

Zeitschrift: Museum Helveticum : schweizerische Zeitschrift für klassische Altertumswissenschaft = Revue suisse pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique = Rivista svizzera di filologia classica

Herausgeber: Schweizerische Vereinigung für Altertumswissenschaft

Band: 67 (2010)

Heft: 2

Artikel: Caieta's Undying Fame : Aeneid 7.1-7

Autor: Skempis, Marios

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-109709>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. [Siehe Rechtliche Hinweise.](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. [Voir Informations légales.](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. [See Legal notice.](#)

Download PDF: 14.03.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

Caieta's Undying Fame: *Aeneid* 7.1–7

By Marios Skempis, Erfurt

Abstract: This paper discusses the Hellenistic background of Virgil's epic by pointing out an unnoticed point of intersection between Callimachus' *Hecale* and the *Aeneid*. I argue that the brief narrative section on Caieta's funeral and commemoration in *Aen.* 7.1–7 is strikingly similar to a distich from Michael Choniates, which touches upon the monumentalization of Hecale's death. Based on the supposition that Choniates preserves verbatim text from the *Hecale*, I cast light on thematic as well as structural correspondences between Virgil's Caieta-narrative and Callimachus' *Hecale*. My analysis shows that the Roman poet uses the mid-point of his epic to reflect on the evolution of the epic genre.

In the past three decades, Richard Thomas has drawn attention to the Hellenistic background of the opening of *Aeneid* 7:¹ the aetion of the port Caieta is typical for its etymological learning; the Circe-section exhibits a remarkable blend of sources from Homer to Apollonius of Rhodes;² Circe's weaving exemplifies Callimachean aesthetics (*tenuis ... telas*, l. 14). In this paper, I wish to reinforce this line of reading and examine a Hellenistic text that seems to have exerted a major influence on Virgil in his modelling of Caieta's funeral, Callimachus' *Hecale*. A few echoes of this work have already been noticed recently. I shall elaborate on the role of the *Hecale* as a model for Caieta by drawing attention to further textual allusions as well as thematic correspondences. Over and above, I intend to show how much can be gained for the text of Virgil by carefully studying the testimonia of the fragmentary *Hecale* and what the exuberant presence of the *Hecale* in the opening of *Aeneid* 7 means for our understanding of the epic genre in the *Aeneid*.

* This paper originates from ideas presented at the Latin Workshop 'Landscapes' held in Basel, Switzerland (Oct. 2008). The argument has greatly benefited from the criticisms of Henriette Harich, Damien Nelis, Stephen Wheeler and Ioannis Ziogas.

- 1 See R. F. Thomas, 'From *Recusatio* to Commitment: The Evolution of the Virgilian Program', *PLLS* 5 (1985) 61–73; id., "'Stuck in the Middle with You": Virgilian Middles', in S. Kyriakidis & F. de Martino (eds) *Middles in Latin Poetry* (Bari 2004) 123–150. On the *Aeneid* and Hellenistic poetry see A. S. Hollis, 'Hellenistic Colouring in Virgil's *Aeneid*', *HSCP* 94 (1992) 269–285; W. Clausen, *Virgil's Aeneid: Decorum, Allusion, and Ideology* (München/Leipzig 2002); D. Nelis, *Virgil's Aeneid and the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius* (Leeds 2001); R. Hunter, *The Shadow of Callimachus. Studies in the Reception of Hellenistic Poetry at Rome* (Cambridge 2006), *passim*.
- 2 On this see the excellent remarks in Nelis (n. 1), 259–262; see also S. Kyriakidis, *Narrative Structure and Poetics in the Aeneid. The Frame of Book 6* (Bari 1998) 90–117.

Virgil opens the second half of his epic with a four-line epigram devoted to an unheroic character, Caieta:

*Tu quoque litoribus nostris, Aeneia nutrix,
aeternam moriens famam, Caieta, dedisti;
et nunc servat honos sedem tuus, ossaque nomen
Hesperia in magna, si qua est ea gloria, signat.
At pius exsequiis Aeneas rite solutis, 5
aggere composito tumuli, postquam alta quierunt
aequora, tendit iter velis portumque relinquit.
(Virg. Aen. 7.1–7)*

You too gave to our coasts, Caieta, nurse of Aeneas,
Undying fame when you died, thanks to rumour. For here
In the mighty Twilight Land, your name still marks your bones,
You ennoble this site even today – if that's in itself any glory.
Righteous in ritual detail, Aeneas completes the interment, 5
Building a rising mound, then, after tranquillity settles
Over the deep, hoists sail for the voyage and slips from the harbour.³

The first four verses of Book 7 commemorate the loss of Aeneas' nurse, which takes place as the Trojans reach the promontory eventually named after her. In fact, Virgil does not narrate her death, which presumably occurs between Books 6 and 7, but only her funeral. The transition from the *katabasis* theme to Caieta is made at the end of Book 6 (*tum se ad Caietae recto fert limite portum. | ancora de prora iacitur; stant litore puppes, ll. 900–901*), where the state of her existence is rather unclear.⁴

I contend that Virgil is under the influence of Callimachus' *Hecale* when he takes up the generic interplay between epic and epigram in the Caieta-episode.⁵ To start with, Virgil makes use of the common compositional technique in Hellenistic epigrams, and Hellenistic poetry in general, of highlighting everyday people,⁶ and brings it into line with his own innovative version of an intergeneric dialogue. In addition, the second person address *tu quoque* at the first line

3 Here I follow the text of R.A.B. Mynors, *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* (Oxford 1969). All translations of Virgilian passages are taken from F. Ahl, *Virgil: Aeneid. With an Introduction by Elaine Fantham* (Oxford 2007), whereas the Callimachean ones are either from F. Nisetich, *The Poems of Callimachus* (Oxford 2001) with occasional slight adaptations or entirely my own.

4 Cf. M.C.J. Putnam, *Virgil's Aeneid: Interpretation and Influence* (Chapel Hill/London 1995) 103. On the closural function of these verses see J. Wills, 'Homeric and Virgilian Doublets: The Case of *Aeneid* 6.901', *MD* 38 (1997) 185–202, here 196–198.

5 On epigrams embedded in the *Aeneid* see A. Barchiesi, 'Palinuro e Caieta: Due "epigrammi" virgiliani (*Aen.* V.870 sg.; VII.1–4)', *Maia* 31 (1979) 3–11; M. Dinter, 'Epic and Epigram – Minor Heroes in Virgil's *Aeneid*', *CQ* 55 (2005) 153–169; T.R. Ramsby, *Textual Permanence. Roman Elegists and the Epigraphic Tradition* (London 2007) 19f.

6 See M. Fantuzzi & R. Hunter, *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge 2004) 133; G. Zanker, *Modes of Viewing in Hellenistic Poetry and Art* (Madison 2004) 96f.; id., 'Charac-

introduces the reader to the mechanics of the funerary epigram, where similar apostrophes are usually at home.⁷ The identity of *tu* is revealed by the end of the line, where the profession (*nutrix*) is given of the person referred to. Kyriakidis has already pointed out that a parallel is found in Callimachus' *Hecale*:⁸

] ς Μαραθῶνα κατέρχομαι ὄφρακ	
] δε καθηγήτειρα κελεύθου	
]ηκας ἄ μ' εἴρεο καὶ σύ [γε] μαῖα	
]ι τι ποθὴ σέο τυτθὸν ἀκοῦσαι	
]γρηὺς ἐρημαίῃ ἔνι ναίεις	5
] ι γενέθλη	
(Call. <i>Hec.</i> fr. 40 H.)	

... I am going down to Marathon to ...
 ... my guide on the way
 ... as you have asked me in your turn, Grandmother
 ... so I desire to hear a little something of you
 ... [why] you live, an old woman, in an isolated
 [country] ... family

This seems to be the end of Theseus' introductory speech to Hecale in which he tells her who he is and where he goes to. Then he addresses her and announces that it is her turn to give him rudimentary data required. The designation μαῖα should not be taken literally, but rather as sign of affection towards the old woman that motivates her upcoming speech, while it also anticipates her role as a surrogate mother to Theseus.⁹ It is clear that the context here is in no way similar to lines 1–4 of *Aeneid* 7, though it should be noted that μαῖα does fall into the same metrical position as *nutrix*.¹⁰ Interestingly enough, a further direct address to Hecale as μαῖα is recorded in the surviving fragments, and this time within an epitaph:

terization in Hellenistic Epigram', in P. Bing & J. S. Bruss (eds) *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram: Down to Phillip* (Leiden/Boston 2007) 233–249.

7 N. Horsfall, *Virgil: Aeneid 7 A Commentary* (Leiden et al. 2000) 46; Kyriakidis (n. 2) 79; on diverse forms of address in Greek epigrams see R. Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (Urbana 1942), 230–237; D. Meyer, *Inszeniertes Lesevergnügen. Das inschriftliche Epigramm und seine Rezeption bei Kallimachos* (Stuttgart 2005) 63–67; C. Tsagalis, *Inscribing Sorrow: Fourth-Century Attic Funerary Epigrams* (Berlin/New York 2008) 257.

8 Kyriakidis (n. 2) 79 with note 10.

9 On this matter see the analysis in A. Ambühl, *Kinder und junge Helden. Innovative Aspekte des Umgangs mit der literarischen Tradition bei Kallimachos* (Leuven/Paris/Dudley 2005) 41–45.

10 Although καὶ σύ is admittedly not at the beginning of a line, I nevertheless favour an intertextual reading of the two passages, given that *tu quoque* recurs as cross-reference at different positions within the *Aeneid*; on this see, for instance, below note 30.

ἴθι, πρηεῖα γυναικῶν,
 τὴν ὁδόν, ἣν ἀνίαί θυμαλγέες οὐ περόωσι.
 < > πολλάκι σεῖο,
 μαῖα, < > φιλοξείνοιο καλιῆς
 μνησόμεθα· ξυνὸν γὰρ ἐπαύλιον ἔσκεν ἅπασιν. 5
 (Call. *Hec.* fr. 80 H.)

Go, gentlest of women, along
 the road heart-breaking pains travel not.
 often of you,
 mother, ... your hospitable hut
 will come to our mind, a place where all could rest.

The word μαῖα bridges the two Callimachean fragments, since it introduces in fr. 40 H. Hekale as an internal narrator and marks in fr. 80 H. her definite withdrawal from the narrative. Against the background of this interrelation, it seems probable that Virgil, by referring to Caieta as *nutrix*, might have decontextualized the first Callimachean direct address and recontextualized it in a setting reminiscent of the second one.

At this point, I wish to bring a hitherto unnoticed intertext for Caieta into consideration that can help us to better comprehend the stylization of diction in Caieta's funeral. It is a distich found in Michael Choniates concerning Hekale and her own undying fame:

καί ἐθανοῦσαν ἐνὶ μνήμῃ θέτο οὐ θνησκούση
 οὐ γὰρ ἔην νήκουστα ἐτήσια δεῖπν' Ἐκάλεια
 (*Theano* 339–340 = *SSH* 289 B)

and after her death [he] rendered her memory undying;
 for the annual Hekalean banquet was certainly not unheard

Taking a close look at the cited passages, both of them introduce the theme of death. In fact, there seems to be a striking resemblance between Virgil's *moriens* (l. 2) and Michael Choniates' θανοῦσαν (l. 1). In case θανοῦσαν does indeed reflect Callimachean diction, one may reasonably assume that Virgil has appropriated the Greek participle in a symmetrical way without turning to an elaborate use of variation technique. Furthermore, the concept of undying fame as rendered in the phrase ἐνὶ μνήμῃ οὐ θνησκούση of Michael Choniates, corresponds to Caieta's *aeterna fama*. The projection of Hekale's posthumous fame to the future becomes clear also in the surviving fragments: in fr. 80 H. a group of people, most probably neighbours or passers-by, will frequently reflect on Hekale's unmatched hospitality. In addition, μνήμη ("memory"; cf. fr. 80.5

H.: μνησόμεθα, “commemorate”¹¹)¹² bears an inherent allusiveness, since it can also evoke μνήμα (“tomb”), the monument that preserves the memory of the departed. In a similar way, the term *signat* (l. 7) semantically vacillates between “inscribe” and “mound” (*signum*/σῆμα) and consequently validates the physical distance from the world of the living. It is fame (*fama*, l. 2) and glory (*gloria*, l. 4) which take Caieta’s σῆμα to the level of μνήμα. Tsagalis elaborates on the μνήμα-σῆμα connection:

The μνήμα [...] expressed the passage from the σῆμα (mound) to the memorial safe-guarding the survival of the deceased’s memory. What was implicitly indicated in the σῆμα became explicitly stated in the μνήμα. Whereas the σῆμα guaranteed a presence among the living and made the survival of the departed’s memory a by-product, the μνήμα had as its sole purpose the preservation of the deceased’s memory by turning the mound into a monument, by making the man-made artefact a vehicle for remembrance.¹³

Just like Hekale, Caieta undergoes a similar transformation: after her physical death she becomes a sign, a harbour, although Virgil prefers to present this *metamorphosis* the other way around, that is by referring to Caieta at first as a harbour at the end of book 6 (*Caietae ... portum*, l. 6.900) and then, in a slightly ‘paradoxical’ manner, as an individual at the beginning of book 7 (*Aeneia nutrix | ... Caieta*, ll. 7.1–2).¹⁴ Within this context, S.G. Nugent speaks pointedly of the “distillation of the woman’s body into pure signification”, a process that in fact applies to both women.¹⁵ After all, Caieta, as well as Hekale, follows the traditional pattern of female representation in the epic genre, according to

- 11 Richard Hunter wonders whether *litoribus nostris* (l. 1) reflects Callimachus’ plural μνησόμεθα, thus giving a new, political bite (*per litteras*). Pace R. Jenkyns, *Virgil’s Experience. Nature and History: Times, Names, and Places* (Oxford, 1998) 464, who sees in these verses an allusion to A. R. Arg. 3.990–994.
- 12 A.S. Hollis, ‘A Fragmentary Addiction’, in G.W. Most (ed.), *Collecting Fragments – Fragmente sammeln* (Göttingen 1997) 111–123, at 118f. notices the common reference to the commemoration of Hekale’s frugal feast by Theseus, articulated by the hero himself or the epic narrator, in Nonn. *Dion.* 17.60–62 and in Mich. Chon. i.157.11ff. Moreover, he argues that “Nonnus’ ἄει δ’ ἐμνώετο (compare ἄει μμνήσθαι in Michael) could be a verbatim borrowing by Callimachus”. Thus, it becomes clear that the discourse of commemoration must have been extensive and thereby quite central in the *Hecale*. For a further parallel see *Triph. Il. excid.* 657–658 with A. S. Hollis, ‘The Hellenistic Epyllion and its Descendants’, in S.F. Johnson (ed.), *Greek Literature in Late Antiquity. Dynamism, Didacticism, Classicism* (Hampshire 2006) 141–157, here 150.
- 13 Tsagalis (n. 7) 151; see also J.S. Bruss, *Hidden Presences. Monuments, Gravesites, and Corpses in Greek Funerary Epigram* (Leuven et al. 2005) 30–34.
- 14 On Caieta and the device of prolepsis see J.D. Reed, *Virgil’s Gaze. Nation and Poetry in the Aeneid* (Princeton, 2007) 130 with n. 4; on Ovid’s ‘response’ to Virgil’s Caieta (*Met.* 14.443–444) see S. Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext. Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge 1998) 108f.; J.J. O’Hara, ‘Virgil’s Best Reader? Ovidian Commentary on Vergilian Etymological Wordplay’, in P. E. Knox (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Ovid* (Oxford 2006) 100–122, at 115f.
- 15 S.G. Nugent, ‘The Women of the *Aeneid*: Vanishing Bodies, Lingering Voices’, in Chr. Perkell (ed.), *Reading Vergil’s Aeneid: An Interpretive Guide* (Norman OK 1999) 251–270, at 268.

which maternity (or even surrogacy, in this case) is aligned with mortality.¹⁶ Thus, the unending fame granted to both women seems to be somewhat associated with the characterizations *μαῖα* and *nutrix*.¹⁷

The fragments of Callimachus per se seem to provide further indication for the association of Caieta with Hekale: The discourse of honour (*honos*, l. 3), as it appears in the descriptive words of the Virgilian narrator, can be reminiscent of the similar elusively epitaphic context in fr. 2 H. (τίον), where old Hekale is said to be widely honoured for her unprecedented hospitality.¹⁸

τίον δέ ἐ πάντες ὀδῖται
ἦρα φιλοξενίης· ἔχε γὰρ τέγος ἀκλήιστον

and all travellers honoured her
for her graciousness, for she kept her house unlocked

The honour attributed to a woman stands out, on the one hand, as a *topos* trait that might actually go back to traditional formulaic articulations of praise in female centred epic discourse (Hom. *Od.* 1.429–432; 7.66–68); on the other, it accounts for a rather standard constituent of epitaphic discourse, which transgresses gender limitations.

Let me now turn to matters of diction concerning the verbal links between Michael Choniates and Virgil that I have pointed out. Already Pfeiffer has called attention to some parallels in Callimachus that argue for the Callimachean authorship of the two verses in Michael Choniates: He notices the resemblance of ἐνὶ μνήμῃ θέτο to the Callimachean phrasing ἐνὶ μνήμῃ κάτθεο, occurring twice in the *Aetia* (fr. 7.24 and 75.55 Pf.).¹⁹ What he (and others) failed to see, however, is that the phrase at issue seems to work as a sort of ‘formula’ that marks an aetiological story sanctioned each time by a narrative authority (fr. 7 Pf.: Kalliope; fr. 75 Pf.: Xenomedes). In fr. 7.23–24 Pf. the Muse is about to explain to the persona ‘Callimachus’ the action of an aischrological rite in the cult of

16 For this line of thinking in Homer see S. Murnaghan, ‘Maternity and Mortality in Homeric Poetry’, *ClAnt* 11 (1992) 242–264.

17 On women as addressees of epitaphs in general see J. Murray & J. M. Rowland, ‘Gendered Voices in Hellenistic Epigram’, in P. Bing & J. S. Bruss (eds) (n. 6), 211–232, here 217f.

18 In my view, fr. 2 H. contains discernible epigrammatic features such as the praise of the departed measured upon the range of recognition by a group of people (πάντες ὀδῖται). The epigrammatic nature of fr. 2 and 80 H. seems to frame the ‘epic’ narrative of the encounter between Theseus and Hekale. On the ‘ring composition’ in these fragments see L. Lehnus, ‘Ipotesi sul finale dell’ Ecale’, *ZPE* 117 (1997), 45–46.

19 R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus*, vol. i (Oxford 1949) 255 on fr. 264; A. S. Hollis, *Callimachus: Hecale* (Oxford 1990) 268 on fr. 83. G. Massimilla, *Callimaco: Aitia. Libri primo e secondo. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento* (Pisa 1996) 258 on fr. 9.24 adduces further parallels from Plato and notes that κατατίθημαι can also mean “*mi pongo nella memoria*” (“bring back memories of something, recall something”) in an absolute form, citing [Theogn.] 717.

Apollo Αἰγλήτης that takes place on the island Anaphe.²⁰ It was the radiant epiphany of Apollo Αἰγλήτης that has effected the name ‘Anaphe’. In Callimachus as well as in Apollonius Rhodius (*Arg.* 4.1694–1730) the Anaphe-episode stands for the last test of the Argonauts on their way back home, so this must have been a good reason for Virgil to draw a thematic parallel with his Caieta, the last stop in the wandering of the Trojans just before they reach Latium. Moreover, the phrase describes in fr. 75.51–63 Pf. the authorial practice of Xenomedes, who wrote a local history of the island Keos in which an aetion of the island’s name was included.²¹ Thus, the contextual specificity of both instances reveals a special connection of this ‘formulaic’ juncture with aetiologies of places or place names; a practice that actually occurs in Michael Choniates as well, who refers to the monumentalization of Hekale (and subsequently her deme) through the institution of an annual ritualized banquet named after her. Virgil seems, then, to have chosen only one half (ἐνὶ μνήμῃ οὐ θνησκούση ~ *aeterna fama*) of a referential nexus that is inextricably intertwined with a phrase exemplifying commemoration, a process required in the context of Callimachean poetry for aetiological connections to come about. In a way, Caieta’s ‘undying memory’ evokes not just the exclusively Callimachean formulaic core, but, what is more, by allusion to that, brings about an aetiology stylized in topographical terms.

Virgil has surely not been reluctant to give out the name of the person honoured: he mentions the port of Caieta in 6.901, while in 7.1 he uses a denomination and subsequently a reference by name. The use of names has been acknowledged as an immanent trait of sepulchral epigrams, which “led to the gradual development of the self-cohesion and autonomy of this category.”²² This enhances, of course, the categorization of the reference to Caieta into the epigrammatic genre. As far as I can see, this cannot have been a direct influence from Callimachus, however, since Hekale’s name does not occur either in the epitaph of fr. 80 H. or in *Theano* 339–340. Yet, it is indicative that a potentially straightforward reference to Hekale’s name is substituted by the use of wordplay, a more subtle way of reference: In fr. 80.4 H. the word καλή (‘hut’) seems to evoke the name of the departed in a para-etymological manner, whereas in Michael Choniates the Ἐκάλεια δεῖπνα provides the necessary, and surely more

20 For the treatment of this story in Callimachus and its Apollonian intersections see A. Köhnken, ‘Apoll-Aitien bei Kallimachos und Apollonios’, in D. Accorinti & P. Chuvin (eds), *Des Géants à Dionysos. Mélanges de mythologie et de poésie grecques offerts à Francis Vian* (Alessandria, 2003), 207–213, at 208f.; P. Chuvin, ‘Anaphé, ou la dernière épreuve des Argonautes’, in D. Accorinti & P. Chuvin (eds), 215–221; E. Livrea, ‘Il mito argonautico in Callimaco: L’episodio di Anafe’, in G. Bastianini & A. Casanova (eds), *Callimaco: Cent’anni di papiri. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi, Firenze, 9–10 giugno 2005* (Firenze 2006) 89–99.

21 For Callimachus’ *rimando alla fonte*-technique in this fragment and the way he uses Xenomedes as a source see now E. Magnelli, ‘Callimaco, fr. 75 Pf., e la tecnica narrativa dell’*elegia ellenistica*,’ in A. Kolde, A. Lukinovich, A.-L. Rey (eds) *Κορυφαίω ἀνδρί. Mélanges offerts à André Hurst* (Genève 2005) 203–212, here 206f.

22 Tsagalis (n. 7) 243.

direct, association. However, both epitaphs do include a denominative vocative (μαῖα ~ *nutrix*) addressing the profession and/or social function of the deceased that conveys affection and sympathy.

The lexical parallels between the *Aeneid* and the text of *Theano* referring to Hekale's death and her commemoration make plausible the idea that Michael Choniates has at this point copied Callimachus. On these grounds, one may reasonably come to the conclusion that the wording at least in Michael Choniates' *Theano* 339 reflects the lost text of Callimachus' *Hekale* to the extent of a verbatim borrowing. Adrian Hollis is definitely right to have included it in the category of 'fragments' under 83 in his edition.²³ I am inclined to think that the phrase at issue most probably occupied a place near the end of the poem, where the aetiology of the place name (deme 'Hekale') was linked to the deceased old woman in terms of the two further honours that Theseus instituted for her (cult of Zeus 'Hekaleios', annual 'Hekalean' banquet; cf. Plut. *Thes.* 14.2). Likewise, Hollis provides a plausible context for the occurrence of the word νήκουστα in the poem: "perhaps Hecale's name would be 'not unheard', due to the honours which Theseus conferred on her in a verse allusion to the *Hecale*'s ending".²⁴

What is more, both women, Hekale and Caieta, are associated with memory, which ensues from a glorified death. Hence, their tombs serve as 'timemarks',²⁵ that is, sites reminiscent of a certain time and/or situation from the past, and obtain a practical usefulness as points of topographical navigation: Hekale bestows, through Theseus' intervention, her name upon a deme situated quite close to the highlands of Attica, whereas the Trojan Caieta ends up marking an Italian promontory, under the patronage of Aeneas. Regarding Caieta, Virgil insists on death's (in-)corporeality, since he uses an explicitly (in-)corporeal sign, the bones, as a metonymy for the grave²⁶ – or as an implicit reference to death by cremation.²⁷ Name (*nomen*) and 'body' (*ossa*) are turned into means

23 In addition, he has shown that the rare epithet νήκουστα (*l.* 340) could well be Callimachean vocabulary as well, and thereby it is quite possible that it belongs to the original text of the *Hecale*; see A.S. Hollis, 'The Beginning of Callimachus' *Hecale*', *ZPE* 115 (1997) 55–56; H. Lloyd-Jones, *Supplementum Supplementi Hellenistici* (Berlin/New York 2005) 35 on fr. 289 B. Further on Michael Choniates and Callimachus see A. S. Hollis, 'A New Fragment on Niobe and the Text of Propertius 2.20.8', *CQ* 47 (1997) 578–582; id., 'Callimachus: Light from Later Antiquity', in F. Montanari & L. Lehms (eds), *Callimaque. Vandœuvre – Genève, 3–7 septembre 2001* (Genève 2002) 35–54, at 49–51.

24 Hollis (n. 19), 40 note 60.

25 On tombs as 'timemarks' in Homer see J. Grethlein, 'Memory and Material Objects in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*', *JHS* 128 (2008) 27–51, at 28–32.

26 For the central position of the body, even of the incorporeal, dead body, and its use as metaphor for decoding the text of the *Aeneid* see A. Bowie, 'Exuvias effigiemque: Dido, Aeneas and the Body as Sign', in D. Montserrat (ed.), *Changing Bodies, Changing Meanings. Studies on the Human Body in Antiquity* (London/New York 1998) 57–79.

27 I. Ziogas points out to me that *ossa* is etymologically linked to *uro* (*ossa ... ab usto dicta, propter quod cremarentur ab antiquis*, Isid. *Orig.* 11.1.86) and might suggest an etymology of Caieta's

of a social action (*honos*) that cast space (*sedem*) with special significance and generate glory through commemoration. The port of Caieta functions ultimately as a topography of remembrance; a place where the dead is monumentalized in collective memory, where the humble and the low becomes a sign of glory.

It is noteworthy that in both cases the prerequisite that ensures immortality is the social interaction with a hero. Aeneas exhibits his exemplary sense of duty (*pius*, l. 5) as he performs the funeral rites in detail by raising a tomb to honour the deceased nurse (*aggere composito tumuli*, l. 6). After Theseus has defeated the Marathonian Bull, he returns to Brilessos in order to express his gratitude to the old woman who granted him hospitality. Fr. 79 H. (τίνος ἠρίον ἴστατε τοῦτο;) gives, in all probability, a glance at the astonishment of Theseus as he looks at a tomb raised before him – the *diegesis* makes it clear that he was surprised to find her dead (*dieg.* xi.1–2: αἰφνίδιον δὲ ταύτην εὐρών τεθνηκυῖαν). He does not seem to be aware of the fact that the tomb he sees is meant for Hekale. The ignorance of Theseus shows that he did not manage to participate in the preparations of Hekale's burial, like pious Aeneas has done in order to pay a proper tribute to his own nurse. Whereas the use of the word ἠρίον suggests in Callimachus heroic honours as a means of ethical reciprocity and compensation for a moral action, Virgil chooses a term (*tumulus*), which is actually detached from such grave connotations;²⁸ and the blatant morality of the honoured is missing as well.

Hekale's female *kleos* is to be seen against the background of her ill-fated maternity and conceived in heroic terms by use of the ἠρίον.²⁹ However, this cannot have been the case for Caieta. There is a lack of important data regarding this character. Aeneas' nurse is not individualized by Virgil, she does not even act in the narrative, and she is certainly not heroized. She is a rather obscure figure, previously unmentioned in the poem, whose sudden death during the journey of the Trojans to Latium acquires relevance. Her posthumous honour might be intertextually dependent on that of Hekale, but is apparently designed to put a special emphasis on Aeneas' *pietas*, recalling perhaps the righteous deed of Theseus towards his surrogate mother Hekale (the hero returned to Brilessos, after he has confronted the Marathonian Bull, in order to pay a tribute to the old hostess for having taken good care of him). Aeneas' stance

name, already put forward by Servius (*lectum tamen est in philologis in hoc loco classem Troianorum casu concrematum, unde Caieta dicta est, ἐπὶ τοῦ καίειν*, Serv. ad *Aen.* 71). It has already been acknowledged that Ovid alludes to this etymology in his reference to Caieta (*hic me Caietam notae pietatis alumnus | ereptam Argolico quo debuit igne cremavit*, *Met.* 14.443–444); see J.J. O'Hara, *True Names. Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay* (Ann Arbor 1996) 183; cf. M. Erasmo, *Reading Death in Ancient Rome* (Columbus 2008) 99.

28 On the actual connotations of the word *tumulus* in this episode see M. Paschalis, *Virgil's Aeneid: Semantic Relations and Proper Names* (Oxford 1997) 244.

29 See C. McNelis, 'Mourning Glory: Callimachus' *Hecale* and Heroic Honors', *MD* 50 (2003) 155–161. Hollis (n. 19), 264 notes that the word ἠρίον is a Homeric *hapax* recurring in Hellenistic poetry.

towards his nurse might be a way to compensate his maternal deficit.³⁰ It seems, then, that, whereas Callimachus has drawn both his characters as more or less ethical paradigms, Virgil concentrates in his Caieta on the resonance of the honouring party without giving, however, his readers access to the motivation of Aeneas' action. The *pietas*-motif embeds, on the one hand, the Caieta-episode in the ethics of the Virgilian epic, while, on the other, it continues the immanent conciseness of the sepulchral epigram in which evaluative terminology has a prominent place.

But ethics do not exhaust Virgil's concerns regarding this episode; these extend to politics in a broad sense, since the naming of an Italian promontory after the Trojan Caieta serves to some extent the poetics of colonization in the *Aeneid*,³¹ where a continuum between the Trojan past and the Roman present needs to be established.³² In this particular case, Aeneas proves himself a founder of a harbour (*oikistes*), though he does not make himself its eponym.³³ Similarly, Theseus is shown in the *Hecale* to be also an *oikistes*, but not an eponymous founder. The episode of Theseus' sojourn in Hecale's cottage that leads to the founding of the Attic deme 'Hekale' is obviously embedded in the larger project of the unification of Attic villages into one state, the *synoikismos*.³⁴ Thus, two ordinary women, two surrogate mothers, who in spite of their low social status do have an individual importance to heroes, seem to trigger off ways of expressing national identity through founding activity.³⁵

After verbal and structural parallels have been established, I wish to make a point on the semasiological aspect of Caieta. The semantics of her name

- 30 In *Aen.* 1.407–408 (*quid natum totiens, crudelis tu quoque, falsis | ludis imaginibus?*) the hero complains to his divine mother Venus, who constantly deludes him, about the inappropriate way of contact between mother and son. It is fascinating that Aeneas refers here to his mother using the key phrase *tu quoque* (l. 407).
- 31 Cf. Lyc. *Alex.* 1075–1082, where the death of another Trojan woman, Setaia, who was responsible for setting the ships of the Greeks during their *nostos* on fire, marks a rock in a promontory. Note also the association of both Setaia and Caieta with the burning of ships (see note 27).
- 32 On the mechanics of time in Virgil's *Aeneid* against the aetiological backdrop of Callimachus' *Aetia* see D. Nelis, 'Patterns of Time in Virgil: The *Aeneid* and the *Aetia* of Callimachus,' in J.P. Schwindt (ed.), *La représentation du temps dans la poésie augustéenne – Zur Poetik der Zeit in augusteischer Dichtung* (Heidelberg 2005) 71–83, esp. 82f.
- 33 On the diverse practices of founding a colony and the notion of eponym see I. Malkin, 'What's in a Name? The Eponymous Founders of Greek Colonies,' *Athenaeum* 63 (1985) 114–130; on Aeneas as founder of colonies see N. Horsfall, 'Aeneas the Colonist,' *Vergilius* 35 (1989) 8–27; cf. I. Malkin, *The Returns of Odysseus. Colonization and Ethnicity* (Berkeley et. al. 1998) 194–198.
- 34 For Theseus as *synoikist* see H.J. Walker, *Theseus and Athens* (New York/Oxford 1995) 196; R. Parker, *Athenian Religion: A History* (Oxford 1996) 10–17; S. Mills, *Theseus, Tragedy, and the Athenian Empire* (Oxford 1997) 26f.
- 35 A.M. Keith, *Engendering Rome: Women in Latin Epic* (Cambridge 2000) 47f. underscores the political symbolism of Caieta as a mother-figure within the context of colonization. Note also the role of Romulus' *lupa nutrix* in the development of national identity in *Aen.* 1.275–277.

is connected to the *Hecale*, which proves to be once more quite an important intertext.³⁶ The adjective κητώεσσα occurs twice in Homer as a part of the formula κοίλην Λακεδαίμονα κητώεσσαν (Hom. *Il.* 2.581–582; *Od.* 4.1–2) and is understood either as full of “marine monsters” (< κῆτος) or as “full of fissures” (< καιέτας).³⁷ According to the Homeric scholia, the Alexandrian grammarian Zenodotus suggested και(ε)τάεσσαν instead in his own edition of the Homeric text (Schol. in *Od.* 4.1) and took the word to mean ‘minty, full of catmint’ (καλαμινθώδης; cf. Hsch. κ 219; Apoll. Soph. 99.16). Callimachus seems to be in line with Zenodotus’ *diorthosis*,³⁸ as he uses the Homeric *varia lectio* in order to designate the Laconian river Eurotas:

κο]ίλης ἐπὶ νηὸς ο [5
 ἵππους καιτάεντος ἀπ’ Ἐυρώταο κομίσσαι
 (Call. *Hec.* fr. 475–6 H.)

... aboard ship ...
 to bring horses from concave Eurotas

The consequently Laconian topography accompanying the term can be reinforced by the Laconian vocabulary. Stratis Kyriakidis has argued that “Caieta seems to be etymologically connected with the Laconian word καιέτας – καιετός [...] meaning a hollow cleft in a rock, a fissure or a precipice, a cavern”.³⁹ Thus, on the one hand, Callimachus might have taken the epithet to mean ‘hollow, concave’ with reference to Eurotas’ deep riverbed, as opposed to Zenodotus and the lexicographers,⁴⁰ on the other, Virgil might have been influenced once more by the *Hecale* in shaping his Caieta by having the name of his character attributed to the natural concavity of a harbour. In this case, he would emerge as a ‘Homererklärer’ *more hellenistico* inasmuch as he interprets

36 At this point it would be rather useful to mention that the hospitality scene of the *Hecale* (and the parallel one of the *Victoria Berenices* in *Aetia* 3) has been cited as model for the Aeneas/Evander scene in Book 8; on this see Hollis (n. 19) 350; id., (n. 1) 285; B.A. Fyntikoglou, *Ταπεινή Φιλοξενία. Μορφή και Λειτουργία του Μοτίβου στον Καλλιμαχικό και Ρωμαϊκό Νεοτερισμό* (Thessaloniki 1997) 94–122; cf. C. Klodt, ‘Die Hütte (Verg. *Aen.* 8,337–369). Bescheidene Verhältnisse’, in *Bescheidene Größe. Die Herrschergestalt, der Kaiserpalast und die Stadt Rom: Literarische Reflexionen monarchischer Selbstdarstellung* (Göttingen 2001) 31f.

37 See G.S. Kirk, *The Iliad: A Commentary*, vol. i: books 1–4 (Cambridge 1985) 213 *ad* 2.581; J. Latacz, C. Brügger, M. Stoevesandt, E. Visser, *Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar. Band II, 2. Gesang, Faszikel 2: Kommentar* (München/Leipzig 2003) 188 *ad* 2.581; A. Heubeck, S. West, J.B. Hainsworth, *A Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey*, vol. i: books i–viii (Oxford 1988) 193 *ad* 4.1.

38 See Hollis (n. 19) 191f.; A. Rengakos, *Der Homertext und die hellenistischen Dichter* (Stuttgart 1993) 85f.

39 Kyriakidis (n. 2) 87f. On founding and naming practices see C. Dougherty, *The Poetics of Colonization: From City to Text in Archaic Greece* (New York/Oxford 1993) *passim*.

40 I owe this point to Magdalene Stoevesandt.

Homer by consciously relying on a source, Callimachus fr. 47.6 H., which has already had the same intention.⁴¹

I conclude with some remarks on the structure of the *Aeneid*. The strong echoes of Callimachean vocabulary deriving from the *Hecale* as found in Virgil's text require that the traditional stance towards a bipartite division of the *Aeneid* in an Odyssean and an Iliadic part respectively should certainly be qualified.⁴² For the dependence of the Virgilian diction in the Caieta episode on a Hellenistic miniature epic such as the *Hecale* that tried to redefine the way of writing epic, indicates the existence of a further epic, non-Homeric, intertext, and that on a marked position within the poem.⁴³ It is surely not difficult to decide whether the Caieta-episode coincides with the preliminaries to the second proem or it should be thematically attached to the Odyssean part, given that the *Hecale* was heavily influenced by the *Odyssey*,⁴⁴ as a sort of "epitaph of closure."⁴⁵ The Circe-section is to some extent a rework of Circe in the *Odyssey* and the *Argonautica*, a poem also greatly indebted to the *Odyssey*. In addition, it is a common-place observation that the invocation of the Muse Erato in 7.37–45 is modelled on the invocation of the same Muse in the *Argonautica*.⁴⁶ Damien Nelis has recently pointed out a structural parallel between Virgil's *Odyssey* and Virgil's *Iliad*: the introductory line of the second proem (7.37) alludes to Juno's first words in the *Aeneid* (1.37), which in their turn recall the opening of Homer's *Iliad*.⁴⁷ This is surely indicative of Virgil's intention to produce a balanced, well thought-out structure for his poem.

Accordingly, there seems to be a deeper connection in the sequence 'Caieta – Circe – Erato' that underlies the opening of *Aeneid* 7 and binds it to Hellenistic

- 41 On Virgil as an 'interpreter of Homer' see T. Schmit-Neuerburg, *Vergils Aeneis und die antike Homerexegese. Untersuchungen zum Einfluß ethischer und kritischer Homerrezeption auf imitatio und aemulatio Vergils* (Berlin/New York 1999). Still useful on the subject is, of course, the monumental study of G. N. Knauer, *Die Aeneis und Homer. Studien zur poetischen Technik Vergils mit Listen der Homerzitate in der Aeneis* (Göttingen 1964).
- 42 For a review of this traditional approach see J. Farrell, 'The Virgilian Intertext', in C. Martindale (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil* (Cambridge 1997) 222–238, at 229.
- 43 Even the limited space dedicated to Caieta (9 lines in sum) seems to be under the influence of the *Hecale* as miniature epic and certainly disproportional to the six-book-long 'Iliad' and 'Odyssey' of Virgil.
- 44 This issue is treated extensively in M. Skempis, *'Kleine Leute' und große Helden in Homers Odyssee und Kallimachos' Hekale* (Berlin/New York 2010).
- 45 The term is borrowed from A. Rossi, *Contexts of War. Manipulation of Genre in Virgilian Battle Narrative* (Ann Arbor 2004) 33.
- 46 See S. Mack, 'The Birth of War: A Reading of Aeneid 7', in C. Perkell (ed.) *Reading Vergil's Aeneid: An Interpretive Guide* (Norman OK 1999) 128–147, at 128–134; Nelis (n. 1) 267–275; A. Hardie, 'Juno, Heracles, and the Muses at Rome', *AJP* 128 (2007) 551–592, here 576–581.
- 47 D. Nelis, '«Et maintenant, Erato ---»: à propos d'Enéide VII, 37', *REA* 109 (2007) 269–271. This point was also made independently in Hardie (n. 46) 577. D. P. Fowler, 'First Thoughts on Closure: Problems and Prospects', *MD* 22 (1989) 75–122, at 94f. points to another Homeric parallel for the position of the second proem within the structure of the *Odyssey*.

epic.⁴⁸ Primary evidence for this is that the section of 'bridge-narratives', as Stephen Hinds has aptly called them,⁴⁹ preceding the second proem echo both the *Hecale* of Callimachus and the *Argonautica* of Apollonius.⁵⁰ The placing of signposted allusions to the two apparently most representative samples of Hellenistic epic writing in the middle of a Roman epic, which actually sees itself within the tradition of its predecessors, calls for a comparison with their position in the middle of the epic tradition whose poles are by Virgil's time the Homeric epic and the *Aeneid* itself. In other words, the prominence of Hellenistic epic at the beginning of *Aeneid* 7 is Virgil's way to reflect on the evolution of the epic genre. As far as the Caieta-episode is concerned, he stresses the Callimachean persistence in the 'small form', a perfect example of which is the Hellenistic elaboration on epigram, as well as the typically Hellenistic 'mixing of genres'. In these terms, Virgil boldly states the self-reflectiveness of the *Aeneid* in the epic tradition.

Correspondence:
 Marios Skempis
 Seminar für Religionswissenschaft
 Universität Erfurt
 Postfach 900 221
 DE-99105 Erfurt

48 I intend to deal in more detail with the significance of this sequence for the poetics of the *Aeneid* as a whole and its relation to Hellenistic epic elsewhere.

49 Hinds (n. 14) 109.

50 G.B. Conte, 'Proems in the Middle', *YCS* 29 (1992) 147–159 has shown that mid-point proems become intensely programmatic in Latin literature and should be seen against a Hellenistic backdrop.