The conflict between Jupiter and Juno in the *Aeneid* is commonly read as a battle between the forces of order (masculinity, rationality, good) and chaos (femininity, irrationality, evil). The present article argues that this schematization, though morally and aesthetically satisfying, fails to account for most of the data. Virgil’s Jupiter is in fact concerned solely with power (*imperium*) and adulation (*fama*), despite persistent attempts by readers—and characters in the poem—to see him as benign. By systematically discussing every appearance of Jupiter in the poem, the article seeks to correct the distorted or incomplete views of the god that arise from selective examination. The first section looks at Jupiter’s own speeches to illustrate his motivations. The second section demonstrates how these motivations, though frequently misconstrued by the human characters, are confirmed by the glimpses of Jupiter focalized through the omniscient narrator. The third discusses the implications of this portrait of Jupiter for Virgil’s vision of Rome and of human happiness.

“Now I will tell you the answer to my question. It is this. The Party seeks power entirely for its own sake. We are not interested in the good of others; we are interested solely in power. Not wealth or luxury or long life or happiness: only power, pure power. What pure power means you will understand presently.”

George Orwell, 1984

“his ego nec metas rerum nec tempora pono: imperium sine fine dedi.” Virgil, *Aeneid* 1.278–79

To claim that Virgil’s Jupiter, like Orwell’s O’Brien, is interested solely in power would be only partially correct. First, Jupiter’s interest in power is not merely as an end in itself, but also as a means to contain the chaos he fears.

I am extremely grateful to Anthony Corbeill, Mark Griffith, Peter Knox, Ellen Oliensis, Gareth Williams, and the anonymous reader for their insightful comments and great endurance.

1. Unless otherwise noted, Latin texts are those of Mynors 1969 and translations are my own.
(Aen. 1.61). Second, in addition to power, Jupiter has one other concern: honor. Not the internal quality of moral uprightness, that is, but adulation from others, which for divinities consists of prayers (vota) and sacrifices (honores), for mortals (and sometimes divinities too) of nomen and fama. Beyond power and adulation, however, it is accurate to say that Jupiter has no other concerns. His preoccupation with these engenders the emotions that Lucretius says good Epicureans, especially gods, are free of—fear (metus), anxiety (cura), and wrath (ira)—without a trace of love or compassion to counterbalance them. The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate the terrible simplicity of Virgil’s Jupiter, a simplicity that excludes concern not only for human pleasure and pain, but even for human morality and justice.

My primary strategy is one of defamiliarization: that is, to attempt to meet Virgil’s Jupiter, both in his own actions and speeches and in what is said of him, as if we were encountering him for the first time. All readers, of course, will bring to the text certain expectations. The sources of these are particularly rich for Jupiter, including perceptions of Zeus/Jupiter in Homer and other authors, of the divinity worshipped by the ancient Romans, and of Octavian/Augustus, whom Virgil associates or even (sometimes) implicitly equates with Jupiter. Such expectations are an essential part of the way Virgil intends us to interpret the character of the chief god; allusive writers invariably invite us to “compare and contrast” with the model. But we must be especially alert to those times when the text deliberately raises expectations and then frustrates them. Virgil himself gives us the classic example of a character’s hopes engendering a dangerous misreading: when Aeneas reads the mural in the temple of his divine archenemy gloating over scene after scene of Trojan calamity, his response is to feel relief that his new hosts are so full of compassion. It is my argument that readers of the Aeneid, like this reader within it, have been too willing to let their hopes and expectations impose upon the text elements that are in fact conspicuous by their absence.

What Jupiter represented for the ancient Romans is a complex question that deserves much further study, but one issue in particular is essential to an understanding of Virgil’s poem: the tension between Jupiter’s functions as tribal

2. On the “equation” of Octavian/Augustus with Jupiter, see Thomas 2001: 40–54. The scare quotes are necessary: Aeneas at various times “equals” (e.g.) Achilles, Augustus, Jupiter, and Antony, and by applying the principle of transitivity one rapidly degenerates into nonsense. Unlike Ovid, who overtly and consistently refers to Augustus as Jupiter throughout the exile poetry, Virgil never makes the “equation” explicit; it is telling that Ward 1933, despite the many references to Augustan poetry in her article on “The Association of Augustus with Jupiter,” has not a single citation from Virgil’s major works. There is also a danger of projecting one’s assumptions about Augustus, positive or negative, onto Virgil’s Jupiter. Dowden 2006: 112, for instance, states that “[t]here is a strong sense already in the Aeneid that Jupiter reflects the beneficent control of the Roman world by Augustus”—as if Augustus’ “beneficent control” were something Roman authors unequivocally endorsed. My strategy in the present article is to leave aside the Augustus/Jupiter “equation,” with all it implies, and focus instead on how Jupiter is actually portrayed in the poem.

3. For a more extended discussion of the parallel between Aeneas’ “reading” and ours, see Barchiesi 1999: 330–41; for a concise one, see Perkell 1999b: 45–46.
god of the Romans and as transcendent God of the universe.⁴ The Romans saw themselves as the people specially selected by Jupiter to rule the world; their military success was both symbolized and guaranteed by their unique relationship with the most powerful of all gods (Fears 1981: 34–43). On the other hand, in Stoic philosophy, “Jupiter” could mean the benevolent soul of the cosmos, an impartial God whose just governance embraced all peoples alike. Cleanthes’ famous Hymn to Zeus, for instance, refers to him as the “supreme ruler of Nature, governing all things with Law” (2), the one from whom all mankind derives (4), and whom the whole world obeys (7–8).⁵ As we shall see, this fundamental tension between the two conceptions of Jupiter deepens the tragedies of the victims in the Aeneid: their prayers and pietas prove futile, not because of their moral failings, but because they realize too late that the god from whom they sought justice or sympathy is interested only in Roman sovereignty.

Those who happen to be on the losing side find that there is no necessary connection between political order and moral order. But does there need to be? The subtitle of Philip Hardie’s (1986) important book, Cosmos and Imperium, adumbrates an intuitively compelling argument: the proper ordering of the universe (cosmos) entails the exercise of power (imperium), whether by men or by gods. It is our human weakness that leads us to expect things like compassion and fairness from the enforcer of order and Fate. And yet, the collision of that weakness with the implacable strength of destiny is part of what gives the Aeneid—and the Iliad, and Greek tragedy, and all tragic literature—its grip on the human imagination. Moreover, Jupiter is far from transcendence even within the fiction of the poem; it is hard to see his rape of Juturna or his applause for Aeneas’ battle atrocities as the impersonal enforcement of Fate. Virgil has chosen to give voice and face and hands to the ruler of the universe. We as readers are encouraged to respond, like Dido and Turnus, not to a principle but to a person.

evil), however, is accepted by nearly all readers, and the focus of debate is on which side ultimately wins. Though morally and aesthetically satisfying, this schematization fails to account for most of the data. What no one has yet done is systematically examine Jupiter, not as the benign abstraction that readers—including the characters in the poem—wish him to be, but as a richly depicted character with a personality and motivations of his own.7 Virgil telegraphs the fundamental elements of this personality with his very first allusion to Jupiter, *rapti Ganymedis honores* (“the *honores* of seized Ganymede,” 1.28); as the poem unfolds, the consistency of the god’s motivations becomes increasingly and frighteningly clear.

The much-discussed multivalence of the *Aeneid*, the complex counterpoint of its different “voices” (Parry 1963; Lyne 1987), is both a source of its enduring fascination and a notorious stumbling block for the interpreter. By examining evidence selectively, for instance, one can make strong cases both that Aeneas is a model of humanity (his pity for Lausus, his attempt to repair the truce) and that he is a particularly brutal warrior (his mocking denial of sympathetically portrayed suppliants); similarly, Turnus can be made out as both a “thug” (breaking the truce, parading heads on stakes) and a tragically pitiable youth (downy cheeks, pathetic plea at end).8 This sort of selective examination has led to distorted or incomplete views of Jupiter as well. The present article seeks to redress this imbalance by taking into account every appearance of Jupiter in the poem. The first part will examine Jupiter’s own words in the order they appear, especially the speeches generally considered to show him in a positive light, in order to illustrate his motivations. The second will attempt to show how these motivations, though frequently misconstrued by the human characters, are confirmed by the glimpses of Jupiter focalized through the omniscient narrator. The third will discuss the implications of this portrait of Jupiter for Virgil’s vision of Rome and of human happiness.

I. JUPITER SPEAKS

The words that Virgil puts in Jupiter’s mouth make his personality vivid: magisterial and ferocious, consolatory and mocking, he exhibits a far greater range of tone and emotion that we might expect from the mouthpiece of Fate.

7. Feeney 1991 comes the closest, rightly insisting on the “characterful” nature of Virgil’s Jupiter; I am much indebted to his discussion.

8. As O’Hara 2007: 96 notes, “At times scholars on both sides of the debate resemble attorneys prosecuting or defending clients accused of crimes in the real world, rather than readers of a literary text or scholars trying to look impartially at data or evidence.” For representative presentations of the “case” for and against Turnus, respectively, see Thomas 1998 and Stahl 1990. Kallendorf 2007: 9 observes that the practice of excerpting short, edifying passages from the *Aeneid* in commonplace books “shattered antiquity into shards of morality and eloquence that could easily be made compatible with a much later culture founded on a value system that modern scholars find different in many ways from that of antiquity.”
Yet all of these emotions, I suggest, derive from his attachment to *fama* and *imperium*. I consider below the seven times Jupiter speaks: consoling Venus (1.254–96), dispatching Mercury (4.198–237), making a promise to Cybele (9.80–106), addressing the council of the gods (10.1–117), consoling Hercules (10.464–73), negotiating with Juno over Turnus (10.606–32), and effecting a reconciliation with Juno (12.791–842).

1. THE CONSOLATION OF VENUS

Jupiter’s prophecy to Venus in book 1 could be called the keynote speech for an “optimistic” reading of the poem. The god’s smile (*subridens*, 1.254) and the “expression with which he calms the sky and storms” (*uultu, quo caelum tempestatessque serenat*, 255) have reassured millennia of readers that the storms of Roman history will be cleared away by the sunshine of the Pax Augusta. In recent decades, close readings of the prophecy itself have shown some of the ways in which this view needs to be nuanced, recognizing that “the surface optimism of the poem or prophecy is undercut by darker material partially suppressed” (O’Hara 1990: 3). But I suggest that there is an even more fundamental problem with the speech’s “surface optimism”: *Jupiter’s vision of the Roman future is grim*. This is true not only of the centuries of war and conquest, but even—and especially—of the vision of Peace that supposedly “shines through the dark places” (Williams 1972: 177) and compensates for the suffering and sacrifice necessary to achieve it.

To explain what I mean by this shocking statement, let me give a brief overview of what images of Peace customarily look like in the ancient world. Examples are not far to seek. Both of the Homeric epics offer vignettes of the just king whose rule gives rise to agricultural bounty and feasting among his people. A scene on the Shield of Achilles, for instance, shows a king happily watching his harvesters fill their arms with sheaves while an ox is being prepared for a great feast and women scatter abundant barley for the workmen (*Il*. 18.550–60). Odysseus in disguise comparing his wife to a good king makes the connection between justice and fertility even more explicit, declaring that the king’s good laws give rise to abundant grain, fruit-laden trees, prolific sheep, and even a sea full of fish (*Od*. 19.108–114). Hesiod also makes clear the agricultural reward for those who give “straight judgments,” creating a beautiful picture of Peace—“wide-seeing Zeus never marks out grievous war as their portion”—with her abundant harvests, oaks full of acorns and honey, fleecy sheep, and fertile, faithful womenfolk (*WD* 225–37). When the blood feud in the *Oresteia* is replaced by the rule of law, the goddesses originally of vengeance are persuaded to become protectors of fertility.

9. Tarrant 2004: 125, summarizing the general opinion, calls the prophecy “the most optimistic statement in the poem.”

10. O’Hara 1990: 128–163 provides an incisive analysis of the prophecy’s ambiguities (most notably whether “Caesar” represents Julius Caesar or Augustus) and elisions (most notably the fratricide of Romulus and the civil wars).
ensuring a similarly bounteous harvest of crops, livestock, and children (Eum. 921–26, 942–48, 956–60).

In the more violent Roman world, peace involves a greater element of escapism, but pleasure and beauty still play a leading role. Lucretius’ enchanting tableau of Venus caressing Mars (DRN 1.31–40), for instance, imagines peace in terms not of food but of sex: as the god of war sinks into the lap of the goddess of love, she pours forth sweet words, seeking “placid peace” (placidam ... pacem, 1.40) for the Romans. The fantastic vision of the Golden Age in Virgil’s own Eclogue 4 includes ready-dyed sheep (42–45) along with the standard fare of golden fields, blushing vines, and dripping honey (28–30); the more realistic vision of Eclogue 9 has the sidus Iulium arising “to make the ears of grain rejoice with fruit and the grape to take in color on the sunny hills” (47–49; see Clausen 1994: 283, White 1988: 351). And nowhere is the connection between peace and fertility more prevalent than on the Ara Pacis, especially on its exquisite panel of a beautiful female figure, both maternal and luscious, holding babies and surrounded by young animals, flowers, and winsome nature divinities. Whether the medium is visual or verbal, Peace is easy to portray. The camera loves her.

Compare the image with which Jupiter’s speech leaves us:

“aspera tum positis mitescent saetula bellis: cana Fides et Vesta, Remo cum fratre Quirinus iura dabunt; dirae ferro et compagibus artis claudentur Belli portae; Furor impius intus saeua sedens super arma et centum uinctus aënis post tergum nodis fremet horridus ore cruento.”

1.291–96

“Then the harsh ages will grow gentler, with wars put aside; grey-haired Faith and Vesta, Quirinus with Remus his brother will give laws; the dire gates of War will be shut with iron and constricting fetters; impious Furor within, sitting upon savage arms and shackled behind its back with a hundred brazen knots will roar, horrible, with gory mouth.”

The only word in this entire passage that connotes beauty or pleasure is mitescent, “will grow gentler.” Yet rather than following up with an image of what this mellowing will look like, Jupiter immediately glosses it with an ablative absolute, “with wars put aside”; the best he has to say about peace is that it is an absence of war. The adjectives Jupiter chooses to describe this happy state are revealing: “grey-haired, dire, constricting, impious, savage, shackled, brazen, horrible,

11. Ross 2007: 151 observes that these three lines, which each contain a molossus in the third foot (flauescet, pendebit, sudabunt), recall the rhythm of both the “devolution” of the Golden Age in Catullus 64.38–40 (mollescunt, purgatur, conuellit) and Aeneid 1.291 (mitescent, discussed below).

12. This figure has not yet been definitively identified; possible candidates are Tellus, Venus, Italia, Ceres, and Pax. See Zanker 1988: 172–79.
gory.” So are the divinities. Most Roman goddesses, despite their character flaws, are at least physically beautiful; Jupiter has managed to come up with two who are almost militantly unattractive, choosing for Fides the adjective canus, “white- or grey-haired (implying old age)” (OLD s.v. canus 2.a), which is applied twice to Vesta later in the poem (5.744, 9.259). Servius struggles a bit with the epithet, explaining that it is either because “Fides is found in grey-haired people” or because priests making sacrifices to the goddess bound their hand in white cloth, as at Horace Carm. 1.35.21–22 (see Nisbet and Hubbard 1970: 396). But even if hoariness can be argued to imply aged respectability or religiosity, it certainly gives no impression of beauty.

The other two beings presiding over the Pax Augusta present even more problems. Most obviously, as Ennius’ Jupiter famously declares to Mars about the latter’s twin boys, “There will be one whom you will raise up to the blue region of the sky” (unus erit quem tu tolles in caerula caeli, 65 V), not two—and number two will in fact be murdered by number one.13 As Servius Auctus rightly observes, “Here he covers up about the murder, both because he joins them, and because he calls him not ‘Romulus’ but ‘Quirinus,’ since one who could have deserved to become a god could not have committed a murder” (hic dissimulat de parricidio, quod et iungit eos, et quia non Romulum, sed Quirinum appellat, ut non potuerit parricidium facere qui meruerit deus fieri, on 1.292–93). In addition to the fratricide, the other problem with Romulus is that he represented persistent militarism, not peace: Servius comments, “It’s agreed, moreover, that the temple of Janus was [always] open under Romulus” (constat praeterea Iani templum patuisse sub Romulo), and Auctus adds, “because he was never free from wars” (quia bellis numquam vacavit). After mentioning the view of others that “Remus and his brother” designated simply “The Romans,” Servius proffers his own theory that the twins actually represent Augustus and Agrippa, excusing the bizarre equation of Remus and Agrippa with an unconvincing poetico usus est more (“he has employed poetic usage”). He elsewhere tells us that, in an attempt to avert a pestilence by placating his murdered brother’s Manes, “a curule chair with a scepter and crown and other insignia of power was always placed beside Romulus when he was making an official pronouncement, so that they would appear to be ruling equally” (sella curulis cum sceptro et corona et ceteris regni insignibus semper iuxta sancientem aliquid Romulum ponebatur, ut pariter imperare viderentur, on 1.276). In placing such emphasis on the reconciliation and joint rule of the brothers, as James O’Hara notes, “Jupiter predicts something that will not, can not, and did not happen” (1990: 153).

In line with his choice of a fratricidal militarist to preside over peace, Jupiter conspicuously refers to iron (ferro, 293) and bronze (aënis, 295), the metals of war. Far from conjuring up images of the Golden Age, this imagery instead

13. Like a Roman schoolboy, the god Mars recites this line to his father twice in Ovid’s works (Met. 14.814, Fast. 2.487); see Conte 1986: 57–59.
emphasizes “the unfortunate linking of Jupiter with the Iron Age” (Ryberg 1958: 129). As Richard Thomas (2004–2005) has shown, Virgil consistently associates Jupiter with the forcible end of the Golden Age presided over by Saturn (e.g., *Saturnus ... arma Iouis fugiens et regnis exsul ademptis*, “Saturn ... fleeing the arms of Jupiter and exiled from his stolen kingdom,” 8.319–20), and the present passage is no exception, despite the assumption of most readers that it prophesies the Augustan golden saeculum.14 If one tries to visualize the culmination of Jupiter’s prophecy, especially in comparison with the richly appealing imagery of the Ara Pacis or previous literary depictions of peace, one begins to realize how perversely monochromatic Jupiter’s vision of the Roman future actually is. There is no mention of any of the blessings that peace confers, of fertility, abundance, pleasure, friendship, freedom, art, intellectual inquiry; not one item from the litany of Roman achievements grudgingly recited by the would-be revolutionaries in *Monty Python’s Life of Brian* (“All right, but apart from the sanitation, the medicine, education, wine, public order, irrigation, roads, a fresh water system, and public health, what have the Romans ever done for us?”). Whether Furor is sufficiently well imprisoned never to break out is doubtful, as the poem abundantly demonstrates (see Tarrant 2004: 123–26). But from a human perspective, the strength of the prison may be a less pressing problem than the bleakness of the landscape that surrounds it. This bleakness is all the more striking given the association of Jupiter elsewhere with agricultural bounty. He got his start, after all, partly as a rain god. Though “Jupiter” and “iuuare” are not etymologically related, the Romans believed they were, and a passage of Ennius quoted by Varro (*LL* 5.65) emphasizes Jupiter’s watery role in “helping” men, plants, and what Roland Kent (1938: 63) delightfully calls “beasties all.” In his translation of Euhemerus’ “Holy History,” which shows the origin of gods as mortals, Ennius has Jupiter traveling through the world and giving to various societies “laws, morals, and grain” (*leges mores frumentaque*, Lactantius *Div. Inst.* 1.11.44). One of Jupiter’s cult titles was *Frugifer* (“grain-bearer,” *CIL* XII 336, *Apuleius de Mundo* 37); Cicero has Scipio refer to the planet Jupiter as “that gleam which brings prosperity and health to the race of men” (*hominum generi prosperus et salutaris ille fulgor*, *Rep.* 6.17); coins from the late second century B.C. show a cornucopia superimposed on a thunderbolt and surrounded by a wreath of various grains and fruits (Fears 1981: 47). The absence of agriculture from Jupiter’s prophecy contrasts not only with all other portraits of peace from the ancient world, but also with a salient role of Jupiter in literature and cult.

Because of the importance of Jupiter’s first speech for an “optimistic” reading of the poem, or indeed for any reading of the poem, it is worth looking more closely at how readers have responded to its closing tableau. Interestingly, while “pessimistic” readers tend to write it off as a happy dream of an unrealizable Golden Age (e.g., Putnam 1995a: 12), it is the stalwartly optimistic Richard Jenkyns (1985: 60) who is more attuned to some troubling elements in the vision’s imagery:

Sometimes [Virgil] is fierce when there seems no compelling need for him to be so. Anchises ends the show of heroes in the underworld by talking of war; the whole poem ends suddenly on a note of violence. Now it can be and has been argued that Virgil writes these passages as he does to enforce a pessimistic picture of the human condition—I shall indeed return to this question—but the same argument can hardly be applied to the majestic speech which Jupiter makes to Venus in the first book, smiling, the poet tells us, and wearing the face with which he calms the skies and storms. He prophesies a glorious history for the Roman people, culminating in the time of Augustus, when peace will reign and the gates of war be closed, and he ends by depicting Furor bound with a hundred brazen chains, howling and dribbling blood [quotation of 1.294–6].

*Here is no questioning note.* This is a symbolic picture of peace and order triumphant, a little like those medieval representations of St. Michael and the serpent; but observe the *eager savagery* with which it is expressed. Virgil did not have to end this serene speech in a *spirit of ferocity*; he chose to do so. (emphasis added)

Like nearly all readers—Venus included, perhaps—Jenkyns takes Jupiter’s facial expression as proof that the speech is “optimistic.” He states categorically that “the same argument [i.e., a pessimistic reading] can hardly be applied” to Jupiter’s speech, and again, “Here is no questioning note.” Yet if one approaches the speech without these assumptions, one finds that Jenkyns’ sensitive ear has picked up not only a “questioning note” but a screeching dissonance.¹⁵ There is a definitive difference between this passage and “those medieval representations of St. Michael and the serpent”: those representations contain St. Michael, winged, handsome, and large, a visible manifestation of Good. Would such images have the same effect if the whole frame were filled with the serpent, locked in chains but very much alive and roaring with bloody mouth? Jenkyns correctly points out the “eager savagery” and “spirit of ferocity” with which peace is described, but he is unwilling to accept the implications of this observation. “Here is no questioning note”: not from Jupiter, certainly—but why not from Virgil?

If pleasure is excluded from Jupiter’s vision, there is still a possibility of one redeeming quality: justice. One could argue that Virgil attributes to Jupiter

¹⁵. In a later discussion of the same passage, Jenkyns 1998: 661 notes that “Virgil shrewdly gives a harsh edge to the trumpets’ blare.”
a vision that is austere, to be sure, but still morally sound. But in fact, just as the entire freight of attractiveness rests on mitescent, so the entire freight of justice rests on two phrases: iura dabunt and Furor impius. Though iura dabunt does indeed conjure up “the great civilizing function of Rome” (Austin 1971: 112), the problematic choice of Romulus and Remus for the lawgivers, as we have seen, questions more than it assures the possibility of a just rule. The imprisonment of Furor impius has given rise to the perceived dichotomy between pietas and furor that informs most readers’ conception of the poem’s moral landscape. Yet what is it, in Jupiter’s view, that makes Furor impius? At several critical moments (as I shall discuss below) Jupiter both applauds and instigates furor in the human world, so it cannot be the case that furor is inherently contrary to what he considers the proper disposition of mankind—that in his view furor (= evil) is inevitably opposed to pietas (= good). For now, I would simply point out the possibility that the phrase Furor impius, usually taken in the non-restrictive sense of “Furor, which is impius,” can also be taken in a restrictive sense, “that Furor which is impius,” allowing the possibility that some varieties of furor and pietas—in Jupiter’s view—are not incompatible.16 I shall suggest that both qualities meet with his approval, not through any inherent moral value, but only insofar as they contribute to the sovereignty of himself and of Rome.17

Given Jupiter’s depiction of peace, we need not belabor his depiction of the centuries of war that precedes it. Venus’s complaint concludes with the question, “Is this the honor that pietas gets? Is this how you return us to royal power?” (hic pietatis honor? sic nos in sceptrum reponis?, 1.253). Jupiter’s précis of Roman history addresses these two themes—that is, fama and imperium—and no others. Aeneas will “wage a huge war in Italy and crush fierce peoples and impose mores and walls on men” (bellum ingens geret Italia populosque ferocis / contundet moresque uiris et moenia ponet, 263–64), subduing the Rutulians in three years (265–66); fulfilling his thirty years of imperium, Ascanius will transfer the kingdom and fortify Alba Longa (269–71); the race of Hector will rule for three hundred years (272–73), “until a priestess-queen, Ilia, heavy/pregnant with Mars, will give birth to twin offspring” (donec regina sacerdos / Marte grauis geminam partu dabit Ilia prolem, 273–74). Romulus, “happy in the tawny pelt of his nurse-wolf” (lupae fuluo nutricis tegmine laetus, 275), will establish the walls of Mars and his own name for the Romans (276–77), to whom Jupiter has given imperium sine fine (279). Finally, harsh Juno, who currently “harasses sea

16. On the moral ambiguity of furor, see Perkell 1999b: 35–39: she notes that, as the poem progresses, “pietas and imperium are achieved not through transcendence of furor but rather precisely through its exercise” (38).

17. Mackie 1988, especially in his analyses of books 2, 10, and 12, eloquently demonstrates that Aeneas’ “pietas results from the direction of his actions, not the conduct of them” (172); any amount of furor and brutality are consistent with pietas as long as they further the cause of Fate. Whereas he focuses on “The Characterisation of Aeneas,” my argument complements his by focusing on Jupiter’s stated policies and responses to human actions.
and lands and sky with dread” (279–80), will “change her plans for the better” (consilia in melius referet, 281) and join Jupiter in favoring the Romans, “masters of the world and the togate race” (rerum dominos gentemque togatam, 282); a time will come when descendants of Assaracus will “press down Phthia and brilliant Mycenae with slavery (servitio premet) and lord it over (dominabitur) conquered Argos” (284–85). As a consolation to a power-and-honor-hungry goddess, the speech is quite effective, showing as it does the triumph of her race over both present and future enemies. What the patriotic summary lacks is any mention of moral claims that the Romans might have to world leadership: this is a discourse of power alone. Even if the fictive audience (Venus) is indifferent to justice, the fact remains that Virgil has chosen such an audience to shape the prophecy whose implications, rightly, are seen by all readers as extending far beyond its immediate context.

A possible exception to this moral vacuity lies in the phrase mores ponet (“will impose mores,” 264), which could be interpreted to imply bringing civilization to the barbarians. Yet two later passages argue against seeing the Roman project as an advance in either morality or culture. One is Anchises’ untranslatable injunction to the “Roman”:

“tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento
(hae tibi erunt artes), pacisque imponere morem,
parcere subjectis et debellare superbos.”

6.851–53

“You, Roman, remember to rule the peoples with imperium (these will be your ‘arts’), and to impose mos on peace, to spare the subjected and to war down the proud.”

Anchises has just conceded that the Romans will be inferior in art, oratory, and science (6.847–50); the Roman “arts” will be to rule with imperium. Unlike Jupiter, Anchises acknowledges the loss of the precious things for which imperium will be the Romans’ substitutebut like Jupiter, he conceives of “peace” in terms of the exercise of power. The other passage is Jupiter’s final speech, where he specifically stipulates that the Italians will keep their own mores (12.834), a contradiction both of his prophecy about Aeneas (see O’Hara 2007: 79–80) and of the necessity of “civilizing” the native people.

Any other faint suggestions about the moral superiority of the conquerors are similarly belied by their own context or by passages later in the poem. Aeneas will crush populos ferocis (1.263), which could be understood to imply savagery—but ferox is later used by Jupiter himself as a term of approbation for Aeneas’ own fighting spirit (10.610). The one assertion that the new society will be “better” (melius) is embedded, ironically, in a description of the power struggle between

18. Jenkyns 1985: 69: “The sense of pain expressed in the first part of this sentence is perhaps greater than most interpreters suppose, surprising though that may seem.”
Jupiter and his wife, and it is the threat to Jupiter’s own realm, caelum, that causes him to pronounce the judgement: what makes Juno aspera is her harassment of “sea and lands and sky with dread.” For Juno to “change her plans for the better” means for her to join Jupiter in favoring the Romans, “masters of the world and the togate race.” While the phrase gens togata does give at least a hint of “civilisation and peace,” it is framed by references to the “slavery” that the Romans will impose upon the world, implicit in rerum dominos and explicit in servitio premet and dominabitur. There is no mention of harmonious hierarchy or of any improvement in the human condition. The only “happiness” is that of a son of the war god rejoicing in the pelt of a wolf.

In addition to the aggrandizement of Roman power, the other theme sounded in Jupiter’s prophecy is that of honor. His opening lines assure Venus that she will see her promised city and walls and will bear her son to the stars (258–60), the ultimate elevation in rank. The other mortal to receive the signal honor of apotheosis will be “Trojan Caesar.” This figure, whether Julius Caesar or Augustus (for present purposes his identity is irrelevant), combines Jupiter’s twin obsessions in a single line:

“nascetur pulchra Troianus origine Caesar, imperium Oceano, famam qui terminet astrastr, Iulius, a magno demissum nomen Iulo. hunc tu olim caelo spoliis Orientis onustum accipies secura; uocabitur hic quoque uotis.”

1.286–90

“Trojan Caesar will arise, of beautiful lineage, to bound his imperium with Ocean, his fama with the stars, Iulius, a name derived from great Iulus. You, freed from worry, will someday receive in heaven this man burdened with Orient spoils; he too will be summoned with prayers.”

Though some translators render terminet with a future (“will bound”), the present subjunctive in fact belongs to a relative clause of purpose (“to bound”), a significant nuance: from Jupiter’s perspective, Caesar will arise in order to acquire the

19. The adjective used of Aeneas, magnanimus (“greathearted”), recurs with bitterest sarcasm in the mouth of Juturna, who recognizes in the fateful Dira the proud commands of the “greathearted” god who raped her (iusa superba / magnanimi Iouis, 12.877–78); see “Rape” below.

20. For the argument that this “Caesar” refers to Augustus, see Kraggerud 1992; to Julius Caesar, see Dobbin 1995; to both (in an ambiguous, riddling way), see O’Hara 1990: 155–63. My own view is closest to that of Dobbin: the defied “Caesar . . . Iulius” refers to Julius Caesar, and Jupiter then leaps ahead to Augustus with the adverb tum. Jupiter’s concern is with the Romans’ world domination; from that perspective, the decade-and-a-half of civil war following Julius Caesar’s death is an irrelevance. I agree with O’Hara that, for Virgil’s human audience (as opposed to Venus, who shares Jupiter’s preoccupations), this is a puzzling and deceptive version of the history they had just lived through, pace the scholars who find Jupiter’s prophecy “perfectly clear, without the obscurities and ambiguities customary to oracles” (“parfaitement clairs, sans les ambiguïtés et obscurités habituelles aux oracles,” Grimal 1989: 1).
two things that matter, imperium and fama. The only adjective in the entire speech that means anything like “beautiful” (pulchra) is used, appropriately enough, of Caesar’s lineage, a compliment to his listener (allusit propter Venerem, “he made that allusion on account of Venus,” as Servius notes) but also a reminder of Jupiter’s priorities and of the absence of beauty or pleasure from his historical summary. Just as Jupiter’s description of Ascanius/Iulus concentrates solely on his name (267–68), despite the emphasis elsewhere in the poem on the boy’s beauty (pulcher Iulus, 5.570, 7.107, 9.293, 9.310), so “Iulius” is characterized only as “a name derived from great Iulus.” Far from highlighting any pleasure that might come from this Caesar’s material prosperity, the phrase “burdened with Orient spoils” (spoliis Orientis onustum) creates at best a neutral and at worst a rather negative image of the wealth he is destined to acquire.

I have argued that Jupiter’s prophecy gives no hint of the blessings normally associated with peace. The only attractions it offers are imperium, forcible control, and fama, adulation. Its deficiency in so many elements conducive to human pleasure is unique among depictions of peace in the ancient world. Nor is it the case that the Romans were some kind of neo-Spartans who considered conquest and military reputation sufficient for “happiness”: the Ara Pacis makes clear that fertility and beauty were a draw for them as for any sane society. Nevertheless, there remains the curious fact that Jupiter’s speech is invariably viewed as “the most optimistic statement in the poem” (Tarrant 2004: 125), even by the peaceloving race of modern academics. Why?

One reason is the undeniable power of Jupiter’s rhetoric. Not for nothing did Tennyson dub Virgil “Wielder of the stateliest measure ever moulded by the lips of man”—and Jupiter gets the stateliest lines. The god’s “promises to Venus about Rome’s future power are couched in terms so sweeping and totalizing (e.g., 279: imperium sine fine dedi) that even modern readers can be affected emotionally and can vicariously experience a Roman reader’s sense of elation” (Syed 2005: 44). Jupiter’s unfeigned allegiance to the Roman imperial cause lends his words additional gravity and conviction. Whether or not that cause and its spokesdivinity are ultimately conducive to human happiness, a full reading of the poem demands that we allow ourselves to feel the thrill of their majesty.

A second reason is the expectation and hope created by the prelude to the speech. As I shall discuss below (under “Nature”), Jupiter’s calming of the weather in the Aeneid is confined to the introductions to his orations, but it nevertheless has a strong effect on reading practices: by turning upon Venus the “expression with which he calms the sky and storms” (uultu, quo caelum tempestatesque serenat, 255), he projects “serenity” into the subsequent tale of violence. 21 Honorifics like

21. Pöschl 1962: 17: “In Jupiter is most clearly manifest the divine power that binds the demonic forces and the basic strength of Latinity, serenitas—which includes in one untranslatable word, mental clarity, cheerfulness of soul, and the light of the southern sky.” Yet the other appearance of serenat in the Aeneid designates a false calm designed to conceal furious turmoil within: conquered
pater omnipotens (1.60, 3.251, 4.25, 6.592, 7.141, 7.770, 8.398, 10.100, 12.178) and hominum sator atque deorum (“sower of men and gods,” 1.254, 11.725) also lead the reader to expect the paternal benignity of a kosmischer Allgott.22 The characters in the poem cling to this view as long as they can, and its readers are in some ways encouraged to do the same. Like Aeneas standing before Juno’s mural, we want to find meaning in suffering, to find compassion in the powers that control human destiny. But as the picture of Jupiter unfolds, it becomes increasingly clear that the old “tribal god” has merely “put on the mask of eternity and universality” (Johnson 1999: 61) without softening his aggressively pro-Roman bias. To claim that this bias necessarily accords with justice is to impose a theology of morality on what is essentially a theology of victory.23 The Romans must have been in the right, because they won.

I hope to demonstrate that the values and character traits that emerge in Jupiter’s debut are amplified in his subsequent appearances. His action immediately after the speech, sending Mercury to lull Dido into a placid disposition toward the Trojans (1.297–304), confirms his indifference to human emotions except as a tool to further the acquisition of power. David Ross (2007: 109) asks, “Could Virgil have devised a more unexpected or harsher way of concluding his preview of Roman history than this juxtaposition of Roman destiny and the individual to be sacrificed to it?” Jupiter’s vicarious manipulation of Dido is harsh and cruel, certainly—but to the careful reader of the prophecy itself, it should not be unexpected.

2. IARBAS AND MERCURY

If the consolation of Venus shows a smiling and serenely confident Jupiter, his response to his son Iarbas (see “Rape” below) reveals the wrath that can flare up when his plans for Roman imperium are temporarily thwarted. The Libyan king shrewdly targets Jupiter’s two weak spots, questioning both his power and the fama that derives from it. Iarbas begins by calling Jupiter “all-powerful” and defining himself and his people as ones who give Jupiter the appropriate honor (4.206–207). He then suggests that Jupiter’s failure to respond to the human situation betokens impotence: either Jupiter does hurl thunderbolts but with faulty aim, so there is no reason to fear him, or thunderbolts are merely a natural phenomenon, “blind fires” that generate “empty rumblings” (208–210). Iarbas sees Dido’s rejection of himself and acceptance of Aeneas solely in political
and martial terms, the acquisition by an unworthy master (dominus, 214) of Dido’s kingdom (regna, 214) and spoil (raptum, 217). There is no indication of any sexual jealousy, nor does it occur to him to mention the turpis cupidō (“foul lust,” 194) of Dido and Aeneas that Fama has just revealed to him (196–97). He knows only that someone else has acquired the power that should have been his. And his parting shot, that in worshipping such a god “we are cherishing empty fama” (famamque fouemus inanem, 218), recapitulates his opening sally’s accusation of either impotence (“your honor is undeserved”) or non-existence (“you’re only a rumor”). Like father like son: this masterpiece of persuasion shows how perfectly Iarbas has absorbed his father’s language of power and adulation.²⁴

Jupiter’s response, not surprisingly, is couched entirely in terms of imperium and fama, without the slightest recognition that there could be any other human motivation. Like Iarbas, he sees the affair as a misguided power play. He tells Mercury to upbraid “the Dardanian leader who now in Tyrian Carthage / waits and doesn’t regard the cities given by Fate” (Dardaniumque ducem, Tyria Karthagine qui nunc / exspectat fatisque datas non respicit urbes, 224–25). The verb he chooses to describe Aeneas’ behavior is carefully delayed and slightly shocking: after “who now in Tyrian Carthage” we expect something like “is embroiled in foul desire,” not exspectat, “waits (in expectation for something).”²⁵ As the line continues, “and doesn’t regard the cities given by Fate,” the implication is that Aeneas’ crime, from Jupiter’s perspective, consists in waiting in expectation for the wrong city. This idea recurs with the question at the end of the speech: “What’s he building? Or what’s he hoping, halting with an enemy race?” (quid struit? aut qua spe inimica in gente moratur?, 235). According to Jupiter’s way of thinking, Aeneas should be motivated by thoughts of the fama (gloria, 232; laus, 233) that springs from imperium, and the foolish mortal happens to be operating on the wrong part of the globe. That Aeneas might be lingering in Carthage not because he is “waiting” or “building” or “hoping” for something, but rather because he is enjoying something (e.g., love), does not occur to Jupiter.

This is not to say that Jupiter does not experience desire and other human emotions. Far from it: his furious reaction seems quite human.²⁶ His complaint that Venus has shortchanged him suggests not merely objective disapproval but personal disappointment:

“Non illum nobis genetrix pulcherrima talem promisit Graiumque ideo bis uindicat armis;”

²⁴. Block 1981: 141–42 observes that, in contrast to the prayers of Aeneas (1.603–605) and Dido (4.24–27), which appeal to the gods’ sense of justice, “Iarbas appeals to Jupiter’s pride in power, and gets results immediately.”

²⁵. The verb has caused difficulty for commentators, as it demands an object but none is stated: see Austin 1955: 81.

²⁶. Feeney 1991: 143–44 states that “Vergil’s Jupiter here is distinct from Homer’s Zeus, for he is not stirred to the passion of anger” and that “[a] god who can feel anger can feel pity.” Uncharacteristically, I disagree on both counts.
sed fore qui gravidam imperiis belloque frementem
Italianam regeret, genus alto a sanguine Teucri
proderet, ac totum sub leges mitteret orbem.”

4.227–31

“Not a man like this did his most beautiful mother
promise me and thus twice redeem him from the Greeks’ arms;
but that there would be one to rule an Italy pregnant with
imperia and roaring with war, to bring forth a race
from the high blood of Teucer and send the whole world under laws.”

What the “most beautiful mother” promised was calculated to appeal to Jupiter:
a man of imperium and fama, someone “to rule”—another relative clause of purpose, like qui terminet of Caesar (1.287)—“an Italy pregnant with imperia and
roaring with war,” to have a famous lineage (nomen being a species of fama),
and to “send the whole world under laws.” Servius Auctus reports that some
readers try to separate gravidam from imperiis, wrenching the Latin into “to rule
with imperia an Italy pregnant with abundance of things and roaring with war”
(qui Italiam gravidam rerum abundantia et bello frementem imperiis regeret, on
4.229)—an impossible grafting of that agricultural prosperity which I have argued
is glaringly absent from Jupiter’s prophecy. With typical Virgilian ambiguity, it is
not specified in regeret whether Aeneas would bring a savage and warlike land
into peaceful submission or whether he would simply preside over a land that was,
by nature, “pregnant with imperia and roaring with war”; in fact, as we learn in
the second half of the poem, he brings war with him. Similarly, sub leges mitteret
orbem could imply either “bring the world under the rule of law,” something
presumably good and just, or “impose dominion/terms of occupation upon the
world,” something morally neutral at best. When Iarbas says that he gave loci
leges (“conditions of occupation,” 4.213) to Dido’s people, or when Dido’s curse
prophesies that Aeneas will hand himself over sub leges pacis iniquae (“under
conditions of unjust peace,” 4.618, the only other appearance of sub leges in the
poem), “justice” is obviously not their concern. There is nothing to indicate that
it is Jupiter’s concern either. The imagery of forcible domination, the “spirit of
ferocity,” resembles that in the initial prophecy to Venus. When Jupiter discovers
that Aeneas is not fulfilling Venus’s promise, he orders the affair to be broken
off immediately. His outrage stems from the fact that Aeneas has forgotten his
“better fama” (221).

27. The phrase genetrix pulcherrima occurs at one other place in the Aeneid, in the context of
bloodlust: as Putnam 1999: 218 notes, “Instead of bringing his two combatants together for the final
clash the poet has Venus, trenchantly styled Aeneas’ ‘most beautiful mother’ (genetrix pulcherrima
[12.554]), put into his mind the destruction of Latinus’ city.” Aeneas, significantly, attributes the
idea not to Venus but to Jupiter, justifying his decision to burn the city to the ground (12.569) with a
terse Iuppiter hac stat (“this is Jupiter’s choice,” 12.565).
This combination of all-too-human anger with ignorance of human motivations does not show Jupiter in a particularly positive light. Victor Estevez (1982: 33–34) forcefully articulates the reader’s disappointment in the god’s behavior, calling Jupiter’s \textit{ira} here a “distorted reaction,” a capitulation to the “forces of irrationality and chaos,” a “fall from grace,” and “blameworthy shortsightedness.” Yet whether or not Jupiter’s response is “blameworthy,” it is consistent with the principles he exhibits elsewhere in the poem. Estevez claims that Jupiter’s inordinate anger here is a Juno Moment in which the king of the gods falls off the Olympian wagon of calm rationality. This sort of observation, though more commonly made of Aeneas than of Jupiter, is ubiquitous in pessimistic readings of the poem; indeed, nearly all readers agree that Juno represents the forces of turmoil and disagree mainly about whether they have been satisfactorily disposed of by the poem’s end. But if my argument is correct that Jupiter considers \textit{fama} and \textit{imperium} the only goods worth having, then his reaction to Aeneas’ delay is neither irrational nor inconsistent. The puzzle is what took him so long to catch on.

Since \textit{fama} is one of Jupiter’s two prevailing concerns and a major theme throughout the Dido episode (and the poem), it is worth examining more closely what it actually means. Translations tend to obscure the issue by rendering the same Latin word as both “fame” (good) and “Rumor” (bad). As Jeffrey Tatum (1984: 448) observes, “\textit{Fama} is the relationship of the individual to the many; its synonyms, \textit{honos} and \textit{gloria}, like its antonyms, \textit{infamia} and \textit{invidia}, show that its meaning always depends on context, and that even if it is a desirable attainment for any public figure, it is not in itself a virtue unambiguously good.” What can be said with certainty, however, is that the portrait of Fama preceding and motivating the speeches of Iarbas and Jupiter is unambiguously bad: she is an “evil” (\textit{malum}, 174), “foul” (\textit{foeda}, 195), “horrible huge monster” (\textit{monstrum horrendum, ingens}, 181), “as tenacious of the false and depraved as she is a reporter of the truth” (\textit{tam ficti prauique tenax quam nuntia ueri}, 188). As an ideal worth sacrificing everything for, it would be fair to say that she leaves something to be desired. The comparable abstraction in Homer, \textit{kleos}, is made to seem at least a contender as a telos for human existence; Achilles’ choice between \textit{nostos} (“homecoming”) and \textit{kleos} (“being celebrated in song”) is a hard one. In the \textit{Odyssey} (11.488–91), the dead hero may opine that he chose wrong—that, like Woody Allen, he would have preferred to achieve immortality through not dying. But at least in the context of the \textit{Iliad} there is no suggestion that \textit{kleos} is in itself an unworthy aspiration, let alone the sort of demon that Virgil so memorably depicts in \textit{Aeneid} 4.

3. THE PROMISE TO CYBELE

Jupiter’s next speech occurs in the flashback conversation with Cybele, the Great Mother and his own mother. The goddess has complained that the trees from her sacred grove, which she happily gave to Aeneas for his fleet, are about to...
be burned by Turnus (9.80–92). Jupiter responds with a series of questions of theological import:

“o genetrix, quo fata uocas? aut quid petis istis?
mortaline manu factae immortale carinae
fas habeant? certusque incerta pericula lustret
Aeneas? cui tanta deo permissa potestas?”

9.94–97

“O mother, where are you summoning Fate? Or what are you seeking with such things? Could keels fashioned by mortal hand have immortal right? Or Aeneas, in certainty, pass through uncertain perils? To what god is such power permitted?”

Although the characterization here is subtler, Jupiter’s choice of words and issues confirms the preoccupations with power and reputation exhibited in his first two speeches. He views the transition from mortality to immortality as essentially an elevation in rank; for ships made by mortal hand to break caste by achieving the “immortal right” (immortale fas) seems improper. Cybele appealed to him on the basis of affection, calling herself “your dear mother” (tua cara parens, 84) and the grove “beloved to me” (dilecta mihi, 85). Jupiter ignores the terms of endearment and responds with the language of power: “To what god is such potestas permitted?” Even his subsequent promise to transform the ships into sea goddesses is expressed in terms of violence and control: he will “snatch away” (eripiam, 101) their mortal form and “command” (iubebo, 101) them to be goddesses who “cleave” (secant, 103) the foaming sea. In the catalogues of Nereids by Homer and Hesiod, Dotus is given no epithet, but Galatea is called agakleites (“famous”) and eueides (“of beautiful appearance”); several myths revolve around the nymph’s beauty. Sea nymphs are meant to be ornamental. The epithet given by Jupiter is, predictably, one designating their lineage (Nereia, “of Nereus”). The image of “cleaving the foaming sea with their breast” (103), while perhaps verging on the erotic, lacks the tenderness that will characterize the transformed ships’ encounter with their former master (10.215–59; see Fantham 1990).

4. THE COUNCIL OF THE GODS

Only once in the poem does Jupiter summon the gods to plenary assembly.28 He expresses his displeasure at their instigation of war, asking why their “opinion was changed” (sententia uobis / uersa retro, 10.6–7) when he “had forbidden Italy to meet the Trojans in war” (abnueram bello Italiam concurrere Teurcis, 8); the time for war will come, he assures them, when Carthage brings destruction over the Alps, but for now the treaty should be respected (11–15). After lengthy

28. On the various generic precedents for the concilium deorum, see Bretzigheimer 1993: 26–36; Virgil’s is a curious hybrid of scenes of command, conflict, and discussion (29).
complaints by Venus (18–62) and Juno (63–95), the pater omnipotens calms not only the assembly but the earth, aether, and sea (100–103), an interesting blend of simile and reality that recalls the famous simile of Neptune calming the sea like a Roman statesman (1.148–53). Jupiter apparently abandons his original plea for peace, declaring instead that he will allow the war to proceed without divine intervention: “His own undertakings will bring suffering or sorrow to each. Jupiter is king to all equally” (sua cuique exorsa laborem / fortunamque ferent. rex Iuppiter omnibus idem, 10.111–12). He then swears an oath by the Styx and shakes Olympus with his nod (113–15). Taken alone, these speeches would cast Jupiter in a positive light as the supreme god “whose moral force and authority have been for many readers the anchor of a stable and comforting reading of the poem” (O’Hara 2007: 81). He says he had forbidden the war and reprimands the gods for countermanding his authority; his controlling, calming influence on the weather is emphasized, conjuring up images of beauty and serenity; he declares himself sublimely impartial; and he ratifies his words with the gods’ most awesome, unbreakable oath.

The problem with this picture is that Jupiter’s two main points contradict his words and actions elsewhere in the poem. It is difficult to reconcile his words to Venus, “[Aeneas] will wage a huge war in Italy” (bellum ingens geret Italia, 1.263), with his statement here that “I had forbidden Italy to meet the Teucrians in war,” as readers since Servius have complained (on 10.8, 107). Thomas (2004–2005: 145) observes that “Virgil draws attention to [this contradiction] with an exquisite intratextual marker,” for Jupiter’s phrase sententia ... uersa (10.6–7) echoes his earlier declaration, neque me sententia uertit (“nor does any opinion change me,” 1.260). Jupiter declares repeatedly that he will be impartial and not intervene, but this too proves to be false: he prevents Pallas and Lausus from meeting in combat (10.436–37), and Mezentius enters the battle “by the promptings of Jupiter” (Iouis monitis, 10.689). O’Hara (2007: 103) concludes his discussion of the Aeneid’s inconsistencies with a question not unlike that with which Virgil ends the proem (tantaene animis caelestibus irae?, 1.11): “What kind of a world are we in, if Jupiter can swear falsely by the Styx? Can one be certain of anything in this poem?” The answer to O’Hara’s question, I suggest, resembles the answer to Virgil’s. Such great wrath is in the hearts of the gods above, and the behavior of Jupiter, far from being inconsistent, is quite predictable. His “insincere temporizing” (Harrison 1990: 90), or what in ordinary parlance is generally called “lying” (see Hershkowitz 1998: 98), accords with his indifference to morality and his preoccupation with his own sovereignty.

29. Wilson 1979: 363 links the mantic clause rex Iuppiter omnibus idem with the one that follows it, fata uiam inuenient, translating, “The fates will find a way whereby the kingship of Jupiter will make itself felt to all alike.” Feeney 1991: 145 (with bibliography) notes that Jupiter’s “grand declaration of impartiality ... resists quasi-theological exegesis”; Horsfall 1995: 143 characterizes it as “not doctrine but bluff.”
The phenomenon of expectation causing readers to see the opposite of what is actually there is especially prevalent in Jupiter’s consolation of Hercules. This scene is crucial to an interpretation of Jupiter’s character, because it is frequently cited as a counterexample—the counterexample—to the heartlessness I have been attempting to demonstrate. When Pallas is about to die at Turnus’ hand, he prays to Hercules (who in some versions of the tradition is his father), and Hercules weeps over the youth’s impending death. Jupiter responds to his son with a short speech about the inevitability of human mortality:

Alcides [Hercules] heard the youth and suppressed a mighty groan within the depth of his heart and poured forth empty tears. Then the father addressed his son with friendly words: “The day for each man is fixed, short and irrecoverable is everyone’s time for life; but to stretch out *fama* through deeds, this is the task of virtue. Beneath the high walls of Troy so many sons of gods have fallen—nay, along with them fell Sarpedon, my progeny; for Turnus, too, his Fate is calling and he’s come to the limit of his given time.” So he speaks, and turns his eyes away from the Rutulian fields.

When discussing this scene from memory at a recent classics convention, several eminent Latinists claimed that Jupiter rather than Hercules wept; others have claimed in print that Virgil does not show gods weeping at all. Yet both of these claims are contradicted by the text. Tears are shed not only by previously mortal newcomers, Hercules (10.465) and Juturna (*lacrimas oculis Juturna profundit*), “Juturna pours forth tears from her eyes,” 12.154), but also (as Venus mentions to Vulcan) by veterans, Thetis and Eos/Aurora (*te filia Nerei, / te potuit lacrimis Tithonia flectere coniunx*, “the daughter of Nereus, the wife of Tithonus was able to move you with tears,” 8.383–84), and even by Olympians, Venus (*lacrimis oculos suffusa nitentis*, “bathing her gleaming eyes in tears,” 1.228; *durum Aeneae fleuissem saepe laborem*, “I had often wept over Aeneas’ harsh labor,” 8.380) and—most surprisingly—Juno (*adlacrimans*, “weeping (at him),”...
Virgil recognizes no interdict on divine tears that would prevent Jupiter from expressing grief in this way. But rather than taking this opportunity to show the chief god’s sympathy, Virgil instead highlights Jupiter’s indifference to human suffering in general and his emotional disengagement from any individual humans in particular.

Both the traditional relationship between Jupiter and Hercules and the introduction to the speech itself lead us to expect that Jupiter will “respond to Hercules’ tears for Pallas’ death with a father’s understanding and compassion” (Ross 2007: 72). Not only were the two gods commonly joined in Roman cult (Costa 1919: 1–14), but in the Christian era, their relationship was compared by Christian converts such as Arnobius to that of God the Father and God the Son, a development not entirely inconsistent with their ancient roots (Mattingly 1952). The tears of Hercules and the beginning of the line that follows them, tum genitor natum, seem to be leading up to an expression of paternal affection, and Hercules’ role as the “true offspring of Jupiter” was also emphasized earlier in the poem ( uera Iouis proles, 8.301). The connotations of the line’s second half, dictis adfatur amicis, are harder to pin down. “Friendly” is not exactly the response one might wish from a parent consoling a grieving child; is Jupiter exhibiting true “kindness,” or is he giving “friendly advice” like that of Job’s comforters? The word allows for both possibilities, but the first part of the line would seem to point toward the former.

Another factor creating an expectation of Jovian compassion is the scene’s rich intertextual background. All readers agree that Jupiter’s speech alludes to the conversation between Zeus and Hera in Iliad 16 (431–61) about the death of Sarpedon, an allusion signaled by Jupiter’s own mention of the incident (Knauer 1964: 299). But the contrast with the Homeric model could hardly be starker. Once again, the sensitive ear of the optimistic Jenkyns (1985: 65) picks up the discordant note, but he refuses to accept the implications of his own discomfort:

Virgil’s scene is a fine one, but not without some awkwardness: to this reader at least its inferiority to its Homeric counterpart is too clear for comfort. That cannot have been Virgil’s intention; however, he does
choose to signal his imitation of Homer here with a more than usual degree of explicitness. (emphasis added)

My argument is that the “awkwardness” and “inferiority” of Virgil’s scene are intentional—that the flatness of Jupiter’s speech in comparison with Zeus’s is the reason Virgil signals his “imitation” so deliberately.

A brief glance at the *Iliad* scene will illustrate the differences. Zeus looks down on his son Sarpedon, fated to die by Patroclus’ hand, and laments to his wife the mortal’s impending death:

Seeing them, the son of crooked-scheming Kronos pitied them, and addressed Hera, his wife and sister: “O woe is me (*moi*), that in my eyes (*moi*) Sarpedon, dearest of men, is fated to be vanquished at the hand of Patroklos son of Menoitios. The heart in me (*moi*) strains two ways in my breast as I ponder it, whether to snatch him up while he’s alive from the tearful battle and place him in the fertile land of Lycia, or vanquish him now at the hands of the son of Menoitios.”

*Iliad* 16.431–38

Zeus’s personal affection for his son is reflected in his threefold repetition of *moi*, the reference to his own “heart,” and the designation of Sarpedon as “dearest of men.” He also feels “pity” for both mortals, as the narrator tells us, and as implied by Zeus’s designation of battle as “tearful.” Though he grudgingly accepts the principle in Hera’s subsequent lecture (439–57) about why he must not attempt to tamper with Fate (Moira), his sorrow is evident when he “poured down bloody drops to the earth, honoring his dear son” (16.459–60), whether these are to be seen as “tears of blood” or merely a grotesque omen.33 However feckless Zeus’s emotions may ultimately be, it is clear that Sarpedon’s death does touch them. Jupiter, by contrast, utters not one word that would indicate his recognition of human suffering or an emotional connection with Sarpedon. In place of Zeus’s reference to “tearful battle” and Sarpedon as “dearest of men,” Jupiter mentions only the “high walls of Troy” and Sarpedon as “my progeny.” Whereas Zeus groans that he cannot fight against Moira, not once does Virgil’s Jupiter, in this scene or elsewhere, express regret or reluctance about bowing to the dictates of Fate. The old question about the relative strength of Jupiter and Fate in the *Aeneid* is unanswerable precisely because they never disagree.34

Two other Homeric episodes are also important models for Virgil’s *consolatio*. Stephen Harrison (1990: 192) cites Nestor’s speech to Telemachus in *Odyssey*

---

33. Barchiesi 1984: 19–21 discusses the interesting ancient controversy about the composition and implications of the bloody drops sent down by Zeus.

34. As Servius succinctly observes (on 10.628), “The voice of Jupiter is Fate” (*vox enim Iouis fatum est*); see Commager 1981. For a comprehensive discussion of *fatum/fata* in the *Aeneid*, see Pötscher 1977: 22–95.
3.108–13 as a classic example of the *occidit et* topos, which supposedly consoles the bereaved listener by pointing out that other great men have died too: Achille, Ajax, and Patroclus all lie dead at Troy, “and there lies my dear son, both mighty and blameless, Antilochus, surpassingly swift in running and a fighter too” (*Od*., 3.11–12). But like Zeus’s in *Iliad* 16, Nestor’s speech serves to highlight what is absent from Jupiter’s. The old man’s brief eulogy of his son expresses both affection (“dear”) and pride (“mighty and blameless”), mingled with the implicit regret that one so talented and good should have to die so young. For Jupiter, Sarpedon is neither “dear” nor “blameless,” but simply “my progeny.” Second, Jupiter’s speech alludes to that of Sarpedon himself earlier in the *Iliad*, the locus classicus for the “heroic code” (*Il*. 12.322–38): the inescapability of death means that the hero’s task is to win glory for himself—which he would happily exchange for immortality, but that is not an option. This elevation of *fama* in light of the brevity of mortal life is precisely the point of Jupiter’s speech. But in the mouth of an immortal enjoying the perpetual good times Sarpedon would prefer, the sentiment rings rather hollow. Moreover, what Jenkyns (1985: 66) refers to as Jupiter’s “praise of stoical virtue” seems essentially similar to Sarpedon’s calculus. If there is a difference between Homeric *kleos* and Virgilian *fama*, as I suggested above, it is in the extreme negativity of Virgil’s portrayal of Fama, the hideous monster as wedded to depravity and lies as to truth.

We are now in a position to speculate on the implications of the coda to the speech, in which Jupiter “turns his eyes away from the Rutulian fields.” Here again, readers frequently allow their expectations to condition their interpretation of this typically cryptic Virgilian gesture. Servius, unable to accept the plain meaning of *reicit oculos* (“he turns his eyes away”), forces the Latin to say that Jupiter turns his eyes toward the fields in benediction (*respiciendo fecit partem feliciorem*, “by gazing upon the area he made it happier/more blessed,” on 10.473). On the absurdity of John Conington’s (1883: 279) comment on 10.473, “The averting of the eyes to parallel to [sic] the shedding of tears of blood in Hom.,” little need be said. Harrison’s comment (1990: 193) is more in line with the *communis opinio* that Jupiter’s speech exhibits paternal feeling: “Jupiter turns his eyes away from the battle in sorrow, not with the detachment of the Homeric Zeus at *Il.* 13.2–3 (cf. Griffin, *Life and Death*, 197); the contrast with Homer’s divine audience is characteristically Vergilian (so again at 758–9).” But the Homeric parallel Harrison cites could be interpreted in precisely the opposite way: if “he turns his eyes away” signifies “detachment” in the Homeric context, why not suppose that it signifies the same thing in the Virgilian context? Conington notes, “Virg. has taken the words but not the sense of another passage in Hom., *Il.* 21.415.” In that passage, Athena turns her eyes away from Ares, whom she has just wallopéd with a large stone, in contempt and mockery. In the *Aeneid*, Minerva averts her eyes to

35. “And when I die, be sure you let me know / Great Homer dy’d three thousand years ago” (Alexander Pope, *Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot*, 123–24).
reject the supplication of the Trojan women (1.482), Dido to reject the plea of Aeneas (4.469). If the commentators do not adduce any parallels for averting eyes in sorrow, that is very likely because there are none. Moreover, the Aeneid lines Harrison cites state that “the gods in Jupiter’s house feel pity for the empty wrath of both sides and that mortals should have such suffering” (dī lōius in tectis iram miserantur inanem / amborum et tantos mortalibus esse labores, 10.758–59), not that Jupiter himself does. In fact, nothing in Virgil’s text, here or elsewhere, indicates that Jupiter feels sorrow or pity, despite what mortals devoutly believe, and in this he would appear to be unique among the gods of the Aeneid.

While thoughts about the inevitability of death necessarily arouse sadness and sympathy in us mortals, we should beware of projecting these emotions onto Jupiter. What a fictional character, a creation of paper and ink, “really feels” is of course a meaningless question. We can say with certainty, however, that there is no overt indication of sorrow, no adjective describing his emotional state or his affection for mortals individually or collectively, and that Virgil’s silence on this point presents a stunning contrast to all the Homeric models.

6. NEGOTIATION WITH JUNO OVER TURNUS

The next appearance of Jupiter, on the other hand, leaves little room for doubt about his attitude toward human suffering. Crazed with grief over the death of Pallas, Aeneas has just committed a series of atrocities, gathering eight youths for a human sacrifice (10.517–20), mocking a father’s plea in the name of paternal love (524–34), sacrificing a priest (535–42), taunting a warrior that his mother will never bury him (557–60), and sneering, “die, and, a brother, don’t desert your brother” (morere et fratrem ne desere frater, 600), an echo of the prototypically impious Pyrrhus’ words to Priam (2.547–50). In a simile that has long troubled commentators, Aeneas is compared to one of the hundred-armed creatures who traditionally helped Zeus win the battle against the Titans, but who in Virgil’s simile, shockingly, are fighting against Jupiter (10.565–70). There would appear to be a family resemblance between the hundred-armed here and Furor in Jupiter’s prophecy, bound with a hundred brazen knots and sitting upon saeua arma; the same root applies to Aeneas’ “rage,” desaeuit (569), and the last word describing his aristeia is furens (604). Most readers both ancient and modern agree that in this passage “Aeneas’ actions are blatantly offensive to basic notions of human decency” (Tarrant 2004: 118).

It is here, and here only, that Jupiter, “spontaneously” (ultro), chooses to make an approving comment on the battle of which he is a spectator:

Iunonem interea compellat Iuppiter ultro:
“o germana mihi atque eadem gratissima coniunx,
ut rebare, Venus (nec te sententia fallit)

Troianas sustentat opes, non uiuida bello
dextra uiris animusque ferox patiensque pericli.”
10.606–610

Meanwhile, Jupiter spontaneously addresses Juno:
“O my sister and also my most pleasing wife,
just as you thought (and your opinion wasn’t wrong)
Venus props up the Trojans’ strength, not the men’s right hand
vigorou in war and a spirit fierce and enduring of danger!”

The terms of endearment with which he addresses his wife-and-sister are the first
we have heard from him, and they are of course heavily ironic, introducing as they
do a sarcastic comment amounting to “I told you so.” But more disturbing than his
gloating to his wife (the honeymoon is long over, as she points out) is his applause
for Aeneas’ fighting spirit precisely at what most readers would consider Aeneas’
moral nadir. Though Jupiter uses a plural, “men’s right hand” (dextra uiris), the
spotlight has been on Aeneas for so long (since 10.511, nearly a hundred lines)
that Jupiter’s comment must refer primarily to that hero. Moreover, the point of
Jupiter’s ironic quip that “Venus props up the Trojans’ strength” is to emphasize
precisely that Venus is not propping up the Trojans’ strength; Aeneas’ furor, unlike
that of Dido (via Cupid) and Turnus (via Allecto), is “entirely spontaneous and
in character” (Coleman 1982: 161–62). Aeneas has several moments of humanity
during the war, and he is soon to have one of his best, when he sees the good
Lausus dying for his father and the pietatis imago causes him to relent and pity the
boy (10.824–26). Yet Jupiter reserves his approval—his only stated approval of
any action in the poem—for the climax of Aeneas’ cruelest rampage. Jupiter tends
to be sparing of evaluative adjectives: the densest cluster we have seen is in the
description of peace at the end of his prophecy (“grey-haired, dire, constricting,
impious, savage, shackled, brazen, horrible, gory”), where the “eager savagery”
was directed against a personification of Furor. Here, Jupiter applies the vocabulary
of “Roman military virtue” (Harrison 1990: 222) to Aeneas furens in his pitiless
slaughter of suppliants whose roles as priests, fathers, sons, and brothers have
been brought to the fore.

This comment by Jupiter is rarely discussed by critics, yet it is essential to
an interpretation both of his character and of the moral enigma surrounding the
poem’s final scene. One of the questions raised by the Aeneid, put simply, is
whether furor can ever be a good thing.37 As Hardie (1998: 63) points out, “The
furus that rages through the poem owes as much to the madness and Maenadism
of tragedy as it does to the anger and thumos (‘battle-spirit’) of epic,” and this
dual association of furor with battle-spirit (good, at least potentially) and madness
(certainly bad) makes a simple moral judgment call impossible. G. K. Galinsky
(1999: 451) argues that Aeneas’ furor in book 12 is entirely appropriate: “Whereas

37. Thornton’s (1976: 159–63) appendix on ira and furor is useful in this regard.
his furor in Book 2, e.g., which Putnam and others believe the end of the epic recalls, was misguided, his furor at the end of the epic is not: both the divine will, as indicated by the dea dira, and Aeneas’ own inclination are in concert.” In book 10, the “divine will” clearly corresponds to “Aeneas’ own inclination”—but what does this say about the divine will? The moral issues are cast into clear relief, with Aeneas behaving as cruelly as an epic hero can; Jupiter responds with approval and even, shall we say, joviality. Galinsky’s interpretation of the final scene must be correct if we accept the Jovian equation of “laudable behavior” with “anything conducive to the establishment of Roman imperium.” But if we allow that Jupiter’s moral compass may be skewed, as his inappropriate applause in book 10 would suggest, then the question posed by the poem’s end remains open.

Juno appeals to her husband on the front most likely to make an impression, namely, Turnus’ own illustrious nomen and the honor he has given Jupiter by placing generous gifts on his altar (10.618–20). The mention of sacrifices made by Turnus is the sort of appeal common in the Iliad; in particular, Zeus responds favorably to the reminder of Hector’s goodness and remarks on his own love for the pious mortal (II. 24.66–70). Jupiter’s terse reply (breuiter, 10.621) conspicuously lacks any mention of either approval or affection: he declares simply that if Juno seeks to buy some time for the “youth about to fall” (caduco ... iuueni, 622–23), he has “room to have indulged thus far” (hactenus indulsisse uacat, 625)—about as unemotional a response as one could imagine. It is Juno, weeping (adlacrimans, 628), who points out the basic injustice of the situation, namely that “a heavy doom awaits an innocent man” (manet insontem gravis exitus, 630). Before simply attributing Turnus’ “innocence” to Junonian bias, we should try to see the issue without assuming that the ultimate end of establishing Roman imperium justifies any means. As Aeneas admits, Fate is the only justification for his conquest of Italy (11.112). Does standing in the way of Fate—that is, trying to prevent a foreign invader from stealing one’s fiancée—constitute moral culpability?

7. THE RECONCILIATION WITH JUNO

If the prophecy to Venus in book 1 is the keynote speech for an optimistic reading of the poem, the conversation with Juno in book 12 could be called the concluding argument. Here at last the king of the gods puts his foot down and forbids the forces of chaos to hold further sway. But like his opening speech, this one is as remarkable for what it does not say as for what it does. The question posed in the proem was essentially the problem of Evil—namely, why must the good, in this case a man conspicuous for his pietas, suffer (1.8–11)? Jupiter does not address this question. Instead, he frames the issues in the terms that reflect his priorities. Aeneas, as Juno well knows, is destined by Fate for the elevation

in rank that is apotheosis (12.794–95): therefore, “was it fitting for a god to be violated by a mortal wound?” (mortal in decuit uiolari uulnere diuum?, 12.797). The rhetorical question is a mirror-image of the one he asked Cybele, where he frowned upon the notion of ships made by mortal hand having immortal privileges (9.95–96). In both cases, the source of his indignation is the transgression of the human/divine boundary, a violation of fama. His second complaint is that it would be improper for “power to grow for the conquered” (uim crescere uictis, 12.799), a violation of imperium. Finally, Jupiter wants Juno to stop her “grim cares often rushing back at me from your sweet mouth” (mihi curae / saepe tuo dulci tristes ex ore recursent, 12.801–802), a violation of his right not to be bothered with such things. 39

At the end of this speech, however, Jupiter finally appears to exhibit something like compassion for the sufferings that humans have endured throughout the poem. He catalogues Juno’s mischief and orders her to desist:

“uentum ad supremum est. terris agitare uel undis
Troianos potuisti, infandum accendere bellum,
deformare domum et luctu miscere hymenaeos:
ulterius temptare ueto.”

12.803–806

“It’s come to the last. You were able to agitate the Trojans on both land and sea, to ignite an unlawful war, to deform a house and mingle wedding songs with mourning: I forbid you to try any further.”

In particular, the phrase luctu miscere hymenaeos—the only time a word designating sorrow crosses Jupiter’s lips—may conjure a poignant image of a blood wedding, that most tragic of themes. Jupiter is not aloof or indifferent; our first glimpse of him was tossing curae in his heart (1.227), cares pertaining to the human world. But does this passage reveal any sympathy or compassion, the Greek and Latin both meaning “suffering with,” for the humans whose affairs are so interesting to him?

If we examine carefully the words and imagery Jupiter chooses, we see that this “something like compassion” is not really compassion, that his concern is for Juno’s violation of order and decorum rather than for the suffering she has caused. To “agitate/continually drive” the Trojans on land and sea is emotionally neutral; it emphasizes that Juno has kept them from their assigned place. He might have made the same complaint if she had tried to interfere with the weather. Juno has “ignited” a war that is infandum, “unlawful, not to be spoken of”—he focuses

39. As so often, a temporary grammatical ambiguity resolves itself in a surprising way. The phrase mihi curae appears at first a double dative, indicating that Juno’s pain would “be a source of care for me”—but the next line reveals curae as a nominative, the gist of the lines being, “so the complaints from your sweet [IRONY] mouth stop giving me a headache.”
on the legality and fitness of it, not that it is “cruel” or “grim” or “hateful.” She has “deformed” the house, brought it out of its proper shape. In this context, then, *luctu miscere hymenaeos* could be said to exhibit less compassion than simply “brought them grief”; just as she “deformed the house,” so she deformed the wedding, mixing it up, importing an emotion unsuitable to its genre. The verbs he chooses, “ignite, agitate, deform, mingle,” all suggest a disturbance in the proper alignment and placement of things. Jupiter’s focus is on the functioning of institutions, not the experience of individuals.

Jupiter’s closing speech makes a point of responding to questions raised at the beginning of the poem. The apparently anti-Trojan compromise he presents to Juno reverses the terms of the apparently pro-Trojan prophecy he delivered to Venus, similarly “smiling on her” (*ollı subridens*, 1.254 = 12.829): whereas to Venus he had emphasized Trojan conquest, to Juno he emphasizes that the Ausonians will keep their language, *mores*, name, and religious customs, with the Trojans contributing only to the gene pool (12.834–37). The poet had asked, “Is such great wrath in the minds of the gods above?” (*tantae animis caelestibus irae?*, 1.11); Jupiter assures Juno that the two of them are alike in the floods of wrath beneath their hearts (*irarum sub pectore fluctus*, 12.831). Juno had asked, “Does anyone adore the divinity of Juno hereafter, or will they as suppliant place an offering (honor) upon her altars?” (*et quisquam numen Iunonis adorat/ praeterea aut supplex aris imponet honorem?*, 1.43–44). Jupiter promises that the race arising from the Trojan and Italian amalgamation will be second to none in *pietas* and in worship of her:

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

12.838–40

> “The race that will arise hence, mingled with Ausonian blood, you will see go beyond men, beyond gods in *pietas*, nor will any race equally celebrate your honors.”

Jupiter’s last word calls attention to a dark aspect of the gods’ thirst for adulation, for *honor* consists not only of “reputation,” but also of “blood sacrifice.” The themes of human sacrifice to Juno and to Diana Nemorensis are of central significance to the *Aeneid*, both thematically and structurally. Yet as we shall see

[40. The present discussion is somewhat truncated, as I have discussed this speech at length elsewhere (Dyson 1997: 454–56; 2001: 125–30).

41. Dyson 2001: 234–35: “Aeneas may try to conciliate Juno with heartfelt prayers, but these will be to no avail if he fails to follow the proper procedures. The ‘one head given for many’ accomplishes nothing—or worse than nothing—if the victim is unwilling. The rites of Diana Nemorensis, with their cycle of priest-become-victim, reflect the cycle of bloodshed that characterized Roman history from its beginnings. The first part of this book ends with the *honores* of Juno and the second part with the *honores* of Diana; despite bitter squabbles within the Olympian...
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(“Prayers and Omens” below), Virgil also allusively suggests that the recipient of the two most prominent offerings, Dido and Turnus, is Jupiter himself.

II. OTHER ENCOUNTERS

Jupiter’s speeches are complemented by his actions and the glimpses of him supplied by the narrator and other characters. Some of these encounters involve the exercise of power over humans, through sexual aggression, punishment by thunderbolt, or the manipulation of emotions. Others involve controlling the weather, generally—except before his speeches—by bringing darkness and storms. All fall into a fairly limited set of categories, which I consider briefly below: “Rape,” “Punishment,” “Nature,” “Prayers and Omens,” and “Interventions in War.”

1. RAPE

Hesiod, one of Zeus’s most devout apologists, describes the god’s extramarital affairs—the source of such delightful goddesses as the Muses and the Graces—with circumlocutions like “mingled in love” (e.g., Theog. 940, 944). To be “loved” by a god need not be a negative thing, especially if the “beloved” is willing, and readers who wish to excuse Jupiter’s adulteries invariably employ such vocabulary to describe his sexual encounters. A positive interpretation of these encounters was also available to Virgil’s ancient audience. Europa with Jupiter-as-bull, for instance, could symbolize fertility and renewal: in 81 B.C., L. Volumnius Strabo issued a denarius whose obverse depicted a laureate head of Jupiter and whose reverse showed Europa mounted on the bull, along with ivy (a famously evergreen plant, symbolic of Rome’s continuing vigor) and a winged thunderbolt. Yet Virgil chooses to describe most of Jupiter’s extramarital liaisons with rapere (or its compounds), which means “to seize and forcibly carry off”—an action that, when applied to sex, our own culture calls “rape.” While there is no explicit reference to the suffering of the first three victims (Ganymede, a Garamantian nymph, and Io), the last, Juturna, is given a prominent lament that stands in for the keening of Hector’s wife, mother, and sister-in-law near the end of the Iliad (24.723–75).

pantheon, at day’s end, both amount to the same thing. The sacrifice of Turnus does not ‘work.’ According to the logic of the poem, that sacrifice is necessary, but its consequence will be the sacrifice of Aeneas and many after him.”

42. See, e.g., Thornton 1976, who speaks of Electra as “one of the many loves of Jupiter,” mentions “Jupiter’s affection for the beautiful Trojan youth Ganymede” (78), and says of Io, “Jupiter loved her” (46). Heinze 1993: 200 calls Juturna “Jupiter’s beloved.” Buchheit 1963 refers to Ganymede as Jupiter’s “Liebling” (61) and says that “Io ist von Juppiter zur Geliebten erkoren worden.” 114).

43. Fears 1981: 52, who also cites Theophrastus’ description of a miraculously evergreen plane tree under which Zeus is said to have “mingled (emigē) with Europa” (Hist. pl. 1.9.5); this plane tree is mentioned by Varro (RR 1.7.6), whose work Virgil knew well.
The first allusion to Jupiter in the *Aeneid* makes clear that his *rapere* is one of the chief causes of the Trojan War. Juno’s murderous wrath and “savage pain” (*saeuique dolores*, 1.25), the narrator informs us, sprang not merely from the Judgment of Paris, but from “the hated race and the *honores* of seized Ganymede” (*genus inuisum et rapti Ganymedis honores*, 1.28). Servius comments that the Trojan race was hateful to Juno “because of Dardanus, the son of [Jupiter’s] mistress Electra” (*propter Dardanum Electrae paetricis filium*, on 1.28). This lineage is stressed several times in the *Aeneid* (1.380, 6.123, 7.219–20, 8.134–37). From Juno’s standpoint, of course, it makes no difference whether the union was consensual, and the sources are silent on this point. But Ganymede, who receives pride of place as the last cause named, was *raptus*, a word that denotes both “sexually assaulted” (so Servius) and “carried up to the sky” (so Servius Auctus). The phrase *rapti Ganymedis honores* identifies Jupiter’s two passions: *rapti* signifies the exercise of power, while *honores*, especially the elevation in rank from mortal to immortal, is the compensation in *fama* that Jupiter offers his victims.

Not only does Virgil tamper with tradition in making Ganymede a cause of the Trojan War,44 but later in the poem he also elaborates on the abduction itself. The cloak given as a prize in the boat race sports one of the *Aeneid*’s many disastrous hunting scenes: Jupiter’s eagle “seized [the boy] up on high” (*sublimen ... rapuit*, 5.255), while his “aged guardians stretch their hands in vain to the stars and the barking of dogs rages” (256–57). The word *sublimis* recalls Jupiter’s prophecy of Aeneas (1.259), but with the neutral *feres* (“you will bear”) replaced by *rapuit*. This presentation of Ganymede’s disappearance from the earth offers no Olympian happy ending, focusing instead on the grief and loss of those left behind (Putnam 1995b: 424).45 The Christian Dante, in a brilliant reworking of this passage, uses the abduction of Ganymede as a symbol for the inexorability and inscrutability of divine love (*Purg*. 9.19–33). But the Virgilian ecphrasis gives little reason to hope for such beneficence.

Two other objects of Jupiter’s desire are mentioned in passing. One is the mother of Iarbas, who was “begotten by Ammon [Jupiter] on a seized Garamantian nymph” (*Hammone satus rapta Garamantide nympha*, 4.198). The act is relegated to the same curt participle applied to Ganymede, *raptus*.46 As we have seen, the offspring of this union has internalized his father’s values (see I.2 “Iarbas and

---


45. Hardie 2000: 240, noting an allusion to Ennius’ Romulus (the first deified Roman) in the opening of the boat race, suggests that “another reader might wish to fill in the dots, and pursue the hint of a transcendentalist plot-line.” The ecphrasis itself, however, does not encourage the reader to focus on the positive.

46. Feeney 1991: 144 observes, “At the moment when Aeneas is to be separated from Dido, Vergil activates the inveterate distinction between human responsibility and divine imperviousness, by showing the inconsequentiality of the god’s sexual involvement beside the catastrophic repercussions of the human’s.”
Mercury” above). The other, though the act itself is not described, is Io as she appears on Turnus’s shield, “now covered with bristles, now a cow” (iam saetis obsita, iam bos, 7.790). Monica Gale (1997: 177) sees emblems of the two sides of Turnus’ character in the two images on his shield, the evil fire-breathing Chimaera and “the defenceless woman transformed into an animal through the desires and jealousies of the gods.” Yet Virgil has chosen to leave the pathos of Io’s experience largely implicit, focalizing, as with Ganymede, through the spectators: the cow is guarded by Juno’s watchman while her father looks on (790–91). The poet makes no overt reference either to Io’s suffering or to her traditional metamorphosis into the goddess Isis.

For Ganymede, the Garamantian nymph, and Io, we do not hear about their ultimate responses, and in cases such as this that makes a great difference. Apotheosis could, after all, be a reward sufficient to atone for any earthly suffering; Jupiter’s rapere could be symbolizing the charis biaios, “violent grace,” that the reverent chorus in Aeschylus’ Hymn to Zeus saw as the suffering necessary to perfect our human wisdom (Ag. 176–83). But as the Aeneid draws to a close, one story’s unhappy ending is made brutally clear. Juno asks the nymph Juturna, “goddess to goddess” (diua deam, 12.139), to bring help to her brother Turnus, declaring that Juturna is her favorite Latin nymph of all those who “have ascended the thankless bed of greathearted Jupiter” (magnanimi Iouis ingratum ascendere cubile, 12.144)—an ironic use of magnanimus along the lines of Catullus’ glubit magnanimiti Remi nepotes (“shucks the descendants of greathearted Remus,” poem 58.5). The poet tells us, parenthetically, that Juturna had become a goddess when the “high king of the aether consecrated this honor for her in exchange for virginity snatched away” (hunc illi rex aetheris altus honorem / Iuppiter erepta pro uirginitate sacrauit, 12.140–41). This quid pro quo, honor for erepta virginitas, recalls rapti Ganymedis honores (1.28). But whereas near the poem’s beginning the Ganymede episode was focalized through Juno, emphasizing her wrathful jealousy of a rival’s honores, near the poem’s end the perfect passive participles to which the experiences of Ganymede and the Garamantian nymph were reduced burst forth into a shrill present—and future. Juturna’s own voice declares emphatically that apotheosis is not worth her virginity:

“haec pro uirginitate reponit?
quo uitam dedit aeternam? cur mortis adempta est condicio? possem tantos finire dolores
nunc cerite, et miser fratri comes ire per umbras!”
12.878–81

“He trades me this for virginity?

47. Jovian apologists (Buchheit 1963: 114; Thornton 1976: 115) emphasize Juno’s cruelty to Io and cite an obscure version of the myth in which Juno transforms the maiden into a cow before Jupiter can have his way with her. But whether or not Jupiter’s passion is consummated, Io would never have been on Juno’s radar without it.
For what did he give eternal life? Why is the state of death robbed away? At least I could have put an end to such pain, and gone to the Shades, my wretched brother’s companion!”

Far from being reasonable compensation, Juturna considers the honor given her by “greathearted Jupiter” ([magnanimi iouis, 878])—a use of magnanimus every bit as ironic as Juno’s—a positive evil, a permanent inability to put an end to her suffering. For her, an immortality bereft of human love and companionship (882–83) is misery. And indeed, given what the gods are like, could an eternity spent in their company really be considered a reward? Like the horrific description of Fama, this speech calls into question the value system that puts such elevation in rank ahead of love.

2. PUNISHMENT

Jupiter in the Aeneid metes out punishments for one thing only: violations of rank. To attempt to transgress the boundary between mortal and immortal is bad, but to attempt to usurp Jupiter’s honor is worst.

The catalogue of punishments recited by the Sibyl is revealing in this regard. What is interesting for our purposes is that it begins with those punished by Jupiter himself, wielder of that ultimate weapon, the thunderbolt. The first three groups or individuals named, the Titans (6.580–81), the Aloidae (582–84), and Salmoneus (585–94), are all punished for variations on the same crime: attempting to usurp the role of Jupiter. Yet the rhetorical presentation of these crimes is instructive, for the length and vividness of the descriptions increase as the magnitude of the threat decreases. The Titans, traditionally punished for attempting to wrest away Jupiter’s sovereignty of the universe, are disposed of in two lines. The Aloidae, giant figures who tried to pile up mountains to reach Olympus, are not attested as appearing in Tartarus before Virgil; these receive three lines. By contrast, Salmoneus, who attempted to pass himself off as Jupiter, gets a full ten lines, more space than any other sinner (the closest is Tityos with six). Unlike the preceding groups, this obscure human upstart with a tinfoil thunderbolt posed no real threat to the cosmic order. Yet the elaborate and lengthy description of his impersonation of Jupiter and its “cruel punishment” ([ crudelis ... poenas, 48. Ross 2007: 69 calls Jupiter’s recompense to Juturna “the cruelest of divine rewards”; Barchiesi 1999: 328 observes that “her condition of immortality ... is nothing more than eternal suffering.”

49. On Juturna as the voice of protest, see Perkell 1997.

50. Note that the only mortals in the poem who have passed or will pass the boundary successfully are those promoted by Jupiter himself: his son (Hercules), his victims (Ganymede, Juturna), and Romans/proto-Romans (Julius Caesar and/OR Augustus, Aeneas).

51. On the strange manipulations of tradition in Virgil’s catalogue of sinners, see Zetzel 1989, especially 268. Edgeworth 2005: 3–4 discusses the formulaic nature of most Underworld catalogues; Virgil’s inclusion of Salmoneus among the usual suspects (Ixion, Sisyphus, and Tityus) is unique.
585) highlights his crime as the worst; from Jupiter’s perspective it is indeed the unforgiveable sin, for the mortal “demanded the gods’ honor for himself” (*diiumque sibi poscebat honorem*, 589). The prominence assigned to Salmoneus here contradicts the supposition that Jupiter is concerned only with cosmic issues and the grand sweep of history: where his own *fama* is concerned, he exhibits the same petty jealousy and wrath as any other Olympian. Moreover, though many other sins follow, none of them are depicted as meriting the thunderbolt or even the interest of Jupiter himself, being delegated instead to vultures and Furies. Despite the peculiarly Roman emphasis in Virgil’s Underworld on “rules, punishment, and justice” (Zetzel 1989: 283), injustice in the abstract matters less to Jupiter than does a personal insult.

The two other transgressions in the *Aeneid* deemed worthy of punishment by thunderbolt are similar violations of the boundary between mortal and immortal. Though Anchises does not specify why the “father of gods and king of men blasted me with the winds of his thunderbolt and afflicted me with fire” (*me diuum pater atque hominum rex / fulminis adflauit uentis et contigit igni*, 2.648–49), the reader of the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite would remember that the goddess threatened such a punishment from Zeus if Anchises boasted about his liaison with her (*HH* 5.286–88); Aphrodite feels particularly remorseful about having lain with a mortal (253–55). The resurrection of Hippolytus (as Virbius) by Diana’s love and Asclepius’ art (7.765–69) also draws down Jupiter’s indignation and thunderbolt, not because of the specifics of the case, but because “any mortal” (*aliquem mortalem*) was allowed to return from the Underworld (7.770–71). Whether Hippolytus (now disguised and called Virbius, under the witness protection program) is deified or merely resurrected temporarily is ambiguous: *ad sidera aetheria* (“to the aetherial stars,” 767–68) implies that he is immortal, and in Ovid’s version Virbius complains that he is now “one of the minor gods” (*de disque minoribus unus*, *Met.* 15.545), but *aetuum exigeret* (“spend his life,” 776–77) implies that he is not. In any event, it is not Hippolytus himself who is the object of Jupiter’s ire, but rather the “inventor of such medicine and art” (773) as to make possible the crossing of the boundary without Jupiter’s permission. Hippolytus has literally ascended to a position where he does not (in Jupiter’s opinion) belong: the *sidera aetheria* and *superae aurae*. Interestingly, Juno’s admonition to Allecto, though not a punishment, expresses in similar terms the displeasure she knows the ruler of Olympus will feel at the Underworld goddess’s sojourn on earth: he would not wish for her to “wander too freely over the aetherial breezes” (*super aetherias errare licentius auras*, 7.557). That Allecto is stirring up a war that will cause untold suffering in the human world is not mentioned. Juno knows that what her husband will care about is Allecto being *out of place*.

One other aspect of Jupiter’s punishments deserves notice: sometimes they are meted out by other gods for transgressions against themselves. The *Aeneid*’s first mention of Jupiter by name is in Juno’s indignant cry that Pallas (Minerva) was allowed to appropriate her father’s thunderbolt and destroy an entire fleet for the
crime of one man (Oilean Ajax), whereas she, Jupiter’s sister and wife, receives no such perks (1.39–48). Similarly, in the speech that launches her mischief in the poem’s second half, she complains that the city of Calydon was handed over to Diana’s wrath by Jupiter himself (*ipse deum ... genitor, 306*), an unusual twist that serves to link the present lament with the one about Minerva stealing the thunderbolt in book 1. Both Minerva and Diana were enraged by slights to their honor; though Jupiter does not administer the punishment, he is willing to allow his daughters to destroy a fleet and a city in order to take their vengeance.

3. **Nature**

Jupiter was originally a divinity of the sky and weather, and this remains an important function of his in the *Aeneid*. Readers from antiquity onward have observed the natural metaphor of “storms of passion,” with Juno/Hera the divinity of the Aer (turbulent “lower air”) and Jupiter of the Aether (serene “upper air”), which seems to fit the poem nicely: the storm/furor roused by Juno is given some play, but ultimately calmed by the clear rationality and order represented by her husband. As we have seen, Jupiter delivers his prophecy of Roman destiny “with the expression that calms the sky and storms.” The problem with this model, however, is that the only “storm” Jupiter calms in the *Aeneid* is the assembly of fractious gods (10.97–103). In fact, though he sometimes temporarily suppresses destructive forces, he is more often said to unleash them.

The imprisonment of the winds, which forms the backdrop for Juno’s rousing of the poem’s first storm, is crucial to an understanding of Jupiter’s character and of the poem’s ultimate message. The winds’ *ira* (1.57) need to be suppressed to prevent the sweeping away of “seas and lands and deep sky” (*maria ac terras caelumque profundum, 1.58*); Jupiter, “dreading this” (*hoc metuens, 1.61*), imposed a mountainous mass upon them. Their chaotic wrath forms an obvious analogue to the passions that drive Juno, whom Jupiter likewise describes as “now harrying sea and lands and sky with dread” (*quae mare nunc terrasque metu caelumque fatigat, 1.280*). In both passages, the threat to Jupiter’s own territory (*caelum*) produces dread (*metus*). Jupiter’s speech leaves it ambiguous who feels the dread, but in the winds passage the omniscient narrator informs us that it is felt by Jupiter himself. The forcible containment of the potentially destructive winds is a model for Jupiter’s *imperium* throughout the poem: it reappears in the suppression of the monster Typhoeus by a mountain (*Inarime Iouis imperis imposta Typhoeo, 9.716*), which Hardie (1994: 225) calls a “strong image of Olympian might imposed on forces of rebellion: cf. 1.61–2,” and most prominently, of course, in the tableau of Furor locked in a hundred chains (1.293–96). Like the monster beneath the still-simmering volcanic mountain, and like

52. The magisterial study of Zeus by Cook 1964–1965 iconically captures this double function: Volume 1 discusses “Zeus as God of the Bright Sky,” while Volume 2 discusses “Zeus God of the Dark Sky (Thunder and Lightning).”
the winds whom Juno’s bribery so easily unleashed (1.65–83), Furor is still very much alive, not calmed but imprisoned.

That Jupiter cannot defuse the forces of chaos, but can only suppress them forcibly and temporarily, is also hinted at by several offhand remarks of characters and narrator that have cumulative weight. Of the three chaotic items discussed above—the winds, Typhoeus, and Furor—the first two are associated, by speaking characters in parallel situations, with the limits of Jupiter’s control. Under the influence of her connubial bribe, Aeolus assures Juno that she is the one who manipulates Jupiter so as to grant him (Aeolus) the sovereignty over winds and storms (1.76–80), and the readiness with which he succumbs to her request suggests that this may be more than idle flattery. Similarly, Venus flatters Cupid by calling him “you who alone scorn the Typhoean shafts of the supreme father” (solus ... patris summi qui tela Typhoëa tennis, 1.664–65), implying that the ungovernable power of erotic love surpasses even Jupiter’s “Olympian might imposed on forces of rebellion.” Finally, when Jupiter first takes the stage in person, the narrator tells us that the god is “tossing cares in his heart” (iactantem pectore curas, 1.227). The connotations of cura are at least as ambiguous as those of its cognate “care,” covering equally a parent’s solicitude, a lover’s affection, and a tyrant’s anxiety. Yet it is no coincidence that metus and cura, the first two emotions ascribed to Jupiter, are precisely those which Lucretius had labeled as destructive of happiness, insisting that the good Epicurean should be free from them (DRN 2.16–19; see Dyson 1997).

Though critics generally emphasize Jupiter’s imprisoning the destructive forces of Nature, the Aeneid more often shows him stirring them up. Most famously, his terrifying power resides in the thunderbolt, as two of his offspring remind him (Venus 1.230 fulmine terres, Iarbas 4.208 fulmina torques), and we see his thunderbolts-in-progress at Vulcan’s forge being alloyed with metus and irae (8.431–32). The Arcadians think they have seen him in their sacred grove shaking the black aegis and arousing storms (8.352–54), and a battle is compared to Jupiter’s bringing of hail and violent weather (9.682–71). Interestingly, the only reference by a character to Jupiter as a calming influence is in the negative: Palinurus declares the storm to be such that he could not hope to reach Italy “even if Jupiter should promise it on his own authority” (si mihi Iuppiter auctor / spondeat, 5.17–18). In one particularly eerie twist, the “malignant light” (luce maligna, 6.270) of the Underworld is compared to the darkness ubi caelum condidit umbra / Iuppiter (271–72); the clause ubi caelum condidit umbra seems to be complete, with umbra the subject (“shadow has hidden the sky”), and it is therefore disconcerting to find in the next line that umbra is ablative and Jupiter the enjambed subject (“with shadow has Jupiter hidden the sky”). In fact, with the exception of serenat in book 1 and the gods’ assembly in book 10, Jupiter’s

weather-related activities in the poem are confined to bringing clouds, storms, thunderbolts, and darkness.

In addition to the Arcadian grove where Jupiter’s stormy avatar seems to have appeared, the two specific mentions of Jupiter’s sacred groves associate them with chthonic forces. The Cyclopes are said to be “like lofty oaks with elevated crowns” (*quales cum uertice celso / aëriae quercus*, 3.679–80) or cypresses from the forest of Jupiter or the grove of Diana (681). Pandarus and Bitias, gatekeepers of the Trojans’ camp, are raised in the grove of Jupiter (9.673), “equal to their ancestral fires and mountains” (674), and compared, like the Cyclopes, to “lofty oaks” who nod “with crowns on high” (*quales aëriae ... quercus ... sublimi uertice*, 9.679–82). It is surely a carefully crafted correspondence that the two similes both compare men (or humanoids) to oak trees, have the ablative of *uertex* modified by “high” (*celsus/sublimis*), contain the phrase *aëriae quercus*, and open with *quales* at lines 679 (!) of the third books of the first and second halves of the poem. In the case of the Cyclopes, the comparison of these proverbially impious, Zeus-hating monsters to trees in the “forest of Jupiter” forms a surprise ending; for Pandarus and Bitias, their provenance from the “grove of Jupiter” forms their introduction. I have argued at length about the central significance to the *Aeneid* of sacred groves (Dyson 2001). Here I would merely point out that the association of Jupiter’s trees with paradigmatically monstrous figures is less anomalous than it may seem.

### 4. Prayers and Omens

There is a simple formula for Jupiter’s response to prayers: those which further the advance toward Roman *imperium* are answered immediately and positively, and those which do not are ignored. The justice of a suppliant’s claim is not a factor.

The contrast can best be observed in the case of Dido, who repeatedly calls upon Jupiter for support she has every reason to expect. She is, after all, the wise ruler of a just society (1.507–508). The first words spoken to her by the Trojan spokesman Ilioneus identify her as “queen, to whom Jupiter granted it to found a new city and to rein in proud peoples with justice” (*o regina, nouam cui condere Iuppiter urbem / iustitiaque dedit gentis frenare superbas*, 1.522–23); Aeneas’ first speech to her includes a prayer that the gods, if there is any justice in the

---


55. Williams 1962: 201 discusses the scholarly disagreement over the meaning of *uertice celso*, which could mean both “on a high peak” and “with high tree-top”; he argues persuasively for the latter, partly by comparing 9.679–82.

56. See Smith 1990 and 1997: 71–73 for a similarly line-precise parallel, an allusion to *Aen*. 10.475 at *Met*. 10.475. Though I would not stake my reputation on the claim that ancient authors played such games with line numbers, it does not strike me as inherently implausible (and we can note in passing that book 9 is precisely 100 lines longer than book 3, making it easy to count backward from the end). Dante did it all the time.
world, will reward her pietas (1.603–605). Dido’s prayer to Jupiter at the fateful banquet (1.731–33) expresses her confidence in his just governance of the laws of hospitality and her hopes that the day will be happy and memorable for all their descendants. Yet Jupiter makes no response, and as the reader knows, the day will in fact be “memorable” as the beginning of the disastrous love that is to bring undying enmity between the two peoples. Dido invokes Jupiter again when still wavering about whether to give in to her growing passion for Aeneas, praying that the pater omnipotens will drive her to the Underworld with his thunderbolt before she violates her pudor (4.24–27). Whether or not this should be seen a genuine request, Dido implicitly regards Jupiter is a benign guardian of morals who will not only punish human transgressions, but even prevent them. From Jupiter, no answer.

His absent presence is made all the more palpable in the simile comparing Dido in love to a deer wounded “in the Cretan woods” (nemora inter Cresia, 4.70) who “wanders in the Dictaean forests and groves” (siluas saltusque peragrat / Dictaeos, 4.72–73). The emphatic enjambment of the molossus Dictaeos alludes to the Cretan locale known for the rearing of Jupiter, whom Virgil in the Georgics refers to simply as the “Dictaean king” (Geo. 2.536). A few lines after this simile, Juno, realizing that Dido has been infected by the pestis of love, is called the “dear wife of Jupiter” (cara Iouis coniunx) when she goes to Venus to complain (4.90–92); as Denis Feeney (1991: 182) points out, this is a choice example of how “trenchant juxtapositions cast into relief the feebleness of human effort beside the gods’ impervious self-suﬃciency.” More importantly, the wound of the simile is to become a literal death-wound: after she has resolved to die, Dido summons Anna to help her prepare a “sacriﬁce to Stygian Jupiter” (sacra Ioui Stygio, 638)—a sacriﬁce that Dido knows will be not of cattle but of her own body. The strange

57. As Hardie 2002: 24 notes, “The phrase ‘absent presence’ has become a cliché of post-Derridian and post-Lacanian criticism, but the oxymoron has a venerable antiquity”; see p. 25 for ancient examples and passim for application to Ovid’s poetry.

58. In the Georgics, Virgil describes the rearing of the infant Jupiter in a “Dictaean cave” (Dictaeo ... sub antro, 4.152) and refers to Jupiter’s Iron Age as the scepter of the Dictaean king (2.536) replacing the age of golden Saturn (2.538). In the Aeneid, Jupiter’s close association with Dictaeus is implicit in the Penates’ dream admonition to Aeneas on Crete that “Jupiter refuses you the Dictaean fields” (Dictaea negat tibi Iuppiter arua, 3.171). For a persuasive analysis of the way Crete in the Aeneid represents “Recurring Trauma and Alternative Fate,” see Armstrong 2002. Crete is the location of many other myths relevant to Dido’s story, of course—Ariadne, Pasiphae, and the Labyrinth, to name a few—and my argument does not exclude these other allusions. But aside from the present passage and Ecl. 6.56 (in the story of Pasiphae), the adjective Dictaeus in Virgil refers specifically to Jupiter.

59. On Dido’s death as a devotio, a ritual of self-sacriﬁce intended to curse one’s enemies, see Tupet 1970. Higget 1972: 184 notes that Dido, wounded but unable to die (4.689–92), “lies writhing like a sacrificial animal struck and not killed.” The phrase “Stygian Jupiter” may recall not only Dis/Pluto, but also the somewhat mysterious Veiovis, Jupiter’s “hellish counterpart” (Palmer 1974: 140; see Wissowa 1912: 236–39). Alfo¨ldi 1972 discusses what appears to be this god’s dual identity as a “young Jupiter” and an “underworld Jupiter”; both aspects have solid grounding in ancient texts. It is no coincidence that Aeneas’ ultimate destination, according to legend, was to become
circumlocution for the god of the dead suggests Dido’s ultimate awareness that she is being “sacrificed” to Jupiter himself.

For Jupiter, as Dido finally realizes, is not her protector but the leading agent of her downfall. After Aeneas has declared his intention to leave, Dido complains that “neither greatest Juno nor the Saturnian father looks upon these things with fair eyes” (nec maxima Iuno / nec Saturnius haec oculis pater aspicit aequis, 4.371–72). She is torn between her indignation at Jupiter’s injustice and her Epicurean sarcasm at the thought that the gods meddle in human affairs at all (380–81; see Dyson 1996). Again, no answer. After Aeneas has abandoned her by cutting his ship’s rope with his Jovian lightning-like sword, ensis fulmineus (4.579–80), Dido cries indignantly to Jupiter that her foreign guest has broken the laws of hospitality (4.590–91). No answer. Finally, Dido comes to accept that the immutable fata Iouis (4.614) are the source of all her troubles, and she bitterly names them before she pronounces her curse on Aeneas (615–29) and prepares the sacrifice of her own body to “Stygian Jupiter” (638). Much of the pathos of the Dido episode, I suggest, comes from the way her confident prayers to the god of justice and hospitality disintegrate into sarcasm and despair. For as the reader knows, far from responding to Dido’s pleas, Jupiter’s role is to ensure that Aeneas will fail to respond to them as well (4.331, 356, 396, 440).

Like Dido, Turnus begins with a confident belief in Jupiter’s favor that moves from complaints to disillusionment and despair. After the epiphany of Iris (9.6–13), Turnus “lifted both hands to the stars” (duplicisque ad sidera palmas / sustulit, 9.16–17)—precisely the same gesture of pietas as that with which Aeneas is introduced (duplicis tendens ad sidera palmas, 1.93). Turnus is uncertain whether she has been sent by Juno or Jupiter (as Servius notes on 9.16 and 9.22), but later evidence suggests that he decided it was Jupiter (Mackie 1990: 80). His blindness to the god’s disfavor leads to one of the poem’s most blatant misinterpretations of an omen. A voice from on high (in fact that of Cybele, with Jupiter’s permission) has just declared that the Trojans need not defend the ships because they are to turn into sea-goddesses at her command. After the transformation takes place before his eyes, Turnus rejoices that “Jupiter himself has snatched away the accustomed aid” from the Trojans (Iuppiter ipse / auxilium solitum eripuit, 9.128–29). The reader, of course, is well aware that Jupiter is not on Turnus’ side. After Turnus has broken into the Trojans’ camp, Jupiter intervenes, with a message sent by Iris to Juturna, to keep him from remaining there too long (9.802–805). It is to Jupiter that Turnus complains when he realizes that he has been deceived by the phantom Aeneas (in fact sent by Juno), seeing the respite from death as a humiliation (crimen, 668) and a punishment (poenae, 669) rather than a mercy. Here again he stretches his “two hands to the stars” (duplicis ... manus ad sidera, 10.667), and the description of his mental state, ignarus rerum (“ignorant of
things,” 666), echoes the memorable phrase describing Aeneas’ response to the Shield, rerumque ignarus imagine gaudet (“ignorant of things he rejoices in the image,” 8.730); but whereas the imago of Roman history brings Aeneas joy, the imago of Aeneas brings Turnus misery. Finally, after Turnus recognizes the Dira and realizes that the game is up, his despair is summarized in the phrase “Jupiter my enemy” (Iuppiter hostis, 12.895). The awareness that Jupiter is not only thwarting him in this instance but has actually been his enemy all along saps Turnus’ will to keep fighting.60 C. J. Mackie (1990: 85) well summarizes the tragic irony of Turnus’ misplaced faith in the tribal god of the Romans: “in the tragedy of Turnus, as in the case of Dido, the pietas of the victim is an essential factor in bringing disaster closer. The mistake of Turnus is to have too much faith, not too little.”

Prayers for Jupiter’s mercy, either to spare a loved one or to bring a swift death to one’s bereaved self, are as fruitless as the appeals to his justice by Dido and Turnus. Evander’s wish that Jupiter might bring back his own youth (8.560) is presumably a merely rhetorical ploy, but his prayer that Pallas might be spared or he be allowed to “break off this cruel life” (crudelem abrumpere uitam, 8.579) is earnest. Even the reminder of his and Jupiter’s common Arcadian heritage (8.573; see Harrison 1984) brings no response. Nisus, for all his agnosticism about whether the gods or their own desires inspire men (9.184–85), nevertheless responds to Euryalus’ wish for a glorious death with an appeal to the justice of “Jupiter, or whoever else may look upon these things with fair eyes” (Iuppiter aut quicumque oculis haec aspicit aequis, 9.209). The echo here of Dido’s complaint, nec Saturnus haec oculis pater aspicit aequis (4.372), may remind the reader of how little concern Jupiter in fact has for justice or grief. After the death of Euryalus, his mother prays that the Rutulians or Jupiter himself, “great father of the gods” (magne pater diuum, 9.495), will “break off [her] cruel life” (crudelem abrumpere uitam, 9.497). Like Evander, she appeals to Jupiter’s sense of pity for a parent’s suffering at the loss of a child, with the repetition of crudelem abrumpere uitam (= 8.579) at the end emphasizing the similarity between the two grieving parents. Like Evander, she receives no response.

When mortals’ prayers have to do with the advancement of Roman imperium, on the other hand, Jupiter responds visibly, audibly, and immediately. The prayer of Anchises after the omen of Iulus’ flaming head is paradigmatic. He begs Jupiter for help “if we deserve it through pietas” (si pietate meremur, 2.690); since the issue at stake is getting the Trojans to leave Troy, something Jupiter desires, he responds with thunder on the left and a splendid comet as soon as the prayer leaves Anchises’ mouth (2.692–94). A similar situation occurs in Sicily, where Aeneas appeals to Jupiter’s own pietas to avert the flames from his ships or else kill him with a thunderbolt (5.687–92); as with Anchises’ prayer, the thunderous

60. Feeney 1991: 181 notes that “moments when humans recognize divine action clearly for what it is tend to be moments of final catastrophe.”
(and rainy) response comes as soon as Aeneas gets the words out (5.693–94). The specter (facies, 722) of Anchises that subsequently appears to Aeneas attributes Jupiter’s action to pity (miseratus, 5.727). The Sibyl, similarly, ascribes to Jupiter both justice and love (aequus amauit Jupiter, 6.129) in his decision about which lucky mortals get return tickets from the Underworld. In book 12, Jupiter is invoked several times as the just guardian of human pacts (12.178, 200, 496). But as we have seen, the actual appearances of Jupiter in the poem would suggest that pity, justice, and love are human projections, not characteristics that the god exhibits himself.

The flaming apex on Iulus’ head and the comet that follows both have echoes later in the poem, and both are attributed to Jupiter.61 When the aged Acestes shoots an arrow into the air during the games, it bursts into flame and continues to fly like a shooting star or a comet (5.519–28). The precise interpretation of this omen is much disputed (Williams 1960: 141–43), but Aeneas, in any case, credits it to Jupiter’s marking Acestes with special honores (5.533–34). In the Underworld Heldenschau, Anchises associates the “twin crests” (geminae cristae, 6.779) on the head of Romulus with signal honor awarded him by Jupiter (6.780). As Romulus is one of the four beings (along with Remus, Fides, and Vesta) whom Jupiter designates as presiding over the Pax Augusta, it is appropriate that this one human should be selected for the mark of Jupiter’s favor as he gives his imprimatur to nascent Rome. That the plumes are geminae, however, especially followed by Anchises’ subsequent bizarre instruction to “turn your twin eyes” (geminas nunc flecte acies, 6.788), reminds the reader of Romulus’ “twin” and the fratricide that marked the beginning of Roman history.62

During Aeneas’ wanderings, Jupiter comes to the fore, mostly in expressing his disapproval by various supernatural signs.63 Aeneas’ sacrifice to Jupiter on Actium (279), however, appears to be without incident, and his Jovian fortunes improve after that. Helenus’ prophecy assigns to Jupiter the comforting role of overseeing Aeneas’ maiora auspicia (374–75) and of allotting Fate (375–76). In book 7, once the Trojans have reached their final destination, Jupiter’s

61. On star imagery throughout the Aeneid alluding to the sidus Iulium, see Williams 2003.
62. Servius (on 6.779), explaining the “twin crests,” observes that Romulus “did absolutely everything this way [i.e., “doubled”], to appear to reign with his brother, so that he might not condemn himself as guilty of murder: whence he had everything doubled, as if sharing with his brother” (omnino in omnibus hoc egit Romulus, utcum fratre regnare videtur, ne se reum parricidii iudicaret: unde omnia duplicia habuit, quasi cum fratre communia). Feeney 1999: 229–30 points out that the phrase huius ... auspiciis (6.781) also hints at the auspice-taking contest that gave rise to the murder of Remus: Romulus was a “genuinely ambiguous figure,” and “what is striking in Vergil is the way in which we are reminded of Remus even as we hear the praise of Romulus the founder.”
63. Thrace: Aeneas’ sacrifice to Jupiter is followed by the grotesque omen of a bleeding tree (3.21–46). Crete (“great Jupiter’s island,” 104): Anchises’ prayer (116) misfires and he finds he has misinterpreted the oracle (171). Strophades: Aeneas summons Jupiter to share slaughtered cattle (222–23), then is given a seemingly dire prophecy by the Harpy Celaeno stemming from Jupiter (251). See Harrison 1985 on the ways Virgil manipulates tradition in order to augment the role of Jupiter.
interventions are wholly positive and approving. He himself plants the idea
\((\text{sic Juppiter ipse monebat}, 7.110)\) of the table-eating that will fulfill the omen
prophesied in book 3,\(^{64}\) and Aeneas, recognizing that he has found his homeland
at last (122), makes an offering to Jupiter and the shade of his father (133–
34). Jupiter responds with a spectacular display of sound and light, the \textit{augurium
maximum} of three thunderclaps from a clear sky, shaking a golden cloud “himself,
with his own hand” \((\text{ipse manu}, 7.143)\). In introducing the Trojan race to king
Latinus, Ilioneus has every reason to claim, as he does, the ancestry and favor
of Jupiter (7.219–21). Jupiter’s presence at the beginning of the second half of
the poem is more palpable and, for the Trojans, more ostensibly benign than
anywhere else.

Benignity toward the Trojans, however, means hostility to their enemies, and
the poem’s final prayer/omen pair has sinister implications for Turnus. Numanus
Remulus has just delivered his lengthy taunt about the Oriental effeminacy of the
Trojans (9.598–620). Ascanius, wishing to punish him, utters a prayer and vow
to Jupiter before letting loose his arrow, promising him a bullock “now butting
with its horn and scattering sand with its feet” \((\text{iam cornu petat et pedibus qui
spargat harenam}, 9.629)\). Jupiter responds immediately with thunder out of a
clear sky (630–31). It is no coincidence that Turnus, who is compared to a young
bull butting with its horns and scattering sand (12.103–106) just like the one
Ascanius promises, will be sacrificed by Ascanius’s father at the end of the poem
\((\text{immolat}, 12.949)\). Like Dido, compared to a deer wounded in Jupiter’s grove
at the beginning of her book and sacrificed to “Stygian Jupiter” at its end, Turnus
turns simile into reality, reminding us that the gods’ \textit{honores} come not merely
from spoken words but from human blood.

5. \textsc{Interventions in War}

Jupiter’s role in war can also be summarized simply: he ensures that the
Trojans lose in Troy and win in Italy. Homer states in line 5 of the \textit{Iliad} that
“the will \((\text{boulē})\) of Zeus was coming to fulfillment”; Virgil several times refers,
not to Jupiter’s will, but to his \textit{imperium} \((4.238–39, 5.747, 5.784, 8.381, 9.716)\).
Though Virgil does not himself attribute the outcome of the wars to Jupiter at
the beginning, it is clear that Jupiter is the one who is ultimately in control.

Jupiter’s heavyhanded manipulation of the fall of Troy has caused distress not
only to Aeneas and the Trojans (2.326–27) but also to some modern scholars.\(^{65}\)
When Venus reveals to Aeneas the Olympians working to overthrow Troy, Jupiter
is the final, climactic element in the list:

\footnotesize
64. As Harrison 1985: 144–45 observes, “The action involved—placing wheat-cakes under
the fruit they are about to eat—is perfectly natural, which only makes Vergil’s introduction of Jupiter

to motivate it all the more conspicuous.”

65. Jupiter’s determination appears to contradict Vulcan’s strange assertion (8.398–99) that the
all-powerful father and Fate would have allowed Troy to stand for ten more years if Venus had
intervened sooner.
“ipse pater Danais animos uirisque secundas sufficit, ipse deos in Dardana suscitat arma.”

2.617–18

“The father himself supplies spirits and favorable strength to the Greeks, he himself stirs up the gods against Trojan arms.”

But then Iulus’ hair catches fire; Anchises prays to Jupiter for a sign that this is a favorable omen, sees a spectacular comet, and is instantly converted to believing that the gods are on Troy’s side after all (uestroque in numine Troia est, “Troy is under your divine power,” 2.703). R. G. Austin (1964: xxi) finds this “apocalypse of devils” and Anchises’ “irrational” response so disturbing that he attributes the whole scene to a late-life religious crisis in the poet: “perhaps here, more than anything else, there lies the ultimate reason for his wish that the Aeneid should be destroyed.” Whether or not Austin’s dismay is justified, it bears a striking resemblance to that of Turnus upon discovering that the god he thought was helping him has become a demon: di me terrent et Iuppiter hostis (“the gods terrify me, and Jupiter my enemy,” 12.895). Moreover, Anchises’ newfound confidence in Jupiter’s guidance does not transfer to his son, whose mind is bewildered by “I don’t know what hostile divinity” (nescio quod ... male numen amicum, 2.735) into leaving his wife behind, the cruelest torture he suffers (746); we soon hear from the lips of Creusa’s imago that the responsibility for their parting rests with the “ruler of highest Olympus” (superi regnator Olympi, 779).

In the Italian war, despite Jupiter’s assertion at the council of the gods that he will remain impartial (10.107–113), he is specifically said to intervene twice in book 10, twice in book 11, and at the climax in book 12, a “sustained crescendo of power which has no parallel in epic” (Feeney 1991: 145). He prevents Pallas and Lausus from meeting, preserving them for greater foes (10.436–38). It is through his monita that Mezentius attacks the Trojans (10.689); the atheist’s mocking prayer that Jupiter will see to his case (10.743–44) is ironically echoed by Aeneas’ real prayer before killing him (10.874–76). Jupiter “stirs up Tarchon for savage battle and increases his wrath with no gentle goads” (in proelia saeua / suscitat et stimulis haud mollibus inicit iras, 11.727–28). After Turnus hears of Camilla’s death, it is Jupiter’s “savage divinity” (saeua numina, 11.901) that causes his self-destructive fury. In fact, it becomes apparent that Jupiter is responsible for many or even most of the events that decide the course of the war in the final three books, including which man will win (12.725–27).66

The sending of the Dira in book 12 (843–55) is perhaps the single event that has caused most distress to those who would see Jupiter as a symbol of rationality and order. Whether or not this pestis is the very same that Juno sent in book 7, the two are a “structurally parallel and complementary pair” (Hershkowitz 1998: 89).

66. See Dyson 2001: 119–21 on the strange ambiguity of these lines, in contrast to Homer’s clarity.
The Dira does Jupiter’s dirty work, not only on this occasion, but whenever he sends terrifying evils to the human race:

\[
\text{hae Iouis ad solium saeuique in limine regis}
\text{apparent acuuntque metum mortalibus aegris,}
\text{si quando letum horrificum morbosque deum rex}
\text{molitur, meritas aut bello territat urbes.}
\]

12.849–52

These appear at the throne and on the threshold of Jupiter, the savage king, and sharpen dread for ailing mortals, whenever the king of the gods is planning horrid death and disease, or frightening cities that deserve it with war.

Juno was the “savage wife of Jupiter” (\textit{saeua Iouis coniunx}, 7.287) as she worked herself up to the frenzy that culminated in sending the Fury to instigate the Italian war. But that the husband should stoop to his wife’s level and in fact be referred to himself as the \textit{saeuus rex} (12.849) is deeply disturbing to many readers.\(^\text{67}\) M. Owen Lee (1979) is a typical example: “The destructive force—irrational, vindictive, relentless—is called Juno. The creative force—rational, benevolent, stable—is called Jupiter” (24); but with the Dira, “Jupiter, hitherto the divine embodiment of reason and purpose, seems utterly changed; he sends an irrational and destructive female spirit to speed the action to its end” (100). Lee concludes, “the supreme irony, the terror of the final page is that the vindictive spirit has been sent by the father-god. The world has indeed gone awry” (143).\(^\text{68}\)

Paradoxically, however, this passage is also unique in quite a different way. The clause \textit{meritas aut bello territat urbes}, “or frightens cities that deserve it with war” (12.852), is the narrator’s only assertion in the entire poem of Jupiter’s justice.\(^\text{69}\) Virgil lays special emphasis on \textit{meritas}, placing it after a rare line-beginning \textit{molossus} (\textit{molitur}) and separating it from its noun (\textit{urbes}) with pronounced hyperbaton. The focalization here (see Fowler 1990) is especially puzzling, as every previous adjective in the passage would appear to suggest sympathy for the human victims: Jupiter himself is \textit{saeuus}; the mortals are \textit{aegri}, “sick, weak, troubled”; the death and disease he brings are \textit{horrificus}, “horror-inspiring.” The \textit{aut} in 852 seems to represent a shift of focus from the misery (terror, disease, death) of individual mortals to the “just war” visited upon deserving cities, a sudden cut from the human to the god’s-eye view. But what does it mean for a city to be “deserving” of war? And why has Virgil chosen to

\(^\text{67}\) See Knox 1997 on the discomfort of ancient commentators with the epithet \textit{saeuus} applied to “good” gods and heroes.

\(^\text{68}\) Johnson 1976: 130 articulates the Dira’s role even more forcefully: “She represents and brings with her into the poem and its closure the full fruition of the evil, incomprehensible darkness that has drifted through the poem but has never, until now, overwhelmed it.”

\(^\text{69}\) All other passages cited by Bianchi 1996: 746 in discussing Jupiter’s association with justice are either direct or indirect quotations of speaking characters.
embed his only assertion of Jupiter’s justice in a passage that most readers see as Jupiter’s nadir? I leave these questions for other readers to answer.

A more prominent appeal to the justice of Jupiter comes from the narrator’s striking address to the god himself. At the end of the first proem—one of the most marked positions in the poem—the poet had asked the Muse a question that haunts the entire epic: tantaene animis caelestibus irae? “Is such great wrath in the minds of the gods above?”, 1.11 Aside from two more invocations of Muses (7.37, 9.77), the narrator addresses a divine being in only one other place. After asking what god can expound for him the slaughter wrought by Aeneas and Turnus during their double aristeia (12.500–503), the narrator then turns specifically to Jupiter: tanton placuit concurrere motu, / Iuppiter, aeterna gentis in pace futuras? (“Did it please you, Jupiter, for peoples destined for eternal peace to clash with such strife?” 12.503–504). These two bitter questions—unique authorial intrusions, parallel in form, metrically identical, and framing the narrative at its beginning and near its end—must surely be taken as a pair. The first asks about the problem of Evil in general, whether divine wrath can cause so much suffering for a good man; the second asks about that specific evil, civil war, which plagued Roman history from its foundation and dominated Virgil’s formative years. I have argued that Virgil’s narrative, in a determined refutation of Lucretius, answers the first question with an overwhelming affirmative (Dyson 1997). In the present paper, I hope to have demonstrated that everything we have seen of Jupiter suggests an affirmative answer to the second as well.

III. JUPITER, HAPPINESS, AND ROME

Mens immota manet, “the mind remains unshaken while the vain tears fall.” That is the Virgilian note. But in Homer there was nothing, in the long run, to be unshaken about. You were unhappy, or you were happy, and that was all. Aeneas lives in a different world; he is compelled to see something more important than happiness.

What C. S. Lewis (1942: 38) means to say here is correct, but what he actually says is not. There is nothing more important than happiness. Not even Orwell’s O’Brien is capable of pursuing unhappiness for its own sake; the pleasure he derives from power is deeply disordered, but power and pleasure are still goods that, like all goods, are capable of increasing human happiness when pursued in the proper way. What Lewis means is that Aeneas is compelled to see something more important than the pleasure of physical and emotional intimacy, which he must sacrifice for the higher good of securing future benefit for his descendants. This is the sort of choice rational beings make every minute: not whether to pursue good or evil, but rather which of competing goods to pursue at any one time. Aeneas is striving for obedience to a higher power, an inheritance for his progeny, and the promise of peace. It may be that the “happiness” he gains from
the sacrificial pursuit of these goods, whether or not he obtains them, outweighs the pain of losing Dido and the guilt of knowing that he has betrayed and ruined her.

It matters, then, whether the ideal proposed by Jupiter is likely to produce “happiness” in any meaningful sense. If Roman imperium leads to the attainment of other goods, such as the blessings of peace, then it is worth sacrificing for. This is the moral framework within which the Aeneid has traditionally, and I think correctly, been interpreted; readers may disagree about whether a labor tantae molis (“of such great weight”) was tantî (“of such great value”), but some sort of calculus of cost and reward is encouraged by the rhetoric of the poem. The purpose of this paper has been to demonstrate that the chief god does not see things this way. In his view, imperium and fama are the primary goods, indeed the only goods, and of the cost of these in human terms he is scarcely even aware. His gift to the Romans is imperium without end; Caesar’s purpose is to bound his imperium with the Ocean, his fama with the stars; Aeneas’ is to rule a nation pregnant with imperia and roaring with war. Hae tibi erunt artes: Anchises echoes Jupiter’s values when he declares that the role of Roman imperium is not to make possible things like art and science, but rather to take their place.

If Virgil were a “hierophant of imperial power” (Jenkyns 1985: 73) who endorsed this view without qualms, he could not have given us Dido, or Turnus, or Juturna, or Aeneas himself. As monuments like the Ara Pacis and “Augustan poetry” beautifully attest, the view of imperium as the summum bonum was not endorsed by Augustus either. One of the aims of Virgil’s poem was to ensure that this be so, that an unquestioning imperialism not be allowed to obliterate compassion and love. What makes the Aeneid the fulcrum of Western literature rather than a forgettable sermon, however, is partly its seductive portrayal of Jupiter’s side: the poet means us to feel the pull of Empire, the patriotic thrill of imperium sine fine dedi, the hope for paternal benignity and justice from a smiling pater omnipotens. Ignoring these emotions flattens the poem as much as ignoring its cries of anguish. My argument is not that we should shut our ears to the “epic voice,” but rather that our response should include an awareness that its chief proponent is deaf to any others. Readers engaging the perennial question of how far the Aeneid is anti-Augustan may find it fruitful to consider how far it is anti-Jovian—whether the true terror of the Aeneid is not the triumph of Juno, but the triumph of Jupiter.
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