7) The link between the rhetorical thesis and the term ἐπιρρήματα θετικά was first laid by H. Throm, *Die Thesis. Ein Beiträg zu ihrer Entstehung und Geschichte* (Paderborn 1932), 159 f.

8) Sometimes the difference is made to coincide with the division between rhetoric and philosophy: Stephanus in *Arist. de int.*, *CAG* 18,3,2,17 ff. discusses τὰ θετικὰ ἐπιρρήματα, ἀ παρὰ τοῖς ἤπεροροι, like πλευστῶν and γαμητῶν, and proceeds to distinguish between dialectic or philosophical discussions which are καθόλου 'should (any)one marry?' and rhetorical ones which add particular circumstances ('should so and so marry?'). This is only one instance from among many, cf. L. Calboli, *La dottrina degli “status” nella retorica greco e romana* (Bologna 1984), 42.


11) Cf. *ApD. Adv.*, *Gramm. Gr.* II i 130,7 f.: δεῖ and χρῆ indicate an ἔλλειψις τοῦ πράγματος, therefore one must always add *what* someone is supposed to do; see Sluiter 1990, 110 (cf. n. 3). Η χρῆ expresses 'obligation' only, it would have the meaning of the verbal (modal) category 'imperative', cf. ibid. 89 ff.

12) See e.g. 27,12 ff.; 49,13 ff.; 64,11 ff.; 66,7 ff.; 68,17 ff.; 88,10; 122,15 ff. et s.ae.

13) For the position of article and demonstrative pronoun in the phrase διὰ τῶν τριῶν τῶν μόνων στίχων, see KG I 628 A. 5, and see Tzetzes 52,25: τίς δὲ περὶ εἰς ταύτης ξύβρος. The position of ὅλος remains problematic. A more incisive emendation might run thus: προγόμμασι θέει ἄποτελε ὅλον τίνι πλὴν Δαυκωνίω συντόμως δραχυλογήματι. Alternatively, read δὴν, cf. Scholia ad Hermog. IV 394 Walz, ad Hermog. p. 49 Rabe (cf. note 8). I owe this suggestion to J. Wisse.

14) For the 'Laconic brevity', see 93,20 f. φιλοσυντόμως δὲ γράφον, νῦν κατὰ τῶν ∆άκων, cf. 94,18 f.; 29; 95,25.


16) See for the connection between προγόμμασι and θέες, Lausberg § 1106; 1136; Frisc. *Praexercitamina Gr. Lat.* III 439,11 ff.: *Posse est deliberatio alicuius rei generalis ad nulium personam certam pertinentis vel aliam partem circumstantiae, ut si tractemus 'an navigandum', 'an ducendum uxorem' etc.: Aphth. *Rhet. Gr.* I 108,15 ff. Walz Θέες ἐστὶν ἐπάκεφις λογική θεωρούμενος τοῦ πράγματος. Τῶν δὲ θέεων οἱ μὲν εἰς πολλὰ πολλὰ πολλοὶ πολλοί πολλοὶ πολλοὶ νομοθετῶν ἐν γαμητῶν, ἐν πλευστῶν κτλ. (an example of θεωρητικά would be εἰ σφαιροειδῆς ὁ σφαιράς) ... διεννῆχον δὲ θέεις ὑποθέτους, τῷ τὴν μὲν ὑπόθεσιν ἔχον περίστασιν, τὴν δὲ θέεις ἐπέκειται εἶναι ... πρῶτον δὲ ή θέες ἐν προγόμμασιν, ἀντίθειαν καὶ λόγιον κατὰ ζήτημα δέχεται: διαμείνει τούτῳ ή θέες, πρῶτον μὲν τῇ καλομενή εἴρων, ἤν ἀντὶ προομοίου εἴρετο, εἰς χρῆσιν τοῖς τελικοῖς κεφαλαίοις, νομίμῳ, δικαίῳ, συμφέροντι, δυνάτῳ.

**MORE ON PUNS IN THE CLEOPATRA ODE**

In a recent note in this journal, H. Jacobson has suggested that Horace describes Cleopatra’s snakes as asperae (*carm.* 1.37.26) because they are *aspides*. Although Jacobson had been anticipated, the unobtrusiveness

of the pun, and the fact that Nisbet and Hubbard do not mention it in their commentary, made it well worth pointing out. Still, it seems to me that there is more to be said on this and related points.

First of all, Nisbet and Hubbard note that asperas includes "a clear suggestion that snakes are rough to the touch (which is not the case)". That is what all the popular writers on herpetology say, but the case is not quite so simple. Any creature with scales is at least a little bit rough: in fact, if snakes were absolutely smooth they would not be able to crawl. That snakes feel much smoother than they look does not quite prove that it is impermissible to describe them as rough. However, this is perhaps a mere quibble. What is more important is that no one seems to have inquired about the source of Horace's aspidological information. We may well wonder whether he had ever seen an asp, and it is unlikely, to say the least, that he had ever touched a living specimen: it also seems unHoratian to consult zoological treatises. Nisbet and Hubbard (ad loc.) quote only one ancient parallel for the idea that asps are rough: Nicander's ἀσπίδησσαν ἐπιρρυτεῖν φοιλίδεσσαν/ἀσπιδᾶ φοινήσσαν (Ther. 157-58). When we consider that Vergil was one of Horace’s closest friends and was writing the Georgics around the same time Horace wrote the Cleopatra Ode, that Nicander’s Theriaca were a major source for the Georgics, and that Vergil used this very passage of Nicander for his own description of the chersydrus, it seems very likely that Horace’s information about asps (whether true or false) came directly from Nicander, indeed from the very passage which Nisbet and Hubbard quote. Tedious and unpleasant as Nicander’s works undoubtedly are, Horace need not have read far into the roll to get to the asp, even if Vergil did not point him towards the right passage. Any herpetological errors in the Cleopatra Ode may therefore be blamed on Nicander rather than Horace.

Finally, one point in favor of believing that a pun on asperas is intended is the abundance of word-play in Horace and specifically in this poem: two other instances which Nisbet and Hubbard omit are Haemoniae (20), which is both 'Thessaly' and 'Bloodland', and priuata (31), which is both 'as a private citizen' and 'deprived (of her I would like to put forward two more puns or possible puns in the Cleopatra Ode, which I believe have not been noticed. On pede libero in the first line, Nisbet and Hubbard note that the adjective means "‘unfettered’, referring alike to the nimbleness of the dance and to Rome’s freedom from Cleopatra’s chains’. But with an invitation to drink in the preceding clause (Nunc est bibendum), it seems at least possible that Horace expects his readers to think of the god Liber as well and perhaps also of his other name Lyaeus. This possibility becomes, I think, a probability when we consider deliberata morte ferocior in the last stanza (29). As Nisbet and Hubbard note, deliberare "‘means more than decernere; it suggests that the decision has been taken after weighing the pros and cons’": in fact, as they imply by their wording (‘‘weighing’’), it is etymologically related to libra rather than liber. In this