2021

Translation and Juvenal: A Study in Translation analysis and the implications for Classics translation through the lens of modern-language translation

Daisy Catling-Allen

Translation and Juvenal

A Study in Translation analysis and the implications for Classics translation

through the lens of modern-language translation

By

Daisy Catling-Allen

Thesis Advisors:

Bert Lott

Curtis Dozier

Rachel Friedman

A thesis submitted to the Department of Greek and Roman Studies in partial

fulfillment of the

requirement for the degree of

Bachelor of Arts

Vassar College

December 2020

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

This thesis has been a very long time in the making. It has spanned multiple years and departments.

I would like to say a very special thank you to my major advisors Curtis Dozier and Ken Livingston, both of whom spent many hours discussing with me how to integrate Cognitive Science and Greek and Roman Studies in a Latin-language based thesis.

I would also like to thank the other professors of the Greek and Roman studies department Rachel Friedman, Bert Lott, and Tara Mulder all of whom have helped me learn and truly understand ancient languages and translation in readiness for this thesis.

My final thank you goes to my family and friends who had to listen to me rigorously discuss translation theories, classics translation, and Juvenal for at least two years before I wrote a single word.

Introduction

For a lot of classicists, might I say all classicists, translation is a huge part of their job. For many people, whether they know ancient languages or not, it is incredibly useful to have English translations of texts that they want to study. This is the same for all fields that require translation, no matter the time period of the original text.

Within the last fifty years academics have seen a boom in linguistic and translation studies for all language conversions. In Classics, scholars have been interested in translation for as long as they have been translating. Unfortunately, Classics is not a particularly scientific field, it is often more interested in the human experience than the mechanics behind it. This has resulted in a very arbitrary translation culture where scholars tend to only critically think about translations in a literary context, this results in translations that are so wildly different they do not appear to have the same original text. In fact, there is a culture of "you should read it in the original language" because this is seen as the only way to experience the text properly, wit this culture surrounding translation one has to ask whether translators are trying to provide a resource for people or just showing off their own skills. This is because scholars recognise that a translator will always be influenced by their own interpretation of the original text when writing their translation: insofar as scholars believe one cannot write a translation without placing their interpretation into it.

Having examined a lot of linguistic studies myself, I started to wonder why it is Classics seems to look at translation so much differently than other modern language translation fields. Linguistic and Translations studies fields tend to look at translation as a more scientific process (rather than a more artistic one) which can create more uniformity and ease in learning the process as well as presenting clear goals for future translators. This caused me to want to examine Classics translations through modern translation theories and see if it is really all that different to modern language translations or if see if there is something else going on and why that might be happening.

I decided to work on Juvenal's *Satires* because we have seen a big change in scholarly thought very recently for him, and there is also a lot of scholarship within the different veins of thought. I knew this would be helpful to see how this change in interpretation would affect the

translation. To focus my analysis on the text I also narrowed it down to a single satire (*Satire 10*) and to four sections of the satire itself. This way I could spend more time with the words and phrases in the translations for a more in depth analysis. *Satire 10* is also one of the most popular of the satires in scholarship as well as for "notable quotables" in modern English-speaking countries. I chose the four sections of *Satire 10* to get a broad view of translation practices throughout the Satire and the entire work. One would assume that the methods of translation would be the same or at least very similar throughout the sampled sections as to the whole text.

The first section I chose was the first line of thought, spanning 3 and a half lines:

> *Omnibus in terris, quae sunt a Gadibus usque*
> *Auroram et Gangen, pauci dinoscere possunt*
> *uera bona atque illis multum diuersa, remota*
> *erroris nebula….*

      I chose these lines to emulate the idea of "start as you mean to go on": the first few lines should be translated in the same way as the rest of the satire. This is also a very helpful section because it contains demonstratives and pronouns as well as place names all which present different challenges to a translator. Demonstratives and pronouns can refer back to something, so the translator has to decide whether to refer back demonstratively or implicitly. For place names, we now tend to use different place names in English to Latin, so a question to ask: is does a translator choose to keep that word different or make it more familiar to the audience.

The second section I chose was line 76-81:

> *...iam priden, ex quo suffragia nulli*
> *uendimus, effudit curas; nam qui dabat olim*
> *imperium, fasces, legiones, omnia, nunc se*
> *continet atque duas tantum res anxius optat,*

panem et circenses….

This section contains one of most well-known lines of Juvenal: "bread and circuses". This is a phrase we often use to describe politicians placating people without actually addressing their problems in modern societies. This makes it very interesting to examine in translation because a translator could choose to use the well-known translation or they could choose to render it in a way that more accurately reflects the meaning in Latin. We also see a list of common Roman symbols of power here (*fasces* and *imperium*), and so the translator has to translate these so that their audience will understand what Juvenal is talking about here.

The third section I have chosen is line 203-206:

> *non eadem uini atque cibi torpente palato*
>
> *gaudia; nam coitus iam longa obliuio, uel si*
>
> *coneris, iacet exiguus cum ramice neruus*
>
> *et, quamuis tota palpetur nocte, iacebit.*

Here is the least notable section in terms of translation decisions and quotes; that is not to say this would be easy to translate, far from it, but we are not seeing cultural challenges or well-known phrases here. However, this is a very graphic scene involving masturbation or manual stimulation to the penis by a companion. We can see here how the translator could struggle with this depending on their target audience and their own comfort level surrounding sexually explicit scenes.

The fourth and final section I chose was lines 354-356:

> *ut tamen et poscas aliquid uoueasque sacellis*
>
> *exta et candiduli diuina tomacula porci,*
>
> *orandum est ut sit mens sana in corpore sano.*

We have here another infamous line "a healthy mind in a healthy body" used by many American societies as a motto, this phrase will give the translator the same struggle as the line from section 2. We also see here a pretty typical sacrifice scene, this is something that would be

difficult to render to an audience with no knowledge of these rituals, so it is interesting to see how the translators will render this.

When choosing my translations I wanted to have them all be close together in publication date so that while there would be some difference in interpretation they wouldn't be too wildly different in their use of English such as happens over decades of time. As well as this, I chose translations from the last thirty years (1990 - 2020) since this is within my own lifetime and so the English used would be the most similar to my own language. This makes exploring deeper meanings of words an easier task. Nor did I want them coming from wildly different places either, this is because having a different receiving culture can affect the translator in a way that is not productive to this discussion. To reduce this effect all my texts were published in New York (though not only in New York).

I chose the 2004 *Loeb* edition of *Juvenal* by Sarah Morton Braund, the 1991 *Penguin Classics* edition by Niall Rudd, and the 2016 *Oxbow* edition by John Godwin. These span audiences in age and classics-experience, I will explore these differences in the following chapters.

History of Latin Satire

Juvenal is one of the last in a line of Roman satirists. The genre morphed over the centuries, as is unsurprising, but the first to introduce the Greek Hexameter and the *Saturae* was Quintus Ennius (239-169 BCE). He wrote many works including plays and annals, but his four books of satire were a Latin introduction to the meter and comedy style which had previously been used only by the Greek writers[1].

Continuing this tradition after Ennius, came Gaius Lucilius (c. 180-102 BCE) who truly cemented Satire as a genre for Latin writers. While much of his work does not survive, what does is considered crude and often conversational in its approach. His aim appears to be moral preachment, which is where we see our later authors' goals stemming from.

---

[1] Suerbaum, W. and Eck, W. (2006)

Contemporary to Lucilius is Marcus Terentius Varro (116-27 BCE). Varro was a military leader and scholar under the first Triumvirate. His Satires mainly come down to us in fragments after they had been used by grammarians in their own texts. But while we, in some places, only have titles to work with we can see that he used a lot of dialogue and fantastical scenarios[2] to seemingly create manuals on daily life.

Finally we come to Horace, or Quintus Horatius Flacco (65-8 BCE) who is the last historically recognised Satirist before Juvenal and probably the most famous of the bunch. Horace is known for his multitude of works and styles from epigrams to epodes and most famously his Odes. But his Satires focus on human failings and even call out previous Satirists for their styles of writing.[3] Horace remains Epicurean in his values and his writing but maintains a brief and disciplined manner as compared with Lucilius's loose and frenetic one.

Some other authors between Horace and Juvenal produced satiric material (Seneca, T. Petronius Niger and Manilius Vopiscus to name a few) though none are seen as Satirists because of their range of writings, the small size of the satiric components, or the lack of surviving material. The only author who is often noted in this history is Persius (Aulus Persius Flaccus, 34-62 CE) whose poems obviously take influence from Lucilius and Horace but whose Latin is dense and difficult and scholars describe him to be "lack[ing] Juvenal's brilliance"[4]

Introduction to Juvenal

Juvenal, or Decimus Iunius Iuvenalis, was a poet working in the late 1st and early 2nd centuries CE. His surviving works, *The Satires*, are works in the genre of satire. This, like the modern genre of satire, is a poetic form commenting on society in a joking fashion in dactylic hexameter.

Very little is known about Juvenal himself and most of the evidence we have come from within his Satires. There are also multiple biographies, most especially the *Vita Iuvenalis*, the manuscript of which dates no later than the tenth century. He seems to have been the son or adopted son of a freedman and a pupil of Quinitilian. Biographies agree on his birthplace as Aquinum. We do not have an accurate birth date but he seems to have been born under Trajan

---

[2] Eck, W., Sallmann, K., and Schmidt, P. (2006)
[3] Graf, F., Müller, W., Müller, C., and Kytzler, B. (2006)
[4] Ferguson (1979) pg XV

and survived after Hadrian's reign (something around 55 - 183 CE). Every biography mentions a period of exile near the end of Juvenal's life though he himself never mentions such a time.

From his Satires we can see a wide range in education, Juvenal is known to play with the hexameter of Satire to varying degrees of success (or so some scholars believe). He also implements rhetorical speech and a vast array of personae within the Satires. A reader can also enjoy his range of vocabulary which he adjusts often even within a single *Satire*. He jumps from foriegn words to common speech to archaic terms to make points about characters and the society of Rome as necessary.

As you can see from the above array of Satirists there is a lot of variation in the genre of Satire. Some satirists are more composed and argumentative, some philosophical teachers, some are angrier and shouting into the void. The only thing they do all have in common is this critique of the modern era and peoples, and often a hearkening back to "better days". Juvenal refers back to his predecessors often enough that we can see his wide-reading of them, for instance his First Satire is headed by a "programme poem" that mimics those of Horace and Persius[5].

Juvenal is known for his mixing of other literary styles into his Satires, the most obvious example is his blurring of epic and satire in the First Satire with his more grandiose turns of phrase. However, Juvenal is most well known and characterised by his maturation throughout his satires. Scholars often split Juvenal's works into two sections: his angry young self, and his matured calmer self. Whether this reflects an actual maturation of Juvenal or merely another movement of his writing in form and experience is still up for debate. But no matter whether Juvenal is talking through himself or another character, angry or despondent, he is dealing with large societal issues and complaints of the disgrace of contemporary Rome.

For the purposes of this thesis, I will be focusing on Juvenal's tenth Satire, written in his later years, described by Paul Murgatroyd[6] as "one of the most famous and fascinating" of his Satires. It came in his later years where he seems to be more interested in discussing the issues than just ranting about them.

---

[5] Jones, F. (2007) p. 4.
[6] Murgatroyd, P. (2017) p. 1

I will now examine the methodologies discussed in translation and linguistic studies over the last few decades.

Translation Methodologies

When translators create a new textual translation there are many different possible methods and resources they can use. Some start off by reading previous translations. Modern cognitive scientists and linguistic researchers consider there to be four main methods of translation: linguistic, sociocultural, literary and interpretive[7]. These have been applied to modern language translation, but not historically to ancient language translation.

One issue surrounding the application of these translation methods is how slowly Classics tends to apply new streams of thought as they enter the academic world. Many in the fields of anthropology, linguistics, cognitive science and others claim that translation as a form of study and thought didn't exist until the 1960s[8]. Classicists have obviously been translating long before this, but have not critically analysed the field itself until much more recently than most disciplines. That is why it's so important to make these strides to connect Classics to translation studies. This will involve looking at Classics translations through the lens of Translation studies but also examining how classicist translators have been doing this work before Translation studies even existed. For example, classicist translators tend to use dictionaries for expanded meanings of words and phrases since unlike with modern languages there is no other way of accessing this information. Another resource is specific text commentaries, which I have included as a method of translation.

Commentaries

Commentaries are, in their essence, a tool to explore a text in more depth. This includes explaining the Latin words and their meanings; exploring the inferences that can be made from those meanings; connecting to other points in the text or other texts with similar views or allusions. The author can also expand historical or mythological points made in the text and explain what these points would mean to a Latin reader.

---

[7] Zhu, L. (2017) p. 136
[8] Munday, J. (2008) p.4

Most importantly for our use, commentary authors can translate lines or phrases for lower level Latin learners. They can either do this line by line or at the beginning of commentary on a section (some of these "translations" are actually paraphrases which quickly show what is going on but are not useful to higher level translators).

Translators, or those working to produce a published translation at least (rather than our Latin students), can use a commentary for any of the above purposes. Since the author will be aiming their translation at lower level readers, it will be more accurate in relation to the Latin (in general) and less poetic or metaphorical. This accuracy is designed to improve Latin-English understanding. By using this type of translation, the translator can be sure their readers have a grasp of the grammar and meaning before they then explore the meaning in an English language context.

Linguistic

The linguistic translation model, commonly referred to as the "word for word" model, is probably the most recognizable to classicist translators. From the first Latin class, students are taught to find English word or phrase equivalents for Latin words. As they progress, students are exposed to more possibilities for translating single words and small phrases into English and are told to choose the best one. This choice often leads to a lot of discrepancies even in published translations like the ones we are looking at here, since words will have many different meanings and connotations and so depending on the translator a single word could be translated ten or more different ways.

This is possibly the oldest translation methodology or at least the oldest discussed practice for translation; we have comments from Cicero arguing for literal translations of Greek texts into Latin. However, in most disciplines this method has lost a lot of support over the 20th century with the advent of more systematic approaches taking translation out of a language learning activity and into literary, philosophical, and cultural contexts.

This is not to say that the linguistic approach is not itself also systematic. Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) wrote on the strategies and ideas inherent in this methodology. With the *Caloque* (or literal) translation, the translator is often confronted with two types of words, ones

which require servitude and ones which garner choice[9]. This is essentially, how much choice the translator has in their rendering of this word: either not very much (servitude) or a lot (garnering choice).

The linguistic method of translation is very useful in Latin to English translation because it often necessitates a deeper understanding of grammatical and syntactic structures that is useful for people learning or already knowing Latin. However, it can just as often create "translatese" phrases, which render the source language grammar but does not fit well with the receiving language. This is why often this method is combined with others when creating a translation for wider usage beyond the classroom.

Socio-linguistic

The socio-linguistic, socio-cultural, or cultural translation method focuses on transmission of large cultural ideas and circumstances instead of on exact wording transition or small phrases. This method highlights the receiving culture as well as the source culture because it is looking for a transmission between the two. The first instance of scholarship on socio-linguistic is from 1796 when Whilhelm von Humboldt said "Every translator is doomed to be done in by one of two stumbling blocks: he will either stay too close to the original, at the cost of taste and the language of his nation, or he will adhere too closely to the characteristics peculiar to his nation, at the cost of the original."[10], so we can see how long people have been concerned with cultural transmission when translating.

In more recent years, we have seen a boom in globalization and interest across the globe in other languages and cultures. This has resulted in the advent of digital translation methods, most famously Google Translate[11]. While many hoped this would result in an increase in cultural diversity and knowledge, it has actually given a privilege to European languages and many technologies cannot cope with the complexities associated with spoken languages, since these are the dominating countries in world relations[12].

---

[9] Vinay, J. & Darbelnet, J. (1958), p. 23
[10] Contained in a letter to A.W. Schlegel, dated July 23rd, 1796
[11] Bassnett, S. (2014) p 126
[12] Bassnett, S. (2014) p 126

As a result of this privileging, anthropologists, especially, have seen a renewal of socio-linguistic models of translation between languages and even within languages [13]. This methodology also lends itself well to spoken translation and interpretation since the translator has the room to evaluate the two cultures they are spanning and can adapt for these cultures easily, as well as expand by moving between the two. Translators in this methodology are required to be fluent in both cultures/languages.

This methodology would be very useful in Latin to English translation because it can incorporate the discussion that is already being had in Classics translation of "domestication vs foreignization"[14]. Socio-linguistic translation can explore both the methods of presenting a foreign culture in a way such that it is obviously different, while also situating it in a way that is familiar to the audience culture. This can be especially helpful since this ancient culture is no longer accessible to the modern layperson except through reading about it.

One pitfall of this method is that translators cannot say they are experts in ancient Roman cultures, just more expert than many of their readers, since obviously they do not have firsthand experience. This, like the consumption of many cultures, can be mitigated by exposure to the textual and physical evidence that we do have. And even in this difficulty some scholars find hope, for instance Mitter (1987) describes how any interaction with another culture is meaningful and expands the reader's own understanding and worldview: "meaning and value are intimately connected; to recover meaning, the just appreciation of value is essential"[15]. We can easily see how this can apply to even seemingly inaccessible cultures such as ancient Rome.

Literary

A literary translation model is striving to eliminate the spatial and temporal divide between the source text and the translation,[16] so much so that it gives the illusion of being the original text. Literary translations have seen a renewal in modern times in translation studies as a way to bridge the gap between the theory of translation and the practice of it [17]. This is one of

---

[13] Brisset, A. (2017) p 255

[14] Weissbort, D. & Eysteinsson, A. (2006) p 53
[15] Mitter, P. (1987) p. 5
[16] Bassnett (2014) p. 26
[17] Weissbort, D. & Eysteinsson, A. (2006) p 393

the main types of translation already easily recognisable to classicist translators since it lends itself best to written translation over spoken. It is also where we find some difficulty for classicist translators since there can often be a struggle between achieving grammatical accuracy to the Latin and comprehension of the scene set out in the text.

This methodology is based around looking for meanings in the text and finding a transmission of these meanings in the receiving language[18]. Meaning can be defined as either referential: a word symbolising an object, process, or abstract thing, or connotative: a word also requires some extra explanation such as an emotional tie as described by Nida and Taber[19].

Nugroho raised some complications with this method for translation. Often with this mindset, translators see their text as aiming for a complete end translation[20] instead of looking at translation as a process of finding equivalence, this methodology instead looks to recreate the wheel so to speak.

Interpretive

Sometimes denoted as the "interpretive approach" or the "theory of sense"[21], the interpretive theory of translation prioritises the "sense" of the text over grammatical accuracy. It was adopted by the Academy of Translation and Interpretation of Paris in the 1960s, due to the idea that all translation is paraphrasing[22]. This means that when a translator creates a text, they are creating something that should mimic the effects of the original text rather than the linguistic characteristics. Professor Seleskovitch emphasises this idea by saying all the words and structures are only symbols, which show the path, but not the path itself[23].

The characteristics of this translation method are most prominent in spoken word interpretation and translation. A translator should comprehend the meaning of the text, deverbalise it (i.e. take it out of words and into an idea) and then reformulate it in the new language[24]. Only by doing this can the readers of the translation understand what is going on in

---

[18] Turney, G. 1984. p 75
[19] Nida, E. A. & Taber, C. R. (1982) p 4
[20] Nugroho, A. B. (2007) p 67
[21] Qiang, K (2013) p. 237
[22] Jungwha, C (2003). p.4
[23] Seleskovitch, D. & Lederer, M. (1995) p 35
[24] Seleskovitch, D. & Lederer, M. (1995) p 36

the original text. The interpretive method also lends itself to gestures and much more informal conversation between languages.[25] Qiang also focuses on the way that interpretation is a direct relationship between two languages rather than dividing the process into two phases: comprehension and expression, as we see in traditional linguistic theory.

This is a useful method for Latin to English translation because often we have trouble understanding what is actually happening in the original text. This stems from the priority given in lower level Latin classes to understanding the grammar and linguistic components rather than getting a grasp of the events in the text. For many students of Latin, a translation is essential for getting from "I understand every word and how it works but have no idea what's going on in this line" to "I know what's happening here" which is a difficult step to take just from the text itself. The interpretive translation will help readers move away from the two phases of linguistic translation to understanding. For non-Latin readers, this is important because they are reading a translation often just to enjoy this different world and so really want an interpretation of the text rather than a translation created according to a linguistic model.

One obvious difficulty with this translation methodology is the idea that it is founded on the translator's interpretation or impression of the text. But whenever we read anything we will be imparting our own interpretation and feelings surrounding the text and as Wrede said in 1983, we cannot escape some subjective experience of anything from landmarks to books[26]. What a reader must consider when utilising translations written under this model is that the main interpretation is that of the original author and it is being processed by the translator. The translator's job is to pass on their experience of the source text to the reader of the translation, and with that thought firmly in mind, many are able to do just that.

From all these translation methodologies we can see the variety of goals and end results that translators are working towards during their process. This will inform how we think about the translations we read. In order to move backwards through this process we can also look at translations so as to evaluate the translator's procedure and how they have achieve the goals they themselves have set out in their books.

---

[25] Qiang, K. (2013) p 236
[26] Wrede, J.(1983) p 9

Rudd, N. *Juvenal The Satires*. With intro. and notes by Barr, W.

Niall Rudd wrote his 1991 translation (latest edition published in 2008) for a wider audience than the other translators. Not only is it published through *Penguin Classics* but in his review Astbury describes it as "immensely useful to those of us who have to teach Roman satire in translation and the general reader will find it a reliable and readable version"[27] demonstrating how it is designed to not be read alongside the Latin itself, whereas the other translations have facing Latin. Rudd is especially considerate of the translation process, much of his translator's preface is an evaluation of previous translations of Juvenal's *Satires* comparing the Bohn, Dryden, Green, and Humphries translations[28], he mostly focuses on whether they appeared to use meter[29] and how linguistically accurate their translations were[30]. Rudd comments in his translator's note that he was attempting to do a line for line translation (taking Satire 1 as his example) and maintaining meaning within lines to the same as the original[31]: he is attempting to "keep to the same number of lines as his author" [32].This often limits a translator of Latin into English because of the vast amount of English needed to substitute for one or two words in Latin. He is also concerned with the rhythm of his translation and wants to emulate the metrical form of satire in the English since it is "too important to sacrifice"[33]. This is a particularly interesting endeavor since Rudd has chosen to translate the poem into a prose style (though still technically a poem), by not including a metrical function in his own text. While he strives to abide still by the poetic devices associated with poetry, such as keeping the line count the same and using a metrical pattern with every line "[being read] naturally with six stresses"[34], this does not come through in his actual translation. The text appears like prose, with long lines that often run over and the rhythm is not easily apparent in the reading even to Astbury who was not "always conscious of any underlying rhythm"[35]

---

[27] Astbury (1992), p. 93
[28] Rudd uses six of seven pages of his preface to describe some of the decisions made by previous translators.
[29] Rudd (1991) p.xxix
[30] Rudd (1991) p. xxviii
[31] Rudd (1991), p. xxix
[32] Rudd (1991) p. xxix
[33] Rudd (1991), p. xxix
[34] Rudd (1991), p. xxxi
[35] Astbury (1992), p. 92

Rudd has a broad view of Juvenal's aims throughout the *Satires*, but he mentions Satire 10 in particular as "that of a disenchanted observer reflecting on man's futile and misguided aspirations"[36]. Rudd mostly sees Juvenal as a rhetorician and entertainer who is dependent on Rome in her current form for his work, but who often tries to correct her people and the city herself at certain times.

Section 1

In all the countries that stretch from Cadiz across to the Ganges and the lands of dawn, how few are the people who manage to tell genuine blessings from those of a very different order, dispelling the mists of error.

As suggested in all the commentaries, Rudd uses the modern place names for *Gadibus* and *Gangen*; this ties into the idea of a wide uneducated audience. He expects his readers to not be accustomed to ancient names for places and so uses the modern forms for familiarity. The most interesting aspect of this phrase is "lands of dawn" for *Auroram*. Aurora is the goddess of the dawn and often, she is used as an embodiment of the phenomenon. Rudd has chosen to take away this mythological reference to instead continue the idea of "lands" presented earlier. This could be due to the wider audience he is likely aiming at that would not understand the mythological reference. However, "lands of dawn" doesn't really mean anything to a modern English reader and so this translation could be causing more problems than its answering.

Rudd imitates the Latin more closely than the commentators seem to suggest when he says "those of a very different order". Mayor and Ferguson both want *illis* to be representative of *mala* things. The latin does give it a comparative quality as compared to the *vera bona* which would suggest them not being good at least, however it does not make them explicitly bad. By being very literal here Rudd has shown the quality of the Latin in his translation, it is purposefully vague and so is he.

---

[36] Rudd (1986) p. 36

Another way he reduces this emphasis is to use "different" as a translation for *diversa* as Courtney suggests rather than "opposite". This makes the comparison of the things being prayed for smaller.

From a literary standpoint, Rudd does seem to be creating a vivid picture. When he says "lands of the dawn", he is translating the image we are meant to see from *Auroram* rather than a direct representation, i.e. the goddess. This works better for an audience that doesn't know the cultural implications of the word, though Rudd does not go the extra step of making that cultural connection (for a sociocultural translation).

Rudd also seems to be incorporating his metrical talents in his literary nature. The first phrase in the Latin is highly spondaic which mimics the "stretch" of lands highlighted by both Juvenal and Rudd, in a poetic fashion just as Rudd wants his translation to be read. By using "in all the countries" and "across to the" and "the lands of ", Rudd is extending the line and how long it takes to read. For an English reader this is the same as reading slowly for the spondees.

Another thing Rudd does to build this literary picture is to phrase *pauci dinsocere possunt* as a question in his translation: "how few are the people who manage". This is pretty much a rhetorical question, which is not a stress presented by the Latin. Rudd has done this to emulate a tone he sees from Juvenal of calling out the idiocies of the word he lives in, but not being as angry with it all as Juvenal is usually seen to be in the earlier satires. Rud himself does not seem to abide by this line of thought instead believing Juvenal to be trying to "evoke indignation, contempt, and disgust, and that this purpose was normally further by his satirical wit"[37] but that "not every poem displays the same intensity of feeling"[38]; which is a much more nuanced view than other authors of his time.

While Rudd has been very close to the Latin when talking about the *diversa* things, he does show his interpretation varying slightly from the exact text. By saying "those of a very different order", Rudd is bringing attention to the large difference in blessings and other things people are getting. This big difference is not apparent in the Latin itself and so is an interpretation Rudd is placing over the top during the translation process.

---

[37] Rudd (1986) p. 39
[38] Rudd (1986) p 39

According to the Harper's Latin Dictionary[39], the moral sense of good is an extended definition for *bonum* after more grounded "goods". This is another example of Rudd applying an interpretation to *bona* by making it a "blessing" rather than a "benefit". This choice fits in better with the theme of the satire (that of prayer). This is because "blessing" has a grander connotation than "benefit" to a modern English audience. This is also an example of a sociocultural transmission since Rudd has translated an idea of prayer benefit in the Latin to a parallel idea in English.

To keep his visage or appearance, Rudd tends to dismiss a more strict linguistic model of translation. For instance, he uses "countries" for *terris*, whereas the idea of distinct sets of land is not quite what the word means, but more of a focus on the land itself that is encompassed by the Roman world, which is why "lands" is often used in a more literal sense.

The same can be said for his representation of case and number of nouns. Rudd uses "mists" for *nebula*, which is a singular noun. Now this does sound more literary than a singular translation, but it does not show the Latin as clearly. Rudd also has trouble representing the dative case of *illis* in his translation (admittedly this case does not often translate easily into English). By connecting it closely to the "genuine blessings" earlier he makes it more accusative in the English.

Section 2

Long ago, the people cast off its worries, when we stopped selling our votes. A body that used to confer commands, legions, rods, and everything else, has now narrowed its scope, and is eager and anxious for two things only: bread and races.

Knowing how to translate concepts of power and authority (*imperium, fasces, legiones*) is probably the hardest part of translating for a non-classicist audience. For instance, Courtney does not even mention this in his commentary. Mayor gives a translation of this segment that tends toward using Latin words rather than translating them[40]. Ferguson explains *imperium* and

---

[39] Lewis (1899) p. 246, column 2
[40] Mayor (1878) p. 98

fasces as concepts and provides a basic translation of *imperium* as "authority" instead of delving further into the depth of the meaning for a Roman audience.

Rudd seems to be following their example by using mainly Latin words and concepts for each of these honours. He uses "commands" for *imperium* which is pretty accurate to the idea of control of the military of either a specific place or of the entire Roman army (for the Emperor only), but for a modern audience "commands" does not portray the military aspect that a Latin audience would know. "Legions" has a synonymous meaning in Latin and English and is a very common and accurate translation. Rudd uses "rods" for *fasces*, which is culturally accurate, but means basically nothing to a modern English-speaking audience. So he is prioritising an understanding of military terms over simpler terms that would be known to his English-speaking audience.

Rudd follows Mayor's example in making *effudit curas* very literal ("cast off it worries") as compared with Courtney's suggestion of "has lost interest in politics". Courtney has identified the meaning of the phrase (in a literary model), whereas Rudd and Mayor are using a more linguistic model and using word meanings.

Mayor and Courtney both have *se continet* in the singular (which Rudd does) whereas Ferguson present a plural translation. This difference stems (in the English) from whether the translator is representing the people as a single entity or as a mass of individuals. Both ideas can exist in English, but the idea of the people being a single entity is more common to a Roman mind. This transference of an idea (or at least the identification of a similar idea) between cultures shows a sociocultural translation model at work here.

Rudd also appears to be introducing some Roman culture by translating *circenses* as "races" rather than the equivalent word "circuses" in English. This better represents what would have happened in ancient Rome, but this might not be obvious to an English-speaking audience.

Since Rudd is aiming his translation at a wide, non-classicist audience, one would expect him to explain major differences in culture such as the practice of "selling votes". This would appear to have a negative connotation to most modern English-speaking audiences who believe in a democratic system whereby we vote based on the efficacy of a candidate. Often in Roman society there would be many political bodies working much more openly than they do in

American society to give who they choose the power of office. The people (*populus*) of Rome were still the ones to vote, but their votes were more easily swayed by the political situation than we experience in the modern day. The idea of "selling votes" would not have a negative connotation for a Roman that it might now. Polybius refers to a law about how open bribery would have been punished by death, but says nothing about bribery being done in secret[41]. Rudd does not transmit this difference to his readers, which is a failing of the sociocultural model of translation.

Rudd does a lot of rearranging here of Latin for his English. For instance, he rearranges *legiones* and *fasces* seemingly for no reason. Perhaps it reads better for a literary man like Rudd, an emeritus professor of Latin literature at Bristol University until his retirement[42]. He also rearranges phrases to make the English sound more chronological. Rudd translates *ex quo suffragia nulli vendimus, effudit curas* as " the people cast off its worries, when we stopped selling our votes". This creates a timeline of events in the English that is not necessarily apparent from the Latin. This rearrangement is not supported by other commentaries and shows a literary translation method being chosen over a linguistic model. The other commentaries instead focus on the events themselves rather than which led to which, Mayor for instance says "once it granted commands, fasces, legions, what it pleased; now it narrows its ambition"[43]. He is showing that while things have changed it is less so a causation than Rudd presents.

Another issue with this section is how Rudd is representing the present tense of *vendimus*, he has switched from the third to the first person in his telling, but by putting the *vendimus* so far in the past with this arrangement there's no way to portray the continual aspect presented by the present tense verb (even without thinking of the English equivalent tense).

Rudd is not showing a lot of interpretation here, his sticking close to the Latin linguistically has left him not much room to place his own interpretation over the translation. The only instance of interpretation is his rearrangement of the section dealt with in the last two

---

[41] Lintott (1990), p. 3
[42] Unknown (2015)
[43] Mayor (1878) p. 85

paragraphs. By putting them in a different order from the Latin, he is showing that he sees a connection not presented immediately by Juvenal.

From a literary standpoint, Rudd does seem to be taking some liberties to make the scene in his image. One translation is of interest, namely how Rudd represents the *populus* here. There is no word in Juvenal's text to represent the "people" that Rudd talks about, but the idea of the citizens of Rome is present in the actions dictated in the Latin. "The people" is a very different idea for modern audiences than for ancient Roman audiences. A better word in modern English would be "rabble" or "mob". This chaotic negative connotation does not appear for modern audiences and this is lost in Rudd's translation. He has created a more civil scene which matches more what a modern audience might expect from the voting public. This civility also makes the punch of "bread and races" weaker. If the crowd were one to be chaotic and easily roused (like we would expect of a mob) the idea behind them being easily pleased by small gestures would make more sense. However, to maintain a veneer of civility and superiority that many people associate with ancient Rome, Rudd is minimising the connections that his audience can make.

Section 3

He loses his former zest for food and wine as his palate grows numb. He has long forgotten what sex was like; if one tries to remind him, his shrunken tool, with its vein enlarged, just lies there, and, though caressed all night, it will continue to lie there.

To begin with, Ferguson identifies *torpente palato* as an ablative absolute, which would normally be rendered as a separate idea, even a separate phrase, in English. Rudd has instead integrated the idea "as his palate grows numb" into the sentence. This places the loss of interest in food and wine as a more ongoing phenomenon than is implied by the Latin. Whereas the idea should be based around how he has lost this interest and now lives a zest-free life.

Courtney identifies line 206 as extremely spondaic (having only one dactyl and one trochee) which for him matches the scene, saying "The penis is as torpid as the spondees".

Rudd seems to be emulating this sensation in his own translation, but splitting lines 205 and 206 into many phrases and using many commas to slow the line down in its reading.

Rudd is being more conservative than the commentary authors, with the exception of Mayor who also doesn't want to use the word penis, by using "tool" to represent *neruus*. This is not reflective of Juvenal or his Latin, which makes this an interpretive move by Rudd. He is purposefully disguising the true intent of the Latin, in both word and meaning, and creating his own image here. He has placed his own thought on top of his translation. This is a way to cover up unappealing details in English translations of Latin texts that is surprisingly common.

Rudd does accurately portray *iam pridem* in the way Ferguson suggests. Both render this as "long forgotten". This portrays the Roman idea of forgetting, which focuses on the process of losing something rather than saying a memory has been lost. This is a sociocultural transmission that still makes sense to an English-speaking audience.

Rudd follows a linguistic model when translating the forms of *iaceo*, he uses the correct tense for each that aligns with the Latin tense (of present and then future indicatives). But he also uses the same word to translate which, as Ferguson points out, hints at the inevitability of the outcome. This is especially fearful for male readers, something that is universal is the fear of aging at its effects on the body.

There is a dichotomy in Rudd's translation that stems from this fear and the ideas surrounding the male genitalia. Rudd calls the penis a "shrunken tool" and yet a line later has it "caressed all night long". Changing from a crass description to a gentle action does make the scene jarring to a reader. This difference is likely due to Rudd's proclivities, not Juvenal's. Rudd both wants to hide the penis and also look after it. The act of caressing does not fit with the rest of the scene.

Section 4
Still, that you may have something to ask for - some reason to offer the holy sausages and innards of a little white pig in a chapel - you ought to pray for a healthy mind in a healthy body.

There is some division in the commentary writers as to the nature of these lines. Mayor and Courtney both take the diminutives to be exaggeration and thus satirical and making fun of the whole ritual. Ferguson, however, calls them scornful which considers the much angrier tone that we associate with earlier satires of Juvenal. Rudd seems to be siding with mayor and Courtney on this, he calls the *tomacula* "holy sausages", which is a funny image to most English readers and makes the whole scene somewhat comedic.

Mayor wants to be exact in what *exta* can entail (lungs, liver, and heart), however Rudd has chosen "innards" which is much broader. This fits the line structure better and makes the scene shorter; but it does minimise the importance of the ritual and its elements for the reader. This means the translation does not work well from a sociocultural standpoint since the very important ritual is not being explained in an adequate way for the audience.

Rudd could be supporting Courtney's assumption that by making this scene as silly as he has Juvenal is in fact mocking the act of prayer itself with his lack of respect. Courtney even goes so far as to say that Juvenal is implying that "prayer is an unnecessary concession to human weakness because we ourselves can provide its object."[44] From these lines, it is not obvious if Rudd would support Courtney's theory in so far as that, but he does seem to be mocking the situation through his translation.

The only part of the commentaries to undermine this mocking tone, is the spondaic nature of line 356 (identified by Courtney) which he notes as "solemn". This would suggest that the scene should have a more serious tone. It could also suggest that this line (giving the actual advice) is the one that people should pay attention to because it is being so serious in comparison to other lines. This could also have something to do with how *mens sana in corpore sano* is a stock prayer of ancient Romans according to Ferguson. Juvenal himself is restricted by the prayer he wants to include and the way in which it is presented to him.

When it comes to the *divina tomacula*, Rudd is only considering one of the meanings of *divina*, meaning offering (the one preferred by Courtney). It can also point to the act of ritual divination/saging itself. By calling them "holy sausages", Rudd is ignoring the later meaning and putting the *tomacula* in a more religious, less ritualistic, setting. This would be easier for the

---

[44] Courtney (1980) p. 486

audience to grasp conceptually, but it does not open up the Roman world to them in an adequate way.

He does give a modern parallel to the ritual by calling the sausages "holy" and saying the offering would happen in a chapel. These are very Christian terms that most English speakers would be familiar with. While it does not portray the ancient culture onto the modern one, it does give a frame of reference for the reader. It is one step in a sociocultural model for this scene.

Rudd also uses some slightly elevated language in this section "still that you may" and "you ought to pray". While these phrases are not in and of themselves indicative of an elevated piece, they do not fit with the more colloquial language of other sections of the text. This is Rudd's interpretation of the importance of religion overlaying his translation. This is the teacher-Juvenal, which one would expect to be more educated and proper and so Rudd has portrayed him as such in his translation.

Overall, Rudd's translation shows a lot of his interpretation written onto the text. This often causes issues within the text where he had before tried to emulate some of Juvenal's tone and has had to change his tact when his own opinion arises. Though Rudd, of all the translators dealt with in this paper, is the most interested in the Satires as poems, he does not create a poetic medium for his translation. He does not use a literary model of translation which would best suit this end, nor does he pay close attention to the Latin to create a linguistic translation. With an audience of non-experts in ancient Rome, one would expect a lot of sociocultural references that would either place the Roman world in the modern day or open it up to the modern reader. Rudd has instances of doing both, but neither consistently. This inconsistency makes reading and engaging with the text as a whole difficult because it keeps bringing the reader out of the text to reorient themselves.

Braund, S. *Juvenal and Persius*. Loeb Classical Library 91.

Sarah Morton Braund wrote her translation for the Loeb Classical Library in 2004. She describes her goals for this translation as "[trying] to convey the verve and energy of his rhetorical impetus... and tone of superiority"[45] and to make it "vivid, vigorous and accessible without compromising accuracy to the Latin text."[46] This would suggest that she is aiming for something between a linguistic and literary translation because she is trying to create the literary scene of Juvenal while keeping the grammar obvious to her readers. We could also see some of an interpretive translation in how she is trying to convey a "tone of superiority" which can be seen as her interpretation of Juvenal's language and how she wants to show him to her audience.

Section 1

In all the lands extending from Cadiz as far as Ganges and the Dawn, there are few people who can remove the fog of confusion and distinguish real benefits from their opposite.

Commentaries do not constitute a theory of translation, but since they are so often used (and remarked upon by all the translators analysed here), they do have a large impact on translators and their translations for Latin-to-English translations in particular. Braund mentions her own use of them in her translator's note and thus is it important to look at them alongside her translation, specifically Courtney[47].

In the translation itself, Braund follows a suggestion by Mayor and Ferguson to use the modern name for *Gadibus* rather than a more ancient name. This fits in with Braund aiming at a wider audience since the modern name will be more recognisable.

Each commentary makes a comment about *diuersa*: Mayor and Ferguson both make a connection to the *diuersa* being *mala* as compared to the *bona* in the same line. Braund does not follow this thought within the translation so closely. She does use "opposite" as a signifier of that. This is in direct contradiction to Courtney's comment on this line. Courtney mentions that *diuersa* should be "different" and not " opposite" since Juvenal is writing in what we call Silver Latin rather than the older Golden Latin, this is important when we think about this as a

---

[45] Braund (2004) p. viii
[46] Braund (2004) p. vii
[47] Braund (2004) p. ix

linguistic translation later. This could be because she wants to make the connection of *mala* more obvious in her translation.

A literary translation of this passage would likely emulate the imagery of the scene painted by Juvenal. A vast landscape filled with many ignorant people and a few who know a certain truth about the world, i.e that they pray for the wrong things. Braund starts painting this picture in a way a modern reader would understand by using modern place names and an English synonym for *Aurora*. Dawn and Aurora are both names, but in modern English only one brings up images of sunrise, and this is how Braund chose to render the name/abstract notion of the East.

Braund also talks about a "fog of confusion" which captures some of the meaning of *erroris nebula* while she is not being completely accurate to the meaning in Latin (which is more of wandering or erring than confusing). This is a very literary translation.

However, "real benefits from their opposites" is much closer to a Latin wording than a Latin meaning. While the image is the same it does not transfer the idea of movement to loss that the commentaries above tease out by using error[48].

For a sociolinguistic approach to this section, Braund would need to create a discussion within these languages (Latin and English) that is not necessary for a linguistic or literary translation for instance. She has certainly explored the world building in the beginning of this Satire. She uses "lands" for *terris* which shows a foreign concept of land division to the modern English reader (who would likely prefer "country" to "land"). But it is comprehensible to English readers still in its current form.

Generally this section relies heavily on previous knowledge of Roman culture since it does not work to make the "lands" seem as vast as they would have for Roman reader (since to them this would have been the whole world). Nor does Braund conceptualise "good" and "different" and their context within the poem to come.

Many of these questions of context would require a paraphrasing-type translation rather than a more literal one that Braund is attempting. A paraphrase would have the space to explain that the world presented is everything and that the good and bad will be explained later as well

---

[48] Mayor (1878) p. 65

as the context of prayer and ritual to come. This type of translation lends itself much better to an interpretive methodology.

An interpretive translation would produce the ideas represented in the Latin for an English audience. Like above, this would be representing selling votes as campaigning.

Braund is really working against an interpretive theory in this part of her translation. While she does use modern place names, this does not communicate the vastness of the world, nor does it work for most audiences as describing the world end to end. For instance for a modern audience, it might be better to say from furthest west to furthest east in some form. This would vary from what Braund might consider a translation (representing Latin words with English words) but it would communicate the ideas expressed.

I have mentioned above how "fog of confusion" does not equate exactly to *erroris nebula* since it does not express the wrongness of *erroris*. However many English cognates (error) are much stronger in their meaning. To an English speaker an error is completely wrong whereas *error* to a Latin speaker is more divergence from what is completely correct.

One place she does use an interpretive translation is "Dawn". The use of a name to substitute for the name *Aurora* in Latin, both of which have the same meaning, is exactly what interpretation means within this context.

As we have already covered in her translator's note Braund explains her goals in her translating, she aims to be "vivid, vigorous and accessible without compromising accuracy to the Latin text" while maintaining his energy and "tone of superiority". This is not an uncommon goal for most translators of Latin, to both be linguistically true but to create a literary text. We've seen above a lot of examples of Braund diverging from the linguistic goal such as her mixing of cultural examples. She also adds and paraphrases to make her narrative more "vivid".

Linguistically, Braund is following the grammar of the Latin very closely and this shows in a simple sentence structure that is easy to follow. Braund has really achieved a linguistic translation that is in keeping with her stated goals. Overall, it is the theory her translation fits with best for this section.

Section 2

It's way back that they discarded their responsibilities - since the time we stopped selling our votes. The proof? The people that once used to bestow military commands, high office, legions, everything, now limits itself. It has an obsessive desire for two things only - bread and circuses.

Mayor provides a full translation as well as notes on specific words and phrases and an extensive commentary on similar phrases and ideas across what feels like all ancient Latin literature (as well as some ancient Greek too). Mayor sticks much closer to ideas from the Latin where Braund diveges so that her audience (with less knowledge of antiquity) can understand. He also follows the Latin order more closely. He links the ideas of *long ago* and *stopping selling votes,* Braund instead brings forward the idea of *shirking responsibility*. This does make a more cohesive narrative, giving a broad sense of change before going into examples that later includes *what the people gave out*. We can see some differences between Courtney's suggestions and Barund's choices in word choice, but ideas follow the same functions.

Ferguson highlights *imperium* as authority, rather than Braund's "military commands". This is a difference in ideology behind *imperium*. Ferguson is being broader in his consideration, while Braund is restricting the meaning to its more well-known facet. Ferguson also recognises a more plural meaning in *se continet* that is present ideologically in the Latin, but not grammatically. Braund ignores this and keeps to the singular nature of *continet*.

If we read this section through a literary theory lens the question is whether Braund chooses to use ideas from ancient Rome or the modern day. When she is talking about the *imperium, fasces, legiones*, Braund chooses to use more modern explanations for these ideas. This is not quite a form of domestication (Bassnett, 2014), whereby Braund would have used modern equivalents. She has instead chosen to explain what each word would have meant to an audience and means to a modern audience. This gives enough context for the translated culture to understand without completely situating it within the culture. Courtney, in his commentary, uses much more foreign terms (which were obviously available to Braund) which would situate the text in the originator culture.

This sense of translated culture is complicated by the infamous phrase "bread and circuses". This is a very interesting phrase because it is so well known outside of Juvenal studies, it is used in the modern day (usually in a political setting) to refer to superficial appeasement of the masses. While this is a common turn of phrase, its translation doesn't fit with Braund's other choices. It is securely odd. People now do not want bread or circuses to appease them, but for Juvenal this is very literal. Braund chooses to keep the standard translation to make her audience more comfortable again. It is recognisable and so would be appropriate for a more layperson oriented translation.

We can see Braund forming an interaction between cultures with her "military commands, high office, legions". Braund has taken similar ideas from both cultures *imperium* to military officers, *fasces* to magisterial power and governance, and *legiones* to armies. By finding a translation that is applicable to both cultures, she has successfully used a sociocultural approach.

Something Braund does not try to translate, however, is the idea of "selling our votes". This is something that to most modern English-speaking audiences sounds abhorrent. However, to Juvenal this is a simple and expected pastime. This is a form of campaigning for politicians in ancient Rome and so when people no longer have the sway they once had, they lose confidence and civil pride. A modern equivalent is in the downturn in voter turnout for elections. It is only those heavily involved who still care and are not placated by superficial niceties like the masses that Juvenal laments here. This dramatic shift in culture is not explained by Braund in her translation which makes it a jarring image for readers. This divergence from a sociolinguistic translation method does not work for Braund because of this fact.

Braund seems to go out of her way to avoid communicating a sense of what the people used to give in her translation, like we would expect in an interpretive translation. Juvenal uses *curas* to mean a civic duty or political concern. Braund does not communicate the political nature of *curas* in this circumstance, she only notes the "responsibilities" side of this idea, for example.

Her lack of interpretive action makes it difficult to compare her translation here with the theory itself.

The linguistic model is the one Braund is most focussed on achieving, as stated above. Within this section there are many examples. She inserts "The proof?" into line 78. There is nothing in the Latin to suggest an interjection like this. Her linguistic translation has been broken for the sake of a better read. While this does seem to align with her goals, it does disrupt an otherwise direct translation. We also see this in her sentence structuring.

It is hard to comment too closely on sentence structure because of how this has been imposed after composition and can be up for debate. All my translators reported using the same edition of the Oxford Classical Text, presuming they all follow this editor's choices in textual differences this should eliminate this issue of different manuscripts. But Braund seems to separate phrases that are kept together in the Latin to avoid a run-on sentence in the English.

Section 3

The delights of food and wine are no longer the same as his palate grows numb, and as for sex - it's now just a distant memory, or if you try to rouse him, his stringy little prick lies limp with its enlarged vein and will stay limp though you coax it all night long.

In terms of commentaries, Mayor does not have much to say here in terms of translation except a paraphrase of the lines to give an idea of the goings on. Courtney, also only really comments on how the meter reflects the actions of stroking the penis. Braund does to some extent replicate this lengthening of the line: "all night long" is typically a drawn out phrase in English, which would make you move slower (just like a line of spondees).

Ferguson identifies *torpente palato* as an ablative absolute which is usually separated from the main clause in meaning and translation. Braund has rendered it here very much within the clause. Perhaps she thinks it is an ablative within the phrase even though she has not translated it very ablatively. Ferguson also identifies *ramice* with the testicles rather than with the penis (as Braund does), however this is not explained further in Ferguson and is likely an example of metonymy that Braund has taken less literally than Ferguson.

For a literary translation, Braund is mimicking Juvenal's poetic language here and building a vivid picture. She goes into more detail with her description of "stringy little prick" than is relevant from the Latin. She explores another meaning of *neruus* (sinew) to build her picture and expand on the image Juvenal has already provided.

Braund also explores the literary facet with *obliuio* as "distant memory". *Obliuio* actually means forgetfulness but since there is a different idea of remembering between cultures she has expertly navigated a way to bridge this gap.

Braund does a good job representing some cultural ideals in this section. As in most time periods, men in ancient Rome did not want to lose the ability to penetrate with their penis. The depth of Juvenal's description is matched by Braund, since in most modern English speaking contexts this is a fear shared by men now. Some things never change. Sometimes cultures have the same ideals and this makes translating those ideals very easy.

We also see the difference in remembering for different cultures. Juvenal talks about a long-time forgetting whereas this doesn't mean much for modern English speakers. We use the idea of a memory being long gone. In other words, we have a loss, how we got there doesn't matter as much; but Juvenal is focussing instead on the losing of the memory. Were Braund to phrase this as forgetfulness rather than a distant memory, her audience would be more confused. But this does make the translation lose the idea from the original text.

The interpretive reading can also be applied here in that the difference between forgetfulness and distant memory is an interpretation. Braund has identified the idea behind Juvenal's phrasing and made it make sense to a modern English audience with a similar idea. She has transferred the interpretation that a Latin-speaking reader would have had to an English-speaker's context to give them the same interpretation.

In a linguistic context, Braund chooses to render *torpente palato* as "as his palate grows numb" rather than a "with numb palate", this makes the phrase more temporal than circumstantial. She has changed the communication of the line that doesn't match the Latin.

Something Braund does well is the repetition of forms of *iaceo*. She uses the same word "limp" with slightly different surroundings. This shows Juvenal's language very well. She also, as she has done elsewhere demonstrates and copies the Latin phrase order very well.

Section 4

Yet, to actually give you something to ask for and some reason to offer the guts and little sacred sausages of a shining white piglet at the little shrines, you should pray for a sound mind in a sound body.

To start with, Mayor points out here that *candiduli divina tomacula porci* is a satirical exaggeration, Courtney agrees that the diminutives used here are ironic. Were one to take it as such when translating it they would probably do something similar to Braund. She puts the emphasis on "little sausages" and the "piglet". She has made it seem more like a joke than a serious ritual.

Both Courtney and Ferguson highlight how *divina* could either mean "offering/feast for gods" or "divination". Ferguson does not make a judgement about this, but Courtney dismisses the divining idea. Braund seems to think the same thing since she too only accounts for them as an offering for prayer.

Like she has done before, Braund is really good at painting a picture from her translation (perhaps in her effort to create a "vivid" translation). She uses the poetic language of "shining white piglet" to create a scene reminiscent of a Roman sacrifice. She also becomes more colloquial in these lines: "to actually give you" does not match the grander language "in all the lands" of section 1. This is a shift that does not seem to work since it changes the tone of her translation. This is not a mimic of the Latin which maintains a similar tone here as elsewhere.

This is especially obvious since a well-known and oft translated phrase follows it *mens sana in corpore sano*. Braund translates the forms of *sanus* as "sound". While this is accurate to the Latin it is not a colloquial translation for a modern English speaker. Perhaps because the phrase is so well known it should sound forgein and Roman-esque, but it does not work with the rest of the phrase and so disrupts the flow of the translation. This phrase *mens sana…* was a common prayer and so would not have been associated with elevated language or tone in the Latin either.

This is a particularly interesting section to examine through a sociocultural lens (from which the theory of sociolinguistic translation stems). It is describing a common occurrence in one culture and trying to make it accessible to readers from a completely different culture.

She is very vague with "guts'' and "sausages" for *exta* and *tomacula*. While this is a quick way of explaining what is happening, as Mayor describes, *exta* could refer to the heart, or lungs, or liver, or all the above. The English reader is missing an important point of this ritual (what is actually included) and so may have the wrong idea of this culture. While "sausage" does grant more of an idea about *tomacula*, it is still rather undescriptive. This could be to keep the line shorter or due to a lack of knowledge about what ancient sausages looked like; either way it does leave a little too much to the imagination.

The placement for these rituals is also ambiguous: "little shrines". This reflects those diminutive qualities that Courtney pointed out, but it does make the whole situation sound like a joke. This is in line with some of the scholarship she has written in which she believes Juvenal to be "gently mocking the entire process of prayer"[49]. If Braund believes that Juvenal is not being serious she will not take the time to make this ritual very accessible to her readers since, as she sees it, it doesn't really matter.

The idea of how to explore the intricacies of ritual and sacrifice, and so that when we translate such scenes for a non-Latin-reading audience, is largely influenced in Greco-Roman texts by the translator's interpretation of the Latin. This is because they cannot ask the author, nor is there anyone left alive from this culture to discuss the initracies with. If a translator feels that the scene is not important, or that the author was not being serious about the scene, they could try to skimp out on translating the scene to be understandable. Braund is playing up the comedic essence of this scene without showing the background it invokes in her translation possibly because she sees Juvenal here as joking around. This means that a reader would have to have previous knowledge of such ritualistic practices to understand the gravity of what Juvenal is saying. Perhaps, Braund is assuming her audience has this knowledge since they have picked up a Loeb edition of the text?

---

[49] Murgatoyd (2017) p 2

Braund thinks this is a humorous spin on the ritual practice of sacrifice and so she will see that in the Latin and reflect it in the English. This harks back to the sociocultural idea that classicists are representing the culture the way they interpret it. She does this through the emphasis on "little" and by using the colloquial language of "yet, actually". This is taking away the seriousness of the scene that is usually associated with sacrifices because it is all tiny and in a day-to-day manner in her translation.

However, this joking tone is disrupted by "sound mind in a sound body." She wants to convey the phrase people know in a way that they know (foreignising and grand) even though it doesn't fit the sense she is building. Her disruption of the joke makes the lines awkward; you cannot joke about a tiny white piglet and also be serious about mental and physical health in the same thought or scene. To make something accessible, she has sacrificed the fun, this is a failure in the translation.

Some of the issues for a linguistic translation have been covered above: *exta* as "guts" does not convey the word meaning and *divina* loses one of its meanings for brevity.

Braund also loses some of her fidelity to the Latin with "yet, to actually". In the Latin Juvenal says *ut tamen* which more accurately is "nevertheless, for the purpose of." Yet is a softer version of nevertheless that does not always convey the contrariness of *tamen*. "Actually" is just an emphatic rather than expressing the purpose that Juvenal is getting at in his poem. We can see how the two goals of Braund's translation cannot be realised simultaneously and that interrupts the translation itself.

When considering phrase structure and sequence, Braund is very true to the Latin grammar and sequence which accomplishes her goals of increased accuracy.

Overall, Braund is focussing on making a linguistic translation that is informed by her interpretation of Juvenal as an author. Her comedic episodes and large turns of phrase show how Braund is viewing Juvenal's work as a comedica venture against prayer and that he is not being serious in his tone.

Godwin, J. *Juvenal Satires Book IV*. With intro., trans. and comm.

James Godwin wrote his translation in 2014 for an audience with little or no Latin. His position as a high school Latin teacher would also impact his translation since he is expecting his audience to be young and inexperienced. Godwin recently retired from his position at Shrewsbury school, working with students between ages 13 and 18[50]. His book is presented with facing Latin and English (described as "a literal English translation" in his preface[51]) as well as a commentary in the back. This would suggest that Godwin is using a linguistic model for translation as he is focussed on transferring the Latin to English in a syntactical way.

Godwin also made a commentary alongside his translation to "help those with little to no Latin"[52], I will be looking at this commentary in addition to the other commentaries (Ferguson and Mayor) for Godwin's translation, since obviously his own research for both his commentary and his translation. I will not be using Godwin's commentary for Braund or Rudd's translations since it was published after both their translations and it is also not the sort of text they would have referred to when creating their translations since it is aimed at Latin students rather than Latin scholars since it focuses on simple Latin questions and social/cultural differences that impact the text. Most of what is included would probably not be news to Latin scholars but would be helpful to newer Latinists.

Section 1

In all lands which stretch from Cadiz right up to the East and the Ganges, few people can set aside the cloud of error and distinguish truly good things from those that are very different.

Godwin uses modern place names like both the Mayor and Ferguson commentaries, he is using an example they have given by making it situated in the modern language. He also chose those names because it suits his audience with their lack of Latin background. This would also aid in the fact that his audience likely wouldn't have much knowledge of the ancient names either,

---

[50] Found at https://www.bloomsbury.com/author/john-godwin-40761. Last accessed 18 October 2020
[51] Godwin (2016). p.1
[52] Godwin (2016). p. 1

considering that they will likely have little cultural Roman knowledge either alongside their little Latin knowledge.

Courtney makes the point here that *diversa* has a different meaning in Silver and Golden age Latin. He proscribes using "different" rather than "opposite". Godwin follows this advice which makes the sense a little more vague, but is truer to a Latin meaning.

Godwin varies from all the commentaries is his use of "East" for *Auroram*. This is another example of his making the translation more accessible to his audience. They might not know that Aurora is the goddess of the dawn etc. and so he provides an English counterpart that they would understand. He does mention that Aurora represents the sunrise (and so the east) in his commentary on the text. He also explains what each area is, in a way that none of the other commentaries do, specifically to give his audience context.

Ferguson and Mayor highlight how *illis* is representative of *mala* things, bad things. Godwin does not use this interpretation in his translation, instead letting the reader make that leap in logic. He leaves it at "those that are very different", which alludes to bad things but is not definite.Godwin is leaving this last step to the reader which is emblematic of a literary translation rather than showing the interpretation.

In his commentary, Godwin translates *dinoscere* as "discern", but in his translation he uses "distinguish". There's no obvious reason for this difference, especially in a text designed to help Latin learners.

In a literary sense, Godwin uses much more effluent language than what is immediately apparent from the Latin. He chooses to add superlatives and use extended meanings rather than primary ones.

He translates *nebula* as "cloud" which is an extended meaning of the word. It is still an applicable translation but it is much more physical than saying "fog" or "mist" which are much more common translations and are much less easily to imagine grasping unlike clouds. He is creating a more solid image from the Latin rather than translating for the exact picture it is implying. The imagery created here is much more vivid, which was likely Godwin's intention when using superlatives. He has created some strong images and even feelings, by saying "all the way up to" he is mimicking the journey with the length of the phrase and the speed of

reading the phrase. This strong image is a vivid one because it embeds an experience in the language.

Godwin provides a lot of the emphasis that is not in the Latin to create this vividness. Words like "truly" and "very" do not have Latin counterparts in either word or meaning. This contributes to the imagery that Godwin is creating with his "cloud of error". The same can be said for "different" for *diversa*. He is making a strong yet complicated image from emphatic and descriptive language amid vague adjectives.

To describe how vast an area he is describing, Godwin says "in all lands which stretch…" In the Latin, this idea of stretching is embedded in *usque* which literally means "up to" or "all the way". This extension of the word into a verb is a literary move that exposes the meaning that is not apparent in the words of the text itself.

As mentioned above, Godwin is not working to a sociolinguistic translation and seems to be trying to make everything make sense to an English reader without expanding their knowledge of the culture of origin. In this section of his translation this comes up in a few ways.

Godwin uses the modern place names in his geography. This does not open the avenue for a sociolinguistic theory because it does not transfer the culture of ancient Rome to the modern English reader.

Nor does Godwin explore how vast this would be. In the modern day, the land between Cadiz and the Ganges is large, but not the whole world. To a Roman, it pretty much would have been the whole world. This idea has not been translated by Godwin here, and so he is failing to apply a sociolinguistic lens to this scene.

He also renders *bona* and *illis* very literally to the Latin. This is good for the learning aspect of reading this translation but it does not provide the framework needed for the rest of this Satire about prayer. He does not provide a foundation for what are "good things" to Juvenal's audience, which admittedly Juvenal does expand on throughout his Satire, but he would have expected his audience to have some idea what these good things were because it was their culture. Godwin has used the literary translation method well here, but it is not the most appropriate for this readership.

From an interpretive standpoint, Godwin sees Juvenal as humorous but still taking his subject matter seriously. Throughout the sections here we see how he translates the humourous language with hilarity but he also maintains the epic turns of phrase that show how serious the subject matter is. We cannot see the humour here in his translation of this section, but the emphasis he adds shows how he believes Juvenal is being serious and truly trying to make a point about sacrifice.

Theoretically, Godwin's translation should be incredibly close to a linguistic translation of the Latin because he is trying to expose newer Latin learners to the language. However, he doesn't appear to be doing that.

Godwin uses the English cognate "error" for *erroris*, this shows the etymology of the word very nicely. However, the meaning of the words is very different. *Error* is a wandering from the correct path, error is a completely wrong path. So while this is good for learning to translate it is not good for general knowledge about Latin. This ties into an issue for many languages with English translation. Since English is an amalgamation of so many other languages it often has words that appear to be the same in both languages, however they can have different meanings or connotations in another language.[53] This is the same for Latin and so we must ask ourselves whether it is better to learn a language based on these similar words or to use different ones to make the differentiation of languages easier.

In his commentary, Godwin identifies *remota nebula* as an ablative absolute, which would usually be translated outside the main clause, something like "setting aside the cloud of error, few people are able…" But Godwin himself translates *remota as* following *possunt* like a verb (in the same way as *dinoscere*). This could be to make the sentence run better, but it does differ from a linguistic translation.

Other examples already mentioned include "East" for *Auroram*; "cloud" for *nebula*; and "stretch" rather than a meaning of "being".

He also rearranges the phrasing in the translation, were he to keep the Latin order it would read "few people can distinguish truly good things from those that are very different and

---

[53] Nugroho (2007). P. 68

set aside the cloud of error". He may have done the order he has as a nod to the ablative absolute he identifies.

Section 2

It is a long time now since any of us sold our votes to anyone, and the mob has thrown away their concerns. At one time the crowd used to hand out military power, the rods of office, legions, everything - now it holds itself back and just longs anxiously for two things only: bread and the games.

In this section, there is some disagreement between commentaries about how to render *suffragia vendimus*. Courtney suggests "has lost interest in politics" which identifies the meaning behind the words in a modern context. However, Mayor and Godwin render it something closer to "sold out votes". This is much more literal as compared to the Latin, but it sounds off to the audience without the knowledge of what this meant to the ancient Romans.

There is also some disagreement about *se continet*, Courtney, Mayor and Godwin all see it as an impersonal construct whereas Ferguson gives it a third plural subject. This changes whether we see the mob as the subject, or the people making up the mob. Most modern audiences would be more comfortable with identifying people rather than having them be a mass, so it is interesting that Godwin renders it as he does.

Mayor translates *imperium* as "commands", Ferguson as "authority" and Godwin chooses "military power". All are appropriate for different aspects of the word. Godwin's "military power" ties into the "legions" later and the image created might be why he chose that translation.

To see Godwin's literary translation come into full play we can see how he translates *panem et circenses*. Unlike the idea of "bread and circuses" that has entered the English-spoken mindset, Godwin translates it as "bread and the games". This is much closer to the meaning for the Latin, but is a difference for what people are probably expecting (colloquially known as "bread and circuses") and so can be jarring. For most modern English speakers circuses are

familiar: we often think of a large gathering with lots of fun and entertainment. This is different from games in that we often associate a competitive edge to games, like sports.

The idea of image creation can be used for the other things that the crowd used to hand out, he describes *fasces* as "rods of office" and keeps the English cognate "legion". He is literally creating an image we are familiar with rather than one that is familiar to ancient Romans. Both have descriptive qualities which fit a literary translation and create a sociolinguistic model for the reader to understand the culture better.

Something that is very interesting is that Godwin describes the people as "the mob". This is very appropriate to the idea in ancient Rome where society was split into the imperial family, the military, aristocratic families and everyone else (which included men, women, children and slaves of all social and financial classes). This sense is the same for modern audiences, we have splits in society that divide between the elite and the lower classes. Modern English-speaking societies understand these devices and we often describe a mob as an unruly force of people as Romans think of the non-elite.

Godwin limits how crazy the "mob" idea is by representing the people as a "crowd" later. While these are not exactly the same group they are similar enough that Godwin can pretty accurately transmit the political ideas to his audience. He can display a "mob" which represents the people Juvenal is referring to, while also representing what his target audience would think of as a mob. The back and forth nature of using two different words for the same idea is a very good example of a sociolinguistic translation.

Godwin, in his commentary, identifies a negative sense to *continet* and *optat* (not seen elsewhere). His interpretation here gives emphasis to everything that has been lost by the people. He is tapping into the serious nature of Juvenal that was mentioned above. He shows this in his translation by postponing "only". This emphasises the longing of the people.

In addition, his translation for *imperium, fasces, legiones* shows his military-minded interpretation. The descriptive way he translates also shows the poeticism he sees in Juvenal's Satires.

Godwin specifies that *effudit* means "thrown away" in his commentary, a very literal translation that makes this part of his translation very linguistic. He does the same for *vendimus*

as "sold", the idea of selling votes seems wrong to a modern audience but it is what the Latin is saying.

He also sticks very closely to the person and number of the verbs. He includes the author in *vendimus* but distances him in *effudit*, since the former is in the first person plural and the latter in the third person singular. He matches the Latin because he is showing his readers how the endings affect the translation, since this is a learning text.

He does not stick so closely with *iam pridem* which has more of a "long ago", The way Godwin has translated it "a long time now since" better shows the parts of this phase, but it has a stock meaning that he does not use. His translation requires him to adjust the following phrase too for it all to make sense, which is not ideal for many translators.

Section 3

Now that his palate is numb, he no longer has the same joy in wine or food. Sex is long forgotten, or if you try, his tiny organ lies there with its bulging vein and even though it is massaged all night long it will go on lying limp.

Godwin abides by Ferguson's identification of *torpente palato* as an ablative absolute by setting it aside from the main clause. However, he does not take *ramice* as to apply to the tesicles as Ferguson suggests, but with the penis. This is either because he thinks it should go with *neruus* or because he thinks that it is a varicose of the penis being represented by a varicose of the testicles.

Ferguson describes *palpetur* as "stroked, coaxed, worked on" whereas Godwin translates it to "massaged" which is a softer version of a similar action. A sign that Godwin might be distancing himself from the action itself which is sexual in nature to make it less so for his likely younger targeted audience. In fact, all of the commentaries are sparse for these lines probably for the same reason.

When Godwin is translating certain words, we can also see this prudishness . He translates *neruus* as "organ" rather than "penis" or something else more appropriate. While this

isn't an incorrect translation it does create a different meaning that does not accurately match with the Latin.

Godwin also creates a satirical image of the penis and the vein and how the penis is so small compared to the vein on it; and by describing the former as a "tiny organ" and the latter a "bulging vein" Godwin maintains this satirical imagery.

One issue sociolinguistically that occurs in this section is how memory and forgetting are represented. Godwin chooses to render the idea of memory as something "long forgotten", which is much more similar to the Roman idea of memory, described as "an orderly house wherein one can find memories and how they connect with other memories with relative ease",[54] as compared with the modern notion of a memory itself (as an object) being long gone, which is often understood to have never been imprinted on the brain and so not accessible[55]. In other words it is the difference between not being able to access something and not having it anymore. This is an example of a transmission of culture that fits into a sociolinguistic model very well.

Interestingly, Godwin also renders "wine"/ *vini* in the same way and place in the sentence as the Latin. This shows the significance of wine in Roman culture and how Godwin recognises it and emulates it in his own translation. By placing "wine" before "food" we are seeing how the drink is more important than food, which is not generally how it is portrayed in modern societies.

Godwin does not use any of the graphic imagery that Juvenal conjures here, this is due to his interpretation of Juvenal's text. In his commentary, Godwin points out that this section has some very satirical imagery, it is a little nonsensical and vague, and he does create a nonsensical image rather than the graphic and realistic one that Juvenal presents. We can infer that Godwin is playing up this nonsensical imagery for a likely younger target audience which you might expect him to avoid exposing a graphic image of a penis to.

Godwin is interpreting the image as a nicer coaxing than maybe is applicable from the Latin. This goes along with making the scene softer and thus funnier rather than as overtly

---

[54] Farrell (1997), p. 3
[55] Peterson & Peterson (1959), p. 4

sexual. The emphasis on the funny aspects of a tiny penis and a giant vien juxtaposed to a soft coaxing makes the whole scene just that much funnier.

He also specifies with his commentary the power of *iam* when describing the lost things to the man, the timeline seems important to Godwin whereas it might not have this significance elsewhere.

A repetition of forms of *iaceo* for Godwin represents the inevitability of impotence for this author. He also says that the spondees reinforce this. Godwin himself translates them the same way, using "to lie" as a base.

In a linguistic model, Godwin is being very accurate to the Latin grammar. For instance his use of "same joy" for *eadem...gaudia* might not seem completely right for an English speaking audience, but it fits the Latin syntax. It is an unusual phrasing, making "joy" a noun rather than a part of a verbal phrase as is more often used in English.

Godwin identifies a mixed conditional with *coneris...iacebit* describing the choice of trying and the inevitability of nothing coming of it; Godwin's translation shows this by making the apodosis "if" and the protasis "will".

To make his ablative absolute work in context, Godwin had to rearrange the syntax of the sentence. He brought forward the phrase *torpente palato* to do this. While this makes more sense in English it does not represent the Latin accurately. Otherwise, Godwin is following the Latin order well.

Section 4

To give you something however to demand, and a reason to dedicate the entrails and the sacred little sausages of a white piglet at little shrines, you should pray for a healthy mind in a healthy body.

Mayor suggests that *candiduli divina tomacula porci* is especially satirical and Godwin uses this in his translation, putting emphasis on the diminutives and word order, making the whole scene

sound less realistic. Godwin does not go as far as Ferguson by calling the *tomacula* "hot dogs" though.

Both Courtney and Ferguson point out the dual meaning of *divina* but Godwin chooses to ignore the secondary meaning. *Divina* can either represent sacrifice/offering for the gods, or it can involve divination. Godwin focuses only on the offering aspect to simplify the sense of the scene.

Courtney, Mayor and Ferguson all point out the satirical nature of this scene and Godwin also plays with this concept. He calls them "sacred little sausages" at "little shrines". This use of the diminutive (identified as such by Courtney) makes the scene somewhat funny but the elevated tone of the first line takes away some of the humour by placing it in a grand setting of demanding gifts from the Gods.

Godwin does play up the comedy of the image though. Before he seems to have taken some of the didactic nature of Juvenal seriously, but here it is not coming out like that. He does not go as far as to make this whole thing a joke though. This is appropriate because it makes the message sound more believable.

Godwin expands on the *ut* phrase when he says "to give you". This does not appear in the Latin and is an extension of the subjunctive verbs in the *ut* phrase. The addition here provides some sense for the English that is not necessarily necessary but it does sound better.

We see the methodology behind prayer here, and it makes more sense because of the more serious tone Godwin uses. Godwin chooses to use somewhat serious language to communicate the culture being represented here while also considering the joking tone that Juvenal uses in the Latin.

Godwin uses "healthy" for *sana* both times it is used in this section rather than "sane" which is a more common translation. This is a more commonly used word in modern day English for this context. Sane isn't often applied to the body even though it technically can have the same meaning here.

For many scholars there is a split in the Satires. The earlier satires are angrier and more joking, this is likely because he wrote them when he was younger. However, the later satires are

more mature and serious in their tone[56] compared to the angry shoutings of the "younger Juvenal". While it is contested whether Satire 10 is one of these more mature satires (see Bellandi, Tengstrom and Rudd[57]) Godwin does seem to think so saying that book 3 and following "marks a slight lightening of the angry tone"[58]. His more serious tone shows his interpretation quite well.

Godwin chooses to translate *exta* as entrails. This is very vague as it can refer to any particular internal organ, specifically the heart, lungs and liver. This is an interesting choice, linguistically and sociolinguistically. By being vague, Godwin is not expanding on a part of the culture he is exploring. And it also does not identify something that would be apparent to a Latin reader, what exactly is being dedicated.

Godwin has ended up with a more literary translation than a linguistic one. One would think that he would want to aim for a linguistic representation since this text is meant to assist students early in their Latin careers. He also does a good job representing the cultural differences to some extent. He is not always describing events as they happen in the Latin, but he does make an effort to explore the culture for his modern day audience.

---

[56] Keane (2015). P. 6
[57] Murgatoyd (2017). P. 13
[58] Godwin (2016). P. 5

Conclusion

Looking back, we can see there are a lot of difficulties presented to a translator during their writing and translating process. Rudd, Braund and, Godwin come into their texts with different ideas about what they can get from Juvenal and about what they want their audience to get from their translations.

Niall Rudd sees Juvenal as a complex speaker who comes after a long line of satirists and is finding ways to be different to them all. His Juvenal can change from line to line and certainly from satire to satire, he can be raging against the city and then lose steam and go into a philosophical thought[59]. Rudd wants to create a poem similar to Juvenal which can be read metrically, unfortunately this is not apparent in the final product.

Rudd wants to create some linguistic features relevant to the original text in line with the linguistic theory of translation described by Vinay and Darbelnet. Which left a lot to be desired in terms of a literary translation when he would not create vivid images with his words. When considering his audience, probably the widest of the translations dealt with here, Rudd is very adept at the socio-linguistic/ cultural translation which often transmitted Roman ideas in a way an English-speaking layperson would understand (like calling *imperium*, "commands") in some places. However sometimes he just lets things stand (like using "rods" for *fasces*) causing some of the meaning to be lost for his modern audience. He always wants to maintain a certain PG rating, we might say, in comparison to the commentators, especially when dealing with explicit sexual scenes. This could come from his own discomfort, but also works well considering his wide and likely varied audience.

His interpretation of Juvenal is also something that underlies the entire text without explicitly being shown. Since Rudd believes Juvenal to be so eclectic in his own text, it is understandable that Rudd's translation would be similar. He has scenes where we feel the history of a moment such as the races in section 2, but then we lose the majesty of a ritual in section 4. By not choosing as explicitly a way to translate, Rudd's translation has left a lot up to the reader in terms of interpretation. One could think Juvenal funny one minute and angry the next and philosophical the next! This is not ideal because a reader would want to read Rudd's

---

[59] Rudd (1986) p. 37

translation to get an idea about this Juvenal and what he's about, this is not something they can get from sitting down and reading this translation. He has presented a text that does not have any of the underlying cohesion of Juvenal. Even someone who believes Juvenal to be eclectic would see something that brings it all together, Rudd has not presented this cohesion.

Susanna Morton Braund sees Juvenal as more an entertainer than anything else, this is very apparent in her translation. She also comments that *Satire 10* is a didactic poem designed to teach people the issues surrounding prayer[60] so we can infer that her translation will be focussed on the entertainment and teaching factors. The interesting aspect is how she combines her view of an entertainer with that of a teacher.

In discussing how she will create her translation Braund comments that she will aiming for a vivid translation without losing Latin accuracy. This would mean we will see a literary and/or linguistic translation. Throughout this analysis we have seen Braund put an emphasis on linguistic similarity in her translation to be in line with the original text, such as her use of "yet, actually" for *ut tamen* in section 4. She has also been successful in creating some explicit imagery with her words, such as "his stringy little prick" in section 3; however this is not consistent: in her section 1 the width of the world that Juvenal describes is not encapsulated by Braund in the same way. We can see here how her priorities line up when writing the translation. Braund has put a linguistic translation ahead of a literary one, this could have something to do with the presentation of the text. Loeb editions have facing Latin text, so we can assume that Braund considered this when she was translating. She is attempting to have the text match the Latin closely so that when one is reading it they can see the connections between the texts more clearly.

We also see Braund's interpretation of Juvenal throughout her translation. As commented before, she seems to view Juvenal as mocking the process of prayer[61] and this is very present in her translation, especially in section 4 with her comments of "little sacred sausages of a shining white piglet at the little shrines". This plays up the hilarity of the situation rather than Braund considering what the reader thinks about ritual sacrifice before seeing this interpretation laid upon the scene. One would hope that reading a translation, the reader

---

[60] Braund (2004) p. 364
[61] Murgatoyd (2017) p 2

would be able to gain some understanding of the world it takes place in; but this is not apparent here. Braund does not take into account a socio-linguistic methodology for her translation perhaps because she expects her audience to already have this knowledge. However, for an audience that does not know Juvenal's Rome her translation is not useful. The Loeb collection is possibly the most famous of Classical texts, and thus we can imagine that a new Latin student would come across this text and Braund should have considered this fact in her translation process. The Loeb editions have been described as "instantly recognisable" to even the most amateur Classicist[62], so we can wonder how much knowledge these new students will actually have about the culture Juvenal is talking about.

In a similar vein, John Godwin created his translation in 2016 as a classroom text. He also has facing Latin but includes a commentary in the back of the book. To this end he aims to create a "very literal translation"[63] to make the process of a student translating easier his readers will be able to look at the Latin and with the assistance of the commentary and the translation they should be able to create their own translation and even "read" the Latin.

Godwin's translation does abide by the linguistic methodology throughout his translation, but he also includes a lot of socio-cultural reckonings within his translation. For example, in section 2, he has "military power, the rods of office, legions, everything" which is both accurate to the idea behind the Latin words as well as an accurate and brief translation of the words themselves. Godwin also places his interpretation in his translation when he emphasises the comedy in many scenes especially when Juvenal is being explicitly sexual in section 3. These instances are partly due to Godwin's audience, which we can presume to be younger than that of Braund and Rudd (and thus he would not want to focus on the overtly sexual aspects), but also because of Godwin thinking of the funny aspects of scenes.

An added interest in Godwin is his inclusion of a commentary. We can assume that by including a commentary Godwin would then not feel the need to include explicit cultural allusions and explanations in addition to his interpretations. Godwin provides more detail about Juvenal's culture and the many interpretations surrounding the text in his commentary. In the translation itself, Gowin does seem to abide by this in that he only shows his own interpretation

---

[62] Wilson, E. (2006)
[63] Godwin (2016) p. 1

and takes away some of the vagueness that Juvenal provides in the original text perhaps hoping his readers will be able to see the differing interpretations from the Latin, which is facing his translation.

From all of this we can see how difficult it is to translate a text for a specific goal. Each of the translators had obvious aims, but all of them blurred the lines of translation theories and methodologies which causes some disturbance to their translations. Each translator would often have to sacrifice some goal for another, such as creating a linguistic translation over a literary one. As such, I believe that it would be more productive to translate with a specific method in mind. This way a translator could create something that would actually achieve their goals.

Current Latin-to-English translations often attempt to create a transparent view of the original text for an English-speaking audience. However, each translation is more an artform than a scientific endeavour and that raises the question of how a translation is not just a new text created by the translator. How can it be right to have three wildly different texts all claim to be the same. This is not something that is seen in other language translation cultures where there is a focus to the translation which results in texts that more accurately portray a single goal.

While this subject is being grappled with in the field of Classics, it is not yet seemingly a problem for classicists. Is it not a problem that we cannot read a text without learning a whole new language? How can a field of study be so elitist in our "modern era"? I believe that analysing translations and finding the language to accurately discuss them is vital to this movement away from the belief that you can only read a text in the original language. What comes next? Next, we have to have the discussion before translation, we have to find a way to translate a text into another language without the metaphor of translation.

Works Cited

Astbury, P. 1992. Review of *Juvenal, the Satires* by Niall Rudd and William Barr. *Hermathena*.
    152, 91-93

Braund, S. M. 2004. *Juvenal and Persius*. Loeb Classical Library 91. Cambridge, MA: Harvard
    University Press.

Bassnett, S. 2014. *Translation*. New York, NY: Routledge

Brisset, A. 2017. Globalization, translation, and cultural diversity. *Translation & Interpreting*
    Studies: The Journal of the American Translation & Interpreting Studies Association.
    12(2): 253-277

Clausen, W. V. 1992. Oxford Classical Texts: *A. Persi Flacci et D. Iuni Iuvenalis: Saturae*. Oxford:
    Oxford University Press

Courtney, E. 1980. *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*. London: The Athlone Press

Eck, W., Sallmann, K., and Schmidt, P. 2006. Varro, *Brill's New Pauly*, English Edition by: Christine
    F. Salazar. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e1228710

Farrell, J. 1997. The Phenomenology of Memory in Roman Culture. *The Classical Journal*. 97 (4)
    373-383

Ferguson, J. 1979. *Juvenal; The Satires*. London: Macmillan Education Ltd.

Graf, F., Müller, W., Müller, C., and Kytzler, B. 2006. Horatius. *Brill's New Pauly*. English Edition
    by: Francis G. Gentry. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e517270

Godwin, J. 2016. *Juvenal Satires Book IV*. With intro., trans. and comm. Havertown, Oxbow
    Books.

Jones, F. 2007. *Juvenal and the Satiric Genre*. London: Duckworth Publishing.

Jungwha, C. 2003). The Interpretive Theory of Translation and Its Current Applications.
    Interpretation Studies.

Keane, C. 2015. *Juvenal and the Satiric Emotions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lewis, C. T. 1899. *Harper's Latin Dictionary*. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers.

Lintott, A. 1990. Electoral Bribery in the Roman Republic. *The Journal of Roman Studies*. 80: 1-16

Mayor, J. E. B. 1878. *The Thirteen Satires of Juvenal: with a commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge
    University Press.

Mitter, P. 1987. Can we ever understand alien cultures?. *Comparative Criticism*. 9: 3-34

Munday, J. 2008. *Introducing Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.

Murgatroyd, P. 2017. Juvenal's Tenth Satire. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Nida, E. A. & Taber, C. R. 1982. *The Theory and Practice of Translation.* Leiden: E.J. Brill

Nugroho, A. B. 2007. Meaning and Translation. *Journal of English and Education.* 1(2): 66-74

Peterson, L.R., & Peterson, M.J. 1959. Short-term retention of individual verbal items. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 58, 193-198

Qiang, K. 2013. Application of the Interpretive Theory of Translation in Interpreting Practice. *Canadian Social Science*. 9 (6): 236-241

Rudd, N. 1986. *Themes in Roman Satire.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Rudd, N. 1991. *Juvenal The Satires*. With intro. and notes by Barr, W. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Seleskovitch, D. & Lederer, M. 1995. *A Systematic Approach to Teaching Interpreting.* Paris: Didier Erudition

Suerbaum, W. and Eck, W. 2006. Ennius, *Brill's New Pauly*, English Edition by: Francis G. Gentry. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e330670

Turney, G. 1984. Translation, Literary Translation and Pseudotranslation. *Comparative Criticism*. 6:73-85

Unknown. 2015. "Death of Professor Niall Rudd". University of Bristol Department of Classics and Archeology. Written 9th October 2015. https://www.bristol.ac.uk/classics/news/2015/niall-rudd.html

Vinay, J. & Darbelnet, J. 1958. *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company

Weissbort, D. & Eysteinsson, A. 2006. *Translation - Theory and Practice; a historical reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Wilson, E. 2006. "Found in Translation: Reading the classics with help from the Loeb Library". *Slate*. August 15, 2006. https://slate.com/culture/2006/08/the-loeb-classical-library.html

Wrede, J.1983 Reading as experience: on the aesthetics of literary interpretation and criticism. *Comparative Criticism*. 5: 3-20

Zhu. L. 2017. An embodied cognition perspective on translation education: philosophy and

pedagogy. *Perspectives Studies in Translation Theory and Practice*. 26(1); 135-151