ΖΗΛΟΤΥΠΙΑ: A BRIEF EXCURSION INTO SEX, VIOLENCE, AND LITERARY HISTORY

ELAINE FANTHAM

JEALOUSY, THAT IS SEXUAL JEALOUSY, is often associated with acts of violence by both male and female lovers, and until recently the jealousy of a betrayed husband was recognised in Mediterranean societies as exonerating if not actually justifying murder. We recognise the motivation of such acts as a mixture of genuine passion and wounded pride (or "honour"), that is both love and self-love. In classical Athens the circumstances of bourgeois and upper-class marriage made it likely that marriages would be contracted and perhaps continue throughout life without passion, while few wives would be exposed to, or risk, the hazards of infidelity.[1] Thus both the practical and the emotional circumstances would reduce the frequency of occasions for jealous passion in marriage. Indeed the greatest example of jealous passion in tragedy, the "barbarian" or non-Greek Medea, would probably have been seen by Euripides' audience not as wife of Jason, but as his concubine in a union unsanctioned by *oikos* or *polis*.[2]

Instead we find jealousy, particularly jealousy manifested in physical violence, in the unstable world outside the *oikos*: between homosexual *erastes* and *eromenos*, lover and *hetaira*, master and concubine, or mistress and gigolo. This can be illustrated from the history of the word-family which is the subject of my paper.

Jealousy and its cognates in the Romance languages derive ultimately from Greek ζῆλος, but this word is almost never sexual in reference: rather it covers good and bad envy of achievement, or desire for an abstract, most

[1]A referee has pointed out that in Asian and Islamic societies where arranged marriages are the norm, it is generally accepted that passion is generated by sexual relations and so will develop naturally from marriage. On the other hand these societies appear to me more favourably disposed to heterosexual love-making than many of the Athenians about whom we read. For an objective account of Athenian behaviour towards wives in the classical period (roughly from 500–300 B.C.) see Kenneth Dover, "Classical Greek Attitudes to Sexual Behaviour," in *Women in Antiquity; the Arethusa Papers*, eds. John Peradotto and J. P. Sullivan (Albany, N.Y. 1984) 145–146; *Popular Greek Morality in the time of Plato and Aristotle* (Oxford 1974) 205–212.

[2]Many of the audience would have seen Jason's repudiation as justified because she had given herself to him without the consent of her *kurios*; others would have drawn the analogy between her excluded status as a non-Corinthian at Corinth and that of any foreign woman at Athens after the citizenship law of 451, if her state of origin did not have *epigamia*, the right of producing citizen children in marriage. See D. M. MacDowell, *The Law in Classical Athens* (London 1978) 67 and 87. Note that W. den Boer, *Private Morality in Greece and Rome* (Leiden 1979) argues that Medea is lawfully married in the eyes of the chorus and her own conviction.

PHOENIX, VOL. 40 (1986) 1.

often honourable, goal.[3] The closest equivalent of sexual jealousy in Greek is the compound root ζηλοτυπ- found in the substantival adjective ζηλότυπος and the derivative verb ζηλοτυπέω and noun ζηλοτυπία. Photius and the *Suda* alike define this as ζῆλος ἐξ ὑπονοίας, τοῦ ἀνδρὸς κατὰ τῆς οἰκείας γυναικὸς εἰς ἕτερον ἀσελγῆ ὑπόνοια, "envy arising from suspicion, the suspicion of a man concerning his own wife/woman against an immoral third party." But although the root is attested from the early fourth century, appearing almost simultaneously in Aristophanes' *Plutus*, produced in 388 B.C., and Plato's *Symposium*, dated shortly after 385,[4] it is not associated with marriage until at earliest the middle of the next century.

In *Plutus* Aristophanes is recycling the traditional humour at the expense of aging women which had provided him with a prolonged episode in *Ecclesiazusae* (973–1111) five years previously. A rich old woman enters, grieving for the loss of her gigolo. No longer poor, he has abandoned her, but she still tries to deceive herself about his attentions, speaking of his jealous behaviour when he noticed someone casting a glance at her while she rode through the streets to the Mysteries.

> ἐπὶ τῆς ἁμάξης ὅτι προσέβλεψέν μέ τις,
> ἐτυπτόμην διὰ τοῦθ' ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν.
> οὕτω σφόδρα ζηλότυπος ὁ νεανίσκος ἦν. *Plutus* 1014–16

There is no suggestion that the word ζηλότυπος is a new coinage; rather it seems to occur spontaneously in the comment on the youth's violent behaviour in 1015. But the context raises questions about the formation of this compound, its usual reference, and Aristophanes' immediate intention here. Compounds formed with *typos* are abundant in Greek from the fifth century on, and are of two types: proparoxytone forms are passive in force, and common in lyric poetry, from Aeschylus and Pindar through Euripidean lyric to Hellenistic epigram. Paroxytone -τύπος forms are active, often substantival and denoting human agents: they seem to arise slightly later and are particularly common from the beginning of the fourth century.[5] Several

[3]ζηλόω first appears (as the good *eris* of competitive skill) in Hesiod *Op.* 23; the noun ζῆλος, as malicious envy in its first instance, at *Op.* 195. *Zelos* is combined with *phthonos* by Democritus 191 DK, Lysias 2.48, and Plato *Philebus* 47e and 50c (where it is conceived as an undesirable emotion and a kind of pain, *lupe*), but contrasted in Ar. *Rhet.* 1388a30. For a possible sexual association note Polyxena's language at Eur. *Hec.* 352 ζῆλον οὐ σμικρὸν γάμων / ἔχουσα, where, however, the preceding βασιλεῦσι νύμφη suggests that *zelos* is rather competition for the honour of a royal marriage.

[4]For the dating of the composition of *Symposium*, see Dover's edition (Cambridge 1980) 10; he suggests a date between 384 and 379. The dramatic date is given by Agathon's tragic victory of 416 B.C. when Socrates would have been in his mid-fifties and Alcibiades, elected strategos in 415, at least 30.

[5]For the full list of compounds ending in *-tupos* or *-ktupos* see Paul Kretschmer, *Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache* (Göttingen 1944) 463; there are at least fifty formations. I

words, such as χαλκοτυπος and χρυσοτυπος occur with both accentuations and meanings. According to Chantraine and other recent lexica ζηλοτυπος should be of the first type: "frappé par l'envie" as Chantraine translates it.[6] It is normally accented proparoxytone. But we note that Aristophanes in this first attested instance has preceded it by active τύπτειν—and he dearly loves a little violent horseplay involving this verb.[7] Has he inherited the word and understood it as normally passive, but allowed himself a mild pun—construing it as "beating up out of jealousy?" Could he have coined the word, after all, and started it on its way? The formation of the derivative verb ζηλοτυπέω by Plato shortly after *Plutus* was produced need not argue against this, since Greek forms, e.g., χαλκοτυπέω from the active χαλκοτύπος. And although the prefix of such active forms is normally the object of the verbal suffix, it is precisely in comedy that we might expect a formation that flouts the conventional logic of its type.

In fact the other rare instances of this root from the fourth and early third century also occur in violent settings. One of the most complex and ambiguous is the first recorded instance of the verb form at Plato *Symp.* 213d. The

---

have checked many of these in LSJ and offer some samples to support my generalisations. For the passive formations compare, e.g., ἁλίτυπος "sea-beaten" Aesch. *Persae* 946, Eur. *Or.* 373; χοροίτυπος "struck in the dance" Hom. *Hymn. Herm.* 31; χρυσότυπος "made of beaten gold" Eur. *El.* 470; χαλκότυπος "inflicted by bronze weapons" *Il.* 19.25, "made of beaten bronze" *A.P.* 5.362. For the active formation compare χαλκοτύπος "bronze-beating" Xen. *Ages.* 1.26, *Poroi* 4.6, Lycurgus 58, Dem. 25.38; ὀρεοτύπος/ὀροιτύπος/ὀροτύπος "mountain-beating" used of water in Aesch. *Septem* 85, of miners/woodcutters in Theophrastus *HP* 3.3.7, Nicander *Ther.* 5.377, *A.P.* 7.445. Plutarch forms the verb χαλκοτυπεῖν "to forge" and the noun χαλκοτυπεῖον from the root χαλκοτύπος. An interesting case is the vulgar sexual insult χαμαιτύπη (= she who is banged on the ground?) which first appears in comedy, Timocles fr. 22.2 K, Menander *Samia* 133, fr. 879 Koerte, then in Theopompus and later prose. This is best construed as a passive (the masculine would be proparoxytone) but the parallel active form occurs in Aristotle *HA* 620a31 in the sense "striking at ground level," and applied to a hawk. One of the earliest active formations seems to be χοροιτύπος "beating out the dance" Pindar fr. 156 (cf. the passive compound, above). However, the division between prosaic active form and poetic passive does not hold for *zelotupos*, which occurs in two epigrams of Meleager, *A.P.* 5.151 χερῶν ζηλοτύπων δύναμιν, and 152 ζηλοτύπους ὀδύνας. I am reminded by a referee that, especially in the case of rare words or usages, the recorded accentuation represents the decision of later grammarians and may reflect their interpretation of the word rather than its original meaning and pronunciation.

[6]Pierre Chantraine, *Dictionnaire etymologique de la langue grecque* (Paris 1970); for ζηλότυπος see under ζηλῶ 2.400 and τύπτω 4.1145. Hjalmar Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg 1960) 1.612 lists the form without comment. But see also 2.945–946 under τύπτω ("Oft als Hinterglied") for information on the variants.

[7]τύπτειν is Aristophanes' favourite word for violence or beating up and is frequently the focus of assault on unpopular types, followed by the protest that this is an act of *hubris*; cf. Dover, *Aristophanic Comedy* (London 1972) 37; there are comic beating episodes in *Birds* 1010 f., and *Ecclesiasusae* 642 f., and sequences including 13 instances of *typtein* from *Clouds* 1323 to 1379 and from 1409 to 1443. The alternate beatings of Dionysus and Xanthias in *Frogs* 618–674 provide a different type of humour without the issue of *hubris* arising.

drunken Alcibiades has come on a *komos* to the house of Agathon, to crown the poet for his recent victory in the tragic contest, and quickly enters into the spirit of the gay party by pretending that his relationship with Socrates is passionate and physical. At the first sight of Socrates—whom he did not notice while he was focussing his attention on Agathon—he is startled and accuses him of lying in wait for him (ἐλλοχῶν) as an *erastes* might lurk in order to take his *paidika* by surprise with an embrace. Socrates answers in kind:

καὶ τὸν Σωκράτη, "Ἀγάθων," φάναι, "ὅρα εἴ μοι ἐπαμυνεῖς· ὡς ἐμοὶ ὁ τούτου ἔρως τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐ φαῦλον πρᾶγμα γέγονεν. ἀπ' ἐκείνου γὰρ τοῦ χρόνου, ἀφ' οὗ τούτου ἠράσθην, οὐκέτι ἔξεστίν μοι οὔτε προσβλέψαι οὔτε διαλεχθῆναι καλῷ οὐδ' ἑνί, ἢ οὑτοσὶ ζηλοτυπῶν με καὶ φθονῶν θαυμαστὰ ἐργάζεται καὶ λοιδορεῖταί τε καὶ τὼ χεῖρε μόγις ἀπέχεται. ὅρα οὖν μή τι καὶ νῦν ἐργάσηται, ἀλλὰ διάλλαξον ἡμᾶς, ἢ ἐὰν ἐπιχειρῇ βιάζεσθαι, ἐπάμυνε, ὡς ἐγὼ τὴν τούτου μανίαν τε καὶ φιλεραστίαν πάνυ ὀρρωδῶ."

"Agathon, take care and protect me. This fellow's passion[8] has become a serious problem. For since I fell in love with him, I'm no longer allowed to look at a handsome youth or chat with him, but this man here goes to extraordinary lengths and out of jealous passion and envy starts calling me names and can scarcely keep his hands off me. Be careful that he doesn't do something dreadful this time. Please make a truce between us[9] or protect me when he tries to force me, for I'm quite terrified of the fellow's crazy passion for his lover."[10]

Although the entire paragraph is extraordinarily difficult to translate, I believe the clue lies in the active lustful violence of τὼ χεῖρε μόγις ἀπέχεται

[8]Dover (*Symposium* 161) translates "my passion for him" pointing out that Socrates subsequently calls Alcibiades' emotion *philerastia* not *eros*. Yet I believe Plato is deliberately ambiguous, trading on the double option of subjective and objective genitive to match Alcibiades' dual role as would-be *paidika* and *erastes*.

[9]Διαλλαγαί, the regular term for truce, or reconciliation, extends the parallel between love and warfare; cf. Eur. *Med.* 896 καὶ διαλλάχθηθ' ἁμὰ / τῆς προόσθεν ἐχθρᾶς ἐς φίλους μῆτρος μέτα and Men. *Perik.* 1006 διαλλαχθήσομαι. The parallel is made explicit in Terence's adaptation of Menander's *Eunuchus*, 59–61: *in amore haec omnia insunt vitia: iniuriae, / suspiciones, inimicitiae, indutiae, bellum, pax rursum.* Here *iniuriae* may represent *hubris*, and *indutiae* certainly translates διαλλαγαί.

[10]*Philerastia*, "passion for the lover," occurs only here, but has been prepared by Aristophanes' introduction of *philerastes* at 192b (in his list of erotic types, it is the complement of *paiderastes*). The form of this noun echoes *paiderastia* (*Symp.* 181a, 184c) and *philogymnastia* (182c, 205d). The precedent for the formation *phil-erastes* in Ar. *Wasps* 88 φιληλιαστής (for which I am indebted to a referee) supports the hypothesis that Plato is colouring Aristophanes' speech in *Symposium* with language characteristic of the playwright. Bury on 213e glosses *philerastia* as *anteros*, but in *Symposium* this concept has yet to be isolated and named. It occurs only at *Phaedrus* 255d and there the corresponding verb is *antiphilein* (255d, 256e). *Philerastia* in 213e and the adjective in 192b must be a general addiction to lovers, not the immediate specific reciprocity of *anteros*.

and βιάζεσθαι. Socrates, while acknowledging his active role as *erastes*, deliberately attributes to his "*paidika*"—the now adult Alcibiades—the aggressive lust normally associated with unspiritual *erastai*, and like the self-deceiving old woman of Aristophanes depicts the handsome and coveted young man in the affair as insanely jealous of the older person's attentions to others.

The irony is inverted and developed by Plato in many different ways as he unwraps the reality confessed by Alcibiades—that Socrates' interest in him is entirely Platonic and intellectual, so that he resisted the desperate seductions of Alcibiades even when he was at the height of his youthful charm. Alcibiades continues the pose of the pursued one with his mockery of Socrates' Silenus-like ugliness, and paradoxically accuses him of *hybris*—not the usual *hybris* of violence that overrides the rights of another citizen by physical, or sexual, assault to gratify his arrogance, or lust,[11] but the fastidious contempt of the chaste: ὑβριστὴς εἶ says Alcibiades (215b7) before his seduction narrative, leading some readers perhaps to expect another accusation of violence; then after his report of failure, he ends, "Socrates rejected my charms," κατεγέλασεν τῆς ἐμῆς ὥρας καὶ ὕβρισεν (219c4 recalling 215b7).

After his speech, in the byplay when Alcibiades and Socrates manoeuvre around Agathon, Socrates urging Agathon to recline beyond him out of reach of Alcibiades, while Alcibiades begs him to let Agathon lie between them, the pretence that Alcibiades is a jealous darling of Socrates, angry at his attentions to the rival *kalos* Agathon, is crystallised in Alcibiades' conclusion at 222a7–b4:

ταῦτ' ἐστίν, ὦ ἄνδρες, ἃ ἐγὼ Σωκράτη ἐπαινῶ· καὶ αὖ ἃ μέμφομαι συμμείξας ὑμῖν εἶπον ἅ με ὕβρισεν. καὶ μέντοι οὐκ ἐμὲ μόνον ταῦτα πεποίηκεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ Χαρμίδην τὸν Γλαύκωνος καὶ Εὐθύδημον τὸν Διοκλέους καὶ ἄλλους πάνυ πολλούς, οὓς οὗτος ἐξαπατῶν ὡς ἐραστὴς παιδικὰ μᾶλλον αὐτὸς καθίσταται ἀντ' ἐραστοῦ.

The violence attributed by Socrates to Alcibiades at 213d is the sort of jealousy that would normally be shown by an *erastes* towards his *eromenos*, and Socrates has been playing on the ambiguity of ὁ τούτου ἔρως τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in a way which is not possible in English. Alcibiades, already a grown man, capable of both heterosexual and homosexual active roles, is credited with the violent jealousy common in an *erastes* while he is mockingly equated with an *eromenos* by Socrates' use of ἠράσθην, and by the unique noun *philerastia* "passion for a/his lover," or more likely, "passion for lovers in general." For ὁ τούτου ἔρως, given by ἠράσθην the sense of "my passion for him," has to be reinterpreted as soon as we reach the next sentence, which

[11]On *hubris* see Kenneth Dover, *Greek Homosexuality* (London 1978) 34–38, and D. M. MacDowell, "HYBRIS in Athens," *G&R* 23 (1976) 14–31, *The Law in Classical Athens* (London 1978) 129–132. On Alcibiades' seduction narrative see *Greek Homosexuality* 157–158, and on Plato's philosophical exploitation of homosexuality *ibid.* 153–170.

illustrates so forcibly "his passion for me." As for the sense of ζηλοτυπῶν, which was our starting point, while the rest of the sentence demonstrates Alcibiades' tendency towards assault, the pairing of ζηλοτυπῶν with φθονῶν, a purely psychological concept, suggests that Plato sees this too as a state of mind, whether we understand it as "acting like one in a violent passion," taking the suffix as active and the sense as desiderative, or as "acting like one smitten by passion." The verb depends for its meaning on Plato's understanding of the basic adjective, and since Aristophanes plays such a leading role in the *Symposium* we may expect Aristophanic influence in its komastic later phase.

The badinage and verbal horse-play of *Symposium* marks the surfacing in literature of what must have been an established spoken idiom—the language of lovers which the fifth century would have found indecorous outside the private party or the comic stage. The fourth century with its new concentration on personal relationships, as opposed to a man's traditional relationship with *oikos* and *polis*, brings to light both language and behaviour not previously thought worthy of public mention. Yet there is some self-censorship in the language of authors like Xenophon, whose treatment of homosexual relationships is notable for decorum equally of language and behaviour.[12]

Dover's *Greek Homosexuality* has brought out fully the value of *Symposium* and of Aeschines' *Against Timarchos* for documenting social aspects of homosexual behaviour, including episodes of jealous and/or drunken violence.[13] Such violence against a citizen incurred the charge of *hybris*, but as Dover has shown, the conceptual flexibility of *hybris* enabled a pleader to apply it to many aspects of the gay life besides the assault of a rival or the sexual assault of an *eromenos*. Thus in reporting Timarchus' homosexual career Aeschines speaks with hypocritical sympathy of the jealous indignation of Pittalakos, who had allegedly spent a great deal of money on Timarchos (1.58): ὠδυνᾶτο,[14] οἶμαι, ὁ Πιττάλακος, μάτην, ὥς γ' ᾠ̓ετο, τοσοῦτον ἀργύριον ἀνηλωκώς, καὶ ἐζηλοτύπει τὰ γιγνόμενα. καὶ ἐφοίτα ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν. The direct object is now the abstract "what was going on" and the verb must refer to emotion, not action. Apparently Pittalakos did not attempt violence, and his visits limited themselves to verbal importuning. In return he was treated violently by Hegesandros and his drinking companions, who

[12]Dover (*ibid.* 159–160) notes two discussions, *Mem.* 1.2.29 f., and *Symp.* 3.8–14, but the whole tone of Xenophon's *Symposium* is more inhibited and his vocabulary more euphemistic and less imaginative than in Plato's very different *Symposium*. The fourth century respectability noted by Dover (151) has already set in. The root ζηλότυπ- does not seem to be found in Xenophon.

[13]On *Against Timarchus, ibid.* 18–57, especially 52–57, on violence between rivals.

[14]ὀδυνᾶσθαι and ὀδυνή along with λυπεῖσθαι and λυπή seem to have provided the more seemly equivalents for ζηλότυπ- in authors of tragedy and formal prose; cf. λυπεῖσθαι Eur. *Med.* 286, 703, λύπην ἀνιαροτάτην *Med.* 1113.

went out and vandalised his home. What Aeschines in 1.62 calls *hybris*, they excused as παροινία (1.61).[15] Aeschines, the only orator to use the root at all, has two other relevant passages: in 3.211 his use of ζηλοτυπέω is metaphorical, contrasting the creature who asserts an unjustified claim to virtue, κάθαρμα ζηλοτυποῦν ἀρετήν[16] with the man who has lived a virtuous life. How forcefully do we take this image? Is it of a coarse lover laying lecherous hands on a pure female? Or more vaguely, of a man coveting, hankering after, virtue, just as the noun denotes mere covetousness earlier in the same speech? For Demosthenes is reproached with envy of Philocrates over his acceptance of bribes at 3.81: τῆς πρὸς Φιλοκράτην ὑπὲρ τῆς δωροδοκίας ζηλοτυπίας: here the syntax of the word has changed again, focussing on the rival, and ζηλοτυπία differs from φθόνος only in its power to evoke crude associations.

Should we perhaps differentiate between the physical, active associations of ζηλότυπος and the more psychological connotations of the derivatives ζηλοτυπέω, ζηλοτυπία? The situation is complicated because the rare early instances of ζηλότυπος appear only in comedy, the other forms in oratory and dialogue. In Menander's *Perikeiromene* the jealousy of the lover Polemon leads to violence when he finds his girl Glycera apparently embracing a rival, and humiliates her by cutting off her hair—an act which she herself calls *hybris* at *Perik.* 724. Later, overcome with shame, he describes his actions thus (986–988):

ὁ δ' ἀλάστωρ ἐγὼ
καὶ ζηλότυπος ἄνθρωπος α.[
εὐθὺς ἐπαρῴνουν.

The text is unfortunately damaged but the missing word is unlikely to change the interpretation of ζηλοτυπία, "I, the destructive spirit,[17] jealous

[15]παροινία / παροινεῖν often entail considerable violence; besides Aesch. 1.61, cf. 2.154 and 2.4 associating *paroinia* with *hubris*. Both episodes refer to an occasion when (according to Demosthenes 19.196 f.), Aeschines and his drinking companions had abused and assaulted (not sexually) an Olynthian girl of good family who had been forced to attend their party. Compare also Men. *Perik.* 988 cited below, and Lucian *Het. Dial.* 15.322/323 (Loeb 7.462.) A. W. Gomme and F. H. Sandbach, *Menander* (Oxford 1973) 94 on *Aspis* 386 and 150 on *Dysk.* 93 show that the word did not imply the actual influence of drink. At Xen. *Symp.* 6.1 and 6.10 the word is first defined etymologically as τὸ τοίνυν παρ' οἶνον λυπεῖν τοὺς συνόντας, then applied in a persuasive definition first to a discourteous silence, then to outright rudeness at the drinking party.

[16]It should be noted that Aeschines is the first extant source for the transitive use of the verb. While 1.58 does not permit a physical interpretation, 3.211 could be read as a metaphorical assault on the beloved. Further transitive uses occur in Athenaeus 12.352a (below, n. 34), which could, however, be construed as an absolute usage of the verb, and Plut. *Mor.* 267d (below, n. 28).

[17]The use of *Alastor*, here (with which cf. *aliterios* at Men. *Epitr.* 894) implies that jealous anger or a lover's moral indignation can be a destructive force, a home-breaking source of ruin. The adaptation of these religous ideas into domestic life requires separate treatment.

creature that I am, instantly flew into a rage." The violence is conveyed by the verb παροινεῖν, leaving the adjective to convey Polemon's state of mind. It seems then that, although the root is associated with violence and denotes a violent disposition, it did not denote actual "beating up," and the verbal association in Aristophanes is either accidental, or word-play for the occasion.

But the violent associations of ζηλοτυπία are beyond doubt in the cruder tradition of *magodia* and mime deriving from comedy.[18] The fifth Mimiambos of Herodas, a particularly unpleasant study of a jealous mistress ordering the brutal lashing of her slave-lover, is entitled ΖΗΛΟΤΥΠΟΣ, or as Cunningham suggests,[19] perhaps Η ΖΗΛΟΤΥΠΟΣ. The word does not occur in the actual text of Herodas: certainly the content of *Mimiambi* 5 offers no opportunity, since the mistress is addressing slaves who will not dare to use an abusive term, but it might have been expected elsewhere. This mime tradition supplies one of the streams which carry the word into the vocabulary of Latin, as well as Greek, but before changing tongues I would like to return to the moral tradition of serious prose.

Plato does not discuss sexual jealousy as such, though in the *Philebus* he classifies *eros* as though it automatically denoted unreciprocated desire, grouping it with *lupe* as a kind of deficiency.[20] Aristotle too gives no explicit attention to *eros* in the *Nicomachean Ethics*,[21] though he does handle a situation similar to that of Polemon or Pittalakos in his treatment of *orge*: at 1149b20 he points out that no one commits *hybris* in a state of distress (λυπούμενος) but anyone acting in anger acts in distress; the man committing

[18]It should be noted that there is almost no evidence for the nature of mime before the third century B.C.. Both E. Wüst (*RE* 15.2 s.v. "Mimos" 1727–33) and P. Maas (*RE* 3A.1 s.v. "Simodoi" 159–160) cite only Strabo 648 and Athenaeus 620a–621d—both writers of our own era—for descriptions of *magodoi* and related developments of mime. On *magodoi* Athenaeus comments (621c) "the magodist . . . has tambourines and cymbals, and all his garments are feminine; he not only makes indecent gestures, he does everything that is shameless, at one time acting the parts of women as adulteresses or pimps, at another a drunken man going to meet his mistress in a revel rout" (tr. C. B. Gulick, Loeb 6.347).

[19]*Herodas: Mimiambi*, ed. I. C. Cunningham (Oxford 1971) 148 for the title, 5 and 8–9 for Aristokles' evidence and the Oxyrhynchus papyrus. Cunningham describes the central woman of this papyrus as "determined, ruthless, shameless, jealous, an adulteress, and an attempted poisoner." But the papyrus mime *Select Papyri* 3 tr. D. L. Page (London 1970) 350–361 seems to be a prose outline for improvisation rather than the text intended for performance. In general mime and its derivatives do not distinguish between the jealous woman and the lustful wife/adulteress; ζηλότυπος is sometimes used where λαικαστρία or καταπυγών would be more appropriate. See also n. 28.

[20]*Philebus* 47e1–2 on which see W. W. Fortenbaugh, *Aristotle on Emotion* (London 1975) 9–10.

[21]See further Fortenbaugh's discussion "Menander's *Perikeiromene*: Misfortune, Vehemence, and Polemon," *Phoenix* 28 (1974) 430–443 for the application of Aristotelian standards to the moral evaluation of this episode in Menander and similar violent acts.

hybris acts with enjoyment (*hedone*). In a similar connection he comments at 1150a27–30, "we would regard as worse a man who feels no anger when he beats another person than someone who does so in anger. For what would he do if he were in the grip of emotion when acting?"

Aristotle's successors interested themselves extensively in practical moral situations and in the control of the emotions.[22] Thus we find a careful Stoic distinction between ζῆλος and ζηλοτυπία in several of the doxographers. The brief definitions are not specifically erotic; a typical instance is D.L. 7.111, derived from Chrysippus' *Peri Pathon*, which defines ζηλοτυπία as a subvariety of *lupe* distinct from ζῆλος. Whereas ζῆλος is distress over something one does not oneself possess (ζῆλον δὲ λύπην ἐπὶ τῷ ἄλλῳ παρεῖναι ἃ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπεθύμει), ζηλοτυπία is distress over another's possession of what one also possesses (λύπην ἐπὶ τῷ ἄλλῳ παρεῖναι ἃ καὶ αὐτὸς ἔχει). The Stoic definition offered by Cicero *Tusculans* 4.17 (*SVF* 3.415) is similarly based on "what one desires." *Obtrectatio autem est ea quam intellegi ζηλοτυπίαν volo, aegritudo ex eo quod alter quoque potiatur eo quod ipse concupiverit.*[23] While the definition allows for the application of ζηλοτυπία to many varieties of covetousness, and the compound comes to displace ζῆλος for all types of envy in Greek prose writers of the first century A.D. and thereafter, it also correctly describes some types of sexual jealousy, and the Stoic writers were familiar with ζηλοτυπία in the context of adultery. Diogenes Laertius cites Zeno, Chrysippus, Diogenes the Cynic, and Plato in their respective *Politeiae*[24] for the advantages of enjoying community of wives (7.131 = *SVF* 3.728) πάντας τὲ παῖδας ἐπίσης στέρξομεν πατέρων τρόπον καὶ ἡ ἐπὶ μοιχεία ζηλοτυπία περιαιρεθήσεται. From this time on, however, ζηλοτυπία without further specification becomes generalised as either envy of what one has not or jealous possessiveness of what one has, and the more earthy associations with sex and violence persist only for the verb and the adjectival noun ζηλότυπος.[25]

Herodas was almost certainly a contemporary of Callimachus, little later than the flowering of Menander's comedy.[26] But the cruder mime persisted

[22]I am indebted to my colleague Brad Inwood for drawing my attention to the Stoic interest in this theme, and for discussion of the relevant fragments. Besides *SVF* 3.412 and 415, n. 413 = Stobaeus 2.92 W, and 414 = Ps.-Andronicus *Peri Pathon* 2.

[23]It is probably under the influence of his reading *peri pathon* literature for the *Tusculans* that Cicero uses this root three times in his correspondence with Atticus in June 45 B.C., each time in the sense of social or political envy: *Att.* 13.13 (SB 321.1) ζηλοτυπεῖσθαι, 13.18, (SB 325) ζηλοτυπεῖν, and 13.19 (SB 326) the coinage ἀζηλοτυπητόν in the sense of *minus invidiosum*.

[24]Note that Plato does not himself use the ζηλότυπ- root in his discussion of the elimination of jealousy through the community of wives and children (*Resp.* 457d–466d) or elsewhere outside the *Symposium*.

[25]Compare the use of *zelotupein* at Demetrius *on Style* 292 for simple envy.

[26]For the dating see Cunningham (above, n. 19) 2, "the late 70s and early 60s of the third century B.C.."

and thrived in Roman as in Greek society. The jealous and adulterous mistress survives in Juvenal's allusion to the *zelotypae scrinia moechae* (6.278), who, like the villainess of Herodas, *iacet in servi complexibus*. Another reference in Juvenal makes explicit the association with mime, for the potential performer in a mime is labelled *zelotypus Thymeles, stupidi collega Corinti* (8.197). The cuckold of mime is such a favourite butt that we can surmise that *zelotypus* flourished in Latin of the first century A.D. just because it was a stock designation, like *stupidus*,[27] of the popular role. Mime also explains, I believe, the typology of the allusion in Petronius (45.7); when the adulterous steward is thrown to the wild beasts at the local games there will be brawling in the audience: *videbis populi rixam inter zelotypos et amasiunculos*.[28] A second Petronian instance is addressed to the *matrona* Scintilla, jealous of her husband's slave catamite (69.3). The word is applied to slighted husbands and lovers by Martial (1.93.13), Quintilian (4.2.30),[29] and again Juvenal at 5.44. In an odd vulgarisation of Vergil's Dido-narrative jasper is eruditely described as *quas in vaginae fronte solebat / ponere zelotypo iuvenis praelatus Iarbae*.[30] We see so little of Iarbas in *Aeneid* 4. Is it possible that his role had been adapted into a mime or pantomime representing an erotic triangle composed of Dido, Aeneas, and the Moor?[31]

Such triangles of jealousy become the stock of Roman elegy, but the

[27]The Juvenal passage seems to be the first evidence for the role-name *stupidus*; note the Scholiast's comment on 6.276: *Uruca mimologi stupidi nomen finxit qui a femina sua sic frequenter fallitur cum agit personam mariti.* It is possible that *stupidus*, despite a change of emphasis, took over from *zelotypus* as role-designation for the cuckold. For the adultery plot in mime compare Ovid *Tr.* 2.505 *cumque fefellit amans aliqua novitate maritum*, and Sen. *Contr.* 2.4.5 *mimicae nuptiae, in quibus ante in cubiculum rivalis venit quam maritus.*

[28]Both Petronian instances, like Juvenal 6.278, seem to depend on the jealous mistress theme, but 69.3 shows the woman as jealous of her husband's favourite. We may surmise that Trimalchio's own success-story, achieving by gratifying both master and mistress (75.11) was another theme derived from mime, in which comedy would be drawn from their mutual jealousy. Besides the motif of adulterous wife, jealous of her slave-lover's mistress, note the theme of jealous wife, with unfaithful husband, at Plut. *Mor.* 267d (Loeb 4.28): Ἰνὼ ζηλοτυπήσασα δούλην ἐπὶ τῷ ἄνδρι λέγεται . . . ἐκμανῆναι. (Here despite the role of the rival as direct object the context suggests a state of mind rather than physical violence.) This theme lies behind Propertius 3.15, cautioning Cynthia not to harm Lycinna and citing the paraenetic myth of Dirce's jealous cruelty against Antiope.

[29]*Nam quid exponet quae zelotypum malae tractationis* (*hubris* again!) *accusat . . . cum totum crimen uno verbo in qualibet actionis parte posito satis indicetur? Zelotypus* is the single word which implies physical assault.

[30]Cf. *Aen.* 4.261 *stellatus iaspide fulva / ensis erat . . . dives quae munera Dido / fecerat*, and for Iarbas' jealousy 4.203 *amens animi et amore accensus amaro* and 213–214.

[31]A Pantomime on the story of Dido is attested by Macr. 5.17.5: *ut fabula lascivientis Didonis . . . ita pro vero per ora omnium volitet ut . . . histrionum perpetuis et gestibus et cantibus celebretur.* (See Ludwig Friedlaender, *Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire* [London 1909] 2.101 and n. 17.) On the Roman stereotype of the "jealous Moor" cf. Livy 29.23.4 and 30.12.18 *ut est genus Numidarum in Venerem praeceps.*

sympathetic lovesick soldiers of Menander's *Perikeiromene* and *Misoumenos* and *Sicyonios* were less popular with Roman comedy and elegy than the violent or vainglorious Thraso, or Pyrgopolynices. The excluded lover or his soldier rival were ready-made figures, and both lover and soldier feature in scenes of jealous violence. We may recall Ovid striking his girl in *Amores* 1.7; the jealous and violent rustic of Tibullus 1.10.53–58; or the brilliant inversion of Propertius 4.8 in which Cynthia is the avenging and jealous lover and Propertius the unfaithful offender.[32] But Latin poetry, like serious Greek poetry, would not use the prosaic or comic *zelotypia*. All that can be claimed is *amor*, in combination with *dolor* or *furor*.[33]

The jealousy scenes of comedy fathered episodes in mime and elegy, and the picaresque novel, but the truest successors of the comic tradition, faithful to Menander even in details of vocabulary, dialogue, and action, are the low-life prose scenes of Lucian called *Hetairon dialogoi*. Here we are dealing not with justified marital indignation but the world of Don Jose and Carmen, of jealous captains and loose ladies. Greek tradition still felt that physical jealousy and violence were either comic or barbaric and inappropriate to the well-bred citizen or the sedateness of bourgeois marriage—as we see from Athenaeus' horror story of King Cotys of Thrace (12. 352a).[34] His sadistic murder of his wife was barbaric by any standards, but one also senses Athenaeus' amazement that such passion should be felt for a *wife*, who was after all under the king's own jurisdiction. The proper context of violence was the liaison, and Lucian's mime-like scenes are set in this world.

It is difficult to gauge how far the dialogues are independent of New Comedy. Certainly three dialogues of violent jealousy seem to reflect Menander's *Perikeiromene*. In the ninth dialogue the returning Polemon (the

[32]This episode has been justifiably related by S. Evans, "Odyssean Echoes in Propertius IV, 8," *G&R* 18 (1971) 51–53, to the return of Odysseus and his vengeance on the suitors in *Odyssey* 22, but it is equally a deliberate inversion of the sex-roles in traditional scenes like the return of the comic soldier. Propertius' description of the flight of the rival women into the neighbour's house echoes the flight of the innocent Glycera, and is in turn matched by the flight of the rival in Lucian's *Hetairon dialogi* (below). The whole literary transmission of these scenes of jealous violence from comedy (starting with Polemon) to elegy and to later Greek erotic literature is well presented by John Yardley in "Lover's Quarrels: Horace *Odes* 1.13.11 and Propertius 4.5.40," *Hermes* 104 (1976) 124–128, listing these and many other passages. Propertius sums up the tradition: 3.8.33 *aut tecum aut pro te mihi cum rivalibus arma / semper erunt: in te pax mihi nulla placet.*

[33]Besides the nouns *dolor/ira/furor* note Propertius' use of *furibunda* (3.8.3, 4.8.52), and verbs like *saevire* (Prop. 4.8.55, Ovid *A.A.* 2.461), *dolere* (Prop. 2.5.15; Ovid *A.A.* 2.448), and the whole sequence on jealousy in the mistress from *A.A.* 2.447–461. Seneca's *Medea* speaks similarly of her *ira* and *dolor* but the chorus express her deadly jealousy best (866–869): *frenare nescit iras / Medea, non amores. / nunc ira amorque causam / iunxere. quid sequetur?*

[34]ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς οὗτός ποτε καὶ ζηλοτυπήσας τὴν αὐτοῦ γυναῖκα ταῖς αὑτοῦ χερσὶν ἀνέτεμε τὴν ἄνθρωπον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰδοίων ἀρξάμενος. As in Plut. *Mor.* 267d (cited above, n. 28) the aorist participle implies "having become enraged with jealousy."

name is unchanged) finds his girl with the civilian Philostratos and musters a siege force to recover her, but the civilian claims he will put the mercenary to flight with broken sherds; this certainly recalls *Perik.* 380 f. and 526 f., though it may also draw on Menander's *Kolax*, which we know partly from Terence's *Eunuchus*. In dialogue fifteen Parthenos tells her friend about the violent scene made by a returning soldier when he found the *hetaera* Krokale at dinner with another man. Out of jealousy and excessive passion (ζηλοτυπία τις . . . καὶ ἔρως ἔκτοπος) he came and stormed the house, and only failed to beat up his girl because she escaped next door. The violent soldier was the butt of comedy before Menander, and this kind of jealous knock-about probably featured in the rowdier plays of Diphilus and Philemon, but dialogue eight, which could be entitled ΖΗΛΟΤΥΠΟΣ, again seems to take its theme of jealousy straight from *Perikeiromene*. It opens with the hypothesis that jealous violence is the best proof of love and will bring the best profits from the repentant lover after one of his attacks: the symptoms are those attested from this and other plays of Menander.

AMPELIS Ὅστις δέ, ὦ Χρυσί, μήτε ζηλοτυπεῖ μήτε ὀργίζεται μήτε ἐρράπισέ ποτε ἢ περιέκειρεν ἢ τὰ ἱμάτια περιέσχισεν, ἔτι ἐραστὴς ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν;

CHRYSIS . . . τἆλλα, φιλήματα καὶ δάκρυα καὶ ὅρκοι καὶ τὸ πολλάκις ἥκειν ἀρχομένου ἔρωτος σημεῖον καὶ φυομένου ἔτι· τὸ δὲ πῦρ ὅλον ἐκ τῆς ζηλοτυπίας ἐστίν. ὥστε εἰ καὶ σέ, ὡς φῇς, ὁ Γοργίας ῥαπίζει καὶ ζηλοτυπεῖ, χρηστὰ ἔλπιζε καὶ εὔχου ἀεὶ τὰ αὐτὰ ποιεῖν. (299, Loeb 7.402)

* * *

AMPELIS Καὶ μὴν οὗτός γε μόνον ὀργίζεται καὶ ῥαπίζει, δίδωσι δὲ οὐδέν.

CHRYSIS Ἀλλὰ δώσει—ζηλοτυπεῖ γάρ—καὶ μάλιστα ἢν λυπῇς αὐτόν. (299, Loeb 7.404)

This lover exemplifies all the behaviour we have sampled in the ζηλότυποι of Plato, of Aeschines, of comedy and its heirs in Roman elegy: finding his girl with another man, he came to her door by night and struck her:[35] he even threatened to kill her and tore her dress (the anticlimax may be deliberate comic effect). But Lucian's happy ending is without sentiment. The lover's repentance means the girl's profit, for in contrition he gave her a whole talent and paid for sole access to her over an eight months' contract (Lucian 300, Loeb 7.407).

[35]Combination with the physical verb ῥαπίζειν confirms that Lucian understood ζηλοτυπεῖ of actual violence. ῥαπίζειν itself probably arises under the influence of Menander's play Ῥαπιζομένη (also noted by John Yardley [above, n. 32]), since it is a rare verb elsewhere. The fragments attributed to *Rhapizomene* (esp. 358, 359 Koerte-Thierfelder, and 366) suggest a false accusation of unfaithfulness, presumably against the girl who gets beaten. The plot is probably similar to *Perikeiromene:* see T. B. L. Webster, *Introduction to Menander* (Manchester 1974) 179, and cf. 135 on the *Empimpramene*.

I have tried to investigate two aspects of the ζηλοτυπία family: the extent to which the word's association with violence in context was understood to be part of its actual meaning, and the evolution of the *zelotypos* role or the scene of jealous violence in the lower genres of dramatic verse and in prose. The relatively prosaic, if not colloquial, origin of the word excludes it from the serious world of tragedy. By the same token it largely directs the locus of these forms to the demi-monde, excluding respectable marriage. But then aesthetics and morality converge. Jealousy between married partners is not comic (unless it is proved unjustified and resolved in forgiveness). Too often it can lead to rage and tragic violence. Only the amoral mime and related genres could turn the jealous cuckold into a source of fun. Yet regrettably this more cruel genre almost certainly dominated the public interest and appealed by its relative sadism,[36] displacing the more romantic or sophisticated triangles of the heterosexual and homosexual liaison which seem to have been the source of the ζηλότυπος family. The merciless mime generated *commedia dell'arte*, the ironic setting of *i Pagliacci*, and cuckoldry came to displace the intrigues of the demi-monde as a theme of popular entertainment. We are kinder in some ways: though sexual jealousy is still fuel for comedy, I would like to think we have relegated sexual violence to the tragic mode.

Department of Classics,
103 East Pine,
Princeton University,
Princeton, N.J., 08544.

[36]One can only speculate on the element of sadism (or masochism) which relished the violence of these scenes. But Terence's Menandrian dictum *amantium irae amoris integratio est* (*Andr.* 555) has the key to their emotional appeal: quarrels and reconciliation add spice to a relationship, saving it from the danger of unromantic security.