

### An Inadvertent Conjecture: Horace, C. 3.1.5

After an introductory stanza, the Roman Odes proper, and Book III of the Odes, begin with a grand generalization about gods and men:<sup>1</sup>

regum timendorum in proprios greges,           5  
reges in ipsos imperium est Iovis,  
clari Giganteo triumpho,  
cuncta supercilio moventis.

The second word seems a bit negative for the context. Both Jupiter and human kings – not to mention Augustus, introduced by name in 3.3.11-12 – should inspire a mixture of awe, respect, admiration, and yes fear, not only the last: *timendorum* is more appropriate to a Phalaris or a Dionysius of Syracuse (alluded to in 17-18), to Saturn rather than to Jupiter.<sup>2</sup>

I find from the Oslo Horace repertory<sup>3</sup> that Peerlkamp conjectured *verendorum*, but I had already devised a better solution before I knew that: *tremendorum*.<sup>4</sup> Unfortunately, Binging *regum tremendorum* returned two ‘hits’ and revealed that I had been anticipated by L. P. Wilkinson, or perhaps by that fabulous beast, *typotheta ignotus*. In his review of Gordon Williams’ little green commentary on Odes III,<sup>5</sup> Wilkinson twice quotes the line with *tremendorum*, but shows no sign that he realizes that it is not the transmitted text. Which raises an interesting question: how should an *apparatus criticus* report that a conjecture is both inadvertent and (in the editor’s opinion) correct?

**Post scriptum:** When I first drafted this note a few years ago, Bing gave only two hits for ‘regum tremendorum’, both from Wilkinson’s review of Williams. Now I get four,

<sup>1</sup> These lines contain no variants pertinent to my argument.

<sup>2</sup> R. G. M. Nisbet and Niall Rudd (*A Commentary on Horace, ‘Odes’, Book III*, Oxford, 2004) wish to restrict the meaning of *regum* to “Eastern rulers who, because of their total and arbitrary power, are dreaded by their own subjects” and add that Horace “would not have regarded Augustus as either a *rex* or as *timendus* in the sense required here”, contra D. P. Fowler, “Horace and the Aesthetics of Politics”, in S. J. Harrison (ed.), *Homage to Horace: A Bimillenary Celebration* (Oxford, 1995), 248-66, at 263-64, with further references, who wants to include Augustus among the ‘kings’. My conjecture (if it is mine – see below) makes the latter a bit easier and removes one of Nisbet and Rudd’s objections (*timendus*).

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.tekstlab.uio.no/horace/repertories/search>.

<sup>4</sup> Better as closer to the paradosis, and including fear and awe as well as admiration.

<sup>5</sup> G. Williams, *Horace’s Odes Book III* (Oxford, 1969); Wilkinson’s review: *CR* 20.2 (1970) 189-93

including quotations of Horace by Thomas Moore, Montesquieu, and a NeoLatin author I have been unable to identify since I entered the site ‘by the back door’, as it were. It will take further research in libraries to check these out and see whether they are scanning artifacts or misquotations by Moore, Montesquieu, and whomever. While interesting, that will not much affect the main thrust of my argument.