

Appendix 2: The Golden Bough: Orphic, Eleusinian and Hellenistic-Jewish Sources of Virgil's Underworld in *Aeneid* VI

The belief in an underworld is very old, and most peoples imagine the dead as going somewhere. Yet they each have their own elaboration of these beliefs, which can run from extremely detailed, as was the case in medieval Christianity, to a rather hazy idea, as was the case, for example, in the Old Testament.¹ The early Romans belonged to the latter category and do not seem to have paid much attention to the afterlife. Thus Virgil, when working on his *Aeneid*, had a problem. How should he describe the underworld where Aeneas was going? To solve this problem, he drew on three important sources, as Eduard Norden (1868–1941) argued in his famous commentary on *Aeneid* VI: Homer's *Nekuia*, which is by far the most influential intertext in *Aeneid* VI,² and two lost poems about descents into the underworld by Heracles and Orpheus (§ 3). Norden had been fascinated by the publication of the Christian *Apocalypse of Peter* in 1892,³ but he was not the only one: this intriguing text appeared in, immediately, three (!) editions;⁴ moreover, it also inspired the still useful study of the underworld by Albrecht Dieterich (1866–1908).⁵ A decade later Norden published the first edition of his commentary on *Aeneid* VI, and he continued working on it until the third edition of 1927.⁶ His book still impresses by its stupendous erudition, impressive feeling for style,

1 In general, see Bremmer, *The Rise and Fall of the Afterlife* (London and New York, 2002).

2 For Homer's influence, see still G.N. Knauer, *Die Aeneis und Homer* (Göttingen, 1964) 107–147.

3 See E. Norden, *Kleine Schriften zum klassischen Altertum* (Berlin, 1966) 218–233 ('Die Petrusapokalypse und ihre antiken Vorbilder', 1893¹). In his monumental new commentary, N. Horsfall, *Virgil, "Aeneid" 6. A Commentary*, 2 vols (Berlin and Boston, 2013) 1.xxiii, 2.650 mistakenly states it was 1 *Enoch*.

4 For the bibliography, see the most recent edition: T.J. Kraus and T. Nicklas, *Das Petrus-evangelium und die Petrusapokalypse* (Berlin and New York, 2004).

5 A. Dieterich, *Nekyia* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1893, 1913²). For Dieterich, see most recently H.-D. Betz, *The "Mithras" Liturgy* (Tübingen, 2003) 14–26; A. Wessels, *Ursprungszauber. Zur Rezeption von Hermann Useners Lehre von der religiösen Begriffsbildung* (New York and London, 2003) 96–128; H. Treiber, 'Der "Eranos" – Das Glanzstück im Heidelberger Mythenkranz?', in W. Schlachter and F.W. Graf (eds), *Asketischer Protestantismus und der 'Geist' des modernen Kapitalismus* (Tübingen, 2005) 75–153 (many interesting glimpses of Dieterich's influence in Heidelberg); C.O. Tommasi, 'Albrecht Dieterich's Pulcinella: some considerations a century later', *St. Class. e Or.* 53 (2007) 295–321; F. Graf, 'Mithras Liturgy and 'Religionsgeschichtliche Schule'', *MHNH* 8 (2008) 59–71.

6 E. Norden, *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis VI* (Leipzig, 1903¹, 1927³) 5 (sources).

ingenious reconstructions of lost sources and all-encompassing mastery of Greek and Latin literature, medieval apocalypses included. It is, arguably, the finest commentary of the golden age of German Classics.⁷

Norden's reconstructions of Virgil's Greek sources for the underworld in *Aeneid* VI have largely gone unchallenged in the post-war period,⁸ and the next worthwhile commentary, that by the late Roland Austin,⁹ clearly did not feel at home in this area. Now the past century has seen a number of new papyri of Greek literature as well as new Orphic texts, and, accordingly, a renewed interest in Orphic traditions (Ch. III). Moreover, our understanding of Virgil as a poetic *bricoleur* or mosaicist, as Nicholas Horsfall calls him,¹⁰ has much increased in recent decades.¹¹ It may therefore pay to take a fresh look at Virgil's underworld and try to determine to what extent these new discoveries enrich and/or correct Norden's picture. We will especially concentrate on the Orphic (Ch. III), Eleusinian (Ch. I), and Hellenistic-Jewish backgrounds of Aeneas's descent. Yet a Roman poet hardly can totally avoid his own Roman tradition or the contemporary world, and, in a few instances, we will also comment on these aspects. As Norden observed,¹² Virgil had divided his picture of the underworld into six parts, and we will follow these in our argument.¹³

7 For Norden, see most recently E. Mensching, *Nugae zur Philologie-Geschichte*, 14 vols (Berlin, 1987–2004) 2.5–16, 5, 6.8–112, 11.83–91; J. Rüpke, *Römische Religion bei Eduard Norden* (Marburg, 1993); B. Kytzler *et al.* (eds), *Eduard Norden (1868–1941)* (Stuttgart, 1994); W.M. Calder III and B. Huss, “*Sed serviendum officio...*” *The Correspondence between Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf and Eduard Norden (1892–1931)* (Berlin, 1997); W.A. Schröder, *Der Altertumswissenschaftler Eduard Norden. Das Schicksal eines deutschen Gelehrten jüdischer Abkunft* (Hildesheim, 1999); A. Baumgarten, ‘Eduard Norden and His Students: a Contribution to a Portrait. Based on Three Archival Finds’, *Scripta Class. Israel.* 25 (2006) 121–140; Horsfall, *Virgil*, “*Aeneid*” 6, 2.645–654, with additional bibliography at 645 n. 3, although overlooking K.A. Neuhausen, ‘Aus dem wissenschaftlichen Nachlass Franz Bücheler’s (I): Eduard Nordens Briefe an Bücheler (1888–1908)’, in J.P. Clausen (ed.), *Iubilet cum Bonna Rhenus. Festschrift zum 150jährigen Bestehen des Bonner Kreises* (Berlin 2004) 1–39 (important for the early history of the commentary) and J. Rüpke, ‘Dal Seminario all’esilio: Eduard Norden a Werner Jaeger (1934–1939)’, *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia* (Siena) 30 (2009) 225–250; see now also O. Schlunke, ‘Der Geist der lateinischen Literatursprache. Eduard Nordens verloren geglaubter Genfer Vortrag von 1926’, *A&A* 59 (2013) 1–16.

8 For a good survey of the *status quo*, see A. Setaioli, ‘Inferi’, in *EV II*, 953–963.

9 R.G. Austin, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber sextus* (Oxford, 1977). For Austin (1901–1974) see, in his inimitable and hardly to be imitated manner, J. Henderson, ‘*Oxford Reds*’ (London, 2006) 37–69.

10 N. Horsfall (ed.), *A Companion to the Study of Virgil* (Leiden, 2000²) 150.

11 See especially N. Horsfall, *Virgilio: l’epopea in alambicco* (Naples, 1991).

12 Norden, *Aeneis* VI, 208 (six parts).

13 As Horsfall, *Virgil*, “*Aeneid*” 6, has used my previous articles for his commentary, I will refer to him only in cases of substantial disagreements or improvements of my analysis. I freely make use of

1 The area between the upper world and the Acheron (268–416)

Before we start with the underworld proper, we have to note an important verse. At the very moment that Hecate is approaching and the Sibyl and Aeneas will leave her cave to start their entry into the underworld,¹⁴ at this emotionally charged moment, the Sibyl calls out: *procul, o procul este, profani* (258). Austin (*ad loc.*) just notes: ‘a religious formula’, whereas Norden (on 46, not on 258) only comments: ‘Der Bannruf der Mysterien ἐκὰς ἐκὰς’. However, such a cry is not attested for the Mysteries in Greece but occurs only in Callimachus (*H.* 2.2). In Eleusis it was not the ‘uninitiated’ but those who could not speak proper Greek or had blood on their hands that were excluded,¹⁵ but Norden was on the right track. The formula alludes to the beginning of the, probably, oldest Orphic *Theogony* (Ch. III.2), which has now turned up in the Derveni papyrus (Col. VII.9–10, ed. Kouremenos *et al.*), but allusions to which can already be found in Pindar (*O.* 2.83–5), Empedocles (B 3.4 DK), who was heavily influenced by the Orphics, and Plato (*Symp.* 218b = *OF* 19): ‘I will sing to those who understand: close the doors, you uninitiated’ (*OF* 1 and 3).¹⁶ A further reference to the Mysteries can probably be found in the poet’s subsequent words *sit mihi fas audita loqui* (266), as it was forbidden to speak about the content of the Mysteries to the non-initiated.¹⁷

my ‘Orphic, Roman, Jewish and Christian Tours of Hell: Observations on the *Apocalypse of Peter*’, in T. Nicklas *et al.* (eds), *Other Worlds and their Relation to this World* (Leiden, 2010) 305–321; ‘Tours of Hell: Greek, Roman, Jewish and Early Christian’, in W. Ameling (ed.), *Topographie des Jenseits* (Stuttgart 2011) 13–34 (somewhat revised and abbreviated as ‘De *katabasis* van Aeneas: Griekse en Joodse achtergronden’, *Lampas* 44, 2011, 72–88) and ‘Descents to Hell and Ascents to Heaven’, in J.J. Collins (ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature* (Oxford, 2014) 340–357.

¹⁴ For the entry, see H. Cancik, *Verse und Sachen* (Würzburg, 2003) 66–82 (‘Der Eingang in die Unterwelt. Ein religionswissenschaftlicher Versuch zu Vergil, Aeneis VI 236–272’, first published in 1980).

¹⁵ This volume, Ch. I.1.

¹⁶ For the verse, see this volume, Ch. III.2 and 3. For further versions of this highly popular opening formula, see O. Weinreich, *Ausgewählte Schriften II* (Amsterdam, 1973) 386–387; C. Riedweg, *Jüdisch-hellenistische Imitation eines orphischen Hieros Logos* (Munich, 1993), 47–48; A. Bernabé, ‘La fórmula órfica “Cerrad las puertas, profanos”. Del profano religioso al profano en la materia’, *Ilu* 1 (1996) 13–37 and on *OF* 1; P.F. Beatrice, ‘On the Meaning of “Profane” in the Pagan-Christian Conflict of Late Antiquity. The Fathers, Firmicus Maternus and Porphyry before the Orphic “Prorrhesis” (*OF* 245.1 Kern)’, *Ill. Class. Stud.* 30 (2005) 137–165, who at p. 137 also observes the connection with *Aen.* 6.258.

¹⁷ In addition to the opening formula, see also *Hom. H. Dem.* 476; *Eur. Ba.* 471–472; *Diod. Sic.* 5.48.4; *Cat.* 64. 260: *orgia quae frustra cupiunt audire profani*; *Philo, Somn.* 1.191; Horsfall on *Aen.* 6.266. For the secrecy of the Mysteries, see Horsfall on *Aen.* 3.112 and 6.266.

The ritual cry, then, is an important signal for our understanding of the text,¹⁸ as it suggests the theme of the Orphic Mysteries and indicates that the Sibyl acts as a kind of mystagogue for Aeneas.

After a sacrifice to the chthonic powers and a prayer, Aeneas and the Sibyl walk in the ‘loneliness of the night’ (268) to the very beginning of the entrance of the underworld, which is described as *in faucibus Orci*, ‘in the jaws of Orcus’ (273), an expression that also occurs elsewhere in Virgil and other Latin authors.¹⁹ Similar passages suggest that the Romans imagined their underworld as a vast hollow space with a comparatively narrow opening. Orcus can hardly be separated from Latin *orca*, ‘pitcher’, and we seem to find here an ancient idea of the underworld as an enormous pitcher with a narrow opening.²⁰ This opening must have been proverbial, as in [Seneca’s] *Hercules Oetaeus*. Alcmena refers to *fauces* (1772) only as the entry of the underworld.²¹ All kinds of ‘haunting abstractions’ (Austin), such as War, Illness and avenging Eumenides, live here.²² In its middle there is a dark elm of enormous size, which houses the dreams (282–4).²³ The elm is a kind of *arbor infelix*,²⁴ as it does not bear fruit (Theophr. *HP* 3.5.2, already compared by Norden), which partially explains why the poet chose this tree, a typical arboreal *Einzelgänger*, for the underworld. Another reason must have been its size, *ingens*, as the enormous size of the underworld is frequently mentioned in Roman poetry,²⁵ unlike in Greece. In the tree the empty dreams dwell. There is no Greek equivalent for this idea, but Homer (*Od.* 24.12) also situates the dreams at the beginning of the underworld. In addition, Virgil places here all kinds of hybrids and monsters, some of whom are also found in the Greek underworld, such as Briareos (*Il.* I.403), if not at the entry. Others, though, are just frightening figures from Greek mythology, such as the often closely associated Harpies and Gorgons,²⁶ or hybrids like the Centaurs and Scyllae. According to Norden (p. 216), ‘alles ist griechisch gedacht’,

18 For similar ‘signs’, see Horsfall, *Virgilio*, 103–116 (‘I segnali per strada’).

19 Verg. *Aen.* 7.570 with Horsfall *ad loc.*; Val. Flacc. 1.784; Apul. *Met.* 7.7; Gellius 16.5.11.6; Arnob. 2.53; *Anth. Lat.* 789.5.

20 H. Wagenvoort, *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture and Religion* (Leiden, 1956) 102–131 (‘Orcus’); for a, possibly, similar idea in ancient Greece, see West on Hes. *Th.* 727.

21 See also *ThLL* VI.1, 397.49–68.

22 For a possible echo of Empedocles B 121 DK, see C. Gallavotti, ‘Empedocle’, in *EV II*, 216f.

23 For a possible Greek source, see Horsfall, *Virgilio*, 126f.

24 Most important evidence: Macr. *Sat.* 3.20.3, cf. J. André, ‘Arbor felix, arbor infelix’, in *Homages à Jean Bayet* (Brussels, 1964) 35–46; J. Bayet, *Croyances et rites dans la Rome antique* (Paris, 1971) 9–43.

25 Lucr. 1.115; Verg. *Aen.* 8.193, 242, 251 (*ingens!*); Sen. *Tro.* 178.

26 Horsfall on *Aen.* 7.323–340; Bernabé on *OF* 717 (= *P. Bonon.* 4).33.

but that is perhaps not quite true. The presence of Geryon (*forma tricoloris umbrae*: 289) with Persephone in a late fourth-century BC Etruscan tomb as Cerun may well point to at least one Etruscan-Roman tradition.²⁷

From this entry, Aeneas and the Sibyl proceed along a road to the river that is clearly the real border of the underworld. In passing, we note here a certain tension between the Roman idea of *fauces* and the Greek conception of the underworld separated from the upper world by rivers. Virgil keeps the traditional names of the rivers as known from Homer's underworld, such as Acheron, Cocytus, Styx,²⁸ and Pyriphlegethon,²⁹ but, in his usual manner, changes their mutual relationship and importance. Not surprisingly, we also find there the ferryman of the dead, Charon (298–304). Such a ferryman is a traditional feature of many underworlds,³⁰ but in Greece Charon is mentioned first in the late archaic or early classical Greek epic *Minyas* (fr. 1 Davies/Bernabé),³¹ a lost Boeotian epic dating, perhaps, from the early fifth century.³² The growing monetization of Athens also affected belief in the ferryman, and the custom of burying a deceased with an obol, a small coin, for Charon becomes visible on Athenian vases in the late fifth century, just as it is mentioned first in literature in Aristophanes' *Frogs* (137–42, 269–70) of 405 BC.³³ Austin (*ad loc.*) thinks of a picture in the background of Virgil's description, as is perhaps possible. The date of Charon's emergence probably precludes his appear-

27 See Nisbet and Hubbard on Hor. C. 2.14.8; P. Brize, 'Geryoneus', in *LIMC* IV.1 (1990) 186–190 at no. 25.

28 A. Henrichs, 'Zur Perhorreszierung des Wassers der Styx bei Aischylos und Vergil', *ZPE* 78 (1989) 1–29; H. Pelliccia, 'Aeschylean ἀμέγαιρος and Virgilian *inamabilis*', *ZPE* 84 (1990) 187–194; Horsfall on *Aen.* 6.438.

29 Note its mention also in *OF* 717.42.

30 L.V. Grinsell, 'The Ferryman and His Fee: A Study in Ethnology, Archaeology, and Tradition', *Folklore* 68 (1957) 257–269; B. Lincoln, 'The Ferryman of the Dead', *J. Indo-European Stud.* 8 (1980) 41–59.

31 C. Sourvinou-Inwood, 'Reading' *Greek Death to the End of the Classical Period* (Oxford, 1995) 303–361; J.H. Oakley, *Picturing Death in Classical Athens* (Cambridge, 2004) 108–125; J. Boardman, 'Charon I', in *LIMC*, Suppl. 1 (2009) 142.

32 A. Debiasi, 'Orcomeno, Ascra e l'epopea regionale minore', in E. Cingano (ed.), *Tra pannelismo e tradizioni locali: generi poetici e storiografia* (Alessandria, 2010) 255–298 at 266–279.

33 Oakley, *Picturing Death*, 123–125, 242 n. 49 with bibliography; add R. Schmitt, 'Eine kleine persische Münze als Charongeld', in *Palaeograeca et Mycenaea Antonino Bartoněk quinque et sexagenario oblata* (Brno, 1991) 149–162; J. Gorecki, 'Die Münzbeigabe, eine mediterrane Grab-sitte. Nur Fahrlohn für Charon?', in M. Witteger and P. Fasold (eds), *Des Lichtes beraubt. Toten-ehrung in der römischen Gräberstrasse von Mainz-Weisenau* (Wiesbaden, 1995) 93–103; G. Thüry, 'Charon und die Funktionen der Münzen in römischen Gräbern der Kaiserzeit', in O. Dubuis and S. Frey-Kupper (eds), *Fundmünzen aus Gräbern* (Lausanne, 1999) 17–30.

ance in the poem on Heracles' descent (§ 3),³⁴ although he seems to have been present already in the poem on Orpheus' descent (§ 3).

Finally, on the bank of the river, Aeneas sees a number of souls and he asks the Sibyl who they are (318–20). The Sibyl, thus, is his 'travel guide'. Such a guide is not a fixed figure in Orphic descriptions of the underworld, but a recurring feature of Judeo-Christian tours of hell and going back to *1 Enoch*, which can be dated to before 200 BC but is probably not older than the third century.³⁵ This was already seen, and noted for Virgil, by Ludwig Radermacher, who had collaborated on an edition with translation of *1 Enoch*.³⁶ Moreover, another formal marker in Judeo-Christian tours of hell is that the visionary often asks: 'who are these?', and is answered by the guide of the vision with 'these are those who...', a phenomenon that can be traced back equally to Enoch's cosmic tour in *1 Enoch*.³⁷ Such demonstrative pronouns also occur in the *Aeneid*, as Aeneas' questions at 318–20 and 560–1 can be seen as rhetorical variations on the question 'who are these?', and the Sibyl's replies, 322–30 contains *haec* (twice), *ille*, *hi*.³⁸ In other words, Virgil seems to have used a Hellenistic-Jewish apocalyptic tradition to shape his narrative,³⁹ and he may have used some other Hellenistic-Jewish motifs as well, as we will see shortly (§ 2 and 5).

2 Between the Acheron and Tartarus/Elysium (417–547)

Leaving aside Aeneas' encounter with different souls (333–83) and with Charon (384–416), we continue our journey on the other side of the Styx. Here Aeneas

34 *Contra* Norden, *Aeneis* VI, 237.

35 L.T. Stuckenbruck, 'The Book of Enoch: Its Reception in Second Temple Jewish and in Christian Tradition', *Early Christianity* 4 (2013) 7–40.

36 L. Radermacher, *Das Jenseits im Mythos der Hellenen* (Bonn, 1903) 14–15, overlooked by M. Himmelfarb, *Tours of Hell* (Philadelphia, 1983) 49–50 and wrongly disputed by H. Lloyd-Jones, *Greek Epic, Lyric and Tragedy* (Oxford, 1990) 183, cf. J. Flemming and L. Radermacher, *Das Buch Henoch* (Leipzig, 1901). For Radermacher (1867–1952), see A. Lesky, *Gesammelte Schriften* (Munich and Berne, 1966) 672–688; Wessels, *Ursprungszauber*, 129–154.

37 As was first pointed out by Himmelfarb, *Tours of Hell*, 41–67.

38 Himmelfarb, *Tours of Hell*, 49–50; J. Lightfoot, *The Sibylline Oracles* (Oxford, 2007) 502–503, who also notes 'that 562–627 contains three instances each of *hic* as adverb (580, 582, 608) and demonstrative pronoun (587, 621, 623), a rhetorical question answered by the Sibyl herself (574–577), and several relative clauses (583, 608, 610, 612) identifying individual sinners or groups'. Add Aeneas' questions in the *Heldenschau* in 710ff and, especially, 863 (*quis, pater, ille...*), and further demonstrative pronouns in 773–774, 776 and 788–791.

39 Differently, Horsfall on *Aen.* 6.320.

and the Sibyl are immediately ‘welcomed’ by Cerberus (417–25), who first occurs in Hesiod’s *Theogony* (769–73), but must be a very old feature of the underworld, as a dog already guards the road to the underworld in ancient Indian, Persian and Nordic mythology.⁴⁰ After he has been drugged, Aeneas proceeds and hears the sounds of a number of souls (426–9). Babies are the first category mentioned. The expression *ab ubere raptos* (428) suggests infanticide, which is also condemned in the Bologna papyrus (*OF* 717.1–4), a *katabasis* in a third- or fourth-century papyrus from Bologna, the text of which seems to date from early imperial times and is generally accepted to be Orphic in character.⁴¹ This papyrus, as has often been seen, contains several close parallels to Virgil, and both must have used the same identifiably Orphic source.⁴² Now ‘blanket condemnation of abortion and infanticide reflects a Jewish or Christian moral perspective’. As we have already noted Jewish influence (§ 1), we may perhaps assume it here too, as ‘abortion/infanticide in fact occurs almost exclusively in *Christian* tours of hell’.⁴³ And indeed, the origin of the Bologna papyrus should probably be looked for in Alexandria in a milieu that underwent Jewish influences, even if much of the text is of course not Egyptian-Jewish.⁴⁴ We may add that the so-called *Testament of Orpheus* is a Jewish-Egyptian revision of an Orphic poem and thus clear proof of the influence of Orphism on Egyptian (Alexandrian?) Judaism.⁴⁵ Yet some of the Orphic material of Virgil’s and the papyrus’ source must be older than the Hellenistic period, as we will see shortly.

40 M.L. West, *Indo-European Poetry and Myth* (Oxford, 2007) 392.

41 For the text, with extensive bibliography and commentary, see Bernabé, *Orphicorum et Orphicis similia testimonia et fragmenta*. II, 2, 271–287 (= *OF* 717), who notes on p. 271: ‘omnia quae in papyro leguntur cum Orphica doctrina recentioris aetatis congruunt’.

42 This has been established by N. Horsfall, ‘P. Bonon.4 and Virgil, *Aen.* 6, yet again’, *ZPE* 96 (1993) 17–18; see also Horsfall on *Aen.* 6.548–636 and 7.182.

43 Lightfoot, *Sibylline Oracles*, 513 (quotes), who compares *1 Enoch* 99.5; see also Himmelfarb, *Tours of Hell*, 71–72, 74–75; D. Schwartz, ‘Did the Jews Practice Infant Exposure and Infanticide in Antiquity?’, *Studia Philonica Annual* 16 (2004) 61–95; L.T. Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108* (Berlin and New York, 2007) 390–391; D. Shanzer, ‘Voices and Bodies: The Afterlife of the Unborn’, *Numen* 56 (2009) 326–365, with a new discussion of the beginning of the Bologna papyrus at p. 355–359, in which she argues that the papyrus mentions abortion, not infanticide.

44 A. Setaioli, ‘Nuove osservazioni sulla “descrizione dell’oltretomba” nel papiro di Bologna’, *Studi Ital. Filol. Class.* 42 (1970) 179–224 at 205–220.

45 Riedweg, *Jüdisch-hellenistische Imitation eines orphischen Hieros Logos* and ‘Literatura órfica en ámbito judío’, in A. Bernabé and F. Casadesus (eds), *Orfeo y la tradición órfica* (Madrid 2009) 379–392; F. Jourdan, *Poème judéo-hellénistique attribué à Orphée: production juive et réception chrétienne* (Paris 2010).

After the babies we hear of those who were condemned innocently (430), suicides (434–6),⁴⁶ famous mythological women such as Euadne, Laodamia (447),⁴⁷ and, hardly surprisingly, Dido, Aeneas' abandoned beloved (450–76).⁴⁸ In this way Virgil follows the traditional Greek combination of *ahôroi* and *biaiothanatoi*.⁴⁹ The last category that Aeneas and the Sibyl meet at the furthest point of this region between the Acheron and the Tartarus/Elysium are famous war heroes (477–547). When we compare these categories with Virgil's intertext, Odysseus' meeting with ghosts in the *Odyssey* (11.37–41), we note that before crossing Acheron Aeneas first meets the souls of those recently departed and those unburied, just as in Homer Odysseus first meets the unburied Elpenor (51). The last category enumerated in Homer are the warriors, who here too appear last. Thus, Homeric inspiration is clear, even though Virgil greatly elaborates his model, not least with material taken from Orphic *katabaseis*.⁵⁰

3 Tartarus (548–627)

While talking, the Sibyl and Aeneas reach a fork in the road, where the right-hand way leads to Elysium, but the left one to Tartarus (541–3). The fork and the preference for the right are standard elements in Plato's eschatological myths, which suggests a traditional motif.⁵¹ Once again, we are led to the Orphic milieu, as the Orphic Gold Leaves regularly instruct the soul 'go to the right' or 'bear to the right' after its arrival in the underworld,⁵² thus varying Pythagorean usage for the upper world.⁵³ Virgil's description of Tartarus is mostly taken from *Odyssey* Book 11,

⁴⁶ Y. Gris , *Le suicide dans la Rome antique* (Montr al and Paris, 1982) 158–164.

⁴⁷ These two heroines were clearly popular in funereal poetry in Hellenistic-Roman times: *SEG* 52.942, 1672.

⁴⁸ For the place of Dido in Book VI and her connection with Heracles' *katabasis*, see R. Nauta, 'Dido en Aeneas in de onderwereld', *Lampas* 44 (2011) 53–71.

⁴⁹ See, *passim*, S.I. Johnston, *Restless Dead* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1999); Horsfall on *Aen.* 6.426–547.

⁵⁰ Norden, *Aeneis VI*, 238–239.

⁵¹ Pl. *Grg.* 524a, *Phd.* 108a; *Resp.* 10.614cd; Porph. fr. 382; Corn. Labeo fr. 7.

⁵² A. Bernab  and A.I. Jim nez San Crist bal, *Instructions for the Netherworld* (Leiden, 2008) 22–24 (who also connect 6.540–543 with Orphism); F. Graf and S.I. Johnston, *Ritual Texts for the Afterlife: Orpheus and the Bacchic Gold Tablets* (London and New York, 2013²) no. 3.2 (Thurii) = *OF* 487.2, 8.4 (Entella) = *OF* 475.4, 25.1 (Pharsalos) = *OF* 477.1. For the exceptions, preference for the left in the Leaves from Petelia (no. 2.1 = *OF* 476.1) and Rhethymnon (no. 18.2 = *OF* 484a.2), see the discussion by Graf and Johnston, *Ritual Texts*, 108, 111. The two roads also occur in the Bologna papyrus, cf. *OF* 717.77 with Setaioli, 'Sulla descrizione', 186f.

⁵³ R.U. Smith, 'The Pythagorean Letter and Virgil's Golden Bough', *Dionysius* NS 18 (2000) 7–24.

but the picture is complemented by references to other descriptions of Tartarus and to contemporary Roman villas. What do our visitors see? Under a rock there are buildings (*moenia*),⁵⁴ encircled by a threefold wall (548–9). The idea of the mansion is perhaps inspired by the Homeric expression ‘house of Hades’, which must be very old as it has Hittite, Indian and Irish parallels,⁵⁵ but in the oldest Orphic Gold Leaf, the one from Hipponion, the soul also has to travel to the ‘well-built house of Hades’.⁵⁶ On the other hand, Hesiod’s description of the entry of Tartarus as surrounded three times by night (*Th.* 726–7) seems to be the source of the threefold wall.⁵⁷ Around Tartarus there flows the river Phlegethon (551), which comes straight from the *Odyssey* (10.513), where, however, despite the name Pyriphlegethon, the fiery character is not thematized. In fact, fire only gradually became important in ancient underworlds through the influence of Jewish apocalypses.⁵⁸ The size of the Tartarus is again stressed by the mention of an *ingens* gate that is strengthened by columns of adamant (552), the legendary, hardest metal of antiquity,⁵⁹ and the use of special metal in the architecture of the Tartarus is also mentioned in the *Iliad* (VIII.15: ‘iron gates and bronze threshold’) and Hesiod (*Th.* 726: ‘bronze fence’).

Finally, there is a tall iron tower (554), which according to Norden and Austin (*ad loc.*) is inspired by the Pindaric ‘tower of Kronos’ (*O.* 2.70). However, although Kronos was traditionally locked up in Tartarus,⁶⁰ Pindar situates his tower on one of the Isles of the Blessed. As the tower is also not associated with Kronos here, Pindar, whose influence on Virgil was not very profound,⁶¹ will hardly be its source. Given that the Tartarus is depicted like some kind of building with a gate, *vestibulum* and threshold (575), it is perhaps better to think of the towers that sometimes formed part of Roman villas.⁶² The *turris aenea* in

⁵⁴ Cf. A. Fo, ‘Moenia’, in *EV* III.557–558.

⁵⁵ *Il.* VII.131, XI.263, XIV.457, XX.366; Emp. B 142 DK, cf. A. Martin, ‘Empédocle, Fr. 142 D.-K. Nouveau regard sur un papyrus d’Herculaneum’, *Cronache Ercolanesi* 33 (2003) 43–52; M. Janda, *Eleusis. Das indogermanische Erbe der Mysterien* (Innsbruck, 2000) 69–71; West, *Indo-European Poetry*, 388. Note also *Aen.* 6.269: *domos Ditis*.

⁵⁶ Graf and Johnston, *Ritual Texts*, no. 1.2 = *OF* 474.2.

⁵⁷ For Hesiod’s influence on Virgil, see A. La Penna, ‘Esiodo’, in *EV* II, 386–388; Horsfall on *Aen.* 7.808.

⁵⁸ Lightfoot, *Sibylline Oracles*, 514.

⁵⁹ *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos I* (Göttingen, 1955) s.v.; West on Hesiod, *Th.* 161; Lightfoot, *Sibylline Oracles*, 494f.

⁶⁰ On Kronos and his Titans, see Bremmer, *Greek Religion and Culture, the Bible, and the Ancient Near East* (Leiden, 2008) 73–99.

⁶¹ For rather different positions, see R. Thomas, *Reading Virgil and His Texts* (Ann Arbor, 1999) 267–287 and Horsfall on *Aen.* 3.570–587.

⁶² Norden, *Aeneis* VI, 274 rightly compares *Aen.* 2.460 (now with Horsfall *ad loc.*), although 3 pages later he compares Pindar; E. Wistrand, ‘Om grekernas och romarnas hus’, *Eranos* 37

which Danae is locked up according to Horace (C. 3.1.1) may be another example, as before Virgil she is always locked up in a bronze chamber (Nisbet and Rudd *ad loc.*).

Traditionally, Tartarus was the deepest part of the Greek underworld,⁶³ and this is also the case in Virgil. Here, according to the Sibyl, we find the famous sinners of Greek mythology, especially those that revolted against the gods, such as the Titans (580), the sons of Aloeus (582), Salmoneus (585–94) and Tityos (595–600).⁶⁴ However, Virgil concentrates not on the most famous cases but on some of the lesser-known ones, such as the myth of Salmoneus, the king of Elis, who pretended to be Zeus. His description is closely inspired by Hesiod, who in turn is followed by later authors, although these seem to have some additional details.⁶⁵ Salmoneus drove around on a chariot with four horses, while brandishing a torch and rattling bronze cauldrons on dried hides,⁶⁶ pretending to be Zeus with his thunder and lightning, and wanting to be worshipped like Zeus. However, Zeus flung him headlong into Tartarus and destroyed his whole town.⁶⁷ Receiving nine lines, Salmoneus clearly is the focus of this catalogue, as the penalty of Tityos, an *alumnus*, ‘son’,⁶⁸ of Terra, ‘Earth’ (595), is related in 6 lines, and other famous sinners, such as the Lapiths, Ixion,⁶⁹ and Pirithous (601), are

(1939) 1–63 at 31–32; idem, *Opera selecta* (Stockholm, 1972) 218–220. For anachronisms in the *Aeneid*, see Horsfall, *Virgilio*, 135–144.

63 Il. VIII.13, 478; Hes. *Th.* 119 with West *ad loc.*; G. Cerri, ‘Cosmologia dell’Ade in Omero, Esiodo e Parmenide’, *Parola del Passato* 50 (1995) 437–467; D.M. Johnson, ‘Hesiod’s Descriptions of Tartarus (*Theogony* 721–819)’, *Phoenix* 53 (1999) 8–28.

64 Except for Salmoneus, they are also present in Horace’s underworld: Nisbet and Rudd on Hor. C. 3.4.

65 Compare Soph. fr 10c6 (making noise with hides, cf. Apollod. 1.9.7, to be read with R. Smith and S. Trzaskoma, ‘Apollodorus 1.9.7: Salmoneus’ Thunder-Machine’, *Philologus* 139 [2005] 351–354 and R.D. Griffith, ‘Salmoneus’ Thunder-Machine again’, *ibidem* 152 [2008] 143–145); Man. 5.91–94 (bronze bridge); Greg. Naz. *Or.* 5.8; Servius and Horsfall on *Aen.* 6.585 (bridge).

66 In line 591, *aere*, which is left unexplained by Norden, hardly refers to a bronze bridge (previous note: so Austin) but to the ‘bronze cauldrons’ of Hes. fr. 30.5, 7.

67 For the myth, see Hes. fr. 15, 30; Soph. fr. 537–541a; Diod. Sic. 4.68.2, 6 fr. 7; Hyg. *Fab.* 61, 250; Plut. *Mor.* 780f; *Anth. Pal.* 16.30; Eust. on *Od.* 1. 235, 11.236; P. Hardie, *Virgil’s Aeneid: cosmos and imperium* (Oxford, 1986) 183–186; D. Curiazi, ‘Note a Virgilio’, *Musem Criticum* 23/4 (1988/9) 307–309; A. Mestuzini, ‘Salmoneo’, in *EV IV*, 663–666; E. Simon, ‘Salmoneus’, in *LIMC* VII.1 (1994) 653–655.

68 Austin translates ‘son’, as Homer (*Od.* 7.324, 11.576) calls him a son of Gaia, but Tityos being a foster son is hardly ‘nach der jungen Sagenform’ (Norden), cf. Hes. fr. 78; Pherec. F 55 Fowler; Apoll. Rhod. 1.761–762; Apollod. 1.4.1. For *alumnus* meaning ‘son’, see *ThLL* s.v.

69 Ixion appears in the underworld as early as Ap. Rhod. 3.62, cf. Lightfoot, *Sibylline Oracles*, 517.

mentioned only in passing. It is rather striking, then, that Virgil spends such great length on Salmoneus, but the reason for this attention remains obscure.

Moreover, the latter sinners are connected with penalties, an overhanging rock and a feast that cannot be tasted (602–6), which in Greek mythology are normally connected with Tantalus.⁷⁰ We find the same ‘dissociation’ of traditional sinners and penalties in the Christian *Apocalypse of Peter*.⁷¹ Apparently, specific punishments gradually stopped being linked to specific sinners. Finally, it is noteworthy that the furniture of the feast with its golden beds (604) points to the luxury-loving rulers of the East rather than to contemporary Roman magnates.⁷²

After these mythological *exempla* there follow a series of mortal sinners against the family and *familia* (608–13), then a brief list of their punishments (614–17), and then more sinners, mythological and historical (618–24).⁷³ In the Bologna papyrus, we find a list of sinners (*OF* 717.1–24), then the Erinyes and Harpies as agents of their punishments (25–46), and subsequently again sinners (47ff.). Both Virgil and the papyrus must therefore go back here to their older source (§ 2), which seems to have contained separate catalogues of nameless sinners and their punishments. But what is this source and when was it composed?

Here we run into highly contested territory. As we noted in our introduction, Norden identified three *katabaseis* as important sources for Virgil, the ones by Odysseus in the Homeric *Nekuia*, by Heracles,⁷⁴ and by Orpheus.⁷⁵ Unfortunately, he did not date the last two *katabaseis*, but thanks to subsequent findings of

70 J. Zetzel, ‘Romane Memento: Justice and Judgment in Aeneid 6’, *Tr. Am. Philol. Ass.* 119 (1989) 263–284 at 269–270.

71 Bremmer, ‘Orphic, Roman, Jewish and Christian Tours of Hell’.

72 Note also Dido’s *aurea sponda* (*Aen.* 1.698); *Sen. Thy.* 909: *purpurae atque auro incubat*. Originally, golden couches were a Persian feature, cf. *Hdt.* 9.80, 82; *Esther* 1.6; *Plut. Luc.* 37.5; *Athenaeus* 5.197a.

73 P. Salat, ‘Phlégyas et Tantale aux Enfers. À propos des vers 601–627 du sixième livre de l’*Énéide*’, in *Études de littérature ancienne, II: Questions de sens* (Paris, 1982) 13–29; F. Della Corte, ‘Il catalogo dei grandi dannati’, *Vichiana* 11 (1982) 95–99 = *idem, Opuscula IX* (Genoa, 1985) 223–227; A. Powell, ‘The Peopling of the Underworld: *Aeneid* 6.608–627’, in H.-P. Stahl (ed.), *Vergil’s Aeneid: Augustan Epic and Political Context* (London, 1998) 85–100.

74 Norden, *Aeneis VI*, 5 n. 2 notes influence of Heracles’ *katabasis* on the following lines: 131–132, 260 (cf. 290–294, with Lloyd-Jones, *Greek Epic*, 181 on Bacch. 5.71–84, and F. Graf, *Eleusis und die orphische Dichtung Athens in vorhellenistischer Zeit* (Berlin, 1974) 145 n. 18 on *Ar. Ra.* 291, where Dionysus wants to attack Empusa), 309–312 (see also Norden, *Kleine Schriften*, 508 note 77), 384–416, 477–493, 548–627, 666–678; Horsfall on *Aen.* 6.120.

75 Norden, *Aeneis VI*, 5 n. 2 notes influence of Orpheus’ *katabasis* on lines 120 (see also Norden, *Kleine Schriften*, 506–507), 264ff (?), 384–416, 548–627; Horsfall on *Aen.* 6.120.

papyri we can make some progress here. On the basis of a probable fragment of Pindar (fr. dub. 346), Bacchylides, Aristophanes' *Frogs*,⁷⁶ and the second-century mythological handbook of Apollodorus (2.5.12), Hugh Lloyd-Jones (1922–2009) has reconstructed an epic *katabasis* of Heracles, in which he was initiated by Eumolpus in Eleusis before starting his descent at Laconian Taenarum.⁷⁷ Lloyd-Jones dated this poem to the middle of the sixth century, and the date is now supported by a shard in the manner of Exekias of about 540 BC that shows Heracles amidst Eleusinian gods and heroes.⁷⁸ The Eleusinian initiation makes Eleusinian or Athenian influence not implausible, but as Robert Parker comments: 'Once the (Eleusinian) cult had achieved fame, a hero could be sent to Eleusis by a non-Eleusinian poet, as to Delphi by a non-Delphian'.⁷⁹ However, as we will see in a moment, Athenian influence on the epic is certainly likely.⁸⁰ Given the date of this epic we would still expect its main emphasis to be on the more heroic inhabitants of the underworld, rather than the nameless categories we find in Orphic poetry. And in fact, in none of our literary sources for Heracles' descent do we find any reference to nameless humans or initiates seen by him in the underworld, but we hear of his meeting with Meleager and his liberation of Theseus (see below).⁸¹ Given the prominence of nameless, human sinners in this part of Virgil's text, then, the main influence seems to be the *katabasis* of Orpheus rather than the one of Heracles.

There is another argument as well to suppose here use of the *katabasis* of Orpheus. Norden noted that both Rhadamanthys (566) and Tisiphone (571) recur in Lucian's *Cataplus* (22–23) in an Eleusinian context;⁸² similarly, he observed that the question of the Sibyl to Musaeus about Anchises (669–70) can be paralleled by the question of the Aristophanic Dionysos to the Eleusinian initiated where Pluto lives

76 The commentary of W.B. Stanford on the *Frogs* (London, 1963²) is more helpful in detecting Orphic influence in the play than that by K.J. Dover (Oxford, 1993).

77 H. Lloyd-Jones, 'Heracles at Eleusis: P. Oxy. 2622 and P.S.I. 1391', *Maia* 19 (1967) 206–229 = *Greek Epic*, 167–187; see also R. Parker, *Athenian Religion* (Oxford, 1996) 98–100.

78 J. Boardman *et al.*, 'Herakles', in *LIMC* IV.1 (1988) 728–838 at 805–808.

79 Parker, *Athenian Religion*, 100.

80 Graf, *Eleusis*, 146 n. 22, who compares Apollod. 2.5.12, cf. 1.5.3 (see also Ov. *Met.* 5.538–550; *P. Mich. Inv.* 1447.42–43, re-edited by M. van Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers' Digests?* (Leiden, 1997) 336; Servius on *Aen.* 4.462–463), argues that the presence of the Eleusinian Askalaphos in Apollodorus also suggests a larger Eleusinian influence. This may well be true, but his earliest Eleusinian mention is Euphorion 11.13, and he is absent from Virgil. Did Apollodorus perhaps add him to his account of Heracles' *katabasis* from another source?

81 *Contra* Graf, *Eleusis*, 145–146. Note also the doubts of R. Parker, *Polytheism and Society at Athens* (Oxford, 2005) 363 n. 159. Meleager: Bacch. 5.76–175, with Cairns *ad loc.*

82 Norden, *Aeneis* VI, 274f.

(*Frogs* 161ff, 431ff). Norden ascribed the first case to the *katabasis* of Orpheus and the second one to that of Heracles.⁸³ His first case seems unassailable, as the passage about Tisiphone has strong connections with that of the Bologna papyrus (*OF* 717.28), as do the sounds of groans and floggings heard by Aeneas and the Sibyl (557–8, cf. *OF* 717.25; Luc. *VH.* 2.29). Musaeus, however, is mentioned first in connection with Onomacritus' forgery of his oracles in the late sixth century and remained associated with oracles by Herodotus, Sophocles and even Aristophanes in the *Frogs*.⁸⁴ His connection with Eleusis does not appear on vases before the end of the fifth century and in texts before Plato.⁸⁵ In other words, it seems likely that both these passages ultimately derive from the *katabasis* of Orpheus, and that Aristophanes, like Virgil, had made use of both the *katabaseis* of Heracles and Orpheus. To make things even more complicated, the descent of both Heracles and Orpheus at Laconian Taenarum (above and below) shows that the author himself of Orpheus' *katabasis* also (occasionally? often?) used the epic of Heracles' *katabasis*.⁸⁶

We have one more indication left for the place of origin of the Heracles epic. After the nameless sinners we now see more famous mythological ones. Theseus, as Virgil stresses, *sedet aeternumque sedebit* (617). The passage deserves more attention than it has received in the commentaries. In the *Odyssey*, Theseus and Pirithous are the last heroes seen by Odysseus in the underworld, just as in Virgil Aeneas and the Sibyl see Theseus last in Tartarus, even though Pirithous has been replaced by Phlegyas. Originally, Theseus and Pirithous were condemned to an eternal stay in the underworld, either fettered or grown to a rock. This is not only the picture in the *Odyssey*, but seemingly also in the *Minyas* (Paus. 10.28.2, cf. fr. dub. 7 = Hes. fr. 280), and certainly so on Polygnotos' painting in the Cnidian lesche (Paus. 10.29.9) and in Panyassis (fr. 9 Davies = fr. 14 Bernabé). This clearly is the older situation, which is still referred to in the hypothesis of Critias' *Pirithous* (cf. fr. 6). The situation must have changed through the *katabasis* of Heracles, in which Heracles liberated Theseus but, at least in some sources, left Pirithous where he was.⁸⁷ This liberation is most likely another testimony for an Athenian connection of the *katabasis* of Heracles, as Theseus was Athens' na-

⁸³ Norden, *Aeneis* VI, 275.

⁸⁴ Hdt. 7.6.3 (forgery: *OF* 1109 = Musaeus, fr. 68), 8.96.2 (= *OF* 69), 9.43.2 (= *OF* 70); Soph. fr. 1116 (= *OF* 30); Ar. *Ra.* 1033 (= *OF* 63).

⁸⁵ Pl. *Prot.* 316d = Musaeus fr. 52; Graf, *Eleusis*, 9–21; Lloyd-Jones, *Greek Epic*, 182–183; A. Kaufmann-Samaras, 'Mousaios', in *LIMC* VI.1 (1992) 685–687, no. 3.

⁸⁶ As is also observed by Norden, *Aeneis* VI, 237 (on the basis of Servius on *Aen.* 6.392) and *Kleine Schriften*, 508–509 nos 77 and 79.

⁸⁷ Hypothesis Critias' *Pirithous* (cf. fr. 6); Philochoros *FGrH* 328 F 18; Diod. Sic. 4.26.1, 63.4; Hor. *C.* 3.4.80; Hyg. *Fab.* 79; Apollod. 2.5.12, *Ep.* 1.23f.

tional hero. The connection of Heracles, Eleusis and Theseus points to the time of the Pisistratids, although we cannot be much more precise than we have already been (above). In any case, the stress by Virgil on Theseus' eternal imprisonment in the underworld shows that he sometimes also opted for a version different from the *katabaseis* he in general followed.⁸⁸

Rather striking is the combination of the famous Theseus with the obscure Phlegyas (618),⁸⁹ who warns everybody to be just and not to scorn the gods.⁹⁰ Norden unconvincingly tries to reconstruct Delphic influence here, but also, and perhaps rightly, posits Orphic origins.⁹¹ His oldest testimony is Pindar's *Second Pythian Ode* (21–4), where Ixion warns people in the underworld. Now Strabo (9.5.21) calls Phlegyas the brother of Ixion,⁹² whereas Servius (*ad loc.*) calls him Ixion's father. Can it be that this relationship plays a role in this wonderful confusion of sources, relationships, crimes and punishments? We will probably never know, as Virgil often selects and alters at random!

4 The Palace and the Bough (628–636)

After another series of nameless human sinners,⁹³ among whom the sin of incest (623) is clearly shared with the Bologna papyrus (*OF* 717.5–10),⁹⁴ the Sibyl urges Aeneas on and points to the mansion of the rulers of the underworld, which is built by the Cyclopes (630–1: *Cyclopum educta caminis moenia*). Norden calls the idea of an iron building 'singulär' (p. 294), but it fits other descriptions of the underworld as containing iron or bronze elements (§ 3). Austin (*ad loc.*) compares Callimachus, *H.* 3.60–1 for the Cyclopes as smiths using bronze or iron, but it has escaped him that Virgil combines here two traditional activities of the Cyclopes. On the one hand, they are smiths and as such forged Zeus' thunder, flash and lightning-bolt, a helmet of invisibility for Hades, the trident for Poseidon and a shield for Aeneas

⁸⁸ For this case, see also Horsfall, *Virgilio*, 49.

⁸⁹ D. Kuijper, 'Phlegyas admonitor', *Mnemosyne* IV 16 (1963) 162–170; G. Garbugino, 'Flegias', in *EV* II, 539–540 notes his late appearance in our texts.

⁹⁰ Even though it is a different Phlegyas, one may wonder whether Statius, *Thebais* 6.706 *et casus Phlegyae monet* does not allude to his words here: *admonet* ... "*discite iustitiam moniti*..."? The passage is not discussed by R. Ganiban, *Statius and Virgil* (Cambridge, 2007).

⁹¹ Norden, *Aeneis* VI, 275–276, compares, in addition to Pindar (see the main text), Pl. *Grg.* 525c, *Phaedo* 114a, *Resp.* 10.616a.

⁹² To be added to Austin *ad loc.*

⁹³ D. Berry, 'Criminals in Virgil's Tartarus: Contemporary Allusions in *Aeneid* 6.621–624', *CQ* 42 (1992) 416–420.

⁹⁴ Cf. Horsfall, 'P. Bonon.4 and Virgil, Aen.6'.

(*Aen.* 8.447).⁹⁵ Consequently, they were known as the inventors of weapons in bronze and the first to make weapons in the Euboean cave Teuchion.⁹⁶ On the other hand, early traditions also ascribed imposing constructions to the Cyclopes, such as the walls of Mycene and Tiryns, and as builders they remained famous all through antiquity.⁹⁷ Iron buildings thus perfectly fit the Cyclopes.

In front of the threshold of the building, Aeneas sprinkles himself with fresh water and fixes the Golden Bough to the lintel above the entrance. Norden (p. 164) and Austin (*ad loc.*) understand the expression *ramumque aduerso in limine figit* (635–6) as the laying of the bough on the threshold, but *figit* seems to fit the lintel better.⁹⁸ One may also wonder from where Aeneas suddenly got his water. Had he carried it with him all along? Macrobius (*Sat.* 3.1.6) tells us that washing was necessary when performing religious rites for the heavenly gods, but that a sprinkling was enough for those of the underworld. There certainly is some truth in this observation. However, as the chthonian gods were especially important during magical rites, it is not surprising that people did not go to a public bath first. It is thus a matter of convenience rather than principle.⁹⁹ But to properly understand its function here, we should look at the Golden Bough first.¹⁰⁰

The Sibyl had told Aeneas to find the Golden Bough and to give it to Proserpina as ‘her due tribute’ (142–3, tr. Austin *ad loc.*). The meaning of the Golden Bough has gradually become clearer. Whereas Norden rightly rejected the interpretation of Frazer’s *Golden Bough*,¹⁰¹ he clearly was still influenced by his *Zeitgeist* with its fascination with fertility and death and thus spent too much attention on the comparison of the Bough with mistletoe.¹⁰² Yet by pointing to the Mysteries (below) he already came close to an important aspect of the Bough.¹⁰³

⁹⁵ Hes. *Theog.* 504–505; Apollod. 1.1.2 and 2.1, 3.10.4 (which may well go back to an ancient *Titanomachy*); see also Pindar fr. 266.

⁹⁶ Istros *FGrH* 334 F 71 (inventors); *POxy.* 10.1241, re-edited by Van Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers’ Digests?*, 68.92–98 (Teuchion).

⁹⁷ Pind. fr. 169a.7; Bacch. 11.77; Soph. fr. 227; Hellanicus *FGrH* 4 F 87 = F 88 Fowler; Eur. *HF* 15, *IA* 1499; Eratosth. *Cat.* 39 (altar); Strabo 8.6.8; Apollod. 2.2.1; Paus. 2.25.8; *Anth. Pal.* 7.748; schol. on Eur. *Or.* 965; *Et. Magnum* 213.29.

⁹⁸ As is argued by H. Wagenvoort, *Pietas* (Leiden, 1980) 93–113 (‘The Golden Bough’, 1959¹) at 93.

⁹⁹ See also S. Eitrem, *Opferritus und Voropfer der Griechen und Römer* (Kristiania, 1915) 126–131; Pease on Verg. *Aen.* 4.635.

¹⁰⁰ For Aeneas picking the Bough on a mid-fourth-century British mosaic, see D. Perring, ‘“Gnosticism” in Fourth-Century Britain: The Frampton Mosaics Reconsidered’, *Britannia* 34 (2003) 97–127 at 116.

¹⁰¹ Compare J.G. Frazer, *Balder the Beautiful = The Golden Bough* VII.2 (London, 1913³) 284 n. 3 and Norden, *Aeneis* VI, 164 n. 1.

¹⁰² As observed by Wagenvoort, *Pietas*, 96f.

¹⁰³ Norden, *Aeneis* VI, 171–173.

Combining three recent analyses, which have all contributed to a better understanding, we can summarize our present knowledge as follows.¹⁰⁴ When searching for the Bough, Aeneas is guided by two doves, the birds of his mother Aphrodite (193). The motif of birds leading the way derives from colonisation legends, as Norden (pp. 173–4) and Horsfall have noted, and the fact that there are two of them may well have been influenced by the age-old traditions of two leaders of colonising groups.¹⁰⁵ The doves, as Nelis has argued, can be paralleled with the dove that led the Argonauts through the Clashing Rocks in Apollonius of Rhodes' epic (2.238–40, 561–73; note also 3.541–54). Moreover, as Nelis notes, the Golden Bough is part of an oak tree (209), just like the Golden Fleece (*Arg.* 2.1270, 4.162), both are located in a gloomy forest (208 and *Arg.* 4.166) and both shine in the darkness (204–7 and *Arg.* 4.125–6). In other words, it seems a plausible idea that Virgil also had the Golden Fleece of the *Argonautica* in mind when composing the episode of the Golden Bough. This is not wholly surprising. The expedition of Jason and his Argonauts also was a kind of quest, in which the Golden Fleece and the Golden Bough are clearly comparable. In addition, Colchis was situated at the edge of Greek civilisation so that the journey to it might not have been a *katabasis* but certainly had something of a *Jenseitsfahrt*.¹⁰⁶

Admittedly, the Argonautic epic does not contain a Golden Bough, but in a too long neglected article, Agnes Michels (1909–1993) pointed out that in the introductory poem to his *Garland* Meleager mentions 'the ever golden branch of divine Plato shining all round with virtue' (*Anth. Pal.* 4.1.47–8 = Meleager 3972–3 Gow-Page, tr. West).¹⁰⁷ Virgil certainly knew Meleager, as Horsfall notes, and he also observes that the allusion to Plato prepares us for the use Virgil makes of Plato's eschatological myths in his description of the underworld, those of the *Phaedo*, *Gorgias* and *Er* in the *Republic*.

104 In this section on the Golden Bough, I refer just by name to D.A. West, 'The Bough and the Gate', in S.J. Harrison (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid* (Oxford, 1990) 224–238; Horsfall, *Virgilio*, 20–28 (with a detailed commentary on 6.210–211) and D. Nelis, *Vergil's Aeneid and the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius* (Leeds, 2001) 240f. The first two seem to have escaped R. Turcan, 'Le laurier d'Apollon (en marge de Porphyre)', in A. Haltenhoff and F.-H. Mutschler (eds), *Hortus Litterarum Antiquarum. Festschrift H.A. Gärtner* (Heidelberg, 2000) 547–553.

105 West, *Indo-European Poetry*, 190; Bremmer, *Greek Religion and Culture*, 59f.

106 For the myth of the Golden Fleece, see Bremmer, *Religion and Culture*, 303–338. For the expedition of the Argonauts as *Jenseitsfahrt*, see K. Meuli, *Gesammelte Schriften*, 2 vols (Basel, 1975) 2.604–606, 664–665, 676; R. Hunter, *The Argonautica of Apollonius: literary studies* (Cambridge, 1993) 182–188.

107 A.K. Michels, 'The Golden Bough of Plato', *Am. J. Philol.* 66 (1945) 59–63. For Agnes Michels, a daughter of the well-known Biblical scholar Kirsopp Lake (1872–1946), see J. Linderski, 'Agnes Kirsopp Michels and the Religio', *Class. J.* 92 (1997) 323–345.

However, there is another, even more important bough. Servius tells us that ‘those who have written about the rites of Proserpina’ assert that there is *quiddam mysticum* about the bough and that people could not participate in the rites of Proserpina unless they carried a bough.¹⁰⁸ Now we know that the future initiates of Eleusis carried a kind of pilgrim’s staff consisting of a single branch of myrtle or several held together by rings (Ch. I.2). In other words, by carrying the bough and offering it to Proserpina, queen of the underworld, Aeneas also acts as an Eleusinian initiate,¹⁰⁹ who of course had to bathe before initiation.¹¹⁰ Virgil will have written this all with one eye on Augustus, who was an initiate himself of the Eleusinian Mysteries.¹¹¹ Yet it seems equally important that Heracles too had to be initiated into the Eleusinian Mysteries before entering the underworld (§ 3). In the end, the Golden Bough is also an oblique reference to that elusive epic, the *Descent of Heracles*.

5 Elysium (637–678)

Having offered the Bough to Proserpina, Aeneas and the Sibyl can enter Elysium, where they now come to *locos laetos*, ‘joyful places’ (cf. 744: *laeta arva*) of *fortunatorum nemorum*, ‘blessed woods’ (639).¹¹² The stress on joy is rather striking, but on a fourth-century BC Orphic Gold Leaf from Thurii we read: “Rejoice, rejoice” (Χαῖρε<ε>, χαῖρε). Journey on the right-hand road to holy meadows and groves of Persephone’.¹¹³ Moreover, we find joy also in Jewish prophecies of the Golden Age, which certainly overlap in their motifs with life in Elysium.¹¹⁴ Once again Virgil’s description taps Orphic poetry, as *lux perpetua* (640–1) is also a typically Orphic motif, which we already find in Pindar and which surely must

108 Servius, *Aen.* 6.136: *licet de hoc ramo hi qui de sacris Proserpinae scripsisse dicuntur, quiddam esse mysticum adfirmant ... ad sacra Proserpinae accedere nisi sublato ramo non poterat. inferos autem subire hoc dicit, sacra celebrare Proserpinae.*

109 The connection with Eleusis is also stressed by G. Luck, *Ancient Pathways and Hidden Pursuits* (Ann Arbor, 2000) 16–34 (‘Virgil and the Mystery Religions’, 1973¹), if often too specifically.

110 R. Parker, *Miasma* (Oxford, 1983) 284 nos 12–13.

111 Suet. *Aug.* 93; Dio Cassius 51.4.1; G. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World* (Oxford, 1965) 68.

112 For woods in the underworld, see *Od.* 10.509; Graf and Johnston, *Ritual Texts for the Afterlife*, no. 3.5–6 (Thurii) = *OF* 487.5–6; Verg. *Aen.* 6.658; Nonnos, *D.* 19.191.

113 Graf and Johnston, *Ritual Texts for the Afterlife*, no. 3.5–6 = *OF* 487.

114 *Oracula Sibyllina* 3.785: ‘Rejoice, maiden’, cf. E. Norden, *Die Geburt des Kindes* (Stuttgart, 1924) 57f.

have had a place in the *katabasis* of Orpheus, just as the gymnastic activities, dancing and singing (642–4) almost certainly come from the same source(s),¹¹⁵ even though Augustus must have been pleased with the athletics which he encouraged.¹¹⁶ The Orphic character of these lines is confirmed by the mention of the *Threicius sacerdos* (645, with Horsfall *ad loc.*), obviously Orpheus himself.

After this general view, we are told about the individual inhabitants of Elysium, starting with *genus antiquum Teucris* (648), which recalls, as Austin (*ad loc.*) well saw, *genus antiquum Terrae*, *Titania pubes* (580),¹¹⁷ opening the list of sinners in Tartarus. It is a wonderfully peaceful spectacle that we see through the eyes of Aeneas. Some of the heroes are even *vescentis* (657), ‘picnicking’ (Austin), on the grass, and we may wonder if this is not also a reference to the Orphic ‘symposium of the just’, as that also takes place on a meadow.¹¹⁸ Its importance was already known from Orphic literary descriptions,¹¹⁹ but a meadow in the underworld has also emerged on the Orphic Gold Leaves.¹²⁰

The description of the landscape is concluded with the picture of the river Eridanus that flows from a forest, smelling of laurels (658–59).¹²¹ Neither Norden nor Austin explains the presence of the laurels, but Virgil’s first readership will have had several associations with these trees. Some may have remembered that the laurel was the highest level of reincarnation among plants in Empedocles (B 127 DK; note also B 140), whereas others will have realised the poetic and Apolline connotations of the laurel.¹²²

After Trojan and nameless Roman heroes (648–60), priests (661) and poets (662), Aeneas and the Sibyl also see ‘those who found out knowledge and used it for the betterment of life’ (663: *inventas aut qui vitam excoluere per artis*, tr.

115 Pind. fr. 129; Ar. *Ra.* 448–455; Plut. *frr.* 178, 211; *Visio Pauli* 21, cf. Graf, *Eleusis*, 82–84.

116 Horsfall, *Virgilio*, 139.

117 For the Titans being the ‘olden gods’, see Bremmer, *Greek Religion and Culture*, 78.

118 Graf, *Eleusis*, 98–103.

119 Pind. fr. 129; Ar. *Ra.* 326; Pl. *Grg.* 524a, *Resp.* 10.616b; Diod. Sic. 1.96.5; Bernabé on *OF* 61.

120 Graf and Johnston, *Ritual Texts for the Afterlife*, no. 3.5–6 (Thurii) = *OF* 487.5–6, no. 27.4 (Pherae) = *OF* 493.4.

121 The Eridanus also appears in Apollonius Rhodius as a kind of otherworldly river (Arg. 4.596ff.), but there it is connected with the myth of Phaethon and the poplars, and resembles more Virgil’s Lake Avernus with its sulphur smell than the forest smelling of laurels in the underworld. For the name of the river, see now X. Delamarre, ‘Ἠριδανός, le “fleuve de l’ouest”,’ *Études Celtiques* 36 (2008) 75–77.

122 N. Horsfall, ‘*Odorum lauris nemus* (Virgil, *Aeneid* 6.658)’, *Scripta Class. Israel.* 12 (1993) 156–158. Perhaps, later readers may have also thought of the laurel trees that stood in front of Augustus’ home on the Palatine, given the importance of Augustus in this book, cf. A. Alföldi, *Die zwei Lorbeerbäume des Augustus* (Bonn, 1973); M. Flory, ‘The Symbolism of Laurel in Cameo Portraits of Livia’, *Mem. Am. Ac. Rel.* 40 (1995) 43–68.

Austin). As has long been seen, this line closely corresponds to a line from a cultural-historical passage in the Bologna papyrus where we find an enumeration of five groups in Elysium that have made life livable. The first are mentioned in general as those ‘who embellished life with their skills’ (αἱ δὲ βίον σοφίῃσιν ἐκόσμεον = *OF* 717.103), to be followed by the poets, ‘those who cut roots’ for medicinal purposes, and two more groups which we cannot identify because of the bad state of the papyrus. Inventions that both improve life and bring culture are typically sophistic themes, and the mention of the archaic ‘root cutters’ instead of the more modern ‘doctors’ implies an older stage in the sophistic movement.¹²³ The convergence between Virgil and the Bologna papyrus suggests that we have here a category of people seen by Orpheus in his *katabasis*. However, as Virgil sometimes comes very close to the list of sinners in Aristophanes’ *Frogs*, both poets must, directly or indirectly, go back to a common source from the fifth century,¹²⁴ as must, by implication, the Bologna papyrus. This Orphic source apparently was influenced by the cultural theories of the sophists. Now the poets occur in Aristophanes’ *Frogs* (1032–34) too in a passage that is heavily influenced by the cultural theories of the sophists, a passage that Fritz Graf connected with Orphic influence.¹²⁵ Are we going too far when we see here also the shadow of Orpheus’ *katabasis*?

Having seen part of the inhabitants of Elysium, the Sibyl now asks Musaeus where Anchises is (666–78). Norden (p. 300) persuasively compares the question of Dionysus to the Eleusinian initiates where Pluto lives in Aristophanes’ *Frogs* (431–3).¹²⁶ In support of his argument Norden observes that normally the Sibyl is omniscient, but only here asks for advice, which suggests a different source rather than an intentional poetic variation. Naturally, he infers from the comparison that both go back to the *katabasis* of Heracles. In line with our investigation so far, however, we rather ascribe the question to Orpheus’ *katabasis*, given the later prominence of Musaeus and the meeting with Eleusinian initiates. Highly interesting is also another observation by Norden. He notes that Musaeus shows them the valley where Anchises lives from a height (678: *desuper ostentat*) and compares a

123 Cf. M. Treu, ‘Die neue ‘Orphische’ Unterweltsbeschreibung und Vergil’, *Hermes* 82 (1954) 24–51 at 35: ‘die primitiven Wurzelsucher’.

124 Norden, *Aeneis* VI, 287–288; Graf, *Eleusis*, 146 n. 21 compares *Aen.* 6.609 with *Ar. Ra.* 149–150 (violence against parents), 6.609 with *Ra.* 147 (violence against strangers) and 6.612–613 with *Ra.* 150 (perjurers). Note also the resemblance of 6.608, *OF* 717.47 and *Pl. Resp.* 10.615c regarding fratricides, which also points to an older Orphic source, as Norden already saw, without knowing the Bologna papyrus.

125 Graf, *Eleusis*, 34–37.

126 Neither Stanford nor Dover refers to Virgil.

number of Greek, Roman and Christian Apocalypses. Yet his comparison confuses two different motifs, even though they are related. In the cases of Plato's *Republic* (10.615d, 616b) and *Timaeus* (41e) as well as Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis* (*Rep.* 6.11) souls see the other world, but they do not have a proper tour of hell (or heaven) in which a supernatural person (Musaeus, God, [arch]angel, Devil) provides a view from a height or a mountain. That is what we find in *1 Enoch* (17–18), Philo (*SpecLeg* 3.2), *Matthew* (4.8), *Revelation* (21.10), the *Testament of Abraham* (10), the *Apocalypse of Abraham* (21), the *Apocalypse of Peter* (15–16), which was still heavily influenced by Jewish traditions, and even the late *Apocalypse of Paul* (13), which drew on earlier, Jewish influenced apocalypses. In other words, it is hard to escape the conclusion that Virgil draws here too, directly or indirectly, on Jewish sources.¹²⁷

6 *Anchises and the Heldenschau* (679–887)

With this quest for Anchises we have reached the climax of book VI. It would take us much too far to present a detailed analysis of these lines but, in line with our investigation, we will concentrate on Orphic and Orphic-related (Orphoid?) sources.

Aeneas meets his father, when the latter has just finished reviewing the souls of his line who are destined to ascend 'to the upper light' (679–83).¹²⁸ They are in a valley, of which the secluded character is heavily stressed,¹²⁹ while the river Lethe gently streams through the woods (705): the Romans paid much more attention to this river than the Greeks, who mentioned Lethe only rarely and in older times hardly ever explicitly as a river.¹³⁰ Here those souls that are to be reincarnated drink the water of forgetfulness. After Aeneas wondered why some would want to return to the upper world, Anchises launched into a detailed Stoic cosmology and anthropology (724–33) before we again find Orphic material: the soul locked up in the body as in a prison (734), which Vergil derived almost certainly straight from Plato, just like the idea of engrafted (738, 746: *concreta*) evil.¹³¹

¹²⁷ *Contra* Horsfall on *Aen.* 6.792.

¹²⁸ For the reference to metempsychosis, see Horsfall on *Aen.* 6.724–751.

¹²⁹ 679–680 *penitus convalle virenti inclusas animas*; 703: *valle reducta*; 704: *seclusum nemus*.

¹³⁰ Theognis 1216 (plain of Lethe); Simon. *Anth. Pal.* 7.25.6 (house of Lethe); Ar. *Ra.* 186 (plain of Lethe); Pl. *Resp.* 10.621ac (plain and river); *TrGF* Adesp. fr. 372 (house of Lethe); *SEG* 51.328 (curse tablet: Lethe as a personal power). For its occurrence in the Gold Leaves, see Riedweg, *Mysterieterminologie*, 40.

¹³¹ Soul: Pl. *Crat.* 400c (= *OF* 430), *Phd.* 62b (= *OF* 429), 67d, 81be, 92a; [Plato], *Axioch.* 365e; G. Rehrenbock, 'Die orphische Seelenlehre in Platons *Kratylos*', *Wiener Stud.* 88 (1975) 17–31;

The penalties the souls have to suffer to become pure (739–43) may well derive from an Orphic source too, as the Bologna papyrus mentions clouds and hail, but it is too fragmentary to be of any use here.¹³² On the other hand, the idea that the souls have to pay a penalty for their deeds in the upper world twice occurs in the Orphic Gold Leaves.¹³³ Orphic is also the idea of the cycle (*rota*) through which the souls have to pass during their Orphic reincarnation.¹³⁴ But why does the cycle last a thousand years before the souls can come back to life: *mille rotam volvere per annos* (748)? Unfortunately, we are badly informed by the relevant authors about the precise length of the reincarnation. Empedocles mentions ‘thrice ten thousand seasons’ (B 115 DK) and Plato (*Phaedr.* 249a) mentions ‘ten thousand years’ and, for a philosophical life, ‘three times thousand years’, but the myth of Er mentions a period of thousand years.¹³⁵ This will be Virgil’s source here, as also the idea that the souls have to drink from the river Lethe is directly inspired by the myth of Er where the souls that have drunk from the River of Forgetfulness forget about their stay in the other world before returning to earth (*Resp.* 10.621a).

It will hardly be chance that with the references to the end of the myth of Er, we have also reached the end of the main description of the underworld. In the following *Heldenschau*, we find only one more intriguing reference to the eschatological beliefs of Virgil’s time. At the end, father and son wander ‘in the wide fields of air’ (887: *aëris in campis latis*), surveying everything. In one of his characteristically wide-ranging and incisive discussions, Norden argued that Virgil alludes here to the belief that the souls ascend to the moon as their final abode. This belief is as old, as Norden argues, as the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, where we already find ‘die Identifikation der Mondgöttin Hekate mit Hekate als Königin der Geister und des Hades’.¹³⁶ However, it must be objected that ‘verifiable associations between the two (i.e. Hecate and the moon) do not survive from

A. Bernabé, ‘Una etimología Platónica: *Sôma* – *Sêma*’, *Philologus* 139 (1995) 204–237. For the afterlife of the idea, see P. Courcelle, *Connais-toi toi-même de Socrate à Saint Bernard*, 3 vols (Paris, 1974–1975) 2.345–380. Engrafted evil: Pl. *Phd.* 81c, *Resp.* 10.609a, *Tim.* 42ac. Plato and Orphism: A. Masaracchia, ‘Orfeo e gli “Orfici” in Platone’, in idem (ed.), *Orfeo e l’Orfismo* (Rome, 1993) 173–203, reprinted in his *Riflessioni sull’antico* (Pisa and Rome, 1998) 373–396.

132 Treu, ‘Die neue ‘Orphische’ Unterweltsbeschreibung’, 38 compares *OF* 717.130–132; see also G. Perrone, ‘Virgilio Aen. VI 740–742’, *Civ. Class.Crist.* 6 (1985) 33–41; Horsfall on *Aen.* 6.739.

133 Graf and Johnston, *Ritual Texts* 6.4 (Thurii) = *OF* 490.4; Graf and Johnston 27.4 (Pherae) = *OF* 493.4.

134 *OF* 338, 467, Graf and Johnston, *Ritual Texts*, 5.5 (Thurii) = *OF* 488.5, with Bernabé *ad loc.*

135 Pl. *Resp.* 10.615b, 621a. Curiously, Norden does not refer to this passage in his commentary on this line, but at p. 10–11 of his commentary.

136 Norden, *Aeneis* VI, 23–26, also comparing Servius on 5.735 and 6.887; Ps. Probus p. 333–334.

earlier than the first century A.D'.¹³⁷ Moreover, the identification of the moon with Hades, the Elysian Fields or the Isles of the Blessed is relatively late. It is only in the fourth century BC that we start to find this tradition among pupils of Plato, such as, probably, Xenocrates, Crantor and Heraclides Ponticus, who clearly wanted to elaborate their Master's eschatological teachings in this respect.¹³⁸ Consequently, the reference does indeed allude to the souls' ascent to the moon, but not to the 'orphisch-pythagoreische Theologie' (Norden, p. 24). In fact, it is clearly part of the Platonic framework of Virgil.¹³⁹

In the same century Plato is the first to mention Selene as the mother of the Eleusinian Musaeus,¹⁴⁰ but he will hardly have been the inventor of the idea, which must have been established in the late fifth century BC.¹⁴¹ Did the officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries want to keep up with contemporary eschatological developments, which increasingly stressed that the soul went up into the *aether*, not down into the subterranean Hades?¹⁴² We do not have enough material to trace exactly the initial developments of the idea, but in the later first century AD it was already popular enough for Antonius Diogenes to parody the belief in his *Wonders Beyond Thule*, a parody taken to even greater length by Lucian in his *True Histories*.¹⁴³ Virgil's allusion, therefore, must have been clear to his contemporaries.

137 S.I. Johnston, *Hekate Soteira* (Atlanta, 1990) 31.

138 W. Burkert, *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism* (Cambridge MA, 1972) 366–368, who also points out that there is no pre-Platonic Pythagorean evidence for this belief; see also F. Cumont, *Lux perpetua* (Paris, 1949) 175–178; H.B. Gottschalk, *Heraclides of Pontus* (Oxford, 1980) 100–105.

139 Wilamowitz rejected the 'Mondgöttin Helene oder Hekate' already in his letter of 11 June 1903 thanking Norden for his commentary, cf. Calder III and Huss, "Sed serviendum officio...", 18–21 at 20.

140 Pl. *Resp.* 2.364e; Philochoros *FGH* 328 F 208, cf. Bernabé on Musaeus 10–14 T.

141 A. Henrichs, 'Zur Genealogie des Musaios', *ZPE* 58 (1985) 1–8.

142 *IG* I³ 1179.6–7; Eur. *Erechth.* fr. 370.71, *Suppl.* 533–534, *Hel.* 1013–1016. *Or.* 1086–1087, fr. 839.10f, 908b, 971; P. Hansen, *Carmina epigraphica Graeca saeculi IV a. Chr. n.* (Berlin and New York, 1989) no. 535, 545, 558, 593.

143 For Antonius' date, see G. Bowersock, *Fiction as History: Nero to Julian* (Berkeley, LA, London, 1994) 35–39, whose identification of the Faustinus addressed by Antonius with Martial's Faustinus is far from compelling, cf. R. Nauta, *Poetry for Patrons* (Leiden, 2002) 67–68 n. 96. Bowersock has been overlooked by P. von Möllendorff, *Auf der Suche nach der verlogenen Wahrheit. Lukians Wahre Geschichten* (Tübingen, 2000) 104–109, whose discussion also supports an earlier date for Antonius against the traditional one in the late second or early third century.

7 Conclusions

When we now look back, we can see that Virgil has divided his underworld into several compartments. His division contaminates Homer with later developments. In Homer virtually everybody goes to Hades, of which the Tartarus is the deepest part, reserved for the greatest sinners, the Titans (*Il.* XIV.279). A few special heroes, such as Menelaus and Rhadamanthys, go to a separate place, the Elysian Fields, which is mentioned only once in Homer.¹⁴⁴ When the afterlife became more important, the idea of a special place for the elite, which resembles the Hesiodic Isles of the Blessed (*Op.* 167–73), must have looked attractive to a number of people. However, the notion of reincarnation soon posed a special problem. Where did those stay who had completed their cycle (§ 6) and those who were still in process of doing so? It can now be seen that Virgil follows a traditional Orphic solution in this respect, a solution that had progressed beyond Homer in that moral criteria had become important.¹⁴⁵

In his *Second Olympian Ode* Pindar pictures a tripartite afterlife in which the sinners are sentenced by a judge below the earth to endure terrible pains (57–60, 67), those who are good men spend a pleasant time with the gods (61–67) and those who have completed the cycle of reincarnation and have led a blameless life will join the heroes on the Isles of the Blessed (68–80).¹⁴⁶ A tripartite structure can also be noticed in Empedocles, who speaks about the place where the great sinners are (B 118–21 DK),¹⁴⁷ a place for those who are in the process of purification (B 115 DK),¹⁴⁸

144 For Hades, Elysium and the Isles of the Blessed, see most recently Sourvinou-Inwood, 'Reading' *Greek Death*, 17–107; S. Mace, 'Utopian and Erotic Fusion in a New Elegy by Simonides (22 West²)', *ZPE* 113 (1996) 233–247. For the etymology of Elysium, see R. Beekes, 'Hades and Elysion', in J. Jasanoff (ed.), *Mír curad: studies in honor of Calvert Watkins* (Innsbruck, 1998) 17–28 at 19–23. Stephanie West (on *Od.* 4.563) well observes that Elysium is not mentioned again before Apollonius' *Argonautica*.

145 For good observations, see U. Molyviati-Toptsis, 'Vergil's Elysium and the Orphic-Pythagorean Ideas of After-Life', *Mnemosyne* IV 47 (1994) 33–46. However, recent scholarship has replaced her terminology of 'Orphic-Pythagorean', which she inherited from Dieterich and Norden, with 'Orphic-Bacchic', due to new discoveries of Orphic Gold Leaves (Ch. III.1). Moreover, she overlooked the important discussion by Graf, *Eleusis*, 84–87; see also Graf and Johnston, *Ritual Texts*, 100–108.

146 For the reflection of this scheme in Pindar's threnos fr. 129–131a, see Graf, *Eleusis*, 84f. Given the absence of Mysteries in Pindar, *O.* 2 and Mysteries being out of place in Plutarch's *Consolatio* one wonders with Graf if τελετᾶν in fr. 131a should not be replaced by τελευτᾶν.

147 For the identification of this place with Hades, see A. Martin and O. Primavesi, *L'Empédocle de Strasbourg* (Berlin and New York, 1999) 315f.

148 F. D'Alfonso, 'La Terra Desolata. Osservazioni sul destino di Bellerofonte (*Il.* 6.200–202)', *MH* 65 (2008) 1–31 at 14–20.

and a place for those who have led a virtuous life on earth: they will join the tables of the gods (B 147–8 DK). The same division between the effects of a good and a bad life appears in Plato's *Jenseitsmythen*. In the *Republic* (10.616a) the serious sinners are hurled into Tartarus, as they are in the *Phaedo* (113d–114c), where the less serious ones may be still saved, whereas 'those who seem [to have lived] exceptionally into the direction of living virtuously' (tr. C.J. Rowe) pass upward to 'a pure abode'. But those who have purified themselves sufficiently with philosophy will reach an area 'even more beautiful', presumably that of the gods (cf. 82b10–c1). The upward movement for the elite, pure souls, also occurs in the *Phaedrus* (248–9) and the *Republic* (10.614de), whereas in the *Gorgias* (525b–526d) they go to the Isles of the Blessed. All these three dialogues display the same tripartite structure, if with some variations, as the one of the *Phaedo*, although the description in the *Republic* (10.614bff) is greatly elaborated with all kinds of details in the tale of Er.

Finally, in the Orphic Gold Leaves the stay in Tartarus is clearly presupposed but not mentioned, due to the function of the Gold Leaves as passport to the underworld for the Orphic devotees. Yet the fact that in a fourth-century BC Leaf from Thurii the soul says: 'I have flown out of the heavy, difficult cycle (of reincarnations)' suggests a second stage in which the souls still have to return to life, and the same stage is presupposed by a late fourth-century Leaf from Pharsalos where the soul says: 'Tell Persephone that Bakchios himself has released you (from the cycle)'.¹⁴⁹ The final stage will be like in Pindar, as the soul, whose purity is regularly stressed,¹⁵⁰ 'will rule among the other heroes' or has 'become a god instead of a mortal'.¹⁵¹

When taking these tripartite structures into account, we can also better understand Virgil's Elysium. It is clear that we have here also the same distinction between the good and the super good souls. The former have to return to earth, but the latter can stay forever in Elysium. Moreover, their place is higher than the one of those who have to return. That is why the souls that will return are in a valley below the area where Musaeus is.¹⁵² Once again, Virgil looked at Plato for the construction of his underworld.

149 Graf and Johnston, *Ritual Texts*, 5.5 = OF 488.5; Graf and Johnston 26a.2 = OF 485.2. Dionysos Bakchios has now also turned up on a Leaf from Amphipolis: Graf and Johnston, *Ritual Texts*, 30.1–2 = OF 496n.1–2.5.

150 Graf and Johnston, *Ritual Texts*, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1 (all Thurii), 9.1 (Rome) = OF 488.1, 490.1, 489.1, 491.1.

151 Graf and Johnston, *Ritual Texts*, 8.11 (Petelia) = OF 476.11; Graf and Johnston, *Ritual Texts*, 3.4 (Thurii) = OF 487.4 and ibidem 5.9 (Thurii) = OF 488.9, respectively.

152 This was also seen by Molyviati-Toptsis, 'Vergil's Elysium', 43, if not very clearly explained.

But as we have seen, it is not only Plato that is an important source for Virgil. In addition to a few traditional Roman details, such as the *fauces Orci*, we have also called attention to Orphic and Eleusinian beliefs.¹⁵³ Moreover, and this is really new, we have pointed to several possible borrowings from *1 Enoch*. Norden rejected virtually all Jewish influence on Virgil in his commentary,¹⁵⁴ and one can only wonder to what extent his own Jewish origin played a role in this judgement.¹⁵⁵ More recent discussions have been more generous in allowing the possibility of Jewish-Sibylline influence on Virgil and Horace.¹⁵⁶ And indeed, Alexander Polyhistor, who worked in Rome during Virgil's lifetime and wrote a book *On the Jews*, knew the Old Testament and was demonstrably acquainted with Egyptian-Jewish Sibylline literature.¹⁵⁷ Thus it seems not impossible or even implausible that among the Orphic literature that Virgil had read, there also were (Egyptian-Jewish?) Orphic *katabaseis* with Enochic influence. Unfortunately, we have so little left of that literature that all too certain conclusions would be misleading.¹⁵⁸ In the end, it is still not easy to see light in the darkness of Virgil's underworld.¹⁵⁹

153 For the Orphic influence, see also the summary by Horsfall, *Virgil, "Aeneid" 6*, 1.xxii–xxiii.

154 Horsfall, *Virgil, "Aeneid" 6*, 2.650 is completely mistaken in mentioning Norden's 'pressing and arguably misleading, belief in the importance of Jewish texts for the understanding of *Aen.6*': Norden, *Aeneis Buch VI*, 6 actually argued that from the 'jüdische Apokalyphtik ... kaum ein Motiv angeführt werden kann, das sich mit einem vergilischen berührte'.

155 For Norden's attitude towards Judaism, see J.E. Bauer, 'Eduard Norden: Wahrheitsliebe und Judentum', in B. Kytzler *et al* (eds), *Eduard Norden (1868–1941)* (Stuttgart, 1994) 205–223; R.G.M. Nisbet, *Collected Papers on Latin Literature* (Oxford, 1995) 75; Bremmer, 'The Apocalypse of Peter: Greek or Jewish?', in *idem* and I. Czachesz (eds), *The Apocalypse of Peter* (Leuven, 2003) 15–39 at 3f.

156 C. Macleod, *Collected Essays* (Oxford, 1983) 218–299 (on Horace's *Epode* 16.2); Nisbet, *Collected Papers*, 48–52, 64–5, 73–5, 163–164; L. Watson, *A Commentary on Horace's Epodes* (Oxford, 2003) 481–482, 489, 508, 511 (on Horace's *Epode* 16); L. Feldman, 'Biblical Influence on Vergil', in S. Secunda and S. Fine (eds), *Shoshannat Yaakov* (Leiden, 2012) 43–64.

157 Alexander Polyhistor *FGrH* 273 F 19ab (OT), F 79 (4) quotes *Or. Sib.* 3.397–104, cf. Norden, *Kleine Schriften*, 269; Lightfoot, *Sibylline Oracles*, 95.

158 Horsfall, 'Virgil and the Jews', *Vergilius* 58 (2012) 67–80 at 68–69 has contested my views in this respect, but his arguments are partly demonstrably wrong and partly unpersuasive, see my 'Vergil and Jewish Literature', *Vergilius* 59 (2013) 143–150.

159 Various parts of this paper profited from lectures in Liège and Harvard in 2008. For comments and corrections of my English I am most grateful to Annemarie Ambühl, Danuta Shanzer and, especially, Nicholas Horsfall and Ruurd Nauta.