov. Ars 3.571
PVGNAE [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.19
PVGNARE [1]
Ter. Eu. 777
PVGNASTI [1]
Ov. Am. 3.1.38
PVGNETVR [1]
Ov. Ars 3.589
PVGNIS [1]
Hor. S. 1.2.66
PVLCHER [1]
Ov. M. 13.753
PVLCHECRIA [1]
Prop. 2.25.1
PVLCHERA [1]
Ter. Ph. 104
PVLCHERAE [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.5
PVLCHERE [1]
Ter. Eu. 774
PVLCHEVDINEM [1]
Ter. Ph. 105
PVLCRA [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.6
PVLLA [2]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.18;
Tib. 1.2.62
PVLPAMENTVM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 90
PVLSABANT [1]
Prop. 2.14.21
PVLSATA [1]
Prop. 1.16.6
PVLSATVR [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.93
PVLSET [2]
Ov. Am. 2.19.39;
Prop. 4.5.47
PVLSO [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.15.10
PVLOCARE [1]
Plaut. Ba. 1117
PVLTARE [1]
Plaut. Ba. 1120
PVLYERE [2]
Hor. S. 2.3.251;
Mart. 10.14.2
PVPVLA [1]
CLE 950.3
PVPVLO [1]
Aul. Gel. 4.14.6
PVRIR [1]
Ov. Ars 3.55
PVROR [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.8
PVRPVREAE [1]
Ov. M. 13.814
PVRPVREI [1]
Apu1. Ap. 9
PVRVS [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.23
PVT [3]
Ov. Ars 2.522;
2.533; M. 13.847
PVTARIS [1]
Ov. Ars 1.733
PVTAS [1]
Ter. Eu. 813
PVTAT [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.2
PVTE [1]
Tib. 1.6.71
PYRAMVS [1]
Ov. M. 4.71
PYRRV [1]
Ter. Eu. 783
PYTHAGORAS [1]
Cic. Phil. fr. 10.3.1
QVADRANTAL [1]
Plaut. Cur. 110
QVAERAT [1]
Lucr. 4.1181
QVAERE [1]
Ter. Eu. 810
QVAERERE [2]
Ov. Am. 2.19.40;
Fast. 5.331
QVAERET [1]
Ov. Am. 1.9.14
QVAERIT [1]
Ov. Am. 1.8.51
QVAERITE [1]
Tib. 1.2.35
QVAERITVR [2]
Fortun. 1.12 (2)
QVAERO [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.253
QVAESIERIS [1]
Ov. M. 13.756
QVAESISSE [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.88
QVAESITVM [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.20
QVAESO [2]
Tib. 1.1.58; 1.5.75
QVAESTIONEM [1]
Plaut. Am. 1017
QVANTILLVM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 110
QVARE [2]
Ov. Ars 2.531;
Fast. 5.331
QVATIVNT [1]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.1
QVEANT [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.25
QVEO [1]
Plaut. Cur. 64
QVERAR [1]
Prop. 1.8.22
QVERARIS [2]
Prop. 2.4.1;
3.25.16
QVERCV [1]
Ov. M. 13.799
QVEREBAR [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.12
QVERELA [1]
Prop. 1.16.39
QVERELIS [2]
Prop. 1.16.13; Tib.
1.2.9
QVERELLA [1]
Lucr. 4.1182
QVERELLIS [2]
Ov. Ars 3.455; Rem.
509
QVEROR [1]
Prop. 1.16.6
QVERVLAE [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.30
QVESTI [1]
Ov. M. 4.84
QVESTV [1]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.16
QVESTVS [1]
Stat. S. 1.2.196
RACEMIS [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.343
RADICE [1]
Ov. M. 14.713
RADIIS [2]
Ov. M. 4.82; Prop.
1.3.33
RAEDA [1]
Mart. 10.14.1
RAMOS [1]
Ov. M. 13.812
RAPACEM [1]
Tib. 2.4.25
RAPACIS [1]
Tib. 1.5.59
RAPIAM [1]
Tib. 2.4.23
RAPIDI [1]
Tib. 1.2.44
RAPIDO [1]
Tib. 1.2.40
RAPIET [1]
Ov. M. 13.773
RAPINA [1]
Ov. Rem. 301
RAPTA [2]
Tib. 1.2.26; 1.8.58
RAPTAE [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.53
RAPTAS [1]
Ov. M. 13.731
RAPTVS [1]
Ov. Ars 3.570
RAPVI [1]
Juv. 9.75
RAPVISTI [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.19
RAPVIT [1]
Ov. M. 13.775
RARA [3]
Ov. Am. 2.19.6; Ars
3.580; Tib. 2.3.77
RARO [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.93
RASTRIS [1]
Ov. M. 13.765
RATIO [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.250
RATIONE [3]
Hor. S. 2.3.266;
2.3.271; Ov. M.
14.701
RAVCA [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.50
RAVCVM [1]
Prop. 1.16.39
REBVS [1]
Sex. Turp. 202 (R)
RECEDIT [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.92
RECEDO [1]
Pliny Ep. 7.5
RECENT [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.9
RECEPTVS [1]
Ov. Am. 1.8.78
RECIDERE [1]
Ov. M. 13.766
RECINENS [1]
Prud. Symm. 1.63
RECUPER [1]
Ov. Am. 1.8.75
RECIPIERE [1]
Au! Gell. 4.14.5
REICIPIAT [1]
Plaut. Cur. 86
RECISA [1]
Ov. Ars 3.574
RECTA [2]
Plaut. Am. 1042; Ter. Ph. 112
RECTE [2]
Plaut. Cur. 171; Ter. Eu. 773
RECTIVS [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.15.8
RECTVMST [1]
Ter. Eu. 784
RECVBARE [1]
Prop. 2.25.20; Tib. 2.6.46
RECVRRIT [2]
Ov. Am. 2.1.26; Tib. 1.5.73
RECVSAT [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.258
RECVSEM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 164
REDDET [1]
Ter. Eu. 797
REDDE [3]
Ov. Am. 1.6.23; Ep. 10.56; Ter. Eu. 796
REDDERE [2]
Hor. S. 2.3.270; Prop. 1.16.20
REDDES [1]
Apul. Ap. 9
REDDET [1]
Lucilius 939
REDDITVS [1]
[Quint.] Decl. Mai. 15.7
REDEAM [2]
Hor. S. 2.3.264; Ter. Eu. 49
REDEAMV [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.33; M. 13.844
REDEMI [1]
Juvi. 9.76
REDEVNT [1]
Stat. S. 1.2.195
REDI [2]
Plaut. Cur. 115; Tib. 2.3.74
REDIMITA [1]
Catull. 63.66
REDIRE [2]
Ov. Ars 3.64; Stat. S. 1.2.35
REDIT [3]
Prop. 2.25.20; Tib. 2.6.46
REDITVRVM [1]
Tib. 2.6.13
REDITVRS [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.261
REDVCTIS [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.86
REFER [1]
Ov. M. 13.747
REFERAT [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.41
REFERENS [4]
Catull. 63.75; Ov. Am. 3.11.14; Prop. 1.3.35; 1.16.16
REFERE [1]
Tib. 1.2.48
REFERT [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.16
REFERNT [1]
Ov. M. 14.742
REFORMIDAT [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.94
REFVDIT [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.91
REFVGIT [1]
Tib. 1.5.72
REGEM [1]
Plaut. Am. 1042
REGIA [1]
Ov. Am. 3.1.40
REGINA [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.26.11
REGNA [1]
Ov. Ars 3.564
REGNARE [2]
Ov. Am. 2.19.33; M. 13.844
REGNAT [1]
Ov. M. 13.854
REGNI [1]
Ov. M. 13.758
RELAXA [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.17
RELENTESCAT [1]
Ov. Am. 1.8.76
RELEVERE [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.25
RELICTA [2]
Ov. Am. 1.8.52; Pers. 5.168
RELIGARE [1]
Ov. M. 14.735
RELIGATE [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.1
RELINVANT [1]
Ov. M. 4.86
RELIQVERNT [1]
Ov. M. 13.734
REMEAT [1]
Apul. Ap. 9
REMINISCERE [1]
Stat. S. 1.2.37
REMOVERAT [1]
Ov. M. 4.81
REMVGiat [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.6
RENODATIS [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.28
RENOVENVR [1]
Ov. Ars 3.583
REPENSA [1]
Ov. Am. 1.8.80
REPERTA [2]
Claud. Eutr. 1.88; Ov. Fast. 4.114
REPETENS [1]
Ov. M. 13.739
REPETO [1]
Ov. Ep. 10.51
REPVLNSA [3]
Ov. Am. 1.6.42; 2.19.6; Ars 3.580
REPVLNSIS [1]
Ov. M. 13.735
REPVLSO [1]
Ov. M. 13.860
REPYLSVS [3]
Ov. Am. 1.8.76;
3.11.9; Prop. 2.4.2
REQVIESCERE [2]
Prop. 1.16.15;
2.17.15
REQVIESCIT [3]
Ov. Am. 1.6.45;
1.9.7; Tib. 1.2.4
RESARCIETVR [1]
Ter. Ad. 121
RESECVTA [1]
Ov. M. 13.749
RESEEDIT [1]
Ov. M. 13.780
RESERARE [2]
Ov. Am. 3.1.45;
Tib. 1.8.60
RESERAT [1]
Tib. 1.2.18
RESERATA [1]
Prop. 1.16.19
RESERAVIMVS [1]
Ov. Ars 3.577
RESERET [1]
Tib. 1.2.31
RESIDENS [1]
Ov. M. 13.787
RESFERSIT [1]
Livy Per. 89
RESPICE [1]
Plaut. Cur. 115
RESFICIENS [1]
Prop. 2.7.10
RESPONDE [1]
Ter. Eu. 792
RESPONDEAT [1]
Ter. Eu. 810
RESPONDES [1]
Prop. 1.16.26
RESTANT [1]
Lucilius 946
RESTAT [1]
Prop. 2.25.18
RESTITVAT [1]
Fortun. 1.12
RESTITVENT [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.2
RESTITVENTVR [1]
Ter. Ad. 120
RESVMPSI [1]
Ov. Am. 2.1.21
RESVRGVNT [1]
Ov. Am. 1.9.29
RETIA [1]
Ov. Am. 1.8.69
RETIENT [2]
Claud. Eutr. 1.97;
Tib. 1.1.55
RETIAGERE [2]
Ov. M. 13.809; Tib.
1.2.73
RETRO [2]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.10;
REVERTITVR [1]
Ov. M. 13.777
REVOCAITVR [1]
Ov. Ars 3.63
REVOCAT [1]
Ov. Am. 2.1.24
REVOCAIRE [1]
Tib. 1.8.78
REVOCAT [2]
Hor. S. 2.3.264;
Ter. Eu. 49
REVOCATVR [1]
Prop. 1.16.11
REVOMIT [1]
Ov. M. 13.731
RIDES [1]
Tib. 1.2.87
RIGAVIT [1]
Prop. 3.3.52
RIGET [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.28
RIGIDA [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.17
RIGIDAS [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.24
RIGIDIS [1]
Ov. M. 13.846
RIGIDO [2]
Ov. Am. 1.6.73;
Rem. 35
RIGIDOS [1]
Ov. M. 13.765
RISVO [1]
Ov. M. 13.797
RIMA [1]
Prop. 1.16.27
RIMOSAS [1]
Prop. 2.17.16
RISI [1]
Ov. Rem. 501
RISISSE [1]
Tib. 1.8.73
RISIT [2]
Ov. Am. 1.6.11; M.
13.774
RITIV [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.268
RIVALE [1]
Ov. Am. 1.9.18
RIVALEN [2]
Ov. Ars 3.563;
3.593
RIVALIS [1]
Ov. Rem. 677
RIXA [3]
Ov. Ars 3.71; Rem.
31; Prop. 2.19.5
RIXAE [2]
Hor. Carm. 3.14.26;
Tib. 2.4.37
RIXAS [1]
Tib. 1.1.74
RIXIS [1]
Prop. 1.16.5
ROBORIBVS [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.28
ROBVR [1]
Ov. Am. 2.1.28
RODERE [1]
Pers. 5.170
ROGARIS [1]
Juv. 9.73
ROGAS [1]
Plaut. Am. 1025
ROGAT [1]
Prop. 2.25.19
ROGATA [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.20
ROGES [2]
Ov. M. 13.823;
Prop. 2.4.2
ROGITAS [2]
Plaut. Cur. 19;
Ter. Eu. 794
ROGO [2]
Plaut. Am. 1026;
Tib. 1.2.46
ROGOS [1]
Ov. Rem. 38
RORE [1]
Ov. Ars 3.565
SAPIENTIOR [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.265
SAPIS [1]
Plaut. Cur. 28
SAPITIS [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.25
SATIARE [1]
Stat. S. 1.2.36
SATOS [1]
Tib. 2.3.70
SATVM [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.6
SAVCIA [1]
Prop. 1.16.5
SAVCIVS [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.15
SAVIA [1]
Apul. Ap. 9
SAVIIS [1]
Plaut. Cur. 56
SAVIVM [2]
Plaut. Cur. 60; 94
SAXO [4]
Ov. M. 13.810;
14.713; Prop. 1.16.29; 2.17.13
SAXVM [1]
Ov. M. 14.758
SACENA [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.347
SCELESTAM [1]
Plaut. Am. 1025
SCELESTE [1]
Plaut. Cur. 40
SCELESTIE [1]
Plaut. Am. 1025
SCIAT [2]
Plaut. Cur. 29;
Prop. 3.3.49
SCIBI [1]
Ter. Eu. 805
SCIENS [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.25
SCIES [1]
Plaut. Cur. 75
SCIET [1]
Ov. Ars 2.247
SCIMVS [2]
Lucr. 4.1174; Ov. Am. 3.8.25
SCINDET [1]
Ov. Ars 3.569
SCIO [1]
Ter. Ph. 110
SCIRE [1]
Plaut. Cur. 134
SCIS [2]
Juv. 9.73; Ter. Eu. 790
SCISSOS [1]
Tib. 1.10.53
SCIT [1]
Plaut. Cur. 81
SCITAST [1]
Ter. Ph. 110
SCITO [1]
Plaut. Cur. 53
SCOPVLIS [2]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.21;
Ov. M. 13.801
SCORTARI [1]
Ter. Ad. 102
SCORTORVM [1]
[Quint.] Decl. Mai. 14.3
SCREANTI [1]
Plaut. Cur. 117
SCRIBE [1]
Auson. Ep. 23.7
SCRIBERE [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.2
SCRIPTVM [1]
Aul. Gell. 4.14.2
SCVTA [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.16
SCVTVS [1]
Luciliius 938
SCYLLA [1]
Ov. M. 13.730
SECVBET [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.42
SECVDNO [1]
Tib. 1.2.75
SECVR [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.37
SECVREM [1]
Petron. 97
SECVRIBVS [1]
Plaut. Ba. 1119
SECVRVS [1]
Tib. 1.1.77
SECVTAE [1]
Ov. M. 13.781
SEDATVM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 118
SEDE [1]
Ov. M. 4.78
SEDEO [1]
Tib. 1.1.56
SEDES [1]
Tib. 1.2.81
SEDVLA [1]
Prop. 1.3.32
SEDVLYVS [2]
Tib. 1.5.72; 2.4.42
SEGES [1]
Ov. Ars 3.562
SEGNES [1]
Ov. Ars 2.233
SEGNIS [2]
Claud. Eutr. 1.78;
Tib. 1.1.58
SEMIADAPERTA [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.4
SEMINA [1]
Ov. Am. 3.1.59
SEMISSONAE [1]
Plaut. Cur. 117
SEMIMAT [1]
Plaut. Cur. 36
SENECTAE [1]
Ov. Ars 3.59
SENECTVS [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.94
SENECTVI [1]
[Quint.] Decl. Mai. 15.7
SENEM [2]
Tib. 1.2.90; 2.1.74
SENES [1]
Ov. Ars 3.78
SENESCET [1]
Ov. Ars 3.594
SENESCIT [2]
Ov. Am. 1.8.53; Ars 3.82
SENEX [2]
Ov. Am. 1.9.4;
Plaut. Am. 1072
SENILIS [1]
Ov. Am. 1.9.4
SENSERIT [1]
Prop. 2.17.18
SENSERVNT [2]
Ov. M. 13.785;
13.786
SENSIMVS [1]
Plaut. Cur. 58
Ov. Am. 2.12.2; 3.1.56; M. 14.743; Tib. 2.6.46
SIVM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 75
SINVNT [1]
Ov. Ars 3.58
SINVS [2]
Plaut. Cur. 82; Tib. 1.2.96
SIRIT [1]
Plaut. Cur. 27
SISTAS [1]
Plaut. Cur. 163
SISTO [1]
Plaut. Cur. 163
SISYPHOS [1]
Prop. 2.17.7
SITHONIA [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.26.10
SITI [1]
Plaut. Cur. 121
SITIAM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 139
SITIM [2]
Plaut. Cur. 118; Prop. 2.17.6
SITIS [1]
Ov. M. 13.768
SITIT [2]
Plaut. Cur. 110 (2)
SITV [1]
Ov. Am. 1.8.52
SMARAGDOS [1]
Tib. 2.4.27
SOCERVM [1]
Ov. M. 13.855
SOCIA [1]
Cic. Phil. 2.45
SOCIETATEM [1]
Petron. 97
SOCIIS [1]
Ov. Ars 3.564
SOCIO [1]
Ov. Am. 1.9.6
SODALI [2]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.19; Plaut. Cur. 68
SODES [1]
Ter. Ph. 103
SOL [3]
Ov. M. 4.82; 13.811; 13.853
SOLA [6]
Ov. Ars 3.563;
Prop. 1.16.25;
1.16.35; Tib.
1.2.51; 1.2.52;
2.1.76
SOLAM [1]
Ov. Ars 3.561
SOLATA [1]
Ov. M. 13.747
SOLE [1]
Catull. 63.67
SOLEA [1]
Pers. 5.169
SOLEBAM [1]
Pliny Ep. 7.5
SOLEBAT [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.13
SOLET [6]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.14;
Plaut. Cur. 76; 79;
Prop. 1.16.38; Sen.
QNat. 4 A pr. 6;
Sex. Turp. 202 (R)
SOLETIS [1]
Ov. M. 13.843
SOLI [3]
Ov. M. 13.853;
Plaut. Cur. 111;
Ter. Eu. 793
SOLIBVS [1]
Ov. M. 13.793
SOLIDA [1]
Ov. Ars 2.640
SOLIS [1]
Ov. Am. 2.1.24
SOLITO [1]
Tib. 1.2.72
SOLITVM [1]
Ov. M. 4.83
SOLLERS [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.41
SOLLICITA [1]
Ov. M. 14.706
SOLLICITAE [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.8
SOLLICITARE [1]
Ov. Am. 3.1.50
SOLLICITAS [1]
Prop. 1.16.40

SIGNA [7]
Ov. Am. 1.6.50; Ars 2.234; Rem. 510;
Prop. 1.16.8;
3.3.48; Ter. Eu. 808; Tib. 1.1.75
SIGNARAT [1]
Ov. M. 13.754
SIGNVM [1]
Ter. Eu. 781
SILENT [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.55
SILENTE [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.40
SILENTI [1]
Ov. M. 4.84
SILENTIVM [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.9
SILVA [2]
Ov. Ars 3.574; M. 13.822
SILVESTRI [1]
Ov. M. 13.815
SILVICULTRIX [1]
Catull. 63.72
SILVIS [2]
Hor. Epod. 11.6;
Ov. M. 13.760
SIMVLACRA [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.9
SIMVLANS [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.20
SIMVLARAT [1]
Ov. Rem. 501
SIMVLAT [1]
Tib. 1.5.73
SIMVLATVS [1]
Ov. Am. 1.8.71
SIMVLATRES [1]
Ov. Am. 1.8.82
SINERES [1]
Ov. M. 4.74
SINISTRO [1]
Pers. 5.164
SINISTRVM [1]
Ter. Eu. 775
SINIT [1]
Tib. 1.2.25a
SINV [4]
SOLLICITO [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.64
SOLLICITVS [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.253
SOLO [2]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.10; Tib. 1.2.68
SOLV [1]
Ter. Eu. 780
SOLVERE [1]
Tib. 1.2.60
SOLVM [3]
Ov. Ars 3.592; M. 13.817; Tib. 1.2.45
SOLVS [2]
Ov. Am. 1.6.34; Tib. 1.5.74
SOLVTA [1]
Ov. Am. 3.1.51
SOLVTVM [2]
Juv. 9.79; Ov. Ars 2.237
SOMNIET [1]
Prop. 4.5.48
SOMNIS [1]
Ov. Am. 1.9.25
SOMNOS [1]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.3
SOMNVS [4]
Ov. Am. 1.6.41; Prop. 1.16.22; 2.19.6; Tib. 1.2.74
SONANT [1]
Tib. 2.4.37
SONAT [1]
Plaut. Cur. 113
SONES [1]
Tib. 1.2.10
SONITV [1]
Plaut. Ba. 1120
SONITVM [2]
Plaut. Cur. 156; 158
SONITVS [2]
Catull. 63.74; Tib. 1.2.78
SONO [1]
Tib. 1.2.20
SONVERNT [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.49
SONVISSE [1]
Tib. 1.8.66
SONVM [3]
Ov. M. 14.740; Tib. 1.2.32; 1.8.58
SONVS [2]
Juv. 9.78; Ov. M. 14.749
SOPHRONAM [1]
Ter. Eu. 807
SOPITIS [1]
Ov. Am. 1.9.26
SOPOR [1]
Tib. 1.2.2
SOPOREM [1]
Tib. 1.2.77
SOROR [1]
Plaut. Cur. 51
SOROREM [1]
Ter. Eu. 806
SORORVM [1]
Ov. M. 13.743
SORS [2]
Ov. Am. 1.6.46; Prop. 2.25.2
SORTE [3]
Hor. S. 2.3.269; Ov. Am. 1.6.46; Prop. 2.17.5
SPARGAM [1]
Ov. M. 13.866
SPARGENTVR [1]
Ov. Ars 3.76
SPARGERE [1]
Juv. 9.84
SPARSA [1]
Ov. Ars 3.72
SPATOSSVM [1]
Ov. Am. 1.8.81
SPE [1]
Ov. M. 14.715
SPECIE [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.353
SPECIES [1]
Ov. Ars 2.233
SPECTARE [1]
Ov. M. 13.767
SPECTENT [1]
Tib. 2.4.41
SPECVLATOR [1]
Ov. Am. 1.9.17
SPECVLO [2]
Claud. Eutr. 1.94; Prop. 3.25.14
SPEM [2]
Ov. Am. 1.6.52; Petron. 97
SPERAVI [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.49
SPEREMYS [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.5
SPERET [1]
Ov. Ars 3.592
SPERNIS [1]
Tib. 1.8.55
SPERNIT [3]
Ov. M. 13.776; 14.714; Tib. 1.8.61
SPERNO [1]
Ov. M. 13.857
SPES [2]
Ov. M. 14.704; Tib. 2.6.20
SPICIO [1]
Plaut. Cur. 155
SPINA [1]
Ov. Ars 3.68
SPINAM [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.354
SPIRITVS [3]
Hor. Epod. 11.10; Prop. 1.16.32; Tib. 1.8.58
SPLENDIDA [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.336
SPLENDIDIOR [1]
Ov. M. 13.791
SPOLIATRICEM [1]
Mart. 4.29.5
SPONDVM [1]
Cic. Phil. fr. 10.3.1
STABVLANTVR [1]
Ov. M. 13.822
STACTA [1]
Plaut. Cur. 102
STARE [1]
Tib. 1.2.93
STARES [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.19
STAT [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.95
STATVA [1]
Plaut. Cur. 140
STATVAM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 140
Ov. M. 13.856; Prop. 1.16.14
SVPSTVLIT [1]
CLE 950.6
SVRDA [2]
Mart. 10.14.8; Ov. Am. 1.8.77
SVRDAS [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.54
SVRDIO [2]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.21; Ov. M. 13.804
SVRDIS [1]
Prud. Symm. 1.65
SVRDVS [1]
Prop. 4.5.48
SVRGENTE [1]
Ov. M. 14.711
SVRGERE [1]
Tib. 1.2.24
SVRGET [1]
Prop. 1.16.32
SVSCITET [1]
Prop. 2.4.4
SVSPENDE [1]
Juv. 9.85
SVSPENSA [2]
Tib. 2.1.77; 2.4.23
SVSPICIT [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.1
SVSPIRARE [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.10
SVSPIRIA [3]
Mart. 10.14.9; Ov. M. 13.739; Stat. S. 1.2.33
SVSILITE [1]
Plaut. Cur. 151
SVSTINEO [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.58
SVSTINET [2]
Ov. M. 14.731; Prop. 2.25.18
SVSTINVI [1]
Ov. Am. 3.11.9
SVSVRRO [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.87
SVSVRROS [1]
Prud. Symm. 1.62
SVTILIBVS [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.335
SYMAETHIDE [1]
Ov. M. 13.750
SYRISCE [2]
Ter. Eu. 772; 775
TABELLAM [1]
Catull. 32.5
TABELLAS [2]
Ov. Am. 2.19.41; Tib. 2.6.45
TABELLIS [1]
Ov. M. 14.707
TABYLAS [1]
Juv. 9.75
TABYVLATO [1]
Aul. Gel. 4.14.3
TACE [6]
Plaut. Cur. 95; 124; 132; 156; 156; Ter. Eu. 797
TACEANT [1]
Ov. Am. 1.4.66
TACEO [2]
Plaut. Cur. 132; 156
TACES [3]
Plaut. Cur. 41; 84; Prop. 1.16.18
TACET [3]
Plaut. Cur. 21; 22; Tib. 2.4.34
TACITAE [1]
Stat. S. 1.2.194
TACITIS [2]
Prop. 1.16.26; 1.18.24
TACITVRNA [1]
Tib. 1.2.32
TACITVRNIISSIMVM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 20
TACTV [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.93
TAEDIA [3]
Ov. Am. 2.19.25; Ars 2.530; M. 14.718
TAEDIS [1]
Tib. 1.2.61
TAETRIS [1]
Lucr. 4.1175
TALENTVM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 64
TALES [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.5
TANAIN [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.1
TANGAM [2]
Ter. Eu. 798; 809
TANGAS [1]
Ter. Eu. 797
TANGE [2]
Hor. Carm. 3.26.12; Ov. Am. 3.8.16
TANGERE [1]
Plaut. Cur. 108
TANGET [1]
Ov. Ars 3.588
TANGIS [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.22
TANGO [1]
Ov. Ep. 10.53
TANTELEA [1]
Prop. 2.17.5
TARDAS [1]
Prop. 1.10.16
TARDAT [1]
Tib. 1.2.23
TARDITATE [1]
Cic. Phil. Fr. 10.3.1
TARPEIAE [1]
Prop. 1.16.2
TARTARO [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.17
TECTA [6]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.6; Lucilius 938; Ov. Am. 1.6.58; 1.8.52; Ars 2.540; M. 4.86
TECTO [1]
Ov. Ars 2.245
TECTVM [2]
Ov. M. 14.752; Prud. Symm. 1.66
TEGANT [1]
Tib. 2.3.76
TEGAT [1]
Ov. Rem. 32
TEGR [1]
Ov. M. 13.748
TEGIT [2]
Ov. M. 13.822; 13.849
TEGLAS [1]
Cic. Phil. 2.45
TELA [3]
580

Ov. Am. 2.1.19; 2.1.21; Tib. 2.6.15
TELEMVS [2]
Ov. M. 13.770; 13.771
TELINVM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 103
TELIS [1]
Ov. Ars 3.590
TELLVREM [1]
Tib. 1.2.85
TEMPESTATIS [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.268
TEMPLIS [1]
Tib. 1.2.83
TEMPORA [13]
Apul. Ap. 9; Ov. Am. 1.6.24; 1.6.32;
1.6.37; 1.6.40; 1.6.48; 1.6.56;
2.12.1; Ars 3.82;
Fast. 5.335; M. 14.732; Prop.
1.3.37; Tib. 1.2.3
TEMPORE [3]
Apul. Ap. 9; Ov. Ars 2.532; M. 13.734
TEMPORIS [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.70
TEMPAT [2]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.12;
Tib. 1.2.17
TEMPENT [1]
Ov. M. 4.85
TEMPYS [3]
Ov. Am. 1.8.81; Ars 3.60; 3.69
TENDIS [1]
Ov. Am. 1.8.69
TENEAR [1]
Pliny Ep. 7.5
TENAT [2]
Tib. 2.6.52 (2)
TENEBAS [1]
Ov. Am. 3.11.11
TENEBIS [1]
Ov. Ars 3.563
TENEBRAS [1]
Plaut. Cur. 97
TENEBRIS [3]
Ov. Am. 1.6.10;
Tib. 1.2.25; 2.1.76
TENER [1]
Prud. Symm. 1.62
TENERA [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.11
TENERAE [1]
Ov. Am. 3.4.1
TENERAS [2]
Ov. Ars 3.568; M. 13.754
TENERE [2]
CLE 950.1; Tib. 1.2.51
TENERIS [2]
CLE 950.2; Tib. 1.2.73
TENERO [2]
Ov. M. 13.791; Tib. 1.5.62
TENERS [1]
Ov. Ars 2.534
TENERVM [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.2
TENES [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.26.9
TENET [4]
Hor. Epod. 11.24;
Mart. 4.29.6; Ov. Am. 1.9.18; Tib.
1.2.47
TENETVR [2]
Ov. M. 14.713; Tib.
1.2.27
TENAVIT [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.5
TENVI [1]
Ov. Ars 3.77
TEPIDA [1]
Catull. 63.65
TEPIDIS [1]
Ov. M. 13.827
TEPIDUS [2]
Prop. 1.16.22; Tib. 1.2.46
TERETIS [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.28
TERITVR [1]
Prop. 2.25.17
TERRA [3]
Ov. Am. 1.9.7;
Plaut. Cur. 141;
Tib. 1.1.53
TERRAS [1]
[Quint.] Decl. Mai. 15.7
TERRETE [1]
Tib. 1.2.35
TERRIBLEM [1]
Ov. M. 13.772
TERRIS [1]
Prop. 2.17.9
TERTIVS [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.5
TESTES [2]
Ov. Ars 3.458;
Prop. 2.9.41
TESTIBVS [1]
Plaut. Cur. 31
TESTIS [2]
Juv. 9.77; Ov. Am. 1.6.70
TESTVDINES [1]
Lucilius 938
TETIGISSE [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.86
TETIGIT [1]
Ov. Ars 3.560
TETRICIS [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.351
TEVCR [1]
Ov. M. 14.698
THAIDOS [1]
Prop. 2.6.3
THALAMOS [2]
Ov. Ars 3.560;
3.592
THEBIS [1]
Plaut. Am. 1046
THESEO [1]
Ov. Ars 3.457
THESSALVM [1]
Plaut. Am. 1043
THETIS [1]
Mart. 10.14.4
THISEBE [1]
Ov. M. 4.71
THRACIO [1]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.11
THYIAS [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.15.10
THYNA [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.3
THYNNO [1]
Lucilius 937
TIBIAE [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.30
TIBIARVM [1]
Cic. Phil. fr. 10.3.1
TIBICINAM [1]
Cic. Phil. fr. 10.3.1
TIME [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.20
TIMEAT [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.39
TIMEBAM [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.9
TIMEO [2]
Ov. Am. 1.6.14; 1.6.15
TIMES [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.30
TIMETO [1]
Tib. 1.5.69
TIMIDAE [1]
Ov. Rem. 33
TIMIDE [1]
Tib. 1.2.15
TIMIDIS [1]
Ov. Ars 2.234
TIMOR [1]
Tib. 1.2.24
TIMORE [1]
Tib. 2.1.77
TIMVISSE [2]
Ov. Ars 3.455; Tib. 1.2.28
TINCtvS [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.14
TINGANT [1]
Mart. 10.14.3
TINGIT [1]
Tib. 2.4.28
TIRONI [1]
Ov. Ars 3.566
TITVLVM [1]
Ov. Rem. 302
TOGAM [1]
Tib. 2.3.78
TOLLE [1]
Ov. Ars 3.594
TOLLENS [1]
Ov. M. 14.734
TOLLIS [1]
Juuv. 9.84
TORMENTA [1]
Ov. M. 14.716
TORO [9]
Claud. Eutr. 1.81; Ov. Am. 2.19.42; 3.1.51; Ep. 10.55; Prop. 1.3.34; 2.17.4; Tib. 1.2.56; 1.2.75; 1.8.62
TORQVEAR [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.34
TORQVES [1]
Tib. 2.6.17
TORVM [1]
Ov. Ep. 10.51
TORVOS [1]
Ov. M. 13.844
TOTA [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.55
TOTIENS [1]
Prop. 1.5.21
TRACTANDA [1]
Tib. 1.1.73
TRACTARI [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.267
TRADANTVR [1]
Ov. Ars 3.577
TRADITA [1]
Prop. 1.16.10
TRAGOEDIA [1]
Ov. Am. 3.1.35
TRAHAM [1]
Ov. M. 13.865
TRAICTA [1]
Prop. 1.16.27
TRANSFODIT [1]
Livy Per. 89
TRANSGRESSA [1]
Tib. 2.1.75
TRANSIRE [2]
Ov. Am. 1.9.27; Tib. 1.5.73
TRANSIREM [1]
Prop. 2.7.9
TRANSITE [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.47
TRANSITVS [1]
Ov. M. 4.77
TRANSLATAM [1]
Ov. M. 13.868
TRANSNABAS [1]
Ov. Ars 2.250
TREMENTE [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.20
TREPVLNA [2]
Plaut. Cur. 160;
Tib. 1.2.91
TREPNDANTVM [1]
Ov. M. 14.739
TREPIDARE [1]
Pers. 5.170
TREPIDAS [1]
Ov. Am. 3.8.26
TRIBVISSE [1]
Lucr. 4.1183
TRIBVLIS [1]
Ov. M. 13.803
TRIVBNI [1]
Au1. Gel1. 4.14.6
TRIBVNRVM [1]
Au1. Gel1. 4.14.1
TRIBVNS [1]
Au1. Gel1. 4.14.4
TRICLINIA [1]
Mart. 10.14.3
TRICLINV [1]
Apul. Ap. 75
TRIENTES [1]
Mart. 10.14.5
TRIGINTA [1]
Plaut. Cur. 63
TRIMV [1]
Hor. S. 2.3.251
TRISTI [1]
Tib. 1.2.49
TRISTIOR [1]
Prop. 1.16.14
TRISTIS [1]
Ov. M. 14.710
TRITA [1]
Prop. 2.17.14
TRIVIS [1]
Prop. 2.17.15
TRIVIO [1]
Prop. 1.16.40
TRIVMPHALES [1]
Ov. Am. 2.12.1
TRIVMPHIS [1]
Prop. 1.16.1
TRIVMPHO [1]
Ov. Am. 2.12.5
TRIVMPHOS [1]
Ov. M. 14.719
TRVIVENTIOR [1]
Ov. M. 13.803
TVBA [1]
Tib. 2.6.10
TVBAE [1]
Tib. 1.1.75
TVENDA [2]
Ov. Am. 3.4.2; Ars 2.234
TVENDO [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.80
TVLI [3]
Ov. Am. 1.6.20;
2.19.49; Prop.
1.16.44
TVLIT [3]
Ov. Am. 1.6.52;
3.8.16; M. 14.716
TVMENT [1]
Tib. 1.8.68
TVMIDOS [1]
Ov. Am. 1.9.13
TVMLIV [1]
Plaut. Ba. 1120
TVNDE [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.54
TVNDERE [1]
Tib. 1.2.86
TVNICA [1]
Ov. Am. 3.1.51
TVNICAS [2]
Ov. Ars 3.569 (2)
TVRA [1]
Tib. 1.8.70
TVRBA [5]
Claud. Eutr. 1.92;
Ov. Fast. 5.349; M.
13.743; Prop.
2.6.3; Tib. 1.2.95
TVRBAE [2]
Ter. Eu. 800; Tib.
1.5.63
TVRBAEM [1]
Sex. Turp. 200 (R)
TVRPE [5]
Ov. Am. 1.9.4 (2);
Ars 1.733; 2.534;
M. 13.847
TVRPES [1]
Prop. 1.16.7
TVRPI [2]
Lucr. 4.1174; Ov.
Am. 1.8.52
TVRPITOR [1]
Prop. 1.16.12
TVRPIS [5]
Ov. Am. 1.6.72; M.
13.847; 13.848;
Prop. 1.16.22; Ter.
Ph. 107
TVRPITER [2]
Ov. Am. 3.8.8; Ars
3.80
TVRR [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.82
TVRRIS [1]
Ov. Am. 2.19.27
TVSCO [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.28
TVTA [1]
Ov. M. 13.743
TVTAE [1]
Ov. M. 13.769
TVTE [2]
Plaut. Cur. 9; Per.
573
TVTI [1]
Ov. Ars 2.637
TVTO [1]
Ov. Rem. 29
TVTVM [1]
Ov. Ars 2.243
TVTVS [1]
Tib. 1.2.27
TVMPANO [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.15.10
TVRIO [2]
Tib. 1.2.75; 2.4.28
TVRRHENVS [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.12
VACAT [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.60
VACCAS [1]
Ov. Ars 2.239
VACVO [3]
Ov. Am. 2.19.42;
2.19.45; Pliny Ep.
7.5
VADIMOHIIS [1]
Plaut. Cur. 162
VAFER [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.12
VAGOR [1]
Tib. 1.2.25
VAGVS [1]
[Quint.] Decl. Mai.
15.7
VALE [3]
Ov. Am. 1.6.71;
1.6.72; M. 4.79
VALEANT [1]
Tib. 2.6.9
VALEAT [2]
Plaut. Cur. 19;
Tib. 2.6.9
VALEN [1]
Ov. Am. 1.4.67
VALERE [2]
Hor. Epod. 11.11;
Plaut. Cur. 169
VALET [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.22
VALETE [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.74
VALIDA [1]
Ov. M. 13.762
VALLE [1]
Tib. 2.3.72
VALLIBVS [1]
Ov. M. 13.821
VALVISTIN [1]
Plaut. Cur. 16
VALVIT [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.21
VANA [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.9
VANESCIT [1]
Ov. Am. 1.8.80
VATES [3]
Ov. M. 13.733;
Prop. 2.17.3; Stat.
S. 1.2.33
VATIS [1]
Stat. S. 1.2.197
VATVM [1]
Ov. M. 13.774
VBER [1]
Ov. M. 13.826
VDA [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.18
VDAS [1]
Pers. 5.165
VDIS [1]
Prop. 2.7.10
VECTE [1]
Lucilius 942
VECTES [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.81
VECTI [1]
Ter. Eu. 774
VECTIGALIS [1]
Apul. Ap. 75
VECTIS [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.26.7
VELA [1]
Prop. 3.7.71
VELATA [1]
Ov. Am. 3.1.51
VELEN [1]
Ov. M. 13.848
VELIM [2]
Plaut. Am. 1025; Tib. 1.2.64
VELIS [3]
Pers. 5.170; Prop. 2.17.10; Ter. Eu. 813
VELIT [2]
Ov. Am. 3.4.6; Ter. Ph. 115
VELLE [1]
Tib. 1.2.92
VELLEM [2]
Ov. M. 13.805; Ter. Eu. 786
VELLICENT [1]
Plaut. Merc. 408
VELOX [1]
Ov. Am. 2.1.29
VELV [1]
Tib. 2.1.71
VENALE [1]
Plaut. Cur. 34
VENEFICVM [1]
Plaut. Am. 1043
VENENA [1]
Prop. 2.17.14
VENEREM [1]
Tib. 1.2.40
VENERI [4]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.9; Ov. Am. 1.9.3; Plaut. Cur. 72; 73
VENERIIS [1]
Plaut. Cur. 162
VENERIS [9]
Aul. Gell. 19.9.12; Hor. Carm. 3.26.5; Lucr. 4.1172; Plaut. Cur. 71; Tib. 1.2.79; 1.2.90; 1.10.53; Ov. Rem. 506; Val. Aed. fr. 2.5
VENERVNT [1]
Ov. Fast. 4.108
VENI [2]
Ov. M. 13.839; Prop. 2.25.2
VENIAM [1]
Catull. 32.3
VENIAS [1]
Ov. Rem. 505
VENIENT [1]
Plaut. Per. 568
VENIENTEM [1]
Lucr. 4.1180
VENIET [2]
Prop. 2.14.20; Tib. 2.4.43
VENIMVS [2]
Ov. Ep. 10.57; Ter. Ph. 103
VENIO [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.33
VENIRE [1]
Aul. Gell. 4.14.6
VENISSE [1]
Aul. Gell. 4.14.5
VENIT [6]
Ov. Am. 1.6.13; M. 14.702; 14.750; Petron. 97; Tib. 1.2.76; 2.1.76
VENITO [1]
Ov. Rem. 505
VENIVNT [1]
Ov. M. 13.769
VENTI [2]
Aul. Gell. 19.9.12; Val. Aed. fr. 2.3
VENTIS [5]
CLE 950.3; Hor. Epod. 11.16; Carm. 3.10.7; Ov. Ars 3.584; M. 13.807
VENTO [2]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.12; Ov. Am. 1.6.51
VENTOS [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.42
VENTVRA [1]
Ov. M. 14.726
VENTVRAE [1]
Ov. Ars 3.59
VENTVRAM [1]
Tib. 1.8.65
VENTVS [1]
Tib. 2.4.40
VENVS [20]
Aul. Gell. 19.9.12; Auson. Ep. 23.1; CLE 950.8; Mart. 10.14.6; Ov. Am. 1.4.66; 1.9.29; Ars 3.564; M. 13.759; Plaut. Cur. 3; 125; Prop. 3.16.20; Tib. 1.1.73; 1.2.16; 1.2.34; 1.2.97; 1.8.57; 2.3.72; 2.4.24; 2.6.9; Val. Aed. fr. 2.5
VER [1]
Apul. Ap. 9
VERA [1]
Ov. M. 13.775
VERAX [1]
Tib. 1.2.41
VERBA [18]
Ov. Am. 1.6.20; 1.6.42; 1.8.78; 2.1.22; 2.19.50; M. 14.707; 14.715; 14.717; 14.744; Rem. 34; 509; 678; Prop. 1.8.22; 1.16.34; 2.17.16; Tib. 1.2.22; 2.1.74; 2.6.12
VERBERA [2]
Ov. Am. 1.6.19; Ars 2.533
VERBERET [1]
Tib. 1.2.7
VERBERIBVS [1]
Tib. 2.3.80
VERBIS [4]
Ov. Am. 3.1.35; M. 4.77; Plaut. Cur. 79; Tib. 1.5.67
VERBO [1]
   Tib. 1.2.79
VERBVMM [1]
   Plaut. Cur. 21
VEREOR [1]
   Ov. M. 13.858
VERISSIME [1]
   Pliny Ep. 7.5
VERITA [1]
   Ov. Am. 3.1.54
VERNENT [1]
   Apul. Ap. 9
VERNO [1]
   Apul. Ap. 9
VERNOS [1]
   Ov. Ars 3.61
VEROS [1]
   Ov. Ars 2.639
VERRENDIS [1]
   Ov. Am. 1.9.14
VERSA [1]
   Ov. Am. 2.1.26
VERSATVR [1]
   Tib. 1.5.70
VERSET [1]
   Hor. S. 2.3.249
VERSIBVS [1]
   Ov. Am. 3.1.38
VERSICVLOS [1]
   Hor. Epod. 11.2
VERSO [2]
   Ov. Am. 1.6.49; 1.2.10
VERS [2]
   Ov. Am. 3.8.27; 1.16.41
VERSYS [2]
VERTAT [1]
   Prop. 1.16.28
VERTI [1]
   Prop. 1.16.43
VERTIT [1]
   Tib. 1.2.44
VERTITVR [1]
   Ov. Am. 2.19.26
VERVM [5]
   Auson. Ep. 23.3; Juv. 9.70; Ov. Am. 1.4.65; M. 13.807; 13.818
VESPERA [1]
   Plaut. Cur. 4
VESTE [3]
   Ov. Am. 1.6.19; Tib. 1.2.26; 2.3.76
VESTEM [1]
   Ter. Ad. 121
VESTIBVLVM [1]
   Prop. 2.14.32
VESTIBVS [1]
   Claud. Eutr. 1.87
VESTIGIA [2]
   Ov. Am. 3.8.19; Ep. 10.53
VESTIS [2]
   Ov. Am. 1.8.51; Tib. 2.4.30
VESTITV [1]
   Ter. Ph. 107
VESTRA [1]
   Ov. Am. 3.1.40
VESTRAS [1]
   Ov. Ars 3.455
VESTRO [2]
   Lucilius 795; Ov. M. 13.854
VETAT [2]
   Plaut. Cur. 33; Tib. 1.2.24
VETERES [1]
   Tib. 2.3.69
VETERIS [4]
   Ov. Am. 3.8.19; M. 14.698; Plaut. Cur. 96; 100
VETO [2]
   Plaut. Cur. 42; 145
VETVS [2]
   Ov. Ars 3.565; Plaut. Cur. 100
VETVSTAS [1]
   Ov. Ars 3.77
VI [3]
   Apul. Geil. 4.14.5; Ter. Eu. 790; 796
VIA [3]
   Ov. Am. 1.9.9; Plaut. Cur. 32; 35
VIAE [2]
   Ov. Ars 2.235; M. 14.748
VIAM [1]
   Tib. 1.5.64
VIAS [5]
   Hor. Carm. 3.7.29; Ov. Ars 2.246; Plaut. Mer. 406; Tib. 1.6.72; 2.1.78
VIATOR [1]
   Petron. 97
VICEM [3]
   Hor. Carm. 1.25.9; Ov. Am. 1.6.23; Prop. 3.25.15
VICES [1]
   Ov. M. 4.72
VICIMVS [1]
   Ov. Am. 2.12.2
VICINA [1]
   Ov. M. 14.748
VICINVS [1]
   Hor. Carm. 3.7.23
VICISSIM [2]
   Plaut. Cur. 106; Ter. Eu. 815
VICTA [7]
   Apul. Ap. 9; Ov. Am. 2.1.28; Prop. 1.16.36; Tib. 1.2.2; 1.2.9; 1.5.67; 2.4.33
VICTAS [1]
   Tib. 1.2.67
VICTI [1]
   Ov. Am. 1.9.29
VICTOR [1]
   Ov. Rem. 28
VICTORIA [1]
   Ov. Am. 2.12.5
VICTOS [1]
   Tib. 2.4.39
VIDE [4]
   Plaut. Cur. 119; 128; 153; Ter. Ph. 111
VIDEAMVS [1]
   Ov. M. 14.751
VIDEAS [1]
   Ov. Am. 1.6.17
VIDEAT [2]
Lucr. 4.1184; Ov. Ars 1.738
VIDEATVR [1]
Ter. Eu. 785
VIDEBIS [2]
Plaut. Cur. 168;
Prop. 3.7.71
VIDEBIT [2]
Ov. Am. 1.6.69;
Rem. 511
VIDEOBO [1]
Plaut. Am. 1050
VIDEBOR [1]
Ov. M. 14.727
VIDEMV [1]
Ter. Ph. 104
VIDEN [3]
Plaut. Cur. 93;
160; Ter. Eu. 783
VIDENDI [1]
Tib. 2.3.77
VIDENTI [1]
Ov. M. 13.841
VIDEO [2]
Plaut. Cur. 146;
Ter. Eu. 788
VIDEOR [1]
Ov. M. 13.868
VIDERAT [2]
Ov. M. 14.698;
14.700
VIDERE [3]
Ov. Ars 2.521;
2.522; M. 13.825
VIDERI [1]
Stat. S. 1.2.200
VIDERIT [1]
Tib. 1.2.56
VIDET [2]
Ov. M. 13.853;
Plaut. Cur. 170
VIDETIS [1]
Ov. M. 14.729
VIDETVR [1]
Ter. Eu. 786
VIDI [6]
Ov. Am. 3.11.13;
Ars 3.67; M. 13.840;
Plaut. Cur. 20;
Tib. 1.2.43;
1.2.89
VIDISTI [1]
Plaut. Cur. 168
VIDIT [1]
Sex. Turp. 199 (R)
VIDVA [1]
Plaut. Cur. 37
VIGIL [1]
Pliny Ep. 7.5
VIGILANDA [1]
Tib. 1.2.76
VIGILAREM [1]
CLE 950.5
VIGILATAE [1]
Ov. Ars 1.735
VIGILATVM [1]
Ov. Fast. 4.109
VIGILES [1]
Stat. S. 1.2.196
VIGILET [1]
Prop. 4.5.47
VIGILVM [1]
Ov. Am. 1.9.27
VILISSIMI [1]
[Quint. Decl. Mai. 15.7
VILLOSA [1]
Tib. 2.3.76
VILLOSAE [1]
Ov. M. 13.836
VIM [2]
Ter. Eu. 778; 807
VINCE [1]
Auson. Ep. 23.3
VINCERE [2]
Hor. Epod. 11.24;
Ov. M. 14.702
VINCES [1]
Ov. Ars 3.563
VINCI [1]
Tib. 1.8.55
VINCIS [2]
Ov. M. 14.718;
14.721
VINCITVR [1]
Tib. 1.5.60
VINCLA [2]
Tib. 1.1.55; 1.5.66
VINCLIS [2]
Tib. 1.2.90; 2.3.80
VINCTA [1]
Ov. Ars 3.53
VINCTIS [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.342
VINCTVM [1]
Tib. 1.1.55
VINCVLA [1]
Ov. M. 14.735
VINDEMIA [1]
Plaut. Cur. 111
VINEAM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 140
VINI [1]
Plaut. Cur. 96
VINIPOLENS [1]
Plaut. Cur. 116
VINO [3]
Plaut. Cur. 80; 82;
Tib. 1.2.1
VINOLENTI [1]
Cic. Phil. fr.
10.3.1
VINOSISSIMA [1]
Plaut. Cur. 79
VINVM [5]
Ov. Am. 1.6.37;
1.6.59; Plaut. Cur. 78; 126; Sex. Turp.
201 (R)
VIOLA [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.14
VIOLANDA [1]
Tib. 2.4.24
VIOLEIA [1]
Ov. Ars 3.67
VIOVAVI [1]
Tib. 1.2.79
VIOLENTIOR [1]
Ov. M. 13.801
VIR [7]
Catull. 63.69; Hor.
Carm. 3.10.15; Ov.
Am. 1.4.61; 2.12.3;
3.4.1; Ter. Eu.
785; Tib. 1.2.33
VIRENTI [1]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.17
VIRES [2]
Ov. M. 13.864; Tib.
2.6.10
VIRGA [1]
Ov. Am. 3.1.34
VIRGIN [2]
Ov. Ars 3.75;
Plaut. Cur. 37
VIRGEN [2]
VIRGINIS [1]
Ov. M. 13.733

VIRGIS [1]
Ov. M. 13.800

VIRGO [5]
Juv. 9.72; Ov. M. 13.734; 13.740; 13.746; Ter. Ph. 104

VIRGVNCVLA [1]
Prud. Symm. 1.64

VIRI [3]
Juv. 9.85; Ov. Ars 3.586; Stat. S. 1.2.196

VIRIBVS [1]
Ov. M. 13.868

VIRIDES [1]
Tib. 2.4.27

VIRIDIS [1]
Catull. 63.70

VIRIS [4]
Ov. Ars 2.234;
Plaut. Cur. 57;
Per. 567; Tib. 1.1.76

VIRO [6]
Hor. Carm. 3.10.2;
Ov. Am. 1.9.6; Ars 3.456; Rem. 34;
Ter. Eu. 799; Tib. 1.2.21

VIRORVM [2]
CLE 950.4; Ov. M. 13.740

VIROS [3]
Ov. M. 13.850;
Prop. 3.3.50; Tib. 2.1.72

VIRTUTEM [1]
Ter. Eu. 778

VIS [13]
Aul. Gel. 19.9.12 (2); Auson. Ep. 23.9; Lucr. 4.1172;
Mart. 10.14.10;
Plaut. Am. 1025; 1028; Ter. Eu. 798;
Val. Aed. fr. 2.3; fr. 2.6

VISA [1]
Ov. M. 14.740
VISCERA [1]
Ov. M. 13.865
VISERE [1]
Pliny Ep. 7.5
VISVM [1]
Aul. Gel. 4.14.1
VISVS [2]
Ov. Am. 3.11.15; M. 13.760
VITA [4]
Ov. Am. 3.8.11;
3.8.12; Prop. 1.8.22; Sex. Turp. 202 (R)

VITABIT [1]
Ov. Ars 2.529
VITAE [1]
Ov. M. 14.732

VITAM [3]
Catull. 63.71; Ov. M. 14.725; Tib. 2.6.19

VITARE [1]
Claud. Eutr. 1.89
VITIBVS [2]
Ov. M. 13.800;
13.813
VITIIS [1]
Prop. 1.16.46

VITIO [1]
Ov. Rem. 30

VITREO [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.55
VITRICVS [1]
Ov. Rem. 27
VITRO [1]
Ov. M. 13.791
VIVA [1]
Ov. M. 13.865

VIVAS [2]
Plaut. Am. 1023;
Tib. 2.6.53

VIVAT [1]
Prop. 2.17.9
VIVERE [1]
Prop. 1.16.12

VIVIT [1]
Plaut. Am. 1046

VIVO [1]
Ov. M. 13.810

VIVVM [1]
Ov. M. 14.713
VIX [5]
Juv. 9.76; Ov. M. 13.826; 13.835;
14.753; Prop. 2.17.12
VIXI [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.26.1

VIXIMVS [1]
Lucr. 4.1173
VLCEROSVM [1]
Hor. Carm. 1.25.15
VLCISCAR [1]
Plaut. Am. 1043
VLIXES [1]
Ov. M. 13.773

VLMITA [1]
Juv. 9.81
VLTOR [1]
Ov. M. 14.750
VLOREM [1]
Tib. 1.8.72

VLTRA [1]
Ov. M. 14.730

VLTRO [4]
Hor. S. 2.3.262;
Prop. 2.25.19; Ter. Eu. 813; 47

VMBRA [2]
Ov. M. 13.793;
13.815

VMBRAS [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.13

VMBROS A [1]
Tib. 2.3.72

VMENTES [1]
Ov. M. 14.734

VMEROS [1]
Ov. M. 13.845

VMIDA [2]
Ov. Ars 3.573;
Prop. 1.16.4

VNCTA [1]
Mart. 10.14.4

VNCTAE [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.340

VNDA [2]
Ov. Ars 3.63; M. 13.779

VNDAE [1]
Ov. M. 13.786
VNDANTIS [1]
Prud. Symm. 1.67
VNDAS [1]
Ov. M. 13.866
VNDIS [1]
Ov. M. 13.799
VNGVE [1]
Ov. Ars 3.568
VNGVEM [1]
Pers. 5.162
VNGVENTA [1]
Prop. 2.4.5
VNGVENTO [1]
Mart. 10.14.4
VNGVENTVM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 101
VNGVIS [1]
Prop. 2.4.3
VNGVIT [1]
Lucr. 4.1179
VNICA [1]
Prop. 2.25.1
VNICVS [1]
Ov. M. 13.853
VOCA [1]
Ov. M. 14.720
VOCABANT [1]
Prop. 2.14.21
VOCANTI [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.31
VOCE [5]
Hor. S. 2.3.257;
Ov. Am. 1.4.70; M. 14.706; Tib. 1.2.13, 1.2.91
VOCEM [2]
Ov. M. 13.745;
Plaut. Cur. 95
VOCENT [1]
Plaut. Merc. 408
VOCER [1]
Tib. 1.1.58
VOCES [3]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.22;
Plaut. Cur. 166;
Tib. 2.6.48
VOCET [2]
Hor. S. 2.3.262;
Tib. 1.2.32
VOCCLA [1]
Prop. 1.16.27
VOLANTES [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.13
VOLEBAM [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.43
VOLENT [1]
Plaut. Am. 1051
VOLENTES [1]
Plaut. Cur. 89
VOLET [3]
Ov. Am. 2.19.33;
Ars 2.529; Prop. 3.3.50
VOLNERA [2]
Ter. Eu. 779; Tib. 1.1.76
VOLNERET [1]
Tib. 1.2.26
VOLNVS [1]
Hor. Epod. 11.17
VOLO [3]
Plaut. Cur. 27;
134; 148
VOLT [6]
Hor. S. 2.3.267;
Ov. Fast. 5.352;
Plaut. Cur. 46; 55;
56; Tib. 1.2.34
VOLTIS [1]
Plaut. Cur. 90
VOLVCREM [1]
Prud. Symm. 1.64
VOLVCRES [1]
Ov. M. 13.849
VOLVCRI [1]
Ov. M. 13.807
VOLVERE [1]
Ov. Ars 3.586
VOLVNTATE [2]
Fortun. 1.12 (2)
VOLVPTAS [1]
Ov. M. 13.751
VOLVET [1]
Prop. 2.17.8
VORAT [1]
Ov. M. 13.731
VORTAM [1]
Plaut. Cur. 69
VOTA [3]
Ov. Am. 1.4.67;
Prop. 1.16.44;
Stat. S. 1.2.33
VOTIS [2]
Tib. 1.8.78; 2.6.54
VOTO [2]
Ov. Am. 2.19.6; Ars 1.737
VOTVERO [1]
Plaut. Per. 568
VOVI [1]
Plaut. Cur. 72
VOX [2]
Juv. 9.78; Plaut. Cur. 113
VRBE [2]
Ov. Am. 1.6.55;
Tib. 1.2.25
VRBEM [3]
Hor. Epod. 11.7;
Ov. M. 14.746;
Stat. S. 1.2.197
VRBES [1]
Ov. Am. 1.9.19
VRBIBVS [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.29
VRBIS [1]
Ov. M. 4.86
VRE [1]
Ov. Am. 1.8.70
VRERE [2]
Hor. Epod. 11.4;
Mart. 10.14.9
VRET [1]
Ov. Ars 3.567
VRETVR [1]
Ov. Ars 3.573
VRGVE [1]
Lucilius 946
VR [1]
Hor. Carm. 3.7.11
VRIIS [1]
Tib. 1.2.98
VRRITVR [1]
Ov. M. 13.763
VROR [1]
Ov. M. 13.867
VRS [1]
Ov. M. 13.803
VRSAE [1]
Ov. M. 13.836
VSA [1]
Ov. Am. 3.1.38
VSV [3]
Ov. Am. 1.8.51;
Rem. 503 (2)
VSVM [2]
Ov. Am. 1.8.75; M. ZEPHYRO [1]
13.782
VSVS [1]
Ov. Am. 1.6.5
VTENDVM [1]
Ov. Ars 3.65
VTERE [1]
Tib. 1.5.75
VTI [4]
Apul. Ap. 9; Hor.
Carm. 3.15.10; Ov.
Fast. 5.353; Plaut.
Cur. 43
VTIMVR [1]
Ov. Rem. 29
VIITVR [1]
Ov. Fast. 5.338
VTVTNR [1]
Ov. Am. 1.9.25
VWA [1]
Ov. M. 13.795
VVAE [1]
Ov. M. 13.813
VVLGATA [1]
Ov. M. 13.831
VVLNERA [2]
Ov. Am. 3.8.9; Ars
3.572
VVLNVS [1]
Aul. Gell. 4.14.3
VVLTV [2]
Ov. Ars 2.525; Rem.
510
VVLTVS [3]
Ov. M. 13.767;
13.845; 14.756
VXOR [2]
9.72
VXORE [1]
Plaut. Am. 1015
VXOREM [5]
Dec. Laberius 141;
Ov. Am. 2.19.46;
Plaut. Am. 1045;
1049; Ter. Ph. 115
VXORES [1]
Ov. Ars 3.585
VXORI [1]
Plaut. Merc. 410
VXORIS [2]
Livy Per. 89 (2)