si gladium in Asia non strinxissem, si hostem non uidissem, tamen †per† triumphum in Thracia duobus proeliis merueram. (38.49.12)

Speaking in the senate in 187 B.C., Manlius Volso claims a triumph on the strength of (i) his Galatian campaign in the summer of 189 B.C., and (ii) his battles with the Thracians on his return journey in 188 B.C..

It is tempting to restore sense by deleting *per*, but it is difficult to account for its presence in the text; hence it has usually been replaced by another word or words. The traditional correction is *proconsul*; recent editors prefer Nitsche's *patres conscripti*, which has little palaeographical probability and can probably be ruled out by the occurrence of *patres conscripti* at the end of the next sentence. (To delete it there, as OCT does, is quite gratuitous; there is no objection to its ending a sentence.) I suggest <nu>per, the omission being due to haplography after *tamen. Nuper* would refer to the previous year; the word can have a wide range of reference.

Romani sociique paulo plus sescenti et prouincialium auxiliorum centum quinquaginta ferme ceciderunt. tribuni militum quinque amissi et *pauci* equites Romani cruentae maxime uictoriae speciem fecerunt. (39.31.15–16)

'Since there were only six military tribunes to a legion . . . this represented a severe loss to the officer-establishment. The odd suggestion that the loss of a few cavalry gave the impression of a bloody battle may indicate that these were prominent Roman figures (so W–M), but more probably Livy groups the loss of the tribunes and the cavalry together as indicating severe fighting', says Walsh. The 'odd suggestion' in question is, I think, due not to Livy but to his copyists: I would read <*non*> or <*haud*> *pauci.* The part played by the cavalry has been described in §11: they had penetrated the enemy's camp but had got into difficulties and been forced to dismount; nevertheless they had borne the brunt of the battle, as their commander acknowledges in §17 (*eorum maxime opera hostes fusos, castra capta et expugnata esse*). Editors similarly insert a negative at 39.55.5 (before *placuit*) and at 40.22.4 (before *rarum*).

Aberdeen W. S. WATT

CRETE IN THE *AENEID*: TWO INTERTEXTUAL FOOTNOTES

I

In her perceptive paper on 'Crete in the *Aeneid*' Rebecca Armstrong[1] adverts to the relatively small extent to which Book 3 appears indebted to Homer: 'In a book so recognizably, ostentatiously Odyssean, it is remarkable that comparatively little of the material contained actually finds its source, even indirectly, in Homer.'[2] I believe that Homeric influence is more significant than she allows, in particular, that the effect of Odysseus' cover-stories deserves more attention than she allots it.[3]

The *Odyssey* gives Crete some prominence as an element in an alternative narrative, of which we are immediately reminded by the line with which Anchises directs our attention towards the island (3.104): *Creta Iouis magni medio iacet insula ponto*;

[1] R. Armstrong, 'Crete in the *Aeneid*: recurring trauma and alternative fate', *CQ* 52 (2002), 321–40.

[2] Ibid., 329. [3] Ibid., 338, n. 83.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.302 Published online by Cambridge University Press

compare *Κρήτη τις γαῖ' ἔστι, μέσοι ἐνὶ οἴνοπι πόντωι* (*Od.* 19.172). The poet of the *Odyssey* was clearly interested in the island for its own sake. His choice of a Cretan alias for Odysseus in the cover-stories which he tells on his return incognito to Ithaca (13.256ff., 14.199ff., 19.172ff.)[4] was dictated by more than the fact that the island's distance from Ithaca would minimize the risk of inconvenient questions from people familiar with the area,[5] and though the *Odyssey* may have contributed to the Cretans' reputation for mendacity, it is most unlikely that this was current when the epic was composed.[6] We must admire the virtuosity with which Odysseus adapts his story to his listener, culminating in the version told to Penelope, an impressive precursor of Ionian ethnography, and well conveying the contrast with rugged Ithaca.[7]

I am not the only reader of the *Odyssey* to have thought that Odysseus' cover-stories were adapted from an earlier, less fantastic version of the hero's *nostos*, such as seems to be implied by the prooem (1.3 *πολλῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἄστεα καὶ νόον ἔγνω*) and by Alcinous' expectations (8.572–6), taking the hero by way of Crete, Thrinacia, and Thesprotia (and perhaps Egypt).[8] This view was argued most notably by Woodhouse, who, however, weakened his case by presenting the hypothetical earlier version as historical, 'the real experiences of the real Odysseus on the way home from Troy'.[9] Recently Reece has revived this approach.[10] Obviously, one can have a lot of fun devising possible scenarios, and no doubt others have played this game besides those who have ventured into print. Such speculations need not presuppose a stable *Proto-nostos*; indeed, the differences between the various versions of Odysseus' cover-story argue against fixity. But the poet of the *Odyssey* clearly thought novelty important (cf. 1.351–2), and there are many other indications that he knew more than one way of telling his story.[11]

Thus far the three of us who have argued for a prior, more realistic, narrative have not, so far as I can see, brought into play considerations that would be unlikely to occur to an attentive ancient reader (such as Virgil clearly was). (Here I should stress that I mean 'reader'; many of what may strike us as inconsistencies or inconcinnities would not be obvious to one who simply heard the poem, particularly to someone familiar, as the original audience of the *Odyssey* must have been, with repeated

[4] On Odysseus' cover-stories, see further Peter Grossardt, *Die Trugreden in der Odyssee und ihre Rezeption in der antiken Literatur* (Bern, 1998), esp. 35–48 (on Odysseus' adoption of a Cretan alias); A. Hoekstra in A. Heubeck and A. Hoekstra, *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey* 2, *Books ix–xvi* (Oxford, 1989), on *Od.* 13.256–86; J. Russo in J. Russo, M. Fernández-Galiano, and A. Heubeck, *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey* 3: *Books xvii–xxiv* (Oxford, 1992), on 19.172–9; Irene J. F. de Jong, *A Narratological Commentary on the* Odyssey (Cambridge, 2001), 326–8, 596–7. The story that he tells Laertes (24.304–14) is rather different, one among many indications that the end of the *Odyssey* comes from a different hand (or hands): see further S. West, 'Laertes revisited', *PCPhS* 215 (1989), 113–43.

[5] *διὰ τὸ δυσεξέλεγκτον ὡς μακρὰν τῆς Ἰθάκης*, as Eustathius (on 13.256) puts it.

[6] See further Grossardt (n. 4), 282–93.

[7] Perhaps better seen as a survival of the early hexameter poetry concerned with journeys by land and sea (and easily accommodating brief items of heterogeneous information) illuminatingly surveyed by M. P. Nilsson, '*ΚΑΤΑΠΛΟΙ*. Beiträge zum Schiffskataloge u. zu der altionischen nautischen Literatur', *RhM* 60 (1905), 161–89 = *Opuscula Selecta* 2 (Lund, 1952), 761–92; see also P. Janni, *La Mappa e il Periplo* (Rome, 1984), 120–2.

[8] S. West, 'An alternative nostos for Odysseus', *LCM* 6 (1981), 169–75; ead. *Omero, Odissea* 1: *libri i–iv* (Milan, 1981), lxxxiii–xc.

[9] W. J. Woodhouse, *The Composition of Homer's* Odyssey (Oxford, 1930), 25–8, 126–36.

[10] S. Reece, 'The Cretan Odyssey: a lie truer than the truth', *AJPh* 115 (1994), 157–73.

[11] Some Homerists might prefer to analyse the relevant phenomena as manifestations of fluid performance traditions.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.302 Published online by Cambridge University Press

handlings of episodes from the Matter of Troy.) We gain support from Malkin's study of the myths relating to Odysseus and other heroes who travelled far from home in the aftermath of the Trojan War.[12] His subtle and variously learned discussion brings out very clearly the extent to which a more realistic alternative appears to underlie and interpenetrate the epic.

> The alternative realities in the *Odyssey* conventionally known as the 'lying tales' tell not only of dissimulated identities but also of alternative returns of Odysseus himself. Notably, instead of reaching an other-worldly Phaiakia he reaches a very concrete one, where he declines the offer of Alkinoös and chooses to go to Epirote Thesprotia on his own to enrich himself by collecting gifts. Phaiakia here loses its metadimension and becomes simply a stop on the way to familiar Thesprotia.
>
> . . . Homer shows [at 19.279ff.] that he is aware of an alternative to the looking-glass geography of the *Odyssey.* Phaiakia is no longer the utopia through whose mist Odysseus returns to the real world. . . . The story seems to be implied in the scene when the bewildered Odysseus wakes up in Ithaca after the Phaiakians have left him asleep on the shore [13.204–6] The poet of the *Odyssey,* yet again, is playing with options and alternatives.

Malkin is not much interested in Crete; his discussion focuses on the Thesprotian references of Odysseus' cover-story. But we see a vestige of an earlier narrative taking Odysseus to Crete curiously intertwined with the actual plot when Eumaeus recalls what he had heard from an Aetolian, exiled for homicide (14.382–5):

> *φῆ δέ μιν ἐν Κρήτεσσι παρ' Ἰδομενῆϊ ἰδέσθαι*
> *νῆας ἀκειόμενον, τάς οἱ ξυνέαξαν ἄελλαι·*
> *καὶ φάτ' ἐλεύσεσθαι ἢ ἐς θέρος ἢ ἐς ὀπώρην,*
> *πολλὰ χρήματ' ἄγοντα, σὺν ἀντιθέοις ἑτάροισιν.*

As it now stands, this report quite lacks substance; it looks like a gratuitous invention. It would be a nice irony, highly characteristic of the poet, if it had once represented the truth. We have perhaps a further survival in the remarkably precise description of the point on the south coast of Crete where the greater part of Menelaus' fleet was wrecked (3.286ff.), though this detail is quite irrelevant to Nestor's narrative, which is focused on Menelaus himself and the fortunate five ships that reached Egypt with him: has this been recycled from a context in which Odysseus' landfall was related?[13]

The germ of an alternative route for Telemachus, in which Crete, not Sparta, was to be the second stage, is attested by the scholia on *Od.* 3.313:

> *καὶ σύ, φίλος, μὴ δηθὰ δόμων ἄπο τῆλ' ἀλάλησο*] *οὗτος ὁ τόπος ἀνέπεισε Ζηνόδοτον ἐν τοῖς περὶ τῆς ἀποδημίας Τηλεμάχου διόλου τὴν Κρήτην ἔναντι τῆς Σπάρτης ποιεῖν. οἴεται γὰρ ἐκ τούτων τῶν λόγων κατὰ τὸ σιωπώμενον ἀκηκοέναι τὸν Νέστορα παρὰ τοῦ Τηλεμάχου ὅτι καὶ ἀλλαχόσε περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς πευσόμενος παρεσκεύαστο πλεῖν. διὸ καὶ ἐν τῇι α΄ ῥαψωδίαι ἔγραψε "πέμψω δ' ἐς Κρήτην τε καὶ ἐς Πύλον ἠμαθόεντα" (93). καὶ ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ ἀλλαχοῦ* (284–6) *"πρῶτα μὲν ἐς Πύλον ἐλθέ . . . κεῖθεν δὲ Κρήτηνδε παρ' Ἰδομενῆα ἄνακτα· ὃς γὰρ δεύτατος ἦλθεν Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων."*

These lines have percolated to a few of the medieval MSS as 1.93ab.

Despite the rather dogmatic tone of this note, what is alleged about Zenodotus' reasoning can be no more than guesswork, since he left no commentary. This is the strangest of all reported Zenodotean variants, and obviously invites speculation—and

[12] I. Malkin, *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity* (Berkeley, 1998), esp. 1–31, 120–38, 150–5; for the passages quoted see 9, 131–2; see also review by Margalit Finkelberg, *SCI* 21 (2002), 243–50.

[13] Again suggestive of a *kataplous*/*periplous*; cf. n. 7.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.302 Published online by Cambridge University Press

no doubt invited it in antiquity. The problem approaches a satisfactory solution once we accept that Zenodotus' text was not an attempt at a critical edition, but an old existing copy in which he had marked his atheteses without consistently close attention to the wording. There are various indications that it was a rhapsode's copy, above all drastic abridgements (e.g. *Il.* 2.60–70, reduced to two lines; 156–68, reduced to one line; 9.23–31, reduced to two lines).[14] I would guess that Zenodotus' copy of *Odyssey* 1 had been modified for performance before a Cretan audience.The statistics for Homeric papyri show that, unsurprisingly, the beginnings of the two epics were particularly popular; a performer might introduce a neat touch of local interest in the first 300 lines without having to worry about devising an alternative to Telemachus' visit to Sparta.

Is it likely that Virgil knew of this eccentric variant? If we think it highly probable that he was familiar with the Hellenistic literary criticism preserved for us in the scholia,[15] it is surely not overbold to suppose that this textual curiosity came to his attention. Speculation about its implications, about the narrative potential of an alternative—and significantly more hazardous—itinerary for Telemachus, and about possible connections with Odysseus' cover-stories should not be disregarded among the factors governing the role assigned to Crete in the *Aeneid*'s plot. The *Odyssey* had established the island as well suited to 'an attempt to switch stories, to take a different, but equally valid turn away from the dominant narrative'.[16]

II

Difference from the *Odyssey* is highlighted when we learn that Idomeneus' former kingdom is available for immediate possession:

> Fama uolat pulsum regnis cessisse paternis
> Idomenea ducem, desertaque litora Cretae,
> hoste vacare domum sedesque astare relictas. (*Aen.* 3.121–3)

Contrast Nestor's report, in which Idomeneus winds up the catalogue of Greek chiefs who reached home safely:

> πάντας δ' Ἰδομενεὺς Κρήτην εἰσήγαγ' ἑταίρους,
> οἳ φύγον ἐκ πολέμου, πόντος δέ οἱ οὔ τιν' ἀπηύρα. (*Od.* 3.191–2)

Proclus' summary of the *Nostoi* has nothing to say about the Cretan leader, and Diodorus' account (5.79.4) of the hero cult offered by the Cretans to him and Meriones indicates a happy lack of untoward incident.

But Greek legend found endless scope for elaboration on the aftermath of the war (as indeed Aeneas' own story demonstrates), and Idomeneus did not enjoy that immunity from further vicissitudes with which Nestor was blessed. It is not, however, clear what explanation for Idomeneus' expulsion Virgil expected his readers to supply from their general familiarity with Greek legend. Servius (on 121) relates the story which has gained a kind of canonicity as the plot of Mozart's *Idomeneo*: being overtaken, like many of the Greek chiefs, by a terrible storm on his homeward journey,

[14] See further M. L. West, *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad* (Munich and Leipzig, 2001), 33–45.

[15] See further R. R. Schlunk, *The Homeric Scholia and the* Aeneid: *A Study of the Influence of Ancient Homeric Literary Criticism on Vergil* (Ann Arbor, 1974).

[16] Armstrong (n. 1), 328.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.302 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Idomeneus vowed to sacrifice *de re quae ei primum occurrisset*, and was met on landing by his son; the consequence, either of his fulfilling his disastrous vow or of his delaying to fulfil it, was plague, and he was driven out.[17] Association with this story, as Armstrong emphasizes,[18] casts a most sinister light on the sickness which, as spring turns to summer, devastates the Trojan settlement. But this was not the only tale told of Idomeneus' unhappy homecoming. Lycophron offers a horrific narrative of trust betrayed and sacrilegious slaughter, the last item in Cassandra's catalogue of the miseries inflicted on the returning Greeks in retribution for the violence done to her, the agent of divine justice being in this case Nauplius, avenging the wrong done to his son Palamedes:

> ἥξει δὲ Κνωσσὸν κἀπὶ Γόρτυνος δόμους
> τοὐμὸν ταλαίνης πῆμα, πᾶς δ' ἀνάστατος
> ἔσται στρατηγῶν οἶκος. οὐ γὰρ ἥσυχος
> πορκεὺς δίκωπον σέλμα ναυστολῶν ἐλᾷ,
> Λεῦκον στροβήσων φύλακα τῆς μοναρχίας,
> ψυδραῖσιν ἔχθραν μηχαναῖς ἀναφλέγων.
> ὃς οὔτε τέκνων φείσετ' οὔτε συγγάμου
> Μήδας δάμαρτος ἠγριωμένος φρένας,
> οὐ Κλεισιθήρας θυγατρός, ἣς πατὴρ λέχος
> θρεπτῶι δράκοντι συγκαταινέσει πικρόν.
> πάντας δ' ἀνάγνοις χερσὶν ἐν ναῶι κτενεῖ,
> λώβαισιν αἰκισθέντας Ὀγκαίου βόθρου. (1216–24)

[The misery arising from my suffering will come to Cnossus and to Gortyn's homes, and the rulers' house will be utterly ruined. For the fisherman will voyage without rest as he drives on his two-oared skiff, to send distracted Leucus, the kingdom's guardian, firing his hatred with ingenious lies. In his anger Leucus will spare neither Idomeneus' children nor his wedded wife, Meda, nor his daughter Clisithera whom her father will give in bitter wedlock to the snake he reared. With impious hands he will slay them all in the temple, mutilated like the victims of Oncaea's pit.][19]

Lycophron does not explain what happened on Idomeneus' return, but since he has already told us that the old hero (*Αἴθωνος αὐτάδελφον ἐν πλασταῖς γραφαῖς*)[20] will be buried near Colophon (431–2), further travel is evidently envisaged. Of course, since Virgil's Idomeneus has moved westward (400–1 *et Sallentinos obsedit milite campos / Lyctius Idomeneus*), we cannot supply from Lycophron what Virgil does not tell us. But Lycophron did not draw his stories from his own imagination, and we ought not to assume that the tale told by Servius was the only one which Virgil might have had in mind.

If we can detach our reading from that association, we might see the misfortune which visits the Trojans not as a divine punishment directed specifically against them but as the explanation for the availability of this apparently desirable and formerly prosperous region: like many hopeful colonists they suffer for failing to make thorough enquiries. What might be supposed to have gone wrong for lack of Idomeneus' once firm control need not be specified.

With this episode Aeneas is shown that the surviving Greeks do not all return to live

[17] See further J. G. Frazer, *Apollodorus, The Library* 2 (Cambridge, MA and London, 1921), appendix xii, 394–404; M. L.West, *The East Face of Helicon* (Oxford, 1997), 441–2.

[18] Armstrong (n. 1), 324–5.

[19] Idomeneus had left his kingdom in the hands of Leucus, his adopted son, who was corrupted by Nauplius. Oncaea is probably to be understood as a title of Demeter.

[20] Cf. *Od.* 19.183.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.302 Published online by Cambridge University Press

happily ever after. That the tables are turning in favour of the Trojans will be further indicated by their encounters with Helenus and Andromache and with the wretched (and enigmatically named) Achaemenides (3.588ff.). In the *Alexandra* the restoration of Trojan fortunes is conspicuous in the passage immediately following Cassandra's predictions for Idomeneus, the famous prophecy of Roman greatness which constitutes the heart of the Lycophron question (1226–80).[21] Contrast with the horror of the sacrilegious massacre of Idomeneus' kin highlights the triumphant opening,

> γένους δὲ πάππων τῶν ἐμῶν αὖθις κλέος
> μέγιστον αὐξήσουσιν ἄμναμοί ποτε
> αἰχμαῖς τὸ πρωτόλειον ἄραντες στέφος
> γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης σκῆπτρα καὶ μοναρχίαν
> λαβόντες. (1226–30)

[Again my descendants will increase the glory of my forefathers, winning with their spears the wreath of victory and gaining rule and sovereignty by land and sea.]

The prophetess is unstinting , and uncharacteristically straightforward, in her praise for Aeneas, her kinsman, βουλαῖς ἄριστος οὐδ' ὀνοστὸς ἐν μάχαις (1235), παρ' ἐχθροῖς εὐσεβέστατος κριθείς (1270).

The authenticity of this passage has been much debated, but it must have been present in the text of the *Alexandra* current in Virgil's time. There are other allusions to Lycophron in the *Aeneid*,[22] and it is difficult to believe that he did not expect some of his readers to be familiar with the poem. Anchises himself points us towards the *Alexandra* when Aeneas reports the dream revealing that Hesperia, also called Italy, is their destination:

> sola mihi talis casus Cassandra canebat.
> nunc repeto haec generi portendere debita nostro
> et saepe Hesperiam, saepe Itala regna vocare.
> sed quis ad Hesperiae uenturos litora Teucros
> crederet? aut quem tum uates Cassandra moueret? (3.183–7)

Typically, Cassandra's predictions pass unheeded until it is too late for them to matter. But here Anchises' recollection of her words at least serves to confirm Aeneas' nocturnal vision.[23] A direct reference to the *Alexandra* would be unsubtle. That is presented as a report to Priam by the servant sent to watch the apparently demented princess, not a confidential communication to Anchises; nor is Hesperia among the poem's toponyms. But this glimpse of Anchises as the patient recipient of apparently meaningless ravings only now seen to have significance reveals to Aeneas that the course of his journey westward is part of a divine plan framed long before Troy fell.

To an anonymous (and undatable) epigrammatist the Cretan image of misdirection, the labyrinth, typified the *Alexandra* (*A.P.* 9.191):

> οὐκ ἂν ἐν ἡμέτεροισι πολυγνάμπτοις λαβυρίνθοις
> ῥηιδίως προμόλοις ἐς φάος, αἴ κε τύχηις·
> τοίους γὰρ Πριαμὶς Κασσάνδρη φοίβασε μύθους,
> ἄγγελος οὓς βασιλεῖ ἔφρασε λοξοτρόχις.

[21] See further S. West, 'Lycophron italicised?', *JHS* 104 (1984), 125–51; Valeria Gigante Lanzara, *Licofrone, Alessandra* (Milan, 2000), 5–21.

[22] See further S. Josifovič, *RE* Suppl. xi (1968), 922–5; S. West, 'Notes on the text of Lycophron', *CQ* 33 (1983), 114–35 (132–5); Valeria Gigante Lanzara, 'Echi dell' *Alessandra* nella poesia latina', *Maia* 51 (1999), 331–47 (almost entirely Virgilian echoes).

[23] Compare Servius' comment (on 183), *bene Cassandrae inseruit testimonium, quae divinationem ab Apolline acceperat.*

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.302 Published online by Cambridge University Press

εἰ δέ σε φίλατο Καλλιόπη, λάβε μ' ἐς χέρας· εἰ δὲ
νῆις ἔφυς Μουσέων, χερσὶ βάρος φορέεις.

It is pleasing to see that in the home of the labyrinth the plain sense of Cassandra's words becomes clear; it would be even more pleasing if Virgil could be supposed to have known this epigram.

Hertford College, Oxford STEPHANIE WEST
stephanie.west@hertford.ox.ac.uk

THE CERBERUS-LIKE FUNCTION OF THE GORGONS IN VIRGIL'S UNDERWORLD (*AEN.* 6.273–94)

In his commentary on Book 6 of the *Aeneid*, Austin refers several times to Wistrand's observation that Aeneas and his underworld guide, the Sibyl, arrive at an actual 'house of Orcus' modelled by Virgil upon a Greek house of the kind we find described in Vitruvius 6.7.1–2.[1] Neither Wistrand nor Austin points out that the two infernal travellers leave Orcus' house through the same door by which they first entered. It makes sense that neither would bother to mention this fact, since Greek houses do only have one entrance-way. However, realization that this is the case throws light on the role played by the Hellish monsters listed in 285–9.

Aeneas at first sees a group of personified shapes in the vestibule area on the road side of the entrance-doors (*vestibulum ante ipsum primisque in faucibus Orci*, 273) and after entering the interior of the house he walks around the edge of the peristyle to the doorway at the far end of the peristyle court facing the entrance (*adverso in limine*, 279); he then makes his way back through the court—in the centre of which (*in medio*, 282) the shadowy elm grows—towards the entrance, where the shades of various wild beasts 'are stabled' (*Centauri in foribus stabulant*, 286). The verb *stabulant* refers to occupancy of the rooms known as *equilia*, Vitruvius' word for 'stables', located within the house to the side of the main entrance. Among the horde of beasts in these stables are the Centaurs, the most horse-like of monsters, and also the Gorgons, on which we shall focus attention presently. What has never been pointed out is that these frightening apparitions of Hell clearly offered Aeneas no resistance as he entered the house but inspired terror only as he sought to make his exit through the same entrance-way. This in turn leads us to suppose that they were within their stalls at his moment of entry, but appeared at the stable-doorways (*in foribus*) in order to block his path as he tries to depart. No wonder Aeneas is terrified (290). He has to get past these Hellish forms in order to leave Orcus' house and get back onto the road that leads to Acheron.

Given their behaviour, a far greater emphasis can now be laid upon the fact that the last shape in the list is that of the three-bodied spectre, *forma tricorporis umbrae* (289). This unnamed triple-bodied creature denoting Geryon, who is also three-headed, as Hesiod makes explicit at *Theog.* 287, reminds us of another beast with three heads, namely the Hell-dog Cerberus *latratu . . . trifauci* (417) on guard in Virgil's underworld at the entrance to Hades on the far side of the infernal water.[2] Just as Cerberus' task

[1] See R. G. Austin, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Sextus* (Oxford, 1977), 118–21 *ad* 273, 275, 280, 282, 285ff.; and E. Wistrand, 'Virgil's palaces in the *Aeneid* ', *Klio* 38 (1960), 146–54.

[2] On the mythological parallels between Cerberus and Geryon and on Heracles' dealings with both figures, see my *Catabasis*: *Vergil and the Wisdom-tradition* (Amsterdam, 1979), 83–6, where I suggest that both of Heracles' adversaries may have been versions of a 'conflict with monsters'

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.302 Published online by Cambridge University Press