



VIRGIL AND THE *RHESVS* ATTRIBUTED TO EURIPIDES: AN UNNOTICED ALLUSION AT *AENEID* 1.25–7?*

ABSTRACT

This article argues that the Virgilian narrator's account of Juno's anger at the outcome of the Judgement of Paris at Aen. 1.25–7 contains an allusion, which seems to have gone unnoticed, to a prologue transmitted in some manuscripts of the Rhesus attributed to Euripides. It also discusses the problem of the origin of this prologue. Finally, it suggests some interpretative possibilities arising from recognition of the allusion.

Keywords: Virgil; Euripides; *Rhesus*; Juno; allusion; epic; tragic prologues; ancient scholarship

At *Aen.* 1.25–7, the Virgilian narrator describes Juno's anger at the outcome of the Judgement of Paris:¹

necdum etiam causae irarum saeuique dolores
exciderant animo; manet alta mente repostum
iudicium Paridis spretaeque iniuria formae . . .

Nor yet had the causes of her anger and her cruel pain slipped out of her memory: the judgement of Paris, the injury of her scorned beauty, remains stored away deep inside her mind . . .

Scholars have observed that the Judgement of Paris is mentioned in Hom. *Il.* 24.25–30 (lines 29–30 were athetized by Aristarchus) and that it featured in the lost poem from the Epic Cycle entitled *Cypria*, seemingly towards the beginning (Arg., Procl. *Chrest.* 86–90 Severyns; fr. 4 Bernabé).² Virgil gives the story particular prominence in the opening of his own poem by listing it as one of the two main causes of Juno's anger against the Trojans, the other being the rape of Ganymede (*Aen.* 1.8 *causas*, 1.25 *causae*).

In addition to these parallels in Homer and the *Cypria*, a further Greek text may be cited: a prologue to the *Rhesus* attributed to Euripides, which is spoken by Hera and in which she cites the Judgement of Paris as a reason to take revenge against the Trojans. This prologue is transmitted in an anonymous hypothesis of unknown date, Diggle's hypothesis

* I wish to thank Francesco Busti, Joseph Farrell, Luuk Huitink and Matthew Payne for their generous and valuable comments and suggestions. I am also grateful to *CQ*'s two anonymous readers, as well as to its editor, Bruce Gibson, for providing advice which helped to improve this article significantly.

¹ The text of Virgil is cited from the edition of G.B. Conte, *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis* (Berlin and Boston, 2019²), the text of Euripides from that of J. Diggle, *Euripidis fabulae* (Oxford, 1984–94), 3 vols. Translations are my own unless otherwise indicated.

² On Homer, see G.N. Knauer, *Die Aeneis und Homer. Studien zur poetischen Technik Vergils mit Listen der Homerzitate in der Aeneis* (Göttingen, 1979²), 371, and already F. Ursinus, *Virgilius collatione scriptorum Graecorum illustratus* (Antwerp, 1567), 196. On the *Cypria*, E.C. Kopff, 'Virgil and the Cyclic Epics', *ANRW* 2.31.2 (1981), 919–47, at 924, 927; U. Gärtner, 'Virgil and the Epic Cycle', in M. Fantuzzi and C. Tsagalis (edd.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception* (Cambridge, 2015), 543–64, at 560. On Aristarchus' athetesis, see F. Schironi, *The Best of the Grammarians: Aristarchus of Samothrace on the Iliad* (Ann Arbor, 2018), 633–5 with references.

(b), contained in some of our manuscripts of the play.³ The author of the hypothesis quotes eleven lines of a prologue which he reports could be found in some manuscripts (ἐν ἐνίοις δὲ τῶν ἀντιγράφων) and which he judges to be ‘banal’ and unworthy of Euripides (πεζὸς πάνυ [*sc.* πρόλογος] καὶ οὐ πρέπων Εὐριπίδῃ), suspecting them rather to have been interpolated by an actor (καὶ τάχα ἄν τινες τῶν ὑποκριτῶν διεσκευασκότες εἶεν αὐτόν).⁴ In this prologue, Hera enjoins Athena to avenge the slight that both of them suffered at the Judgement of Paris.⁵ These are the lines of the prologue to which, I argue, Virgil is alluding (hypothesis (b), [Eur.] *Rhes.* 39–44 = Adesp. fr. *81.6–11 *TrGF*):

ἔμοι γὰρ οὐδὲν ἔστιν ἄλλιον βάρος,
 ἐξ οὗ γ’ ἔκρινε Κύπριν Ἀλέξανδρος θέαν
 κάλλει προήκειν τῆς ἐμῆς εὐμορφίας
 καὶ σῆς, Ἀθάνα, φιλότατης ἐμοὶ θεῶν,
 εἰ μὴ κατασκαφεῖσαν ὄψομαι πόλιν
 Πριάμου, βίαι πρόρριζον ἐκτετριμμένην.

There is no more painful burden for me—ever since Alexander judged that the goddess Aphrodite surpassed my beauty and yours, Athena, dearest to me among the gods—than if I shall not see Priam’s city razed to the ground, with its foundations violently dug up.⁶

It should first be considered how these lines fit into the context of the prologue and, assuming that this prologue was in fact written for the extant *Rhesus* (on this question, see below), how they might fit into the context of that play. The full prologue is not transmitted, but it is plausible that, in what followed, Hera and Athena plotted to thwart Rhesus’ attempt to join forces with the Trojans.⁷ Athena achieves this at *Rhes.* 595–667, when she first persuades Odysseus and Diomedes not to return to the Greek camp immediately after slaying Dolon (595–621). Then, taking the form of Aphrodite, she allays Paris’ concerns that the Trojans are under attack and assures him that she, ‘Aphrodite’, remains mindful of the honour he paid her at the Judgement of Paris (642–67, especially 647–8). Athena’s trickery might thus be seen as the fulfilment of a plot to punish the Trojans outlined in the prologue by Hera and Athena, in which the Judgement is cited as an important motivation for the goddesses’ revenge.

Let us now consider the passage itself in more detail and how it might have influenced Virgil. The Judgement of Paris is a story which seems to have been particularly appealing to Euripides (*Andr.* 274–92, *Hec.* 629–56, *Hel.* 23–5, 676–8, *IA* 182–4, 573–89, 1283–314, *Tro.* 924–33, 970–82).⁸ The language used in this *Rhesus* prologue, when

³ Diggle’s MSS VLQ (Vaticanus gr. 909, fol. 295v; Laurentianus 32.2, fol. 119r; Harleianus 5743, fol. 66v); cf. Diggle (n. 1), 3.428.

⁴ For this interpretation of πεζός instead of the more common sense of ‘prosaic’, see M. Fantuzzi, *The Rhesus Attributed to Euripides* (Cambridge, 2020), 137–8.

⁵ It was Valckenaer in the eighteenth century who pointed out that the speaker can only be Hera (L.C. Valckenaer, *Diatribe in Euripidis perditorum dramatum reliquias* [Leiden, 1767], 94). The only known appearance of Hera in Attic tragedy (not counting this prologue) seems to have been in Aesch. fr. 168 *TrGF*, a fragment which has been assigned to the *Wool-Carders* (Ξάντριά) or to the *Semele* or *Water-Carriers* (Υδροφόροι). For discussion, see M. Wright, *The Lost Plays of Greek Tragedy*, 2 vols. (London, 2016–19), 2.48. I am grateful to Matthew Payne for drawing my attention to this fragment.

⁶ Translation from Fantuzzi (n. 4), 137.

⁷ W. Ritchie, *The Authenticity of the Rhesus of Euripides* (Cambridge, 1964), 110–11; M. Fantuzzi, ‘Performing and informing: on the prologues of the [Euripidean] *Rhesus*’, *Trends in Classics* 7 (2015), 224–36, at 230–1.

⁸ It is unclear to what extent, if at all, the Judgement featured in Euripides’ fragmentary *Alexandros* (fr. 42–63, V.1.174–204 *TrGF*): see I. Karamanou, *Euripides, Alexandros. Introduction, Text and Commentary* (Berlin and Boston, 2017), 10–11.

compared with the other passages, looks fairly conventional: κριν- words and μορφ- words are especially common in Euripides' versions and elsewhere, though in none of the passages just referred to is the emphasis placed specifically on Hera's anger at the outcome of the Judgement.⁹ A further sign of the conventionality of the language is the high number of allusions to fifth-century Athenian tragedy that have been noted in these lines, an observation that has been used in support of the theory that these lines are not by Euripides.¹⁰ Where Virgil's account of the Judgement of Paris is concerned, earlier adaptations into Latin of the episode that survive only in fragmentary condition—such as Ennius' *Alexander*, a play seemingly related to Euripides' *Alexandros*, in which Paris' decision is already described as a *iudicium* (Inc. fr. 151.17–18 *TrRF* = *Alexander* 48–9 Jocelyn), and a hexameter poem entitled *Cypria Ilias* (fr. 1–2 Blänsdorf) attributed to a Naevius who is not the same man as Cn. Naevius, author of the *Bellum Punicum*—may also be relevant.¹¹

Some readers may prefer to believe that Virgil is not alluding to any specific version of the Judgement of Paris. It must also be admitted that the status of the *Rhesus* prologue is not unproblematic, given that it is transmitted only in one of the hypotheses to the play and not in the actual text. While there is no doubt whatsoever that Virgil knew and alluded elsewhere in the *Aeneid* to the *Rhesus* itself,¹² there is debate among scholars about whether this alternative prologue would have been known in Virgil's time.

Let us address, therefore, the potential objections to the suggestion that at *Aen.* 1.25–7 Virgil is alluding to this prologue of the *Rhesus* attributed to Euripides. First, its provenance. The statement by the author of hypothesis (b) that the prologue in question was written by an actor is generally accepted as true.¹³ The interpolation is believed to have occurred on the occasion of a reperformance of the play in the fourth or early third century B.C.E.:¹⁴ in such contexts, prologues seem to have been particularly susceptible to interpolation by actors.¹⁵ Much of the rest of the information provided by hypothesis (b)

⁹ On Euripides, see T.C.W. Stinton, *Euripides and the Judgement of Paris* (London, 1965), 60, who describes κρίσις, ἔρις and μορφή as the three 'key-words of the action': κρίσις and προκρίνω are used in Proclus' summary of the *Cypria*, as well as νεῖκος and κάλλος (Procl. *Chrest.* 86–90 Severyns). The words κρίσις and ἔρις are also found in an anonymous papyrus dated to the first century B.C.E. or first century C.E. containing a hexameter account of the Judgement seemingly given by Penelope (*P.Berol. inv.* 10584 = *P.Schubart* 8 = 952 *Suppl. Hell.* = 72 *APHex* II [forthcoming]). It would have been interesting to compare the language used in Euripides' versions of the Judgement with those of Sophocles in a satyr drama entitled *Krisis* (fr. 360–1, IV.324–5 *TrGF*) and of the fifth-century B.C.E. dramatist Cratinus in a comedy entitled *Dionysalexandros* (fr. 39–51, IV.140–7 K.–A.), had these two texts survived. It is also noteworthy that the story seems to have been told by Pindar (*Pae.* 8a, fr. 52i(A) S.–M.).

¹⁰ Th.K. Stephanopoulos, 'Tragica 1', *ZPE* 73 (1988), 207–47, at 208–9.

¹¹ That Naevius' poem contained an account of the Judgement seems likely: fr. 1 Blänsdorf has been interpreted as describing Aphrodite's preparations for the beauty contest: E. Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford, 1993), 108.

¹² B.C. Fenik, 'The influence of Euripides on Vergil's *Aeneid*' (Diss., Princeton, 1960), 54–96; A. König, *Die Aeneis und die griechische Tragödie. Studien zur imitatio-Technik Vergils* (Diss., Berlin, 1970), 89–109; B. Pavlock, *Eros, Imitation, and the Epic Tradition* (Ithaca, NY, 1990), 87–112. Cf. P.R. Hardie, *Virgil Aeneid Book IX* (Cambridge, 1994), 30.

¹³ V. Liapis, 'An ancient hypothesis to the *Rhesus*, and Dicaearchus' *hypotheses*', *GRBS* 42 (2001), 313–27, at 317; A. Fries, 'The *Rhesus*', in V. Liapis and A.K. Petrides (edd.), *Greek Tragedy after the Fifth Century: A Survey from ca. 400 BC to ca. AD 400* (Cambridge, 2019), 66–89, at 84–5; Fantuzzi (n. 7), 231.

¹⁴ Fantuzzi (n. 7), 224.

¹⁵ See E. Hall, 'Tragic theatre: Demetrios' rolls and Dionysos' other woman', in O. Taplin and R. Wyles (edd.), *The Pronomos Vase and its Context* (Oxford, 2009), 159–79, at 161–2 and, more generally, P.J. Finglass, 'The textual tradition of Euripides' dramas', in A. Markantonatos (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Euripides*, 2 vols. (Leiden and Boston, 2020), 1.29–48, at 32.

has, however, given rise to debate. For instance, it is unclear whether this prologue was composed for the genuine *Rhesus* of Euripides, listed in Aristotle's *Didascaliae* as a genuine Euripidean play, or whether, assuming that the *Rhesus* that has come down to us is not by Euripides but by a later unknown imitator, this prologue was written for the extant inauthentic play.¹⁶ It therefore cannot be proved with absolute certainty that the play for which this prologue was written is the same play as the one to which Virgil alludes elsewhere in the *Aeneid* (see footnote 12), although it is plausible that the prologue was indeed written for the extant *Rhesus* (see above). Furthermore, on the one hand, some scholars argue that this prologue was already known to, and cited by, the Peripatetic Dicaearchus (*fl.* c.320–300 B.C.E.).¹⁷ Hypotheses on the plays of Euripides are ascribed to him and he is mentioned by the author of hypothesis (b) as the source for the quotation of the first line of another prologue to the *Rhesus* also preserved in this hypothesis (Eur. fr. 660a *TrGF*).¹⁸ Other scholars, on the other hand, believe that our prologue was unknown to Dicaearchus and was quoted by a later source.¹⁹ As stated above, it is not known who the author of the hypothesis was or when they were active, but those scholars who reject the idea that the source for the text of our prologue and for the negative judgement expressed about it is Dicaearchus generally hold that this information in fact probably rather derives, at least in part, from Aristophanes of Byzantium.²⁰ So our prologue could in theory have been quoted by Dicaearchus, by Aristophanes himself, or by a later grammarian or commentator. Some even go so far as to suggest that it may have been quoted by Arius Didymus, active during the reign of Augustus (c.65 B.C.E.–10 C.E.).²¹

Two recent editors of the play, Liapis and Fries, however, argue that Aristophanes of Byzantium did not know our prologue. They do so on the grounds that, in the hypothesis explicitly assigned in our manuscripts to Aristophanes of Byzantium, Diggle's hypothesis (c), Aristophanes writes that a chorus of Trojan guards performs the prologue to the play (ὁ χορὸς συνέστηκεν ἐκ φυλάκων Τρωϊκῶν, οἱ καὶ προλογίζουσι, 'the chorus is composed of Trojan guards, who also perform the prologue', Ar. Byz. hypothesis (c), [Eur.] *Rhes.* 52–3).²² On their account, this statement implies that Aristophanes did not know our prologue, because, if he had known it, he would have mentioned it, since, as both of them point out, the usual practice of Alexandrian scholars was not to omit without comment passages they deemed spurious.²³ In support of their

¹⁶ Hypothesis (b), [Eur.] *Rhes.* 24–5 = Arist. *Didascaliae* fr. 428 Gigon, part.

¹⁷ So A. Kirchoff, 'Das Argument zum *Rhesos*', *Philologus* 7 (1852), 559–64, at 563–4, endorsed by Wehrli (Dicaearchus fr. 81) and more recently by V. Liapis, *A Commentary on the Rhesus Attributed to Euripides* (Oxford, 2012), 62–5.

¹⁸ Though some scholars doubt the ascription to Dicaearchus of hypotheses on the text of Euripides: for an account of the issue, see M. van Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers' Digests?* (Leiden / New York / Cologne, 1998), 1–32.

¹⁹ Scholars who subscribe to this view include Ritchie (n. 7), 31; A. Fries, *Pseudo-Euripides, Rhesus. Edited with Introduction and Commentary* (Berlin and Boston, 2014), 112; and Fantuzzi (n. 4), 134–5.

²⁰ Ritchie (n. 7), 31; Fantuzzi (n. 4), 134–5. Without denying that some of the information contained in hypothesis (b) is due to Aristophanes of Byzantium, P. Carrara, 'Dicearco e l'hypothesis del *Reso*', *ZPE* 90 (1992), 35–44, at 37 n. 9 suggests that the hypothesis also bears traces of the scholarship of Arius Didymus.

²¹ Ritchie (n. 7), 31; Carrara (n. 20), 37 n. 9.

²² Liapis (n. 13), 317–18; Fries (n. 19), 26.

²³ Liapis (n. 13), 318 n. 5: 'Omission of suspect lines was *not* practised by the Alexandrians' (emphasis original); Fries (n. 19), 26: 'That Aristophanes of Byzantium did not know them [the two prologues cited in hypothesis (b)] can be deduced not only from our standard text, but also from the statement in his hypothesis [*sc.* Diggle's hypothesis (c)] that the sentry chorus

claim, both of them adduce Pfeiffer's explanation of the scholarly methods of Zenodotus and Aristophanes of Byzantium, without mentioning that Pfeiffer's explanation in fact concerns not Zenodotus' and Aristophanes' work on Greek tragedy but their work on the text of Homer.²⁴ It is not obvious that the methods the Alexandrian scholars employed on the text of Homer can straightforwardly be considered identical to those that they employed on the text of a Greek tragedy.

Indeed, as Pfeiffer himself surmises, Zenodotus' text of the *Iliad* may have been based on a single manuscript which he considered the best among the many available in the library of Alexandria, which presumably contained widely diverging texts.²⁵ One could imagine that, while Aristophanes did adopt the Alexandrian practice of not deleting from a text lines which were contained in the manuscripts of Homer, he left unmentioned a prologue added by an actor which survived only in 'wild' copies²⁶ to which he may or may not have had access.²⁷ The argument of Liapis and Fries that Aristophanes of Byzantium did not know our prologue of the *Rhesus* based solely on the fact that he did not mention it in his hypothesis is one that is made from silence. In fact, it cannot be argued with certainty that Aristophanes did not know our prologue. And, even if he did not know it, our prologue was clearly circulating in some manuscripts at the time hypothesis (b) was written, which is likely either around the time of Aristophanes or after it.²⁸ It does not matter a great deal for my argument whether our prologue was originally cited by Dicaearchus, by Aristophanes or by a later grammarian. In any case, it cannot have disappeared from circulation completely before reappearing in the tradition represented by the Byzantine manuscripts of Euripides, and therefore it seems difficult to rule out the possibility that Virgil could have known and alluded to it.

Now that it has been established with a reasonable degree of plausibility that Virgil could have accessed a manuscript of the *Rhesus* containing this prologue, let us consider the similarities between the Greek and the Latin texts in greater detail:

necdum etiam causae irarum **saeuique dolores**
exciderant animo; manet alta mente repostum
iudicium Paridis spretaeque iniuria **formae** . . .

"delivered the prologue" [...]. The Alexandrians did not as a rule omit passages they deemed spurious.'

²⁴ R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1968–76), 1.115 ('Zenodotus did not suppress the lines [*sc.* of Homer] of which he doubted the genuineness, but left them in the context, marking them, however, on the margin with the obelus; he disclosed his own opinion and enabled the reader to check it') and 1.173–4 ('[Aristophanes was] reluctant to delete lines or to put conjectures in the text'; 'he and his pupils preferred to express their opinions by signs in the margin').

²⁵ Pfeiffer (n. 24), 1.110. Cf. M.L. West, *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad* (Munich and Leipzig, 2001), 33–45, especially 43: 'Zenodotus' text [of the *Iliad*] was a rhapsode's copy, or directly descended from one. It was not a critical text constructed by him from multiple sources, but a single exemplar that he happened to own and in which he marked his *atheteses*: that was his διόρθωσις.'

²⁶ The term used by Fries (n. 19), 26. See further W.S. Barrett, *Euripides: Hippolytos* (Oxford, 1966²), 56 n. 1.

²⁷ See the cautious approach of Fantuzzi (n. 4), 135.

²⁸ As Finglass (n. 15), 35 points out, 'texts of Euripides continued to circulate outside that city [*sc.* Alexandria], and it seems unlikely that an Alexandrian edition [*sc.* of Euripides] could have entirely dominated the tradition of a poet increasingly read over the Greek-speaking Mediterranean.' For a description of the Euripidean papyri dated between the first century B.C.E. and the first century C.E. (up until 2009), the majority of which were discovered at Oxyrhynchus, see P. Carrara, *Il testo di Euripide nell'antichità. Ricerche sulla tradizione testuale euripidea antica, sec. IV a.C.–sec. VIII d.C.* (Florence, 2009), 211–42.

ἔμοι γὰρ οὐδέν ἐστιν ἄλγιον βάρος
 ἐξ οὗ ἔκρινε Κύπριν Ἀλέξανδρος θεῶν
 κάλλει προήκειν τῆς ἐμῆς εὐμορφίας ...

dolor corresponds to ἄλγιον (*TLL* 5.1.1837.31–2), which is also recalled by *iniuria*, and two words denoting emotional suffering are in both passages placed at line-end. A temporal perspective is essential to both passages: the temporal indication *necdum etiam ... manet* corresponds to ἐξ οὗ, ‘since’ (LSJ ἐκ II), which itself is reminiscent of *Il.* 1.5–6 Διὸς δ’ ἐτελείετο βουλή, | ἐξ οὗ δὴ τὰ πρῶτα ... , a passage which is concerned not only with the origin of a conflict in the general context of the Trojan War but precisely with a conflict set in motion by the anger of Achilles, a theme alluded to markedly by Virgil at the beginning of the *Aeneid*.²⁹ Athena is Hera’s interlocutor in the *Rhesus* prologue, and she is in the Virgilian Hera’s thoughts, as will be revealed at *Aen.* 1.39–41 (*Pallasne exurere classem | Argium ... potuit ...*, ‘yet Pallas had the power to burn down the fleet of the Argives ...’). Both sentences begin from negation (*necdum*; οὐδέν). While it may be true, as the author of the hypothesis says, that the style of this passage is ‘banal’ (πεζός), there is one crucial point that makes the notion that Virgil is alluding specifically to this passage particularly attractive. Indeed, both passages present the Judgement of Paris as a particularly significant motive for Hera/Juno’s anger against the Trojans, emphasizing the pain caused by not having been selected as the most beautiful goddess (κάλλει, εὐμορφίας; *formae*). In the Greek prologue, it is actually Hera who is speaking: the Virgilian narrator proceeds ‘as if he were quoting her [*sc.* Juno]’.³⁰ Accounts of the Judgement of Paris given from the perspective of Hera/Juno are not common.

There is therefore good reason to believe that Virgil is alluding to the *Rhesus* prologue. Yet, to the best of my knowledge, this is a parallel which has never been cited by any Virgilian commentator. At the very least, future commentators should consider mentioning this allusion to the *Rhesus* prologue in their notes on *Aen.* 1.25–7. Furthermore, accepting this allusion may open the way to some profitable interpretative possibilities which I survey here by way of conclusion.

The striking fact that, in the *Iliad*, the Judgement is mentioned for the first time only in the final book of the poem (*Il.* 24.25–30) makes it particularly striking that Virgil should include a reference to it so early and at such a prominent position in *Aeneid* Book 1.³¹ Indeed, as already mentioned above, the lateness of this reference in Homer, as well as the belief that Homer did not even know the story of the Judgement of Paris, led Aristarchus to athetize *Il.* 24.29–30, a decision rejected by most, but not all, modern editors.³² Davies has highlighted the significance of this passage within the context of the *Iliad* by showing that the reference to divine strife in *Iliad* Book 24, at a moment when

²⁹ The Homeric half-line Διὸς δ’ ἐτελείετο βουλή was apparently imitated by the author of the *Cypria* (fr. 1.7 Bernabé = Σ A Hom. *Il.* 1.5 van Thiel). On reminiscences of the anger of Achilles at the beginning of the *Aeneid*, see most recently J. Farrell, *Juno’s Aeneid. A Battle for Heroic Identity* (Princeton, 2021), 55–6.

³⁰ Farrell (n. 29), 118, citing Laird’s analysis of Juno’s use of ‘free indirect discourse’ (A. Laird, *Powers of Expression, Expressions of Power. Speech Presentation and Latin Literature* [Oxford, 1999], 96–9). A.M. Seider, *Memory in Vergil’s Aeneid: Creating the Past* (Cambridge, 2013), 7 suggests that these lines offer ‘a portrait of the working of Juno’s memory’.

³¹ One of *CQ*’s anonymous readers suggests that Virgil’s mention of the Judgement of Paris from line 25 onwards in the first book of the *Aeneid* may constitute a stichometric allusion to Homer’s brief account of the Judgement which begins at line 25 of the twenty-fourth and final book of the *Iliad*: ‘the analogy could be that Virgil “worked the other way round”.’

³² M.L. West, *The Making of the Iliad: Disquisition and Analytical Commentary* (Oxford, 2011), 412.

reconciliation on the human level is imminent, gains by being understood in relation to the situation in *Iliad* Book 1, where anger among humans is rife, but potential strife among the gods is easily quelled.³³ It would be perfectly in keeping with what we know about Virgil's allusive technique that he should be particularly attentive to lines that had received special scrutiny in Homeric scholarship. Moreover, Virgil's reference to the Judgement comes at the beginning of a series of allusions to what Farrell has recently called a 'Long *Iliad*', a full account of the Trojan War as told in a series of epic poems including Homer's *Iliad* as well as poems from the Epic Cycle such as the *Cypria*.³⁴ That Virgil is alluding to the *Cypria*, as scholars have suggested (see note 2 above), is plausible, and it is particularly attractive to imagine him alluding at the beginning of his poem to an episode which not only featured towards the beginning of the *Cypria* but also constitutes what stands chronologically as one of the earliest causes of Juno's anger against the Trojans. It is widely recognized that the question of possible alternative beginnings is one that Virgil thematizes again and again in *Aeneid* Book 1.³⁵

Throughout the *Aeneid*, Virgil also often enriches his epic material with allusions to tragedy, and in Book 1 there is evidence that he engages with tragic prologues in particular. For instance, Mac Góráin has argued that, as early as the second line of his epic, Virgil alludes to the prologue of Euripides' *Bacchae*.³⁶ Venus' epiphany disguised as a huntress wearing buskins in front of Aeneas (1.314–37) has been seen to echo the prologue (and ending) of Euripides' *Hippolytus*,³⁷ and thus may potentially be seen to form a pendant with Juno's earlier 'tragic' opening. And by alluding to the *Rhesus* so early in the epic, Virgil sets into motion a pattern of allusion which extends at least until Book 9 and the Nisus and Euryalus episode. In particular, during the description of Juno's temple in Carthage later in Book 1, Aeneas' tearful reaction to seeing an image depicting the fate of Rhesus, which occupies a full five lines of text (1.469–73), would gain extra point after the allusion to the *Rhesus* tragedy in the prologue: the Trojan hero could be perceived as misreading the scene and not understanding that he himself, as another victim of Juno's wrath, is in a sense another Rhesus.³⁸ More generally, Virgil's allusion to the *Rhesus* prologue fits well within what Farrell calls the 'culminating re-integration of tragedy into a totalizing epic structure that rivals Homer'.³⁹

Leiden University

BASIL L.P. NELIS
b.l.p.nelis@hum.leidenuniv.nl

³³ M. Davies, 'The Judgement of Paris and *Iliad* Book XXIV', *JHS* 101 (1981), 56–62, at 59–60.

³⁴ Farrell (n. 29), 116–20.

³⁵ D.P. Nelis, 'From didactic to epic: *Georgics* 2.458–3.48', in M. Gale (ed.), *Latin Epic and Didactic Poetry. Genre, Tradition and Individuality* (Swansea, 2004), 73–107, at 94.

³⁶ Verg. *Aen.* 1.2 *uenit* ~ Eur. *Bacch.* 1 ἦκω (a suggestion which, however, has not convinced all readers: see J.J. O'Hara, *BMCR* 2014.04.10); *Aen.* 1.4 *saeuae memorem Iunonis ob iram*, 1.8 *Musa, mihi causas memora, quo numine laeso* ~ *Bacch.* 6–9: see F. Mac Góráin, 'Virgil's Bacchus and the Roman Republic', in J. Farrell and D.P. Nelis (edd.), *Augustan Poetry and the Roman Republic* (Oxford, 2013), 124–45, at 129–30.

³⁷ E.L. Harrison, 'Why did Venus wear boots? Some reflections on *Aeneid* 1.314f', *PVS* 12 (1972–3), 10–25, at 18; cf. P.R. Hardie, 'Virgil and tragedy', in F. Mac Góráin and C. Martindale (edd.), *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil* (Cambridge, 2019²), 326–41, at 336 and 339 (on Juno's 'mental...rehears[al of] old plays as examples to imitate in her own behaviour').

³⁸ On Aeneas as 'a model for the negative reader who resists the bias of the text' in this scene, see S. Casali, 'Nisus and Euryalus: exploiting the contradictions in Virgil's "Doloneia"', *HSPH* 102 (2004), 319–54, at 348. My thanks to Francesco Busti for suggesting this idea to me.

³⁹ Farrell (n. 29), 37.