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ABSTRACT

Scholars have long recognised in the works of Aristophanes passages that could be called paraclausithyric or komastic, such as the so-called 'duet' of Ecclesiazusae 960-76. Yet the extent to which Aristophanes played with the theme of the excluded lover and his song – the paraclausithron – has not been fully realised. It is very possible that Lysistrata and Vespae contain passages in which Aristophanes

\[1\] It should also be made clear that this paper is not intended to be a thorough discussion of all aspects of the paraclausithron, the bibliography on which is formidable. See, among many others, De la Ville de Mirmont 1909; Headlam & Knox 1922 on Herodas 2; Lamer 1922; Garte 1924; Gopley 1942, 1956; Burrell 1966; Nisbet & Hubbard 1970 on Hor. Car. 1.25; Cairns 1972, 1975, 1977, 1992; Yardley 1978; Fedeli 1980 on Prop. 1.16; Murgatroyd 1980 on Tib. 1.2 and 1.5; McKeown 1987 on Amores 1.6 and 2.2; Williams 1969 on Hor. Car. 3.9, 10, 14, 15, 16 and 26; Brown 1987 on Lucr. 4.1171-84; Murgatroyd 1994 on Tib. 2.6; West 1995 on Hor. Car. 1.25; Cummings 1996 and 2001; Mathy 2002 on Tib. 1.2, 1.5 and 2.6; and West 2002 and Nisbet & Rudd 2004 on Hor. Car. 3.9, 10, 14, 15, 16 and 26. The komos is intimately connected with the paraclausithron, and the importance of Minyard 1976 to understanding the meaning of k̂m̄os and ἀμφικίαντϊα seems not to have been widely recognised. Despite the effective advocacy of Cairns 1972:6 for the superiority of komos over paraclausithron, this paper will use the latter as being preferable for its strong association with the specific song or speech of the lover before the beloved's dwelling. It is an effective shorthand term for 'amatory komos song': see Yardley 1978:19 n. 1. Depictions of, or references to, the lover either at the door of the beloved or seeking admission to the beloved can be called paraclausithyric situations. The amatory komos procession, typically called simply the komos, is not under consideration here.

The author wishes to acknowledge the helpful suggestions of the anonymous referees for Acta Classica and the advice of Prof. Alan Sommerstein, who provided some further relevant references and whose useful comments greatly helped to clarify the author's thinking in several places. Thanks are also owed to Drs John Yardley and Jim McKeown for their input on a much earlier version.
manipulates the *topoi* that are common in later literary *paralauseishyra*. These para-
clausithyric elements both serve merely humorous purposes and contribute more
subtly to structural coherence. This paper comprises two parts: an introduction
gives a broad case for the existence of the paraclausithyric elements and suggests
what they might add to the plays, and a commentary section presents detailed
support and references for the arguments made in the introduction.

Introduction

Many have noticed that in *Lysistrata*, with the start of the *parodos* at line 254,
Aristophanes effectively abandons the sex-strike (often called 'Plan A') that
has been the focus of the Prologue, to concentrate on the occupation of
the Acropolis ('Plan B'), only returning to the strike with the episode that
begins at line 706. But even then it is only with the next episode and the

---

2 In addition to the passages mentioned in this paper, the following also appear to
be possible paraclausithyric parodies: the aftermath of *Es*. 960-76 through to 1094;
*Ach.* 395-409 (only a weak possibility); *Eq.* 725 ff.; *Pl.* 959-1094. Also compare
*Thes.* 414-519. The scene in *Es.* has attracted much attention: Bowra 1958; Usher
particularly good discussion); Davidson 2000:50-51. Parody is not used here in its
standard modern sense of 'satirical imitation' – because there does not seem to be
any attempt to make fun of the paraclausithyric situation or existing paraclausithyra
– but in its musical sense: 'a serious reworking of a composition, involving additions
to or essential modifications of the original ... One method was to borrow themes from a vocal composition and treat them in a new, usually more expanded
manner' (Apel 1969:643). In particular, mediaeval parody masses offer a strong
parallel to the sort of generic or thematic variation under discussion here. A parody
mass incorporates material borrowed from secular polyphonic compositions, with
no apparent satirical or comic intention. It should be made clear that this paper
does not argue that paraclausithyric parody is the primary meaning or purpose of
the passages in question. The paraclausithyric *topoi* do not obstruct or hinder the
primary dramatic meaning of the passages in question – they comprise simply an
extra layer of meaning. The siege in *Lysistrata* is still a siege, but one that is also a
paraclausithyric parody.

3 References to the commentary are introduced by 'c.', followed by the title of the
play and the numbers of the lines in question: e.g. '(c. *Vesp.* 398)'. Abbreviations
not found in H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. Stuart-Jones, R. MacKenzie (edd.), *A
Greek-English Lexicon* (9th ed., Oxford 1968) or P.W. Gilre et al. (edd.), *Oxford Latin
dictionary* (Oxford 1968-82), can be found in G.W.H. Lampe (ed.), *A Patristic Greek
Lexicon* (Oxford 1961) or C.T. Lewis & C. Short (edd.), *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford
1879).
scene between Cinesias and Myrrhine starting at 829 that the sex-strike is truly and vividly illustrated. Henderson (1987:97) rightly notes that since Aristophanes ‘wants the Acropolis to be the scene of action for the rest of the play’, he cannot show the strike occurring in individual homes. But he also argues convincingly (1975:95), focussing on the sexual implications of πῦλη (c. Lys. 250), that Aristophanes uses sexual imagery and sexually ambiguous language to help link the two plans and to make ‘the latter action analogous to the former’, thus achieving ‘a wonderful cohesion of action and theme.’ Vaio (1973) suggests that Aristophanes makes some effort to link Plans A and B during the siege by repetition of the motifs of sex and home and by the merging of the ἀκρόπολις and πόλις. And Sommerstein (1990:4) comments: ‘the Acropolis is the headquarters of both [schemes] ..., whose siege (conducted with quasi-phallic weapons ...) can be seen as an attempted rape.’

There is, however, one further way in which Aristophanes unites the sex-strike and the occupation and siege (c. Lys. 241) of the Acropolis: subtle use of the paraclausithyric situation. A brief summary of the play’s early action sheds light on this unity. The prologue occupies approximately the first 250 lines, during which time the conjugal strike and the occupation of the Acropolis are plotted. At line 146, Lysistrata proposes that the women sit at home, made-up and dressed for sex in order to arouse their men, and then reject them once the men are aroused. At 209-37 the women swear their elaborate oath to refrain from sex. Only three lines later, Lysistrata announces that the older Athenian women have seized the Acropolis. She next sends Lampito away, and announces that she and the other women will go to help defend the Acropolis, summarised in the statement xunemba vlwmen eijsou `sai tou `moclou v~ (246; c. Lys. 246). Even if the men come with threats and fire, the women will not open the gates (ἀνάβασις πῦλας, 250; c. Lys. 250) unless the men agree to their terms. In response to this brave statement, in the last two lines before the parodos, Calonice exclaims: ‘That, by Aphrodite, they shall never do, for if we let them in it would be for nothing that we women have a reputation for being restless

4 Vaio (1973:377) observes that the scene between Myrrhine and Cinesias brings about ‘the transformation of the city center into a private household. For ... Myrrhina turns the environs of the Acropolis into a make-shift bedroom.’ Foley (1982:7) elaborates on Vaio: ‘But as the play proceeds the distinction between acropolis and home collapses; the action in the public and private worlds becomes one ... The image of the walled acropolis becomes, like the household, an enclosed, carefully guarded female realm that the males are trying to penetrate.’
and devilish' (trans. Henderson 1987:97-98). Only eight lines after the oath is sworn and the sex-strike initiated, the younger women are heading off to the Acropolis to join those who have already initiated Plan B. Lampito's departure is necessary on two counts: she must return to Sparta to initiate the sex-strike there, but no doubt Aristophanes was also reluctant to have a Spartan participate in the occupation of the Acropolis.5 With the parodos at 254 the semi-chorus of old men enters, ready to attempt to eject the occupying women.

The basic premise of the paraclausithyric situation is that a man on one side of a barrier is attempting to get to a woman on the other side. This is the situation in the parodos of the Lysistrata, albeit writ large. Although Aristophanes has apparently set aside the sex-strike for the moment, the immediacy with which the siege follows on the initiation of the strike primes the audience to read a sexual subtext into the siege itself, particularly with the addition of the younger women to the force occupying the Acropolis. When the chorus of men arrives, although they are old men, the audience might instinctively feel that the sex-strike motivates the siege as much as the desire to rescue the treasury.6 The fact that the Acropolis was sacred to a virgin goddess could have very much helped the association.7 In the siege through to the arrival of the Proboulus and Lysistrata's exit from the Acropolis to negotiate, Aristophanes uses enough topos that have strong parallels in many other paraclausithyra to make it very likely that the paraclausithyric elements here are not accidental. Virtually every major paraclausithyric topos is alluded to, including mention of bad weather (c. Lys. 327), the lover's pains and discomfort (c. Lys. 254), sleeping before a door (c. Lys. 282), past successes in such circumstances (c. Lys. 273-74), the lover's threats (c. Lys. 249), the hardness or cruelty of the beloved (c. Lys. 253), and a high density of vocabulary for doors and door parts (c. Lys. 246, 250, 264 and 265), something that occurs in only a few genuine siege-scenes. This comprehensiveness increases the likelihood that the presence of these topos is deliberate.

5 I owe this observation to an anonymous referee.
6 Bowie (1997:14) has also suggested that this is komastic: The dysfunctional nature of the city at this time is then demonstrated by the arrival of the Old Men with logs and vine-torchces (308), in another parody of the komos. There is also a hint of the wedding komos: the Old Men get a “wedding bath” (378), which, unlike the hieros gamos of the Anthesteria, marks the final split between the sexes.' Bowie does not further elaborate on the komastic elements.
7 I thank Prof. Alan Sommerstein for stressing the importance of this.
Once the siege is underway, the paraclausithyric situation helps to underline Lysistrata's 'mastery of the situation and her control of the Acropolis' (Sommerstein 1990:176). While the excluded lover asks either to be admitted or for the beloved to come out, Lysistrata's four entrances from the stage-house are all unbidden and at her own discretion (as noticed by Sommerstein 1990:176). The paraclausithyric elements in these scenes are picked up explicitly with the arrival of Ginesias at 831, and his attempts first to call out Myrrhine, and then to have sex with her. As Henderson (1980:206) has observed, Ginesias is portrayed as a 'defendant pleading with heartless authorities; excluded lover; even the prostitute's client who must pay the bawd for his favorite.' Here, however, Aristophanes uses the paraclausithyric elements to illustrate graphically, and somewhat touchingly, the degree of Ginesias' attachment to his wife, as he somewhat willingly plays the role of excluded lover to his own wife (cf. Henderson 1980:207).

The Vesp. also contains a particularly prolonged development of the paraclausithyric situation. It seems that only Zimmermann has noticed this, although he does not elaborate on the idea. At line 65 of the prologue it is explained that Bdelycleon is sleeping on the roof as part of his efforts to keep his father from going outside. This is because Philocleon is addicted to, or in love with (he is called a φιλιλαυτής, 88; c. Vesp. 88) jury service. Aristophanes spells out clearly that Philocleon acts like a love-struck youth: he is either sleepless because of his love or, when asleep, dreams of his beloved. He writes praises of his beloved on doors. He arrives at the law-courts long before dawn and sleeps there before the doors (104; c. Vesp. 104). He is therefore kept under guard at home (c. Vesp. 112). Many attempts have been made to cure Philocleon of his love (c. Vesp. 114).

---

8 Because many others have noticed the fairly obvious paraclausithyric nature of this scene it is not included at the end of this article with the other main passages under discussion here. See e.g. Copley 1956:10-11; Bowra 1958:380-81.

9 Zimmermann 1985:1.100: 'Eher ähnelt die ganze Szene einer komischen Darstellung eines Paraklausithyrons.' Gildersleeve (1880:457-58 n. 1) thinks that the scene parodies the Danae story, possibly Euripides' version, and he alludes to a paraclausithyric tone: 'So in reading the Wasps with a class some time since I was amused by a parallelism which suggested itself to me for the first time between the situation of Philocleon in the confinement of his house, and that of Danae in her tower. Bdelycleon corresponds to Akrisios, and an analogous chorus would not be far to seek. The measures are plaintive, indeed caterwauling, and would suit a serenade or rather aubade under the windows of a prisoner.' Reckford agrees that Philocleon is 'like Phaedra or Steneboia, perhaps, or like Danae locked in her tower' (1987:234).
Philocleon appears at lines 143-44, trying to escape by the chimney (c. Vesp. 143). But then at line 152 he is at the door (c. Vesp. 198, 198-200), banging on it and demanding it be opened.

Philocleon’s outrageous attempts to escape continue, as do the amatory topoi. But at lines 211-21 Philocleon is very clearly talked about as something of a shut-in beloved. His fellow jurors are in the habit of coming by in the middle of the night carrying lamps (c. Vesp. 219), singing honey-sweet songs (μέλα/ ἀρχαῖα μελοσωφρονέων χήρατα 219-20; c. Vesp. 219), with which they call Philocleon out (note παρακαλείν 215 and 218, and ἐκκαλείν 221; c. Vesp. 215). Reckford (1987:234-45, 249) makes some good observations on Philocleon’s lovesickness.¹⁰

The chorus finally arrives at line 230, and more paraclausithyric topoi begin to accumulate (c. Vesp. 235-68, 317, 324, 328). The chorus sings to Philocleon, calling him out, and Philocleon emerges (probably from a window) to reply (c. Vesp. 271, 318b, 379). More such topoi follow in the scene starting at line 334, including the lover’s wish for a metamorphosis that would help him reach the beloved (c. Vesp. 324), the lover digging his way into the house (c. Vesp. 350), until finally Philocleon prepares to climb out of the window on a rope (379; c. Vesp. 398), another, but less common, paraclausithyric motif. However, Philocleon’s escape attempt is detected and, while he is climbing down, Bdelecleon orders Xanthias to climb up and beat Philocleon back with the airesione from the door (398-99; c. Vesp. 398), which is perhaps intended to bring to mind how the excluded lover often hangs his garland on the beloved’s door as a symbol of his vigil. Here, instead of the garland being hung on the beloved’s door by the lover who has been denied entry, the garland is used to beat the lover who is being refused exit. Philocleon is finally dragged back inside at 403, ending the first epirrhematic syzygy. Debate between the chorus and Bdelecleon continues for some while afterward, but the developed paraclausithyric parody has petered out. Certainly there are some inconsistencies here as Philocleon is, in seemingly contradictory fashion, portrayed as both lover and beloved. But it is the overall amatory tone that is important, and his ‘included’ status in these particular scenes.¹¹

¹⁰ Cf. Reckford 1977:294: ‘... at present he is pining away like a lovesick girl in a Euripidean tragedy. The parody is marvellous fun – Philocleon as Danae ... or as Stheneboia ... But it also shows how much Philocleon’s jurymania is an erotic passion and the very heart of his vitality and feeling of identity.’

¹¹ For Aristophanes, the joke is always the thing. He would no doubt have agreed with Emerson’s maxim: ‘A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds,
This paraclausithyric element increases the humour of these opening scenes, but it also graphically illustrates the extent of Philocleon’s philhellasticia. Yet clearly there is something more. As is the case with Lysistrata, there is on the surface something of a lack of coherence between the opening of the play and the end. Vaiο (1971), Banks (1980), Konstan (1985) and Slater (2002:104-11) have shown how the opening and closing scenes are linked by various motifs that help to illustrate, and comment on, the change in Philocleon’s character. The paraclausithyric elements of the opening scenes also help to link the two parts.

Later in the play, after Philocleon has been instructed by Bdelycleon in the niceties of the symposium, he proclaims his intent to get drunk (μεθυσθείς 1252). Philocleon replies, foreshadowingly: ‘Drinking’s a bad thing. From wine comes door-breaking, striking and stoning (θυροκόπησαι καί στρίχνω καί βέλειν), and then having to pay out money while the hangover’s on you’ (c. Vesp. 1254, 1255). Then, in the final episode, Xanthias enters and recounts Philocleon’s riotous behaviour at the symposium and his subsequent komastic revel homeward. Philocleon himself enters at 1340, every bit the drunken komast, wielding a torch and dragging a flute-girl along with him, being chased by a baker whose stall he has destroyed on his revel. While the symposium was a major symbol of the aristocratic life, the komos revel was hardly less characteristic and was particularly associated with the young, as was the komasts’ frequent hybistic behaviour (c. Vesp. 1303). In contrast to his earlier role as a shut-in beloved, even a feminised one, he is now every bit the young masculine komast, girl in hand, dancing in the streets, and more or less controlling the action of the final scenes. It would have been hard for Aristophanes to find a more vivid illustration of Philocleon’s changed character.

If Aristophanes is deliberately using established paraclausithyric topoi in these passages, the topoi must have come from somewhere. Olson (1988) has argued, quite rightly, that the so-called love duet of Ec. 952-75 is based adored by little statesmen and philosophers and divines. With consistency a great soul simply has nothing to do’ (Essays 4, ‘Spiritual Laws’). See the comments of Dover 1972:41-45, 59-65 on Aristophanes’ illogicalities and inconsistencies.

12 These references are merely a representative sampling and are by no means meant to be exhaustive. Of course, MacDowell 1971 is indispensible.

13 Because Philocleon’s komai is not going to end with him seeking admission to a beloved, the discussion in the commentary section below will only draw attention to several close connections between paraclausithyric situations and komai and not analyse this scene in any depth.
on the *paraclausithyron*. The extent of the manipulation of common later paraclausithryic *topoi* in *Lysistrata* and *Vespas*, in addition to the other possible parodies mentioned in note 2, suggests that there were existing *paraclausithyra* on which Aristophanes could model his parodies. *Paraclausithyra* and paraclausithric scenes in poetry must have been far more common in the 5th century, and even earlier, than the meagre poetic remains indicate.

**Commentary**

*Lysistrata* 241-431

241 ἀκρόπολιν: the site of the siege. For siege imagery in paraclausithric contexts, see McKeown 1987- on Ov. *Am.* 1.6.29-30; 1.9.19-20. See also Thphr. *Char.* 27.9; Men. *Peri.* 388-92, 476-87 (Amott); Ov. *Ars* 2.123-24, Alciphr. 3.9.1-2; 4.16.3; Philostr. *Ep.* 56; Agath. *AP* 5.294. For the violent assault on the beloved's door in general, see Headlam & Knox 1922:82-84. At Philostr. *Ep.* 12, love is described as occupying the acropolis of the eyes (οὕτω καὶ ὁ ἔρως τὴν τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἀκρόπολιν).

246 μοχλῶς: μοχλός (also 264, 310, 487) can be used of the bars of a city's gates, but is often also used of the bolt of a house-door, or even of the door of an inner room (e.g. *V.* 113, 154, 200; *Thes.* 415; cf. Plb. 15.30.7; Htl. 6.9.2.3). For μοχλός in paraclausithric contexts, see Anac. Fr. 431 *PMG*; Theoc. 2.127; Apollod. *Car.* 6.1 K-A. For general amatory contexts, cf. Lucian, *Tim.* 13.8; *Tos.* 17.9. Cf. *sera* in Tib. 12.6; 1.8.76; Prop. 4.5.48; Ov. *Am.* 1.6.24, 32, 40, 48, 56; 2.1.28; *Ars* 2.244, 636; *Met.* 14.710; Juv. 6.0.31; *claustria* in Ov. *Am.* 1.6.17; and *meatus* in Claud. *Eutrop.* 1.81.

249 ἀπειλᾶς: for ἀπειλή (also at 339) meaning 'threat' in amatory contexts, see Men. Fr. 661.2 Kock; Lucian, *Tos.* 17; Alciphr. 4.8.4; Aristodem. *FHG* 3.310 (paraclausithric). The Men's Leader elaborates on the threats at 306-11. Threats in general are common in paraclausithric contexts: Theoc. 2.127; Prop. 2.25.17; Hor. *Carm.* 2.8.20; 3.26.6; Ov. *Am.* 1.6.61 (with McKeown 1987-: *ad loc*); *Ars* 3.581; *Rem.* 35; Suet. *Oct.* 3.2;

---

14 ‘The poetic basis of the scene is an Aristophanic adaptation of a well-known poetic genre with exceptionally clear and prominent sexual roles, the paraclausithyron’ (Olson 1988:329).

15 See Cummings 2001 for the suggestion that Gnesippus could have been largely responsible for the development of the literary *paraclausithyron*. 96

249 πῦρ: Fire (πῦρ also at Lys. 269, 293, 299, 306, 320, 340, 372-75, 386; cf. e.g. λαμπτός 316, 376; ἁμπελός and φανός 308; ἐμπρήσμαι 269; ἐμπρήμασι 311; ἐμπρήσασθα 381; λαμπήν 319; καμένου 320; and the abundant other references to fire throughout the siege) is a common weapon of the excluded lover, who typically carries a torch. For πῦρ itself in paraclausithyric contexts, see Mel. AP 12.85.7; Ael. VH 13.1; Paul. Sil. AP 5.281.6. Komasts' torches can be called simply πῦρ: Plu. Alex. 38.2; Philostr. Im. 1.2.2. For the lover threatening or using fire to attack a house: see McKeown 1987: on Ov. Am. 1.6.57-58 (fero ignique); Headlam & Knox 1922: 83; Gow 1952: 2.57. To the references provided there, add Men. Dy. 60 (Amott) and Fortunatius 90.22-26 (ed. Halm). At Nub. 1490 and 1494 Strepsiades and his slaves use torches to burn down the Thinkery. The secular komos, coming usually after a symposium, was, of course, nocturnal. References to night or darkness (both of which presume that the komast has some form of light), and torches are extremely common in later mentions of komoi. Elsewhere in Ar., torches are seen as an essential element of komoi: e.g. Ec. 692, 978; Lys. 1217; Pl. 1041. For λαμπτός and ὀξ in Ar., see Stone 1981:254-56. For explicit mentions of torches (Greek ἁμπελός, ὀξ, λαμπτός or φανός) in paraclausithyric contexts, see Ar. Ec. 978; Schol. ad Lys. 1216.1; Theoc. 2.128; Anon. AP 12.116.4; Herod. 2.35; Strat. AP 12.252.1; Chariton 1.3.2; Helio. 4.17.4. For some Latin examples (fex, funalia and tarda), see Hor. Cam. 3.26.7; Tib. 1.2.36, 61; Prop. 1.3.10; 1.13.26; 1.16.8; Ov. Am. 1.6.58; Ars 2.530; Pers. 5.166. Torches are so strongly associated with komoi that a daytime reveller can be pictured carrying a torch with him: Hor. Serm. 1.4.51-52. Cf. also Philostr. Im. 1.2.2 (ἰς, on Κάμος); 1.2.3, 5. For visual evidence, see Lamer 1922, Peschl 1987 and Kilmer 1993.

250 ἀνοίξα: for ἀνοίγουμαι and ἀνοίγω in paraclausithyric contexts, see Ar. Ec. 961, 971, 974; Strat. AP 12.252.4; Lucian, Bis. Acc. 29; Ant. Lib. 39.4; Helio. 4.17.4. For amatory komastic situations, see Anacreon 33.10; Chánto 1.3.4; Lucian, DMeretr. 8.3; 12.3. Latin equivalents (adperio, aperio, pando, patefacio, pateo, resero) are more common in paraclausithyric passages: Plaut. Ba. 1118; Cur. 21, 56, 93; Tib. 1.2.10, 18, 31; 1.8.60; 2.3.71; Prop. 1.3.33; 1.10.16; 1.16.1, 19; 2.9.42; 3.20.29; Ov. Am. 1.6.2; 2.19.25; 3.1.45; Ars 2.245; 3.456, 577; Met. 14.739, 740; Stat. S. 1.2.34; Mart. 4.29.6.

250 πύλαι: for πύλη used for a house door in a paraclausithyric context, see Iambl. Π 25.112. Cf. also Suda πi.3168.1 <Πύλη ... θύρα δὲ ἐπὶ οἴκου. θύρα (309, 311, 353) is the usual word. For πύλη as a clear sexual
double-entendre in an adulterous romantic context, see Eratost. AP 5.242.3-6 and Archil. Fr. 196a.21 West (P. Colon. 7511). For more on the feminine gates of love,’ see Henderson 1975:95-96, 137-38. Henderson (1975:122) also suggests that μορφος might ‘have sexual overtones,’ but this seems to be based only on perceived general phallic imagery (as is also the case with κορμος [battering ram] of 255).

253 ἀμαχς (and cf. 1014: οἰδέν ἔσται θηρίον γυμνάκιος ἀμαχότερα): for the firmness or obstinacy of the beloved in paraclausithryc situations (usually expressed by comparisons with stone, iron or wood) see Theoc. 3.18, 39; 23.19-20, 54-55; Prop. 1.9.31; 1.16.29-30; Ov. Met. 14.711-13, 748-58; Ant. Lib. 39.6; Philostr. Ep. 14; and Maced. Cons. AP 5.229. Also see Nisbet & Hubbard 1970:48-49; Murgatroyd 1980:66-67, 138-39; McKeown 1987-2.139, 313; and Maltby 2002:319-20. There is no standard Greek adjective used of an unyielding beloved, unlike Latin lentus or durus. The beloved in his/her fierceness is sometimes compared to a wild animal: Theoc. 3.15-16; 23.19; Pl. Ba. 1122 et passim (an inversion); and Hor. Carm. 3.10.18; cf. L.jx. 1014. At Pl. As. 145 the custos is the object of such a comparison. Of course, the general irresistibility of love is a common topos in poetry from Sappho 130.2 onward: see McKeown 1987- on Ov. Am. 1.6.35-36. Cf. Plu. Mor. 755d:  ἔρωτι δὲ μάχεσθαι χαλεπών. For Eros as ἀμαχς see S. Ant. 799 and Philostr. Ep. 12. At Hdl. 10.16, Chariclea’s beauty is also ἀμαχς.

254 μαραί: cf. also 397, 433, 971-72; V. 156, 341. The word suits an amatory context. At Aeliphr. 3.26.3 it is used of an adulterous wife; cf. also 3.36.1. At Antisthenes, Fr. 34.4-5 (at Ath. 5.220d) brothels are μαρά αἰσχίματα. Compare also ἀναιδεῖς 369, τρυφή 387, ἰκόλοστίματα 398 and τρυφὴν 405.

255 ἀλγής: the paraclausithryc lover regularly complains of his/her physical hardship: Ar. V. 230-35, 246-47, 259, 286-305, 312-14; Men. Mes. A13; A50-56 (Arnott); Theoc. 3.52 (ἀλγείς); Asspr. AP 5.64, 167 (ἀλγεῖς, line 1), 189; Anon. AP 12.115.3-4; Mel. AP 12.167.1-4; Phld. AP 5.4; 5.120; Val. Aed. 2.3; Hor. Carm. 1.25.11-12 (with Nisbet & Hubbard 1970:296-97, 299-98); 3.7.6; 3.10.3, 10, 19-20; 326.10; Tib. 1.229-30 (with Murgatroyd 1980:81-82); Prop. 1.16.34; 2.17.13-16 (with Cairns 1975:15-17); Ov. Am. 1.6.51-55; 1.19.15 (with McKeown 1987-2.149-50 and 266), Ars 2.235-38, Ep. 10.49, 135-41; 18.1 passim; 19.71 et passim, An.ont. 53; Mart. 10.82; Nemes. Est. 4.38; Philostr. Ep. 29. For dolor and doke in Latin paraclauithyra, see Murgatroyd 1980 on Tib. 1.2.1; 1994 on 2.3.73; and Maltby 2002 on both. For the overall physical discomfort of the paraclausithryc lover, cf. Pl. Smp. 203c-d. In Latin poetry the lover typically complains of the hard-
ness of the threshold on which he spends the night: Tib. 2.6.47; Hor. Epod. 11.22; Ov. Am. 1.6.68; Rem. 5.08.877; Met. 14.7.09; Fasti 5.3.39.

264 κλήθρουσιν: κλείθρον/κλήθρον/κλήθρον is rare in paraclausithyric contexts: Helio. 4.17.4. For κλήθρα of house doors, cf. V. 1484. It can simply be a synonym for μοχλός: Hsch. k.2890.1 < κλείθρα> μοχλοί ... πύλαι; μ.1767.1 <μοχλοί> κλείθρα. See above on μοχλός. For possible sexual connotations, see Ath. 7.Ο72.28.980.26 PG: τῆς παρθενίας σφαγῶν καὶ κλέθρων. Alan Sommerstein has suggested (per litt.) that κλήθρον is elevated stylistically, noting that its sole other occurrence in Aristophanes (Vesp. 1484) is in a paratragic context, and that the combination κλήθρουσιν καὶ μόχλοισι is Euripidean (Andr. 951). Cf. S. Ant. 1186; OT 1262, 1287, 1294; A. Th. 396.

265 προπύλαια: Although normally used of a palace or large public building, Ar. does use it of a domestic house at V. 875. In Philostr. Im. 1.2 Κάμιος is sleeping in a προπύλαια.

265 πακτοῦν: cf. V. 128 and see on lines 246 and 264 above.

269 ἐμφρήσωμεν: see above on πύρ 249.

270 τὴν Λύκωσα: ‘the old men think that Lykon’s wife must be the ring-leader: her name was Rhodia’ (Henderson 1987:102). For this Rhodia, see Storey 1993:90-92. Names with ’Poθ- in them evoke beauty, and are commonly attributed to wanton women: see Bömer 1969-86 on Ov. Met. 6.87; Courtney 1980 on Juv. 9.3; Peschel 1987:469.

271 ἐγγανάντα: the beloved sometimes mocks the excluded lover: Theoc. 11.78; Tib. 1.8.71; Prop. 3.25.15-16; Ov. Met. 14.744; and Nemes. Eid. 4.7. See Murgatroyd 1980:71, 95 on Tib. 1.2.87; 184 on 1.5.69-70. Also cf. Pl. Smp. 212e.

273/4 Κλεομένης: the men remember a successful siege from the past. In 508 the Spartan king Cleomenes had come to help support the archon Isagoras in the face of strong popular opposition. The intervention failed and Cleomenes’ small force together with Isagoras’ supporters were forced to retreat to the Acropolis where they were besieged for two days before a truce was arranged and the Spartans allowed to leave. This recollection of past success is the equivalent of the common paraclausithyric ἀπος where the excluded lover recalls previous occasions when he successfully sought admission: cf. V. 266-70, 354-59. Compare Theoc. 3.7; Prop. 4.7.15-20; Ov. Ep. 5.15-20; 10.51-54; 15.147-50. A variation on this is the lover reminding the beloved of past occasions on which she obliged him: Ar. Esg. 7.42-45; Pl. 975-1022 (an inversion, where the beloved recalls past favours); Theoc. 11.27; Pl. As. 177, 204-14 (a λέξις is addressed, rather than the beloved); Men. 392-93 (inverted); Truc. 633-34; Hor. Carm. 3.10.13; Prop.

282 καθεύδων: the lover often sleeps before his beloved’s door and Philocleon sleeps before the doors of the lawcourts (*V.* 104). For possible or definite references to actual sleeping in paraclausithyrionic contexts, see Pl. *Smp.* 183a (cf. Aristen. 2.20.24 Mazal), 203b; Call. *AP* 5.23; Anon. *AP* 12.90.5; Prop. 1.16.22; Ov. *Rem.* 508; *Met.* 14.709-10; Philostr. *Ep.* 29. At Philostr. *Im.* 1.2 Κόμος is sleepy. For θυραλεύν and θυραλέα in paraclausithyrionic contexts see Headlam & Knox 1922:83, to which add the komastic references in Philo, *On Husbandry* 37; *On the Cherubim* 92; and John Chrysostom, *Homily* 37 (on 1 Cor. 14.34) 61.318.43-45 PG. For perceived etymological connections between κόμος/κομάζειν and κόμα, see *Etym.* Magn., s.v. *κομάζειν*, and Hdn. *Schem. Hum.* 111.1-5. The *topos* suits the military context particularly well, as Ovid realised in *Am.* 1.9 (militat omnis amans): per-vigilant ambo; terraque requiescit uterque –/ ille fores domina servat, at ille duis.


310 καλούντως: καλέω is sometimes used of calling a woman out (Plbl. 10.26.4) or inviting a lover (Theoc. 3.7), but more common in paraclausithyrionic contexts is εικολέω (Ar. *Lys.* 850, 851, 864, 872; *V.* 221, 271) and παρακαλέω (cf. *V.* 215, 218). Requests for the beloved to come out are unusual in classical paraclausithyra: Theoc. 3.19; 11.42, 63; Pl. *Curs.* 151-52; *Mil.* 1248; Ov. *Met.* 13.838-39; *Ael.* N.A 1.50; 9.66 (cf. 9.13). Of course, that is simply because the lover typically wants to go in, as the besieging men do here. Because the main interest in the paraclausithyric situation is the lover’s suffering, the excluded lover achieves his goal only rarely. In a few cases, however, the beloved does go out to the lover: see Plaut. *Curs.* 162-215; Ge. *Castr.* 1.26; Tib. 1.2.15-22; Lucian, *Bis Ave.* 31; Fabius 116. Diosc. *AP* 12.14 might refer to a boy sneaking out in response to his suitors, but the epigram is too cryptic to be certain about the situation described. If Plaut. *Bacch.* 1116-207 is a type of inverted paraclausithyron (see Cummings 1996:226-28), then it offers some strong parallels. Nicobulus and Philoxenus arrive at the Bacchises’ house to fetch their sons, and, in response to their threats of a violent assault on the door, the two Bacchises emerge. The Bacchises control the action in the scene that follows and slowly lure reluctant old men inside. In the paraclausithyric scene at Ar. *Ec.*
949-1111, the lover calls the girl down from her upper window, but that is only to let him in, not for her to come out (δεῦρο δή, δεῦρο δή, / φῶλον έμνεν, καὶ σὺ μοι / καταδρμόοσα τήν θύραν / άνοιξον τήν δ', 960-63). The girl eventually appears (1037), but only briefly and fails to unite with her lover. Much has been written about this scene, but Halliwell (2002:131-33, 139-40 n. 31) offers a good overview.

310 χαλέων: cf. Ar. V. 1482 and Eratosth. AP 5.242.4. See also on line 246.

311 πιέζειν: cf. V. 152. See also on line 246.

327 ύδριαν: water (see also ὕδωρ 335 and 371, and καταβαίνομεν 374 and 375) is sometimes used by the beloved to dampen the lover's passions: Hor. S. 2.7.90-91; possibly Lucil. 943-44 (Marx 841-42); and possibly Pers. 5.166.

340 μυσαράς: cf. παμμυσαρά 969. This is another suitable adjective for wanton women (cf. on line 253): Theoc. 2.20. It is associated with adultery at John. Chrys. David 54.697.1 PG; Hom. in Rom. 60.420.32 PG; and Theatra 56.543.75 PG.

356 λαλεῖν: for this verb used of lovers' talk, see Mel. AP 12.122.4; 159.1; Philol. AP 5.120.4; 5.306.1; Plu. Mor. 623a; Strat. AP 12.21.3; 12.21.18.1; [Lucian], Am. 53.

361 ἐκοψέν: cf. V. 275a, 1254; Ec. 976; and εἰς τὴν θύραν κρυβόν ἔμπεωμεν at V. 309. For κοπτ- compounds in paraclausithyra, see Lys. Fr. 17.2 G-B; Antiph. Fr. 239.3; Herod. 2.50; Plu. Mor. 713c; Anaxanti. 33.6; Ael. N. A. 1.50; and Lucian, Bis Acc. 29 and 31.

387 τρυφή: cf. 974 and V. 687. It is also appropriate in amatory contexts: Pl. Symp. 197d; Plu. Mor. 645d; 753a (τρυφίῳ is used of the woman who sings a paraclausothyron) and Alc. 16.1.

423 ἀποκέκλεισμα: cf. ἀπεκλείσατε 487; κεκλείσατα 1071; κεκλεισμένης V. 198; ἀποκλείεις 334; ἀπέκλειον 719. For ἀποκλείοι in other paraclausithyric contexts, see Timoecles, Fr. 25.5; X. Mem. 3.11.10; Fr. Genr. 27; Plu. Gal. 19.5; Stat. AP 12.193.6; Lucian, DMen. 8.3; 14.1; 15.2; Alkiphr. 4.10.3; 17.5; Philostr. Ep. 28; and Aristaen. 2.16.5 Mazal. The Latin equivalents are exclusus (Ter. Ad. 119, Ein. 49; Lucil. 937 [Marx 938]; Lucr. 4.1177; Tib. 2.3.73; 4.39; Hor. S. 1.2.67; 2.3.260; 264; Prop. 1.5.20; 1.16.8; 2.25.2; 3.16.20; 3.25.15; Ov. Am. 1.6.31; 1.878; 3.48; Ars 3.69, 588, Rem. 36; HING, Ep. 7.5; [Quint.] Decl. Mel. 15.7; and Claud. Enarr. 1.81) and claudo (Hor. Carm. 3.7.29; Tib. 1.2.6; 2.3.77; 2.4.22; 2.6.12; Prop. 1.3.36; 1.16.18; 3.3.49; Ov. Am. 1.6.29; 2.1.17; 20; 2.7.9; 2.19.38; 2.23.12; 3.4.7; 3.8.7; 3.11.12; Ars 2.523, 635; Rem. 506; Fast. 4.110; and Sen. QNat. 4 A pr. 6).
424 μοχλός: cf. 428, 431, and 432. In contrast to line 246, here μοχλός refers to a tool used for prying open a door. For it and μοχλέω and its compounds (cf. ἐκμοχλέωτε 429; συνεκμοχλέωσαι and ἐκμοχλέωτε 430), cf. Paus 299, 307. For μοχλός in other paraclausithyric contexts, see Antiph. 195.6 Kock; Theoc. 2.127; Helio. 4.17.4.4. Compare κρανίς προσβάλλων in Lys. 3.4; ancis in Plaut. Truc. 256, and the mech's and arcus (perhaps also a prying tool) at Hor. Carm. 326.7.

431 αὐτόματα: αὐτόματος is often used of a god appearing in an epiphany; see McKay 1967:188-89 and Eur. B. 448; Apoll. Rhod. 4.41; J BJ 6.293-96; Acc 12:10; Ach. Tat. 8.6.13; Non. D. 44.22, 45.283. Cf. Horn. Il. 5.749; Call. H. 2.6-7; and Weinreich 1929. Hero Mechanicus discusses automatic door opening in his Automatopoeica (e.g. 22.1 and 3.3) and Pneumatōs (e.g. 38.1-35 and 39.1). The beloved is commonly deified in ancient love poetry, and religious/hymnic/suppliant language is found in Greek and Latin paraclausithyra. For the appearance of a beloved being treated as an epiphany, see McKeown 1987-2.103-05 on Ov. Am. 1.5. Also compare Prop. 4.8.49-52. For the deification of the beloved, see Lieberg 1962; Lilja 1965:187-90; Wiseman 1985:160-61; McKeown 1987-2.179 on Ov. Am. 1.7.7-28; Murgatroyd 1994:153 on Tib. 2.4.47-48; and Murgatroyd 1989: 308 on Rhiaruns, AP 12.38. For such deification in Ar., see Ussher 1973:211 on Ec 976. For the topos in paraclausithyra, see Yardley 1978 and Watson 1982. For some exclusively Greek examples, see Schol. on Pl. I. 2.1; Pl. Phdr. 251a-b, 252c-e, 255a; X. Mem. 3.11.3; Theoc. 3.46-51 (implicit); Att. Gell. 18.12.4 (Frag. Fab. Inc. 46 Götz); Philostr. Ep. 19; Ath. 15.670d-e; Anon. AP 12.140; Mel. AP 12.158; and Strat. AP 12.223, 254. The entrance of Lysistrata in effect, and quite appropriately, brings to an end the paraclausithyric elements.

Vespasian 88-398, 1254-1422

88 φιληλαστής: Philocleon is an old man, but that is not an obstacle to his being a lover, although the senex amator was viewed with disgust by both the Greeks and the Romans. To the references given by Murgatroyd 1980:96, McKeown 1987-2.262 and Maltby 2002: 178-81, add Pl. Baub. 1163-64 and Sen. Rhet. Contr. 2.6.4. Hence Philocleon’s actions here, and the chorus of old men being cast as Philocleon’s suitors, are clearly ridiculous. Alan Sommerstein points out (per litt.) that, in Aristophanes, old men become successful lovers over and over again: Dicaeopolis (Adr.), Demos (Eq.), Trygaios (Pac), Peisetairos (Ar.), and Blepyros (Ec).
91 ὑπνοῦ: for the lover’s sleeplessness, see Murgatroyd 1980:251 on Tib. 1.8.63-64 and McKeown 1987-2.34 on Ov. Am. 1.2.1-4. For the topos in paraclausithyric contexts, see Mel. AP 5.191; 12.72; Hor. Carm. 3.7.8.

97 γεγραμμένον: compare Adh. 144. Door-writing occurs in paraclausithyric contexts at [Theoc.] 23.45; Mel. AP 5.191.7; Pl. Mer. 409. Mel. AP 12.23 mentions what could be considered a form of door-writing. Cf. also Ov. Am. 3.1.53-54; Courney 1995 no. 92 (CLE 950 = CIL. 4.5296); and CIL. 4.1894 (quoting Prop. 4.5.47-48), 1893 (Ov. Am. 1.8.77-78) and 1895 (Ars 1.475-76), all written near the same door.

104 προκαθείδεις: note also 337. For sleeping before the beloved’s door, see above on 1.38. 282.

112 φυλάττομεν: 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, and Lucian DMeretr. 12. Cf. also Ov. Ep. 18; Met. 4.61; and also Apul. Met. 6.11.

113 μοχλάσω: see above on 1.38. 246.

114 νόσον: for attempts to cure the lover of his love, see Murgatroyd 1980:89 on Tib. 12.59-60; Maltby 2002:153, 250.

127 ὅπων: (and 317, 350, and 352) for the importance of a mere crack to the excluded lover, or included beloved, cf. Prop. 1.16.27; 2.17.16; Ov. Am. 1.6.3-4 (with McKeown 1987-) and Met. 4.74-77 (with Börner 1969-86). For the lover needing only a small opening to get through, see below on 317 a.

143 κάτη: ὅπη (see above on Vesp. 127) in Xenarch. Fr. 4.10-11 K-A might refer to some type of chimney-hole: μὴ κλίμακα στηγάμενον εἰσ-βήταιναι κάθεν. ἐνοπίς κάτωθεν εἰσδύπην στέγην. Ar. Fr. 10 K-A might also be amatory (see K-A ad loc.): καὶ ὅπης κάτι πέγγους. For the lover entering a house through the roof, see Ter. Eun. 588-89 (of Zeus visiting Danae): deum see in hominem convorisse atque in aleras angulas / unisse clanculum per inpluviun factum factum mulieri (with which compare the euhemerizing version of the same myth at Prud. e. Symm. 1.66-67: ... per tectum diones amator / imitidibus reptis ... ); Cic. Phil. 2.45 (of Antony entering Curio’s house to avoid the guards put on the door by Curio’s father, discussed at length in Sussman 1998 and very briefly in Cummings 1996:285): ... cum tu tamen non sola, hortante libidinis, cogita murendo per tegulas demittitur, Ov. Ars 2.244-46; Suda I.ets.655.1-7: Ἡ Φάνων τίφας. See also Trenkner 1958:130.

198 κεκλεισμένης: see above on 1.38. 423.

198-200 θύρας ... θύραν ... βάλανον ... μοχλόν: for similar accumulation of door parts in other paraclausithyra, see Pl. Am. 1026-38; Bac.
1119; Cur. 148-54; Per. 569-72; Lucet. 4.1177-79; Catul. 63.6; Hor. Epod. 11.21-22; Cam. 1.253-6; Prop. 1.16.42-43; Ov. Am. 1.6.73-74 (and McKeown 1987-2.160); Petron. 97; Eratosth. AP 5.242. For ἐβάλλος in paraclausithyric contexts, see Eratosth. AP 5.242.4 (a double-entendre similar to Lys. 414).

215 παρακαλεῖν: see also 218 and ἐκκαλέω 221 and 271. See above on Lys. 310.

219 λόγους: cf. 249, 255, 262, et al., and see above on Lys. 249.

219 μυνηρίζοντες μέλη: The paraclausithymn is typically plaintive or whining. Some element of plaintiveness might be implicit in the etymology of τὸ παρακλαυσιθυρίαμ. Fink 1973:3.167: ‘Unverbierrung von κλαυ~(τιος) und θήρα mit παρα-’. The Scholia on Ar. V. 977 glosses κυξόμενα (whining) as follows: παρακλαυσιττα, ὡς ἐπὶ κυκὼν δὲ εἶπε ... κυξήθης γὰρ λέγεται πολλὰ τις δειφή ἐπὶ κυκὼν. Compare the use of paraclausio in Rufin. AP. 5.103.1, a particularly whiny paraclausithymn. For μέλη, see on 271 ἄδοιχες.

235 λαϖτών: for past successes recalled, see above on Lys. 273-74.

237 νύκτωρ: of course, κομικὰ usually take place at night; see above on Lys. 249.

247 κακὸν τη δράση: for the dangers that face the komastic lover wandering the streets, see McKeown 1987- on Ov. Am. 1.6.9-14 and 2.11.51-52, and Murgatroyd 1980; Maltby 2002 on Tib. 1.2.25-28.

248 παίς: For komastic lovers accompanied by slaves, usually carrying a torch or lamp, as here, see Cummings 2001:43 n. 16.

250 τῶν πιλων: see also βορβορος 259, and ὅθορ 265. For bad weather, see above on Lys. 254. See also MacDowell 1971 on 259 and 264.

255 βόρειον: for wind in paraclausithyric situations, see Asclep. AP 5.167; Mel. 12.167.1; Hor. Carm. 1.25.19-20; 3.7.2, 5; 3.10.4, 7; Tib. 1.2.7; Prop. 1.16.24, 34; Ov. Am. 1.6.51-54 (with McKeown 1987-2.149-50); Ep. 18.39-46. See also on Lys. 254.

268 οὐ μὴν πρὸ τὸν: for the lover reminding the beloved of past good times together, see also 354 ff., and above on Lys. 273-74.

271 ἄδοιχες: paraclausithyra are typically sung. Songs and singing are specifically mentioned in paraclausithyric contexts at Thoec. Id. 3.38; 11.13, 18, 39, 52; Diod. Sic. 17.72.6; Plu. Mar. 753b (ἂδειν τὸ παρακλαυσιθυριάμ); Lucian, Bi Av. 31; Mon. enc. 10; Ael. NA 9.13; Aristarch. 1.14.3, 6; 2.19.6, 7 Mazal.

317a τῆκομαι: for the lover wasting away, see McKeown 1987-2.126 on Ov. Am. 1.6.5-6.
318b-319a ὦχο ὀλός τε ἐμ' ἄδειν: Philocleon must not sing lest he alert his son to what is going on (cf. 336-37, 371-72). MacDowell (1971: 177), who thinks that Philocleon cannot sing 'because of his distress', notes the humorous effect of Philocleon singing 'at the top of his voice' about his inability to sing, and compares Polonius' 'Brevity is the soul of wit' speech (Hamlet 2.2.90-99). A clearly discernible element of furtīnus amor is present in few early Greek paraclausithyra (it is much more prevalent in Latin elegy and later works), but see Ar. Ec. 949-50; Lyr. Alex. Adept. 5.7-8; and P.Teb. 1.12.d.15.

324 με παίησον: for the lover's desire to metamorphose into something that will make him able to reach his beloved (cf. Vesp. 144, 207, 353), see Murgatroyd 1994:129 on Tib. 2.4.7-10, to which add Theoc. 11.54 and Ov. Ep. 18.49-52. Petropoulos (2003:74-85 and 120-24) offers a good survey of the motif in Greek nuptial contexts. Zeus was a good model for the lover gaining success by changing his form.

328 κεραυνη: cf. Tib. 1.2.8, with Murgatroyd 1980 and Maltby 2002 ad loc., and also Ov. Am. 1.6.132 with McKeown 1987 ad loc.

334 ἀποκλείων: see above on Lys. 423.

341 μ' εὐωχεῖν: this might allude to the lover's wooing of the beloved, appropriately twisted to suit the inverted situation – the custos is trying to keep the enclosed lover to himself.

350 διορίξα: for the lover digging his way into the beloved's house, see Aristodem. FHG 3.310 (Ath. 13.585a; the lovers come with διάλειψα τα ἄμοις) and also compare Ar. Nub. 1486, where Sphagiades, preparing to attack the Thinkery, calls to his slave to bring him a σμινύη.

379 θυρίδος: for windows in paraclausithyric contexts, see Ar. Ec. 698 (and the girl in the 'love-duet' [Bowra 1958:376-91] at 952-75b is probably at an upper window, not on the roof); Praxilla 754; Asclep. AP 5.153; Lucil. 943 (Marx 841); Dec. Lab. 141-43 Ribbeck (possibly referring to the same type of situation seen in Hor. Carm. 1.25.1); Hor. Carm. 1.25.1; 3.3.60; Prop. 2.19.5; 3.20.29; Apul. Apol. 75; Lucian, Bœ Aa: 31; Babr. 116; Anasten. 2.1.14 Mazal.

379 καλωδίων: and also καθμα 396. For the lover or beloved climbing down a rope, see Apollod. Gel. Fr. 1 K-A; Prop. 4.17.17-18; Trenkner 129-30.

389 ὁ Λύκε δέσποτα, γείτων ἦρως: the lover regularly attempts to enlist support of some deity by appealing to the deity's experience as a lover; see Ov. Am. 1.6.53-54 (with McKeown 1987-2.149); 3.6.23-50; Ep. 19.129-40. Zeus is similarly invoked at Asclep. AP 5.167.6. Here, of course, Lycus' experience is as a lover of the lawcourts.
390 δακρύσωμα: for the tears of the lover, see McKeown 1987-2.132-33 on Ov. Am. 1.6.17-18; Murgatroyd 1980 on Tib. 1.2.13-14 and 1.5.37-44, and Murgatroyd 1994 on Tib. 2.6.

398 φυλλάσι: the τίρσιον was made from branches, often formed into a wreath or garland. The lover usually is garlanded, since he has come from a symposium. The lover also commonly hangs his garland on the beloved’s door, which is the nearest parallel to the τίρσιον being taken from the door. For some Greek examples only, see Alex. Fr. 114; Asclep. AP 5.145; Theoc. 2.153; Mel. AP 5.191. Cf. also Ec. 1034; Eq. 729; Pl. 1088. For more, see Murgatroyd 1980:77; McKeown 1987-2.158; Fedeli 1980:374; Hunter 1999:117.

1254 καὶ θυροκοπήσαι καὶ πατάξαι καὶ βαλεῖν: The thought is similar to Eub. 93 K-A (‘The fourth bowl of wine leads to hylbris, the fifth to yelling, the sixth to kómе, the seventh to black eyes and the eighth to a summons’), on which see Hunter 1983:181-89 and Kassel & Austin 1986:244-45. For θυροκοπέων, see in particular Antiph. Fr. 236 K-A and Trypho, Fr. 109 (Velsen = Ath. 14.618c): αἰθήσεων δ’ εἰότιν ἱερασμάτω ἡθος αἰθομένων, τὸ δ’ αὐτὸ καὶ κρυστάλλων. Λελ. NA 1.50 uses it in a clearly paraclausithyric reference. It occurs in another comic writer: Diph. Fr. 129 K-A. Θυροκοπέων here must be an act worthy of a fine, and so must be stronger than mere knocking (see MacDowell 1971:294). It probably refers to actual damage to a door, probably a beloved’s. In contrast to the many references to forced entry by lovers, there are very few to people breaking down doors to get into a party. For violent assaults on the beloved’s house, see on Lys. 241. Βάλλεων could refer to (1) throwing stones at the beloved’s window or door (cf. Hor. Carm. 1.25.1-2 with Nisbet-Hubbard ad loc); (2) fighting with rivals before the beloved’s house (see Headlam & Knox 1922:83 on Herod. 2.34-37; Lys. 3.5, 7-8, 17-18 [an excellent example], and Niceph. Greg. Byz. Hist. 8.1.3 [Schopen-Bekker 1.285; a particularly amusing one involving a troop of archers and mistaken identity]), or (3) standard violent komastic behaviour directed at anyone unfortunate enough to cross the komasts’ path, as Arnott 1996:303 (with references) suggests. Occasionally, a displeased beloved might pelt a komast, as at Gel. 4.14.5. See Arnott 1996:302-03 on Alex. Fr. 112.5 (βαλαμικάρ) and Hunter 1983:189 on Eub. Fr. 94.10 (βάλλεων) for more, and for references to the surprisingly abundant earlier discussions. Treggiari 2002:96 has an interesting discussion on pelting as part of public ἀντικιμία at Rome. Comitia Aed. 564 Kock offers the proverb τὴν αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ γὰρ θύραν κρατεῖ λίθο, on which see Edmonds 1957-61:3Α.442-43. See Pütz 2003:181-86, 213 for

**1225 kραπάλης.** see Lucian, *Bis Acc.* 16 and 17, and Alciphron 4.10.2.

**1303 Ἴβραστοτάτος.** cf. περὶ ἵβρατζεων 1303 and ἤβρατζε 1441. *Komi* and *hybris* are often associated: e.g. Lys. 3.22; Eub. Fr. 93 K-A (cited above on 1254); Plb. 10.26.3-5; D.S. 16.87.1; D.H. 10.7.3-4; D.C. 9.39.7; Epit. 61.9.2; Plu. Mor. 552b; *Alex.* 67.6; *Dem.* 20.3; Lucian, *Bis Acc.* 17; Ael. *VH* 13, Lib. *Comp.* 10.7 (‘... nor having dined is the farmer moved to beat on doors [τηροκοπῆιν], nor does he commit *hubris* [ἵβρατζε] and sport and think that to be young means to commit some great evil’). See Fisher 1992:99-102 for drink, symposia and *hybris*, and p. 102 in particular for discussion of this passage. Hesychius even offers ‘commit outrage under the effect of drunkenness’ (ἵβρατζε μετὰ μέθης) as part of his definition of *komázei* (*κ.4827*). Aristotle (*Rh.* 2.1378b28-29) notes that ‘the young and the rich are hubristic: for they think that they show their superiority when they commit *hubris*’ (διὰ τῷ ὁδὸν ἵνα καὶ ὁ πλούσιος ἴβρασται ὑπερέχειν γὰρ ἀπειτεῖν ἰβράτζεις); see Fisher 1992:97-99, 102-04 for the connections between *hubris*, youth and wealth. See also Minyard 1976:214; Fisher 1988:1175; Murray 1990:139-44; Burton 1992:229; Fisher 2000:355; Pütz 2003:181-88.

**1422 πατάξαι καὶ βαλεῖν:** as predicted at 1254.
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