

Colby



Colby Quarterly

Volume 30
Issue 3 *September*

Article 4

September 1994

Arruns, Ascanius, and the Virgilian Apollo

John F. Miller

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.colby.edu/cq>

Recommended Citation

Colby Quarterly, Volume 30, no.3, September 1994, p.171-178

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ Colby. It has been accepted for inclusion in Colby Quarterly by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ Colby.

Arruns, Ascanius, and the Virgilian Apollo

by JOHN F. MILLER

AMONG THE DIVINITIES of Virgil's *Aeneid*, few if any are more varied in their cultic and cultural associations within the poem than Phoebus Apollo.¹ He figures as Homeric champion of the Trojans, patron deity of their illustrious descendant Augustus, as god of healing, of colonization, and, most conspicuously, of prophecy. Virgil combines these (and other) aspects into a rich composite vision of Apollo. The poet allots this god relatively little space as a character—compared with the chief divine players, Jupiter, Juno, and Venus—but he is important nonetheless. One index of that importance is the fact that he is mentioned more often than any other deity in the *Aeneid*, with the single exception of Jupiter.² Although his actual appearances are limited to four, these all occur at critical points. And three of these scenes obviously relate closely to one another. A recurrent theme in the Virgilian version of the Aeneas legend is Apollo's guidance of the Trojan exiles from Troy to Italy.³ Virgil introduces this theme in striking fashion by having the first piece of divine advice, at Delos, spoken directly by the god himself to Aeneas (3.93–99). Besides the cryptic injunction that the hero should seek his ancient mother, Apollo delivers a prophetic promise of worldwide dominion someday for the *domus Aeneae*. Later, in Book 9, after witnessing the first martial achievement by the preeminent member of that *domus*, Ascanius' dispatch of Remulus Numanus, Phoebus renews the Augustan prophecy uttered at Delos in somewhat fuller terms (9.638–44). This scene marks the only other time that Apollo himself speaks, and so it quite appropriately corresponds to, and heightens, the god's words to Ascanius' father.⁴ Between these two episodes we are offered a powerful depiction of how the prophecies to Aeneas and Ascanius will be, in chronological terms, enacted

1. This paper was originally presented at the University of Pennsylvania in November 1989 at the conference Poetry and Scholarship in the Tradition of Vergil. I am grateful to those who offered comments on that occasion, especially to the organizer of the symposium, Joseph Farrell. For a recent overview of Apollo in the *Aeneid* (which does not discuss the scene with Arruns) see J. F. Miller (forthcoming).

2. See A. G. McKay (1984).

3. The Apolline injunction at Delos (3.90–99); the Penates' clarification of this message in Apollo's name (3.154–55; 161–62); prophetic advice from Apollo's seer Helenus (3.359–60; 371–73) and from the Cumaean Sibyl in Book 6; Ilioneus to Latinus at 7.241–42 *iussisque ingentibus urget Apollo / Tyrrhenum ad Thybrim et fontis vada sacra Numici*. Cf. the message that Celaeno learned from Apollo (3.251–52), Aeneas' report of an Apolline prophecy concerning Palinurus (6.343–46), and the Trojans' (nonprophetic) visit to Apollo's temple at Actium (3.274–90). Nicholas Horsfall (1989) 14–15 has recently challenged the traditional view that Apollo's guidance on the journey from Troy was a Virgilian innovation, largely on the basis of *Origo Gentis Romanae*. For the older opinion see, for example, R. Heinze (1915) 84. This issue deserves further study.

4. See E. L. Harrison (1981) 215.

by Apollo himself. In the climactic scene on Aeneas' shield, Apollo turns the tide of battle at Actium (8.704 ff.); the celebration of that victory is then set at Apollo's temple (8.720 ff.). The one called *pius arquitepens* at Delos (3.75), and who cheered the archery of Ascanius (9.654–55 *primam hanc tibi magnus Apollo / concedit laudem et paribus non invidet armis*), will himself decide the cataclysmic struggle at Actium with his bow (8.704 *Actius . . . arcum intendebat Apollo*). The universal dominion and peace promised in the god's two prophetic speeches will be concretized in the expansive *pompa triumphalis* viewed from his own Palatine temple.

Given the clear interrelations of these three Apolline scenes, what are we to make of this god's other appearance as a character in the *Aeneid*, his response, as the deity of Mount Soracte, to the Etruscan warrior Arruns' prayer in Book 11 for victory over Camilla?

Arruns sic voce precatur:

“summe deum, sancti custos Soractis Apollo,
quem primi colimus, cui pineus ardor acervo
pascitur, et medium freti pietate per ignem
cultores multa premimus vestigia pruna,
da, pater, hoc nostris aboleri dedecus armis,
omnipotens. non exuvias pulsaeve tropaeum
virginis aut spolia ulla peto, mihi cetera laudem
facta ferent; haec dira meo dum vulnere pestis
pulsa cadat, patrias remeabo inglorius urbes.”
auditi et voti Phoebus succedere partem
mente dedit, partem volucris dispersit in auras:
sterneret ut subita turbatam morte Camillam
adnuat oranti; reducem ut patria alta videret
non dedit, inque Notos vocem vertere procellae.

(11.784–98)

Does the presentation of Apollo here cohere with his other appearances, beyond the rather superficial fact that, by granting Camilla's death, the god supports Aeneas' ally⁵ no less than he does Aeneas and the Trojans themselves? Or does

5. In the context in which he appears, Arruns is most naturally taken to be a member of the Etruscan forces led by Aeneas' ally Tarchon which are currently engaged with Camilla and her troops. This is the dominant interpretation of the passage (for a sampling of opinion see Alfredo Valvano [1984]). Already in antiquity scholars countered this view, suggesting that Arruns actually belongs to Turnus' and Camilla's side, an association that he violates for one reason or another (“Arruns was a traitor. His motive was jealousy”: Norman W. DeWitt [1925] 108; Thomas Köves-Zulauf [1978] 192 and 200–01 argues that Arruns attacks Camilla from priestly motives and that the whole episode is “a sacral drama”). Two reasons stand out for locating Arruns in the ranks of Turnus: 1) Servius (on 11.762) takes the fact that Arruns stalks Camilla when she withdraws from the fighting no less than in the midst of battle (11.762–65) as an indication that the two must be allies. But Arruns' stealthy pursuit of Camilla as she momentarily rests from battle need not mean that he follows her directly into her camp. 2) Donatus ap. Servius ad 11.762 points to a more serious problem. In the catalog of Italian warriors, the Faliscans dwelling around Mount Soracte (7.695–96) march under Messapus' direction in the contingent of Turnus' army from southern Etruria. Not only does Arruns' devotion to Apollo at Soracte imply that the hero lives nearby, but his prayer clearly identifies him as a member of the Hirpi Sorani, the priestly families responsible for the fire ritual, who resided in the Faliscan territory (Pliny 7.19; Servius on *Aen.* 11.785). No one has satisfactorily explained the discrepancy between *Aeneid* 7 and 11 on this point, but I would still insist that Arruns should be counted among the Etruscans fighting with Aeneas. Prompted by Jupiter, Tarchon rouses his Etruscan troops to counterattack Camilla, and he himself shows the way (11.729 ff.). “The Etruscans attack, following the example and success of their leader” (758–59 *ducis exemplum eventumque secuti / Maeonidae incurrunt*). Just then, Arruns, a figure with a recognizably Etruscan name, enters the scene, stalking and eventually fatally wounding Camilla. Although his cowardly strategy diverges from the brave example of Tarchon, Arruns' dispatch of Camilla nonetheless culminates a continuum of military action that started with Tarchon's call for a counterattack. Arruns' appearance in the battle at this point makes sense only if he is fighting on the side of Tarchon and Aeneas.

the local Italian character of Apollo in this episode militate against a significant resonance with his actions as Olympian and Delian elsewhere in the poem? Scholarly silence on this issue might be taken to imply that the latter of these alternatives is nearer the truth. But the Apollo–Arruns scene does relate in several very suggestive ways to other Apolline episodes in the poem’s narrative, especially to Phoebus’ encounter with Ascanius. Taking notice of these thematic links will help to show that the variegated composite picture of Apollo in the *Aeneid* is, as we expect of Virgil, a true synthesis. It will also confirm the presence in the poem of an important dimension of this deity which has only recently begun to be properly appreciated. The three narrative episodes featuring Apollo will then emerge as a progression of sorts in the epic’s unfolding vision of the god.

A convenient point of departure for discussing the Arruns–Apollo episode is its emphatic allusion to *Iliad* 16.233–53. Since Knauer’s analysis,⁶ we now realize that both Arruns’ prayer and Apollo’s response are modeled on the Homeric passage, in which Achilles asks Zeus of Dodona to vouchsafe Patroclus *kudos* in driving the Trojans from the ships and a safe return to the camp, but the god grants only half of his request. Like Achilles, Arruns appeals to a specific, similarly primeval cult, that of Apollo at Soracte, which was likewise famous for its barefooted worshippers.⁷ With spear poised, he urgently asks for the death of the hated Camilla, that *dedecus*, that *pestis*. Arruns forswears any interest in spoils from the victory. So long as the conquest of the dread *bellatrix* be granted, he would return home *inglorius*. Like Zeus, the Virgilian Apollo grants the requested victory, but refuses him any return at all from the battlefield.

The imitation displays Virgil’s penchant for inverting Homeric *loci*. For example, Arruns wishes to kill the warrior who corresponds to the Homeric figure whom the praying Achilles would have Zeus protect. Moreover, the virtual quotation of the Homeric Zeus’ response points to a larger imitative pattern at work. As Knauer first showed in detail, the whole narrative of Camilla’s death is based on that of Patroclus.⁸ Within this imitative scheme, it is particularly appropriate that Apollo grants Arruns the power to slay Camilla, since he plays a decisive role in the demise of Patroclus, striking the Greek hero before Euphorbus and Hector finish him off (*Il.* 16.788–804). The god’s active support of the Trojan cause in the Homeric episode is thus reflected in the Virgilian Apollo, at the same time that Virgil conflates the precise behavior of Apollo, Euphorbus, and Hector into the single figure of Arruns. In the case of Apollo, however, the conflation involves more than narrative economy. It is to

6. Georg Knauer (1979) 310–14 and (1981) 876.

7. *Il.* 16.234–35 ἀμφὶ δὲ Σελλοὶ / σοὶ ναῖουσα ὑποφῆται ἀνιπτόποδες χαμαιεῦναι, details reported only here and in Strabo’s commentary on the passage (328). Cf. Arruns on the rite of walking over burning coals (11.786–88), on which see also Varro ap. Servius ad *Aen.* 11.787, Pliny *NH* 7.19, and Sil. Ital. 5.175–81, which has Virgil’s passage very much in view. (It is perhaps worth noting that Silius quite naturally recalls Apollo as Delian archer god in the midst of his description of the Italian ritual in the god’s honor: *pius arquitepens* alludes to *Aeneid* 3.75, from Virgil’s introduction of Delos.)

8. Knauer (1979) 308–14.

some extent as well a “correction” of Homer. For what has been transferred from Phoebus to Arruns is the stealthy character of the assault—both the Homeric Apollo and the Etruscan strike their victims unawares.⁹ A potentially blameworthy action is thus put at one remove from the god to accord with the favorable Augustan picture of Apollo found in all of his previous mentions in the *Aeneid*. The same process is at work in the construction of the Delian scene of Book 3. Virgil “corrects” Homer there by transferring the lofty prophecy about Aeneas’ descendants to Phoebus from Poseidon, who in the same Homeric passage criticizes Apollo for abandoning Aeneas.¹⁰

Virgil’s invitation to observe a curious similarity between the cults at Dodona and Soracte—both with barefooted worshipers—is a clever Alexandrian touch. The intertextual identification is not, however, just of cultic oddities, but of deities, of Virgil’s Apollo with the Homeric Zeus. Virgil makes this clear from the very first words of Arruns’ prayer, which address Apollo as *summe deum* (11.795), a phrase with no equivalent in the Homeric passage. The epithet certainly makes sense in the mouth of an enthusiastic devotee of a local deity, but for Roman readers it cannot fail to recall the god to whom it most naturally applies, Jupiter, the Latin equivalent to Homer’s Zeus.¹¹ That evocation prepares for the detailed imitation immediately to follow. It also underscores the close correspondence between Apollo and Jupiter in the whole *Aeneid*. While it is hardly remarkable, in the light of Homer and other Greek literature, to depict Apollo acting in accordance with Zeus’ will, Virgil makes a special point of having his Apollo mirror the words and actions of Jupiter. Both of the prophecies spoken directly by Phoebus, in Books 3 and 9, clearly echo the poem’s expansive, inaugural prophecy of Roman greatness uttered by Jupiter in Book 1.¹² When Apollo appears after Ascanius’ martial feat in Book 9, he does so first of all to second the favorable omen just sent by Jupiter. In the present instance, the opening of his response to Arruns echoes the line introducing Jupiter’s response to Ascanius:

9. *Il.* 16.789–91 ὁ μὲν τὸν ἰόντα κατὰ κλόνον οὐκ ἐνόησεν / ἥρι γὰρ πολλῇ κεκαλυμμένος ἀντεβόλησε / στή δ’ ὅπισθεν. . . . *Aen.* 11.801–02 *nihil ipsa nec aurae / nec sonitus memor aut venientis ab aethere teli* and the earlier description of Arruns stalking Camilla from a distance (11.759–67).

10. For the prophecy compare *Il.* 20.307–08 and *Aen.* 3.97–98; Poseidon’s criticism of Apollo at *Il.* 20.293–96. See Harrison (1981) 214–15.

11. So Servius remarks on *Aen.* 11.785: SVMME DEVM ex affectu colentis dicitur: nam Iuppiter summus est. Latin writers do indeed most commonly apply the epithet *summus* to Jupiter; see G. Appel (1909) 97–98, who lists no Olympian examples other than Jupiter (he omits all reference to Virgil). Virgil elsewhere uses the epithet only of Jupiter (1.380, 6.123 *ab love summo*). Arruns’ opening appellation of Apollo, *summe deum*, perhaps alludes to an address to Jupiter in Naevius’ epic, *summe deum regnator, quianam genus odisti* (fr. 18 Str.), in spite of the different syntax of *deum* in the two verses.

Later in Arruns’ prayer to Apollo, the expression *pater . . . omnipotens* (11.789–90) similarly calls Jupiter to mind. Virgil refers to him thus at *Georg.* 2.325, *Aen.* 1.60, 3.251, 4.25, 6.592, 7.141 & 770, 8.398, 10.100 and 12.178, although in these instances the two words are contiguous, as also at Lucretius 5.399. We occasionally find *omnipotens* alone applied to other deities, both in Virgil (*Juno* 4.693, 7.428, *Fortuna* 8.334) and elsewhere (see Appel [1909] 101, where the reference to *Apollo omnipotens* at *Cic. Tusc.* 4.73 is erroneous), but the epithet virtually belongs to Jupiter in Virgil’s day (cf. *Aen.* 2.689, 4.206 & 220, 5.687, 9.625, 10.615 & 668). On the epithet’s early history see E. Courtney (1993) 67–68 (on Q. Valerius Soranus fr. 2.1).

12. With 1.283–96 compare 3.97–98 (esp. 3.97 *cunctis dominabitur oris* with 1.285 *victis dominabitur Argis*) and 9.641–44.

*audiit et voti Phoebus succedere partem
mente dedit, (11.794–95)*

*audiit et caeli genitor de parte serena
intonuit laevum. (9.630–31)*

These are the only two times in all of Virgil that the collocation *audiit et* is used as a transitional formula,¹³ and accompanied by an oblique form of the word *pars*, albeit in different senses. In both instances the line closely follows a prayer delivered by a warrior at the critical moment before he shoots his weapon.¹⁴ Moreover, in this response Apollo appears, like Jupiter throughout the poem, to be concerned with executing the designs of Fate. His granting of Camilla's death to Arruns may at first glance seem to be simply a partisan action on behalf of his loyal Etruscan devotee. Yet since we have just heard (from the mouth of Diana) that Camilla *fatis urgetur acerbis* (11.587), Apollo's support of her fall at this point in the battle can be interpreted as furthering the plan of Fate. Indeed, it was Jupiter, the principal agent of *fatum*, who goaded the Etruscans to counterattack (11.725–28), which narrative movement climaxes with Arruns' dispatch of Camilla. Once again, Phoebus follows the lead of his father. A distinction is sometimes drawn between the actions of Jupiter and those of all other deities in the *Aeneid*: he, as *divum pater atque hominum rex*, works toward the fulfillment of Fate's ordinances, while the other divinities, major or minor, pursue essentially private concerns.¹⁵ Virgil's Apollo deserves a seat next to Jupiter in this configuration. Even apart, then, from the similarity noted between the cults at Soracte and Dodona, and the role of Phoebus in Homer's Patroclus narrative, it is difficult to imagine Virgil "replacing" the Zeus of the Homeric scene with any other god but Apollo or Jupiter. For readers attuned to the rest of the *Aeneid* as well as to the Homeric model the text displays three "motivations" for Apollo's appearance in this scene.

Whether or not there is significance, as I suggested, in the echo here of Jupiter's answer to Ascanius' prayer in Book 9, a striking parallel does exist between Apollo's own actions in these two scenes—the only scenes, remember, in the narrative of the battle books in which this god figures as a character. On both occasions Apollo's message or response is twofold. Both times he supports the Trojan cause, but also qualifies the granted military victory; and he does so for related reasons. This pattern of Apolline action is most probably not accidental, for the entire episodes to which the scenes belong correspond in several other ways. Arruns and Ascanius are both in some sense "surrogates" of the absent Aeneas.¹⁶ The two antagonists, Camilla and Numanus, are closely

13. The two words open a line in completely different syntactic configurations at 7.225 (*et* = "both") and 7.516 (*et* postponed).

14. Incidentally, these are the only two such prayers in the poem's main narrative addressed to Olympian deities: Ascanius to Jupiter at 9.625–29; Arruns to Apollo at 11.785–93. Elsewhere to Luna (9.404–09), Tiber (10.421–23), Hercules (10.460–63), to Diana in the inset narrative at 11.557–60, and Mezentius' brazen prayer to his hand and weapon as *deus* at 10.773–76.

15. See, for example, W. A. Camps (1969) 42–43.

16. On this facet of Arruns, see Thomas G. Rosenmeyer (1960) 160 and 162, and Laurence R. Kepple (1976) who, however, presses the parallels so far that "the triumph of Aeneas over Turnus" emerges as "a portent of Aeneas' own death."

associated with Turnus.¹⁷ Both those antagonists highlight the theme of hardy Italian *virtus* in ambiguous terms, and with similar motifs.¹⁸ In each case we find the contrasting idea of lavish Trojan finery.¹⁹ Apollo's similar responses to Arruns and Ascanius are thus part of a larger narrative design.

When he appears to Ascanius, disguised as an old armorbearer, Phoebus not only congratulates the youth, even comparing the boy's archery to his own; he also prohibits Julius from any further fighting (9.656 *cetera parce, puer, bello*). Many have taken the god's motive here to be simply a desire to protect Ascanius physically, to ensure that, as he himself just announced from the clouds, glorious Julians will someday be born from this youth.²⁰ However, R. O. A. M. Lyne has, I think, convincingly demonstrated that Apollo's prohibition in fact responds more directly to the character of Ascanius as it is manifested here, and to the potentially problematic nature of passion in Virgil's scheme of ideal heroism.²¹ It was Aeneas' passion that made him stray from his duty in the Dido episode; it will be Aeneas' occasional surrender to passion for its own sake in the battle books that will create a profound sense of disquiet about his martial achievements. Now we see the hero's son "raging" (9.652 *ardentem*), an "Ascanius greedy for battle" (9.661–62 *avidum pugnae . . . Ascanium*). While such spiritedness is of course a prerequisite for the typical epic hero, Julius shows signs of getting carried away with his battle rage, of being his father's son in a negative as well as a positive sense. Note that Ascanius displays these heightened passions *after* he has killed Numanus, and that the Trojan chieftains must restrain the boy even after the disguised god's injunction to him. It is because Apollo perceives that the youth's passions may overtake him that he balances his praise of Ascanius' act of prowess with the stern prohibition.

Apollo's qualifying gesture in the case of Arruns is even more momentous. For it results in the very death of the Etruscan warrior. Where the god cheered the victory vouchsafed to Ascanius by the thundering Jupiter, Apollo himself grants Arruns success against Camilla. But the god refuses him a return to his homeland. Why? One might argue that the refusal is prompted by a wish to

17. Numanus had recently married Turnus' sister (9.593–94).

18. At 9.603–13 Numanus praises the Italians' hardy upbringing—hunting in the forest, training with horse and bow—which gives them a vigorousness continuing into old age, as well as their martial and agricultural prowess. But this boast is darkened by the admission that Numanus' folk delight in pillaging (612–13 *semperque recentis / comportare iuvat praedas et vivere rapto*); see N. Horsfall (1971) 1113 and Richard F. Moorton (1989) 109–10. The motif of rapine qualifies the encomium for an Augustan reader in spite of the fact that ancient ethnographic writers regularly attribute such behavior to primitive peoples (Richard F. Thomas [1982] 98; Matthew Dickie [1985] 179). The tale of Camilla's upbringing by her father in the forest (11.570–80) recalls Numanus' characterization of the hardy local inhabitants, but here, too, the primitivism of the Italian heroine is ambiguous. At 11.584–86 Diana suggests that Camilla's current aggressive military activity somehow perverts the life of hunting in wild nature in which the girl was raised (see Moorton [1989] 115–16).

19. In his verbal assault upon the Trojans Numanus directly contrasts the ruggedly virtuous Italians with ornate, effeminate Trojan dress and with the ecstatic Phrygian worship of Cybele (9.614–20). Iarbus and Turnus make similar charges earlier. Camilla pursues in battle a former Trojan priest of Cybele who is decked out in rich Phrygian finery (11.668–782, esp. 772 *peregrina, 777 barbara*). In verse 782, *femineo praedae et spoliis ardebat amore*, the juxtaposition of the first two words perhaps hints at the characterization of Phrygian dress as effeminate. Camilla's keen desire to win such glittering spoils of course leads to her demise.

20. E.g., D. C. Clinton (1930) 120; Harrison (1981) 216.

21. (1987) 200–06. Further discussion in Miller (forthcoming). See also the earlier remarks along the same lines by Roger A. Hornsby (1970) 107.

further the designs of Fate, which we saw to be a factor in his sanctioning Camilla's death. In fact, Arruns is first introduced to us as *fatis debitus* (11.759). The entire scene, however, suggests an additional, or alternative, motive for the negative part of Apollo's response. That motive is not, as has been proposed by Köves-Zulauf, an acquiescence to the need for retribution upon the man who will have violated the person of Camilla, a woman who had been dedicated to a deity by her father.²² Arruns "violates the sacred body" of Camilla (11.591 *sacrum violarit vulnere corpus*; cf. 848 *violavit vulnere corpus*) only from the perspective of Diana, who sends the nymph Opis to shoot Camilla's killer. Although the actions of Apollo and his sister both result in the death of Arruns, the two divine figures are kept completely distinct from one another in this episode. The precise results of their respective actions against Arruns are differentiated, too. Accordingly, their motives must be separate. Now, what the text asserts most strongly about Arruns in his actions both before and after his prayer is the defective nature of his character. Unlike the more glorious epic heroes, he eschews open conflict. As a man of stratagems—*multa . . . arte* (11.760)—he stalks, and shoots, his victim secretly from afar. He is *tacitus* (763); he acts *furtim* (765). Virgil calls him *improbus* (767) as he shakes his spear, a word which, even if here translated "relentless" or "ruthless," cannot wholly shed the negative connotations arising from its usual meaning, "wicked." After striking Camilla, Arruns again displays his cowardice, and his shame, fleeing from the wounded *bellatrix* like a wolf with its tail between its legs (806–15). Although Arruns' disclaimer of spoils from this victory (790–91) seems meritorious, the following claim that "the rest of my deeds will bring me glory" (791–92) sounds presumptuous addressed to a deity, and in his concluding offer to return home *inglorius* (793) "he veils his cowardice under an appearance of magnanimity."²³ Arruns is essentially an ignoble character. In this context, the negative portion of Apollo's response to his prayer has an easily explainable motivation. Apollo denies Arruns a return from the battlefield because he is a cowardly warrior. Since the stealthiness of Arruns' attack is modeled on the Homeric Apollo's furtive assault upon Patroclus, the Virgilian Apollo's punishment of the secretive action is quite ironic, in literary-historical terms. This is yet another dimension of Virgil's "correcting" the Apollo in Homer's Patroclus episode. However, like his chief Homeric referent, the Zeus of Dodona from that same episode, whose response to Achilles harmonizes with the Olympian Zeus' other behavior in the *Iliad*, Virgil's Apollo at Soracte acts in a manner wholly consistent with another Apolline scene in the

22. Köves-Zulauf (1978) 200–01.

23. Conington on 11.793, whose insightful analysis of the whole speech should be consulted. Alone among the commentators, he draws attention to the fact that "what is really an important part of his prayer, his safe return home, he affects to treat not as a matter of prayer at all, but as a sort of concession which he is willing to make." The twofold prayer of the Homeric model, as well as the fact that Apollo immediately treats Arruns' words as two prayers, underscores the presumptuousness of the Etruscan's "concession" (793 *patrias remeabo inglorius urbes*). See also Gordon W. Williams (1983) 177 on the "odd formulation" of Arruns' conclusion: "Arruns' act is militarily useful but cowardly and thus inglorious. His own consciousness of that fact only emerges in the simile which views the world through his eyes: the wolf has done something so dastardly that it knows retribution will follow." On Arruns' character see also Otto Schönberger (1966) 187.

Aeneid. Just as in his meeting with Ascanius, the god's qualification of the victory granted to Arruns stems from a concern with heroic morality.

Apollo is, of course, regularly preoccupied with moral issues in the religion and literature of the Greeks. Already in two of the most well-known scenes in the *Iliad*, which explicitly parallel one another, Apollo checks impetuous heroes in a manner reminiscent of his famous Delphic injunctions—Diomedes, who would fight with gods (5.436–44), and Patroclus, who would exceed his fated lot (16.702–09). Of the Virgilian episodes under discussion, only the restraining of Ascanius recalls these Homeric *loci*.²⁴ It is not impossible, however, that Virgil took from Homer the idea of a pair of scenes in which Apollo deals with moral questions, even if his scenes lack the precise verbal and conceptual correspondences of Homer's pair. In Homer, strong verbal echoes underscore the fact that Apollo is in both instances countering *hybris*. In Virgil, the issues involved—Ascanius' battle rage, Arruns' cowardice—are rather more different from one another. Nevertheless, the similar structure of a twofold response by Apollo, with the second part qualifying the first, invites us to appreciate a relation between the content of the two Apolline responses. Given the more drastic result for Arruns, we might go so far as to see an intensification of Apollo's moral concerns from one scene to the next, much as Apollo's prophecy after Ascanius' dispatch of Numanus heightens that uttered at Delos.

Most importantly, we need to acknowledge Apollo's concern with heroic morality in the *Aeneid*, and therefore to supplement the traditional scholarly account of the Virgilian Apollo. Most summaries rightly note that he is Aeneas' prophetic guide, and martial supporter of the Trojan cause and of Augustus. But there is another side to Apollo that deepens and complicates all these roles. In Virgil's depiction of Actium, there is certainly a moral dimension to Apollo's decisive bow shot. Eastern excesses are checked; wrongdoers are punished. This is in keeping with Augustan ideology. On the great Apolline monument celebrating the event, the Palatine Temple, was pictured a traditional scene intended to evoke such a moral significance for the Augustan victory: the vengeful dispatch of the Niobids by Diana and Apollo.²⁵ At the same time, however, Virgil's Apollo goes beyond Augustan *Religionspolitik*. In his dealings with Ascanius and Arruns, he is concerned with the same issues that he addresses within a national and cosmic perspective at Actium—restraint and punishment—but he addresses them now in the context of individual human lives.

24. See Werner Kühn (1971) 131, who would add Apollo's words to Hector at *Iliad* 20.375–78, but that passage is not really comparable with the commands to Diomedes and Patroclus. Michael Paschalis (1986) has discussed at length ways in which Virgil depicts Apolline oracles in emulation of or polemical opposition to the Pythian Apollo. He goes too far, however, when he says that "Virgil strongly opposed Delphic morality" (p. 50).

25. Propertius 2.31.14; see Antonie Wlosok (1967) 136–37.