University of Massachusetts Boston
ScholarWorks at UMass Boston

Classics Faculty Publication Series | Classics

9-1-2008

Playing for His Side: Kipling's 'Regulus,' Corporal Punishment, and Classical Education

Emily A. McDermott
University of Massachusetts Boston, emily.mcdermott@umb.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.umb.edu/classics_faculty_pubs

Part of the Classics Commons, Education Commons, and the Literature in English, British Isles Commons

Recommended Citation
Emily A. McDermott. "Playing for His Side: Kipling's 'Regulus,' Corporal Punishment, and Classical Education" International Journal of the Classical Tradition 15.3 (2008): 369-392. http://scholarworks.umb.edu/classics_faculty_pubs/7/

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Classics at ScholarWorks at UMass Boston. It has been accepted for inclusion in Classics Faculty Publication Series by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at UMass Boston. For more information, please contact library.uasc@umb.edu.

Playing for His Side:
Kipling's "Regulus," Corporal Punishment, and Classical Education

Rudyard Kipling's short story, "Regulus" (composed in 1908 but first published in 1917), revolves around the flogging – cause, effect, and side-effect – of a student who has let loose a mouse in the mechanical drawing classroom of a late 19th-century British secondary school.[i] The action of the story is divided into two loosely-jointed sections: the first devoted drolly to a fifth-form Latin class's line-by-line explication of Horace's fifth Roman ode (*Odes* 3.5), in which the story's title character is presented as a paradigm of manly virtue; the remainder given over to narration of the mouse-miscreant's progress toward punishment, in thematic counterpoint to the Regulus *exemplum*. Within that idiosyncratic framework, the story tackles as ambitious a topic as the purposes of education, with particular attention to the curricular battle being fought at the time between the "ancient" and "modern sides" and to the kind of character-building that was a primary curricular and extra-curricular goal of colonial Britain's educational system.

The deliciously detailed scene in which Mr. King's adolescent class wends its way through *Odes* 3.5 could be called parodic, except that – to anyone who has participated in a Latin class, as either student or teacher – it is so wickedly true to life. The first to translate is the trickster Beetle, stand-in throughout *Stalky & Co.*, Kipling's collection of boys' school stories, for the author himself as adolescent. An undistinguished Latinist made temporarily confident by "possession of a guaranteed construe, left behind by M'Turk, who had that day gone into the sick-house with a cold" (242), the wily Beetle first feigns hesitancy and a "'Thank-God-I-have-done-my-duty' air of Nelson in the cockpit" (242), then (in a clever application of student-on-teacher negative psychology) volunteers eagerly to continue, despite "well knowing that a reef of

uncharted genitives stretched ahead of him on which in spite of M'Turk's sailing-directions he would infallibly have been wrecked" (244).

Beetle's tenuous show of competence is followed by a rendition from "Pater" Winton, "in aspect like an earnest, elderly horse" (244) – "and a boy is not called 'Pater' by his companions for his frivolity" (245). Thus, the author cleverly introduces the sober-sided protagonist of the story, who will unaccountably disrupt his subsequent class with "the only known jest of his young life" (253). As an early thematic indicator, Kipling further encodes a metatextual nod to the parallelism he will draw throughout the second part of the story between Winton and the title character: "Regulus himself is speaking now. Who shall represent the provident-minded Regulus? Winton, will you kindly oblige?" (244);[ii] he will re-emphasize the identity a little later by committing the pedagogical *faux pas* of calling on Winton a second time, after giving only one other student a turn in the interim. Winton's translation falters only twice. First, to the glee of his peers, he conjures "signs affixed to Punic deluges" (245) – *delubra* ["temples"] having been the only word he did not look up for himself, but asked Beetle for. A bit later, he treads on King's sensibilities by rendering *scilicet* as "forsooth" (an English locution, in that worthy's opinion, fit only for a "leader-writer for the penny press" [246]).

The lesson climaxes as the hapless Paddy Vernon dishes up this *pièce de résistance* of mindless mistranslation:

> "He (Regulus) is related to have removed from himself the
> kiss of the shameful wife and of his small children as less
> by the head, and, being stern, to have placed his virile
> visage on the ground."

> Since King loved "virile" about as much as he did "spouse" or "forsooth" the Form looked up hopefully. But Jove thundered not.
>
> "Until," Vernon continued, "he should have confirmed the sliding fathers as being the author of counsel never given under an alias."
>
> He stopped, conscious of stillness round him like the dread calm of the typhoon's centre. (248)

Poor Paddy has indeed unleashed a storm, as the Latin master moves from a tone "sweeter than honey" (248) to a full-scale dressing-down for mutilation of the Latin language's "few pitiful rules of grammar, of syntax, nay, even of declension, which were not created for your incult sport – your Boeotian diversion" (249).

Although King's classroom style of ritualized sarcasm would surely be decried today, it was standard in the story's own timeframe and all-male scholastic environment.[iii] If King calls Beetle an "idiot" (251), alluding to the "turbid chaos" (246) of his "so-called mind" (244), and informs Paddy that his transformation of the adjective *probrosis* ["shameful"] into a verb "stamps [him] as lower than the beasts of the field" (249) – well, there is no sign – in *this* story, at least – that his students take his sarcasm to heart.[iv] As a whole, in fact, they relish his outbursts, as relieving the monotony of translation. And King, in his urgency to communicate the nobility and pathos of the Regulus story and to point the lessons that this *exemplum* should teach his young charges, can hardly be accused (as so many Latin teachers justly have) of forgetting to comment on the poem being translated as literature.[v]

In Horace's Roman ode, the eponym for Kipling's story is presented as a paradigm of the old Roman virtue of valuing fatherland over self. An indignant query by the poet how a soldier from Crassus's army, captured in the ignominious battle of 53 B.C., can live peaceably with a Parthian wife, "*anciliorum et nominis et togae / oblitus aeternaeque Vestae*" ["unmindful of the sacred shields, of his name, of the toga, of eternal Vesta"] (*Odes* 3.5.10-11), leads into a flashback to the wiser (and sterner) counsel of Regulus, after he was captured with his men during the First Punic War. The imprisoned general had been sent to Rome by his captors, under instructions to persuade the Roman senate to seek an exchange of prisoners. Instead, he fervently pled the exact opposite case: that a soldier who has been captured rather than dying in battle should never be ransomed, because such a man can no more recoup his courage than dyed wool can reclaim its original color (*Odes* 3.5.26-30); he is no likelier to fight bravely than a doe is to do battle once "*extricata densis / … plagis*" ["freed from the tight-woven nets"] (*Odes* 3.5.31-32). Thus, the stoic general resigns himself to death at the hands of a "*barbarus tortor*" ["barbarian torturer"] (*Odes* 3.5.49-50) rather than comply in appeasement of Rome's enemy. The magnanimity of his actions is summed up by a deeply affected King:

> He was a man, self-doomed to death by torture. *Atqui sciebat* – knowing it – having achieved it for his country's sake – can't you feel that *atqui* cut like a knife? – he moved off with some dignity. (251)

If, as King has informed Paddy, his minimum pedagogical goal is simply to communicate to a resistant audience the rules of Latin syntax, he nonetheless refuses in practice to give up his impulse to communicate to his charges an "idea of the passion, the power, the –

the essential guts of the lines which you have so foully outraged in our presence" (248), edifying them through the *exempla* of the noble past.

After the bell rings, the fifth-formers move on to drawing class and the perpetration of the mouse prank. Winton lets loose the mouse; the seemingly fair-minded headmaster oddly takes Winton's hitherto unblemished record not as a mitigating factor but as further impulse to punish him – apparently lest he escape the school without ever having earned physical chastisement – and deliberately rigs the system so this first offender will be flogged for a non-flogging offense (254-255); the various masters express regret at the mildness of Winton's offense ("It should have been a rat" [254; repeated, 271]). While awaiting his punishment, the normally peaceable Winton "[goes] Berserk" (266) and beats five of his friends "to pulp" (261) for coming to "condole" with him on his "misfortune and its consequences" (259); finally, the school chaplain's unsettling summary judgment on the regretful prankster is that his remorse and scruples – in short, "all his conscience" (271) – will debar him from the ranks of the "first-class" public school graduate: he will, the equable Rev. John opines flatly, "never be anything more than a Colonel of Engineers" (271).

Through this quirky series of events, the story's cultural and educational givens unfold: that secondary education is as much *rite de passage* as academic training, that learning to endure pain is an essential element of male character-building, that to take on a role as one of society's governors one must have been tested by physical punishment and the associated mental and emotional stresses. If the conscientious Winton were allowed to complete his school career without having experienced these physical ordeals and learned to modulate his own emotional responses to them, then, how could his masters hope that he would be ready for the hard knocks of military service? A corollary

assumption is that the best boys – the ones with true leadership potential (Winton's "betters" [253]) – are those whose school career has served to tame and channel innate spunk, courage, and strong will, rather than those who achieve and behave out of a combination of conscientiousness and timidity. While King, the Latin master, seems to long for a simple academic meritocracy, expressing distaste for both the "Army *viva voce* examinations – ugh!" he is preparing his students for (241) and the "low type of [education] that examiners expect" (263), it is clear that this educational system is both more and less than that.

Although Kipling's story did not generate a great deal of commentary in the first eighty years after its publication, since the 1990's three critical works have analyzed its "depiction of the uses of classical education in an imperial age."[vi] Plotz (1993), Gaisser (1994), and Montefiore (2000) all work from scholars' recognition that the late 19th-century British curriculum, through its combination of a classical literary education and an obsessive team sports ethic, was geared to turning out army officers and colonial governors imbued with the classic British "stiff upper lip" – what Plotz styles "the legionnaires of New Rome."[vii] As Correlli Barnett has put it, pithily: "Except for young Nazis or Communists no class of leaders in modern times has been so subjected to prolonged moulding of character, personality and outlook as British public-school boys in [the era between 1870 and 1900]."[viii] In the classroom, personal *exempla* like that of Regulus (a paradigm of fortitude, honor, and self-sacrifice) were set before the boys as vehicles of moral edification, and the implicit lessons of Horatian or Virgilian sentiments like "*dulce et decorum est pro patria mori*" ["it is both fitting and sweet to die for your country"] (*Odes* 3.2.13) or "*tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento / (hae tibi erunt artes*)" ["you, Roman, remember: it is your role to command other nations; these

will be your arts…"] (*Aeneid* 6.851-852) were drummed into them.[ix] This academic regimen was complemented by compulsory team sports, which taught "courage, *esprit de corps*, obedience to orders and general 'manliness.'"[x]

Organized sports had originally been added to the curriculum, beginning in 1850, to combat student disorderliness born of excess free time and lack of supervision.[xi] Abetted by Charles Kingsley's influential "muscular Christianity" movement, they were rapidly subsumed into an ethic of "patriotic romanticism" that "fused" with Thomas Arnold's religious/moral view of the role of public school education.[xii] The famous lines written in 1897 by Sir Henry Newbolt about the British in Africa reflect this fusion in its mature state, "[linking], with the most naïve but seductive logic, English playing-field with colonial battlefield":[xiii]

> The river of death has brimmed his banks,
>
> And England's far, and Honour a name,
>
> But the voice of a schoolboy rallies the ranks:
>
> "Play up! play up! and play the game!"[xiv]

Mr. King echoes Newbolt in his approving capsulization of the Regulus *exemplum* – "Regulus was not thinking about his own life. He was telling Rome the truth. He was playing for his side" (247). The metaphor common to both passages succinctly emblematizes the influential role played by compulsory team sports in shaping the thought patterns and behavior of the future practitioners of Britain's imperialist destiny.[xv]

The particular politics characteristically associated with such an education are also made explicit. Throughout the story, reference to the raging curricular battle of the time is so insistent that the reader is left in no doubt that this is what the story is *about*. On one side of this battle were the proponents of a traditional classical education; on the other,

modernizers who advocated training in science, non-classical history, language and literature, and applied mathematics. In the dichotomy, the classics are associated with development of a well-trained mind and moral character through grammatical and humanist study of literary masterpieces. As King sums it up: "Balance, proportion, perspective – life" (264). They are also associated with elitism, political conservatism, and the privileging of landed aristocracy over commercialism. The connection, boiled down to its essence, is that only the aristocracy has both the money and the leisure to indulge their sons with seven years of Latin philological training; the middle classes and the poor need a quicker and more utilitarian solution. The 1868 report of the Taunton Schools Inquiry Commission reflects this assumption in advocating three types of school, generally corresponding to "the gradations of society": a pure classical education at the top, lasting to the age of 18 or 19; a hybrid mix of Latin and more practical subjects, up to a leaving age of 16 for those who would enter careers in the army, medicine, and engineering; and general education (not technical or vocational) to age 14 for the lowest group.[xvi]

At the other pole, the "newly established Modern Side" (249) affiliates itself with democratization, industrialization, and the rising mercantile, newly-moneyed class; this curricular shift was both deprecated and resisted by the gentry, from a conviction that scientific knowledge was "taking prestige away from the upper classes and placing it in the hands of the new middle- and professional-class lords of science, business, and technology."[xvii]

Curricularly, one can locate the United Services College, Kipling's North Devon *alma mater* and the explicit model for the school in *Stalky & Co.*, somewhere in the middle between these two poles. Founded in 1874 by a company of army officers, it

precisely fit model B as described by the Taunton Commission: it took both its Latin and its science seriously. It was, in Kipling's own description, "a caste school" for those wishing to prepare for army service – or, more colorfully, in the words of one of his characters, a "limited liability company payin' four per cent."[xviii] Despite its clear distinction, both in clientele and in curricular philosophy, from the exclusive public schools chartered as charity schools and regulated by the Public Schools Act of 1868, it was still constrained to turn out competent Latinists by its mission to prepare students for the Army exams instituted in 1871, which "gave thousands of marks for Latin" (241).[xix]

The two curricular "sides," then, are fairly embodied in Kipling's story by King (the Balliol classics man who resists utilitarianism in all its forms and ever aims at inflaming a love of literature *per se* in his students) and his counterpart, the "bantam" science master, Hartopp (259).[xx] The reader's first inkling of the Latinist's elitist political leanings comes from his sneering description of oh-so-mercantile Carthage as "a sort of God-forsaken nigger Manchester" (247) – a slur that even in an outspokenly racist era seems to have occasioned an advance attempt on King's part to bar it from the record ("your examiners won't ask you this so you needn't take notes" [247]). Later, when two successive breaks of bottles of chlorine gas in Hartopp's classroom force the Latin master first to open windows in his classroom (249), then to "[bury] his nose in his handkerchief" (251), this indignity "uncork[s]" (253) a diatribe that specifically links his conservative politics with the value to be gained from a classical education:

> Then King, with a few brisk remarks about Science, headed
> them back to Regulus, of whom and of Horace and Rome
> and evil-minded commercial Carthage and of the
> democracy eternally futile, he explained, in all ages and

> climes, he spoke for ten minutes; passing thence to the next Ode – *Delicta majorum* – where he fetched up, full-voiced, upon *'Dis te minorem quod geris imperas'* (Thou rulest because thou bearest thyself as lower than the Gods) – making it a text for a discourse on manners, morals, and respect for authority as distinct from bottled gases, which lasted till the bell rang. (252)

King's case for a literary education is its utility as shaper of *manners* and *morals* and as inculcator of *respect for authority* – all common catchwords of an aristocratic mindset and imperial politics. By contrast, the crass commercialism attributed to Carthage and the hanging reference to "futile" democratization (which, of course, cannot be referred to Carthage but seems rather to have issued from a stream-of-consciousness pairing more pertinent to the Manchester of King's own time) evoke the ethos of contemporary curricular reformers who espouse practical knowledge as a tool of societal progress and upward social mobility.

After the invasions of his classroom by chemical stink, King invites Hartopp, the science master, "to tea and a talk on chlorine-gas" (259) that turns into a running debate between the two. King goes on the offensive first, demanding of Hartopp, "do you pretend that your modern system of inculcating unrelated facts about chlorine, for instance, all of which may be proved fallacies by the time the boys grow up, can have any real bearing on education…?" (263). Hartopp shoots back: "I maintain nothing. But is it any worse than your Chinese reiteration of uncomprehended syllables in a dead tongue?" (263). He further adduces an argument common among those espousing the modern side, that the time spent on the arduous study of the classical languages could readily be put to

more productive use:

> And at the end of seven years – how often have I said it? … seven years of two hundred and twenty days of six hours each, your victims go away with nothing, absolutely nothing, except, perhaps, if they've been very attentive, a dozen – no, I'll grant you twenty – one score of totally unrelated Latin tags which any child of twelve could have absorbed in two terms." (264)

The entire debate is recapped and condensed in a two-line exchange in the story's coda: "'Character – proportion – background,' snarled King. 'That is the essence of the Humanities.' 'Analects of Confucius,' little Hartopp answered" (271).

Beyond Latin philology and cricket or ruggers, a third integral element of the public school system was institutionalized corporal punishment. This was a vital, if less touted, leg of the Victorian educational tripod, viewed not just as a necessary though regrettable tool for control and discipline, but also as a beneficial and vital part of a boy's *rite de passage*: "the point was that beating was a good thing in itself, because it taught the boy to take it."[xxi] The flogging motif in "Regulus" is, then, a third thread braiding the story's disparate pieces together. It seals the Regulus/Winton identification (both will face their impending dooms with fortitude, honor, and gestures of voluntary self-sacrifice), thus tying together the opening segment of the story given over to translation of the Regulus ode and the somewhat longer segment devoted to Winton's progress toward flogging. This identification, in turn, interweaves the two elements of the story's second segment, presenting Regulus/Winton as *praxis* to the educational theory espoused by King in his recurrent curricular debate with Hartopp. Underplayed

by Gaisser and Montefiore, and to some extent misinterpreted by Plotz, the flogging motif is nonetheless critical to understanding Kipling's story.

Over the course of centuries, there has been a sea change in western attitudes toward corporal punishment (in the family, in schools, in the armed forces, in the penal system at large). Beginning in the first half of the 19th century, these attitudinal shifts, grown from seeds planted largely in the Enlightenment, drove numerous reform campaigns seeking to distance "civilized" modern society from the "relics of barbarity" exemplified by various forms of corporal punishment.[xxii] Nonetheless, revolution in actual educational practice came slowly and sporadically. Though by 1908, when Kipling first penned "Regulus," corporal punishment had been legally banned from schools in Iceland (since its founding), Poland (1783), Netherlands (1820), Luxembourg (1845), Italy (1860), Belgium (1867), Austria (1870), France (long-term practice ratified legally by an 1887 Act), Finland (1890) and Japan (1900), resistance to reform had prevailed in the United Kingdom and forty-five of the forty-six United States (excepting only New Jersey).[xxiii]

In England, despite outcry against the brutality and counter-productivity of corporal punishment in schools that dated back at least as far as the 17th century, and despite a lurking awareness among both psychologists and the public that birching on the buttocks was heavily implicated in the genesis of *le vice anglais* (the propensity, à la Swinburne, to sexual flagellation), resistance to legislative reform prevailed right into the 1980's.[xxiv] This inertia was unsurprising in a country where common parlance for a teacher was "bum-bruiser," where Dr. Johnson declared, "My master whipt me well; without that, sir, I should have done nothing," and where school fees at Eton contained a half-guinea annual charge to parents for birch.[xxv] Reform groups tended to attribute reluctance to

abandon the cane in schools to teachers' incompetence or, worse, sadism; Calvinist religious beliefs also predisposed some to trust in physical discipline as moral tool.[xxvi] All of these were certainly causative factors. A more pervasive brake on reform, however, lay in a deep, largely subconscious, sense on the part of teachers, parents, alumni, and even students themselves that corporal chastisement was an integral component of the educational *rite de passage*, creating "an almost mystical bond that ties boys to one another, to their masters, and to the school."[xxvii]

Through the threat and act of flogging, the master establishes his authority and acculturates boys to the rules of their new society, letting them know precisely how far they may go, and how far they may not, in asserting individuality within an authoritarian system. Flogging is the ultimate emblem of the masters' dominance and the boys' submissiveness in an "authoritarian hierarchy."[xxviii] Anthropologist Desmond Morris, after describing instinctual defensive rump-presentation by apes, makes an analogy to schoolboy whippings: "It is doubtful whether schoolmasters would persist in this practice if they fully appreciated the fact that, in reality, they were performing an ancient primate form of ritual copulation with their pupils. They could just as well inflict pain on their victims without forcing them to adopt the bent-over submissive female posture."[xxix] Though surely he is correct that many floggers would be abashed by the comparison, the tenacity of the custom lay precisely in this analogy – for the point of beating is as much to hierarchize as to inflict pain. So Chandos notes:

> Much of the function of flogging was in the nature of a public ritual of humbling submission, exacted from offenders who had treated authority with disrespect, defiance or contempt, or merely looked as if they were

> about to do so; and, indeed, the posture assumed on the block was not unlike the posture of a simian society before dominant senior members, male or female.[xxx]

Somewhat paradoxically, *being* caned provided boys, in converse, with an opportunity to assert high position for themselves within the internally hierarchized set of the boys themselves, as a result of both their selection for punishment and their manliness in facing it. Boys in English public schools "were engaged in an irregular but continuous warfare against adult government"; this warfare was "part of an approved way of life, an educational exercise and a display of the spirit of independence prescriptive by honour for all aspirants to the respect of their peers."[xxxi] By this token, to have merited caning could be a badge of honor in and of itself, for it positioned the boy as daring to stand up to adult authority and (as long as his crime was not disgraceful) as demonstrating his worthiness to take on the mantle of adulthood. "Pushing" masters, indeed, became a game that boys could win:

> For pushing functions not only to ascertain masters' varying tolerance levels, but to discover, affirm, and reaffirm in the eyes of one's peers one's claim to manliness. This is accomplished either by bettering one's superiors in a test of wills, or by taking one's caning "like a man" in the event one oversteps the bounds of discretion. On either outcome, the boy is the winner. He has established his claim to manhood no matter what the result.[xxxii]

Certainly this is the major thrust of the portrayal of the high jinks of the doughty title

hero in Hughes's wildly popular *Tom Brown's School-Days* (1857), as well as of Kipling's Stalky & Co., who spend their time outwitting and visiting finely-conceived vengeances upon masters they have indicted for sins against their communal sense of justice and propriety.

Anthropologically, the institution of corporal punishment is intrinsically tied to western secondary education's service as the liminal stage of an extended male puberty rite: just as boys in primitive tribes undergo separation from their previous place in society and are subjected to trial by ordeal, often accompanied by infliction of physical chastisement, so boys from the Renaissance forward – Ong suggests – were taken from the company of their mothers and sisters, placed in a sex-segregated environment and flogged to make sure they mastered Latin (an academic ordeal), learned the lessons of societal hierarchization, and proved their mettle before they might attain full admission to adult society.[xxxiii] De S. Honey explicitly applies Ong's analogy to "not just the curriculum and teaching methods but indeed the whole process of education in the Victorian public school."[xxxiv] Passage of the public school ordeal in particular leads to what Chandos, recalling Mercurio's words above, dubs a "tribal mystic" – uniquely British and uniquely applicable to the "caste" of future governors, born of triumph over misery.[xxxv]

The privilege of this mystic is reserved to boys of the upper and upper-middle social classes, whose parents willingly and wittingly submit them to these physical ordeals, from what Matthew Arnold called "a wholesome sense of what their sons do really most want, …not by any means anxious that school should over-foster them."[xxxvi] By contrast, he notes disparagingly, the lower-middle classes "wish [their children] to be comfortable at school"; he takes this desire as evidence of their class-based failing of raising children "so indulged, so generally brought up…without discipline, that is,

without habits of respect, exact obedience, and self-control….”[xxxvii] This class distinction explains the odd, between-strokes animadversion of Kipling’s Head, as he canes Stalky & Co. at the end of “The Impressionists”: “Among the – lower classes this would lay me open to a charge of – assault. You should be more grateful for your – privileges than you are.”[xxxviii]

Nor was punishment necessarily expected to be fair. Although this element of the mystic initially seems counterintuitive, it makes perfect sense, given that flogging functioned as a tool of domination and hierarchization, rather than simply as moral corrective: its function was to meet “the demand, the authoritarian demand, that the child should learn to submit to force – and the system which it presents”[xxxix] The injustice of school discipline is a recurrent theme of Kipling’s. Its general fickleness is fairly summed up in an earlier story when Stalky admonishes Beetle: “My Hat! You’ve been here six years, and you expect fairness. Well, you *are* a dithering idiot.”[xl] Similarly, the Head continues the mid-whip *obiter dicta* quoted above by concluding: “There’s a certain flagrant injustice about this that ought to appeal to – your temperament.”[xli] As Tompkins notes, Kipling (like others of his era) condoned “a sufficiently heavy discipline that makes no pretence to be perfect justice,” as contributing to “the best preparation for a resourceful, well-adjusted maturity, since it is not false to the general conditions of life.”[xlii]

If, then, entering the world of men means readiness to undergo the physical and emotional stresses of military or imperial service and war, a spartan school regimen – accompanied by an authoritarian and sometimes capriciously-applied punishment system – is a fittingly-designed preparatory experience for boys. The promise of the English public schools at the time of Kipling’s story was, in sum: “Send us your boys, and we

will turn them out as men, fully capable members of the British 'tribe.' Mentally disciplined through philological study, steeped in *exempla* of fortitude and honor by classical literature and in team cohesion by competitive sports, physically and mentally hardened to harsh reality by systematic corporal discipline, they will issue forth from their schools ready both to fight the wars and battles that will preserve the British Empire and to take on roles as governors of the imperial system."

The flogging motif in "Regulus" must be read in this context. Even the choice of Winton's surname signals the importance of the motif. Since this particular schoolboy has appeared in none of the earlier Stalky stories, the author has free rein to christen him here. It is surely significant, then, that this neo-Regulus shares his name with an infamous instrument of schoolboy torture, the apple-wood "Winton rod" endemic to Winchester College (more officially, "*Collegium Sanctae Mariae prope* Wintoniam" or "*Collegium Beatae Mariae* Wintoniensis *prope* Winton").[xliii]

The anticipated flogging is the central fact of the story – the climax to which all other narrative elements build. The author makes this centrality perfectly clear, right from the beginning of the story's second section, through meticulous detailing of the Head's machinations to bring it about. The appropriate punishment for Winton's particular lapse from virtue ("venial in the Upper Third, pardonable at a price in the Lower Fourth, …rank ruffianism on the part of a Fifth Form boy" [254]) was the imposition that the Head sets upon him of writing out five hundred lines of Latin. The Head goes further, however: by setting a teatime deadline for completion of the imposition, he assures that the boy is put in the double bind of having to miss afternoon sports and so commit a flogging offense:

> Yet it was law to the school, compared to which that of the

> Medes and Persians was no more than a non-committal resolution, that any boy, outside the First Fifteen, who missed his football, for any reason whatever, and had not a written excuse…, would receive not less than three strokes with a ground-ash from the Captain of the Games…King knew without inquiry that the Head had given Winton no such excuse. (255)[xliv]

Accentuating the ethical shadiness of the Head's ploy is the fact that Winton at that moment has already won the First Cap that would exempt him from this punishment; it has even arrived at the school, though it has yet to be conferred on him formally. As Medcalf summarizes the situation: Winton "has had his caning contrived for him – his first caning in seven years at the school – on the eve of his becoming immune from discipline as a member of the First Fifteen."[xlv] The academic meritocrat King looks at this situation and huffs that "the Head is oppressing him damnably" (265). Yet it is also undeniable that, not only here, but generally throughout the Stalky corpus, Kipling assigns the Head a kind of Jovian status: although his individual actions may seem capricious or unfair, they are always, the author implies, part of a greater design to lead his boys to productive manhood.[xlvi] Why, then, does Jove here assert that Winton's lapse from grace has come "very happily" (254) and with cool deliberation engineer his over-punishment in response to it?

The answer lies in his era's belief in the educational value of corporal discipline in and of itself. The Head quite evidently does not conceive of Winton's flogging primarily as a moral corrective. His imposition of five hundred Latin lines would surely have been enough to correct this late-blooming miscreant, who is consumed with remorse

immediately after his infraction ("he arrived at the Head's study just before lunch, penitent, perturbed, annoyed with himself and – as the Head said to King in the corridor after the meal – more human than he had known him in seven years" [254]). But the point of the Head's choice of punishment is not simply to *correct*; it is also designed to assure that, through subjection to corporal discipline, Winton will receive the full benefit of his *rite de passage.*

The Head's ethic here may be contrasted instructively with Thomas Arnold's "beau-idéal of school discipline."[xlvii] Arnold, who viewed corporal punishment strictly as a moral tool, advocated its use against "the naturally inferior state of boyhood," but allowed that it should be dispensed with as the boy grew into mature conscience: "as we saw them trying to anticipate their age morally, so we should delight to anticipate it also in our treatment of them personally."[xlviii] Arnold would not have rushed to over-punish Winton for a first, overly mild offense (*It should have been a rat*). Nor would he, with Reverend John, have deprecated Winton for his remorse and conscientiousness (271). He would, with King, have applauded the boy's characteristic scruples and quick mastery of the lessons of his single childish outburst, as demonstrating that he indeed *anticipated his age morally*. By 1880, however – the precise time when Kipling was at United Services College, and when the cult of manliness and patriotism had reached its full expression – Arnold's views on moral correction had been superseded, or at least complicated, by the notion of "licking them into shape."

As a fifth-former, Winton is approaching the end of his public school career. How does he fare as a potentially successful product thereof? Academically, he has been successful; he is not only a commendable Latin grammarian, but his refusal to beg off punishment makes clear that he has internalized lessons of honor set before him by

classical *exempla*. He is more than a creditable athlete: while most of his peers remain on the Second Fifteen (259), he has played for the First Fifteen all term and is but awaiting the arrival of his First Cap to make his accomplishment official (255). Where he falls down is on the third leg of the system – the one that demands that he learn to face pain and personal abasement with equanimity. The *reason* he has failed in this area is that he has proven himself deficient in the native boyish spunk (*à la* Tom Brown, or Beetle, Stalky, and M'Turk) that sets the punitive cycle in motion. The "costive and unaccommodating virtue" (254) that has prevented Winton from any sort of offense before the age of fifteen is thus properly (in the world of this story) identified by the Head as an obstruction to real growth in the boy's character. When Mr. King pleads on his behalf that this is his first offense, the Head replies drily, "Could you have damned him more completely…?" (254). Winton's good behavior has been, he implies (seconded by the boys themselves), born of timidity and fear that any misdeeds will "count against" him (253; cf. 268, 269, 270), rather than from the appropriate balance between youthful high spirits and obedience to authority that will develop into true military effectiveness. As a result, his emotional mettle has never been tested by physical pain or, even more importantly, nerve-racking anticipation of physical pain.

Probably the most extreme reaction to anticipation of beating is the infamous suicide of twelve-year-old William Gibbs, who hung himself overnight while awaiting execution of his sentence for twice running away from school to escape beatings.[xlix] But autobiographical recollections of public school days are rife with testimonies to the terror students felt in the daily anticipation of physical chastisement -- in A.A. Milne's description, "not the actual pain, but the perpetual fear of it."[l] As for the sufferings of convicted malfeasors in the interval between condemnation and the carrying out of their

punishment, it was a truism among reformers that a long interval "detracts considerably from the value of the punishment as a disciplinary and deterring measure, and at the same time increases considerably its possibilities of inflicting psychological harm."[li] Just so, Kipling in this story nods explicitly to the notion that delayed punishment increases psychological stress, in his approving comment on the Captain of Games: "Mullins, who was old enough to pity, did not believe in letting boys wait through the night till the chill of the next morning for their punishments" (266). Kipling's regularly-caned Stalky & Co. may be cavalier in the face of physical chastisement, but their group hallmark throughout the Stalky corpus is their inveterate "pushing" of the lesser masters; as a result, their punishments are self-induced as testimonials to their lofty position in the hierarchy of their school fellows. In this story, however, it is immediately clear from Winton's "set face and uneasy foot" as he "[hangs] about the corridor" (255) that, as a neophyte to both crime and punishment, he is feeling considerable strain.

Winton's anxiety in anticipation of both the physical pain of flogging and the humiliation and abasement of being subjected to it is what drives him to turn on his friends. After Paddy Vernon accidentally jostles his desk, Winton curses him but is readily forgiven, as "no one is expected to be polite while under punishment" (259). But then, when Paddy continues to scrape his nerves by lamenting the injustice of his sentence, Winton totally unreasoningly "[flings] himself neighing" (261) against the well-wisher and all but throws him from a window. When the others come to Paddy's aid, Winton – up till now known as one who "can't fight one little bit" (269) – tangles with them "crazily in an awful hissing silence" (261), leaving Stalky with a skinned nose, Beetle knocked breathless against the wall, Perowne with a cut forehead and Malpass with "an eye that explained itself like a dying rainbow through a whole week" (261). This

violence seems natural to his teachers ("'Ve-ry human,' said little Hartopp. 'Your virtuous Winton, having got himself into trouble, takes it out of my poor old Paddy'" [263]), but to Winton himself is incomprehensible and disturbing.

Beetle, whose only worldly wisdom issues from books, takes a stab at an explanation: "You went Berserk. I've read all about it in *Hypatia*" (266); the reference is to a popular novel of 1853 by Charles Kingsley (the same Kingsley of muscular Christianity). Beetle continues, "You've gone Berserk and pretty soon you'll go to sleep" (266) – and, sure enough, as soon as his flogging is over, Winton falls into a trancelike repose (289), to wake up to find his First Cap arrived and himself promoted, through King's efforts, to a sub-prefect's position (270). A symbolic initiation has clearly taken place, culminating significantly in Winton's emergence as a "quasi-lictor" (270) – in other words, in his advancement from the ranks of those properly beaten to one whose role is to beat.

Plotz posits an opposition between Winton, whom she sees as an unthinking instrument of Roman or British *pietas* ("Winton so much accepts the Regulus code that his rage is directed not against the punishers but against those who would question the code that punishes"), and Paddy, to whom she ascribes a feminine/barbarian (as opposed to masculine/Roman) affinity for "the life of affections."[lii] This opposition seems overdrawn on Paddy's side, and on Winton's it obscures the real point of his initiation: his innocence to date of corporal punishment has, in fact, *kept* him from properly embodying imperial values; it is only after his berserkery and eventual punishment that he can lay claim to all three thirds of the ideally educated public school boy.

To return for a moment to the reference to Kingsley's *Hypatia*: Surprisingly, neither the word "berserk" (which Beetle seems to tender as having been learned from

Kingsley) nor any of its cognates appears in the cited novel. There is, however, a telling scene in which Kingsley's young protagonist Philammon, a monk who has left the monastic life to learn of real life in the turmoil of 5th century Alexandria, meets up with a crowd of Goths. After initially friendly dealings, one of them sets upon him with murder in his heart, and the hitherto mild-mannered Christian is embroiled in "a fierce struggle, which, strange to say, as it went on, grew absolutely pleasant";[liii] later in the scene, one of the Goths attests that indeed "the spirit of Odin" came visibly on the young monk as he fought (*Hyp.* 47), thus implicitly assimilating him to a berserker, or bodyguard of Odin. The youth soon breaks off, though, "conscience-stricken at the fearful thirst for blood that had suddenly boiled up in him as he felt his enemy under him" (*Hyp.* 44) and is left in a state of quiet submission – "if submission have anything to do with that state of mind in which sheer astonishment and novelty have broken up all the custom of a man's nature" (*Hyp.* 45). The author's summary comment on the incident is that the newness of all the hero's experiences "had driven him utterly from his moorings, and now anything and everything might happen to him" (*Hyp.* 45). This is the scene from Kingsley, I submit, that has brought the reference to *Hypatia* to Beetle's lips.[liv] The rousing of the pacific Philammon anticipates Winton's attempt at "murder" (269), just as the former's confusion and shame at his reaction also mirror the latter's. And Kingsley's image of a young man torn from his moral moorings is not far distant from the Head's sympathetic synopsis concerning Winton: "I have overcrowded him with new experiences" (270).

In short, by knowing and being shamed by how he has reacted, Winton can begin to moderate his future responses to stress (as far as his friends are concerned) and channel his till now leashed anger toward appropriate targets. He has already come to a regretful understanding that, in acting out against the drawing-master, who "had very limited

powers of punishment" (253), he has illuminated his own weakness by taking advantage of another's:

> "*Dis te minorem quod geris imperas,"* King quoted presently. "It is necessary to bear oneself as lower than the local gods – even than drawing-masters who are precluded from effective retaliation. I *do* wish you'd tried that mouse-game with me, Pater."
>
> Winton grinned, then sobered. "It was a cad's trick, sir, to play on Mr. Lidgett." (258)

By the time the much-anticipateed flogging is actually meted out, it has become almost an anticlimax – so much so, that the author glosses over the so-anticipated event in a single nominative absolute phrase ("The little formality over, …" [268]). The emphasis instead is on Winton's suddenly yawning in his executioner's "astonished face," "[staggering] towards the window seat," and falling "deeply and placidly asleep" (268-269) – in other words, on the prelude to his initiation into the world of sub-prefects, his advancement in the hierarchy to a post of command. Thus, even the author's syntax reinforces his thematic point – that the pain of physical chastisement (though dreaded) is of little consequence, in comparison to its utility as a tool of character-building.

The message of Winton's initiation, indeed, has been foreshadowed in miniature by the scene immediately preceding his caning. When Winton arrives at the place appointed for his punishment, he finds himself in line behind an eleven-year-old new boy, "low in the House, low in the Lower School, and lowest of all in his homesick little mind" (267). As this boy stands in line to be flogged for skipping afternoon games, he becomes "white at the horror of the sight" of one of his fellows wailing from pain (267). "His working

lips part stickily," and he is "too terrified to speak" (267). The young sufferer is quickly dealt "three emphatic spanks" (267) by Mullins, a sympathetic sixth-form Captain of the Games who compliments him on his athletic potential and exhorts him to pay back his licking to the "dear little twelve-year-old mother's darling" (267) who has led him astray. The salubrious effects of corporal punishment are clear as the victim walks away, "warm for the first time that day, enormously set up in his own esteem, and very hot against the deceitful Babcock" (268). As portrayed, the first licking takes on importance as a mini-*rite de passage*: through it, a homesick child takes his first step toward manhood. One can almost fall into agreeing with the Head that Winton's fall from grace has come "very happily" (254) – just in the nick of time for him to avail himself of the growth opportunity afforded by a whipping.

Tompkins notes that the theme of the ordeal "is one of the most pervasive of all Kipling's themes. The test of fitness, the test of manhood, is a qualifying examination."[lv] Citing several stories, among them this one, she continues: "These tests are the equivalent of primitive ordeals. The young man who has passed them enters into full membership of his group and receives his full share of responsibility in it."[lvi] The ordeal presented in this story is peculiarly Winton's, but it is also shared in common with every public schoolboy of Kipling's time.

The entire second half of Kipling's story is meticulously crafted to prove the pertinence to plot and theme of the Horatian *exemplum* of courage and patriotism painstakingly translated in the opening classroom scene. Throughout Winton's march to punishment, both King and the boys themselves repeatedly apply Horatian lines to their own real-life situation and highlight parallels between Winton's troubles and Regulus's.

Even before the mouse incident – and perhaps catalyzing it – Stalky has teasingly advised Winton (who is indignant with Beetle over the *delubris* gaffe) to lighten up: "*Dis te minorem quod geris imperas…*," he admonishes, echoing the tag just cited by King from the sixth Roman Ode ["you rule because you hold yourself subject to the gods"], "Don't be too virtuous. Don't brood over it. 'Twon't count against you in your future caree-ah. Cheer up, Pater" (228); this Horatian tag counseling modest and properly hierarchized exercise of authority, quadruply repeated, becomes, in effect, the story's refrain. Winton apologizes to the drawing master for his prank but categorically declines the kindly master's offer to intercede with the Head on his behalf (256), thus affirming his likeness to the self-dooming Regulus. King, after generously helping Winton complete his imposition by reciting "glorious hexameters" (258) for the boy to take down in dictation, sends him off to his flogging with the observation that "I think at this juncture, Pater, I need not ask you for the precise significance of *atqui sciebat quae sibi barbarus tortor*" ["and yet he knew what the barbarian torturer was preparing for him"] (259). After Winton has assaulted his friends, King and Hartopp come into the room to find him being held down by all five sitting on top of him; King inquires wryly: "Oh … *Dimovit obstantes propinquos*. You, I presume, are the *populus* delaying Winton's return to – Mullins, eh?" (262). Stalky shoots back, "No, sir … We're the *maerentes amicos*" (262).[lvii] The story closes with the "Army class boys … coming to their houses after an hour's extra work" (272), cheerfully "chanting, to the tune of 'White sand and grey sand,' *Dis te minorem quod geris imperas"* (272), a suitable motto for those about to enter military service. They salute Mullins as "my *barbarus tortor*" (272) and turn to Winton to say, "'Night, Regulus" (272), leaving the listening King to repeat for the third time: "You see. It sticks. A little of it sticks among the barbarians"

(272; cf. 262, 264), thus clinching (so he hopes) the abiding pertinence and value of a traditional classical education.

What are the lessons learned by the boys in "Regulus"? Academically, they include development of sufficient analytic ability to puzzle, more or less successfully, through the syntactical complexity of a Horatian ode and commitment to memory of one, possibly two, of the twenty Latin tags Hartopp grants they will take with them from school. Through the thematic counterpoint set up between the story's action and Horace's Regulus ode, the author also shows their characters and value systems in the very process of being formed in accordance with their masters' ideals. The boys' likening of Winton's plight to the Roman general's is not just superficial analogizing (i.e., both are going to get thumped). Rather, they are clearly internalizing the moral paradigm presented by the selfless general stoically walking toward sure pain and death – in King's heartfelt words, "playing for his side" (247). Through their nascent ability to face physical punishment and abasement bravely, to confront ignoble impulses in themselves, to modulate anger, fear, and other emotions – above all, perhaps, in their habit of obedience to authority and the concomitant development of strong communal bonds among themselves (exemplified here by the fifth form's loyal cover-up of Winton's berserkery against them) that they will fight to defend – they mold themselves to Regulus's *exemplum*.

Though Kipling carefully avoids explicitly tipping the balance of the King-Hartopp curricular quarrel in either master's favor, his story holds up a mirror to an educational system built on the premise that study of classical language and classical *exempla* is the most effective means of achieving its three coordinated goals: training of the intellect, formation of character, and initiation of a colonial society's sons into the codes of behavior designed to perpetuate its rule. Over the next several decades, in the face of

increasing industrialization, increasing democratization, and the trauma of world war, this educational ideal and the curriculum that fostered it would undergo radical transformation. In Kipling's story, however, it sits crystallized and preserved.

[i] Rudyard Kipling, *A Diversity of Creatures* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1917). Page references to the story will be cited in parentheses in the text. It was not part of the original *Stalky & Co.* collection of Kipling's school stories (originally published in 1899), but it was inserted into the collection when it was republished, with five additional stories and a closing poem, in 1929. Critics confront a bit of a conundrum in dating the story. It was first published in book form in 1917, but with a date of 1908 subscribed beneath the title. Although, according to the rule announced by Kipling in his preface to the collection, this date should be the year the story first appeared in a magazine, the story seems not to have been so published until just before the collection in 1917, appearing in the April issues of both *Metropolitan Magazine* and *Nash's Magazine* (see, e.g., Norman Page, *A Kipling Companion* [London: Macmillan, 1984], 50, 118; Flora V. Livingston, *Bibliography of the Works of Rudyard Kipling* [New York: Burt Franklin, 1927], 223, 368). Critics generally take 1908 as the date of composition without notice of the differing testimony of the preface. To complicate matters further, according to Kipling's wife's journal, he was still working on the story in 1911 (Stephen Medcalf, "Horace's Kipling," in Charles Martindale and David Hopkins, eds., *Horace Made New* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992], 224). Beyond the journal's contradiction of the 1908 date, "the wartime relevance of the story is obvious" (Judith A. Plotz, "Latin for Empire: Kipling's 'Regulus' as Classics Class for the Ruling Classes," *The Lion and the Unicorn* 17 [1993], 164 n. 1). Both Plotz (briefly), 158, and Janet Montefiore, "Latin, Arithmetic and Mastery: A Reading of Two Kipling Fictions," in Howard J. Booth, Nigel Rigby, eds., *Modernism and Empire* (Manchester and NY:

Manchester University Press, 2000), 120-124 (at some length, and illuminatingly), note that the spillage of bottles of chlorine gas in the science laboratory next-door to the Latin master's classroom suggests a connection to the weaponry of World War I, especially as Kipling's own son, John, had been missing in action, presumed dead, since the Battle of Loos in 1915 (the first battle where the British used chlorine gas [Montefiore, 122 and 133 nn. 39-40]). Significantly, too, the same 1917 collection also contained "The Children," Kipling's elegy to the English boys lost in the war.

[ii] Plotz (above, n. 1), 159.

[iii] The fictional King was modeled after W.C. Crofts, the classics and English master at Kipling's school (the United Services' College at Westward Ho!) – though "with some touches" of F.A. Haslam, an earlier Latin master of Kipling's (Page, *A Kipling Companion* [above, n. 1], 50). Similarly, the fictional Head was modeled after the USC headmaster, Cormell Price, and a real-life analogue has been identified for the other teachers too (see, e.g., Page, *A Kipling Companion* [above, n. 1], 51). Kipling's memoir explicitly gives Crofts'/King's sarcasm his stamp of approval, noting that in "Regulus" he had tried to give a "pale rendering of [Crofts'] style when heated": "Under him I came to feel that words could be used as weapons, for he did me the honour to talk at me plentifully; and our year-in year-out form-room bickerings gave us both something to play with. One learns more from a good scholar in a rage than from a score of lucid and laborious drudges; and to be made the butt of one's companions in full form is no bad preparation for later experiences. I think this 'approach' is now discouraged for fear of hurting the soul of youth, but in essence it is no more than rattling tins or firing squibs under a colt's nose" (Rudyard Kipling, *Something of Myself* [Garden City, NY:

Doubleday, Doran and Co., 1937], 36). One thinks also of the beloved Mr. Chips' ungentle and eyebrow-raising dismissal of three generations of a student's family:

> I remember your grandfather – umph – he could never grasp the Ablative Absolute. A stupid fellow, your grandfather. And your father, too – umph – I remember him … – he wasn't much better, either. But I do believe – my dear Colley – that you are – umph – the biggest fool of the lot! (James Hilton, *Goodbye, Mr. Chips* [Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1934], 10.

[iv] The King of the original Stalky series is, by contrast, cast as an often priggish, even mean-spirited foil for Number Five Study's pranks and antics: "he prowls and scowls, glares and gibbers, snarls and sneers, smiles succulently, grins like a hyena, turns ghastly green…Anyone can take a rise out of him, he asks for it" (E.N. Houlton, "Under Which King?," *The Kipling Journal* [December, 1978], 6). By contrast, in this later story (added to *The Complete Stalky & Co.* collection thirteen years after originally being published in a collection for adults [see note 1 above]), Beetle's summary opinion as the class ends is that King is an "interestin' dog" (253), and the master is portrayed as sharp-tongued but good-hearted, as he fiercely champions Winton's cause: "…though King as proconsul might, and did, infernally oppress his own Province, once a black and yellow cap was in trouble at the hands of the Imperial authority King fought for him to the very last steps of Caesar's throne" (254). In his memoir, the author concludes: "C– taught me to loathe Horace for two years; to forget him for twenty, and then to love him for the rest of my days and through many sleepless nights" (Kipling, *Something* [above, n. 3], 37). Kipling

maintained a respectful correspondence with his former teacher, sharing his writings with him and seeking his opinions on them (see Thomas Pinney, ed., *The Letters of Rudyard Kipling*, vol. 1 [Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1990], 45, 112, 117, 138, for examples of letters from Kipling to Crofts dating from the 1880's); in one long letter, Kipling observes that "our Study used to spend a good deal of prep devising atrocious tortures for our Latin Master," then continues: "However, I confess that I was too deeply indebted to you for the run of your library … to hate you with more than a strictly limited and Latin hate" (Pinney, *ibid.*, 118).

To explain the difference between the two Kings, Houlton notes that this more mature work by Kipling is "not really a Stalky story" (Houlton, "Under Which King?," 7), by which he presumably means that the uni-dimensional caricature Houlton calls "Demon King" (Houlton, *ibid.*, 6) is distinctly more at home in a boys' school story than in a man's contemplative look at the values underlying the education he has received. Thus, in the later story, the author has "corrected" his earlier caricature of Crofts to a milder presentation of what Houlton characterizes as "the best Schoolmaster I have met in a book" (Houlton, *ibid.*, 8). On the illusoriness of the King-Kipling conflict in fact rather than fiction, see, e.g., Bonamy Dobrée, *Rudyard Kipling: Realist and Fabulist* (London: Oxford University Press, 1967), 71; Nella Braddy, *Rudyard Kipling: Son of Empire* (New York: Julian Messner, Inc., 1941), 63; and J.M.S. Tompkins, *The Art of Rudyard Kipling* (Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press, 1959), 241, who refers to the amelioration of King's characterization in "Regulus" as an *amende honorable* by the author.

[v] The frequent failure of Latin teachers in this regard is summed up colorfully by Andrew

Dickson White, first President of Cornell, who decries "a system, which made everything of gerund-grinding and nothing of literature," giving the following example: "We were reading the 'De Senectute' of Cicero, – a beautiful book; but to our tutor it was neither more nor less than a series of pegs on which to hang Zumpt's rules for the subjunctive mood" (Andrew Dickson White, *Autobiography* [New York: Century Books, 1905], 27).

[vi] Plotz, *Latin for Empire* (above, n. 1), 153. Plotz was followed by Julia Gaisser, "The Roman Odes at School: The Rise of the Imperial Horace," *Classical World* 87 (1994), 443-456 (with 449-452 centering on "Regulus"). Gaisser was followed by Montefiore in 2000 (see above, n. 1). Gaisser is unaware of Plotz's earlier article, and Montefiore of both Plotz and Gaisser. Two other recent studies have focused on the classroom experience depicted in the story from angles other than the postcolonial: Jim Mackenzie, "Stalky & Co.: the Adversarial Curriculum," *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 36:4 (2002), 609-620, who stresses the contrast between utilitarian and holistic "character-building" models of education; T.J. Leary, "Kipling, Stalky, Regulus & Co.: A Reading of Horace *Odes* 3.5," *Greece & Rome* 55:2 (2008), a study published as this article was going to press. Neither Mackenzie nor Leary seems aware of Plotz, Gaisser, or Montefiore's studies.

[vii] Plotz, *Latin for Empire* (above, n. 1), 152. For background on the connection between the classical education and Britain's imperialist goals, see, for example, Correlli Barnett, *The Collapse of British Power* (New York: William Morrow & Co., 1972); ——, *The Audit of War: The Illusion and Reality of Britain as a Great Nation* (London: Macmillan, 1986), especially 214-223; Joseph Bristow, *Empire Boys: Adventures in a Man's World* (London: Harper Collins, 1991); John Chandos, *Boys Together: English Public Schools*

1800-1864 (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1984); Phiroze Vasunia, "Greater Rome and Greater Britain," in B. Goff, ed., *Classics and Colonialism* (London: Duckworth, 2005), 38-64; Richard Hingley, *Roman Officers and English Gentlemen: The Imperial Origins of Roman Archaeology* (London: Routledge, 2000); Victoria Tietze Larson, "Classics and the Acquisition and Validation of Power in Britain's 'Imperial Century' (1815-1914)," *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 6:2 (Fall, 1999), 185; J.A. Mangan, *Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian Public School: The Emergence and Consolidation of an Educational Ideology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981); ——, *The Games Ethic and Imperialism: Aspects of the Diffusion of an Ideal* (London: Frank Cass, 1986); David Newsome, *Godliness and Good Learning: Four Studies on a Victorian Ideal* (London: John Murray, 1961); Richard Symonds, *Oxford and Empire: The Last Lost Cause?* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986), especially 31-35; T.C. Worsley, *Barbarians and Philistines: Democracy and the Public Schools* (London: Faber, 1940).

[viii] Barnett, *Collapse* (above, n. 7), 24.

[ix] The *dulce et decorum est* tag – oft-quoted with unquestioning approval, was also, famously, the subject of Wilfred Owen's bitter and graphic 1917 poem about a soldier's death from chlorine gas (for discussion, see Montefiore, *Latin, Arithmetic* [above, n. 1], 123-124; cf. Gaisser, *Roman Odes in School* [above, n. 6], 455-456. The pro-*imperium Aeneid* quotation finds its way significantly into Winton's imposition (see Plotz, *Latin for Empire* [above, n. 1], 163; Montefiore, *Latin, Arithmetic* [above, n, 1], 115-116). Gaisser, *Roman Odes in School* (above, n. 6), includes detailed commentary on 19th-century reception of Horace; Medcalf, "Horace's Kipling" (above, n. 1) gives a rich catalogue of

Horace's influence on Kipling's *oeuvre*. Hingley, *Officers* (above, n. 7), 43-45, 56-59, adds an interesting dimension to the discussion of Kipling's imperial use of the classics by noting that Kipling's own fiction, in turn (specifically, *Puck of Pook's Hill*, which pictures centurions defending Hadrian's Wall in Roman Britain), later offered instructive *exempla* to young British soldiers fighting in the two World Wars. Cf. Deborah H. Roberts, "Reconstructed Pasts: Rome and Britain, Child and Adult in Kipling's *Puck of Pook's Hill* and Rosemary Sutcliff's Historical Fiction," in Christopher Stray, ed., *Remaking the Classics: Literature, Genre and Media in Britain 1800-2000* (London: Gerald Duckworth and Co., 2007), 107-123.

[x] Montefiore, *Latin, Arithmetic* (above, n. 1), 114.

[xi] Mangan, *Athleticism* (above, n. 7), 16-67.

[xii] Barnett, *Collapse* (above, n. 7), 27. For a concise account of Kingsley and "muscular Christianity," see Newsome, *Godliness* (above, n. 7), 207-211.

[xiii] Mangan, *Games Ethic* (above, n. 7), 45.

[xiv] For the complete poem, see Henry Newbolt, '*Vitai Lampada*,' *The Island Race* (London: Elkin Mathews, 1914; 1st pub. 1898), 67. One of Kipling's Stalky Stories, "A Little Prep," has an epigraph from Newbolt's "Clifton Chapel."

[xv] This is not to say that either Kipling himself or his boy-heroes accepted the cult of team sports with enthusiasm. Through the Stalky corpus, the protagonists seem more inclined to the kind of free roaming of the countryside that characterized public school boys' leisure time up until the introduction of compulsory sports into the curriculum (see Mangan, *Athleticism* [above, n. 7], 18-21: exploring the countryside, swimming, poaching. Their general resistance to organized sports is reflected by their comments on

their housemaster, Mr. Prout: "In the infinitely petty confederacies of the Commonroom, King and Macrea, fellow house-masters, had borne it in upon him that by games, and games alone, was salvation wrought. Boys neglected were boys lost. They must be disciplined. Left to himself, Prout would have made a sympathetic house-master; but he was never so left…" (Rudyard Kipling, "An Unsavoury Interlude," *The Complete Stalky & Co.* [Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Doran and Co., 1930, orig. pub. 1929], 81). At a later stage in life, and in his own *persona* rather than that of Beetle, Kipling created a public brouhaha with an attack on the games ethic (among other sacred cows) notable for its trenchant reference to "flannelled fools at the wicket or the muddied oafs at the goals" (Rudyard Kipling, "The Islanders," line 32; for discussion of the indignant public outcry, see David Gilmour, *The Long Recessional: The Imperial Life of Rudyard Kipling* [New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2002], 160-164).

[xvi] H.C. Barnard, *A History of English Education from 1760* (London: University of London Press, 1947), 128-134. The Taunton Commission, which worked from 1864 to 1868, investigated all English secondary schools other than public schools and was informed by Matthew Arnold's inspection of secondary schools in several European nations (see, e.g., Matthew Arnold, *On Education* [Baltimore, MD: Penguin Books, 1973], for his essays on French public education). The development of the curriculum between 1830 and the end of the 19th century is concisely summarized by Jonathan Gathorne-Hardy, *The Old School Tie: The Phenomenon of the English Public School* (New York: The Viking Press, 1977), 136-143.

[xvii] T.W. Bamford, *The Rise of the Public Schools: A Study of Boys' Public Boarding Schools in England and Wales from 1837 to the Present Day* (London: Thomas Nelson Ltd., 1967), 105-106.

[xviii] The first quotation is from Rudyard Kipling, *Something of Myself* (above, n. 3), 26; the second from ——, "A Little Prep," *The Complete Stalky* (above, n. 15), 225.

[xix] See Plotz, *Latin for Empire* (above, n. 1), 152-154, for comparison in some detail between the curricula of the elite Rugby and the more hardscrabble USC.

[xx] In "A Little Prep," *The Complete Stalky* (above, n. 15), 219, M'Turk mimics King's elitist rants: "'Crass an' materialized brutality of the middle-classes – readin' solely for marks. Not a scholar in the whole school.'" The topic of ancient vs. modern sides is picked up again in the "coda" to the story, the author's clever verse concoction, "A Translation: Horace, Bk. V. Ode 3" (there are but four books of Horace's *Odes*). This parody of the priamel of Horace's first ode (1.1), printed immediately following "Regulus" in *A Diversity of Creatures*, opposes the poet, "in whose breast no flame hath burned / Life-long, save that by Pindar lit" (17-18), to three types of scientist, the first of whom might just as well be Hartopp: "There are whose study is of smells, / And to attentive schools rehearse / How something mixed with something else / Makes something worse" (1-4).

[xxi] Worsley, *Barbarians* (above, n. 7), 156. See also his discussion, 149-160.

[xxii] Such references are ubiquitous in the reform literature. For discussion, see especially Myra C. Glenn, *Campaigns Against Corporal Punishment: Prisoners, Sailors, Women, and Children in Antebellum America* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984), 39-61 *passim*.

[xxiii] Ian Gibson, *The English Vice: Beating, Sex and Shame in Victorian England and After* (London: Duckworth & Co., 1978), Appendix B, 318. See also "Discipline at School (NCACPS): Facts About Corporal Punishment Worldwide," www.stophitting.com/disatschool/worldwide.php (accessed 1/15/08). There are some discrepancies in the dates on bans cited in the two sources. New Jersey banned corporal punishment by statute in 1868. In the same year, a bill attempting to do the same in Massachusetts (House No. 335) failed, but a passionate minority report was filed decrying corporal punishment as a "relic of English barbarism" (*Reports on the Committee on Education Concerning Corporal Punishment in the Schools of the Commonwealth* [Boston: Wright and Potter, 1868], 18).

[xxiv] As early as 1698, a law was brought (unsuccessfully) before the English that would outlaw corporal punishment in schools (*Lex Forcia*, *being a Sensible Address to the Parliament, for an Act to Remedy the Foul Abuse of Children at Schools, Especially, in the Great Schools of This Nation* [London: Eliz. Whitlock, 1698]). It argued ardently that sin should be punished, but learning "sugared" (*Lex*, 6) and offered a denunciation of schoolmasters who doled out punishment "made to serve a Viler Affection" (*Lex*, 6) – i.e., who were afflicted with a penchant for sexual sadism. Citing (and only slightly misquoting) Samuel Butler's *Hudibras* II.2.465 ("As Pedants in the School-boys breeches / Do claw and curry their own Itches"), the author of the tract concludes: "Then…must [the pupils'] Torments…be, indeed, like those of *Hell* and no other, seeing they arise from an Unquenchable Fire, in the Appetite of their *Master*" (*Lex,* 7, 9). Cf. C.B. Freeman, "The Children's Petition of 1669 and Its Sequel," *British Journal of Educational Studies* 14:2 (1966), 216-223. See Gibson, *English Vice* (above, n. 23), 1-47,

on sources before Freud (dating from the 17th century) that connected flagellation with sexual stimulation. In particular, see Gibson, *ibid*., 20-32, and Chandos, *Boys Together* (above, n. 7), 231-239, for evidence that both English medical writers of the 19th century and the educated Victorian public were aware not only of the prevalence of the "English vice" (so-called by the French, who had long been persuaded, e.g. by Abbé Boileau in 1701, that "lower discipline," or birching on the buttocks, was sexually dangerous) but also of the causal connection between it and much of the flogging in the public schools. Gibson, *ibid.*, 32, cites, for example, a Victorian study of sex by William Acton, a physician Chandos calls "the chief medical apostle of anti-sex" (Chandos, *Boys Together* [above, n. 7], 288, who also, unaccountably, names the doctor "Henry" rather than "William" Acton). Despite general prudery, here at least Acton shows a modicum of frankness: after citing Rousseau, a self-confessed flagellant (and one of his own pet foils), he states flatly, "that [flogging on the buttocks] has a great influence in exciting ejaculation, no one can doubt"; he concludes, "I am almost ashamed to say there are vile old wretches who, to excite emission, have recourse to this means of stimulating their flagging powers. This fact alone should induce those concerned in the education of youth, if flogging is still to be practiced, to see that it is applied on the shoulders, and not on the nates, of youths" (William Acton, *The Functions and Disorders of the Reproductive Organs in Childhood, Youth, Adult Age, and Advanced Life, Considered in Their Physiological, Social and Moral Relations*, 2nd American ed., from 4th London ed. [Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blakiston, 1867, originally pub. London, 1857], 23, available from Google Books [online], http://books.google.com/books?id=TIPUtsXg4cwC&pg=PA23&vq=Rousseau&dq=funct

ions+and+disorders+of+the+reproductive+organs+in+youth&source=gbs_search_r&cad=0_2, accessed 1/10/08).

Kipling himself seems to show awareness of this issue, effectively echoing Acton's prescription to flog on the shoulders rather than the nates, in a vignette in "The Impressionists." There, anticipating the Head's wrath against Stalky & Co. for one of their escapades, the boys' confidant, Reverend John, says, "I should recommend a copy-book on a – h'm – safe and certain part." Their reply encodes a preemptive defense of the Head against impropriety: "He licks across the shoulders, an' it would slam like a beastly barn-door" (Rudyard Kipling, "The Impressionists," in *The Complete Stalky* [above, n. 15], 136).

Corporal punishment was banned in the United Kingdom in 1986, with a follow-up law in England in 1998 assuring that the ban applied to all non-state-run schools. There is still no state-wide ban on corporal punishment (2008) in twenty-one of the United States (Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Wyoming) and in Puerto Rico, though it is now illegal in every European country and in every industrial nation in the world except the US and the outback regions of Australia.

[xxv] George Ryley Scott, *The History of Corporal Punishment: A Survey of Flagellation in its Historical, Anthropological, and Sociological Aspects* (London: T. Werner Laurie Ltd., 1974), 97, 100.

[xxvi] Inasmuch as resistance to reform was based on philosophical choice, it was largely the product of a Calvinist assumption that childhood misbehaviors and failures of

attention are manifestations of original sin, to be aggressively drubbed out of the boy for his own good. This is the view espoused, for example, by Thomas Arnold, distinguished classicist and Head of Rugby School from 1827-1842. Arnold thought boys were a separate, morally unformed breed, prone to evil, and that that evil correlated to the amount of original sin present in each boy: "on these occasions when Arnold felt himself face to face with the devil his fury was frightening and his flogging severe" (T.W. Bamford, *Thomas Arnold on Education* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970], 10-11). Arnold's essay, "Education in School," includes a lengthy philosophical defense of flogging that aligns resistance to it with a false sense of personal dignity and with "Jacobinism" (Bamford, *ibid.*, 121-127). Arnold did, however, set limits both on the offenses at Rugby that might merit flogging and on the number of strokes allowed (normally three, with a maximum of six) (Meriol Trevor, *The Arnolds: Thomas Arnold and his Family* [London: The Bodley Head, 1973], 25-26).

See Glenn, *Campaigns* (above, n. 22), 106-112, on the clash between Calvinist and Unitarian outlooks on corporal discipline in the battle of the "Boston 31" (a coalition of pro-caning schoolmasters) against the reformer Horace Mann.

[xxvii] Joseph A. Mercurio, *Caning: Educational Rite and Tradition* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1972), 122, in a revealing case study of the attitudes toward caning in an elite private preparatory school in Christchurch, New Zealand, in 1969, where this type of punishment was all but universally accepted by masters, students, and parents.

[xxviii] Worsley, *Barbarians* (above, n. 7), 153. Writing just before World War II, Worsley repeatedly assimilates to fascism the public school regimen of selecting and training

oligarchic leaders through indoctrination; he calls the operant principle of the system a "*Fuehrerprinzip*" (7, 9).

[xxix] Desmond Morris, *The Naked Ape: A Zoologist's Study of the Human Animal* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967), 168.

[xxx] Chandos, *Boys Together* (above, n. 7), 222.

[xxxi] Chandos, *ibid.*, 167.

[xxxii] Mercurio, *Caning* (above, n. 27), 126.

[xxxiii] Walter J. Ong, S.J., "Latin Language Study as a Renaissance Puberty Rite," *Studies in Philology* 56:2 (April, 1959), 104-107, *et passim*; on flogging, see 111-113; for sources on primitive puberty rites, 105 n. 1. The common structural features of *rites de passage* were first identified by anthropologist/folklorist Arnold van Gennep in 1909.

[xxxiv] J.R. de S. Honey, *Tom Brown's Universe* (New York: Quadrangle/The New York Times Book Co., 1977), 219-224, in an instructive treatment of the connections between the English public school "system" and puberty rites.

[xxxv] Chandos, *Boys Together* (above, n. 7), 20; cf. 246. Throughout his study, Chandos cites richly from an extensive body of deeply ambivalent 19th-century school memoirs, published and unpublished. Worsley, *Barbarians* (above, n. 7), 155-156, gets at the anthropological nature of the corporal punishment system when he contrasts masters' "rationalizations" for maintaining the system with "the more realistic diehard explanation which is nearer the truth": "The view is somewhat discredited nowadays [1940] that a boy is sent to a Public School 'to be made a man of' – 'to have the nonsense knocked out of him,' to learn, in short, 'to take it.' It is laughed at even in the schools, but, all the same, it is one of the motives which still operates. This is the chief value of Rugby

football, of the dismal runs, and of such diminishing brutality as still survives in school customs. And it is, essentially, one of the moral values of beating."

[xxxvi] Matthew Arnold, *On Education* (above, n. 16), 139.

[xxxvii] Matthew Arnold, *ibid.*, 21.

[xxxviii] Rudyard Kipling, "The Impressionists," in *The Complete Stalky* (above, n. 15), 136. Each dash represents a stroke of the cane. Cf. Arnold Lunn, *The Harrovians*, 6th ed., (London: Methuen, 1926), 70: "…and these board school kids [as opposed to public school kids] always go to law if any one beats 'em." This double standard is invoked angrily by an old boy quoted by Gathorne-Hardy, *Old School Tie* (above, n. 15), 124: "The upper classes were *not* pampered…We were treated with the ferocity of a concentration camp."

[xxxix] Worsley (above, n. 7), 157.

[xl] Kipling, "An Unsavoury Interlude," *The Complete Stalky* (above, n. 15), 83.

[xli] Kipling, "The Impressionists," *ibid*., 137.

[xlii] Tompkins, *Art* (above, n. 4), 241. A major, calculated element insuring the requisite amount of unfairness in the system (along with the resulting opportunities for growth on the part of the victims) was that of boy-justice. The formal investment of prefects with the right to beat, in conjunction with informal tolerance of ragging and fagging, contributed to a lurking atmosphere of fear (especially for younger students). The capriciousness of school rules was accentuated by the general co-existence in the public schools of separate formal and informal school "codes," the latter noted for their arbitrariness. Milne colorfully describes students' plights under these circumstances, first noting that "*mens conscia recti* was of no value," then contrasting the public schools

adversely with "any good modern school" where "no shock of apprehension clutches at the new boy's heart as he realizes that he has turned up his right trouser instead of his left" (A.A. Milne, *It's Too Late Now: The Autobiography of a Writer* [London: Methuen & Co., 1939], 100). `

[xliii] On the composition of the Winton rod itself, see Scott, *Corporal Punishment* (above, n. 25), 98, who says it is of apple wood; "Flogging Instruments Dictionary" [online], available at www.ecstagony.com/eng/dict/dicinstr/instr_w_z.htm (accessed 3 April 2008), agrees, describing the Winton rod as four apple twigs on a wooden handle. (Roundell Palmer, *Memorials*, part 1, vol. 1, 76, ranks its power well below the Rugby birch-rod, "in comparison with which the Winchester instrument of castigation was child's play.") For Winchester's implication in the major public "tunding" scandal of 1872, see Chandos, *Boys Together* (above, n. 7), 244-245; Peter Gwyn, "The 'Tunding Row': George Ridding and Belief in 'Boy-Government,'" in Roger Custance, ed., *Winchester College: Sixth-centenary Essays* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), 431-477, though in this incident at least the offending instrument was the ground-ash, as opposed to the apple-wood Winton rod.

[xliv] It is notable that the Head thus keeps his own hands clean, by (in name at least) turning Winton over instead to boy-justice (set, in this case, in the reluctant hands of his own cousin and study-mate, the captain of games).

[xlv] Medcalf, "Horace's Kipling" (above, n. 1), 225.

[xlvi] Gaisser, *Roman Odes at School* (above, n. 6), 451, characterizes the Head as "the wise stage-manager, the *providens deus* of his boys' lives." At the other pole, Kucich, who analyzes Kipling's fictions and general world-view in terms of what he calls their

"sadomasochistic psychological and cultural logic," points to the Head's "absolute authority as well as his sadistic cruelty" (John Kucich, "Sadomasochism and the Magical Group: Kipling's Middle-Class Imperialism," *Victorian Studies* 46 [2003], 34, 35, respectively; quite surprisingly, though Kucich starts his study from an extended examination of *The Complete Stalky & Co.*, he makes no mention in it of "Regulus"). An anthropological, rather than psychological, perspective on the Head and the hierarchies within the school is perhaps less prejudicial than Kucich's, allowing the Head to function as arbiter of the boys' educational *rites de passage* without attributing his actions to personal or collective psychopathology.

[xlvii] Bamford, *Arnold* (above, n. 26), 125.

[xlviii] Bamford, *ibid.*, 125, 126.

[xlix] Gibson, *English Vice* (above, n. 23), 73-74; Gathorne-Hardy, *Old School Tie* (above, n. 16), 110.

[l] Milne, *It's Too Late Now* (above, n. 42), 99.

[li] Scott, *History of Corporal Punishment* (above, n. 25), 191.

[lii] Plotz, *Latin for Empire* (above, n. 1), 159, 158, respectively.

[liii] Charles Kingsley, *Hypatia, or New Foes with an Old Face* (New York: Macmillan and Co., 1886, orig. pub. 1853), 44. Subsequent page references will be cited in parentheses in the text.

[liv] The actual word "Berserk" *is* found elsewhere in Kingsley's works, e.g., in his1851 novel, *Yeast: A Problem*, where it is applied to hunting dogs "like Berserk fiends among the frowning tombstones, over the cradles of the quiet dead" (Charles Kingsley, *Yeast: A Problem* [New York: J.F. Taylor, 1899], 14. A chapter in Kingsley's later novel,

Hereward the Wake (1866), is titled "How Hereward Turned Berserker," though the reference there is more etymological than substantive. Proceeding from a traditional (though possibly false) assumption that the word literally meant "bare of armor" (*baresark*), the author introduces a story under this title in which the Viking hero engages his foe without his shirt of mail – but it is really a battle-less engagement where he plays trickster rather than raging warrior. The *fact* of human berserkery, then, is found in *Hypatia*, its *name* in *Hereward the Wake.*

[lv] Tompkins, *Art* (above, n. 4), 231-232.

[lvi] Tompkins, *ibid.*, 232.

[lvii] The Latin quotations are from *Odes* 3.5.51 ("he cast aside friends and relations who were blocking his path") and 3.5.47 ("grieving friends"), respectively.