

VII.—On the Origin of Certain Features of the Paraclausithyron

FRANK OLIN COPLEY

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Four conventional features of the paraclausithyron, 1. the lover's procession through the streets, 2. his drunkenness, 3. his garland, and 4. his vigil by the door, are explained as having been derived from corresponding features of the ancient κῶμος.

The ancient paraclausithyron, the lament of the shut-out lover, is based invariably on a stock dramatic scene: the lover, intoxicated, and wearing a garland, comes to the door of his beloved, which he finds shut against him. To the girl within, or sometimes to the door itself, he sings his song, begging for pity, pleading for admission, sometimes cursing the girl for her obstinacy and himself for his folly. It does him no good; the door remains closed. He flings down his garland or hangs it on the doorway, and then himself lies down on the doorstep to await the coming of dawn.¹ Whether the paraclausithyron be cast in lyric, elegiac, pastoral, or epigrammatic form—and it appears in all these guises—the scene remains the same. If all the elements are not specifically included, they are tacitly subsumed. Only the dramatic paraclausithyron shows any important deviation: in some of the examples from Comedy, the lover in the end obtains admission, presumably because he must, in order that the plot may be developed in the desired manner.² Otherwise the incident is completely stereotyped. Whether it was real or fanciful is a question difficult to answer with certainty; to some of the poets it was doubtless pure fancy, an accepted convention of the literary love-affair;³ to others it must have been real

¹ Cf. Erich Burck, "Das Paraklausithyron," *Hum. Gym.* 43 (1932) 186–200; H. De la Ville de Mirmont, "Le παρακλαυθύριον dans la littérature latine," *Philologie et Linguistique, Mélanges Offeris à Louis Havet* (Paris, 1909) 573–576; H. V. Canter, "The Paraclausithyron as a Literary Theme," *AJPh* 41 (1920) 355–357; Alfred Körte, *Die Hellenistische Dichtung* (Leipzig, 1925) 243; F. O. Copley, "A Paraclausithyron from Pompeii," *AJPh* 60 (1939) 335–336.

² Cf. Arist. *Eccl.* 938–975; Plaut. *Curc.* 1–164. But in the mime the lover is regularly excluded, as he is in Aristophanes' and Terence's parodies of the paraclausithyron in the *Lysistrata* and the *Eunuchus*: *Tebt. Pap.* (Grenfell and Hunt) vol. I, No. 2, Sec. (d); Arist. *Lys.* 845–979; Ter. *Eun.* 771–816.

³ Cf. De la Ville de Mirmont, *op. cit.* (see note 1) 580; H. Belling, *Albius Tibullus* (Berlin, 1897) 85, note 1; E. Rohde, *Der Griechische Roman* (1914) 74–76; F. Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen* (Berlin, 1912) 155.

enough.⁴ In any case it is an incident richly productive of poems dealing with the sorrows of love.

One may well wonder where such a scene originated. Whence came this tipsy lover, garlanded, and proceeding so hopefully to his beloved's door, only to be repulsed and lie there on the hard stones all night? Why is he drunk? Why does he wear a garland? And—most strange of all—why does he keep his useless vigil by the door? Are these conventions the result of some poet's ingenuity, or do they have their origin in a sociological phenomenon or folkway of ancient life? These are the questions which this study will attempt to answer.

As it happens, a simple explanation for most of the features of the paraclausithyron-incident lies ready at hand in the fact that the word used by the ancients themselves to designate it is not *παρακλαυσίθυρον*,⁵ for that term is used only for the song, and only by Plutarch, but rather *κῶμος*, together with the corresponding verbs *κωμάζειν* and *ἐπικωμάζειν*.⁶

Now the *κῶμος* was normally the drunken rout or revel which followed after the symposium. The young men who had been drinking together poured out into the streets and went in search of further diversion either at the home of one of their company or at a tavern or brothel. It was a rowdy, drunken crowd; as they went they shouted and sang songs. When the procession ended before a brothel, the young men noisily demanded admission, and if they found the door barred against them they often attacked it with axes and torches.⁷ If they were in mellower mood, they might content themselves with singing a song before the door, and then go on or disperse. Apparently the door seldom was opened, for the ancient writers regularly view this song-before-the-door, or *κῶμος-song*, as I have preferred to call it, as the regular aftermath or

⁴ See below, page 103.

⁵ Plu. *Amat.* 8.753B: *τίς ὁ κολῶν ἐστὶ κωμάζειν ἐπὶ θύρας, ἔδειν τὸ παρακλαυσίθυρον*, κτλ. For a discussion of the etymology of *παρακλαυσίθυρον*, see Canter, *op. cit.* (see note 1) 356, note 11.

⁶ *κῶμος*: Mel. *A.P.* 5.165.2; 190.2; 191.2, 8; 12.23.2; 119.1; 167.2; Paul. Sil. *A.P.* 5.281.1. *κωμάζειν*: Theocr. 3.1; Ascl. *A.P.* 5.64.4; Mel. *A.P.* 12.117.2-3; Anon. *A.P.* 12.115.3; 116.1. *ἐπικωμάζειν*: Call. *A.P.* 12.118.1.

The Roman writers sometimes use the form *comissari* (Plaut. *Pers.* 567), but this more normally refers to the drunken rout rather than to the paraclausithyron-incident. For the latter they employ various descriptive terms such as *occentare fores* (Plaut. *Curc.* 145; *Merc.* 408; *Pers.* 567) or *obsidere fores* (Ov. *Ars Am.* 2.526).

⁷ Cf. Theocr. 2.127-128; Hor. *Od.* 1.25.1-2; 3.26.6-8; Lamer, *RE s.v.* *κῶμος*.

climax of the κῶμος.⁸ The term κῶμος is applied without further distinction first, to the drunken revel or festive procession in general,⁹ second, to that particular form of the revel which ended in a κῶμος-song before the door of a brothel,¹⁰ and finally, to the paraclausithyron-incident with its accompanying lament, the paraclausithyron itself.¹¹

It is the second and third of these usages which concern us here. Not only is the same term employed in both cases; it will be seen at a glance that the situation in each is strikingly similar, not to say identical. Each involves a procession through the streets to the door of a woman's house;¹² each ends with a song there. But the resemblance goes even farther than that. The κωμαστής is always intoxicated, if not to the point of soddenness, at least to that of gayety.¹³ So, too, is the singer of the paraclausithyron.¹⁴ Even when the element of inebriety is minimized or left entirely unmentioned, the invariable procession to the door recalls the drunken passage of the reveler through the streets,¹⁵ and in some cases at least, the tone of the song itself suggests the singer's lack

⁸ This is suggested by the juxtaposition of terms in Plutarch, *loc. cit.* (see note 5), and *de cohibend. ira* 5: ἐπικωμάσαι καὶ ἔσαι καὶ στεφανῶσαι θύραν. See also Lucian, *bis acc.* 31: καθ' ἑκάστην δὲ τὴν νύκτα ὁ μὲν στενωπὸς ἡμῶν ἐνεπίμπλατο μεθύνωντων ἑραστῶν κωμαζόντων ἐπ' αὐτὴν καὶ κοπτόντων τὴν θύραν, ἐνίων δὲ καὶ ἐσβιάζεσθαι σὺν οὐδενὶ κόσμῳ τολμώντων. αὐτὴ δὲ ἐγέλα καὶ ἤδετο τοῖς δρωμένοις καὶ τὰ πολλὰ ἢ παρέκλυπεν ἀπὸ τοῦ τέγους ἀδόντων ἀκούουσα τραχεῖα τῇ φωνῇ ὥδ' αὖ τις τινος ἑταιρικός, ἦ καὶ, κτλ. Cf. Lamer, *op. cit.* (see note 7), Col. 1296.

⁹ Cf. Arist. *Plut.* 1038-1096.

¹⁰ So in the Pratinas-fragment, *ap. Athen.* 617 B. 8, 9-11 (cp. Garrod, *CR* 34 [1920] 129ff.), Theognis 825-830, Diehl, and probably also Alcaeus, frg. 65, Diehl (cp. Smyth, *Greek Melic Poets* [London, 1906] 226 [on Alcaeus XXXIV]).

¹¹ Above, note 6; cf. Lamer, *loc. cit.* (see note 7).

¹² Sometimes, to be sure, a *puer delicatus* rather than a woman is involved, e.g. Ps.-Theocr. 23; Mel. *A.P.* 12.23, and occasionally the song was sung by a woman to her lover, as in the Alexandrian Erotic Fragment (B. P. Grenfell, *An Alexandrian Erotic Fragment* [Oxford, 1896]; Grenfell and Hunt, *Greek Papyri*, second series, 209ff.; J. U. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina* [Oxford, 1925] 177-180).

¹³ Lamer, *op. cit.* (see note 7), col. 1287, *et pass.*; Herod. 1.21.2 (Θρασύβουλος) προέειπε Μιλησίοις, ἐπεὰν σιμήνῃ, τότε πίνειν τε πάντας καὶ κῶμῳ χρᾶσθαι ἐς ἀλλήλους; cf. the eloquent lament of Theognis: οὐ δύναμαι φωνῇ λίγ' αἰδέμεν ὥσπερ ἀηδῶν· καὶ γὰρ τὴν προτέρην νύκτ' ἐπὶ κῶμον ἔβην, 939-940, Diehl.

¹⁴ Arist. *Ecd.* 948; Ascl. *A.P.* 5.167.1-2; Call. *A.P.* 12.118.3; Mel. *A.P.* 12.117.2; Anon. *A.P.* 12.116.1; Grenfell and Hunt, *Tebt. Pap.* 1.1.15-16.1; *id.* 1.2. (d) 20; the κωμαστής, 4-5 (Powell, *op. cit.* [see note 12] 181; Crusius, *Herondas* [1914] 137-138); Tib. 1.2.1-4; Prop. 1.16.5-6; Ov. *Am.* 1.6.37-38.

¹⁵ There must be a procession, even when the poet does not mention it (e.g. Ascl. *A.P.* 5.145, 167; Call. *A.P.* 5.23; Mel. *A.P.* 12.72; Hor. *Od.* 3.10; Tib. 1.2); else how does the lover arrive before the girl's door?

of complete sobriety. Thus, although Theocritus' goatherd does not proclaim his drunkenness, yet his tearful protestations of woe, his pathetic wish to become a bumblebee, that he might penetrate the thicket where Amaryllis is hiding, and his tragicomic threat to lie down and die if she does not requite his love, are sentiments which, to say the least, would not be inappropriate in the mouth of a tipsy man.¹⁶ The same may be said of Asclepiades' bold defiance of the weather as he stands before his beloved's door:

νέϊφε, χαλαζοβόλει, ποίει σκότος, αἶθε, κεραύνου,
πάντα τὰ πορφυρέοντ' ἐν χθονὶ σείε νέφη.¹⁷

The suicide-paraclausithyron of Ps.-Theocritus becomes more believable if we can imagine that its protagonist is drunk; its ugly, half-insane mood is that of a man driven out of his senses by drink.¹⁸ Although in Plautus' *Curculio* Phaedromus seems to be saving his wine as a bribe for Planesium's duenna, yet his maudlin song to the door-bolts¹⁹ suggests that he may have sampled it rather liberally himself. The few examples in which there is no hint of the singer's drunkenness are otherwise so typical of the paraclausithyron as not to constitute true exceptions to the rule.²⁰

In addition to the common element of drunkenness, there is the garland, worn both by the *κωμαστής* and by the singer of the paraclausithyron.²¹ It is, of course, a bit of apparatus left over from the symposium, where the reveler had donned it when the wine was brought in.²² For the *κωμαστής* it had no particular function beyond that of preserving the atmosphere of gayety,²³ but with the singer of the paraclausithyron it is the central point upon which are

¹⁶ *Id.* 3.12, 13-14, 52-54.

¹⁷ *A.P.* 5.64.1-2.

¹⁸ *Id.* 23. See also Ovid's version of the same theme, *Mét.* 14.698-758.

¹⁹ 147-152.

²⁰ E.g. Ascl. *A.P.* 5.145, 189; *Mét.* *A.P.* 12.23, 72, 167; *Hor. Od.* 1.25; 3.10.

²¹ Garland of the *κωμαστής*: *Arist. Plut.* 1040-1041; 1098-1099; of the paraclausithyron-singer: *Theocr.* 3.21; *Ascl. A.P.* 5.145; *Mét. A.P.* 5.191.6; *Anon. A.P.* 12.116.2; *Marc. Arg. A.P.* 5.118; *Alex. Er. Frag.* 25-26 (above, note 12); *Cat.* 63.66-67; *Lucr.* 4.1177-1178; *Tib.* 1.2.13-14; *Prop.* 1.16.7; *Ov. Am.* 1.6.37-38; *Ars. Am.* 2.527-528; 3.71-72; *Mét.* 14.708-709. In the suicide-paraclausithyron of Ps.-Theocritus, the lover is himself the garland: see F. O. Copley, "The Suicide Paraclausithyron," *TAPhA* 71 (1940) 59-60. In Plautus' *Curculio* it must be assumed that a garland formed part of the *ornatus* worn by Phaedromus: Copley, *ibid.*, 60, note 24.

²² Bekker, *Charikles* (1877) vol. I, 160-162.

²³ Cf. L. Deubner, "Ueber die Bedeutung des Kranzes im Altertum," *JDAI* 46 (1931) col. 771.

focused his thoughts and actions. He hangs it on his lady's door;²⁴ he drenches it with his tears;²⁵ when it wilts it is the sign of the brevity of youth and of the joys of love;²⁶ it is a mark of suppli-
ance, and is ticketed with a melancholy inscription.²⁷ Sometimes, as a passage in Propertius shows, it is hung on the door as a smirch on the girl's character, since its presence indicates to the passers-by the class to which she belongs.²⁸ There are, to be sure, many paraclausithyra in which there is no mention of the garland, but this does not mean that the singer in such cases did not have one; it indicates only that he or the poet felt no need of calling attention to it.²⁹

The figure of the drunken, garlanded singer of the paraclausithyron finds then a ready explanation in the identity of the *κῶμος* and the paraclausithyron-incident. The lover is drunk because his prototype, the *κωμαστής*, was so; he wears the garland because the *κωμαστής* wore one; thus prepared and accoutred he goes through the streets to demand admission at the door of his beloved, and when repulsed, to sing his melancholy plaint there. There are but two important differences between the two incidents. The *κῶμος* was normally undertaken by a group of young men, whereas the singer of the paraclausithyron usually goes alone; and the tone of the *κῶμος* was one of revelry, while that of the paraclausithyron is one of tender sentiment.

These differences, however, are not great enough to weaken the thesis of identity, for the paraclausithyron bears vestigial remnants, so to speak, of the two particulars in which it differs from the *κῶμος*. Thus although the singer appears to go alone, he is frequently accompanied by one or more slaves or attendants whom sometimes he even addresses, as does an anonymous writer in the Palatine Anthology³⁰ and the singer of the *Alexandrian Erotic Fragment*.³¹

²⁴ Ascl. A.P. 5.145; Cat. 63.66; Lucr. 4.1177-1178; Tib. 1.2.13-14; Prop. 1.16.7; Ov. Am. 1.6.67-68; Ars Am. 2.528; Met. 14.708-709.

²⁵ Ascl. A.P. 5.145.1-3; Anon. A.P. 12.116.1-2; Ov. Met. 14.708-709.

²⁶ Marc. Arg. A.P. 5.118.3-4; Ps.-Theocr. 23.28-34.

²⁷ Mel. A.P. 5.191.5-8.

²⁸ Prop. 1.16.7: et mihi non desunt turpes pendere corollae; cf. Chariton 1.3.2: σημεία κώμου ἡσυχῇ κατέλιπον· ἔστεφάνωσαν τὰ πρόθυρα, μύροις ἔρραναν, κτλ.

²⁹ E.g. Arist. Eccl. 938-975; Ascl. A.P. 5.64, 164, 167, 189; Call. A.P. 5.23; 12.118; Mel. A.P. 5.190; 12.23, 72, 119, 167; Anon. A.P. 12.115; Ruf. A.P. 5.103; Hor. Od. 3.10. The imagery of Hor. Od. 1.25.17-20 seems to me to imply the garland.

³⁰ 12.116.1-2: παῖ, λάβε τοῦτον τὸν στέφανον.

³¹ 25: αὐτὸ δὲ τοῦτό μοι τοὺς στεφάνους βάλε. Crusius has shown convincingly that this is addressed to an attendant or servant: O. Crusius, "Grenfells Erotic Fragment," Ph 55 (1896) 367-368.

Phaedromus in the *Curculio* is accompanied by a *pompa*, presumably of slaves,³² and the two papyrus paraclausithyron-fragments both demonstrate the presence of at least one other person besides the singer.³³ The rowdy tone of the *κῶμος* is recalled by these same mime-fragments, by the obscenity of a few verses of the young man's song in the *Ecclesiazusae*,³⁴ and by the tradition, maintained by Plautus and to a less extent by other Roman writers, that the songs sung before the door were ribald and disgraceful.³⁵ One might indeed argue that in these last few instances the reference is not to the paraclausithyron but to the *κῶμος*-song; in point of fact it is impossible to say where the one leaves off and the other begins. There is no distinct cleavage between them. The poets appear to have seen in the incident and song of the *κῶμος* a potentially romantic situation which they adopted wholesale with only such changes in scene and tone as were necessary to render it a fit vehicle for the expression of the sorrows and woes of the literary lover.

In view of this fact, how are we to explain the lover's vigil by the door, his *κοίμησις ἐπὶ θύραις*, as Plato calls it.³⁶ There is no reference in any of the extant literature dealing with the *κῶμος* which would serve as a point of origin for this practice of the romantic poets. There is no indication that the *κωμῶστος*, after singing his *κῶμος*-song, threw himself at the entrance to the brothel, there to lie all night. Yet the singer of the paraclausithyron does, or threatens to do, precisely that, in example after example. The *κοίμησις*, in fact, is almost as fixed a convention in the paraclausithyron as are the lover's procession, his drunkenness, and his garland.³⁷ It is a symbolic act, demonstrative of the enslavement of the lover to his passion. Logically, since the paraclausithyron is such a close-knit form, the *κοίμησις* should also have begun with some practice of the *κωμῶστος*, yet no such connection immediately suggests itself.

³² *Curc.* 2.

³³ *Tebt. Pap.* and *κωμῶστος*: above, note 14.

³⁴ 963-965.

³⁵ Plaut. *Merc.* 406-411; Hor. *Od.* 1.25.13-16; Prop. 1.16.10.

³⁶ *Symp.* 183 A.

³⁷ Arist. *Eccl.* 960-962; Theocr. 3.52-53; 7.122-124; Call. *A.P.* 5.23.1-2; Mel. *A.P.* 12.72.1-2; Cat. 63.65; Hor. *Od.* 3.10.3-4; Tib. 1.2.1-4; Prop. 1.16.14, 22; Ov. *Ars Am.* 2.523-524; 3.581; *Met.* 14.709-710; Mart. *Ep.* 10.14.7. For discussion of the real or fanciful character of the *κοίμησις*, see De la Ville de Mirmont, Belling, and Leo, above, note 3.

One thinks at once, somehow, of religious ritual, as if the prostrate lover were going through an act of devotion to his beloved. She is his goddess, and he shows in this way his utter subjection to her power. But to this apparently simple explanation there are several objections. In the first place, prostration forms no part of either Greek or Roman cult. The ancient worshipper usually stands in the presence of his gods; he does not throw himself at their feet.³⁸ Further, as far as Greek paraclausithyra are concerned, there is little evidence that the lover imagined himself as performing a quasi-ritual before the door; the nearest he ever comes to this is to proclaim himself a votive offering to the gods of love, a declaration which is no more than a poetic conceit.³⁹ It is true that in Plautus' *Curculio* the young man, Phaedromus, indulges in comic parody of religious ritual, and the scene is presumably based on a similar one in the Greek original of the play.⁴⁰ However, Fraenkel has shown that the passage has many peculiarly Roman traits, and at least in its details may be entirely original with Plautus;⁴¹ further, whether Greek or Roman in inspiration, it has no connection with prostration, for in the *Curculio*-scene there is no *κοίμησις*. The only plausible case of quasi-ritual apart from this one is in Propertius' paraclausithyron, where a somewhat disputed text suggests that the poet may have Roman, though not Greek, religious practice in mind.⁴² Here again the quasi-ritual includes no *κοίμησις*, but deals instead with the lover's offering of gifts to the door. It is then impossible to explain this convention on the grounds that it is an imitation of religious ritual, even on the rather far-fetched assumption that we have an instance here of Oriental rather than of Greek or Roman cult. The paraclausithyron, apart from the two isolated instances just mentioned, gives no evidence of conscious imitation or parody of any kind of religious practice.⁴³

It might be suggested that the *κοίμησις* is simply an invention of the poets, devised as a dramatic symbol of love's woes. The

³⁸ Cf. Paul Stengel, *Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer* (München, 1898) 73-74 (v. Müller's *Hdbch.* Bd. 5, Abt. 3); Marquardt u. Mommsen, *Hdbch. der römischen Altertümer* (Leipzig, 1885) Bd. 6, Abt. III, 178-179.

³⁹ Mel. A.P. 5.191.5-8; 12.23.3-4. The same is true of the passage in which Meleager speaks of his performance as *ἐμὰ ὄργια*; A.P. 12.119.5-6.

⁴⁰ Plaut. *Curc.* 87-89.

⁴¹ *Plautinisches in Plautus* (Berlin, 1922) 25, 105.

⁴² Prop. 1.16.43-44. See the commentators, especially Rothstein, *ad. loc.*

⁴³ Further, such parody would have been considered in bad taste, as Rohde has shown: *op. cit.* (see note 3), 74-76.

whole paraclausithyron is a lament, and it would be not only natural but artistically sound that the song should culminate in some particularly striking instance of the lover's sufferings. What could be better adapted to this end than the figure of the prostrate lover, chilled by the night winds, wet with the rain or dew, his tear-stained face pressed against the unresponsive stones of the threshold? ⁴⁴ There is about this picture just that melodramatic, sensational quality which would tempt one to ascribe it to rhetorical ingenuity, and to imagine it as a bit of invention which caught hold and was imitated because of its vividness. Besides that, there is some evidence, not however convincing to me, that the *κοίμησις* was seldom, if ever, actually practiced by the poets. De la Ville de Mirmont and Belling ⁴⁵ have both argued that it is hard to conceive of such elegants as Callimachus, Meleager, and Tibullus stretched out on the dirty pavement, and Leo has maintained that Roman police-regulations would have prevented any such disgraceful exhibitions. ⁴⁶

This may be so, although the most polished of gentlemen have been known to do odd things in the name of love, as Plato himself has remarked. ⁴⁷ Furthermore, if the *κοίμησις* was never practiced, what point have the strictures of Lucretius and Martial against it, poets who were not given to tilting at windmills? ⁴⁸ Horace, too, recounts a *κοίμησις* of his own in his autobiographical *Epode* 11; ⁴⁹ Ovid recommends it in his instructions to the lover; ⁵⁰ and the emperor Nero, if we are to believe Suetonius, once endured similar agonies in the name of his love for Poppaea Sabina. ⁵¹ To turn again to the Greeks, Plato, as we have seen, includes the *κοίμησις* in his scornful account of the practices of lovers, and in the earliest complete paraclausithyron extant, the song of the young man in Aristophanes' *Ecclesiazusae*, the singer threatens to "fall down and lie here" if he is not admitted. ⁵²

⁴⁴ Call. *A.P.* 5.23; Mel. *A.P.* 12.72; Theocr. 3.52-53; 7.123-125; Lucr. 4.1177-1179; Hor. *Od.* 1.25.6-8; 3.10.1-4; 19-20; Tib. 1.2.1-4; Prop. 1.16.21-26, 35-40, 45-46; Ov. *Am.* 1.6.17-18; *Mel.* 14.709-710; Mart. 10.14.7-9.

⁴⁵ Above, note 3.

⁴⁶ *Loc. cit.* (see note 3).

⁴⁷ *Symp.* 183A: οἵαπερ οἱ ἔρασταί πρὸς τὰ παιδικὰ, ἱκετείας τε καὶ ἀντιβολήσεις ἐν ταῖς δέησεσιν ποιούμενοι, καὶ ὄρκους ὀμνύντες, καὶ κοιμήσεις ἐπὶ θύραις, καὶ ἐθέλοντες δουλείας δουλεύειν οἷας οὐδ' ἂν δοῦλος οὐδέις, κτλ.

⁴⁸ Lucr. 4.1177-1179; Mart. 10.14.7.

⁴⁹ 19-22; cp. Lejay *ad loc.*

⁵⁰ *Ars Am.* 2.523-524; cf. 3.69-70, 581.

⁵¹ Suet. *Olho* 3.1-2.

⁵² καταπεσὼν κείσομαι ,962.

Although this evidence may not refute the arguments of De la Ville de Mirmont and Belling, and we may still doubt with them that the gallants of Alexandria and Rome would have indulged in such unseemly performances, still it contradicts Leo's assertion, and proves that the *κοίμησις* was a reality at some periods and in some places. Rhetorical and poetic ingenuity may have embellished the incident, and certainly did, but they did not invent it. Whatever it may have become in poetry, it was once a matter of practice, and its origin must be sought in some folkway or circumstance of real life.

Let us recall at this point the changes that took place in the *κῶμος* and *κῶμος*-song when they were taken up by the erotic poets. Basically the process was one of refurbishment together with the addition of a number of subjective ideas. The maudlin procession becomes a lover's pilgrimage; drunkenness is softened to that mild stimulation which is no more than the guide of love; the garland, chance remnant of the symposium, becomes a symbol of love itself and is loaded with sentimental meaning. By proceeding in the reverse direction, by stripping the *κοίμησις* of its romantic associations, may we not arrive at some logical point of origin for it?

To state the obvious, the *κοίμησις* reveals at bottom nothing but the figure of a man, asleep on the stones of a doorway. In the paraclausithyron-incident, he lies there because he is overcome by suffering and disappointment. But let us suppose that instead of a romantic lover we have here a drunken *κωμαστής*. Might he not have fallen and gone to sleep there solely because of the effects of drink?

"And down in lovely muck I've lain,
Happy till I woke again."

Gross as this figure is, yet the emotions it arouses in the beholder are not always so. In some it excites scorn and contempt, in others ridicule, in others pity. If the poet could not find in the drunken sleeper himself much subject for poetry, yet he could in the feelings which that sleeper aroused, especially in that of pity. Further, love and wine have ever gone hand in hand;⁵³ let the poet imagine that it is love rather than wine that has laid the sufferer low. He might feel pity for one drunk with wine; let him feel that

⁵³ Cf. Arist. *Ecol.* 947-948; Ascl. *A.P.* 5.167.1-2; Call. *A.P.* 12.118.3-4; Poseid. *A.P.* 5.213.3-4; Mel. *A.P.* 12.117, 119; Anon. *A.P.* 12.115, 116; Paul. Sil. *A.P.* 5.281.1-2; Tib. 1.2.1-4; Prop. 1.16.5; Ov. *Am.* 1.6.37-38.

same pity for one overcome by his passion. Thus refurbished, let the sleeper become the suffering lover, performing voluntarily and for the express purpose of awaking pity an act which is the outward sign of his woe.

One would scarcely venture to maintain that it was precisely by this process that drunken sleep became the *κοίμησις*, but the conjecture at least does no violence to known facts, whether of literary history or of human nature, and it has the great virtue of connecting the *κοίμησις* with the *κῶμος*, and thus of giving it a starting-point identical with that of the other elements of the paraclausithyron-incident. It might be better, perhaps, to posit a sort of intermediate stage, that point at which the involuntary drunken sleep of the *κωμαστής* became the voluntary act of the *ἐραστής*, and then allow the *ποιητής* to continue the development from there on. Plato's statement would appear to support this theory, since it is clear that he views the *κοίμησις* as a regular practice of the lover, a characteristic feature of the love-making of his day, and not as a phenomenon arising from the heavy drinking of the *κῶμος*.

Substantiation of this theory of the origin of the *κοίμησις* is to be found in the mime-fragment from Tebtunis.⁵⁴ The piece is a parody, to be sure, and of comparatively late date, but it is none the less suggestive. This mutilated papyrus reveals very clearly a rudimentary paraclausithyron-scene which terminates in the drunken sleep of the protagonist.⁵⁵ The action and scene are as follows: there are two characters, one a seaman and demonstrably very drunk.⁵⁶ The other appears to be his slave or attendant.⁵⁷ They

⁵⁴ Above, note 14.

⁵⁵ Such scenes were much favored by the writers of the mimic performance called the *μαγδάλια*, if we may judge from a fragment of Aristoxenus preserved in Athenaeus 14.621B: ὁ δὲ μαγδῶδς καλούμενος τύμπανα ἔχει καὶ κύμβαλα . . . σκηνίζεται τε καὶ πάντα ποιεῖ τὰ ἔξω κόσμον, ὑποκρινόμενος ποτὲ μὲν γυναῖκα καὶ μοιχοῦς καὶ μαστροπούς, ποτὲ δ' ἄνδρα μεθύοντα καὶ ἐπὶ κῶμον παραγινόμενον πρὸς τὴν ἐρωμένην. (Quoted by Crusius, *op. cit.* [see note 31] 382; cf. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, "Des Mädchens Klage," *NGG Phil.-Hist. Kl.* [1896], 230.)

⁵⁶ The protagonist according to Powell and Winter is a seaman; they cite the *περιπέλευκας* of 12 and the *κατ'ἐ>αγμαί* ("shiver my timbers") of 14: J. U. Powell and E. A. Barber, *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature* (Oxford, 1921) 55-56; J. G. Winter, *Life and Letters in the Papyri* (Univ. of Mich., 1933) 216-217.

⁵⁷ He addresses the first character as *κύριος*: *κύριε, καθέδεις*, 18. I take these to be the words of the "attendant," not of the girl, for in typical paraclausithyron-scenes the girl does not appear. The *κυρία* of 3 in no way requires her presence, nor need it be assumed that she obeys the summons: *παράκλυσον ἱκεῶ*, *Κλευπάτ(ρα)* (I prefer Grenfell and Hunt's *Κλευπάτρα* to Crusius' suggested *Κλεῦπατρε* on the grounds that

approach the door of a woman, whom the drunken sailor begs to look out: παράκλινον, ἰκετῶ, Κλενπάτ(ρα).⁵⁸ There follow some badly mutilated lines, but in line 14 the text again becomes clear and its general sense can be followed from there on to the end. The drunken man is refused admission (ἐξαναστατοῦμαι, 16 [= excludor]); he asks for his cloak (δός μοι τὸν τρίβωνα, 17), and sitting or lying down upon it (the "business" can only be conjectured), he falls asleep, for in the next line his attendant cries out: κύριε, καθεύδεις (18). After grumbling about his own ill fortune and his master's stupidity ((ἐγὼ δὲ στρέφομαι καὶ μεθύων ἔρχεται ὁ μέγα . . . , 19-20) the attendant tries to wake his master by telling him that his ship is about to sail (ὁ κελέης σου γέμει, 21).

Such a scene provides a logical starting-point for the κοίμησις, for it links paraclausithyron and κῶμος together; indeed the whole fragment may be envisaged as standing midway between the two: with all the grossness of the drunken rout it yet preserves a hint of the lover's lament in the plea for admission and the melancholy ἐξαναστατοῦμαι, "I'm being shut out!" The drunken sleep comes just at the point where in the paraclausithyron we expect the κοίμησις, that is, after every attempt to gain entrance has failed.⁵⁹ Purged of its crude humor and coarseness, this prostration by the door might well have become, in the earlier stages of the development of the paraclausithyron, a desperate last measure, performed by the hapless lover in one final hope of arousing the girl's pity; repeated over and over again it could have been rendered conventional, a mere custom of the serenader: this stage may be the one we see in the passage from Plato's *Symposium*; vivified by the sentimentalism of the later poets, filled with romantic meaning, would it not be precisely the symbolic κοίμησις which we find in poem after poem of the paraclausithyron type? If there are few available facts with which to support this conjecture, yet it is in complete harmony with the course of development of the other features of the paraclausithyron, and enables us to state with some assurance, as ideally we should be able to do, that the whole paraclausithyron-incident has a single point of origin, the κῶμος.

this appeal is properly to be put in the mouth of the *exclusus*: cf. Theocr. 3.6-7: τί μ' οὐκέτι τοῦτο κατ' ἄντρον παρκύπτουσα καλεῖς; here too the girl does not appear.) For a discussion of the whole fragment see Powell and Winter, *op. cit.* (see note 56), and Crusius' notes *ad loc.* (see notes 54 and 14).

⁵⁸ *Loc. cit.* (see note 57).

⁵⁹ See the passages cited above, note 37.

To conclude, we have in the paraclausithyron and its accompanying scene a romanticized and conventionalized version of an ancient social custom, the revel through the streets. Beginning as the riotous κῶμος it rises in the scale of respectability as the song of the κωμαστῆς tends more and more to become a thing separate from the κῶμος. As this gap widens, the basic features of the song and incident become matters of tradition and convention, no longer necessarily representing an experience of real life, but still preserving to a large extent their original form. With the sentimental poets of love the song and all its elements are charged with subjective significance; in this last stage is laid the true paraclausithyron, a song which in conventional setting describes the plight of the literary lover who has discovered in his musings the bitter truth of the familiar Anacreontic verses:

χαλεπὸν τὸ μὴ φιλῆσαι·
χαλεπὸν δὲ καὶ φιλῆσαι·
χαλεπώτερον δὲ πάντων
ἀποτυγχάνειν φιλοῦντα.