

Magidenko, Maria
2018 Classics Thesis

Title: Love is an Open Door: The Paraclausithyron in Plautus:

Advisor: Edan Dekel

Advisor is Co-author: None of the above

Second Advisor:

Released: release now

Contains Copyrighted Material: No

Love is an Open Door: The *Paraclausithyron* in Plautus

by

MARIA ESTELLA MAGIDENKO

Edan Dekel, Advisor

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the
Degree of Bachelor of Arts with Honors
in Classics

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

Williamstown, MA

April 30, 2018

Acknowledgements

I first would like to thank Professor Amanda Wilcox, who introduced me to Plautus in the spring of my junior year. When I became interested in Plautus's use of doors in his plays, she encouraged me to pursue the topic further through this thesis. Without Professor Wilcox's support, the idea for this thesis would not have been developed.

Next I would like to thank Professor Edan Dekel, who agreed without hesitation to be my thesis advisor the same day I walked into his office to introduce myself and pitch my thesis idea. He has been supportive and thoughtful, always available to suggest new sources and ideas, and advise me not only on my thesis topic, but also about the Classics at large and other subjects of interest in general. Without his guidance, this thesis would not have come to fruition, nor its writing been the enjoyable experience that it was.

I am grateful to the entire Williams College Classics department, particularly Professors Kerry Christensen and Kenneth Draper, whose wisdom and support have been crucial to my development as a student of the Classics, and to Professor Emerita Meredith Hoppin, whose guidance during my first year of Latin was without equal. I also am indebted to Professor Benjamin Rubin, formerly of Williams College, who encouraged me to continue my Classical studies, even when I most doubted my abilities.

Finally, I am grateful to my family and friends for their never-ending love and support. Without them, I would not be where I am today.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter 1: <i>Militia Amoris</i>	8
Chapter 2: The Plautine <i>Paraclausithyron</i>	20
Chapter 3: Admission in the Plautine <i>Paraclausithyron</i>	35
Chapter 4: Violence	47
Chapter 5: Deception Behind Closed Doors	58
Conclusion	70
Bibliography	78

Introduction

Like all literary texts, plays offer not only the literary and performance themes and motifs that writers and audiences were preoccupied with at the time, but also their views concerning the society that surrounded them, the civilizations that they were in contact with, and the values of the generations of people who came before them. The works produced by the Latin playwright Titus Maccius Plautus are of particular interest, as he lived during a period between two major explosions in literary production. Prior to Plautus's time, a plethora of Greek comedies had already been written.¹ Scholars have determined that Plautus's plays are adaptations of these Greek comedies, many of which have since been lost.² However, since Plautus came after their production and was Roman himself, it should not be surprising that his own plays contain themes that were not present in Greek writings, but were either his own creations or motifs familiar to his Roman audience. It is perhaps interesting to note that many of these themes disappeared for a few generations after Plautus's time before reappearing in Roman love elegy a couple of centuries later.³

I am therefore interested in examining how Plautus adopted and altered traditional Greek literary motifs, and established a precedent for the Roman love elegy that followed his time. In particular, I will investigate how six of Plautus's plays—*Amphitruo*, *Bacchides*, *Casina*, *Curculio*, *Menaechmi*, and *Miles Gloriosus*—address the theme of *militia amoris* (“the soldiery of love”) through the incorporation and alteration of the Greek *paraclausithyron*, the song sung by a lover at his mistress's door following his exclusion from her home,⁴ and through the use of

¹ Moore, T. *The Theater of Plautus*. University of Texas Press, 1998. 3.

² *Ibid.*

³ Copley, F. *Exclusus Amator: A Study in Latin Love Poetry*. Baltimore, 1956. 43.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 1.

doors in general as a physical and metaphorical obstacle to the lover's obtainment of the object of his desire. I have chosen these specific plays because their plots all involve some sort of deception that either aids the lover in his quest to obtain his mistress, hides the lovers' affair from a pimp or unworthy husband, or acts as an obstacle to the affair itself. The door is an integral part to the deception, as it prevents its discovery by outsiders when closed and allows its manifestation when opened. Thus, I will examine the relationships of the characters in these plays with doors in *paraclausithyra* and other scenes involving the lovers or their quests for love through the lens of the deceptive plot.

In *Amphitruo*, this deception consists of Jupiter assuming the form of Amphitryon, a commander at war away from home, in order to possess Amphitryon's pregnant wife, Alcmena. Mercury also takes on a false role by assuming the form of Amphitryon's servant Sosia. The two deities trick Alcmena into accepting Jupiter by convincing her that her husband and his servant have returned from war. However, when the true Sosia arrives at the door, Mercury, still in Sosia's form, drives him away to prevent the discovery of the deities' trick. After a confrontation between Amphitryon and Alcmena, Amphitryon becomes convinced of his wife's infidelity and attempts to prove it. When he returns again, he is driven away by Mercury and Jupiter, who claim that he is an impersonator. However, after Alcmena gives birth to twins, one from her husband and one from Jupiter, Jupiter meets Amphitryon in his own form, and reveals his deception. Thus, in *Amphitruo*, the deception consists of a god and his servant impersonating a husband and his servant to possess a married woman.

In *Miles Gloriosus*, a young woman named Philocomasium is the mistress of a Captain named Pyrgopolinices, but loves a young Athenian named Pleusicles. Her servant Palaestrio and Periplecomenus, a friend of Pleusicles's father who lives next door to the Captain, arrange for

Pleusicles and Philocomasium to have a private room in Periplecomenus's house and make a tunnel between the two houses so that Philocomasium can visit her lover. However, after the Captain's servant Sceledrus sees Pleusicles and Philocomasium next door, Philocomasium pretends to have a twin sister who is staying at the neighbor's house to convince him of her feigned innocence. Further, Palaestrio persuades the Captain that his neighbor's wife is in love with him, and arranges for a courtesan named Acroteleutium to pretend that she is the wife in love with the Captain. The Captain believes this act, and gives Philocomasium away to Pleusicles, who is disguised as the master of the ship on which her twin sister and mother are waiting for her. They set sail while the Captain goes to the house next door, where he is attacked and forced to admit his wrongdoing. Thus, Philocomasium uses deception to trick the Captain's servant into believing that she is a twin, Palaestrio lies to the Captain about Philocomasium's family and the lustful neighboring wife, and Pleusicles pretends to be a sailor. The combination of these deceptions is used to free the beloved and unite her with her lover.

Trickery is similarly used to free the beloved in *Curculio*. Phaedromus is in love with Planesium, who is under the ownership of a pimp. Since Phaedromus does not have the money to buy her freedom, he sends his Parasite Curculio to get the money from a friend. While on his quest, Curculio accidentally meets the military officer who is to purchase Planesium from the pimp. The Captain has left the money for Planesium with a banker with the order that Planesium is to be brought to him after the banker receives a letter signed with the Captain's signet. While the Captain is drunk, Curculio steals his signet, forges the letter with it, and delivers it to the banker, who pays the pimp. Planesium is given to Curculio, who brings her to Phaedromus. When the Captain arrives, Planesium recognizes him as her brother. The Captain gives her to Phaedromus, and gets his money back from the pimp. Therefore, the deception is carried out not

by one of the lovers, but by the servant, since Curculio forges the letter that grants Planesium her freedom. Thus, a servant uses trickery to allow his master to obtain his beloved.

In *Casina*, on the other hand, a servant deceives a married man pursuing a woman who is not his wife. Stalino desires to have Casina, an abandoned girl raised by his wife Cleostrata. However, his son Euthynicus desires to marry the same woman. Cleostrata wants to give Casina in marriage to Chalinus, Euthynicus's armor-bearer, so Euthynicus may possess her. However, Stalino wishes for her to be married to Olympio, the bailiff of his estate, so that he can have her himself. The conflict over which servant is to be married to Casina is settled by a drawing of lots, which Olympio wins. Unhappy with the outcome, Cleostrata dresses Chalinus as Casina on the set wedding day, and allows him to be taken by Olympio to the house next door, which Stalino has arranged as his meeting place with Casina. Upon the discovery that the Casina taken by Olympio is false, Stalino confesses and apologizes to his wife for his shameful lust. The play concludes with Casina's marriage to Euthynicus. Thus, the deception in *Casina* is twofold: Stalino attempts to deceive his wife by arranging for an extramarital affair, and Cleostrata uses a trick to expose his intended affair. Therefore, one deception is used in the pursuit of an affair, and another thwarts it.

However, deceptions are not always intentional in Plautine comedy. In *Bacchides*, Mnesilochus asks his friend Pistoclerus to secure for him his mistress, Bacchis. When he finds her, Pistoclerus meets her twin sister who is also named Bacchis and falls in love with her. When Mnesilochus arrives, he discovers that Pistoclerus is in love with a woman named Bacchis. He believes that this Bacchis is his own Bacchis, so he gives back to his father the money that he and his servant Chrysalus had tricked him out of to free Bacchis from the Captain who owns her. After Mnesilochus realizes that he and Pistoclerus love two different women, his servant

Chrysalus contrives another trick to get money from Nicobulus, Mnesilochus's father. After obtaining this money, Mnesilochus and Pistoclerus enjoy themselves at the house of the Bacchides. Nicobulus discovers the trick that has been played on him, and he and Pistoclerus's father go to the house of the Bacchides for their sons. Ultimately, the women coax the old men to forgive their sons and join them in their revelry. Therefore, although the son and his servant knowingly trick the father in order to obtain the money needed to buy the son's beloved's freedom, the son must seek this money twice, because he mistakes his friend's lover for his own.

Twinning similarly causes mistakes in identity in *Menaechmi*. Two twin brothers of the same name who were separated in childhood appear in the same city, causing confusion concerning their identities. Epidamnian Menaechmus, who is married, is having an affair with a courtesan named Erotium. When Erotium mistakes Syracusan Menaechmus, who has arrived to Epidamnus to find his brother, for his twin brother, she invites him into her home for lunch and revelry. He then has an affair with the woman who is having an affair with his twin brother. After a series of humorous run-ins with other inhabitants of Epidamnus who mistake him for his brother, Syracusan Menaechmus is reunited with his twin, and the brothers leave together for Syracuse. Just as in *Bacchides*, characters are deceived by the presence of twins who share the same name. These mistakes in identity then either allow the young men to have affairs they would not have otherwise or hinder their unions with their beloveds.

With the importance of deception to the plots of these six plays in mind, I will examine how Plautus uses closed doors and *paraclausithyra* in general, changes these traditional scenes to appeal to his Roman audience, and creates a form of these themes that is later used by Roman love elegists in their own portrayals of erotic scenes. I begin by exploring the general theme of *militia amoris* ("the soldiery of love") in Plautine comedy in Chapter 1. Although this theme of

love as a battlefield is commonly seen in later Roman love elegy, I investigate its roots and specifically whether it can be found in Plautine comedy. In addition, since it encompasses the themes explored in subsequent chapters, it is an important topic to define and explore before analyzing the other Greek and Roman themes found in Plautus's plays.

My second chapter is dedicated to analyzing the *paraclausithyra* in Plautus's plays. I explore the Greek and Roman forms of the *paraclausithyron* generally, and then categorize Plautus's scenes according to the definitions of these variations on the theme. In addition, I determine how he has modified this traditional theme to make it uniquely his own. Finally, I examine where Plautine comedy fits in the metamorphosis of the Greek *paraclausithyron* into the Roman version of the scene. Since the scene was originally found in Greek sources, and then later in Roman love elegy in its own distinctly Roman form, I want to determine how "Greek" or "Roman" or uniquely his own Plautus's *paraclausithyra* are.

Chapter 3 further analyzes the *paraclausithyra* found in Plautus's plays by focusing on the admission or rejection of lovers after their lamentations at the beloved's door, and what the outcome of the scene reveals about the characters and plots of the plays and Plautine comedy at large. Again, I examine how "Greek" and "Roman" the scenes are, in order to assess where Plautus fits in the evolution of the use of this theme.

In my fourth chapter, I focus on the distinctly Roman aspects of Plautine *paraclausithyra*, specifically the violence and threatening language found in Plautus's *paraclausithyron* scenes. Since violence becomes a staple of later Roman literature, Plautus's use of it allows us to see how an early Roman author was influenced by the society that surrounded him, and determine whether he was at the forefront of the use of this theme in literature. Further, the use of this motif corroborates the adoption and transformation of traditional Greek themes by Roman authors.

My last chapter concludes the analysis of Plautus's *paraclausithyra* by examining their distinctly Plautine characteristics. In particular, I focus on Plautus's use of *paraclausithyra* and doors in general to further the deceptions by lovers and servants that are so essential to the plays' plots. No other Greek or Roman sources rely on *paraclausithyra* so heavily to illustrate the tricks and lies used in *militia amoris*. Thus, after examining how Plautus either follows the Greek model or sets a precedent for the Roman one, I evaluate Plautine *paraclausithyra* as unique Plautine scenes in their own right.

Finally, I offer my conclusions concerning Plautus's role in the metamorphoses of the *paraclausithyron* and erotic scenes involving doors from the Greek to the Roman styles. Since the scene was originally found in Greek sources, and then proliferated in Roman love writings a couple hundred years after Plautus's time, an analysis of Plautus's use of these themes provides much information concerning the process of integration of foreign motifs and the exchange of ideas between nations in general, ultimately allowing us to make conclusions about the metamorphosis of ideas not only over time, but also across borders, a phenomenon that affected societies not only during Plautus's time, but also continues to affect us today.

Chapter 1: *Militia Amoris*

Many ancient Roman authors, and especially the love elegists of the Augustan period (of which the most notable are Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid⁵), were preoccupied with the concept of *militia amoris* (“the soldiery of love”). *Militia amoris* encompasses the warlike aspects of love, such as the pursuit of the beloved by the lover and the arguments that occur between the lovers.⁶ However, while it is often used to describe direct relations between the two lovers, it can also be applied to any conversations, plans, or actions carried out by the pursuing lover or his accomplices in his quest of obtaining his beloved.

In its earliest uses, *militia amoris* simply referred to the application of any language or terminology reserved for warfare to amorous situations.⁷ The earliest documented use of this motif is found in Sappho 1.25, where Sappho pleads with Aphrodite for her aid in her battle for the woman she desires, referring to the deity as a σύμμαχος (“military ally”). Over one century later, Sophocles became the first author to personify the abstract concept of love itself as a deity, a theme extensively used by later love elegists such as Ovid.⁸ Ἔρως ἀνίκητε μάχην (“Love unconquered in battle,” Soph. *Ant.* 781). *Militia amoris* was later used by Greek authors to portray the intensity of love’s onset, the fight of the lover against the power of love, and his victory over the emotion.⁹ However, portrayals of *militia amoris* have not been found in either Greek or Roman comedy written prior to or during Plautus’s time.¹⁰

⁵ Murgatroyd, P. “‘Militia Amoris’ and the Roman Elegists,” in *Latomus* 34 (1975): 59.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 59.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 60.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 61.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 60.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 61.

Further, during Plautus's lifetime, slavery in any capacity was considered "un-Roman" behavior,¹¹ thereby making *militia amoris* as unacceptable as enslavement to another man as a result of financial ruin, military defeat, or other causes of debt. While ancient Greek texts occasionally portray lovers as soldiers or slaves to their passions, most Roman writings produced prior to the age of love elegy under Augustus's reign do not utilize such imagery.¹² However, since Plautine comedy seeks to mock societal expectations, it should perhaps not be surprising that Plautus incorporates this "un-Roman" metaphor to portray his characters.

Plautus sets his comedic plays in the Greek world and identifies his characters as Greeks. However, the characters often talk about Italy and Rome in a positive manner that is inconsistent with their identities as Greeks. This serves to remind the audience that they are not actually Greek, but Romans playing Greeks.¹³ Through this satire, Plautus can avoid repercussions by claiming that he ridicules Greeks and their practices rather than Romans and their traditions. It also allows him to explore immoral situations and desires that were forbidden to members of Roman society but presumably accepted by the Greek.¹⁴ Therefore, when Plautus shows the "Greek" characters engaging in *militia amoris*, he may be mocking the Greeks for their servitude to the emotion, but also commenting on Roman lovers' actions in their pursuits of their beloveds.

The lover Phaedromus opens the play *Curculio* by explaining to Palinurus that he is at the mercy of the gods and goddesses of love. He considers himself a soldier subservient to these deities' desires (Pl. *Cur.* 3-6):¹⁵

Quo Venus Cupidoque imperat, suadet Amor:

¹¹ Segal, E. *Roman Laughter*. Cambridge, 1968. 111.

¹² Copley 1956, 20.

¹³ Moore 1998, 50.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 51.

¹⁵ All excerpts from the plays are from *Plauti Comoediae*, ed. F. Leo. 2 vols. Berlin, 1895-96. All translations are my own unless otherwise stated.

*si media nox est sive est prima vespera,
si status conductus cum hoste intercedit dies,
tamen est eundum quo imperant ingratiis.*

Where Venus and Cupid command, where Love urges:
if it is the middle of the night or first twilight,
if the day is fixed to engage the enemy,
nevertheless you, unwilling, must go where they command.

The statement that one must disregard even a fixed day to engage his enemy suggests that one was expected to drop everything—even a set judicial court date—to follow Venus and Cupid’s command. However, this statement may also be interpreted to imply that one must disregard a set day of battle, since Phaedromus uses the word *imperant* (“command”), which is often associated with a general’s orders given in a military context. Further, Phaedromus emphasizes that his pursuit of love is a battle by identifying the presence of an enemy to be overcome and conquered. This makes him a soldier in addition to a servant to the deities of love. Therefore, the deities to whom he refers are not only rulers, but also his commanders in the battlefield.

By stating that he must do what Venus and Cupid command whether he himself desires to fulfill those actions or not, Phaedromus implies that he does not possess free will, but is instead a completely subservient slave to the deities he invokes. Since these deities are associated with love and the actions associated with loving, Phaedromus is a servant to these actions themselves as well. Through his invocation of *Amor* (“love”), both a deity and the word for love itself, Phaedromus personifies love, transforming it into a living being to whom he owes his loyalty rather than simply identifying it as a goal or state of being. This makes him a servant to not only the gods, but also to love itself. In this instance of *militia amoris*, Phaedromus sees himself as a loyal soldier fighting for what the deities of love and his passion itself demand of him.

This first expression of Phaedromus's fight for his beloved sets the tone for the rest of the play. Phaedromus does not have the money to buy the freedom of his beloved Planesium, a woman owned by the pimp Cappadox, so he sends Curculio, his Parasite, to obtain money while he continues to visit his beloved in secret, in *media nox* ("the middle of the night"). When Curculio accidentally meets the military officer who is to purchase Planesium, he steals the Captain's signet, forges a letter, and delivers it to the banker who was to pay the pimp for the girl. Planesium is then given to Curculio, who brings her to Phaedromus. Thus, Phaedromus's *militia amoris*, which has been determined by Cupid and Venus to require the cover of the night for its success, results in the obtainment of his beloved.

Plautus's *Casina* similarly portrays love as a battlefield. However, the two opposing sides of the war are immediately identified as the father and the son rather than simply referred to as enemies as in *Curculio* (Pl. *Cas.* 50-57):

*nunc sibi uterque contra legiones parat,
 paterque filiusque, clam alter alterum:
 pater adlegavit vilicum, qui posceret
 sibi istanc uxorem: is sperat, si ei sit data,
 sibi fore paratas clam uxorem excubias foris;
 filius is autem armigerum adlegavit suum,
 qui sibi eam uxorem poscat: scit, si id impetret,
 futurum quod amat intra praeseptis suas.*

Now each prepares legions for himself against the other,
 both the father and the son, each unknown to the other:
 the father has commissioned his estate manager to ask
 her to be a wife to him: he hopes that, if she is given,
 there will be prepared for him, unknown to his wife, night quarters out of doors;
 But the son has commissioned his armor-bearer
 to seek her as a wife for him: he knows that, if he obtains it,
 there will be someone for him to love inside his lodging.

The use of the word *legiones* ("legions") in the first line characterizes the struggle for *Casina* as a battle, since it refers to the two opposing sides in the terms used to describe divisions

of soldiers during warfare. However, since both father and son are responsible for the preparation of these army divisions, they each take on the role of commander of their respective armies rather than mere soldiers. While Phaedromus sees himself as a subservient soldier in his pursuit of his beloved in *Curculio*, the two men of *Casina* see themselves as leading military figures in their fight for the same woman. Thus, the two men take on active rather than passive roles in their *militia amoris*. It is also interesting to note that the son employs the armor-bearer in his pursuit of Casina. This may perhaps imply that Euthynicus has a military advantage over his father and foreshadow the conclusion of the fight between the two men that is followed throughout the rest of the play and results in his eventual victory, his marriage to Casina.

Another aspect of the men's fight to note is the contrast between the natures of victory for father and for son. If Stalino conquers, he will have a secret lover out of doors or outside of the home where his rightful wife resides. In addition, the term *excubias* ("night quarters") refers to the military's sleeping arrangements, emphasizing the secretive and battle-like nature of the father's possession of Casina even after their union. However, if Euthynicus is victorious, he will have a wife inside of his home. While both men are secretive in their strategies of obtaining Casina, a victory for the father will result in employment of further secrecy and deception to maintain his relationship with Casina, while a victory for the son will result in an acceptable union with her. Since the son is ultimately victorious, his cause may be interpreted as the morally correct manifestation of *militia amoris*. However, deception is still utilized to achieve this union, since Cleostrata dresses her servant Chalinus as Casina on the day of her wedding to Stalino's servant Olympio. This trick exposes Stalino's intended affair, and allows for the rightful marriage of Casina to Euthynicus to take place.

The two men are not the sole participants in the battle between father and son, however. Olympio, Stalino's servant, and Chalinus, the servant of Stalino's wife Cleostrata, draw lots to determine which servant will marry Casina. After Olympio is deemed victor and future husband of Casina, Chalinus by chance overhears Stalino's plan to ultimately secretly possess Casina. He considers his overhearing of the plot an unexpectedly positive event: *manifesto teneo in noxia inimicos meos* ("I catch my enemies red-handed in their crime," Pl. *Cas.* 507). This discovery of Stalino's plan gives Chalinus hope: *iam victi vicimus* ("Now conquered we conquer," Pl. *Cas.* 510). While Chalinus was defeated by the enemy during the initial battle for the title of future husband represented by the drawing of lots, he believes that he will be ultimately victorious in the war for Casina's hand in marriage. While Chalinus himself does not ultimately become Casina's husband, the side of the war that he represents, that of Cleostrata and her son, is victorious, since Stalino is denied his illicit lover.

Just as the servants act on behalf of the lovers in *Casina*, a third party acts on behalf of the lover to protect the lover's advantage over his enemy in *Bacchides*. Pistoclus acts on behalf of his friend Mnesilochus to keep the Captain, who was promised either Bacchis or her worth in gold, away from the house in which she resides. If Pistoclus is successful, the woman will not be taken away from the designated place where she is to meet her true lover, Mnesilochus. Pistoclus takes pride in his banishment of the Captain's Parasite, who is sent ahead of the Captain to retrieve that which he was owed (Pl. *Bac.* 631-633):

*Militis parasitus venerat modo aurum petere hinc,
eum ego meis dictis malis his foribus atque hac <platea abegi>;
reppuli, reieci hominem.*

The parasite of the Captain recently came here to ask for gold,
With my bad words I drove off this man from these doors and this street;
I repelled, rejected the man.

Pistoclerus relates to Mnesilochus that he had *reppuli* (“repelled”) and *reieci* (“rejected”) the man, suggesting the use of aggressive behavior to force the enemy to abandon his mission of entry and instead retreat. By using active verbs in his description of his actions, Pistoclerus emphasizes his personal responsibility for the successful defense of the home and subsequent retreat by the opposing side. Pistoclerus’s protection of and loyalty to their friendship result in Mnesilochus’s eventual union with his Bacchis, and forgiveness from his father Nicobulus, whom his servant Chrysalus had tricked to obtain the money necessary to buy Bacchis’s freedom while Pistoclerus guarded the home.

Similarly, in *Amphitruo*, Mercury, who takes on the role of Jupiter’s servant, considers it his duty to protect his father’s secret affair with Amphitryon’s wife Alcmena. As Amphitryon’s slave Sosia approaches the house upon his and his master’s return to the town, Mercury takes on Sosia’s likeness to guard the home through trickery (Pl. *Am.* 268-269):

*itaque me malum esse oportet, callidum, astutum admodum
atque hunc, telo suo sibi, malitia a foribus pellere.*

Thus, it behooves me to be wicked, cunning, very clever,
and by his own weapon, trickery, drive this man from the doors.

Mercury refers to the skill of trickery as a *telum* (“weapon”), making his defense of the home and its enclosed love affair a military strategy. This is further corroborated by Plautus’s use of the word *pellere* (“drive”), which is generally reserved for violent contexts. While Jupiter is not himself involved in this aggression, it nevertheless portrays Jupiter’s possession of Alcmena as a circumstance of *militia amoris*, since it must be protected by battle. Further, Mercury emphasizes that Sosia himself possesses the same weapon of deceit, implying that the enemy in this battle for love is similarly armed. This fight for Alcmena is therefore performed on equal footing—neither side possesses a strategic advantage or position above the other.

After the confrontation with the Parasite, victorious Mercury gloats over his accomplishment, emphasizing his responsibility for the success (Pl. *Am.* 463-468):

*Bene prospere hoc hodie operis processit mihi:
amovi a foribus maximam molestiam,
patri ut liceret tuto illam amplexarier.
iam ille illuc ad erum cum Amphitruonem advenerit,
narrabit servom hinc sese a foribus Sosiam
amovisse;*

Well and successfully this work has proceeded for me today:
I removed from the doors the greatest nuisance,
so that it may be permitted for my father to embrace her safely.
When now he will have come to his master Amphitryon,
he will relate that the servant Sosia has removed him from the doors;

Through his use of active verbs, Mercury once again demonstrates his initiative during the struggle, and therefore his responsibility for the successful banishment of Sosia. In addition, his claim that he has maintained safety for Jupiter is reminiscent of the protection of the safety of citizens during war. Therefore, while he himself is not the lover, Mercury acts as a soldier on Jupiter's behalf to protect his possession of the woman he desires.

Mercury's very action of taking on the likeness of Sosia again shows the two sides of the conflict as equals. Jupiter has taken on Amphitryon's likeness to possess Alcmena, and Mercury has taken on the likeness of Amphitryon's servant to protect his master's relationship. Therefore, since both servants and their masters appear as twins in their battles with each other, it should perhaps not be surprising that the two sides are considered equals. The conclusion of the play, the birth of Alcmena's twins, one fathered by the true Amphitryon and the other by Jupiter, further corroborates the equal positions of the two lovers and may even suggest that both sides are ultimately victorious in this case of *militia amoris*.

Miles Gloriosus also demonstrates protection of the lovers by a third party. Palaestrio, who serves Philocomasium, is determined to protect her and her lover Pleusicles from discovery

by the Captain with whom she resides. When Sceledrus, who serves the Captain, sees the lovers through the roof of the neighboring home, Palaestrio resolves to protect their secret by forcing Sceledrus into silence: *vi pugnandoque hominem caperest certa res* (“The matter is certain that by force and by fighting the man I must capture the man,” Pl. *Mil.* 267). By emphasizing that he must use *vi* (“force”), Palaestrio applies aggressive language reminiscent of warfare to his description of his plan. In addition, he claims that *pugnando* (“by fighting”) he will *capere* (“capture”) Sceledrus, transforming his plan of protection into one of strategic offensive attack. Therefore, Palaestrio participates in *militia amoris* by fighting Sceledrus, another servant and the representative of the opposing side of the conflict. He later further aids the lovers by concocting a plan to trick the Captain into thinking that his neighbor’s wife desires him. This deception prompts the Captain to dismiss Philocomasium, allowing her to reunite with her lover. Therefore, the lover’s servant is essential for the lover’s success in his *militia amoris*.

While Plautus often portrays the pursuit of love as a battle, his play *Bacchides* provides a very different image of affection. While lounging with his own beloved Bacchis, Pistoclerus compares the softness of love with the aggression of warfare (Pl. *Bac.* 68-72):

*Vbi ego capiam pro machaera turturem,
[ubique imponat in manum alius mihi pro cestu cantharum]
pro galea scaphium, pro insigni sit corolla plectilis,
pro hasta talos, pro lorica malacum capiam pallium,
ubi mihi pró equo lectus detur, scortum pro scuto accubet?*

Where I would seize a turtle-dove instead of a sword,
[And where another would set in my hand a bowl instead of a boxing glove]
instead of a helmet a bowl, instead of a badge there would be a wreathed garland,
instead of a javelin dice, instead of a coat of mail I would take a soft cloak,
where instead of a horse a couch would be given to me, a whore instead of a
shield would lie nearby?

Pistoclerus appears to bemoan being a lover, since he considers it a comfortable and soft role that is inferior to the harsh and aggressive one he takes on as a soldier. He contrasts the

turtle-dove, a gentle bird and living pet, with a sword, the deadly weapon of choice during battle. He then compares the bowls he drinks from with the boxing glove and helmet, again invoking tools used either during a boxing fight or warfare, two scenes of violence. While drinking is associated with pleasure, it is also an activity that can cause harm if done in excess. Therefore, this contrast may suggest that while his armor protects Pistoclerus from external harm during noble warfare, his pleasurable drinking can harm him from the inside. However, Pistoclerus compares the badge received during battle with a garland, which is a symbol of accomplishment used during festivals or ceremonies. Thus, he compares the work of battle with the pleasures he enjoys while with his Bacchis. This comparison of work with play is continued when he juxtaposes dice with a javelin, since throwing dice is a game, while a javelin is a tool thrown during battle.

Pistoclerus ends his monologue by once again comparing the softness of pleasure and the hardness of warfare. When he compares his coat of armor with a cloak, he emphasizes that the cloak is soft. This juxtaposes two articles of clothing, one that is uncomfortable and made of hard metal with one that is pleasant to the touch and confers comfort and warmth to its wearer. Similarly, when he compares the horse with the couch, he compares two places on which he can sit, one that is a powerful, moving, useful being, with one that keeps him in a relaxed state in a fixed place. Pistoclerus concludes his speech with the comparison between a whore and a shield, the former another vessel of pleasure and the latter a tool for his protection. In addition, the similarity in spelling and pronunciation between the words *scortum* and *scuto* suggests that Plautus chose to pair these items due to their similarity in sound in addition to their usefulness as contrasting images.

Collectively, these comparisons allow Plautus to provide contrasting images of the house of the lover and the battlefield. The former is a place of revelry and pleasure, while the latter is the sphere of work and aggression. These juxtapositions also illustrate how Plautus uses metaphors and other comparative language throughout *Bacchides* to describe the *meretrix*, the pleasures contained within her household, and the tools that she utilizes to keep her admirers.¹⁶ Although these comparisons appear to provide images of love and war that cannot be reconciled, they may also show how Bacchis's house itself is a battlefield where the weapons and armor required for war are replaced by the tools and clothing required for participation in revelry and playful competition such as dice. It becomes the location of a fight of a different nature, one for pleasure rather than conquest.

In her book *Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery*, Elaine Fantham claims that portrayals of love as warfare do not appear in Plautus, since his plots require unity of lovers in the face of a common enemy.¹⁷ If we are to consider the later application of *militia amoris* as the direct struggle between lovers and their arguments, this is indeed true, since Plautus's plays do not possess scenes consisting of two lovers directly fighting with each other. However, if we are to consider the earliest and most general application of *militia amoris* referring to the use of military language in any erotic situation, *militia amoris* is indeed found in the plays I examined. It is interesting to note that, while *Bacchides*'s Pistoclus attempts to provide descriptions of love and war that are clearly in opposition, he achieves the opposite. He demonstrates that both the pursuit of love and the conduction of war use tools and strategies to achieve their goals. While these items and plans are different by nature, they are used in a similar setting. Therefore, although Pistoclus aims to separate *militia* and *amor*, he ultimately unites them.

¹⁶ Duckworth, G. E. *The Nature of Roman Comedy*. Princeton, 1952. 337.

¹⁷ Fantham, E. *Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery*. Toronto, 1972. 32.

In *Amphitruo*, *Bacchides*, *Casina*, and *Miles Gloriosus*, we see servants acting on behalf of their masters to either provide their masters with an advantage over their enemies in possessing their beloved or protect existing love affairs. In these plays, we do not see the lovers directly engaged in the battle, but instead observe representatives of one side fighting those of the opposing side. Since these battles are fought on behalf of lovers for the cause of love, these are indeed scenes of *militia amoris* as defined by the earliest and simplest definition of the term.

Of the plays examined, only *Curculio* demonstrates a lover directly involved in *militia amoris*. Although Phaedromus does not fight with his beloved, he does identify himself as a soldier fighting for the deities of love and for love itself, much like the lovers seen in writings by early Greek authors such as Sophocles and Euripides. Rather than allowing others to fight on his behalf in his quest, he must take initiative to wage war himself. However, unlike the servants in the other plays who claim responsibility for their successes, Phaedromus sees himself as an unquestioning follower of his deities who does only as he is instructed. He lacks the free will to develop his own strategy of attack that the others possess.

Although *militia amoris* was seen as an “un-Roman” preoccupation during Plautus’s time, he incorporates this concept into his plays to demonstrate its actual prolific use not only in Greek, but also in Roman society. While his plays do not show direct conflicts between lovers, they illustrate the protection of lovers and their relationships through *militia amoris* waged by the lovers or by their servants and friends on their behalf. Further, these battles are oftentimes waged on the doorstep of the house enclosing the beloved, with either the true lover or the opposing force attempting to gain entry into the dwelling. Therefore, the concept of *militia amoris* is often intertwined with scenes of *paraclausithyron* illustrating the shut-out lover at the doorstep of his mistress, and topic of the following chapter.

Chapter 2: The Plautine *Paraclausithyron*

The *paraclausithyron* originated as a Greek motif, found in any genre of literature as long as the subject of the writing pertained to love.¹⁸ The term refers to the song that the drunk and garlanded lover sings at his beloved's door following a *symposium* ("drinking party"), begging her to either admit him to her home or to come out to see him.¹⁹ It is often found in conjunction with the *komos* (the revelry following a *symposium*), whose primary elements consist of the lover, his beloved, and the lover's attempt to visit his beloved.²⁰ In the Greek tradition, the *paraclausithyron* also consists of two standard *topoi* ("secondary elements"): the young man expresses the hope that he will find his girl alone, and he acknowledges that his visit is driven by alcohol and sexual desire.²¹ Generally, as long as the scene contains the main elements consisting of a lover's passage through the streets, his exclusion from his beloved's home, and his lament at his beloved's door, the scene may be appropriately classified as a *paraclausithyron*.²²

The door itself is an important element of the *paraclausithyron*, since the complaints and entreaties of the *exclusus amator* ("excluded lover") must occur outside of the closed—and possibly even guarded—door of his beloved.²³ In its literal sense, the door provides a division between the *domus*, the *locus* of a love affair or simply family life, and the public sphere of the *forum*. Yet, the door itself may also represent the nature of desire. While the door keeps the lover from accessing the object of his desire, there exists a possibility that it may be unbarred, allowing

¹⁸ Copley 1956. 1.

¹⁹ Yardley, J.C. "The Elegiac *Paraclausithyron*," *Eranos* 76 (1978): 19.

²⁰ Cairns, F. *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*. Edinburgh, 1972. 6.

²¹ Yardley 1978, 20.

²² Copley 1956, 4.

²³ Nappa, C. "Elegy on the Threshold: Generic Self-Consciousness and the Reader in Propertius 1.16." *Classical World* 100 (2007): 57.

the lover to be admitted into the home.²⁴ Similarly, a mistress prevents her pursuer from immediately sexually possessing her, yet there exists the possibility that she may ultimately yield to him and allow him access to her body.

The door should be a neutral entity, an impartial object that cannot be swayed by threats or flattery.²⁵ Yet, the lovers of the Latin *paraclausithyron*, found most often in Roman love elegy, often address the door itself and beg it to open rather than calling for the mistress inside.²⁶ Prior to the adoption of the Greek *paraclausithyron* scene, the Romans had a folk song that was sung to the shut door in an attempt to persuade it to open on its own.²⁷ This preexisting tradition allowed Romans to associate the lover's lament outside of his beloved's door encountered in the Greek *paraclausithyron* with their own shut-door song, and merge the two motifs into a cohesive, distinctly Roman one. In their version of the *paraclausithyron* scene, Romans view the door as the substitute speaker for the beloved, speaking in the interests of the beloved and against those of the lover.²⁸ For example, in his elegy 1.16, Propertius addresses the door in his plea for admission (Prop. *Eleg.* 1.16.17-18):

*Ianua vel domina penitus crudelior ipsa,
quid mihi tam duris clausa taces foribus?*

Door, perhaps crueler than my mistress inside,
why are you so quiet, your hard doors closed to me?

In his speech to the door, Propertius refers to the door directly, and even implies a relationship between it and his mistress through his comparison of the door guarding his mistress to his mistress inside of the home herself. Further, through its role as the object of address, the

²⁴ Nappa 2007, 58.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 59.

²⁶ Copley 1956, 36.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 28.

²⁸ Cairns 1972, 216.

door takes on a mind of its own rather than remaining an inanimate object as in the Greek tradition. As a result, while Greek lovers address their pleas directly to their beloved beyond the door, Roman lovers must address the doors directly if they are to hope for the possibility of entry.

Plautus's plays thus sit at the crossroads between the distinctly Greek and Roman versions of the *paraclausithyron*. When Menaechmus has an argument with his wife in *Menaechmi*, she banishes him and threatens to exclude him from her home indefinitely. However, rather than begging her to readmit him, Menaechmus utters a monologue expressing that he does not mourn his exclusion from his home (Pl. *Men.* 668-674):

*Male mi uxor sese fecisse censet, quom exclusit foras;
quasi non habeam, quo intromittar, alium meliorem locum.
si tibi displiceo, patiundum: at placuero huic Erotio,
quae me non excludet ab se, sed apud se occludet domi.
nunc ibo, orabo ut mihi pallam reddat, quam dudum dedi;
aliam illi redimam meliorem. heus, ecquis hic est ianitor?
aperite atque Erotium aliquis evocate ante ostium.*

My wife thinks she has inflicted harm onto me, when she shut me out of doors;
as if I did not have another better place to be admitted.
If I am displeasing to you, I must endure it: but I will please this Erotium,
who will not shut me out from herself, but will shut me up at her house.
Now I will go, ask her to return the mantle to me, which I gave her a while ago;
I will buy her another better one. Hey, is any doorkeeper here?
Someone open and call Erotium before the door.

Rather than pursuing his wife, Menaechmus laughs at her attempt to harm him by shutting him out of the house. Menaechmus's language of inside and outside establishes the differences between the women and their homes, as well as their power over his fate with respect to his entrance to or exclusion from the house.²⁹ He contrasts the displeasure he brings to his wife (*displiceo*) with the pleasure he brings to Erotium's household (*placuero*), in order to justify

²⁹ McCarthy, K. *Slaves, Masters, and the Art of Authority in Plautine Comedy*. Princeton, 2000. 67.

his abandonment of his home in favor of his mistress's. He also compares his wife's exclusion with Erotium's inclusion of him within her home. This provides further praise for Erotium and justification for Menaechmus's favoritism toward her. In addition, it provides a clear division between the place where Menaechmus belongs as a result of his status as *paterfamilias* but is excluded from, and the place where he should not be present according to moral convention but is actually able to reside. Since Menaechmus still possesses a reliable and more pleasant home to enter, he does not view his exclusion from his house as a loss, and decides to not pursue his wife. Menaechmus's lack of desire for his wife explains the absence of a *paraclausithyron* scene at his own doorstep following his banishment from his own home by his wife.

However, when Menaechmus approaches Erotium's home in the last two lines of this scene, he calls for someone to come open the door, admit him to the house, and summon Erotium to the doors. This is reminiscent of the Greek *paraclausithyron* scene, as Menaechmus directly addresses those living behind the doors. In addition, this scene contains the three elements of a standard Greek *paraclausithyron*: having been excluded from his own home (*exclisit*), Menaechmus walks to his mistress's home next door (*ibo*), and, upon finding the door closed, he calls out to those beyond the door to admit him (*aperite*). Although neither of the traditional Greek secondary elements is found in this scene, the presence of these three primary elements allows for its classification as a *paraclausithyron*.

When Erotium also shuts Menaechmus out of her house, Menaechmus attempts to pursue her, which he had not done when his wife had shut the door on him (Pl. *Men.* 696-699):

*heús tu, tibi dico, mane,
redi. etiamne astas? etiam audes mea reverti gratia?
abiit intro, occlusit aedis. nunc ego sum exclusissimus:
neque domi neque apud amicam mihi iam quicquam creditur.*

Hey you, I am talking to you, wait,

come back. Do you not even now stay? Will you dare return even for my sake?
She has gone inside, she has shut up her house. Now I am most excluded:
neither at home nor at the house of my mistress now is anything credited to me.

Menaechmus, once again in the true Greek *paraclausithyron* style, directly addresses his mistress rather than the closed door. Rather than simply asking to be admitted, he pleads for her return, which is characteristic of the passionate *paraclausithyra* found in Greek sources. In the last two lines, Menaechmus laments his exclusion, which he had not done earlier outside of his own home. It is interesting to note that he pities his exclusion from both his own home and that of Erotium, perhaps indicating that he may have some affection for his wife as well as for his mistress. Alternatively, he may simply be lamenting the absence of a place for him to sleep rather than his loss of these women whom he should love. Through his use of the word *creditur* (“credited”), Menaechmus implies that neither woman trusts him. Further, since he is not welcome in either home, he cannot expect to find love or physical comfort in either place. As a result of his exclusion, he lacks both the emotional support that a woman can provide and the physical support provided by the home itself.

He later laments his situation again, specifically emphasizing the loss of both his own home and that of his mistress (Pl. *Men.* 963-965):

domum ire cupio: úxor non sinit;
huc autem nemo intromittit. nimis proventum est nequiter.
hic ero usque: ad noctem saltem, credo, intromittar domum.

I want to go home: my wife does not allow it;
But here [at Erotium’s house] no one admits me. Exceedingly wickedly this has progressed.
Here I will always be: at night at least, I think, I will be admitted at home.

Menaechmus does not mention the loss of either woman, but instead explicitly mourns the loss of the two homes. In addition, he refers to his wife by her title, but does not use Erotium’s name. He instead simply states that no one will admit him at this second house.

Menaechmus clearly expresses pity for his position as a man excluded from the places where he had been previously accepted and considered the master rather than as a rejected lover.

At the conclusion of his lament, Menaechmus resolves to remain at the doorstep, although it is not specified at which one. He expresses the hope that someone will eventually admit him at home. Menaechmus relies on womanly pity in his quest to regain entry to the home. This resembles the Greek *paraclausithyron* where the lover expresses hope that he will either be admitted or his beloved will exit her home to be with him. However, he yet again does not express desire for the woman personally, but simply for a place to stay.

Clearly, the women of *Menaechmi* not only use the closed door as an obstacle to Menaechmus's entry and resultant obtainment of his desire, but also utilize exclusion out of doors as a punishment. Prior to banishing him from the home, Menaechmus's wife threatens his perpetual exclusion if he does not return the mantle he had taken from her and given to Erotium: *nam domum numquam introibis, nisi feres pallam simul* ("for you will never enter the house, unless you bring the mantle at once," Pl. *Men.* 661-662). She therefore uses exclusion as a punishment for Menaechmus's infidelity and poor treatment of her. Similarly, Erotium refuses to admit Menaechmus unless he brings her money as repayment for his ill treatment of her (Pl. *Men.* 692-694):

*tu huc post hunc diem pedem intro non feres, ne frustra sis;
quando tu me bene merentem tibi habes despiciatui,
nisi feres argentum, frustra me ductare non potes.*

After this day, you will not set foot into this house, lest you be deceived;
since you hold me, deserving well from you, in contempt,
unless you bring money, you will be disappointed, you cannot take me.

Erotium believes that Menaechmus is mocking her by demanding the return of the mantle he had given her, not knowing that she had just given it away to his twin brother rather than to

him. As a result of this misunderstanding, Erotium becomes offended at his request, and excludes Menaechmus from her home until he can provide compensation for his transgression. Like Menaechmus's wife, Erotium uses the shut door as a boundary with Menaechmus, and his exclusion as punishment for his behavior.

The use of the shut door as punishment is found not only in *Menaechmi*, but in Plautus's other plays as well. In *Casina*, after Stalino discovers that he has been tricked by his wife and humiliated in front of his household, he considers running away from home (Pl. *Cas.* 950-951):

*nūnc agam nēscio, nisi ut improbos
famulos imiter ac domo fugiam.*

Now I do not know what to do, except to imitate worthless
servants and flee the house.

While his flight would be done under his own volition rather than forced upon him by his wife, Stalino claims that he sees it as his sole possible plan of action, because he no longer feels welcome at his own home. Since he states that such a flight is reminiscent of that of worthless servants who have wronged their masters, Stalino implies his identification with such people of low standing and admits his guilt in front of his household. While flight can be used as a route to escape punishment, Stalino views his humiliation as the true retribution for his disgrace. His flight will allow him to avoid continued shame in the aftermath of his punishment.

In Plautine comedy, women are not the only characters to drive their lovers out of doors. Men often use the threat of driving their wives or mistresses out of doors to force them into submission or punish them for being unable to satisfy their desires. In *Casina*, Myrrhina warns Cleostrata that if she meddles in her husband's business, he will drive her out of the house: *ei fóras, mulier* ("Out of doors with you, woman," Pl. *Cas.* 211). Through her warning, Myrrhina emphasizes that being driven out of the home is an undesirable outcome. Further, the warning

demonstrates that Stalino has the power and right to banish Cleostrata if she displeases him. It is therefore especially humorous that Stalino feels as though he must flee his home following the exposure of his intended affair with Casina. Stalino and Cleostrata's roles have been reversed—Cleostrata has assumed the power that had originally been attributed to her husband.

In *Menaechmi*, on the other hand, Menaechmus does not consider his infidelity a shameful affair. Instead, he attempts to assert his power over his meddling wife by threatening to banish her (Pl. *Men.* 112-113):

*praeterhac sí mihi tále post hunc diem
faxis, faxó foris vídua visás patrem.*

Moreover, if after this day you do such a thing as this to me,
I will make it so you go out of our doors to visit your father as a divorcee.

Since Menaechmus does not desire to lose access to his home, he must ensure that his wife is subservient and loyal to him. In the first line, Menaechmus attempts to claim that his wife had wronged him by interfering in his affairs. The banishment that he then threatens in the second line is to be interpreted as punishment for her wrongdoing. Menaechmus uses the shut door to threaten to both deprive his wife of her home and to shame her in front of her father. However, Menaechmus does not ultimately banish his wife until the auction of his home, so this threat of exclusion remains unfulfilled.

Similarly, when the Captain hears the rumor that his neighbor's wife desires him in *Miles Gloriosus*, he searches for a way to rid himself of his current mistress. When he is told that Philocomasium's mother and sister have come to town to take her away, he sees the "visit" as an opportunity to shut his mistress out of doors: *Hercle occasionem lepidam, ut mulierem excludam foras* ("Indeed, wonderful opportunity for me to turn the woman out of doors," Pl. *Mil.* 977). Since the Captain is no longer satisfied with his mistress, he is eager to be rid of her when the

opportunity arises to obtain a better lover. He recognizes that he has the power to do with his mistress as he wishes, and threatens to exercise that power to remove the obstacle preventing him from pursuing his neighbor's wife.

However, the traditional *paraclausithyron* was not an exclusion from the home endured as punishment for ill treatment. It was simply seen as the trial a lover must endure prior to either his success or failure in gaining entry to his beloved's lodging. When Philocomasium's lover Pleusicles comes to retrieve her from the Captain's home in *Miles Gloriosus* and knocks on the door to make his presence known to his lover, her servant Palaestrio answers as though he had not been expecting him (Pl. *Mil.* 1297-1298):

pal. *Adulescens, quid est?*
quid vis? quid pultas? plevs. *Philocomasium quaerito.*

pal. Young man, what is it?
What do you want? Why do you knock? **plevs.** I am seeking Philocomasium.

This scene mimics the Greek *paraclausithyron*, since Pleusicles carries out the three essential components of the scene: upon his arrival to Philocomasium's residence, he knocks on her closed door and expresses the wish to see her. In addition, Pleusicles addresses the people beyond the door rather than the door itself. However, since the Captain had been intending to rid himself of his mistress, and Palaestrio had already previously planned her departure from the Captain's home, this scene is simply a mockery of the *paraclausithyron*. The scene at the door is a formality performed by Pleusicles and Palaestrio in the presence of the Captain so that he will not suspect that this visit was a planned escape to unite the girl with her lover.

Although Plautus utilizes the Greek *paraclausithyron* model for the scenes I previously examined, his play *Curculio* shows the beginning of the assimilation and revision of the Greek scene by Roman writers. When Phaedromus approaches the door with a procession of slaves,

presumably after drinking at a *symposium*, he directly addresses the door of his beloved's home (Pl. *Cur.* 15-16):

*Huic proximum illud ostiumst oculissimum.
salve, valuistin?*

Nearby this is that door, most beloved to my eye.
Hello, are you well?

By referring to the door as *oculissimum* (“most beloved to my eye”), Phaedromus adds sentimental significance to the inanimate object. When Palinurus imitates him by saying *ostium occlusissimum* (“most closed door,” Pl. *Cur.* 16) in response, he transforms the meaning of the phrase, once again making the door an inanimate object and emphasizing the presence of an important aspect of the Roman *paraclausithyron* scene, that of the closed door that is unlikely to be opened. Since Phaedromus speaks directly to the door rather than calling for someone inside such as a servant or his lover herself, this scene is reminiscent of the Roman *paraclausithyron*, where the lover speaks to the door rather than to a person. In addition, his direct address to the door personifies the door itself, which is a distinctly Italian literary theme.³⁰

After greeting the door, Phaedromus sprinkles it with wine, which has been previously interpreted as an action substituting for the knocking on the door that accompanies the lover's song in traditional Greek *paraclausithyra*.³¹ After “knocking” on the door, Phaedromus coaxes the door to open (Pl. *Cur.* 88-89):

*Agite bibite, festivae fores;
potate, fite mihi volentes propitiae.*

Come on, drink, genial door;
Drink deeply, be for me willingly propitious.

³⁰ Copley 1956, 29.

³¹ Frangoulidis, S. “Transformations of Paraclausithyron in Plautus' *Curculio*,” in *Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature*, ed. T. Papanghelis et al. Göttingen, 2013. 272-273.

Phaedromus once again directly addresses the door, which is characteristic of the Roman *paraclausithyron*. By asking the door *bibite* (“drink”) and *potate* (“drink deeply”), and referring to it as *festivae* (“genial”), Phaedromus invokes traditional Italian religious language.³² This demonstrates the adaptation of the Greek *paraclausithyron* to preexisting Roman traditions, perhaps even implying that Plautus’s Roman audience would have received this scene as a familiar motif rather than a foreign, distinctly Greek one. Following these initial requests, Phaedromus sings to the bolts on the door (Pl. *Cur.* 147-155):

*Péssuli, heus péssuli, vós salutó lubens,
vos amo, vos volo, vos peto atque obsecro,
géríte amanti mihi mórem, amoeníssumi,
fíte causa mea ludii barbari,
sussilite, obsecro, et mittite istanc foras,
quae mihi misero amanti ebibit sanguinem.
hoc vide ut dormiunt pessuli pessumi
nec mea gratia commovent se ocíus.
re spicio, nihili meam vos gratiam facere.*

Bolts, hey bolts, I greet you gladly,
I love you, I want you, I ask you and I beg you,
most pleasantly oblige me in my love,
for my sake become Roman acrobats,
jump, I pray, and send this one out of doors,
who is drinking the blood from me miserably loving.
Look at this, how the worst bolts sleep
nor for my sake do they move themselves quicker.
I see that you do not value my good will at all.

The song that Phaedromus sings is a modified version of the traditional Italian folk song sung to door bolts that was thought to force the doors to open on their own accord.³³ Therefore, the scene contains two major deviations from the Greek *paraclausithyron* that indicate its transformation into a distinctly Roman *paraclausithyron* scene: there is an absence of literal door

³² Copley 1956, 29.

³³ Copley 1956, 31.

knocking, and the lover's address is made to the door—or rather the bolts on the door—instead of to the beloved enclosed in the home.³⁴

Phaedromus's address to the bolts contains sensual language reserved for lovers. He tells the doors *vos amo, vos volo* ("I love you, I want you"), which are proclamations generally reserved for one's beloved. However, he goes on to ask them to *gèrite* ("oblige") him in his love affair, which is reminiscent of a command given to one's servant rather than to one's beloved. Therefore, he treats the door not only as a lover, but also subservient in his quest to meet his beloved. This is reinforced when he uses the phrases *causa mea* ("my cause") and *mea gratia* ("my sake"), since he asks the bolts to carry out his wishes for him much like a slave or servant would carry out his master's tasks. At the same time, he prays to the doors by singing *vos peto atque obsecro* ("I ask you and I beg you") and again *obsecro* ("I pray") a few lines later. While he asks the bolts to serve him, he prays to them as though they are deities or simply in authoritative positions higher than his own. This praying also reinforces the scene's religious connotations. Phaedromus's placement of the bolts in a superior position is reiterated when he tells the bolts *nihili meam vos gratiam facere* ("you do not value my good will at all"). He petitions the bolts, much like one petitions a leader, master, or benefactor, to act in his favor. Therefore, he at once treats the bolts on the door as his beloved, his subservient, and his master.

While he demonstrates these distinctly Roman characteristics of the *paraclausithyron*, Plautus still maintains many aspects of the Greek version of the scene. Phaedromus is seen drunkenly walking to his beloved's door, "knocking" with his wine sprinkling, performing a song begging the door to open, and then lamenting his exclusion. The scene also contains the two *topoi* of the Greek scene. Since Phaedromus asks the bolts *mittite istanc foras* ("send this one out

³⁴ Frangoulidis 2013, 275-276.

of doors”), he expresses his wish for his beloved to visit him alone at her doorstep. In addition, he acknowledges that he is being driven by love through his uses of the word *amanti*, meaning “loving.” To further combine the Greek and Roman aspects of this scene in his comedy, Plautus has Phaedromus ask the bolts to be *ludii barbari* (“Roman actors”). In comedy, *barbarus* means “Roman.” Since Plautus’s characters are Greek, but Roman actors perform his plays, the reference to Romans by Greek characters allows Plautus to add humor to this “Greek” scene through the expression of praise for the Roman people from the mouths of Greek characters.³⁵

While the *paraclausithyron* was originally a Greek scene whose adoption by Roman authors is generally dated to the period of love elegy under Augustus, Plautine comedy clearly shows the beginning of the assimilation of this motif to the Roman tradition. In *Menaechmi*, Menaechmus addresses his mistress beyond the door and pleads with her as in the traditional Greek *paraclausithyron*. While *topoi* of the scene consisting of an expression of desire to find the beloved alone and declaration of inebriation are not present, the primary elements—the walk to the door, the knocking on the door, and lament at exclusion—are all observed at Erotium’s doorstep. However, while the shut door is generally used to allow the mistress to delay the pursuer’s progress toward realizing his desire, both Menaechmus’s wife and Erotium exercise the power of the shut door to punish Menaechmus for his infidelity and poor treatment of the women. In *Casina*, exclusion is similarly seen as a punishment, since Stalino ponders leaving his home to escape the aftermath of his disgrace and his feeling of being unwelcome at his own home.

In Plautine comedy, not only women, but also men use the power of the shut door to punish their spouses. In *Menaechmi*, Menaechmus threatens to send his wife back to her father in

³⁵ Copley 1956, 32.

disgrace for being a nuisance to her husband. He uses this threat of throwing his wife out of doors to prevent her from meddling in his affairs outside of the home. In *Casina*, we see a similar warning, since Myrrhina warns Cleostrata that her continuous involvement in Stalino's affairs will provoke him to throw her out of his home. Since both Menaechmus's wife and Cleostrata eventually gain control over the home, these threats are not realized, but instead turned toward their husbands. Therefore, they assume the power that had originally been attributed to the *paterfamilias* of their households.

In *Miles Gloriosus*, we see imitations of both the threat of exclusion by the *paterfamilias* and the traditional Greek *paraclausithyron* scene. When the Captain is told of his neighbor's wife's desire for him, he immediately considers throwing his own mistress out of his home in order to more easily possess his neighbor's wife. He considers this banishment a punishment for his mistress for not sufficiently pleasing him. However, when Pleusicles comes to take Philocomasium away, a mock *paraclausithyron* is carried out at the Captain's doorstep, undetected by the Captain. He does not know that the young man taking Philocomasium away to "her mother and sister" is actually her lover whom she has been visiting in secret at his neighbor's home. In this scene, the door to the Captain's home must be knocked on and opened if Philocomasium is to escape from the Captain. However, the Captain remains under the impression that she is being taken away according to his own desire for her removal, rather than according to a plan concocted by Palaestrio and the two lovers.

In his play *Curculio*, Plautus incorporates distinctly Roman themes into his portrayal of the *paraclausithyron* scene of Phaedromus at the door of his beloved. The primary Greek elements of the drunken procession to the home, "knocking" on the door represented by the sprinkling of the wine, and lover's lament are clearly demonstrated, along with the secondary

elements consisting of the drunk lover and the lover's hope to find the object of his desire alone. However, Phaedromus directly addresses the door's bolts, which is characteristic of the Roman tradition. In addition, he uses religious language previously reserved for Italian liturgy, and the song itself is an Italian folk song used to charm a door into opening on its own, indicating the beginning of the assimilation of the Greek *paraclausithyron* to fit preexisting Roman cultural practices and motifs.

The combination of the elements of the traditional Greek *paraclausithyron* and Roman values in his plays demonstrates Plautus's contribution to the metamorphosis of the scene into a Roman literary motif. Although the proliferation of the *paraclausithyron* scene in Roman literature primary occurred during the Augustan age, Plautine comedy already began using this scene to satirize its characters and their erotic ventures. But what happens to the lovers after their expressions of love and lament during the *paraclausithyron*? To determine the power of such a scene, the successes and failures of the pursuers' attempts at entry must be examined.

Chapter 3: Admission in the Plautine *Paraclausithyron*

In Greek literature, the *paraclausithyron* is found in two distinct forms: the dramatic and non-dramatic. In the dramatic form, all three elements of the traditional *paraclausithyron* are found: the rowdy procession, the lover's knocking on the door, and his lament. The lover's lament may end with either the lover's rejection or admission into the home, depending on the requirements of the story's plot.³⁶ The earliest example of a *paraclausithyron* of the dramatic type has been found in Aristophanes's *Ecclesiazusae*. After the lover comes to his beloved's door and proclaims his love for her, she similarly calls for Eros to let him in (Aristoph. *Eccl.* 958-959):

καὶ ποιήσον τόνδ' ἐς εὐνήν
τὴν ἐμὴν ἰκέσθαι.

And make him come to my bed.³⁷

The lover then pleads for admission in response (Aristoph. *Eccl.* 960-963):

δεῦρο δὴ δεῦρο δὴ,
καὶ σύ μοι καταδραμοῦσα
τὴν θύραν ἄνοιξον
τὴνδ' : εἰ δὲ μή, καταπεσὼν κείσομαι.

Hither now, hither now,
Run down and for me
Open the door.
If you do not, I may fall down and lie here.³⁸

Since the beloved mirrors the lover's emotions, this *paraclausithyron* is used not to demonstrate the lover's difficult trials in his quest of gaining access to his beloved, but to express the extent of the two lovers' sentiments toward each other and introduce their reunion. While the

³⁶ Copley 1956, 7.

³⁷ Text and translation taken from Copley 1956, 8.

³⁸ Ibid.

lover threatens to stay at the doorstep if his beloved does not open the door, this threat is not to be considered sincere, since the beloved clearly expresses her desire to see him. Therefore, the *paraclausithyron* acts as a display of emotion and prelude to the lovers' reunion rather than a scene in itself demonstrating the lover's anguish at his exclusion from his beloved's home.

In the non-dramatic *paraclausithyron*, on the other hand, the lover's song is the focal point of the scene, and the scene necessarily concludes with the lover's rejection, although it may not be explicitly portrayed. While the dramatic *paraclausithyron* can become impassioned—even violent—during the lover's procession and reaction to exclusion, the non-dramatic generally remains romantic-sentimental, and verbal rather than physical.³⁹ There are few surviving early Greek sources containing non-dramatic *paraclausithyra*, but the earliest fragment that has been preserved was written by Alcaeus: δέξαι με κωμάσδοντα, δέξαι, λίσσομαι σε λίσσομαι ("Receive me as I come reveling, receive me, I pray, I pray," Alc. fr. 374 Voigt).⁴⁰

Among the remaining Greek examples, non-dramatic *paraclausithyra* are more abundant in number than dramatic, with most such scenes occurring in epigrams or idylls rather than lyrics or elegies,⁴¹ such as the following idyll by Theocritus (Theocr. 3.6-9):

Ω χαρίεσσ' Ἀμαρυλλί, τί μ' οὐκέτι τοῦτο κατ' ἄντρον
παρκύπτουσα καλεῖς τὸν ἐρωτύλον; ἦ ῥά με μισεῖς;
ἦ ῥά γέ τοι σιμὸς καταφαίνομαι ἐγγύθεν ἦμεν,
νύμφα, καὶ προγένειος; ἀπάγξασθαί με ποησεῖς.

O beautiful Amaryllis, why do you not look out from your cave
inviting me in, your sweetheart? Or do you hate me?
Or at least do I look snub-nosed nearby,
Nymph, and shaggy? You will make me hang myself.

³⁹ Copley 1956, 7.

⁴⁰ Text and translation taken from Copley 1956, 14.

⁴¹ Copley 1956, 14.

Most frequently, the *paraclausithyron* was used to demonstrate the pains of love such as rejection, sacrifice, heartache, loneliness, deceit, and the tears the lover sheds over his beloved. The beloved, often a mistress, is portrayed as a heartless and cruel manipulator of the helpless, subservient lover who cannot fight against his passions or the deities of love who have driven him to her doorstep. In response to his exclusion, the lover rarely takes action to fight against his situation, but instead complains about his position, expresses the hope that his beloved suffers as he has, or warns her that her tools for manipulation, beauty and youth, will eventually abandon her as a result of their temporary nature.⁴² The non-dramatic *paraclausithyron* does not necessarily have to be a literal scene of exclusion at the door, but it must be an expression of the lover's feelings about his rejection. It is a musing on the nature of love rather than the portrayal of a lover's physical exclusion.⁴³

As the Greek *paraclausithyron* was adopted by Roman elegiac poets, most prominently Ovid, Propertius, and Tibullus, its primary elements, such as its setting in front of the beloved's home and address made at a *shut* door, were conserved. Like the Greek lover, the Roman lover bemoans his situation, expressing pity for himself and his trials, resentment of his ill treatment by his mistress, and helplessness at the hands of the gods and his beloved.⁴⁴ However, while the Greek *paraclausithyron* can be found in either the dramatic or non-dramatic form, often leaving the fate of the lover uncertain, the Roman *paraclausithyron* does not do so. In the Roman *paraclausithyron*, the door always remains closed, despite the lover's most adamant pleas.⁴⁵ As Ovid states in *Ars amatoria*: *clausa tibi fuerit promissa ianua nocte* ("The door is closed to you

⁴² Copley 1956, 19.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 20.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 34.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 33.

on the promised night,” *Ov. Ars am.* 2.523).⁴⁶ Thus, unlike their Greek counterparts who may yet be admitted, Roman lovers face perpetual exclusion.

When Plautus utilizes *paraclausithyron* scenes in his plays, they are primarily of the Greek dramatic type, since the doors must either open upon being asked or always remain open. When Pleusicles performs his *paraclausithyron* in front of the Captain’s door in preparation of his departure with Philocomasium in *Miles Gloriosus*, the door must necessarily be opened to allow the lovers to reunite. After Palaestrio answers the door, Pleusicles asks for Philocomasium to exit the home and leave with him for the port (*Pl. Mil.* 1298-1300):

*Philocomasium quaerito.
a matre illius venio. si iturast, eat.
omnis moratur: navim cupimus solve.*

I am seeking Philocomasium.
I am coming from her mother. If she is going, let her go.
She is hindering all of us: We wish to set sail on the ship.

The lover’s walk to the Captain’s home (*Pl. Mil.* 1296-1297), his knocking on the door (*Pl. Mil.* 1297), and expression of his desire to see his beloved (*Pl. Mil.* 1298) are all present during the scene, indicating the presence of a *paraclausithyron*. The plea for Philocomasium’s exit is not observed in isolation, but as one of many actions to be completed for her successful escape, including her actual physical departure from the home, journey to the harbor, and the ship’s departure from the harbor. With respect to the door itself, if Philocomasium is to leave the Captain’s home and live with Pleusicles, she must open the door and exit the home. Therefore, this *paraclausithyron* is of the dramatic form, since the door is ultimately opened for the sake of allowing the plot to proceed.

⁴⁶ Text taken from Copley 1956, 33.

Similarly, in *Curculio*, the lover's procession from the *symposium* (Pl. *Cur.* 15), his door sprinkling (Pl. *Cur.* 88), which substitutes door knocking, and lament song (Pl. *Cur.* 153-155) are all demonstrated, indicating that the scene is a *paraclausithyron*. Although Phaedromus initially despairs at the bolts' inactivity during his song, the door ultimately opens after he concludes singing: *tandem edepol mihi morigeri pessuli fiunt* ("finally, by Pollux, the bolts are compliant to me," Pl. *Cur.* 157). Since the door ultimately opens, this *paraclausithyron* scene must be a dramatic one. The closed door acts as an external obstacle that must be overcome by the two lovers, who are united against the girl's pimp in their passion, rather than a trick of Phaedromus's beloved to keep him away.

Indeed, the door also acts in favor of the lovers, since, when opened, it grants to Phaedromus access to his beloved and allows the lovers to secretly visit each other (Pl. *Cur.* 21-22):

*cum aperitur tacet,
cum illa noctu clanculum ad me exit, tacet.*

When it is opened, it is quiet,
when during the night she secretly comes out to me, it is quiet.

The door must open if Phaedromus is to visit his beloved, and it must do so silently if the two are to continue their affair without detection by the girl's pimp. Through its silence, the open door is an accomplice instead of an obstacle, since it allows the lovers to furtively see each other during the night.⁴⁷ Rather than preventing the culmination of the love affair, it enables it. While the closed door hinders the two lovers, the open door aids them.

The *paraclausithyron* is the only option available to Phaedromus if he desires to see his lover, since he does not have enough money to buy her freedom from the pimp, and the pimp

⁴⁷ Frangoulidis 2013, 271.

cannot be allowed to discover the affair. The *paraclausithyron* is a temporary solution to the lovers' inability to be together, since it allows them to meet for short periods of time while the lover attempts to procure enough money to buy his beloved.⁴⁸ The door must open upon the conclusion of the *paraclausithyron* if the lovers are to continue seeing each other. Therefore, the *paraclausithyron* is a means to continue the affair—and the progression of the plot—rather than the culmination of the lovers' trials.

The silent admission of lovers to the home by means of the door is also found in *Bacchides*. When the father of Mnesilochus comes to the house of the Bacchides with his servant Chrysalus and slave Artamo, the door is successfully opened quietly (Pl. *Bac.* 832-834):

*Agedum tu, Artamo,
forem hanc pauxillum áperi; placide, ne crepa;
sat est.*

Come you, Artamo,
open this door a little; gently, do not make it creak;
this is enough.

Chrysalus emphasizes to Artamo that he must not allow the door to make a noise (*ne crepa*) so the men may observe what Nicobulus's son is doing inside the home. Since Nicobulus is successful in having the door opened, the men have not been excluded from the home. Further, this door, like that found in *Curculio*, is silent while opening, acting as a helper in their quest rather than an obstacle. While Nicobulus is not yet a lover of Bacchis during this scene, he eventually does take on this role, so this attempt to enter the home of the Bacchides may perhaps be interpreted as a preemptive *paraclausithyron*. Further, since the man is successful in entering, the scene may be classified as a dramatic *paraclausithyron*.

⁴⁸ Frangoulidis 2013, 279.

When the fathers of both Mnesilochus and Pistoclerus later come to the home of the Bacchides to confront their sons, they encounter a shut door. After knocking on it and demanding entry, they are greeted by the Bacchides, and invited to enter the house: *I hac mécum intro, ubi tibi sit lepide victibus, vino atque unguéntis* (“come with me inside, where you will have a lovely time with provisions, wine, and oils,” Pl. *Bac.* 1181). Rather than excluding the men from their home, the Bacchides invite them inside and offer them pleasures reserved for lovers such as *victibus, vino atque unguentis* (“provisions, wine, and oils”). Through the mistresses’ offerings to the men consisting of various pleasures, the fathers’ new roles as lovers are implied. Therefore, since the fathers’ requests for admission were fulfilled, and their roles as lovers were consummated, this scene at the door of the house may be classified as a dramatic *paraclausithyron*.

Further, Philoxenus and Nicobulus must enter the home to allow the plot to proceed, since all four men—the two fathers and two sons—must be present in the same place if fathers and sons are to reunite and resolve their conflicts. Therefore, the two fathers must either enter the home or the two sons must exit it. In addition, the play concludes with the fathers becoming rivals of their sons in their pursuits of the women, so the two fathers must enter the house to take on their new roles as lovers of the Bacchides. Since the conclusion of the play requires the entry of the two fathers into the home of the Bacchides, the door must be opened, making the scene of entry a *paraclausithyron* of the dramatic type.

In *Menaechmi*, the door must be opened to allow Menaechmus to visit his mistress. When Plautus first introduces Erotium in the play, she is shown preparing her home to receive Menaechmus for lunch. She commands her servants to keep the doors open: *Sine fóres sic, abi, nolo óperiri* (“Leave the doors thus, go away, I do not wish for them to be closed,” Pl. *Men.*

351). Rather than closing the doors prior to her lover's visit to hinder his possession of her, Erotium keeps them open to ease his entry into her home and access to her. She prevents the enactment of a *paraclausithyron*, since the scene lacks its essential component, the beloved's locked door.

When Syracusan Menaechmus stands on the doorstep instead of immediately entering the unlocked home upon his arrival, Erotium expresses surprise at her lover's hesitation (Pl. *Men.* 361-363):

*animúle mi, mihi mirá videntur,
te híc stáre foris, fores quóí pateant,
magis quám domus tua domus quom haéc tua sit.*

My heart, it appears strange to me
that you stand here outdoors; the doors stand open for you,
because this house is more yours than your own house is.

Syracusan Menaechmus stands outside of Erotium's home, because he does not recognize the woman, so he does not believe that he has the right to enter her home. Therefore, he is simply demonstrating respect for the privacy of a stranger's house rather than performing a *paraclausithyron* scene outside of his familiar beloved's home. Since Erotium believes she is speaking to her lover rather than his twin brother, she finds it remarkable that he is keeping himself outside of her home when he is welcome to enter it. Through her surprise at his hesitation, she implies that Menaechmus is in the habit of entering her home whenever he desires to do so. He is never forced to perform a *paraclausithyron* to curry favor with his mistress.

When Erotium compares her doors to Menaechmus's in the second and third lines, she emphasizes the contrast between her open, welcoming home, and his closed, unwelcoming one. She implies that Menaechmus must fight to gain entry into his own home, but does not have to overcome any obstacles to enter hers. Therefore, if Menaechmus desires his wife and is to hope

to come into his own home to consummate that desire, he may perhaps have to perform a *paraclausithyron* to the shut door, which may or may not be successful in granting him admission. Erotium's home, on the other hand, perpetually remains open to him, making the *paraclausithyron* unnecessary.

Ultimately, however, the door must be shut on Menaechmus to allow the plot of the play to proceed. When he is excluded from both his own home and from Erotium's, he bemoans his situation at Erotium's doorstep: *neque domi neque apud amicam mihi iam quicquam creditur* ("neither at home nor at the house of my girlfriend am I now credited anything," Pl. *Men.* 699). This exclusion may on first glance be thought to be a non-dramatic one, since Menaechmus is unsuccessful in gaining entry. However, his attempts to enter the houses of the women must be unsuccessful if he is to be reunited with his twin brother, since he must be in the public space where he will eventually meet his brother rather than enclosed within a home. His exclusion must necessarily occur to allow the resolution of the confusion caused by the twin brother's presence and reunion of the long lost twin brothers.

Further, Menaechmus's pleas for admission outside of Erotium's home are not the manifestation of the nature of love that is typical of the non-dramatic *paraclausithyron*. Menaechmus pities his lack of a home to enter rather than the loss of either woman or helplessness as a result of passionate love. Indeed, Menaechmus never states in the play that he loves either woman, and ultimately abandons both to pursue a life with his brother. Therefore, his dramatic *paraclausithyron* outside of Erotium's home must result in failure at gaining entry, since the play's conclusion requires that he be reunited with his brother and abandon both his wife and his mistress.

While Plautine comedy often combines both Greek and Roman literary motifs, Plautus primarily utilizes dramatic *paraclausithyra* of the Greek literary tradition to further the plots of his plays. Since his plays require the doors to open or to remain perpetually open to the lover, these scenes must be of the dramatic type, and cannot be classified as Greek non-dramatic or the Roman *paraclausithyron* type. In addition, the scenes are not isolated musings on the nature of love, but rather singular steps taken toward the goals of entry to the home and obtainment of one's desire.

While the scene at the Captain's door in *Miles Gloriosus* is an act performed by Pleusicles to hide his role as Philocomasium's lover from the Captain, it still contains all of the primary elements of the *paraclausithyron*. Further, since the plot requires Philocomasium's escape from the home, the door to the house must open to allow her exit from her residence and reunion with her lover. Since the door opens, and its opening is necessary for the sake of the plot and resolution of the play, the scene must be classified as a dramatic *paraclausithyron*.

Similarly, Phaedromus must be successful in opening the door to his beloved's pimp's home if he is to see her in *Curculio*. Again, all of the elements of the traditional Greek dramatic *paraclausithyron* are observed. In addition, the door yields to Phaedromus's desire, since his beloved exits the home to visit him. While the beloved's exit from the home to see her lover results in her escape with her lover from the Captain in *Miles Gloriosus*, the *paraclausithyron* in *Curculio* allows the two lovers to visit each other in secret without the pimp's knowledge or the girl's escape. The lovers of both plays are able to use the dramatic *paraclausithyron* to their advantage, since they are successful in opening the door and visiting the women they love. The plots of these plays necessitate the opening of the door, making the *paraclausithyron* scene an important element of the lovers' quests to ultimately marry their beloveds.

Out of the Plautine plays I am investigating, only one contains a *paraclausithyron* that results in the lover's failure to enter his beloved's home. In *Menaechmi*, while his own home is always closed to him, Erotium's home is shown to always be open to Menaechmus. Erotium meticulously prepares her home for his visits and forbids her servants from closing the door. She is surprised when she sees Menaechmus's likeness standing outside of the home rather than immediately entering it, since she sees no need for exclusion of her lover from her home. As the mistress of her house, she has no need to hide her lover or to forbid his entry unless he is directly displeasing to her.

However, when Menaechmus insults her by asking her to return the mantle she had accidentally given away to his twin brother, she exercises her power as mistress of her home by banishing Menaechmus from her residence and forbidding his entry in the future (Pl. *Men.* 692-694). Menaechmus performs a *paraclausithyron* at her door, begging her to come back, but she closes the door and never reopens it to him for the duration of the rest of the play (Pl. *Men.* 696-699). Thus, Menaechmus is unsuccessful in his attempt to persuade her to open the door to him. Since the door becomes closed to Menaechmus, one might perhaps think that this *paraclausithyron* is of the non-dramatic or even Roman type. However, Menaechmus's pleas must fail, since he is to meet his twin brother not inside of his mistress's home, but in the public space before it. Further, after this final exclusion, neither his wife nor mistress is necessary for the conclusion of the play, because he is to reunite with his brother and leave the town, abandoning the two women. Therefore, Menaechmus's failed *paraclausithyron* is a dramatic instrument used to further the plot of *Menaechmi*.

While no explicit *paraclausithyron* scene exists in *Bacchides*, the door still plays an important role for the progression of the plot of the play. When Nicobulus comes to the house of

the Bacchides to spy on his son, he is able to successfully open the unlocked door. This door opening is necessary for the plot, since the father is able to find his son and observe his activities. These discoveries prompt his eventual return to the house with Philoxenus and request to be allowed into the home. When the two men come to the door in this second scene, the door is closed to them, so they must ask the Bacchides directly for permission to enter the house. The Bacchides not only allow them to enter the house to confront their sons, but also invite them to join them in their festivities inside of the home. While the two men are not the Bacchides' lovers when they initially come to the home, they assume that role when they enter the house and revel in the pleasures they are offered there. Therefore, their attempt to enter the home can be classified as a *paraclausithyron*, and, since they are successful in their entry and ultimate resolution of the conflict with their sons, it is a *paraclausithyron* of the dramatic type.

While the doors found in Roman *paraclausithyra* must be closed to the lover, those found in Greek sources and in Plautus's plays might yet be opened. Out of the plays I am analyzing, nearly all demonstrate either the lover's successful entry into the home or his beloved's exit from the home following the lover's plea to see his girl. Only *Menaechmus* is ultimately forbidden from entering his mistress's home. All of the plays use the traditional Greek dramatic *paraclausithyron* to further their plots and achieve resolution, so lovers can be united in marriage, fathers reconciled with their sons and their new mistresses, and long lost twin brothers reunited. No door is permanently closed as in Roman elegiac poetry.

While Plautus's *paraclausithyra* are rooted in the Greek dramatic literary tradition, his doors are used in novel ways. They are not only divisions between lover and mistress, but also curiosity and truth, and aggressor and victim. These novel uses of the *paraclausithyron* and doors in general by Plautus will be examined next.

Chapter 4: Violence

While Plautus heavily draws upon literary motifs from Greek sources in his *paraclausithyron* scenes, he also incorporates one distinctly Roman feature, that of violence. While violence does not appear in the Greek *paraclausithyron*, it becomes an important aspect of the Roman tradition, and particularly of later Roman love elegy.⁴⁹ In the Greek tradition, the *komos* from the *symposium* to the beloved's door was sometimes described as a noisy and rowdy affair, such as the following scene Aristaenetus describes in an epistle: πρὸ θύρων ἀκήκοα νέων κωμαστῶν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ μαχομένων ἀορι νύκτωρ ("I heard revelers in front of my house, reveling and battling over me in the dead of night," Aristaenetus *Ep.* 2.19).⁵⁰ However, the drunken lover's plea outside of his beloved's door itself is usually portrayed as a sentimental and docile scene,⁵¹ since the lovers are able to converse peacefully. Therefore, although the procession to the door may be uncivil and even destructive, the lover treats his beloved and her dwelling gently rather than disrespectfully and aggressively. While the lover may verbally berate his beloved for keeping him locked out of doors, he does not physically attack her or the door preventing his possession of her.

In Roman versions of the *paraclausithyron*, however, the lover often uses weapons such as axes, crowbars, and torches against the shut door itself to force entry into the beloved's home.⁵² For example, in *Epode* 11, Horace describes the door he assaulted during a *paraclausithyron* outside of his beloved's home in terms of the physical damage he sustained: *limina dura, quibus lumbos et enfringi latus* ("The hard threshold, on which I broke my flanks

⁴⁹ Copley 1956, 40.

⁵⁰ Text and translation taken from Copley 1956, 25.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 41.

⁵² *Ibid.*

and back,” Hor. *Ep.* 11). Unlike his Greek counterpart, the Roman lover does not shy away from applying physical force in his pursuit of his beloved. Further, while the Greek lover addresses his beloved beyond the closed doors, the Roman lover often addresses the doors keeping him from his beloved directly.⁵³ Since the Roman lover views the door as an external obstacle to obtaining his beloved, it is perhaps not surprising that he would apply force to the doors themselves in an attempt to remove this impediment to his plan. Alternatively, since Romans also view the door as a speaker for the beloved,⁵⁴ the Roman lover’s violence toward the door can be seen as analogous to a lover’s violence against his beloved. The Roman lover does not hesitate to force himself onto his mistress when he sees her as playing coy and inaccessible. Like the door, she is seen as an obstacle to be overcome rather than a prize to be fought for. Therefore, when the Roman lover threatens the door, he threatens not only this physical impediment to his passion, but also his beloved enclosed beyond it.

In the Plautine plays, the transition from the peaceful Greek *paraclausithyron* to an aggressive, distinctly Roman one can already be observed. When Amphitryon comes home to confront his wife and her secret lover, he does not hesitate to knock forcefully on the closed door. In response, Mercury, who acts as guardian of the lovers enclosed in the house, reproaches Amphitryon for his aggression (Pl. *Am.* 1021-1022):

*Tibi Iuppiter
dique omnes irati certo sunt, qui sic frangas fores.*

Jupiter and all of the gods are certainly angry with you, who thus breaks doors.

Through his use of the word *frangas* (“breaks”), Mercury emphasizes the violent manner in which Amphitryon is attempting to gain access to his home. The action of breaking is

⁵³ Copley 1956, 36.

⁵⁴ Cairns 1972, 216.

performed on the door directly in the typical later Roman *paraclausithyron* manner, such as that found in Ovid's *Remedia amoris*, where the lover is told that he may find himself in a fight for his beloved at her doorstep: *effice nocturna frangatur ianua rixa* ("Bring it about that the door is broken by a brawl at night," *Ov. Rem.* 5.443). When Mercury invokes the gods, he claims that the gods themselves are offended by Amphitryon's knocking, implying that Amphitryon behaves impiously through his displeasingly aggressive actions. It is humorous that Mercury specifically invokes Jupiter, since Jupiter himself is located within the home. Jupiter would certainly be angry with Amphitryon for attempting to break into the home simply because he is the one engaged in a love affair with Alcmena, and does not wish to be disturbed or discovered. Further, the situation is humorous through its inversion of the locations of the husband and the lover, since one would expect the husband to be inside of the home, and the lover to be begging for entry outside of it. Mercury is thus able to make a joke during his reproach that is understood by the audience of the play but not detected by Amphitryon. Mercury then continues his criticism by invoking the financial consequences of breaking property (*Pl. Am.* 1026-1027):

*paene effregisti, fatue, foribus cardines.
an foris censebas nobis publicitus praeberier?*

You almost smashed the hinges from the doors, you fool.
Did you think doors are supplied to us at the public expense?

Mercury again emphasizes the aggressive nature of Amphitryon's knocking through his use of the word *effregisti* ("smashed"). Plautus is the only known author to use the word *effregisti* in an erotic context. This word appears in other Latin texts only to describe one's physical destruction of doors, such as the following scene from Terence's *Adelphoe*:

fores effregit atque in aedis inruit ("He smashed the doors and rushed into the temple," *Ter. Ad.*

88). Since Amphitryon's aggression is carried out against the door itself, the distinctly Roman nature of this *paraclausithyron* is suggested.

When Mercury asks his rhetorical question *an foris censebas nobis publicitus praeberier?* ("Did you think doors are supplied to us at the public expense?"), he once again attempts to convince Amphitryon of his wrongdoing, this time by emphasizing the financial costs of aggression rather than the moral consequences of offending the gods. While Mercury had previously claimed that Amphitryon's knocking is offensive to the gods, he now states that his aggression is inappropriate, since doors are not given to citizens for free at the expense of the populace. Mercury thus implies that Amphitryon does not value his possessions. Further, since doors often substitute the beloved in Roman *paraclausithyra*, Mercury may also be suggesting that Amphitryon does not value his wife when he devalues the door that represents her. Therefore, the aggression that Amphitryon demonstrates is directed not only toward the inanimate door itself, but also toward his spouse. To further insult the man, Mercury shames Amphitryon by calling him a *fatue* ("fool").

When Nicobulus attempts to gain entry to the house of the Bacchides in *Bacchides*, he similarly shows that he will not hesitate to show aggression toward the door. He threatens to tear it down (Pl. *Bac.* 1118-1119):

*Heus Bacchis, iube sis actutum aperiri fores,
nisi mavoltis fores et postes comminui securibus.*

Hey Bacchis, order that the doors be opened immediately,
unless you prefer the doors and hinges be broken down by hatchets.

Once again, violence is directed toward the doors directly, since the verb *comminui* ("be broken down") refers to the physical doors and their hinges themselves. This verb, combined with the word *securibus* ("hatchets") in the sentence, illustrates an aggressive scene of attack by

the lover on the obstacle preventing him from accessing his beloved that is typical of the Roman *paraclausithyron*. Further, Nicobulus shows disregard for the women, since, if the women do not open the doors, they—like the doors—will be seen as obstacles that are to be overcome. The Bacchides thus lose their human identities and are grouped along with the inanimate doors as hindrances to Nicobulus’s quest. Therefore, the violence that is threatened against the door is threatened toward them as well. However, Nicobulus does not ultimately demonstrate the aggression he describes, since the women yield to his demands and open the door.

A similar threat is seen during the play *paraclausithyron* scene in *Miles Gloriosus*. When Acroteleutium comes to the Captain’s closed door with her “maid” Milphidippa, pretending to be hopelessly in love with him, she claims that she will break down his door to access her beloved (Pl. *Mil.* 1250):

milph. *Occlusae sunt foris. acr. Exfringam.*

milph. The doors are closed. **acr.** I will break them.

When Acroteleutium claims that she will break the doors in response to Milphidippa’s observation that they are closed, she indicates that she sees them simply as an obstacle to be overcome in her pursuit of the Captain. The word *exfringam* (“I will break them”) demonstrates that Acroteleutium will not hesitate to use physical violence to reach her goal of accessing the Captain. Further, her statement acts as a threat, since it is not ultimately carried out, but simply used to demonstrate her false devotion to the Captain and the measures she is willing to take to have him.

It is also perhaps interesting to note that the lover in this scene is female, and the beloved being pursued male. Very few texts employ female lovers in their scenes of *paraclausithyra*, and they are all Greek. One such example is the anonymous *Alexandrian Erotic Fragment*, which

utilizes a female speaker.⁵⁵ However, no such scenes of female lovers outside of their male beloveds' doors are found in the Roman tradition. Therefore, this Plautine scene may suggest that not only men are capable of using violence to achieve their goals, but also women. Alternatively, this scene of reversed gender roles may have been used by Plautus to make the fake *paraclausithyron* more humorous or to mock traditional Roman *paraclausithyron* conventions. In addition, the word *exfringam* is found in no other Greek or Roman source, perhaps further corroborating the unusual nature of this scene.

Plautus demonstrates violence toward the door by not only male lovers and nontraditional pursuers such as women, but also by servants who are acting on their masters' behalves. In *Bacchides*, when the Captain sends his Parasite and a boy to retrieve either Bacchis or the money she is worth, the Parasite deems the boy's knocking insufficiently assertive and mocks his timidity (Pl. *Bac.* 579-582):

ut pulsat propudium!
comesse panem tris pedes latum potes,
fores pultare nescis. ecquis in aedibust?
heus, ecquis hic est? ecquis hoc aperit ostium?

How the villain knocks!
You can eat up a loaf of bread three feet wide,
but you do not know how to knock on doors. Is anyone in the house?
Hey, is anyone here? Does anyone open this door?

The Parasite insults the boy by claiming *comesse panem tris pedes latum potes* ("You can eat up a loaf of bread three feet wide"), but *fores pultare nescis* ("do not know how to knock on doors"). Since Parasites, such as Epidamnian Menaechmus's Parasite in *Menaechmi*, are known for being able to eat excessive amounts of food while neglecting their service, it is humorous that the Captain's Parasite himself criticizes another for his inability to perform his duty. The Parasite

⁵⁵ Copley 1956, 20.

further derides the boy by calling him a *propudium* (“villain” or “shameful one”). Since the boy is reproached for his inability to knock sufficiently loudly rather than for excessive aggression while knocking, he is being mocked not for being too forceful, but too meek. It is also interesting to note that the boy never speaks in the scene, neither to call for those inside of the house—which perhaps explains why he is being reproached—nor to defend himself. Finally, the Parasite takes over the boy’s duties and knocks himself, calling for the people who are enclosed within the home (Pl. *Bac.* 582). The Parasite thus takes initiative in their quest, and demonstrates to the boy a lesson concerning how he should behave in such a locked-out situation.

In response to the Parasite’s knocking, Pistoclus answers the door. He reproaches the Parasite for the aggressive nature of his knocking (Pl. *Bac.* 583-586):

*Quid istuc? quae istaec est pulsatio?
quae te mala crux agitat, qui ad istunc modum
alieno viris tuas extentes ostio?
fores paene exfregisti. quid nunc vis tibi?*

What is it? What is this knocking?
What bad torture drives you, that in this way
you apply your strength to the door of another?
You almost broke down the doors. What now do you want?

Pistoclus does not shame the Parasite for knocking, but for *istunc modum* (“this way”) in which he knocks on the door of another man’s house, specifically his use of *viris* (“strength”). The word *viris* is often used in scenes describing attacks, battles, and other violent events, so Pistoclus’s use of this word may suggest the aggressive way in which the Parasite knocks. Further, he claims *fores paene exfregisti* (“You almost broke down the doors”), emphasizing that this violence was directed toward the doors directly, and almost resulted in the undesirable consequence of their destruction. Pistoclus again indicates his displeasure when he asks *quid nunc vis tibi?* (“What now do you want?”), implying that the Parasite has nearly accomplished

his goal of destruction and therefore has no other business to conduct at the household. However, from the Parasite's point of view, he has not accomplished his goal, since he has yet to obtain either Bacchis or the money that his master is owed. The force applied to the door was a means to achieve his goal rather than an action of accomplishment itself.

When Pistoclerus claims that some *mala crux* ("bad torture") drives the Parasite, he indicates that the Parasite may not be acting on his own accord, which is true, since the Parasite has come on his master's behalf. This Plautine phrase is used in a similar manner in *Aulularia* (Pl. *Aul.* 522 and 631) and *Casina* (Pl. *Cas.* 416) to indicate a character's disapproval of another's actions and suggest that he views them as illogical. Since the Parasite does not desire to possess Bacchis himself, the violence he inflicts on the door does not translate to the girl herself as in other Roman *paraclausithyra*. He is not attempting to force himself onto the girl, but is instead trying to obtain either her or her monetary value for another. Even the Captain himself does not necessarily desire the girl, since he is willing to accept money in her stead. Therefore, the force the Parasite applies to the door is simply a physical strategy with no metaphorical implications.

The Plautine servant can not only serve as a helper to his master, but also as an obstacle to his master's plan of obtaining his beloved. In *Casina*, Stalino's servant Olympio is married to Casina, so Stalino can gain access to the girl. However, when Stalino attempts to force himself onto Casina immediately following the wedding, Olympio attempts to stop his attack: *forem obdo, ne senex me opprimeret* ("I fasten the door, so that the old man might not overwhelm me," Pl. *Cas.* 891). Olympio closes the door on Stalino to prevent him from having Casina before Olympio is able to consummate their marriage. It is unclear whether Olympio believes this will successfully prevent Stalino from gaining access to the room, since Roman lovers view doors as

obstacles to be overcome rather than immovable objects against which they cannot hope to be victorious. When Olympio claims that his master *opprimeret* (“might overwhelm”) him, he suggests that Stalino is likely to use violence even against his own servant in his quest to possess Casina. However, while other lovers direct their aggression toward the door, violence against the inanimate object is lacking in this scene. Instead, violence is directed toward one’s servant who is also the rightful husband of one’s beloved. The threat of violence is thus made against a person standing in between the lover and his beloved rather than the beloved herself or the inanimate object standing in for her.

Since *militia amoris* (“the soldiery of love”) is itself a term invocative of a military scene, it is perhaps not surprising that violence can be applied in its pursuit. When Amphitryon arrives at his home with the goals to confront his wife and reveal her infidelity, he violently knocks on the door both in an attempt to force entry into the house, and to express his anger with his wife. His entry is hindered by Mercury, who acts as the guardian of Jupiter’s affair with Alcmena. Further, Mercury attempts to shame Amphitryon for his violence by claiming that the gods are displeased with him and that Amphitryon does not value his possessions. Therefore, Mercury acts as not only an obstacle, but also as a speaker of conscience of sorts for Amphitryon, suggesting that the violence Amphitryon applies to the door and therefore to his wife is morally incorrect.

In *Bacchides*, however, Nicobulus’s violence toward the door of the house of the Bacchides is not reproached. However, it is also never actually implemented, since Nicobulus simply threatens violence if he is not admitted willingly into the house. Since he is not yet a lover of Bacchis in this scene, the force he threatens to apply to the door does not necessarily

translate to the woman in the house. However, it metaphorically demonstrates the overpowering of her will, since he intends to open the door whether she desires to have it opened or not.

The threat of violence is similarly utilized in *Miles Gloriosus*. When Milphidippa and Acroteleutium come to the Captain's house during their false *paraclausithyron*, Acroteleutium states that she will tear down the Captain's closed door. The door is again seen as an obstacle to be overcome by the lover in her pursuit of her beloved. Since Acroteleutium never realizes this violence, it remains an unfulfilled threat. However, the lover in this scene is a woman, so the roles of lover and beloved have been reversed. Thus, the typical conventions of the *paraclausithyron* have been challenged. Further, the reversal suggests that women are just as capable of violence as men, an idea generally not accepted by Roman authors. Alternatively, since violence is threatened but never implemented, order in literary and social convention is preserved, since the woman does not actually inflict violence either on the door or her beloved.

Not only lovers, but also servants use violence in Plautine comedy. When the Captain's Parasite comes with his boy to the house of Bacchis to take either her or her worth in gold, he violently knocks on the door. Since he himself does not wish to possess Bacchis, the force he uses does not translate to Bacchis, as it would have if he were the lover himself. Instead, he uses aggression as a means to obtain Bacchis or her monetary worth for the Captain. Therefore, violence is a tool that can be used not only to threaten forceful possession, but also to remove the obstacle standing between the lover and his beloved. This obstacle is often the door, which acts as a physical boundary, or it can be the metaphorical unwillingness of the beloved to be possessed as in *Bacchides*.

However, the servant can act as not only the master's helper, but also as an obstacle to him in his possession of his beloved. While Mercury aids Jupiter in his love affair in *Amphitruo*,

Pistoclerus helps his friend Mnesilochus obtain Bacchis in *Bacchides*, Phaedromus's servant helps him buy his beloved's freedom in *Curculio*, and Palaestrio helps the secret lovers of *Miles Gloriosus* see each other, Stalino's servant Olympio prevents his master from possessing Casina in *Casina*. Following his marriage to Casina, Olympio locks the door to his room, so Stalino cannot enter it and possess Casina before Olympio can consummate his marriage. Although Olympio marries Casina for his master's sake, he must first consummate their marriage due to his role as her rightful husband. He uses the door, which is often seen by lovers as an obstacle to be overcome in their pursuit, to hinder his master's possession. He even claims that his master intends to inflict harm onto him in his quest. Therefore, Stalino threatens not only Casina, but also Olympio and the door that Olympio closes on him to prevent his violent entry. All three people and objects therefore act as obstacles for Stalino to overcome if he desires to possess Casina.

While Plautus often models his *paraclausithyra* and scenes involving closed doors on those found in Greek sources, his plays indicate the beginning of the implementation of distinctly Roman themes in literature concerning love. Most prominent of these is the use of violence in a lover's *militia amoris*. However, while Plautus may be seen as an author at the forefront of the combination of Greek and Roman themes in ancient literature, he also develops his own distinct motifs, such as the use of physical space to develop, realize, hide, or reveal deception. This novel and distinctly Plautine use of *paraclausithyra* and closed doors will be examined next.

Chapter 5: Deception Behind Closed Doors

The six plays I have chosen to examine have two main themes in common: their plots focus on the pursuit of love, and this love involves deception in its realization. This deception is often observed in the form of *furtivus amor* (“stolen love”), a common theme of later Roman erotic poetry.⁵⁶ In this portrayal of an erotic relationship, the beloved is not free to love whomever she wishes, but is instead either a slave to a pimp or married to a husband whom she does not love.⁵⁷ As a result, she and her lover must “steal” their love from her rightful owner or spouse. For example, in *Bacchides*, the young lover Mnesilochus must use deception to trick money out of his father Nicobulus to buy his mistress Bacchis, who will otherwise be forced to remain with the Captain. Similarly, in *Curculio*, Phaedromus must obtain money to buy his mistress’s freedom from her pimp, which he eventually accomplishes through his servant’s forgery of a letter from the Captain who was to buy Planesium. In the meantime, he visits his beloved at her door at night to “steal” time with her while she is under the pimp’s ownership.

Since deception is a prevalent aspect of Plautine love, it should not be surprising that Plautus uses it extensively in his *paraclausithyra* and more generally in scenes involving doors and the houses they belong to. When Phaedromus comes to Planesium’s home and begs the door to open to him in true *paraclausithyron* style, he emphasizes the door’s silence during his visits (Pl. *Cur.* 21-22):

*cum aperitur tacet,
cum illa noctu clanculum ad me exit, tacet.*

When it is opened, it is quiet,
when during the night she secretly comes out to me, it is quiet.

⁵⁶ Copley 1956, 36.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 37.

By stating that Planesium comes out to him *clanculum* (“secretly”), Phaedromus emphasizes the “stolen” nature of their love. Their love itself is of the deceptive nature, since the girl’s pimp lawfully owns her. As a result, the two lovers must visit each other only in secret if they are to see each other. Further, the door itself plays an important role in the consummation of their passion through its silence when the two lovers meet at night. Rather than hindering or preventing their love, the silent door allows Phaedromus and Planesium to visit each other and to avoid detection by Planesium’s rightful owner. The door, and specifically its silent opening, therefore aids the realization of this *furtivus amor*.

Trickery can be used against not only the beloved’s rightful owner, but also the beloved herself. In *Amphitruo*, Jupiter assumes the likeness of Amphitryon to possess his wife Alcmena. He therefore assumes the identity of another being to trick his beloved into engaging in an erotic relationship with him. When Jupiter exits the home with Alcmena, Mercury describes the deceptive scene, emphasizing the falseness in Jupiter’s appearance (Pl. *Am.* 496-498):

*orationem comprimam: crepuit foris.
Amphitruo subditivos eccum exit foras
cum Alcumena uxore usuraria.*

I will cut off my speech: the door creaks.
Behold! The counterfeit Amphitryon emerges through the doors
with Alcmena, the wife borrowed at interest.

Mercury refers to the lover as *Amphitruo subditivos* (“counterfeit Amphitryon”) to emphasize the deceptive nature of Jupiter’s appearance, since he is not actually Amphitryon, but instead a superficial representation of him. By calling Alcmena *uxore usuraria* (“wife of interest”), Mercury suggests that this deception has been performed for the purpose of possessing this woman. It may perhaps be interesting to note that the door in this scene, unlike that in *Curculio*, *crepuit* (“creaks”) rather than *tacet* (“is quiet”). This indicates that the door found in

Amphitruo aids the *furtivus amor* only while it remains shut. When it is opened, it has the potential of warning others of—and even revealing—the deception.

The importance of the shut door for the manifestation of Jupiter’s love is confirmed when Amphitryon arrives at the home following an altercation with his wife. After she asserts that she had just been with him, Amphitryon sets off to town in search of a witness of his absence from home up until this moment. When he returns home without a witness, Amphitryon expresses his irritation at finding the door closed to him (Pl. *Am.* 1018-1020):

*sed aedis occluserunt. eugepae,
pariter hoc fit atque ut alia facta sunt. feriam foris.
aperite hoc. heus, ecquis hic est? ecquis hoc aperit ostium?*

But they have closed up the house. Great,
This is done just as other things have been done. I will knock on the door.
Open this [door]. Hey there, is anyone here? Will anyone open this door?

Through his statement *pariter hoc fit atque ut alia facta sunt* (“This is done just as other things have been done”), Amphitryon emphasizes that the closed status of the door itself resembles the secretive and obstructive nature of his wife’s actions while he was away. He considers the shutting of the door on him, the rightful husband, an action as offensive as infidelity itself, since the shut door aids Alcmena’s *furtivus amor* with one who is not her husband. Rather than forcing the true lover to perform a *paraclausithyron* to gain entry into the home and obtain his beloved, the shut door keeps the lawful husband outside while keeping the counterfeit lover enclosed within the home with his beloved. The shut door therefore prevents the discovery of not only the *furtivus amor*, but also of the deception in identity that has allowed Jupiter to possess Alcmena.

In *Miles Gloriosus*, Philocomasium must similarly use deception in identity to hide her love affair with Pleusicles next door to the Captain’s home. Her servant Palaestrio convinces her

to pretend to have a twin sister to trick Sceledrus, who saw her with Pleusicles, into believing that he saw her sister next door rather than her: *Vt eum, qui hic se vidit, verbis vincat, ne is se viderit* (“So that she may convince the one who saw her here that he did not see her,” Pl. *Mil.* 187). By pretending that she has a twin sister, Philocomasium may be able to convince the Captain’s servant of her feigned innocence. If this deception is successful, she will be able to hide her *furtivus amor* with her true lover Pleusicles under the pretext that her sister is the one engaging him next door.

Further, Palaestrio claims that Pleusicles has no need to hide her love at the house next door, since that is where she meets her true lover as herself. Instead, she must utilize trickery at the Captain’s home, where she resides under the ownership of the one whom she does not love and must therefore deceive (Pl. *Mil.* 191-194):

*domi habet animum falsiloquom, falsificum, falsiurium,
domi dolos, domi delenifica facta, dómi fallacias.
nam mulier holitori numquam supplicat, si quast mala:
domi habet hortum et condimenta ad omnis mores maleficos.*

At home she has a lying spirit, fraud, deceit,
at home trickery, at home enchanting contrivances, at home stratagems.
For a woman never begs the gardener, if she is bad:
at home she has a garden and condiments for all sorts of evils.

Through his list of strategies a woman may use at her home, Palaestrio emphasizes Philocomasium’s ease in performing a deception, since she has many tools at her disposal. Further, by stating that *nam mulier holitori numquam supplicat* (“For a woman never begs the gardener”), Palaestrio emphasizes the woman’s ownership of these tools and her independence in carrying out her plan. She has no need for a gardener when she herself can plant the seeds of her deception and then cultivate the fruits of her work. When he calls the woman’s home a *hortum* (“garden”), Palaestrio claims that these tricks have a place to take root and develop. Since plants

grow where they are planted, these deceptions likewise have a permanent location at the woman's home. The crop metaphor continues when he references the *condimenta* ("condiments") that will decorate Philocomasium's harvested tricks. The home therefore acts as a permanent enclosure and home for the woman's deceptions to be developed and cultivated.

However, Palaestrio appears to have a negative view of the deceptions he describes. He refers to the woman as *mala* ("bad"), indicating that the woman does wrong by utilizing these tools of trickery. Further, at the conclusion of his statement, Palaestrio refers to the deceptions as *omnis mores maleficos* ("all sorts of evils"). This pessimistic language indicates that Palaestrio disapproves of the tools Philocomasium is to use to trick the Captain.

Yet, Palaestrio himself utilizes deception. Along with his neighbor Periplecomenus, he concocts a plan to convince the Captain that Periplecomenus's "wife" is in love with him, so the proud Captain will release Philocomasium in his pursuit of this other woman. Once Palaestrio departs to intercept the Captain, Periplecomenus invites the servant of the woman who is to pretend to be his wife indoors (Pl. *Mil.* 944-946):

*Abeamus ergo intro, haec uti meditemur cogitate,
ut accurate et commode hoc quod agendumst exsequamur,
ne quid, ubi miles venerit, titubetur.*

Therefore let us go inside, so that we may carefully ponder these things,
so that carefully and appropriately we may carry out that which is to be done,
so that, when the Captain comes, it may not falter.

In this scene, the neighbor's house is transformed into a home for deception, since it is where the actors are to plan their performance of a fake *paraclausithyron* at the Captain's door. By stating *Abeamus ergo intro, haec uti meditemur cogitate* ("Therefore let us go inside, so that we may carefully ponder these things"), Periplecomenus emphasizes that his home specifically is the proper location for them to plan their deception, since they do not risk discovery there. The

home is therefore once again an enclosure for the development of trickery. Further, by saying that they are to act *accurate et commode* (“carefully and appropriately”), Periplecomenus appears to express the opinion that their deception is not only not a negative action, but indeed an actively positive one. While Palaestrio views Philocomasium’s deception of the Captain a bad deed, Periplecomenus views their own plan of deception as a good one.

However, while this deception is planned at home, it is actually realized outside of it. Milphidippa, who must pretend to be the “maid” of Periplecomenus’s “wife,” claims that the street is the location where her act is to be performed: *Iam est ante aedis circus ubi sunt ludi faciundi mihi* (“Now, the circus where my games are to be played is before the house,” Pl. *Mil.* 991). Milphidippa clearly sets the stage of her act as the area *ante aedis* (“before the house”), making a physical division between where the plan is developed, the neighbor’s home, and where it is executed, the area in front of the home. By referring to the location as a *circus* (“circus”) and her act as *ludi* (“games”), Milphidippa gives the plan a playful tone, since a circus is the location for entertainment in Roman society, and she views her deception as analogous to games played for sport. Therefore, deceptions both inside the home and outside of it are used to knowingly trick the pursuer—the Captain—into not only remaining oblivious to his mistress’s secret affair, but also comically accepting a nonexistent lover in *Miles Gloriosus*.

Deception is thus used by Plautine characters not only to obtain love, but also to thwart it. In *Casina*, Casina is to be married to Stalino’s servant Olympio, so Stalino can indulge in his lust for her without his wife’s knowledge. Cleostrata realizes that Stalino has asked his neighbor to send his wife to her home, so the neighbor’s house will be at Stalino’s disposal: *liberae aedes ut sibi essent, Casinam quo deducerent* (“So the house might be free for them to lead Casina to,” Pl. *Cas.* 533). Cleostrata claims that the empty house will enable the manifestation of Stalino’s

passion, since no one will be inside of it to interfere with his plan. Further, since Stalino intends to hide his affair from his wife, he hopes to use the neighbor's house as the hiding place for his *furtivus amor*. Upon this realization, Cleostrata does not accept the neighbor's wife into her home to prevent Stalino from obtaining the object of his desire. Stalino is frustrated by his plan's failure (Pl. *Cas.* 596-597):

*Vt bene vocivas aedis fecisti mihi,
ut traduxisti huc ad nos uxorem tuam.*

How well you have made your house empty for me,
How you have sent your wife to ours here.

Stalino sarcastically praises the neighbor's success in sending his wife to Cleostrata, indicating his actual frustration at his neighbor's failure. By stating that the house was supposed to be made empty *mihi* ("for me"), Stalino claims ownership of the plan to set up for himself a place to consummate his passion. This again emphasizes that the neighbor's home had been intended to aid Stalino in his deception of his wife, confirming Cleostrata's speculations.

In response to Stalino's attempt to have an affair unknown to her, Cleostrata uses Stalino's own tool of trickery against him. On the wedding day, she, along with her servants, dresses her servant Chalinus as Casina, so that Chalinus will be married to Olympio in Casina's stead. Her servant Pardalisca muses on this trick of identity that they had developed inside of the home (Pl. *Cas.* 760-762):

*neque usquam ludos tam festivos fieri
quam hic intus fiunt ludi ludificabiles
seni nóstico et nostro Olympioni vilico.*

Never anywhere were games so lively
as those games being played out inside here
with our old man and our estate manager Olympio.

Through her statement that the deception was formed *hic intus* (“inside here”), Pardalisca identifies the house as the location of the development of the deception. The home and its closed doors are thus once again used to hide the development of trickery of a lover. Further, like Milphidippa in *Miles Gloriosus*, Pardalisca refers to the deception as *ludi* (“games”). This provides a playful tone to the description of the trick—and therefore joke—being played on Olympio and Stalino. The similarity between this deception and the one described in *Miles Gloriosus* does not end here, however. When Chalinus, dressed up as Casina, is brought outside, Myrrhina comments that the trickery will be enacted outside of the home (Pl. *Cas.* 855-856):

*Accéptae bene ét commode éximus íntus
ludós visere húc in viam nuptiális.*

Having been received [indoors] well and favorably, we come out of the house to see the nuptial games here in the street.

Once again, the trickery is referred to as *ludos* (“games”), emphasizing the joking and entertaining nature of the game being played on Olympio and Stalino. Since she states that these games are to be played *in viam* (“the street”), Myrrhina emphasizes that, while the deception was developed inside of Cleostrata’s home, its realization will occur not just outside of the home, but indeed in the street, a very public place. While Stalino attempts to use deception to obtain his desire in secret, his wife uses trickery to prevent the consummation of his passion and even publicly embarrass him.

The belief that the public space outside of the home can be used to expose deception is also expressed in *Miles Gloriosus*. When Sceledrus, the Captain’s servant, remains unconvinced that Philocomasium is innocent of having an affair unbeknownst to the Captain, he stations himself outside of the Captain’s door in order to catch her sneaking out to visit her lover at the neighbor’s home (Pl. *Mil.* 328-329):

*At ego ilico observo foris;
nam nihil est qua hinc huc transire ea possit nisi recto ostio.*

But I watch the doors from this spot;
for there is no way she can cross from here to there except through the front door.

Sceledrus believes that the only way Philocomasium can enter the home next door is through the *recto ostio* (“front door”). He stations himself outside of the Captain’s house where he can see the neighbor’s front door, because then he will be able to catch her if she leaves her home to visit her lover. This implies that, while the neighbor’s home encloses the lovers and hides their love from those outside, the space between the houses can expose their *furtivus amor*. Thus, Sceledrus himself identifies the door as a boundary between the location of a secret love and that of its potential exposure.

The door is therefore an essential component of not only the Plautine *paraclausithyron* and erotic pursuit, but also the development and execution of the deception of either an obstacle to obtaining one’s beloved or the beloved herself. In *Curculio*, Planesium is under her pimp’s ownership, so she does not have the free will to love whomever she desires. Since Phaedromus does not have the money to buy her freedom, the love Planesium and Phaedromus share is a prototypical instance of *furtivus amor*, as the lovers “steal” their love from the pimp under the cover of nightfall. Further, the door of the pimp’s home does not challenge their love, but indeed enables it by opening silently when the two lovers meet. Therefore, the door, which is elsewhere seen as an impediment to love, here acts as a helper, but only when it is in its open or quietly opening state.

The door also aids deception in identity. When Jupiter possesses Alcmena, he takes on the appearance of her husband Amphitryon. Jupiter thus deceives his beloved herself, since she believes that she lies with her husband, and not with another being. When the real Amphitryon

comes home, he finds the door closed. Since Jupiter and Alcmena are enclosed within the home, the door serves to prevent the discovery of the deception both by Amphitryon, the rightful husband who is locked out of the house, and by Alcmena, since she is prevented from seeing her husband in duplicate. Mercury also acts as an obstacle to Amphitryon's access to the home, since he stands guard at the door and actively repels him from the home. Thus, the *furtivus amor* is protected both by the shut door of the home and by the servant who stands before it.

In *Miles Gloriosus*, Philocomasium must also utilize deception with respect to identity to prevent the discovery of her *furtivus amor* with Pleusicles. She pretends to be a twin, so that the servant who had seen her with her lover next door believes that her sister is the one visiting Pleusicles. She pretends to be herself at the Captain's home, but her twin sister at the neighbor's house. While she engages in her *furtivus amor* at her neighbor's home, Philocomasium lies to the Captain and his servants when she is inside of the Captain's home, so her deception in identity is located at the Captain's home rather than at the neighbor's.

While her servant Palaestrio voices disapproval of this deception, he corroborates her trickery and is even responsible for its inception, since he initially advises her to take on two identities. Further, to free Philocomasium, Palaestrio and Periplecomenus develop a plan to convince the Captain that the neighbor's wife is in love with him, so he will no longer desire Philocomasium and rid himself of her. The plan to convince the Captain of a love that does not exist is concocted at Periplecomenus's home, so Periplecomenus's home also encloses a deception while it is being formed. However, the two women pretending to be the neighbor's wife and her servant act out their false *paraclausithyron* scene before the Captain's home. Therefore, while the trick is planned inside the neighbor's home, it is played out in the public space in front of it. Thus, both homes and the space before them are instrumental to the

development and execution of deceptions that simultaneously allow the realization of true love and stop the possession of the girl by one who possesses her but does not love her.

Similarly, deception is executed in multiple locations in *Casina*. Stalino attempts to send his neighbor's wife to his own home, so he may steal Casina away to the neighbor's house to engage in *furtivus amor*. The neighbor's home was intended to act as a hiding place for Stalino's passion. However, Stalino's wife Cleostrata becomes aware of this attempted trick, and does not accept the neighbor's wife, keeping the neighbor's home occupied and inaccessible to Stalino. Then, to punish Stalino and prevent his possession of Casina, Cleostrata carries out a deception of her own by dressing up her servant Chalinus as Casina prior to Casina's wedding. Since Chalinus is dressed as Casina inside of Cleostrata and Stalino's home, their home serves as the birthplace for Cleostrata's trick. Since the wedding is performed in the area before the home, however, the deception is realized in the public space in front of it. Once again, deceptions are carried out within two neighboring homes and in the public space in front of them. Further, these deceptions are again intended either to allow the development of a relationship or to prevent it.

While the home usually encloses the development of a deception, and the space in front of it acts as the stage for its execution, the public space can also be seen as the place for its discovery. When Sceledrus remains unconvinced that Philocomasium is innocent of engaging in a love affair, he stations himself outside of the Captain's home, so that he may watch the front door of the neighbor's home to catch her sneaking off to her lover. He believes that this space in front of the house will reveal to him whether a deception has taken place, unaware of the secret passageway between the two homes. While Sceledrus is incorrect in his assumption, his reliance on the public space in front of the home reveals an important aspect of the front door—its

position as the boundary between the private space of the home, which can enclose deception, and the public space in front of the home, where *furtivus amor* cannot be hidden.

Even *Menaechmi*, which does not demonstrate intentional deception of the lover or her guardian, contains such a division between the public and private space. Erotium's home serves as the location for Menaechmus's *furtivus amor* without his wife's knowledge (Pl. *Men.* 171-174). When his identical twin brother arrives to the town, Erotium mistakes Syracusan Menaechmus for Epidamnian Menaechmus (Pl. *Men.* 361-368). Therefore, Syracusan Menaechmus's relationship with Erotium is realized as a result of a mistake rather than intentional trickery. Further, since this relationship is consummated within the home (Pl. *Men.* 473-476), Erotium's home serves as the enclosure for not only Epidamnian Menaechmus's love affair, but also the mistaken love affair between his twin and his mistress.

Thus, while Plautus uses doors and the spaces delineated by them to demonstrate either the culmination or prevention of *furtivus amor*, he also uses them in a novel manner to develop, perform, or reveal deception of either one's beloved or her owner. To the extent of my knowledge, such uses of the *paraclausithyron* and the shut door of the home in general have not been found in any other Greek or Roman source. They are therefore hallmarks of Plautine comedy, belonging neither to the Greek nor Roman worlds, but found in their own distinctly Plautine space and time.

Conclusion

Does Plautus's erotic comedy indicate a more significant influence from the Greek comedies that were written before Plautus's time or from the Roman world by which he was surrounded? In my previous chapters, I have analyzed Plautine comedy's uses of the theme of *militia amoris* and scenes of *paraclausithyron* or doors in general to address this question of Plautus's place in the transition between Greek and Roman erotic literature in the ancient world. While Plautus's plays are adaptations of preexisting Greek comedies, they contain distinctly Roman characteristics, indicating that Plautus was engaged with the world in which he resided.

Although *militia amoris* is a Latin term applied to the lover's fight for his beloved in later Roman love elegy, the motif already existed in ancient Greek sources, as seen in writings by Sappho and Sophocles.⁵⁸ Yet, Plautus was the first to use this theme in comedy.⁵⁹ His use of the theme is especially unusual, since slavery to love was considered "un-Roman" behavior during Plautus's time.⁶⁰ However, he was able to get away with using this theme in his writings, because he sets his plays in Greece rather than in Rome.

In Plautine comedy, a direct fight between lovers or between the lover and another suitor is never seen. While Phaedromus claims that he serves the deities of love on the battlefield for Planesium in *Curculio*, he ultimately relies on his servant to forge the letter that will grant him access to his beloved. Therefore, although he identifies himself as a soldier in the fight for his love, he does not himself bring about his victory. Similarly, although the father and son are identified as the leaders of their respective legions in the battle for Casina in *Casina*, they rely on

⁵⁸ Murgatroyd 1975, 61.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 61.

⁶⁰ Segal 1968, 111.

their servants to draw lots for her hand in marriage and provide them with access to the girl. This protection of a relationship by one's servant is again seen in *Miles Gloriosus* and *Amphitruo*. Although the lover's servant is responsible for obtaining the money for his beloved's freedom in *Bacchides*, his friend actively protects and saves the beloved for him. Therefore, the lovers are not fully responsible for their conquests in *militia amoris* in Plautine comedy, since they rely on their friends and servants to aid them.

Although characterization of love as a battle was not common during Plautus's time, it proliferated in later Roman love elegy. For example, in *Amores* 1.9, Ovid compares the soldier to the lover (Ov. *Am.* 1.9.27-28):

*custodum transire manus vigilumque catervas
militis et miseri semper amantis opus.*

To pass through the band of guards and the troop of sentries
is always the task of the soldier and unhappy lover.

Here, the lover's resemblance to the soldier is explicitly stated. Thus, Roman love elegy does not shy away from identifying the lover as a fighter in the pursuit of his beloved. When Plautus compares the lover to a soldier, he does so by emphasizing the differences rather than the similarities between the two types of men (Pl. *Bac.* 68-72). However, these contrasts ultimately demonstrate how similar the mistress's home is to the battlefield. Therefore, although Plautus does not make the radical choice to unite the lover and the soldier in his writings explicitly, he does characterize the quest for love as a battle, showing the similarities between the two types of men through his seemingly opposing depictions of them.

An important scene during *militia amoris* is that of the *paraclausithyron*, or the shut-out lover begging for access to the beloved outside of her door. The scene is traditionally Greek, and consists of the lover, the beloved, and the lover's plea for admission into the beloved's home.

This scene follows his procession through the street to her doorstep and realization that the door is closed to him.⁶¹ In addition, the lover may express the hope that he will find his beloved alone, and admit that he is drunk.⁶² The Roman *paraclausithyron* differs from the Greek primarily in the lover's address to the door itself rather than to the mistress behind it.⁶³ Scholars have claimed that this difference in addressee occurred because the Romans already had their own version of a shut-door song, which they incorporated into their *paraclausithyra*.⁶⁴

While Plautus's *paraclausithyra* mimic Greek versions of the scene, they are often altered to fit the plot, add humor, or align better with the Roman view of love. In *Menaechmi*, Menaechmus laments his exclusion from his wife's and his mistress's homes, but does not explicitly express desire for either woman, making it appear as though he yearns for a home rather than a lover. Since the *paraclausithyron* is a plea for admission with the intended outcome of obtaining the woman inside of the home, Menaechmus's lack of desire for the women belies the scene's classification as a *paraclausithyron*. Further, the women use the threat of locking Menaechmus out of the home to force him to treat them with dignity. This threat is similarly seen in *Casina* and *Miles Gloriosus*, in which husbands threaten wives with exclusion from the home to ensure obedience and loyalty. Plautus therefore uses the shut door as a punishment or threat of punishment rather than an expression of love in these plays.

However, Plautus preserves the *paraclausithyron*'s primary and secondary elements in *Curculio*, where the drunk Phaedromus arrives at his beloved's home and expresses his desire to see her. When Pleusicles begs the bolts on the door to yield to him, he personifies the door, indicating the scene's classification as a Roman *paraclausithyron* rather than a Greek one.

⁶¹ Cairns 1972, 6.

⁶² Yardley 1978, 19.

⁶³ Copley 1956, 36.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 28.

Both the Greek and Roman versions of the *paraclausithyron* can be found in later Latin sources. About a century after Plautus's time, Lucretius describes a traditional *paraclausithyron* scene (Lucr. 4.1177-79):⁶⁵

*at lacrimans exclusus amator limina saepe
floribus et sertis operit postisque superbos
unguit amaracino et foribus miser oscula fingit.*

But crying, the shut-out lover often buries the threshold
with flowers and wreaths and anoints the haughty doorposts
with perfume and unhappily plants kisses on the doors.

This scene clearly mimics the traditional Greek *paraclausithyron*, where the garlanded drunk lover comes to his beloved's door after a *komos* and expresses his desire for her by leaving his wreath at her door. This scene is particularly reminiscent of that found in *Curculio*, where Phaedromus arrives at his beloved's door and sprinkles it with wine to induce its opening (Pl. *Cur.* 88-89). Thus, the *paraclausithyron* survives even after Plautus's time in its true Greek form. Such a scene is also found in later Roman love elegy (Ov. *Fast.* 5.339-40):⁶⁶

*ebrius ad durum formosae limen amicae
cantat, habent unctae mollia sarta comae.*

Drunk, at the harsh threshold of his beautiful girlfriend,
he sings; his perfumed hair has soft garlands.

In this scene, Ovid similarly references a traditional Greek *paraclausithyron*, since he describes a garlanded and perfumed drunk lover at his beloved's door, much like Lucretius had in his own writings. Therefore, even the Roman love elegists preserved the Greek *paraclausithyron* in their depictions of lovers at their beloveds' doors. However, they also describe more traditionally Roman versions of the scene: *respondes tacitis mutua cardinibus*

⁶⁵ Text taken from Copley 1956, 44.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 82.

(“your hinges are silent in response,” Prop. 1.16.35-36).⁶⁷ Because Propertius directly addresses the door, his plea is a *paraclausithyron* of the Roman type, since the lover speaks to the door rather than to his beloved beyond it. This scene is similar to the one found in *Curculio* (Pl. *Cur.* 147-155), since both Propertius and Phaedromus blame the hinges of the door for their inability to enter the home. Thus, Plautus and the Roman authors who follow him both preserve the Greek version of the *paraclausithyron* and present the more distinctly Roman form of it.

Another difference between Greek and Roman *paraclausithyra* is the result of the lover’s efforts to gain admission into the home. In the Greek *paraclausithyron* of the dramatic form, the lover’s admission or exclusion relies on the requirements of the plot, while the non-dramatic requires that the lover be denied entry.⁶⁸ In the Roman *paraclausithyron*, on the other hand, the lover is always rejected.⁶⁹

The *paraclausithyra* found in the Plautine plays that I investigated are all of the Greek dramatic type. In *Curculio*, *Miles Gloriosus*, and *Bacchides*, the door must open to the lover to allow for the progression of the plot and the reunion of the lovers. In *Menaechmi*, the opposite occurs. Erotium’s home is always open to Menaechmus until he insults her, so she decides to punish him by denying him entry unless he returns with money. However, Menaechmus must be excluded from the home, since he must reunite with his twin brother in the public space in front of it. Therefore, the plot of *Menaechmi* relies on Menaechmus’s rejection by his mistress. Since Plautus’s plays are adaptations of Greek stories, and his *paraclausithyra* are not portrayed as isolated incidents, but rather as scenes within a greater plot, it is perhaps not surprising that his plays do not contain *paraclausithyra* of the Roman type.

⁶⁷ Text taken from Copley 1956, 81.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 7.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 33.

The Roman authors that came after Plautus's time primarily described *paraclausithyra* of the Roman form. While they were aware of the existence of the Greek type, they themselves relied on the Roman (Tibullus 2.3.73-74):⁷⁰

*nullus erat custos, nulla exclusura dolentes
ianua: si fas est, mos precor ille redi.*

There was no guardian, no door shutting out hurt lovers:
if it is right, I beg for that custom to return.

Tibullus acknowledges that there was once a time when lovers were not perpetually excluded from the home. Since Tibullus references a time of potential admission of the excluded lover, it is clear that the awareness of such a tradition survived until the time of the love elegists. However, the love elegists themselves use the Roman form of the *paraclausithyron* in their writings. Therefore, there must have been a transition from one tradition to the other sometime between Plautus's lifetime and the era of love elegy, but Plautus himself used *paraclausithyra* of the older, Greek type.

However, Plautus does incorporate the distinctly Roman theme of violence in his *paraclausithyra* by describing the lovers' knocking on the door as aggressive. In *Amphitruo*, Amphitryon loudly knocks on the door, for which Mercury reprimands him. In *Bacchides* and *Miles Gloriosus*, lovers threaten to tear down the door if it is not willingly opened to them. In *Casina*, Stalino's servant Olympio locks the door to prevent his master from utilizing force against him or his bride. Since violence against the beloved or the door hiding her was not seen in Greek writings, Plautus's use of the distinctly Roman theme indicates that he was influenced by contemporary Roman ideas while producing his plays.

⁷⁰ Text taken from Copley 1956, 72.

Love elegists later used violent descriptions to describe scenes of *paraclausithyron* and the lover's forceful conquest of his beloved. For example, Tibullus describes how a woman can be overpowered (Tibullus 1.10.53-54):⁷¹

...scissosque capillos
femina perfractas conqueriturque fores.

the woman wails that her hair is torn and
the doors are broken through.

In this scene, Tibullus describes the aftermath of a *paraclausithyron* in which the lover is victorious. The lover was successful in breaking the door and possessing the woman whom he desired. Force was therefore applied both to the door and to the woman behind it. This is reminiscent of Plautus's *Casina*, since Stalino similarly attempts to break through the door and possess Casina against her will. Since Plautus used violence in his plays centuries before the love elegists described their woes of love, he was at the forefront of the use of this theme in his *paraclausithyra*.

Finally, let us return to my criteria for selection of Plautine comedies to read and analyze. The six plays that I chose to investigate have the distinctly Plautine characteristic of containing deception within their plots and using *paraclausithyra* and doors in general to further them. In *Curculio*, for example, Phaedromus and Planesium can only secretly visit each other by her door during the night, since Planesium belongs to a pimp. However, the door is more often used to hide the formation of a trick in Plautine comedy. For example, Palaestrio and Periplecomenus plan Philocomasium's escape within Periplecomenus's home in *Miles Gloriosus*, and Cleostrata dresses up her servant as Olympio's bride within her own home in *Casina* to thwart her husband's plan of infidelity. The most prominent deception found in Plautus's plays is that of

⁷¹ Text taken from Copley 1956, 71.

identity, such as Jupiter's appearance as Alcmena's husband and Mercury's appearance as his servant in *Amphitruo*, Philocomasium's claim that she has a twin sister in *Miles Gloriosus*, the confusion of the twin sisters in *Bacchides*, and the confusion of the twin brothers in *Menaechmi*. The former two plays use deception to further the lover's quest of obtaining his beloved, while the latter use deception to hinder it. In no other Greek or Roman sources are *paraclausithyra* and doors in general used to hide such deceptions. This may suggest that this theme of Plautus's never took root with his Roman audience. Or perhaps it simply highlights his individuality and genius.

Ultimately, Plautus's writings are a reflection of his time. While his *paraclausithyra* are of the traditional Greek dramatic type, they also incorporate the distinctly Roman theme of violence that becomes prominent in later love elegy. And although *militia amoris* is found predominantly in either early sentimental Greek writings or later Roman love elegy, it can also be found in Plautus's comparisons of love and war, indicating that he acts as a carrier of the theme from one era of literature to the next. While writing styles change over time and differ between nations with respect to their methods of portraying the pains of love, the core sentiment remains. As Plautus himself eloquently states in *Asinaria*: *uti miser est homo qui amat* ("how miserable is the man who loves," Pl. *As.* 616).

Bibliography

- Cairns, F. *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*. Edinburgh, 1972.
- Copley, F. *Exclusus Amator: A Study in Latin Love Poetry*. Baltimore, 1956.
- Duckworth, G. E. *The Nature of Roman Comedy*. Princeton, 1952.
- Fantham, E. *Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery*. Toronto, 1972.
- Frangoulidis, S. "Transformations of Paraclausithyron in Plautus' *Curculio*," in *Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature*, ed. T. Papanghelis et al. Göttingen, 2013.
- McCarthy, K. *Slaves, Masters, and the Art of Authority in Plautine Comedy*. Princeton, 2000.
- Moore, T. *The Theater of Plautus*. University of Texas Press, 1998.
- Murgatroyd, P. "'Militia Amoris' and the Roman Elegists," in *Latomus* 34, 1975.
- Nappa, C. "Elegy on the Threshold: Generic Self-Consciousness and the Reader in Propertius 1.16." *Classical World* 100, 2007.
- Segal, E. *Roman Laughter*. Cambridge, 1968.
- Yardley, J.C. "The Elegiac Paraclausithyron," *Eranos* 76, 1978.