INTRODUCTION

1. LIFE

Our evidence for St.’s life comes mainly from the Silvae, particularly 3.5, an epistle to his wife, and 5.3, the poem on his father’s death. St. was a poet of two cities and two cultures. He was born around 50 ce in Naples, ‘practically a Greek city’ (quasi Graecam urbem, Tac. Ann. 15.33), where Hellenic culture was supported by Roman wealth and power. The city celebrated Greek-style games founded by Augustus; Greek and Latin, and probably Oscan, were spoken in the city, with Greek remaining the language of cultural prestige in many official contexts. St. was the son of an eminent grammaticus and Greek professional poet who, composing in a tradition of extemporaneous poetry, won prizes at the major Greek games and was honoured with a statue in the Athenian agora. St. was doubly privileged: born in a city with a rich cultural heritage, he was taught a demanding curriculum in Greek literature by his father in a period when such knowledge was crucial for social advancement.

At some point in St.’s youth father and son moved to Rome where St. senior had a successful career as grammaticus to the Roman elite and probably also to the imperial family. He enjoyed too the great honour of reciting his poem on the civil war of 68–9 in the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitol (5.3.199–204). The father thus may have been closer to the imperial court than the son. Although St. won first prize in poetry at Domitian’s Alban games, he did not win at the more important Capitoline games, possibly in the same year, 90 ce. His property at Alba, near Domitian’s summer palace (3.1.161–4), often believed to have been a gift to St. from the emperor, was probably given by Vespasian to St.’s father, who was buried there (5.3.35–40); St. received from Domitian only the water rights, which from the time of Augustus were a common

---

1 On 5.3 and St.’s career see Hardie 1983: 5–14.
2 Leiwo 1994: 40–1 comments that for the Romans the positive side of Hellenism was cultural: literature, arts, architecture. St. idealises Naples as a place where Roman and Greek traditions harmoniously mingle (3.5.93–4).
4 On the Greek character of Naples see D’Arms 1970: 142–3; Hardie 1983: 2–4; Leiwo’s 1994 survey of the epigraphic use of Greek and Latin in Naples concludes that the city stands out in Campania in its use of Greek as the language of bureaucracy, though often in a hybrid form, until the end of the third century ce.
5 On the success of St. senior as a grammaticus see McNelis 2002; on the tradition of Greek professional poets see Hardie 1983: 16–30; on the statue see Clinton 1973.
6 McNelis 2002: 79.
8 As Coleman 1986: 3105 notes, ‘St. nowhere boasts of familiarity with the emperor’. When once invited to an imperial banquet he was one of more than 1,000 guests (4.2.33).
9 3.5.32–3; 4.2.65–7; 5.3.225–30. On the disputed date of St.’s victories see Coleman on Sib. 4 pp. xvii–xviii.
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imperial grant (Fron. *AQ. 99.3, 105.1*). The social status of father and son remains unclear; possibly they never reached equestrian rank. St. died probably in 96 CE, the same year as Domitian's assassination.

In addition to the five books of *Silvae* St. wrote an early poem on Domitian's wars, *De bello Germanico*, of which only four lines survive, and the epic poems *Thebaid* and the *Achilleid*, the latter incomplete. Juvenal, perhaps spuriously, suggests that St. also wrote a pantomime script *Agaue*. Martial, Pliny and Quintilian do not mention St. Silius and St. knew one another's poetry but it is impossible to determine priority in any allusion. Juvenal is the only near-contemporary author to mention St.; his condemnatory sketch of St. prostituting his *Thebaid by public recitation* (7.82–7) has provided a persistent image of St. as the literary hack, his epic a 'whore' that he tries to market to the Roman people through public recitation. The *Silvae create an image of a poetic self and of a literary culture that is quite different*. We should look to the *Silvae not so much for biographical facts as for St.'s representation of his career. In *5.3* St. models his life on that of Horace, whose father also was a powerful influence (S. 1.6). St. shows traditional filial piety but emphasises the literary rather than moral education his father gave him. Thus also promotes the genius of the son as an experimenter with Roman literary traditions from his special vantage point of biculturalism. In Rome St. found a cultural environment responsive to his new style of poetry. Extemporaneous composition was one of the high-profile events at Domitian's Capitoline games.

The degree to which 'the virtuoso skills of the epideictic performer had already penetrated the cultural life at the capital' is demonstrated by the grave monument of the eleven-year-old Q. Sulpicius Maximus, who acquitted himself with honour among the Greek poets at the Capitoline games of 94 CE. His affectionate

---

10 See Eck 1983: 72–3; Rodgers 2004 on Fron. *AQ. 99.3, AQ. 105.1*; Peachin 2004: 127–30 provides the startling statistics that in the late first century CE only about 9 per cent of Rome's aqueduct system was publicly available for the city's non-elite population; the rest received water by imperial grant. On imperial *beneficia* see Millar 1977: 135–9.
11 The idea that Juv. 4 parodies the council of the gods in St.'s *De bello Germanico* goes back to the Vallan scholia (Courtney on Juv. pp. 195–200).
12 See Courtney on Juv. 7.87.
13 White 1993: 63 suggests that the silence may be owing to St.'s low social status; Roman poets are silent on Greeks and grammatici. In addition, Roman authors do not usually refer to their contemporaries unless to write their obituaries, as Pliny does for Martial and Silius in *Ep. 3.5 and 3.7* respectively.
14 On the relationship between Silius and St. see Hutchinson 1993: 121–3.
16 Nagel 2000: 47–50; the filial modesty is closely connected with his literary modesty.
parents had the boy’s extemporaneous competition verses inscribed above the Latin epitaph, proof of the complex cultural milieu in which St. worked and over which Domitian presided, one that encouraged public, extemporaneous performance, whether at the official games or in the recitation hall.\textsuperscript{19} In the \textit{Silvae} St. cultivates a double vision of himself as both Roman and Neapolitan, a poet who introduced the epideictic and improvisational features of Greek professional poetry to a Roman audience, to Roman literary traditions, and to book form.

2. \textsc{The Character of the Silvae}

The \textit{Silvae} are epideictic poetry. They describe and celebrate contemporary Flavian culture, its literary and political figures, its villas and works of art, its entertainments, its families and its court. They were written and published between 89 and 96 ce, in the latter part of the reign of Domitian (81–96), last of the Flavians. Books 1–3 were published as a set early in 93, shortly after publication of the \textit{Thebaid} in 92, and book 4 was published two years later; a fifth book appeared posthumously.\textsuperscript{20} There is nothing else quite like the \textit{Siluae} in extant Roman literature.\textsuperscript{21} Paradox is their basic aesthetic and intellectual mode. They are playful and earnest, intimate and elevated, improvisational and learned; they challenge generic distinctions between ‘high’ and ‘low’ poetic forms, between epic and epigram; the shortest poem of book 2 is the most epicing in style (2.5). In the stylistic extremes of haste and elevation they are profoundly anti-Callimachean; but in their learning and their interest in ‘minor’ themes and characters they are closely tied to Hellenistic poetic traditions. They are thus experimental poetry trying out new styles and themes (e.g. the villa); vividly descriptive, they have powerful visual and imaginative appeal. The prefaces which introduce each book emphasise the novelty of the \textit{Siluae} with a mixture of pride and modesty;\textsuperscript{22} this is new work by that renowned epic poet St., the first preface claims,\textsuperscript{23} yet they are only short, amusing pieces, \textit{libellos} (1 pr. 2), a word that calls to mind Catullus’ refined and superbly wrought \textit{little poetry book, lepidum nouum libellum | arido modo pumice expolitum} (1.1–2). Such claims to modesty were a conventional means of drawing attention to one’s literary prowess, while guarding against critical attack.\textsuperscript{24}

We do not know whether the individual poems were actually performed on the spot.\textsuperscript{25} Certainly the published text cultivates the \textit{fiction} of improvisation and

\textsuperscript{19} \textit{CIL} vi. 33976; see Rawson 2003: 17–20.
\textsuperscript{20} On the dating see Coleman on \textit{Silu.} 4 pp. xvi–xx; Gibson on \textit{Silu.} 5 pp. xxviii–xxx.
\textsuperscript{21} Lucan wrote ten books of \textit{Siluae}, completely lost; see 2.7.54–72m.
\textsuperscript{22} Hutchinson 1993: 36. \textsuperscript{23} Well known throughout Italy (\textit{Theb.} 12.814–15).
\textsuperscript{24} See Fowler 1995: 211 on modesty as a ‘generic pretence’.
\textsuperscript{25} St. claims that his poems were dashed off hastily in the heat of the moment (1 pr. 2–4 \textit{hos libellos, qui mihi subito calore et quadam festinandi voluptate fluxerunt}). A few however required...
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performance. In the prose prefaces St. talks of extemporisation both as a fault, meaning that the *Siluae* were unpolished,26 and as a virtue, meaning that they show the poet’s virtuosity in swift composition.27 The prefaces’ play with modesty thus gives only a limited idea of the poems themselves.28 The *Siluae* moreover were presumably revised before being published in a poetry book; publication after the original occasion allowed the poems to assume new meaning and a new coherent form.29 Beginning his preface to book 1 St. claims that he hesitated a long time (diu multumque dubitaui) before he collected the poems for publication, thus establishing from the start a tension between the (seemingly) spontaneous original occasion and the laboured process of (re)collection and publication.30 Indeed, ‘haste of composition’ is a literary strategy that puts the *Siluae* in witty dialogue with the newly completed *Thebaid* (1 pr. 6–7); each of the *Siluae* claims to have been produced in two days or less, whereas the *Thebaid* was the product of twelve years of careful labour.31 Yet since St. was already a published epic poet, the *Siluae* are works of poetic maturity, though St. teasingly calls them ‘foreplay’ (1 pr. 9 praeluserit), like the *Batrachomyomachia* ascribed to Homer or the *Culex* ascribed to Virgil.32 Under a show of modesty St. places himself in the rank of Homer and Virgil. Indeed, given the publication of the *Thebaid*, *praeluserit* hints at further great works, specifically another epic, to come, so that St. will in fact surpass the achievement of Virgil and rival Homer.

The *Siluae* however have lagged behind the *Thebaid* in critical reputation. As praise poetry written for friends and the emperor, they have been regarded as the decadent product of a decadent regime,33 either nauseous flattery, or at best subversion,34 Art historians and archaeologists have recently helped give a more balanced view of Domitian’s reign; for example, after Augustus Domitian engaged in the most extensive rebuilding of the city.35 And he by no means dominates the *Siluae*. Out of the first publication of seventeen poems only two directly address the emperor (1.1, 1.6). None of the books of the *Siluae* is dedicated to Domitian, although St. acknowledges the emperor’s authority by starting books 1 and 4 with poems in his honour.36 In book 2 only 2.5 acknowledges

more thought, e.g. St. consulted with Polla about the poem for Lucan’s anniversary (2 pr. 22–6); he took a long time in writing the poem on Earinus (3 pr. 15–20); 3.5 is a letter to his wife and thus not originally ‘performed’.

26 Cf. 2 pr. 7–9 huius amiss recens ululus... epicedio prosecutus sum adeo festinanter ut excusandam habuerim affectibus tuis celeritatem. He fears too the scrutiny of ‘a too harsh file’ (asperiore lima).

27 Cf. 1 pr. 13 gratiam celeritatis....

28 Hutchinson 1993: 36.

29 Henderson 1998: 113: the ‘Siluae challenge us to respond to their rewriting’.


31 1 pr. 13–14; *Theb*. 12.811–12.

32 praeludo occurs in classical Latin poetry only here and at the start of the *Achilleid*.

33 Full of ‘kitsch’ (Conte 1994: 483).


36 Cf. 1 pr. 16–17 sumendum enim erat ‘a Ioue principium’; 4 pr. 2–4 with Coleman.
2. THE CHARACTER OF THE *SILVAE*

Domitian at its close. As Rimell points out of Martial, there are no easy answers to the question of the Flavian poets’ political beliefs; the personal style of St.’s and Martial’s poetry puts interpretation ultimately with the readers, ‘the ultimate device for sliding loose of incrimination’. Yet certainly the early 90s, the time of publication of the *Silvae* and *Thebaid*, were deeply troubled by high-profile executions and expulsions; after the mutiny of Saturninus in 89 Domitian’s reign seems to have entered a period of increased paranoia, if not terror. The *Silvae* were undoubtedly shaped by the political turmoil of Domitian’s last years to the extent that especially in book 2 they emphasise friendship and withdrawal from public life and boldly transfer political paradigms to the private sphere. As praise poetry they are devoted to finding new terms of excellence for the Flavian culture of leisure and friendship.

One of the most controversial features of the *Silvae* is the frequent use of myth. Myth is a sign not of the essential artifice of these poems but of their close reflection of contemporary culture where art as well as literature provided Romans on a daily basis with an expanded emotional and intellectual lexicon. In the *Silvae* St. uses myth to illustrate arguments, to console, move, and delight, often in an encomiastic or playful context. He frequently enters into competition with the mythological world, claiming for instance that Pollius Felix is superior to the legendary poets of antiquity (2.2.60–2). Such hyperbole is often not to modern taste. But it is underwritten by the need to find an appropriate vocabulary for new poetic themes, here the villa and its architect whose outstanding qualities call for the poet to respond with inventive hyperbole; it is also underwritten by wit, for this is poetry written in the first instance for cultured friends who would enjoy the conceit that Pollius as engineer/architect could effortlessly ‘charm’ nature. The ludic quality of the *Silvae* should not be underestimated; their very playfulness was the feature singled out for attack by their first critics. They thus pivot on a dual aesthetic of exuberant splendour and informal occasionality, seriousness and humour.

Hinds has observed that one of the most famous and enduring tales of Roman literary history is that of Silver Age decline and decadence, and he points to St.’s statement of deference to Virgil at the end of the *Thebaid* as the verses that have perhaps been the most influential in keeping post-Augustan epic out of the modern literary canon. Yet the *Silvae* show that this view of the *Thebaid* is contingent and partial; in 4.7.25–8 St. expresses his pride in having successfully

39 Zanker 2004: 36–42. Szelen' 1972 comments that a unique feature of the *Silvae* was the intermingling of humans and deities in a contemporary setting; but the Romans would encounter ‘gods’ on a daily basis through public and private works of art.
40 Van Dam on 2.1.88–102; Damon 2002.
41 Cf. 1 pr. 9 stilom remissione praeluserit. But critics have objected to their playfulness from their very first publication (4 pr. 29–30 exercit autem ioco non licet? ’secreto’ inquit).
challenged the Aeneid with his ‘bold lyre’. The Silvae thus are important for understanding St.’s epics as the epics in turn are important for understanding the Silvae. Most of our literary sources for Domitian’s reign postdate it. All the more reason then to study the Silvae for, along with Martial’s Epigrams, they offer vivid, contemporary testimony to the social, intellectual and political culture of Domitian’s Rome and the poet’s role within it.

3. TITLE/TITLES

i. Siluae

The title is the poet’s own, first occurring at 3 pr. 7 tertius hic Siluarum nostrarum liber ad te mittitur.\(^43\) Metaphorical titles for literary collections were a Hellenistic convention, attacked by Pliny the Elder who preferred the plain Historia Naturalis to ‘Honeycomb’ or ‘Meadow’ (Nat. 1.24–8). Silvae acknowledges a debt to Hellenistic aesthetics, and surely also to Lucan’s now lost ten books of Siluae.

But why Siluae?\(^44\) silua has the literal meaning of ‘wood’ and the metaphorical meaning of ‘raw material’. Quintilian uses the term in its sense of ‘raw material’ to describe a hastily produced literary work or rough draft (Inst. 10.3.17).\(^45\) However, he is writing of oratory, not of poetry; he uses silua in the singular, not the plural, and St. only uses Siluae in the plural. Problematic also is Aulus Gellius’ use of Siluae in the preface to the Noctes Atticae (pr. 5–6) to connote ‘variety within unity’, for he has in mind a long prose miscellany, not poetry books.\(^46\)

Recently Wray has argued that the title Siluae is a sophisticated calque on Greek ὅλαντα, which means ‘wood’ in the literal senses of ‘forest’ and the ‘material’ from which objects are crafted, and ‘poetic material’ in a metaphorical sense.\(^47\) The Greek term used figuratively was subject to slippage between singular and plural; hence we can understand Siluae as a polysemous term, a collective plural meaning ‘Wood/Woods’ and ‘poetic material’ (to be crafted into interesting forms).\(^48\) The title reflects St.’s fondness for etymological play in the Silvae, including with Greek words; typically its artfulness exists in tension with notions of a hastily produced work or of random variety that the term silua/ae also connotes. The idea of ‘trees’ also then remains in play; their long figurative association with poetry is expressed, for instance, at Cic. Leg. 1.1: both live a long time and are sown, one by the farmer’s art, the other by the imagination. The title also surely refers to Virgil’s programmatic use of the word siluae in the

---

\(^{43}\) Cf. also 4 pr. 24.

\(^{44}\) See Bright 1980: 20–42 for detailed discussion of the various possible meanings; also Coleman on Silu. 4 pp. xxi–xxiv.

\(^{45}\) Cf. also Cic. Orat. 12.


\(^{47}\) Wray 2007.

\(^{48}\) Coleman on Silu. 4 p. xxiii notes that Suetonius uses ὅλαντα to describe the encyclopedic (800 book) commentarii of L. Ateius Praetextatus and this may be its title.
4. THEMES OF BOOK 2

i. Overview

Paradox is a favourite stylistic trope of the *Siluae*. Not surprisingly therefore book 2 is constructed around two paradoxical themes: the destructiveness of death,

---

50 The best discussions to date are Coleman on *Silu.* 4 pp. xxviii–xxxii; Schröder 1999: 180–9.
51 Newlands 2009a.
52 As indeed happened even with the *tituli*: M gives ‘via Domitiana’ as the title of 3.5.
an ineluctable natural force, and the power of art to tame nature and confer immortality.

Consolatory poems make up the bulk of book 2 (1, 4, 5, 6, 7); it may therefore seem somewhat monochromatic by comparison with the highly varied first book, which has no consolatory poems. Hardie referred to book 2 as ‘lightweight, eschewing the political and public themes which appear in Book 1’.53 True, the dedicatee is the elderly Melior, not the up and coming Stella of book 1 who was among those in charge of Domitian’s Secular games.54 And whereas book 1 begins and ends with poems to Domitian (1.1 and 1.6), only 2.5 refers to the emperor, and then only in its conclusion (27–30). Yet premature death is hardly ‘lightweight’. Melior dominates the collection with three poems (1, 3, 4), and the book, St. claims, is oriented towards his interests (2 pr. 4), hence its literary and domestic preoccupations.55 In its elevation of private life it forms a significant counterpoint to book 1. It boasts two new kinds of poem, the villa poem (2.2) and the posthumous birthday poem (2.7), while the creative, witty imitation of Ovid in 2.3 and 2.4 and of Martial in 2.5, along with the close engagement with Lucan in 2.7, reveals the book’s concern with literary history and poetics. The tension between art and nature provides a dynamic theme throughout, appearing overtly in 2.2 but also in various forms from the start; for example 2.1 promotes the advantages of nurture over nature, a conclusion then scrutinised in the mock-heroic 2.5. From its long first poem on the original theme of a foster child’s death to the final poem on the death of the epic poet Lucan book 2 advertises the experimental quality of the Silvae as a new literary work.

The fact that none of the addressees of book 2 was particularly prominent or powerful in Flavian society makes this book also socially interesting.56 It reflects new attitudes towards traditional aristocratic values concerning kinship and wealth. Book 2 reveals a thematic shift away from the idea that virtue is based on inherited family prestige, perhaps not a surprising idea under the Flavian dynasty which expanded the senatorial and equestrian orders to bring in capable administrators and create a new elite based on talent rather than ancient family glory.57 The fame of Pollius Felix, a Neapolitan businessman and retired philosopher, rests squarely on virtue, not ancestry (2.2.146n.).

Also to be queried is the assumption that book 2 is not concerned with political themes. Some critics have argued that the retirement from public life of the main addressees of book 2, Melior and Pollius Felix, was politically motivated.58 But retirement to one’s estate was perfectly usual for an elderly, wealthy Roman. All the same, as was argued above, the book’s emphasis on the virtues of withdrawal may well be a comment on current political conditions. Throughout the book

56 On the addresses of book 2 see section 6.iii.
St. takes the language of public discourse and applies it to private virtues, thus elevating the life of cultured withdrawal as an alternative to political life. A concern with the relationship between emperor and poet is also evident in the book, expressed obliquely in 2.4 and 2.5 and more overtly in 2.7. This middle book in the first collection of *Silvae* is largely domestic in theme, but it challenges the powerful hierarchies of politics and literary genres.

### ii. Lament and consolation

#### Background

As in the *Thebaid*, premature death figures prominently in the *Silvae*, but their focus is consolation rather than lament. In the ancient world the death of a child or youth was regarded as particularly tragic since it meant not only the loss of future promise but a reversal of the natural order whereby the young looked after the old. St. bridges the emotional gap between consoler and consoled by sharing in the mourner’s grief; with only words left to rely on he creates a literary memorial for the deceased, using abundant mythological comparisons, wordplay and puns, elaborate descriptions of the funerals, and an overall epicising style.

The Roman tradition of literary consolation basically developed from two main sources, the Roman funeral oration, the *laudatio funebris*, which marked the climax of the Roman funeral, and Greek verse epigram, though the poetic tradition traced its origins to the episode in the *Iliad* when Priam and Achilles weep together for Hector (Hom. *Il.* 24.507–51). Social factors also influenced the development of consolatory literature in Rome in the early imperial period. The virtual demise of the Republican funeral pageant with its public parade through the city and its display of ancestor masks (Plb. 6.53–5) led to a new interest in graveside posthumous rituals and in new forms of artistic, commemorative expression. Tombs increasingly became objects of artistic display; carved mythological scenes first appeared at the end of the first century CE as an important type of funerary art. In literature praise of the dead was transferred to the more private prose epistle and elegy with a new emphasis on consolation. Cicero’s poetic self-consolation on the death of his daughter Tullia is lost, but much of the thought remains in his *Tusculan Disputations* 1 and 3 and in the letter of Sulpicius Severus to Cicero (Fam. 4.5).

St.’s epicising, mythological poems of consolation can be seen as textual counterparts to the elaborately decorated graves.

---

59 Griessmair 1966; Lattimore 1962: 184–98; Fedeli on Prop. 3.7.2.
60 Hardie 1983: 86.
61 Only fragments of such speeches remain (Flower 1996: 128–38). Scourfield 1993: 15–26 reviews the tradition of consolatory literature, both poetry and prose. Also Durry xxiii–xxxiv; N-H i 280–1; Gibson on *Silv.* 5 pp. xxxi–xxxiv.
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tombs appearing at this time; in both art and text myth displayed or elevated the social rank of the deceased and the bereaved, while providing a common emotional language for coming to terms with death.65

That the literary tradition of consolation is ‘rich in banality’ is a fairly common view;66 the Silvae have often been regarded as rhetorical exercises along the prescriptive lines of the treatise of Menander Rhetor (c. 300 CE), the earliest extant work on epideictic theory.67 But while the experience of death is universal, its expression can vary widely according to the particular circumstances and the importance and character of those involved. Indeed, literary consolations pose particular challenges for poets in their attempt to defy death by memorialising a person’s life. Davis argues that the consolatory poem, which typically moves from lament to consolation proper, can be a particularly dynamic form: ‘The mood of lament is rebellion . . . the mood of consolation is reconciliation after curse.’68 Indeed, recent scholarship on poetry of lament and consolation has argued for a more flexible approach to the genre that emphasises its potential for eclecticism.69

St.’s contribution to the genre

Book 2 reveals St. as an important innovator in literary consolation; the Silvae provide us with more poems of this type than does any other body of Roman literature (2.1, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 3.3, 5.1, 5.3, 5.5). They experiment with the various generic affiliations of lament and consolation, including pastoral, elegy, and especially epic, and they range widely over different occasions; for instance the book begins with a poem on the death of a child set at the pyre and ends with a poem on the poet Lucan written for his birthday anniversary; with mock-heroic elan, 2.4 and 2.5 lament a parrot and a lion; 2.6 applies an epic theme, the tragic death of an ephebic warrior, to a beloved slave.

2.1 announces the novelty of the poet’s approach to consolation with its lengthy commemoration of a child and son of freed slaves, Melior’s beloved foster son, to be sure, but without lineage. The earlier Roman poetic models for consolation (barring Ovid’s poem on the death of Corinna’s parrot, Am. 2.4) concerned elite figures.70 True, Martial laments the untimely deaths of slave children but in

67 On Menander’s date see Russell and Wilson xxxiv–xl. They also caution against the ‘hypostasizing of generic patterns’ (xxxiii) in poetry from rhetorical theory many centuries later. See also Zablocki 1966: 309–10; Hardie 1983: 103–9; Gibson on Silv. 5 pp. xxxi–i.
68 Davis 1967: 119.
69 Th´evenaz 2002 argues that Mart. 5.34, 5.37, 10.61 (on Erotion) use the original occasion to display a creative engagement with literary genre; see also Fedeli on Prop. 3.7 pp. 229–32.
70 McKeown in 109 groups 2.1 with Hor. Carm. 1.24 (Horace’s and Virgil’s friend Quintilius Virginius), Virg. A. 6.868–86 (the emperor’s nephew Marcellus), Prop. 4.11 (the aristocratic Cornelia), Ov. Am. 3.9 (Tibullus), Epicedion Drusi (Livia’s son).