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Editor’s note: This paper was commissioned by the Classical Association of Victoria to provide an overview of the critical literature on Book 6 of Virgil’s Aeneid, for the benefit of those teaching the VCE Latin course as well as general interest.

Classics is a subject that exists in the gap between us and the Greeks and Romans. The questions raised by Classics are the questions raised by our distance from ‘their’ world, and at the same time by our closeness to it, and by its familiarity to us. The aim of Classics is not only to discover or uncover the ancient world... Its aim is also to define and debate our relationship to that world.¹

Introduction

The sixth book of Virgil’s Aeneid is widely acknowledged as the pivotal point of the whole work;² Horsfall describes book six as ‘a triumph.’³ Perfectly poised, Aeneas is suspended at a mid-point between his past and his future, just as the reader is at the mid-point of the work itself. This book concludes the events of the first half of the poem, and provides the framework in which the second half of the poem will be situated. In addition, it is a crucial point in the characterisation of Aeneas himself.⁴ ‘The important thing was for Aeneas to come to terms with himself, to face his own past (as he has not yet faced it) and to see his future and his country’s future (as he had not yet seen them).’⁵ Overall, Williams concludes, ‘in book six, at the centre of the poem, he [Aeneas] takes his final leave of the Trojan and Homeric past and turns towards the Roman future.’⁶ It is, of course, of great importance to a student’s understanding of the Aeneid to also develop a consideration of the work as a whole. As Warden notes, ‘the poem is a complex network of relationships, none of which has its full meaning on its own.’⁷ Nonetheless, the sixth book has many interesting points when undertaking a detailed study.

The sixth book is popular amongst students and scholars,⁸ along with the second book (the last night of Troy) and the fourth book (the Dido episode).⁹ In addition to the importance of book six for the work as a whole, we can also tease out a number of other interpretations from this book. It marks a liminal phase both for Aeneas, and for the Trojans as a group. The transition is a personal one for Aeneas, but the Trojans are also in a transitional state, as they have set foot in Italy, but will not reach their final goal until
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¹ Beard and Henderson (2000), 6-7.
² Williams (1990), 191; Feldherr (1999), 115; Gransden and Harrison (2004), 71; Horsfall (2013), xiii.
³ Horsfall (2013), xiii.
⁴ Mackay (1955), 184; Otis (1959), 167; Williams (1990), 191; Most (2001), 162-163; Hardie (2004), 144, and see Mackie (1988) on the characterisation of Aeneas more generally.
⁵ Otis (1959), 177.
⁶ Williams (1990), 207.
⁷ Warden (2000a), 351.
⁸ There is a vast amount of scholarship on Virgil and it continues to grow all the time. A few works can be suggested within the English literature as starting points for interested students. I have selected works here that are readily available at libraries in Melbourne, and are published in English. The most recent commentary of book six is Horsfall (2013), see also Austin (1977) and Macclennan (2003). Guides intended for students of the text are numerous, see for example Camps (1969), Hardie (1998), Gransden and Harrison (2004) and Ross (2007). Collections of printed essays can be a useful starting point to a variety of viewpoints, for example, see Harrison (1990); Horsfall (1995); Martindale (1997), as well as Gransden (1996) for a collection of translations of Virgil. There have been two schools of thought in regards to the interpretation of the poem, see Farrell (2001) and Schmidt (2001) for introductory surveys to the major theories and players. These works will serve as pointers in the direction of further scholarship on other contentious issues not covered here, for example, the gates of sleep and the golden bough.
⁹ Gransden (1984), 1; Gransden and Harrison (2004), 71.
book seven.\textsuperscript{10} Book six also gives us perhaps the most emotional scene in the poem, in Anchises and Aeneas’ reunion,\textsuperscript{11} as well as a particularly notable and extensive representation of the underworld.\textsuperscript{12} It has also been suggested that the depiction of the Underworld serves to crystallise Aeneas’ moral ideas, in that it offers the legible geography that Aeneas has sought so long in his earthly wanderings. Where you are reveals who you are. Heroes and lovers, the good and the bad, occupy different realms, separated by clear boundaries and presided over by different judges.\textsuperscript{13}

Likewise, there is much to approve of in the theory of Feldherr that the narrative of book six produces a change in the physical passage of Aeneas’ journey,\textsuperscript{14} before book six his journey is erratic and twisting, like the Labyrinth through which he enters the Underworld, but after book six, his journey, and indeed his resolve,\textsuperscript{15} are strengthened and he proceeds in straightforward manner. Aeneas ‘will never again have any fundamental doubt’ regarding his destiny.\textsuperscript{16} In later times, book six takes on an entirely different importance, through its influence on Dante and the interplay of pagan and Christian ideas regarding the underworld.\textsuperscript{17} It was also incredibly popular in the Medieval period, where it was read and exploited by many.\textsuperscript{18}

Hardie discusses the function of such journeys to the Underworld as we see in the sixth book of the \textit{Aeneid}. He notes

\begin{quote}
These desires have an obvious narratological function. A hero must have a plausibly strong motivation to make the difficult and dangerous passage from their world to the next. Motivation of the character within the poem is related to problems that face the author and his audience: an epic Underworld is the most obtrusively digressive kind of episode, and might appear as an appendage loosely bolted onto the main plot. The reader’s desires and emotions also need to be engaged, if the pleasure of the text is to carry us through the description of an epic Underworld, and prevent the temptation to skip on to the point at which the hero re-emerges from the Underworld, or wakes up.\textsuperscript{19}
\end{quote}

This idea, that an epic Underworld can appear added on to the plot, rather than an integral part of the work, is clearly seen in the \textit{Aeneid}. Although the sixth book is a focal point, equally, from the point of view of the second half of the poem, it could be argued that it ‘is as though book six never existed.’\textsuperscript{20} ‘No narrative thread links it to any later event, in terms of plot it could vanish completely without making any difference at all.’\textsuperscript{21} Despite the fact that the plot of book six is not consciously referenced in the second half of the poem, yet Horsfall notes ‘book six is also massively integrated into the poem’s plot and intellectual structure.’\textsuperscript{22}

\section*{On Inconsistency and Emendation}

Although Virgil did not, of course, finish

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{10} Gransden (1984), 20; Zetzel (1989), 263.
\textsuperscript{11} Gransden (1990), 78.
\textsuperscript{12} Gransden (1990), 79.
\textsuperscript{13} Feldherr (1999), 85.
\textsuperscript{14} Feldherr (1999), 92-93.
\textsuperscript{15} Most (2001), 163.
\textsuperscript{16} Most (2001), 163.
\textsuperscript{17} Gransden (1990), 75.
\end{flushright}
the _Aeneid_ prior to his death, there are no indications that this should be of great concern when analysing book six. Horsfall suggests that lines 886-901 may be the only passage in the book that the poet never brought up to a high standard of finish. It pays to be cautious in suggesting the emendation of ancient texts unless there is good evidence for such emendations. It was still being suggested as recently as the early 1990s that the problematic nature of the departure from the Underworld could be resolved by postulating earlier alterations to Virgil’s original text. In a similar fashion, it is something of an evasion to argue that passages that are difficult for a modern scholar to interpret would have been removed or reworked in the final version, had Virgil had time to finish the work in its entirety. In the words of Tarrant, ‘imputation of failure to the author should be the critic’s last resort.’ O’Hara argues strongly that inconsistencies in Virgil, and other works, should be a subject for interpretation, rather than something to be explained away. It is also interesting to consider how far the poet expected his reader to read into the text itself, especially in cases where mythology allows us to expand upon what he has written. It is always best to assume instead that Virgil meant what he said, even if it is not clear to us, unless there is a pressing reason to suggest otherwise. As Horsfall suggests

Likewise Goold notes ‘We may at once reject the thought that Virgil fumbled and did not intend precisely what he wrote.’ Instead, discrepancies and contradictions within book six, and the wider work, may reflect the large number of sources and variations in their original material. This is particularly the case in considering the description of the Underworld, for which Virgil clearly drew on a number of different sources.

**The Arrangement of the Underworld: Reconciling Opposing Representations?**

The presentation of Virgil’s Underworld has generated a large amount of scholarly literature. Most scholars recognise a bipartite or even tripartite division within the Underworld as presented by Virgil, and there has been considerable discussion over how to reconcile

---

23 Most (2001), 165; O’Hara (2007), 77-78.
24 Horsfall (2013), xiii.
27 Tarrant (1982), 52.
28 O’Hara (2007), 78.
29 Putnam (2003), 179.
30 Horsfall (2013), xxvi.
31 Goold (1992), 122.
35 Technically, of course, it is common to separate the book into three sections, being the preparation for entering the Underworld, then the mythological Underworld and the philosophical Underworld (e.g. see Williams (1990), 193), but here the reference is to a tripartite division of the part of the book when Aeneas is actually in the Underworld – into a mythological, a moral and a philosophical Underworld. See Norwood (1954); Otis (1959), 165, 168; Otis (1963), 289-311; Solmsen (1990), 208; Zetzel (1989), 267; Williams (1990), 193.
these diverse and opposing representations. As O’Hara notes, the difficulties with the Virgilian Underworld cannot be attributed to the unfinished state of the work at Virgil’s death; ‘the problems in the underworld are too numerous to fix.’

Virgil’s depiction of the Underworld shows the clear influence of many sources. Aside from the Homeric nekyia, discussed above, Norden suggested early on that the text owed a debt to lost katabaseis of Orpheus and Heracles. Modern scholars have suggested influences from popular folklore, mystery religions and even Jewish sources. Influence from Plato seems obvious on the latter part of the katabasis, and Cicero’s Somnium Scipionis seems to also have been influential. It is usually divided by modern scholars into two parts – a mythological portion (lines 264-675) and, in the speech of Anchises, a philosophical/theological portion (lines 675-892). Prior to discussing these two sections of Virgil’s Underworld and their issues separately, a few words on how the representation of the Underworld as a whole is to be interpreted is necessary.

How are we to reconcile these opposing views of the Underworld that Virgil presents? It is obvious that they do not form a coherent whole. For example, it is clear that Virgil intends that Dido and Sycaeus will remain in the Underworld permanently, as will all the figures of the mythological Underworld, which contradicts the discussion of rebirth as represented in the philosophical Underworld. Attempts were made to reconcile the text on this matter, but none were successful. Scholarship now is inching towards general agreement that the reader is not intended to reconcile these viewpoints, and that it is important that the focus be on a poetic interpretation rather than an attempt to read Virgil’s Underworld as expounding an organised creed. It is possible that this disjunct is caused by an attempt to meld together various sources of widely differing background, but it also serves a poetic function in the context of the poem. Just because modern scholars expect to find consistency here does not mean that Virgil was interested in making his version of the Underworld internally consistent. These parts are independent of one another – different functions – not combined into a single consistent doctrine. Thus the mythological Underworld provides the opportunity for Aeneas to come face to face with, and to overcome his past, in preparation for moving on with his mission. The philosophical Underworld is essential for Virgil’s desire to foretell the glorious future of Rome, as an impetus for the continuation of the plot and of Aeneas’ journey. It is indeed important to view the katabasis as a whole from...

42 Otis (1959), 168; Zetzel (1989), 267; As Horsfall (xxv) notes ‘some of the ways in which individual figures are categorised appear at least rather odd: we may wonder why Sycaeus, who is not a victim of love, is at Dido’s side. The victims of love are a particularly untidy group, blameless and scandalous, suicides and not.’

43 Williams (1990), 193.

44 Otis (1959), 165.

45 Otis (1959), 165.

46 Otis (1959), 166.

47 For example: Otis (1959), 166, 169; Solmsen (1990), 209; Williams (1990), 194; the idea itself is relatively early – e.g. Nettleship (1875), 139 notes ‘the reader is left to harmonise them as he can.’

48 Williams (1990), 193.

49 Williams (1990), 194.
the point of view of its poetic and narrative functions, rather than its internal coherence or ability to function as a creed; as Horsfall points out ‘we have no reason to suppose that Vergil is attempting to present some sort of creed or system of belief: that would make the centre of Aen. 6 entirely unlike everything else he wrote.’

Thus each part of the Underworld is well suited to the purpose which Virgil intended it to convey, and there is no real need to reconcile the two representations contained within them into a single coherent representation of the Underworld.

It is, however, important to note that the division is also not as clear-cut as it can appear to be in the scholarly literature, as threads owing to different sources can be seen running through book six. As Zetzel explains:

In addition, despite the obvious contradictions in the eschatology outlined in the overall account of Virgil’s Underworld, there are structural parallels linking the whole of the work, for example, between the souls waiting to cross the river into the underworld, and the souls awaiting rebirth in Anchises’ speech. Perhaps, as O’Hara, and others, suggest, the inconsistencies in the underworld were Virgil’s intention.

Virgil’s ‘Mythological’ Underworld: Themes of Reversal and Interplay with Source Material

It is no secret that possibly the most essential source for Virgil’s Underworld is Homer’s nekyia in book eleven of the Odyssey. Gransden contends that ‘in this poem, with its deliberate references to Homer, it is the memory of Odysseus which Virgil wishes in particular to evoke.’ Other sources have been suggested, although there is not always scholarly consensus. These include popular folklore, and possibly even pictorial representations, and the literary tradition. The literary tradition on which Virgil is drawing here includes, in addition to Homer, representations in Hesiod, Lucretius, Horace and in Platonic myth. For example, the fork in the road where Aeneas is directed to the right is a ‘standard

What Virgil does, however, is far more thoroughgoing than any of the available precedents: his underworld has two schemes which interpenetrate one another. The Homeric Nekyia provides a narrative framework, as Knauer has shown in convincing detail, for the entire underworld: not only the encounters with the shades of Palinurus, Dido, and Deiphobus, modelled on Odysseus’ meetings with Elpenor, Ajax and Agamemnon, but even the description of Tartarus, the meeting with Anchises, the prophecies of the future and, less clearly, the philosophical explanation of the fate of the soul all find their roots in Homer. At the same time, however, the elaborate geography of the underworld, with fixed places for different classes of soul, the ferry of Charon, the fork in the road between Tartarus to the left and Elysium to the right, the emphasis on judgement, the theory of metempsychosis and purification, all point to a far more developed eschatology with an Orphic-Pythagorean background.

---

50 Horsfall (2013), xxv.

---

52 See Warden (2000a) for a detailed analysis.
53 O’Hara (2007), 91-95, especially 93 where he states ‘these difficulties are neither accidental nor trivial.’ See also Norwood (1954), 17, who attributes inconsistencies in the work to their aesthetic effect, Mackie (1988), 127-128 and Zetzel (1989), 274 who states ‘These discrepancies between the Virgilian underworld and the world of myth and history as Virgil’s readers would know it are normally explained individually – as the result of the incompleteness of the Aeneid, of the use of unfamiliar sources, or of Virgil’s tendency to episodic composition – but it is significant that so many such peculiarities occur in a single book.’
55 Williams (1990), 194.
56 Zetzel (1989), 275; Williams (1990), 198; Bremmer (2009), 191 suggests also possible influences by Pindar and in the construction of contemporary Roman villas.
element[s] in Plato’s eschatological myths. It has been suggested that the meeting with Dido owes to Hellenistic elegy, and specifically to Catullus. Another important influence that can be seen is that of Orphic sources, and Bremmer suggests that some of the monsters in Virgil’s Underworld may even originate from the viewpoint of an Etruscan-Roman tradition. There is some confusion between what can be attributed to the katabasis of Orpheus and what instead belonged to the katabasis of Heracles, both lost, especially as the author of the katabasis of Orpheus appears to have had access to the katabasis of Heracles. However, certain places in the text seem to have a strong Orphic influence, such as the part of nameless sinners. Nonetheless, there is clear evidence to support that fact that Virgil sometimes chose to depart from his source material and innovate in his description of the Underworld.

Although this text had an important influence, there is much in Virgil’s Underworld which is distinctly un-Homeric, such as the positive aspects of life after death, and the topography itself. The setting out of the Underworld in the initial parts of Aeneas’ journey follow the traditional setting, although the most important of the shades represented are, of course, those most relevant to Aeneas personally. In addition, the presentation of the sinners and their crimes has been given a Roman twist. It is particularly interesting to note the intertwining of different ideas and source materials in Virgil’s description of Tartarus. The main influences are mythological sources, with named transgressors and punishments, and Orphic-Pythagorean sources which typically do not provide this information. As noted above, this tangling of ideas from different backgrounds can be identified throughout the Virgilian underworld. Zetzel raises the suggestion that this combining of ideas leaves Virgil more room in which to include Roman elements in his depiction of the Underworld.

The obvious parallels between the people that Odysseus and Aeneas meet in their respective engagements with the Underworld have long been noted by scholars. Both Palinurus and Misenus clearly owe something to Elpenor, the silence of Dido parallels the silence of Ajax, and the conversation with Deiphobus brings to mind that of Odysseus with Agamemnon. Circe is alluded to in the figure of the Sibyl, whose role is much more important here, and the reunion with Anchises recalls the episodes both with Anticleia (Odysseus’ mother) and with Teiresias. Other, more generic concordances

57 Bremmer (2009), 190.
58 Feldherr (1999), 103, who notes ‘So too, the wandering motion of Dido within the grove, contrasting with the purposeful, directed tread of Aeneas, is characteristic not only of her in her love-struck state, but of the distracted lover in general.’
59 For example, see Smith (1993), 305-312.
60 Williams (1990), 195; Bremmer (2009), 185, 189-191.
61 Bremmer (2009), 187.
63 Bremmer (2009), 194.
64 Solmsen (1990), 214; Feldherr (1999), 95; Bremmer (2009), 187, 197.
65 Williams (1990), 192, 194.
66 Williams (1990), 194; It is important to note here that a nekyia does not necessarily denote the same event as a katabasis. The LSJ defines a nekyia as ‘a rite by which ghosts were called up and questioned about the future,’ whilst it defines a katabasis as simply ‘a way down, a descent’.
67 Williams (1990), 194.
69 Zetzel (1989), 265-266.
70 Zetzel (1989), 266, 268.
72 Williams (1990), 195; Feldherr (1999), 103; Bremmer (2009), 190 notes ‘Thus, Homeric inspiration is clear (in the ordering of the souls met), even though Virgil greatly elaborates his model.’
73 Gransden (1984), 24; Solmsen (1990), 214; Williams (1990), 195.
74 Gransden (1984), 24, Solmsen (1990), 221.
can be seen as well, such as the role of Minos as judge and the description of traditional sinners within the Underworld.\textsuperscript{75} Parallels in the wording have also been identified at various places.\textsuperscript{76} The use of Homeric material tapers off with the parade of heroes, and it is easy to see why this should be the case. Firstly, the representation of death and the afterlife in Elysium is distinctly un-Homeric in tone, and secondly as West concisely states ‘Homer is producing dead heroes; Virgil wishes to review heroes yet unborn.’\textsuperscript{77} Jewish influence on the text is debatable.\textsuperscript{78} It is equally acknowledged that these meetings have greatly expanded and adapted, through Virgil’s innovation, the use of other source material, and developments in the genre between Homer and Virgil.\textsuperscript{79}

‘The Aeneid begins as an Odyssey but ends, with no ambiguity at all, as an Iliad.’\textsuperscript{80} The arrangement of Virgil’s Aeneid\textsuperscript{81} is often said to be a combination of the works of Homer, taken in reverse.\textsuperscript{82} That is, the first six books are the Odyssey portion of the Aeneid, and the last six books are the Iliad portion of the Aeneid.\textsuperscript{82} In this, Gransden suggests that it may be possible to discern a wider reversal of Homer’s work – ‘Odysseus travels to a known home, Aeneas travels from his known home to an unknown destination. In the Iliad, a war is fought which aims at the destruction of a city, in the Aeneid, a war is fought which aims at the foundation of a city.’\textsuperscript{83} In this vein, Feldherr argues that the layout of the Underworld in Virgil is self-consciously promoting its reliance upon its Odyssean model with a specific focus on ‘the section of the katabasis in which the Odyssey, in turn, measures itself against Iliadic epic.’\textsuperscript{84}

It is also possible to discern a reversal in the representation of Aeneas’ conversations with his deceased friends and comrades. The three people with whom he speaks in the initial part of his Underworld journey are themselves, Williams suggests, emblematic of important events in Aeneas’ journey thus far – ‘Palinurus represents the voyage, Deiphobus the events of Troy’s last night, Dido the stay in Africa.’\textsuperscript{85} As Gransden notes, the order in which Aeneas converses with these shades in the Underworld reverses the order in which he lost them in life, Palinurus, then Dido, then Deiphobus.\textsuperscript{86} He suggests ‘that Aeneas is reaching an accommodation with the events of his own past in order to confront his future.’\textsuperscript{87} This ties in nicely with the general opinion in modern scholarship of the thrust and aim of book six of the Aeneid.

Virgil’s ‘Philosophical’ Underworld: The Heroic Future of Rome

The parade is a tour de force. In context, it inspires Aeneas. It is a celebration of Roman people and Roman achievements. It is praise of Augustus and his family, the Julii. It deals sensitively with some troubling events and people. It is optimistic, but not blindly so – triumphant but not triumphalist. It makes humanity and empire seem, perhaps only for a moment, compatible.\textsuperscript{88}
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75 Although here Virgil sometimes diverges from the normal representation of such sinners, for example see Zetzel (1989), 268-269; Putnam (1990), 562-566.

76 Williams (1990), 195.

77 West (1990), 246.

78 For example, see Bremmer (2009), 188-189 on potential use of Hellenistic-Jewish motifs. Contra Horsfall (2013), xxiii ‘I know of no passage of Aen. 6 for which a Jewish origin may safely be claimed.’

79 Gransden (1984), 25; Bremmer (2009), 190, 205.

80 Farrell (2001), 27.

81 Gransden (1984), 12.

82 Gransden (1984), 12.

83 Gransden (1984), 12.

84 Feldherr (1999), 103.

85 Williams (1990), 198.


The pageant of heroes presents a very different view of the Underworld to that given in the first part of book six of the *Aeneid*. Identified sources include popular folklore, Varro *Imagines* and Homeric *teichoscopia*,89 Orphism,90 Pythagorean philosophy, Stoicism and Plato, particularly the story of Er in the tenth book of the *Republic*,91 as well as Neo-Platonic eschatology.92 Williams suggests influences from groups of *exempla* of philosophical or rhetorical schools, as well as highlighting a possible influence from carved images of processions.93 As with his descriptions of the mythological Underworld, Virgil relies both on a long history of Greek ideas, interspersed with mystical and philosophical teachings that were popular amongst his contemporaries.94 Warden goes so far as to suggest that Virgil has modelled Anchises on the figure of the famous Greek philosopher, Epicurus.95 Initiatory influences can also be seen.96

The view of the afterlife presented here in Virgil is not a single enshrined doctrine, and it is not necessary to conjecture as to whether it was a matter of personal belief to Virgil himself,97 as it suffices to note simply that it serves his purposes most admirably at this juncture of the work. In form, this section of the work owes much to Lucretius,98 and investigation has shown that there is a prolonged and complex interplay between this portion of book six and book three of Lucretius’ *De Rerum Natura*.99 Of course, although the expression is based heavily on Lucretius, the material and viewpoints in Virgil’s work would have been anathema to Lucretius himself.100 Otis suggests that ‘the philosophical afterlife is only a symbolic setting for the Roman future.’101

It is important to keep in mind that the figures represented in the parade of heroes were mostly, if not all, easily identifiable to Virgil’s intended audience.102 As O’Hara notes, this produces an effect on the reader; ‘the gap between what Aeneas can understand and what the reader is reminded of is considerable, and important.’103 Controversy is still ongoing as to whether the eulogistic passage in honour of Marcellus, the deceased heir of Augustus, was original to the work, or was added later by Virgil.104 As Solmsen suggests, Virgil has to be very careful in his description of the souls, after all, ‘since those about to begin a new life on earth are to be the noble figures of Rome’s history, any intimation that they are second-class souls would have been the height of tactlessness.’105 There has been a long history of controversy over the overall tone of this section of the Virgilian Underworld.106

**Conclusion**

The *Aeneid* continues to generate a large amount of investigation.89 Horsfall (1995), 145.
90 Gransden (1984), 26 – ‘Note the presence of Orpheus and his pupil Musaeus in positions of conspicuous importance.’
91 Williams (1990), 192, 200.
92 Williams (1990), 201; Gransden (1984), 26.
93 Williams (1990), 202.
95 Warden (2000b), 86.
96 Gransden (1990), 82; Horsfall (1995), 150; Anagnostou-Laoutides (2006), 8-11. The amount of influence from mystery rituals is debated by some, for example, see Williams (1990), 192.
97 Otis (1959), 172.
98 Gransden (1990), 82; Williams (1990), 200; Warden (2000b), 83-92.
100 Gransden (1984), 27; Warden (2000b), 87.
101 Otis (1959), 169.
102 Horsfall (1995), 146.
103 O’Hara (1990), 166.
104 See, for example, Goold (1992), 110-120 in favour of this passage being a later addition, and Horsfall (1989), 266-267; Horsfall (1995), 147-148 for an opposing viewpoint.
105 Solmsen (1990), 219.
106 See, for example, Feeney (1986).
of study and literature, and there is still room for vigorous debate and discussion about many aspects, both of the sixth book of the Aeneid specifically, and of the poem as a whole. Along with Connor, I too must confess that ‘I still have not made up my mind about the Aeneid.’ But this speaks directly to the relevance of, and interest in the text today, that it can still generate such fierce debate and discussion, both in scholarship and amongst students of Virgil.
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