THE ETYMOLOGY OF MILITIA IN ROMAN ELEGY

It has long been understood that ancient poets, both Greek and Roman, had a considerable interest in etymology and that they both offer explicit etymologies and also allude to etymologies in less explicit ways. Commentators have generally concentrated on the etymologies of proper names found in ancient poetry. But in recent years scholarly interest has extended also to the etymologies of common nouns, adjectives and verbs. The process of recognising just how widespread etymologies are in ancient poetry has been a gradual one. Some contributions have come from scholars primarily concerned with the history of ancient etymologising and its philosophical links, and others from studies of the use of etymologies by various ancient poets.

In Chapter 4 of Tibullus, a Hellenistic poet at Rome (see above n. 2), I built upon the perceptions of earlier scholars and also tried to sketch in outline the intellectual domain to which ancient etymologising belongs. I suggested that we should look for this purpose not only to etymology proper, but also to that other important area of ancient thought about language, semantics, which is discussed along with etymol-

---

1 An abbreviated version of this paper was delivered at a conference held at Heiligendamm, DDR, in November 1983, and organised by Professor W. Hering of the University of Rostock. The full version formed part of a paper given at the University of Bari in May 1984. I am grateful to those who commented on these occasions. I am also indebted to Mr. I.M. Le M. DuQuesnay, Dr. Duncan F. Kennedy and Dr. Robert Maltby for advice on this work. Dr. Maltby drew on the manuscript of his A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies, to be published in the series ARCA, at present in preparation. These scholars are not necessarily in agreement with the conclusions offered and are not responsible for remaining errors, particularly since the subject matter of this paper poses two severe methodological problems: (1) allusions to etymologies in Roman poetry are often fleeting and can only be demonstrated, if at all, by exhaustive discussion, which is impossible here; (2) negative propositions about the absence of such allusions are inevitably provisional and subject to revision.

2 A useful collection of bibliographical references is to be found at Severin KOSTER, Tessera. Sechs Beiträge zur Poesie und poetischen Theorie der Antike (Erlanger Forschungen. Reihe A Geisteswissenschaften 30), Erlangen, 1983, p. 48 n. 6 (some studies of ancient etymology) and p. 49 n. 9 (some studies of the use of etymology in Latin poetry). More references can be found in Francis CAIRNS, Tibullus: a Hellenistic poet at Rome. Cambridge, 1979, Ch. 4, esp. p. 90 f. n. 13, p. 92 n. 15. This discussion is not noted by KOSTER. See also below n. 3.
ogy by both the major surviving texts on ancient etymology, Varro's *De Lingua Latina* and Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae*. It was argued that etymologising in ancient poetry was not merely a form of word-play, but was an important part of a respectable ancient intellectual activity, namely the investigation of the universe through an examination of language, which in antiquity was believed to be an analogue and reflection of the real world. This is not to say, of course, that every slight piece of etymology or semantics in an ancient poet must be regarded as a serious and scientific attempt to reveal absolute truth. Ancient poets range in their use of etymology and semantics from the serious to the trivial. But, when using etymology and semantics, an ancient poet was drawing on a 'science' which in itself was certainly not regarded as trivial. At the very least a poet's use of it gave his poetry an intellectual substructure; and once we perceive this, we are some way towards countering the impression which some ancient poetry may give of lacking intellectual depth. *Tibullus* Chapter 4 was of course directed primarily towards elucidating the texture of Tibullan verse, and therefore its latter portion illustrates copiously Tibullus’ uses of etymology and semantics, in connection not only with proper names but also with common nouns, adjectives and verbs. But Tibullus is by no means alone in his use of these techniques. The use of them by Lucretius, Virgil and Ovid is well recognised; and further investigations in this area are currently under way. No doubt studies of most major Greek and Roman poets would yield parallel results; indeed a recent paper reveals a remarkably similar technique with common nouns, verbs and adjectives in Homer.

In the present paper I wish not simply to exemplify further the hypotheses of *Tibullus* Chapter 4 but to apply them in a new direction. There specific etymologies used in specific contexts were discussed. Here the suggestion is offered that some etymologies are not only present in specific contexts but are also immanent conceptually throughout a whole literary form; and the etymology of *militia* and its impact on Roman elegy is treated as an example. The two vital texts are:


4 Mr. D. Fowler is currently investigating this area in Lucretius, and Dr. James McKeown in Ovid.

miles autem appellatur vel a militia, id est duritia, quam pro nobis sustinent, aut a multitudine aut a malo quod arcere milites solent, aut a numero mille hominum.

Digest 29.1.1, Ulpian 45 ad Edictum militem Aelius a mollitia κατ' ἄντιφρασιν dictum putat eo quod nihil molle sed potitus asperum quid gerat. sic ludum dicimus in quo minime luditur.

Paulus Festus 109 (Lindsay) = 122 (Müller)

Although neither Varro nor Isidore derive militia from mollis or mollitia, we can be sure that the doctrine linking militia, mollitia and duritia was known before the later first century BC, since whichever Aelius is being cited by Festus, he certainly antedated that period 6.

The significance of this etymology is clear: there is no conceptual antithesis more fundamental for Roman love-elegy than the opposition between, on the one hand, the mollitia of elegiac love poetry, of the elegiac love-poet and of his life of elegiac love, and, on the other, the duritia of his direct opposite, the epic poet, who is a durus poeta, whose verses are duri and who describes militia, a theme characterised by duritia 7.

The etymology is thus fundamental to the whole literary form; and naturally it surfaces frequently. Its appearances range from the obvious to the subtle and from the simple to the complex. Each of the three surviving Roman elegists knew the etymology; but for reasons which will be considered later, their uses of it are dissimilar. Tibullus and Ovid are (in proportion to the length of their elegiac output) less complex and assiduous in their exploitation of it, and Propertius much more so.

First Tibullus and his more obvious use of the etymology:  

pace bidens vomerque nitent, at tristia duri 
militis in tenebris occupat arma situs (1, 10, 49 f.)

(cf. Virgil Aeneid 2, 7: duri miles Ulixi - and see below).

In a context already marked by other wordplay, the adjective duri attached to militis gives a concise derivation which reinforces the ‘semantics’ of the couplet. 1, 10 is, interestingly, the epilogue to Tibullus’ first

6 The candidates are: L. Aelius Stilo (ca. 154-90 BC, cf. Kl. P. s.v. Aelius I Kaiserzeit! 14); and C. Aelius Gallus (republican period, cf. Kl.P. s.v. Aelius I Republikanische Zeit 3). Dr. Robert Maltby kindly informs me that «R. REITZENSTEIN, Verrianische Forschungen, Breslau, 1887, p. 90, argues in favour of Aelius Stilo on the grounds that Miles is a Plautine play title. He is of the opinion that (p. 89 f.) of 7 occurrences of Aelius alone in Festus, 6 refer to Stilo and only one to Gallus, and that all 4 occurrences of Aelius alone in Paulus refer to Stilo».

7 Cf. e.g., OWEN on Ovid Tristia 2, 307; BÖMER on Ovid Fasti 2, 3.
book and like the prologue (1, 1) it sets out to characterise his work implicitly through a description of his way of life.

The other Tibullan evocation of the etymology is more subtle and thus demonstrates that it was well-known to his audience. In the programmatic prologue to his first book (1, 1), Tibullus is contrasting Messalla’s military achievements with his own lack of desire for military glory and he is also relating how he himself sits as an excluded lover outside his mistress’ door: *et sedeo duras ianitor ante fores* (1, 1, 56)—on which see also *Tibullus* p. 102. When her door is next mentioned (1, 1, 73 ff.), Tibullus is speaking about breaking it down and he is boasting: *hic ego dux milesque bonus* (1, 1, 75). The intervening lines, which deal with other topics, are thus cleverly bridged.

Of the three surviving Roman elegists Propertius makes the most frequent and complex use of the etymology. Two early elegies, 1, 6 and 1, 7, are shot through with it. In 1, 6 Tullus is planning to go off to Asia on *militia* and hopes to take Propertius along with him (cf. 30). Two delicate allusions to the etymology appear at line 11 (*his ego non horam possum durare querelis*) and line 18 (*et nihil infido durius esse viro*). The first (11) stresses that, far from being a *durus miles*, Propertius cannot even *durare* his mistress’ opposition to this prospect for a single hour. The second (18) is the thwarted Cynthia’s equation of the *duritia* of the would-be *miles* with a lack of *fides*. But the final four couplets of 1, 6 exploit the etymology in a much more explicit way:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{non ego sum laudi, non natus idoneus armis:} \\
&\text{hanc me militiam fata subire volunt.} \\
&\text{at tu, seu mollis qua tendit Ionia, seu qua} \\
&\text{Lydia Pactoli tingit arata liquor,} \\
&\text{seu pedibus terras, seu pontum carpere remis} \\
&\text{ibus et accepti pars eris imperii;} \\
&\text{tum tibi si qua mei veniet non immemor hora,} \\
&\text{vivere me duro sidere certus eris (29-36).}
\end{align*}
\]

Here the paradox, whereby the *miles* is said, albeit in highly flattering terms, to be going to travel in *mollis Ionia* and is implied to be about to enjoy a less *duro sidere* than the poet, is underlined strongly by the etymological play involved.

---

8 *Cf.* e.g., Wolf Steidle, «Das Motiv der Lebenswahl bei Tibull und Properz», *WS* 75, 1962, p. 100 ff.

9 *Cf.* Francis Cairns, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*, Edinburgh, 1972, pp. 3 ff.

In 1, 7 Propertius exploits the etymology for literary polemical purposes. In contrast to 1, 6, where its main locus was the final eight lines, the etymology appears mainly in the initial eight lines of 1, 7:

Dum tibi Cadmeae dicuntur, Postume, Thebae
armaque fraternae tristia militiae,
atque, ita sim felix, primo contendis Homero,
—sint modo fata tuis mollia carminibus—
nos; ut consuemus, nostros agitamus amores,
atque aliquid duram quaerimus in dominam;
 nec tantum ingenio quantum servire dolori
cogor et aetatis tempora dura queri (1-8).

This passage contains a number of pointed polemical antitheses, which have been explored by Franz Quadlbauer 11 and Paolo Fedeli 12. The effect of the etymology, as in 1, 6, is to reinforce their paradoxical aspects, already heightened by the militia amoris topos implicit here, as in so many of the contexts treated in this paper. The «soft» love-poet’s prayer for the Fates to be «soft» to the «hard» epic of Ponticus about the war of Thebes, along with the love-poet’s claims to have a «hard» mistress and a «hard» life are simultaneously challenged and reinforced by the built-in element of αντιφράσεως in the etymology. Later in 1, 7, at line 19, Propertius harks back to this etymological complex, when he envisages Ponticus’ conversion to love and his attempts at love-elegy and gloatingly tells him: et frustra cupies mollem componere versum.

There are many further appearances of this etymology in Propertius, of different levels of complexity and used for different purposes. To begin with minor references in similar contexts, his first explicit literary manifesto, 2, 1, describes his liber as mollis in its second line. The succeeding lines declare that Cynthia is the inspiration and subject of his poetry, until at line 19 Propertius begins a complex recusatio of war as a poetic subject which leads up to the statement nec mea conveniunt duro praecordia versu (41). Then follows a brief priamel, which includes the item enumerat miles vulnera (44). The notion of soldiering is picked up in 1. 45 by the contrasting nos contra angusto versantes proelia lecto.

with its allusion to the *militia amoris* 13. Further declarations of Propertius’ attachment to love lead to the finale, the statement that his tombstone will (appropriately, since he will have died in the warfare of love) read: ‘*Huic misero fatum dura puella fuit*’ (78). The etymology is thus played upon delicately throughout 2, 1, without being made obtrusive at any point.

In 2, 30, another literary piece 14, the *senes* who attack Propertian elegy, here represented by *convivia*, and who by implication want him to write bellicose epics (19-22), are described as *duri* (13 f.). A similar glance at the etymology appears at 2, 34, 44, where Lynceus, a poet who is said to favour every poetic form except elegy, and who has now fallen in love, is counselled to take up elegy and is urged *inque tuos ignes*, *dure poeta veni*, only to be told in the very next line (45) that he will be no safer in love than were the epic poets, Homer and Antimachus. A little later Lynceus learns that he will suffer *duros ... amores* (49). Here too the etymology is being tellingly, though tactfully, employed.

Book 3 of Propertius opens with an explicit literary manifesto full of standard polemic between elegy and epic 15. Propertius foresees himself as a poetic *triumphator*, who has nevertheless rejected epic, the poetry of war, and who has won his triumph with a Callimachean opus suitable for peace-time reading (17 f.). Immediately he invokes the Muses:

\[
\text{mollia, Pegasides, date vestro serta poetae:} \\
\text{non faciet capiti cura corona meo (3, 1, 19 f.).}
\]

The force of the softness/hardness terminology derives implicitly from the prior context and particularly from *pace* in line 17. Finally Propertius 4, 1, his last poetic manifesto 16, alludes to the etymology in a restricted but amusing way. Horos tells the poet to write love-elegy, since that is his *castra* (135), and then goes on to predict:

\[
\text{militiam Veneris blandis patiere sub armis,} \\
\text{et Veneris pueris utilis hostis eris (4, 1, 137 f.).}
\]


The joke here lies in the emphatic statement by Propertius' adversary that love is indeed the *mollis militia*.

In addition to these uses of the etymology in specifically literary polemical contexts, Propertius also introduces it into poems which contrast different ways of life and so may implicitly involve literary polemic, but which are not primarily concerned with it. These I note briefly for completeness:

1) 1, 14, 18. Addressing the «*vir militaris*» Tullus, who is a non-lover (cf. 1, 6), Propertius notes that Venus can be *dolor* even to *duris mentibus* i.e. to military men like Tullus.

2) *Pacis Amor deus est, pacem veneramur amantes:* 
   
   _stant mihi cum domina proelia dura mea_ (2, 5, 1 f.).

   Here the topical contrast and comparison between love and war is being underlined through the etymology.

3) 3, 11, 20. Hercules, who brought peace to the world (*pacato... orbe, 19*) i.e. through force, then worked the *mollia pensa* for his mistress Omphale i.e. for love.

Final place however in the treatment of Propertius has been reserved for an example which is particularly interesting in its subtlety and power: 3, 12 is a propemptikon addressed to Propertius' cousin Postumus, who is the husband of Aelia Galla and who, seemingly, is about to depart on a military expedition. At 1. 2 Postumus is described as a *miles*; and indeed much of the elegy is devoted to his imagined military exploits and to the tales which he, like Ulysses, will tell on his return. In the exact centre of the poem —and so at the very turning point of the propemptikon— appears the couplet:

   _sed securus eas: Gallam non munera vincent duritiaeque tuae non erit illa memor_ (3, 12, 19 f.).

   This is the only occurrence in Propertius of the word *duritia*; and its prominent and distinctive use here reveals the poet's expectation that his readers would regard *militia* and *duritia* as virtual synonyms. Propertius' point is that, since Aelia Galla will understand Postumus' moral obligation to undertake *militia*, she will not, although she loves him, dwell on the fact that it is also *duritia* and so opposed to love.

Ovidian elegy returns to a lower level of exploitation of the etymology. Ovid certainly knew the etymology, as is shown by such simple examples as *...sine militis usu/mollia securae peragebant otia gentes* (*Metamorphoses* 1, 99 f.) or *...duri militis uxor erat* (*Ars Amatoria* 3, 110). He was willing also to use it in more subtle ways: e.g. at *Ars Amatoria* 2, 233 he defined *amor* as militiae *species* and then four lines later

17 _Cf. o.c. above (n. 9), pp. 197 ff._
pointedly claimed mollibus *his castris et labor omnis inest* (236); and at *Amores* 1, 11, 9 he tells Nape, Corinna's maid, that she does not have durum ... *ferrum* in her heart, before appealing to her four lines later: *in me militiae signa tuere tuae* (12) —cf. also possibly *Amores* 1, 9, 42; 2, 1, 22. But Ovid did not have the obsession with the etymology which is found in Propertius. One demonstration of this is *Amores* 1, 9, a *synkrisis* between *amor* and *militia* which exhausts virtually every other topic about love and war 18, but which pointedly abstains from the clear use of this etymology. Another is the fact that, although Ovid to some extent continues the tradition of explicit literary polemic (e.g. in *Amores* 1, 1; 1, 2; 1, 15; 2, 1; 2, 18; 3, 1; 3, 15), he does not seem to make much use of the etymology in connection with it: the possible oblique play upon it at *Amores* 2, 1, 19 ff. is unobtrusive. It is hard to avoid the conclusion that Ovid regarded the etymology as so pervasive and commonplace in elegiac poetry and so integral to his subject-matter that he deliberately and teasingly refrained from exploiting it too frequently.

It may be asked what relationship the etymology bears to the poetic manifestos of the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Here a probable, if not certain, answer can be given. As far as can be judged from the prologue to Callimachus’ *Aetia* and from the other —admittedly patchy— evidence which survives, the Greek manifestos did attack epic and its subject-matter, warfare. But they do not seem to have linked the concept of «hardness» with war or with epic. There is indeed one passage (Hermesianax *Fr.* 7, 36 Powell) which speaks of Mimnermus as having invented the «soft breath» (μαλαχων πνευμα) of the pentameter. This single and highly specific characterisation of the elegiac metre does seem to indicate that «softness» could be a desirable characteristic for Hellenistic writers; again, *mollis* and *durus* (and their Greek equivalents σκληρος and μαλαχος) were certainly used in a general sense to refer to style long before their more specific use by Roman elegists in literary polemical contexts involving epic and *militia* (cf. e.g. TLL s.vv. mollis pp. 1376 f.; durus p. 2310; Aristotle *Rhetorica* 1409 b9; Philodemus *Rhetorica* 1, 197S). But the paucity of Greek parallels for a link between softness and elegy and the absence of evidence for a Greek link between «hardness» and epic make it less likely that this range of critical vocabulary was fully developed in lost Hellenistic Greek literature 19. It is true

---

18 Cf. *o.c.* above (n. 13) for these topoi.

19 The literary programmes have been studied by many scholars, including notably WIMMEL (*o.c.* above, n. 15), Mario Puelma PIWONKA, *Lucilius und Callimachos*, Frankfurt am Main, 1949; Athanasios KAMBYLIS, *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik* (Bibliothek der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaften IV F.2), Heidelberg, 1965.
that in Greek antiquity σκληρότης was thought to be the end-product of athletic exercises and of participation in the Games, while μαλακία was declared to be characteristic of those who avoided them. It is also true that a further link was made in Greek thought between these physical activities and warfare, in that exercises and agonistic activities were seen as a preparation and training for war. But the application of the hardness/softness concept directly to war in the context of literary polemic by elegy against epic seems, on the available evidence, to have been a Roman development, inspired of course by the already existing stylistic implications (derived from Greek) of mollis and durus. The particular appropriateness and piquancy of applying the concept in an epic/elegy context derived in part from the etymology of militia and in part from the fact that it underlined the antithesis/opposition of love and war which was so universal in elegy —see above and n. 13. Propertius was probably not responsible for introducing the concept, and the polemics it made possible, into Roman poetry (see below); but he certainly adopted them enthusiastically —and all the more so because of his constant fascination with literary manifesto poetry. The notion that this was a Roman development is confirmed of course by the existence of the earlier Roman, but not also Greek, etymology associating militia and duritia though mollitia.

The fact that neither Tibullus nor Ovid exploit the etymology for literary purposes has a number of explanations. To begin with, Tibullus, in the prologue and epilogue of his first book, like Propertius in the prologue of his Monobiblos, explored his literary ideals in implicit rather than explicit terms, that is, he revealed them in his fictional ποιητής; and in his second book Tibullus maintained the same practice. Since such implicit literary polemic did not require him to contrast his own poetry explicitly with that of other poets, he had no need to exploit the etymology in such a context. But at the same time Tibullus’ decision not to write explicit literary polemic must have been, at any rate in Book 2, fully deliberate, since by that time, if not before the publication of Book 1, there were Propertian precedents to hand. Tibullus’ choice may well reflect in part a distaste for explicit literary polemic —including the explicitly polemical use of the militia/mollitia/duritia etymology. Ovid’s sparing use of the etymology in general and his reluctance to link it with explicit literary polemic certainly reflects from the beginning a deliberate decision, in his case probably a part-reaction against the practice of his predecessor Propertius.

21 Cf. Cairns, o.c. above (n. 2), pp. 11 ff.
Two questions with a bearing on this problem remain. First, when did the etymology originate; and second, who first introduced it into poetry? It is scarcely possible to affirm with certainty the absence from a particular author of an etymology. But, as far as I have observed, no implied derivation of *militia* from *mollis* seems to be present in Plautus, Terence, Catullus or Lucretius. In the last case the absence is all the more striking because the phrase *fera moenera militiai* appears at *De Re-rum Natura* 1, 29, in a literary programmatic passage contrasting the effects of Mars and Venus on the composition of poetry. Here, if anywhere, would have been the appropriate place for it.

On the other hand, the etymology is found in the three surviving Roman elegists and also in Virgil and Horace. Hypotheses naturally spring to mind on the basis of these facts: the 40s BC suggest themselves as the time when the etymology entered poetry; and C. Cornelius Gallus seems a likely candidate as its originator. That would readily explain its appearance in the three elegists as well as in Horace and Virgil. The clear Horatian lyric examples are not particularly striking or frequent: *cf. Odes* 2, 9, 17 ff.; 2, 12, 3 ff. (both, interestingly, in literary programmatic contexts) and *Odes* 1, 7, 19 ff. This relatively small number of examples could suggest that the concept was not particularly at home in the Roman lyric tradition. The earlier *Satires* 10, 43 ff., however, contrasting the *forte epos* of Varius with the *molle atque factum* of Virgilian bucolic, shows a livelier but apparently isolated interest in what was then a newer concept in literature. Virgil, on the other hand, alludes, often fleetingly, to the etymology more frequently: *cf. Georgics* 2, 170; 2, 369; 3, 41 f.; *Aeneid* 2, 7 (see above); 4, 423; 5, 730 f.; 7, 504; 9, 726; 10, 146; 10, 745; 11, 48; 11, 452; 11, 728; 12, 73; 12, 309; 12, 410. Of these passages only *Georgics* 3, 41 f. seems to have literary-critical intent. Elsewhere Virgil appears to be using the etymology to underline in one way or another the essential nature of war and arms.

But there is one additional and earlier Virgilian example which has literary-critical content and which also, and startlingly, reveals precisely the origin of the etymology in Roman poetry, thus confirming the hypothesis that it was introduced by Gallus: at *Eclogue* 10, 44 ff., where Cornelius Gallus is himself the speaker, Virgil writes:

\begin{quote}
Hic gelidi fontes, hic mollia prata, Lycori,  
hic nemus; hic ipso tecum consumerer aeo.  
nunc insanus amor duri me Martis in armis  
tela inter media atque adversos detinet hostis (42-45).
\end{quote}

---

22 *Catalepton* 9, 42, *horrida quid durae tempora militiae*, has been left out of this discussion since I intend to treat that poem elsewhere. It is generally dated to the late 30s or early 20s BC.
MILITIA IN ROMAN ELEGY

(Cf. also molliter, 33; dura, 46, the latter used of Lycoris, who is going off to war with Gallus' rival!). Ross, commenting upon other aspects of ll. 44 f., writes 23: «...if we grant as well that there is every likelihood that these two lines derive from Gallus' poetry...» (p. 99 n. 1). The pattern of appearance of the etymology of militia within Roman poetry amply confirms Ross's suggestion; and the literary polemical associations of some of the elegiac and lyric appearances also confirm the other hypothesis found in the same sentence of Ross: «Then, if we understand the references to Mars, war, and arms poetically rather than literally ... we may see here a shadow of the Gallan original of the motif of War which so appealed to Tibullus especially».

Gallus doubtless derived the etymology from a contemporary or earlier first-century BC legal source, perhaps 'Aelius' himself. This may be a reflection of his youthful legal studies. It is perhaps worth emphasising that Roman poets eagerly embraced etymology and semantics as poetic tools in part because etymology and semantics had been adopted as standard exegetical tools in legal studies by the jurists of around 100 BC 24.

If Gallus first introduced the etymology into Roman poetry, then further light is thrown on its distribution among the other three Roman elegists. It is constantly becoming clearer that of the three, Propertius was the one most powerfully influenced by Gallus 25, that four elegies of the Monobiblos are addressed to him, and that he was joint patron, along with L. Volcacius Tullus, of Propertius in his Monobiblos period 26. That Gallus' influenced Tibullus also is undoubted 27. But the sparser presence of the etymology in Tibullus goes hand in hand with other indications of powerful counterinfluences to Gallus upon Tibullus' style and content 28. The similar dilution of the etymology in Ovid may have as additional part explanation the same influences. As for Virgil and Horace, it is probably no accident that Virgil, the youthful friend of Gallus, should have shown a fondness for the etymology, while Horace, who had no links with Gallus, should have used it much less frequently.

25 Cf. o.c. above (n. 23) and Francis Cairns, «Propertius 1, 4 and 1, 5 and the 'Gallus' of the Monobiblos», in o.c. above (n. 5), 61 ff., where references to discussions in the intervening period are given.
26 Cf. Cairns, o.c., above (n. 25), 88 ff.
27 Cf. o.c. above (n. 23), Ch. 7.
28 I hope to explore this topic in a future paper.
The etymology, then, seems to have been a first-century BC invention by a Roman jurist, to have been first imported into Roman elegy by Gallus, and already in the work of Gallus to have had a literary-polemical function. It is a major, new, and specifically Roman feature of literary polemic; and it, and the methodological principle underlying it, point the way for further investigations along similar lines.
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