Homer's Chariot Race and Virgil's Boat Race

Given the relationship between Homer and Virgil, it is of fascinating interest in our judgement of both poets to consider particular episodes where it is clear that Virgil's unique model was Homer. The most obvious of such points of comparison are the funeral games (*Aeneid* 5, *Iliad* 23), the night expedition (*Aeneid* 9, *Iliad* 10), and the final fight (*Aeneid* 12, *Iliad* 22). The visit to the underworld might be added, bringing in the *Odyssey* (*Aeneid* 6, *Odyssey* 11), but there is so much more to Virgil there, in the symbolism of death, the geography of the underworld, the pageant of future Romans, that the comparison is not between like and like. In the other three cases fruitful comparisons can be made; and what is immediately obvious is that whereas Virgil closely imitates the situations—funeral games presided over by the hero of the epic, night expedition of two warriors from the hero's side, final fight between the two leaders in full view of both armies—he changes as he imitates. If Homer does it one way, he does it another; if Homer is heroic and uplifting, Virgil introduces pathos and failure. And this principle of alteration is most noticeable in our present subject, for when Homer made a chariot race the most significant event in his games, and put it first, and gave it more lines of description than all the other events put together, and he had eight events in all, Virgil has four events in all, taking his last three (foot race, boxing, archery) from Homer's last seven; and he puts his own most prestigious event at the beginning, making it the longest, as Homer did, though not by so great a difference from the others, and the fullest of incident. But he makes a radical change. Although the chariot race was the most important event at funeral games in Greek heroic epic,[1] and at the classical Greek games, as we can see from Pindar, Virgil invents a boat race.

This was a brilliant idea. After all, they had been sailing, and the skills required would have been practised. They have just arrived back in Sicily, having left Carthage and Dido; the boats and crews are ready.

Where did he get the idea from? Not from literature, so far as we can tell. It is surprising how little reference there is to boat races in the

ancient world.[2] They must have had them; natural human competitiveness would lead to rivalry between oarsmen and steersmen. From the major classical authors available to us, there is a νεῶν ἅμιλλα in the review of his expeditionary force by Xerxes (Herodotus VII 44), the statement by Thucydides (VI 32) that the ships of the Athenian armada which set off in 415 for Sicily and disaster raced each other as far as Aegina, ἅμιλλαν ἤδη μέχρι Αἰγίνης ἐποιοῦντο, and (not included by Gardner) the wonderful stanza at the beginning of the *Fifth Isthmian* by Pindar, which actually brings into association chariot and boat races. This ode begins with an invocation to a divinity called Theia, treated by Pindar as a personification of human aspiration: 'Mother of the Sun, goddess of many names, because of you men put particular value on gold, and ships competing on the sea, and horses with chariots, are admired as they race round in pursuit of the honour that you bestow.' The word ἅμιλλα comes here as in the historians; the ships and the chariots are wonderful (says Pindar) in the 'swift-turning competitions'—ὠκυδινάτοις ἐν ἁμίλλαισι θαυμασταὶ πέλονται. Other evidence is patchy. Stephanus of Byzantium says that there was a regatta at the Actian Games, founded by Augustus to celebrate his victory; and this of course, if true, would be very significant for Virgil's choice. Dio Chrysostom[3] alleges that the ship Argo won a boat race at the proto-Isthmian festival, which encourages Gardner (*op. cit.* n. 2, p. 91) to believe that such races were at some time a part of the Isthmian Games; I find this difficult to believe in the absence of other evidence, although we may note that Pindar's reference above is for an Isthmian victor. Finally, in the ephebic inscriptions from Athens, starting around 330 BC, there are several references to victories in boat races.[4] In all these sources, the term used is ἅμιλλα (νεῶν ἅμιλλα or πλοίων ἅμιλλα) or the combatants are described as ἁμιλλώμενοι, so that we can reasonably assume not only a regular form of competition, but a particular name for it. From somewhere among all of this, most significantly if it was from Actium, Virgil got the idea for his epic.

I begin however with the Iliadic chariot race.

Homer's description is vividly and brilliantly exciting, the most memorable of the eight events in his games. What makes it particularly dramatic is the human element. We know most of the competitors, for the *Iliad* is now close to its end; and we, like the Greek spectators, are

keenly interested in the result. The competitors react to each other too, and to Achilles, and the crowd reacts, so that there is a kind of primary intensity about the whole.

There are some oddities in the tale. First Achilles sets out five valuable prizes; and five drivers stand up. Most are known to us: there are Diomedes and Menelaus from the foremost leaders, Meriones and Antilochus from those of the second rank (Meriones second in command of the Cretans, and Antilochus the young son of Nestor who plays a progressively increasing role in the *Iliad* as it moves towards its end). The fifth competitor, however, is one we have hardly heard of, a specialist at this event who has not been seen in the *Iliad* fighting at all, but only as leader of one of the contingents in the Catalogue of Ships in Book 2, namely Eumelus, son of Admetus and Alcestis, from Thessaly. He had the best horses in the Achaean army, after Achilles of course.[5]

So Homer has a cast of five: Eumelus, Diomedes, Menelaus, Antilochus, Meriones. And who do we think will win? To anyone who is au fait with the *Iliad*, it is unthinkable that Diomedes will come second in anything. He is a natural winner; or, to put it another way which meant virtually the same to Homer and his hearers, Athene loved him. We expect Diomedes to win, and will be surprised if he does not.

Before the race begins, there is a touch of Homeric humour. Ancient Nestor gives his son Antilochus some gratuitous advice about tactics, making a special point about how best to deal with the turn at the far end of the course. Nestor reckons that if you can come first out of the bend it will be very difficult for anyone else to catch you. We naturally expect there to be great competition and excitement at that point.

But in fact the description of the race is limited to two incidents on the way back from the turn, between the two leading chariots and between two further back—that is, between Eumelus and Diomedes about who is going to be first, and between Antilochus and Menelaus about who is going to be third. Meriones does nothing. He is not in competition, completes the course, and finishes last.

The incident between Antilochus and Menelaus in third/fourth position need not take much of our time, as Virgil does not make any attempt to imitate it. Briefly, it raises a question of gamesmanship. None of Virgil's captains is so keen to win that he bends the rules of the competition to improve his chances. But Antilochus, with the impetuosity of youth, got in Menelaus' way, almost causing a crash, and making the

older and most cautious man rein in his horses.[6] Thus Antilochus passed him, managed to hold his lead, and would have come in third, except that there had been an accident ahead; so Antilochus actually came in second, a result far beyond any possible expectations that he or his estimable father could have had.

More relevant to us is the incident ahead. Eumelus, the expert driver, was actually in front of Diomedes, by less than a chariot's length. Then three things happened in quick succession: Diomedes dropped his whip; somehow he had it in his hand again; and the yoke on Eumelus' chariot snapped, so that it crashed and he was thrown out. It is characteristic for Homer that at such a decisive moment he introduces the gods. It was Apollo, he says, who made Diomedes drop his whip. This is understandable, Apollo being the god who regularly frustrated the Achaeans, and in any case he had had a close personal connection with Eumelus' horses (*Il.* 2.766). In reaction to that, Athene moved in, returned the whip to her protégé, and caused Eumelus' chariot to crash. Two of these three things that happened could, from our point of view, have been accidents (the dropping of the whip and the crash of the chariot); the third (the return of the whip) looks like a miracle, a divine interference with the laws of nature. The gods are part of the world of the humans in the *Iliad*, and their influence is seen at moments of high tension or decisive importance. People win by the help of the gods as well as by their own qualities. It in no way lessens the achievement of Diomedes that he had the help of Athene. On the contrary, if we view the matter properly, it enhances it.

So the outcome of the race is decided by divine intervention, but the winner was the one who should always have won. Antilochus came second, Menelaus third, Meriones fourth. And Eumelus followed them in, pulling his broken chariot behind him and shepherding his horses in front. There is general sympathy for him, including from Achilles who is presiding at the games.

It is a very vivid narrative, both in the two incidents that are told in detail and also in the general descriptions. And the interest is enhanced by four verbal exchanges included by Homer for dramatic effect, showing the strength of feeling and the manners of both watchers and contestants. Virgil does not imitate this aspect either, so I just mention them. Before the winner comes fully into sight, there is a dispute between Idomeneus and the lesser Ajax about his identity; they get very heated

on the subject. Then, after all are in, Achilles proposes to give Eumelus the second prize as a consolation, and is surprised by the strength of Antilochus' objection. Thirdly, Menelaus complains about Antilochus' doubtful tactics out on the course, and is mollified with difficulty. And last, when the prizes have been distributed, Eumelus getting a special consolation prize, and the original fifth prize being therefore left unawarded, Achilles makes his way through the crowd and presents it as a mark of honour to aged Nestor, and stands there listening politely to Nestor's inevitable recollection of past successes. These dramatic episodes, with interchange of speech, add their part to the tale, showing the personalities of the characters and the humanity of the poet. This is how people do behave in sporting situations. We recognise the motivations. In Idomeneus and Ajax we may dimly see the unruly partisanship of football crowds; in Achilles' extraordinary suggestion of a change in the rules, the action of the President of the world chess organisation during the Karpov/Kasparov world title match in 1985; in Antilochus' action out on the course the soccer or rugby player who impedes an opponent with a straight run for the goal; and in Achilles' attention to aged Nestor, the polite spot-lighting of old retired athletes at such occasions as 'Sportsman of the Year'.

The story is so vivid that the little oddities rather surprise one. How come five prizes were announced before it was known that there were five contestants? Why is there no description of the tight situation at the turn? How exactly did Antilochus get in the way of Menelaus? The answers to these questions are peculiar to Homer, deriving from the conditions of oral poetry. The poet has described chariot races before; some features of the story have become regular by repetition; for some the explanation is no longer explicitly given.

This was the narrative that Virgil had in mind when he was composing his boat race.

His games, in honour of Anchises, are held at the west tip of Sicily, not so much funeral games as anniversary ones, for it is a year since Anchises died. In the mean time Aeneas has been in Carthage. He has now realigned himself, and is on his way to Italy. From Virgil's structural point of view, Book Five is an obvious place for the games, one of the odd-numbered books in the first half, transitional, at a quieter level, separating Four from Six. There is no place for games at the end, where

Homer placed his. For Virgil is going to build up to the killing of Turnus as the final scene. Games just before would disrupt the effect, games after diminish it.

Having decided that his relationship with Homer made games desirable, he made the imaginative decision to replace the chariot race with a boat race. A chariot race could only have been a pale shadow of Homer; the description of the charioteers, and the horses, and the tension of the race, had been done once and for all. Later writers could not compete. The chariot races in Statius (Book 6) and Quintus of Smyrna (Book 4)[7] and even in Sophocles' *Electra* are quite unmemorable. Virgil gave himself whole new opportunities by switching to a boat race. Secondly, he makes the action take place mostly at the turning point, a rock in the sea; in this he follows what we expected, but did not get, in Homer's narrative. And it is clear that races could be won or lost at that point. Thirdly, he has exactly four competitors. Homer's fifth, Meriones, had nothing to do. Virgil divides his four into two pairs, gives each a significant piece of action at the turn, and has them so close together that they merge after the turn, the winner of the second pair catching up and passing the loser of the first. In these details his treatment is more organised than Homer's.

At 116–123 he gives the names of the four competitors and of their boats. There are Mnestheus, whose boat is called Pristis ('Sawfish'); Gyas, with a huge boat called Chimaera; Sergestus on the Centaur; and Cloanthus on the Scylla. Pristis, Chimaera, Centaurus, Scylla: the names seem convincing. Mnestheus, Gyas, Sergestus, Cloanthus: here we have trouble.

The difficulty is that these names have no impact. Although all four have appeared in Virgil's narrative before, they seem totally unmemorable, nonentities, names to fill out lines. This is the greatest weakness, perhaps the only one, in Virgil's description. The effect of it can be shown by the simple question, 'Who won?'. I do not know how many times I have read Book Five, but I simply cannot remember the winner of the boat race; the names are virtually interchangeable. Sergestus stands out as different and thus memorable, for a reason to which I shall come. Otherwise, there seem to be no individual characteristics. Even Virgil seems to have forgotten who won! At line 493, when Mnestheus enters for another event (the archery), Virgil describes him as '*modo navali certamine victor*', when in fact he had not been the victor, but had

come second.

Contrast this with Homer. Diomedes is so outstanding that not only do we recognise his personality and achievements, but there is not the slightest likelihood that we could forget that it was he who won. And it would be absurd to confuse the others—Menelaus and Antilochus; even Meriones. Each is an easily distinguished individual. We do not know Eumelus, the newcomer; but having one unknown merely adds the spice of uncertainty to the race.

I find it difficult to understand why there is such a huge difference. Homer's greatest skill perhaps lies in character drawing, the presentation of human personalities. But Virgil is the humanist par excellence, and yet his characters are for the most part lifeless. Is it such a difficult thing to distinguish the characters in your story by giving them different characteristics—a thing achieved by even second-rate novelists? People excuse Virgil by pointing out that Homer's games come at the end of the *Iliad* when we have got to know the heroes, and he has the tremendous advantage of being able to build on rounded figures already familiar to his hearers. With Virgil's games in Book Five, they say, this cannot happen. But if Virgil's games had come at the end like Homer's, we would still have been as ignorant of any individual personality in Mnestheus, Gyas, Sergestus and Cloanthus as we are in Book Five.

He has made an attempt to make them familiar. After the storm in Book One, when most of Aeneas' fleet has been separated from him, one ship certainly sunk, others missing, he laments their loss (1.222); among those who are named are **Gyas** and **Cloanthus**: *fortemque Gyan fortemque Cloanthum*, with what seems a strangely wooden, but evidently intended, repetition of the adjective. Later in Book One, at line 510, hidden in mist, Aeneas has the pleasure of seeing his lost comrades safe in the temple of Juno at Carthage; and among them are **Sergestus** and **Cloanthus**: *Sergestumque videt, fortemque Cloanthum* (*fortem* again). And when he shakes their hands, on being demistified, at 612, among those named are again *fortemque Gyan fortemque Cloanthum*. So at least we know that these are senior ship's captains, **Sergestus** and **Gyas** and **Cloanthus**. **Mnestheus** has not yet been named. But in Book Four, at 288, when the god Mercury has been sent down from the sky to warn Aeneas to be on his way, the leader summons those who would obviously be his chief lieutenants, **Mnestheus** and **Sergestus** and Serestus, and gives them orders to get the fleet ready to sail. So all

four of the competitors have been heard of before in the *Aeneid*. But it has not done much good. The most in the way of a defining adjective that we have heard has been *fortem*. We have not, as in the *Iliad*, learned to distinguish the characters by differentiation of behaviour, or even of epithets. Virgil's captains remain just names.

He tries again to distinguish them when they are introduced before the race, again with an ingenious idea, by making three of the four ancestors of known Roman families. This gives a wider dimension to the men, rather like the wider dimension given to the heroes in the Greek army at Troy by our knowledge of their background, their home and parents: Tydeus and all those stories about Thebes for Diomedes, Locris for the Oilean Ajax. The Catalogue of Ships places the current generation of heroes in a wider context. Virgil is perhaps trying to achieve something similar by using the future instead of the past. Mnestheus is said to be an ancestor of the Memmii, Sergestus of the Sergii, Cloanthus of the Cluentii. This might help, especially if those families had strong distinguishing features. But, at least to our knowledge, they did not; so again nothing much has been achieved. The Memmii were indeed an old Roman family. The best known representative is that C. Memmius to whom Lucretius addressed his *De Rerum Natura*. He was a distinguished orator, who was convicted of excessive bribery in the consular elections for 53 and went into exile, proceeding to live in Athens as a wealthy nabob.[8] He does not add a great deal of distinction to his ancestor.[9] Sergestus' position is worse. For by far the most famous representative of the ancient patrician family of Sergii was Lucius Sergius Catilina, Catiline, abhorred by one and all. As to the Cluentii, they were not even Roman (which adds to the doubts some have felt about about '*Romane Cluenti*' in 123),[10] but an Italian equestrian family, famous for one man, Aulus Cluentius, defended by Cicero in one of his greatest speeches, on a charge of poisoning. As for Gyas, his name is so clearly Greek, indeed mythological, that he could hardly be the ancestor of a Roman family.[11] So although Virgil's attempt to differentiate these ship captains by making them founders of Roman *gentes* was a promising one, he was not able to select really significant descendants. And once again no memorable connection is made. As Heinze says, if he had been able to get an Appius or a Fabius, something might have been achieved;[12] but perhaps in those names of such importance to early Roman history, victory or defeat in the boat race would have been

invidious.

In case the names have slipped the reader's mind, I give them again: Mnestheus, Gyas, Sergestus, Cloanthus. The race begins. And there are two incidents at the turning point, each involving two boats, and mirroring each other. The two in front on the outward stage were Gyas, with the biggest of the four boats, and Cloanthus. Gyas' steersman Menoetes tried to take a wide course round the rock, against the instructions of his impetuous commander. Cloanthus took the opportunity to cut inside and turn first, making Gyas so angry that he pushed Menoetes bodily off his position at the rudder and into the sea, taking over the job of steering himself. Menoetes, who was not a young man, managed with difficulty to clamber up onto the rock, much to the amusement of the watching Trojans, who thought it funny to see him swimming in the sea, and spewing up the salt water when he got to safety: *et salsos rident revomentem pectore fluctus.*

The other two boats were close behind, Sergestus just ahead of Mnestheus. This time the boat in front took a course too close to the rock, as Sergestus tried to keep inside his pursuer; but there was not enough room, and he impaled his boat on the rock ledge down at water level, breaking the oars on his left side.

Those are the two incidents at the turn, and as I say they mirror each other. In the one case the boat that takes the inside line is second at that point, but gets through; in the other, it is leading, but is wrecked. The decisions are those of the captains and steersmen; no god causes the error of judgement or the accident.

Mnestheus' crew were rowing well now, on a high after getting clear away from Sergestus, and they caught up and passed the lumbering Gyas, rather oddly slowed down by having its captain instead of the usual steersman at the rudder. Mnestheus then pursued Cloanthus, out in front. And Virgil gets the excitement of a close finish with the efforts of the crews and the shouting of the onlookers. At this point he chooses to introduce the gods. Cloanthus, unwilling to lose the lead which he has held since the turn, prays to the gods of the sea for help, and a minor god called Portunus, worshipped from ancient times by the Romans as god of harbours and doors (*portuum portarumque*, Varro) puts up a large hand and gives the boat a push. Thus Cloanthus wins amid great enthusiasm, Mnestheus comes second, Gyas third; and a long time later Sergestus comes in under sail, the boat having difficulty steering

straight. This too caused laughter.

It is certainly a fine description. Virgil has picked the two key moments, the turn and the finish, and to that extent may be thought to have improved on Homer, who did not use the turn for his description, and had no excitement at the end for the first position at least, Diomedes coming in on his own far in front of the rest. There is however some lowering of standards of behaviour, as there is throughout Virgil's games. Gyas' act of throwing Menoetes overboard is both so excessive (reminding us of Publius Claudius Pulcher, in the First Punic War, throwing the sacred chickens overboard and thus leading to a major defeat for the Roman navy) and so self-damaging (if Virgil is right that the boat would not go so fast with an unfamiliar hand on the tiller) that it is sickening foolishness for us as well as for Menoetes. Such an action should not happen in a public event; the lack of control is a bad example to the young. Virgil admits this, because he is critical of Gyas' action, describing him as *oblitus decorisque sui sociumque salutis* (174), but he seems to excuse him on the grounds of youth (*iuveni* 172), as he later does Nisus and Euryalus.

Secondly, the laughter of the crowd at Menoetes is insensitive. To laugh at the unmerited misfortune of another human being is not the highest moral reaction. They laugh too at Sergestus' boat coming in crabwise. It seems to me indicative of difference that the Greeks did not laugh at Eumelus when he came down the course pulling his chariot behind him. Commentators point out that the Greeks laughed at Ajax, the lesser Ajax, when he fell in the foot race and got filth from slaughtered cattle in his mouth and nostrils; and they suggest that Virgil got the laughter from there. But in Homer the people laugh more with Ajax than at him,[13] and in any case he is not a very estimable person. Menoetes has done nothing to lose the sympathy of the crowd.

On Sergestus, there have been many who have thought that his hitting the rocks through courting danger is figuratively reminiscent of his most famous descendant Catiline. This is a line of interpretation which (as is well known) fits other incidents in the *Aeneid*, Pompey being alluded to variously under the guise of Priam and Palinurus.[14] Few surely would doubt that Virgil is capable of this second level of meaning, though perhaps it is not exactly to be called allegory.[15]

As to the gods, Virgil only brings them in at the end, with Portunus ensuring the victory for Cloanthus. Somehow I find this less successful

than the actions of Athene and Apollo in the *Iliad* story. They had been seen before in the poem involved with the achievements of the heroes. Whether we understand it or not, for Homer and his hearers these gods were an inherent part of human life, an explanation of events. Portunus is a bit of an irrelevance. The push he gives smacks of divine machinery rather than religious faith.

The poetry of Virgil is as always at the highest level; and his description of the efforts of the rowers bears comparison with Homer's of the crouch of the charioteers and the straining of the horses. In Virgil's conscious composition too there is a feature not present in Homer, that is, three brilliant and expressive similes to colour the description. These are long, 'Homeric', similes. As the boats get under way, in lines 144–147, he cleverly compares them with chariots starting a race, thus alluding to his model. Then, at the point after the turn, when Mnestheus has shaken off his opponent Sergestus, and pursues the wallowing Gyas, he is like a dove which has come out of a cave with a wild beating of wings, and then glides effortlessly down into the outside country (213–217). And, most memorable of all, the boat of Sergestus, damaged by having hit the rocks, comes along awkwardly like a snake on a track, its back broken by a wagon wheel or by blows from a wayfarer, 273–279:

> qualis saepe viae deprensus in aggere serpens,
> aerea quem obliquum rota transiit aut gravis ictu
> seminecem liquit saxo lacerumque viator;
> nequiquam longos fugiens dat corpore tortus
> parte ferox ardensque oculis et sibila colla
> arduus attollens; pars vulnere clauda retentat
> nexantem nodis seque in sua membra plicantem.

All three similes, the chariots, the dove and the snake, are brilliant and vivid. In contrast Homer, following his usual practice, does not have similes where the narrative has its own excitement, preferring to use them to diversify passages of undiluted fighting; he has the occasional comparison here, but no imaginative simile until it is all over, and then he has one to embroider the softened feelings of Menelaus after his exchange of words with Antilochus.[16]

I pointed out that, for whatever reason, Virgil has not produced individual personality in the competitors. It may be of interest to learn

what happened to these four in the latter part of the epic, when surely Virgil could do with identifiable subordinates to Aeneas in the fighting in Italy. Two of the four competitors, the victorious Cloanthus and the rash Sergestus, are never heard of again. Gyas appears once, in the group of senior officers who escort Aeneas back into battle in Book 12,[17] when he has been miraculously healed of the wound he received at the treacherous breaking of the truce. This is a scene where Virgil is close to Homer, showing the victorious assault by one side in a quick succession of victories by a number of leaders from it.[18] Here Gyas kills an opponent, his one recorded achievement in all the fighting; but it is no small achievement, because his victim is Ufens, one of the leaders of the thirteen contingents in the Latin army, enumerated at the end of Book Seven. Mnestheus, in contrast, comes in frequently, and is virtually a staff officer to Aeneas like Achates. Indeed, he is named in the *Aeneid* more often than Achates.[19] He competes in another event in the games, the archery, and again comes second. He is one of those left in charge of the camp when Aeneas goes up river to see Evander in Eight and Nine, and he has the credit for leading the rally which drives the dangerous Turnus out of the Trojan camp at the end of Nine. He assists Aeneas when he is wounded in Twelve, and like Gyas comes out with him when he is healed, and kills an opponent in the ensuing attack. So Mnestheus is the one of the four who plays a large role; it is probably true to say that we simply have not noticed.

So—to compare chariot race with boat race. Homer wins overwhelmingly on human interest, and clearly on vividness of description. Both races, however, are full of incident, and Virgil does not fall short here. Structurally, it is Virgil who shows a more conscious control, planning his tale in a more logical way, and variegating it with three brilliant similes. Perhaps the distinction between *ingenium* and *ars* applies: the one poet the unconfined genius, the other the greater craftsman.

M.M. WILLCOCK
University College, London

NOTES

1. The chariot race dominated the games for Pelias (Pausanias V 17.9, Preller-Robert II 37) and those for Amarynceus (*Iliad* 23.640).

2. The evidence was assembled by P. Gardner in *JHS* 2 (1881), 90–97, 315–17.
3. *Orat*. 37.15.
4. Gardner, *op. cit*. n. 2, pp. 315–17.
5. *Iliad* 2.763–67, 770.
6. *Iliad* 23.418–37. The description is not wholly clear.
7. Much of Quintus' race is lost in a lacuna in the text, as Professor Huxley pointed out in discussion.
8. See Cicero, *Ad fam*. XIII 1.
9. E. Kraggerud (*Symb. Osl. Suppl*. 22, 1968, p. 142, n. 78) draws attention also to another C. Memmius, in Sallust, *Jugurtha* 27.
10. E. Kraggerud (*op. cit*. n. 9), 132–33.
11. The note by Servius (on 5.117) that Gyas was the ancestor of the Geganii, a family of importance in the early republic, is not to be taken seriously.
12. R. Heinze, *Virgils epische Technik*, 152.
13. See *Iliad* 23.780–84.
14. 2.557, 5.871.
15. Heinze protests against the term (*op. cit*. n. 12, p. 153).
16. *Iliad* 23.598–99. Menelaus' feelings are compared to morning dew on the young corn. For an explanation, see J. Latacz, *Zum Wortfeld "Freude" in der Sprache Homers* (1966), pp. 223, 226.
17. 12. 456–461.
18. See *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc*. 29 (1983), p. 89.
19. The score is Mnestheus 23 :: Achates 21.