

THE PETRONIAN SOCIETY

Newsletter

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA

VOL. 6 NO. 1

EDITOR: GARETH SCHMELING

JUNE 1975

ANNOUNCEMENTS

In the Petronian Society Newsletter 5.1, the announcement of the death of Prof. Ettore Paratore was greatly exaggerated.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

von Albrecht, M., *Meister römischer Prosa von Cato bis Apuleius* (Heidelberg: Lothar Stiehm, 1971). Chapter 7 is devoted to an interesting and in-depth literary study of *Sat.* 44.14-45. (Astbury)

Chirol, E., and Sennequier, G., "Musée des antiquités de Rouen. Deux importantes donations," *RLouvre* 22 (1972) 257-258. A glass vase found at Trouville-en-Caux, dated to A.D. 100, which is similar to the one mentioned in Petronius 52.3.

Cizek, E., *L'époque de Néron et ses controverses idéologiques* (Leiden: Brill, 1972). Sections on Petronius.

Cizek, E., "A propos des premiers chapitres du *Satyricon*," *Latomus* 34 (1975) 197-202. Rhetoric and the first five chapters of the *Satyricon*.

Colker, M., "Is There New Evidence of the Survival of a Fuller Petronius?" *Scriptorium* 24 (1970) 55-56. Answer: no. See also E. Campanile, "Un glossario medioevale attribuito a Petronio," *Studi Urbinati* 35 (1961) 118-134.

Davies, M., "The Suicide of Ajax: A Bronze Etruscan Statuette from the Kappeli Collection," *Antike Kunst* 14 (1971) 148-157. Davies links the theme with Greek and Roman symposiac activities, specifically, the sword-dance (Xenophon, *Symp.* 2. 11-15) and mimic imitations of the mad Ajax (Petronius 59). (Sandy)

Desmed, R., "A propos du fragment XXX de Pétrone," *IM* 33-35 (1972) 10-12.

Dobroiu, E., "Doua studii petroniene," *StudClas* 14 (1972) 239-244. An inquiry into the treatment of Petronian manuscripts by Díaz y Díaz and Sullivan.

Flores, E., *Letteratura latina e società* (Naples: Liguore Editore, 1973).

Fraenkel, E., "La Matrona di Efeso e altri capitoli di Petronio," *Belfagor* 29 (1974) 687-695. Notes on *Sat.* 111-112, 1-4, 12-15, 83, 115, 126. (Astbury)

Gagliardi, D., "Anth. Lat. 692R," *Helikon* 9-10 (1969-1970) 667-670. On *Frag.* 32.

Gallivan, P.A., "Some Comments on the Fasti for the Reign of Nero," *CQ* 24 (1974) 290-311. On pp. 302-303 Gallivan puts T. Petronius Niger as July suffect consul in A.D. 63. (Astbury)

Giardina, G.C., "Note a Petronio," *MCR* 5-7 (1970-1972)

178-187. Notes on ten critical readings: 5. vv. 15 ff.; 28.5; 30.9; 46.1; 54.5; 91.2; 118.5; 126.15; 127.5.

Kenney, E.J., "Petronius Arbiter," *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 15th Edition (New York: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1974) 189-191. Brief introduction to Petronius, the *Satyricon*, plus short bibliography.

Mantovanelli, P., "Curiosa Felicitas," *QIFL* 2 (1972) 59-71. On *Sat.* 118.5: *ars et ingenium*.

Mitchell, K., "Two Textual Problems in Petronius," *Hermes* 103 (1975) 90-100. At *Sat.* 56 read: *Cecropica ge et aleae* instead of + *aecrophagie saele* +; and *caniae et pedalia* for + *canale et pedale* +.

Pellegrino, C., "Il Bellum Civile nel *Satyricon*. Possibilità di una nuova ricostruzione del testo," *RCCM* 14 (1972) 155-164.

Rougé, J., "La justice à bord du navire," *Studi in onore di Edoardo Volterra* (Milan: Giuffrè, 1971), Vol. 3, pp. 173-181. On *Sat.* 108: Legal rights of shipowners and passengers.

Sandy, G., "Scaenica Petroniana," *TAPA* 104 (1974) 329-346.

Scobie, A., *Apuleius Metamorphoses (Asinus Aureus) I. A Commentary* (Meisenheim/Glan: Anton Hain, 1975). 133 pp. + 5 plates. Hard covers. DM 43. Apart from references to Petronius in the commentary, a prefatory essay, "The Ass-Tale and Folklore," pp. 26-46, might be of general interest to Petronian scholars who are concerned with folklore in the *Satyricon*. (Scobie)

Scobie, A., "Notes on Walter Anderson's *Märchen vom Esel-menschen*," *Fabula* 15 (1975). The article deals with a previously unknown T'ang dynasty ass-tale and its relationship to a Kirghiz ass-tale which Anderson (*Roman Apuleja i Narodnaja Skazka*, Kazan 1914, pp. 140f.) thought was not linked to European variants of the ass-man. I have suggested that the story passed from the West to China along the Silk Route prior to the ninth century. (Scobie)

Smith, M.S., *Petronius, Cena Trimalchionis*. Edited and with critical apparatus and commentary (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975). 256 pp.

Tanner, R.G., "Petronius 44," *Hermes* 100 (1972) 496-498. *Sat.* 44.3-5; 9.

Ure, P., "The Widow of Ephesus: Some Reflections on an International Comic Theme," *Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama: Critical Essays by Peter Ure*, ed. by J. C. Maxwell (Liverpool University Press: Liverpool, 1974) 221-236. Reprinted from the *Durham University Journal* 18 (1956-1957) 1-9. (Astbury)

Walsh, P.G., "Was Petronius a Moralist?" *G + R* 21 (1974) 181-190. Answer: no.

a Review of Carlo Pellegrino

"Su alcuni problemi della tradizione manoscritta del Satyricon: introduzione ad una nuova edizione critica" (RCCM 10, 1968, 72-85).

"Nuove ricerche sulla tradizione manoscritta del Satyricon" (RCCM 11, 1969, 203-213).

"Il Bellum Civile nel Satyricon: possibilit  di una nuova ricostruzione del testo" (RCCM 14, 1972, 155-164).

by T. Wade Richardson

Scholarship on the text of Petronius since M ller's 1965 edition has consisted of the following: a number of reviews of M ller (the longest being that of Nelson), a short article by Br zek, a series of articles by Dobroiu, a book by van Thiel, and the present three articles by Pellegrino. Van Thiel's work, because it is complex and comprehensive, has perhaps the most potential, although some of his hypotheses are neither satisfying nor probable (the origin of the florilegia, Γ , proliferating excerpts and collations). The basic idea of L being a repaired and recombined edition is very attractive and must be close to the truth. Of course Sage had come to a similar conclusion nearly fifty years ago, but it has remained buried among his writings and the dissertations of his pupils, either overlooked or unrecognized as important by textual scholars, including M ller and van Thiel. Sage was sure, for example, that the L-MSS were not older than thirteenth-century, and that they contain restorations. Pellegrino, while also missing Sage's work, and not seeming to pay attention to the advances made by Ullman, continues with the all-important task of trying to identify the MS sources of Pithou, Tornaesius and Scaliger, and with their help seeks to modify knowledge of the relationship of L to O. The upshot of his articles seems to be that the recombinations were made not by van Thiel's maker of L, but by the sixteenth-century editors themselves. I say "seems" because this is by no means the main thrust of P.'s arguments, which span four years of work and respond to changing stimuli, including the appearance of van Thiel's work. To judge from the first subtitle, P. had in mind the sort of systematic description of the MS sources appropriate to the introduction to a critical edition. Yet the data of scholarship are clearly less interesting to him than the hypothetical basis of L. The O sources are dealt with in rapid and desultory fashion: in one remarkable paragraph the "nonhumanistic" E is given pride of place, B is assigned to the twelfth century, and R is ignored while P gets a mention — all without discussion, although these are scarcely the current assumptions. Passing on to the L-class, P. opens with a brisk description of the small differences in content between 1 (Scaliger's edition, which P. calls Ls) t p, hitherto regarded as unimportant, but of great significance in P.'s scheme. Noted also are the editors' use of symbol conventions, such as v.c., in reference to MS sources, and this introduces the first problem dealt with, the sources of the Tornaesius edition. The facts are familiar: the editor names, or rather alludes to, his sources in an introduction. All are identifiably either O-class segments or "fragmenta" save for two, and since t contains L one safely assumes that they were L-class MSS. According to Goldast they belonged to Cujas and Dal champ and are thus the Cuiacianus and Dalecampianus. Tornaesius writes in his introduction that he received the former after the earlier pages (prioribus foliis) of his edition had gone to the printer. Not wanting to deprive scholars of the more worthwhile readings (digna oculis studiosorum), he entered them in a list after the text under the heading Variae lectiones ex v.c. And now the problem: the text runs to 109 pages and the variants cover the first 67, discontinuing at c. 112. This had been thought explainable as follows: Tornaesius received his new MS after that 67 pages, about two-thirds, had left his hands; for the last third no appendix was needed be-

cause the better readings could go right into the text. Such an explanation satisfied Sage, Ullman and M ller, but P. makes two objections: two-thirds is too much to describe as priora folia; and more decisively, marginalia attributed to v.c. commence at c. 22. At this point, then, Tornaesius received the Cuiacianus, of which he made two uses, according to P.: some readings he noted in the margin, and the others he put at the end as an afterthought. This hypothesis, whether right or wrong, suffers at present from serious inadequacies. It does not explain why the method changed at c. 112; but more seriously — and this is typical of the reasoning throughout P.'s work — there is a lack of internal substantiation. Here, for example, no attempt was made to compare the readings of Cuiacianus known from other sources with those cited for v.c. after c. 22. There has been hesitancy to make much of this symbol, seeing that the marginalia are peppered with all sorts of attributions and glosses, and one-third of the marginalia assigned to v.c. refer only to asterisks. Another way for P. to have tested his hypothesis would have been to check the text readings for the portion unique to L before and after c. 22. Since one would expect the editor to prefer some readings from his new MS, the proportion of "unique" readings should decline after c. 22. This seems to take place only after c. 112 (Dorothy Fulmer, University of Pittsburgh Abstracts (1936) 102). Investigation of this area is far from complete, and I think for now we can continue to accept that v.c. can refer to other MSS, and that priora folia are the first four forms (Ullman). This first concern in background, as it were, to the concern of much of P.'s first two articles: the sources for Pithou's editions. To start, P. takes exception to two important inferences drawn by Buecheler:

- (1) the Alt. Pithoei is B
- (2) the Vetus Pithoei is the codex Benedictinus

and to the contention of Ullman, assented in by M ller:

(3) the Tolosanus of p² is the Cuiacianus. P. casts these as the current and inviolate assumptions and then proceeds to disagree, but (1) has already been denied at considerable length by Sage. From the arguments back and forth it is clear that the MSS, if not identical, were closely related. P. adds a refinement: Alt. Pithoei exhibits a tendency to emend. As to the symbols Vet., vet. and Vet. ex. referring to the Benedictinus, this has already been denied by Ullman and doubted by Sage, and is thus not the datum of all current thought, as P. avers. He does, however, make a number of original deductions, proceeding as follows: for p¹ Pithou had 5 MS sources, of which one only apparently belonged to the L-class, the Benedictinus. Yet in the passages unique to L Pithou gives 24 variant readings — a feature noted before but not thought worthy of explanation. P. assigns one of two reasons for this, both of great potential significance: either the variants appeared in Pithou's Benedictinus, or they came directly from one or more other L-MSS available to him for his edition. Conjectures are eliminated because of Pithou's professed distaste for them. For p² Pithou definitely had another L-MS, the Tolosanus. The variants cited under Vet. at cc. 88 and 131 indicate to P. that here Vet. = Tolosanus, and readings at cc. 99, 111, 117, 126 seem to support this. A preliminary (and highly noncontroversial) conclusion: Vet. (capitalized, distinguished from vet.) can stand for something other than the Benedictinus in Pithou's usage. Now, the Benedictinus is mentioned specifically in only four places, thrice in p¹, once in p². On all occasions where the passage occurs only in L Pithou uses a formula like Benedictinum unicum in hac parte exemplar — seeming to prove that when he got out his first edition he had only one long MS, the Benedictinus. P.'s explanation, taking into account the other evidence, is that P. did have another long MS, but at these points the reading was missing or obscured, i.e. it was not complete. But what of the reason for referring to this important MS only as v.c. in p¹ while in p² mentioning the Tolosanus by name? — Because, says P., Pithou was confined by the practice of editors of the day whereby only MSS with "lezioni particolarissime" were cited by name. In the other cases the generic symbols, concludes P., have the value of consensus codicum. The identification of the Tolo. and Cuiacianus introduces the complex question of the inter-

dependence of the sixteenth-century editors with their sources. It was first made by Ullman on both external grounds — a perhaps ambiguous piece of Scaligeriana seeming to show that Pithou had borrowed a MS of Cuias in 1569, the date when the first Tolosan manuscript occurred —, and internal (agreements between readings that Pithou quotes as coming from Tolosan and those of Tornaesius' Cuiacianus). But P. regards the identification as obscured beyond certainty by marks of emendation in the readings of Tolosan cited by p², occurring between 1569 and 1587, at which later date Pithou saw it for a second time after it had passed through the hands of Scaliger. This, incidentally, could explain most of the discrepancies. P.'s second article is least ambitious of the three, owing in part to a lengthy recapitulation. Further evidence of the possible existence of another long MS in Pithou's hands for his first edition is then examined. Readings occur in florilegia used by Pithou (his "fragments"), it is noted, which are identical with the allegedly unique ones from vetus Benedictinus. This is not seen as conflicting, but as proof that in their low regard for florilegia editors of the day did not regard them as true MSS. Thus if one were to suppose for the sake of argument that Pithou had only one long MS, variant readings in p¹ could come only from it, and this seems to be lent support, says P., by the variants and marginalia of Scaliger and Tornaesius. As for the two oldest L-MSS, the Cuiacianus and Benedictinus, a significant clue to their nature is provided, according to P., by the fact that Scaliger's edition (1) lacks six passages, all of which appear in Pithou, while five are found in Tornaesius. P.'s explanation is that at these points Scaliger is following the Cuiacianus only, which here must have been lacunose, while the other editions combined L and O MSS for their texts. Motive and occasion is established by examining the passages: c. 20. 8, a section omitted by Scaliger, is argued by P. to be an insertion into the Quartilla Episode by the epitomator of O to "improve" the narrative by making the omissions less obvious, and to enhance the moral tone with a heterosexual scene. The other cases may be argued similarly: the epitomator usually took material from elsewhere in his exemplar, but occasionally made a short interpolation (as at c. 126. 12). P. advances his hypothesis tentatively, reserving the right to deal with it more fully later. The case at c. 136, where the editors again seem to have chosen slightly differing versions from their MSS, leads P. to state a general conclusion: both L and O made different epitomes from a larger but damaged archetype. Comparing the two traditions, P. reaffirms the view of Müller that O was careful revision to render a flowing narrative, with traces of interpolation for that purpose but lacking in the scope that Fraenkel and Müller proposed. We note that this is a cautious, conservative view of the relationship of L to O, with little attempt made to establish L's physical characteristics. Van Thiel's articles, coming between the second and third of Pellegrino's, held up a complex interrelationship, one first hinted at by Sage, and pointed the way for further study (P. characterizes the van Thiel schema as interesting but too rigid). The Bellum Civile becomes the focus of attention, and P. proposes that the verse order indicated in the Cuiacianus is the correct one, and that this is the key piece of evidence for determining two major problems: the composition of the L-class, and the intent of the Satyricon. Recovered from the marginal notations in Tornaesius, the order of Cuiacianus has been up to now considered incorrect, the result of mechanical error. The order of O was presumed correct. P. however suggests that two factors indicate that there is something behind it: the lacunae in the Cuiacianus occur at some distance from the transpositions and thus do not affect them; and if they were simply mechanical failings the silence of Pithou and Scaliger is difficult to explain. A parenthesis follows on the editors' use of asterisks. They seem to have a twofold origin: they existed in the MS sources (as appears to be confirmed by Tornaesius), and they were introduced conjecturally by the editors themselves, usually to signal lacunae but sometimes as a mere "aggiunta meccanica". At any rate, they existed in both Cuiacianus and Benedictinus. These MSS, continues P., seem to have had other ways of signalling lacunae, often misunderstood both by deriv-

ative MSS such as the Memmianus and by the editors themselves in different ways, so that even in areas of definite lacunae no asterisk may appear. P. believes, and he is no doubt correct, that understanding the practice of the editors (and this can be only a beginning now) will have an important effect on our knowledge of the exemplar from which the Cuiacianus and Benedictinus derive. This, after van Thiel, he calls Λ . A further way to explore the matter is through the character of the maiora excerpta. To P. they convey the impression both of a large florilegium and of an attempt, still in rough form, to provide the text with narrative unity through the choice of material. These rude characteristics remain, according to P., either because they were in Λ or because of alteration in the copies derived from Λ , which P. calls λ (presumably the archetype of Cuiacianus and Benedictinus). The florilegia P. deems to be a reduced copy of Λ wherein the moralistic strain is most exhibited. Further, an inspection of ϕ yields clues of its predecessor: titles, combination of sentiments, changes of argument, sequential appearances, logic changes — all point to similar features in Λ and explain why the editors posited lacunae if they did not appear in their MSS, and why they often differed, with two confusing results: asterisks were added where lacunae did not exist, or the lacunae were missed altogether. In the Cena text there is found by P. a perfect parallel with the lacunae in the Cuiacianus' Bellum Civile, which leads him to his most basic conclusion: L is in fact a fusion of Λ and O made not by λ but by the sixteenth-century editors themselves. How the Cena does this, however, is left unexplained, but in a footnote P. offers an explanation of the maxims that appear out of place (after c. 82) in L: as stated, according to the witness of L, its predecessor λ was in intent a textual unification. The compiler was working with a text of Λ , which contained a gap between cc. 37. 6 and 79, and with the florilegia. Because of their position in ϕ the compiler knew the correct place of the six maxims which he wished to insert in λ . But to put them there would disturb the unifying principle, while there was an opportune spot after the Cena at c. 82, next to another maxim. All the maxims could reside there as a natural intermezzo to the narrative. An alternative explanation proposed: Λ contained the maxims, copied by ϕ and λ , which latter changed the order for the reason suggested. As for the poem at c. 82. 5, it might have entered L from a florilegium at the hands of a sixteenth-century editor. To P. the transpositions in the Cuiacianus' Bellum are more difficult of explanation than the lacunae. He believes it was O that deliberately inverted the order, putting vv. 19-31 after 1-18 to improve the homogeneity of the poem and amplify the beginning (the order in the Cuiacianus vv. 1-18, 32-57, 19-26, lacunae of 27-31, and 61-66); so also with vv. 226-232. It is, finally, necessary to justify the order of the Cuiacianus. With an eye on the Pharsalia can one say that the purpose of the Bellum was critical or parodistic? P. believes that Petronius was trying to compose a poem of some pretension along Alexandrian lines. In Pharsalia I he discerns a pattern of progression related to Stoic logic, a badge of the author's credo: at the beginning Destiny's designs for Rome producing historical consequences; at the end corruption, and a moralizing conclusion. This is fancied paralleled in Petronius by Epicurean distaste for excess and pleasure, whose consequences are derangement and war. Cuiacianus' order, with Heu pudet effari, etc., coming after Ingeniosa gula, etc., is thus felt to show the logic better. This order, we note, is only a minor change in the whole poem, yet its textual significance to P. is great, since it demonstrates our reliance on the work of the sixteenth-century editors whose methods are so obscure and imperfect. The entire subject is extremely involved, and will take a good deal more unravelling than P.'s present studies, as he is fully aware. Many more examples must be brought in, for the supporting material now provided is often too thin to make the reasoning convincing. More use should be made of the work of Sage and Ullman. The points themselves vary in value, as I think will be clear from the foregoing, from the tried and casual to the ingenious and complex. Any further work to be done on the subject should not ignore them.

A NOTE BY

D.W.T. VESSEY

In 1877 Theodore Watts-Dunton prevented Algernon Charles Swinburne from publishing his novel Lesbia Brandon. The author's manuscript and galley-proofs (of which several copies were printed) survived. In an appendix to his massive and idiosyncratic edition (London: The Falcon Press, 1952), Randolph Hughes included portions cancelled by the author prior to sending the book to press. In chapter III, an account is given of the severe birching received by Herbert Seyton at the hands of his tutor, Denham, who is inspired to frenzied savagery by sexual motives. (That Swinburne identified himself with Herbert is brought out, for example, by Jean Overton Fuller, Swinburne: A Biography [New York: Schocken Books, 1971] pp. 127-8.) Most of the details in this passage that were suppressed by Swinburne relate, as elsewhere, to details about flogging which, as Hughes remarks (p. 498), the author "presumably thought ... would be too much for the general public of that day." As Holmes adds, Swinburne "made up for his restraint by incorporating them [the deletions], and others much more gruesome, in the unpublished Flogging Block and other similar compositions", e.g. The Whippingham Papers. There is, however, one exception. Some time after the completion of the torture, unjustly imposed but involving the use (or misuse) of two birches, Herbert and his sister Lesbia find Denham in the library where he is "reading with a fitful relish impaired by straying thoughts" (p. 37 in Hughes, p. 224 in Edmund Wilson's edition The Novels of A. C. Swinburne [New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1962]). In Swinburne's manuscript, this had originally appeared as "reading Petronius" (Hughes, p. 516). Clearly the specification of the Satyricon as the work giving the sadistic Denham "fitful relish" and "straying thoughts" was entirely appropriate. The reason for Swinburne's deletion no doubt lay in the fact that he believed that a Victorian reader would be shocked to find a man entrusted with the moral and pedagogic welfare of youth selecting such an unsuitable text for his private perusal. No other classical author was, however, substituted. Those most greatly esteemed at the time would have been unlikely to produce the response described by Swinburne. As readers of the bibliographical appendix to E. J. Dingwall's chapter on Saint Maria Maddalena de' Pazzi in Very Peculiar People (London: Rider, 1950) will recall, the Victorian obsession with not sparing the rod manifested both in universal scholastic torments and in private 'discipline' establishments frequented by 'penitential' adults: hence there would have been much greater horror in Denham's pleasure in the salacious Petronius than in his failure to spoil Herbert. Furthermore, in reviewing Swinburne's Poems and Ballads (1866) in The Athenaeum, Robert Williams Buchanan had insultingly identified Swinburne with "Gito, seated in the tub of Diogenes, conscious of the filth and whining at the stars" (issue of August 4th 1866,

pp. 137-8). As John A. Cassidy has written, the references "to Swinburne as Gito shows that Buchanan was well informed about the facts of Swinburne's private life" (Algernon C. Swinburne, New York: Twayne, 1964 p. 117). Later, in an article in Under the Microscope published in July 1872, Swinburne was to take his revenge by implying that Buchanan was a homosexual like Petronius (cf. Cassidy, p. 141). In view of the litigation that arose out of his continuing dispute with Buchanan, it may well be that allusions to Petronius were a sore point with Swinburne thereafter. That the Satyricon would have possessed a strong appeal to Swinburne, the devotee of de Sade, cannot be doubted. He liked Juvenal too (see his letter to John Nichol in Cecil I. Lang, The Swinburne Letters [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959] IV, p. 224). His masochistic flagellomania (on which, cf., e.g., Rupert Croft-Cooke, Feasting with Panthers [London: W. H. Allen, 1967] pp. 20-28; Overton, op. cit., esp. 44, 67-70, 132-3, 135-7, 161-2; Jerome J. McGann, Swinburne: An Experiment in Criticism [Chicago and London: Chicago University Press, 1972] pp. 269-84) would have drawn him to such descriptions of flogging as occur in Satyricon 11 and, even more, 105 (perhaps the passage that set Denham's thoughts a-straying?). In fact, classical authors were deeply associated with chastisement in Swinburne's mind. As Edmund Wilson has written:

"One of his memories of his school days seems incredible, yet he mentions it several times in his letters. Already a master of metrics, the boy had handed in a copy of Latin galliambics, a metre of which the only surviving example is Catullus' Attis, and though he had never in his school days, he says, been punished for committing a single false quantity, he was now given a flogging by his tutor on the ground that galliambics were not a proper metre. To remember this in afterlife does not seem to make Swinburne indignant but to afford him a certain satisfaction: though he had appealed from the tutor to another master, who took a more lenient view of his galliambics, he seems to assume that the tutor was right. Why? One supposes that, knowing he was helpless at games but had out-distanced his tutor at classics, he was willing to pay this price for his pride; and, after all, was he not partly indebted for his proficiency in Latin and Greek by the rigors of corporeal [sic] punishment with which Eton boys were constantly threatened?" (Op. cit., p. 32).

In Love's Cross Currents, the much-fustigated Reginald Harewood is the object of a Horatian reminiscence: "Those who plied the birch with true loving delight in the use of it enjoyed whipping such a boy intensely. Orbilius would have feasted on his flesh — dined off him" (London: Chatto and Windus, 1905, p. 30; p. 63 in Wilson). The curious may also refer to the strange fantasies described in Croft-Cooke (op. cit., pp. 26-7) which involve fictitious cousins, Latin verse composition and a new theme for Ovid's Metamorphoses (boy in to birch).