THE JUVENALIAN INFLUENCE

ON BYRON'S DON JUAN

APPROVED:

Lloyd N. Jeffrey
Major Professor

Anthony Damico
Minor Professor

E. S. Clifton
Director of the Department of English

Robert B. Toulouse
Dean of the Graduate School

THE JUVENALIAN INFLUENCE ON

BYRON'S *DON JUAN*

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the

North Texas State University in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

Diane Gardner Dunson, B. A.

Denton, Texas

August, 1967

PREFACE

This thesis is a comparative study of Juvenal and Lord Byron, with emphasis on the particularly kindred aspects of the poets' works. The two men lived hundreds of years apart, yet their ideas and attitudes are so similar that the connection bears research. In many instances, the relationship between the poets is only temperamental; at other times, the subject matter of Byron reveals the direct influence of Juvenal. This paper treats in detail the major topics of interest which Juvenal and Byron shared--society, morality, war, death, and the purpose of life. The first chapter on the nature of satire serves as an introduction to the study of these topics and is designed to bridge the time gap between the poets. The backgrounds of Juvenal and Byron are considered briefly to show the comparable social and political atmosphere of their early manhood. The remaining three chapters deal in detail with the subject matter of Juvenal's *Satires* and Byron's *Don Juan*, with emphasis on the modernity, soundness of judgement, and worth of that which the two men have to say.

For the particular study of the Juvenalian influence on Lord Byron, and especially on *Don Juan*, there were no

specific books available. Most critical references never mention the correlation between the two poets, but a close perusal of their satires indicates a definite similarity in background, subject matter, purpose, and attitudes. The quotations from Byron's verse are taken from the Cambridge edition of 1905, edited by Paul Elmer More. References to Don Juan are by Canto (Roman numerals) and stanza (Arabic numerals). The New American Library edition of Juvenal's satires, translated by Hubert Creekmore, has been used throughout. The Indians Press edition of Rolfe Humphries' translation was indeed helpful, but the Creekmore edition rendered Juvenal into frank, slangy verse which revealed the poet's great modernity with effectiveness. Quotations from Juvenal are identified by satire (Roman numerals) and lines Arabic numerals).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
PREFACE		iii
Chapter		
I.	THE NATURE OF ROMAN SATIRE	1
II.	THE COMPARABLE BACKGROUNDS OF JUVENAL AND LORD BYRON	11
III.	BYRON AND JUVENAL ON SOCIETY	22
IV.	BYRON AND JUVENAL ON WOMEN, MARRIAGE, AND MORALITY	40
V.	BYRON AND JUVENAL ON WAR, DEATH, AND THE MEANING OF LIFE	61
VI.	CONCLUSION	89
BIBLIOGRAPHY		93

CHAPTER I

THE NATURE OF ROMAN SATIRE

Of all the literary forms invented and mastered by past and present writers, only one belongs uniquely to the Romans--satire. Modern authors have altered the style and added new elements, but they are all indebted to Roman literature. It is largely the effect of one satirist, also Roman, a poet named Juvenal, that has given satire the connotation it has in modern literature--the biting irony, forceful wit, and sharp lashes at humanity in general. As this study will show, this poet had a particularly profound influence upon the English satirist-in-verse Lord Byron, who likewise found humanity and its foibles to be his major source of material. The form grew to a great extent out of protest against the didacticism and bombast of Roman literature previous to the time of Horace. Through poetry, satire began as a change from conventional topics to a clear, undisguised attempt to determine man's weaknesses and possible solutions to society's decadence resulting from those weaknesses.

Before examining the structural nature of Roman satire and other developmental influences, a definition of this form

is in order. Gilbert Highet has formulated a comprehensive description of satire, one as true for modern authors as it was for the Romans:

> Satire is a continuous piece of verse, or of prose mingled with verse. . . . generally characterized by the free use of conversational language, . . . its predilection for wit, humor and irony, great vividness of description. . .and the general intention of improving society by exposing its vices and follies.[1]

This definition is consistent with that offered by Samuel Johnson, that satire is "a poem in which wickedness or folly is censured."[2] Both scholars considered the English satiric tradition a direct result of the Latin tradition, for this general reforming purpose was stated by Lucilius, Horace, and later Juvenal. The two main groups of satirists which developed in Rome in the quarter of a century before Christ were both concerned with the problem of exposing society as it existed. By far the most important of these two groups were the poets, who, writing in hexameter, "usually specialized in invective against clearly identifiable or thinly disguised personalities."[3] From the originator, Lucilius, to

---

[1]Gilbert Highet, The Classical Tradition (New York, 1949), p. 305.

[2]J. Wight Duff, Roman Satire (Connecticut, 1964), p.3.

[3]Highet, The Classical Tradition, p. 303.

the one who gave the form its modern sense and purpose, Juvenal, each left his mark on the literary form, influences which will be discussed later. The other group of satirists, followers of Menippus of Gadara, wrote in parodies, and little work survives from the Greek. This type of satire was much less eloquent and of practically no direct effect on modern satire. History has proven that the ability to perceive facets of human nature and express them succinctly in verse has been of infinite value in literary development through the ages, and the verse satire, with its serious tone and purpose, has more successfully pointed the world to a new sense of morality.

In creating this literary form, Roman satirists adopted the hexameter to suit the wide range of emotions they hoped to span and the variety of effects they wanted to create. The free-moving, yet concise verse can be seen as a logical result of the particular bent of the satiric Roman mind. The Romans had a peculiar gift for expressing the greatest amount of substance in the fewest possible words. The short, pithy statement, the epigram, apothegm, and the diatribe, for example, are direct influences from the Greeks. The Romans made the most extensive use of the apothegm, however, for this literary form suited their feeling for the small detail. Interest in character traits of people rather than philosophy is a foreshadowing of the Roman love for anecdotes, which later became so clearly manifested in Horaces's

Sermones.[4] Part of the Roman education included practice in oratory, which gave the men who were to become satirists a thorough background in presenting material in the most effective way possible. The Romans were masters at writing so concretely that the reader was spared needless detail; he received only what was necessary to the total effect on the senses. The Romans chose the couplet in certain poems for the purpose of invective epigram, but to write their most eloquent satire, these men chose the hexameter because they could make it adapt itself to everything from comic frivolous conversation to lengthy didacticism.[5]

Of no less originality than the use of this particular meter is the Roman gift for vivid vocabulary and frank expression in satire. Juvenal extended the tradition of the epigram begun by Martial by polishing his subtle satires with bitter venom. According to Highet, "Juvenal himself has never been surpassed in the craft of etching on the human heart with pure acid,"[6] and it is this ability to portray a whole realm of experience in five or six words that has had a significant force on modern satirists. The Roman poets, and especially Juvenal, had a gift for understanding the

---

[4] Elizabeth Haight, Roman Use of Anecdotes (New York, 1940), p. 5.

[5] Highet, The Classical Tradition, p. 316.

[6] Ibid., p. 306.

subtle shades of meaning in words, and they never failed to choose the one most graphically descriptive, no matter how shocking.

The use which the major poets made of this gift of irony and satire frequently was manifested in character sketches and scenes of contemporary life. Each in his own way attacked the problem of society according to his view of poetry, but it was left to Juvenal to establish the pattern for future satirists. It was partially his wish to point out human fallacies that led Byron, the English Juvenal, to undertake his masterpiece of satire, Don Juan, a subtle but no less incisive war on society than the one the Roman had waged, a panorama of short scenes designed to reveal mankind's foibles. All of the satirical poets employed graphic descriptions of the appearance of Rome and its people--Lucilius and his market place, Horace and his boors wandering in the streets, Persius and the downfall of Roman education and the resulting deplorable literary condition, and most detailed of all, Juvenal and his poverty-ridden streets and gaudy, lavish banquets of the wealthy. The contrast between wealth and poverty was later to be of as great interest to Lord Byron as it was to Juvenal, and both were masters in their own way at revealing society's sham and vanity.

Most critics agree that real Roman satire began with Gaius Lucilius, for he was the first to devote much time and effort to perfecting this new Roman art form. His thirty books of satire stem largely from the social unrest he perceived during the Gracchan rule.[7] It was Lucilius' style that later was adapted by the Stoic, Persius, and he followed the same pattern of "frank, fearless satire"[8] that was later to characterize Juvenal. Little more need be said of the bitter sarcasm and pedantic style of Lucilius beyond the fact that he "invented" the satiric vein, for only a small portion of his work is extant.

Persius wrote six satires, all of which appear traditionally Roman. He wrote for the learned scholar, and he delighted in carefully choosing two words to be put together in original contrasts, ones which would only be understood by the erudite.[9] Persius attempted little actual criticism of man and society; he merely pointed out that man is indifferent to his own vices and acutely aware of the faults of others. Steeped in Stoic philosophy, he debated frequently

---

[7]L. R. Lind, Latin Poetry (Boston, 1957), p.4.

[8]Haight, p. 148.

[9]J. P. Sullivan, editor, Critical Essays on Roman Literature (London, 1924), p. 61.

the conflict between freedom and slavery of man's spirit.[10] He was ever serious about his task of writing, and his philosophy remained consistent, revealing a sharp feeling of sincerity. Persius' Satires would never be considered mere imitations; for, although he borrowed from other writers, he infused each satire with his own personality and philosophy. The themes he presented were tempered with his background in Stoicism, "which supplied him with texts of virtue, true liberty, curses of ignorance, superstition, passion, and wealth."[11] His style serves as a vital link between Horace and Juvenal, the two major Roman satirists, for his writing was remarkably and severely realistic and blazingly passionate at the same time.

With the advent of Horace on the Roman literary scene, satire as well as other writing took a turn for the polished and urbane. There can be no doubt that Horace was frequently a satirist, yet the style of his collection was not the erudite one of Persius or the scathing one of Juvenal, but, for the most part, one of tolerance, friendship, and non-personal humor. In Horace's own "Defense of Satire" he states that his object is "not to give pain," but rather "to observe the

---

[10] Ibid., p. 70.

[11] Haight, p. 153.

the conduct of others, and to profit thereby."[12] The application of Horace's satire can be extended to all social levels; he intends no personal conviction of one group. If Horace's satirical pen could be said to have a moralizing tendency, it would be his belief that unrestrained criticism of another's vices can only lead to mutual criticism.[13] Horace's satires often assume the appearance of philosophical discussions, for his topics include the degree of justice for certain crimes, envy of high social rank, false ambition of wealth, and talkative boors. There is ever-present in his satires the wish for peace, friends, and life in the country. A new definition of satire was in order as soon as Horace's first book of satires was published, for "his own temperament and the occasions that called for expression shaped his material beyond the scope of his own definition,"[14] the one which had prevailed from the beginning of satire. Never the fiery, critical, sarcastic Lucilius, and seldom the learned, severe Persius, Horace wrote both from observation

---

[12] H. Rushton Fairclough, translator, Horace: Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica (Cambridge, 1926), p. 47.

[13] Meyer Reinhold, Essentials of Greek and Roman Classics (New York, 1946), p. 310.

[14] Tenney Frank, Catullus and Horace (Oxford, 1928), p. 173.

and experience about whatever he considered important. His influence on other poets probably will never be completely acknowledged, but his major effects on later writers, and on Lord Byron in particular, can not be overestimated.

Considering the fact that Juvenal has been declared the "greatest satiric poet who ever lived,"[15] little is known of his personal background. Scholars have ascertained that he was free-born and received the customary education for a middle-class boy. Beyond this, Juvenal tells us nothing of his youth. The reader is never aware of the social conditions under which he grew up, but by the time Juvenal began to publish in his middle 40's he was a poor dependent of some rich patrons.[16] This life as a "client" was degrading and demoralizing; the relationship to the patron was generally marked by pretentious displays of servility that concealed his hatred. Juvenal felt this disgrace keenly and became the first to speak out forcefully against such treatment. There is evidence from his poetry that he was in Rome during the Domitian rule, for his apparent banishment under the pretext of conferring military distinction came

---

[15]Gilbert Highet, Juvenal the Satirist (Oxford, 1954), p. 2.

[16]Ibid., p. 5

around this time.[17] Supposedly he was banished because he had denounced the political influence of one of the emperor's favorite comedians.[18] From such an obscure and yet troublesome early life, one might expect the bitterness and anger that comes from the heart of Juvenal, but in his time he was not recognized as the chief of satirists. However, years have proven that he is worthy of study for the soundness of his ideas and the effect of his work on generations of poets to follow. His subject matter, style, and philosophy are to be studied in detail in the following chapters, with emphasis on his influence on Lord Byron.

---

[17] Oskar Seyffert, Dictionary of Classical Antiquities (New York, 1956), p. 340.

[18] Ibid.

CHAPTER II

THE COMPARABLE BACKGROUNDS OF JUVENAL AND LORD BYRON

The largest portion of this thesis deals with the relationship of Juvenal and Lord Byron in regard to both their similarities and differences. Some brief consideration, therefore, must be given to the political and social background of the two men. Both of these rebels matured under similar situations of tyranny and corruption, and this kinship undoubtedly played a major role in determining their parallel attitudes and personalities.

A short sketch of Juvenal's life was given in the last chapter, but, to compare his background with Lord Byron's, there must be added to this a brief resumé of the political situation of his youth. Juvenal no doubt heard as a young boy of the scandals and atrocities which Nero was perpetrating at Rome. After he committed suicide, Nero was succeeded by four emperors chosen only by the armies, which began a series of disorganized rule, until Vespasian took command and the Flavian line came into power.[1] Society had degenerated,

---

[1]Hubert Creekmore, translator, The Satires of Juvenal (New York, 1963), Introduction, p. x.

and the people felt no great desire for an honest ruler. Vespasian was a good man and even somewhat of an author, a man who ruled without tryanny and murder. When his son ended his own rule after two years, Domitian came into power, and Rome was again flooded with vice and immorality of every sort. The age of Domitian under which Juvenal suffered was one of indescribable crimes and terrors, an era reminiscent of the tyrannical reigns of Nero and Tiberius. According to H. J. Rose, Domitian was not without some interest in learning, but there was always conflict between the men of letters and the government. Under his rule, all free speech eventually came to an end, because he was so frightened and "full of his own superhuman importance," that he feared any philosophical opposition from the scholarly people.[2] From his experiences under this rule, Juvenal was beset with fear and a grave sense of the social injustices that afflicted the middle class as a result of Domitian's dictates.[3] He saw the way favorites of the emperor and others of the equestrian rank were able to advance politically, although they were entirely unworthy. Early in his rule, Domitian had made great strides in expanding the empire, but he grew more and

---

[2]H. J. Rose, A Handbook of Latin Literature, (New York, 1960), p. 389.

[3]Highet, Juvenal the Satirist, p. 37.

more corrupt, and throughout the years of Juvenal's youth the country remained in the hands of a despot.[4] It is not surprising that from the society abused by this tyranny comes a writer horrified and disgusted with the inequities he views and a determination to make them obvious to the world. There will be an attempt to show later that it was this same sort of tyranny that motivated Lord Byron to speak out in satire also.

The bitterness which Juvenal felt toward all the evil consequences and gross inequities of despotism can account for his caustic attitude and bitter sarcasm. Juvenal went one step beyond merely reminiscing about the heroes of old Rome; he ruthlessly (although usually indirectly) compared them to the evil rulers of his own day. He perceived, although perhaps he did not always understand, the changes going on in society, and he recorded angrily the gradual but steady decline of morality and the rapidly increasing vice. His description in Satire Four of an imperial council held by Domitian on a ridiculously trivial subject is one example of Juvenal's treatment of despotic rulers. He revealed as no other poet could the downfall of the nobles, people lowered to poverty because of their own vices. Poor most of his life, Juvenal purposely gave his ill-feeling a moral

[4]Creekmore, Introduction, p. xi.

tone, but he may still be credited with "a real hatred of vice and preference for simplicity and honesty."[5] Another character which interested Juvenal greatly was the tradesman who had been freed from bondage and had become rich in the process. Women who were now living an independent life of their own--not the standard virtuous one of early Rome--interested Juvenal also, and they became the topic of one of his best satires. When a detailed study is made of Juvenal's sixteen Satires, it is found that no group or class actually escapes his wrath for long. The hypocrites, women, patrons and clients, artists, scholars, even "civilized" cannibals, all come up for careful scrutiny under the stinging pen of this poet.

It is indeed fortunate that more is known of the early life of Lord Byron than of that of his Roman predecessor, but much concerning the man himself similarly remains shrouded in mystery. According to Marchand, Quennell, and other biographers, Byron's ancestry was an unfortunate mixture of violent instability, riotous living and notoriety. His father was known as a lover and rover, and his mother was no less emotionally unstable, although in a different way, doting on the boy and abusing him at the same time. His early education

---

[5]Rose, p. 406.

was a combination of Calvinistic skepticism toward humanity and a desire to experience all that life held in store for him. His mother made him ever-conscious of his "superior destiny" as a descendent of the Gordons and an heir to the Byron peerage.[6] His pride was undoubtedly hurt early in life as a result of his insecure home life in which he was alternately loved and rejected by his mother. He, as Juvenal had, learned early to view with scorn the injustices he encountered, and by the time he entered preparatory school at Harrow, he had already formed very definite ideas on the English educational system, seeing it as harsh and oppressive. Even at that early age, Byron was already a defender of the weak, and he passionately hated tryanny of any sort.[7]

The political background of Bryon's work was greatly similar to Juvenal's also, for each lived in a period of unrest, one in which a constant division occurred between two factions of society. For all of Byron's life the Tories were in power, and the line between liberal and conservative was sharply drawn. The first group of Romantic poets, Wordsworth and Coleridge, were revolutionists early in their youth, but by the time of Byron's early manhood, they had

---

[6] Leslie A. Marchand, <u>Byron</u> Vol. I, (New York, 1957), p. 40.

[7] <u>Ibid</u>., p. 96.

become almost completely conservative, and of the second group, only Shelley remained constant in his desire for revolution. Because of his radical political opinions, Byron caused a minor upheaval when he assumed duties in the House of Lords. His was a philosophy opposed to tyranny, and he wrote skeptically about society's being totally emancipated. The second-generation Romantics rebelled with passion against the extreme conservatism of their forerunners. There was little they could do except express despair over the shattered state of Europe at the end of Napoleon's near success, but the elaborate sarcasm Byron received from the Edinburgh Review and the critic's stated wish for him to write no more infuriated him to the point of writing satire. The political unrest of the times, combined with Bryon's personal instability, undoubtedly encouraged this turn to satire, for, like Juvenal, he found this form the most useful instrument for expressing his resentment and hatred for the hypocrisy he viewed.

Juvenal sums up the whole intention of his work when he declares that satire is the only kind of literature which has any genuine reason for being written, because it deals with real life, the only worthwhile subject.[8] This form is

---

[8] Highet, Juvenal the Satirist, p. 48.

more suited to his intention to present all of life, for he plunges the reader into the midst of the happenings under consideration. It is doubtful that he is telling the whole truth, but verisimilitude is present, nevertheless, because he writes from a viewpoint that the readers can understand and about things that they have seen. His subject encompasses also the whole realm of the past and all its follies. Juvenal can be just as indignant about past crimes as about contemporary ones, for he sees the presentness of the past in man's actions. His subject is all human life, but the chief emphasis is on the vice-infested and immoral side of this life. By revealing largely the seamy and criminal, Juvenal accentuates the vices he is satirizing. There is a strange passage at the end of the first satire that indicates Juvenal's hesitation to denounce certain known historical facts outright:

> esperiar quid concedatur in illos
> quorum Flaminia tegitur cinis atque Latina
>
> Then I'll make a test of how much I may
> be allowed to say of lords whose ashes lie
> beside the Flaminian Way.
> (I, 170-171)

This passage would seem to indicate that he is going to write first of the dead rich and their vices to test the public reaction. He senses that even so harmless a subject as this may stir the anger of the emperor. No Roman writer before

this period had ever chosen topics from the known historical past, and it is Juvenal's skill in making the past live that allows his material to remain current. He intends to use names from the past probably merely to avoid censorship,[9] for he clearly feels that it is the current vices of Rome that need amending. It is also Juvenal's intention to reveal that the current immorality of Rome is a result of all the vices of the past, as he says:

> nil erit ulterius quod nostris moribus addat
> posteritas, eadem facient cupientque minores
> omne in praecipiti vitium stetit. . . .
>
> The future will find no worse morals to
> add, no new follies to try; Our descendents
> will desire and do the same things we've done.
> (I, 147-149)

He is looking at the ages of mankind through retrospect and seeing that vice has not changed significantly, that only the surrounding circumstances are altered.

When Byron began his masterpiece, Don Juan, he declared his purpose in the poem to be "to write an 'epic satire' which by carrying his hero through the situations of the heroic epic would reveal 'things as they really are,' the essentially unheroic motivations and actions of modern man."[10]

---

[9]Highet, Juvenal the Satirist, p. 57.

[10]Edward E. Bostetter, ed., Selected Poetry and Letters (New York, 1965), Introduction, xxiii.

Byron wrote to reveal the cant and abuses of society; he chose to shock the reader into recognizing the false illusions by which he lives, and his work continually reveals the true motivations behind society's shams. Byron uses his satire to place in constant juxtaposition what man should be and what he is in reality. He is not merely describing and enumerating vices by any means, but rather he intends to show their relation to daily morality. Byron never feared harsh criticism as did Juvenal. Fuess characterizes him as a "daring and fearless man" who "for years satirized European sovereigns without showing the slightest sign of trepidation. He espoused unpopular causes, and often, of his own choice, ran close to danger, when mere silence would have assured him security."[11] Byron, as does Juvenal, sees the state of humanity as being in severe need of correction; he desires the end of his satire to reveal to man that, although he was born passionate of body, he nevertheless has a capacity for love of good that can be more overwhelming than the passion, if it is allowed to come to the foreground.[12]

---

[11]Claude M. Fuess, Lord Byron as a Satirist in Verse (New York, 1964), p. 212.

[12]Bostetter, Introduction, p. xxv.

A short description of the styles of the two satiric poets needs to be included at this point, for both are similar; indeed, the styles of Juvenal and Byron can be seen as a direct outgrowth of their kindred intentions in writing satire. Both of these men can be characterized by a smoothly flowing rhythm, with the meter intending to convey a direct idea itself by the feeling it creates. Byron is ever aware of his word choice, and he delights in absurd rhymes to end a couplet. Juvenal never chooses a soothing euphemism when a blatant, somewhat off-color word would better suit this purpose. Byron uses innuendo where Juvenal speaks clearly and loudly. The invective in Juvenal is fierce and biting, and Byron does not always choose the route of subtlety for venting his anger, as can be seen in the verses on Castlereagh in the Dedication to Don Juan. Although often serious, Byron is ever quite versatile and eloquent, changing to a great extent from the constant, unrelieved exaggeration and incessantly pessimistic humor of his forerunner, Juvenal. The Roman frequently writes in short, epigrammatic statements, but even at his briefest there is a grandeur and loftiness of purpose in what he has to say and a high degree of metrical skill. He is able to contain in once compact, terse line the moral content of an entire stanza of Byron, a pithiness which Byron could never rival. Much could be said

of the essential moral purpose and of the equally free-moving, flowing verses of Lord Byron, for he tries to make whatever he has to say as beautiful as it is pointed in meaning. Byron's use of epic qualities is more complicated than that of Juvenal. Ridenour's statement seems appropriate in supporting this statement:

> It does not. . . seem reckless to suggest that in his lesser way and from. . . his predominately rationalist point of view, Byron is attempting as radical a redefinition of the nature of epic and the epic hero as was Milton in Paradise Lost.[13]

Like Juvenal, Byron uses epics and epic diction and subject matter throughout his satires. Another similarity of style lies in the fact that both Juvenal and Byron are always present in their satires, and each encourages the involvement of the reader. Both use hyperbole, a tool of any effective satirist, to a great extent, and the most abundant examples are found in passages of invective. However, it is sufficient for the moment to say that each had similar intentions and that these intentions were reflected in the style chosen for writing satire.

---

[13] George M. Ridenour, The Style of Don Juan (New Haven, 1960), p. 92.

CHAPTER III

BYRON AND JUVENAL ON SOCIETY

A close perusal of the letters of Lord Byron to his friends indicates that the young poet read much of Juvenal and admired him in many ways. This attraction to the Classics and to one satirist in particular could remain just an interesting coincidence if it were not for one fact. The whole perpetuation of mankind's ideas relies upon one generation's absorbing the philosophies and teachings of the past, applying them to the new era, and coming to an awareness that the Classical past always affects the modern present. When Byron embarked in 1809 on his first satire, "English Bards and Scotch Reviewers," he modeled his work on the first satire of Juvenal, the first six lines being an actual paraphrase establishing his bond with the past. From these quotations it becomes immediately clear that both feel the time had come to speak out against the injustices of society. As Byron paraphrases,

> Still must I hear?--Shall hoarse Fitzgerald bawl
> His creaking couplets in a tavern hall,
> And I not sing, lest, haply, Scotch reviews
> Should dub me scribbler and denounce my Muse?

Prepare for rhyme--I'll publish, right or wrong:
Fools are my theme, let satire be my song! (II, 1-6)

Juvenal's first satire begins:

> Semper ego auditor tantum? numquamne reponam
> vexatus totiens rauci Theseide Cordi?
> impune ergo mihi recitaverit ille togatas,
> hic elegos?

> Must I be forever only a listener--never talk back,
> Though bored so often by the Theseid of Cordus, the hack?
> Is this man or that, without my revenge,
> To pour out a stream of love wails, farces. . .ream on
> ream. . .? (I, 1-4)

While Byron makes few direct allusions to Juvenal, the kinship cannot be denied, for he found in the Roman poet the same fierce indignation about the world and its people that he found in his own attitudes toward life. Many of his favorite themes were ones explored by Juvenal--the vanity of human wishes, love and marriage, war and its effects, wealth and poverty, and many others. When Byron began his masterpiece of satire, Don Juan, he assumed much of the angry tone of Juvenal's work as he raged at contemporary evils; at this point there was none of the gentle laughter of Horace's satiric tradition which was to be part of his poem also. Both Juvenal and Byron state the nature of their subject matter explicitly. The Roman writer declares,

> quidquid agunt homines, votum timor ira voluptas
> quadia discursus, nostri farrago libelli est.

> Whatever mankind indulges in--His prayers, fears
> diversions, rage,
> Delights and business--that is the medley of my page.
> (I, 85-86)

In two separate passages of Don Juan Byron states his topics:

> I sketch your world exactly as it goes. (VIII, 89)

and

> A bird's-eye view, too, of that wild society:
> A slight glance thrown on men of every station. (XIV, 14)

Perhaps because of the Horatian influence on his work, Byron in no way intends to limit his outrage against society, but he does temper his venom with a little more subtlety than does Juvenal.

Since the subject matter of Byron and Juvenal depends to such a great extent upon the philosophical tenets of each, let us first look closely at the general philosophy of life that they held. Although he displayed a generally Stoic view of life, Juvenal could not be considered definitely either Stoic or Epicurean, for he never investigated any particular system; philosophy was secondary to his main task. Gilbert Highet asserts that while "the central ideas of his poems came ultimately from the vast store of Greco-Roman philosophical arguments,"[1] his ideas, pessimistic and moralizing, were uniquely his own. Byron, for his part, although

---

[1]Highet, Juvenal the Satirist, p. 172.

often criticized as metaphysically naive, explored many philosophies and incorporated them into his work. He saw the world as hostile and complex, and from this observation, he ultimately achieved a real awareness, an understanding apart from any set school of philosophy. As Grierson notes, "if Byron had no philosophy, there may be a philosophy in that very want."[2] Byron is skeptical about Stoic advice on happiness, for he feels that those who preach the "art of happiness" do not appear to have achieved any success in the matter. Byron comments satirically on the Stoic who alone knows happiness when he says,

> Just as I make my mind up every day
> To be a _totus_, _teres_, Stoic, Sage,
> The wind shifts and I fly into a rage. (XVII, 10)

Just as Juvenal denied any belief in stated systems, Byron also refused to be aligned with any group, for he felt that no philosophy could be practiced in such a complex and rapidly changing world as the one in which he lived.

Certainly both poets were familiar with the Greek philosophers, but an important contrast in their view can be seen through their different attitudes toward some of the ideas of Socrates. In Satire Eleven, Juvenal relates the Socratic teaching of "Know Thyself" with great admiration

---

[2] H. J. C. Grierson, _The Background of English Literature: Classical and Romantic_ (London, 1934), p. 93.

and declares that it is a precept to be used in every phase of life (XI, 26-28). However, Byron chooses to ridicule an equally famous Socratic idea in Don Juan.

> Socrates said, our only knowledge was
> 'To know that nothing could be known;' a pleasant
> Science enough, which levels to an ass
> Each man of wisdom, future, past, or present. (VII, 5)

In their skepticism, both men chose to secure wisdom through actual "down-to-earth" experience, to believe nothing until proven by fact. Although he held philosophy "sacred" and admired its great heroes, Juvenal felt that people "who learned in the school of life to make do with all the discomforts and yet not chafe and fret at the yoke" (XIII, 21-22) are to be highly praised. As is seen in Don Juan, Byron felt too that on the whole true experience could teach "discernment to the sensitive" (XIV, 49) better than philosophy could. To Juvenal, man's greatest achievement would be a "sound mind in a sound body" and a "stout heart that has no fear of death" (X, 356-357). Byron's final acceptance of life has overtones which are closer to despair and tragedy than Juvenal ever reached in his stern acceptance when he says,

> How little do we know that which we are!
> How less what we may be! The eternal surge
> Of time and tide rolls on, and bears afar
> Our bubbles; as the old burst, new emerge,
> Lash'd from the foam of ages; while the graves
> Of empires heave but like some passing waves. (XV, 99)

Both poets reject systems for independent thought and reach the same contention that life can never be explained and can only partially be understood through experience.

The difference between Byron and Juvenal in their attitudes toward philosophy can be seen as a reflection of the different eras in which they lived. Very similar in some ways, these eras were by no means identical. Juvenal as a part of the classical age accepted the value of the Greeks and recognized their impact on Roman philosophy. He was concerned with practical applications of these philosophies, and he tried to extract the useful aspects from the strict dogma of the systems. By the time Byron began to write his satires, he had, like many of his contemporaries, developed a skepticism about these beliefs. In the broad historical views, this doubtful attitude can be seen as a gradual tempering through the years from strict following of doctrine to more independent, critical thought.

Verse satire took from the teachings of the great philosophers a collection of maxims about ordinary life. Juvenal and Byron alike chose the commonplace aspects of life and ordinary foibles of human nature as their chief topic for satire. Byron is assailing not one particular facet of life, but rather "a bigoted and absolute government, a hypocritical

society, and false idealism."[3] Many of the commonplaces of life suggested by J. Wight Duff are found in both Juvenal and Byron, topics such as "riches and covetousness, social customs in general, drunkenness, caprices of fortunes, complaints about one's lot, . . .life as a stage, dinner parties, . . .the vanity of existence."[4] Juvenal concentrates in the eighth satire on the uselessness of noble ancestry who have no true worth, in the tenth on the emptiness of fame which society creates, and in the third on the disadvantages of life in Rome. Byron reveals the evils of society by concentrating on individual vices, with special emphasis on the sin of avarice. Byron aimed chiefly at the selfishness and stupidity of the small class of aristocrats, and for these social parasites and office seekers he felt nothing but contempt.[5] His opinions about English society are nowhere more clearly expressed than in _Don Juan_. Both poets were disgusted with the narrow-minded attitudes they encountered and found them suitable objects of satire.

It was mentioned earlier that both Byron and Juvenal grew up in comparable societies filled with vice and sin of all sorts. There is an interesting similarity in their

---

[3]Fuess, p. 167.

[4]Duff, p. 30.

[5]Fuess, p. 173.

views and in the sameness of their conclusions about society's eventual outcome. At this point in the paper, there comes a need for specific examples of the coinciding pictures of the two societies, ones which reveal the influence of Juvenal on his nineteenth-century counterpart. The decay of aristocracy is a favorite topic of both poets. After Juvenal finishes his opening justification for writing satire, he launches immediately into a description of the world of Rome from the point of view of the man in the street. In very few lines, the reader is in the midst of the rich criminals, and at every corner can be seen the murderers, perverts, and crooked politicians who have achieved wealth while the poor become poorer. Basically Juvenal's mob has the same passions as could be found on any street corner today. Each character is representative of a way of life and of a widespread injustice in society. He shows to the reader an ex-slave now posing as an aristocrat, a woman publicly fighting a wild boar, a barber as wealthy as any noble, a newly-rich lawyer,and one of the emperor's pawns.[6] By the time this procession has passed, the reader feels that Juvenal views the corruption and crime of society as a direct result of misused wealth. He is not suggesting any particular change in the

---

[6]Highet, Juvenal the Satirist, pp. 50-51.

class system but simply declaring that something is wrong with the present situation. Many of the ideas in this chapter are echoed later in the third satire, Juvenal's attack on life in the big city. Through the form of a monologue, Juvenal recounts all the discomforts and dangers that result from living in Rome. Making a living is impossible because honesty is not rewarded, and the poor are hindered from jobs because society judges on the basis of wealth. Juvenal would have the reader believe that no one can get ahead unless he is a crook or the accomplice of one (III, 41-57).

Byron presents a picture of society no less graphic than that of Juvenal, for in a broad sense all of Don Juan deals with the modern European world. The last six cantos are devoted to society at large and to the manners of the aristocracy. Byron specifies the facets of society which he is condemning--the materialism, selfish irresponsibility, frigidity, and unnaturalness.[7] He ridicules all the affectations and artificialities of life in high society, aspects such as hunting, love intrigues, and expensive foods. Byron too presents a parade of characters as did Juvenal. He shows to us a duchess, a "rich banker's squaw," parolees, new actors, alcoholics, free-thinking philosophers, gamblers,

---

[7]Elizabeth F. Boyd, Byron's Don Juan (New York, 1958), p. 81.

lawyers, and every other type, all representative of the whole society. After gathering this motley assortment together for a party, Byron makes this now-famous comment on modern life:

> Society is now one polish'd horde,
> Form'd of two mighty tribes, the Bores and Bored.
> (XIII, 95)

He asserts anew in Canto XIV that he intends to write only the truth about society. Byron introduces the reader to Lady Adeline and Duchess Fitz-Fulke, both of whom are infatuated with Don Juan. English aristocracy suffers a serious defamation as the motives of the Duchess and relations with her husband are revealed. Lady Adeline is meddlesome, and, as Byron says, "her heart is vacant." (XIV, 85) Her marriage was without bickering, but no warmth pervaded the union. Byron uses this example to reveal the destructive idleness that pervaded the high society at that time. The ennui and apathy of the aristocracy are seen as a direct result of the boredom, and Byron declares that absolute ruin can come from such a slight occasion as an idle game of billiards. After a dinner party designed around French cooking, Byron takes the opportunity to ridicule again the idle pastime of matchmaking. The poem ends without offering any explanation or solution to society's vices. The final cantos reflect the world as Byron saw it, the "seeming

and being, hypocritical cant, and reality"[8] that are a part of that world.

Another problem of society, the misuse of wealth, is a topic of interest to both Juvenal and Byron. Gilbert Highet feels that a great amount of Juvenal's complaints and indignation toward the rich stem from the fact that others are rich while he is not.[9] Were he not so impoverished, undoubtedly he would not be so vicious in portraying the exploitation of the poorer classes by the rich. Juvenal's motives in depicting the rich were partially pure and at the same time partially personal and rationalizing as he tried to reconcile his own life with that of those around him. To Juvenal the worst sins of all were greed and extravagance, both perverted uses of wealth, and it was this pair of vices that he intended to prove as the chief debauching influence on the Romans. Juvenal saw his people as subject to both of these sins at the same time, as they obtained wealth at the expense of the poor and then wasted it in lavish luxury. He felt one major area of the wealth-poverty conflict that needed special correction was the patron-dependent relation. He perceived that rich patrons never shared their wealth with

---

[8] _Ibid._, p. 30

[9] Highet, _Juvenal the Satirist_, p. 51.

their dependents as they once had done, but they used them only for display purposes. There is no help through working available to these people because no honest labor is rewarded with money. Juvenal was close to the tradition that propounded farming as the only occupation worthy of any honor, and he felt scorn for any wealth made through a lucky business turn. However faithful a man might be as a dependent, he would ever have to suffer disgrace and insults at the mercy of his patron.

Juvenal also saw the despair arising from poverty that came to the intellectuals of society. In Satire Seven he was quick to inform the readers that schoolmasters and poets were truly appreciated by the populace; gratitude for intellectual efforts was displayed by the assurance of continually crowded classrooms for the teachers. The problem of just payment for such a noble and appreciated profession was as acute in Juvenal's day as it is in current times, and he saw the situation as a reflection of the poor values of society. By a quick series of contrasts between wealth and poverty, Juvenal reveals the indignities that most intellectuals must suffer. He sums up all the injustices in one final contrast: the yearly pay of a schoolteacher is equal to the bonus a jockey receives when he rides one winner. (VII, 229-243) Juvenal hesitates not in the least to say

that it is the rich who are to blame for the misery of society, because it is they who squander fortunes in lavish pretense of loving culture, while the poor grow daily poorer.[10]

The subject of wealth versus poverty is investigated just as thoroughly by Byron in his satire as it is by Juvenal, but he does it somewhat more subtly. He generally does not express his indignation as forcibly as does the Roman, and he chooses to show the result of wealth indirectly through his dull, bored aristocratic characters rather than through the direct and brutal descriptions of Juvenal. However, it is not difficult to find great similarities in the opinions and even examples of the two poets as they discuss the rich aristocrats.

There is an interesting parallel in the reaction of both poets to the attention given the rich and the neglect to the poor when some disaster occurs. Juvenal tells in Satire Three of a poor man who lost his home in a fire and no one was concerned for him, whereas if it had been an aristocrat's house, society would have put on mourning and the law courts would have adjourned out of pity. (III, 212-215) Man's inhumanity to man is revealed by Byron in his account in _Don Juan_ of the battle of Ismail when he tells of the

---

[10] _Ibid_., p. 10.

removal of the prince from the battlefield with only a slight knee wound, while commoners lay dying everywhere. (VIII, 10, 11) Juvenal has only scorn for the aristocrats who are so proud of their "pedigrees" that they depend on their family history as their sole commendation in life. He exhorts them to follow the ancient values of honor, compassion and upright character. Byron feels also that these virtues should be upheld, and he expresses these feelings by attacking the Duke of Wellington as an exact opposite of these qualities. He says,

> You have obtain'd great pensions and much praise.
> Glory like yours should any dare gainsay,
> Humanity would rise, and thunder 'Nay!' (IX, 1)

Juvenal gives certain conditions under which it is proper to trace one's ancestry back to its lofty beginnings--only if one's staff is completely honest, one's wife blameless, and no one is waiting to steal one's money. (VIII, 127-131) His tone of voice indicates that he is certain that most of the aristocrats cannot pass such tests of virtue. He is appalled at the undignified behavior that the upper class is displaying, especially the absurd stage productions. The public is corrupted by such pretensions, as they view these "buffooneries" with approval. Byron also sees the upper class as largely responsible for the degeneration of society. Don Juan saw the world in entirety and came to the conclusion

that

> . . . the low world, north, south, or west, or east
> Must still obey the high--which is their handle,
> Their moon, their sun, their gas, their farthing candle.
> (XII, 56)

He warns in an earlier canto that

> To mend the people's an absurdity,
> A jargon, a mere philanthropic din,
> Unless you make their betters better:. . .
> (X, 85)

Byron does not preach the virtues of the soul as Juvenal does, but rather he shows the disgrace of not possessing any such humanitarian instincts, as he says of Wellington again,

> . . . a man so great as
> You, my lord duke! is far above reflection:
> The high Roman fashion, too, of Cincinnatus,
> With modern history has but small connection:
> Though as an Irishman you love potatoes,
> You need not take them under your direction;
> And half a million for your Sabine farm
> Is rather dear!--I'm sure I mean no harm.
> (IX, 7)

These two poets viewed the aristocracy from entirely different vantage points. Juvenal the impoverished seems at times to be justifying his opinion by pointing out that, however far back one traces his name, the first of his ancestors could nevertheless have been an ordinary shepherd or someone "even worse." (VIII, 272-275) Byron ridicules the heritage he has, when he exposes his famous ancestors as ones who would "strip the Saxons of their <u>hydes</u>, like tanners." (X, 36) Both poets feel an intense hatred for the selfishness

and pride of the aristocracy, a scorn expressed in Byron's words:

> What icebergs in the hearts of mighty men,
> With self-love in the centre as their pole!
> What Anthropophagi are nine of ten
> Of those who hold the kingdom in control!
> (XIV, 102)

The final judgment of the two poets is understandably similar, for they were both born into times which saw the aristocracy as the seat of power. As Byron says,

> I have seen some nations like o'erloaded asses,
> Kick off their burthens, meaning the high classes.
> (XI, 83)

At this point the other side of society, the poverty-ridden group, needs to be considered, and the attitudes of Byron and Juvenal are not as similar in this field of interest. Juvenal expresses sympathy for the poor, probably because he had experienced such poverty personally. He saw no disgrace in being poor as long as respectability was maintained. It should be mentioned, however, that Juvenal's conception of poverty was a situation in which one had to pay "a great sum to fill the bellies of slaves." (III, 167) He does have definite opinions about the humiliation the poor gentry must suffer at the hands of the rich, and some of his lines in Satire Three show genuine concern for the suffering of humanity, as he says,

quid quod materiam praebet causasque iocorum
omnibus hic idem, si foeda et scissa lacerna,
si toga sordidula est et rupta calceus alter
pelle patet, . . .
nil habet infelix paupertas durius in se
quam quod ridiculos homines facit.

And what of this, that the poorman gives food
and occasion for jest if his cloak be torn and dirty;. . .
Of all the woes of luckless poverty none is harder
to endure than this, that it exposes man to ridicule.
(III, 147-149, 152-153)

Byron views the lower classes from his lofty perch of aristocracy, so he does not write with quite the insight of Juvenal. He announces in Don Juan that he is going to write of the "lower world's condition," (XV, 92) but he actually devotes little attention to it in the poem. When he introduces commoners into his work, it is usually done to show the pretensions that come with rank and power. When he compares an illegitimately pregnant peasant girl with the immoral Duchess of Fitz-Fulke in Canto XVI, he presents the girl's plight more favorably than that of the Duchess, in order to show the loose morals and pretensions of the rich. Both poets use banquet scenes in their works to contrast the poor classes with the aristocracy. Juvenal related the way in which the rich man takes luxurious, expensive food for himself but offers unpalatable fare to his poor guests. He asks only that the rich man "dine with them as a fellow-citizen," but his pleas go unheard. Likewise Byron shows Wellington

dining sumptuously while the people starve, and he says to him,

> Some hunger, too, they say the people feel:--
> There is no doubt that you deserve your ration,
> But pray give back a little to the nation.--
> (IX, 6)

It is of little importance that Byron did not experience directly the poverty he pictures for the reader. What is of greater relevance is that he followed the tradition which Juvenal had enlarged upon of presenting class relationships and social oppression as vital and necessary topics of verse satire.

CHAPTER IV

BYRON AND JUVENAL ON WOMEN, MARRIAGE, AND MORALITY

As keen observers of human nature and society, both Juvenal and Byron used satire to question the morality of their times. Although they lived a long time apart, each employed similar concepts and even comparable examples in their moralizing. Both Juvenal and Byron had as much to say about the "inner state" of society as they did about the outer manifestations of moral corruption. Juvenal composed an entire satire on the nature of women, with copious warnings on the evils of marriage. Likewise, Byron gives the reader a clear description of his opinions on love and marriage in Don Juan. The poets see love, marriage, man's relation to woman, and perversions of moral good in society as fit topics of satire, and there is again a great similarity in their views, although they are by no means identical.

Juvenal attacks the depraved, unchaste nature of women in several satires, but as he assembles most of these opinions in Satire Six, a comparison of these passages with Byronian passages of the same subject matter should be sufficient to suggest the Juvenalian character of Byron's satire. Juvenal's

Satire Six is a specific defamation of wives. The great majority of the women whom Juvenal attacks are rich, and, in the way in which he presents them, they form a social gallery of all Roman women. They are beautiful and ugly, young and old, but one thing they have in common is some vice or affectation sufficient to cause Juvenal to condemn the whole species. Juvenal lists all different types of women in the world--the vicious, extravagant, quarrelsome, sex-crazy, gossipy, affected, domineering, lying, treacherous, and even murderous,[1] and by this catalog he intends to show what no man should marry. The possibility that some woman might make a good wife is quickly renounced, for he says that such a woman would be so proud of her virtues that she would become unbearable.

> quae tanti gravitas, quae forma, ut se tibi semper imputet?
>
> What dignity, what beauty, in a wife are
> worth the price if she's forever reckoning
> up her virtues to you?
> (VI, 178-179)

Byron has similar feelings about such perfection as he says,

> To others' share let 'female errors fall,'
> For she had not even one--the worst of all.

---

[1]Highet, Juvenal the Satirist, p. 92.

and

> Perfect she was, but. . .perfection is
> Insipid in this naughty world of ours.
> (I, 16, 18)

It appears that all contact Byron had with marriage disillusioned him and caused him to be cynical about "perfect" wives. He took a closer look at these objects of perfection and concluded that

> I've also seen some wives (not to forget
> The marriage state, the best or worst of any)
> Who were the very paragons of wives
> Yet made the misery of at least two lives.
> (XIV, 95)

Both poets express with vehemence their opinion that such perfection would prove boring and meaningless. Juvenal begs to be spared the haughtiness that such virtue would entail, and he asks for a simple farm wife:

> Quis feret uxorem cui constant omnia? malo,
> malo Venusinam. . .
>
> But who can endure a wife who had all
> the virtues known? I'd much rather have a wife
> used to rural ways. . .
> (VI, 166)

He declares that beauty and virtue would not be worth the price because even "supreme and rare qualities lose their charm and pall when spoiled by pride." (VI, 180) Byron's Lady Adeline is another example of the too perfect woman, one who dazzles all the men and remains a constant mystery. However,

> . . .whether coldness, pride, or virtue dignify
> A woman, so she's good, what does it signify?
> (XIV, 57)

One of the reasons that the two poets felt that there could be no "perfect" wife was the realization which they both reached that women are rash, impetuous creatures. Juvenal regards the whole female sex with contempt, and quite often he forgets that men can be rascals also. It is almost with delight that he points out to his friend, who is about to marry, the case of the senator's wife who followed a gladiator, abandoning her home, family, and country.

> inmemor illa domus et coniugis atque sororis
> nil patriae indulsit, plorantesque improba natos,
> . . .reliquit.
>
> Forgetful of home, of husband and sister,
> devoid of pity, she thought not of her
> country and left. . .her weeping children. . .
> (VI, 85-86)

Juvenal seems to think that all women are of this rash tendency. Byron, on the other hand, holds no scorn or contempt for women in general; he merely points out their weaknesses and leaves the situation unresolved. He appears to be almost laughing as he says,

> Men with their heads reflect on this and that--
> But women with their hearts on Heaven knows what!
> And yet a headlong, headstrong, downright she
> . . .would risk. . .the world. . .to be
> Beloved in her own way. . . .
> (VI, 2, 3)

Byron would agree with Juvenal, no doubt, that woman's rash nature causes many of the distressing situations which she encounters, but he records the faults of the other sex also. Juvenal gives the impression that man has caused none of the dissension in his relations with women, but Byron comes nearer reaching a two-sided concept. The poets concur on one important point, however--women are demanding. Juvenal says that there is no limit to the demands of a woman, and "What a neighbor has that she does not own, he (her husband) must buy." (VI, 152) Similarly, Byron's Sultana was also quite materialistic. She is described by Byron in this manner:

> Whate'er she saw and coveted was brought;
> Whate'er she did not see, if she supposed
> It might be seen, with diligence was sought,
> And when 'twas found straightway the bargain closed.
> (V, 113)

It is interesting that the two poets reach a point of agreement when they assert the possible origins of the passionate nature of women. It seems evident that Byron had read Juvenal's account of certain passion-inspiring foods, for both poets mention the same dangers of eating oysters late at night. According to the Roman,

> quid enim Venus ebria curat?. . .
> grandia quae mediis iam noctibus ostrea mordet. . .
>
> For what does Venus care, when. . .
> She at midnight slurps huge oysters. . .
> (VI, 300, 303)

Byron's words are a near paraphrase:

> While Venus fills the heart. . .
> Eggs, oysters, too, are amatory food. . . .
> (II, 170)

The women in the poetry of both Byron and Juvenal are victims of an uncontrollable, impatient nature as is evidenced by their spasmodic outbursts of passion. Juvenal's women let out the cry, "Iam fas est, admitte viros," "Let in the men," signifying their readiness for adultery. In Byron the reader can turn to Donna Julia's confession in Canto One for an example of impatience:

> My breast has been all weakness, is so yet;
> But still I think I can collect my mind;
> My blood still rushes where my spirit's set,
> As roll the waves before the settled wind;
> My heart is feminine, nor can forget--
> To all, except one image, madly blind;
> So shakes the needle, and so stands the pole;
> As vibrates my fond heart to my fix'd soul.
> (I, 196)

Along with the impetuous nature of women, both poets took delight in satirizing the idleness and shallowness of the typical woman. As the poets describe certain pastimes of women, they both come to the conclusion that women deliberately find means to annoy men. Juvenal declares,

> si gaudet cantu, nullius fibula durat
> vocem vendentis praetoribus. Organa semper
> in manibus. . .

> If your wife loves music, no professional
> singer can save himself from her summons.
> She's always handling instruments. . .
> (VI, 379-381)

In the passages following the above quote, the poet makes it clear that the women in question are performing only for themselves, much to the chagrin of the husbands. In Canto Thirteen, Byron recalls an evening of similar entertainment, one which included singing so bad that the headache which he endured as a result of the noise still lingers. Byron felt that a great many women performed not out of a love of music but rather out of a desire to display their attractiveness. As he says,

> the two youngest loved more to be set
> Down to the harp--because to music's charms
> They added graceful necks, white hands and arms.
> (XIII, 107)

Juvenal is ever harsh in his criticism of ways in which women make use of leisure hours. The ladies of his poems waste the day in such pursuits as stripping the slaves for the lash, daubing their faces with cream, chatting with girl friends, reading the daily paper, and consulting fortune tellers. Byron presents a more comprehensive view, for he shows more than just one type of woman, but their leisure activities are remarkably comparable to those portrayed by Juvenal. His female characters may enjoy lovers or be

virtuous wives, and some may even write novels about their experiences.

> Some take a lover, some take drams or prayers,
> Some mind their household, others dissipation;
> Some run away, and but exchange their cares,
> Losing the advantage of a virtuous station;
> Few changes e'er can better their affairs,
> Theirs being an unnatural situation,
> From the dull palace to the dirty hovel:
> Some play the devil, and then write a novel.
> (II, 201)

Whatever examples they choose, both poets reveal disgust over the idleness and shallowness of women's pastimes.

Byron and Juvenal reach another point of agreement when they explore the personality of the adulterous woman. Juvenal observes the increase of adultery angrily, and he speaks out against it with a richly humorous wit, one characteristic of Byron at his most ribald:

> anticum et vetus est alienum. . .lectum
> concutere. . . .
>
> To set your neighbor's bed a-shaking. . .
> Is now an ancient and long-established practice.
> (VI, 21-22)

When Byron mentions adultery it is with acceptance and tolerance, not anger.

> For me, I leave the matter where I find it,
> Knowing that such uneasy virtue leads
> People some ten times less in fact to mind it,
> And care but for discoveries and not deeds,
> And as for chastity, you'll never bind it
> By all the laws the strictest lawyer pleads,

> But aggravate the crime you've not prevented,
> By rendering desperate these who had else repented.
> (XII, 80)

Byron does not accept the double standard as Juvenal does. He feels that men are just as guilty of self-love as women are and probably lie about their wrong-doing just as much also; everyone lies sometimes and women should not be made to suffer unduly for this vice.

> Self-love in man, too, beats all female art;
> They lie, we lie, all lie, but love no less;
> (VI, 19)

Both poets agree that any wife, no matter how desirable, will not long remain faithful and loving. Juvenal asks,

> Unus Hiberinae vir sufficit? ocius illud
> extorquebis, ut haec oculo contenta sit uno.

> Will Hiberina be satisfied with one man?
> Sooner compel her to be satisfied with one eye!
> (VI, 53-54)

Somewhat more philosophical about the situation, Byron agrees with Juvenal's basic idea:

> In all her first passion, woman loves her lover;
> In all the others all she loves is love,
> Which grows a habit she can ne'er get over. . .
> One man alone at first her heart can move;
> She then prefers him in the plural number,
> Not finding that the additions much encumber. . . .
> Yet there are some, they say, who have had <u>none</u>,
> But those who have ne'er end with only one.
> (III, 3, 4)

Juvenal and Byron alike have much to say about the shrewd, cunning way in which wives carry on extra-marital

affairs. It is interesting to note that both compare adulterous women to tigresses. Juvenal says,

> Cum gravis illa viro, tunc orba tigride peior. . .
>
> She assails her husband, worse than
> A tigress is said to be at the loss of her cubs.
> (VI, 270)

In Canto Five Byron adopts a similar attitude in what almost constitutes a paraphrase:

> A tigress robb'd of young, a lioness,
> Or any interesting beast of prey,
> Are similes at hand for the distress
> Of ladies who cannot have their own way. . .
> (V, 132)

Byron pictures in Canto One the foolish appearance the wronged husband presents when he learns of his wife's affair. He befriends the lover and then,

> when the spouse and friend are gone off wholly,
> He wonders at their vice, and not his folly.
> (I, 94)

Juvenal is also concerned with the outcome of such illicit affairs, and he is convinced of the triumphant boldness of women.

> nihil est audacius illis
> deprensis, iram atque animos a crimine sumunt.
>
> There's nothing bolder than women caught
> red-handed; out of their guilt their rage and
> courage are drawn.
> (VI, 284-285)

In speaking of the unchaste, fickle nature of women, Juvenal utters these now famous words:

novi
consilia et veteres quaecumque monetis amici:
'pone seram, cohibes.' sed quis custodiat ipsos
custodes. . .

I know the course that you advise, 'Put a
lock on, keep her indoors.' But who's
to guard the guards themselves?
(VI, 346-348

Byron agrees with the advisability of such a course of action:

The Turks do well to shut--at least, sometimes--
The women up, because, in sad reality,
Their chastity in these unhappy climes
Is not a thing of that astringent quality
Which, in the North, prevents precocious crimes. . .
(V, 157)

In the poems of the two satirists can be found at least one kindred reason for the adultery of women, an explanation aside from their passionate natures. Both Byron and Juvenal had understandably similar views about the mothers-in-law and their husband-trapping instincts on behalf of their daughters. Juvenal views them as a threat to happiness, for as he says,

. . .desperanda tibi salva concordia socru.

You'll have to despair of knowing any peace
at home if your mother-in-law's alive.
(VI, 231)

She is seen as one who instructs her daughter in the art of stripping the husband of all his wealth, and the typical mother-in-law even aids in the seduction of lovers for her daughter. It is Juvenal's contention that such a mother

could not teach her daughter honest ways, for she knows none of them herself; and, since she receives vicarious satisfaction from her daughter's escapades, the mother-in-law continues to encourage such indiscretions. Byron's views are similar in that he is aware of the predatory nature of mothers also. His marriage to a woman whom he considered a prude doubtless caused his opinion that a worldly mother-in-law means a better wife. As he says,

> I think you'll find from many a family picture,
> That daughters of such mothers as may know
> The world by experience rather than by lecture,
> Turn out much better for the Smithfield Show
> Of vestals, brought into the marriage mart,
> Than those bred up by prudes without a heart.
> (XII, 16)

A disapproval of marriage and the married state can be seen in the attitudes of the two poets, undoubtedly a direct result of their unfavorable opinions about women. Both Byron and Juvenal warn against the ties of marriage, and when they do so, it is with their own individual personalities and attitudes, ones which are consistently kindred in this area of interest also. When Juvenal warns against marriage, he uses images of destruction--"Why marry, when ropes are so cheap and suicide so easy?" (VI, 30-31) Byron sees this union as something needing a cautious approach but not abhorrence, as he says,

> 'Tis melancholy and a fearful sign
> Of human frailty, folly, also crime
> That love and marriage rarely can combine. . .
> Marriage from love, like vinegar from wine--
> A sad, sour, sober beverage--by time
> Is sharpen'd from its high celestial flavour,
> Down to a very homely household savour.
> (III, 5)

When Juvenal reports the reasons for marriage, he does so with his customary cynicism and bitterness. He shows that the dowry money a wife brings to her husband has a great deal to do with his opinion of her. As he says,

> Bis quingena dedit. Tanti vocat ille pudicam. . .

> Her dowry was in the millions, at a
> price so right, he declares her chaste.
> (VI, 137)

From money as a reason for marriage, he moves quickly on to beauty. Juvenal declares that when any analysis is made of love, it becomes obvious that it is the wife's beauty which the husband loves, not the whole woman. Once her lovely appearance begins to fade, she no longer can expect him to grant her requests.

> vidua est, locuples quae nupsit avaro.
> si verum excutias, facies, non uxor amatur.

> The wealthy wife of a man who sighs for
> nothing but money is really unmarried in any case. . .
> Chase the truth down and you'll find
> it's not the wife but the face he loves. . . .
> (VI, 141, 143)

The women in Juvenal's Satires are seen as mistreated and perhaps unfairly judged by their husbands, but the poet offers

them no sympathy. Since he scarcely regards them as human, it would be difficult to expect them to have pity on a woman cast out because she has lost her beauty. Byron, on the other hand, is more sympathetic with the feminine sex. In Don Juan he says,

> man to man so oft unjust,
> Is always so to women: one sole bond
> Awaits them, treachery is all their trust;
> Taught to conceal, their bursting hearts despond
> Over their idol, till some wealthier lust
> Buys them in marriage--and what rests beyond?
> A thankless husband, next a faithless lover,
> Then dressing, nursing, praying, and all's over.
> (II, 200)

Both Byron and Juvenal agree that rarely can there be a stable, constant love relationship with a woman. The Roman asks the rhetorical question,

> quis deditus autem
> usque adeo est, ut non illam, quam laudibus effert,
> horreat inque diem septenis oderit horis?
>
> Who is so deeply in love he never shrinks at all
> from the very woman he praises to the skies--
> What's more, hates her at least sixteen hours
> out of twenty-four?
> (VI, 181-183)

Byron agrees:

> Love bears within its breast the very germ
> Of change; and how should this be otherwise?. . .
> And how should the most fierce of all be firm:
> Would you have endless lightning in the skies?
> (XIV, 94)

It is to be expected from such low opinions of love that both

poets would look with disdain upon marriage. Juvenal says that if a man is devoted to a particular woman, he should accept the yoke of marriage, but he offers this warning:

> nullam invenies quae parcat amanti;
> ardeat ipsa licet, tormentis gaudet amantis
> et spoiliis;. . .
>
> You will find no woman who spares the man
> who loves her. Though she glow with passion,
> she loves to torment and plunder her lover.
> (VI, 208-210)

Byron also despairs in the possibility of a happy marriage:

> The same things change their name at such a rate;
> For instance--passion in a lover's glorious,
> But in a husband is pronounced uxorious.
> (IV, 6)

He feels that marriage should exist with love, yet from all appearances of the present state of society, no such combination is possible. Byron recognizes fully the careful scrutiny of society as it views the marriage situation. It is his observation that

> Is not all love prohibited whatever,
> Excepting marriage? which is love, no doubt,
> After a sort; but somehow people never
> With the same thought the two words have helped out:
> Love may exist _with_ marriage, and _should_ ever,
> And Marriage also may exist without;
> But love _sans_ bans is both a sin and shame
> And ought to go by quite another name.
> (XII, 15)

It should be pointed out that Byron had a great amount of personal experience from which to draw his conclusions,

relationships that Juvenal never had, so far as is known. In Don Juan Byron arranges for his hero to meet women of every age and social status, beginning with Don Juan's mother and Donna Julia, and moving from there to Haidee, the Sultana, the Empress Catherine, the orphan Leila, Lady Adeline, the Duchess of Fitz-Fulke and Aurora Raby. Byron never reached the point of hating women, a statement that could never be made about his Roman counterpart. Both saw women as weak and even ridiculous, but Byron reached a level of pity and compassion that Juvenal never did.

Both poets thought that love as society regarded it was the pathway to personal restrictions on freedom and to an end of any happiness. Byron feels that each person is partially responsible for the decline of morality, because love has given place to selfish passions, extravagances, and mistakes.[2] He yearns for a true freedom in love, yet he recognizes the eventual hurt such freedom brings to the one loving. As he says,

> If she loved rashly, her life paid for wrong--
> A heavy price must all pay who thus err,
> In some shape; let none think to fly the danger,
> For soon or late Love is his own avenger.
> (IV, 73)

Byron feels that love can only exist when it is free and unrestrained and that it thrives best in an atmosphere of

---

[2]Boyd, p. 61.

independence outside of marriage. Considering his philosophy of love, it is understandable that Byron saw marriage as an unnatural state, one offering no joy or hope to man. Byron viewed love as an "institution of nature but marriage of society,"[3] and he found no way for a favorable combination of the two. So many marriages were founded upon money, a factor cited by Juvenal to be the chief incitement to marriage, that Byron eventually declared the whole institution to be the antithesis of true love. Byron has distinct opinions of money and love in marriage:

> Love rules the camp, the court, the grove,--for love
> Is heaven, and heaven is love:--so sings the bard,. . .
> But if Love don't, Cash does, and Cash alone. . . .
> Heaven is not Love, 't'is Matrimony.
> (XII, 13, 14)

Byron saw any hypocrisy as sin, and, to him, the act of binding oneself to another and pretending to enjoy the situation was the deepest hypocrisy. Both poets expressed themselves about the morality of marrying for the purpose of reform, and they reached the same conclusion that such a task was impossible. Juvenal felt that woman married only to obtain from her husband all of the material possessions possible while winning him over to her side. As he laments, the husband will soon become perfectly submissive to the

---

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 64.

reforming will of the woman. Byron saw from his personal experience with marriage that even a union with a "perfect" wife could not cause him to accept society's moral concepts.

The theme of the miseries of the married state was very old even in Juvenal's day. From the first treatment of this theme, Hesiod's account of Pandora and the evils which she wrought upon mankind, down through the Arabian Nights and even the Canterbury Tales, woman can be seen as opposed to man's happiness. Gilbert Highet traces such an anti-marriage idea to the working class, and he suggests that Juvenal was drawing largely on misogynistic propaganda of such people.[4] Certainly there is no evidence that he had the direct experiences which Byron encountered. Scholars as yet have offered no explanation for the source of Juvenal's violent emotions which caused him to hate all wives indiscriminately. The reader is left only with the assurance that it is total madness to marry.

While both poets rejected the concept of marriage, both doing so with no hesitation, it should be pointed out that they did so for somewhat different reasons. Byron rejected any bondage that trampled man's free soul. He knew the joys of abandoning one's total self to another, and his experience

---

[4]Highet, Juvenal the Satirist, p. 93.

with marriage proved that such close association prohibited any independence in love. Juvenal, on the other hand, apparently drew his disapproval from observation, not experience. He felt that all women were depraved and lustful, and thus he concluded that no contract with such people would be beneficial. Regardless of the reason, both poets followed the tradition of revealing the treacheries of marriage and of doing so through satire.

A study of the mere disappointments which the two felt one could expect in marriage would not be sufficient to reach an understanding of their moral beliefs. Both men wrote in terms of behavior as right or wrong, hypocritical or honest, sincere or deceitful. Juvenal and Byron alike faced the problem of man's never-changing nature, and they were keenly interested in the moral values that formed the foundation of life. Each saw the failures of the marriages around them as symptoms of a greater decay in society's morals, and each wrote of the vanity of human existence. In their moralizing, Juvenal represents the ancients in that he views moral questions in terms of the absolute. Byron, on the other hand, recognizes various subtle and complex grades of morality, levels which change as man changes. He incorporated into his poetry this refusal "to accept any of the creeds and

idealisms of his day,"[5] and he gradually became more and more uncertain about established principles as he matured. If Byron was truly cynical, he was so because he saw his ideal of perfection in human nature betrayed by the frailty, weakness, and ignorance of the ordinary man.[6] He perceived the same encompassing vanity which Juvenal had remarked about earlier, and, as a result of the disparity between right and wrong, he constantly faced the dilemma of reconciling heart and reason in his views on morality. It is his contention that

> Though sages may pour out their wisdom's treasure,
> There is no sterner Moralist than Pleasure.
> (III, 45)

Throughout the poem he proceeds to reveal man's pleasures in all their ramifications. He makes no judgments, but rather he allows the situation to speak for itself. Byron has a highly developed sense of moral right and wrong, even while performing some of his worst escapades. He remains beyond conventional standards of morality, always an enigma. Wheth er or not the reader can forget the discrepancy between Byron's personal life and his teachings, the severe moral indictments about society remain. As he states his purpose in Canto Twelve,

---

[5] Fuess, p. 179.
[6] Boyd, p. 161.

> . . .'T'is always with a moral end
> That I dissert. . .
> My Muse by exhortation means to mend
> All people, at all times, and in most places. . .
> (XII, 39)

On the other hand, Juvenal never reaches the level of acceptance of society's vices which Byron was to reach later. Juvenal always "hates most people, or despises them" and "believes rascality is triumphant in his world."[7] He was so intent on straightening society's morals that he chose only the most abominable and debauched areas for reporting. While the two poets diverged at times on which particular segment of society's morality they chose to discuss, they reached very similar conclusions on love and marriage and the eventual outcome of the present morality.

---

[7]Highet, The Anatomy of Satire, p. 235.

CHAPTER V

BYRON AND JUVENAL ON WAR, DEATH,
AND THE MEANING OF LIFE

As stated in the preceding two chapters, Byron and Juvenal chose society and morality as their most frequent topics of satire, yet they drew upon other strikingly similar areas of interest for subject material. Both satirists explored extensively the meaning of war, its origin, and its effect on society. Likewise, old age and death were causes of concern to the poets, and they reveal their ideas about them in their satires. Both felt keenly about the de-emphasization of nature and expressed a desire to return to the purity of the natural state. Numerous other topics could be considered in this comparison of the two satirists, yet all ideas return in the end to their basically similar ideas about the purpose of life and man's inner, rebellious nature. The philosophies and substance of their writings grew out of a comparable way of viewing life and people. To what extent Juvenal directly influenced Byron in the latter's impressions of war, death, nature, freedom and even the purpose of life can not be unquestionably determined in every

case; but the parallels between the two poets are worth noting, whether they indicate actual influence or only mental kinship.

Neither Byron nor Juvenal is ambiguous about tyranny and its vicious product, war. Both speak out in violent terms about the degrading effect of any sort of tyranny. Both depict a ruler possessing all the tyrannical, despotic qualities possible, in order to show the disastrous outcome of a dictatorship. Juvenal attacks the imperial rule by using Domitian, an emperor whose cruelty was still fresh in the memory of the citizens, as an example of an oppressor at his most depraved, and he does so by relating the incident of the enormous fish purchased while the people were starving. As he says,

> quis enim proponere talem
> aut emere auderet, cum plena et litora multo
> delatore forent?
>
> for who'd dare put on sale
> Or buy so big a fish when even
> the beaches were thick with informers?
> (IV, 46-48)

Through an elaborate exaggeration, Juvenal shows the ridiculous concern Domitian has to possess such a magnificent fish and the impressive array of councillors summoned to solve this trivial problem for the emperor. Each councillor is a typical sycophant, fearful of the emperor's power; they are

basically moral men but afraid of the consequences of speaking their minds. Many of their attitudes are found in Bryon's later invective--an apathy regarding truth, a servile instinct, a desire to avoid any violence. After his elaborate presentation of imperial folly, Juvenal laments upon the end result:

> atque utinam his potius nugis tota illa dedisset
> tempora saevitiae, claras quibus abstulit urbi
> inlustresque animas impune et vindice nullo.
>
> Even so, if only he had devoted to trifling
> nonsense
> Like this all those days of cruelty and violence
> When he robbed the city of its most
> noble and brilliant souls,
> Unpunished, with none to avenge!
> (IV, 150-152)

Byron's invective against Castlereagh in the Dedication to Don Juan is, in a general way, very reminiscent of Juvenal's satire on Domitian. Byron describes him thus:

> Cold-blooded, smooth-faced, placid miscreant:
> Dabbling its sleek young hands in Erin's gore,
> And thus for wider carnage taught to pant,
> Transferr'd to gorge upon a sister shore,
> The vulgarest tool that Tyranny could want. . .
> An orator of such set trash of phrase
> Ineffably--legitimately vile,
> That even its grossest flatterers dare not praise,
> Nor foes--all nations--condescend to smile . . .
> A tinkering slave-maker, who mends old chains,
> With God and man's abhorrence for its gains.
> (Dedication, 11, 12, 13, 14)

Both poets rage at the gluttony and wastefulness of the rulers. Juvenal speaks of the money of the state squandered at the emperor's banquet:

qualis tunc epulas ipsum gluttisse putamus
induperatorem, cum tot sestertia, partem
exiguam et modicae sumptan de margine cenae,
purpureus magni ructarit scurra Palati. . .

What sort of feasts must we suppose
the emperor himself gobbled up
when by a parasite duke. . .those
hundreds of dollars were puked--
(IV, 28-31)

Likewise, Byron feels only scorn for a greedy monarch:

Howe'er the mighty locust, Desolation,
Strip your green fields, and to your harvest cling,
Gaunt Famine never shall approach the throne--
Though Ireland starve, great George weighs twenty
stone.
(VIII, 126)

The poets concur also in their major objections to tyranny, its lawlessness. Juvenal is biting in his hatred of injustice, as he reveals by a discussion concerning the violent death of a man at the hands of an angry, unreasoning mob:

'sed quo cecidit sub crimine? quisnam
delator quibus indicibus, quo teste probavit?'
'nil horum; verbosa et grandis epistula venit
a Capreis.' 'bene habet, nil plus interrogo.'

'But how bad was the charge that finished
him? Who informed? What evidence, what witness,
proved the case?'

'It wasn't like that. An immense long-
winded letter was sent from Capri.'

'All right, I've got your meaning. That's
all I need to know.'
(X, 70-72)

Byron is equally scathing toward a government that perverts the law, as he implies in his reflections on More's tomb at Canterbury:

> Even the bold Churchman's tomb excited awe,
> Who died in the then great attempt to climb
> O'er kings, who <u>now</u> at least <u>must talk</u> of law
> Before they butcher.
> (X, 74)

Juvenal laments ruefully about tyranny:

> unde illa priorum
> scribendi quodcumque animo flagrante liberet
> simplicitas?
>
> Where find the open mind
> our distant ancestors had to write
> whatever their hot, angry passions wished?
> (I, 151-152)

Byron rages against all restrictions, but his principal target is restraint on thought:

> For me, I deem an absolute autocrat
> <u>Not</u> a barbarian, but much worse than that.
> And I will war, at least in words
> . . .with all who war
> With Thought;--and of Thought's foes by far most rude
> Tyrants and sycophants have been and are.
> (IX, 23, 24)

Byron is waging a personal war with "every despotism in every nation," (IX, 24) whereas Juvenal is largely concerned only with the decay of Roman freedom. Both poets are scornful of people as a whole who no longer express any interest in political reform and in ridding the country of tyranny. As Juvenal says, the public no longer cares for anything but

"bread and games." (X, 81) Byron is not wholly committed to democracy, only dedicated against tyranny:

> . . .I wish men to be free
> As much from mobs as kings--from you as me.
> (IX, 25)

Just as the two satirists are close in their desire to end tyranny and in a tentative, implied support of a more democratic society, so do they agree on the most horrid and malignant outcomes of despotism--war. Byron devotes three cantos of Don Juan--VII, VIII, and IX--to the frightful aspects of war, and there is a strong resemblance between these cantos and Juvenal's Fifteenth Satire. The Juvenalian quality of Byron's war cantos is easily revealed by a comparison of parallel passages.

When introducing descriptive passages about battle, both poets recall Homer and incorporate an ironic loftiness of tone associated with the epic. Juvenal claims that his satiric tale is closer to truth than the story Ulysses told of his travels. He asserts his hold on truth,

> solus enim haec Ithacus nullo sub teste canebat.
>
> For Ulysses had none to swear his tales were
> not pure bunk.
> (XV, 26)

In his opening canto on war, Byron urges Homer to contrast the greater horrors of modern warfare with those of his day:

> O thou eternal Homer! I have now
> To paint a siege, wherein more men were slain,
> With deadlier engines and a speedier blow,
> Than in thy Greek gazette of that campaign. . .
> (VII, 80)

Both poets are horrified and repulsed at the deeds which they must relate concerning war, and they express this hatred in similar terms. Juvenal writes of strange events that have recently occurred and declares that it is

> nos vulgi scelus et cunctis graviora coturnis;
> nam scelus. . .
> nullus aput tragicos populus facit. accipe nostro
> dira quod exemplum feritas produxerit aevo.
>
> a crime of the common people
> and worse than any found in tragedies;
> for though you search every verse of
> the drama. . .you'll find no crime committed
> by a whole people. But listen to what a
> prime example horrible savagery in our day
> has produced.
> (XV, 29-32)

Bryon comments in like manner:

> And as. . .
> You hardly will believe such things were true
> As now occur, I thought that I would pen you'em
> But may their very memory perish too!--
> Yet if perchance remember'd, still disdain you'em
> More than you scorn the savages of yore,
> Who <u>painted</u> their <u>bare</u> limbs, but <u>not</u> with gore.
> (VIII, 136)

The two poets see the battles beginning with shouts of passion and hatred and resulting in slaughter and butchery. Both are masters at vivid description of this bloodshed. With the feeling of actually being present in the battle,

Juvenal says:

> paucae sine vulnere malae,
> vix cuiquam aut nulli toto certamine nasus
> integer. aspiceres iam cuncta per agmina vultus
> dimidios, alias facies et hiantia ruptis
> ossa genis, plenos oculorum sanguine pugnos.
>
> Few jaws and chins escape being gashed,
> Few noses, or none, come out of the fracas
> unblooded, unsmashed. Throughout
> the ranks can be seen broken faces, looking
> like none that's human, bones
> gaping through torn cheeks, and fists
> that run with blood from eyes.
> (XV, 54-58)

Byron is equally vivid in describing the violence of the action:

> Three hundred cannon threw up their emetic,
> And thirty thousand muskets flung their pills
> Like hail, to make a bloody diuretic. . .
> There the still varying pangs, which multiply
> Until their very number makes men hard
> By the infinities of agony,
> Which meet the gaze whate'er it may regard--
> The groan, the roll in dust, the all-white eyes
> Turn'd back with its socket. . . .
> (VIII, 12, 13)

The two poets related incidents in specific battles which are remarkably alike. As Juvenal describes the horror,

> hic. . .praecipitans capiturque. ast illum in plurima sectum
> frusta et particulas, ut multis mortuus unus
> sufficeret, totum corrosis ossibus edit. . .
>
> Now one. . .trips up and is caught.
> They hacked his body to thousands of
> bits and pieces so that one gob of the
> dead man might go to each man in the
> conquering mob. And they ate him up bones
> and all. . .
> (XV, 78-80)

Byron's account is no less ghastly:

> A Russian officer. . .felt his heel
> Seized fast. . .
> In vain he kick'd, and swore, and writhed, and bled. . .
> The teeth still kept their gratifying hold. . .
> A dying Moslem, who had felt the foot
> Of a foe o'er him, snatch'd at it, and bit
> The very tendon which is most acute. . .and quite
>   through't
> He made the teeth meet. . . .
>
> (VIII, 83, 84)

Byron does not conclude the tale with an account of cannibalism, but he does equate without hesitation the brutality of war with the bestiality of this atrocity. Juvenal declares that no tribes ever before raged as furiously as the present group of savages, and he decides that

> nec poenam sceleri invenies nec digna parabis
> supplicia his populis, in quorum mente pares sunt
> et similes ira atque fames. . . .
>
> You can mete out no penalty proper
> for such a crime, no punishment frame
> for people in whose minds anger and hunger
> are one and the same.
>
> (XV, 129-131)

Byron is more general and introspective in his hatred for war, a different attitude from Juvenal that again points out the fundamental differences in their characters. He equates war with hell itself:

> All that the mind would shrink from of excesses;
> All that the body perpetrates of bad;
> All that we read, hear, dream of man's distresses;
> All that the devil would do if run stark mad;

All that defies the worst which pen expresses;
All that by which hell is peopled, or as sad
As hell--mere mortals who their power abuse--
Was here (as heretofore and since) let loose.
(VIII, 123)

After vivid pictures of the bloodshed of war, both poets appeal to man's humanity and urge a return to compassion. The battle of Ismail in Don Juan is seen as nothing more than "empty military glory and futile conquest,"[1] and Byron contrasts this so-called glory with the pain and loss of life found in battle. In Canto Eight, Byron emphasizes the contrast between the senseless attacks and conquests and the selfless generosity of the soldiers' fighting. To Byron, the greatest nobility is in this unselfish compassion, for to him,

The drying up a single tear has more
Of honest fame, than shedding seas of gore.
(VIII, 3)

On the needless expenditure of human lives, Byron has this to say:

The bayonet pierces and sabre cleaves,
And human lives are lavished everywhere.
As the year closing whirls the scarlet leaves
When the stripp'd forest bows to the bleak aid,
And groans; and thus the peopled city grieves,
Shorn of its best and loveliest, and left bare. . .
(VIII, 88)

---

[1]Boyd, p. 26.

The greatest bravery is displayed in a unique way, in Bryon's opinion:

> The truly brave,
> When they behold the brave oppress'd with odds,
> Are touch'd with a desire to shield and save. . .
> (VIII, 106)

Juvenal also appeals to man's sympathy for the misfortunes of others, and he voices an attitude which was to be Byron's later--that man is bound inextricably to man through ties of love:

> mollissima corda
> humano generi dare se natura fatetur,
> quae lacrimas dedit; haec nostri pars optima. sensus
> plorare ergo iubet causam dicentis amici. . .
> quis enim bonus. . .
> ulla aliena sibi credit mala?
>
> Nature, in giving tears to man, confessed that he
> Had a tender heart; this is our noblest quality
> Therefore she makes us weep for the anguish of
> friends. . .
> For what good man, . . .
> Believes he's untouched by any other's adversity?
> (XV, 131-133, 141)

Byron dramatizes his philosophy of love and protection by Juan's rescue of the orphan Leila, who was about to be slain. He has Juan explain it in this manner:

> 'At least I will endure
> Whate'er is to be borne--but not resign
> This child, who is parentless, and therefore mine.'

When asked to choose between his "fame and feelings, pride and pity," (VIII, 101) Juan remains true to his nobler instincts. Byron recognizes that such compassion and concern

are lamentably rare:

> If here and there some transient trait of pity
> Was shown, and some more noble heart broke through
> Its bloody bond, and saved perhaps some pretty
> Child, or an aged, helpless man or two--
> What's this in one annihilated city,
> Where thousand loves, and ties, and duties grew?
> (VIII, 124)

Juvenal, likewise, bemoans the loss of compassion and sympathy, and he declares that it is the ability to care that separates man from the beasts.

> separat hoc nos
> a grege mutorum, atque ideo venerabile soli
> sortiti ingenium divinorumque capaces
> atque exercendis pariendisque artibus apti
> sensum a caelesti demissum traximus arce,
> cuius egent prona et terram spectantia. . . .
> tantum animas, nobis animum quoque, mutuus ut nos
> adfectus petere auxilium et praestare iuberet. . .
>
> Compassion distinguishes us from
> dumb brutes; so we along,
> Who have been endowed with a nature
> deserving respect, who own
> The genius for godlike deeds, are
> fit to cultivate
> And use the arts, have drawn from highest heaven
> those traits of donated feeling denied to lowly
> beasts with gaze lowered to the ground. . .
> But to us He [God] gave soul as well, that
> love for each other might stir us to ask
> or offer aid. . .
> (XV, 142-147, 149-150)

Byron says much the same thing about the need for compassion as Juvenal did:

> That reflect <u>one</u> life saved, especially if young
> Or pretty, is a thing to recollect,
> Far sweeter than the greenest laurels sprung
> From the manure of human clay, though deck'd

> With all the praises ever said or sung:
> Though hymn'd by every harp, unless within
> Your heart joins chorus, Fame is but a din.
> (IX, 34)

Although both poets recognize the need for compassion, they realize that man is often only a step away from the animal. Juvenal laments the lack of communion between men:

> sed iam serpentum maior concordia. parcit
> cognatis maculis similis fera.
>
> But today there's more fellowship among snakes
> than among mankind. Wild beasts spare those
> with similar markings. . .
> (XV, 159-160)

According to Juvenal, no strong beast ever kills a weaker member of its species, with the implication that mankind could achieve a deeper greatness and humanity by the same policy. Byron emphasizes the beastlike quality of man:

> O thou, too, mortal man! What is philanthropy?
> O world! which was and is, what is cosmogony?
> Some people have accused me of misanthropy,
> And yet I know no more than the mahogany
> That forms this desk, of what they mean; _lykanthropy_
> I comprehend, for without transformation
> Men become wolves on any slight occasion.
> (IX, 20)

Yet like Juvenal, Byron admits that the savage beasts have more mercy than men do. In speaking of the two murderers chasing Leila, the child whom Juan rescued, Byron says,

> Match'd with them,
> The rudest brute that roams Siberia's wild
> Has feelings pure and polish'd as a gem--
> The bear is civilized, the wolf is mild.
> (VIII, 92)

Byron goes beyond the level of Juvenal's insight into the reason of this perversity of man's nature that causes war. He explores the core of the problem, searching to know who should be condemned for the atrocities of war.

> And whom for this at last must we condemn?
> Their natures? or their sovereigns, who employ
> All arts to teach their subjects to destroy?
> (VIII, 92)

Byron recognized the selfish motives behind war, and he felt that all wars were terrible because they embodied "every human crime conceivable."[2] Under the momentary glory and heroism, Byron perceived the hypocrisy, blind ignorance, and political bribery present in any war.

The pessimism and cynicism of Byron's cantos on war are not his final comment, for he feels that somewhere in the future will be a civilization that knows nothing of the relentless tyrants and cruel war that he is relating. Although he expresses an insight into war and its meaning that Juvenal does not, Byron clearly has been influenced by the Roman in his subject matter, tone, and attitude.

Byron goes beyond the limitations of Juvenal in his examination of yet another point of interest--old age and death. Both poets feel keenly the miseries of approaching senility, but Byron attempts a philosophical reckoning on the

---

[2] _Ibid._, p. 78.

subject, a reasoning which ends only in skepticism. Once in speaking of an adaptation of Juvenal's Tenth Satire, Byron is reported to have said,

> 'The lapse of ages _changes_ all things--time--the language--the earth--the bounds of the sea--the stars of the sky, and everything "about, around, and underneath" man, _except man himself_. . . .The infinite variety of lives conduct but to death, and the infinity of wishes lead but to disappointment.[3]

Both poets are relentlessly serious in their approaches to old age and death, never lapsing into the laughing tone of other parts of their satires. Much of what Juvenal feels about death has to be implied from his attitude about old age. As he says in Satire Ten,

> hoc recto vultu, solum hoc et pallidus optas.
> sed quam continuis et quantis longa senectus
> plena malis. deformem et taetrum ante omnia vultum
> dissimilemque sui, . . .
> plurima sunt iuvenum discrimina,. . .
> una senum facies.
>
> Yet how fierce,
> How unceasing the miseries that protracted old
> age sustains!
> First of all, the face, distorted, hideous, not
> the same
> As it used to be--rough hide instead of skin. . .
> In many ways young men differ. . .
> Old men look alike. . . .
> (X, 188-198)

---

[3]Highet, _Juvenal the Satirist_, p. 125.

In refutation of the desire to possess a long life, Juvenal lists in detail all the weaknesses that beset old people. Their decreptitude and feebleness are sources of disgust to their families. Juvenal lists the ways in which old men lose all their sensory faculties. They no longer enjoy food, sex, or music, for all their perceptions are dulled with age. They are subject to all manner of illnesses and become jealous of those who are healthier. Juvenal feels that "worse than any physical lack is a failing mind," (X, 233) and old age rarely escapes this infirmity. If one lives long enough, one will see all his friends and even his children die:

> haec data poena diu viventibus, ut renovata
> semper clade domus multis in luctibus inque
> perpetuo maerore et nigra veste senescant.
>
> This is the punishment of those who live long:
> death slashes one after another in their homes,
> and woes untold abound, and they, in constant
> grief. . .grow old. . . .
> (X, 243-245)

Byron does not merely state reasons why one should not prefer a long life as Juvenal had stated. Throughout <u>Don Juan</u> the reader can find a definite dread of the approach of old age. He speaks of "middle age" in Canto Twelve:

> Of all the barbarous middle ages, that
> Which is the most barbarous is the middle age
> Of man; it is--I really scarce know what;
> But when we hover between fool and sage. . .

> Too old for youth,--too young, at thirty-five,
> To herd with boys, or hoard with good threescore,--
> I wonder people should be left alive;
> But since they are, that epoch is a bore. . . .
> (XII, 1, 2)

Byron, too, is disgusted with the loss of sensory perception that comes with age:

> when our moon's no more at full,
> We may presume to criticize or praise;
> Because indifference begins to lull
> Our passions, and we walk in wisdom's ways;
> Also because the figure and the face
> Hint, that 't is time to give the younger place.
> (XIII, 4)

The heirs in Byron's poem wait for death to bring the expected inheritance, much as they did in Juvenal's poem. In his words,

> The dreary "Fuimus" of all things human
> Must be declined, while life's thin thread's spun out
> Between the gaping heir and gnawing gout.
> (XIII, 40)

Undoubtedly, Byron felt at times that what Juvenal had implied about the desirability of an early death must be at least partially true. To a man as intensely alive as Byron always was, any impairment of the senses would be as destructive as actual death. In contemplating the benefits of early death, he says,

> 'Whom the gods love, die young,' was said of yore,
> And many deaths do they escape by this:
> The death of friends, and that which slay even more--
> The death of friendship, love, youth, all that is,

> Except mere breath; and since the silent shore
> Awaits at last even those who longest miss
> The old archer's shafts, perhaps the early grave
> Which men weep over may be meant to save.
> (IV, 12)

The thought of death seems to be constantly present with Byron; at least it forms a considerable part of his material, but Juvenal never dwells on the subject at length. As Byron encounters the death of a military commander whom he knew quite well, he ponders the significance of such a death; the conclusion is a mystery with no solution. He wonders,

> 'Can this be death? then what is life or death?
> Speak!' but he spoke not! 'Wake!' but still he slept!--
> 'But yesterday and who had mightier breath?. . .
> I gazed. . .
> To try if I could wrench aught out of death
> Which should confirm, or shake, or make a faith;
> But it was all a mystery. Here we are,
> And there we go;--but _where_?. . .
> Can every element our elements mar?
> And air--earth--water--fire live--and we dead?
> _We_ whose minds comprehend all things?
> (V, 36, 38, 39)

Though at times Byron seems to speak of death in a bantering, somewhat satiric tone, he is not laughing at death. He sees all too clearly the sharp end of man's schemes for immortality, and he perceives death scoffing at man's sorrow.

> Death laughs at all you weep for:--look upon
> This hourly dread of all! whose _threaten'd sting_
> Turns life to terror, even though in its sheath:
> Mark how its lipless mouth grins without breath!

> Mark how it laughs and scorns at all you are!
> And yet *was* what you are: from *ear* to *ear*!
> It *laughs not*--there is now no fleshly bar
> So call'd; the Antic long hath ceased to *hear*,
> But still he smiles. . .
> it is sad merriment,
> But still it *is* so; and with such example,
> Why should not Life be equally content
> With his superior, in a smile to trample
> Upon the nothings which are daily spent
> Like bubbles on an ocean much less ample
> Than the eternal deluge, which devours
> Suns as rays--worlds like atoms--years like hours?
> (IX, 11, 12, 13)

Byron seems to be scorning not death itself but rather the men who waste precious living hours with constant thoughts of death. He is again keen in pointing out that what is only being threatened is of lesser consequence than the immediate life. Although Juvenal expressed himself only slightly on death, there is indication that he probably had just such firm convictions about adversity in the face of death as Byron did later. Consider, for example, his admonition about what prayers men should make:

> orandum est. . .
> fortem posce animum mortis terrore carentem,
> qui spatium vitae extremum inter munera ponat
>
> Pray for courageous spirit that's not afraid
> of death and can say long life is the
> least of nature's gifts. . .
> (X, 357-358)

Byron admits to the human nature which makes the fear of death natural to man, but he realizes that such courage

as Juvenal mentioned can come from the depths of sorrow. Death is and always will be a part of man:

> Death, so call'd, is a thing which makes men weep. . .
> 'Tis round him, near him, here, there, everywhere;
> And there's a courage which grows out of fear.
> Perhaps of all most desperate, which will dare
> The worst to know it!--when the mountain's rear
> Their peaks beneath your human foot, and there
> You look down o'er the precipice, and drear
> The gulf of rock yawns,--you can't gaze a minute
> Without an awful wish to plunge within it.
> (XIV, 3, 5)

Lastly, Byron personifies Death and speaks of the inevitability of its approach:

> Oh Death! thou dunnest of all duns! thou daily
> Knockest at doors, at first with modest tap,
> Like a meek tradesman when, approaching palely,
> Some splendid debtor he would take by sap:
> But oft denied, as patience 'gins to fail, he
> Advances with exasperated rap,
> And (if let in) insists, in terms unhandsome,
> On ready money, or a 'draft on Ransom.'
> (XV, 8)

Undoubtedly, Byron felt Juvenal's influence keenly in this matter of death, yet he surpassed him in his searching questions of the human condition, for Byron approached death as he did everything else--with personal, immediate concern.

Closely associated with the theme of death is the idea of the hopelessness of man's aspirations in the world. Both Byron and Juvenal express in their works the feeling that man is nothing more than a mere plaything subject to the whims of higher beings. There is a remarkable kinship in the way

the two poets regard these caprices of fortune. Juvenal speaks of seemingly successful men:

> cum sint,
> quales ex humili magna ad fastigia rerum
> extollit quotiens voluit Fortuna iocari.
>
> They're the sort who were begot in gutters,
> the sort that Fortune loves to lift up and
> cloak with highest success whenever she wants
> to laugh at a joke.
>
> (III, 38-40)

Byron speaks in like manner:

> However, Heaven knows how the Fate who levels
> Towns, nations, worlds, in her revolving pranks,
> So ordered it. . .
>
> (VI, 44)

With wry humor, Byron makes note of man's foolishness in regard to Fortune:

> 'But droop not: Fortune, at your time of life,
> Although a female moderately fickle,
> Will hardly leave you. . .
> For any length of days in such a pickle.
> To strive, too, with our fate were such a strife
> As if the corn-sheaf should oppose the sickle:
> Men are the sport of circumstances, when
> The circumstances seem the sport of men.'
>
> (V, 17)

The two poets choose different examples of the possible reverses of fortune, but both admit that man is at the mercy of fortune in such situations. Juvenal favors a political application in relating sudden reversals of fortune:

> si Fortuna volet, fies de rhetore consul;
> si volet haec eadem, fiet de consule rhetor.

> If Fortune chooses, you'll rise to consular post
> from classroom; If she feels otherwise, you'll fall
> from consul to rhetor.
>
> (VII, 197-198)

He makes a general statement about the uselessness of acquiring wealth, with an example of a man about to lose his life in a storm at sea:

> non suffecerat aurum. . .
> frigida sufficient velantis inguina panni
> exiguusque cibus. . .
>
> Yesterday all the gold. . .wouldn't hold
> his desires in check; but today he's glad of
> some rags to cheat the cold. . .and some
> scraps of food to eat. . .
>
> (XIV, 298-301)

Both poets realize that greedy, self-gratifying aspirations of man are vain, because Fortune can cause man to lose his prosperity at any time. Juvenal developed an entire satire around the idea of what prayers man should make in the face of possible destruction. Juvenal relentlessly casts aside each wish humans usually make and declares that not one is worth having fulfilled. Wealth is always sought after, but it, too, is vain. Poverty has its rewards:

> cantabit vacuus coram latrone viator.
>
> A man who has nothing can whistle in a robber's
> face.
>
> (X, 22)

One seeks power and prestige, but, in doing so, he arranges for his own destruction. As Juvenal says,

> quosdam praecipitat subiecta potentia magnae
> invidiae, mergit longa atque insignis honorum
> pagina.
>
> Great power, which incites great envy,
> hurls some men to destruction;
> They are drowned in a long, splendid
> stream of honors.
>
> (X, 56-57)

The poet pictures great generals enduring any toil and danger just as long as they can receive the glory from the deeds. However, Juvenal removes any desire on the reader's part to possess such glory when he says,

> tanto maior famae sitis est quam
> virtutis. quis enim virtutem amplectitur ipsam,
> praemia si tollas?
>
> the thirst for fame
> is so much greater than for virtue! For
> who would embrace Virtue herself if you
> stripped away her rewards:
>
> (X, 140-144)

He also makes clear the relative worth of generals, and he does so in Byron's favorite quote from the Roman:

> expende Hannibalem: quot libras in duce summo
> invenies?
>
> Put Hannibal on the scales. What will you
> find he weighs?
>
> (X, 147)

Juvenal concludes by asking "Then men should pray for nothing?" (X, 346) He answers his own question to the effect that man should leave all decisions to the gods, who know best what man needs:

permittes ipsis expendere numinibus quid
conveniat nobis rebusque sit utile nostris.
nam pro iucundis aptissima quaeque dabunt di.
carior est illis homo quam sibi.

You'll let the gods themselves bestow
What may suffice for your good and
be most useful to your affairs. For in
place of what we enjoy, they'll give what
best befits our case: Man is more precious
to them than to himself.

(X, 347-350)

Philosophers before Juvenal had treated the problem of prayer and faith, but no one had ever enriched it with such detail about the disastrous results of false prayer. The truths which he espouses could almost be considered clichés in the modern world; nevertheless, they show an acute insight into the vanity of life. Juvenal reaches a simplicity in style that emphasizes the seriousness of his purpose, as he urges the return of man to virtue away from materialism.

monstro quod ipse tibi possis dare, semita certe
tranquillae per virtutem patet unica vitae.

I'm pointing out simply what you can
give yourself. For the one true path
to peaceful life must surely through
virtue run.

(X, 362-363)

A theme very kindred to Juvenal's can be found throughout Don Juan, for Byron, too, scoffs at the absurdity of man's aims and desires. To prove the futility of all of life, Byron asks,

> When we know what all are, we must bewail us,
> But ne'ertheless I hope it is no crime
> To laugh at all things--for I wish to know
> What, after all, are all things--but a show?
> (VII, 2)

While seemingly protesting that all of life is a sham, Byron appears also to be answering the charges of the critics who find him scornful of virtue. For those who claim he has "a tendency to under-rate and scoff at human power and virtue," (VII, 3) Byron has only the retort that he possesses no baser convictions than other philosophers "who knew this life was not worth a potato." (VII, 4) Byron seems determined not to disappoint critics who had found him irreverent, as he declares,

> Ecclesiastes said, 'that all is vanity'--
> Most modern preachers say the same, or show it
> By their examples of true Christianity:. . .
> And in this scene of all-confess'd inanity;
> By saint, by sage, by preacher, and by poet,
> Must I restrain me, through the fear of strife,
> From holding up the nothingness of life?
> (VII, 6)

Any regimented form of doctrine, including religion, was bothersome and hypocritical, in Byron's opinion. His war was, however, "not with Christ's teachings, but with those persons and institutions that have misconstrued them. . ."[4] Platonism did not escape his sardonic tone for long either:

---

[4] C. N. Stavrou, "Religion in Byron's Don Juan," Studies in English Literature, III (Autumn, 1963), 580.

What a sublime discovery 't was to make the
Universe universal egotism,
That all's ideal--all ourselves: I'll stake the
World (be it what you will) that that's no schism.
Oh Doubt!--if thou be'st Doubt, for which some take thee,
But which I doubt extremely--thou sole prism
Of the Truth's rays, spoil not my draught of spirit!
Heaven's brandy, though our brain can hardly bear
it.

(XI, 2)

One might wonder at the irony of Byron's position on the meaning of life. While he expounds on the futility and nothingness of life as it is, his poem constantly asserts the wonder of being alive, the joy of loving, and the actual worth of life itself. Byron held that "all worthwhile morality grew out of. . .sincere respect for another,"[5] not a worship created through threats.

As did Juvenal, Byron often related life's treachery and indifference to man's need for security and permanence. Unlike Juvenal, however, Byron believed that pleasure kept one from making irreparable mistakes; he found life indestructibly joyful and confronted it with such high expectations and anticipation that his pursuit for intensity of feeling would not allow him to submit to any shoddy, hypocritical institution. Likewise, it is because Byron believes that man is capable of reforming his ways that he is so intent on provoking him to do so.[6] Byron is just as admiring of

---

[5]Ibid., p. 582.

[6]Ibid., p. 586.

courage in the face of adversity as was Juvenal:

> 'T is thus with people in an open boat,
> They live upon the love of Life, and bear
> More than can be believed, or even thought,
> And stand like rocks the tempest's wear and tear.
> (II, 66)

In a sense, Byron is exhorting his readers to return to virtue and morality as Juvenal did, but it is to be only a morality which is in accordance with the personal dictates of each man's heart. Byron suggests that man would be wise to follow only what he can know for certain:

> 'To be, or not to be?'--Ere I decide
> I should be glad to know that which <u>is being</u>.
> 'T is true we speculate both far and wide,
> And deem, because we <u>see</u>, we are <u>all</u>-<u>seeing</u>:
> For my part, I'll enlist on neither side,
> Until I see both sides for once agreeing.
> For me, I sometimes think that Life is Death,
> Rather than Life a mere affair of breath. . . .
>
> There's no such thing as certainty, that's plain
> As any of Mortality's conditions;
> So little do we know what we're about in
> This world, I doubt if doubt itself be doubting.
>
> It is a pleasant voyage perhaps to float, . . .
> on a sea of speculation;
> But what if carrying sail capsize the boat?
> Your wise men don't know much of navigation;
> And swimming long in the abyss of thought
> Is apt to tire: a calm and shallow station
> Well nigh the shore. . .
> is best for moderate bathers.
> (IX, 16, 17, 18)

Byron felt man could better his condition by living for the present, as he did, rather than succumbing to a fear of the

future. Whereas Juvenal wanted mankind to be willing to take what the gods had to offer, Byron urged man to action in seeking fulfillment and depth of understanding of the human condition. Byron reminds all skeptics and believers that even though life is, in actuality, only a jest, mankind should confront this vanity of the present with the truth that comes from an acceptance of life.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

The impact of classical literature on British and American writing has never been doubted by scholars, yet the influence has remained too easily accepted rather than investigated. There has never been any thorough study of the classical tradition which Byron clearly follows in many instances, although even a superficial reading of Byron's verse reveals a wealth of material from a classical background. He adopted and changed the classical satiric tradition to suit his own modern and broadminded purposes and capacities.

It becomes evident that the Juvenalian influence on Byron is only a part of the general classical influences on the entire poem Don Juan. Byron seems to feel that there is no clear division between the ancient writers and the modern authors, and thus there can be no decision made as to what is direct influence and what is only a vague kinship among all writers in considering one poet's impact on another poet. It is clear that at times Byron actually sought to associate himself with the Roman tradition rather than attempting a

completely individual creativity, and this unique attitude toward the classics is manifested in his choice of classical subject matter and his traditional attitudes toward life.

Byron had experienced life at so many varied points that his satire was inevitably to reach a greater depth than that of Juvenal. By the end of his life, Byron had reached a skeptic, wry outlook toward society and morality, whereas Juvenal, as long as he wrote, was unrelieved in his anger toward man and his hatred of life. It is this wry attitude, developed from a personal confrontation with human life as it exists, that led Byron to attempt a witty type of satire. His skepticism never gives any access to a scorn or denial of man's dignity; he maintains above all else the true worth of man.

Byron's philosophical outlook reached beyond that of his Roman predecessor, and to accomodate this larger scope, he mastered the epic satire. He employs themes similar to the Roman ones, yet his verse is ever more encompassing and broad. Byron is not one to be easily satisfied with the precise answers the Romans made to questions involving life itself; he intends to search for every possible solution to the potential outcome of mankind.

Gilbert Highet asserts that Juvenal's chief influence down through the ages has been on the intellectuals.[1] His bitterness has such concentration of thought that he appeals to the thinker primarily. Although Juvenal is not a deep reasoner and only a superficial philosopher, he, nevertheless, is able to state with a conviction and force greater than Byron's two important facts that mankind has to face. He ever asserts that wealth without responsibility brings only decay and that uncontrolled power brings cruelty and madness.[2] It is Juvenal's insight into the false illusions by which man lives that causes his words to continue to be quoted. His stubborn idealism and especially his fervent belief that yielding to the corruptions of wealth brings destruction have influenced countless satirists, no matter how indirectly, and undoubtedly will continue to do so. It was Juvenal's uncompromising moral earnestness, which he expressed with relentless and sometimes savage power, that made him an important influence upon the satirical work of Lord Byron. Although the exact extent of this influence can never be proved, it is undeniable that they considered comparable

---

[1] Highet, _Juvenal the Satirist_, p. 230.

[2] _Ibid_.

areas of subject matter for satire and that they expressed kindred attitudes about society, morality, and the ultimate purpose of life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Bellamy, R. L., Byron the Man, London, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., Ltd., 1924.

Bigland, Eileen, Passion for Excitement, New York, Coward-McCann, Inc., 1956.

Bostetter, Edward E., ed., George Gordon, Lord Byron, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

Boyd, Elizabeth French, Byron's Don Juan, New York, Humanities Press, 1958.

Calvert, William J., Byron Romantic Paradox, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1935.

Duff, J. Wight, Roman Satire, Connecticut, Archon Books, 1964.

Elliott, Robert C., The Power of Satire, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1960.

Fairclough, H. Rushton, Horace, Satires, Epistles, and Ars Poetica, Harvard University Press, 1926.

Frank, Tenney, Catullus and Horace, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1928.

Fuess, Claude M., Lord Byron as a Satirist in Verse, New York, Russell and Russell, Inc., 1964.

Goode, Clement Tyson, Byron as Critic, New York, Haskell House, 1964.

Gordon, G. S., ed., English Literature and the Classics, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1912.

Grierson, Sir Herbert, The Background of English Literature, Classical and Romantic, New York, Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1960.

Hadas, Moses, A History of Latin Literature, New York, Columbia University Press, 1952.

Haight, Elizabeth Hazelton, The Roman Use of Anecdotes, New York, Longmans, Green and Co., 1940.

Highet, Gilbert, The Anatomy of Satire, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1962.

_______________, The Classical Tradition, New York, Oxford University Press, 1949.

_______________, Juvenal the Satirist, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1954.

Hopkins, Kenneth, Portraits in Satire, London, Barrie Books, Ltd., 1950.

Juvenalis, Decimus Junius, The Satires of Juvenal, translated by Rolfe Humphries, Indiana, Indiana University Press, 1958.

_________________________, The Satires of Juvenal, translated by Hubert Creekmore, New York, New American Library of World Literature, Inc., 1963.

Lind, L. R., ed., Latin Poetry in Verse Translation, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1957.

Lovell, Ernest J. Jr., Byron: the Record of a Quest, Texas, University of Texas Press, 1949.

MacKenzie, Harriet Margaret, Byron's Laughter, California, Lymanhouse, 1939.

Marchand, Leslie H., Byron, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1957.

Marjarum, Edward Wayne, Byron as Skeptic and Believer, New York, Russell and Russell, Inc., 1962.

Musurillo, S. J., Symbol and Myth in Ancient Poetry, New York, Fordham University Press, 1961.

Owen, W. G., A Persi Flacci et D. Iuni Iuvenalis, London, E. Typographeo Clarendoniano,

Quennel, Peter, Byron, London, Duckworth, 1934.

Reinhold, Meyer, Essentials of Greek and Roman Classics, New York, Barron's Educational Series, Inc., 1946.

Ridenour, George M., The Style of Don Juan, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1960.

Rose, H. J., A Handbook of Latin Literature, New York, E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1960.

Seyffert, Oskar, Dictionary of Classical Antiquities, New York, World Publishing Co., 1956.

Simcox, George Augustus, A History of Latin Literature, Vol. II, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1883.

Sullivan, J. P., ed., Critical Essays on Roman Literature, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1963.

Thomson, J. A. K., The Classical Background of English Literature, London, George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1948.

________________, Classical Influences on English Prose, London, George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1956.

West, Paul, ed., Byron, A Collection of Critical Essays, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.

Wright, Henry P., ed., Juvenal, Boston, Ginn and Co., 1901.

Articles

Stavrou, C. N., "Religion in Byron's Don Juan," Studies in English Literature, II (Autumn, 1963), 567-594.