Dryden and Juvenal's First Satire

DAVID BROOKS

I

Dryden's theory of translation is well known. He divides translations into three kinds: metaphrase, paraphrase, and imitation. Metaphrase is literal, word-for-word translation; paraphrase follows the sense of the author, rather than his precise words; imitation departs from the original at the pleasure of the translator, and really constructs a new poem on the basis of the old. Dryden rejects the two extremes of metaphrase and imitation, and chooses the middle way of paraphrase.[1]

Throughout his later critical writings Dryden showed himself aware of both the technical and material difficulties of translation: the impossibility of recreating "beauties" dependent on the language and metre of the original, and the doubtful desirability of reproducing the customs and manners of an alien society for an audience unfamiliar with them.[2] By choosing paraphrase, he hoped to capture the spirit of his author, even though he might lose the body.[3]

In his *Discourse of Satire* prefixed to his translation of Juvenal and Persius, Dryden says that he and his collaborators have taken a way "somewhat . . . betwixt a paraphrase, and imitation."[4] He makes his customary justification of paraphrase, and apologizes for departing from his own rules to some extent by occasionally substituting English social phenomena for Roman.[5] In this paper I examine Dryden's version of Juvenal's first satire, for the sake of showing how far from their originals Dryden's translations of Juvenal can be. Because the differences between the two authors call for an explanation, I also illustrate the various factors that produced them.

1 See the preface to *Ovid's Epistles* in John Dryden, *Of Dramatic Poesy and Other Critical Essays*, ed. G. Watson (London 1962), I.268-72 — hereafter referred to as Watson.

2 See Watson, I.269-72 (Preface to *Ovid's Epistles*, 1680); II.22-24, 30 (Preface to *Sylvae*, 1685); 153-55 (*Discourse of Satire*, 1693); 214-15 (*The Life of Lucian*, 1711, prob. written 1696); 234-35, 245-47, 250-51 (Preface to the *Aeneis*, 1697).

3 Watson, II.153.

4 Watson, II.152.

5 Watson, II.152-55.

These factors are of several kinds. Some are common to all English translators of any period; some are peculiar to those of the Restoration; and some belong especially to Dryden's own case.

The first of these are the difficulties that arise out of Juvenal's Roman character, and his use of Latin. As a satirist, Juvenal deals with contemporary Roman life, and his work is full of topical and culturally-bound allusions. These will probably not be capable of a literal translation, but must be either omitted or glossed silently, with the probable result of altering any poetic effect that depends on them. His style of declamation, also, largely depends on the powers of metrical and linguistic resources difficult or impossible to match in English, on the great flexibility in movement of the hexameter, and on the freedom in word order permitted by Latin.

In the Restoration the difficulties of translating Juvenal are aggravated by the current literary conventions. The end-stopped couplet, and the neo-classical tendencies to prefer generalities to particulars, or abstractions to concrete images, and to avoid over-bold rhetorical figures all impose their own stylistic demands, and they may prevent the translator from giving much consideration to the nature of the movement and imagery of his original. Together with the requirement of clarity and intelligibility they may also produce a degree of paraphrase that alters not only the sense of the original, but also its tone and feeling. Under these conditions much of the peculiar character of Juvenal may be lost from a translation.

In considering any Restoration translation of Juvenal, we must also remember that seventeenth-century editions sometimes differ from modern editions both in substantive readings, and in punctuation, and that seventeenth-century commentators sometimes offer different interpretations from those of modern commentators. The Restoration translator, therefore, sometimes had quite a different view from ours of what it was he had to translate, and we should not be surprised if a distinctive Juvenalian effect, not present to the mind of the translator, is absent from his translation.

With Dryden we must also consider his characteristic licentiousness in translation: his tendency to paraphrase very freely — sometimes more freely than any constraints could have compelled him to — and his tendency to indulge in the kind of poetic effects congenial to himself, regardless of the character of his author.

II

In the preface to his translation of the first satire Dryden admits that he has translated it "somewhat largely".[6] This should not be surprising, since in this satire Juvenal is at his most flamboyant. He uses a theatrical manner and striking rhetorical effects that the end-stopped couplet and the conventions of imagery of the Restoration are especially unfitted to reproduce. Dryden seems to have felt unable to compromise much with Juvenal, and to have decided to go his own way. Like all generalizations about Dryden's translation this statement needs qualifying. On the one hand, Dryden has not renounced all constraints — to some extent his renderings have been influenced by seventeenth-century editions and commentaries, and he has tried to take into consideration their accounts of particular passages. On the other hand, not all his departures from Juvenal's text are due to the difficulties of imitating Juvenal's effects; some of them seem to be due to sheer caprice. However, it is true that the original character of Juvenal's poem is largely lost, that the character of Dryden's translation reflects Dryden's own temperament, interests, and literary habits, and that these have produced something considerably different from Juvenal's poem.

It is easier to state that the original character of Juvenal's poem has been largely lost, than to say what exactly has been put in its place. It is difficult to generalize about Dryden's translation: Dryden's treatment of Juvenal is not uniform — he does different things to him in different places — and the overall character of Dryden's translation is not coherent, sometimes not even consistent. The explanation of these facts lies in the variety of the factors that have influenced the translation, and the variability with which they have operated. I must, therefore, restrict myself to discussing tendencies. Such tendencies will not be found throughout the translation, but they are sufficiently pervasive to be worth noting.

III

Juvenal opens his satire by complaining of the tediousness of contemporary poetry, and by revealing that he is going to take

6 *The Works of John Dryden*, Gen. ed. H. T. Swedenberg, Jr. (University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London), IV, (1974), 91 — hereafter referred to as *Works*.

up poetry himself in order to have revenge on the poets who have so often bored him with their recitations. He offers to explain why he has chosen to write satire particularly, and he presents his motives in the form of a series of pictures of the various evils that pervade Roman society.

Four features of the satire are relevant to a comparison with Dryden's version. The first two of them arise from the fact that the satire is a speech addressed to an imaginary audience.

First, Juvenal's speech is suasive in character — Juvenal wishes to make a strong impression on the mind of his audience, and to gain their approval for his views. To attain these ends he uses very striking rhetorical effects. Juvenal is not primarily interested in attacking a set of victims. Although there is an element of attack in his manner, he acts mainly like a lawyer, who addresses a jury, and whose principal interest is to present evidence of misdemeanour in the most impressive form possible. To produce his effects he relies on those rhetorical devices that lend themselves to such a function: various kinds of irony, hyperbole, oxymoron, implication, epigram, onomatopoeia, and vivid sensory images.

Connected with the use of these devices is the fact that often Juvenal is not merely interested in evils as such, but also in some incongruous aspect of them. Their incongruity lends itself to presentation by means of oxymoron or irony, and contributes to the striking character of the speech.

Secondly, the satire is an oratorical performance, a brilliant display of rhetorical skills that demand admiration in their own right. This aspect of the satire is seen partly in the effects mentioned above — some of them are very elaborate and spectacular — and partly in a theatrical manner of delivery. This manner exploits the flexibility of the hexameter, and consists in sudden changes in movement and tone.

The third feature concerns the relationship of Juvenal, himself, to the situation in Rome. Juvenal does not present himself as a disinterested literary critic or moralist. He feels personally involved with both the bad poetry and the various evils current in Rome. He feels exasperated with the bad poetry because he has had to sit through so many boring poetry-readings, and his exasperation has moved him to take up poetry himself. Similarly, his indignation at the evils of Rome is influenced by his own social position. He identifies himself as a member of that poor client class whose plight he describes in the middle and latter parts of the poem, and his indignation is that of a poor but

honest citizen who is enraged by the vices of the great, and the prosperity of social upstarts.

The fourth feature is Juvenal's habit of self-depreciation. Juvenal does not exalt himself above the bad poets of Rome, but implies that he will make just as bad a poet as they. The revenge that he intends to take on his poetic fellows is that with his own recitations he will bore them just as much as they have bored him. His self-depreciation has an important manifestation at the end of the poem where Juvenal reneges on his intention to satirize contemporary society, and declares that he will only attack the dead.

In Dryden's version the suasive character of Juvenal's speech is lost. Juvenal's effects either disappear or are toned down to such an extent that they lose their striking character. His interest in the incongruous aspects of the evils of Rome is toned down or disappears. In its presentation of the case Dryden's translation shows marked differences from Juvenal's original both in its attitude to the audience, and in its treatment of the subject-matter. Dryden tends to employ open condemnation, and disparagement, using for these purposes simple critical or derogatory descriptions. These devices make the translation both more didactic, and more of a satiric attack than the original. In general, they turn it into a lecture. Within this character Dryden is not always consistent: sometimes he uses a judicial manner; sometimes he becomes magisterial, and addresses his audience with authority; sometimes he adopts the free-and-easy manner of a Restoration gentleman addressing his equals.

The speech's character as an oratorical performance is also lost. The striking effects disappear or are toned down. The changes in movement and tone that give the speech its theatrical manner disappear.

With the third feature of Juvenal's satire — his personal involvement with the situation in Rome — the issue is more complicated. Dryden has to preserve Juvenal's exasperation with the bad poets — it is too rooted in the sense of the poem — but he does not preserve Juvenal's involvement with Roman evils. Dryden omits Juvenal's references to himself which make plain that involvement, and in the translation the poet's indignation seems to be that of a disinterested moralist. Yet Dryden does not maintain this character consistently. In those parts of the poem where he uses his free-and-easy manner, the attitude of the poet becomes amused cynicism or flippancy.

With the fourth feature of the satire — Juvenal's habit of self-depreciation — the issue is again complicated. In some passages Dryden keeps this characteristic. Indeed, he exaggerates it into buffoonery. Such buffoonery is incompatible with the dignity that he bestows elsewhere on Juvenal. In other passages where a modern student might find further instances of self-depreciation, Dryden does not do so. His interpretations make him give those passages a different character. In such instances he seems to have been influenced by seventeenth-century commentaries.

IV

In the following series of illustrations I do not discuss these points in turn, but whichever of them arise from each example. (i) Near the beginning of the satire Juvenal complains of the triteness of the mythological subject-matter of contemporary poetry, and ridicules it by alleging that it has certain disastrous effects on the places where it is recited:

> Nota magis nulli domus est sua, quàm mihi lucus
> Martis, & Æoliis vicinum rupibus antrum
> Vulcani. Quid agant venti; quas torqueat umbras
> Æacus; unde alius furtivae devehat aurum
> Pelliculae: quantas jaculetur Monychus ornos;
> Frontonis platani, convulsaque marmora clamant
> Semper, & assiduo ruptae lectore columnae.
> Expectes eadem à summo, minimoque Poëta.[7]
>
> (11.7-14)

[No one's home is better known to him, than the grove of Mars, and the cave of Vulcan near the Aeolian rocks are to me. Fronto's[8] plane-trees, his shivered marbles, and his pillars broken by the constant stream of readers are always echoing what the winds are doing, what shades Aeacus[9] is torturing, whence that other fellow[10] is carrying off that stolen, golden sheepskin, and how large the ash-trees are that Monychus[11] is hurling. You must expect the same things from the greatest poet and the least.]

This passage illustrates both the suasive character of the speech, and its attraction as an oratorical performance. These aspects

7 All quotations of Juvenal are taken from *D. Junii Juvenalis et A. Persii Flacci Satirae*, ed. Ludovicus Prateus (Paris, 1684). This, the Delphin edition, was one of the editions used by Dryden, and provides a suitable text for comparison.

8 Some wealthy patron who lends his gardens for poetry-readings.

9 One of the judges of Hades.

10 i.e. Jason.

11 One of the Centaurs. Juvenal alludes to the battle between the Centaurs and the Lapithae.

are to be seen in the effects that it employs, and in the theatrical quality of its organization.

The passage is organized to produce a kind of rhetorical flight and descent. The first sentence is brief and downright. The second sentence opens with a slow build-up through the series of subordinate clauses from "Quid agant" to "ornos"; then, when the main clause is reached with "Frontonis", there is a rapid run along the line which seems about to end in an apparent climax in "clamant", but which carries on to reach its real climax in "Semper" at the beginning of the next line. The sentence then descends from its climax, and moves smoothly to its close in "columnae". The third sentence, a terse maxim, re-establishes the speech on the level of plain statement.

The effects used in the passage are of several kinds. Implication is present in the use of "alius" to refer off-handedly to Jason; an ironic climax is produced by placing at the end of a run-on line the contemptuous diminutive "Pelliculae" to allude to the Golden Fleece; and vivid images are used in the detailed presentation of both the mythological themes, and of the features of Fronto's garden.

But the predominant effect is hyperbolical, and Juvenal uses the organization of the passage to reinforce its hyperbolic character. The first sentence contains a simple hyperbole that serves to introduce this feature, and to set off the more elaborate series of hyperboles contained in the second sentence. Juvenal displays his virtuosity by producing not one but three hyperbolical effects in and around the climax contained in the main clause of the second sentence. The audience is not allowed to dwell on the first of these, "convulsaque marmora"; the rapidity of the line hurries them on to the apparent climax of the sentence in "clamant", and then forward to the surprising second hyperbole in the real climax, "Semper"; even now, Juvenal has not finished, and as the rhetorical flight moves towards its close, the audience is treated to still another hyperbole in the remainder of the sentence, "& assiduo ruptae lectore columnae". This elaborate organization of multiple effects makes this passage one of the most spectacular in the satire.

A passage as elaborately organized as this must undergo simplification, and considerable change in the course of translation. There can be for Dryden no attempt to capture its original character. The sheer technical difficulties arising out of the

different potentialities of English and Latin, and of the couplet and the hexameter preclude any such attempt. In general, the rhetorical flight and descent of the passage depends too much on the versatility of the hexameter, which Dryden's couplet cannot even begin to match; and, in particular, the climactic structure of the second sentence depends on certain syntactical peculiarities of Latin: on the possibility of placing several subordinate noun clauses expressing the direct object of a sentence in front of the main clause, and on the possibility of splitting up the elements of the subject of a clause, and placing some of them before, and some of them behind, the main verb. There are also difficulties relating to content. Dryden's readers are not likely to be as familiar as Juvenal's with the details of the mythological references, nor as interested in them. They will also be unacquainted with the patron, Fronto, to whom Juvenal alludes.

This situation encourages Dryden to paraphrase considerably. For a large part of the passage he makes no attempt to follow Juvenal's sense, but merely uses it as a source of ideas out of which he constructs something of his own .

Dryden's version is as follows:

> No Man can take a more familiar note
> Of his own Home, than I of *Vulcan's* Grott,
> Or *Mars* his Grove, or hollow winds that blow
> From *Ætna's* top, or tortur'd Ghosts below.
> I know by rote the Fam'd Exploits of *Greece*;
> The Centaur's fury, and the Golden Fleece;
> Through the thick shades th' Eternal Scribler bauls;
> And shakes the Statues on their Pedestals.
> The best and worst on the same Theme employs
> His Muse, and plagues us with an equal noise.[12]
>
> (11.9-18)

This paraphrase has come about in the following manner. Juvenal's opening sentence

> Nota magis nulli domus est sua, quàm mihi lucus
> Martis, & Æoliis vicinum rupibus antrum
> Vulcani.

can be fairly closely followed:

> No Man can take a more familiar note
> Of his own Home, than I of *Vulcan's* Grott,
> Or *Mars* his Grove,

Dryden merely omits the reference to the Aeolian rocks.

12 All quotations of Dryden's translation are from *Works*, IV.

He then takes the first two subordinate clauses of Juvenal's second sentence

> Quid agant venti; quas torqueat umbras
> Æacus;

and uses them as material from which, with some additions of his own, he can make up the rest of his couplet, and the rest of his sentence:

> , or hollow winds that blow
> From *Ætna's* top, or tortur'd Ghosts below.

Aeacus disappears, the winds become hollow, they are given an origin around Etna's top, and the ghosts are located in the underworld. The reference to Etna is possible because, as Dryden discovered from his commentaries, the rocks of Aeolus, God of the Winds, were the Liparene islands near Mount Etna.[13]

The remaining two subordinate clauses of Juvenal's sentence

> unde alius furtivae devehat aurum
> Pelliculae: quantas jaculetur Monychus ornos;

likewise become source material for Dryden. But this time he must begin a new sentence of his own, and he, therefore, constructs one that neatly fills out a couplet, and that repeats Juvenal's expression of exasperation:

> I know by rote the Fam'd Exploits of *Greece*;
> The Centaur's fury, and the Golden Fleece;

The mythological details disappear, and the events to which Juvenal alludes are baldly summarized.

All that remains of Juvenal's second sentence is the main clause:

> Frontonis platani, convulsaque marmora clamant
> Semper, & assiduo ruptae lectore columnae.

This too becomes source material, and Dryden, naturally composing in couplets, makes up another:

> Through the thick shades th' Eternal Scribler bauls;
> And shakes the Statues on their Pedestals.

Dryden both omits and condenses. Fronto and the broken pillars disappear. Juvenal's plane-trees become mere "thick shades". His "clamant/Semper" and "assiduo lectore" are run together to make "th' Eternal Scribler" who "bauls". Dryden interprets

13 Cf. *Juvenal's Sixteen Satyrs*, tr. Sir Robert Stapylton (London, 1674), p. 9; *Decimus Junius Juvenalis and Aulus Persius Flaccus*, tr. Barten Holyday (Oxford, 1673), p. 6; Prateus, p. 3.

"columnae" as the pedestals of the statues ("marmora"), and combines this reference with that to "convulsaque marmora" (which he takes as "shaken statues").[14]

With Juvenal's concluding sentence and line

> Expectes eadem à summo, minimoque Poëta

in order to make up his own couplet, Dryden has, this time, to expand Juvenal's sense:

> The best and worst on the same Theme employs
> His Muse, and plagues us with an equal noise.

Dryden's free paraphrase naturally alters the original's style of declamation. Dryden's version takes on the manner of a lecture. His couplet, and the precise sense and tone that he adopts combine to turn the passage into a series of magisterial pronouncements. This change appears in two ways: in the greater prominence given to the poet himself, and in the introduction into the passage of open condemnation and disparagement.

In the original Juvenal's mention of himself is restricted to the first sentence, and is only of minor importance, since that sentence serves merely to introduce the theme of the passage, and to act as a foil to the more brilliant second sentence. In the second sentence Juvenal does not mention himself. He objectifies his exasperation into the series of hyperboles concerning the destructive power of poetry-readings. Juvenal effaces himself in order to present the evidence against bad poetry and poets in this striking form.

In Dryden's version, however, the emphasis shifts from the evidence to the poet, himself. By omitting the details of the mythological themes, and by giving only a summary of them Dryden reduces their interest and importance. Correspondingly, he increases those of his own self-assertion. In his version there is not only the initial sentence "No Man can take a more familiar note ... than I ...". This is immediately followed by a new sentence of Dryden's own "I know by rote ...", and in both cases, aided by the measured movement of the couplet, Dryden has adopted a lofty and self-assertive tone.

Such a manner fits naturally with the use of open disparagement. Juvenal with his hyperbolical effects has no need for any-

14 No doubt by "marmora" Juvenal means "statues", but in view of "ruptae", surely "convulsa" means "shivered" rather than just "shaken"?

thing so direct and crude. But since Dryden cannot imitate Juvenal in this respect, he must substitute something of his own.

Thus, in reducing Juvenal's series of hyperboles to a single couplet, Dryden has relied for poetic interest on the terms "Scribler" and "bauls", and being under the necessity of expanding Juvenal's concluding statement in order to make up a couplet, he has added the clause "and plagues us with an equal noise." These examples of derogatory description overshadow the poor remnant of Juvenal's hyperbole "And shakes the Statues on their Pedestals", and help to preserve the character of authority that Dryden's instances of self-assertion have already given to his version.

(ii) Juvenal proceeds to declare his own qualifications for writing, and offers to explain his motives for choosing satire:

> Et nos ergo manum ferulae subduximus: & nos
> Consilium dedimus Syllae, privatus ut altum
> Dormiret. Stulta est clementia, cùm tot ubique
> Vatibus occurras, perituraе parcere chartae.
> Cur tamen hoc libeat potiùs decurrere campo,
> Per quem magnus equos Auruncae flexit alumnus:
> Si vacat, & placidi rationem admittitis, edam.
> (11.15-21)
>
> [Well, I too have flinched under the cane; I too have advised Sulla to retire and sleep sound. When you meet so many bards everywhere, it is foolish clemency to spare paper that will only be wasted.
>
> But why I prefer to run down the same course over which the great foster-son of Aurunca[15] wheeled his horses, if you've the time, and will quietly listen to reason, I'll tell you.]

This passage illustrates both Juvenal's habit of self-depreciation, and his sudden changes of tone and manner. The former is seen in the first four lines. Juvenal implies that he has had the same literary education as others. He has been caned at school, and performed exercises in declamation at college. This is, of course, only the worst kind of reason for writing. Juvenal's claim is merely that he is no less qualified to write than anyone else, not that he is especially fitted to do so. This bad reason is offered deliberately for its comic effect. Similarly, Juvenal argues that it would be pointless for him, out of any sense of humanity, to refrain from taking his revenge by writing. His own works will not last long enough to cause his fellow poets much vexation. Juvenal degrades himself in the eyes of his audience, and this

15 i.e. Lucilius, the first Roman satirist (c. 180- c. 102 B.C.), born at Suessa Aurunca in Latium.

self-degradation is reinforced by imagery and tone. He presents an undignified picture of himself hastily withdrawing his hand after the cane has struck it; he depreciates the declamatory exercise, and by association his part in it, by off-hand dismissal ("altum/Dormiret"); and he comically emphasizes the despicable character of these episodes by the vehement repetition of "Et nos".

This self-depreciation also contributes to the changes in tone in the second half of the passage. After the indignities of the first four lines, Juvenal suddenly moves into an exalted praise of his predecessor, Lucilius, which is embodied in a magnificent periphrasis, presenting Lucilius as a charioteer. Then, as suddenly, he switches to a conversational manner to invite his audience to hear his motives for taking up satire. The tonal distance between the praise and the invitation is indicated by the rather uncomplimentary way in which the latter is issued ("if you'll quietly listen to reason").

Dryden's translation is as follows:

> Provok'd by these Incorrigible Fools,
> I left declaiming in pedantick Schools;
> Where, with Men-boys, I strove to get Renown,
> Advising *Sylla* to a private Gown.
> But, since the World with Writing is possest,
> I'll versifie in spite; and do my best
> To make as much waste Paper as the rest.
> But why I lift aloft the Satyrs Rod,
> And tread the Path which fam'd *Lucilius* trod,
> Attend the Causes which my Muse have led:
> (11.19-28)

Dryden's paraphrase has again produced considerable changes. Juvenal's self-depreciation largely disappears, and his changes of tone disappear altogether. On examination Dryden's alterations are found to have a partial basis, at least, in his understanding of the passage, and in his need to make plain what might otherwise appear obscure.

Dryden must have understood Juvenal's "ergo" in the first line to mean "therefore" instead of "well then", and, in consequence, he must have taken the whole clause "Et nos ergo manum ferulae subduximus" — in his translation "and therefore I have withdrawn my hand from the cane" — to be the equivalent of the statement "and therefore I have left school". He must have thought that Juvenal was arguing that the tediousness of contemporary poetry caused him to abandon his education, in order, presumably, to get his revenge on the poets by writing himself.

Dryden expands Juvenal's "ergo" into the complete line "Provok'd by these Incorrigible Fools" to bring out the force of the argument, and he paraphrases "Et nos ... manum ferulae subduximus" as "I left declaiming in pedantick Schools", thus making clear what he considers the implication, the idea that Juvenal has left school. To fit in the reference to the declamation to Sulla, and to fill out the picture of the rhetorical schools, he makes up his own line "Where, with Men-boys, I strove to get Renown."[16]

In the course of these clarifications Dryden typically relies on explicit derogatory descriptions — "Incorrigible Fools", "pedantick Schools", "Men-boys" — and these, together with the lofty tone that he adopts, continue the disdainful character of Dryden's version, which at this point contrasts strongly with the manner of the original.

But Juvenal's satiric presentation of himself is not entirely lost. Dryden renders Juvenal's

> Stulta est clementia, cùm tot ubique
> Vatibus occurras, perituraе parcere chartae

by the triplet

> But, since the World with Writing is possest,
> I'll versifie in spite; and do my best
> To make as much waste Paper as the rest.

Dryden paraphrases Juvenal's sense in two contradictory ways. In the first half of his triplet he turns Juvenal's defensive excuse for vindictiveness into a direct, aggressive assertion — "I'll versifie in spite" — and so preserves the authoritative manner that he has so far employed. But in the second half of the triplet he

16 If "ergo" is translated as "therefore", the clause "& nos/Consilium dedimus Syllae, privatus ut altum/Dormiret" does not follow naturally — "And therefore I have withdrawn my hand from the cane, and I have given advice to Sulla etc." is incoherent. If Dryden felt any doubts about this interpretation, they might have been dispelled by Holyday's comment. Holyday, who accepts this interpretation, suggests "There is an especial *Emphasis* to be put in the Praeterperfect tenses *Subduximus* and *Dedimus*. ... For though our author had perform'd these younger exercises Heretofore, yet Now, he saith, he will venture upon a more manly talk." This seems to mean that the tense of these verbs suggests the idea that the actions which they denote are no longer being continued. Thus, Juvenal's Latin would amount to the statement "And, therefore, I have withdrawn my hand from the cane, and, though I once advised Sulla ..., I do so no longer." See Holyday, p. 11.

takes Juvenal's modest belief that his own works will quickly perish, and exaggerates it to the point of buffoonery. He makes the production of waste paper the deliberate purpose of the poet. Such buffoonery may have been congenial to Dryden with his taste for low humour, but it is quite out of place in the middle of a passage as dignified as Dryden's has become.

In the last few lines of his version Dryden sustains his grand style, and so eliminates Juvenal's variety of tone. Again, to some extent Dryden's alterations are due to his understanding of the passage, and his need to make things clear. Juvenal's allusion to Lucilius must be changed, since Dryden's readers are unlikely to grasp the identity of "the foster-son of Aurunca", or why Juvenal should allude to him at this point. Therefore, he ignores the allusion altogether, and substitutes a couplet of his own that makes clear the reference both to satire, and to Lucilius, himself:

> But why I lift aloft the Satyrs Rod,
> And tread the Path which fam'd *Lucilius* trod.

In the last line of Juvenal's passage, Dryden must have understood "rationem admittitis" as meaning "listen to my reasons", not "listen to reason", and this necessarily prevents the uncomplimentary aspect of Juvenal's last line from appearing in Dryden's version. However, it hardly justifies Dryden's turning Juvenal's casual invitation ("Si vacat . . .") into the imperious command

> Attend the Causes which my Muse have led.

Dryden is simply preserving the authority of his own version, a quality in which he obviously took great delight.

(iii) Juvenal proceeds to list some of the evils that have led him to choose satire for his genre:

> Cum tener uxorem ducat spado: Maevia Tuscum
> Figat aprum, & nudâ teneat venabula mammâ:
> Patricios omnes opibus cùm provocet unus,
> Quo tondente gravis juvenis mihi barba sonabat:
> Cùm pars Niliacae plebis, cùm verna Canopi
> Crispinus, Tyrias humero revocante lacernas
> Ventilet aestivum digitis sudantibus aurum,
> Nec sufferre queat majoris pondera gemmae:
> Difficile est Satiram non scribere.
>
> (11.22-30)

> [When a soft eunuch marries; when Maevia transfixes the Tuscan boar, and grasps her hunting-spear, bare-breasted; when a single man — under whose razor my rough youthful beard rasped —

> challenges the whole nobility with his wealth; when Crispinus[17], a fragment of the Nile plebs, a slave of Canopus, hitching up on his shoulder his Tyrian cloak, airs a ring on his sweaty finger in summer, and cannot support the weight of a larger gem: it's difficult not to write satire.]

This passage illustrates both Juvenal's manner of presenting evidence to his audience, and how this manner of presentation is sometimes associated with the incongruity in Roman evils.

Throughout the passage Juvenal is dealing with phenomena which go against either the natural order of things, or the accepted social order: the marriage of the eunuch violates the natural order; the hunting activities of the well-born Maevia, the accumulation of wealth by a barber, and the rise to rank and prosperity of the low-born and oriental Crispinus all violate the social order. In the first three cases of these phenomena the incongruity of their situation is pointed up by devices of word-order that produce striking ironic effects.

The incongruity of the eunuch's marrying is pointed up by placing the incongruous element "spado" which is the subject of its clause in the unusual and emphatic position at the end of the clause. In the case of Maevia the incongruity of her hunting is emphasized by the similar placing of the incongruous element "aprum", the direct object of its clause, at the end of the clause, and also by placing the whole phrase "Figat aprum" at the end of a run-on line. The incongruity of the barber's accumulation of wealth is first emphasized by making his fortune equal not merely to that of some of the nobility but to that of all of them together, and then this exaggerated contrast is pointed up by placing "Patricios omnes" at one end of the line, and "provocet unus" at the other.

The presentation of Maevia is made still more striking by the vivid imagery of "Figat aprum" which suddenly zooms in on the actual transfixing of the boar, by the image "nudâ teneat venabula mammâ", and by the onomatopoeic effect of that clause which presents the actual bouncing of the breast.

The presentation of Crispinus is less startling. Juvenal first establishes his humble and oriental origins with the phrases "pars Niliacae plebis" and "verna Canopi", and then contrasts his present prosperity and rank in a brief description of two of his

17 Crispinus, born in Canopus, a city at the mouth of the Nile, came to Rome as a fishmonger. He was made a knight by Domitian, and became a member of the latter's privy council.

actions ("Tyrias humero revocante lacernas", and "Ventilet aestivum digitis sudantibus aurum") and one of his disabilities ("Nec sufferre queat majoris pondera gemmae"). This description implicitly presents the nature of Crispinus' vice, that of effeminacy.

Dryden's version is as follows:

> When Sapless Eunuchs mount the Marriage-bed,
> When Mannish *Mevia* that two handed Whore,
> Astride on Horse-back hunts the *Tuscan* Boar,
> When all our Lords are by his Wealth outvy'd,
> Whose Razour on my callow-beard was try'd:
> When I behold the Spawn of conquer'd *Nile*
> *Crispinus*, both in Birth and Manners vile,
> Pacing in pomp, with Cloak of *Tyrian* dye
> Chang'd oft a day for needless Luxury;
> And finding oft occasion to be fan'd,
> Ambitious to produce his Lady-hand;
> Charg'd with light Summer-rings his fingers sweat,
> Unable to support a Gem of weight:
> Such fulsom Objects meeting every where,
> 'Tis hard to write, but harder to forbear.
>
> (11.29-43)

Dryden's version shows a considerable difference in interest from Juvenal's original. Dryden is not interested in presenting evidence in a striking way, or in pointing up incongruities in Roman evils. He has a simpler and more direct interest in the evils, themselves, for their own sake, and as instances of vice and ugliness. This is indicated by his interpolated line "Such fulsom Objects meeting every where": he sees such phenomena as disgusting and repulsive, and his treatment is intended to make them appear so.

The barber, as a mere social upstart, offers Dryden no scope to develop this interest, and the couplet "When all our Lords . . ." is, in consequence, only a perfunctory paraphrase of Juvenal's sense. But in the eunuchs (now plural in Dryden's version), Maevia, and Crispinus, Dryden has figures who can be presented as examples of gross and perverted sexuality, and who, as such, lend themselves to appropriate vilification.

In the case of the eunuchs Dryden substitutes for Juvenal's simple "uxorem ducat" the paraphrase "mount the Marriage-bed", and so shifts the emphasis of his version from the idea of marriage in the abstract to that of the sexual act, itself. He also increases the emphasis on the eunuchs' abnormal sexuality by qualifying his own noun "Eunuchs" by the adjective "Sapless".

The suggestions of "mount" and "Sapless" have a reductive, dehumanizing effect, and the grossness and vileness of the resulting picture are reinforced by the heavy alliteration of "s's" and "m's".

In his commentary Dryden offers a note that states that "Mevia" is "a name put for any impudent and mannish woman".[18] Masculinity and immodesty are perhaps implied in Juvenal's presentation of Maevia as an Amazon with bare breast, but these features remain implicit. They are not in the foreground of attention. Juvenal's portrait of Maevia is picturesque, even elegant. Dryden, however, is more concerned to emphasize what he regards as the implications of the passage, and he, therefore, ignores Juvenal's sense, and substitutes a couplet of his own. In his couplet the emphasis has shifted from the abstract incongruity of Maevia's hunting at all to the offensiveness of both her physique, and her conduct. This is brought about by the derogatory expressions "Mannish", "two handed" (= "big, bulky, strapping" *OED*), and "Whore", and also by the image "Astride on Horse-back" which emphasizes in the grossest way Maevia's unladylike character. The vileness of this portrait is also reinforced by alliteration — this time of "m's" and "h's".

With Crispinus Dryden is closer, in spirit at least, to the original, but his treatment of Crispinus is more heavy-handed, and less subtle than Juvenal's. In Juvenal's account Crispinus' effeminacy is suggested in three ways: by the dandyish manner in which he dresses — he wears his cloak so loose that he has to hitch it up continually — by his airing his ring, and by his inability to wear a heavier ring. The second of these is another example of satiric hyperbole. Crispinus is so weak that the weight of the ring makes his finger sweat, and he has to wave his hand about in order to cool it down. Dryden spoils both the simplicity and the fineness of wit of this picture. Because of his interpretations he overloads Crispinus with unnecessary vices: he interprets "Tyrias humero revocante lacernas" (lit. "his shoulder recalling Tyrian cloaks" — poetic plural) as meaning that Crispinus changes his cloak several times a day, and he attributes this custom to a love of luxury; he also misses the point of Crispinus' gesture with the ring — he thinks Crispinus wishes to show off the delicacy of his hand — and so makes him guilty of self-conscious affectation besides. Moreover, in Dryden's version Crispinus' effeminacy is more extreme: Dryden translates Ju-

18 *Works*, IV.108.

venal's poetic plural "digitis sudantibus" literally, thus making Crispinus appear wearing several rings instead of merely one, and he interprets "aestivum ... aurum", where "aestivum" has only the function of indicating time, as though it were a reference to a special type of light ring designed for summer use.

The difference in interest between Juvenal and Dryden is associated with a difference in manner. Whereas Juvenal makes an impressive presentation of evidence, employing effects of word order and imagery, Dryden engages in a more straightforward satiric attack, and adopts a more didactic attitude. The invective of his attack can be seen throughout the passage, not only in the reductive imagery that presents the eunuchs, and the derogatory expressions applied to Mevia, but also in the description of Crispinus, in the use of the phrases "Spawn of conquer'd Nile" and "Lady-hand". The didacticism appears in the account of Crispinus. Whereas Juvenal presents only vivid images of Crispinus' behaviour, or short statements of fact concerning him, and leaves their implications to be grasped by the audience, Dryden makes the implications, as he understands them, explicit. This involves him in making moral judgments, and in assuming the role of instructor to the audience. Thus he substitutes for Juvenal's "pars ... plebis" and "verna Canopi" the description "both in Birth and Manners vile"; he makes plain the motivation behind what he takes to be Crispinus' change of garb by adding to his rendering "with Cloak of *Tyrian* dye/Chang'd oft a day" the explanatory phrase "for needless Luxury"; and he clarifies, according to his own interpretation, Crispinus' action and motive in exhibiting his ring by interpolatng the couplet:

> And finding oft occasion to be fan'd,
> Ambitious to produce his lady-hand.

His moralistic attitude is also reinforced by the judicial movement that has been given to the couplet.

(iv) Further on Juvenal cites another example of Roman depravity, that of legacy-hunting gigolos:

> Cùm te summoveant qui testamenta merentur
> Noctibus, in coelum quos evehit optima summi
> Nunc via processûs, vetulae vesica beatae.
> (11.37-39)
>
> [... when you are thrust aside by those who earn legacies at night, those who are carried up to heaven by what is now the best road to the highest advancement, the bladder of a wealthy old woman.]

The persuasive function of the speech is seen in this passage in two features: in the use of "te" to involve the audience in the

situation that Juvenal is describing, and in the two rhetorical effects involving "Noctibus" and "vesica". Both of the latter are ironic climaxes: "Noctibus" at the end of the run-on line producing a surprising conclusion to the clause "qui testamenta merentur . . .", and "vetulae vesica beatae" producing a similar effect as a phrase in apposition to and explaining the preceding "optima . . . via". The impressive character of the latter example is enhanced by the strong contrast between the "celestial" nature of the end of the gigolos' activity, and the uncelestial nature of their means, and this contrast is set off by the abrupt change from the vague and abstract phraseology of "optima summi/Nunc via processûs" to the grotesquely concrete image "vetulae vesica beatae".

Dryden translates:

> When Night-performance holds the place of Merit,
> And Brawn and Back the next of Kin disherit;
> For such good Parts are in Preferment's way,
> The Rich Old Madam never fails to pay.
>
> (11.55-58)

Dryden's paraphrase does not show the persuasive function of the original. Juvenal's reference to the audience through "te" disappears, and this is indicative of the different relationship in which the poet stands to the audience in Dryden's version. Dryden's poet may entertain or instruct, but he does not try to manipulate his audience in Juvenal's manner.

Not unexpectedly, Juvenal's effects are toned down. Dryden cannot produce the kind of climaxes that Juvenal can manage with the hexameter and the Latin language. Although his paraphrase contains good examples of Drydenian effects of contrast, they are tame in comparison with Juvenal's. The difference in the order in which the ideas are introduced is enough to lose the surprising quality of Juvenal's effects. Although in Dryden's version there is a strong contrast between the insinuating "Night-performance" and "holds the place of Merit", and between the grossly concrete "Brawn and Back" and the abstract "next of Kin disherit", the incongruous elements "Night-performance" and "Brawn and Back" are introduced to the audience's understanding before their contrasts, instead of after them, thus making any climactic effect impossible.

We can also observe in this passage the free-and-easy manner that Dryden occasionally employs, and the amused cynicism that accompanies it. These differ not only from the grim irony of Juvenal's original, but also from the domineering tone that Dry-

den uses elsewhere, and the dignified moralistic manner that he adopts. Like the instances of inappropriate buffoonery, this example of the Restoration manner indicates the lack of coherence in Dryden's version. Dryden translated from passage to passage, using at each point whatever style was congenial to him, without considering the overall character of the whole.

(v) The last two examples come from the very end of the satire. Here Juvenal represents himself as engaged in a dialogue with a friend and adviser.

[Juvenal] Dicas hîc forsitan, unde
Ingenium par materiae? unde illa priorum
Scribendi quodcumque animo flagrante liberet
Simplicitas, cujus non audeo dicere nomen?[19]
Quid refert dictis ignoscat Mutius, an non?
[Friend] Pone Tigellinum, teda lucebis in illa,
Quâ stantes ardent, qui fixo gutture fumant.
[Juvenal] Qui dedit ergo tribus patruis aconita, vehetur
Pensilibus plumis, atque illinc despiciet nos,
Et latum mediâ sulcum deducit arenâ?[20]
[Friend] Cùm veniet contrà, digito compesce labellum:
Accusator erit, qui verbum dixerit, hic est.[21]
(11.150-161)

[(Juvenal) Perhaps you may say here, where shall I find the talent to match the subject? where find that freedom of our ancestors in writing whatever the burning soul desired — that freedom

19 In some modern editions, e.g. Duff's, the punctuation differs here. A question mark is put after "simplicitas", and "cujus non audeo dicere nomen" becomes a separate sentence, and hence an example of Juvenal's bluster similar to "Quid refert dictis ignoscat Mutius, an non?"

20 In Prateus, as in most other editions of Juvenal, this line actually occurs after "Quâ stantes ardent, qui fixo gutture fumant" where it makes an awkward crux. I have transposed it, because from his translation

> Shall They who drench'd three Uncles in a draught
> Of poys'nous Juice, be then in Triumph brought,
> Make Lanes among the People where they go,
> And, mounted high on downy Chariots, throw
> Disdainful glances on the Crowd below?
> (11.238-42)

it seems that Dryden followed Holyday, who agrees with "the apt conceit of *Ptolemaeus Flavius* ... who ... thinks here is *only* a *dislocation* or transposition of this troublesome verse; and that it should be plac'd two verses lower" [i.e. after "Pensilibus plumis, atque illinc despiciet nos"]. Holyday interprets the line as meaning "that *Tigellinus* his train of followers made a large lane through the people" (Holyday, p. 17).

21 The distribution of speeches between Juvenal and his friend differs slightly from edition to edition. The one given here is that of Prateus.

whose name I do not dare to speak? What does it matter if Mutius[22] forgive my words or not?

(Friend) Cite Tigellinus,[23] and you will blaze in that pitch in which men with their throats fixed stand and burn and smoke.

(Juvenal) Shall, then, the man who has given aconite to three uncles be carried along on his hanging down-filled cushions, and thence look down on us, and trace a broad furrow through the midst of the arena?

(Friend) When he comes up, press your finger to your lip. He who merely says the word 'This is he' will be counted as an informer.]

The subject of this dialogue is the possibility and the desirability of writing satire. Juvenal first suggests that his friend may think him neither talented enough to succeed in satire, nor brave enough to speak his mind freely in the manner of the ancient Romans. Juvenal ignores the former charge, but replies to the latter by speaking as though he were Lucilius, his satiric predecessor, who had fearlessly attacked a powerful adversary, P. Mucius Scaevola. The friend then points out that if Juvenal follows Lucilius' example by attacking the great, he will suffer a dreadful death at the stake. Juvenal can only respond with an indignant rhetorical question. This expresses his sense of the intolerable injustice that such villains should not only enjoy their ill-gotten gains, but also treat ordinary folk with contempt. The friend, nonetheless, advises him to suppress his indignation, and remain silent. Otherwise, he will be regarded as an informer, and have to risk the dangers of that role.

In the following part of the dialogue the friend advises Juvenal to write only mythological verse, because that offends no one. Then he contrasts the effect of writing satire:

[Friend] Ense velut stricto quoties Lucilius ardens
Infremuit, rubet auditor, cui frigida mens est
Criminibus, tacitâ sudant praecordia culpâ.
Inde irae, & lacrymae. Tecum priùs ergo voluta
Haec animo, ante tubas: galeatum serò duelli
Poenitet. [Juvenal] Experiar quid concedatur in illos,
Quorum Flaminia tegitur cinis, atque Latina.
(11.165-171)

[(Friend) Whenever blazing Lucilius roars, as though with drawn sword, the hearer whose mind is cold with crime reddens, and his innards sweat from secret guilt. Thence come rage and tears. So, first, turn these things over in your mind, before the trumpets sound. It's too late for a soldier to regret going to war, once his helmet's donned.

22 P. Mucius Scaevola, consul in 133 B.C.; satirized by Lucilius.
23 Sofonius Tigellinus, a notorious favourite of Nero.

(Juvenal) Then I shall try what I may say about those whose ashes are covered by the Flaminian and Latin Ways.[24]]

These lines conclude the satire. Juvenal finally gives way to his friend's advice, and decides to attack only those who are safely dead and buried.

In these passages can be seen both Juvenal's personal involvement with the vices and evils of Rome, and the final comic example of self-depreciation, the former being used to set off the latter. Juvenal's indignation at the prosperity of such villains as those who have poisoned their uncles is not disinterested, but comes from a sense of personal injury. He is enraged that these men should not only be wealthy, but should despise the honest poverty that he represents. This sense of personal injury leads him to utter the bold rhetorical question "Quid refert dictis ignoscat Mutius, an non?" But Juvenal's bravery has no solid foundation. In the end his fear of the dangers of writing satire is stronger than his rage, and he tamely submits to the abject compromise of satirizing only the dead, because they cannot retaliate. This is the supreme ironic effect of the poem: that Juvenal, who has repeatedly expressed his indignation, and asserted his intention to satirize contemporary society, should at the last be frightened off, and resolve to engage only with those opponents who cannot fight back. This irony is in keeping with the disparaging way in which he has all along presented himself.

Dryden's translation of these passages is as follows:

Some may, perhaps, demand what Muse can yield
Sufficient strength for such a spacious Field?
From whence can be deriv'd so large a Vein,
Bold Truths to speak, and spoken to maintain;
When God-like Freedom is so far bereft
The Noble Mind, that scarce the Name is left?
E're *Scandalum Magnatum* was begot,
No matter if the Great forgave or not:
But if that honest licence now you take,
If, into Rogues Omnipotent, you rake,
Death is your Doom, impail'd upon a Stake:
Smear'd o're with Wax, and set on fire, to light
The Streets, and make a dreadful blaze by night.
Shall They who drench'd three Uncles in a draught
Of poys'nous Juice, be then in Triumph brought,
Make Lanes among the People where they go,
And, mounted high on downy Chariots, throw

24 Great roads leading out of Rome, and lined with tombs.

Disdainful glances on the Crowd below?
Be silent, and beware if such you see;
'Tis Defamation but to say, That's He!

(11.225-244)

But when *Lucilius* brandishes his Pen,
And flashes in the face of Guilty Men,
A cold Sweat stands in drops on ev'ry part;
And Rage succeeds to Tears, Revenge to Smart.
Muse be advis'd; 'tis past consid'ring time,
When enter'd once the dangerous Lists of Rhime:
Since none the Living-Villains dare implead,
Arraign them in the Persons of the Dead.

(11.251-258)

In these versions (and also in that of the lines between them which I have not quoted) Dryden has eliminated the dialogue. The speeches of Juvenal and his friend are run together to make up a single speech that is given to the poet, and is continuous with the rest of the satire. The friend's suggestion introduced by "Dicas hîc forsitan . . ." becomes a reflection attributed by the poet to unspecified members of the audience — "Some may, perhaps, demand . . ." — and it serves to introduce the poet's own reflections on the theme. The friend's "Pone Tigellinum . . ." becomes the poet's advice given to the audience — "But if that honest licence . . .". Similarly, Juvenal's "Qui dedit ergo . . ." becomes a question raised by the poet so that he can give his own view of it, and his interlocutor's response "Cùm veniet contrà . . ." becomes a further piece of advice belonging to the poet. In the second passage Dryden makes Juvenal turn his attention from his audience, and address his own Muse. The friend's "Tecum priùs ergo voluta . . ." becomes the poet's own "Muse be advis'd . . .".

The elimination of the dialogue and the attribution of all the material to Juvenal is associated with two other changes in the character of the passages. First, Juvenal's personal involvement disappears. Dryden so alters matters of detail that the poet no longer seems to have any private interest in the subjects under discussion. He appears quite unconcerned, as he offers advice, or discusses common topics for the benefit of his listeners. Thus, Juvenal's "unde/Ingenium par materiae?" which implicitly refers to Juvenal, himself, is turned into the impersonal and general "what Muse can yield/Sufficient strength . . . ?" "Cujus non audeo dicere nomen?" is depersonalized as "that scarce the Name is left?", and, most significantly, Juvenal's reference to himself in

"atque illinc despiciet nos" is removed. Dryden paraphrases with "throw/Disdainful glances on the Crowd below."[25]

Secondly, Juvenal's base change of heart disappears. The didactic manner that Dryden imposes is not compatible with the kind of compromise that concludes the original. Dryden must preserve the dignity of his version. Thus, he deals with the friend's advice "Tecum priùs ergo voluta . . ." by turning it into the poet's own address to his Muse, and he makes the best he can of Juvenal's cowardly "Experiar quid concedatur . . ." by substituting a paraphrase which turns it into a merely prudent stratagem. In his version the poet only conceals his attack on contemporary evils by disguising it as one on those of the past.[26] The paraphrase with its fierce imperative "Arraign them in the Persons of the Dead" enables Dryden to retain the note of authority, so that, whereas in the original Juvenal ends in a ludicrously humiliating posture, in Dryden's version the poet maintains his dignity to the last.

25 Cf. an earlier instance of Dryden's depersonalization. In the scene where the clients collect their dole, Juvenal identifies himself as one of them:

> Jubet à praecone vocari
> Ipsos Troiugenas: nam vexant limen & ipsi
> Nobiscum.
> (11.99-101)
> [He (i.e. the distributor of the dole) orders even the noble descendants of the Trojans to be summoned by the herald, for they are crowding the threshold with us.]

Dryden translates

> The Cryer calls aloud
> Our Old Nobility of *Trojan* Blood,
> Who gape among the Croud for their precarious Food.
> (11.152-154)

26 Cf. Prateus' comment (p. 31) on "Experiar quid concedatur . . .": "Juvenalis verba, Saltem igitur mortuos lacessam, & eos dumtaxat Satirâ vellicabo, qui ulcisci nequeunt: sic profectò in aliena persona & vivi vapulabunt." [The words of Juvenal, In that case I shall at least attack the dead, and pinch by my satire only those who cannot avenge themselves: thus really in someone else's person the living shall also be beaten.]