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Puzzling indeed are the questions that confront the interpreter who permits himself a closer look at Vergil's list of so-called Etruscan heroes in the tenth Book of the Aeneid. As a matter of fact, hardly anywhere else in his epic does Vergil appear to be as evasive as in his account of these legendary allies of Aeneas. It is the aim of the present article, first, to state the most perplexing problems facing the reader here, and, secondly, to cast at least some light on them without, however, claiming to solve any.

The crucial question the interpreter has to grapple with obviously relates to the identity of these heroes. But other issues also present themselves when the passage is subjected to a closer examination. In the first place, what are we to gather from the order in which the names of these heroes are arranged? In the second, did Vergil invent their names himself or did he take them over from another source, and, if so, which source? Thirdly, why does Vergil present these very heroes as the allies of Aeneas?

Before elaborating on these questions, we should first consider the identities of the heroes. To this end, two points need be stressed right from the outset. In the first place, it appears that the names of these heroes to a very great extent are shrouded in mystery. Both ancient and modern scholars have drawn attention to the fact that most of them do not occur in the general tradition. In the second, it is also evident that they play a very insignificant role in the further narrative. That such is indeed the case, we shall now endeavour to show by a discussion of these heroes.

The first leader to follow Aeneas' ship is Massicus (166), whose name has puzzled ancient and modern scholars alike, especially since nowhere else in Latin or other antiquarian literature does it occur as a personal name. Moreover, no other ancient writer shares Vergil's opinion that one Massicus was a king of Clusium. Roman writers usually relate the name to a Campanian mountain celebrated for its fertility and choice wines. Nevertheless, an interesting view is put forward by Servius. Referring to Vergil's practice of attributing the names of rivers and mountains to Italian leaders, he maintains that Massicus is to be identified with mons Massicus, a view which has found support with some modern scholars—without justification, in our opinion. It is indeed doubtful just how far Servius may be considered a reliable source in matters of this nature. What is more, although Campania was once occupied by the Etruscans and mons Massicus is probably Etruscan, it certainly should not be taken for granted that Vergil intended to identify the king of Clusium with the famous mountain between Latium and Campania. Servius' view therefore appears to be as unlikely as his further identification in the same place, be it noted, of Massicus with
Osinius, whom Vergil elsewhere in Book 10 introduces as ‘rex Clusinis adventus Osinius oris’. 9

In view of these objections, the problem obviously remains and has to be solved along different lines, but how? Perhaps we can do no better than to assume that since a name had to be found for the leader of Clusium at the time of Aeneas’ arrival in Latium, and seeing that the name of Lars Porsenna who lives in the first years of the Roman Republic could not be used to this end, Vergil selected at random the name of the Campanian mountain without in any other way identifying or associating it with his hero, who notably does not figure again in the Aeneid.

However that may be, another question here presents itself: if we are to discard Servius’ identification of Massicus with Osinius, how is this apparent anomaly of two kings for Clusium to be explained? At least we need not blame this on Vergil as being a typical example of his inaccuracy in such matters. Perhaps we may best explain it by assuming, with Heyne and other scholars, 10 that Osinius was a king (Lars) of Clusium who, under the leadership of Massicus, commanded an Etruscan division.

The second Etruscan leader is ‘grim’ Abas (‘torvus Abas’, 170), whose name, contrary to that of Massicus, is well established by tradition. In fact, Greek mythology knows three different heroes of this name, 11 though they are not easily distinguished from one another. It should also be noted that in so far as these heroes are connected with one place, as king or founder, they are variously localized, for example in Phocis, Thessaly, Euboea and Argos.

In the Aeneid the name occurs four times: as a companion of Aeneas in 1,121, a Greek in 3,286, a warrior slain by Lausus in 10,427, and an Etruscan leader in the present passage. Scholars are agreed that the one falling victim to Lausus is to be identified with the Abas under discussion, 12 whom Vergil connects with Populonia and the island of Ilva (the modern Elba). This is indeed significant, particularly since no other antiquarian or mythological source links a hero of this name to Etruria, let alone Populonia or Ilva.

Perhaps it may be explained by assuming that Abas also figured as a Greek in whatever source Vergil may have consulted in compiling his catalogue. If this was indeed the case, Vergil probably quite typically ‘transposed’ this particular hero, as he did others, 13 from somewhere in Greece to Etrurian Populonia and the nearby Ilva. Abas, the ‘very knot and stay of the battle’ (‘pugnae nodumque moramque’), becomes Lauses’ first victim, his fall and the merciless massacre of his companions following upon his death being depicted most vividly. 14

Third in the series of Etruscan leaders is the fascinating Asilas (175), accompanied by a thousand men from Pisa (179) and apparently introduced here as a counterpart to Umbra in the catalogue of Italian heroes. 15 The name of this hero, it should be noted, is just as obscure as those of the two mentioned above, for nowhere else in antiquarian literature does a hero of this name appear. Occurring as it does only in the Aeneid, it is once used for a Rutulian and four times for the hero under discussion. 16
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Asilas resembles the said Umbra in that he too is a diviner (‘vates’), exceeding the latter in the variety of his magical abilities, however, which compare well with those attributed to the seer Helenus. What is more, in Asilas are united all the manifold arts which comprised the famous Etrusca disciplina, for not only is he ‘hominum divumque interpres’ (175) but also haruspex, astrologus, auspex and an expert in divination from lightning. In lines 175–77 Vergil explicitly states: ‘tertius ille hominum divumque interpres Asilas, cui pecudum fibrae, caeli cui sidera parent/ et linguae volucrum et praesagi fulminis ignes.’ Obviously Asilas is presented both as an authentic representative of Etruria, the very centre of soothsaying in antiquity, and as the most Etruscan of all these leaders. Characterized as ‘fortis’ in 12,127 and 550, Asilas displays his bravery, his name being connected with reputed heroes like Messapus, Mnestheus and Serestus.

Following Asilas is the fourth leader, Astyr (180), whose identity is likewise veiled in obscurity, for nowhere else in Latin antiquarian literature prior to Vergil does this warrior appear. The name would seem to suggest that Astyr was originally considered as the heros eponymus of the Astures, a Spanish tribe, and the name does indeed figure as such in Silius Italicus, though admittedly he could have borrowed it from Vergil. Moreover, the fact that Astyr in the passage under discussion figures as a horseman (‘equo fidens’, 181) resembling another horseman, Laurus, in the list of Italian heroes, may be further proof that he is indeed to be associated with the Astures, who were renowned for their horses. If we may therefore assume that Astyr also appeared as the heros eponymus of the Astures in the source supposedly consulted by Vergil for compiling this list, he is yet another example of a hero ‘transposed’ by Vergil from his original territory to another. Astyr, who, like Massicus, does not figure again in the Aeneid, is the leader of three hundred men (‘ter centum’, 182) representing the famous Caere, Pyrgi and Graviscae.

Serious if not insuperable problems are posed by the names of the next two heroes, the Ligurians Cunarus and Cupavo (186). The first of these problems concerns the transmission of the name of Cunarus by the various manuscripts. Generally speaking, commentators either opt for the reading Cinyre or Cunare. For example, while Wagner and others read Cinyre, both Sabbadini and Mynors, following Servius Danielis, have Cunare. If I were to make a choice, I would support the latter reading for two reasons. First, it may be argued that Cunarus renders a more agreeable alliteration with Cupavo, viz. Cu-Cu. Secondly, and this I consider decisive, Servius Danielis quotes the form Cunare maintaining that the name of the Ligurian hero was derived from the Picenian mountain Cunara, or Cunarus for that matter.

Perhaps Servius refers to the same mountain alluded to by the elder Pliny, who states of Ancona: ‘colonia Ancona adposita promunturio Cunero’. It should be noted, however, that Servius’ assertion with regard to the derivation of Cunarus from the said mountain in all probability rests upon a confusion between Cunara and Cunerum. Further, the variant reading of Cinyre is perhaps to be explained as due to the inability of a commentator to locate this name, which in fact does not
appear elsewhere. Connecting it with the Greek κινυρος, 'complaining', he probably considered it to correspond well with the sad lot of Cycnus, the father of Cunarus' companion Cupavo. Due to the conjectural nature of these arguments and lack of further evidence, we must finally admit our inability to establish with certainty where Vergil's supposed source obtained the name Cunarus.

As to the passage on Cupavo (186–97), two problems in the main confront us here. While the first involves Vergil's presentation of this hero as the son of Cycnus, the second relates to an interpretation of the dubious phrase, 'crimen, Amor, vestrum' (188). Dismissing the latter as beyond the scope of this article, we may have a look at the former. It is significant that of the ancient writers only Vergil presents one Cupavo as the son of Cycnus, alluding also to the well-known legend of Cycnus who, in grief for his beloved Phaethon, sang amidst poplars, once the latter's sisters, 'with music solacing his woeful love'.

Cycnus, on the other hand, figures as a Ligurian king in the Genealogiae, better known as the Fabulae, a mythological handbook generally attributed to Hyginus (second century AD), as well as in the works of other writers. What is more, the legend of Phaethon's death in Eridanos-Po dates back as far as Timaeus, so that the entire story appears to be pre-Vergilian.

Basing our view on these facts, we may perhaps explain the problem by assuming that both Cunarus and Cupavo figured in the source which Vergil is supposed to have consulted. To embellish his narrative, Vergil presents one of them, Cupavo, as the son of the Ligurian Cycnus, linking him at the same time with Cunarus to form another pair of heroes. Should this assumption prove plausible, we may perhaps conclude that the presentation of Cupavo as Cycnus' son is the only invention on Vergil's side. At any rate, Rehm's hypothesis that both these names are to be regarded as the poet's own invention appears to be unfounded on account of the fact that both names appear in alphabetical order on Vergil's list, which may imply that they occupied similar positions on the original list presumably consulted by him. Strangely enough, the two Ligurians do not figure again in the narrative, nor are any cities represented by them.

The last two heroes are the Mantuans, Ocnus and Aulestes (198–212), who, like Cunarus and Cupavo, figure as a pair. It is significant that Vergil not only presents Ocnus as the son of the prophetess Manto and the Tiber-god ('fatidicae Mantus et Tusci filius amnis', 199) but also as the founder of Mantua, to which he supposedly gave his mother's name ('qui muros matrisque dedit tibi, Mantua, nomen', 200). A masterpiece of Vergilian obscurity, this passage poses almost insoluble problems for the interpreter. What here strikes one immediately is the fact that no other ancient writer, as far as can be established, shares Vergil's view that Mantua should be regarded a derivative from Manto. But the issue becomes even more complicated when we consider that even in antiquity it was apparently a matter of controversy. In fact, while Servius derives Mantua from Mantus (the Etruscan name of Dis pater), Isidorus absurdly explains it: 'quod manes tuetur'. Moreover, modern scholars are also not agreed on this issue, so that there is no light from either side. Perhaps we may assume that Vergil,
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desperately in need of an etymology for Mantua, considered the name of Manto, legendary daughter of the Theban seer Tiresias, as most suitable to this end, or perhaps Page is closer to the truth with his suggestion that it was only used 'in order to give a legendary dignity to Mantua, Vergil's native city'.

Equally controversial is the supposed relationship between Ocnus and Manto, as well as the fact that Ocnus is presented as the founder of Mantua. No evidence whatsoever is to be found to this effect in the works of other ancient writers. On the contrary, Servius Danielis maintains that Ocnus was the son or brother of Aulestes, the legendary founder of Etruscan Perusa. To avoid a clash with Aulestes, Ocnus is said to have crossed the Apennines, eventually becoming the founder of Felsina, the Etruscan forerunner of Bononia (Bologna), while his army erected 'castella', amongst others Mantua. Basing their view on this account, some modern scholars are of the opinion that Ocnus is to be identified with Arnus or Aunus, who figures in the Punica of Silius Italicus. Due to notable differences in the transmission of this name by the manuscripts, such identification should not, however, be taken for granted. It has also been surmised by the same scholars that Ocnus and Aunus may be derivatives of one and the same name, for example Auncus, although the supporters of this view would appear to consider Auncus too readily as a real Etruscan name. Further discussion of the question as to whether Ocnus is in fact a derivative of Auncus may therefore be dismissed as mere speculation.

On the basis of Servius' account quoted above, it is apparently justifiable to assume that in the Latin antiquarian tradition presumably followed by Vergil, Ocnus did in fact figure as the founder of Felsina-Bononia, not of Mantua. If this was indeed the case, we may conclude that Ocnus is yet another example of a hero whom Vergil had 'transposed' from his city of origin to another, viz. from Felsina-Bononia to Mantua. However true this may be, it still does not explain the apparent inconsistency with the account in the ninth Eclogue to the effect that Bianor was the founder of Mantua, unless we are to accept Servius' suggestion that Ocnus is to be identified with Bianor. But it is also possible that while writing the passage on Ocnus, Vergil was no longer aware of the fact that in his ninth Eclogue he had presented Bianor as the founder of Mantua. Notably, Ocnus does not figure again in the Aeneid.

The list concludes with the second Mantuan, Aulestes (207–12), who, as we have noticed above, is presented by Servius Danielis as the father or brother of Ocnus. Significantly, Vergil alludes neither to this supposed relationship between Aulestes and Ocnus, nor to the former's place of origin. Nevertheless, the introduction of Aulestes, whose name may be derived from the Etruscan Aule, poses these questions, amongst others: Why is he associated with Mantua? What was Vergil's intention in relating him to Ocnus? Is he to be considered more important than Ocnus, perhaps the most important Etruscan leader?

It is indeed difficult to see why Vergil should associate Aulestes with Mantua simply because, as has been stated earlier, Servius Danielis maintains that he was
the founder of Perusia. Due to lack of further detail, we may perhaps surmise that Vergil in his manner also 'transposed' this hero from his original city to another locality, in this instance from Perusia to Mantua. Yet we should at the same time point out that Vergil does not explicitly state that Aulestes comes from Mantua. In fact, this can only be inferred from Aulestes' being listed immediately after Ocnus, and from the fact that no specific place of origin is mentioned in the passage dealing with this hero.

Just as dubious as his association with Mantua is Aulestes' relationship with Ocnus. Perhaps we may gather from this that Vergil was acquainted with the legend that they were related by ties of blood. A more probable explanation, however, is that he intended to conclude this catalogue in a manner similar to his introduction of the catalogue of Italian heroes in Book 7; in other words, with a pair of heroes who are related by ties of blood. Witness, for example, Mezentius and his son Lausus as the first heroes in the latter catalogue. This clearly underlines his importance, for not only is no other Etruscan leader here presented as a king, but it is also significant that Aulestes alone is vested with the power and authority of entering into an alliance. Of equal significance is the further fact that of the eight Etruscan leaders he alone is described as 'gravis', 'a man of weight', and that only his ship is 'enormous' ('immanis', 209) and forced on by a hundred oars ('centenaque arbore', 207).

From the above survey it is evident that the names of Aeneas' Etruscan allies, presumably representing heroes eponymi, city-founders and other legendary figures, are to a considerable extent veiled in obscurity. Some of them are only scantily accounted for in other Latin antiquarian and mythological literature, while others do not figure there at all. For example, whereas Abas, Astyr and Ocnus can be traced elsewhere, not a single reference to Asilas, Cunarus and Cupavo can be found except in the Aeneid. What we do know about Aulestes can only be inferred from comment on Ocnus, and Massicus is perhaps named after mons Massicus. The impression is therefore left that, with the exception of Massicus, the names of these heroes may have been borrowed from an existing list.

We accordingly now turn to two very closely related issues raised right at the outset, viz. the order in which the heroes are arranged, and the question as to whether they are the fruit of Vergil's own imagination or taken over from another source. To this end we now present the names in the order in which they appear in the catalogue: Massicus; Abas, Asilas, Astyr; Cunarus, Cupavo; Ocnus, Aulestes. It is immediately evident that, with the exception of Massicus and Aulestes, who
actually frame the others, these heroes, like the Italian heroes in the seventh Book, are arranged in alphabetical order. The fact that Massicus and Aulestes disturb this order perhaps indicates that Vergil considered them the most important of these leaders.

The question now to be answered is whether Vergil did in fact invent these names himself putting them in alphabetical order deliberately. Bearing in mind their obscurity and their relatively insignificant role in the further narrative, it still seems unlikely that Vergil either invented their names, as has been suggested, or that he intentionally put them in alphabetical order, or, for that matter, that their order is due to mere chance. A more feasible assumption, in my opinion, would be that he borrowed them from an existing list, where their names had already been arranged in alphabetical order. A list of this kind, perhaps one consisting of legendary city-founders (ktistai), might have formed part of the corpus of Varro, 'most learned of Romans', as Quintilian aptly styles him. That this famous Roman scholar, well versed in antiquarian mythological lore, had a special interest in alphabetical order is well illustrated by his reduced list of 21 comedies attributed to Plautus, and by other instances as well. But it is also a well established fact that Vergil drew extensively upon Varro, particularly for antiquarian and mythological matter. If Varro was in fact Vergil's primary source, I presume that he would have drawn upon his Antiquitates, and more specifically on that part of it which was entitled Res humanae.

Should these premises appear plausible, we may assume that Vergil, while making his choice, selected from the supposed list only those names which appealed to him as most suitable for his catalogue, attributing more than one city to some of these ktistai. This perhaps explains why specific leaders represent the peoples of several cities. In allocating the various cities to these leaders, Vergil possibly used his own discretion, deviating from his source whenever he wished. But it also appears that the prominence of the heroes was determined by the cities represented by them. Perhaps this is why Massicus and Aulestes, the leaders of the famous Clusium and Vergil's home town Mantua respectively, frame the six remaining heroes who presumably represent less renowned cities.

It now remains for us to consider our third question posed at the beginning, viz. Vergil's intention in presenting these heroes as Aeneas' allies. Here it should be noted that these leaders, representing altogether nine cities and thirty boat-loads of men ('ter denis navibus', 231), consist of four Etruscans, two Ligurians and two Mantuans. Now on this issue Vergilian scholars have speculated to some extent. Heinze, for example, postulates that Vergil, in order to ensure the credibility of his story about the victory of the few Trojans and Arcadians over the numerous and mighty Italians, had to present allies capable of equalling the latter in bravery.

Heinze's view, if applied to all these heroes, appears to be correct. However, one senses that there are also other considerations applying more specifically to the various groups of heroes. As to the Mantuans, there is no doubt that their
inclusion was decided by patriotic considerations; in other words, Vergil’s sole intention was to have people from his native place figure in the catalogue. Obviously the verses on these heroes (198–212) were primarily written as a eulogy on the environment of Mantua, Lake Benacus (Lago di Garda) and the Mincius. How vividly these areas must have seized upon the poet’s imagination in his earliest youth is evident from both the Eclogues and the Georgics. To vent his deepest feelings, he pays tribute to them and the people living there, bringing the catalogue to a magnificent climax and a beautiful end.

Scholars are not agreed on the inclusion of the Ligurians. While Heyne imputes it to the ability of the Ligurian race to adorn poetry and Cartault singles out the embellishment of the catalogue by the story about Cycnus and Phaethon, Catherine Saunders argues for the ancient origin of these peoples as a possible consideration. However attractive these views may appear to be, it remains doubtful whether artistic considerations as such were decisive to the inclusion of heroes in a troop catalogue like this. More probable, in my opinion, is that the Ligurians were included primarily on account of their bravery, which was proverbial and is attested to by Vergil himself.

It is evident that as far as the Etruscans and Ligurians in particular are concerned these views are based on mere hypothesis. But since conjectures of this kind lead us nowhere, the problem obviously remains. To my mind, however, it may be explained in a much simpler way. Perhaps Vergil argued that since both sides had to have strong allies, the people of Latium and further south were to be made allies of Turnus, whereas the Etruscans, Ligurians and Mantuans, the only people practically left, had to further the Trojan cause. If this view should prove acceptable, we would at least have a partial explanation for Vergil’s statement early in the seventh book that Italy in its entirety was involved in the war.

Let us conclude by adding some final observations in this regard. Whatever Vergil’s real intention might have been in presenting these peoples as Aeneas’ allies, it should be borne in mind that they all played a significant role in the political and cultural development of Rome. Notably the Etruscan civilization contributed largely towards Rome’s ultimate grandeur. But it should also be noted that the Etruscans are not presented as equal allies; rather as allies under the leadership of Aeneas, as had been decreed by destiny and the will of the gods. In fact, Vergil explicitly states: ‘... tum libera fati classem conscendit iussis gens Lydia divum/ externo commissa duci’. In other words, the subjugation of the Etruscans by the descendants of the Aeneadae many centuries later had already been proclaimed by fate in prehistoric times.

In conclusion, if this discussion has perhaps offered no solution to any of the numerous problems facing the interpreter of the passage in question, it has at least shown that they do exist. But it has also proved, I hope, that the saying ‘nomen est omen’, if applied to Vergil and more specifically to this passage, indeed bodes ill for the interpreter.
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35. Page 313 (on 10,199).
34. For the Ligurian bravery, cf. Diod. 5,39,1; Verg.
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22. Aen. 7,43-44: '... totamque sub arma coactam! Hesperiam' (the italics are mine).
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