

# Human saliva harming snakes

Post by “Bryan” of January 17, 2024 at 5:07 PM

The starting text "est itaque ut" is uncertain, another possible rendering of the text is:

“**Excetra** ut serpens, hominis quae tacta salivis

disperit ac sese mandendo conficit ipsa.” (DRN 4.638)

**excetra** = viper (it could be from ἔχιδναῖ, traditionally held as a poisonous snake, viper, but perhaps also a constrictor) (Wiktionary)

So instead of the usual "there is a certain snake" we could have "there is the Excetra Snake" or "there is the Echidna Viper"

This idea is from Bailey's commentary, page 1258, where he says "most likely the corruption conceals the name of some snake"