

OID'S CANACE AND EURIPIDES' *AEOLUS*: TWO NOTES ON *HEROIDES* 11*)

BY

SERGIO CASALI

I. Canace's lovesickness

Starting at Ovid, *Heroides* 11.21, Canace recalls the beginning of her incestuous relationship with her brother, Macareus (*Her.* 11.21-26)¹):

o utinam, Macareu, quae nos commisit in unum,
uenisset leto serior hora meo!
cur umquam plus me frater quam frater amasti,
et tibi, non debet quod soror esse, fui?
ipsa quoque incalui qualemque audire solebam,
nescio quem sensi corde tepente deum.

There follows a list of the symptoms of lovesickness: pallor, thinness and lack of appetite²), insomnia and groans (27-32):

fugerat ore color, macies adduxerat artus,
sumebant minimos ora coacta cibos;
nec somni faciles et nox erat annua nobis,
et gemitum nullo laesa dolore dabam;
nec, cur haec facerem, poteram mihi reddere causam,
nec noram, quid amans esset; at illud eram.

*) I am indebted for help at various stages to Alessandro Barchiesi, Gian Biagio Conte, Luigi Galasso, Mario Labate, Jim McKeown, Gianpiero Rosati, and above all to Gareth Williams for many valuable suggestions. A first version of this article was written during my National service as a conscientious objector at the 'Centro di Igiene Mentale' of Alba in Summer 1996: I wish to thank the staff (especially Mrs Patrizia Franco, Mrs Patrizia Miozzo and Mrs Cecilia Dalcielo), my colleagues (Mr Alberto Fabbrini and Mr Luca Pezzotta), and the patients of the Center, for having let me study in a friendly and relaxed atmosphere.

1) I am using the edition of A. Palmer, *P. Ovidi Nasonis Heroides with the Greek Translation of Planudes* (Oxford 1898).

2) Canace's lack of appetite is probably particularly noticeable in the house of Aeolus: in the *Odyssey* (10.8-9) οἱ (the sons and daughters of Aeolus) δ' αἰεὶ παρὰ πατρὶ φίλῳ καὶ μητέρῳ κεδνῇ / δαίνονται· παρὰ δέ σφιν ὀνείατα μυρία κεῖται ('they *always* banquet with their dear father and their loving mother; unending quantities of food are set before them').

It is her old nurse who realises that Canace is in love: '*Aeoli*' dixit '*amas*?' (34). Canace blushes and lowers her eyes (35-36).

Ovid's Canace is a wholly innocent creature. Love is a god about whom she has only heard, never met: *qualem... audire solebam*, 25 ('implying complete innocence beforehand', P.E. Knox *ad loc.*, 264)³. Love grows inside her, but she does not recognise it. This romantic version of the relationship between Canace and Macareus is an Ovidian innovation. In saying *ipsa quoque incului*, Canace denies the current version of the myth. In Ovid, Canace falls in love with Macareus, whereas all the other sources agree that Canace was seduced by Macareus, without any hint that she might possibly have responded to his love⁴: thus, for example, the hypothesis of Euripides' *Aeolus* in *POxy* 2457, lines 24-25 Austin (διέφθειρεν ['seduced'])⁵ or [Plut.] *Mor.* 312c = *Parallel. Min.* 28a (ἐφθειρε ['seduced']). Now, φθείρω or διαφθείρω are fairly 'neutral' verbs⁶, but in Stobaeus, *Florilegium* 4.20.72 Wachsmuth = *FGH Hist* 23 F 3 Jacoby, we read that Macareus ἐρασθεὶς ἐβιάσατο τὴν προειρημένην ('fell in love with his sister and raped her'). It is true that *quoque* implies that Macareus took the first step⁷: but this does not detract from the atmosphere of tender romanticism and virginal innocence in the pathetic memory of 21-36: "the power of passionate love [...]—which is an enigma for her—suddenly explodes in the innocent young girl. She is not seduced or raped as in the other ancient descriptions, but she immediately feels attracted to him"⁸.

3) Ovid: *Heroides. Select Epistles* (Cambridge 1995).

4) There is a good discussion in H. Jacobson, *Ovid's Heroides* (Princeton 1974), 162-163; cf. S. Jäkel, *The Aiolos of Euripides*, *GB* 8 (1979), 101-102; F. Verducci, *Ovid's Toyshop of the Heart: Epistulae Heroidum* (Princeton 1985), 199. But see also M. Labate, *La Canace ovidiana e l'Eolo di Euripide*, *ASNP* 7 (1977), 589-590, who believes it is possible that the Canace of Euripides did not limit herself to submitting to her brother's initiative, even if he considers it likely that little space was devoted to the theme of love in the tragedy.

5) First ed.: E.G. Turner, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Part XLIII* (London 1962), 70-73; see the review by H. Lloyd-Jones, *Gnomon* 35 (1963), 443-444; and C. Austin, *Nova Fragmenta Euripidea in Papyris Reperta* (Berlin 1968), 88-89, for an updating of the text.

6) Φθείρω also in schol. Aristoph. *Nub.* 1371, προφθείρω in Tzetzes on Aristoph. cit. [βνέω ['to have sexual intercourse'] in Aristoph. cit., ομιλέω ['to have sexual intercourse'] in Ps.-Dion. Halic. *Ars Rhetorica* 9.11 = II 345 Usener-Rademacher].

7) Cf. Jacobson (above, n. 4), 163: "Ovid maintains the dominant role of the brother". Jäkel (above, n. 4), 102 exaggerates somewhat: "there is no notion of seduction, nor is there any hint that Macareus seduced the sister".

8) V. Pöschl, *Esperienze d'amore nel libro delle Eroidi*, in: *Ovidio poeta della memoria. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Sulmona, 19-21 ottobre 1989* (Rome 1991), 24.

If, however, we go on with our reading of the epistle, we find a surprise waiting for us. We had reached the point where the nurse finally reveals to Canace the cause of her sickness: it is love. The following couplet goes beyond all our expectations (37-38):

iamque tumescabant uitiati pondera uentris
aeagraque furtiuum membra grauabat onus.

The reader suddenly discovers that while Canace was wondering about the nature of the mysterious god who was making her heart burn, she was in fact already pregnant. *Iamque* (37) is highly significant. It implies that the previous description of the lover's physical symptoms was actually contemporaneous to the first stages of a pregnancy. Canace is lovesick, *iamque* the pregnancy becomes obvious: a surprising transition. Her virginal ignorance of what love was did not lead us to expect that Canace had already had an actual physical experience of love (cf. e.g. the ignorance of Byblis in *Met.* 9.457, and the comment by Jacobson: "so commonplace is this account of the growing pangs of love that one almost forgets that underneath it all there lies an already consummated sexual relationship")⁹). The reader had been led to imagine a game of glances between the brother and sister, a love that was just blossoming. The list of symptoms, too, suggested a passion that had not yet been consummated (cf. e.g. the lovesickness of Phaedra in *Hippolytus* and that of Byblis in *Met.* 9.535-537 *esse quidem laesi poterat tibi pectoris index / et color et macies et uultus et umida saepe / lumina, nec causa suspiria mota patenti*). Usually, the nurse realises that the heroine is in love, and then goes on to play a role of mediation; thus, for example, the nurses in Euripides' *Hippolytus*, in *Ciris*, and Myrrha's nurse in *Met.* 10¹⁰). Here, however, immediately after the entry of the nurse, we discover that there is no need for any mediation. Perhaps also the mention of *herbae* and *medicamina* in 39-40 (*quas mihi non herbas, quae non medicamina nutrix / attulit...*)

9) Jacobson (above, n. 4), 169.

10) Cf. *Met.* 10.408 '*sensimus' inquit 'amas'*. For the theme of an observer who deduces from the appropriate symptoms that a man is in love, cf. Call. *Epigr.* 43; Asclepiades, *AP* 12.135 (= 18 Gow-Page); Hor. *Epod.* 11.8-10; Ov. *A.A.* 1.737-738 *ut uoto potiare tuo, miserabilis esto, / ut qui te uideat dicere possit 'amas'*. The similarities between the nurses of Canace, Myrrha in *Met.* 10.298-502, and the one in *Ciris* lead us to imagine that the common model (particularly appropriate in the case of the incestuous story of Canace) was Cinna's *Zmyrna*: see Knox (above, n. 3), on 11.33-34, p. 265.

leads us to an unexpected conclusion: it is true that nurses often suggest the use of drugs and *herbae*: we may think of Phaedra's ambiguous nurse: Eur. *Hipp.* 509-510 ἔστιν κατ' οἴκους φίλτρα μοι θελκτῆρια / ἔρωτος ('I have got some magic love philtres at home'), or Myrrha's nurse: Ov. *Met.* 10.397 *seu furor est, habeo, quae carmine sanet et herbis*. These nurses' herbs should be of use in healing the unhappy lovesickness of their respective heroines; in the case of Canace, on the contrary, the possibility of curing her love no longer exists: the herbs are to be used to provoke an abortion (and in any case, they prove to be as useless as the ones that Phaedra and Myrrha never actually took)¹¹).

The list of the symptoms of lovesickness is a commonplace of erotic poetry (see e.g. Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.13.5). However, we have seen that Canace is already pregnant when she experiences such troubles as an unhealthy complexion, weight loss, lack of appetite. *nec, cur haec facerem, poteram mihi reddere causam* (31): according to Canace, instructed by the nurse, the cause of these ailments is love. But if we consider Canace's peculiar situation at the moment of that 'sickness', we may wonder whether this diagnosis is really correct. The symptoms which Canace describes are indeed the conventional symptoms of literary lovesickness; but they are also the symptoms of another kind of 'sickness': the pregnancy itself, and especially the first stages of it. Not only love poetry but also ancient medicine reveals catalogues of symptoms which are extremely similar to those experienced by Canace. Consider, for example, the discussion about the *κίσσα* (*pica*, the whole of the digestive and alimentary troubles of women in the first months of pregnancy) in Soranus of Ephesus, *Women's Diseases* 1.17:

Παρέπεται δὲ ταῖς ἐν τῷ συμπτώματι τυγχανούσαις ἀνατροπὴ στομάχου, ἥτοι πλάδος, ναυτία τε [...] καὶ ἀνορεξία ποτὲ μὲν πρὸς πάντα, ποτὲ δὲ πρὸς τινα, καὶ τῶν ἀσυνήθων ὀρεξίς [...], δύσχροια καὶ δυσαρεστήσεις, ὄξυρεγμία [...], ἐνίαις δὲ καὶ [...] βάρος καὶ σκοτώματα καὶ ἀλγήματα κεφαλῆς, ἀπορία τε καὶ ὠμῶν χυμῶν πλήθος καὶ ὠχρότης καὶ ἀτροφία.

'The women who have this trouble have an upset stomach, nausea and humoural excess [...], and a *lack of appetite* either for every food, or for some particular food (cf. *sumebant minimos ora coacta cibos*), but also a wish for unusual foods [...]; an *unhealthy complexion* (cf. *fugerat ore color*), uneasi-

11) Cf. also Verducci (above, n. 4), 213.

ness, heartburn [...]; some of them feel [...] heaviness, dizziness, headache, anxiety (which may easily explain the sleeplessness: *nec somni faciles*, and the groans), frequently a bitter taste in the mouth; *pallor* and *weight loss* (cf. *macies adduxerat artus*)¹²).

Perhaps Canace's diagnosis is not correct; perhaps she is a woman who experiences the effect of conception and mistakes them for the usual literary apparatus of falling in love (hence the irony of line 38, *aegra... furtivum membra grauabat onus*, where *aegra* connects with the previous description of sickness). We may wonder whether Canace is really in love.

At this point, then, the romantic version that Canace has given us of her relationship with her brother begins to crumble. The 'first step' taken by Macareus, implied, as we have seen, by *quoque* (25), is found to be a fairly resolute one. When Canace spoke about the hour *quae nos commisit in unum* (21), she was not referring to the topos of lovers sharing the same soul. And when she said *cur umquam plus me, frater, quam frater amasti, / et tibi, non debet quod soror esse, fui?* (23-24), *amo* had a far more concrete meaning than the one it has in the similar expression at *Met.* 9.456 (Byblis) *non soror ut fratrem, nec qua debebat, amabat*. On the other hand, when Canace says *uitiati pondera uentris*, she speaks of herself in a decidedly brutal manner. *uitiare*, in the sense of 'to deflower', is a colloquially blunt term; in *Met.* 4.798 *uitiare* = 'to rape': "the directness of Canace's description is arresting" (Knox *ad loc.*, 265). May the truth perhaps be that things did not go so differently from the mythological vulgate and Euripides' *Aeolus*, and that Canace is mitigating reality *a posteriori*?

It may be objected: but the text does not explicitly say that at the moment of the description of her lovesickness Canace is *already* pregnant: the 'accident' might have taken place subsequently. The whole process of Canace's discovery of love, described in lines 25-32, might refer to *before* her conception of the 'fruit of sin'. Her lovesickness, with all its symptoms, might precede the 'violation of her womb'. In this way, the virginal innocence that Canace displays in 21-32 would be saved. It is true: the text does not explicitly say that the love-sick Canace is already pregnant. The implications discussed above seem to me decisive (above all, I refer to the significance of *iamque* in line

12) See also, for further references, D. Gourevitch, *Le mal d'être femme. La femme et la médecine dans la Rome antique* (Paris 1984), 148-155.

39); but it is possible to resist implications. There is one more factor, however, to be taken into consideration. In the epistle, we have a description of an illness of Canace: Canace is sick—with love. Now, the fact is that at a certain point, we also come across an illness of Canace in the model text of the epistle, that is to say, Euripides' *Aeolus*. The fragmentary hypothesis of Euripides' *Aeolus* informs us that in the model tragedy, Canace *pretended to be ill in order to hide the birth of her child*: POxy 2457, lines 25-26 Austin:

ἡ δ' ἔγκυος γενή[θεῖσα
τὸν τόκον ἔκρυπτεν τῷ νοσεῖν προ[σποιη]τῷ;

'She became pregnant and hid the birth by pretending to be ill'.

In Euripides' *Aeolus* also, then, there was a (false) *illness* of Canace. Even if the text of the hypothesis says that the illness was intended to hide the birth of the baby (and not the entire pregnancy), it is highly probable that in Euripides' play Canace's false illness also disguised, at least, the last stages of the pregnancy. The fact that in Euripides, Canace's illness was closely linked to the fact that she was pregnant seems to me to offer a valid confirmation of the idea that in Ovid also, Canace is sick (with love)—and pregnant. It is attractive to imagine that some of the symptoms listed in *Her.* 11.29-32 were already mentioned in Euripides.

In both cases, an illness *hides* a pregnancy. In Euripides, Canace succeeds in delaying Aeolus' discovery of her pregnancy by means of her illness; in Ovid, on a metaliterary level, she succeeds in delaying the reader's discovery of her pregnancy by means of her lovesickness. The fact that the illness was *only a pretence* in Euripides might also offer a further confirmation of the suspect advanced above: is Canace really in love? The tragic Canace pretended to be ill to cover up her pregnancy: might the new elegiac (and pregnant) Canace also *pretend* to be (love)sick? Perhaps this innocent Canace is not wholly sincere. Euripides' Canace pretends to be sick; Ovid's Canace pretends to be *lovesick*. After all, the other sources all agree: Canace does not love her brother.

II. Canace and Jupiter

Canace complains about the cruelty and fierceness of her father: Aeolus succeeds in mastering the most impetuous winds, but he is unable to master his own temper (15-20):

imperat, heu! uentis; tumidae non imperat irae:
 possidet et uitiiis regna minora suis.
 quid iuuat admotam per auorum nomina caelo
 inter cognatos posse referre Iouem?
 num minus infestum, funebria munera, ferrum
 feminea teneo, non mea tela, manu?

‘What advantage is there for me to be able to count Jupiter among my forefathers?’ Perhaps Ovid is thinking of the rhetorical question in Prop. 4.11.11-14 *quid mihi coniugium Paulli, quid curus auorum / profuit aut famae pignora tanta meae? / Non minus immitis habuit Cornelia Parcas: / et sum, quod digitis quinque legatur, onus*. The theme of *quid profuit*, the vanity of human possessions, noble titles, and merits acquired during life, in the face of death, is, however, found ubiquitously in funeral orations from the time of Homer onwards¹³). But can we be sure that Ovid’s use of these rhetorical questions is intended merely to amplify and increase the pathos?

In Canace’s epistle, unlike Phaedra’s, and in the monologues of Byblis and Myrrha, no justification, or argument in defence of incest, is to be found¹⁴). On the contrary, the defence and justification of incest was undoubtedly a subject that was present in Euripides’ *Aeolus*. Furthermore, it has recently been noted that Canace’s epistle is pervaded by a tragic irony: Canace writes her letter, in which she complains about the unyielding cruelty of her father, and immedi-

13) *Il.* 5.53-54; cf. Prop. 3.18.11-12, with P. Fedeli (Bari 1985), *ad loc.*; Hor. *Carm.* 1.28.4, with R.G.M. Nisbet-M. Hubbard (Oxford 1970), *ad loc.*

14) See for example Jacobson (above, n. 4), 174-175: “Yet, this approach [that of Euripides’ *Aeolus*], the very argumentation that Ovid’s Phaedra uses so blatantly and shamelessly, is totally absent from Canace’s letter. Nowhere the slightest attempt to justify her deed. This heroine is too young, too naïve, too modest, or perhaps too upright to question the criminality of her incest. She may question and implicitly deplore the severity of the punishment and the mercilessness of her father, but she will not attempt extenuation of her actions, defense of herself”. Cf. also Verducci (above, n. 4), 206. K. Philippides, *Canace Misunderstood: Ovid’s Heroides XI, Mnemosyne* 49 (1996), 426-439, is misleading when she assumes that the permission accorded by Aeolus to marriages between his sons and daughters involves that incest is not a fundamental, discussed, and outrageous, issue in Euripides’ tragedy.

ately afterwards, she commits suicide; but the reader, who knows Euripides' *Aeolus*, knows that at the very moment that Canace is writing her letter, Macareus is talking to his father, Aeolus, and convincing him to forgive his daughter. Far from being the implacable murderer who *tumidae non imperat irae* (11.15), as described by his daughter, Aeolus changes his mind and decides to spare her. Macareus hurries to break the news to Canace, but he arrives too late: the heroine is dead, and in turn, Macareus commits suicide, standing over his sister's dead body¹⁵). Thus Canace's decision not to present any argument in her defence turns out not to be an intelligent choice. When Canace is discovered by her father, and says: *ipsa nihil praeter lacrimas pudibunda profudi: / torpuerat gelido lingua retenta metu* (11.81-82), the reader cannot help thinking that it would have been much better for her if she had found the courage to say something in her defence: it is true that Aeolus was irascible, but he was also prepared to let himself be convinced (the newborn baby's attitude seems to be wiser: *uagitus dedit ille miser sensisse putares: / quaque suum poterat uoce rogabat auum*, 85-86).

Let us, then, reread the rhetorical question 'What use is Jupiter to me?' Perhaps it can be seen in a different light. The reader would be perfectly capable of answering the question *quid iuuat... inter cognatos posse referre Iouem?* It would not have been at all useless for Canace to appeal to Jupiter, and it would have been of even more help for her to be able to appeal to Jupiter as her own forefather. When she asks *quid iuuat... inter cognatos posse referre Iouem?*, the heroine gives up an excellent opportunity to use a strong argument in her favour. Among her forefathers, Canace had a god who had calmly married his own sister, subsequently having a large number of illustrious children, without any sense of shame.

15) See G.D. Williams, *Ovid's Canace: Dramatic Irony in Heroides 11*, CQ 42 (1992), 201-220; S. Casali, *Tragic Irony in Ovid's Heroides 9 and 11*, CQ 45 (1995), 509-511. This reconstruction is based on the version of the myth contained in the *Tyrhenica* by a certain Sostratus (probably the grammarian Sostratus of Nysa: cf. Williams 205, n. 26; on 'Sostratus', see also J.J. O'Hara, *Sostratus Suppl. Hell. 733: A Lost, Possibly Catullan-Era Elegy on the Six Sex Changes of Tiresias*, TAPA 126 [1996], 173-219, esp. 198 ff.) as reported by Stobaeus (*Florilegium* 4.20.72 Wachsmuth = *FGH Hist* 23 F 3 Jacoby): Μακαρεύς δὲ τὸν γεννήσαντα προεξιλειωσάμενος ἔδραμεν εἰς τὸν θάλαμον ('after appeasing his father, Macareus ran into Canace's bedroom'). The faithfulness of Stobaeus' account with respect to the plot of the *Aeolus* is accepted, for example, by T.B.L. Webster, *The Tragedies of Euripides* (London 1967), 159; Jäkel (above, n. 4), 112.

In the Hellenistic period, the model of the incestuous marriage between Zeus and Hera had been proposed as a justification, in the eyes of the Greeks, of the marriage between Ptolemy Philadelphus and his sister, Arsinoe: cf. Theocr. 17.126-134¹⁶). The scholia BQ on Hom. *Od.* 10.7 take pains to use this argument to justify the incestuous marriage of the children of Aeolus (p. 447 Dindorf; “facile in hoc scholio agnoscas hominem Alexandrinum regibus suis adulantem”, Buttman):

ἀρχαῖον ἔθος τὸ συνοικίζειν ἀδελφούς. καὶ ὁ Ζεὺς ἀδελφῇ οὕσῃ τῇ Ἥρᾳ. μεγίστη γὰρ εὐδαιμονία καθ’ Ὅμηρον ἡ ὁμοφροσύνη. ὅταν οὖν τῷ τῆς συνοικίσεως ἐπιτερπεῖ προσυπάρχη τι φυσικὸν φιλοστοργίας πάθος ἐκ γένους καὶ συντροφῆς παιδικῆς, διπλασιάζεται εὐνοία.

‘It is an ancient custom for brothers and sisters to marry each other. Even Zeus married Hera, who is his sister. Harmony is the highest form of happiness in Homer. When the pleasure of marriage is completed by a natural feeling of love deriving from being descended from common ancestors, and being brought up together as children, love is redoubled’¹⁷).

But Canace’s failure to use this argument is striking, above all because the reader of the *Heroides* has already seen it used, in a less fitting situation, by the Phaedra of the fourth epistle (4.133-134):

Juppiter esse pium statuit, quodcumque iuaret,
et fas omne facit fratre marita soror¹⁸).

16) See A.S.F. Gow (Cambridge 1950), *ad loc.*, 345-346; P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford 1972), I 117-118; II 209-210.

17) Cf. also the comment by Jacoby on *FGrHist* 604 F 1 (= Schol. T Hom. *Od.* 10.7). The model of the divine couple Jupiter-Juno continued to be at the disposal of all those who wanted to make use of it. For example, Caligula: cf. Dio Cassius 59.26.5 Ζεὺς τε εἶναι ἐπλάττετο, καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο καὶ γυναιξὶν ἄλλαις τε πολλαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἀδελφαῖς μάλιστα συνεῖναι προεφασίσαστο (‘he pretended to be Zeus, and used that as a pretext for seducing many women, and in particular his sisters’); Aur. Vict. 3.10 *quin etiam, sororum stupro ac matrimonii illudens nobilibus, deorum habitu incedebat, cum Iouem se ob incestum, ex choro autem Bacchanali Liberum assereret*. In Sen. *Apocol.* 8.2-3, a god that is hostile to Claudius argues that in condemning his son-in-law, L. Junius Silanus Torquatus, to death for incest with his sister (*sororem suam, festiuissimam omnium puellarum, quam omnes Venerem uocarent, maluit Iunonem uocare*), the dead emperor had, in reality, condemned Jupiter himself, as well. Cf. also [Sen.] *Octavia* 219-221; 282-285; 533-535; 658.

18) The theme is anticipated in 4.35-36 *si mihi concedat Iuno fratremque uirumque, / Hippolytum uideor praepositura Ioui*.

Perhaps it is not by chance that in this passage from *Her.* 4 (*Iuppiter esse pium statuit quodcumque IVVaret*), we come across a pun on the etymology of *Iuppiter* analogous to the one present in 11.117-118: *quid IVVat... IOVem*¹⁹). This argument is also used by Byblis in her monologue (*Met.* 9.497-499):

di melius! di nempe suas habuere sorores:
sic Saturnus Opem iunctam sibi sanguine duxit,
Oceanus Tethyn, Iunonem rector Olympi.

It is also taken up in the letter to Caunus: 9.555 *sequimur magnorum exempla deorum*. Undoubtedly, Hippolytus and Caunus are characters that are rather hard to convince; but Aeolus, in contrast to what Canace believes, is much more malleable.

It is attractive to imagine that while Canace writes that it is of no use to have Jupiter as a relation, Macareus himself has already successfully used this same argument in the course of his first talk with Aeolus (the one in which he convinced his father to allow marriage between brothers and sisters), or perhaps during his second conversation (which takes place at the same time as the composition of Canace's letter). We know that Aeolus made a sort of boast of his divine lineage in Euripides' tragedy²⁰). The presence of this theme

19) See, for example, Cic. *Nat. Deor.* 2.64 *Iuppiter, id est iuuans pater, quem, conuersis casibus, appellamus a iuuando Iouem*; R. Maltby, *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies* (Liverpool 1991), s.v. 'Iuppiter'; for Ovidian puns about this etymology, see J.C. McKeown, *Ovid: Amores, I. Text and Prolegomena* (Liverpool 1987), 49. In *Trist.* 2, Ovid places Phaedra and Canace in the same couplet, as examples of scandalous love stories treated by tragic writers: *numquid in Hippolyto nisi caeca est flamma nouercae? / nobilis est Canace fratris amore sui* (384-385; the juxtaposition of Canace with Euripides' *Hippolytus* is, among other things, a confirmation of the fact that Ovid was familiar with Euripides' *Aeolus*; cf. Jacobson [above, n. 4], 160 n. 5).

20) Cf. fr. 22 Nauck of the *Aiolus*: τὴν δ' εὐγένειαν πρὸς θεῶν μὴ μοι λέγε, / ἐν χρημασιν τόδ' ἐστί, μὴ γαυροῦ, πάτερ / κύκλῳ γὰρ ἔρπει· τῷ μὲν ἐσθ' ὃ δ' οὐκ ἔχει / κοινοῖσι δ' αὐτοῖς χρώμεθ'· ὃ δ' ἂν ἐν δόμοις / χρόνον συνοικῇ πλεῖστον, οὕτως εὐγενής ('do not speak to me about the nobility that comes from the gods; it lies in riches, so do not be proud of it, father. It goes round in circles: one person has something that another does not have but we should use it together; the truly noble person is the one who keeps his goods as long as possible in his own house'). The fr. was undoubtedly pronounced by Macareus (and not by Canace, as Knox says *ad loc.*, 262) during his first talk with Aeolus: probably, in his attempt to convince his father to allow marriage between brothers and sisters, Macareus argued that in this way, the wealth of the family (identified by him with εὐγένεια) would not be dispersed; if sisters married brothers, there would be no dowries to pay to people outside the family; cf. the last two lines of the fr. with Ps.-Dion. Halic. *Arts Rhetorica* 9.11 (II 345 Usener-Radermacher); Macareus advises his father to let brothers and sisters marry ἵνα τὸ οἶκεῖον

in Euripides' *Aeolus* would be an excellent precedent for its use in Ovid: it is highly significant that shortly after using the argument of Jupiter's marriage to his sister, Byblis specifically quotes the story of the children of Aeolus as a precedent that justifies her own insane passion: *at non Aeolidae thalamos timuere sororum* (9.507)²¹.

Num minus infestum, funebria munera, ferrum...? If Canace had used the argument of Jupiter, perhaps the sword sent to her by her father could have truly been of less harm to her.

PISA, Scuola Normale Superiore

διοικήσεται ('in order to administer the family patrimony'); see the discussion in Jäkel (above, n. 4), 105-109; and R. Scaford, *The Structural Problems of Marriage in Euripides*, in: A. Powell (ed.), *Euripides, Women and Sexuality* (London-New York 1990), 164 and 174 n. 38 (with a bibliography). In the light of this theme of the *Aeolus*, I believe that Canace's ironic words in *Her.* 11.100 *hac tua dote, pater, filia diues erit?* have paradoxical overtones: Canace would marry a brother of hers, and so there would be no need for a dowry, seeing that the sum would remain in the family.

For the supposed relationship of 11.17-20 with the genealogy (Aeolus, the son of Hellen, who in turn was the son of Zeus, was the father of Sisyphus, Athamas, Cretheus and Salmonceus) contained in fr. 14 Nauck (of doubtful authenticity, perhaps belonging to the *Melanippe Sophe*), cf. Labate (above, n. 4), 586; Jäkel (above, n. 4), 102-103.

21) *unde sed hoc noui?* (9.508): from Canace's letter, of course (cf., for example, 9.522 and *Her.* 11.3, with the pun on *ferrum*, the 'sword' for Canace, and the 'stylus' for Byblis; the reference in 9.556 to the *durus pater* who does not hinder their relationship is clearly in contrast with the destiny of Canace and Macareus; cf. *Her.* 11.6 *dura... patri*; the imaginary scene of 9.503-504 is a good description of the probable final scene of the *Aeolus*; cf. also *Her.* 11.125-126); probably, also from Euripides' *Aeolus*: Byblis' comment in 9.506 (*finge placere mihi: scelus esse uidebitur illi*), immediately before the reference to the children of the *Aeolus* (and therefore immediately after the illustration of the example of the gods) recalls a famous line of the *Aeolus*: fr. 19 Nauck *τί δ' αἰσχρὸν ἦν μὴ τοῖσι χρομένους δοκῇ* ('what is shameful, if it does not seem to be so to those who do it?'); Byblis seems to reflect on the idea that incest may be shameful if it seems to be so to those (i.e. Caunus) who commit it.