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No substantial research on the παρακλαυσίθυρον or exclusus amator motif in Greek and Latin literature has followed in the wake of Copley's monograph of 1956.¹ His study and the earlier work of De la Ville de Mirmont, Canter, Pesquali, Burck, Copley himself, and Elizabeth Haight,² have to a large extent compensated for the apparent lack of interest in the motif among classical scholars, as evidenced by the mere paragraph by Paul Maas in the Realencyclopadie³ and the three-and-a-half lines by the unnamed contributor in the Oxford Classical Dictionary. This lack of interest is not limited to classical scholars. One searches in vain for an entry on the motif in the standard dictionaries of literary terms and in the encyclopaedias of various languages.

What attention has been focused on the motif has for the most part been of the 'Motivgeschichtliche' kind, where the origins and development of the motif have been traced from social custom to literary genre and motif, and the various ingredients and features of the motif established. Relatively little attention has been turned on the problem of how this highly stylised literary motif has been exploited by individual poets.⁴

Yet the frequency of the motif in poetry⁵ of different countries and ages proclaims its popularity and a certain topicality or relevancy to actual social custom. Even in its most literary form among, for example, the Roman elegists,

³. RE XVIII,3,1202. Cf. also Crisius, 'Elegie', RE V,2, 2285, 2292, 2295, 2302.
⁵. For the motif in prose authors, cf. Copley, 1956, 1–27.
there is some reference, even if only by way of contrast, to everyday situations. Nor did the motif die with classical antiquity. The paraklausithyron is one stage in an erotic sequence: after an evening of revelry at a symposium and subsequent marching about the streets with his fellow-revellers (κόμῳς), a young gallant serenades outside a brothel or his beloved’s door (παρακλαυσιθύρων), is either admitted or shut out (exclusus amator), and, if admitted, soon denounces the approach of dawn which brings an end to his amorous adventure (dawn-song, ‘alba’, ‘Tagelied’). Each of these stages has produced a wealth of mainly erotic poetry, both pre- and post-Classical. For a motif already conventional in Greek New Comedy and in Latin erotic verse to have survived and multiplied so prodigiously in languages and literatures often unrelated to and uninfluenced by one another, that motif must have contained something universally human and had a life-giving umbilical connection with the social and courtship customs and ritual of various peoples and times.

Although the actual terms παρακλαυσιθύρων and exclusus amator appear first in Plutarch and Lucretius respectively, Aristophanes’ Ekklesiazusai 938–975 (performed in 392 bc) offers the earliest surviving example of reasonable

---


7. On the origins and development of the motif from the κόμῳς, cf. Copley, TAPhA 1942, 97ff; 1956, 1–6. On the etymology of the term παρακλαυσιθύρων, cf. Canter, 356–8 n.1. Copley, TAPhA 1942, 96–8 and 1956, 1–42, offers an account of the motif and discusses the differences between the Greek paraklausithyron and the Latin exclusus amator. He points out (TAPhA 1942, 96 n.2) that the lover was usually admitted in comedy, excluded in mime; Canter, 368, describes the exclusion as invariably present in the Latin type.

Classical scholars have generally studied the genre or motif solely in classical literature. Canter’s assertions that there are no extant examples of the song in Latin literature after Ovid’s Amores (355), and that the paraklausithyron is ‘indigenous to Greek soil’ (368), are demonstrably wrong. Copley, 1956, 139, makes a similar mistake; cf. the review of his book by M. P. Cunningham, CPh 53, 1958, 39–41. A. T. Hatto has edited a work which gives some idea of the vitality of this motif in world literature: Eos. An Enquiry into the Theme of Lovers’ Meetings and Partings at Dawn in Poetry, London–The Hague–Paris, 1965. True paraklausithyra, as distinct from the dawn song, appear in the following: a Korean folksong (128f), a poem by Hercules Strozza (1473–1508) which contains the entire process from komos to dawn song (292f), a poem dating from c. 1510 by Lodovico Ariosto (411), anonymous Dutch poems from c. 1544 (491–499), a 19th century anonymous Polish example (607). Greek and Latin dawn songs are dealt with on pp. 28f, 255–263 and 271–281. To the examples from other literatures may be added the following: Song of Solomon (especially 5, 2–8; 2, 8–13; together with a dawn song, 2, 16–17 and 3, 1–6); Shakespeare, Twelfth Night I,5,131–4; Romeo and Juliet II,2 (preceded by a komos, I,4 and I,1, and followed by a dawn song, III,5); The Two Gentlemen of Verona IV,2; Much Ado About Nothing II,3 and V,2; Longfellow, ‘Serenade’.

length of the motif in Greek literature. In this example, however, the lover stands before the door and exchanges endearments with his not-unwilling lady, while an old woman intervenes. In other words, this earliest extant example is itself not a ‘lament or serenade before the door’ of a reluctant girl. It is already a developed use of the motif. It does, however, contain an element typical of the lament: the lover threatens to fall down and lie on the doorstep: καταπεσόντα κεισομαι, 963. The threat of the thwarted suitor recurs constantly in the later versions. 10

In Latin literature the motif is at least as early as the opening scene of Plautus’ Curculio (c 193 BC), during which the lover, Phaedromus, in love with Planesium who is owned by Cappadox and guarded by a duenna, apostrophises the door, exhorting it to drink with him (in the hope that the duenna herself will partake), and open. While the duenna fetches the girl, Phaedromus addresses the door-bolts, pessuli (147–155).

The motif was a commonplace especially in comedy, erotic elegy and Hellenistic epigram. 11 A glance through the fifth book of the Palatine Anthology reveals the frequency and ingredients of the motif (the door, the garlands, the tears, the inclement weather, the threats, the inscription on the door or garland, the prostration, the long and cold night, the obdurate girl, the lament), but, more important, the countless variations and mutations the motif underwent from one poet or poem to another. The ‘Urform’ of the ‘lament before the door’ of the girl becomes, for example, a lament for a boy (Asklepiades, Anth. Pal. V,145); 12 a wish that ‘she may one day also stand before my door’ (Asklepiades, Anth. Pal. V,164); a lament ending with a warning that ‘you will one day be old and have no one at your door’ (Kallimachos, Anth. Pal. V,23); instead of the usual rain, a jug of water descends on the lover (Paulus Silentiarius, Anth. Pal. V,281). These examples span a period from the 3rd Century BC to the middle of the 6th Century AD.

The same deliberate variation appears in other poets: in Theokritos 3 the

---

10. Cf. Pasquale, 421; Canter, 358; Maas, RE XVIII,3,1202. Bowra, 378 n,8, disagrees that the Aristophanes passage is the earliest Greek paraklausithyron extant. The difference of opinion is due, as he suggests, to different definitions of the paraklausithyron. Pasquale, 419f, discusses early examples which he does not consider as true paraklausithyra. Copley, TAPhA 1942, 101–106, gives four conventional features, stated or implied, of the motif: the procession through the streets, drunkenness, the garland, and the vigil at the door. He argues, while admitting the paucity of the evidence, that the koisinēç originated in the drunken sleep on the doorstep. This is more convincing and in keeping with the motif as a whole than Bowra’s view (384f) that the lover’s prostration is an image drawn from wrestling, and signifies the lover’s submission or surrender. A threat, to die or at least to remain on the doorstep till dawn in order to proclaim the lady’s cruelty, rather than a surrender is involved in the prostration.


goatherd lover stands before a cave which of course has no door; in Catullus

carm. 67 the door, in a dialogue with the poet, reveals the scandal of those
living in the house; in Tibullus 1,2 the complaint is addressed to the door itself;
in Propertius I,16 (the longest surviving paraklausithyron) it is the door itself
which complains and quotes the lover's lament within his own (17-44); in
another long description, Ovid's Amores I,6, the lover addresses the door-
keeper, and Propertius I,3,35-46 presents Cynthia's querella delivered from
her bed (34). In fact, among the numerous surviving Greek and Latin examples
of the motif, none is complete in all details or preserves the original genre or
'Urlied'. Only the variations have survived, it seems.13 This variation is the
most characteristic feature in the occurrence of the motif, and suggests a
vitality and potential surprising in so highly conventionalised a literary topos.

The motif occurs in seven of Horace's Odes: I,25, III,7, III,9, III,10, III,15,
III,16 and III,26.14 Pasquali has examined the Greek and Hellenistic elements
in Horace's paraklausithyra (especially III,10) and Horace's own contribution
to the motif. Copley has found Horace's originality especially in the fusion of
the literary paraklausithyron and the Roman diffamatio.15 But there has been
little explicit analysis of how and why Horace uses and varies the motif in his
poetry. This paper is an attempt to analyse the poetic function or effect of the
motif in the poems where it occurs. Such a study seems necessary in view of the
very conventionality of the motif and its relatively frequent and concentrated
occurrence in the Odes. Here surely is an opportunity of studying how a first-
rate Latin poet exploited a conventional literary motif.

If one could have established with any degree of certainty the chronological
order of composition of these seven poems, it would have been possible to
trace the development of the motif in Horace's work.16 A vague chronological
order could perhaps be reconstructed on the basis of the closeness of each
occurrence to the 'original' form. But such an approach makes the fallacious
assumption that a poet's fullest or most 'original' use of a literary motif is

13. But cf. the sound approach of Hatto, 17: "There will be no attempt here to reduce this
rich harvest to variations of one "Urlied" or even of several".
14. Apart from the occurrences in Sat. I,4 and II,3, the motif appears also in Epode 11
and Sat. I,2, 64-67.
15. Pasquali, 419-460; Copley, 1956, 52-69. It is perhaps significant that the odes in
which the motif appears have attracted little critical attention. Cf. the 'Nachwort und
bibliographische Nachträge' by E. Burck in A. Kiesling & R. Heinze, Q. Horatius Flaccus:
Oden und Epoden, Zürich-Berlin, elfte Auflage, 1964, 639-640. E. Fraenkel, Horace,
Oxford, 1957, has nothing on these seven poems.
16. Commentators have generally avoided dating these seven odes. F. Ritter, Q. Horatius
Flaccus, Leipzig, 1857, has found I,25, III,7 and III,9 undatable, has dated III,10 before
29 BC, III,15 and 16 to 24 BC, and III,26 to 21 BC; F. Plessis, Œuvres d'Horace: Odes,
Épodes et Chant S Éculaire, Paris, 1924, reprinted Hildesheim, 1966, dates III,7, 16 and 26
to c. 25-23 BC; Kiesling-Heinze date III,16 late and III,26 to 23 BC. E. Staedler, Thesaurus
Horatianus, Berlin, 1962, 2-6, has given the traditional dates for all Horace's poems, down
to the season or month; thus, in chronological order: III,16 (Dec. 34), III,10 (winter 30),
III,26 (summer 29), III,9 (spring 28), I,25 (summer 28), III,7 (winter 25), and III,15 (autumn
also his earliest. Copley finds III,26 Horace’s most complete use, yet the poem has been dated by Plessis and by Heinze to c. 23 BC, thus relatively late among the odes of the first three books, and more or less contemporary with III,7 and III,16 where the motif appears only briefly.

The interpreter is forced to fall back on the only other arrangement, that of the transmitted text, that is, at least in the case of Horace’s Odes, the order in which the poems were intended by the poet to register on the reader’s mind. Moreover, the occurrence of the motif of the paraklausithyron in poems next to or so close to one another suggests a deliberate invitation by Horace to the reader to analyse and compare the poet’s ingenuity and inventiveness in his use of the motif in each poem.

_Carm. I,25_

Scholarly opinion on this poem ranges from the curt dismissal by Birt and Page to the unqualified appreciation by Williams. This controversy on the tone, intention and literary quality of the poem is perhaps a result of its being a complex nexus of inherited, heterogeneous material. Copley has indicated Horace’s fusion of the _lupanar_ song with the true paraklausithyron, with the addition of the well-worn theme of the _moecha senescens_, the whole in his view being ruthlessly cold and humourless, lacking the sorrow and regret of Propertius’ elegy III,24–25. Pasquali also compared these two poems to prove Horace’s greater originality. The present analysis is an attempt only to examine the role of the paraklausithyron motif in the poem, in the hope that some further light may be shed on the poetic intention and quality of the poem.

The dramatic situation of the poem is not explicitly stated. But conventional ingredients establish the motif in the reader’s mind: _iuuenes_ (2), _somnos adimunt_ (3), _ianua limen_ (4), and the quotation from a lover’s actual lament: ‘me tuo longas pereunte noctes, / Lydia, dormis?’ (6–8). To these conventional details Horace has added others to sharpen and individualise the picture: the pebbles

---

rattling on the *iunctas fenestras* (1f), the sexual eagerness of the *iuuenes* implied in *iactibus crebris* and *proteruil* (2) and contrasting with their diminishing interest (*parcius, 1; nec, 3; minus et minus iam, 6*), and the ironical and witty transformation of the door into the lover of the threshold – apparently the only eventual lover near the house (*amatque / ianua limen*).  

From the first two stanzas the reader also realises that this Lydia must be a *meretrix* with a considerable clientele (*iactibus crebris* *iuuenes* ... *tibi somnos adimunt* ... *ianua* ... *quae multum facilis movebat / cardines*) who sing the conventional *paraklausithyron* (7–8) before her door or under her window, though less frequently as she grows older. The inclusion of part of an actual *paraklausithyron* is therefore intended to suggest to the reader the frequency of its use outside Lydia's door. In other words, Horace has made use of the very conventionality of the motif to evoke a type of lover and a typical occurrence in the life of Lydia.

A problem arises with the involvement of a *meretrix*. In the 'original' *paraklausithyron*, the group of revellers went to a brothel, and were probably admitted. In the developed literary motif, a single lover, accompanied at most by attendants, serenaded before the door of a specific beloved, and was usually excluded. Horace has fused the two. But the reader is left with a problem: Can there be any question of an *exclusus amator* when so many lovers are admitted that the hinges have worn smooth? How is the reader to understand the poet's exclusion in the midst of Lydia's free admission of other suitors? Or does Lydia admit only *iuuenes proterui* from the number of whom Horace excludes himself? Is Horace warning Lydia that she will one day be old like himself? Is the poem in fact an attack on Lydia for refusing admission to the poet? Kiessling–Heinze have suggested that the poem is not an attempt to break down Lydia's reluctance, as in the case of Ovid *A.A. III*, 69 where it is clearly

---

21. Pasquali, 443, suggests that the detail about the pebbles on the window is a new, Roman aspect, as such windows on upper floors were typical of Roman houses. Cf. also Ritter.


24. Prop. I,16 offers an example of one lover being excluded in favour of another: the garlands and torches lying on the ground (8, reading *exclusis* with the MSS) outside the door indicate another lover already inside. But cf. W. A. Camps, *Propertius. Elegies Book I* Cambridge, 1966, *ad loc.* There is at any rate no suggestion of this possibility in Horace's poem.

25. Kiessling–Heinze, 110. They rightly draw attention to the contrast between the 'Hohnlied' and the citation from the conventional *paraklausithyron*.  

56
stated that the girl is now excluding lovers altogether. They find Propertius III,25,11–16 closer to our poem.

There is evidence for the view that an exclusus amator is involved here. The mere quotation of part of a true paraklausithyron proves that it was used before the door of a meretrix. And the use of the singular me (7) instead of a plural (for a group of revellers) seems to place the cited paraklausithyron, not before a brothel, but before a particular woman's house. Also, contrary to what one might expect, the lover in the cited paraklausithyron expects to remain exclusus for the traditional long period of time (longas noctes, 7; cf. Asclepiades, Anth. Pal. V,148; 189; Ovid Am. II,19,21f).

But Propertius III,25,11–16 offers more evidence. There are enough verbal parallels with Horace's poem to justify its use in establishing further dramatic background for carm. I,25: in uicem (I,25,9) and inque uicem (III,25,15); non sine questu (I,25,16) and queraris (III,25,16); anus (I,25,9 – III,25,16). Propertius' inque uicem exclusa implies not only a change of situation with age, but a reversal of roles: if Cynthia in her turn will be exclusa, then Propertius now or in the past must be or have been exclusus. Horace predicts an aged Lydia on the streets (in angiportu, 10), hence exclusa26. Then, before the reversal, he must in the first two stanzas be an exclusus amator. Finally, surviving examples antedating Horace's poem prove the possibility of such an interpretation: Theokritos 7,120f; Ps.-Theokritos 23,27–34; Kallimachos, Anth. Pal. V,23; Asclepiades, Anth. Pal. V,164; Marcus Argentarius, Anth. Pal. V,118; and the Alexandrian Erotic Fragment are based on the reversal of the male and female roles.27

The intricate interconnections and overlapping show how subtly Horace has interwoven the paraklausithyron with the lupanar-song and the exclusus amator theme. We shall never know for certain to what extent this fusion was deliberate or subconscious. We can, however, accept two certainties: the employment in a single poem of disparate elements to form a new creation, and the poet's resultant attempt at his own variation on the traditional material. We cannot dogmatically deny that the poet here casts himself in the role of an exclusus amator, and that he intended his poem to be taken as a variation on the paraklausithyron type.

In the following three stanzas the poet issues a warning to Lydia that her present situation will not always last, and that her beauty will fade with

26. Obviously she is not in the streets on a komos as her male counterpart. Acron defines an angiportus as a cul de sac or a narrow alley. Catullus c. 58,4 predicts the same fate for Lesbia.

advancing age. Her iuuenes will diminish in number and frequency but also in quality (the moechos arrogantes, 9, are quite different), until the whole situation changes and she in turn becomes a wanderer about the streets, an exclusa amatrix in fact.

The depiction of Lydia as an exclusa amatrix can, as indicated above, be assumed from the tradition. But the poem itself provides us with pointers to this interpretation. The tears (10), the street (10), the inclement weather (11f) and the lament (15–20) are all integral elements, by Horace’s time almost technical terms, by which readers could identify the motif. But, no less important, these highly conventional details are fused with some of the most realistic description to be found in Horace’s Odes. This realism is truly devastating. For three stanzas Horace unleashes a tirade of unflattering, frightening and very un gallant description that has caused some scholars disgust and discomfort. As an old woman, says Horace to the still young and attractive Lydia, you will weep over low-grade moechi, lonely in an alleyway, in dark, cold and bleak weather, your ulcerated liver on fire with lust like a mare’s, complaining all the while of the young men’s delight in green ivy and myrtle and their disdain for you now, a withered leaf in the winter wind. Fusing the conventional or literary and the real, Horace has, in short, taken the traditional plight of the exclusus amator, intensified it and applied it in his prediction to the ageing Lydia. No exclusus amator on rejection faced the indignity and humiliation of moechi arrogantes, or the loneliness and desolation, never faced weather as inclement, furious and cosmically inevitable, nor felt such burning desire or envy as that in store for Lydia here.

The reader inevitably asks why Horace has gone to such lengths to hold up to Lydia such a terrible future. To resort to the explanation that the poem is purely a literary exercise with traditional material is insufficient. One is reminded of the poem to Lyce (carm. IV,13): is Horace in 1,25 also attacking the indecorum of a woman who refuses to act her age? And is one meant to think of the Lydia of carm. I,8, I,13 and III,9, that is, is the tone of I,25 a result

31. Thus S. Commager, The Odes of Horace, New Haven–London, 1962, 247–249, interprets I,25 and IV,13 as attacks on those who refuse to accept change and thus become guilty of indecorous behaviour. The analysis of the relation of odes I,23–25 by C. Fuqua, CPh 1968, 44–46, to the effect that nature is a perspective or norm for human conduct in the three poems, lends support to this view.
of a rebuff by Lydia, reconciliation with whom is expressed in III,9. Such autobiographical interpretations present more problems than solutions. Apart from questions of dating, there are other obstacles. In III,9, for instance, it is Lydia who is the rejected one, and I,25 presents no direct evidence of any personal feud between Lydia and the poet. Moreover, the Lydia of I,25 is a meretrix; the Lydia of III,9 cannot be.

Yet Horace must have expected his readers to connect the poems if only because they contain the same girl. Not many of Horace's girls receive mention in more than one poem, let alone four. What, then, binds the poems beyond the girl they share? In I,8 Lydia's hold on a certain Sybaris is playfully revealed; in I,13 the poet's jealousy over Lydia's relationship with Telephus is clothed in exaggerated elegiac language; I,25 is a warning to Lydia that she will age into an unloved prostitute; and III,9 presents a teasing verbal duel between Lydia and the poet that ends in reconciliation. There is some continuity: the various 'phases' of Lydia's life. It is not a biographical or historical continuity, but a dramatic continuity, and one which depends not on the actual chronological order of composition but on the poet's arrangement of the poems. Further than that we should not go.

The basic intention in a paraklausithyron is to gain admission. This 'Werbungsidée', fundamental in Latin erotic elegy, may have been intended in this lyric by Horace. But there is no internal evidence in the poem itself to make the reader feel certain about the dramatic situation. We cannot say for sure that the poet is at Lydia's door pleading for admission; or that he is reviling her for an earlier rebuff. In the traditional paraklausithyron the warning was intended to strengthen the lover's suit. And the more terrifying this warning, the more likely was he to influence the reluctant girl. Horace may be trying to frighten Lydia. But nothing in the poem proves or disproves this. In short the reader is given no information to help him establish whether the poet is pleading not to be excluded, or denouncing Lydia for having recently excluded him.

Horace may be relying on his reader to reconstruct the dramatic situation from the tradition. But which tradition? It is safer to assume that Horace has


33. Cf. especially the words multi Lydia nominis (7) and the comparison with Romana Ilia (8), who, as Birt, Horaz' Lieder. Studien zur Kritik und Auslegung, Leipzig, 1925, 94, has pointed out, was 'die Krone der Weiblichkeit'.

34. Chloe appears in five poems (I,23, III,7, III,9, III,19, III,26), Glycera in four (I,19, I,30, I,33, III,19), Cinara (IV,1; Epi. I,7,28; Epi. I,14,23), Phlooe (I,33, II,5, III,15) and Lyde (II,11, III,11, III,28) in three each, Chloris (II,7, III,15) and Phyllis (II,4, IV,11) in two each.

deliberately suppressed the traditional paraklausithyron setting. After all, he
could so easily have established it firmly with a word or two, as he does in
III,7 and III,10. Why suppress details about the dramatic setting and thus
confuse the reader? Mainly, I think, to achieve ambiguity and a new, personal
expression within the conventional motif. In addition to the possible pleading
for admission and the possible denunciation at having been rejected, there is
the more certain expression of the poet’s impatience at and pity for Lydia’s
behaviour. Her closing of the door and window-shutters belies for Horace,
whether he is exclusus or not, an attitude against the carpe diem view of life,
and a mental and physical exclusion of life and its concomitant joy and inevi­
table change. Her attitude also belies a belief that there will always be other
opportunities and occasions. Against this failure to accept inevitable change
and advancing age Horace’s main concern is directed. Hence the sharp con­
trast between present, past and future, and the intensification of the traditional
warning. This is no simple warning that she will regret excluding a suitor:
this is a warning against rejecting life and not heeding the demands of change.

The motif is thus an integral part of the meaning of the poem and not mere
ornament. Pity for Lydia, rather than hatred or resentment, pervades the poem:
minus et minus iam? (6) and the final image (17–20) clearly convey this. New
complexity and interest are achieved for the motif, and the strong connection
with the theme of transience and mortality, and the accompanying need for
decorum, as well as the apparent involvement of the poet, at least in the sense
that the theme intensely occupied Horace, override whatever was inherited
from the tradition.

_Carm. III,7_

The motif occurs next in a poem that is clearly not itself the lament and where
the poet himself is not visualised as the exclusus amator: _carm._ III,7,29–32. The
dramatic situation is clear: the poet assures Asterie that her beloved Gyges,
delayed by storms at Oricum in Epirus on his way back from profitable trading
in Bithynia, will remain true to her despite the greatest temptation from his
hostess Chloe; but she, Asterie, causes the poet concern: she is under pressure
from a young cavalryman named Enipeus; she should firmly exclude him and
await the return of her Gyges in the spring. Clearly the tone is ironical and
humorous, a deliberate contrast with the preceding Roman Odes,36 but also
with Horace’s previous use of the motif in I,25.

Again technical terminology establishes the motif for the reader: _prima
nocte, domum claude, sub cantu querulae tibiae, te saepe vocanti / duram
difficilis mane._ Again, on a technical level, Horace is inviting the reader to
recognise the fusion of disparate elements, in this case the Greek paraklausithyron with the Roman _diffamatio_ in which illicit, adulterous suit is addressed

---

36. Cf. Plessis and Shorey-Laing _ad loc._
to a Roman matrona. But it is especially inversion that brings a new slant and revitalises the motif: not the usual poet-lover complaining about his exclusion, but a poet warning a friend's beloved to make sure she in fact excludes suitors. Horace is ironically amused in his contemplation of Asterie's fears about Gyges' fidelity when in fact her own fidelity is in greater jeopardy from her very neighbour uicinus Enipeus (23). By contrast the temptation and threat to Gyges (9ff) are remote: a go-between messenger pleads Chloe's suit to Gyges, using mythological exempla; Enipeus presents a more immediate, real threat: he is uicinus, he is not a myth, but real, a skilled horseman and athletic swimmer, admired by young women on the practice grounds of the Campus Martius, and he comes at night with a paraklausithyron in which he serenades her with complaining tibia and calls her dura. The syntax enforces this contrast: Chloe's protestations of love are cast in indirect statement (9–12); Enipeus' physical prowess is cast in the indicative mood despite quamuis (25–28).

It is tempting to interpret the portrayal of Gyges as an exclusus amator as well, despite his geographical remoteness from Asterie's door. There are details to support such an interpretation: he is young and constant (4), is experiencing inclement weather, cold and sleepless nights, and sheds tears, not at his lady's door admittedly, but in a far-off land (5–8). There is a strong contrast between Gyges and Enipeus: Gyges is absent in a foreign land, is a merchant (merce beatum, 3), is true to Asterie; Enipeus is at hand, a soldier, courting Asterie with the conventional paraklausithyron that suggests he does so before other doors as well as Asterie's. Thus: if Enipeus is an exclusus amator, then Gyges is the inclusus amator— or would be if stormy weather and geography had not excluded him.

Again the intricate and functional employment of the motif is apparent. Horace in fact uses the motif to express his thoughts: he thinks with and through the conventional motif. It is structurally intrinsic in the poem.

Carm. III,9 and III,15

The exclusa amatrix inversion, preserved in the examples quoted earlier, appears briefly again in carm. III,9,19f and III,15,8–10: (quid) si flaua excutitur Chloe | reiectaque patet ianua Lydiae? and filia rectus | expugnat iuuenum domos, | pulso Thylas uti concita tympano.

That the motif is in fact present in III,9,19–20 seems certain: the presence of Lydia here may be intended to recall the paraklausithyron addressed to her (I,25); Chloe appears with other occurrences of the motif (III,7 and III,26); ianua is a standard clue; and excutitur can be interpreted in the sense of being

excluded from a house.³⁸

There is less certainty as to whether the motif is present in III,15,8–10. Obviously there is more scope in the case of an *exclusus amator* for play on the idea of the lover as a soldier, with weapons serving him in either role. But what weapons are we to understand in the case of an *exclusa amatrix*? There are indications that, both in the literary convention and perhaps in actual life, girls did in fact attack the doors of young men, though, naturally, their weapons are never mentioned. Plautus presents us with a scene in which a *meretrix*, Acroteleutium, and an *ancilla*, Milphidippa, argue over the former’s intention of forcing the door of her beloved: ‘AC. Durare nequeo, / quin eam intro. MI. Occlusae sunt fores. AC. Ecfrringam. MI. Sana non es.’ Seneca informs us: ‘Crispus Passienus saepe dicebat adulationi non opponere, non claudere ostium, et quidem sic quemadmodum opponi amicae solet quae, si impulit, grata est, gratior si effregit.’³⁹

Horace uses the unmistakably military term *expugnat*, thus transferring the behaviour of young men to young women, and so perpetuating the literary convention. The reader may also be expected to connect the bacchantic behaviour of Pholoe (10) with the bacchantic weather awaiting another *exclusa amatrix*, the Lydia of I,25.

These two uses of the inverted motif differ in tone and poetic function. The overall tone from the amused analysis of the manoeuvring between the sexes in *carm.* III,9 colours lines 19–20: the words are a plea for the resumption of the former relationship. Tenderness, apology, tentative approach are suggested especially in the initial *reiectae* with its admission of guilt, in the suspended *Lydia* at the end of the line (balancing and contrasting with the *Chloe* of the previous line), and in the soft sounds. In contrast, the words of *carm.* III,15, 8–10 occur in a harsher context: Chloris, Ibycus’ wife, is warned to act her age and leave the storming of young men’s doors to young women – her daughter, for instance. That Horace felt that such behaviour was rather indecorous, unnatural in fact, even for Chloris’ daughter, emerges from lines 10–12: the daughter is like a bacchante, driven by passion for Nothus like a *lasciua caprea*. Similarities with I,25 can only confirm the view that the paraklausithyron motif is intended: an old woman, refusing to act her age, a young woman behaving in her raging lust like an animal proverbial for its lust, and a com-

---


parison with a bacchante. These details, though obviously not exactly corresponding, are sufficiently close to link the poems thematically, but also as regards the use of the paraklausithyron motif.

*Carm. III,10*

Immediately after the cryptic use of *iamua* and *executitur* in III,9,19–20, the reader is confronted with the longest example of the motif in Horace's work. *Ode* III,10 has therefore enjoyed rather more critical attention as a complete paraklausithyron. Discussion has been concerned mainly with the problems of the Greek and Roman elements in the poem, the relationship of 'Wahrheit' and 'Dichtung', and Horace's originality and poetic intention. Critics are agreed at least on the tone of the poem: polished, ironical, exaggerated, amused. 40 The dramatic situation, too, is easily recreated by the reader: the poet pleads that, even if Lyce were a Scythian and married to a savage and jealous husband, she would not exclude him so cruelly as she does now. 41

Conventional details are supplied to identify the motif: the lover's vigil and prostration at the lady's door (2–4, 19–20), his suffering, pallor and humility (13–14), the inclement weather (3–8, 19–20), the girl's cruelty (the name *Lyce*, 1; the hypallage in *asperas*, 2; *ingratam ... superbiam*, 9; *difficilem*, 11; the similes, 17–18); the closed door (*foris*, 2; *liminis*, 19). The presence of a husband (2) comes from the Roman *diffamatio*: this turns the conventional paraklausithyron from a lament addressed to a *meretrix* or single girl into a lament to a Roman matron.

Horace is in fact using two separate versions of the *exclusus amator* motif within the paraklausithyron. Firstly, cast in the form of an impossible conditional clause: if Lyce were a Scythian, in Scythia, married to a barbarian, she would not let him suffer the vile weather of Scythia (*incolis ... Aquilonibus*) while stretched out before her door (1–4). Secondly, cast in the present indicative, his present situation, the dramatic situation: she is not a Scythian, but an Italian (*Tyrrenhus genuit parens*, 12), living in a fine mansion with beautiful gardens (*nemus / inter pulcra satum tecta*, 5–6), and is married to a husband who is infatuated with a Thessalian mistress (15). Yet she shuts him out.

Supposed and dramatic situations are neatly balanced: Scythian–Italian; *saeuo ... uiro ... saucius*; the weather of lines 3–4 with that of lines 5–8 and 20–21. The weather of the dramatic situation is a good deal worse than that of the supposed situation: not only does its description take up more space (4 lines as against two words), but contains more elements (not only wind, but *streptius, nites* and *aquaec*). Lyce is also portrayed as far more cruel and obstinate in the dramatic situation (9–20); in fact the main portion of the
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41. Cf. the paraphrases of Acron and Porphyrio. Ritter failed to separate the dramatic from the supposed situation when he remarked that the garden described was too luxurious for Lyce if she were a Scythian.
poem is devoted to this. Only in one respect is the supposed situation worse: the jealous husband. The two situations are thus carefully contrasted and qualified: the supposed situation, with jealous husband and less foul weather (and therefore less incentive to open the door), yet less reluctant Lyce; the dramatic situation, with husband elsewhere occupied and fouler weather (and therefore greater incentive to open the door), yet entirely obstinate Lyce.

The skill with which Horace has handled the conventional motifs of para-
klausithyron and *exclusus amator* is at once clear. The exaggeration in the ideas, language and entire handling of the traditional material suggests that Horace is deliberately mocking the elegiac poet-lover's stance, or the entire paraklausithyron convention, and showing up its basic ridiculousness and separation from reality. At the end of the poem he himself returns to reality: he will no longer lie at the closed door. Such mockery of the elegiac convention appears elsewhere in Horace's work.⁴² And his insight into and warning against moral behaviour that does not take account of the realities of life brings *carm.* III,10 into close alliance with 1,25.

*Carm. III,16*

In *carm.* III,16,1–4 the motif of the excluded lover is far less obvious, yet, I maintain, firmly evoked:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{inclusam Danaen turris aenea} \\
\text{robustaeque fores et uigilum canum} \\
\text{tristes excubiae munierant satis} \\
\text{nocturnis ab adulteris.}
\end{align*}
\]

Again some standard elements appear: *inclusam, robustae fores, nocturnis ab adulteris*. These have been supplemented by details from the myth of Danaë: *turris aenea, canum uigiliae*. That we in fact have here a reference to the *exclusus amator* motif seems to me proven by the phrase *nocturnis ab adulteris*: like *fores* it is not derived from the myth. With the addition of *inclusam* we are accurately given the basic details of the motif: the secluded girl, the door, the nocturnal paramours.

But *carm.* III,16 is itself not a lover's lament, nor is the poet a complaining lover. The humour is now more subtle. The elaborate precautions to seclude Danaë are in vain, powerless against the influence of 'gold'. The doors are not closed by an obstinate lady, but by an apprehensive father (3–80). And then the reader suddenly becomes aware of a novel and amusing implication: Jupiter, king of gods and of men, has been cast in the role of an *exclusus amator*, albeit a successful one.

Carm. III,26

Copley found this poem the completest form of the paraklausithyron in Horace's work on the grounds that it contained the various phases of the whole process. He argued that the poem is not, as usually understood, a farewell to love with a dedication in a temple of Venus of the appropriate tools of a profession such as one finds in the Greek Anthology, as this would make the surprise ending too harsh. The poem, according to him, has its setting before Chloe's door where a fresh assault on the door is about to take place: paries (4) is the wall of Chloe's house, not of a temple. The entire poem is then a song of the exclusus amator – the closest example in Horace to the original paraklausithyron.

Williams takes fuller account of the very specific details of the setting in lines 3-6 (of which Copley says nothing). How is one to interpret habebit (4) if the scene is outside Chloe's house? We have examples of garlands and inscriptions being affixed to the door or door-post, but none of the soldier-lover's weapons being affixed to the wall. Besides, the reader is given none of the conventional clues to establish the dramatic setting of the motif as being before the beloved's door. There is an obstinate Chloe, but she is absent from the dramatic setting inside the temple of the goddess of love where the retired poet-soldier-lover is about to dedicate the tools of his trade. That he does not do this at the end of the poem comes as a surprise: he is after all not retiring as a soldier in the service of Venus. This inversion is functional: Horace is playing with a literary convention, as he will do again in carm. IV,1.

There are details which refer to the exclusus amator motif: the weapons of the soldier-lover being dedicated to Venus:

hic, hic ponite lucida
funalia et uectes et arcus
oppositis foribus minaces (6–8).

Controversy has surrounded these weapons, and interpretations have ranged from the purely literal to the purely symbolic. The presence of oppositis foribus (8) clearly indicates that we have here the various tools of the exclusus amator. The lucida funalia were obviously used for the nocturnal escapade, the uectes clearly for breaking the door-hinges. 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

44. Williams, 1968, 206ff; cf. also Reitzenstein, 11f; Pasquali, 498–501.
as ludicrous. The catalogue-like listing of the items, the busy and bossy hic, hic ponite, and the exaggeration in minaces combine with the general irony of the poem to poke fun at the literary clichés and self-conscious poses of especially the elegiac poets. The literary clichés, including that of the exclusus amator, do not serve to express personal experience or emotion, though one should ask why Horace turned to this specific theme in the first place. If viewed in relation to his work as a whole, the poem becomes an individual expression of both the carpe diem theme and of man’s reluctance to let go of love and life. In conception and poetic intention the exclusus amator motif has been made functional, mainly as ironical comment, but also as an organic part of Horace’s ‘Themakth’.

From the above discussion emerge the following conclusions about Horace’s use of the paraklausithyron motif: only in one, probably early, ode (III,10) has he approached the ‘original’ form of the paraklausithyron where the poem itself is a lament before the door, although 1,25 preserves the lupanar-song fused with the true paraklausithyron; nowhere does he use the ‘earliest’ form as found in Aristophanes, where the lover addresses his entreaty to a not-unwilling girl while a third person keeps the door closed. Horace, very much like the Anthology poets before and after him, varies the motif in length, tone, context and ingredient elements; seldom is there repetition, the total picture of the motif growing in the reader’s mind over several poems; there is a deliberate invitation to the reader to compare the various occurrences and applaud the poet’s technical finesse. The poet relies on the very conventionality of the motif to evoke it in his reader’s mind; especially in the brief, even cryptic, uses of the motif, one or two conventional details are sufficient to establish the motif and setting. The motif is used to achieve a structural unity both of groups of poems (the pairs III,9 and 10; III,15 and 16; the contrasting 1,25 and III,9) and within
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45. There are parallels for the use of the uectes: uecte atque ancipiti ferro effringam (Lucil. XXIX, 34 L.M.); huc (procede) . . . cum uecti (Ter. Eun. 771). The attempts at explaining or changing et arcus, ever since the gloss in the codex Reginensis informed readers that bow and arrows were to frighten the door-keepers (‘quibus ianitores terrerent’), are well known. The ineffectiveness of such a weapon against a closed door has led to alterations which have never been convincing (Bentley’s securesque, Cuningham’s et harpas, Keller’s ascias). Scholars have preferred to retain et arcus and to give a satisfactory interpretation. Thus arcus has been read as purely symbolic, either ex uoto or as the bow of Cupid or Amor (Reitzenstein, Pasquali, Birt, 1925, 94f, Kiessling); or literally, as real as the other weapons (Heinze), in fact effective as the gloss maintained (Doering), or referring to a kind of bow-shaped stone-thrower or tormentum (Birt, who adds that it is a relic from Horace’s ‘Militarzeit’), or a ‘military engine’ (Page), or small darts thrown in jest by the revellers (Plessis), or a bent, bow-shaped bar to break the door-hinges (Copley, 1956, 160 n.38). Commager, 146–8, and Williams, 1968, 206–8 and 1969, 133, present the most satisfactory view: the weapons are mentioned here as being among those of the soldier who in the literary convention becomes the soldier of Venus, yet keeps the formidable arms as a token of his military preparedness in the cause of love.
individual poems (especially I,25 and III,10). The motif is associated with dominant Horatian themes: mortality, *decorum, carpe diem* (I,25; III,10,15,26), luxury (III,16), and with the amused contemplation of the relationship between man and woman (III,7 and 9). In almost all the cases there is a deliberate exaggeration and ironical mockery of the conventional erotic pose of the lover before the closed door. Horace's own imaginative trademark has been imprinted on his use of the motif and this originality is traceable on the levels of context, tone and even detail. And the reader must conclude that Horace has felt and thought through and in the inherited image: it is organically integrated into the fabric of the poems as a vehicle of expression rather than as an appendage from conventional usage.
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