moreover, are not steps "backward." They are, rather, like his rejection of Ishtar, indications of ethical progress—steps forward toward a kind of happiness which the alewife could never know.

Lastly, I must object to the implications of Jacobsen's following statement: "Gilgamesh's first quest for immortality in fame defied the gods and brought their retribution on him; this quest for actual immortality is even more deeply defiant; it defies human nature itself, the very condition of being human, finite, mortal. And in the end it is Gilgamesh's own human nature that reasserts itself; it is a basic human weakness, a moment of carelessness, that defeats him." 30 Gilgamesh's quest for immortality is in one sense a defiance of his human nature, but it is not so much a defiance of it that his human nature must "reassert itself" by revealing Gilgamesh's human weakness. Rather, his human nature asserts itself and reveals itself in all that he does, including his quest for immortality. To desire immortality, and to seek to obtain it if that seems possible, is after all not merely not contrary to our nature, but rather perfectly human. The doctrine of the Symposium, that men by nature desire immortality and the eternal possession of the good, including the good of life itself, is emphatically confirmed by the example of Gilgamesh. It is, moreover, in my opinion, the main point of the story that Gilgamesh, far from defying or contradicting human nature by his actions, rather through them succeeds in doing what men by nature tend to do and need to do if they are to fulfill their nature and obtain true happiness.

In attempting to underscore the similarities between the Gilgamesh Epic and the Symposium, I have, I realize, failed to do justice to their dissimilarities, for example, contemplation of the idea of Beauty, so important in the Symposium, has no counterpart in Gilgamesh. My thesis, however, has not been that significant dissimilarities do not exist, but rather that the similarities, in theme, structure, and treatment are so outstanding that they afford sufficient basis for asserting that the seeds of a teleological view of man's nature can be found in the Gilgamesh Epic. That thesis should now have been adequately documented.

A GREEK INDECENCY AND ITS STUDENTS
ΛΑΙΚΑΖΕΙΝ

Three words of the Aristophanic lexicon, λαικάζειν, λαικαστής and λαικάςτρια, are not fully explained by the contexts in which they occur. The remains of ancient learning known to scholars of the sixteenth century contained no clear and unambiguous doctrine about them. A considerable amount of fresh material however has accumulated during recent centuries. The Latinists W. Heraeus and A. E. Housman studied what was available to them around the years 1914 and 1930 respectively and came to firm conclusions but without persuading many students of Aristophanes' comic scripts in particular or of the Greek language in general. G. P. Shipp has recently drawn attention to a third century A.D. document, first published as long ago as 1925, which has the verb in a context leaving little doubt about the user's meaning. This paper attempts to consider systematically the evidence now available and to make clear how Aristophanes and other Athenians of the fifth, fourth and third centuries B.C. used the word group. It is argued that the verb remained alive among some speakers of Greek without change of function until very late and that Housman's explanation of the Aristophanic passages was correct. The course of scholarly discussion since Greek texts began to be printed is elucidated and an ambiguous statement by a Byzantine student of Aristophanes is shown to be the root cause of the widespread inability of modern Hellenists to grasp the truth. A recent attempt to extend the range of slanders anciently levelled against the inhabitants of Lesbos is refuted. One appendix publishes the text of a letter written about λαικάζειν by A. E. Housman to the reviser of Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon. Four other appendices discuss passages of Attic comedy whose general interpretation has been affected by the prevailing uncertainty as to the particular sense of λαικάζειν and its derivative nouns. A sixth relates to λαικάζειν a number of uses of the name of the grapheme lambda.

ATTIC GREEK

The pattern of occurrence of the words in the literature which survives from the fifth, fourth and third centuries shows that their tone was coarse to educated Athenian ears. The verb λαικάζειν is clearly evidenced five times in the remains of comedy, the masculine noun λαικαστής once, and the feminine noun λαικάςτρια four times. I cite the nine passages in question without prejudging any issue textually:
ΛΑΙΚΑΖΕΙΝ

Aristophanes, Equ. 164-7

τούτων ἀπάντων αὐτὸς ἀρχέλας ἔσει,
kai τῆς ἀγορᾶς καὶ τῶν λιμένων καὶ τῆς πυκνός·
βουλὴν πατήσεις καὶ στρατηγοὺς κλαστάσεις
dήσεις φιλάξεις, ἐν πρωτανεώ τλαικάσεις.

Aristophanes, Thesm. 49-63

μέλλει γὰρ ὁ καλλιεπῆς Ἀγάθων
πράμος (πρόμος Grynæus) ὁμέτερος — ὁ μόνον βινείσθαι;

· tis ὁ φονήσας; · νήνεμος αἰθήρ.
· ὅροφοις τίθεναι δράματος ἀρχαὶ.
κάμπτει δὲ νέας ἀγίδας ἐπῶν,
tά δὲ τορνεύει, τά δὲ κολλομελεῖ,
καὶ γνωμοτυπεῖ κάντονομάζει
καὶ κηροχυτεῖ καὶ γογγύλλει (Porsen: γογγυλίζει)
καὶ χοανεύει. · καὶ λαικάζει.

· tis ἀγροϊτας (Bentley: ἀγρωτας) πελάθει ἑριγκοῖς;
· ὁς ἔτοιμος σοῦ τοῦ τε ποιητοῦ
tου καλλιεργοῦ κατὰ τοῦ ἑριγκοῦ
συγγογύλας (Enger: γογγυλίσας) καὶ συστρέψας
tουτὶ τὸ πέος χοανέλθαι.

· ἢ που νέος γ ὅν ἤσθ ὁ βριστής ὁ γέρον.

Cephalodorus, fr. 3 Kock (Athenaeus XII 553 a, XV 689 f.)

ἐπειτ’ ἄλειψοσθαὶ πρὶς τὸ σωμά μοι
μύρων ἱρινον καὶ βόδινων, ἀγαμι, Ξανθία·
καὶ τοὺς ποσίν χωρίς πρὶς μοι βάκκαριν.

· ὃ λακκόπροκτε, βάκκαριν τοῖς σοῖς ποσίν
ἐγὼ πρίσωμαι; t laikais ὄμαρβάκχαριν.

Menander, Dysc. 888-926

μάγειρε
Σίκων, πρόελ[θε διηύρο μ[o] [σ] ὑδάτ[τ]οιν. ὃ Πόσείδον,
ioan ἔχειν ὀμ[F] διατριβήν. · συ μ[ε] κα[m]εῖς; · ἔγωγε,
tiμορίαν [βουλ]εῖ λαβεῖν ἀν ἀρτίως ἐπασχεῖς;

· ἔγω δ’ ἐπασχ[ον ἀρ]τίος. οὐ λαικάσει φιλαρῶν;

Strato, fr. 1. 36-9 (Athenaeus IX 383 a)

πηγὸς πάρεστι; — πηγὸς; οὐχὶ ἔλεκας εἰ ἔρεις σαφέστερον ἢ βούλει μοι λέγειν;
— ἀτάσθαλος γ’ εἰ πρέσβυ, φησίν, ἀλα φέρε·
tοῦτ’ ἔσθ’ ὁ πηγὸς, τοῦτο δείξον.

Aristophanes, Ach. 72-910

ξενιζόμενοι δὲ πρὸς βιαν ἔπινομεν
ἐξ ὕαλίνων ἐκπομάτων καὶ χρυσίδων
The words in question are absent from what survives of the period’s historiography, oratory and philosophical writing. None of the comic personages who use them is demonstrably a free-born, city-dwelling, property-owning, conventionally educated male. Aristoph. *Equi.* 167, Cephis. fr. 3. 5 and Men. *Peri.* 485 come from the mouths of coarsely spoken slaves;* Men. Disc. 892 from a professional μάγευρος whose low origins frequently show through a veneer of sophistication; Aristoph. *Ach.* 79, 529, 537 and *Strat.* fr. 1. 36 from men of agricultural background, one of whom has a particularly foul tongue and the other a scorn for unconventional modes of speech; Aristoph. *Thesm.* 57 from the aged kinsman of a tragic poet of humble origins. The last mentioned affects ignorance of philosophical profundities and hostility to poetic forms of speech; he is sexually
aggressive\textsuperscript{21} and given to coarse words and phrases.\textsuperscript{22} One can only guess about the identity of the speaker of Pherocrates fr. 149.2. Meineke’s universally accepted theory that it was a comic Achilles\textsuperscript{23} needs reconsideration; Achilles was possessed of more education than the majority of the heroes and his instructor, the gentle centaur Chiron, had, to judge by Pherocrates’ title, a part in the comedy. The words had a strongly affective character. λαικάστης and λαικάστρια are always used abusively\textsuperscript{24} and in four cases out of five λαικάζειν refers without question to an act which in the view of the speaker degrades the addressee.\textsuperscript{25} The verb is quite different in tone from such mild indecencies as βδεῖν, πέρδεσθαι, χελείν, βινεῖν. The common opinion that at Aristoph. Equ. 167 the addressee is being flattered\textsuperscript{26} must accordingly be called in question.

Affective use cannot be said to have obliterated the denotative force of the words. The comic contexts do not themselves make completely clear this force but would seem to exclude various theoretical possibilities. Aristoph. Thesm. 49-62. Men. Dysc. 888-92, and Aristoph. Ach. 72-9 suggest that the act in question is something other than the offering of one’s anus for penetration;\textsuperscript{27} Aristoph. Ach. 523-37 that it is an act commonly performed by female prostitutes and one more generally despised than the other characteristic acts of such persons;\textsuperscript{28} Men. Peric. 428-5 that it is an act regarded as more shameless, where a woman is concerned, as sitting astride a supine male.\textsuperscript{29}

In scribblings made in Attica during the fifth and fourth centuries λαικάζειν occurs once (Θεοδοσία λαικάδ[ι] εβ on a black-glazed skyphos),\textsuperscript{30} λαικάστρια twice (Ἀρθίσμος καλός, Πολυτίμε λαικάζειν on a piece of cut stone\textsuperscript{31} and καὶ λαικάστρια on a black-glazed spindle-whorl),\textsuperscript{32} and λαικάς, a feminine noun not recorded from comedy but clearly related in some way to the verb, four times (Κλεύνις λαικάστρια, Ἐκυλλα λαικάς, Σωφρονίς λαικάς, Ἀρχής λαικάς on a strip of lead).\textsuperscript{33} The fact that the proper name on the skyphos has been scratched out, the context of the four cases of λαικάς and the nature of the material on which they were inscribed confirm what can be deduced about the tone of the word group from the remains of literary Attic. The subject of the verb at its five comic appearances is a male. On the skyphos it is a female. This fact points in the same direction as the existence of both masculine λαικάστης and feminine λαικάστρια in comic scripts.

The four words evidenced in Attic are all secondary formations. λαικάς at one time probably applied (like φωγάς) to both males and females. In fifth century Attic, however, the overwhelming majority of nouns in –αδ– in common use were feminine. Hence the differentiation λαικάς/λαικαστής. The latter agent noun and λαικάστρια derive quite clearly from the verb λαικάζειν. λαικάστρια would have related to λαικάς as did μοιχεύτρια to μοιχής and πορνεύτρια to πόρνη, i.e. with an emphasis on habituality. The relationship between λαικάς and λαικάζειν on the other hand is not at all clear. H. Frisk\textsuperscript{34} and P. Chantraine\textsuperscript{35} made the noun a back formation from the verb; for them a λαικάς would be a female who endures the action of the verb; the analogy being provided by ἀποφράς.\textsuperscript{36} Both believed that
CORINTHIAN GREEK

The verb is evidenced outside Attic even before the fifth century. A fragment of a clay votive plaque painted in sixth century B.C. Corinth represents in front of a pottery kiln above the spy-hole a small bearded figure with prominent buttocks and a large and swollen penis which he holds with both hands. The figure was without doubt a βασικάνων ἐπικαμήνων, an image whose function was to protect the kiln against hostile powers. To the right side of the demonic image is plainly visible the sequence of letters lamba-alpha followed by what looks like the bottom of an iota. The scholars who first published the plaque and its inscriptions connected the three letters in an unspecific way with λαικάζειν. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff declared that nothing else was written on the missing part of the plaque and cited with Delphic brevity Hesychius, II p. 584 Latte λαία; ἐπὶ τῆς ἀθηροργίας (∼ Photius, I p. 369 Naber λαίαι; κατ’ ἀποκοπὴν ἐπὶ τῆς αἰθηροργίας) and Strato, A.P. 12.187.6 τοῖς φθονεροῖς λάμβδα καὶ ἀλφα λέγε. H. Herter found a name Λαικάζων for the protective demon, supposing the missing part of the plaque to have contained the other letters of this name. All three scholars seem to have believed that the person responsible for the letters was trying to describe the ithyphallic figure.

It would be useful to have collected all ancient representations of single ithyphallic figures accompanied by writing of some kind. I know only of two, one carved in relief on marble in Durazzo with the words et tibi, the other drawn upon a wall in Pompeii with the words Felicio tomintare. There must be many others. I have collected a number of drawings of the penis (with or without the testicles) accompanied by writing. In a few cases the word or phrase is abusively descriptive of someone other than the artist. In most there is some kind of curse, threat or humiliating order: e.g. on a floor mosaic in Rome Ėpē, on walls in Pompeii and Herculaneum ... te pedicaro ..., habeat Clymene, Iucundo (in Greek letters), Paridi, lige (i.e. linge) Aspasia, C. Raro male eueniat, and Masueta (i.e. Mansueta) tene, on a stone (possibly from a lintel) in northern England inuidiosis mentula, on a stone in upper Moesia inuidī (i.e. inuidē) quī (i.e. qui) ciuis hoc cacafīt anus erit.
on a large stone in Dalmatia shaped as a penis inuidis hoc.\textsuperscript{53} This material is late and Roman. Nevertheless it comes from a significantly wide area and offers some control over guesswork. I should accordingly suggest that the sixth century Corinthian inscription relates to the doom threatening any enemy of the kiln’s proprietor and take the letters ΛΑΙ either as part of an imperative/optative/future form of λαικᾶζειν now lost or as an abbreviation of such a form. We certainly have to do with a mode of counter aggression rather than the erotically orientated activity which grammarians call αἰσχρούργία.\textsuperscript{54} There is no reason to think that the Corinthian usage of λαικᾶζειν differed from the Attic.

**ROMAN GREEK**

Two passages of first century A.D. Latin literature, a representation of the speech of a freedman of Syrian origin from a prose-verse novel, Petronius 42.\textsuperscript{255}

exceptit Seleucus fabulae partem et ‘ego’ inquit ‘non cotidie laur; baliscus enim fullo est, aqua dentes habet, et cor nostrum cotidie liquescit. sed cum mulsi pultarium obduxi, frigori †laecasin† dico

and an epigram in elegiac distichs. Martial 11.58\textsuperscript{36}

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{cum me uelle uida tentumque Telesphore sentis,} \\
\text{magna rogas - puta me uelle negare: licet? -} \\
\text{et nisi iuratus dixi 'dabo', subtrahis illas,} \\
\text{permittunt in me quae tibi multa, natis.} \\
\text{quid si me tonsor, cum stricta nouacula supra est,} \\
\text{tunc libertatem diuittiasque roget?} \\
\text{promittam; neque enim rogat illo tempore tonsor,} \\
\text{latro rogat; res est inperiosa timor:} \\
\text{sed fuerit curua cum tuta nouacula theca,} \\
\text{frangam tonsori crura manusque simul.} \\
\text{at tibi nil faciam, sed lota mentula lana} \\
\text{†λαιτικά † in † cupidae dicet auritiae,}
\end{align*}
\]

seem to indicate the existence at some levels of contemporary spoken Greek of the syntagm λαικᾶζειν τῷ δεῖνι λέγο, a coarse equivalent of the literarily attested κλάζειν / ομιζείν / χαίρειν / ἐντρώσῃ τῷ δεῖνι λέγο.\textsuperscript{57} The indirect object would have been some person whose humiliation was required.\textsuperscript{58} A syntagm τὸν δείνα λαικᾶζειν parallel in form but opposite in function to τὸν δείνα χαίρειν\textsuperscript{59} might also be considered as a possible Latin source. In either case λαικᾶζειν would have been used absolutely as in the literary record.

The Latin alicit laecasin dico can only have been created and maintained by uneducated speakers.\textsuperscript{60} Whether they perceived a particular denotive force in the Greek verb as well as an abusive function the passages of Petronius and Martial do not of themselves make clear.

ἀπὸ ἔθνων καὶ πόλεων καὶ δήμων πολλαὶ βλασφημίαι ῥηματικῶς πεποιημέναι, ὡσπερ κιλικίες, τὸ νοθολογεῖν, καὶ αἰγυπτιαζείν, τὸ πονηρεύεσθαι, κρητιζειν, τὸ ψεῦδεσθαι, λευκιζειν, τὸ ἀσχροποιεῖν, αἰξονεύεσθαι, τὸ κακολογεῖν

and a passage of Eustathius' commentary on the Iliad\(^{63}\)

... περὶ τοῦ ... λευκιζεῖν ... γράφουσιν οἱ παλαιοὶ καὶ ταύτα, ἐναὶ βλασφημιάς καὶ ἀπὸ ἔθνων καὶ πόλεων καὶ δήμων πολλαὶ ῥηματικῶς πεποιημέναι ἔθνων μὲν οἷον κιλικίες καὶ αἰγυπτιαζεῖν τὸ πονηρεύεσθαι καὶ κρητιζεῖν τὸ ψεῦδεσθαι ... ἐκ πόλεων δὲ οἰον λευκίζειν τὸ ἀσχροποιεῖν. ἐπὶ παραγαγόντες Φερεκράτους χρησιν ἐν ἱδρυμὶ τὸ δόρας δὲ σοι γυναίκας ἐπὶ Λασβίας ἐπάγουσιν ἀμοβατόν τὸ 'κακὼν γε δὸρον ἐπὶ έχειν λακκαστρίας', ός τοιοῦτον οὕσαν τῶν Λευκίων γυναικῶν. ἐκ δήμων δὲ βλασφημιά τὸ αἰξονεύεσθαι ἦσαν κακολογεῖν

show that some Greek speakers resident in Rome around the end of the first century would have recognised a particular force in λακκάστρια. Suetonius clearly felt that while the verb λευκιζεῖν did not belong to normal contemporary discourse the noun λακκάστρια did. He accordingly explained λευκιζεῖν by citing a passage of Pherecrates in which seven women of the island of Lesbos were dubbed λακκάστριαι and glossed the verb with ἀσχροποιεῖν. In scholarly Greek from the third century B.C. onwards ἀσχροποιεῖν and the noun from which it was formed could relate to many forms of sexual vice.\(^{64}\) Since, however, there was a doctrine current among men of learning not many years after Suetonius' time associating the mouthing of the vaginal and anal orifices with the Phoenicians\(^{65}\) it is almost certain that Suetonius knew this doctrine and thought of Lesbianism as the mouthing of the penis, as did everyone else in Antiquity.\(^{66}\)

Another passage of the same note in Eustathius' Iliad commentary offering an etymology of λακκάστριαι\(^{67}\)

αἱ βήθσειται λακκάστριαι, τουτέστι πόρναι, ἐκ βήματος παράγοντα τοῦ λακκάστριαν, αὐτὸ δὲ παρὰ τὸ λα ἐπιτάκτικον γίνεται καὶ τὸ κάζειν, ὁ ἐστὶν κοσμεῖν. σκαπτεῖται γὰρ καὶ τὸ ἀκάρας ὡς ἐπὶ ἡπάλῳ ἐρωτεύεται κοσμεῖσθαι

is followed by quite irrelevant explanations of κασσωρίς and κασσαλβίς. All three etymologies are likely to have come from a section of Suetonius' treatise very severely cut in the Paris epitome, the one ἐπὶ γυναικών.\(^{68}\) A superficial reader might think the etymologist ignorant of any idea associating λακκάστρια with oral vice. In fact he took for granted that contemporaries knew what women abused as λακκάστριαι were thought to get up to and considered it sufficient to make a euphemistic allusion.
Petronius and Martial were men of the same class and style of education as Suetonius. They sought readers among their own class. The full coarseness of the tone which syntagms like aliqua laecasin dico had for members of this class can now be appreciated. Latin speakers of all classes frequently threatened to thrust their penises down the throats of those who had offended them and sometimes actually did so.\textsuperscript{69} This act came to symbolise in a special degree arrogance and haughtiness.\textsuperscript{70} In some registers of the language the verb irrumare\textsuperscript{71} was used so much in statements expressive of annoyance as to become practically synonymous with contenere.\textsuperscript{72} A freedman more Latinate than Petronius' Seleucus might have said frigus irruo rather than frigori laecasin dico.

It could be argued that first century A.D. speakers of Latin sensed the coarseness of laikáceiν tινi lέγo but mistook the nature of the coarseness and falsely made the verb synonymous with their own irrumari/fellare. Against this is the fact that Suetonius' doctrine about Lesbianism and, more importantly, his way of elucidating leσβιáceiν, occur in a number of works written by men unlikely to have been influenced by Latin ways of thinking.\textsuperscript{73} Also the great likelihood that Suetonius drew his material from lexicographers who had worked in a tradition which began in the Alexandrian Museum.\textsuperscript{74}

Heraeus collected the ancient discussions of Lesbianism, including the one in Eustathius' Homer commentary which is now known to have come from Suetonius' Περὶ βλασφήμιων, and argued their significance for the use of laikáceiν in the scripts of Attic comedy. He allowed laikáceiν however to be synonymous not only with irrumari/fellare but also with cumnum lingle and scortari. Housman ignored the sexological absurdity of such a view and contented himself with observing that all recorded instances of the verb could be satisfactorily explained in terms of fellation. Housman's conclusion applies to everything which has turned up from both literary and non-literary sources since 1931. The passages of comedy and the Attic graffito made openly and crudely an accusation which orators could only hint at.\textsuperscript{75}

The Corinthian plaque described above\textsuperscript{76} seems to have escaped the notice of Heraeus and Housman as it has recent lexicographers. Housman's doctrine would exclude the possibility of ΛΑΙ being the start of Λαικάζων.\textsuperscript{77} Something like laikαζε however would link very prettily the sixth century B.C. demon with the first century A.D. Petronian freedman and the talking penis of Martial's epigram. The demon's stance and language symbolised his scorn for any power which might threaten the well-being of the kiln and its contents. In another epigram Martial rebuffs a critic of his work with the command fac mihi quod Chione.\textsuperscript{78} The talk of literary critics had long been assimilated by its victims to the βασκανία of ancient superstition.\textsuperscript{79} Chione was a notorious laikáστρια.\textsuperscript{80}
The verb λαικάζειν was alive in the Greek of third century Egypt with the sense which Suetonius assumed his readers to perceive in it at the beginning of the previous century. It occurs in at least two of the many love charms found by excavators of Greek-speaking Egyptian sites. In one a Poseidonios from Arsinoe in the Fayum tries to have a woman Heronous bound with

διέγιρε μοι σεαυτόν νέκων δαίμον, ὅστις ποτ’ ἔλθε, ἔτεκε ἀγαθής ἔτεκε θήλεα, καὶ ὅπως ἤτις πάντα τόπον καὶ εἰς πάν ἄμφωδαν καὶ εἰς πᾶσαν οἰκίαν καὶ κατάδρον Ἡρωινοῦν, ἦν ἔτεκεν Πολεμάρις, ἔμοι Ποσιδώνιφ, ὃν ἔτεκεν Θεσπροβίσθης, ὅπως μὴ βεινήθη, μὴ πυγισθῆ, μὴ λεικάσῃ, μηδὲν πρὸς ἡδονὴν ποιησῇ ἄλλῳ ἀνδρὶ εἰ μὴ ἐμοὶ μόνῳ Ποσιδώνῳ. ⁸¹

In the other an Ammonion tries to bind a Theodotiseus with

καταδεσμεῖα σαὶ ἡ Θεοδωτισσᾶς εἰς τὴν οὐράν τοῦ ὄφεως καὶ εἰς τὸ στόμα τοῦ κροκοδίδου καὶ τοῖς κέρασι τοῦ κρεοῦ καὶ τὸ ἱθ’ τῆς ἀσπίδος καὶ ταῖς ᾦδεῖς τῆς ἐλεύθερα καὶ τὸ προσπέλατο τοῦ θεοῦ ἔνα μὴ δυνηθῆς ἔτερφ ἄρσεν συμπληγῶσα πῶς μὴ βινηθῆναι μὴ τὸ πυγισθῆναι μὴ τῇ ληκάζειν μὴδὲ καθ’ ἡδονὴν μεθ’ ἔταφρο ἀνθρώπῳ εἰ μὴ μόνος ἔγω Ἄμμωνιον Ἐρμίταρι. ⁸²

Poseidonios and Ammonion are using a single more or less set formula. The trio of verbs refer with blunt brevity to the sexual use of the three apertures of the woman’s body, a theme which often exercised the talents of more sophisticated users of the Greek language. ⁸³ A related formula which makes no open reference to fellation appears in the fourth century book of magic recipes from Heracleopolis, cod. Paris. Bibl. Nat. suppl. gr. 574 (μὴ βινηθῆτω, μὴ πυγισθῆτω, μηδὲ πρὸς ἡδονὴν ποιήσῃ ἄλλῳ ἀνδρός, εἰ μὴ μετ’ ἐμοῦ τοῦ δείκων). ⁸⁴ and in spells cast by a Theodorus from Oxyrhynchus (ὅπως μὴ βινηθῆ, μὴ πυγισθῆ, μὴ τῇ ἡδονῆς ἄφορος ἑπετελέσῃ μεθ’ ἔτερφῳ, μὴ ἄλλῳ ἀντίρι συνέλθῃ εἰ μὴ Θεοδώρῳ ὃν ἔτεκε τὸ Ταξιαντίς) ⁸⁵ and a Sarapamon from Antinoopolis (ὅπως μὴ βινηθῇ, μὴ πυγισθῇ, μηδὲν πρὸς ἡδονὴν ποιησῇ ἔταφρο ἀνδρὶ εἰ μὴ ἐμοὶ τῷ Σαραπάμωνι, ὃν ἔτεκεν Ἀρέα). ⁸⁶

It cannot be determined whether the original formula contained a reference to fellation omitted by the Heracleopolis recipe-giver, Theodorus and Sarapamon, or whether a recipe-giver used by Poseidonios and Ammonion added it. ⁸⁷ Clearly, however, the word λαικάζειν seemed to some magic-makers rather more gross than βινηθεῖν or πυγισθεῖν. Poseidonios’ grasp of the conventions of orthography was as weak as his sense of linguistic decency. Ammonion’s grasp was stronger but far from perfect. Most of the misspellings in their charms are phonetic in character. λεικάςθη and ληκάζειν are not. The -ειν- in the former would suggest that either Poseidonios or his source found it difficult to distinguish λαικάζειν from λειχεῖν. The latter verb was often used in more literate texts in regard to the Phoenician type
of oral sexuality but, in so far as it retained other functions, did not acquire the outrageously obscene character of λαικάζειν. Ammonius’s ληκάζειν would be a phonetic ‘misspelling’ of *λεικάζειν = [likazin]. The same semantic contamination may lie at the base of three medieval misspellings: λαγάζειν in cod. Ravenna, Bibl. Class. 429 (schol. Aristoph. Eccl. 920), leicazin in cod. Rome, Vat. lat. 3294 (Martial 11. 58. 12), and λεικαλέος in cod. Venice, Bibl. Marc. 434 (Lucian, Lex. 12).

THE GREEK OF THE GRAMMATICAL SCHOOLS

The familiarity with the literal force of λαικάζειν displayed by the Roman gentleman Suetonius and the semi-literate magic-maker of the Fayum also appears in statements in exegetical material concerning Aristophanes’ Βάτραχωi and Ἐκκλησίαζοντα put together by serious students sometime before the Christianisation of the Greek schools and in at least one entry in the Συναγωγή πασών λέξεων κατά στοιχείον compiled by Hesychius at Alexandria in the fifth or sixth century. This familiarity was accompanied however by a feeling that the words were too coarse for normal use in scholarly prose.

Cod. Venice, Bibl. Marc. gr. 474 has against Aristoph. Ran. 1308 (1343 Dindorf) αὕτη ποθ’ ἥ μοῦσα, ὠοί λέεσβιαζεν ὅδε τὸ παρανόμως πλησίαζεν, διεβάλλοντο γὰρ ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὁ λέεσβιαζεν καὶ ἐν τῷ εἰς Φερεκράτην ἀναφερομένῳ Χείρωνι Ἴ. Ἡ λεεσβίδας... λαικάστριας. Instead of using λεεσβίζειν to gloss λεεσβιαζεν the grammarian responsible used the euphemistic but imprecise ἤχοροσταί. He then cited a passage of another comedy, Vesp. 1346, whose context made it plain that the verb λεεσβίζειν referred there to fellation. Finally he adduced the same doctrine on λεεσβιαζεν as had Suetonius, using the same passage of Pherocrates in which Lesbian women were equated with λαικάστριαι. There was clearly a single ultimate common source. What is interesting however is that a grammarian writing several centuries later than this source could assume the same sort of familiarity with the literal sense of λαικάστρια in his pupils. His feelings about linguistic propriety allowed him to cite a classical author’s use of λαικάστρια but forbade him to use any member of the word group in his own discourse, just as it forbade him to use the precise and doubtlessly still current πέος, κύσθος and βινέν. 

Against Eccl. 920 δοκεῖς δὲ μοι καὶ λάβδα κατὰ τοὺς λεσβίους the Ravenna codex has λαιχάζειν οἱ Λέεσβιοι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄρχοντος στοιχείου. Despite a degree of corruption it is clear that the grammarian responsible took the orthodox ancient view of Lesbianism, interpreted Aristophanes’ λάβδα as standing euphemistically for λαικάζειν and considered his pupils familiar enough with this verb not to need an explanation. He contented himself with stating a theory about how the
Lesbians got their reputation. The nature of the exegetical problem made the use of the verb unavoidable. The other scholia to this play dealing with sexual matters are linguistically reticent.

At II p. 586 Hesychius does not gloss λεσβιάζειν with λαίκάζειν but offers the same sort of roundabout explanation as appears at Suetonius, Π. βλασφ. XIII 254 (see above, p. 18) and at schol. Aristoph. Ran. 1308 πρὸς ἄνδρα στοματεύειν. Λεσβιάδας γὰρ τὰς λαίκαστρίας ἔλεγον. It looks however as if a different passage of comedy appeared in his source. Despite his fascination with the riches of the Greek sexual vocabulary Hesychius was usually careful to give his own discourse a decent garb. He could not avoid using λαίκαστρια at II p. 586, s.v. λεσβιάζειν. The entry IV p. 42, σκερρόλιγγες λαίκαστοι ἢ ὑπισταί, should perhaps be emended and interpreted to take account not only of the familiarity with the λαίκάζειν word group which Hesychius assumed among his readers but also of his customary linguistic reticence.

It seems to me that, though small, the evidence is sufficient to permit the conclusion that λαίκάζειν, λαίκαστής and λαίκαστρια belonged at least to the passive vocabulary of most Greek-speakers down to the end of the fifth century. Some may disagree but must allow that many both among the educated and the uneducated knew quite well what the words signified.

The apparent failure of ancient commentators to offer any explanation at Aristoph. Ach. 529, Equ. 167 and Thesm. 57 and the absence of the words from the lemmata of many ancient lexica might at first sight suggest ignorance on the part of the grammarians concerned. It must however be remembered that no work of ancient learning has been transmitted to us in a pure unabbreviated state, that we have very little which was not either designed in the first instance for the education of the young or later adapted for that purpose, and that ancient grammarians, whatever kind of material they were dealing with, never sought to describe it exhaustively. There always had to be a positive case if a word was to gain admittance to the lemma of a commentary or a lexicon. A word in common use in the grammarians’s speech community would be noted only if in the literary text or texts within his purview it showed an odd or apparently odd use.

The Όνομαστικά compiled by Iulius Polydeuces of Naucratis (Pollux) between A.D. 166 and 176 is one of the many lexica which lack the words in question. The absence of λαίκαστής from the list of injurious appellatives given in the section περὶ κιναιδοῦ (6.126-7) and of the pair λαίκαστής/λαίκάστρια from the section on αἰσχίους τέχναν (7.201-3) falls into perspective once it is noted that the verb bínēin is absent from the section on copulation (5.92-4) and the nouns πέος, πρωκτός and κύσθος from the section on anatomical terminology (2.168-76). Polydeuces was writing for the benefit of orators and although his taste in vocabulary was catholic enough in some directions to offend the purists of his day he would have drawn the line, as orators and teachers oratory had done for many centuries, against words of the gross character of λαίκάζειν.

The lexicon of Hesychius aimed at readers of Greek literature. The absence of
lemmata for λαικάζειν, λαικαστής and λαικάστρια must be considered along with the use to which λαικάστρια was put in the explanation of λεσβιάζειν. The compiler clearly thought the words quite different from λεσβιάζειν, i.e. as too familiar to require explanation. That must have been the case where many other lexicographers were concerned.

Five direct statements about λαικάζειν, λαικαστής and λαικάστρια in Aristophanic scholia and lexic containing material put together in Antiquity have in the past obscured the link with fellation and might still be thought to suggest that late Antiquity shared the ignorance of the Middle Ages and modern times. They are:

(i) schol. cod. Ravenna, Bibl. Class. 429, cod. Modena, Bibl. Est. α.Π.5.10, Aristoph. Ach. 79 λαικαστάς; πόρνους.105
(iii) Etymologicum Genuinum Λ. p. 30 Alpers λαικάζειν καὶ λαικάστρια. οὕτως δὲ ἢ τίτιδε/τετθείκή παρὰ Δάκωσιν. Ὁρος ὁ Μελῆσιος.107
(iv) Cyrillic, Gloss. Λ 41, p. 111 Drachmann λαικάζω: τὸ ἀπόθω.108
(v) Magna grammatica Λ, col. 1578 Gaisford λαικάζειν: τὸ μαστροπεῖν.109

In interpreting statements like these it must be remembered that our tradition of ancient grammatical writing, where individual items are concerned, has suffered a great deal of abbreviation as well as wholesale excision; that the vocabulary available to grammarians for discussing sexual matters did not always permit precision; that precision in some matters was not always thought desirable; and that the ancient theory of metaphor did not cover very effectively all the ways in which imaginative speakers and writers transferred words from their normal environments. Of the five statements two relate to passages of Aristophanes where the words in question were used more to stir up feeling than to describe facts and the frontier of metaphor was approached, if not crossed. It is likely enough that the other three relate to passages of similar character in comedies now lost.

Modern scholars have been divided over the question whether at Aristoph. Ach. 78-9 ἡ λαικαστάς τέτ καὶ καταπύγωνας was coordinate with ἄνδρας or with τοὺς πλέιστα τὸν μαζίν καταφάγουν τε καὶ πιεῖν†.110 The latter interpretation entails relating λαικαστάς directly to specific acts; the former entails relating the word to the social stigma attaching to such acts. Our scholia do not make clear how the grammarian from whose work they descend answered this fundamental question. He appears to have commented on λαικαστάς but not on καταπύγωνας. The latter word was etymologically translucent.111 It occurred often in angrily spoken passages of comedy without causing comment about its sense.112
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Commentators used it freely in their own discourse. It belonged to many levels of speech throughout antiquity and shows no sign of the obscene tone which λαϊκαστής must have possessed in the year 425 B.C. and, if the preceding argument is correct, retained until the end of Antiquity. The rarity of the particular formation λαϊκαστής and its etymological opacity were perhaps sufficient to stimulate a note. The transmitted λαϊκαστάς: πόρνος would have indicated some of the tone of the word and suggested only a little more vaguely than λαϊκαστάς: αἰσχροποιείς or ... ἀρρητοποιείς or ... τῷ στόματι αἰσχροφρογοίντας its literal force. It is likely that the original note was more extensive.

By the time of the author of the note both πόρνος and πόρνη had had a long history. In recorded Attic both words refer commonly to persons who performed sexual service for financial reward. They had a rough but not obscene tone. Their etymological link with πέρνημι (poetical to Athenian ears) and πέπρακτος was probably perceptible. Two synonyms, the participle ἡπαρπηκώς in the case of the male and the noun ἔταιρα in the case of the female, drew attention away from commerce to the least physical aspect of the service provided. πόρνη tended to be used of the woman who sold herself cheaply and ἔταιρα of the woman who commanded a high price. Applied to a married citizen woman, e.g. one thought guilty of adultery, it had an extremely abusive tone. Applied to prostitutes on the other hand it conveyed no more opprobrium than that which was generally felt for the trade of prostitution, a trade looked down upon but not scorned as much as in some other societies. For a male however to engage in prostitution was much more disgraceful in Athenian eyes than for a female. ἡπαρπηκώς accordingly tended to be a fairly neutral term, the counterpart of πόρνη, and πόρνος a term of violent abuse, even when applied to a self-confessed prostitute. Pagan society in the Greek-speaking cities of late Antiquity used πόρνος and πόρνη much as did that of classical Athens.

There is no reason why a male should not have earned money through gratifying females vaginally or other: males anally but no passage of recorded pagan Greek demands a translation of πόρνος like ‘sodomite’. Some passages would justify a translation like ‘catamite’. Others are opaque. There is however abundant evidence that both males and females took money in return for acts of fellation as well as for more acceptable acts. The modern Anglo-Saxon associates male prostitution primarily with submission to buggery. Fellation may have been the prime thought in the mind of the grammarian commenting on Aristoph. Ach. 79. In any case it would seem that this grammarian was trying to represent the affective force of λαϊκαστής at least as much as its literal meaning.

If our scholia to the Αἰχρνής represent truly the ancient source, this source contained material on the events referred to at v. 524 (under the lemma πόρνην δὲ
Συμαίνει) and at v. 527 (under the lemma Ἀπασίας πόρνα διό), ignored the use of λαϊκάστρια at v. 529 and set πόρνης against λαϊκάστριας at v. 537. Here no attempt was being made to provide a meaning. The commentator was merely making clear the economy of the speaker’s argument.

An entry in the glossary attributed to the fifth century archbishop of Alexandria, Cyril,λαϊκάστρια; ἡ πόρνη (A 42, p. 111 Drachmann), and similar statements in Byzantine grammatical writings use πόρνη with the tone this word possessed in Christian society. Among Christians it related to any kind of sexual activity apart from that leading to procreation. A statement in an Aristophanic commentary is however likely to have been Cyril’s ultimate source, a statement using πόρνη in a less unmeasured way, one for example similar to that in schol. Ach. 537, or one which pointed out that the comic speaker was addressing or talking about a πόρνη and which proceeded to give an etymology of the word actually used. It cannot be held that Cyrilus did not know what λαϊκάστρια meant.

The lyric poems of Alcman were perhaps the major literary source of the Lydian items in the Λέξεις of Aristophanes of Byzantium and the many lexicographical works which drew from this store in later antiquity. Old Attic comedy however often presented personages speaking Laconian and must have supplied many words dubbed Laconian in the extant lexic. Adler guessed that Oros made his statement about the Lydian use of λαϊκάστρια in the treatise Περὶ ἔθνικῶν. This however clearly dealt with geographical names. The Περὶ πολυσπαθῶν λέξεων might be a better guess. If Oros had equated the λαϊκάστρια with the suckling child rather than the wet-nurse his statement would have to be treated seriously. As things stand only guesses can be offered. I offer two. The first is that behind Oros’ statements lay an attempt to interpret an obscure passage of comedy in which a Laconian speaker addressed a wet-nurse abusively. The wet-nurse occupied a lowly status in Greek societies and was often thought to be given to deceit. My second guess is inspired by the Corinthian kiln protector; Oros’s source may have been talking about λαϊκάζειν rather than λαϊκάστρια and quoting a comic Laconian’s reaction to a wet-nurse’s imagined βασκανία. No conclusions are possible as to whether Oros himself was familiar with the literal sense of λαϊκάζειν.

A very large number of verbs absent from the common language or used in an unusual way are glossed in the Aristophanic scholia and the extant lexic with ἄπαταν. The source of Cyrilus’ λαϊκάζω: τὸ ἄπατο would have been an attempt
to explain a passage of comedy in which a person despised by the speaker was accused of being given to the practice of fellation. The open mouth symbolised not only stupidity and readiness to be deceived but also the triumph felt by an inferior person at having deceived a superior. The kind of address made by the lustful old man to the fellatory pipe-player at Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1345-50

| óρας ἐγὼ σ’ ὡς δεξιῶς ύφειλόμην  |
| μέλλοντας ἴδῃ λεσβεῖν τοὺς ἐκμπότας·  |
| δὲν οὖσαν ἀπόδος τῷ πέει τῳδ’ καριν.  |
| ἀλλ’ οὐχ ἀποδώσεις οὐδ’ ἐφιλεῖς οἷδ’ ὅτι.  |
| ἀλλ’ ἐξαισπιήσεις κάγχανει τούτῳ μέγα·  |
| πολλοῖς γὰρ ἴδῃ χάτεροις αὐτ’ ἠγάσεσον.  |

must have been common in lost plays. The orators whom the comedians constantly accused of deceiving the Demos and of being given to unmanly sexual practices promoted their deceptions by movements of the lips and tongue as well as of the lower trunk. Cyrillus may be convicted of misleading vagueness but not of ignorance.

— v —

Taken literally the anonymous and not certainly ancient statement λαικάζειν: τὸ μαστροποτένι suggests ignorance on the part of the person responsible. The agents of those who themselves performed sexual services were called μαστροποι in classical Athens and in the Greek communities of the Roman empire. Such persons however had a thoroughly bad reputation, one worse than that of πόρνων and πόρναι, and deceitfulness was one of several specific vices regularly attributed to them. Hesychius’ lexicon contains an entry making μαστροπος synonymous with ἀπατεών. The source of the gloss in cod. Leiden, Voss. gr. 20 may have been saying nothing substantially different from Cyrillus.

NON-ATTIC LITERARY GREEK

Now that we know λαικάζειν and its companions to have survived in the spoken Greek of the imperial period, their absence from most kinds of formal writing and the gingerliness with which the grammarians handled them take on a new significance. The words must have retained the coarse uneducated tone they possessed in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. Most writers had, naturally, no occasion to use them but moralists, dream interpreters and astrologers did and these preferred polite periphrasis. The history of a piece of ancient folklore is very instructive. At least one temple of Hera contained a plastic representation of the goddess fellating Zeus. ‘Orpheus’ had allegorised the story. The poets of
classical epic, lyric and tragedy ignored it. Apparently also even those of comedy. The third century B.C. philosopher Chrysippus discussed it at length.\textsuperscript{158} This writer’s language was notoriously blunt\textsuperscript{159} and we may guess that he employed λαϊκάζειν or λαϊκάστημα or both. Those imperial writers on philosophy however who ventured an allusion to the story, the pagan Diogenes and the Christians Clement of Rome, Theophilus and Origen took great trouble to avoid plain language.\textsuperscript{160}

Traces of the word group appear in the traditions of three kinds of archaizing literature consciously indebted to Attic comedy but generally decent in choice of vocabulary, the epigram, the dialogue and the erotic epistle. Criticism of these traditions must take account of the tone which the word group continued to possess.

The text of an epigram written after the time of Philippus of Thessalonica and attributed in cod. Rome, Bibliotheca Vat. Pal. 23 to Nicarchus

εὕμερεθής πείδευ με καλή γυνή ὁν τε καὶ ἀκμῆς
ἀπτής, ἀν τε καὶ ἦ Σιμύλα πρεσβύτερη.
†ἡν μὲν γάρ με νέα περιλήψει ἢν δὲ παλαιή†
γραιά με καὶ ἴσιον Ἰμύλα †δικάσεται†

defied all comprehension for more than a century and a half.\textsuperscript{161} In the late eighteenth century R. F. P. Brunck\textsuperscript{162} and J. Toup\textsuperscript{163} realised that it referred to fellation, a common theme of Greek epigram.\textsuperscript{164} The unmetrical and nonsensical δικάσεται was changed by Brunck to λιχμάσεται and by Toup to λειχάσεται. Succeding editors of the Anthology have followed one or the other.\textsuperscript{165} Palaeographical considerations led F. Jacobs to propose λαϊκάσεται in his second edition of the Anthology but contemporary orthodoxy about the sense of this verb made him withdraw.\textsuperscript{166} W. Heraeus resurrected Jacobs’ short-lived proposal at the same time as he pointed out the true sense of λαϊκάζειν.\textsuperscript{167} The issue could be deemed settled if it were not for two considerations. One is that the verb λαϊκάζειν is used absolutely in all the passages where the transmission is secure. The other is that Greek epigrams are normally, however gross the theme, reticent in vocabulary;\textsuperscript{168} an ending like the one conjectured for this poem would be crude even for a Nicarchus.\textsuperscript{169}

A passage of Lucian’s dialogue Λεξιφάνης

μῶν ἕκεινον, ἢν δ’ ἐγὼ, φῆς Δίωνα τὸν καταπύγονα καὶ λακκοσθέαν, τὸν
μύρτσανα καὶ σχινοτρώκταν νεανίσκον, ἁναφλόντα καὶ βλεμάζοντα ἢν τινα
πεόδη καὶ πόσθωνα αἰσθήται; τινι ἐὼν ΓΝΕ βινέον Ωτ’ ἕκεινος καὶ
λαϊκαλέος. ἄλλα τοι γε τὴν ̣θεόν, ἢ δ’ ὤς ὁ Ἐθημος, ἡμιμάσας ...

seems to apply to an effeminate young man an adjective λαϊκαλέος based on the verb λαϊκάζειν.\textsuperscript{170} There are few linguistic indecencies in Lucian’s dialogues.\textsuperscript{171} The Ψευδολογίςτης, a work much concerned with oral sexuality, uses neither λαϊκάζειν nor λαϊκαστής.\textsuperscript{172} The novel and poetic form of λαϊκαλέος\textsuperscript{173} and the
generally outlandish style of speech affected by Lucian’s personage probably made its tone, like that of περιβολής and πόσιθος, acceptable.\textsuperscript{174}

The Vienna manuscript of the Epistles of Aristaenetus (phil. gr. 310: XIII cent.) has a ἐταίρα write to a well-off young man who has abandoned her:

ἐγὼ τοῖνυν ἡ λαϊκάς τῶν κακῶν ἐμαυτὴν αἴτιώματι.\textsuperscript{175}

J. Mercier saw the link between λαϊκάς and λαϊκάζειν but thought he could translate ἡ λαϊκάς τῶν κακῶν with ‘malorum omnium conciliatrix’.\textsuperscript{176} Other scholars tried to emend λαϊκάς away.\textsuperscript{177} The publication in 1934 of the fourth century B.C. Attic curse on Κλείνης λαϊκάστερα, Ἑκυλλα λαϊκάς, Σωφρονίς λαϊκάς, Ἀρχίς λαϊκάς provided the epigraphist Louis Robert with an opportunity to sneer at critics of the Aristaenetus tradition.\textsuperscript{178} As if the non-occurrence elsewhere in recorded literature of λαϊκάς created the only problem. The most recent editor of Aristaenetus, O. Mazal,\textsuperscript{179} prints the tradition. Aristaenetus however avoided indecent words\textsuperscript{180} and preferred to the vocabulary of fifth century A.D. spoken Greek one drawn from classical literature, in particular from the scripts of comedy. He may often have erred about the niceties of old Attic usage\textsuperscript{181} but it is hard to believe, given what we know of how λαϊκάζειν continued to be used, that he would have so mistaken the tone of λαϊκάς as to make a female appealing to a cultivated person for sympathy apply it to herself. The very worst that this female can say about her rival is that she is τετάραν ομολογοῦσα χίεια ... εἰ πάνι πολλοῖ.

BYZANTINE GREEK

There is no sign that scholarly persons in Christian Byzantium knew the verb λαϊκάζειν or either of its nominal derivatives except through the medium of the old pagan literature and the exegetical material which had accumulated around this literature. We have seen that the sense of λαϊκάζειν was seldom if ever contextually plain in literary texts and that the grammarians of antiquity usually thought the word too well known to require explanation.

Writers on orthography like Choeroboscus in the sixth century\textsuperscript{182} and Theognostus in the ninth\textsuperscript{183} probably took the doctrine λαϊκάστρια: ἡ πόρνη from Cyrilus.\textsuperscript{184} The latter may have also been the source of λαϊκάζω: ἀπατῶ in various Byzantine lexic.\textsuperscript{185} A work by Cyrilus’ contemporary Oros supplied the mysterious λαϊκάστρια ... ἡ τίτθη παρὰ Λάκωσιν to the so-called Etymologicum Geminum.\textsuperscript{186} An annotated manuscript of Aristophanes provided the compilers of the Suda with λαϊκαστής: ὁ πόρνος.\textsuperscript{187} A relatively complete copy of Suetonius’ Περὶ βλασφημίων enabled Eustathius in the twelfth century to make the truth about λαϊκάζειν plain for scholars of the twentieth.\textsuperscript{188}

A doctrine λαϊκάζειν: πορνεῖειν appears without obvious ancient precedent in the collection of ἐπιμερισμοῖ falsely attributed to Herodian\textsuperscript{189} and in the
commentary upon Aristophanes' Ἰππεῖς composed by Demetrius Triclinius in fourteenth century Thessalonike. Against v. 167 (λαικάζεις) Triclinius wrote πορνεύεις, δέον σιτῆσαι. The same scholar wrote against Aristoph. Ach. 79 (λαικαστάς τε καὶ καταπύγωνας) καὶ ἀμφότερα τοὺς πόρνους σημαίνει. The doctrine λαικάζειν: πορνεύειν must derive from λαικαστής: πόρνος. What Triclinius had in mind is not as clear as many modern scholars have supposed. The ranges of meaning possible for πορνεύειν and πόρνος in fourteenth century scholastic Greek were very wide.

In pagan Greek the nouns πόρνος and πόρνη always denoted the purveyors of sexual services. Attic writers applied the middle verb πορνεύεσθαι to the activity of the πόρνος and the πόρνη. Grammarians of the imperial period tended to use the active πορνεύειν absolutely of this activity. Classical πορνεύεσθαι nevertheless did not die out. Other words denoted the purchasers of the service in question and their mode of activity.

In the canonical books of the New Testament πόρνη occupied the same semantic field as in pagan literature but had a much more abusive tone. πόρνος and πορνεύειν functioned very differently. The verb referred regularly to the male part in an act of extra-marital intercourse. This was a usage of the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, resulting apparently from the difficulty of covering with one Greek word the wide semantic field of the Hebrew וּנְה. The noun πόρνος which occurred in only one obscure passage of the Old Testament was used by St. Paul not of the male prostitute but of the male who frequented female prostitutes. We have here something more than a special dependence on septuagintal modes of expression or a general inability to use the Greek language in a literate way. The Christian ethos differed radically from that of the old pagan aristocracies. The leaders of the new sect regarded with similar disgust both the prostitute and the prostitute’s customer. What offended them in the prostitute was his/her imagined lack of control over his/her sexual appetite rather than his/her greed for money and the absence of shame about how he/she acquired it. The customer’s lack of control looked similar. It was an easy matter for the semantic fields of πόρνος and πορνεύειν to be extended and especially so as the formal etymological relationships of the words had become for the uninstructed quite obscure.

The biblical usages were taken up by homiletical writers as early as the third century and even by grammarians of the Christian persuasion as early as the fifth. They certainly affected medieval explicated of the pagan classics. Nonetheless these explicators could not escape the influence of the actual texts they were handling and the way in which πόρνος and πορνεύειν functioned in them. Presumably the doctrines λαικάζειν: πορνεύω and λαικαστής: πόρνος had some specific meaning for men like Triclinius. What it was however we cannot now with certainty tell.
MODERN MISINTERPRETATION

During the Italian renaissance the path to a proper understanding of λαικάζειν and its derivatives was blocked by two extremely influential decisions, one about the text of Martial 11. 58. 12, the other about the interpretation of Aristoph. *Equi.* 167 and the comment attached to it by Triclinius.

Cod. Rome, Vat. lat. 3294 (X or XI cent.) has the quite incomprehensible word *leicazin* at Martial 11. 58. 12. So too early printed texts from 1470 down to the Aldine of 1501. As to what stood in other manuscripts known to humanist scholars there is little published information. Domizio Calderini, having learned of the existence of the Greek verb λεσβιζειν from reading Aristophanes’ Σφήκες (v. 1346), conjectured that Martial had written λεσβιζειν *cupidae dicet avaritiae.* The first printers of Calderini’s commentary on the epigrams left blanks where Greek words stood in the copy supplied. Whoever looked after the printing made in Venice in 1480 supplied the non-existent but comprehensible verb λειχάζειν for Calderini’s intended λεσβιζειν. This person would have had in mind certain uses of λείχειν by Aristophanes and of lambere and lingere by Martial. The new word entered printed texts of Martial’s poems in 1501. Bonaventura Vulcanius listed it in his *Onomasticon vocum latino-graecarum* published in Strasbourg in 1536. Sigismund Ghelen introduced it to the text of schol. Aristoph. *Eccl.* 920 in 1547, and J. F. Gronov to that of Petronius 42. 2 some time between 1664 and 1671, and J. Toup to that of Nicarchus, *A.P.* 5. 38. 4 in 1790. It acquired a place in a number of much used Greek lexica.

In 1498 Musurus printed against Aristoph. *Equi.* 167 the scholion λαικάςεις: δέ νεν εἰπέν σιτήσεις. ή ἐν πρυτανείῳ ἀριστήσεις. παρ’ ὑπονομαίον οὐν εἰπέν ὡς ἐν κομφυδίᾳ ἀντὶ τοῦ πορνεύσεις δέν καὶ λαικάστρια ἢ πόρνη. Musurus’ principal source was clearly a manuscript carrying Triclinius’ commentary. The first translators of Aristophanes understood the commentator to have used πορνεύειν in the biblical fashion. Andreas Divus turned ἐν πρυτανείῳ λαικάςεις with ‘in Pytaneo scortaberis’, Bartolomio and Pietro Rositini with ‘ne’t Pritaneo potrai cortigianare’, Henri Étienne’s θησαυρὸς τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης of 1572 interpreted λαικάζειν with ‘decipio’ and ‘scortor’, λαικαστής with ‘scortator’ and ‘qui corpore quaestum facit’. For several centuries translators of Aristophanes followed Andreas Divus and dictionary makers Henri Étienne. Sporadic attempts to restore λαικάζει at Nicarchus, *A.P.* 5. 38. 4 and λαικάζειν at schol. Aristoph. *Eccl.* 920, Petron. 42. 2 and Martial 11. 58. 12 foundered largely because of the authority exercised by dictionaries.

W. M. Lindsay’s 1903 edition of Martial restored λαικάζειν at 11. 58. 12 as Schneidewin’s 1842 edition had done. Lindsay was able to adduce fresh manuscript evidence to back the restoration. In 1915 W. Heraeus stressed the importance of this evidence and drew attention to the implication of the ancient discussion of λεσβιζειν/λεοβιάζειν for the sense of λαικάζειν without, however, challenging in all instances the sense alleged for the latter word by the dictionaries. In 1931 A. E. Housman pointed out that no passage of an ancient text containing
Laikazein had necessarily to do with copulation.\textsuperscript{223} The reviser of Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon, H. Stuart Jones, was aware of Housman's views but ignored them.\textsuperscript{224} As did H. Frisk,\textsuperscript{225} E. A. Barber,\textsuperscript{226} and P. Chantraine.\textsuperscript{227} Indeed most scholars who have referred in print to \textit{laikazein} since 1931 maintain firmly and often with some passion that for the Attic comedians, for Petronius and for Martial the root sense of the verb is identical with that of \textit{bivein}.\textsuperscript{228} There is a certain significance in the fact that some makers of Latin dictionaries\textsuperscript{229} and some editors of the newly found Menandrian \textit{Δῦσκολος}\textsuperscript{230} form an exception.

At least six causes can be suggested for the tenacity with which the false view of \textit{laikazein} has been maintained: the first the great authority reposed in dictionaries and commentaries; the second the apparent phonetic similarity of \textit{laikazein} and \textit{ληκαν};\textsuperscript{231} the third the apparent analogy between \textit{οὐχὶ λαικάσειν}, \textit{laecasin tibi dico} etc. and such locutions from those vulgar registers of modern languages which have been familiar to scholars as ‘bugger off’, ‘fuck off’, ‘fous le camp’, ‘get stuffed’, ‘get fucked’, ‘va te faire foutre’, ‘fa foutre’, ‘va fan’ cul’, ‘du kannst mich mal am Arsch lecken’;\textsuperscript{232} the fourth the rareness in the same registers of depreciatory locutions obviously linked with fellation;\textsuperscript{233} the fifth the apparent schematism of the grammarians’ doctrine about Lesbian perversity; and the sixth the character of the transmitted text of Aristoph. \textit{Equ.} 167. The last two causes suggested involve issues still worth extended discussion.

Lesbianism

The seven references to Lesbian sexual practice in extant Attic comic scripts,

Aristoph. \textit{Vesp.} 1345-50

\begin{quote}
дрάς ἐγὼ σ’ ὡς δεξιῶς ὑφειλόμην
μέλλουσαν ἢδη λεσβιείν τοὺς ξυμπότας
ἀν οὖνεκ’ ἀπόδος τῷ πέει τρίῳ χάριν.

ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἀποδάσεις οὐδ’ ἐφιαλεῖς οὐδ’ ὅτι,
ἀλλ’ ἐξαπατήσεις κάγχανει τοῦτῳ μέγας
πολλοῖς γὰρ ἢδη χάτέροις αὐτ’ ἡργάσο
\end{quote}

Aristoph. \textit{Ran.} 1301-8

\begin{quote}
oὔπος δ’ ἀπὸ πάντων μὲν τῷ ἑρέι πορνιδίων
σκολίων Μελήτου, Καρικῶν αὐλημάτων,
δρηνων, χορειών. τάχα δὲ δηλωθῆσεται,
ἐνεγκάτω τις τὸ λύριον, καίτοι τί δεῖ
λύρας ἐπὶ τούτων; ποῦν ἢ τοῖς ὀπτράκοις
αὐτή κροτοῦσα; δεῦρο Μοῦσ’ Εὐριπίδου,
πρὸς ἤπερ ἐπιτήδεια ταῦτ’ ἄδειν μέλη.

αὕτη ποθ’ ἢ Μοῦσ’ οὐκ ἐλεσβίαζεν; οὐ;
\end{quote}
Aristoph. *Ecl. 918-23*234

> ηδη τον ἄπε Ἰωνίας
> <(οὐχ ἦκει σοῦταῖρος)> τρόπον τάλαινα κνησίας.
> <(ἡ γὰρ μήτηρ ἄλλη)> δοκεῖς δὲ μοι καὶ λάβδα κατὰ τοὺς Λεσβίους.
> ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἂν ποθ᾽ ύφαρπάσαι τάμια παίγνια τήν δ᾽ ἐμὴν ἰραν οὐκ ἀπολέεις οὐδ᾽ ἀπολήψει

Pherecrates, fr. 149235

δῶσει δὲ σοι γυναίκας ἔπτα Λεσβίδας.

Theopompus, fr. 35

τίνα μὴ τὸ παλαιὸν τοῦτο καὶ θρυλούμενον [δὲ ἡμετέρων στομάτων] εἶπο σόφισμ᾽, ὁ φασὶ παιδὰς Λεσβίων εὐερεῖν

Strattis, fr. 40

ἐγώδα ἡτοπίνικος† ὀργισθεὶς ἐφη τῷ στόματι δράσω τοῦθ᾽ ἐπερ ... 

Strattis, fr. 41236

† ἡ μῆποτ᾽ ὁ παῖ Ζηνὸς ἦ ταῦτα μόληςτ ἀλλὰ παραδόος τοῖς Λεσβίοις χαίρειν ἐδα,

are all in themselves somewhat opaque. Other vices besides the practice of fellation were attributed to individual persons of Lesbian origin. Sappho’s trisadism was notorious.237 Some verbs of the type of λεσβίζειν/λεσβιάζειν almost certainly could indicate a multitude of vices.238 The Lacedaemonians, Cretans and Chalcidians were all proverbially pederasts.239 The Lacedaemonians were also breakers of promises240 and lovers of money,241 the Cretans liars,242 and the Chalcidians lovers of money.243 On the other hand the ancient grammarians attribute no characteristic vice to the whole population of Lesbos except the practice of fellation.244 The seven passages of comedy which associate the Lesbians with a vicious practice seem to view with disfavour only one of the parties to the practice. In at least four males are involved. To make the passages carry merely a general accusation of shameless and uninhibited sexuality245 does not do justice to their harsh tone. Not one of them positively and indisputably excludes the idea of fellation and the other ideas exculpated by modern scholars do not elucidate more satisfactorily the obscure Aristoph. *Ran.* 1301-8 and *Ecl.* 918-23.

Musurus printed *Ran.* 1308 as a statement, ἀντὶ ποθ᾽ ἢ Μοῦδα ὁ πού ἔλεβιαζεν οὐ, despite the scholiast ἐν ἐρωτήσει λέγει, ἀντὶ οὐκ Ἰφροποιεί, which he also printed. So too di Giunta. Andreas Divus (1538) translated the verse as a question:
haec quando Musa non coinquinabat, non?". Frischlin (1586) on the other hand made it a firm negative statement: 'haec certe Musa numquam ante in Lesbe fuit'. An apparently illogical locution in which a second oò strengthens a negative statement occurs sporadically in many kinds of Attic writing. The phenomenon began to attract attention in the early nineteenth century and most modern scholars treat Ran. 1308 as an instance of it. For Dionysus however to deny that the 'Muse' brought on stage by Aeschylus to accompany with a castanet dance his parody of a Euripidean tragic song practised fellation has little obvious point. Consequently ἥλεσβίας is taken to mean either 'played the lyre in the manner of a Lesbian expert' or 'made love in the attractive Lesbian way' or both. It cannot be said that the point is thereby much sharpened.

Brunck (1783) took account of the scholiion and translated: 'numquamne haec musa Lesbias imitata est? non?'. J. H. Frere's 'this Muse, I take it, is a Lesbian Muse' (1820) and C. Poyard's 'cette Muse là m'a bien l'air d'une Lesbianne' (1860) spring from the same mode of interpretation. Brunck did not try to explain why Dionysus should have made such an allegation. I suggest that at the festival for which Aristophanes designed his script the castanet-dancer wore a mask with the features of a party-entertainer notorious for the sexual services she supplied on the side. The intention was to imply that Euripides' songs appealed to the kind of person who liked to watch castanet-dancers and have his penis sucked, that Euripides' use of the Greek language in these songs resembled the use the λαϊκόστρια made of her tongue. Essentially the same criticism was being made in a scenic way of Euripides' lyric style as had been made verbally of Agathon's at Thesm. 57. It may have been anticipated at vv. 826-7, where the chorus refers to the στοματοθρόγος ἕκταυ βασάνιστρια λίσφη γλῶσσα. The astonished and horrified question put into the mouth of the Euripides-loving Dionysus served to verbalise the joke, in other words to remind less quick-witted spectators of the reputation which the castanet-dancer, now a resident of Hades, had when she carried on her profession in Athens.

It has to be admitted that the use of double oò with an interrogative tone is not evidenced elsewhere. This has little over-all significance considering how few the recorded instances of the non-interrogative use are. We are dealing in either case with a colloquialism. For myself I cannot see why, if intonation could make a string of words containing a single oò suggest a positive, the same should not be possible with a double oò. Certainly the doubt that has been cast on the ancient commentator's punctuation of Ran. 1308 does not provide sufficient grounds for bringing into question the doctrine about Lesbianism universally held in Antiquity.

Musurus printed against Eccl. 920 the nonsensical scholiion in cod. Florence, Bibl. Laur. 31. 15: λάβδα: λαίραζος εις Αἰδείας ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου στοιχείου. Ghelen's alteration of λαίραζος to λειράζοσιν reduced the degree of nonsense only a little. Interpreters could get no help from the scholiion in dealing with the Aristophanic verse. Andreas Divus translated this verse with 'uideris autem mihi et labda secundum Lesbios' and many more serious scholars of the sixteenth,
seventeenth and eighteenth centuries took λάβδα as a noun denoting one of the partners to an act of cunnilingus, an act ordinarily associated in Antiquity with the Phoenicians. Some perhaps had in mind Juvenal 6. 322 or Martial 7. 67. 13-17. Most, however, seem to have thought as does the most recent commentator on the play, R. G. Ussher, who interprets: 'you are prepared for cunnilingus (assuming, of course, that you won’t if I can help it). The verse as commonly interpreted could hardly be said to have much point. The context demands that the Lesbian behaviour referred to should be something worse than Ionian behaviour. Whatever constituted Ionian behaviour it is not clear that Ussher’s alleged form of Lesbianism was accounted worse by Athenians of the year 392. There is no doubt however that Lesbianism as the grammarians of the Alexandrian tradition defined it was for fourth century Athenians the lowest form of sexual vice.

The ancient grammarian from whose work the scholium comes seems to me to have extracted a more satisfactory sense from the verse. His words are better, though far from perfectly, preserved in cod. Ravenna, Bibl. Class. 429 (fol. 188v): λαυκάζειν οί δέσβες τού ἄρχοντος στοιχείου. He clearly thought that it was the infinitive λαυκάζειν which λάβδα represented. Brunck and Blaydes were on the right track in proposing that the name of the grapheme represented λεοσβίζειν or λείχειν. But while λείχειν sometimes and λεοσβίζειν mostly if not always referred to behaviour obscene and practically unmentionable in polite society neither was itself an obscene word. λαυκάζειν on the other hand was the Aristophanic speaker is a female. She tries to assert a superior sensibility. After accusing the other personage on stage of being, like the females of Ionia, unable to ignore the itches of her genitals she raises the level of insult with a suggestion that her rival is prepared to make her mouth as well as her vagina available for sexual activity. She tries at first to separate herself from the coarseness of this suggestion by means of an alphabetical euphemism but then enforces her point by referring explicitly to the Lesbians and their reputation. λάβδα σοι λέγω was certainly a variant of λαυκάζειν σοι λέγω in some registers of spoken Greek by the early first century B.C. It seems likely that spoken Attic already in 392 had the same way of masking the literal use of the verb and that at Eccl. 920 Aristophanes exploited it. The verse should not be allowed to shake confidence in what the ancient grammarians in unison say about the reputation of the Lesbians.

THE TEXT OF ARISTOPHANES, EQV. 167

Ar Aristoph. Equ. 163-7 a slave informs a vendor of sausages of the contents of an oracle. Power over the affairs of Athens is to pass into the vendor’s hands. He will control the people and the people’s principal physical possessions, the Agora, the harbours and the Phyx; he will not have to take any notice of the members of the Boule; he will inflict every kind of legal humiliation upon the strategoi. All this in
grandiose language of the type regularly used in oracles. Then with ἐν Πρυτανείῳ expectation is created of a verb or phrase of the same tone as τοῦτον ἄρχεταξ εἶσαι etc. describing participation in elaborate banquets. There is, however, a sudden and comically surprising descent into extreme coarseness. Flattery turns to insult. The new supreme ruler will be given penises to suck\textsuperscript{262} rather than what was normally set before those privileged to eat and drink in the Prytaneum.\textsuperscript{263} The insult is of a piece with what the slave has already said to the vendor at vv. 158 – ὃ νῦν μὲν οἴδεις – and will say at vv. 181 – ποιήσω κάκες ἀγοράς εἰ καὶ ἄρασθος. No reaction occurs. This was often the case in comedy. Indeed the vendor’s failure to react may have been designed to aid his characterisation\textsuperscript{264} and to prepare the spectators for such confessions of unmanliness as ἐπέ μοι καὶ τὸ θύρω ἀλλαντοπώλης ὅπως ἀνὴρ γενήσομαι (vv. 178-9) and καὶ τι καὶ βινεσκόμην (v. 1242).

In the commentary from which our scholia descend the element of comic surprise in ἐν Πρυτανείῳ ἃλοκάσεις\textsuperscript{†} was certainly noted. For the use of παρ’ ὑπόνοιαν in schol. Venice, Bibl. Marc. gr. 474, ἃλοκάσεις\textsuperscript{†}: δέον ἐπείνας σιτήσεις, ἢ ἐν πρυτανείῳ ἄριστας, παρ’ ὑπόνοιαν ὅν ἐπείνας ὃς ἐν κομῳδίᾳ,\textsuperscript{265} one might compare the scholia on vv. 60, 107, 136, 176 et al. A gloss above ἃλοκάσεις\textsuperscript{†} in cod. Milan, Bibl. Ambros. L. 39 sup., ὡς λακκοπρωκτόν, not printed until 1969,\textsuperscript{266} shows, I think, that the ancient grammarian also made some attempt to indicate the force of ἃλοκάσεις\textsuperscript{†}. In his view the slave was prophesying the kind of degradation to which those who permitted sexual use of their anuses ultimately had to come. Some passage like Cephasod. fr. 3. 4-5, linking λακκοπρωκτία and fellation, may have been in his mind.\textsuperscript{267}

Andreas Divus was deceived by the Triclinian scholion printed by Musurus and Ghelean, as I explained above.\textsuperscript{268} For the sixteenth century translator the slave was prophesying in a flattering way yet another tyrannical privilege: satisfaction of sexual desire at public expense.\textsuperscript{269} This misinterpretation has persisted, varying only according to the degree of freedom permitted at the translator’s time in the discussion of sexual matters. I note Bartolomio and Pietro Rositini’s ‘nel Pritaneo potrai cortiganare’ (1545), N. Frischlin’s ‘in Prytaneo sortum accubabis molliter’ (1586), J. H. Frere’s ‘you shall feast and fornicate in the council house’ (1820), T. Mitchell’s ‘... the Prytaneum and a she-companion in it’ (1836), L. Seeger’s ‘wirst im Prytaneion huren’ (1845), W. J. Hickie’s ‘and in the Prytaneum you shall wench’ (1853), C. Poyard’s ‘tu feras la débauche au Prytanée’ (1860), W. Ribbeck’s ‘du selbst sollst im Rathaus f-‘ (1867), B. B. Rogers ‘make the Hall your brothel’ (1910), A. Willems ‘tu paillarderas au Prytanée’ (1919), H. van Dael’s ‘au Prytanée tu ... paillarderas’ (1923), R. Cantarella’s ‘e nel Pritanèo forterai’ (1953), R. H. Webb’s ‘and keep your wenches in the City Hall’ (1962), B. Marzullo’s ‘nel Pritanèo ci vai a fottere’ (1968), P. Dickinson’s ‘and use the Assembly hall to have your women in’ (1970), A. H. Sommerstein’s ‘you will have the right ... to screw whom you will in the Town Hall’ (1978).

In 1881 W. G. Rutherford not only suggested that a form of sexual activity more discreditable at Athens than πορνοκοπία was being predicted but also proposed
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that the middle λαϊκάσεi should be read instead of the active λαϊκάσεις so as to bring the verb into line with the plainly pejorative λαϊκάσομαι and λαϊκάσει at Cephisod. fr. 3. 6 and Strat. fr. 1. 36 respectively. Against Rutherford K. Zacher argued that, while the contexts of Cephisodorus and Strato demand a passive sense, that of Aristophanes demands an active and pointed out that the active form λαϊκάσεις is carried both by the two Aristophanic manuscripts which antedate the 1204 sack of Constantinople and by most of the younger manuscripts. Accordingly, in Zacher’s view, λαϊκάσεις was to be read and the traditional interpretation maintained. Since Zacher’s time another instance of the middle future has turned up, Menan. Disc. 892, incontestably related in sense to Cephisod. fr. 3. 6 and Strato, fr. 1. 36. The evidence about the text of all four passages is now commonly taken to justify the traditional interpretation of Aristoph. Equ. 167.

Discussion has run in a circle. Consideration, however, of the tone of all the comic passages in which λαϊκάζειν, λαϊκαστής or λαϊκάστρια occurs, of Suetonius’ use of λαϊκάστρια and of the Fayum magician’s use of λαϊκάζειν enables the circle to be broken. Judgement about the text of Aristoph. Equ. 167 must depend on interpretation of how the poet used λαϊκάζειν. It can no longer dictate interpretation.

The manuscript evidence does not in fact provide a firm starting point. A second hand in cod. Venice, Bibl. Marc. gr. 474, as Zacher knew, altered λαϊκάσεις to λαϊκάσει. The first hand of cod. Paris, Bibl. Nat. gr. 2715 (XVI cent.) wrote λαϊκάσεις. It is difficult to see whence λαϊκάσει could have come except from ancient tradition. The passages of Cephisodorus and Strato stood unrestored until the early nineteenth century. It was furthermore a simple matter for an original λαϊκάσει following πατήσεις ... κλαστάσεις δήσεις φυλάξεις to have turned into λαϊκάσεις. The opposite development was much less easy. In any case ancient and Byzantine scribes tended to eliminate the middle future forms of a large number of Attic verbs which expressed some exercing of the senses or denoted some functional state or process. The evidence looked at as a whole strongly suggests that λαϊκάζειν was one of these verbs. Even if the manuscript tradition at Equ. 167 was united on λαϊκάσεις there would be little reason for reposing complete confidence in it and certainly none for using it to reject the pattern of use suggested for λαϊκάζειν by the other contexts of occurrence.