The Reconciliations of Juno

D. C. Feeney

The Classical Quarterly, New Series, Vol. 34, No. 1. (1984), pp. 179-194.

Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0009-8388%281984%292%3A34%3A1%3C179%3ATROJ%3E2.0.CO%3B2-O

The Classical Quarterly is currently published by The Classical Association.

Classical Quarterly **34** (i) 179–194 1984 *Printed in Great Britain*

THE RECONCILIATIONS OF JUNO*

I

The reconciliation between Juno and Jupiter at the end of the *Aeneid* (12. 791–842) forms the cap to the divine action of the poem. The scene is conventionally regarded as the resolution of the heavenly discord that has prevailed since the first book; in particular, it is normal to see here a definitive transformation of Juno, as she abandons her enmity once and for all, committing herself wholeheartedly to the Roman cause. So G. Lieberg, for example: 'I due emisferi di Giove e di Giunone alla fine del poema si ricongiungono nella totalità del mondo divino, garante del glorioso futuro di Roma';[1] or W. Kühn: 'In einem strahlenden, vollen Schlussakkord endet das Göttergespräch.'[2]

The comments of Servius give rise to second thoughts. As Juno accedes to Jupiter's requests (841, 'mentem laetata retorsit'), he observes: 'iste quidem hoc dicit; sed constat bello Punico secundo exoratam Iunonem, tertio uero bello a Scipione sacris quibusdam etiam Romam esse translatam'. The reconciliation during the Hannibalic war is part of the Ennian tradition, as Servius informs us on *A.* 1. 281, 'consilia in melius referet': 'quia bello Punico secundo, ut ait Ennius, placata Iuno coepit fauere Romanis'.[3] If Juno was placated, she had been hostile: Ennius' *Annales* will have shown her ranged against the Romans on the side of Carthage.[4] Now, Ennius was not canonical, and Vergil was not bound to be committed to this Ennian picture of Juno's involvement in the Carthaginian wars; he was free to have his Juno become a supporter of Rome some nine hundred years before Ennius. At various points in the poem, however, it is plain that Vergil does indeed adhere to this Ennian tradition: by referring back to his predecessor's *Annales* he looks forward to the time when Juno will once again take up arms against the Aeneadae, on behalf of her favoured city Carthage.

* For their help and criticism I thank Professor R. G. M. Nisbet and Dr N. Horsfall; also my colleagues in the Society of Fellows, Professor Herbert Bloch, N. Krevans, and Richard Garner; together with the participants in Professor Richard F. Thomas's seminar at Harvard University, who heard a draft of this paper in February 1983.

I refer to the following books by author's name only: V. Buchheit, *Vergil über die Sendung Roms* (Gymnasium Beiheft 3, Heidelberg, 1963); R. Häussler, *Studien zum historischen Epos der Antike* (Heidelberg, 1. Teil 1976, 2. Teil 1978); W. Kühn, *Götterszenen bei Vergil* (Heidelberg, 1971); J. Vahlen, *Ennianae Poesis Reliquae*[3] (Leipzig, 1928).

[1] p. 165 of 'La Dea Giunone nell' Eneide di Virgilio', *Atene e Roma* 11 (1966), 145–65.

[2] p. 165 (general discussion pp. 162–7, 169). Cf. P. Boyancé, *La Religion de Virgile* (Paris, 1963), p. 27, 'L'évolution qui conduit Junon de son hostilité du debout à son acquiescement de la fin est une des données capitales de la religion de l'*Énéide*'; Buchheit, pp. 133–50, esp. p. 147; idem, 'Junos Wandel zum Guten', *Gymnasium* 81 (1974), 498–503; C. H. Wilson, *CQ* n.s. 29 (1979), 365 ff.; Agathe Thornton, *The Living Universe. Gods and Men in Virgil's Aeneid* (Mnemosyne Supplement 46, Leiden Brill, 1976), pp. 144 f., 152 ff.; Gordon Williams, *Technique and Ideas in the Aeneid* (Yale University Press, 1983), pp. 76 f.

[3] *Ann.* 291 V.

[4] cf. Buchheit, p. 54: 'Juno war bisher, bis zum 2. Punischen Krieg, den Römern feindlich gesinnt. Da sie ihre Feindschaft in Verbindung mit dem punischen Krieg aufgibt, muss sie als die grosse Gegenspielerin Roms auf der Seite der Karthager dargestellt gewesen sein'. See, too, Häussler 2, pp. 195 ff. Silius Italicus in the *Punica* is following Ennius as well as Vergil in his use of Juno as Rome's divine antagonist in the Hannibalic war: see L. B. Woodruff, *Reminiscences of Ennius in Silius Italicus* (University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, vol. 4, New York, 1910), pp. 403 ff.

The cardinal passage is the 'concilium deorum' at the beginning of Book 10.[5] Jupiter chides the gods for causing war between the Trojans and Latins, and for taking sides in that war (6–10). But a proper time for them to fight will come, he tells them: 'adueniet iustum pugnae (ne arcessite) tempus | cum fera Karthago Romanis arcibus olim | exitium magnum atque Alpis immittet apertas: | tum certare odiis, tum res rapuisse licebit' (11–14). This is a promise of a divine conflict to mirror the human one,[6] and it is directed principally at Juno, as Servius observes in his note on 'ne arcessite' (11): 'nolite bellorum tempora praeoccupare. et bene satis facit uxori cum prohibitione. significat autem bellum Punicum secundum.' Necessarily, these words of Jupiter will have had far more resonance for their original audience, with school-acquired knowledge of *Annales Quinti Ennii* in their head, than they can for us; Jupiter is foretelling the role Juno will play on the side of Carthage in the *Annales* of Ennius.

If Jupiter prophesies Juno's support of Hannibal, he also prophesies her reconciliation in the *Annales*. He does so in his major speech to Venus in Book 1: 'quin aspera Iuno, | quae mare nunc terrasque metu caelumque fatigat, | consilia in melius referet, mecumque fouebit | Romanos' (279–82). The positioning of these lines causes chronological problems if one takes them to refer explicitly to the scene in Book 12, as is generally done,[7] since they come after the death of Aeneas, after the founding of the city of Rome. As T. Halter puts it:

> Wir stellen kurz die zunächst äusserlich erscheinende Frage, seit wann Juno eigentlich nicht mehr zürnt. Da sie schon im 12. Buch (818) von ihrem Hass ablässt, hätte ihre Meinungsänderung zwischen den Kämpfen und der Herrschaft des Aeneas, also zwischen den Versen 264 und 265, erwähnt werden müssen. Warum folgt Vergil in diesem wichtigen Punkt nicht der Chronologie?[8]

The answer to Halter's question is that Vergil does follow the chronology here, the Ennian chronology, as Servius comments (on 281), when he locates Juno's change of heart: 'quia bello Punico secundo, ut ait Ennius, placata Iuno coepit fauere Romanis'. N. Horsfall has drawn the right conclusion, observing that Juno's reconciliation belongs at this point in the prophecy because it was 'a necessary prelude to the defeat of Carthage, the first great obstacle to *imperium sine fine* encountered by Rome overseas and to the great wave of foreign conquests she undertook in the sixty years after the second Punic war – including, of course, *Pthiam clarasque Mycenas*'.[9] After Juno's reconciliation she will acquiesce in the conquest of Greece, seeing her favoured cities of Mycenae and Argos go under, in poetic fulfilment of the pledge she had made to Zeus in the *Iliad*: ἤτοι ἐμοὶ τρεῖς μὲν πολὺ φίλταταί εἰσι πόληες, | Ἄργός τε Σπάρτη τε καὶ εὐρυάγυια Μυκήνη· | τὰς διαπέρσαι, ὅτ' ἄν τοι ἀπέχθωνται περὶ

[5] Norden, *Ennius und Vergilius. Kriegsbilder aus Roms grosser Zeit* (Leipzig, 1915), pp. 43 ff., contended that the whole setting here was Ennian, based on a putative council in *Annales* 7, at the beginning of the second Punic war. But his case has been undone by W. H. Friedrich, *Hermes* 76 (1941), 113–16; S. Timpanaro, *SIFC* 23 (1948), 37 ff.; M. Wigodsky, *Vergil and early Latin Poetry* (Hermes Einzelschriften 24, 1972), pp. 65 f.

[6] It is not simply a promise of a future war between men, as interpreted by V. Simpson, p. 26 of 'The annalistic tradition in Vergil's *Aeneid*', *Vergilius* 21 (1975), 22–32; see Norden, op. cit. n. 5, p. 51; Häussler 2, p. 190.

[7] e.g. by R. G. Austin in his commentary on Book 1 (Oxford, 1971), on 281: 'Iuno will amend her design... For her yielding see 12. 841'.

[8] *Form und Gehalt in Vergils Aeneis* (Munich, 1963), p. 14.

[9] p. 3 of 'Dido in the light of history', *PVS* 12 (1973–4), 1–13.

κῆρι· | τάων οὔ τοι ἐγὼ πρόσθ' ἴσταμαι οὐδὲ μεγαίρω.[10] Consider, too, the Homeric paradigm for Jupiter's promise to Venus. In *Odyssey* 1, Zeus comforts Athene over her suffering protégé, promising that Poseidon will eventually lay aside his anger against Odysseus: Ποσειδάων δὲ μεθήσει | ὃν χόλον.[11] Poseidon's relenting is not an action described in the poem itself: Teiresias tells Odysseus how to placate the god (11. 121 ff.), and as the poem ends Odysseus' atonement is still in the future. Similarly, in the *Aeneid*, the final reconciliation of Juno which Jupiter prophesies is not represented in the narrative, but lies beyond the poem's close.

A third and final passage. In the poem's introduction, Vergil describes Juno's love for Carthage (1. 15 ff.), saying 'hoc regnum dea gentibus esse, | si qua fata sinant, iam tum tenditque fouetque' (17 f.). 'iam tum' is crucial – '*even then* she was planning for Carthage to rule the peoples of the earth', anticipating the aid she would give Carthage later on, when the issue of who should rule the world was to be decided. It is as good as certain that the motif referred to in 'regnum... gentibus' is an Ennian one. Lucretius and Livy, in related language, both represent the Punic wars as a contest for world dominion,[12] and E. J. Kenney observes that 'no doubt Ennius was their common model'.[13] Certainly in the case of Lucretius, we may point to clear imitation of an Ennian line, which looks as if it belongs in a description of the final struggle between Scipio and Hannibal: 'Africa terribili *tremit horrida* terra *tumultu*' (310 V); cf. Lucr. 3. 834 f., 'omnia cum belli trepido concussa *tumultu* | *horrida contremuere*'.[14] The Vergilian 'regnum... gentibus' employs a word that appears in Lucretius' use of the motif ('utrorum ad *regna* cadendum', 836), and a word that appears in Livy's ('iura *gentibus* daret', 30. 32. 2). The rivalry for supremacy posited by the topos is caught by Vergil with the opposition of 'regnum' (17), applied to Carthage, and 'regem' (21), applied to Rome.[15] Vergil, then, in 'iam tum' looks forward to Juno's helping Carthage at a much later date; in 'hoc regnum dea gentibus esse | ... tenditque fouetque' he refers to a commonplace about the world hegemony of Carthage which is almost certainly Ennian in origin, applied to the Punic wars; and in 'regnum... gentibus' he may even be using language from that Ennian context. The likelihood of allusion to Ennius here is increased if we accord weight to Servius' comment on the next lines ('progeniem sed enim Troiano a sanguine duci | audierat Tyrias olim quae uerteret arces', 19 f.): 'et perite "audierat"; in Ennio enim inducitur Iuppiter promittens Romanis excidium Carthaginis'. The whole context 'anticipates' the *Annales*.

[10] *Il.* 4. 51–4. Ovid follows a similar line in *Fast.* 6, where he has Juno boast of the sacrifices she made for the Romans' sake: he is more systematic, including Homer's three towns plus Samos, mentioned in Vergil's proem as Juno's second favourite city (*A.* 1. 16); 'paeniteat Sparten Argosque measque Mycenas | et ueterem Latio supposuisse Samon' (6. 47 f.).

[11] *Od.* 1. 77 f.

[12] Lucr. 3. 833–7, 'ad confligendum uenientibus undique Poenis, | omnia cum belli trepido concussa tumultu | horrida contremuere sub altis aetheris oris, | *in dubioque* fuere utrorum ad regna cadendum | *omnibus humanis* esset terraque marique'; Liv. 29. 17. 6 (quoted by Kenney in his commentary on Lucr. 3 (Cambridge, 1971), on 832–42), '*In discrimine* est nunc *humanum omne* genus, utrum uos an Carthaginienses principes orbis terrarum uideat'; idem 30. 32. 2, 'Roma an Carthago iura gentibus daret ante crastinam noctem sciturus'.

[13] On 832–42. One sees a sign of the same formulation in Polybius, who refers to Carthage and Rome as τὰ πολιτεύματα τὰ περὶ τῆς τῶν ὅλων ἀρχῆς ἀμφισβητήσαντα (1. 3. 7). But Polybius generally speaks of a solely *Roman* bid for surpemacy (see the passages in Walbank's note on 1. 3. 4), while for the Roman literary tradition Ennius will have been the true parent.

[14] See Bailey on Lucr. 3. 835, Kenney on 3. 834–5.

[15] Horsfall draws attention to the force of the words, art. cit. n. 9, p. 3.

Ennius had Juno fighting for Rome against Carthage, and so, it seems, does Vergil. What then to make of the reconciliation between Juno and Jupiter in Book 12? Some scholars disregard the Vergilian evidence for Juno's activities in the Punic wars, and will have the reconciliation in Book 12 as quite complete.[16] Others regard the scene in Book 12 in the same way, but are aware of the force of the 'Ennian' passages and conclude, with varying degrees of discomfort, that Vergil has fallen into self-contradiction. Thus B. C. Fenik, discussing Jupiter's words in Book 10 ('adueniet iustum pugnae (ne arcessite) tempus'...etc., 11 ff.); 'This squares poorly with the end of the *Aeneid* where Juno's reconciliation lapses into an anticlimax if we are to believe that she again fought against Rome at a later time. We must recognise an inconcinnity here, which may be the result of Vergil's attempting to combine an earlier tradition with a version he wished to create himself.'[17]

A few commentators face and accept the implications,[18] but W. R. Johnson is the only writer on the reconciliation scene in 12 to expound at length the case that there is something fundamentally qualified about Juno's acquiescence to Jupiter.[19] His discussion is most valuable and important; my remarks may stand as a supplement.

Exactly what do Juno and Jupiter agree to in Book 12? All the talk is of Troy. Juno pleads that the vile race of Teucer alter nothing of her Latins' 'mores', not name or dress or nationality or language; the hated name which she wishes to be obliterated is the last word we hear from her lips:

> illud te...
> pro Latio obtestor...
> ne uetus indigenas nomen mutare Latinos
> neu Troas fieri iubeas Teucrosque uocari
> aut uocem mutare uiros aut uertere uestem.
> sit Latium, sint Albani per saecula reges,
> sit Romana potens Itala uirtute propago:
> occidit, occideritque sinas cum nomine Troia (819–28).

Jupiter readily concedes: 'commixti corpore tantum | subsident Teucri' (835 f.). This is a great victory for Juno. It settles the point of grievance between her and Venus, as expressed in their speeches in Book 10, where Venus begs Jupiter to allow Troy to be re-established,[20] and Juno will not have it. Above all, it satisfies the vast

[16] e.g. Buchheit, p. 147: 'Während Ennius erst den zweiten punischen Krieg, Horaz den Tod des Romulus, also die Zeit nach der Gründung Roms, dafür ausgewählt hat, verlegt Vergil die Versöhnung zurück in die römische Urzeit [I return to Horace below]...Juno ist sozusagen von Beginn der römischen Geschichte an die Freundin Roms'. See the works cited in nn. 1 and 2 above.

[17] 'The influence of Euripides on Vergil's *Aeneid*' (Diss. Princeton, 1960), pp. 236 ff. ('discrepancies' and 'contradictions', p. 237); cf. N. Moseley, *Characters and Epithets. A Study in Vergil's Aeneid* (Yale, 1926), pp. 38 f.; Häussler 2, pp. 189 ff. ('diese verräterischen Inkongruenzen', p. 189). Häussler sees the references back to the Ennian tradition as an untidy and unwholesome element: 'Und zugleich schien uns deutlich geworden zu sein, dass eine Aeneis ohne diese Rücksicht und mit einer vorbehaltlos definitiven Versöhnung Junos als Abschluss an Einheit der Motivation und religiösem Ethos nur hätte gewinnen können' (p. 193).

[18] e.g. Büchner, *RE* 2R 16. 1457: 'Der Kampf und damit die Handlung kommt erst zu Ende, als Iuno beigibt (12. 841). Nicht für immer: ist ihr doch vom Schicksal in der Zukunft noch grosse Möglichkeit verheissen, für Karthago zu kämpfen (10. 11 ff.).' Cf. Conway on 1. 281 (see n. 26 below).

[19] *Darkness Visible. A Study of Vergil's Aeneid* (University of California, 1976), pp. 123–7.

[20] *A.* 10. 60–2, 'Xanthum et Simoenta | redde, oro, miseris iterumque reuoluere casus | da, pater, Iliacos Teucris'. On the important theme of 'Pergama recidiua' in the *Aeneid*, see W. S. Anderson, 'Vergil's second *Iliad*,' *TAPA* 88 (1957), 17–30; W. Suerbaum, 'Aeneas zwischen Troja und Rom. Zur Funktion der Genealogie und der Ethnographie in Vergils Aeneis', *Poetica* 1 (1967), 176–204; G. N. Knauer, *Die Aeneis und Homer*, Hypomnemata 7 (Göttingen, 1964), pp. 351 ff.

resentment against the Trojans which the proem of Book 1 had set out as part of Juno's motivation for persecuting Aeneas and his men (1. 23 ff.).

The crucial point is the obvious one, that Juno's hatred of Troy is only half her motivation. As Horsfall points out,[21] she has a 'mythological' motive for her hatred of the Aeneadae – the judgement of Paris and all the Homeric matter connected with the name of Troy (1. 23–8) – and she has an 'historical' motive, her predilection for Carthage and fear of the fate that awaits the city at the hands of Aeneas' descendants (12–22).[22] (Bluntly, for the purposes of the first motive she is regarded as 'Argive Hera', while for the purposes of the second she is viewed under the aspect of the Carthaginian Tanit.)[23] This second, historical motive is the engine that supplies the momentum of the narrative of Books 1 and 4,[24] which culminates in Dido's curse and the evocation of Hannibal, to engage Rome and Carthage irrevocably in future warfare.[25] In Book 12 only Juno's 'mythological' grievance is removed;[26] the other remains potent, its consequences already irresistibly in train. Juno knows it, and Jupiter knows it: 'es germana Iouis Saturnique altera proles, | irarum tantos uoluis sub pectore fluctus' (830 f.). I should follow Servius here,[27] who explains in these words:

'soror Iouis es, id est Saturni filia'. unde non mirum est tantam te iracundiam retinere sub pectore. nam scimus unumquemque pro generis qualitate in iram moueri: nobiles enim etsi ad praesens uidentur ignoscere, tamen in posterum iram reseruant. quod nunc Iunoni uidetur obicere: nam cum se concedere diceret, petiit tamen quod grauiter posset obesse Troianis

(he means the loss of their name).[28] My only difference is that Juno is reserving her anger far longer into the future than Servius suggests – until she reappears in her old role in the *Annales*. As we read the scene in Book 12, we must have always in mind the Ennian Juno, of whose actions Vergil has regularly reminded us.

Does this mean, as Fenik complains, that 'Juno's reconciliation lapses into an

[21] art. cit. n. 9, p. 2.

[22] cf. Büchner, *RE* 2R. 16. 1339.

[23] On this identification, see *RE* 2R. 4. 2184; Pease on *A.* 4. 91; Lieberg, art. cit. n. 1, 153 n. 37; G.-Ch. Picard, *Les Religions de l'Afrique antique* (Paris, 1954), pp. 65, 109. C. Bailey confuses the two faces of Juno here (*Religion in Virgil* (Oxford, 1935), pp. 131 f.): 'out of this hatred of the Trojans arises the special position which Juno holds in the *Aeneid* of the patron-goddess of the newly founded Carthage'.

[24] See especially Horsfall, art. cit. n. 9, on the crucial importance of the Carthaginian theme in the early books; cf. V. Pöschl, *The Art of Vergil. Image and Symbol in the Aeneid* (tr. G. Seligson, University of Michigan, 1962), pp. 13 ff., esp. p. 15, 'Juno...is first the mythical personification of the historical power of Carthage'; W. Warde Fowler, *Virgil's 'Gathering of the Clans'* (Blackwell, 1916), p. 40, 'At the outset of his poem, with all the emphasis he can use, Virgil associates [Juno] in interest – an interest perverse in the eyes of all Romans – with the most deadly enemy Rome ever had to meet, and with the mythical queen of Carthage, the Cleopatra of his poetic fancy.' Wigodsky (op. cit. n. 5, p. 29) is quite mistaken to assert that 'Vergil is not interested in the Punic Wars as such'; while Robert Coleman plays down Juno's association with Carthage, as a result of taking Juno's reconciliation in 12 as complete (n. 53 to 'The Gods in the *Aeneid*', *G&R* 29 [1982], 143–68).

[25] 4. 622 ff.

[26] As seen by Conway, in his note on Jupiter's promise of Juno's reconciliation (1. 281, 'in melius referet'): 'The time of this final acquiescence of Juno in the greatness of Rome is left unspecified both here and in 12. 841, where she desists merely from persecuting Aeneas on condition that the language, religion and government of Rome shall be Italian, not Asiatic'.

[27] The result is very close to Johnson's, op. cit. n. 19, p. 126, esp. n. 106. The passage is much discussed: bibliography in Kühn, p. 164 n. 9; add Wigodsky, op. cit. n. 5, pp. 67 ff., on 'Saturnia'.

[28] On 12. 830. Servius' interpretation is similar to the comments of the bT scholia on *Il.* 15. 212, where Poseidon stops supporting the Greeks – for the moment: εὐσχήμονα τὴν ἀπαλλαγὴν ὁρίζεται, ἐπιτείνων τὴν ὀργὴν εἰς ὕστερον. On such shared themes in the Greek and Latin commentators see Fraenkel, *JRS* 39 (1949), 151–4.

anticlimax if we are to believe that she again fought against Rome at a later time'?[29] We should rather think of the anticlimax that is attendant upon the traditional account of the scene, whereby the daemonic power that has generated the action so far evaporates with an order, a request, and a smile. It is a question of emphases. Johnson's eloquent account lays its principal stress on what the scene holds of the sinister and baleful. While acknowledging the essential accuracy of his reading, we must recognize that none the less there *is* a resolution of sorts here, that something *is* accomplished which is not wholly shabby or a fraud.[30] This much is guaranteed even by the elaborate formal correspondences between the Jupiter-scene in 12 and the Jupiter-scene in 1:[31] the relief which Jupiter promises Venus may not be unalloyed when it comes at the end of the poem, but in some measure it does come. Another formal sign to mark Juno's acquiescence is seen in the frame of the scene with Jupiter. At the beginning, Jupiter addresses her as she is looking down on the fighting from a cloud ('fulua pugnas *de nube* tuentem', 792). 'de aere, de elemento suo', comments Servius: the identification is based on the allegorists' equation of *Ἥρα* and *ἀήρ*.[32] Jupiter chides her: 'aut qua spe *gelidis in nubibus* haeres?' (796). At the end of the dialogue, won over by Jupiter, Juno gives a token of her agreement by leaving her element: 'interea excedit caelo *nubemque relinquit*' (842). The device is perhaps rather mechanical, but it signals an accommodation.[33]

What the scene in 12 resolves is the question of Aeneas' settlement in Latium, and the final passing away of Troy; it does not resolve any more of Juno's grudges. The divine reconciliation is qualified to the extent that it reflects only so much of the Roman endeavour as has been accomplished so far: it leaves open what historically remains open. The great anxieties that surround the first beginnings of the Roman state are not dispelled at a stroke; the momentum of empire continues, and the energies of the poem's forward movement are held in suspense, not checked. Ahead lie centuries of strain, with Carthage as the highest crisis, and Juno's hate once more to face.

In a recent paper on 'The Judgement of Paris and *Iliad* xxiv',[34] M. Davies has well described the way in which Homer's final book establishes a contrast between the ability of men to achieve reconciliation with each other, and the relentless nature of the gods' animosities. He goes on to detect a Vergilian reversal of this Homeric pattern:

> in *Aen.* xii 791 ff. Jupiter bids [Juno] set aside her resentment and loathing of the Trojans and she consents with surprising speed and readiness. Jupiter smiles, and reconciliation and peace are restored on Olympus. On earth, however, there is no such happy resolution: Turnus begs for mercy but Aeneas is overwhelmed by hatred and anger and kills the suppliant. The whole

[29] loc. cit. n. 17.

[30] I find some of Johnson's comments of the evil of Jupiter disconcerting (op. cit. n. 19, p. 126 and n. 110); also his suggested interpretation of 'his mentem retorsit' (p. 127).

[31] On these correspondences see Halter, op. cit. n. 8, pp. 14 ff., 78 ff.; Knauer, op. cit. n. 20, pp. 324 ff.; Kühn, pp. 164 f.; Buchheit, art. cit. n. 2, pp. 499 ff.

[32] See Servius on *A.* 7. 300; R. Heinze, *Virgils epische Technik*[3] (Leipzig, 1915), p. 299; Pease, ed. Cic. *N.D.*, pp. 716 f.; F. Buffière, *Les Mythes d'Homère et la Pensée Grecque* (Paris, 1956), pp. 107 f. Note Juno's '*aeria*...sede', 12. 810.

[33] 'excedit caelo' is puzzling to me. What does it mean to say that Juno 'left the *caelum*', and what is the relation between this phrase and 'nubemque relinquit'? In the scheme that saw Juno as 'aer', Jupiter was the 'caelum' (Pease, ed. Cic. *N.D.*, pp. 715 f.; Buffière, op. cit. n. 32, p. 106). Hence I have sometimes been tempted to read 'cedit' (in the sense of 'deferring' or 'yielding to', *OLD* s.v. 8 and 10): 'she deferred to the Jupiter-element and left her own'. I am by no means confident of this; but note the parallelism between '*cedit* caelo nubemque *relinquit*' and the words spoken earlier in the scene by Juno: 'et nunc *cedo* equidem pugnasque exosa *relinquo*' (818).

[34] *JHS* 101 (1981), 56–62.

poem ends not as the *Iliad* does on a note of mortal reconciliation and reintegration, but surprisingly and distressingly on a note of continued hatred, hostility and rage.[35]

This is fine comment on the distinction between the attempts of Homer's men and Vergil's men, but I would suggest that in the *Aeneid* even the immortal sphere is unreconciled within itself at the close, just as in the *Iliad*. The significant contrast at the end of the poem is that between the deadly weakness of men's efforts and the ease with which the gods can make an arrangement while still unreconciled in full: this is their essential invulnerability, their power – ῥεῖα μάλ' ὥστε θεός.[36] Homer's gods reach a momentary accommodation without their grievances being abnegated;[37] Juno does the same with Jupiter, winning a point, losing a point, and deferring a third.

II

The discussion so far has involved many incidental references to the figure of Juno in Ennius' *Annales*. It is time to turn directly to Ennius, in an attempt to discover what aspects of Ennius' goddess and her activities lie behind the reconciliation scene in *Aeneid* 12. Further evidence will come from Ovid, and above all from Horace, whose third 'Roman Ode' exhibits, like Vergil's closing episode, an angry Juno making an accommodation concerning the incipient Roman power. In Horace, too, the talk is all of the passing away of Troy; if we must try to ascertain what Ennian sanction there may be for the common talk of Troy, we must also express some opinion on the notorious topic of why this subject received such emphasis from these poets at this time.[38]

Even in saying so much I have run ahead of the argument, because it is by no means agreed that the common elements between Vergil and Horace are in fact Ennian, or that the Juno whom we see and hear in Horace's ode bears any relation to the Juno of Ennius' *Annales*. The Ennian episode which is the focus of the problem is the Council of the Gods in the first book.[39] On the agenda of the meeting was the apotheosis of Romulus. We do not rely solely on Horace for this knowledge. Ovid twice tells the story of Mars asking Jupiter for permission to fetch his son Romulus to heaven, reminding Jupiter of an earlier occasion when a promise had been given that this elevation would one day take place (*Fast.* 2. 481 ff.; *Met.* 14. 806 ff.). In the *Metamorphoses* passage, Mars refers explicitly to a 'concilium deorum' as the setting for the giving of the promise ('concilio quondam praesente deorum', 812), and in both passages he quotes an identical line as the exact words of Jupiter's promise: 'unus erit quem tu tolles in caerula caeli' (*Met.* 14. 814 = *Fast.* 2. 487). This line is quoted

[35] 61.

[36] *Il.* 3. 381, 20. 444. Johnson is good here, op. cit. n. 19, p. 124. J. Griffin, *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford, 1980), p. 189, has convincing observations on the gods' 'ease' in Homer, and on the Euripidean 'contrast between human misery and the radiant unconcern of the gods'. Vergil's passionately involved deities are, in this regard, rather closer to Homer's than to Euripides'.

[37] Besides Davies, see Macleod on *Il.* 24. 25–30 ('the judgement of Paris'): 'Homer heightens and extends his tragedy by taking us back to where it started. This reminds us that even if for the moment "the gods" are to unite in allowing the ransom of Hector's body, the gods hostile to Troy still have reason to be as angry as ever; and the city they hate must fall.'

[38] Discussion tends to resolve itself into deciding either for or against the proposition that a real project of moving the capital lies behind the insistence on Troy's total disappearance: Fraenkel has a history of the dispute (a dispute which also involves Liv. 5. 51–4, on transferring the capital to Veii): *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), pp. 267–9. See further n. 80 below.

[39] frr. 60–5 V; see Vahlen, pp. clix–clxi.

by Varro as his first example of poetic diction,[40] and is virtually certain to be a line of Ennius.[41] Mars tells Jupiter that he has memorized the words and stored them up in his retentive mind. The verse which conveys this claim refers just as happily to the cultivated poet who has retained from childhood bits of hairy Ennius in his head: 'tu mihi concilio quondam praesente deorum | (nam memoro memorique animo pia uerba notaui) | "unus erit quem tu tolles in caerula caeli" | dixisti' (*Met.* 14. 812–15).[42]

It is in fact generally reckoned that Horace's poem recalls Ennius' council in *Ann.* 1.[43] Ovid refers to Ennius' 'concilium' explicitly ('concilio... deorum', *Met.* 14. 812),[44] while Horace's reference characteristically avoids that degree of precision: '*consiliantibus*... diuis' (17 f.). But although Ennius is not just the formal model (that is, for the basic idea of a 'concilium deorum'), but also the model for the *occasion* (to discuss the apotheosis of Romulus), there are few scholars who claim that the content of Juno's speech in Horace is based on anything Juno might have said in Ennius. Some commentators say nothing on the subject.[45] Many deny the notion outright, or express serious doubt,[46] while Heinze, Steuart, Wilkinson, Waszink and Commager represent the small group who consider that the words of Horace's Juno are drawn originally from the mouth of Ennius.[47] Heinze and Commager point to the strong correspondences between Horace's scene and Vergil's in *Aeneid* 12, with their common insistence on the disappearance of Troy, and conclude that Ennius is the joint source,[48] thus by-passing the argument over whether Horace followed Vergil or Vergil followed Horace.[49]

[40] *LL* 7. 5 f., 'Dicam in hoc libro de uerbis quae a poetis sunt posita... incipiam hinc: "unus erit quem tu tolles in caerula caeli | templa".'

[41] cf. Vahlen, p. clx, 'Nam Ennianum esse Ovidius quidem non dicit, sed Varro de LL vii 6 etsi non monet aperte, tamen indicat non obscure ei qui novit morem Varronis.'

[42] After the interview with Jupiter, Mars descends and snatches up Romulus in his chariot (*Met.* 14. 818 ff.; *Fast.* 2. 496, as befitting the genre, a much more elliptical version). The line from the *Fasti* ('rex patriis astra petebat equis') resembles Horace's reference to Romulus' 'death' ('Martis equis Acheronta fugit', *Carm.* 3. 3. 16): it is natural to assume a common Ennian model (indeed, Horace's 'Martis' has been emended to 'patris' on analogy with Ovid's line: see Bentley ad loc.).

[43] cf. Vahlen, p. clix; G. Pasquali, *Orazio Lirico. Studi*[2] (Florence, 1964), p. 687; T. Oksala, *Religion und Mythologie bei Horaz*, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 51 (Helsinki, 1973), pp. 102, 156. It seems to be taken for granted that Horace sets the council *after* Romulus has been snatched away by Mars (exceptions include Häussler 2, p. 195 n. 23). But this snatching away is part of what the council is there to decide. Ovid gives us naturally to understand that the gods decided in advance that Mars would be allowed to rescue his son for immortality, and I see nothing in Horace's poem that is at odds with this picture.

[44] As does Lucilius, in his parody: 'uellem concilio uestrum, quod dicitis olim, | caelicolae, hic habitum, uellem adfuissemus priore | concilio', frr. 20–2 W.

[45] No comment, for instance, from Gordon Williams, *The Third Book of Horace's 'Odes'* (Oxford, 1969), who rather views the speech as 'a sort of answer to a problem raised by the contemporary epic, the *Aeneid*: how and when did Juno's hostility to Rome cease?'. Fraenkel, op. cit. n. 38, p. 267, and Kiessling-Heinze, on *Carm.* 3. 3. 15, only refer to Horace's taking from Ennius the motif of a 'concilium deorum': in his discussion of the speech itself, Fraenkel does not mention Ennius.

[46] cf., e.g., Vahlen, p. clix; Oksala, op. cit. n. 43, p. 156 (both doubting); Pasquali, op. cit. n. 43, p. 687; Häussler 2, p. 195 n. 23; Buchheit, p. 146 (all denying: 'vor allem aber war in diesem "concilium deorum" schwerlich von Troia die Rede', Buchheit, loc. cit. n. 626).

[47] E. M. Steuart, *The Annals of Quintus Ennius* (Cambridge, 1925), p. 176; R. Heinze, *Vom Geist des Römertums* (Leipzig, 1938), pp. 230 ff.; L. P. Wilkinson, *Horace and his Lyric Poetry* (Cambridge, 1946), pp. 73 f.; J. H. Waszink, *WS* 70 (1957), 325; Steele Commager, *The Odes of Horace: A Critical Study* (New Haven and London, 1962), p. 222 n. 122.

[48] Wigodsky, op. cit. n. 5, p. 147, draws the same conclusion, but refers to *Ann.* 8, not *Ann.* 1.

[49] Bibliography on the priority question in Wigodsky, loc. cit. previous note; Buchheit, p. 146 n. 626.

I think it is fair to say that the *natural* conclusion to draw from Horace's poem and its connection with *Aeneid* 12 is that both go back to Ennius and depend on Juno's voicing of similar sentiments in the council in *Annales* 1.[50] I think it is also fair to say that the *only* reason for declining to draw this conclusion is the belief that Ennius' Juno was not reconciled to Rome until the Hannibalic war, and therefore could not have made any agreement favourable to the Roman state at any earlier stage.[51] The general tendency of my argument will by now be plain. Vergil could depict Juno, at a very early stage of Roman history, making a deal with Jupiter (agreeing to Aeneas' settlement but winning the final annihilation of Troy), while still remaining full of menace until finally placated during the Punic wars. With such a pattern before our eyes, we need not allow the knowledge that Ennius' Juno was likewise not fully reconciled to Rome before Hannibal's time to prevent us from concluding that in *Annales* 1 she may have come to some qualified agreement, the prototype of Vergil's, agreeing to the apotheosis of Romulus on condition that Troy vanish for ever.

The details of the case remain to be worked out, but first it is worth bringing to bear another argument to show that there is likely to have been some sort of reconciliation with Juno involved in Ennius' account of the decision to grant godhead to Romulus. In describing (or inventing)[52] the apotheosis of Romulus, Ennius took over many essential details from the traditional accounts of the apotheosis of Heracles.[53] He is unlikely to have been original in this. As J. K. Newman points out, Theocritus 17 is good evidence for the existence of Hellenistic epics which treated Heracles as paradigm for the deification of Alexander and later monarchs.[54] In that poem we see Alexander and the first Ptolemy enjoying immortality in heaven (16 ff.). They sit opposite Heracles, and escort him to Hebe's chamber after the feast. Their immortality is explicitly said to be a result of their descent from Heracles:

> ἔνθα σὺν ἄλλοισιν θαλίας ἔχει Οὐρανίδησι,
> χαίρων υἱωνῶν περιώσιον υἱωνοῖσιν,
> ὅττι σφεων Κρονίδης μελέων ἐξείλετο γῆρας,
> ἀθάνατοι δὲ καλεῦνται ἑοὶ νέποδες γεγαῶτες.
> ἄμφω γὰρ πρόγονός σφιν ὁ καρτερὸς Ἡρακλείδας,
> ἀμφότεροι δ' ἀριθμεῦνται ἐς ἕσχατον Ἡρακλῆα (22–7).

Various items of the Romulus story recall the Heracles legend. Each was the mightier twin;[55] the 'death' of each involves a storm, the disappearance of the body, and the inference amongst those left behind that their leader must have become a god.[56]

[50] Though one may speculate about one poet being 'put onto' the subject by the other.

[51] cf. Vahlen, p. clix, denying that Juno spoke as Horace says: 'Infesta enim antiquitus Romanis dea iram in secundo demum bello Punico delenivit. Cf. Servius in *Aen.* 1. 281 "bello Punico secundo, ut ait Ennius, placata Iuno coepit favere Romanis" (VIII fr. XVIII). Quid igitur tum incipiat favere, quae iam ante Romanis ut regni fines late proferrent concesserit?' Identical reasoning in Buchheit, p. 146.

[52] In favour of Ennius' originality, see, e.g., Wilamowitz, *Der Glaube der Hellenen* (Berlin, 1932), ii. 422 n. 2; A. Elter, *Donarem Pateras... Horat. Carm. 4, 8* (Bonn, 1907), pp. 40, 31 ff.; against, e.g., R. M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy Books 1–5* (Oxford, 1965), p. 84.

[53] See especially Elter, op. cit. n. 52; also J. K. Newman, *Augustus and the New Poetry*, Coll. Latomus 88 (Brussels, 1967), pp. 68 ff.

[54] p. 71; cf. n. 2, 'The coincidence of Theocritus and Ennius here (cf. the same phenomenon in Horace, *Odes*, IV, 8) shows that they were both drawing on common Hellenistic material, not that Ennius knew the work of Theocritus'.

[55] cf. A. R. Anderson, *HSCPh* 39 (1928), 31, 'The identification of Romulus as a successor of Hercules was further helped by the fact that each was the mightier twin'. See generally Anderson 29 ff.

[56] 'subito coorta tempestas cum magno fragore tonitribusque tam denso regem operuit nimbo ut conspectum eius contioni abstulerit; nec deinde in terris Romulus fuit. Romana pubes sedato

An Ennian fragment ('Romulus in caelo cum dis genitalibus aeuum | degit', 115 f.V) echoes the conventional phraseology describing Heracles' new life in heaven: cf. *Od.* 11. 602 f., αὐτὸς δὲ μετ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι | τέρπεται ἐν θαλίῃς; Hes. *Th.* 954 f., ὃς μέγα ἔργον ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνύσσας | ναίει ἀπήμαντος καὶ ἀγήραος;[57] id. fr. 25. 27 f., ζώει δ' ἔνθά περ ἄλλοι 'Ολύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες | ἀθάνατος καὶ ἄγηρος; Hom. *Hym.* 15. 7. f.; Theoc. 17. 22. Of particular concern for our purpose is the fact that a stock element of the Heracles tradition dealt with the problem of how Hera gave over the notorious anger which she had exercised against the hero since his birth.[58] The tradition is unanimous in linking together the enrolment of Heracles amongst the gods, the abandonment by Hera of her anger against him, and the marriage of Heracles to Hebe as a token of the reconciliation. Hesiod gives the details, fr. 25. 26–33:

> νῦν δ' ἤδη θεός ἐστι, κακῶν δ' ἐξήλυθε πάντων,
> ζώει δ' ἔνθά περ ἄλλοι 'Ολύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες
> ἀθάνατος καὶ ἄγηρος, ἔχων καλλίσφυρον Ἥβην,
> παῖδα Διὸς μεγάλοιο καὶ Ἥρης χρυσοπεδίλου·
> τὸν πρὶν μέν ῥ' ἤχθηρε θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη
> ἔκ τε θεῶν μακάρων ἔκ τε θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων,
> νῦν δ' ἤδη πεφίληκε, τίει δέ μιν ἔξοχον ἄλλων
> ἀθανάτων μετά γ' αὐτὸν ἐρισθενέα Κρονίωνα.

Apollodorus has a précis: ἐκεῖθεν δὲ τυχὼν ἀθανασίας καὶ διαλλαγεὶς Ἥρᾳ τὴν ἐκείνης θυγατέρα Ἥβην ἔγημεν, 2. 7. 7. For a fuller account, see Diodorus.[59] A late Etruscan mirror survives, which gives a pictorial representation of the tradition.[60] Jupiter is presiding over the reconciliation between Hercules and Juno; fertility symbols suggest that what we are seeing is Hercules 'being presented as son-in-law'.[61]

It has been claimed that Heracles' marriage to Hebe was reflected by Ennius in Romulus' marriage to 'Hora' (his earthly wife Hersilia, who became, like Hebe, a goddess of youth).[62] This interpretation is based upon a vexed fragment; 'teque Quirine pater ueneror Horamque Quirini' (*Ann.* 117 V). It has been long denied – most

tandem pauore postquam ex tam turbido die serena et tranquilla lux rediit, ubi uacuam sedem regiam uidit, etsi satis credebat patribus qui proximi steterant sublimem raptum procella, tamen uelut orbitatis metu icta maestum aliquamdiu silentium obtinuit. deinde a paucis initio facto, deum deo natum, regem parentemque urbis Romanae saluere uniuersi Romulum iubent,' Liv. 1. 16. 1–3; cf. D.S. 4. 38. 4 f., εὐθὺς δὲ καὶ κεραυνῶν ἐκ τοῦ περιέχοντος πεσόντων, ἡ πυρὰ πᾶσα κατεφλέχθη. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα οἱ μὲν περὶ τὸν Ἰόλαον ἐλθόντες ἐπὶ τὴν ὀστολογίαν, καὶ μηδὲν ὅλως εὑρόντες, ὑπέλαβον τὸν Ἡρακλέα τοῖς χρησμοῖς ἀκολούθως ἐξ ἀνθρώπων εἰς θεοὺς μεθεστάσθαι. As Ogilvie notes (op. cit. n. 52, p. 84), this is all typical of the passing of Greek heroes.

[57] West ad loc. says that taking ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν with ναίει produces a very awkward hyperbaton; but the parallel passages incline one to accepting it.

[58] The rage of Hera is famous since Homer; cf. *Il.* 18. 119, ἀλλά ἑ Μοῖρ' ἐδάμασσε καὶ ἀργαλέος χόλος Ἥρης; Hes. *Th.* 314 f., [Τυδρην] Λερναίην, ἣν θρέψε θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη | ἄπλητον κοτέουσα βίῃ Ἡρακληείῃ.

[59] 4. 39. 2 f., προσθετέον δ' ἡμῖν τοῖς εἰρημένοις ὅτι μετὰ τὴν ἀποθέωσιν αὐτοῦ Ζεὺς Ἥραν μὲν ἔπεισεν υἱοποιήσασθαι τὸν Ἡρακλέα καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον μητρὸς εὔνοιαν παρέχεσθαι... τὴν δ' Ἥραν μετὰ τὴν τέκνωσιν μυθολογοῦσι συνοικίσαι τὴν Ἥβην τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ.

[60] Published *Ann. d.Inst.* 19 (1847), pl.T; a reproduction conveniently in Roscher's *Lexicon*, 1. 2. 2259.

[61] So J. G. Winter, *The Myth of Hercules at Rome* (Macmillan, New York, 1910), p. 179 n. 2, against the earlier interpretations, as represented by Peter in Roscher. Cf. J. Bayet, *Les Origines de l'Hercule Romain* (Paris, 1926), pp. 380 ff., esp. p. 381, 'La scène s'analyse donc strictement comme la réconciliation d'Hercule et Junon au seuil des demeures divines: c'est une variante de l'apothéose du héros'.

[62] cf. Elter, op. cit. n. 52, p. 40, 33; Anderson, loc. cit. n. 55; Newman, op. cit. n. 53, p. 68.

recently and vigorously by Skutsch[63] – that Ennius knew of the identification of Romulus and Quirinus, and Skutsch asserts accordingly that fr. 117 V can have nothing to do with the transformation of Hersilia into Hora;[64] the line concerns another god and another consort. Let the verse pass before such disagreement. There is, however, an Ovidian passage which may give some support to the presupposition that Juno's reconciliation in *Ann.* 1 might have involved her playing some part in the marriage of the newly enrolled god. Ovid tells the story of the assumption of Hersilia in *Met.* 14, straight after the heavily Ennian episode of the interview of Mars and Jupiter and the taking up of Romulus into heaven (805–28): note that it is *Juno* who takes the initiative in bringing Hersilia to join her husband: 'flebat ut amissum coniunx, cum *regia Iuno* | Irin ad Hersilien descendere limite curuo | imperat...' etc. (*Met.* 14. 824–31). Besides the heavenly marriage, the other 'Herculean' elements of Romulus' deification are to be seen condensed in Horace, where Juno says that she will give over her anger, and allow Romulus to be enrolled amongst the gods:

> 'protinus et grauis
> *iras* et inuisum nepotem,
> Troica quem peperit sacerdos,
>
> Marti redonabo; illum ego lucidas
> inire sedes, ducere nectaris
> sucos et *adscribi quietis*
> *ordinibus patiar deorum*' (30–6).[65]

This material is not Horatian. It goes back to Ennius, who had it from Greek epic, nationalistic, encomiastic, mythological.

So far from a reconciliation of Juno being out of place in Ennius' council in *Annales* 1, it appears that the goddess' relenting is an indispensable part of the conception of Romulus' apotheosis.[66] There is no reason to resist this conclusion on the grounds that Juno later fought against Rome for Carthage. It is not a circular argument to bring in the qualified reconciliation of Vergil's *A.* 12 as evidence of a qualified reconciliation in *Ann.* 1, because in the first part of the paper the reasons for this interpretation of *A.* 12 were self-sufficient and did not depend for their validity on any hypothesis about the content of *Ann.* 1. Further, one may look to Horace's ode, to see there a Juno who is not yet an enthusiastic partisan of the Roman state: 'her promise deals with the deification only, and, so far from indicating the direct protection implied by "fauere" [i.e. in Serv. *A.* 1. 281, 'placata Iuno coepit fauere Romanis'], holds out a clear threat of reprisals should there be any attempt to restore Troy'.[67] As Steuart sums up, 'In Bk 1 Juno so far relents as to agree to the deification

[63] *Enniana* (London, 1968), pp. 132–7 (with introductory bibliography on the discussion, p. 132). Of course, the apotheosis of Romulus and the identification with Quirinus are two separate issues.

[64] p. 133.

[65] Note that Horace has Hercules prominently on display as a paradigm for the deification of Augustus: 'hac arte Pollux et uagus Hercules | enisus arces attigit igneas, | quos inter Augustus recumbens | purpureo bibet ore nectar', 9–12. On such paradigms in Horace and Vergil, see D. Pietrusiński, 'Apothéose d'Auguste par la comparaison avec les héros grecques chez Horace et Vergile', *Eos* 66 (1978), 246 ff.

[66] The one obvious difference between Ennius' Romulus story and the Greek Heracles legend is that in Ennius the accommodations are made before Romulus' 'death', while with Heracles it seems that it was regular to have them settled after Mt Oeta. See n. 78 below.

[67] Steuart, op. cit. n. 47, p. 176. Cf. Page on 38 'exules': 'the word is employed however with a certain amount of contempt; with all her magnanimity Juno is not above the feminine weakness of saying something unpleasant (cf. the sneer implied in "peperit sacerdos", l. 32...)'. I should not make too much of Juno's 'magnanimity' in this poem.

of Romulus; but active cooperation does not begin till the period of the Second Punic War'.[68]

One paragraph of more speculative matter before returning to Vergil. The congruence between Horace and Vergil in their emphasis on Troy leads one to regard it as likely that when Juno spoke in *Ann.* 1, she stipulated the final end of Troy as a condition of her agreeing to Romulus' apotheosis (Ennius will have had ample room to deploy the theme of Juno's hatred of Troy in the early part of the book, which dealt with the fall of Troy and the wanderings of Aeneas). She may have demanded that the Troy of Priam remain waste for ever. She may have insisted, like Vergil's Juno, on the matter of the *name*. The 'concilium deorum' is usually located by scholars either at the time when the twins are exposed,[69] or else just before the actual foundation of Rome.[70] In either case, but particularly in the latter, the gods may well have wanted to settle the crucial question of what would be the name of the new city and the new people.[71] In Ennius' version, Romulus and Remus were the sons of a woman with the conspicuously Trojan name of Ilia,[72] the very grandsons of Aeneas.[73] Aeneas' first settlement in Latium had been called simply – 'Troia':[74] did Juno demand as her price for acquiescence that the new city of his grandsons *not* receive what might have seemed an obvious name?[75] Ennius was grappling with divergent and incompatible myths: it would not have been out of place for him to explain how the Trojans came and

[68] loc. cit. n. 67.

[69] Vahlen, p. clxi; Skutsch, op. cit. n. 63, p. 131; E. H. Warmington, *Remains of Old Latin I* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1935), on fr. 57 W.

[70] Rosenberg, *RE* 'Romulus' 2R 1. 1097 f.; Waszink, art. cit. n. 47, 325. This location seems more likely, as being of far greater moment: now is decided the beginning of the state whose achievements are the subject of the whole work. In the *Fasti*, Ovid has Juno tell of how Mars helped placate her by promising that she would be powerful in the city of her grandson: 'ipse mihi Mauors "commendo moenia" dixit | "haec tibi. tu pollens urbe nepotis eris"' (6. 53 f.). Mars 'bribes' Juno as Vergil's Jupiter does (12. 838–40); if both scenes go back to Ennius' 'concilium deorum', Mars' words are very apt as spoken to mollify his mother when the city of Rome is on the point of being established: 'commendo moenia haec tibi...'.

[71] In favour of the city's name as a topic of debate in Ennius, I find only L. Mueller, *Q. Enni Carminum Reliquiae* (Petersburg, 1884), p. 178, and L. Valmaggi, *Q. Ennio. I Frammenti degli Annali* (Turin, 1947), pp. 18 f.

[72] 'Ilia' is the original name in the myth, where she was the daughter of Aeneas (see next note). 'R(h)ea Silvia' was invented after Ennius as part of the scheme that devised the Alban king lists: see Rosenberg, 'Rea Silvia', *RE* 2R 1. 341–5, Bömer on Ov. *Fast.* 2. 383. As Bömer observes on the significance of the name 'Ilia', 'Diese Version setzt die troische Abkunft, speziell die Vaterschaft des Aeneas voraus'. This is the version to which Horace alludes, '*Troica* quem peperit sacerdos', 3. 3. 32.

[73] cf. Serv. 'auct.' on *A.* 1. 273, 'Naeuius et Ennius Aeneae ex filia nepotem Romulum conditorem urbis tradunt'; cf. Serv. *A.* 6. 777, 'dicit...Iliam fuisse filiam Aeneae'.

[74] cf., e.g., Serv. *A.* 1. 5, 'Troiam autem dici, quam primum fecit Aeneas, et Liuius in primo (1.1.4) et Cato in Originibus testantur'. Extensive parallel passages, bibliography and discussion in W. A. Schröder, *M. Porcius Cato: Das erste Buch der Origines. Ausgabe und Erklärung der Fragmente* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1971), pp. 95 ff. As Schröder says, 'Fast alle antiken Autoren nennen die erste trojanische Niederlassung in Latium übereinstimmend Troia' (p. 96). It must be stressed that there is no *direct* evidence that Ennius utilized this tradition. But the tradition is virtually unanimous in saying that the Trojans arrived at an area called the 'ager Laurens', and *there forthwith founded* '*Troia*' (cf. passages listed in Schröder, pp. 95 f.: Paul. p. 504. 11 L; Liv. 1. 1. 4; D.H. *Ant.* 1. 53. 3; App. *Reg.* fr. 1. 1; Dio fr. 4. 4). A line of Ennius gives the first half of this version: 'quos homines quondam Laurentis terra recepit' (34 V). I do not see it as unlikely that he gave the second.

[75] cf. Waszink, art. cit. n. 47, 325, who argues, on the basis of Lucil. fr. 31, that Neptune in Ennius may have objected to the foundation of a 'noua Troia'.

did not leave their name.[76] The question of the city's name was very important to Ennius. As Romulus and Remus take up their posts for the decisive contest in augury at the foundation of the city, the poet tells us: 'certabant urbem Romam Remoramue uocarent' (83 V). In the 'concilium deorum' Jupiter had informed Mars that only one of his twin sons would gain immortality.[77] If Juno won her point about the city's not having 'Troy' for title, Jupiter may have told Mars that the city would be named after one of his sons: the winner would receive the prize of godhead.[78]

Hypotheses about 'what must have been in Ennius' become dear to their architects, but to few others. To return to Vergil's last book. The salient elements of his Ennian model which stand out more certainly are the insistence on the passing away of Troy, the limited or qualified nature of the goddess's acquiescence, and the mention of the deification of a god's son. If one has the Ennian archetype in mind, one sees why the dialogue between Jupiter and Juno *starts off* as if it is going to be a discussion on the apotheosis of Aeneas: 'quae iam finis erit, coniunx? quid denique restat? | indigetem Aenean scis ipsa et scire fateris | deberi caelo fatisque ad sidera tolli. | quid struis?' (793–6).[79] Juno's harping on the name of Troy may (more tentatively) be seen as an allusion to the words of the same goddess in *Ann.* 1. There she may have demanded that the city should not be called 'Troia' but, if needs be, 'Roma' or 'Remora'; in Vergil, one name crowds in upon another as she ends her speech, pleading that the new race should not be Trojans or Teucri – Latin, Alban, Roman, Italian, anything but Trojan:

> illud te...
> pro Latio obtestor...
> ne uetus indigenas nomen mutare Latinos
> neu Troas fieri iubeas Teucrosque uocari
> aut uocem mutare uiros aut uertere uestem.
> sit Latium, sint Albani per saecula reges,
> sit Romana potens Itala uirtute propago:
> occidit, occideritque sinas cum nomine Troia (819–28).

'cum nomine Troia...' To Vergil and Horace the lapsing of Troy was a part of their poetic heritage, but one feels compelled to ask what charged the topic with such

[76] Schröder, op. cit. n. 74, pp. 102 ff., conveniently collects the various historical and poetic accounts of the name changes and adoptions involved in the Trojan immigrants' losing their proper title.

[77] cf. Ov. *Fast.* 2. 485–8 (Mars is speaking): 'redde patri natum. quamuis intercidit alter, | pro se proque Remo, qui mihi restat, erit. | "unus erit, quem tu tolles in caerula caeli" | tu mihi dixisti: sint rata dicta Iouis.' Is there a contrast with Castor and Pollux, twins who were both deified?

[78] Here would be the explanation of Ennius' placing of the reconciliation of Juno *before* Romulus' death, rather than after it, as the strict example of Heracles required: cf. n. 66 above. I realize that in Horace Juno speaks only of Romulus as a candidate for immortality, but it is reasonable to allow ground for Horace's tact in recasting the story of how Augustus' model joined the gods. After all, by any reconstruction of the council, there must have been some mention of the embarrassing Remus, if we follow the evidence of Ovid that Jupiter spoke of both twins, promising immortality for only one of them ('unus erit quem tu tolles'...etc.; '"unus" is clearly said in contradistinction to "ambo"', Skutsch, op. cit. n. 63, p. 131). Horace is suppressing *some* talk of Remus: it is only a question of how much.

[79] cf. N. W. De Witt, *CR* 34 (1920), 66, on the 'similarity of treatment' in *A.* 12 and Hor. *Carm.* 3. 3: 'Juno is reminded that Aeneas is to become a deity under the title "Aeneas indiges", and to this she tacitly consents, just as she assented to the assumption of Romulus, but she again makes stipulations.' Cf. Commager, op. cit. n. 47, p. 222. This is not to say that Aeneas was elevated to heaven in Ennius, a notion argued against by Skutsch, op. cit. n. 63, p. 131.

urgency for them. A tradition of this kind is simply available, and unrigorous: it is up to the inheritors to make something or nothing of it. Fraenkel contests the old idea that the poets are directly disparaging an actual political proposal, as reported in Suetonius, that the capital should be transferred from Rome to Troy.[80] But Fraenkel is also representative of a reluctance to see anything of more moment in the words of Horace's Juno than 'a matter of ordinary feeling and therefore of poetry, with no political implication whatever'.[81] The implied opposition between poetry and significance is unnatural, while a directly political reference is not the only one which the poems' surfaces may yield.

It seems plain that in both Horace and Vergil Troy represents, at the least, degeneracy and moral shabbiness.[82] The historical setting for each poet is a remote one, fixed at the time when the nation is being established; while many commentators are content to accept the possibility in Horace of an 'allegorical' reference to the present,[83] it is rare for the same approach to be applied to those portions of the *Aeneid* where Troy and Trojans are the subject. By its nature, the ode can stand in a more direct significative relation to the present than can the overtly 'historical' epic. Horace may generate and exploit a symbolic reference in 'Troy' within his small compass, loading it with the ills of the past and promising 'bonus euentus' to the state if that inheritance is forsworn.[84] Vergil, on the other hand, is more tightly bound to his setting, and the significance of Troy is likely to be of a more aetiological character. Such is the approach of Thomas, who sees the dubious moral character and civilized corruption of the Trojans as being 'a flawed element which will be transmitted to the present, and realized in the moral degeneracy which is a part (and only a part) of modern Roman civilization'.[85]

It is important also to bear in mind that the Trojan past dwindles while the epic progresses, as Aeneas and his men escape from the dream of founding simply another Troy, in the manner of Helenus.[86] Especially, the final dialogue between Jupiter and Juno purports to jettison so much of the Trojan background that only their 'corpora' are to contribute to the new race ('commixti corpore tantum | subsident Teucri', 835 f.). Alone, these promises are not powerful and unequivocal enough altogether to annul the effect of the earlier fears of Trojan contamination; the Trojans' 'corpora' may be sufficient infection. Yet Jupiter's words go some way towards dampening these fears, and it is possible that some hope of escape is to be read here. The 'Trojanness' of Rome is not inevitably effective, and may be outgrown.

This is difficult, and uncertain. At least what may be established is the fact that Vergil is using Troy in the same way as he had in the *Georgics* ('satis iam pridem sanguine

[80] The Suetonius passage is *Iul.* 79. 3; see Fraenkel, op. cit. n. 38, pp. 267 ff. Professor Nisbet suggests to me that the notion of a literal rebuilding of Ilium is perhaps too lightly rejected; there was no question of moving the capital, but the site was of high strategic value, especially for a Parthian campaign, and might have been built up as a base of the type Agrippa maintained in Lesbos. We must await the commentary.

[81] p. 269: cf. the works cited in Commager, op. cit. n. 47, p. 222 n. 121. Oksala too is cautious about possible 'Allegorie', op. cit. n. 43, p. 102.

[82] For Horace, note especially the first lines of Juno's speech (3. 3. 18–24). On the degeneracy of Troy in the *Aeneid*, see now Richard F. Thomas (taking the speech of Numanus Remulus as his text, 9. 598–620): *Lands and Peoples in Roman Poetry: The Ethnographical Tradition* (Cambridge Philological Society, Suppl. vol. 7, Cambridge, 1982), pp. 98 ff.

[83] On various allegorical interpretations of Troy in the ode see Commager, op. cit. n. 47, pp. 215 ff.

[84] Thus Commager, op. cit. n. 47, pp. 216 ff. My approach owes a great deal to his discussion.

[85] Thomas, op. cit. n. 82, p. 99.

[86] On this development, see the works cited in n. 20 above.

nostro | Laomedonteae luimus periuria Troiae', 1. 501 f.), and in the same way as Horace had used the murder of Remus in *Epode* 7: the effect is to embody a radical anxiety about the integrity of the state by pushing far back into the past the original springs of Roman corruption. What is different in the closing stages of the *Aeneid* is the hope expressed of the possibility of rehabilitation: this much is in common with Horace's third Roman ode. The passing of Troy, an 'historical fact' in Ennius, is susceptible to treatment, in the differing textures of ode and epic, as a possible release from 'the weight of all the evil elements in the past'.[87]

Anxiety about the validity of the state may be expressed, in the conventions of epic or lyric, as an apprehension concerning the goodwill of heaven, the divine sanction. This uncertainty is incorporated by the poets in the perennial and potent shape of Juno. As Warde Fowler says of her part in the *Aeneid*,

> this use of Juno . . . was perhaps made easier and more natural because, as a goddess, she belonged rather to Rome's early enemies than to Rome herself. She was a familiar figure in many or most of the cities mentioned in the pageant [*A.* 7. 647–817] – on the Aventine, at Tibur Praeneste and Falerii, in southern Etruria (as Uni), and in Campania. But at Rome, strange to say, she had no great local name and fame in early times, and thus no feelings could be hurt if a Roman poet made her the deadly enemy of Rome.[88]

One of Juno's towns above all we must add to Warde Fowler's list – Carthage. The identification of Italian Juno with the chief goddess of the Carthaginians was no fiction of the poets.[89] The Pyrgi inscription appears to show the grouping as early as *c.* 500 B.C.[90] Hannibal himself, in honouring Juno Lacinia, linked the goddesses together,[91] as did the Roman government, by some mode of thought of other, when they strenuously honoured Juno during the war to which Hannibal gave his name:

> Au cours de la deuxième guerre punique, la Junon Reine de l'Aventine et la Junon de Lanuvium reçurent de nombreux et importants témoignages de dévotion et de respect [Liv. 21. 62. 8, 22. 1. 17], et par là se traduisait l'inquiétude des Romains à sentir leurs ennemis puniques protégés par une déesse éminemment dangereuse pour Rome, comme Héra l'avait été pour Énée et ses Troyens.[92]

From both an historical and literary point of view, the most significant supplication to Juno was that of 207.[93] Here was sung a 'carmen' by Livius Andronicus, and it may have been this ceremony which Ennius selected as the occasion for the long-awaited final reconciliation of Juno.[94]

Juno's position as Rome's most respected divine antagonist is reflected in the disproportionate number of 'euocationes' which the tradition accords to her. Four

[87] Commager's phrase, op. cit. n. 47, p. 221.

[88] loc. cit. n. 24. On this disparity between Juno's cult in Rome and the other local towns, see G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*[2] (Munich, 1912), pp. 187 ff. She was, of course, part of the Capitoline triad from Etruscan times, but dramatically inferior to Jupiter in cult.

[89] On the identification, see n. 23 above.

[90] cf. G. Dumézil, *La Religion romaine archaïque* (Paris, 1974), pp. 665–7.

[91] Liv. 28. 46. 16 (cf. Cic. *Div.* 1. 48); cf. Dumézil, p. 465; R. Bloch, p. 388 of 'Héra, Uni, Junon en Italie centrale', *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres* (1972), 384–95; V. Basanoff, *Evocatio. Étude d'un rituel militaire romain* (Paris, 1947), pp. 63 ff.

[92] Bloch, 394. What most Romans of this era knew about Aeneas and the Trojans is a controversy best left untouched here.

[93] Liv. 27. 37. 7; cf. Horsfall, art. cit. n. 9, 2.

[94] As suggested by Steuart, op. cit. n. 47, pp. 175 ff., and Buchheit, pp. 144 f., esp. n. 620. Other suggestions include a 'concilium deorum' after Cannae (Vahlen, p. clxxxix); a dialogue between Jupiter and Juno at the same date (Norden, op. cit. n. 5, pp. 168 f.); a divine discussion upon Hannibal's appearance before the walls of Rome (on the basis of Sil. *Pun.* 12; G. Fürstenau, 'De Silii Italici imitatione quae fertur Enniana' (Diss. Berlin, 1916), pp. 61, 63).

cases of 'euocatio' are reported, and in three of them Juno is the deity concerned.[95] One of these (at Carthage) is very problematical as an historical event,[96] and Ogilvie is certainly right to say that there 'were many other "euocationes" now unknown to us (Pliny, *N.H.* 28. 18), and the ratio of three Junos to one (Vertumnus) may be perfectly coincidental'.[97] What is probably not coincidental is the evidence, implied in the sample, that the 'euocationes' involving Juno were the ones dwelt upon and retained.

Buchheit would trace the origin of Juno's role in Latin poetry back to Naevius.[98] However that may be, she embodies antipathy to Rome in Ennius, Vergil, Horace, Ovid, and Silius. Each of these poets shows her being reconciled, and on different occasions. 'Consistency is not necessary with these legends', observe Nisbet and Hubbard, remarking on the various dates.[99] The dates vary, but the paradigms of vindictiveness and conditional tolerance are remarkably consistent, a tribute to the power of the goddess. For poets writing even about their own times, it is natural to treat her as unmanageable and disquieting. In a major key, there is Horace's picture of Carthaginian Juno still active in the civil wars, avenging her people's defeats: 'Iuno et deorum quisquis amicior | Afris inulta cesserat inpotens | tellure, uictorum nepotes | rettulit inferias Iugurthae' (*Carm.* 2. 1. 25–8). In a minor key, there is Ovid's Juno in the *Fasti*, asserting her claim in queenly fashion to be the bestower of the name for the month of June (6. 21–64). Strife supervenes when her claim is contested by Iuventas (67–88), and even Concord's arrival fails of a resolution, as that goddess too joins in the bickering (91–6). The poet bows his way out, with a bland allusion to the issue of an earlier quarrel of Juno's: 'perierunt iudice formae | Pergama' (99 f.).

In the *Aeneid* Juno moves some considerable distance from her original stance of total opposition to Rome. At the end of the epic the forces represented by Juno nudge closer to those of Jupiter, and rest there for the while, in tension. One thinks perhaps of Plutarch's good and evil divine principles, which hold the universe in shifting balance;[100] the lines of Euripides which he quotes as his leitmotif[101] are in harmony with the poem's close:

οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο χωρὶς ἐσθλὰ καὶ κακά,
ἀλλ' ἔστι τις σύγκρασις ὥστ' ἔχειν καλῶς.

Magdalene College, Cambridge D. C. FEENEY

[95] At Veii, Falerii Veteres, Carthage (the fourth is Vertumnus at Volsinii); see Ogilvie, op. cit. n. 52, p. 674.
[96] A comprehensive discussion by E. Rawson, in *JRS* 63 (1973), 168 ff.
[97] loc. cit. n. 95.
[98] pp. 54 ff.
[99] On 2. 1. 25.
[100] *De Is. et Os.* 369A ff.
[101] 369B (fr. 21 Nauck).