

THE THEOPHANY OF APOLLO IN VERGIL, *AENEID* 9:
AUGUSTANISM AND SELF-REFLEXIVITY

Sergio Casali
University of Rome “Tor Vergata”

*This paper is dedicated
to the memory of Giorgio Brugnoli*

The ninth book of the *Aeneid* relates the siege of the Trojan camp during the absence of Aeneas, who leaves his son and the greater part of his army to seek an alliance with Evander’s Arcadians and with the Etruscans.¹ The first part of the book concerns the prodigy of the ships that are transformed into nymphs, and the night-sortie of Nisus and Euryalus. At line 503 there begins a large-scale attack on the Trojan camp, with a lengthy series of battles. At lines 590–663 we find the episode on which we will focus our attention. Vergil introduces Ascanius’ first intervention in war: he kills with an arrow Numanus Remulus, husband of Turnus’ younger sister. Remulus insults the Trojans as a soft and effeminate race, in contrast to the rough, vigorous people of Italy. Ascanius calls for the assistance of Jupiter, who answers with a thunderclap, and then he shoots an arrow, killing Numanus. From heaven Apollo expresses his admiration of Ascanius’ valor, and then descends to earth and warns the boy not to get involved in the combat again.

1. Apollo’s intervention as a staging of metanarrative

Apollo’s intervention in the narrative is divided into two distinct moments. In the first moment Apollo assists in the killing of Numanus and pronounces a soliloquy in which he approves of Ascanius’ deed. After this, he descends from heaven, assumes the appearance of the aged Butes, and addresses Ascanius directly. What Apollo says to Ascanius—that is, the second of his two speeches—constitutes the first problem of the episode. All by himself up in heaven, he spoke words of enthusiastic praise for Ascanius’ enterprise. Now he presents himself to Ascanius and says to him, “That’s enough, no more war for you” (9.652–56):

¹ I wish to thank the Delphic audience for many interesting reactions, especially Alessandro Barchiesi, Giovan Battista D’Alessio, John Miller, Nancy Felson, Kathryn Morgan, Richard Thomas. Thanks to Fabio Stok: my ideas about Ascanius’ destiny have been much influenced by conversations with him. Thanks also to Joe Farrell and Philip Hardie for stimulating criticism and valuable comments on this paper.

. . . atque his ardentem dictis adfatur Iulum:
 “sit satis, Aenide, telis impune Numanum
 oppetiisse tuis. primam hanc tibi magnus Apollo
 concedit laudem et paribus non inuidet armis;
 cetera parce, puer, bello.”

“Be satisfied, son of Aeneas, to have struck Numanus with your darts while remaining unscathed yourself: the great Apollo grants you this first boast, and does not grudge the first efforts of a warrior equal to himself; but from now on, boy, abstain from combat.”²

Here there is a powerful effect of surprise. When Apollo descends from heaven and assumes the appearance of Butes, the reader is referred unmistakably to a precise Homeric model: Apollo’s appearance to Ascanius in the guise of Butes, who was the squire of Anchises and was then named by Aeneas as the *comes* of Ascanius, is modeled on Apollo’s appearance to Aeneas in *Il.* 17.322–41. There Apollo appears to Aeneas “like in body to Periphas the herald, son of Epytus (Ἐπυτίδης), who was growing old as a herald in the service of his old father (Anchises), knowing friendly thoughts in his breast” and therefore he does exactly the opposite of what Apollo does to Ascanius in the *Aeneid*: he *incites* Aeneas to combat.³

² For perplexities about Apollo’s second intervention cf. e.g. Hardie 199: “Apollo’s second address to Ascanius is curious, setting limits to the boundlessness of the last words of his first address *nec te Troia capit*.”

³ Hardie 207, ad loc. We have already met a character named *Epytides* in 5.545–51: Aeneas calls Epytides, who is *custos* and *comes* of Ascanius, and instructs him to start the *lusus Troiae*. We might even think that the two characters (Epytides in *Aen.* 5 and Butes in *Aen.* 9) are the same person, namely one Butes son of Epytus and so brother of the Homeric Periphas (cf. dubiously Conington ad loc.). In any case, even if they are not the same person, they are interconnected by their common Homeric intertext. This association between the epiphany of Apollo and an intensely Trojan/Alban/Julian tradition such as the *lusus Troiae* is appropriate in the context of ethnic-cultural conflict of the Ascanius-Numanus episode (see below). For the connection of Epytides (in the context of the Alban *lusus Troiae*) with the fifth Alban king, Epytus, see Brugnoli 165–66, who also suggests an association between Epytides/Epytus and Atys (an alternative name for the fifth Alban king), the ancestor of the *gens Atia* and a participant in the *lusus Troiae* (5.568–69). This may be confirmed by the double occurrence of the word *alba* in the line immediately preceding the introduction of Atys, 5.565–67 *quem* (sc. *Priamum*) *Thracius albis / portat equus bicolor maculis, uestigia primi / alba pedis frontemque ostentans arduus albam*. This is not only a generic reference to Alba Longa (where Ascanius will transfer the *lusus*:

As an introduction to Apollo's appearance to Ascanius, Vergil's allusion to the Homeric episode in which Apollo incites Aeneas to battle creates the expectation that the god will spur Ascanius to action as well. Instead, what we have is an exhortation to have done with war. From Homeric instigator, Apollo is unexpectedly transformed into the god of moderation and of "know thyself." *Sit satis . . . , parce, puer, bello. Meden agan*, and a *puer* should not take risks in a war that does not concern him. Now, this is the last epiphany of Apollo in the *Aeneid*, and this Apollo who intervenes to counsel moderation and a "know thyself" that presents itself as an invitation to forget about war, greatly resembles the god's first epiphany in Vergil—that is, his Callimachean epiphany in *Eclogue* 6.3–5.⁴

Apollo's appearance in line 638 as *crinitus* had given a first clue in the direction of a divine intervention in "poetic" material.⁵ And Apollo's words to Ascanius (enough with war) are quite in keeping with his Callimachean role: just as he forbids the poet to write epic (*reges et proelia*), so he forbids Ascanius to take part in epic.⁶

The core of Apollo's message to Ascanius agrees, a bit disconcertingly, with the exhortation of Numanus Remulus himself: Apollo forbids Ascanius to

5.596–601), but a precise allusion to the *fourth* Alban king, namely *Alba*, immediately preceding Atys in the series of the Alban kings (cf. e.g. Liv. 1.3.8, Ov. *Met.* 14.612–13).

⁴ Verg. *Ecl.* 6.3–5 *cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthia aurem / uellit et admonuit: "pastorem, Tityre, pinguis / pascere oportet ouis, deductum dicere carmen"*; cf. Callim. *Aitia* fr. 1.21–24 Pf. and e.g. Prop. 3.3, Hor. *C.* 4.15.1–4 *Phoebus uolentem proelia me loqui / uictas et urbis increpuit lyra, / ne parua Tyrrhenum per aequor / uela darem*.

⁵ Cf. Miller 106: "Looking down from the cloud he is *crinitus* 'long-haired' (9.638), an attribute regularly associated with his gentle role as lyre-player (which is how he was represented at his Palatine temple," cf. Prop. 4.6.31–32, Tib. 2.5.2–8, Ov. *Am.* 1.1.11–12, *AA* 3.141–42. See esp. Propertius 4.6.31–22 (*warrior*, and *not* poetic, Apollo appearing to Augustus at Actium) *non ille attulerat crinis in colla solutos / aut testudineae carmen inerme lyrae*. Significantly, when Propertius closes his description of the battle of Actium, whose fulcrum was a speech (of incitement to fighting) of Apollo to Augustus, we have the trespass from warrior Actian Apollo to Callimachean Apollo through the statement that *bella satis cecini: citharam iam poscit Apollo / uictor et ad placidos exiit arma choros* (Prop. 4.6.69–70); cf. *Aen.* 9.654 *sit satis, Aenide* (Apollo's Callimachean exhortation).

⁶ The address to Ascanius as *puer* may recall Callimachus' characterization of the poet as *παῖς* (fr. 1.6 Pf.). Furthermore, Jupiter encourages Ascanius in martial deeds by thundering (631 *intonuit*): when Apollo forbids Ascanius to take part in martial action, he sets himself against Jupiter's "thundering" in quite a Callimachean way (Callim. fr. 1.20 βροιτᾶν οὐκ ἐμόν, ἀλλὰ Διός).

continue taking part in the epic narrative (which is an allegory of the poet deciding to exclude Ascanius from his poem); Numanus concluded his speech with an exhortation of strong metaliterary import: *sinite arma uiris et cedite ferro* (620), “leave weapons to men and renounce the blade”—but *sinite arma uiris* also suggests “abandon *Arma uirumque*,” which is to say, abandon the *Aeneid*.⁷ And “abandon *Arma uirumque*” is exactly what Apollo tells Ascanius to do.

The strong metapoetic suggestion contained in Apollo’s speech to Ascanius is not at all fortuitous. In reality, Apollo’s appearing to forbid the continuation of Ascanius’ epic career constitutes the staging of a vitally important narrative decision. The Callimachean Apollo who intervenes to advise the poet on choosing his poetic path is, naturally, a staging of the moment in which a poetic decision is made. The poet decides not to write epic, and the way in which this decision gets staged is by means of the epiphany and speech of Apollo. So in the *Aeneid* as well Apollo’s intervention to keep Ascanius from an epic career is a staging of Vergil’s decision to exclude Ascanius’s further participation in the epic plot of the *Aeneid*.

In fact, Ascanius is effectively excluded from that plot. Our episode is a rite of passage, but one that in reality leads nowhere. *Macte noua uirtute, puer* immediately peters out into *cetera parce, puer, bello*. This *uirtus* is illusory: Ascanius remains a *puer*.⁸ His epic career is over: he will reappear at 10.132–38, again as a *puer*, described in a soft, orientализing way, and then in Book 12 he will receive, again as a *puer*, the famous counsel of Aeneas, *disce, puer, uirtutem ex me . . .* (12.435–40): for Ascanius the *Aeneid* will end with *uirtus* as something that he must still learn.⁹

This exclusion of Ascanius could seem to us an event of no particular importance. Ascanius is a *puer* and, after his brief exploit against Numanus, he remains outside a war that he never really entered. But we feel this way because we are too familiar with the *Aeneid*. Apollo does not come down from heaven for nothing, and his appearance to Ascanius marks a narrative juncture that is essential to the plot of the *Aeneid*. For us it is normal that the war in Latium concludes with Aeneas killing Turnus. For the first reader of the *Aeneid* this

⁷ Hardie 197, ad loc.: “V.’s reader will take *sinite arma uiris* in the further sense of a command to leave the world of martial epic.”

⁸ In 9.310–13 was announced Ascanius’ attainment of virile maturity (*nec non et pulcher Iulus, / ante annos animumque gerens curamque uirilem, / multa patri mandata dabat portanda; sed aurae / omnia discerpunt et nubibus inrita donant*). But on Ascanius’ failure in his running of Nisus and Euryalus’ mission see Casali 2004.

⁹ On the problems of Ascanius’ “evolution” in the *Aeneid*, and on his problematic “virility” in association with the figure of Ganymede, cf. Bellandi, esp. 924–28 (with further bibliography).

outcome was not at all to be taken for granted. The conclusion that this reader would probably have expected was that Ascanius would put an end to the war in Latium, succeeding his father and, at the end, killing in single combat Mezentius, his last remaining Italian opponent. Specifically, this final death would be the result of an arrow shot from his bow.

The reconstruction of the pre-Vergilian legend of Aeneas' war in Latium is a complicated and difficult affair. But some fundamental elements of what must have been the canonical plot of the Trojans' wars in Latium can be established with certainty. The standard version of the war between the Trojans and Italians, which goes back to Cato's *Origines*, included three successive phases of combat: in the first war, Latinus died; in the second, Turnus died and Aeneas "disappeared"; in the third, decisive war, Ascanius and Mezentius remained to fight each other, and at the end Ascanius put an end to the story by killing Mezentius in a duel. (Or else, in another version, by concluding a peace with him.)

This is the general picture; the reality is rather more complex, and it is difficult to assign the different versions of the story to the various authorities involved.¹⁰ Let us say however that one can assume with reasonable certainty that:

(i) in Cato Ascanius resolved the war by killing Mezentius; it is impossible to say with certainty whether in Cato Ascanius killed Mezentius with an arrow.

(ii) Cato's account of Mezentius' death at the hands of Ascanius was included (and this is hardly surprising) in the story of Trojan origins propounded by a representative of the *gens Iulia*, namely, L. Julius Caesar.¹¹ Lucius Caesar, finding the information perhaps in Cato or another source, or perhaps making it up, specified that Mezentius' death was brought about by Ascanius using a bow and arrow.

(iii) The importance attributed to Ascanius' feat in the specifically Julian tradition about the Trojans in Latium was such that the very name of "Iulus" was bound up in it: Lucius Caesar explained the name *Iulus* as deriving from ἰοβόλος, *id est sagittandi peritus* (in the words of Servius Danielis), or rather "arrow

¹⁰ The Catonian story is mainly to be reconstructed from four contradictory and confused notes of Servius: cf. Serv. *Aen.* 1.267 (= Cato fr. 9 P.² = 9a Schr.), 4.620 (= fr. 10 P.² = 13a Schr.), 6.760 (= fr. 11 P.² = 11 Schr.), 9.742 (= fr. 9 n. P.² = fr. 10b Schr.). For the possible presence of alternative versions in Cato, see M. Barchiesi. Cf. also Hall 17. For a discussion of the difficult problem of the references to Cato's version of the war in Latium in the Servian commentary, see Stok 2004: 138–50.

¹¹ On L. Julius Caesar (one quotation in Serv. Dan. *Aen.* 1.267, nine in *OGR*), see Weinstock 17 n. 6.

shooter”;¹² or from ἰουλος (“first beard”), *a prima barbae lanugine* [*quam* ἰουλον *Graeci dicunt,*] *quae ei tempore uictoriae nascebatur* (in the words of Servius and Servius Danielis).¹³ The second etymology proposed for the name Iulus (from the Greek ἰουλος) was also associated with Ascanius’ slaying of Mezentius and motivated by it.

The version in which the end of the war between Trojans and Italians was sealed by a peace treaty signed between Ascanius and Mezentius is not likely to have been recorded either in Cato (if not, at most, as an alternative version),¹⁴ or in Lucius Caesar, in spite of the testimony of *OGR* 15.4.¹⁵ It must have been present in some other source, whose ideological intention is difficult to evaluate.¹⁶ In any case, Vergil alludes more than once in Book 10 to the peace treaty tradition he discards from his poem.¹⁷

¹² See Weinstock 9–10 and n. 6 (“ἰοβόλος was pronounced ‘iovolos’”).

¹³ The reference to L. Caesar, and the etymology from ἰοβόλος, appear only in Servius Danielis. In Servius’ note it is recorded only the etymology *a prima barbae lanugine* (without any mention of the corresponding Greek word), and the last reference to a source was that to Cato at the beginning of the scholium. This, however, does not seem, *pace* Richard, to be evidence enough to state that the etymology *a prima barbae lanugine* was already advanced by Cato.

¹⁴ Servius’ testimonies about the Catonian story (see above, n. 10) are absolutely in agreement on the point of Ascanius’ killing of Mezentius.

¹⁵ *OGR* 15.4 stands in contradiction with Serv. Dan. 1.267 *et occiso Mezentio Ascanium* [*sicut L. Caesar scribit*] *Iulum coeptum uocari, [uel quasi ἰοβόλον, id est sagittandi peritum]*. So, *pace* D’Anna 108, the reference to Lucius Caesar in *OGR* 15.4 is probably to be considered as erroneous; so also Richard 110–11, who thinks that the version of the peace treaty is to be credited to Aulus Postumius, *De aduentu Aeneae* (also quoted by *OGR* 15.4), and not to L. Caesar.

¹⁶ Philo-Julian, according to Bandiera 43. This is a view hard to accept, if it is true that L. Caesar maintained that the very name of Iulus derived from the glory of the killing of Mezentius. That version might have been philo-Etruscan in a general way, without having been necessarily connected to a Julian directly propagandistic intention (influence of Maecenas?), something possibly to be associated with Vergil’s decision to present the Etruscans in the *Aeneid* in a positive light (by separating the bad guy Mezentius from the whole of them).

¹⁷ For (unnoticed) allusions to the version of the story in which the war against Mezentius ended not by Mezentius’ killing but instead by a peace treaty signed between him and Ascanius, see esp. 10.846 *tantane me tenuit uiuendi, nate, uoluptas*, to be read self-reflexively as a comment by Mezentius on his own tradition: “such a great desire of living possessed me,” namely in the *other* versions of his story (e.g. DH 1.65); and 10.902 *nec tecum meus pepigit mihi foedera Lausus*, where Mezentius rejects these alternative versions. Notice also that in 7.652 Lausus is the leader of a surprisingly large contingent (*mille uiros*): “this reference to a large Etruscan contingent on the Italian side seems to be

The first reader of the *Aeneid*, then, expected Ascanius, and not Aeneas, to put an end to the war: in a poem as obviously pro-Julian as the *Aeneid*, this would have had to seem the most natural and predictable narrative option. Apollo's epiphany in Book 9 is the moment at which Vergil informs the reader that he has exercised a different option. Ascanius, the founder of the *gens Iulia*, gets shunted to the margins of the epic plot, his role as a warrior is dispensed with, and the one who intervenes to bring all this about is none other than Apollo himself.

What is at stake in the Numanus episode is the elimination of Ascanius' central role in the traditional outcome of the Trojans' war in Latium. This is confirmed by the entire construction of the scene. Apollo forbids Ascanius to pursue an epic career, but the scene as a whole constitutes a kind of degraded anticipation, or substitution, that does not in any way compensate for the glorious finale that could have, or should have fallen to Ascanius. The young man's deeds of valour against Numanus actually contain many allusions to the martial climax of the career that Apollo intervenes to prevent.

The very fact that Numanus' death occurs *in the absence of Aeneas* (who has gone in search of an alliance with the Arcadians and the Etruscans) alludes to the fact that in the traditional account Mezentius' death at Ascanius' hands also took place in Aeneas' absence—that is, after his death or assumption into heaven.¹⁸

2. Numanus' death as a "degraded" version of Mezentius' death; the name of "Iulus"

In the pre-Vergilian tradition, Mezentius was the Trojans' principal antagonist, more important than Turnus (who died during the second phase of the war), and was killed by Ascanius with a bow and arrow. This feat was so important that a well-established tradition made it the basis of Ascanius' receiving the all-important name Iulus. In the *Aeneid*, however, Ascanius shoots a character who is absolutely marginal, is never previously attested, and who lacks any sort of identity except as husband to Turnus' younger sister—herself otherwise unheard of.

In the *Aeneid*, of course, Ascanius appears right from the beginning with the double name Ascanius/Iulus. The decisive importance of the *name* of Aeneas' son is underlined by the fact that Vergil first mentions him in an etymological explanation of his name during Jupiter's prophecy to Venus at 1.267–68 *at puer Ascanius, cui nunc cognomen Iulo / additur (Iulus erat dum res stetit Ilia regno)* . . . There is something noteworthy here, a narrative decision on Vergil's part whose importance, to my knowledge, has never been realized. Until these words of

a survival from the other version" (Fordyce ad loc.), that according to which *all* the Etruscans, led by Mezentius, fought against the Trojans.

¹⁸ On this cf. Scarcia 879 n. 81.

Jupiter, for the first 266 lines of the poem, no mention has been made of the existence of a Trojan son of Aeneas. For the poem's first reader, this omission must have pervaded the narrative up to this point with an extraordinarily powerful element of suspense. There is no trace of a Trojan son of Aeneas in the poem, which is fair enough.¹⁹ But in the storm scene, in the scattering of the Trojan ships, and in the landing in Libya, Aeneas never shows any concern about his son, or any relief at having him safe at his side, and this fact is a narrative expedient that aims to keep the reader in a state of alert: for an Augustan poem it was fundamental that Aeneas reach Italy together with a Trojan son, and there were well-established traditions according to which the Trojan son of Aeneas (whose name varied, but was generally Ascanius) *did not* accompany his father on the voyage West.²⁰ The possibility of incorporating them into the Julian *Aeneid* would have been inconceivable. Vergil says nothing about Ascanius and so maintains an atmosphere of tension up until Jupiter's prophecy, when Jupiter reveals to the reader that a Trojan son of Aeneas does exist and that he is accompanying Aeneas on his voyage to Latium. Vergil is clearly toying with the concerns of his pro-Julian readership: this son is not only Trojan, but *very* Trojan, because he is called not only Ascanius, but now Iulus as well, and this name Iulus comes from Ilus, the (second) name of Ascanius as long as Ilium still stood. Jupiter's etymological explanation probably goes to the very heart of the whole propagandistic invention of the Trojan origins of the *gens Iulia*, which was perhaps based on nothing other than the similarity between the names Iulius and Ilium: on the basis of this similarity a Trojan Iulus, son of Aeneas, was created. The appearance of Aeneas' son, with his onomastic issues, as a character in the poem is in itself a piece of meta-propaganda: by which I mean, Jupiter's words are meaningless. Why, after all, when the kingdom of Ilium had fallen, would Ascanius' surname, Ilus, have to change into Iulus? What Jupiter is giving is not an explanation, but rather a quasi-scholarly commentary on the origin of the

¹⁹ But we should note that this absence is made worse by the association of *Lavinia* . . . *litorea* (1.2–3, obviously suggesting the name of Aeneas' *Italian* wife) with *genus* . . . *Latinum* (1.6), and with the Alban kings (*Albanique patres*), an association which raises since the beginning the issue of the non-Julian descentance of the Alban royal line. The designation of the Alban kings as *patres* brings up a sore point: they are the "fathers"—but of whom? of us the Romans? or of Augustus?

²⁰ Cf. e.g. Hellanicos *FGrHist* 4 F 31 = DH 1.47.5–6: after the fall of Troy, Ascanius, after a while, comes back to Troy, whereas only Aeneas goes West, and founds Rome with Odysseus (F 84 = DH 1.72.2; see Solmsen and Ampolo on this much debated issue; also Horsfall 1979: 376–83; Ambaglio 124). Cf. Gabba 94. In Naevius and Ennius, almost certainly, there was no Ascanius at all: Romulus was a grandson of Aeneas through his Trojan daughter; on this, see Casali 2007.

Julian family legend: the Iulii invent a progenitor named Iulus, and “with a certain amount of good will” (in Càssola’s words), this Iulus could be connected with Ilium.²¹ I doubt whether there would really be any propagandistic advantage in parsing the resemblance between Iulus and Ilus. It will be no accident that such an etymology is attested nowhere else (except at Appian, *BC* 2.68)²² and, especially, that it is not put forward by other exponents of the Julian, or pro-Julian tradition.

At any rate, Ascanius in the *Aeneid* is already Iulus right from the beginning. This does not remove the fact that Vergil alludes to the pro-Julian etymology of Iulus as ἰοβόλος in the scene of Numanus’ death. *Tum primum bello celerem intendisse sagittam / dicitur ante feras solitus terrere fugacis / Ascanius* (9.590–91) alludes to the etymology of *Iulus* from ἰοβόλος, “arrow shooter.”²³ It is not by chance that Apollo will insist on the use of the name Iulus *after* the bowshot: we have twice *adfatur Iulum* from Apollo’s point of view: Apollo “speaks to him who has now in fact rightly ‘become’ Iulus.”

But the effect of this appeal to the “honorific” etymology of the name Iulus is in reality to signal and to emphasize the degradation of Iulus: in Vergil’s poem, Ascanius does *not* become Iulus, *id est sagittandi peritus*, by personally killing a great antagonist with a decisive shot and so putting an end to the wars in Latium. He is an ἰοβόλος who is scaled-down, marginal, useless. *Intendisse sagittam* is a precise gloss of *Io-bolos*;²⁴ the first reader of the *Aeneid* was invited to read into the killing of Numanus a prefiguration of another fatal arrow-shot to come, that of Ascanius against Mezentius; but this suggestion will collapse just when Apollo *adfatur Iulum*, “speaks to Iulus”—to deny him that very shot that is to come.

The allusion to Iulus/Iobolos at 590–91 is intended to diminish Iulus, and not to exalt him. This is confirmed by a reference in the same verses to a previous allusion by Vergil to this etymology. This occurs the first time that Ascanius

²¹ Cf. e.g. F. Càssola, *EV* s.v. *Iulia gens* 60: “Numerose genti romane facevano risalire la propria genealogia fino all’età eroica, e in particolare vantavano progenitori troiani . . . I Giulii si trovavano in una situazione di vantaggio, perché il loro presunto capostipite, *Iulus*, poteva, con una certa dose di buona volontà, apparire simile a quello di *Ilus*, eroe eponimo di Ilio, antenato di Priamo e di Ettore.”

²² App. *BC* 2.68 (before Pharsalus): “He (Caesar) offered sacrifice at midnight and invoked Mars and his own ancestress Venus (for it was believed that from Aeneas and his son, Ilus, was descended the Julian race, with a slight change of name).”

²³ Cf. Richard 116 n. 30, D’Anna 111, Hardie 186. O’Hara 1996: 121–22 is sceptical about this.

²⁴ In Greek ἰοβόλος is used more frequently in the meaning of “poison shooter,” “poisonous” (said e.g. of poisoned arrows). I wonder whether this cannot be relevant for *Aen.* 1.688–90 ‘. . . *occultum inspires ignem fallasque ueneno.*’ / *paret Amor dictis carae genetricis, et alas / exiit et gressu gaudens incedit Iuli.* Is Vergil suggesting an etymology of *Iulus* from ἰοβόλος = “poisonous”?

launches an arrow in war, “though before he was accustomed to sow terror among *beasts* and put them to flight.” The reference is precise: the reader is referred to the previous scene in which Iulus appeared as Iobolos, namely, at the moment when he strikes Silvia’s stag—the cause that unleashes the war in Latium: 7.497–99 *Ascanius curuo derexit spicula cornu; / nec dextrae erranti deus afuit, actaque multo / perque uterum sonitu perque ilia uenit harundo*. In this case as well, *derexit spicula* glosses “Iulus.” The glorious gesture by which, in the pro-Julian tradition, the Iobolos put an end to the war in Latium, becomes an inglorious gesture with which the new, Virgilian Iobolos accidentally sets the very same war in motion.

Will we return later to the scene in which Ascanius shoots Silvia’s stag—which is analogous to the scene of Numanus even as an anticipatory staging of a future event in Ascanius’ traditional career. Right now I will just make a suggestion about the phrase *nec dextrae erranti deus afuit* (498): the expression is vague and ambiguous: who is the “god” who “did not abandon the hand of Ascanius so as to make him miss the mark”? “Allecto or not? Discussion continues . . . not always helpfully” (Horsfall ad loc.). The *deus* must be Allecto (says Servius), but evidently to call her *deus* means deliberately creating a problem (“At 505 *pestis* will of course refer to Allecto, unchallenged; here her agency is momentarily wreathed in sinister terminological indirection,” Horsfall). I believe that we can advance a hypothesis about Vergil’s use here of an expression that involves a masculine *deus* who guides Ascanius’ arrow infallibly to its mark. My hypothesis is that the philological tradition about the killing of Mezentius with an arrow by Iulus-Iobolos aimed at creating a parallelism with the killing of Achilles by Paris under the guidance of Apollo. It was Apollo the Julian god who guided Ascanius’ arrow.

This may be confirmed by the scene of the Sibyl’s prophecy in *Aen.* 6: Aeneas invokes Apollo as the god who has always had compassion for the Trojans, and in particular who in the aftermath of the *Iliad* directed Paris’ bowshot at Achilles (6.56–58):

Phoebe, grauis Troiae semper miserate labores,
Dardana qui Paridis *derexti tela* manusque
corpus in Aeacidae . . .

The Sibyl’s prophecy famously refers to an *alius Achilles* who awaits the Trojans in Latium (6.89–90):

alius Latio iam partus Achilles,
natus et ipse dea.

One might ask whether, for a reader familiar with the pre-Vergilian legend of the war in Latium, this ought not to mean that this second Achilles too (who will have been easier to imagine as Mezentius rather than Turnus) will not also be fated to be killed (perhaps by Iulus?) by a fateful arrow guided by Apollo. And this suggestion would be still stronger if in effect the killing of Mezentius at Ascanius' hands had been presented in the pro-Julian tradition as sponsored by Apollo.

If this was true, the intervention of Apollo after the killing of Numanus would be even more striking: not only the god *does not* guide Ascanius' arrow, but, when he intervenes, he intervenes just in order to *prevent* the narrative development that would have guided the plot towards the killing of Mezentius at Ascanius' hands with the help of Apollo himself.

3. Iulus and Jupiter

The killing of Numanus with an arrow is, then, a degraded anticipation of a future from which Ascanius is forever excluded by Apollo's intervention. Also the etymology of Iulus from Iobolos is evoked only to be degraded.²⁵ But these are not the only elements that make up the picture. Also the intervention of Jupiter constitutes another degraded substitution from Ascanius possible future epic career. Ascanius invokes Jupiter to assist him when he shoots at Numanus, and Jupiter responds with a thunderclap from the clear sky (9.630–31):

audiit et caeli genitor de parte serena
intonuit laeua.

Now, in the pro-Julian tradition concerning the Trojans' wars in Latium, Ascanius received the *augurium maximum* from Jupiter in the course of his war against Mezentius: Dion. Hal. 2.5.5 explains that the Romans considered signs on the left to be propitious: "Ascanius, son of Aeneas, in fact, at the time when he was being attacked and besieged by the Etruscans under Mezentius' command, and was girding himself to attempt a final sortie, was constrained by his predicament amidst lamentations to invoke Jupiter and the other gods so that they might give him favorable signs for the sortie, and they say that in fair weather there was a flash of lightning on the left. Since his attempt had an excellent outcome, they say that this sign continued to be regarded as propitious by his descendents."²⁶

²⁵ Also the other etymology of Iulus from ἰουλος, the "first beard" growing to Ascanius when he killed Mezentius, might be evoked by Apollo's words in his soliloquy: *macte noua uirtute puer . . .*, where *noua uirtus* might suggest the "first beard" as the first sign of Ascanius' virility.

²⁶ Cf. Harrison 1985: 161–62, Hardie 202.

The sortie to which Dionysius refers is the “final” one and its outcome is “excellent.” Therefore, it must be the sortie that ends with the last death of the war, namely, that of Mezentius. Therefore, it is evident that in the pro-Julian version of the end of the war in Latium, which was certainly subscribed to at least by Lucius Caesar, Jupiter’s thunderbolt introduced the episode of Mezentius’ death at the hands of Ascanius.²⁷ The thunderbolt in the clear sky that Jupiter sends to Ascanius in *Aeneid* 9, then, is a sign of divine approval that in reality deprives Ascanius of one that is infinitely more important—one that the pro-Julian tradition presented precisely as the originary aition of the *auguria maxima*. As a result of his prayer, Ascanius receives Jupiter’s thunderbolt, but he receives it *now*, and will not receive one later.

Jupiter’s intervention to ratify Ascanius’ shot at Numanus in all likelihood has further implications. There existed still a third etymological explanation of the name Iulus, attested in the *Origo Gentis Romanae* 15.5, which attributes it to (Lucius) Caesar and (improbably) Cato: Iulus from *Iovulus, “little Jupiter,” and thus Iolus, and thus Iulus (*OGR* 15.5): “Admiring Ascanius’ courage,²⁸ the Latins not only regard him as a descendent of Jupiter, but call him, first, Iolus, abbreviating the name and changing its form somewhat, and then Iulus: from him the Julian family was descended, as Caesar writes in his second book and Cato in the *Origines*.”²⁹ Several considerations can be based on this etymology: (i) first of all, it should be noted that this is the only one of our ancient etymologies with any chance of finding scientific confirmation;³⁰ (ii) one should also consider the possibility that this etymology is to be connected in some way with the notice concerning Jupiter’s thunderbolt during Ascanius’ final sortie as reported by Dion. Hal. 2.5.5; (iii) there is a definite link between this etymology and the mysterious figure of Vediovis, “the young Jupiter” (? Cf. *Ov. Fast.* 3.429–48; *Iuppiter est iuuenis*, 437), who was surely the most important god of the *gens*

²⁷ The details are partly hypothetical. It is theoretically possible that the final sortie to which the source of Dionysius refers introduced a victory leading to the signing of the peace treaty: but this seems improbable in the light of Dionysius’ narrative. In any case, this does not affect the substance of our argument.

²⁸ *ob insignem uirtutem* could refer to the signing of the peace treaty with Mezentius, which the author of the *OGR* has just narrated (15.4): but Richard 110 rightly maintains that *ob insignem uirtutem* is instead to be connected to the killing of Mezentius in a duel, and that the etymology from *Iovulus is to be associated with the duel version, and especially with the killing with the bow: see below.

²⁹ Brugnoli 189–90 suggests the possibility that this passage hints at a further etymology, possibly advanced by L. Caesar himself: *Iolus* (> *Iulus*) from an hypothetical *AscanIOLVS*, a diminutive of *Ascanius*.

³⁰ *Iulus* < **Iouilios*: cf. Walde–Hofmann 729, Pokorny 184.

Iulia during the most ancient period,³¹ and who is considered by some, according to his nature as a god of archery, to be the link between the *gens Iulia* and Apollo himself (which yields the possible analogy between ἰοβόλος *iouolos* ~ “Iovulus” (Veiovis) ~ Apollo).³²

Despite the impossibility of imposing order on the different traditions (and it is especially difficult to attribute them to their original sources), one can say this much with certainty. When Vergil represents Ascanius as invoking Jupiter before he shoots an arrow and after he has requested and obtained from Jupiter a favorable omen in the form of a thunderbolt in a clear sky, he is alluding to important elements of the pro-Julian legend concerning Ascanius: Ascanius the archer invokes Jupiter as Veiovis, the archer god who is the ancient protector of the *gens Iulia*, and a figure who tends to get confused with Apollo; the protection of Veiovis the archer was perhaps connected with the *augurium maximum* that accompanied Ascanius’ final sortie against Mezentius, and all this is associated with a further etymology of Iulus as “little Jupiter” and so Veiovis, which was connected, along with those of ἰοβόλος, “arrow shooter” and ἰουλος, “first beard,” to his victory over Mezentius.

Vergil, then, wastes all these Julian connections in an episode that is marginal to his drama, an episode that, through Apollo’s “Callimachean” intervention, seals Vergil’s decision to eliminate from his poem and even from any possible sequel that might follow the last line of the *Aeneid*, the possibility of rehearsing those heroic deeds that won for Ascanius the name of Iulus, and for his descendants the imperial eponym Iulius.

The fact that Ascanius’ bow is called “fateful” (631 *fatifer arcus*) at this point sounds merely ironic.³³ Hardie comments that “the word is first found in V., here and in 8.621 *fatiferumque ensem*, the sword that will kill Turnus at the end of the poem. Both weapons ‘bring death,’ but both also are ‘bearers of fate,’ instruments of the larger Trojan destiny.” The point, however, is that Aeneas’ sword really is a “bearer of fate,” since it is “the sword that will kill Turnus at the end of the poem”; Ascanius’ bow is the “bearer of fate” in the *other* version of the story—the one that Apollo’s intervention refuses to let happen. The suggestion

³¹ Fundamental Weinstock 8–12; see also Richard.

³² Pliny (*NH* 16.216) talks of the ancient statue of Veiovis, with arrows in his hands, and besides him the goat to which also Ovid refers (*Fast.* 3.443–44), as still existent in his times; as for identification of Veiovis with Apollo, cf. Gell. 5.12.11–12.

³³ *fatifer* is to be preferred to the variant *letifer* of P (cf. 10.169 *letifer arcus*). Perhaps, by creating the phrases *fatifer arcus* and *letifer arcus*, Vergil has in his mind the etymology of βίος in Heraclitus fr. 48 (*Etym. Magn.* s.v. βίος; Kirk 116–22) τῷ οὖν τόξῳ ὄνομα βίος, ἔργον δὲ θάνατος. It is worthwhile to remember that this passage is quoted by the Homeric scholia on *Il.* 1.49 (Kirk 116).

that Ascanius' bow is a false "bearer of fate" is underlined intertextually as well: on lines 622–23 *neruoque obuersus equino / contendit telum*: Servius Danielis cites Accius' *Philoctetes* (554–55 Warmington [= 545–46 R³]) *reciproca tendens neruo equino concita / tela*, "on which Wigodsky 89 comments 'only the bow of Philoctetes could conquer Troy, and Ascanius . . . wields a similar bow,' i.e. a bow whose wielder controls the fate of Troy, but now as preserver not destroyer" (Hardie 200). Again, this is true, but only in the *other* version. It is in the other version that Ascanius' bow puts an end to the war in Latium as Philoctetes' bow had ended the Trojan War.³⁴

All these suggestions must have been read by the first reader of the *Aeneid* as prefigurations of Ascanius' future deeds—until Apollo intervened to eliminate the possibility of these very deeds. From a premonition of future glory, the killing of Numanus becomes, thanks to Apollo's intervention, a kind of parody of glory that will never come. Apollo intervenes, and Ascanius' future changes—in a way that is decidedly less flattering to him.

At this point, we cannot avoid posing the question: why? Why does Apollo, who is the Augustan god *par excellence*, who is the incarnation of the Augustan spirit of the *Aeneid*, intervene to obstruct Ascanius? I will try to answer this question in the second half of the paper.

4. Apollo and Numanus

The question is whether Apollo has some particular reason for intervening to stop and scale-down Ascanius, and above all whether he has some particular reason for doing that *now*. In other words, has Ascanius done anything that Apollo does not like?

The course of events—killing of Numanus, Apollo's eulogy in Ascanius' honour, and then the unexpected epiphany of the god to stop Ascanius—has justifiably puzzled Vergil's readers. The traditional answer to the question "why Apollo stops Ascanius?" is that the god stops Ascanius because he wishes to protect him: "Ascanius is not yet ready, for he is *ardens* like Nisus (9.652 ~ 198) and unless stopped in his eagerness for battle, he is likely to become another youthful victim like Euryalus, Pallas, or Lausus. Apollo saves Ascanius for the destiny that awaits him" (Moskalew 149).³⁵ The problem is that actually Ascanius is not threatened with any narrative danger as far as regards his survival during the war in Latium. Nobody could get anxious about Ascanius' survival. On the contrary, I hope that by now the claim that "Apollo saves Ascanius for the destiny

³⁴ Originally the bow of Philoctetes was a gift of Apollo to Heracles. In Sophocles the bow of Philoctetes balances the bow of Paris who, with Apollo's help, had killed Achilles.

³⁵ See also Harrison 1981: 216.

that awaits him” cannot but sound unintentionally ironical to your ears, since what Apollo actually does is to *deprive* Ascanius of “the destiny that awaits him.”

More satisfactory is the reading by Lyne 200–206, since he catches the negative potential of Apollo’s intervention: according to Lyne, Apollo intervenes because he is troubled by the excessive war spiritedness he sees in Ascanius.³⁶ Lyne’s conclusion, however, following a very sharp reading of the episode, seems to be a little optimistic: “Ascanius, it is to be hoped, will be a more successful hero than Aeneas, greater than Aeneas in Aeneas’ role.” He needs more time to mature, but “There is hope. It is wise to keep him out of the war.”

I think that we are on the right track, but I believe that there could be a more precise reason for Apollo’s dissatisfaction with Ascanius. At this point, we have to take into consideration the third character involved into the episode, Numanus Remulus.

An Italian man makes a speech of Italo-centric and anti-oriental propaganda, and Ascanius replies by throwing an arrow into his head. I think that here there is something more than an excess in war ardour to trouble Apollo. First of all, we must remember that here Apollo does not intervene simply as the god of Delphic moderation and as the Callimachean god of poetic choices: Apollo intervenes as the Augustan Apollo, and more specifically as the Actian Apollo: as Hardie notes, lines 9.638–39 *aetheria tum forte plaga crinitus Apollo / desuper Ausonias acies urbemque uidebat . . .* refer the reader to Apollo’s appearance at Actium on the Shield of Aeneas: *Actius haec cernens arcum intendebat Apollo / desuper; omnis eo terrore Aegyptus et Indi, / omnis Arabs, omnes uertebant terga Sabaei* (8.703–705).

At Actium, Apollo *desuper* with his bow puts Antony’s oriental forces into flight. Obviously: as everyone knows, the fulcrum of all Actian propaganda was the mystifying representation of the war between Octavian and Antony as the clash between West and East, between healthy and vigorous Italy and Antony’s

³⁶ The most important points in Lyne’s discussion are: (i) the statement that “much of what the insulting Numanus says about the Italians would appear true and attractive to Italian ears, in other words, to Vergil’s Roman ears; at times indeed his speech echoes Vergil’s own enthusiasm for Italy and the Italians in the *Georgics*” (202); (ii) the acknowledgement of the contradiction between Apollo’s eulogy of Ascanius in his soliloquy and his following dissuasive intervention: “Apollo seems, perhaps, in two minds” (202). Hardie confronts this issue from multiple points of view; cf. especially 199: “Ascanius runs the same danger of excessive action that leads to the destruction of Nisus and Euryalus, of Pandarus and Bitias, and, eventually, of Turnus. No god had intervened to warn Nisus and Euryalus of the dangers of their martial enthusiasm . . . The Delphic precept of moderation prevents the adolescent Ascanius from going too far (as he had done in shooting Silvia’s stag at 7.475–510).” See also Miller 106–107.

effeminate Orientals, led by a woman. So, on the Shield of Aeneas we have Augustus who leads into battle the Italians (*Italos*, 8.678) contrasted with Antony's Orientals: *hinc ope barbarica uariisque Antonius armis, / uictor ab Aurorae populis et litore rubro, / Aegyptum uirisque Orientis et ultima secum / Bactra uehit, sequiturque (nefas) Aegyptia coniunx* (8.685–38).

At Actium, Augustus appears as completely purified from any oriental residue that he could have derived from his Trojan origins: a proudly Italian Augustus fights against weak and female Orientals, with Apollo the archer on his side. This at the end of Book 8. In the following book, more or less in the same collocation in the book, we find the same kind of propaganda based on ethnic-cultural stereotypes: West versus East, masculinity versus femininity, frugality versus luxury, bravery versus cowardice. But this time the typical Actian propaganda is handled by an enemy of the Trojans, Numanus.

The speech of Numanus has been analyzed many times. Around it scholars fight an interpretative battle. The problem is that this speech cannot but sound not only perfectly Roman (Serv. *ad Aen.* 9.600 *DVRVM A STIRPE GENVS Italiae disciplina et uita laudatur: quam et Cato in originibus et Varro in gente populi Romani commemorat*), but also quite “Augustan.”³⁷ Both aspects of Numanus' speech (the praises of archaic Italy and the polemic against Oriental looseness) are essential parts of Augustan and especially Actian propaganda: actually, the speech given by Augustus himself before the battle of Actium in the version of Cassius Dio (50.24–30) is one of the closest parallels I could quote for the speech of Numanus.

This gives rise to a rather strange situation, since in this case we have typically “Augustan” readers (Horsfall, Cairns) who find themselves forced to deny the potential Augustanism of Numanus' speech—because Numanus is killed by Aeneas' son, and his deed is approved by Apollo, the Augustan god *par excellence*. The “anti-Augustan” readers (Thomas, Lyne), on the contrary, are inclined to present Vergil as sympathetic with the character of Numanus. The division of the critical bibliography into two opposed camps (anti-Numanus and pro-Numanus)³⁸ is the unavoidable consequence of a deliberately problematic

³⁷ Cf. A. La Penna, *EV* s.v. *Mezenzio* 513: “Virgilio caratterizza la civiltà italica del tempo di Enea come primitiva, non come barbarica, e ne fa risaltare i caratteri positivi: semplicità, parsimonia, resistenza alle fatiche, coraggio (cf. specialmente il celebre discorso di Numano, 9.602–13), valori in gran parte ereditati dai Romani, e, secondo l'ideologia augustea, da restaurare.”

³⁸ Among the first ones, cf. Horsfall 1971 (and in *EV* s.v. *Numano Remulo*), Cairns 125–27; cf. also Winnington-Ingram, Dickie, and see Bettini, esp. 85–87. Among the second ones, cf. Thomas 93–107, esp. 98–100 (“it seems necessary to recognize in Numanus' speech a condemnation of the debilitating qualities which the Trojans are in the

passage. At the very least, an obvious effect of this scene is that the reader is obliged to ponder carefully on, and necessarily to deconstruct and demystify, the strategies of a propaganda based on ethnic stereotypes. Readers usually very well disposed towards Augustan discourse, and even not very keen on the word “propaganda” itself, find themselves forced to make a careful work of demystification of Numanus’ “propaganda,” so that they can show that his speech is only a disorderly mass of worn-out commonplaces and hackneyed ideas. After which, evidently, we can do the same with Actium—or can’t we?

I would like to underline only a point that seems to me significant in order to highlight the paradoxical nature of this scene as to its ideological implications. Numanus’ speech not only generically re-echoes the Italo-centric themes of the *Georgics*, and especially of the *laudes Italiae*. Numanus expressly “quotes” a line from the praises of rural life of the close of *Georgics* 2: 9.607 *at patiens operum paruoque adsueta iuuentus* “quotes” *Georg.* 2.472 *et patiens operum exiguoque adsueta iuuentus*. It is quite difficult for an Augustan reader of the *Aeneid* to find “wrong” even this claim of Numanus. That Vergil deliberately wants to give rise to this problem is clearly suggested by the words with which Ascanius asks for Jupiter’s help in order to kill Numanus. Ascanius’ reaction is ironically “georgic” (*Aen.* 9.625–29):

Iuppiter omnipotens, *audacibus adnue coeptis*.
ipse tibi ad tua templa *feram* sollemnia *dona*,
 et statuam ante aras aurata fronte *iuuencum*
 candentem pariterque caput cum matre ferentem,
 iam cornu petat et pedibus qui spargat harenam.

audacibus adnue coeptis even “quotes” the program of the *Georgics* (1.40), namely “Vergil’s prayer to Octavian to favour his poetic undertaking” (Hardie 201, ad 9.625), and “Ascanius’ words [in the following lines] echo the language used by Vergil of his poetic triumph in the proem of *Georgics* 3” (Hardie 201, ad 9.626). Ascanius quotes the *Georgics* just when he is about to get rid of a typical exponent of that Italic world that the *Georgics* intended to celebrate. The paradox is evident.

In the proem of *Georgics* 3, Vergil announces that on the rural banks of the Mantuan river Mincius he will erect a temple glorifying the achievements of Octavian—and his Trojan ancestors. We certainly feel that this is a delicate and potentially problematic question: an Italian leader but with oriental ancestors.

process of importing to Italy, which is to recognize the Latins as the defenders of a morally desirable (if doomed) cultural heritage,” 98), Lyne 202 (quoted above); cf. also Quint 24–26.

This contradiction must be neutralized. The Trojanness of Augustus must be englobed into his Italian character. This is the Augustan way of handling this issue.

Ascanius' is not the Augustan way. Ascanius reacts to Numanus' potentially Augustan and Actian speech by throwing an arrow into his head. In Heinze's words, Ascanius's deed is important "of course not for the outcome of the battle, but for the ideological direction of the whole poem: the ancestor of the Julii as the avenger of his own people" (Heinze 272 n. 60) As a matter of fact, the contraposition of Trojan and Italian ethnic nationalism could have indeed been a *possible* narrative development of "the ideological direction of the whole poem." Vergil points out in which direction the narrative could have gone under Ascanius's guide: in a dangerous direction.

The episode of Numanus and Ascanius is a staging of the contradiction between the Trojan and the Italian element in Augustan propaganda. An appropriately moderate, Apolline, way of confronting this contradiction cannot but be a compromise solution. The Trojan-oriental element must be neutralized, in order that the Actian propaganda can work. It is for this reason that Apollo intervenes to stop Ascanius. For the Apollo of the *Aeneid* the reaction of Ascanius is not good at all. Numanus must be englobed into the poem's ideology; he cannot be just bumped off. Ascanius' behaviour is not compatible with Actian ideology. This is why I think that the eulogy of Ascanius spoken by Apollo in heaven is actually to be read as *ironic*: "This is really a valorous deed (ironic): if you behave in such a way (that is, if you give vent to Trojan nationalism), you surely will not reach the stars. If the Julian race will be characterized as distinctively Trojan, how can all the future wars come to an end at Actium? If this is your policy, I should have left you at Troy (as it happened in other traditions)."³⁹

Apollo does not really approve the killing of Numanus. Apollo is the god who is more concerned with the "peaceful," "tranquil" fusion of the Trojan and

³⁹ Apollo's words have "something of oracular obscurity" (Conington ad loc.); see also Petrini 104. *Nec te Troia capit* is a key phrase, with multiple meanings (appropriately, in a speech of the oracular god): (i) in a metanarrative sense, Apollo underlines that in the Virgilian version of the myth, differently from, e.g., Hellanicus' version, Ascanius did not remain at Troy, but instead followed Aeneas in Italy. (ii) "Troy is not enough for you," echoing Philip to the young Alexander: "Macedonia cannot contain you" (Plut. *Alex.* 6.5; see Hardie ad loc.). Okay: but which Troy is Apollo talking about? "Troia" is also the name of the Trojan camp in Latium in the Catonian version of the legend (Cato *Orig.* fr. 4 P.² = 4 Schr.), and Ascanius at the moment is under siege in that very camp. Apollo's words may sound much less emphatic than they appear at first sight. (iii) "Troy (that is, your Trojan past) does not trap you," and this is clearly ironic, since Ascanius has just acted as the champion of Trojan ethnic pride.

the Italic element—appropriately, as the Actian god and the incarnation of the moderate and rational side of Augustan propaganda—a moderate and rational side that not always and not necessarily is the dominant one in the actual politics of Augustus. The conciliation of Trojans and Italians, and the problems that could rise from an overvaluation of the Trojan element, are a fixed idea, an obsession, of the Virgilian Apollo: at Actium he is destined to preside over a representation of a West-East clash, and he is rightly worried about the credibility of this manoeuvre.

In the *Aeneid* there are only two direct interventions of Apollo. The one we are considering is strictly connected to the first one, namely the prophecy of the “ancient mother” given by the god to the Trojans in Delos (3.94–98).⁴⁰ There Apollo is concerned with founding the myth of an Italian origin for the Trojan race.⁴¹ Apollo, the god of rationality and moderation, supports a propagandistic line which is conciliatory in an almost caricatural way: there cannot be any contradiction between Trojan-ness and Italian-ness in Augustus’ race, since we are told that the Trojans themselves are actually Italians. Significantly, the description of Italy, Dardanus’ ancient fatherland, in the prophecy of the Penates as a land *potens armis atque ubere glebae* (3.164), can be seen as “almost a synthesis of the *laudes* of *Georg.* 2” (M. Pavan, *EV* s.v. *Roma* 521)—that is, the same cultural context to which Numanus’ speech refers in *Aen.* 9.

Ascanius as avenger of Trojan ethnic nationalism against Italy cannot please Apollo. An Ascanius still “trapped in Troy” (*NEC te Troia capit*, to be read ironically),⁴² who reasons with bow and arrows, and seems to set out for a politics of frontal, ethnically based, contraposition with the Italian element which he should on the contrary see as his own ancestors, is not an Apollinian Ascanius. Probably Apollo at this moment is much more satisfied with Aeneas’ kinship diplomacy in Latium: in Book 7, with Latinus, Aeneas has wisely exploited Apollo’s invention of the Italian origin of Dardanus, and now he is using kinship diplomacy (but of course leaving appropriately aside the issue of Dardanus’ Italic

⁴⁰ Cf. Miller 105: “That this is the only other prophecy in the *Aeneid* besides the one at Delos that Apollo utters himself underscores the fact that Vergil has carefully designed the two scenes as counterparts”; cf. also Harrison 1981: 214–15.

⁴¹ See Buchheit 151–72.

⁴² In the episode of Nisus and Euryalus, Ascanius showed himself to be completely “trapped in Troy” (that is, both literally trapped in the “Troia” camp which is under siege, and trapped in a regressive Trojan past), by repeating without any overcomings Hector’s deeply wrong behavior in *Iliad* 10: see Casali 2004.

ancestry) with Evander and the Etruscans. This, and not Ascanius', is a Roman, and an Augustan, and an Apollinian, way of going into politics.⁴³

5. The dynastic destiny of Ascanius⁴⁴

The Trojan origin of the *gens Iulia* is a potentially risky claim. We have said that Augustus' Trojan-ness must be englobed in his Italian-ness, and that is the Augustan way of handling the issue. In fact we should say more precisely that this is the Augustan/Apolline way of handling the issue. Apollo, forestalling the poem's development towards an excessively Ascanio-centric direction, is also giving Augustus a good piece of advice: his Trojan-ness must be mitigated, not shown off.

Apollo is the representative, and the allegorical transposition, in the text of the *Aeneid*, of the rational and moderate inspiration of Augustan propaganda: *meden agan*. It seems that the main advice of Apollo as far as regards the solution of the difficulty inherent in the Julians' Trojan origin—that is, the “great idea” of the Italian origin of the Trojans themselves—has not been followed at all by Augustus: this Virgilian version of an Italian origin of Dardanus is completely ignored by the other Augustan sources, and does not leave any traces in the *princeps*' propaganda.

⁴³ We may wonder whether Apollo is really confident in Aeneas until the very end of the poem, or whether also Aeneas eventually disappoints the god. This doubt is raised by the last, disconcerting apparition of Apollo in the *Aeneid*, when the god refuses to heal the wounded Aeneas (12.405–406 *nihil auctor Apollo / subuenit*); on this problem see Miller 108–12. The abandonment of Aeneas by Apollo in the context of the duel with Turnus is particularly striking also because of the disquieting echo of *Iliad* 22.212–13 ῥέπε δ' Ἐκτορος αἰσιμον ἦμαρ, ὄχετο δ' εἰς Ἄϊδαο, λίπεν δέ εἰ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων. An element to be considered might be the ever-increasing identification of Aeneas with Achilles during *Aen.* 12. Apollo, who in the *Iliad* is the promoter of Patroclus' death, and the main enemy of Achilles (and in the sequel of the story will kill him through Paris' arrow), perhaps does not appreciate Aeneas' transformation into Achilles. After all, Apollo maintained his anti-Achillean stance in the Sibyl's prophecy. When he said that *alius Latio iam partus Achilles* (6.89), Apollo, for all his oracular capacity, did not foresee that eventually that Achilles would have been not Mezentius (killed by Paris-Ascanius), not even Turnus, but instead Aeneas himself. Apollo in the *Iliad* had healed *Hector* wounded; now he refuses to heal Aeneas-Achilles.

⁴⁴ On the negotiation of Ascanius' destiny in the *Aeneid*, cf. Stok, forthcoming. For a different reconstruction of the genealogical-ethnic relations of Trojans, Latins, Romans, and Iulii in the *Aeneid* see Bettini: according to him, Vergil in the *Aeneid* would make a distinction between the Romans (and the Iulii in particular) and the Latins: “i primi costituiscono una stirpe *pura e troiana*, che deriva direttamente da Enea tramite suo figlio Ascanio *Iulus*; i secondi costituiscono una stirpe mista” (Bettini 91).

The marginalization of Ascanius-Iulus in the epic plot of the *Aeneid* is another suggestion Apollo and Vergil give to Augustus, and not by chance scaling-down Ascanius means to correct the literally Julian tradition about Trojan origins, the one advanced by L. Julius Caesar, a real ancestor of Augustus.

Now, in the *Aeneid* the scaling-down of Iulus does not affect only his alienation from the epic plot. There is another aspect of Iulus' future that is at stake in the *Aeneid*. If Apollo's advice (and then the poet's decision) is that of scaling-down Ascanius as too regressively Trojan, and so a danger to the ethnic-cultural balance of the Augustan propaganda, this scaling-down should probably affect also the crucial issue of Ascanius' descendents, and so of the belonging of the Alban kings to the *gens Iulia*.

The problem was whether the Alban kings, from which, through Ilia, descended Romulus, were descendents of Ascanius-Iulus, or instead of the Italian son of Aeneas, Silvius Postumus, son of Aeneas and Lavinia.⁴⁵ Apart from the Catonian and pre-Julian version of the story—in which Ascanius died (probably) *sine liberis*, “without sons,” a version obviously devastating from the Julian point of view⁴⁶—there are two ways of confronting this issue.

There is a “light” version: Ascanius is the ancestor only of the *gens Iulia*, and the founder of Alba Longa, but he is not the ancestor of the Alban kings. The Alban kings are the descendents of Aeneas and of his Italian wife, Lavinia, through Aeneas' posthumous son Silvius (Postumus). In this case, the *gens Iulia* can be compensated for its exclusion from the royal Alban line through the attribution of a hereditary priesthood as a consolation prize.⁴⁷

And there is a “hard,” ultra-Julian, version, in which Ascanius is the ancestor of the Alban kings. According to this version, Silvius is generally a son of Ascanius. The *gens Iulia* appropriates the Alban royal line, Romulus included.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ On the difficult problems of the legend of the Alban kings fundamental are the *EV* entries by Giorgio Brugnoli, esp. *Albani, Re; Silvio Postumo; Silvia; Tirro*; and Brugnoli 1983. Very useful also F. Càssola, *EV* s.v. *Iulia gens*.

⁴⁶ See Brugnoli 188 n. 37.

⁴⁷ Cf. DH 1.70.4 (Silvius, son of Aeneas and Lavinia, becomes king after the death of Ascanius; there is a contrast between him and Iulus, a son of Ascanius, who also aspires to the succession; the people vote for Silvius as king: “upon Iulus was conferred, instead of the sovereignty, a certain sacred authority and honour preferable to the royal dignity both for security and ease of life, and this prerogative was enjoyed even to my day by his posterity, who were called Julii after him” [transl. Loeb]); Diod. Sic. 7.5.8; see Brugnoli 188–89 (also on Iulius Proculus, the witness to Romulus' apotheosis).

⁴⁸ Livy (1.3), quite maliciously, and in any case clearly showing how much this was a burning question, wonders whether the Ascanius who founded Alba, whom *Iulia gens auctorem nominis sui nuncupat*, was the son of Aeneas and Lavinia, or instead the son of Aeneas and Creusa. But then, in any case, he says that Silvius, the second king of Alba,

Both of these versions were entirely compatible with the Julian aspirations to genealogical prestige; both of them were potentially Augustan, but one was more Augustan than the other. The “light” version was not unbearable for the Julian honor (also from a dynastic point of view, Augustus still remains related to the Alban kings through Aeneas, even if not through Iulus); but nevertheless it presents some difficulties. It presents especially one weak point, which lays itself open to narrative criticism by the opponents of the Julians. This weak point is obviously the succession of Silvius Postumus to Ascanius: if Ascanius founds Alba, and is the first king of it, why Silvius, and not a son of Ascanius, comes to the Alban throne after him? What happens between Ascanius and Silvius? The episode of the wounding of Silvia’s stag by Ascanius in Book 7 is a narrative anticipation alluding to the tremendously embarrassing conflict between Ascanius and Silvius Postumus.⁴⁹

was the son of Ascanius (without specifying which one of the two): *Silvius deinde regnat, Ascanii filius, casu quondam in silvis natus* (1.3.6). Ovid (*Fast.* 4.19–60) inserts all the Alban kings in Augustus’ genealogy, and speaks of Silvius as the son of Iulus Ascanius (4.39–42); see Barchiesi 1994: 130–68, esp. 155–62. See also below, n. 56.

⁴⁹ A Silvia daughter of Tyrrhus is not attested elsewhere in the pre-Virgilian legend. In Diod. Sic. 7.5.9 Aeneas marries a Silvia ex-wife of King Latinus. The name Silvius is on the contrary extremely important regarding the descent from Aeneas. Silvius Postumus is associated with Tyrrhus in the legend: cf. Cato *Orig.* fr. 11 P.² (= Serv. *Aen.* 6.760): Lavinia, after Aeneas’ disappearance, fearing Ascanius’ *insidiae*, takes shelter, pregnant, *in silvas*, and hides herself in the house of *pastor* Tyrrhus; there she gives birth to Silvius Postumus (cf. also Serv. and Schol. Ver. *Aen.* 7.485). Similarly, in *OGR* 16, Lavinia *in silviam profugit*, and as a guest of Tyrrhus she gives birth to her son, *qui a loci qualitate Silvius est appellatus* (16.1; cf. *Aen.* 6.767 *educit silvis*, echoed in 7.491 *errabat silvis*, in the same metrical position: a reference to the etymology of Silvia *a silvis*, and also, more precisely, an allusion to the etymology of Silvius Postumus as explained in 6.765). *OGR* 16 relates various versions of the events: in one of them Tyrrhus himself later takes care of carrying Lavinia with her son back into the city, after Ascanius promised that he would not have harmed his stepbrother (*OGR* 16.5). It is not clear why Vergil gives such an important name as Silvia to a minor character such as the daughter of Tyrrhus. Brugnoli (*EV* s.v. *Silvia* 855) suggests that Vergil introduces the character of Silvia as a possible alternative to the embarrassing eponymy of the Silvii from Silvius Postumus (cf. also Brugnoli 1983: 175 n. 20). This is interesting, but we can see in the Silvia episode also a less conciliatory side. Ascanius, in *Aen.* 7, accidentally damages the family of Tyrrhus; in particular, he damages a character named *Silvia*: she nourishes a special affection for the deer, and she is the first to react to the offence by calling up the shepherds (7.503 *Silvia prima soror*). Silvius Postumus will be born in the woods, and he will be attended (as Silvia attends the deer?) and protected by Tyrrhus (in a sense, he could be seen as a kind of adoptive son of Tyrrhus), exactly in order to be saved from Ascanius’ hostility against him. Ascanius’ “hostility” to a Silvia daughter of Tyrrhus in the *Aeneid* is a transposition,

Vergil had in front of him these two versions: the Alban kings as descendents of Ascanius, and the Alban kings as descendents of Silvius Postumus.

As everyone knows, Vergil alludes to both of them. But not in the same way. Let's briefly review the relevant passages.

(i) In the Prophecy to Venus (1.267–88), Jupiter says that after 30 years from Aeneas' death, Ascanius will found Alba, transferring there the reign from Lavinium. "The race of Hector" will reign there for 300 years, until queen Ilia will bear Mars the twins. Then Romulus will found Rome, and the Romans will have power without end. The "house of Assaracus" will conquer Greece. Then, *nascetur pulchra Troianus origine Caesar . . . Iulius, a magno demissum nomen Iuli* (1.286–88).

Here Jupiter clearly suggests, even if without an explicit statement, that there is dynastic continuity between Iulus, Romulus, and *Troianus Caesar*. So, in Jupiter's view, the Alban kings are descendents of Iulus.⁵⁰

(ii) In Book 4 we have an interesting treatment of the issue when Jupiter sends Mercury to Aeneas at Carthage. In his talk to Mercury in 4.223–37, Jupiter, after having mentioned Ascanius, unmistakably refers to the "Ausonian offspring" of Aeneas: 4.236 *nec prolem Ausoniam et Lauinia respicit arua* suggests the "Silvian" descentence of Aeneas.⁵¹ *Prolem Ausoniam* in association

and an allusive anticipation, of the future hostility of Ascanius against Silvius, "son" of Tyrrhus, and son of Aeneas. The parallelism between the deer (and Silvia) and Silvius Postumus may sound confirmed if one compares 7.478 *insidiis* . . . *Iulus* (introducing the deer hunt; "*insidiae* . . . belong to the jargon of the hunter . . . even if their exact sense in a deer-hunt remains unclear," Horsfall ad loc.) with Cato, *Orig.* fr. 11 P.² *cuius* (sc. *Ascanii*) *Lauinia timens insidias, grauida confugit ad silvas et latuit in casa pastoris Tyrrhi*.

Moreover, we may see a special point in Vergil's choice of the name Numanus *Remulus* for Ascanius' enemy. The character of Numanus Remulus is connected by Vergil to the Capaneus-like figure of the Alban king Remulus (e.g. *OGR* 18.3): see Brugnoli 167–68. We may add that in this case there is a supplementary point in presenting Numanus Remulus as the enemy of Ascanius: this is another reference to the future hostility of Ascanius towards the royal Alban line descending not from him, but from Silvius Postumus.

⁵⁰ *gente sub Hectorea* refers to Ascanius, son of Creusa, sister of Hector (O'Hara 1990: 145 n. 43).

⁵¹ Pease ad loc.: "Serv.: *ut in sexto* (756–7) '*nunc age Dardaniam prolem quae deinde sequatur / gloria*'; cf. 10.429 *Arcadiae proles*. Elsewhere a proper adjective with *proles* denotes chiefly parentage rather than race; e.g. 4.258 . . . The attempt to identify *prolem* with a particular descendent of Aeneas, such as Aeneas Silvius [*sic*] (6.763–6) is unprofitable; the word refers rather to his race . . ." The opposite is clearly true; cf. Serv. Dan.: *uel quia de Lauinia Siluium habuit*. See also D'Anna 1957: 106–107.

with *Lavinia* . . . *arua* clearly points to Silvius Postumus (*arua* may suggest the metaphor of the woman as fertile land). This is the first appearance of Silvius Postumus in the poem.

It is highly significant how Mercury relates to Aeneas Jupiter's talk. Mercury completely censors every references to Lavinia and Aeneas' Ausonian offspring, and elaborates instead on the theme of Ascanius as "heir": *Ascanium surgentem et spes heredis Iuli / respice, cui regnum Italiae Romanaque tellus / debetur* (4.274–76). Mercury, addressing Aeneas, strategically wraps up a "censored" version of his future descendance. Clearly, the version according to which Silvius Postumus, and not Ascanius, will be the heir to Aeneas' reign is not the best version to offer Aeneas at this moment. The most welcome version is the one according to which Ascanius will be the heir to the Italian and Roman reign, and line 274 aptly distinguishes between the present, growing "Ascanius" and the future "Iulus": there will be a progression from Ascanius to Iulus, the founder of the *gens Iulia*. Whereas Jupiter, in his "private" talk to Mercury, follows the "light" version of Aeneas' descendents (Silvius Postumus), Mercury, when he addresses Aeneas, chooses the ultra-Julian version. Addressing Aeneas is like addressing Augustus: both of them are the recipients of the "hard" version of Ascanius' dynastic destiny. *Spes* is the key word: there is a "hope" that Iulus will be the heir, but not a certainty, and we know that in fact there is a strong risk that Iulus will *not* be the heir to Aeneas' royal power. *Spes Iuli* is at the same time Iulus' hope to become Aeneas' heir, and Aeneas' hope to have Iulus as his own heir, and Augustus' hope to have Iulus as a royal ancestor.

(iii) In 5.596–601 there is the only direct statement on the narrator's part: Ascanius will found Alba Longa; there is no reference to his possible descendance.

(iv) In the Parade of the Heroes in *Aen.* 6, Anchises presents to Aeneas Silvius Postumus, who is destined to be his son from Lavinia, and the ancestor of the Alban kings. There is no possibility for Ascanius to be the ancestor of the Alban kings; the Alban kings are descendents of Aeneas, but they are not Iulii (6.760–66; cf. 789–90 *hic Caesar et omnis Iuli / progeniem*: Iulus is the ancestor of the *gens Iulia*, but not of the Alban kings).

(v) In 8.47–48, in his prophecy, Tiberinus confirms that after 30 years Ascanius will found Alba. Here too there is no reference to his descendents.

(vi) In 8.628–29 the narrator says that on the Shield of Aeneas there is the depiction of *genus omne futurae / stirpis ab Ascanio*. There follows the description of the she-wolf with the Twins: this can possibly be a suggestion that Romulus and Remus are descendents of Ascanius.

The next passage referring to Ascanius' descendents is in Apollo's soliloquy in heaven after the killing of Numanus: Apollo addresses Ascanius as *dis genite et geniture deos* (9.642), "one sired by gods and destined to sire gods," that is Julius

Caesar and Augustus. O'Hara rightly notices that this phrasing implies that, in Apollo's view, Ascanius is destined to sire gods—and *not kings*. Line 9.642 is connected to the line in which Anchises describes Silvius Postumus in 6.765, *regem regumque parentem*: “The polyptoton in each passage—*regem regum; dis . . . deos*; and *genite . . . geniture*—is striking, and helps to link them. Silvius will be king, and father of the line of Alban kings, while Ascanius is born from gods and will have divine descendents (e.g., Julius). But Ascanius' blood will not be in the line of Alban kings.”⁵² When Apollo says the Ascanius is “destined to generate *gods*” the apparent eulogy is undermined by the negative side of this statement: “destined to generate *gods*,” *and not kings*.

This is perfectly in keeping with what we have said about Apollo's attitude towards Ascanius' future in the Numanus episode. Apollo scales down the Julian pretensions to an Ascanius-Iulus protagonist of the war in Latium (the Iobolus-Iovulus killer of Mezentius), and at the same time he takes side with discretion also as far as regards the other Julian pretension, the claim to insert Iulus as ancestor of the line of Alban kings.

Now the important fact to notice is that this “light” version of the Julian genealogy is eventually the winning one in the *Aeneid*. It is commonly said that Vergil does not choose between the two versions.⁵³ In fact, Vergil alludes to both the versions, the hard and the light one, but eventually does take his choice, even if in an implicit way, in the scene of the reconciliation of Juno in *Aeneid* 12.

Juno declares to Jupiter her decision to give up fighting. She only pleads that the Trojans alter nothing of her Latins' *mores*, not name or dress or nationality or language. The goddess is resigned to accept the Alban kings (826 *sint Albani per saecula reges*) and the future power of Rome; she only asks that the new people do not bear the name of Trojans. Jupiter agrees with these words (12.834–40):

sermonem Ausonii patrium moresque tenebunt,
utque est nomen erit; commixti corpore tantum
subsident Teucri. morem ritusque sacrorum
adiciam faciamque omnis uno ore Latinos.

⁵² O'Hara 1990: 146–47. See also D'Anna 1957: 106: “[Silvius Postumus] non è presente nel poema [apart from *Aen.* 6] e l'attenzione di Virgilio si concentra su Ascanio, ma senza però assegnargli le prerogative di Silvio, ché, se il *geniture deos* si adatterebbe bene all'antenato Romolo-Quirino, esso può adattarsi forse anche meglio al progenitore della *gens Iulia*, di cui aveva fatto parte il *diuus Iulius*, mentre dello stesso Augusto non era difficile prevedere la divinizzazione.”

⁵³ See for example Horsfall 1991: 97: “I re di Alba sono discendenti, secondo Virgilio, o di Enea e Creusa (1.267ss.) o di Enea e Lavinia (6.760ss.) . . . Virgilio non si sente costretto a scegliere e non sceglie.”

hinc genus Ausonio mixtum quod sanguine surget,
supra homines, supra ire deos pietate uidebis,
nec gens ulla tuos aeque celebrabit honores.

Jupiter's speech, which definitely decides the future of the Trojan and Italian races, states also, by way of intratextuality, his final decision as far as regards Aeneas' descendance and Ascanius' dynastic destiny. When Jupiter speaks of the race destined to be born from the mixing of Trojans and Italians, he re-uses the very expressions Anchises had used in the Underworld to introduce Silvius Postumus to Aeneas: *commixti corpore tantum* (12.835) and *hinc genus Ausonio mixtum quod sanguine surget* (12.838) unmistakably echo 6.762–63:

. . . Italo *commixtus sanguine surget*,
Siluius, Albanum nomen, tua postuma proles.

As in the case of the war plot, also in the case of Ascanius' dynastic future Vergil accepts the Apolline solution—which is hardly surprising, since Apollo is a transposition of the poet's choices, both poetical and political. The Apolline solution suggests a scaling-down of Trojan Ascanius on all fronts. There was an “immoderate” Julian propagandistic stance, and there was a “moderate” one. Claiming Iulus as the ancestor of the Alban kings, and so claiming the Alban kings and Romulus as members of the *gens Iulia*, was an “immoderate” move. Apollo does not approve it.⁵⁴

⁵⁴ Interestingly, a special interest of a Callimachean Apollo in the poetic treatment of the Alban kings is present also in Propertius 3.3. When Apollo intervenes to stop Propertius' epic pretensions, the poet is just about to write a poem on the Alban kings (Prop. 3.3.3 *reges, Alba, tuos et regum facta tuorum*...). To write a poem on the Alban kings implies confronting immediately the issue of Ascanius-Iulus and of the origin of the *gens Iulia*. It is an extremely risky business. Apollo's intervention is quite apt: Propertius was looking for trouble. All the more so if the reader is meant to notice an echo of *Aen.* 6.765 *regem regumque parentem*, about *Siluius Postumus*, in Prop. 3.3.3 *reges . . . et regum facta tuorum*. And there is also another disquieting element in Propertius' decision to write a poem about the Alban kings: he declares that, looking for inspiration, he was about to drink from the same spring from which Ennius drank (3.3.5–6). An Ennian spring is a very dangerous source of inspiration for an Augustan poem on the Alban kings, since in Ennius' *Annales* there was *no mention at all* of the Alban kings' 300 years of reign. In Ennius' version of the legend, Romulus was Aeneas' grandson, the son of Mars and Ilia, in her turn Aeneas' daughter from the Italian princess daughter of the king of Alba. In Ennius there was no Alban royal dynasty between Aeneas and Romulus, and above all there was no Ascanius-Iulus as the ancestor of the *gens Iulia*. If you want to write an Augustan poem about the Alban kings there is no choice worse than Ennius as a

In this case too, however, as for the Italian origin of Dardanus, it seems that the Apolline advice has not been fully accepted by Augustus. We have circumstantial evidence that the version of Ascanius' descendance most welcome to the *gens Iulia*, and to Augustus, was the "hard" one, that according to which Ascanius was the ancestor of the Alban kings.⁵⁵

Apollo is not simply the Augustan god of the *Aeneid*: he is the god of a particular kind of Augustan discourse, moderate and conciliatory. What Vergil suggests is that, like his ancestor Ascanius, not even Augustus has always been up to his Apollo.

source of inspiration: Apollo's prohibition to a would-be epic poet has never been more timely than in Propertius 3.3. We have an interesting adnotation in Serv. *Ecl.* 6.3 *CVM CANEREM REGES ET PROELIA cum canere uellem. et significat aut Aeneidem aut gesta regum Albanorum, quae coepta omisit nominum asperitate deterritus*. This is surely an autoschediasm (cf. Brugnoli 163); still, it is interesting to note that also in the scholastic imagination Callimachean Apollo tends to be especially interested in interfering in the Alban kings issue. Servius' autoschediasm may be influenced by Prop. 3.3; on the other hand, Propertius himself may possibly be constructing his own idea of singing about the Alban kings as an interpretation of Vergil's *cum canerem reges* as referring to the Alban kings.

⁵⁵ (i) Already Julius Caesar wore the purple *calcei* of the ancient Alban kings, "since he was a relative of them through Iulus" (Cass. Dio 43.43.2); (ii) in the Hall of Fame of the Forum Augustum, dedicated in 2 BC, amongst "the ancestors of the noble Julian line" (Ov. *Fast.* 5.564), there were the Alban kings with their *elogia*. There is no doubt that the Alban kings stood there as members of the *gens Iulia*. It could have been theoretically possible that the kinship dates back to Aeneas, and not to Iulus, but the *elogium* of Aeneas Silvius calls him either "son of Iulus" (Degrassi: [*Aeneas*] *Sil[uius] / Iuli] f. / [Aeneae ne]pos / regnauit a]nn. XXXI*), or "grandson of Iulus" (see recently Spannagel 267–87: [*Iuli ne]pos*). (iii) Under Tiberius, at the funerals of Drusus Caesar, amongst the *imagines* of his ancestors there are *gentis Iuliae Aeneas omnesque Albanorum reges et conditor urbis Romulus* (Tac. *Ann.* 4.9.2). (iv) Strabo himself, for all he thinks that in fact Aeneas and the Aeneads did not move from Asia (13.1.53, p. 608), relates that the Alban kings are "descendants" (ἀπογονοί) of Ascanius (5.3.3, p. 229), namely of the only Ascanius he knows about, the son of Aeneas. Elsewhere, Strabo calls Iulus (he does not know who exactly this Iulus is) τῶν ἀπογόνων εἷς τῶν ἀπὸ Αἰνείου, "one of Aeneas' descendants" (13.1.27, p. 595). (v) Propertius in 4.6, the (apparently, and parodically, in my view) ultra-propagandistic poem about the battle of Actium, introduces a very different Apollo from the Virgilian one as far as the god's attitude towards Alban kings is concerned. Propertian Apollo, appearing to Augustus at Actium, addresses him as: 'O *Longa mundi seruator ab Alba / Auguste, Hectoreis cognite maior auis*,' echoing Jupiter's prophecy in *Aen.* 1.271–73 et *Longam multa ui muniet Albam. / hic iam tercentum totos regnabitur annos / gente sub Hectorea* (same metrical collocations), and so clearly suggesting that Augustus is the descendent, through Iulus, of the royal Alban line.

WORKS CITED

- Ambaglio, D. 1980. *L'opera storiografica di Ellanico da Lesbo*. Pisa.
- Ampolo, C. 1992. "Enea e Ulisse nel Lazio da Ellanico (FGRH 4 F 84) a Festo (432 L)," *PP* 48: 321–42.
- Bandiera, E. 1986. "La mitologia arcaica di Ascanio-Iulo," *Studi di Filologia e Letteratura* (Dip. Scienze dell'Antichità, Lecce). Lecce. 15–61.
- Barchiesi, A. 1994 = 1997. *Il poeta e il principe: Ovidio e il discorso augusteo*. Roma–Bari = *The Poet and the Prince: Ovid and Augustan Discourse*, Berkeley–Los Angeles–London.
- Barchiesi, M. 1981. "Catone, Virgilio e la leggenda ancestrale." In M. Barchiesi, *I moderni alla ricerca di Enea*. Roma. 47–75.
- Bellandi, F. 1991. "Ganimede, Ascanio e la gioventù Troiana." In *Studi di filologia classica in onore di Giusto Monaco*, vol. 2. Palermo. 919–30.
- Bettini, M. 2005. "Un'identità 'troppo compiuta.' Troiani, Latini, Romani e Iulii nell'Eneide," *MD* 55: 77–102.
- Brugnoli, G. 1983. "Reges Albanorum." In *Atti del Convegno Virgiliano di Brindisi nel Bimillenario della morte (15–18 ottobre 1981)*. Perugia. 157–90.
- Buchheit, V. 1963. *Vergil über die Sendung Roms: Untersuchungen zum Bellum Poenicum und zur Aeneis*. Heidelberg.
- Cairns, F. 1989. *Vergil's Augustan Epic*. Cambridge.
- Casali, S. 2004. "Nisus and Euryalus: Exploiting the Contradictions in Vergil's Doloneia," *HSCP* 102: 319–54.
- . 2007. "Killing the Father: Ennius, Naevius, and Virgil's Intertextual Imperialism." In W. Fitzgerald and E. Gowers, eds., *Ennius Perennis: The Annals and Beyond*. Cambridge. 103–28.
- D'Anna, G. 1957. *Il problema della composizione dell'Eneide*. Rome.
- . 1992. *Anonimo: Origine del popolo romano*. Milan.
- Dickie, M. 1986. "The Speech of Numanus Remulus (*Aeneid* 9.598–620)," *PLLS* 5: 165–221.
- Gabba, E. 1976 = 1993. "Sulla valorizzazione politica della leggenda delle origini troiane di Roma." In M. Sordi, ed., *I canali della propaganda nel mondo antico*. Milan. 84–101 = E. Gabba, *Aspetti culturali dell'imperialismo romano*. Florence. 91–112.
- Hall, J. F. 1991. "The Original Ending of the Aeneas Tale: Cato and the Historiographical Tradition of Aeneas," *Syllecta Classica* 3: 13–20.
- Hardie, P. 1994. *Vergil: Aeneid IX*. Cambridge.
- Harrison, E. L. 1981. "Vergil and the Homeric Tradition," *PLLS* 3: 209–25.
- . 1985. "Foundation Prodigies in the *Aeneid*," *PLLS* 5: 131–64.
- Heinze, R. 1996 [1914³]. *La tecnica epica di Virgilio*. Trans. M. Martina. Bologna.

- Horsfall, N. 1971 = 1990. "Numanus Remulus: Ethnography and Propaganda in *Aeneid* 9.598 ff.," *Latomus* 30: 1108–16 = S. J. Harrison, ed., *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid*. Oxford. 305–15.
- . 1979. "Some Problems in the Aeneas Legend," *CQ* 29: 372–90.
- . 1991. *Virgilio: l'epopea in alambicco*. Napoli.
- Kirk, G. S. 1954. *Heraclitus: The Cosmic Fragments*. Cambridge.
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. 1987. *Further Voices in Vergil's Aeneid*. Oxford.
- Miller, J. F. 1994. "Vergil, Apollo, and Augustus." In Jon Solomon, ed., *Apollo: Origins and Influence*. Tucson and London. 99–112.
- Moskalew, W. 1982. *Formular Language and Poetic Design in the Aeneid*. Leiden.
- O'Hara, J. J. 1990. *Death and the Optimistic Prophecy in Vergil's Aeneid*. Princeton.
- . 1996. *True Names. Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*. Ann Arbor.
- Petrini, M. 1997. *The Child and the Hero: Coming of Age in Catullus and Vergil*. Ann Arbor.
- Pokorny, J. 1959. *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Berne.
- Quint, D. 1993. *Epic and Empire*. Princeton.
- Richard, J.-C. 1983. "Sur une triple étymologie du nom Iulus, II," *REL* 61: 108–21.
- Scarcia, R., ed. 2002. *Virgilio: Eneide*. Milan.
- Solmsen, F. 1986. "Aeneas Founded Rome with Odysseus," *HSCP* 90: 93–105.
- Spannagel, M. 1999. *Exemplaria Principis: Untersuchungen zu Entstehung und Ausstattung des Augustusforums*. Heidelberg.
- Stok, F. 2004. "Servio e la geopolitica della guerra italica." In C. Santini and F. Stok, eds., *Hinc Italiae gentes. Geopolitica ed etnografia dell'Italia nel commento di Servio all'Eneide*. Pisa. 111–62.
- . "Il destino di Ascanio." Forthcoming.
- Thomas, R. F. 1982. *Lands and People in Roman Poetry: The Ethnographical Tradition*. Cambridge.
- Walde, A. and J. B. Hofmann, 1938.³ *Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Vol. 1, A–L. Heidelberg.
- Weinstock, S. 1971. *Divus Julius*. Oxford.
- Wigodsky, M. 1972. *Vergil and Early Latin Poetry*. Wiesbaden.
- Winnington-Ingram, R. P. 1971–72. "Digna atque indigna relatu: Observations on *Aeneid* 9," *PVS* 11: 61–74.