

THE MAGNIFICENT FIFTEEN: VERGIL'S CATALOGUES OF THE LATIN AND ETRUSCAN FORCES

CHARLES F. SAYLOR

VERGIL'S catalogue of Latin forces in *Aeneid* 7. 647–817 has been amply commented upon. Yet one most important feature, which has significance for the character of Turnus and the Latins, has not received notice: a deliberate asymmetry in the size and form of the groups enumerated that is designed to express the individualism of the Latin chiefs, a magnificent if disorderly singularity culminating in Turnus and Camilla. This asymmetry is important for the whole epic because singularity of character in the larger scheme of things emerges as negative and undesirable, something to be subordinated to higher purposes. By asymmetry in the catalogue I do not mean its frequently noted variety in the kinds of heroes, their lesser and greater importance, home towns, dress, and weapons, nor the variety of language in their description, although variety in these things has not been related to its proper significance for the Latins.¹ Rather, I mean the unevenness of contingents in bulk, spacing, and order that is forced upon the reader as a general visual impression when the catalogue is scanned, an unevenness that seems particularly impressive when one inspects the number of lines between chiefs in the parade as if they represented true spatial intervals. Spacing of this kind, although a simple

device, is a significant technique of Vergil, as can be seen especially when the Latin catalogue is compared with that of the Etruscan allies in 10. 163–214. Indeed, a shortcoming of prior analyses of 7. 647–817 has been the neglect of the Etruscan catalogue. For when the two are compared, particularly in light of the technique of spacing, it is evident that they express significantly different characters in the two forces described, and that the full effect of either catalogue cannot be felt unless both are viewed together, as seems the case elsewhere in Vergil with two or more similar things. Finally, it appears that Vergil has left his signature in the catalogue of Book 10 by means of the technique, and has done so in a way that reflects his divided feelings about the struggle for Italy.

In general, the view presented here seeks to extend rather than oppose ideas found in earlier analyses of 7. 647–817. For the catalogue has magnetized the interest of many commentators, and each has contributed insights concerning its meaning, structure, and, especially, its variety. Thus, as regards the catalogue's integrity to Books 7–12, a consensus has grown among commentators that Vergil's intent was to give prominence to the Italians, since the poem is about Italy as much as Rome, expresses love of Italy, and is

1. Bibliography directly concerned with 7. 647–817 is R. Heinze, *Virgils epische Technik* (Leipzig, 1908), pp. 364–66, 401, 403, 440, 444; W. Warde Fowler, *Virgil's Gathering of the Clans* (Oxford, 1916), esp. pp. 42–43; A. M. Cook, "Vergil, *Aen.* VII. 641 ff.," *CR*, XXXIII (1919), 103–104; J. W. MacKail (ed.), *The Aeneid* (Oxford, 1930), pp. 286–87; B. Brotherton, "Vergil's Catalogue of the Latin Forces," *TAPA*, LXII (1931), 192–202; E. A. Hahn, "Vergil's Catalogue of the Latin Forces: A Reply to Professor Brotherton," *TAPA*,

LXIII (1932), lxii–lxiii; B. Rehm, "Das geographische Bild des alten Italien in Vergils *Aeneis*," *Philologus*, Suppl. XXIV (1932), 88–96; E. Fraenkel, "Some Aspects of *Aeneid* VII," *JRS*, XXXV (1945), 1–14; R. D. Williams, "The Function and Structure of Virgil's Catalogue in *Aen.* 7," *CQ*, N.S. XI (1961), 146–53. Unless otherwise noted, references are to the text of T. E. Page, *The Aeneid of Vergil, VII–XII* (London, 1900).

deeply concerned with the poignant giving over of native Italy to Roman civilizing influences.² As for the catalogue's order, structure, and technique, Vergil's sources for characters, his changes and discrepancies have been closely studied, and it seems that no exact geographical order can be perceived in the list as it stands.³ Variation was clearly a primary aim in the catalogue, and in this respect Vergil has been praised for surpassing Homer and Apollonius Rhodius.⁴ A major feature of the catalogue's organization, which has often been noted, is the placement of Mezentius and Lausus at the beginning, Turnus and Camilla at the end, so as to frame the less important members of the list by the more prominent ones. Mezentius' lead position is appropriate to his role as *contemptor deorum*, an arch-opposite to Aeneas, and Camilla comes at catalogue's end to give Book 7 a splendid diminuendo, since she appears as a symbol of lost grace and beauty at the conclusion of the martial display.⁵ The complete catalogue, it has been proposed but disallowed on various grounds, is alphabetical in order.⁶ Of more elaborate schemes, one proposes an almost fully concentric order determined by parallelism in the character of the troops and their roles in the subsequent combat, but this has been thought to require many exceptions and considerable stretching.⁷ Another scheme proposed but not fully

elaborated divides the catalogue into five groups according to importance and interest.⁸ Finally, there has been proposed a structure of three general parts, each shading off into the other, with first and last sections symmetrically balanced around a central panel which they enclose. On this view, the central section is made up of six contingents representing the real world of Italian warriors and places, while the outer frames consist of corresponding groups of three and three. Thus Catillus-Coras and Umbro, belonging in character to the world of magic and myth, form one frame about the central group; Aventinus and Virbius, figures of myth, a second; and outside of these, forming a third, larger, independent frame, are the two great warriors, Mezentius and Turnus. Camilla by herself forms a highly evocative pendant to the whole.⁹

Without attempting to maintain that the catalogue's structure has been satisfactorily settled in all respects by any one of the schemes proposed, we can take for granted that it displays a drive for variation, a feature consistently noted by commentators, whatever their views on organization. Even the proponent of the most elaborate scheme advises us that Vergil aimed at no absolute, but only general, symmetry "with piquant variations."¹⁰ It appears too that a similar variation has been practiced in the catalogue's spatial arrangement. That is,

2. Cf. Rehm, p. 89; Fraenkel, p. 8; Williams, pp. 147-48; Adam Parry, "The Two Voices of Virgil's *Aeneid*," in Steele Commager (ed.), *Virgil* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1966), pp. 107-108.

3. Macrobian *Sat.* 5. 15. 5; MacKail, pp. 286-87, following Warde Fowler; Rehm, pp. 86-88.

4. Heinze, pp. 364-65 and n. 2, 401, 440, 444; Rehm, p. 88; Fraenkel, p. 10, with a brief study of the variation of verbs in relative clauses; Williams, p. 150.

5. Heinze, pp. 440, 444; Warde Fowler, pp. 42-43, cf. pp. 34-35; MacKail, pp. 286-87; Fraenkel, p. 11 and n. 19, after Henry, *Aeneidea*, III, 361; Williams, pp. 150, 153, who sees Camilla within his own scheme as a character who ties together historical Italian bravery, the real world, and the mythical, pastoral world.

6. The scheme of Cook followed by MacKail, pp. 286-

87. Cf. the objections of Rehm, p. 92; Brotherton, p. 198 and n. 33; Williams, p. 150.

7. The scheme of Brotherton, who provides a survey of prior ideas on structure. See in opposition Hahn; Williams, p. 150.

8. Hahn's grouping is: Very Important, Mezentius and Lausus, Turnus and Camilla (2, 2); Unimportant, Aventinus through Caeculus (3); Fairly Important, Messapus (1); Unimportant and Least Interesting, middle of the catalogue, Clausus through Oebalus (3); Unimportant but More Interesting, Ufens through Virbius (3).

9. In Williams' scheme the last group of three differs from the first because with them we are led back to a "mood receptive of a different kind of imagination and emotion" (p. 152).

10. Williams, p. 150. On variation, cf. n. 4.

if we imagine 647–817 as a picture of a parade in which spatial intervals between participants are expressed by intervals between proper names punctuating the list (whether or not the contingents of the chiefs are described), we cannot fail to be impressed by the marked variation in spacing. Although it is most evident to the eye, the irregularity may have been audible as well, especially to an ear trained in listening to recitations. There is a general regularity of nine to eleven lines in many parts, but this is varied by lesser and greater intervals, so that spatial arrangement accords with the technique of general symmetry with piquant variation already suggested for the catalogue in other respects. Thus, the first two members, Mezentius and Lausus, come side by side in 648 and 649 respectively, and the placement is appropriate if Vergil wishes us to visualize them riding nearly side by side together. Now, after the intervening mention of the contingent led by Lausus and of the distance in character between father and son which contrasts with their close spatial conjunction, comes Aventinus (657) nine lines (648–56) behind.¹¹ The space between Aventinus and the next leaders, Catillus and Coras (672), is fifteen lines and since they are twins, for their sameness they are shown together in the same line, the only two so grouped in the catalogue. The next space, to Caeculus (681), is nine lines; ten intervene between him and the next leader, Messapus (691); and so on unevenly through the list to Turnus: sixteen from Messapus to Clausus (707), seventeen from Clausus to Halaesus (724), ten from Halaesus to Oebalus (734), eleven from Oebalus to Ufens (745), seven from Ufens to Umbro (752), and ten from Umbro to

Virbius (762). Here a large interval of twenty-one lines precedes Turnus (783), with an almost equal twenty lines to Camilla (803), and a space of fifteen lines to the catalogue's end. Viewed continuously, the raggedness of intervals in the parade is appreciable in the numerical series: 9, 15, 9, 10, 16, 17, 10, 11, 7, 10, 21, 20, and 15.

Having regarded the catalogue's form in this way as an expression of reality, let us further note that there is also an unevenness in the positioning of leaders within contingents. That is, suppose that a general visual impression of the mass, or body, of each contingent is given by the block of lines concerning them. In this case, the number of lines representing a contingent may be different from an interval, whose line count was made from name to name, except where a leader appears in the first line of a block. Thus, for instance, the block representing the contingent of Mezentius, Lausus, and troops will be 647–54 (*primus init* through *Mezentius esset*.) Scanning the catalogue in this way, we must consider where leaders appear in respect to contingents. The position of Messapus (691) represents what might be thought a normal order of marching. *Messapus* comes at the beginning (the first word in the first line except for *at*) of the block describing him and his contingent, and so conveys the visual impression of a chief riding at the head of his troops who trail behind as the rest of the description, in this case to 705. But Messapus is the exception that proves the rule, for the chiefs do not ride at the head of their contingents. In most cases Vergil manages to postpone leaders from first place with epic introductions, some referring to personal prowess, some to family,

11. The method of counting throughout is to begin with the line containing the first name and to go to the last line before the next name occurs. Alternately, however, only lines between those in which names occur might be included. So long as the

leaders' names remain the reference points, the precise method of counting chosen will give virtually the same irregularity of spacing.

others to home towns, but all as if individual glory were more important than a literally leading place in ranks. The space varies from chief to chief. Thus Mezentius and Lausus appear postponed from lead place in their contingent by one and a half and two and a half lines respectively. Aventinus is postponed by approximately two and a half lines, as are the twins, Catillus and Coras. Caeculus trails within the group he leads by three lines, or comes at the head of the fourth with enjambment from the third. Clausus is named one and a half lines into his group, and within his own line (707) his name comes in a phrase, *agmen agens Clausus*, whose very sequence makes playful reference to his order.¹² Halaesus is positioned much as Clausus, as are also Oebalus and Ufens, who are placed one line behind at the head of the second. Umbro next trails by almost three lines, while Virbius' position after him resumes the order of Oebalus and Ufens. The two last outstanding warriors, Turnus and Camilla, are both slightly postponed from leading place, each at the end of the first line of their descriptions. Yet Turnus in particular is the culminating instance of the catalogue's irregularity in this regard, the instance in which the loose, postponed order of the chiefs is magnified and summed up. For in orderly fashion where leaders lead, we might expect him to head the column, or, at least, along with Camilla, to share leading place with Mezentius.

Setting aside for a moment the significance of this disorder, let us see one parallel where the technique of spacing and its purpose are relatively self-evident, for Vergil's use is rare, virtually unique. Certainly, in Herodotus the epic catalogue

(7. 60–90) is used to convey the impression of physical mass, and through magnitude and elaboration it suggests the extravagance of *hybris* in the horde threatening to overwhelm Greece. Lucretius, it has been said, uses catalogues of proofs like ranks of a Roman legion in his didactic epic in order to overwhelm his readers more with the impression of mass and magnitude than with subtle appeal to intellect.¹³ But purposefully asymmetrical structure in an epic catalogue seems only to occur in Ovid, and there in a playful instance, the list of dogs in the episode of Actaeon (*Met.* 3. 206–25). The catalogue blends skillfully the sublime and the low: it lists sonorous Greek names replete with epithets and geographical origins in high epic style, but they are names of dogs, and they mean in most cases little more than “Spot,” “Blacky,” “Woody,” or “Shep.” The catalogue is capped with the poet's Homeric claim that time would not permit him to enumerate more. It is not possible to consider at any length the full effect of the catalogue in a context that is at once baroque, humorous, and grotesque. But the list provides a good example of arrangement that is as individual, random, and diverse as its members, and so conveys the visual impression of a pack of dogs in pursuit: two front runners; then a rush of some swifter than the rest in a stream that is irregular, yet roughly the same in bulk; next the main block or pack of dogs running together; and finally the group evening out into a string, again roughly the same in bulk, but becoming scattered to represent the tail. Thus the two lead dogs (*primi*), Melampus and Ichnobates, run in the first and second lines of the catalogue (206, 207), vying hard as they end

12. Cf., but with different word order for effect, Lucretius 4. 472, depicting a man standing on his head through “topsy-turvy hyperbaton,” noted by L. P. Wilkinson, *Golden Latin Artistry* (Cambridge, 1963), p. 65.

13. On the catalogue in Lucretius, cf. D. E. W. Wormell, “The Personal World of Lucretius,” in D. R. Dudley (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature: Lucretius* (London, 1965), p. 63.

and begin their respective lines. To render their lead visual, there is an interval of two lines (208–209) before mention of the next dog's name and the beginning of the string proper of the pack. The string is irregular with a regular inner bulk of two: three dogs (210), two (211), two (212), one (213), one (214), two with pups, or four (215), and one (216). Then comes the main block of five (217), trailed by lines that even out again into two (218), two (219), and three (220). Then there is an open space (221), as the stream of dogs becomes sporadic after the solid welter of the middle; this open space anticipates the catalogue's—and the pack's—end, three dogs (222), open ground again (223), and finally three more dogs (224) bringing up the rear. In this way, Ovid does not tell us the shape of the pack, but gives a picture of it in word groupings.¹⁴ Viewed continuously, its jagged shape is appreciable in the numerical series: 1, 1, 0, 0, 3, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2 (or 4), 1, 5, 2, 2, 3, 0, 3, 0, 3.

But if Ovid, perhaps learning from Vergil, can supply a lucid, less elaborate parallel for Vergil's technique, it is finally the *Aeneid* itself that must verify the significance of the technique in Book 7, i.e., that form and meaning are connected. The *Aeneid* itself must justify the contention that the technique is deliberate and purposeful, rather than random, and not merely *ekphrasis* for its own sake. Here it must be observed that Turnus and the Latins are heroes of a special kind in the context of the *Aeneid*, for in modern parlance they might be

called good-bad heroes rather than villains. Independent, proud, even noble, they go forth to fight for their native towns that appear so prominently in the catalogue. And, if beside the Trojans they seem too instinctive and uncivilized, too much in character with the unsettled state of Italy, it is also true that the other side has no clear claim on right, goodness, and heroism as Vergil clouds and renders ambiguous the claims of progress and civilization represented by Aeneas and the Trojans in the last phases of the epic.¹⁵ Now an essential, if not the primary, ingredient of this uncivilized Latin character is individualism, a proud, unyielding singularity in accord with which their heroism appears too personal, independent, and disorganized. It is the same quality that Vergil stresses in the Latin leaders, and especially Turnus, in order to render them heroes of the Homeric type, heroes virtually too independent and singular to survive progress and civilization in a world based on compromise and politics. Such individualism, it has been said, belongs to the monolithic, rarefied, and exclusive nature of an Achilles or Ajax rather than to the new kind of hero bound to group or national responsibilities, shackled by sense of duty toward a common good, and never free to follow personal impulses. Thus Vergil develops the former as foil for the latter.¹⁶ From this perspective, the catalogue's form becomes significant, effective, and essential to the characterization of the Latins. Since Turnus, Camilla, Mezentius,

14. That Ovid is capable of such stylistic workmanship is demonstrated by 11. 474–572, an extensive passage which expresses through word arrangement the motion of a stormy sea, as is shown by T. F. Brunner, "The Function of the Simile in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*," *CJ*, LXI (1966), 359–61.

15. On the character of Turnus and the Latins in regard to the Trojans, cf., e.g., Parry, pp. 107–23; V. Poeschl, *The Art of Vergil* (Ann Arbor, 1962), pp. 91–138, on Turnus; J. P. Poe, "Success and Failure in the Mission of Aeneas," *TAPA*, XCVI (1965), 321–36; W. R. Johnson, "Aeneas and the Ironies of *Pietas*," *CJ*, LX (1965), 360–64.

16. On the exclusive, individual kind of hero, cf. the essay

on Ajax by T. G. Rosenmeyer, *The Masks of Tragedy* (Austin, 1963), pp. 153–98; J. H. Finley, Jr., *Four Stages of Greek Thought* (Stanford and London, 1965), pp. 1–27, esp. p. 14. On the individual *vs.* the national hero with reference to Turnus and the Latins, Aeneas and the Trojans, cf. H. Steele Commager, in Steele Commager (ed.), *Virgil* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1966), esp. pp. 11 ff.; C. M. Bowra, "Some Characteristics of Secondary Epic," *ibid.*, pp. 58–61; Parry; Poeschl, pp. 34–60. On the use of the individual hero as foil, see L. A. MacKay, "Achilles as Model for Aeneas," *TAPA*, LXXXVIII (1957), 11–16, and "Hero and Theme in the *Aeneid*," *TAPA*, XCIV (1963), 157–66.

and the Latins generally are highly individual and independent, designed after heroes of the old type, it is precisely this character that the catalogue, as the important first impression of the massed chiefs, should and does convey. Vergil has designed it with the primary purpose of showing, rather than saying, that these are heroes as separate and independent from one another as their uneven, individual order of march, or their variegated equipment, or the rich variety of description: good-bad heroes not comfortable in uniform, not riding in neat, orderly ranks, not under one close command. Hence the special relevance of Ovid's catalogue as an example of evocation of the nature of its members through uneven form. The parade has been compared to cinema in other respects, and truly, to the reader familiar with the bands of good-bad heroes, the groups of fiercely individual warrior-specialists who go forth on impossible missions in countless films, it may explain the catalogue's form to say that Vergil's march of the magnificent fifteen here anticipates the uneven parade of all the Magnificent Sevens who ever rode on the modern screen.¹⁷ But the idea is amply stressed in the catalogue itself by its capping characters, Turnus and Camilla, who supply the last amplification, and confirmation, of its theme of individualism. Also with them, however, individualism takes on a decidedly dark, ominous aspect as the catalogue assumes through them its ethical viewpoint. It has been pointed out that the primary significance of the chimaera worn by Turnus, the catalogue's single most impressive symbol, is disorganization of character. Noble, courageous, but aligned with no final significant purpose,

Turnus is violently individualistic in his drives and hence disorganized, apolitical, and uncivilized in that sense. The same negative individualism—projected to the level of apathy for organized, normal existence and yet presented in softer, more sentimental terms—is the very essence of the catalogue's other capping character, Camilla.¹⁸ And yet it is wrong to suppose that Turnus and Camilla express Vergil's full, final judgment on individualism: as with so many other things in the *Aeneid* we are offered a dialogue rather than a verdict. For the whole catalogue forms a spectrum of individuality, from the relatively innocuous, positive singularity of those warriors whose motive for marching seems little more than wholesome love of homeland to the darker, more somber, and complex forms of individualism in such major characters as Turnus, Camilla, and Mezentius. As such, the catalogue resembles Aeschylus' muster of attacking heroes in the *Septem*, which, as one critic has maintained, represents through *ekphrasis* an array of very different individuals and their separate motives combining inexorably to produce war.¹⁹ Seen broadly as a spectrum of individualism, Vergil's catalogue is integral not only to Book 7 and the characterization of the Latins, but to the *maius opus* and the *Aeneid* at large. For the epic may be described as a sustained tension, manifest at all levels of meaning, between individualism in its multiple forms not aligned with any national or divine purpose and character that is so aligned. Thus, for instance, the tension is reflected in the opposition between wild, willful nature and that which is orderly and controlled in the storm of the epic's prelude, and it is reasserted in

17. Williams, p. 147, remarks on the highly selective eye of the poet as similar to cinema.

18. For the opinions regarding Turnus, Camilla, and the chimaera here, cf. S. G. P. Small, "The Arms of Turnus:

Aeneid 7. 783–92," *TAPA*, XC (1959), esp. 244–45, 248–49, and "Virgil, Dante, and Camilla," *CJ*, LIV (1959), 295–301.

19. Rosenmeyer, pp. 27–38.

Book 7 with the fury Allecto.²⁰ On the divine level, the tension is reflected in a narrowly motivated, self-assertive Juno and a Jupiter who is concerned with wide, universal designs.²¹ It is apparent in the *maius opus* not only between Aeneas and Turnus, but also among Aeneas' own soldiers, who sometimes lose sight of common, extra-individual goals and act out of dangerously personal motives. Nisus and Euryalus, linked with Camilla by virtue of their personal drives, are a case in point.²² The tension appears most consistently in Aeneas himself, in the constant necessity for him to choose between personal impulses and conforming to some higher, more remote plan. Ultimately then, the form of Turnus' column, although it is only a small detail in the whole epic, is integral and significant to the poem's thought because it helps to shape our impressions about those (and some would include Aeneas among them) who must lose in the fight for a settled, civilized Italy.²³

If the form of the Latin catalogue can be seen to acquire purpose and significance within the fabric of the epic's larger ideas, its function and meaning are also confirmed and complemented by comparison with the catalogue of the Etruscan allies in 10. 163–214. For, although no commentator has treated them as such, the two catalogues appear designed to be thought of in conjunction, so as to express the contrast-

ing character of those who follow Aeneas and those who follow Turnus.²⁴ The presumption elicited from the ideas already surveyed is that the catalogues will reinforce in form Latin singularity, personal color, diffusion, and disorder on the one hand and Etruscan single-mindedness, uniformity, regularity, and control under leadership of the Trojan Aeneas on the other. Yet we have already had more than a hint at a contrast between Trojan control and Latin disorder, because, prior to the catalogue of Book 7, we have been presented with a parade, and a martial array at that, of Trojan youth in the Troy Town equestrian exercise during the games of Book 5, games that have been thought to foreshadow the actual conflict in Italy.²⁵ Against the loose, uneven form of the Latin catalogue, with its independent heroes, the Trojan formations suggest discipline, precision, and teamwork. So does the catalogue of Book 10, in different fashion, it is true, but again with reference to 7. 647–817. In general, elements suggesting individualism, unevenness, or disorder are minimized. The list is composed of ships that appear to move in calm, disciplined order accentuated by evenness of spacing. In particular, when we focus on the spacing techniques of this catalogue, it is apparent that the ships are almost tediously aligned, with regular intervals.²⁶ Thus Massicus, the leader, has four lines (166–69); Abas next has five (170–74);

20. Poeschl, pp. 13–33.

21. W. S. Anderson, "Juno and Saturn in the *Aeneid*," *SPh*, LV (1958), 519–32; L. A. MacKay, "*Saturnia Juno*," *G and R*, 2nd Ser., III (1956), 59–60.

22. Cf. Small, *CJ*, LIV (1959), pp. 295–301; G. Duckworth, "The Significance of Nisus and Euryalus for *Aeneid* IX–XII," *AJP*, LXXXVIII (1967), 146 ff.

23. For the view that Aeneas' mission involves the destruction of his own individuality as well as that of the Latins, cf. Parry; MacKay, *TAPA*, XCIV (1963), 157–66.

24. Of critics noted, only Rehm, p. 88, takes any notice of the Etruscan catalogue and then only to remark that the variety of figureheads on the ships in the list is similar to the variety of weapons in the Latin catalogue.

25. On the *lusus Troiae* as foreshadowing, see M. C. J. Putnam, "Unity and Design in *Aeneid* V," *HSCP*, LXVI (1962), 206, 219–21.

26. The method of counting here is the same used for the Latin catalogue. It does not take us very far to observe that this list is bound to be more orderly than a parade of foot and horse because it is made up of ships. The essential point is rather that the choice of the naval array is fundamental to a higher, less matter-of-fact level of meaning. But in any case, Vergil was free to choose any kind of catalogue for the Etruscans, naval or otherwise, and, having chosen a naval list, he was under no constraint to construct it as he did.

Asilas following has five (175–79), or five and a half if we count to *solo* in 180; Astur five (180–84), or four and a half if 180 is divided between him and Asilas. Now the section headed by Cinyras and Cupavo (185–97) is largely concerned with Cupavo's parentage (187–93) and his ship (194–97), but if we visualize the whole section as representing spatial extension for two leaders, it gives each six and a half lines, or virtually the same space allotted each of the other leaders. The next block representing Ocnus and his group (nine lines, 198–206) does not admit of such treatment and is plainly an irregularity breaking the symmetry, but for a definite purpose to which we shall return. The last group, that of Aulestes, is an even six lines (207–12), and a tag of two lines (213–14) serves to conclude the entire catalogue. Viewed in this way, the grouping is markedly regular, with a maximum variation of only two and a half lines (from four to six and a half), in contrast to the extensive unevenness of the Latin catalogue—again, with the single exception of Ocnus. Seen continuously, the impression of uniformity is appreciable in the numerical series (without dividing into half lines): 4, 5, 5, 5, 6, 6, (9), 6. More than that, if we look back through the list to see the positions of the chiefs in their blocks, there is regular, or normal, placement in this respect, again in contrast to the Latin catalogue where leaders are postponed from lead place. Every chief here stands in the line that heads his group, except for Cinyras and Cupavo (and it is apostrophe that displaces them one line from lead place); three of the chiefs (Massicus, Abas, Aulestes) come within the first three words of the leading line in which they appear. Most dramatic is the contrast in position of the chief com-

manders in the two catalogues: Turnus is next to last; Aeneas stands at the very head of the Etruscans, presumably where the leader in normal order would be, in the block that precedes even Massicus (147).²⁷ The primary reason for Vergil's placement of the Etruscan leaders might be to convey the visual impression that they stand appropriately high at some commanding point in the ships. But Vergil's intent is probably no such precise realism with reference to ship's structure, but rather, as with the deliberately postponed positions of the Latin catalogue, only a general, abstract impression of the position of captains over contingents. In the same way, the regular spacing of the leaders of the contingents afloat is not meant as the exact spatial measure from ship to ship, but only as a general impression of regularity and discipline. In all, this catalogue, in its simplicity of structure and in its lack of highly individual and colorful elements, expresses a markedly controlled, linear quality in the Etruscans which reflects and amplifies the quality of leadership in their chief commander, Aeneas himself. It is the uniformity, control, and coordination under authority that will finally triumph over the tendencies displayed, through the form of the catalogue, in Turnus and his forces. Viewed in conjunction, the two catalogues give formal expression to the difference between the Latins and Latinus on the one hand, whose view of Italian civilization is essentially individualistic, lawless, anarchic, and thus disorderly, and the Etruscans and Evander on the other, who see the same civilization as originally politic, regulated by law, well governed and thus orderly. The two catalogues also suggest that the important distinction between the two kings and their

27. Aeneas appears in the second line of the leading block (142–62), or alternately at 159. Note the careful attention given to the positions of Aeneas and Pallas in 156–62.

peoples reflects the tension between Saturnian Juno and Jupiter, as has been well pointed out elsewhere.²⁸

What of the irregular section of Ocnus, the one group that breaks the line, as it were? As has been urged, the breaking of ongoing, epic regularity is peculiar, not to Aeneas and the Etruscans, but rather to the forces of opposition, who exemplify the gloriously personal and nostalgia at its passing. Indeed, it has been thought that even so small an irregularity as the half-line in 7. 760 describing the woods that mourn Umbro is a faltering of the steady epic voice, because it is like the personal elegiac line breaking back upon itself and hence appropriate to the Latin catalogue's irregular quality.²⁹ Strange to say, the irregular form of Ocnus' section is directly related to the same idea, and its significance is only apparent when the contents of the block are considered. Ocnus, like Vergil himself, is from Mantua, and triple anaphora of *Mantus*, *Mantua*, *Mantua* echoes through 199–201. Now, as Vergil has been seen to make laudatory reference to Ennius in the Latin catalogue, singling out Messapus and his men (698–702) as music-makers, so here it is commonly thought that he refers to himself through relationship to Ocnus.³⁰ If we were to eliminate these three lines with their declaration of *Mantus*, *Mantua* from the block of nine, it is interesting to note that the section

would then lose its essence of personal character and become neat and uniform, six lines corresponding to the rest of the column of allies. As it is, however, the block is not uniform; because of the three lines about Mantua (which resemble the proud, nostalgic assertions of geographical origins in the Latin list), it stands forth jagged and independent from the catalogue. Since, through relationship to Ocnus and Mantua, lines 198–206 are really Vergil's own group or representation within the catalogue, a certain impression suggests itself. Vergil appears in the regular, disciplined column of Aeneas and those given to the fight for a civilized, ordered Italy, but the asymmetrical configuration of his part belongs to the ragged, individual column of Turnus and those who march for the private, if sometimes disordered, state of Italy closer to personal will and separate, non-epic nature. Is this not true to the Vergil of divided sympathies, the Vergil revealed by studies of the ambiguous and sometimes disenchanted vision of Aeneas' Italy in Books 7–12?³¹ That is to say, the technique of the two catalogues taken together subtly acknowledges that in the larger sense Vergil counted himself among the followers of Roman order and destiny, but in sentiment and style he showed himself in sympathy with the Latins, among the magnificent fifteen.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

28. Anderson, *SPh*, LV (1958), 526–28.

29. Parry, pp. 107–109.

30. On Ennius in the Latin catalogue, see Williams, p. 151.

31. On the occasional elements of ambiguity and disenchantment, see Johnson (n. 15), Parry, and Poe (n. 15),

and further T. G. Rosenmeyer, "Vergil and Heroism: Aeneid XI," *CJ*, LV (1960), 159–64; R. A. Brooks, "Discolor Aura: Reflections on the Golden Bough," *AJP*, LXXIV (1953), 260–80; W. S. Anderson, *The Art of the Aeneid* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1969), pp. 87–100, 103–106.