# The poetics of Honorius' romantic behaviour
# in Claudian's *Epith.* 1-46[1]

Vasileios Pappas
<vaspappas@uoi.gr>
Department of Philology
Division of Classics
University of Ioannina
University Campus, School of Philosophy, 3rd floor
P.O. Box 45110 GR-Ioannina, Greece

ABSTRACT: In *Epith*. 1-46, Claudian narrates Honorius' impatience for his wedding to his betrothed spouse, Maria. In the half passage (1-19) we hear the poet's voice, while in the remainder it is that of the young emperor (20-46), who expresses his complaints towards Maria's parents, Stilicho and Serena. Claudian presents Honorius as an elegiac lover, who suffers due to his romantic passion. My paper aims to reveal this passage's generic interaction between elegy and epic. We will see that Honorius' love behaviour wavers between his elegiac persona and his epic reality. Furthermore, I attempt to prove that in these verses, Claudian includes a metapoetic discourse on the impact of Callimachean theory within his poetics.

KEYWORDS: Claudian, *Epithalamium de nuptiis Honorii Augusti*, generic interaction, Roman love elegy, epic, epithalamium, Honorius, Stilicho.

## 1. Introduction

Claudius Claudianus[2], the great poet of Late Antiquity from Egypt (probably Alexandria)[3], who came to Italy before 395 AD and became court poet under the western

---

1. I would like to express my gratitude to my colleague at the University of Ioannina, Professor Helen Gasti, for her comments and corrections which significantly improved the first draft of this paper. My thanks, too, to Professors of the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens (in alphabetical order) Roumpini Dimopoulou, Sophia Georgakopoulou, Helen Karamalengou, Andreas Michalopoulos, Sophia Papaioannou and Vaios Vaiopoulos, who attended my presentation given in Athens in the fall of 2022, for our lively discussion and their helpful suggestions. I am also grateful to the *Studia Philologica Valentina*'s anonymous referees for their invaluable comments.

2. See indicatively, Cameron (1970: 1-29); Barnes (2005); Coombe (2018: 1-11).

3. Coombe (2018) 7-8. Given the quality of his Latin, it seems that Claudian was a Latin poet, who as a *doctus poeta*, also knew Greek – a Greek *Gigantomachy* and a series of Greek epigrams are attributed to him, see Coombe (2018: 8-9). On the possibility of Claudian's Greek origin, see Christiansen (1997); Mul-

Emperor Honorius and his guardian and minister Stilicho[4], wrote the *Epithalamium de nuptiis Honorii Augusti* for the marriage of the emperor to Maria, daughter of Stilicho, in 398[5]. The poem is composed in dactylic hexameters, and is accompanied by a short elegiac preface and a set of four *Fescennines* (there is a great deal of debate among scholars on whether these lyric poems precede or follow the *Epithalamium*)[6]. The occasion for this composition may have been the marriage of the thirteen or fourteen-year-old Honorius to the twelve-year-old Maria[7], but the real cause of it was political: in this year, Stilicho and Honorius declared war against the African king Gildo who, encouraged by Eutropius, the powerful advisor of the Emperor of the East and Honorius' brother Arcadius, decided to hold back the grain supply to the West[8]. This marriage was necessary for Stilicho, in order to fortify his position in the court, as his legal guardianship over Honorius was coming to an end[9]. Claudian, as Stilicho's protégé, was careful to highlight his patron's role in this marriage within the poem, as he is the protagonist of it, not the young couple. In other words, this epithalamium is actually a panegyric for Stilicho[10].

In *Epith*. 1-46, Claudian presents Honorius' romantic passion for Maria. In passage 1-20, (until the phrase *queritur secum*) we hear the poet's voice, while in verses 20-46 (from the phrase *quoniam usque verendus* until the *nox umquam*), we hear Honorius' voice in the first person. Honorius, an inexperienced lover (2: *rudis* and 4: *ignarus amandi*), suffers because he does not have his promised bride (1: *promissae virginis*). He is burned by love, suspires, blushes, and writes his sweetheart's name constantly (1-4 and 6-10). He even abandons his usual habits, such as hunting and practicing with weapons (5-6). He offers great gifts to Maria, ornaments that Livia and other first ladies once wore (10-13). He has lost his hope, and the days do not pass (14-15). In the same way, Deidamia felt in love with Achilles in Scyros, teaching him to weave wool and braid his hair (16-19). Honorius accuses his future father-in-law of postponing his marriage (20-22). He does not use the royal luxury, nor did he call upon to a procuress, in order to find a doubtful love (23-27). He does not desire another man's wife, but his promised spouse, who is related to him on her mother's side (28-31). He leaves aside the arrogance of his rank and sends

---

ligan (2007). It seems that Claudian was a pagan, although he was at a Christian court (on pagan authors in Christian courts, see Cameron (2011: 206-230)). His contemporaries, Augustine and Orosius, mention that he was a pagan, cf. *civ*. 5, 26: *poeta Claudianus, quamvis a Christi nomine alienus* («Claudian the poet, although he was foreign to Christ's name») and *hist*. 7, 35: *poeta quidem eximius sed paganus pervicacissimus* («one prominent poet, but very stubborn pagan») respectively. See also, Cameron (1965: 476), (1970: 189-227) and (2016: 7); P. Christiansen and D. Christiansen (2009). However, Claudian's paganism might be only literary, see Cameron (2004: 343).

4. Coombe (2018: 9).

5. Wasdin (2014: 48); Coombe (2018: 13). Claudian composed another epithalamium for the marriage (probably in 399) of his friend and colleague, Palladius, to Celerena.

6. See Cameron (1970: 98); Charlet (2000, vol. 2: 172-174); Horstmann (2004: 113); Gineste (2004: 274-275); Wasdin (2014: 49-50).

7. Wasdin (2014: 62, n. 66); Coombe (2018: 157). The minimum age for a legal Roman marriage was twelve for girls and fourteen for boys (eleven and thirteen, in modern terms), see Hopkins (1965); Shaw (1987: 42, n. 42); Saller (1987). Also, see Clark (1993: 13-14); Evans-Grubbs (2002: 88), where she notes: 'Girls had to be at least twelve years old to be legally married, though they could be betrothed at an earlier age'.

8. Wasdin (2014: 61-62); Coombe (2018: 15).

9. Coombe (2018: 157).

10. Wasdin (2014: 53); Nathan (2015: 20-21); Coombe (2018: 147-149). For Stilicho and Claudian, see Coombe (2018: 11-18). For Claudian as a propagandist poet, see Cameron (1970: 30-62).

his princes to beg for Maria (31-34). Stilicho must grant his daughter to him, because Honorius deserves it; after all, he is the son of Theodosius the Great, who made him his son-in-law, offering his adopted daughter Serena to him as his wife (34-38). After the bride's father, Honorius addresses her mother, Serena, who is his cousin and raised him like a mother (38-43). He states that Serena must return her daughter to her adopted son (43-46). At the end of the passage, we hear the poet again, who comments that through these complaints, Honorius soothes the wound of love (46)[11].

The epithalamium is an old genre, which is already present in Homer (cf. *Il.* 18.478 and 491-496, and 24.57-62, where Hera mentions that among the guests of Peleus' and Thetis' wedding was Apollo with his lyre, as Claudian says in *Epith.* pr17-18). Sappho's epithalamia were famous, while features of the genre occur in ancient Greek tragedy and comedy as well. Hellenistic poets composed epithalamia too (cf. Theocritus' *Idyll* 18 for Menelaus and Helen)[12]. The Latin epithalamia are well-known (Catullus' 61, Statius, *silv.* 1, 2, Claudian's for the marriages of Honorius and Maria, and Palladius and Celerina, Sidonius Apollinaris', Venantius Fortunatus', etc.). The genre evolves over the years and acquires various motifs and literary variations[13]. At the same time, several poets offer their own personal stamp on it, e.g. Statius enhances the role of myth in the epithalamium[14]. Also, in Catullus' 61 and in Claudian's epithalamium for Honorius and Maria, we see the influence of *Fescennini versus* (Italian obscene and humoristic songs that were sung in weddings)[15]. The great model for the epithalamia of Claudian (and other late Latin poets) was Statius (e.g., cf. the use of myth in *silv.* 1, 2, the prologue of our poem and *Epith.* 14-19 (where Claudian likens Honorius' love for Maria with that of Deidamia to Achilles), and the fact that Claudian composes epithalamia for existing and not mythological persons, as Statius did)[16]. At the same time, Claudian innovates, as he writes nuptial songs in lyric metres, i.e. his Fescennine poems, returning somehow in the tradition of the genre, cf. Sappho's epithalamia[17]. Furthermore, by praising not only the newlyweds, but mainly their families (as he does in our poem, with Stilicho) in his epithalamia, he interpolates elements of panegyrical poetry in them contributing the genre's renewal, as he combines its traditional motifs with his contemporary political aims.

During Late Antiquity classical genres were reshaped and new ones appeared (especially in poetry)[18]. The literature of this period «is the product of a tension between the prestigious pagan masters, the social conditions and aesthetic presupposition, peculiar to late antique culture»[19]. Epic poetry, although it had lost its classical form (heroic, historical etc.), remained a favorite genre, but in new classifications (such as panegyric epic, cento epic and biblical epic). At the contrary, the genre of elegy seemed rather despondent[20]. In the period of Late Antiquity, the mixture and interaction within genres

---

11. Claudian's text comes from Hall (1985), and its English translation from Platnauer (1922). The translations from other Latin texts are my own.

12. See *OCD*, s.v. *epithalamium*; Wheeler (1930: 206-210).

13. Russel (1979).

14. Roberts (1989: 321-322).

15. Kroh (1996: 538).

16. Pavloskis (1965a).

17. For Claudian's Fescennine poems, see Conidi (1988).

18. Tsai (2007: 37); Elsner and Hernández Lobato (2017: 1-24).

19. Roberts (1989a: 38).

20. Tsai (2007: 38); Scourfield (2007: 1-32).

–a crucial feature of the Hellenistic poetics (πολυειδία, *Kreuzung der Gattungen*) that signified the Hellenistic poetry's hybridity– were common literary practices[21]. Charlet called this trend of late antique poetics «neo-Alexandrianism», which «manifests itself first in the systematic desire of for mixtures of poetic genres and tone»[22].

Gualandri proved by convincing arguments that Claudian knew Callimachus (as well as other Greek poets) and used a lot of his material in his poetry (e.g., Claudian's Hymn to Delos in his *Panegyric on Stilicho's Consulship* or *In Eutropium*)[23]. Recently I discussed how Claudian/Pluto creates a concealed discourse about poetics in *raptu Pros.* 2, 277-306, a discourse that is based on the rational of generic mixture and the poet's allusive confession to the Callimachean teachings[24]. I believe that Claudian was inspired by Callimachean teachings (he was Alexandrian, after all), e.g., cf. his presentation of gods, heroes and important political persons (like Honorius) as simple men and women or the fact that he integrates elements of several genres in one work (as in our passage, see below). Accordingly, Claudian picks up the Callimachean terminology, as he had read it in the Augustan elegiac poets (e.g., see below the terms *mollis* or *tener*, which equate to the Μοῦσα λεπταλέη). By this way, Claudian demonstrates his Alexandrian learning and his deep knowledge of the classical Latin poetry and its theoretical background as well.

As is well-known, the discussion on Graeco-Roman genre theory began with two great thinkers from Antiquity, namely Aristotle and Horace. In his *Rhetoric* (3.7.1408a10-11), Aristotle spoke for the notion of τὸ πρέπον (*decorum*), i.e. the appropriateness that should characterize a genre. According to the Greek philosopher, each literary work must have an appropriate medium (prose or verse, metre, type of speech, etc.) and an appropriate subject matter (content, generic norms, etc.)[25]. In his *ars* 73–98, Horace developed the Aristotelian idea of appropriateness and highlighted the fact that each theme has its own form (e. g. wars fit hexameters and the epic genre)[26].

Stephen Harrison, in the very important introduction of his reference book *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace* (2007), established the generic groundwork of the genre theory. Among other crucial thinks, he spoke about the «host» and the «guest» genres of a literary work: «[...] the dominating genre of the text is the 'host' which entertains the subordinate genre as a 'guest'. The 'guest' genre can be higher or lower than the 'host' in the conventional generic hierarchy (e.g. tragic elements in lyric or epigrammatic elements in epic), but the 'host' in all cases retains its dominant and determining role, though the 'guest' enriches and enlarges its 'host' genre for now and for the future»[27].

The subject of this study is Claudian's *Epith*. 1-46. I chose this passage, mainly because of the generic interplay abounds in it. The «host» genre of epithalamium is everywhere[28].

---

21. See Fontaine (1977) and Fontaine (1988); Charlet (1988: 77–78 and 81–82) and (2008: 162); Schneider (2001: 460–461); Formisano (2007: 282–283); Roberts (2007); Wasyl (2011: 119); Fuhrer (2013); Pollmann (2017: 19–36).

22. Charlet (1988: 77).

23. Gualandri (2004) and (2013).

24. Pappas (2020).

25. Harrison (2013: 2).

26. Cf. Hor. *ars* 73–74: *Res gestae regumque ducumque et tristia bella | quo scribi possent numero, monstravit Homerus* («Homer taught us in which metre the deeds of kings and leaders and the sad wars may be written»).

27. Harrison (2007: 16).

28. See Harrison (2007: 1-33, and especially 16-18).

The indicators of this genre are diffused throughout the text (21: *iungere*[29]; 26: *thalamis*[30]; 27: *conubia*[31]; 28: *taedae*[32]; 29: *sponsa*[33]; 32: *procum*[34]; 44: *pignora*[35]; 45: *iugalis*[36]). However, the elegiac genre acts as a powerful «guest» here, as Honorius adopts several features of an elegiac lover[37]. But does this mean he is entirely identical to the lovers of Augustan elegy? The purpose of my article is to explore the poetics of Honorius' romantic behaviour in *Epith.* 1-46. I will try to highlight the entirety of his elegiac features, in order to study the generic interaction between elegy and epic, and to reveal the Callimachean allusions that exist in this passage.

## 2. Is Honorius an elegiac lover? It's complicated

In *Epith.* 1-4 and 6-10, Claudian cites Honorius' love symptoms (*erotica pathemata*), which are well-known from Sappho (cf. the famous fr. 31 Lobel-Page) to Theocritus and the Augustan elegists (especially Ovid)[38]:

> Hauserat insolitos promissae virginis ignes
> Augustus primoque rudis flagraverat aestu;
> nec novus unde calor nec quid suspiria vellent,
> noverat incipiens et adhuc ignarus amandi[39].

and

> [...] mens omnis aberrat
> in vulnus, quod fixit Amor. quam saepe medullis
> erupit gemitus! quotiens incanduit ore
> confessus secreta rubor nomenque beatum
> iniussae scripsere manus![40]          10

---

29. See *OLD*, s.v. *iungo*, meaning 7b; *ThLL* 658.
30. See *OLD*, s.v. *thalamus*, meaning 2b.
31. See *OLD*, s.v. *conubium*, meaning 2; *ThLL* 815.
32. See *OLD*, s.v. *taeda*, meaning 2b.
33. See *OLD*, s.v. *sponsa*.
34. See *OLD*, s.v. *procus*; *ThLL* 1592-1593.
35. See *OLD*, s.v. *pignus*, meaning 4a; *ThLL* 2125.
36. See *OLD*, s.v. *iugalis-is-e*, meaning 3; *ThLL* 624.
37. Wasdin (2014: 60-61); Coombe (2018: 165-166).
38. See indicatively, Race (1983); Giangrande (1990); Caston (2006: 273-274 and 283-284); Nagle (1980: 61-63); Michalopoulos (2021). The *erotica pathemata* also occur constantly in the work of the last love elegist of Antiquity, Maximianus, especially in *Elegies* 3 and 5, see Wasyl (2011: 124-125); Fielding (2017: 145-146); Pappas (2023).
39. «Unfelt before was the fire the Emperor Honorius had conceived for his promised bride, and he burned, all unexperienced, with passion's first fever, nor knew whence came the heat, what meant the sighs –a tyro and as yet ignorant of love».
40. «Love's wound occupies all his thoughts. How often he groaned from the very heart; how often a blush, mantling to his cheeks, betrayed his secret; how often, unbidden of himself, his hand would write the loved one's name».

Honorius suffers from love fever (1: *ignes*; 2: *flagraverat aestu*; 3: *calor*; 8: *incanduit*), sighs from the depths of his heart (3: *suspiria*; 7-8: *quam saepe medullis | erupit gemitus!*), all his mind wanders in the wound that Love stabbed him (6-7: *mens omnis aberrat | in vulnus, quod fixit Amor*), and his blush betrays his secret (9: *confessus secreta rubor*). Coombe has proven the strong intertextuality that exists between this passage and Statius' *Achilleid* 1.301-310[41]. The young emperor has no experience in love (2: *rudis, primoque... aestu*; 3: *novus...calor*; 3-4: *nec...| noverat*; 4: *incipiens, adhuc ignarus amandi*). The adjective *rudis* defines the inexperienced lover (a meaning that occurs frequently in several 'light' genres, such as love elegy and pastoral)[42], but has metapoetic connotations too, implying – among other things – the clumsiness of a literary work[43]. This connotation can be seen in the participle *eruditus* of *erudere*, which comes from the preposition *ex* and the adjective *rudis*, and is opposed to this intellectual meaning of *rudis*[44]. Honorius, the superior political/epic persona (2: *Augustus*), is transformed into a novice elegiac lover. Claudian confesses that during this process the emperor will be a bit clumsy, i.e. he will not know how to play the role of elegiac lover properly. After all, he meets love (and therefore the genre of love elegy) for the first time (1: *insolitos...ignes*; 2: *primoque... aestu*; 3: *novus...calor*)[45]. It is entirely plausible that an epic character feels uncomfortable in this new, elegiac environment. This novelty is underlined by the adjective *novus* (3) and the verb *noverat* (4), whose position (one below the other), I believe, gives emphasis to Claudian's innovation, i.e. the transformation of an entirely epic hero into an elegiac lover –a practice that our poet also follows for Pluto's persona in his *De raptu Proserpinae*[46]. Furthermore, these terms include a metapoetic hint, as they imply the literary movement of *poetae novi*, and, thus the Hellenistic poetics, from which Claudian was affected (e.g. the presentation of gods and heroes into simple people)[47]. In this context, the phrase *ignarus amandi* (4) acquires two readings, one literal (Honorius falls in love for the first time) and the other metapoetic. If we take the term *amandi* in the Ovidian metaliterary

---

41. Coombe (2018: 166-168). For the impact of Statius' epithalamium, i.e. *silv*. 1, 2, on late Latin epithalamia, see Pavloskis (1965a). For the impact of the same poem on Claudian's *Epithalamium de nuptiis Honorii Augusti*, see Coombe (2018: 159-171). Moreover, for the connection between this passage and Ov. *met*. 10, 636-637, see Frings (1975) 37.

42. Cf. Prop. 1, 9, 8: *utinam...dicar amore rudis!* («I wish be called inexperienced in love!»), 2, 34, 82: *sive in amore rudis sive peritus erit* ('either he will be inexperienced in love, or experienced'); Ov. *am*. 2, 1, 6: *et rudis ignoto tactus amore puer* («and the inexperienced boy ignoring the touch of love»); *ars* 3, 559: *hic rudis et castris nunc primum notus Amoris* («this unexperienced and having met for the first time the camp of Love»; Nemes. *Ecl*. 2, 1-3: *formosam Donacem Idas puer et puer Alcon | ardebant rudibusque annis incensus uterque | in Donaces venerem furiosa mente ruebant* («Young Idas and young Alcon were inflamed for the beautiful Donace and both of them, passionate in their unexperienced years, rushed with furious mind in Donace's love»).

43. See *OLD*, s.v. *rudis*[1] *-is, -e*. In fact, Ovid juxtaposes it with the term *docta*, cf. Ov. *am*. 2, 4, 16-17: *sive es docta, places raras dotata per artes; | sive rudis, placita es simplicitate tua* («if you are learned, you please me, endowed with rare acts; if you are crude, you please me for your simplicity»). Also, cf. Ov. *trist*. 2.1.24: *Ennius ingenio maximus, arte rudis* ('Ennius was great in his inspiration, crude in his art'); *Pont*. 3, 3, 37-38: *stulto quoque carmine feci | artibus ut posses non rudis esse meis* («and by a foolish poem I made you able to not be inexperienced in my arts»).

44. See *OLD*, s.v. *erudio* and s.v. *eruditus-a-um*; *ThLL*, 833-835.

45. Cf. Ov. *met*. 1.452: *primus amor Phoebi Daphne Peneia* («Phoebus fell in love for the fist time with Daphne from Peneus:).

46. Pappas (2020: 161-162).

47. See Gualandri (2004); Pappas (2020).

sense (i.e. the writing of love poetry)[48], we come to the same conclusion: Honorius is an inexperienced lover who does not know the norms of the elegiac genre. As we will see, this ignorance also allows him to combine the features of epic and love elegy, obeying a central principle of Late Antiquity's poetics, that of generic mixture[49].

Honorius' only interest is in his love wound: *vulnus, quod fixit Amor* (6), a phrase that echoes the words of Propertius and Ovid[50]. In verse 9, Claudian mentions that the emperor's blush betrays his secret (*confessus secreta rubor*). *Secreta* recalls a necessary premise for the elegiac genre, that of secret love (*furtivus amor*)[51]. However, there is a contradiction here, as Maria, the niece of Theodosius, is promised to the emperor (1: *promissae*), and she is not an obscure elegiac *puella*. Honorius' and Maria's connection will be a royal (and epic) marriage, not an elegiac *foedus amoris*. Once again, Claudian incorporates elegiac features into epic characters, such as the royal couple. Honorius, acting like a naïve youth in love, spontaneously writes his beloved's name (9-10: *nomenque beatum | iniussae scripsere manus*). This act recalls the motif of carving the name of the beloved on trees, which is found in several works of *genus tenue*, including Theocritus' non-pastoral *Idyll* 18, Vergil's *ecl.* 10, and Propertius' 1, 18[52]. Accordingly, I

---

48. Cf. the title of Ovid's *Ars amatoria* or *Ars amandi*. Also, cf. Ov. *am.* 3, 1, 15: *et prior 'ecquis erit', dixit, 'tibi finis amandi, | o argumenti lente poeta tui?'* («o you, sluggish poet, when you will really stop to take love as your subject»); *ars* 1, 1: *siquis in hoc artem populo non novit amandi* («if anyone of the people does not know the art of love»), 2, 161: *non ego divitibus venio praeceptor amandi* («I am not coming as teacher of love for the rich men»); *rem.* 513-514: *nec sit tibi finis amandi | propositus* («neither an end of love is settled for you»); *Pont.* 2, 10, 15: *Naso parum prudens Artem dum tradit amandi* («while Naso, with little prudence delivered the Art of love»).

49. Schneider (2001: 460-461); Roberts (2007); Wasyl (2011: 119). See also, Goldhill (2020: xv), where he comments on Late Antiquity's poetics: «[...] how epyllion, epic and epigram take shape in dynamic relation to each other and work self-consciously in the space between generic affiliation and a look over the boundary to different forms». For the poetics of Late Antiquity in general, see Roberts (1989a); Elsner and Hernández Lobato (2017).

50. Cf. Prop. 2, 13, 2: *spicula quot nostro pectore fixit Amor* («as many arrows Love fixed in my chest»); Ov. *ars* 1, 23: *quo me fixit Amor, quo me violentius ussit* («the more Amor pierces me, the more violently he burns me»).

51. Cf. Tib. 1, 2, 19: *Illa docet molli furtim derepere lecto* («she teaches someone to creep secretly from a soft bed»); 1, 2, 36: *celari volt sua furta Venus* («Venus wants her thefts to be concealed»); 1, 5, 7: *parce tamen, per te furtivi foedera lecti* («spare me, by the bond of our secret bed»); 1, 5, 65: *pauper ad occultos furtim deducet amicos* («the poor man will lead you secretly to hidden friends»); 1, 5, 75: *Nescio quid furtivus amor parat* («I do not know the secret love prepares»); Prop. 1, 16, 20: *nescia furtivas reddere mota preces* («you are not moved and you do not know to return my secret prayers»). For *furtivus amor* of Roman love elegy, see Musurillo (1970); Yardley (1978: 22).

52. The carving of the beloved's name on a tree derives from Callimachus' Acontius and Cydippe, in *aetia* fr. 73 (Pfeiffer): ἀλλ' ἐνὶ δὴ φλοιοῦσι κεκομμένα τόσσα φέροιτε | γράμματα, Κυδίππην ὅσσ' ἐρέουσι καλήν («but on your barks you bear some many curved letters, as they say that Cydippe is beautiful»); see Cairns (2006: 85). Cf. Theoc. *Id.* 18, 47-48: γράμματα δ' ἐν φλοιῷ γεγράψεται, ὡς παριών τις | ἀννείμῃ Δωριστί· 'σέβευ μ'· Ἑλένας φυτόν εἰμι' («letters will be written on a tree trunk, so whoever passes could read: 'worship me; I am Helen's plant'»); Verg. *ecl.* 10, 52-54 (where Cornelius Gallus speaks): *certum est in silvis inter spelaea ferarum | malle pati tenerisque meos incidere amores | arboribus: crescent illae, crescetis, amores* («I am sure that I prefer to suffer in wounds, among the caves of wild beasts, and carve my love on tender trees. They will grow, and you, my love will grow»); Prop. 1, 18, 21-22: *a quotiens teneras resonant mea verba sub umbras, | scribitur et vestris Cynthia corticibus!* («O, how often my words echo under the tender shadows and Cynthia's name is written in your bark!»). See Kenney (1983: 45-49); Henkel (2009: 45-52, 11-119, 155-158). Based on Verg. *ecl.* 10, 52-54, Francis Cairns (2006: 106) notes that «carving of the beloved's name upon a tree was probably to be found, before Propertius, in the elegies of Cornelius Gal-

believe that the phrase *nomen scripsere* adds an extra elegiac hint, as it recalls the *scriptae puellae* of the Augustan elegists[53], although Maria did exist in reality and belonged to an epic, aristocratic world.

In verses 5-6, Claudian writes that the *servus amoris* Honorius has abandoned his previous favourite habits, i.e. hunting and practicing with weapons:

> non illi venator equus, non spicula curae,     5
> non iaculum torquere libet[54].

All these activities are genuine Roman virtues, and they recall Horace's exhortation to his friend Lollius that hunting is a «customary task for Roman men»[55]. The abandonment of these martial habits, which again signifies Honorius' transformation from an epic character into an elegiac one, is a great shock for our emperor, as Claudian often mentions elsewhere that he loved weapons; in *paneg. dictus Honorio cos.* III, 22, Honorius is described crawling over Theodosius' shields as a baby[56]. In *paneg. dictus Honorio cos.* III, 39-60, we read that, once he learnt to walk, his father trained him in the military way of life[57]. In *paneg. dictus Honorio cos.* IV, 160-163, Claudian narrates that Diana herself equipped Honorius with her weapons[58]. Honorius' abandonment of these public affairs is reminiscent of Roman love elegy[59], and signifies another elegiac motif present here, the *militia amoris*[60].

In *Epith.* 10-13 Honorius is shown preparing gifts for his bride, jewels that Livia and the wives of past Roman emperors once wore:

> [...] iam munera nuptae                                              10
> praeparat et pulchros Mariae sed luce minores
> eligit ornatus, quidquid venerabilis olim
> Livia divorumque nurus gessere superbae[61].

Coombe rightly comments: «The implication of this is that the adornment is both for the pleasure and satisfaction of the husband, since it is intrinsic to the process of his dealing with the wound of love, and for the pleasure of the bride, since they are, after

---

lus». For the intertextual connection regarding the aforementioned passages between Callimachus, Vergil, and Propertius, see Maltby (2006: 140-141).

53. See Wyke (1987).

54. «Hunting, horses, javelins – for none of these he now cares nor yet to fling the spear».

55. Cf. Hor. *epist.* 1, 18, 49: *Romanis sollemne viris opus*.

56. Cf. Claud. *paneg. dictus Honorio cos.* III, 22: *reptasti per scuta* («you crawled over your father's shields»).

57. See Parkes (2005: 74-75).

58. Cf. Claud. *paneg. dictus Honorio cos.* IV, 160-163: *tibi saepe Diana | Maenalios arcus venatricesque pharetras | suspendit, puerile decus* («Diana often hanged over you her Arcadian bow and her hunting quivers, an ornament for a child»).

59. See Pelling (1988: 261), where he notes that the abandoning of public affairs by Mark Antony (Plut. *Ant.* 58, 11) recalls love elegy.

60. For *militia amoris*, see indicatively Murgatroyd (1975); Drinkwater (2013).

61. «Already he prepares gifts for his betrothed and selects to adorn her (though their beauty is less than hers) the jewels once worn by noble Livia of old and all the proud women of the imperial house».

all, *munera nuptae*»[62]. She also successfully correlates this passage with *Epith.* 58-59, where Vulcan offers gifts to Venus in order to gain sexual pleasure[63]. Pre-nuptial gifts were common practice between spouses in Roman marriages, and the legislation on them began with Constantine[64]. On a metapoetic level, *munera* play a special role in the elegiac genre[65], and are mainly the «weapons» of the poet-lover's rival, i.e. the *dives amator*[66], who in Augustan love elegy collaborates with *lena* (also present in our poem; see below), in order to conquer the *puella*, and lead the poet-lover to play his role, i.e. to fall in love[67]. Honorius is now presented as a *dives amator* (one of the main *impedimenta amoris* in love elegy), as he offers great presents from the glorious, epic past of Rome (13: *Livia divorumque nurus gessere superbae*). Thus, he returns from the elegiac dreamworld to the epic reality.

Moreover, a metaliterary interpretation is implied by the word *ornatus* (11-12: *pulchros...| eligit ornatus*). Literally, this noun means the ornaments that Honorius offers to Maria[68]. However, it is a rhetorical term meaning the adornment of the style of a speech or writing (in Greek: κόσμος)[69]. As Damm notes, «adornment denotes techniques of speech or writing that catch a listener's attention, drawing it to and impressing upon it the ideas it packages. Within *ornatus* exist many so-called 'rhetorical devices', including figures, tropes, syntactic linking, and word order; and there are a large number of related techniques and concepts which make *ornatus* a rich field for those wishing to speak well»[70]. In this context, Claudian is shown to be a self-conscious poet; through Honorius' words, he speaks of a main feature of his poetics, i.e. stylistic adornment, and of the literature of Late Antiquity in general[71].

Honorius' expectations for his love connection with Maria make the days long, and time does not pass quickly:

> incusat spes aegra moras longique videntur
> stare dies segnemque rotam non flectere Phoebe[72].    15

_____

62. Coombe (2018: 175).

63. Coombe (2018: 174-175).

64. See Evans-Grubbs (2002: 110-122).

65. Cf. Tib. 1, 9, 11: *muneribus meus est captus puer* («my boy was captured by gifts»); Prop. 1, 10, 12: *accipe commissae munera laetitiae* («accept the gifts for the joy of trust»), 1.16.36: *victa meis numquam, ianua, muneribus* («door that you never won by my gifts»), 2, 8, 11: *munera quanta dedi* («how many gifts I gave»); Ov. *am.* 1, 8, 67: *poscet sine munere noctem* («he asks for a night without offering gifts»), 2.13.24: *ipse feram ante tuos munera vota pedes* («I myself will offer at your feet the gifts I promised you»), *epist.* 2, 110: *munera multa dedi* ('many gifts I offered'), 14, 124: *quaeque tibi tribui munera* («the gifts I offered to you»); *ars* 2, 166: *cum dare non possem munera, verba dabam* («when I was not able to offer gifts, I was offering words»).

66. Cf. Tib. 1, 8, 29: *munera ne poscas: det munera canus amator* («do not ask for gifts; let the aged lover offer gifts»); Ov. *ars* 3, 531: *munera det dives* («let the rich man offer gifts»). See James (2003: 35-68).

67. Cf. Tib. 1, 5, 47-48: *haec nocuere mihi, quod adest huic dives amator; | venit in exitium callida lena meum* («these things harmed me, because a rich lover is there with her; a cunning procuress wants to destroy me»).

68. See *OLD*, s.v. *ornatus*², meaning 3; *ThLL* 1017.

69. See *OLD*, s.v. *ornatus*², meaning 4; *ThLL* 1018.

70. Damm (2003: 339).

71. See Roberts (1989a: 49-50).

72. «The impatient lover chafes at the delay; the long days seem as though they stood still and the moon as though she moved not her slow wheel».

Here we see another term from elegiac vocabulary, that of *mora* (14: *moras*)[73]. Gardner writes that «Propertius had programmatically introduced delay as part of the elegiac code in the first poem of the Monobiblos, *sua quemque moretur | cura* (1, 1, 35–6), a reference suggesting that *mora* is an unqualified boon to the lover»[74]. Furthermore, the same elegist, along with Tibullus, both say that *mora* prolongs the elegiac relationship[75]. Ovid reminds his female readers that delay is the best procuress[76], and that their delayed response to a love letter rouses their lover even more[77]. On the contrary, the great *preceptor amoris* advises male lovers to hurry if they want to conquer their sweetheart[78]. Honorius obeys these elegiac teachings and is eager for his beloved. Of course, in our poem the one responsible for the delay is not Maria, but Stilicho, as Honorius complains (20-22)[79]. Thus, Claudian thus implies that her father knows the rules of the elegiac game as well.

In verses 16-19 Claudian draws a parallel between Deidamia's passion for young Achilles (the story of her rape at her father's court in Scyros, where Thetis hid her son disguised in girl's clothes, in order to avoid the Trojan War –a myth mainly known from Hellenistic and Roman sources)[80] with that of Honorius for Maria:

> Scyria sic tenerum virgo flammabat Achillem
> fraudis adhuc expers bellatricesque docebat
> ducere fila manus et, mox quos horruit Ide,
> Thessalicos roseo nectebat pollice crines[81].

The reference to Achilles' life makes a connection with the preface of the poem, where Apollo foretells the birth of Achilles and the future Trojan War (*Epith.* pr17-22). Critics have pointed out that Claudian used the comparison between Honorius and Achilles elsewhere, in a heroical context. Moreover, they demonstrated the impact of Statius (mainly his *Achilleid* and his *silv.* 1, 2) upon the entire epithalamium, as in this passage

---

73. Gardner (2008: 68-69).

74. Gardner (2008: 74).

75. Cf. Tib. 1, 3, 15-16: *ipse ego solator, cum iam mandata dedissem, | quaerebam tardas anxius usque moras* («I myself, the comforter, when already I gave my orders, I was constantly and anxiously asking for slow delays»); Prop. 1, 8, 1: *tune igitur demens, nec te mea cura moratur?* («are you really mad, and my care does not delay you?»), 1, 13, 6: *in nullo quaeris amore moram* («you do not seek a delay in any passion»).

76. Cf. Ov. *ars* 3, 752: *grata mora venies, maxima lena mora est* («you will come with pleasant delay, delay is the best procuress»).

77. Cf. Ov. *ars* 3, 473-474: *postque brevem rescribe moram: mora semper amantes | incitat* («and afterwards send him the letter back with a short delay; delay always rouses the lovers»).

78. Cf. Ov. *ars* 1, 373-374: *sed propera, ne vela cadant auraeque residant; | ut fragilis glacies, interit ira mora* («but hasten, so that the sails do not fall and the winds settle down; just as fragile ice, anger dies with delay»).

79. Cf. Claud. *Epith.* 20-22: *quonam usque verendus | cunctatur mea vota socer? quid iungere differt, | quam pepigit* («how long will honored Stilicho forbear to grant my prayers? Why postpones he the union of those whose love he has approved?»).

80. Cameron (2009). Also, cf. Ov. *epist.* 9.

81. «Thus Deidamia, girl of Scyros, e'er yet she sees through his disguise, inflamed with love for the young Achilles, and taught his warrior hands to draw the slender thread and passed her rosy fingers through the locks of that Thessalian of whom all Ida was soon to stand in awe».

as well[82]. The parallel of the young emperor with Achilles in order to highlight his martial and epic profile is undoubtedly a very plausible idea; nevertheless, here Honorius is identified with the transvestite Achilles. Apparently, Claudian uses this simile intending to further strengthen the elegiac profile of Honorius (Propertius also used the image of the effeminate Hercules in Omphale's court)[83], to offer a humorous hint within the poem (cf. 47: *risit Amor*), to foreshadow the scene of Honorius' sexual violence against Maria in *fesc*. 4 (with a comparison to Deidamia's rape), and to predict the arrival of a future descendant (as was the case for Achilles, with Pyrrhus), although Maria never became a mother[84].

However, I believe that these verses include a political and a poetological reading as well. Claudian makes the following comparison between Achilles and Honorius: the mythical hero started his life as an elegiac lover, and so did the Roman emperor. Afterwards, Achilles was transformed into a fierce epic character (17-18: *bellatricesque...|.... manus*), who terrified Troy (18: *Ide*). In the same way, Honorius would be transformed into a powerful emperor, who would terrify the East (i.e. his brother Arcadius, who is silently implied in verses 23-27, as we will see below). The elegiac past of Achilles is signified by several metapoetic terms; he is defined as *tener* («tender», 16: *tenerum...Achillem*)[85], a word with clear Callimachean connotations (Μοῦσα λεπταλέη)[86] that often defines the elegiac *puellae*[87]. Moreover, the term *tener* recalls *Epith*. pr13: *cum teneris nossent congrua modis* («for they knew that lovers' vows ever harmonized with tender strains»), a phrase that implies the Callimachean *leptotes* too. Deidamia teaches (17: *docebat*) Achilles to weave threads (18: *ducere fila*). I believe that here, Claudian uses a poetological meta-language to imply that Deidamia, after her rape by Achilles, is transformed from an innocent virgin (16: *virgo*; 17: *fraudis adhuc expers*) into an elegiac *docta* (17: *docebat*) *puella*, who teaches Achilles to weave textiles (18: *ducere fila*). In metapoetic terms, this is to compose poetry (perhaps a hint towards Statius' *Achilleid*?), as the process of weaving recalls the Callimachean teachings for light and elegant poetical forms. *Fila* can be interpreted as the string of a musical instrument or the style of a speech[88], and *ducere* recalls the compound *deducere*, which refers to poetic composition and is actually an echo

---

82. See Pavloskis (1965a: 170-171) and (1965b: 282-286); Roberts (1989b: 333); Charlet (2002, vol. 2: 174); Parkes (2005); Cameron (2009: 13); Coombe (2018: 156 and 159-171).

83. Cf. Prop. 4, 9, 45-50.

84. Coombe (2018: 159-171).

85. Such as in Stat. *silv*. 2, 1, 88: *tenero...Achilli* («tender Achilles»); see Frings (1975: 118).

86. Cf. Tib. 1, 3, 57: *quod facilis tenero sum semper Amori* («since I am always favorable for tender love»), 1, 4, 58: *iam tener adsuevit munera velle puer* («now a tender boy used to want gifts»); 1, 5, 61-62: *pauper erit praesto semper, te pauper adibit | primus et in tenero fixus erit latere* («the poor [lover] will always be with you; the poor man will go with you first and will be steadfast at your delicate side»); Prop. 1, 17, 22: *molliter et tenera poneret ossa rosa* («and let her put my bones on tender roses»); Ov. *am*. 1, 4, 22: *purpureas tenero police tange genas* («touch your purple cheeks with your tender thumb»); 1, 6, 11: *risit, ut audirem, tenera cum matre Cupido* («Cupid laughed, as I heard, with his tender mother»); 2, 18, 4: *et tener ausuros grandia frangit Amor* («and tender Love crushes those who will dare great things»).

87. Cf. Tib. 1, 3, 63-64: *ac iuvenum series teneris inmixta puellis | ludit* («and a mixed rank, consisting of young men and tender girls, plays»); Ov. *am*. 2, 1, 33: *at facie tenerae laudata saepe puellae* («but with the face of the tender girl, which is often praised»), 2, 14, 37: *at tenerae faciunt, sed non impune, puellae* («but tender girls do it, but not without punishment»).

88. See *OLD*, s.v. *filum*, meaning 2e and 5a respectively; *ThLL* 760-761.

of Callimachean poetics[89]. With this reading, not only does Achilles resemble Honorius, but Deidamia is identified with Maria who, as Claudian mentions, had read Homer and Sappho to, combining the knowledge of dactylic hexameters (i.e. the *Epithalamium*) and lyric metres (i.e. the *Fescennines*)[90]. Maria's metapoetic dimension is fortified by the verb *nectebat* (19) –as *nectere* means, among other things, the composition of poetry[91]– and by the noun *pollice* (19), which can be interpreted as a musical plectrum[92]. In this meaning, this word makes a strong intratextual link with the prologue of the poem, cf. *Epith.* pr10-11: *Terpsichore facilem lascivo pollice movit | barbiton et molles duxit in antra choros* («Terpsichore struck her ready lyre with festive hand and led the girlish bands into the caves»). Terpsichore, the Muse of choric poetry, the *barbitos*, i.e. the musical interment of lyric poetry, the adjective *mollis* that equals to the Greek λεπτός and occurs again in *Epith.* 39 (*mollior*), underline the Callimachean connotations of the prologue, which are implied here once again.

In *Epith.* 20-46, Honorius addresses Maria's father, Stilicho, and her mother, Serena, begging them to permit their marriage. As Wasdin notes, in this way Claudian «manages to give the reader all the information required to understand the complex genealogy of the wedding»[93]. Although this marriage was necessary for Stilicho (see above), and Honorius mentions that Maria was promised to him by a father's orders[94], he presents his future father-in-law somewhat dilatory terms in *Epith.* 20-22:

> Haec etiam queritur secum: 'quonam usque verendus          20
> cunctatur mea vota socer? quid iungere differt,
> quam pepigit, castasque preces implere recusat?[95]'

An erudite reader would recognize Claudian's source for this passage, i.e. Ov. *epist.* 6.73: *adde preces castas commixtaque vota timori* ('add chaste prayers mingled with anxious vows'). Tsai has noted that Honorius' complaints to Stilicho in this passage are similar to Pluto's address to Jove in *raptu Pros.* 1, 93-116, where he expresses his desires for a bride[96]. We observe that Honorius' address to Stilicho and Serena is in fact

---

89. See *OLD*, s.v. *deduco*, meaning 4b; *ThLL* 282. Cf. Ov. *met.* 1, 4: *ad mea perpetuum deducite tempora carmen!* («spin out a continuous song until my era!»); Hor. *carm.* 3, 30, 10-14: *dicar... | Aeolium carmen ad Italos | deduxisse modos* («they will say that I first weave an Aeolian song in Italian rhythm»); Prop. 1, 16, 41: *at tibi saepe novo deduxi carmina versu* («but I often composed for you songs in neoteric verse»). Also, see Gilbert (1976).

90. Cf. Claud. *Epith.* 248-254.

91. See *OLD*, s.v. *necto*, meaning 10; *ThLL* 412.

92. See *OLD*, s.v. *pollex*, meaning 1d; *ThLL* 2543.

93. Wasdin (2014: 51). Cf. especially, Claud. *Epith.* 30-45, where Honorius tells us that Serena is his cousin (daughter of Theodosius' brother, Honorius, whom the emperor adopted after his death, and therefore, the groom's adopted sister), who raised him and stood by him as his true mother (his birth mother was Flaccilla). Stilicho was Theodosius' son-in-law, as he was married with Serena.

94. Cf. Claud. *Epith.* 29-30: *sed quae sponsa mihi pridem patrisque relicta | mandatis* («her I seek who hath long been betrothed to me, who by a father's orders was left my affianced bride»). For paternal consent to marriage in late Roman law, see Evans-Grubbs (2002: 104-110).

95. «Thus too he communed with himself: 'How long will honoured Stilicho forbear to grant my prayers? Why postpones he the union of those whose love he has approved? Why should he refuse to fulfil my chaste desires?'».

96. Tsai (2007: 39-40). Honorius' words recall Acontius' as well, cf. Ov. *epist.* 20, 10-11: *coniugium pactamque fidem, non crimina posco; | debitus ut coniunx, non ut adulter amo* («I asked no sins, but a marriage and agreed faith; I love you not as an adulterer, but as a husband»).

an inner monologue of the emperor in love (20: *queritur secum*), and inner monologues are a narrative technique in Latin love poetry (e.g. Catull. 8; Ov. *am*. 3, 2). The desperate emperor, as an elegiac *servus amoris*, begs the *puella*'s father to let him see her. This act recalls the common practice of the Augustan poet-lover, who is impeded by several *impedimenta amoris*, such as his sweetheart' *ianitor* (e.g. Ov. *am*. 1, 6) or *vir* (e.g. Ov. *am*. 2, 19 and 3, 4)[97]. Although Maria is not a *puella clausa*, the parents' procrastination (or forbiddance) of their daughter's romantic relationship reminds us of a similar parental behaviour that occurs in two love poems from Late Antiquity, namely Nemesianus' *ecl*. 2 (Donace) and Maximianus' *eleg*. 3 (Aquilina). Of course, the situation is not the same here, as Maria belongs to the imperial palace and is not punished for her illicit love. Nevertheless, in *Epith*. 2-46 we have a similar feeling, i.e. that there is reluctance on the parents' side (especially from Stilicho). Stilicho does not grant Honorius' prayers (21). *Mea vota* is Ovid's favourite phrase to mean the poet-lover's wishes[98]. A metapoetic reading occurs again, this time in verse 22. The verb *pangere* (22: *quam pepigit*), apart from meaning «approval», also means «to compose poetry»[99]. In this sense, it is as if Claudian is implying that Stilicho is the author of Honorius' and Maria's love story. And indeed, he is the cause of the lover's pain (due to the delay he imposes, cf. 21: *cunctatur... differt*), and thus the cause of his elegiac profile. Claudian once again uses a word that belongs to the elegiac vocabulary, *preces* (22)[100], but this time the lover's prayers have a chaste intent (22: *castas*), rather than hoping for an elegiac sexual relationship. Honorius is an *exclusus amator* who wishes to stop his elegiac complaints for a good cause, i.e. an epic marriage. If he has his sweetheart, he will stop behaving like an elegiac lover, as Stella did in Stat. *silv*. 1, 2[101]. And what a coincidence – Stella in Statius' epithalamium is an elegiac poet[102], as Honorius is transformed into an elegiac lover.

In *Epith*. 23-27, Honorius mentions that he was very selective regarding the choice of his bride. He did not consult a procuress for this, and was not consumed by various intercourses:

---

97. Wasdin (2014: 51).

98. Cf. Ov. *am*. 1, 4, 67: *si mea vota valent, illum quoque ne iuvet, opto* («if my prayers have power, I wish he has not pleasure either»), 3, 2, 81: *sunt dominae rata vota meae, mea vota supersunt* («my mistress' desires are valid, but mine are superfluous»); *epist*. 4.16: *figat sic animos in mea vota tuos!* («he can fix your mood as I wish»), 16, 119: *at pater et genetrix inhibent mea vota rogando* («but my father and mother restrain me, asking for my prayers»); *rem*. 278: *quid minus optari per mea vota potest?* («what less could I ask for my prayers?»). Also, cf. Prop. 3, 24, 20: *exciderunt surdo tot mea vota Iovi* («so many prayers of mine were lost in deaf Jove»).

99. See *OLD*, s.v. *pango*, meaning 6; *ThLL* 207-208.

100. Cf. Tib. 1, 5, 18: *et precibus felix utitur ille meis* («and he, happy, used my prayers»); Prop. 1, 8a, 14: *neve inimica meas elevet aura preces* («and I wish the hostile breeze not raise my prayers away»), 1, 16, 20: *nescia furtivas reddere mota preces?* («you, untouched, did not know to give back my secret prayers?»), Ov. *am*. 1, 3, 4: *audierit nostras tot Cytherea preces* («Venus has not heard my many prayers»), 1, 6, 61-62: *nec te precibusque minisque | movimus* («neither by prayers or threats do I move you»).

101. Cf. Stat. *silv*. 1, 2, 33-37: *pone o dulcis suspiria vates, | pone: tua est. licet expositum per limen aperto | ire redire gradu: iam nusquam ianitor aut lex | aut pudor. amplexu tandem satiare petito | (contigit!) et duras pariter reminiscere noctes* («stop your sighs, o sweet poet; she is yours. You are permitted now to spread yourself in her threshold freely. Now there is no doorkeeper, nor law, nor modesty. Satiate yourself at last with her embrace you desired (now it happened!), and simultaneously hold in your memory the hard nights»).

102. Cf. Stat. *silv*. 1.2.7: *quas inter vultu petulans Elegea propinquat* («among them immodest Elegy approaches»).

non ego luxuriem regum moremque secutus
quaesivi vultum tabulis ut nuntia formae
lena per innumeros iret pictura penates,                    25
nec variis dubium thalamis lecturus amorem
ardua commisi falsae conubia cerae[103].

Here Claudian makes a political hint against Arcadius and his advisor, the eunuch Eutropius. Zosimus narrates that Eutropius showed pictures of the future empress Eudoxia, thus increasing Arcadius' desire for her[104]. Eudoxia was a powerful woman who intervened in politics, and is known from her conflict with the Patriarch of Constantinople, John Chrysostom, who compared her to Herodias and Jezebel. She was considered an impious empress, due to the fact that the ladies of her court used to cut their hair like the courtesans[105]. Thus, apparently the word *lena* (25) is indirectly attributed to Eutropius, who played the role of a go-between. Furthermore, even the words *luxuriem* and *regum* (23) imply the Roman perception of wealth and corruption of the East, which was established from the first century BC[106]. Apart from its political connotations, the passage also has a poetological reading. Arcadius is presented as the ultimate *dives amator*, who collaborates with *lena* and tries many amatory companions (25: *per innumeros...penates*; 26: *variis...thalamis*) in order to make a dubious choice (26: *dubium...amorem*). This means that Honorius, who has chosen Maria as his wife, resembles an elegiac lover once again, as he is in love with just one girl, just like the Augustan elegists. However, there is a small contradiction here, as Honorius mentioned above (*Epith*. 10-13), namely that he also acted as a *dives amator*, offering gifts (*munera*) from the imperial palace to Maria. Prostitution is implied by the phrase *falsae cerae* (27) too, as *cera* means wax[107], but a writing-tablet also containing accounts (the payment of *lena*)[108]. The innumerable courtesans (25: *per innumeros...penates*; 26: *variis...thalamis*) and the presence of the unspeakable profession of the procuress[109], who offers her services for money, give Arcadius an anti-Callimachean (and epic) dimension[110]. Meanwhile, Honorius, who condemns eastern luxury and is faithful to one woman, adopts the neoteric teachings, once again acquiring an elegiac profile[111].

---

103. «I follow not the example of luxurious princes in seeking the beauties of a pictured countenance, whereby the pander canvass may pass from house to house to make known the charms demanded; nor yet have I sought to choose the uncertain object of my love from this house or from that, and thus entrusted to deceptive wax the difficult selection of a bride».

104. Cf. Zos. 5, 3, 3. Also, see Cameron (1970: 53).

105.. See Brittain and Carroll (1907: 75-84); Georgiou (2019: 117-121).

106. For luxury as a feature of Asian Greeks, cf. Cic. *Verr*. I, 2, 7 and *Flacc*. 71. Also, see Cobb (2013). For *rex*, see *OCD*, s.v. *rex*.

107. See *OLD*, s.v. *cera*, meanings 1, 2, and 3; *ThLL* 849.

108. See *OLD*, s.v. *cera*, meaning 4b; *ThLL* 850.

109. See Edwards (1997).

110. Cf. Callim. *epigr*. 28, 3: μισέω καὶ περίφοιτον ἐρώμενον («I hate the handsome boy that has many admirers»);

111. Although Honorius is not by any means poor, it seems that in this passage he adopts a superficial poverty, apparently for poetical reasons. Poverty has Callimachaen associations, as it is related to the rejection of epic and the preference for «lighter' poetic genres». Cf. Tib. 1, 5, 61-66: *Pauper erit praesto semper, te pauper adibit | primus et in tenero fixus erit latere, | pauper in angusto fidus comes agmine turbae | subicietque manus efficietque viam, | pauper ad occultos furtim deducet amicos | vinclaque de niveo detrahet ipse pede* («The poor [lover] will always be with you; the poor man will go with you first and will be steadfast

In the following four verses (*Epith*. 28-31), Honorius claims that he does not desire another man's wife, but that they promised her to him, the woman who shares a common ancestor from her mother's side, i.e. his father, Theodosius:

> non rapio praeceps alienae foedera taedae,
> sed quae sponsa mihi pridem patrisque relicta
> mandatis uno materni sanguinis ortu          30
> communem partitur avum. [...][112]

Here Honorius expels his elegiac character and adopts an epic one. His sweetheart does not belong to many claimants, as the elegiac *puella* does (*vir*, *maritus*, *dives amator*). She is a respectable Roman virgin, who is betrothed (29: *sponsa*) by a father's orders (29-30: *patrisque relicta | mandatis*)[113]. Honorius is not an elegiac lover, competing with his amatory rivals and losing to them, but an epic one, who wants to marry his (also epic) sweetheart in order to dominate within the political (epic) world. Moreover, Maria is not of obscure origin (as the elegiac *puellae* are), but of an epic one (the same as the emperor). As in all royal families, in the case of Honorius and Maria, their common, aristocratic, origin is the most important factor for their marriage. Furthermore, the phrase *foedera taedae* (28) is a phrase that occurs repeatedly in several epics always at the end of a hexameter (just like in Claudian's line), such as Lucan. 5, 766 and 8, 399, Val. Fl. 2, 173 and Sil. 6, 447. This epic clausula restores Honorius in his epic profile.

In *Epith*. 31-34, Honorius confesses that he has left his dignity aside, and behaves like a suitor:

> [...]          fastidia supplex
> deposui gessique procum; de limine sacro
> oratum misi proceres, qui proxima nobis
> iura tenent. [..][114]

Honorius leaves aside the (epic) pride that comes with his office (31: *fastidia*) and is transformed into an elegiac lover again; he becomes a suppliant (31: *supplex*), a typical

---

at your delicate side; the poor man will be your faithful companion in the crowded throng, he will place his hands under you and create a pathway [for you]; the poor man will surreptitiously lead you to secret friends, and he himself will remove the sandals from your snowy-white feet»), and Claud. *raptu Pros.* 2.300-301: *reges | deposito luxu turba cum paupere mixti* («kings, their extravagant splendour laid aside and mingling with the crowd of poor»). For a Callimachean interpretation of these passages, see Pappas (2016: 88-89) and (2020: 169-170). Also, see Myers (1996: 13), who notes: «poverty expresses a Callimacheanism related to the rejection of the military themes of epic, as well as the rejection of the bombastic style in favour of refined technique and uncommon themes».

112. «I sever not in violence the bonds that unite a wedded woman to her lord; her I seek who hath long been betrothed to me, who by a father's orders was left my affianced bride and who, through her mother, shares with me a common grandsire».

113. See Evans-Grubbs (2002: 88), where she notes: «Among the elite (about whom we have the most information), marriage was usually preceded by betrothal (*sponsalia*), which might last for two or more years. The match was usually arranged by negotiation between the males involved (fathers of marriageable children and often the prospective groom), sometimes acting through intermediaries)».

114. «A suppliant, I have laid aside my rank and acted the suitor. Princes, second only to myself in rank, have I sent from my imperial palace to present my petition».

adjective of the elegiac *exclusus amator*[115]. Furthermore, there is one more word here that recalls the persona of excluded lover, i.e. the threshold (32: *limine*). The word signifies the place where he sings the *paraclausithyron*, namely his beloved's door[116]. Of course, this is not the door of her house, but the door of the imperial palace (an epic location), from which Honorius' representatives came[117]. The phrase *limine sacro* occurs in three passages of classical Latin poetry, i.e. in Hor. *sat*. 1, 5, 99; Lucan. 2, 31; Stat. *Theb*. 9, 638, where it means a temple and not an imperial palace. To a certain extent, when using such words, Claudian sacralises the imperial palace as a holy institution, using an epic phraseology previously associated with temples. Mentioning the imperial palace as a *sacrum limen* could be a pagan epicism. Also, although here Honorius is presented as an elegiac suppliant, he once again combines epic features: he is the emperor, and he gives others, who also are epic figures (33-34: *oratum misi proceres, qui proxima nobis | iura tenent*), the embarrassing (for him) job of begging.

In *Epith*. 34-38, Honorius says to Stilicho that he owes him Maria, because Theodosius made him his son-in-law by marrying him to Serena. He must repay his debt to his father and in this way restore the members of the imperial family to their home:

> [...]    fateor, Stilicho, non parva poposci,
> sed certe mereor princeps, hoc principe natus          35
> qui sibi te generum fraterna prole revinxit,
> cui Mariam debes. faenus mihi solve paternum,
> redde suos aulae[118].

---

115. Cf. Tib. 1, 2, 13-14: *te meminisse decet, quae plurima voce peregi | supplice, cum posti florida serta darem* («you must remember what I told you many times as a suppliant, when I offered flourished wreaths in your door»); 1, 4, 71-72: *querelis | supplicibus, miseris fletibus illa favet* («she favours begging complaints, wretched lamentations»); Prop. 1, 9, 3: *ecce iaces supplexque venis ad iura puellae* («behold, you came and you are lying as a suppliant at your girlfriend's commands»), 1, 16, 4: *captorum lacrimis umida supplicibus* («wet from begging tears of prisoners»), 14: *supplicis a longis tristior excubiis* («sadder due to the long vigils of the suppliant»); Ov. *am*. 1.7.61: *ter tamen ante pedes volui procumbere pedes supplex* («however, three times I wanted to lie before your legs as a suppliant»), 2.5.49: *qui modo saevus eram, supplex ultroque rogavi* («I, who was a savage a moment ago, I begged her spontaneously as a suppliant»); *ars* 1.713: *Iuppiter ad veteres heroidas ibat* («Jove went to ancient heroines»), 2, 527-528: *postibus et durae supplex blandire puellae, | et capiti demptas in fore pone rosas* («and you, as a suppliant, flatter the doors and your cruel girl, and put the contemned roses from your head outside»).

116. Cf. Tib. 1, 2, 17: *quis iuvenis nova limina temptat* («someone young tries new thresholds»), 86: *et dare sacratis oscula liminibus* («and give kisses to sacred thresholds»), 1, 5, 71: *non frustra quidam iam nunc in limine perstat* («someone is not standing in your threshold in vain»), 2, 6, 13: *iuravi quotiens rediturum ad limina numquam!* («how many times I swore to never return in your threshold!»), 47-48: *ego cum dominae dulces a limine duro | agnosco voces* («when I recognise sweet voices from the cruel threshold»); Ov. *am*. 1.6.63-64: *non te formosae decuit servare puellae | limina* («you should not guard the threshold of a beautiful girl»), 68: *dura super tota limina nocte iace!* («to lie down on the threshold all night»), etc. See Copley (1956); MacKay (1956); Yardley (1979); Pucci (1978); Nappa (2007).

117. The adjective *sacer* is applied to the members of the imperial house, see *OLD*, s.v. *sacer -cra -crum*, meaning 7a.

118. «'Tis no small thing I ask, Stilicho; that I admit; yet surely to me, an emperor, son of that other emperor who, by giving thee his brother's adopted daughter to wife, made thee his son-in-law – to me thou dost owe Maria. Pay back to the son the interest due to his sire; restore to the palace those who are its own».

Honorius in verse 34 makes an anti-Callimachean statement; his requirements are large (*non parva*), epic[119], as is plausible, since he asks to marry princess Maria. In order to achieve this (and highlight his epic profile), he uses the elegiac method of self-promotion; he is the emperor, and son of the previous emperor (35: *sed certe mereor princeps, hoc principe natus*). But here, Honorius mainly highlights Stilicho's debt (37: *faenus*)[120] to Theodosius, rather than his own achievements (36-37: *qui sibi te generum fraterna prole revinxit | cui Mariam debes*). He uses the formula *ille ego sum,* followed by relative clauses (a practice which is widespread in genres of *genus tenue*, such as elegy and pastoral)[121], not for his own self-presentation, but in order to remind Stilicho of the favour he has to repay. The reminder of a past favour recalls the similar practice of Augustan elegiac poet-lovers (to their beloved, an obstacle of love, etc.)[122]. In fact, the two imperatives (37: *solve*; 38: *redde*) recall Ovid's exhortation towards the *ianitor* of *Am.* 1.6 to repay his debt to him[123].

In the last section (*Epith.* 38-46) of Honorius' monologue, the emperor in love addresses Maria's mother[124]. In 38-43 (until *mihi*), he speaks of her genealogy: she is the daughter of his uncle Honorius from Spain; therefore, she is his cousin by birth. She stood by him as a true mother, since his birth mother, Flaccilla, died when Honorius was two years old (386 AD). In the final verses, he asks her four anxious questions regarding the marriage's time:

> [...]                                                mater fortasse rogari
> mollior. o patrui germen, cui nominis heres
> successi, sublime decus torrentis Hiberi,                                40
> stirpe soror, pietate parens, tibi creditus infans
> inque tuo crevi gremio, partuque remoto
> tu potius Flaccilla mihi. quid dividis ergo
> pignora? quid iuveni natam non reddis alumno?

---

119. Cf. the Prologue of Callimachus' *Aetia*.

120. See *OLD*, s.v. *faenus*, meaning 2; *ThLL* 169. See Frings (1975: 126), where he notes that this term comes from agriculture.

121. Cf. Prop. 4, 9, 38: *ille ego sum: Alciden terra recepta vocat* («I am he: the earth I accepted calls me Alcides»); Ov. *am.* 2, 1, 1-2: *hoc quoque composui...| ille ego nequitiae Naso poeta meae* («I, that poet Naso, also composed this poem of my naughtiness»), 3.8.23: *ille ego Musarum purus Phoebique sacerdos* («I am he, the pure priest of Muses and Apollo»); *trist.* 10, 4, 1: *ille ego qui fuerim, tenerorum lusor amorum* («I am the man I was, a playful poet of tender loves»); *Pont.* 1, 2, 33-34: *ille ego sum, lignum qui non admittar in ullum: | ille ego sum, frustra qui lapis esse velim* («I am he, to him is not allowed to enter any kind of tree: I am the man who wishes in vain to become a stone»); Calp. *ecl.* 3, 55-57: *ille ego sum Lycidas, quo te cantante solebas | dicere felicem, cui dulcia saepe dedisti | oscula* («I am this man, Lycidas, at whose singing you used to say how happy you were, to whom you gave sweet kisses often»); Nemes. *ecl.* 2, 37-38: *ille ego sum, Donace, cui dulcia saepe dedisti | oscula* («I am he, Donace, to whom you gave sweet kisses often»).

122. Cf. Tib. 1, 5, 9-10: *ille ego, cum tristi morbo defessa iaceres, | te dicor votis eripuisse meis* («they say it was me, who I saved you with my vows from a grievous sickness»); Ov. *am.* 1, 6, 19-22: *certe ego, cum posita stares ad verbera veste, | ad dominam pro te verba trement tuli. | ergo quae valuit pro te quoque gratia quondam – | heu facinus! pro me nunc valet illa parum?* («surely, when you stood scared, naked for flogging, I was who talked to your lady for your own sake. Does the favour I once offered you – alas, what a crime! – have not an equal value for me anymore?»).

123. Cf. Ov. *am.* 1, 6, 23: *redde vicem meritis! grato licet esse quod optas* («repay the favour with your service! You will easily get what you want»), 25-26: *excute! sic, inquam, longa relevere catena, | nec tibi perpetuo serva bibatur aqua!* («open the door! By this way, I say, you will be released from your long chains, and you will not drink slave's water forever!»).

124. See Evans-Grubbs (2002) 89, where she notes that a mother's consent for a marriage, while not legally required, was clearly advisable.

optatusne dies aderit? dabiturne iugalis                          45
nox umquam? [...]¹²⁵

We see that Honorius addresses Serena in the second person of the personal, possessive pronoun (41: *tibi*; 42: *tuo...gremio*; 43: *tu*), a practice that occurs in the typology of divine hymns (*Du Stil*)¹²⁶, and is also used by the Augustan elegists¹²⁷. In this way, Honorius apparently aims to increase Serena's splendour, by presenting her as a goddess. Serena is an epic persona (she belongs to the imperial family), but Honorius hopes that she may be milder than her husband, and give her consent to this love. The adjective *mollior* (39), apart from being typical of women¹²⁸, has Callimachean undertones and is a technical term of the elegiac genre¹²⁹. This connotation is also implied in the prologue, where Claudian mentions that Terpsichore «drove tender dances in caves»¹³⁰. The continuous questions he asks her (43-46), two introduced by the pronoun *quid* (43: *quid dividis*; 44: *quid... non reddis*) and two with the particle –*ne* (45: *optatusne dies aderit?*; 45-46: *dabiturne iugalis | nox umquam?*), give a clear elegiac colour to this passage¹³¹. Accordingly, we bear witness to Honorius' urgent sexual desire (45-46). In his pleas to Stilicho and Serena, we deduce that the young emperor (and, therefore, Claudian) sees this marriage as the restoration of the imperial family to its own palace; note the intratextual link between *redde* (38) and *quid...non reddis?* (44).

After Honorius' monologue, we hear again the poet's voice (46):

Tali solatur vulnera questu¹³².

Claudian characterises Honorius' words as a complaint (*questu*). As Heerink notes, this word «is often used to denote Roman love elegy»¹³³. In other words, it serves as a

---

125. «Mayhap her mother will be less inexorable. Daughter of mine uncle Honorius, whence I derive my name, chief glory of the land of swift-flowing Ebro, cousin by birth, by mother's love a mother, to thy care was mine infancy entrusted, in thine arms I grew to boyhood; save for my birth, thou, rather than Flaccilla, art my mother. Why dost thou separate thy two children? Why not bestow a daughter born upon an adopted son? Will the longed-for day ever come; the marriage-night ever be sanctioned?».

126. See E. Norden (1913: 143-166); Alexiou (²2002: 177).

127. Cf. Prop. 1, 16, 25: *tu sola humanos numquam miserata dolores* («only you have never felt pity for human sorrows»), 35: *tu sola mei, tu maxima causa doloris* («only you, you were the greatest cause of my pain»), 37: *te non ulla meae laesit petulantia linguae* («you were not insulted by any vituperations from my tongue»), 41: *at tibi saepe novo deduxi carmina versu* («but I often composed for you songs in neoteric verse»); Ov. *Am*. 1, 6, 15: *te...timeo* («I am afraid of you»), 16: *tu...fulmen habes* («you hold the thunderbolt»), 45: *tecum tua nunc requiscit amica* («now you are lying with your girlfriend in your arms»). See Yardley (1978: 31-34); Watson (1982); Laigneau (2000: 321).

128. See *OLD*, s.v. *mollis-is-e*, meaning 3a; *ThLL* 1369-1370.

129. See Miller (2002: 4-5); Blanco Mayor (2017: 87, especially footnote 107).

130. Cf. *Epith*. pr9-10: *Terpsichore... | molles duxit in antra choros*. See Frings (1975: 99).

131. Cf. Prop. 1, 18, 5-6: *unde tuos primum repetam, mea Cynthia, fastus? | quod mihi das flendi, Cynthia, principium?* («where to seek the causes for your haughtiness, Cynthia? What is the beginning you gave me for my crying?») and 9-10: *quid tantum merui? quae te mihi crimina mutant? | an nova tristitiae causa puella tuae?* («why do I merit this? Which crime of mine changed you? Is a new girl the cause of your anger?»); Ov. *am*. 1.14.35-36: *quid male dispositos quereris periisse capillos? | quid speculum maesta ponis, inepta, manu?* («why do you ask if your regularly arranged hair was badly lost? Silly girl, why do you hold the mirror by your sad hands?»), and 1.1.5-16, 2.8.5-10, 10.11-14, 19.53-59, 3.3.16-22, 6.54-58, etc.

132. «With such complaint he assuages the wounds of love».

133. Heerink (2020: 200).

«symbolic metonym» signifying the elegiac genre[134]. Also, this word creates an intratextual link with *queritur* (20), making a ring composition in Honorius' words. The etymological connection of these two words recalls the elegiac lament too (*querela*). Furthermore, *vulnera* in poetry can be interpreted as the wounds of love[135]. Thus, by using these two terms from the elegiac vocabulary, the poet underlines the fact that love elegy dominates in the passage that preceded.

## 3. Conclusions

The «host» genre of epithalamium is everywhere in *Epith*. 1-46[136]. The generic indicators are diffused throughout the text (21: *iungere*; 26: *thalamis*; 27: *conubia*; 28: *taedae*; 29: *sponsa*; 32: *procum*; 44: *pignora*; 45: *iugalis*). However, the elegiac genre acts as a powerful «guest» genre here, as Honorius adopts several features of an elegiac lover. Accordingly, he does not expel his epic origin – after all, he is the emperor, the most important epic persona. Honorius is a lover who wavers between elegy and epic.

Therefore, Claudian obeys one of the main literary trends of his era, i.e. the generic mixture. This feature occurs in the prologue of the poem, accompanied by Callimachean connotations too, cf. *Epith*. pr10-14: *Terpsichore facilem lascivo pollice movit | barbiton et molles dixit in antra choros. | Carmina nec superis nec displicuere Tonanti, | cum teneris nossent congrua vota modis. | Centauri Faunique negant. Quae flectere Rhoeton, | quae rigidum poterant plectra movere Pholum?* («Terpsichore struck her ready lyre with festive hand and led the girlish bands into the caves. The gods, the Thunderer himself, disdained not these songs, for they knew that lovers' vows ever harmonized with tender strains. Centaurs and Fauns would have none of it: what lyre could touch Rhoetus or move inhuman Pholus?»). As I mentioned above, this passage includes several intratextual links with terms of *Epith*. 1-46 (*pollice, molles, teneris modis*). Also, it implies the Callimachean poetics too, i.e. the preference of a «light» poetic genre, the epithalamium, which Claudian composes in dactylic hexameters and lyric metres (*Fescennines*) as well. The epic genre, the natural environment of the Centaurs, is rejected. In Claudian's epithalamium, even the Thunderer Jupiter, who recalls Callimachus' Zeus that thunders (*Aet*. Prol. 20: βροντᾶ] ν οὐκ ἐμόν, [ἀλλὰ] Διός, «thunders are Jupiter's task and not mine») enjoys the light poetry – in fact, in *Epith*. 119-120 we hear about the Thunderer Jupiter as a lover (*Epith*. 119-120: *iterumne Tonantem | inter Sidonias cogis mugire iuvencas?*, «Hast thou once more compelled the Thunderer to low among the heifers of Sidon?»). This Callimachean rejection of epic occurs in *Fesc*. 4.14-15 too, where Claudian mentions that love wars are better than martial ones: *'o!' quotiens, 'hoc mihi dulcius | quam flavos deciens vincere Sarmatas!'* («Better this than ten victories over the yellow-haired Sarmatae!»). Moreover, the generic mixture of elegy and epic and the Callimachean poetics of lines 1-46 were already described in *Epith*. pr17-20: *tum Phoebus, urbs quo saxa domat, quo pertrahit*

---

134. Harrison (2007: 31-33).

135. See *OLD*, s.v. *vulnus*, meaning 1d. Cf. Prop. 2, 34, 91-92: *et modo formosa quam multa Lycoride Gallus | mortuus inferna vulnera lavit aqua!* («and now, Gallus washes in the waters of Hell his multiple wounds that he received by his lovely Lycoris»); Ov. *am*. 1, 2, 29-30: *ipse ego, praeda recens, factum modo vulnus habebo | et nova captiva vincula mente feram* («I myself, a recent booty, will now have received my wound and I will bear the new chains by my captive mind»).

136. See Harrison (2007: 1-33, and especially 16-18).

*ornos, | pectine temptavit nobiliore lyram | venturumque sacris fidibus iam spondet Achillem, | iam Phrygias caedes, iam Simoënta canit* («then Phoebus touched his lyre with that nobler quill, wherewith he leads captive rocks and mountain-ashes, and sang to his sacred strings now the promised birth of Achilles, now the slaughter of the Trojans and the river Simois»). Apollo, the god of lyric poetry, who in Callimachus' Prologue of *Aetia* advises the poet to compose «light» poetry (cf. *Aet*. Prol. 22-24: Ἀ[πό]λλων εἶπεν ὅ μοι Λύκιος· '...]... ἀοιδέ, τὸ μὲν θύος ὅττι πάχιστον | θρέψαι, τὴ]ν Μοῦσαν δ᾽ ὠγαθὲ λεπταλέην', «Apollo the Lycean told me: 'my dear poet, make sure you have the thickest sacrifice, but keep your Muse thin'»), now narrates songs of epic content, i.e. the birth of Achilles and the Trojan War. The Alexandrian teachings are included in *Epith*. 47-134 as well, where the ekphrasis of Venus' palace exists and the delightful dialogue between Cupid and his mother. There we hear a detailed description of Venus' palace and the gods are presented as humans and victims of Love. In conclusion, in Claudian's *Epith*. 1-46, a particular feature of the genre theory exists, i.e. the generic mixture. The «host» genre (epithalamium) hosts two powerful «guest» genres, the elegy and epic. Accordingly, it seems that in several parts of the passage, Claudian confesses his Callimachean faith.

## 4. Bibliography

Alexiou, M. (²2002), *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*, revised by D. Yatromanolakis and P. Roilos, Lanham, Boulder, New York and Oxford.

Barnes, M. H. (2005), «Claudian», in J. M. Foley (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Epic*, Malden, 538-549.

Blanco Mayor, J. M. (2017), *Power Play in Latin Love Elegy and Its Multiple Forms of Continuity in Ovid's Metamorphoses*, Berlin and Boston.

Brittain, A. and M. Carroll (1907), *Women of Early Christianity*, vol. 3, London.

Cairns, F. (2006), «Propertius and the Origins of Latin Love-Elegy», in H.-C. Günther (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Propertius*, Leiden and Boston, 67-95.

Cameron, Al. (1965), «Wandering Poets: A Literary Movement in Byzantine Egypt», *Historia* 14(4), 470-509.

— (1970), *Claudian. Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius*, Oxford.

— (2004), «Poetry and Literary Culture in Late Antiquity», in S. Swain and M. Edwards (eds.), *Approaching Late Antiquity: The Transformation from Early to Late Empire*, Oxford, 327-354.

— (2009), «Young Achilles in the Roman World», *The Journal of Roman Studies* 99, 1-22.

— (2011), *The Last Pagans of Rome*, Oxford.

— (2016), *Wandering Poets and Other Essays on Late Greek Literature and Philosophy*, Oxford.

Caston, R. R. (2006), «Love as Illness: Poets and Philosophers on Romantic Love», *The Classical Journal* 101(3), 271-298.

Charlet, J.-L., «Aesthetic Trends in Late Latin Poetry (325–410)», *Philologus* 132, 74–85.

— (ed.) (2000), *Claudien: Oeuvres. Poèmes politiques (395–398)*, vol. 2, Paris.

— (2008), «Tendances esthétiques de la poésie latine tardive (325–470)», *Antiquité Tardive* 16, 159–167.

CHRISTIANSEN, P. G. (1997), «Claudian: A Greek or Latin?», *Scholia* 6, 79-95.

— & D. CHRISTIANSEN (2009), «Claudian: The Last Great Pagan Poet», *L'Antiquité classique* 78, 133-144.

CLARK, G. (1993), *Women in Late Antiquity: Pagan and Christian Lifestyles*, Oxford.

COBB, M. A. (2013), «The Reception and Consumption of Eastern Goods in Roman Society», *Greece & Rome* 60(1), 136-152.

CONIDI, R. B. (1988), *Claudio Claudiano: Fescennini ed epitalamio per le nozze di Onorio e Maria. Introduzione, testo, traduzione e note*, Rome.

COOMBE, C. (2018), *Claudian the Poet*, Cambridge.

COPLEY, F. (1956), *Exclusus amator. A Study in Latin Love Poetry*, Baltimore.

DRINKWATER, M. O. (2013), «*Militia amoris*: Fighting in Love is Army», in T. S. Thorsen (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Latin Love Elegy*, Cambridge, 194-208.

EDWARDS, C. (1997), «Unspeakable Professions: Public Performance and Prostitution in Ancient Rome», in J. P. Hallett and M. B. Skinner (eds.), *Roman Sexualities*, Princeton, New Jersey, 66-95.

FIELDING, I. (2017), *Transformations of Ovid in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge.

GARDNER, H. H. (2008), «Women's Time in the *Remedia Amoris*», in G. Liveley and P. Salzman-Mitchell (eds.), *Latin Elegy and Narratology. Fragments of Story*, Ohio, 68-85.

GEORGIOU, A. (2019), «Empresses in Byzantine Society: Justifiably Angry or SimplyAngry?», in S. Constantinou and M. Meyer (eds.), *Emotions and Gender in Byzantine Culture*, London, 111-140.

GIANGRANDE, G. (1990), «Symptoms of Love in Theocritus and Ovid», *Analecta malacitana* 13, 121-123.

GINESTE, M.-F. (2004), «Poésie, pouvoir et rhétorique à la fin du 4e siècle après J.-C.: Les poèmes nuptiaux de Claudien», *Rhetorica* 22(3), 269-296.

GOLDHILL, S. (2020), *Preposterous Poetics. The Politics and Aesthetics of Form in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge.

ELSNER J. and J. HERNÁNDEZ LOBATO (2017). «Introduction: Notes Towards a Poetics of Late Antique Literature», in J. Elsner and J. Hernández Lobato (eds.), *The Poetics of Late Latin Literature*, Oxford, 1-22.

EVANS- GRUBBS, J. (2002), *Women and the Law in the Roman Empire. A Sourcebook on Marriage, Divorce and Widowhood*, London and New York.

FONTAINE, J. (1977), «Unité et diversité du mélange des genres et des tons chez quelques écrivains latins de la fin du Ive siècle. Ausone, Ambroise, Ammien», in M. Fuhrmann (ed.), *Christianisme et formes littéraires de l'antiquité tardive en Occident*, Genoa, 425–472.

— (1988), «Comment doit-on appliquer la notion de genre littéraire à la littérature latine chrétienne du Ive siècle?», *Philologus* 132, 53–73.

FORMISANO, M. (2007), «Towards an Aesthetic Paradigm of Late Antiquity», *Antiquité Tardive* 15, 277–284.

FRINGS, U. (1975), *Claudius Claudianus. Epithalamium de nuptiis Honorii Augusti Einleitung und Kommentar*, Meisenheim am Glan.

FUHRER, T. (2013), «Hypertexts and Auxiliary Texts. New Genres in Late Antiquity?», in Th. D. Papanghelis, St. J. Harrison and St. Frangoulidis (eds.), *Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature. Encounters, Interactions and Transformations*, Berlin and Boston, 79-89.

Gilbert, C. D. (1976), «Ovid, *Met*. 1.4», *The Classical Quarterly* 26(1), 111-112.

Gualandri, I. (2004), «Claudian's Greek World: Callimachus», in W.-W. Ehlers, F. Felgentreu, and S. M. Wheeler (eds.), *Aetas Claudiana*, München and Leipzig, 78-95.

— (2013), «Claudian, From Eastern to Western», *Talanta* 45, 115-129.

Hall, J. B. (ed.) (1985), *Claudii Claudiani Carmina*, Leipzig.

Harrison, S. J. (2007), *Generic Enrichment in Vergil & Horace*, Oxford.

— (2013), «Introduction», in Th. D. Papanghelis, St. J. Harrison and St. Frangoulidis (eds.), *Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature. Encounters, Interactions and Transformations*, Berlin and Boston, 1-15.

Heerink, M. (2020), «Replaying Dido: Elegy and the Poetics of Inversion in Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*», in N. Coffee, C. Forstall, L. Galli Milić and D. Nelis (eds), *Intertextuality in Flavian Epic Poetry*, Berlin and Boston, 187-203.

Henkel, J. H. (2009), *Writing Poems on Trees: Genre and Metapoetics in Vergil's Eclogues and Georgics*, unpublished doctoral thesis, Chapel Hill.

Hopkins, K. M. (1965), «The Age of Roman Girls at Marriage», *Population Studies* 18(3), 309-327.

Horstmann, S. (2004), *Das Epithalamium in der lateinischen Literatur der Spätantike*, Munich.

James, S. L. (2003), *Learned Girls and Male Persuasion. Gender and Reading in Roman Love Elegy*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London.

Kenney, E. J. (1983), «Virgil and the Elegiac Sensibility», *Illinois Classical Studies* 8(1), 44-59.

Kroh, P. (1996), *Λεξικό αρχαίων συγγραφέων, Ελλήνων & Λατίνων*, Greek transl. D. Lypourlis and L. Tromaras), Thessaloniki.

Laigneau, S. (2000), «Ovide, *Amores* 1.6: un paraclausithyron très ovidien», *Latomus* 59, 317-326.

Lobel, E. and D. Page (1955), *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta*, Oxford.

MacKay, L. A. (1956), «The Well-disposed and Ill-used Door (Propertius 1.16)», *Phoenix* 10(1), 13-19.

Maltby, R. (2006), «Major Themes and Motifs in Propertius' Love Poetry», in H.-C. Günther (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Propertius*, Leiden and Boston, 145-181.

Michalopoulos, A. (2021), «The pathology of Love in Classical Literature», in D. Kanellakis (ed.), *Pathologies of Love in Classical Literature*, Berlin and Boston, 119-134.

Miller, P. A. (2002), «Introduction», in P. A. Miller (ed.), *Latin Erotic Elegy. An Anthology and Reader*, London and New York, 1-36.

Mulligan, B. (2007), «The Poet from Egypt? Reconsidering Claudian's Eastern Origin», *Philologus* 151(2), 285-310.

Murgatroyd, P. (1975), «*Militia amoris* and the Roman Elegists», *Latomus* 34, 59-79.

Musurillo, H. (1970), «*Furtivus Amor*: The Structure of Tibullus 1.5», *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 101, 387-399.

Myers, S. K. (1996), «The Poet and the Procuress: The *Lena* in Latin Love Elegy», *The Journal of Roman Studies* 86, 1-21.

Nagle, B. R. (1980), *The Poetics of Exile: Program and Polemic in the Tristia and Epistulae ex Ponto of Ovid*, Brussels.

Nappa, C. (2007), «Elegy on the Threshold: Generic Self-consciousness in Propertius 1.16», *The Classical Word* 101(1), 57-73.

Nathan, G. (2015), «The Ideal Male in Late Antiquity: Claudian's Example of Flavius Stilicho», *Gender & History* 27(1), 10-27.

Norden, E. (1913), *Agnostos Theos. Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte religiöser Rede*, Leipzig.

Pappas, V. (2016), «*Leno Poeta*: Tibullus's Poem 1.5», *Mediterranean Studies* 24(1), 77-98.

— (2020), «Generic Interplay and Callimachean Theory in Claudian's *De raptu Proserpinae* II, 277-306», *L'Antiquité classique* 89, 157-171.

— (2023), *Maximianus' Elegies. Love Elegy Grew Old*, Berlin and Boston

Parkes, R. (2005), «Model Youths? Achilles and Parthenopaeus in Claudian's Panegyrics on the Third and Fourth Consulships of Honorius», *Illinois Classical Studies* 30, 67-82.

Pavloskis, Z. (1965a), «Statius and the Late Latin Epithalamia», *Classical Philology* 60(3), 164-177.

— (1965b), «The Education of Achilles as Treated in the Literature of Late Antiquity», *Parola del Passato* 20, 281-297.

Pelling, C. (1988), *Plutarch: Life of Antony*, Cambridge.

Pfeiffer, R. (1949), *Callimachus, vol. I: Fragmenta*, Oxford.

Platnauer, M. (ed.) (1922) *Claudian, With an English Translation*, vol. 1, London.

Pollmann, K. (2017), *The Baptized Muse. Early Christian Poetry as Cultural Authority*, Oxford.

Pucci, P. (1978), «Lingering on the Threshold», *Glyph* 3, 52-73.

Race, W. H. (1983), «'That Man' in Sappho fr. 31 L.-P.», *Classical Antiquity* 2(1), 92-101.

Roberts, M. (1989a). *The Jeweled Style: Poetry and Poetics in Late Antiquity*, Ithaca.

— (1989b), «The Use of Myth in Latin Epithalamia from Statius to Venantius Fortunatus», *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 119, 321-348.

— (2007), «Bringing up the Rear: Continuity and Change in the Latin Poetry of Late Antiquity», in W. Verbaal, Y. Maes and J. Papy (eds), *Latinitas Perennis*, vol. 1: *The Continuity of Latin Literature*, Leiden and Boston, 141-167.

Saller, R. P. (1987), «Men's Age at Marriage and its Consequences in the Roman Family», *Classical Philology* 82(1), 21-34.

Schneider, W. C. (2001), «Definition of Genre by Falsification. The False Attribution of the Maximianus Verses to Cornelius Gallus by Pomponius Gauricus and the 'Definition' of their Genre and Structure», *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 129(4), 445-464.

Scourfield, J. H. D. (2007), «Textual Inheritances and Textual Relations in Late Antiquity», in J. H. D. Scourfield (ed.), *Texts and Culture in Late Antiquity*, Swansea, 1-32.

Shaw, B. D. (1987), «The Age of Roman Girls at Marriage: Some Reconsiderations», *The Journal of Roman Studies* 77, 30-46.

Tsai, K. S-C. (2007), «Hellish Love: Genre in Claudian's *De raptu Proserpinae*», *Helios* 34(1), 37-68.

Wasdin, K. (2014), «Honorius Triumphant: Poetry and Politics in Claudian's Wedding Poems», *Classical Philology* 109(1), 48-65.

Wasyl, A. M. (2011), *Genres Rediscovered: Studies in Latin Miniature Epic, Love Elegy, and Epigram of the Romano-Barbaric Age*, Kraków.

Watson, L. C. (1982), «Ovid *Amores* 1.6: A Parody of a Hymn?», *Mnemosyne* 35, 92-102.

Wheeler, A. L. (1930), «Tradition in the Epithalamium», *The American Journal of Philology* 51(3), 205-223.

Wyke, M. (1987), «Written Women: Propertius' *scripta puella*», *The Journal of Roman Studies* 77, 47-61.

Yardley, J. C. (1978), «The Elegiac Paraclausithyron», *Eranos* 76, 19-34.

— (1979), «The Door and the Lover: Propertius1,16», *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 2, 155-162.

## 5. Abbreviations

*OCD*  *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, ed. by Simon Hornblower, Antony Spawforth and Esther Eidinow, Oxford 2012, 4th edition.

*OLD*  *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, ed. by Peter G. W. Glare, Oxford 1968-1982 (reprinted in one volume, 1994, 8th edition).

*ThLL*  *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (available at: http://publikationen.badw.de/en/thesaurus/lemmata).