Byron's Unacknowledged Armenian Grammar and a New Poem

Author(s): G. B. RIZZOLI

Source: *Keats-Shelley Journal*, 2015, Vol. 64 (2015), pp. 43-71

Published by: Keats-Shelley Association of America, Inc.

Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/26177873

JSTOR

Byron's Unacknowledged Armenian Grammar and a New Poem

G. B. RIZZOLI

I N NOVEMBER 1816 Byron started frequenting the Mekhitarist monastery on the Venetian island of San Lazzaro, where he studied Armenian with the learned Father Paschal Aucher (Yarutʻiwn Awgerean,[1] 1774–1854). Byron profoundly identified with "an oppressed and a noble [Armenian] nation" that had preserved its spiritual heritage through centuries of "proscription and bondage."[2] He soon undertook to champion the Armenian language and literature and to this purpose collaborated with Father Aucher on two books. The first, *Grammar English and Armenian* (1817), was an English textbook for Armenians written by Aucher and corrected by Byron. The second book, *A Grammar Armenian and English* (1819), was Byron's project: a grammar of classical Armenian for the use of English speakers, complete with model English translations entitled "Exercises in the Armenian Language."[3] A few years later, Byron proudly claimed that he had "compiled the major part of two Armenian & English Grammars" for Aucher.[4] However, the published books were credited solely to Aucher and did not mention Byron's intellectual contribution. What had been Byron's actual share in the "compilations"? In the absence of manuscripts, we can answer this question only on the basis of biographical information and textual analysis. Unfortunately, Byron's biographers have neglected this episode and have underestimated its impact upon Byron's work,

1. For the sake of consistency and clarity, all Armenian names and text are transliterated according to the Hübschmann-Meillet system. Phonetic transcriptions employ the IPA. Whenever possible, I use the names familiar to Byron and his contemporaries, such as the westernized *noms de plume* the Armenian fathers had chosen.

2. *Letters and Journals of Lord Byron: With Notices of His Life*, ed. Thomas Moore, 2 vols. (London: John Murray, 1830), II, 69n. For a perceptive analysis of Byron's psychological investment in the Armenian cause, see p. 395 in Anahit Bekaryan, "Byron and Armenia: A Case of Mirrored Affinities," in *The Reception of Byron in Europe*, ed. Richard A. Cardwell, 2 vols., *Northern, Central and Eastern Europe* (London: Thoemmes Continuum, 2004), II, 386–405.

3. *Grammar English and Armenian* (Venice: Printed at the Press of the Armenian Academy, 1817), hereafter *G1817*; *A Grammar Armenian and English* (Venice: Printed at the Press of the Armenian Academy, 1819), hereafter *G1819*.

4. Leslie A. Marchand, ed., *Byron's Letters and Journals*, 13 vols. (London: John Murray, 1973–1994), IX, 31; hereafter *BLJ*.

[43]

while textual analyses, hindered by the language barrier, have been lamentably few. In fact, no Byron scholar seems to have read the 1817 book, while only one section of the 1819 volume, the "Exercises in the Armenian Language," has attracted significant critical attention. As an inevitable consequence, only a few pages from *G1819* and no text from *G1817* have so far been recognized as Byron's work, a state of affairs clearly at variance with Byron's claim.

In this article I use a multilingual approach to identify some of Byron's corrections to *G1817* and to argue that he wrote most of the English text of *G1819*, i.e., the "major part" of the grammar section proper, as well as all the "Exercises in the Armenian Language." The "exercises" are comprised of four pieces that are already part of the Byron canon, four extracts of doubtful authorship, and a hitherto unnoticed short poem. I print this poem below, and I distinguish between Aucher's and Byron's contributions to the grammar section of *G1819* (Byron wrote some 117 pages). I also present evidence confirming that the four extracts hitherto tentatively attributed to Byron are indeed by him. I argue that we should add all these texts (totaling approximately 123 pages) to the Byron canon, while we should avoid any pieces that made their first appearance in the subsequent editions of *G1819*, long after Byron had stopped collaborating with Aucher.

This essay's first part entirely revises current accounts of Byron's Armenian studies, using previously unexamined historical testimonies to establish the circumstances of the two books' production. Byron came to the monastery in order to translate the very texts that were published without his name as the "Exercises in the Armenian Language" of *G1819*. He kept visiting the Armenian fathers for more than two years (not a mere couple of months as usually assumed), and he made more translations than previously supposed. He proofread *G1817* and rendered into English the grammar section of *G1819*, which Aucher had written for him in Italian. He also wrote the "Exercises in the Armenian Language," translating them from the Armenian originals with the aid of Latin and Italian versions. Early in 1819, longstanding tensions between the two men exploded over Byron's intended preface to *G1819*. Byron stopped visiting the monastery but left his manuscripts with Aucher, who published them in *G1819*, omitting Byron's name from the title page. As the years went by, Aucher

relented, acknowledging Byron's contributions in an autobiography and in front of pupils and visitors who later recorded his words. Other monks also gave Byron due credit for writing the English part of *G1819*, and I quote the most important of these statements.

They help orient the analyses in the article's second part, where I examine both books' contents. I argue that some of Byron's corrections to *G1817* are still obvious and that they indicate that Aucher did not know enough English to have written most of the English text of *G1819*. Turning to *G1819*, I show that the grammar section was apparently translated from Italian into English by somebody familiar with the Latin grammars taught in British schools. This is indeed the text Byron had translated from Aucher's Italian. It is also obvious that *G1819* was based on manuscripts Aucher had not written and had trouble deciphering. Misreadings apart, Aucher faithfully transcribed Byron's papers even when he knew that Byron's translations were wrong or incomplete. Aucher merely organized the material Byron had left him, adding a few chapters, titles, and sentences that I point out. Except for these additions, *G1819* is Byron's book, the fruit of his labors between 1817 and 1819.

On October 19, 1816, Byron and his friend John Cam Hobhouse "bought Mai's books for ninety-seven francs" at the Ambrosian Library in Milan.[5] "Mai's books" were at the time eight volumes (six separate publications) that the renowned classicist Angelo Mai had edited. Judging by the price, the two friends acquired them all. Mai's most recent book, literally hot off the press, was *Philonis Iudaei De virtute*.[6] It came into Byron's possession, as shown by his intended preface for *G1819*, in which, two years later, he still dialogued with Mai's *dissertatio*.[7]

---

5. John Cam Hobhouse, Lord Broughton, *Recollections of a Long Life: With Additional Extracts from His Private Diaries*, ed. [Charlotte Carleton,] Lady Dorchester, 6 vols. (London: John Murray, 1909–1911), II, 51. It was probably Byron who bought and kept most of the books since Hobhouse did not record this purchase in his list of personal expenses—see his manuscript journal, Add MS 56537, fol. 138v–139r in *Radicals and Reformers in Britain Series 3: The Papers of John Cam Hobhouse, 1786-1869, from the British Library, London* (Brighton: Harvester Press Microform Publications, 1987), microfilm, reel 3.

6. *Philonis Iudaei De virtute eiusque partibus invenit et interpretatus est Angelus Maius A. C. D. Academiae R. monacensis sodalis praeponitur dissertatio cum descriptione librorum aliquot incognitorum Philonis cumque partibus nonnullis chronici inediti Eusebii Pamphili et aliorum operum notitia e codicibus Armeniacis petita* (Milan: Regiis typis, 1816); hereafter "*Philonis Iudaei De virtute*."

7. Mai had claimed that the Armenians, "*Persarum* Scytharumque armis *oppressa natio*" (a nation crushed by the armies of the Persians and of the Scythians), had lost their more refined culture

Mai's book announced an extraordinary discovery: Eusebius of Caesarea's *Chronicon*, a famous universal history whose Greek original no longer existed, had been found in an ancient Armenian translation. With the help of Father Giovanni Zohrab (Yovhannēs Zōhrapean) from the San Lazzaro monastery, Mai was now able to print the Latin translation of parts of the *Chronicon*. Mai also reported that the *Chronicon* was not the only such treasure that Armenian monks possessed. There were also the Armenian version of a history of Alexander the Great, whose Greek original was equally missing,[8] and a theological treatise in which "Esnichius Colbensis . . . persicae sectae commenta (unde etiam Manetis insania manavit) . . . refutavit" (Eznik Kołbacʻi. . . refuted . . . the false tales of the Persian sect [wherefrom Manes' madness also flowed]).[9] Since Byron was then working on *Manfred* and meditating on Manichaeism, the sentence must have sparked his interest. Mai also drew attention to Armenian poetry (p. lxxiv) and devoted two pages (pp. lxxv–lxxvi) to a key passage in the *History of the Armenians* by Moses Chorenensis (Movsēs Xorenacʻi). Mai enthusiastically described the Armenian Bible as perhaps the best ancient translation of the Scriptures (pp. lviii–lxiii) and extolled Giovanni Zohrab's 1805 edition of it (pp. lxv–lxvii). Mai hoped to persuade European scholars to study the Armenian language and manuscripts. His appeal did not remain unheeded. Less than seven weeks after buying "Mai's works," Byron started learning Armenian at the San Lazzaro monastery. English translations from Zohrab's Bible, Eznik, Moses Chorenensis (the very passage Mai had pointed out), and Armenian poetry eventually surfaced as the "Exercises in the Armenian Language" of *G1819* without Byron's name.[10]

(*Philonis Iudaei De virtute*, p. lxx, emphasis added; all translations of non-English quotations are mine). Byron's preface countered that the Armenians were "an *oppressed* and a *noble nation*" that had indeed suffered the depredations of "the satraps of *Persia*" and of "the pachas of Turkey" but had survived morally and culturally (Moore, *Letters and Journals of Lord Byron*, II, 69n; emphases mine). Byron further commented that Armenia "must ever be one of the most interesting [countries] on the globe" because "if the Scriptures are rightly understood, it was in Armenia that Paradise was placed" and "it was in Armenia that the flood first abated." Byron had borrowed these arguments from Mai himself (*Philonis Iudaei De virtute*, p. lxxv).

8. *Philonis Iudaei De virtute*, p. lxxi. Albert Mugrdich Wolohojian has translated these Venetian manuscripts as *The Romance of Alexander the Great by Pseudo-Callisthenes* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969).

9. *Philonis Iudaei De virtute*, p. lxxiv.

10. Ludovico di Breme, Byron's main contact at Milan, may also have encouraged him to study Armenian; for this hypothesis see Giancarlo Bolognesi, "Byron e l'armeno," *Aevum* 71.3 (September–December 1997), 755–68.

On November 13, 1816, three days after arriving in Venice, Byron and Hobhouse went to the Armenian monastery but could not see the library. They returned on November 29. Their guide, Father Paschal Aucher, told them of his desire to write an English-Armenian grammar, and he unveiled some of the library's treasures, particularly the manuscripts containing the history of Alexander and Eusebius' *Chronicon*. Next evening, Byron discussed the Armenian alphabet with Hobhouse:[11] he had already taken his first Armenian lesson with Aucher.

The initial period of Byron's Armenian studies was particularly intense, the "fifty days" recounted in Aucher's autobiography.[12] Byron immediately announced his desire to render both Eusebius' *Chronicon* and the life of Alexander into English.[13] He was probably also planning to translate pages from the Armenian Bible since he was (covertly) likening himself to St. Jerome: "I am studying daily, at an Armenian monastery, the Armenian language. I found that my mind wanted something craggy to break upon; and this—as the most difficult thing I could discover here for an amusement—I have chosen, to torture me into attention" (*BLJ*, V, 130; cf. *BLJ*, V, 137). St. Jerome had learned Hebrew in order to control his intractable thoughts (*Epistulae* 125.12), an endeavor that led to his translating the Bible. Since St. Jerome had also given a Latin version of Eusebius' *Chronicon*, he was an almost obligatory reference point for Byron at the time.

In December, Byron studied passages from the life of Alexander and the Psalms. In order to thank Aucher for his lessons, he paid the printing expenses (1,000 francs) for *G1817*, an English-Armenian grammar begun by Aucher during a previous sojourn in London.[14] Aucher was an exceptional linguist, but his English was still imperfect at the time. He preferred to speak Italian with Byron and needed his help with *G1817*. Byron therefore "used to correct with his teacher, the proofs of the printed sheets" (Dayan, pp. 142–43; cf. *BLJ*, V, 146).

11. See Hobhouse's journal, Add MS 56538, fol. 12v, 22v–23r, 24r (microfilm, reel 3).

12. Aucher's autobiography, written many years after Byron's death and not always reliable, is quoted extensively in the original Armenian with an English translation in Leo Dayan, "Lord Byron at S. Lazarus," *Bazmavēp*, 4 (1924), 133–47, quotation from p. 142; hereafter Dayan.

13. See the letter from Abbot Stefano Aconzio (Stepʻanos Agoncʻ) to Father Minas (Bžškean?), December 9, 1816, quoted on p. 14 in Charles Dowsett, "'The Madman Has Come Back Again!' Byron and Armenian," *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies* 4 (1988–1989), 7–52.

14. See *BLJ*, V, 142 and Aucher's preface to *G1817*, n. p.

The first pages of *G1817* were ready by January 2, 1817, when Byron sent them to his editor, John Murray (*BLJ*, V, 156). By now Byron had already suggested to Aucher that they write an Armenian grammar for English speakers. Aucher later remembered that he "made the grammar, arranging the rules in the Italian language from which Byron was translating them into English" (Dayan, p. 143). Byron confirmed on January 2, 1817: "Padre Paschal—with some little help from me as a translator of his Italian into English—is also proceeding in an M.S. grammar for the *English* acquisition of Armenian—which will be printed also when finished" (*BLJ*, V, 156, original emphasis).

January and February were hectic. *G1817* was being printed, and it was ready by March 3 (*BLJ*, V, 179). Byron had the pleasure of seeing all his names and titles in oversized capitals on the first page of its Armenian preface, where Aucher thanked the "celebrated Poet" ("gerahrˑčʻak Banastełc") for his financial contribution but not for his editorial contribution in checking the English text. Most likely, Byron would not have expected a formal acknowledgement of his proofreading. In the meantime, the collaborators continued with their second grammar. Byron still contemplated publishing an English version of the life of Alexander,[15] but he now concentrated on translating an apocryphal Pauline correspondence from Zohrab's Bible: "The Epistle of the Corinthians to St. Paul the Apostle" and the "Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians."[16]

Byron apparently asked Aucher to translate the epistles into Latin for him (see Dayan, p. 143), probably to facilitate comparing them with two previous versions: La Croze's Latin translation from Fabricius' *Codex Apocryphus*, part three,[17] and the Whiston brothers' better-

15. Letter from the Abbot Stefano Aconzio to Father Jean-Baptiste, February 7, 1817, summarized on p. 119 in Mesrop Gianascian, "Lord Byron à St. Lazare," in *Venezia nelle letterature moderne: Atti del Primo Congresso dell'Associazione Internazionale di Letteratura Comparata (Venezia, 25-30 settembre 1955)*, ed. Carlo Pellegrini (Venice: Istituto per la Collaborazione Culturale, [1961]), pp. 115–26. Byron's translations from the Alexander romance have not come to light, but his interest in this manuscript left a trace in *Don Juan*, XV.65: "Wines too which might again have slain young Ammon" (*The Complete Poetical Works*, ed. Jerome J. McGann, 7 vols. [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980–1993], V, 608). The Armenian text particularly stresses Alexander's belief that he was the son of Ammon; it also attributes his death to poisoned wine.

16. *G1819*, pp. 176-95, hereafter "Corinthians to Paul" and "Paul to Corinthians," respectively.

17. See pp. 681–83 of Maturin Veyssière La Croze's "Remarques sur les deux Lettres Armeniennes qui se trouvent dans le Tome X. de l'Histoire Critique de la Republique des Lettres, pag. 148," in *Codicis Apocryphi Novi Testamenti, Pars tertia, Nunc primum edita, curante Jo. Alberto Fabricio* [ed. Johannes Albertus Fabricius] . . . (Hamburg: Sumptu Viduæ Benjamin Schilleri & Joh. Christoph. Kisneri, 1719), pp. 680–85; this volume of *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti* hereafter cited as "*Codex Apocryphus*, part three."

known Armenian, Latin, and Greek edition.[18] Byron enriched his own translation of the epistles with numerous footnotes, which mostly compared Zohrab's authoritative edition of the Bible with the texts used by La Croze and the Whistons. Zohrab's Bible recorded many textual variants, but Byron was not interested in all of them. His footnotes focused instead on the variants furnished by the Whistons' edition or suggested by La Croze's translation. Byron was thus attempting to join and rekindle an older European polemic around the exact text and the authenticity of the epistles.

Byron briefly interrupted his Armenian studies in early March 1817 due to illness (*BLJ*, V, 179), probably resuming them by March 31, when he reported to Thomas Moore that he had translated the apocryphal epistles (*BLJ*, V, 201). In early April, Byron arranged for these translations to be copied, and he probably sent them to Murray soon after (cf. *BLJ*, VII, 60). For the rest of Byron's life, Murray avoided discussing the controversial epistles, whose publication would have made him liable to accusations of blasphemy. He eventually gave the manuscripts to Moore, who transcribed them in an appendix to his *Letters and Journals of Lord Byron* (1830). Unknown to Moore or Murray, an earlier, rougher version of the two epistles had already been published without Byron's name as the first two "Exercises in the Armenian Language" of *G1819*. However, no reasonable doubt can exist concerning Byron's authorship of these texts, which Andrew Nicholson included in his edition of *The Complete Miscellaneous Prose*.[19]

Three short pieces that immediately follow the epistles in *G1819* as further "Exercises in the Armenian Language" have proven more difficult to attribute. They are excerpts of texts ascribed to St. Gregory the Illuminator (Grigor Lusaworič'), Theodore Chrthenavor (T'ēodoros K'rt'enawor), and St. Nierses Lampronensis (Nersēs Lambronac'i).[20] They all refer to "Paul to Corinthians," verses 16–17, and quote verbatim Byron's own version of the passage. These facts strongly suggest

18. "Epistolæ duæ Armeniacæ" in *Mosis Chorenensis Historiæ Armeniacæ Libri III . . .* , ed. and trans. William Whiston and George Whiston (London: Ex Officina Caroli Ackers Typographis Apud Joannem Whistonum Bibliopolam, 1736), pp. 371–84.

19. *Lord Byron: The Complete Miscellaneous Prose*, ed. Andrew Nicholson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), pp. 70–76.

20. Peter Cochran reprinted them on pp. 53–54 of his "Byron and the Birth of Ahrimanes," *The Keats-Shelley Review* 6.1 (1991), 49–59. Emily Paterson-Morgan attributed them to Byron in "Byron's Armenian Epistles and the 'doctrine of the serpent,'" *The Byron Journal* 40.2 (2012), 143–54.

that he translated them at about the same time as "Paul to Corinthians," in January–February 1817. In fact, there is reason to believe that Byron also sent them to Murray together with the Pauline correspondence.

Byron deemed the epistles "very orthodox," as he wrote to Moore on March 31, 1817 (Moore, *Letters and Journals of Lord Byron*, II, 94). He also "expressed his firm belief in the genuineness of Armenian traditions, *and told the monks so*."[21] Like Aucher himself, Byron probably preferred to think the epistles both authentic and orthodox, and the best grounds for such belief were precisely the three excerpts that follow "Paul to Corinthians" in *G1819*. A book published in 1823 by the Evangelical pastor Wilhelm Friedrich Rinck (1793–1854) indicates that Aucher normally used these passages to defend the epistles' genuineness and orthodoxy.[22]

In fact, the authenticity of the Pauline correspondence had been called into question by two letters published in Fabricius' *Codex Apocryphus*, part three, in the very section Byron studied while preparing his footnotes to the epistles. A scholar from Utrecht had first charged that the apocryphal correspondence promoted heresies; therefore, it could not have originated with an apostle of the faith.[23] Later on, La Croze argued that the epistles were not heretical but were nonetheless a fraud. According to La Croze, they had been forged at the end of the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century by orthodox Armenian ecclesiastics.[24] Aucher agreed that the epistles were orthodox but refuted the rest of La Croze's theory. Three crucial passages from texts in the library of the Armenian monastery in Venice proved that the epistles were in fact much anterior to the date of their supposed forgery. According to Aucher, the epistles had been passed on as genuine since the third century, when St. Gregory the Illuminator had quoted "Paul to Corinthians," verses 16–17 in his sermons, attributing these verses to the apostle. Later on, in the seventh and eleventh centuries respectively, theologian Theodore Chrthenavor and St. Nierses Lam-

21. George Eric Mackay, *Lord Byron at the Armenian Convent* (Venice: Office of the "Polyglotta," 1876), p. 102; emphasis original.

22. See Wilh. Fr. Rinck, *Das Sendschreiben der Korinther an den Apostel Paulus und das dritte Sendschreiben Pauli an die Korinther . . .* (Heidelberg: C. F. Winter, 1823), pp. 13–17.

23. "Viror. doctor. de his epistolis censuræ. Relando suo, N. N. S. P. D." in *Codex Apocryphus*, part III, pp. 670–80.

24. La Croze, "Remarques sur les deux Lettres Armeniennes," pp. 683–85.

pronensis confirmed that the Pauline correspondence was authentic and unquestionably orthodox. The three relevant passages were appended to the epistles in *G1819* (pp. 195–99) as proof of their genuineness and were most probably also included in the package Byron sent to Murray in 1817.

Evidence that Byron sent Murray these three excerpts together with the epistles can be gleaned from Moore's footnote to Byron's letter of March 31, 1817. There Moore anxiously refuted the epistles' authenticity, mentioning that they had been "frequently referred to as existing in the Armenian, by Primate Usher, Johan. Gregorius, and other learned men" (Moore, *Letters and Journals of Lord Byron*, II, 94). Moore had discovered this information in another volume of Fabricius's *Codex Apocryphus*, where it was written in Latin.[25] When Moore translated it into English, he made a revealing error. He apparently thought that "Johan. Gregorius" (a humble seventeenth-century Englishman, John Gregory, chaplain of Christ's Church, Oxford) was a foreign historical personage whose name was not to be anglicized. Most likely, Moore confused John Gregory with St. Gregory, who had also "referred to," i.e., quoted, the epistles. However, information about St. Gregory the Illuminator and his connection with the epistles was not available in Western Europe, so Moore could have learned it only from Byron himself.

In the same footnote, Moore wrote that the manuscripts he had received from Murray contained the following note in Byron's hand: "Done into English by me, January, February, 1817, at the Convent of San Lazaro, with the aid and exposition of the Armenian text by the Father Paschal Aucher, Armenian friar.—BYRON. I had also . . . the Latin text, but it is in many places very corrupt, and with great omissions." Byron's casual mention of "*the* Latin text" implies that he had previously specified which one (emphasis mine). He most probably referred to La Croze's partial and problematic Latin translation from Fabricius' *Codex Apocryphus*, part three. These facts suggest that Moore had in front of him papers in which Byron somehow made the con-

25. *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti, Collectus, Castigatus Testimoniisque, Censuris & Animadversionibus illustratus à Johanne Alberto Fabricio . . . Editio secunda, emendatior & tertio etiam tomo, separatim venali, aucta* (Hamburg: Sumptu Viduæ Benjam. Schilleri & Joh. Christoph. Kisneri, 1719), part II, pp. 920–21.

nections between the authenticity of the Armenian epistles, La Croze, Fabricius' *Codex Apocryphus*, and "Gregorius." Therefore, these papers must have included the extract from St. Gregory's sermons and most probably the other two excerpts as well. However, if Moore and Murray had these three texts, they certainly did not dare to publish them. The extracts meant to prove that the apocryphal Pauline correspondence was genuine, thereby raising doubts about the biblical canon and inviting a prosecution for blasphemy. Consequently, Moore wrote his footnote to deny the authenticity of the epistles, and then somehow managed to lose all the controversial papers Byron had sent to Murray in spring 1817.

After dispatching the Pauline correspondence to Murray, Byron spent several months away from Venice, visiting the monastery only sporadically until a mid-November return "to study Armenian as a relief [from mental anguish]" (*BLJ*, V, 274). Sometime in 1817 or 1818, Byron, assisted by Aucher, translated "some extracts of our ancient Fathers' works, and desired to put these translations into his grammar as practice for Englishmen" (Aucher's autobiography, Dayan, p. 143). "These translations," together with the apocryphal epistles, became the "Exercises in the Armenian Language" of *G1819*. Aucher's testimony should perhaps be enough to justify including all these pieces in the Byron canon. Anyway, we can be certain that Byron translated a fragment from Moses Chorenensis's *History of the Armenians* and another from St. Nierses Lampronensis's *Synodal Oration*, which were printed among the "Exercises in the Armenian Language" both in *G1819* and in its 1832 edition, where Aucher unambiguously attributed them to Byron.[26] Accordingly, they were reprinted by Nicholson in Byron's *Complete Miscellaneous Prose* (pp. 67–69).

"The Exercises in the Armenian Language" of *G1819* also include part of a manuscript Byron sought in visiting San Lazzaro: the treatise against heresies by Eznik Kołbacʻi (named "Esnacius" in *G1819*, p. 199). This excerpt was reprinted in 1991 by Cochran, who "doubt[ed] whether incontrovertible evidence of Byron's authorship" would "ever appear."[27] The travel notes of two French poets, Auguste Brizeux (1806–1858) and Auguste Barbier (1805–1882),

26. Paschal Aucher, *A Grammar Armenian and English* (Venice: Printed at the Armenian press of St. Lazarus, 1832), pp. 161, 167.

27. Cochran, "Byron and the Birth of Ahrimanes," p. 57.

should perhaps be regarded as such evidence. In the early summer of 1832, Brizeux visited San Lazzaro, where a young unnamed monk showed him *G1819*, opening it and indicating at one passage, "voici un morceau qu'il traduisit avec un de nos pères"[28] (here is a piece that he [Byron] translated with one of our fathers). A subsequent visit by Barbier, Brizeux's travelling companion, confirmed Brizeux's information; Barbier also managed to take notes. Brizeux's summary of Barbier's notes reveals that *morceau* was none other than the Eznik fragment. A year later (1833), Antoine Frédéric Ozanam (1813–1853), the Catholic historian and writer, apparently deemed it a matter of public knowledge that this was "un fragment arménien traduit par lord Byron au couvent de Saint-Lazare à Venise" (an Armenian fragment translated by Lord Byron at the monastery of San Lazzaro in Venise).[29] There is also evidence that the manuscript from which the Eznik fragment was printed in *G1819* was not written by Aucher since he could not decipher it properly (see below). Since only Byron and Aucher collaborated on *G1819*, the manuscript must have been Byron's.

Cultivating Byron's interest in Armenian poetry, Aucher made for him Italian translations of "many extracts ancient and modern" (Dayan, p. 143). One such extract, accompanied by an English quatrain, ostensibly its translation, was eventually published, unattributed, in "Exercises in the Armenian Language." The English poem, which has so far escaped the attention of Byron scholars, is printed here for the first time since 1819:

> Cease, Minstrel blind, thy mournful lay,
> In silence from my door depart;
> Thy plaintive notes have stol'n away,
> With tears my sight, with grief my heart.   (*G1819*, p. 212)

The Armenian original is a quatrain composed of seven-syllable lines that do not actually rhyme. However, end-of-line assonance and consonance could have suggested an *aabb* rhyme scheme to the translator. The Armenian poem translates thus:

28. A. Brizeux, "Fragmens d'un livre de voyage.—Venise," *Revue des Deux Mondes* 2, 2nd series (1833), 54–62, p. 56.

29. A. F. Ozanam, "Des doctrines religieuses de l'Inde, à l'époque des lois de Manou. (Suite.)," *Revue Européenne* 7.29 (1833), 513–49; see p. 516n2.

> You blind lyre-player,
> Do not strike [the chords] with force:
> For with the lamentations of your voice,
> My heart has been destroyed together with the light [of my eyes].

The English poem loosely adapts the original without attempting to reproduce its prosody. Instead, it strongly recalls the prosody and subject of Byron's "My Soul Is Dark" (1814), which apostrophizes a harp-playing "minstrel" whose "notes" should relieve the sorrowing "heart."[30] Since Aucher, in 1819, spoke English reluctantly and knew too little of Byron's poetry to imitate it, the English quatrain can be attributed only to Byron. It looks like an impromptu composition, triggered perhaps by the recognition of an affinity, the similarity between the Armenian original and "My Soul Is Dark." As Byron's only surviving verse translation of Armenian poetry, it needs to be included in the Byron canon.

In June 1818, Aucher got a new pupil, John Brand (see Dayan, p. 145), and used Byron's manuscript grammar to teach him,[31] a fact that suggests it was ready for publication. Unfortunately, Byron was unable to pay the printing expenses at this time. Moreover, the fathers' efforts were focused on printing a monumental edition of Eusebius' *Chronicon*, which they desperately tried to put out before a rival one Mai and Zohrab were preparing at Milan. Byron sought British subscribers for the monks' *Chronicon* (*BLJ*, VI, 9, 38) and renounced the project of his own translation.[32] Together with three other books, the *Chronicon* engaged all the resources of the small San Lazzaro press, and the Armenian grammar could not yet be printed.

In the meantime, Byron and Aucher's already difficult relationship was further deteriorating. Aucher found Brand a better student than Byron (see Dayan, p. 145). Byron, who shunned his countrymen like an

---

30. Byron, *Complete Poetical Works*, III, 295–96.

31. Brand found the grammar insufficient and suggested to Aucher that they write English-Armenian dictionaries. See p. 8 of Aucher's English "Preface" to Paschal Aucher and John Brand, *A Dictionary English and Armenian, Vol. I* (Venice: Printed at the Press of the Armenian Academy of S. Lazarus, 1821), pp. 7–9.

32. Byron acquired a copy of the San Lazzaro *Chronicon*. In 1821 he took the names of all the secondary characters in *Sardanapalus* from the *Chronicon*'s lists of Assyrian kings: Zames, Balaeas, Sphaerus, Altadas, Pannias and Ophratanes. See *Eusebii Pamphili Caesariensis episcopi chronicon bipartitum . . .* , ed. and trans. Jo: Baptista Aucher (Mkrtič' Awgerean), 2 vols. (Venice: Typis coenobii PP. Armenorum in insula S. Lazari, 1818), I, 98–100, II, 15–16.

"infection"(*BLJ*, VI, 65), probably came less often so as to avoid Brand, but Aucher felt slighted. He later called Byron a "tête brûlante," a hothead, "der holdt mere af at gjøre Spadserefarter ovre paa Lido, hvor han holdt fire Heste for sin Fornøielse, end at sidde her med en gammel Mand som mig og læse Nygræsk" (who would rather take rides on the Lido, where he kept four horses for his pleasure, than sit here with an old man like me and read modern Greek).[33] Byron, a difficult student, complained about his lessons[34] and made heavy emotional demands upon his teacher, venting his feelings in front of Aucher, who later remembered "how ungovernable was his [Byron's] temper, how unhappy he seemed to be."[35] Aucher once found Byron "bitterlich schluchzend und weinend" (bitterly sobbing and weeping) in front of a crucifix; Byron told him "unter Thränen und tief innerlich bewegt" (in tears and deeply moved) that he hoped he would one day return to Christ and become a Catholic.[36] The violence of Byron's emotions made Aucher uncomfortable. Later on, he confessed that "doch habe er sich auch bisweilen ein Wenig vor ihm gefürchtet, weil er doch oft etwas gar zu Wildes in seinem Wesen gehabt habe"[37] (nevertheless, he had also now and then been a little afraid of him [Byron], because he often had something really too wild in his character).

All these tensions exploded early in 1819. Byron was again spending a lot of time on the island, and he had even been assigned an attendant, the lay brother Nicholas. Fifty years later, brother Nicholas vividly remembered that the poet looked "very yellow. Oh yes! dreadfully yellow!" at the time.[38] This important detail tells us that Byron last vis-

33. Hans Peter Holst, "Reisekammeraten. Novelle" in *Ude og hjemme. Reise-Erindringer* (Copenhagen: C. A. Reitzels Forlag, 1843), pp. 69–126; quotation from pp. 76–77. Holst, the Danish Romantic (1811–1893), met Aucher sometime between 1840 and 1842. Aucher used to tell visitors that he had also taught Byron modern Greek. It is indeed very likely that Byron availed himself of Aucher's knowledge of the language.

34. Isaac Appleton Jewett, *Passages in Foreign Travel*, 2 vols. (Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown, 1838), II, 307.

35. Jewett, *Passages in Foreign Travel*, II, 301–2.

36. Aucher recounted this story in 1841 to József Lonovics, the Hungarian Bishop of Csanád, who shared it with Sebastian Brunner, the editor of the *Wiener Kirchenzeitung*. See Brunner's unsigned article "Lord Byron," *Wiener Kirchenzeitung* (April 1, 1856), 209.

37. Wilhelm Adolph Lampadius, "Schilderung eines Besuchs auf St. Lazaro bei den Mechitaristen. Nebst einer Darstellung des Lebens *Mechitars* und der wesentlichsten Einrichtungen und Erfolge seiner Stiftung, nach dem Englischen des *Alexander Goode*," *Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie* 5.1 (n. s.), (1841), 143–68, p. 146. Lampadius was a catechist at St. Peter's in Leipzig.

38. Mackay, *Lord Byron at the Armenian Convent*, p. 77; cf. also p. 78.

ited San Lazzaro in February–March 1819, when he had icteric hepatitis.[39] Byron's renewed assiduity in spite of serious illness had to do with the grammar he had translated for Aucher. All circumstances were now favorable for its publication. Byron's finances had recovered, Eusebius' *Chronicon* was out of the way and so, probably, was John Brand, who must have already returned to Cambridge to get his MA.[40]

Byron now wrote a preface to which Aucher strenuously objected because, as he later told Murray's son, "it contained some very strong passages against the Sultan, the Sovereign of his native country [Aucher was from Ankara], who might easily have retorted on his friends and kindred for such an insult."[41] Aucher had earlier told the same story to his pupil, the famous scholar Carl Friedrich Neumann (1793–1870).[42] Aucher, however, remained silent about the violent quarrel occasioned by Byron's preface, a quarrel whose echoes had not yet died in 1868, when brother Nicholas recounted it to George Eric Mackay.[43] Byron, reportedly infuriated by Aucher's refusal to allow him to criticize Ottoman rule in the Armenian territories, threatened and offended Aucher. What exactly happened is uncertain, except for the fact that Byron deeply wounded Aucher. The next day Byron apologized for his conduct and was forgiven, and the two men remained on civil terms, although resentments ran deep. According to Aucher, Byron also undertook to compose a second preface (see Dayan, p. 143).

39. Since all the major Byron biographies miss this illness, an explanation is in order. In January 1819, Byron experienced flu-like symptoms, fatigue and severe vomiting for weeks (*BLJ*, VI, 99, 100, 106). He was aware he had a liver disease, and he was warned it was a result of sexual activity (*BLJ*, VI, 99, 100). This strongly suggests a sexually transmissible viral hepatitis, most likely hepatitis B. Byron's worst symptoms subsided towards the end of January (*BLJ*, VI, 99), and by then the jaundice phase would have already begun, lasting 1–2 months. His later comment that by means of this disease his "'way of life'" was "conducting me from the 'yellow leaf' to the Ground" obliquely refers to the jaundice (*BLJ*, VI, 106). By early April 1819, when he met Countess Guiccioli, he was no longer jaundiced and must have cleared the disease. For a brief overview of acute viral hepatitis see, for instance, Raymond S. Koff, *Hepatitis Essentials* (Sudbury, MA: Jones & Bartlett Learning, 2012), pp. 31–33.

40. For John Brand see John Venn and J. A. Venn, eds., *Alumni Cantabrigienses: A Biographical List of All Known Students, Graduates and Holders of Office at the University of Cambridge, from the Earliest Times to 1900*, vol. 2, *From 1752 to 1900*, pt. 1, *Abbey-Challis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), p. 362 (third entry for "Brand, John").

41. John Murray IV, *John Murray III, 1808–1892: A Brief Memoir* (London: John Murray, 1919), p. 53.

42. Carl Friedrich Neumann, *Versuch einer Geschichte der armenischen Literatur, nach den Werken der Mechitaristen frei bearbeitet* (Leipzig: Verlag von Johann Ambrosius Barth, 1836), p. 285.

43. Mackay, *Lord Byron at the Armenian Convent*, pp. 79–80.

Indeed, a "fragment" of a preface was found among Byron's papers after his death by Thomas Moore, who published it in his *Letters and Journals of Lord Byron* (II, 69).[44] The "fragment" replaces the sultan with the "pachas of Turkey," breaking off immediately afterwards. This suggests that Moore found the draft for the second preface. Byron did not finish it and did not return to the monastery, a fact that Aucher attributed to dejection (see Dayan, p. 136). Byron left Aucher the manuscript grammar but failed to give him the money for its publication. He never saw Aucher again, and his last mention of his former teacher expressed bitter disappointment (*BLJ*, X, 128). It is not clear whether Byron ever found out that his second grammar was printed soon after he had ceased visiting San Lazzaro. In October 1821 he was still asking Murray to publish his Armenian epistles (*BLJ*, VIII, 237), apparently ignoring that they were already available in print.

After the quarrel, Aucher was equally hurt and bitter. In late June 1819, he acquired a new pupil, who mastered Armenian in a month (see Dayan, p. 145)—the young Edward Lombe, Esq. of Great Melton, Norfolk (c.1800–1852). Lombe paid for his lessons by defraying the printing expenses for Byron and Aucher's manuscript grammar, apparently ignoring Byron's role. Lombe, a country gentleman who subsequently had a short political career and became no scholar, did not contribute to the grammar. As Aucher clearly stated, Lombe had merely footed the printing bill,[45] a gesture he was to repeat in 1851, when he gave Harriett Martineau the money to publish her translation of Comte's *Positive Philosophy*.[46]

Aucher omitted Byron's name from the title page of *G1819*, writing a preface that suggested he himself was the book's sole author. He probably felt fully justified in claiming sole authorship for the grammar section, since he had devised the rules and examples, while Byron had merely translated. And Aucher had also helped Byron understand at least some of the Armenian texts whose English versions were included

44. Moore's "fragment" was reprinted by the Armenian monks in *Beauties of English Poets* (Venice: In the Island of S. Lazzaro, 1852), where it was dated "*2 January* 1817" (p. iv, emphasis original). This date was a mistaken conjecture based upon the simple fact that in Moore's book the preface was transcribed in a footnote appended to Byron's letter of January 2, 1817.

45. Aucher and Brand, *Dictionary English and Armenian*, pp. 7–8, 11.

46. See Mary Pickering, *Auguste Comte: An Intellectual Biography*, 3 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993–2009), III, 143.

as "Exercises in the Armenian Language." Moreover, an established practice at the San Lazzaro press was that all of a book's collabora- tors be subsumed under the name of the main author. Aucher's own contribution to his elder brother's edition of the *Chronicon* had been so subsumed. Aucher could therefore claim sole authorship of the book, despite his initial agreement with Byron. Byron's draft for the second preface had made clear his expectation to be named as an author: "The English reader will probably be surprised to find my name associated with a work of the present description, and inclined to give me more credit for my attainments as a linguist than they deserve."[47]

For the next couple of years a resentful Aucher hid Byron's author- ship and disparaged his efforts to learn Armenian. In 1819, the very year the book was printed, Aucher told writer Charles Mac Farlane that Byron "had been there with the intention of learning Armenian, but he gave it up either in despair or disgust."[48] In 1830 Mac Farlane— no particular admirer of Byron's—felt he had to add: "We must have been misinformed as to the extent of Lord Byron's acquirements in the Armenian language, or he must have improved after this period, (1819;) for among his papers is found a translation, made by himself, from an unpublished epistle of Saint Paul, which he found in Arme- nian, at Venice."[49]

Thomas Moore's October 1819 visit to San Lazzaro yielded no information about *G1819*;[50] later on, his *Letters and Journals of Lord Byron* only mentioned *G1817*. On Lady Morgan's 1820 visit, Aucher kept silent about Byron.[51] Visiting London in April 1821, Aucher did not disabuse John Murray of his conviction that *G1817* was the only Armenian book in which Byron had ever had a hand.

In 1821 Aucher finished the *Dictionary English and Armenian* begun with Brand in 1818. By now Aucher had reconsidered his relationship with Byron (possibly as a result of the visit to Britain) and was ready to acknowledge Byron's contribution to *G1819*. Aucher's English

47. Moore, *Letters and Journals of Lord Byron*, II, 69n.
48. Charles Mac Farlane, *The Armenians: A Tale of Constantinople*, 3 vols. (London: Saunders and Otley, 1830), I, 305 (endnotes).
49. Mac Farlane, *The Armenians*, I, 305 (endnotes).
50. Wilfred S. Dowden, Barbara Bartholomew and Joy L. Linsley, eds., *The Journal of Thomas Moore*, 6 vols. (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1983-1991), I, 227.
51. [Sydney Owenson,] Lady Morgan, *Italy*, 2 vols. (London: Henry Colburn, 1821), II, 463–66.

preface praised Byron as "the most distinguished of the English poets even in the present splendid age of English poetry" and explained that he had "assisted us in the composition of an English grammar of the Armenian tongue for the use of his own countrymen" (p. 7). In 1825, two of Aucher's pupils, Brand and Alexander Goode, repeated this new official version of Byron and Aucher's collaboration: Aucher had "composed" the book, and Byron had "assisted" him. John Brand wrote that Aucher, "having taught Armenian to Lord Byron, had by his assistance afterwards published a Grammar of that tongue for the use of the English."[52] Goode translated into English Aucher's *Compendiose notizie sulla congregazione de' monaci armeni mechitaristi di Venezia nell'isola di S. Lazzaro*, and mentioned "the late Lord Byron; by whose assistance a Grammar of the Armenian and English languages was composed by the Rev. Doctor Aucher."[53]

Aucher's second, significantly revised edition of *G1819* (1832) contained a new preface that underreported Byron's contribution but at least mentioned his name. The "Advertisement" stated that the book included "some translations of Lord Byron from the Armenian into English" (p. 5). The texts attributed to Byron were the two epistles and the passages from Moses Chorenensis and from Nierses Lampronensis' *Synodal Oration*.

As the years went by, Aucher and others attested more fully to Byron's contribution to *G1819*, increasingly naming Byron as the main or only author of the book, grammar section and "Exercises" included. In September 1827, a San Lazzaro source told K. H. Hermes, the editor of *Das Ausland* (Munich), that the entire *G1819* was "eine Frucht seiner Unterrichtsstunden"[54] (the fruit of his [Byron's] lessons). In September 1839, Lampadius learned from Aucher that Byron had come to him "um mit dessen Beihülfe das Armenische zu studiren und sowohl eine Armenisch-Englische Grammatik zu schreiben, als mehrere Armenische Werke ins Englische zu übersetzen"[55] (in order to study Armenian with

52. See Brand's preface to John Brand and Paschal Aucher, *A Dictionary Armenian and English*, Vol. II (Venice: Printed at the Press of the Armenian Academy of S. Lazarus, 1825), p. 10.

53. [Paschal Aucher], *A Brief Account of the Mechitaristican Society Founded on the Island of S'. Lazaro* [trans. Alexander Goode] (Venice: Printed at the Press of the Same Armenian Academy, 1825), p. 58. Auener's original was published un Venice in 1819 by Tipografia di suddetta isola.

54. K[arl] H[einrich] H[ermes], "Das Kloster der Armenier in Venedig (Schluss.)," *Das Ausland* (January 24, 1828), 98.

55. Lampadius, "Schilderung eines Besuchs," pp. 143–44.

his [Aucher's] help, and to write an Armenian-English grammar as well as to translate several Armenian works into English). Byron was the main author according to French Armenologist Le Vaillant de Florival, himself the pupil of another San Lazzaro father: "L'illustre poète, Lord Byron, étudia la langue arménienne, et composa, avec le secours de son maître, une grammaire arménienne-anglaise"[56] (the illustrious poet Lord Byron studied Armenian and composed an Armenian-English grammar with his teacher's help). By 1860 knowledge about Byron's significant contribution to *G1819* had become so widespread among Armenologists that the writer and activist Mik'ayel Nalbandyan (1829–1866) bluntly declared Byron "hay-angleren k'erakanut'yan heḷinakə"[57] (author of the Armenian-English grammar). In 1873, nineteen years after Aucher's death, a third edition of *A Grammar Armenian and English* was printed at the San Lazzaro press and attributed to "P. Paschal Aucher and Lord Byron." Even though this edition, a partial reprint of the 1832 revised version, did not exactly reproduce Byron's 1819 grammar, it finally made moral reparation to him.

All these testimonies establish that *G1819* was indeed based upon the grammar and the exercises Byron had translated for Aucher. But how faithfully did Aucher transcribe the manuscripts Byron had left him? Fortunately for us, Aucher was a careful editor who made only a few additions that we can easily detect once we understand how he wrote English. An analysis of *G1817*, the grammar he had written and Byron had proofread, reveals Aucher's imperfect knowledge of English together with some of Byron's corrections.

The English text of *G1817* consists of examples, wordlists, dialogues and reading exercises, whose sources I have identified as five grammars and textbooks, complemented by several literary and religious works. Aucher, aware of his insufficient mastery of English, carefully copied, without emendation, material from his English sources. As a result, he sometimes reproduced their errors or misprints. It became Byron's task to make the requisite corrections. A

56. [Paul-Émile] Le Vaillant de Florival, *Mékhitaristes de Saint-Lazare, histoire d'Arménie, littérature arménienne* (Venice: Typographie arménienne de Saint-Lazare, 1841), p. 118.

57. Mik'ayel Nalbandyan, "Hayoc' lezvi usumnasirut'yunə Evropayum ev hay grakanut'yan gitakan nšanakut'yunə" in *Erkeri liakatar žoḷovacu*, ed. Nšan Muradyan, 2 vols. (Yerevan: Haykakan SSṘ Gitut'yunneri Akademiayi Hratarakč'ut'yun, 1947), II, 338–345; quotation from p. 339. I thank Ms. Madeleine Karacaşian for her most kind help with modern Armenian.

word-by-word comparison between the English text of *G1817* and its sources reveals some of Byron's modifications.

G1817 included lists of irregular verbs from a reissue of the final version of Robert Lowth's *Short Introduction to English Grammar*.[58] Lowth sometimes recommended obsolete or simply confusing verb forms. Byron changed Lowth's "slayn" to "slain" (*G1817*, p. 34 and errata[59]), "crope" to "crept" (p. 35 and errata) and "digged" (past participle) to "dug" (p. 36). From Lowth's "Straw, -ew, or -ow, [strawed, &c.] strown," Byron chose "strew -ow (strewed *ew*[*ayl*]*n*[60]) strown" (*G1817*, p. 37). He replaced Lowth's poetical archaism "weet" with the Middle-English form "wet" (*G1817*, p. 39). Lowth had put "Weet, wit, or wot" on a list of defective verbs but, like Pope or Shelley, Byron probably considered "to weet" a regular verb. On page 36 of *G1817*, Byron detected a different type of error. Aucher had rendered Lowth's "Lie, lay, lien, or lain" into Armenian by using the verb *stem*, "I tell a lie, I deceive." The simplest solution, which Byron implemented, was to replace Lowth's verb with "lie, lied, lied" in order to fit the Armenian translation; as a result, Aucher's list of irregular verbs included this one regular verb.

Aucher also used two Italian textbooks, Edward Barker's *A New and Easy Grammar of the English Tongue for the Italians Enriched with Many Phrases and Dialogues*,[61] and Veneroni's *Complete Italian Master*.[62] These books contained English dialogues and wordlists together with their Italian translations. Aucher borrowed the English text for *G1817*, attaching to it phonetic transcriptions and an Armenian translation

58. See Robert Lowth, *A Short Introduction to English Grammar: with Critical Notes. A New Edition, Corrected* (London: J. Dodsley and T. Cadell, 1783). See pp. 93, 94, 97, 100, and 106 for the verbs here discussed.

59. Note that there are at least two different book states for *G1817*. In one, fourteen mistakes listed on the errata page are, confusingly, already corrected in text. The copy belonging to the Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen (Germany) is of this type. The other, presumably earlier, book state has the same errata page but none of the listed mistakes is corrected in text (see a digital version at <http://books.google.com/books?id=RG9KAAAAcAAJ>, accessed December 12, 2014). Page numbers are the same for the two book states.

60. *Ew ayln* is "etc.," here meaning that "strowed" was also an acceptable verb form according to Byron.

61. Aucher used either the first edition (Sienna: Nella Stamperia di Luigi, e Benedetto Bindi, 1766) or the second one (Florence: Nella Stamperia di Gio. Batista Stecchi, e Anton-Giuseppe Pagani, 1771). The relevant parts of the two editions are practically identical.

62. Giovanni Veneroni, *The Complete Italian Master; Containing the Best and Easiest Rules for Attaining That Language* (London: F. Wingrave, 1808); hereafter Veneroni.

based on the Italian one. However, the original Italian translation was not always adequate, or the English was rather awkward. In some of these cases Byron improved the English of Barker or Veneroni for *G1817*. For example, Barker had translated "*Adagio*" as "Softly,"[63] which Byron changed to "Slowly" (*G1817*, p. 45). Unfortunately, this change did not mend matters because Aucher retained his Armenian translation of *adagio*, which was more appropriate to Barker's original "softly": *hangsteamb*, "in a relaxed, easy manner; comfortably," literally *ad agio*, and *handartut'eamb*, "with calm, moderation; peacefully."

Byron changed Veneroni's "Button me" (Veneroni, p. 334) to "Button it [the coat]" (*G1817*, p. 110); "I know nothing almost" (Veneroni, p. 336) to "I know scarcely anything" (*G1817*, p. 114); "I will bring you acquainted with him" (Veneroni, p. 342) to "I will make you acquainted with him" (*G1817*, p. 121); "Without exacting 'tis worth . . ." (Veneroni, p. 345) to "Without exacting too much 'tis worth . . ." (*G1817*, p. 125); "Tell, is it to me that you are speaking?" (Veneroni, p. 363) to "Say, is it to me that you are speaking?"[64] (*G1817*, p. 138). Byron retranslated Veneroni's "*Duoi farfánti che l'hánno assalíto*" (incorrectly rendered "Two rogues who set upon him," Veneroni, p. 341), writing "Two rogues who attacked him" (*G1817*, p. 119). This correction is particularly obvious because there is too much space around "attacked" (which replaced "set upon") and around the first part of the phonetic transcription of "attacked"; on the other hand, Byron probably did not see Aucher's phonetic transcription, which is slightly inaccurate. Byron rephrased an order to a servant: "You shall conduct them to the river" (for "*Li condurréte al fiúme*," Veneroni, p. 349) became "You must conduct them to the river" (*G1817*, p. 130). Byron also addressed spelling problems in Veneroni's textbook, changing "cloaths" (Veneroni, pp. 333 and 355) to "clothes" and "cloathes" (*G1817*, pp. 109 and 136, respectively). Byron managed to get "Farewel" corrected on page 126 of *G1817*, but either he or the compositors missed it on pages 106 and 133 (Aucher had copied the misprints in Veneroni, pp. 331 and 351 respectively). On page 113 of *G1817*, Byron endeavored to emend all the instances of Veneroni's "have eat" (Veneroni, pp. 335–36) to "have eaten," but the first "have eat" on the third line somehow eluded rectification. On page

---

63. See p. 144 of the 1766 edition or p. 152 of the 1771 edition.
64. Word spacing on this line also indicates an alteration at the proofreading stage.

112 of *G1817* Aucher had replaced Veneroni's "Here are the sausages" (Veneroni, p. 335) with "Here are the chicken," apparently thinking that "chicken" was both the plural and the singular form (the Armenian translation read "jagkʻ hawu," "chickens"). Byron probably told him he should have written "chickens," which was inserted into the errata. Aucher corrected "chicken" to "chickens" on the previous page as well (see *G1817*, errata); he also modified the phonetic transcription in both instances (see errata). On page 113 "chicken" had been changed to "chickens" before the final printing.

The errata page suggests that Byron also checked Aucher's phonetic transcriptions, requiring changes to "Flood" (*G1817*, p. 72), "Hare" (p. 76), "Almond" (p. 77), "Thread" (p. 80), and "Linen" (p. 80). "Almond" is a particularly interesting case. Aucher had thought the pronunciation was [ˈolmənd], which he then replaced with [ˈalmənd]. Byron probably pronounced the word with [l]. After Aucher acquired an edition of John Walker's authoritative *Critical Pronouncing Dictionary* (1791), he transcribed [ˈamənd] in his 1821 English-Armenian dictionary.

Out of consideration for Aucher, Byron accepted many obsolete spellings, disregarding the fanciful syllabication and the phonetic transcriptions that consistently rendered English plural -*s* by [s], irrespective of actual pronunciation. Byron apparently hesitated to tell Aucher about two more serious mistakes that were corrected quite late in the process by means of the errata. Aucher had bestowed the title "The Consuls of self-Interest" (*G1817*, p. 167) on a reading exercise from Daniel Fenning's widely-reprinted *Universal Spelling-Book*. As the errata indicates, Aucher had meant "Counsels," and Byron provided the right word here. Another reading exercise was furnished by a real letter recently sent by William Wigram, one of the directors of the East India Company, to Alexander Raphael, a merchant from Madras who was a patron of the San Lazzaro convent. Wigram, who probably did not suspect that his letter would eventually become a textbook exercise, was asking Raphael to vote for him in the upcoming elections for the board of directors. Aucher transcribed this letter, titling it "The quest for a place" (*G1817*, p. 174), which shows that he had misunderstood the message and had moreover confused "quest" with "request." The errata recommended "A letter requesting a Vote," Byron's emendation.

Byron certainly spent many hours proofreading *G1817*, checking it against the original Italian texts and demonstrating English pronunciation for Aucher. Since the compositors did not speak English, there was obviously a lot of work to do, and various misprints passed them all by, for instance, the strange abbreviations and missing apostrophes on pp. 70-71. Aucher had formed the singular "peache" (*G1817*, p. 77) from Veneroni's "peaches" (Veneroni, p. 293),[65] and he had confused "stain" and "strain" (*G1817*, p. 170), and "of" and "off" (in "washed of," *G1817*, p. 168) but these problems were not remedied. This is in fact fortunate for us, since both the mistakes that were overlooked and those that were corrected enable us to assess Aucher's proficiency in English at the time. When he met Byron, Aucher occasionally struggled with spelling, abbreviations, morphology (irregular noun and verb forms), the use of prepositions and particles, and word choice, especially when the words were etymologically related ("consul" and "counsel," "quest" and "request"). His command of English was thus insufficient for him to write *G1819*'s English grammatical explanations and the "Exercises in the Armenian Language." After Byron's desertion, Aucher compiled *G1819* just as he had *G1817*. He carefully transcribed Byron's papers, organizing the material and making only minimal additions to the English text.

That *G1819* is indeed based upon Byron's manuscripts is also demonstrated by internal evidence. The text of the grammar is recognizably the translation of an Italian original that influenced word choice and word order, and that induced the overuse of the passive voice in an attempt to render typically Italian impersonal or passivizing *si* constructions. For instance, the word "mode(s)," i.e., "way(s), manner(s)," often seems to translate *modo/i*, while the frequent use of "sense(s)," i.e., "meaning(s)," was probably suggested by *senso/i*. The sentence "Thus also are conjugated the verbs" (*G1819*, p. 70)[66] probably follows the word order of the more idiomatic *si* construction "così si coniugano anche i verbi." The English text is sometimes the word-for-word translation of an unclear Italian original. For example, the subjunctive mood is so defined: "When it expresses a suspended action, or dependent upon another verb to complete the sense, it is called Subjunctive,

---

65. This mistake was eventually corrected in *G1819*, p. 146.

66. Almost identical variants of this sentence can be found on pp. 75 and 78.

as, et'ē gric'em, *if I write*" (p. 49, original emphasis). It presumably renders "quando esprime un'azione sospesa o dipendente da un altro verbo per completare il senso, si chiama Soggiuntivo," a grammatically correct but confusing Italian sentence that neglects to specify the all-important subjects of the verbs.

The sentence "It is to be remarked in this declension that the second case is changed in the termination" (p. 11) suggests a less awkward Italian original ("è da rimarcare in questa declinazione che il secondo caso varia nella terminazione"). The phrase "changed in the termination" shows the translator's acquaintance with the Latin grammars which were taught in British schools and which employed the same language: "Several nouns in English are changed in their termination to express gender; as, *prince, princess; actor, actress; lion, lioness; hero, heroine,* &c."[67] In fact, the jargon of late eighteenth-century British grammars is used throughout, and while today's readers may find it bewildering, it is good evidence that the text is indeed Byron's.

Byron's authorship is supported by further evidence. One of the first grammatical examples in the book is "Ormzduxt," Ormizd's daughter. She was mentioned (unnamed) in Eznik's treatise from which Byron translated the passage later remembered by Brizeux and Barbier. Byron's version of the Eznik fragment consistently Latinized the name Ormizd as "Hormistus" (*G1819*, pp. 198–203). Since Ormzduxt, Ormizd's daughter, was glossed as "*Hormistus' daughter*" (p. 9, original emphasis), Byron must have translated these grammatical examples as well. Incidentally, since "*Hormistus' daughter*" makes an appearance on the very first pages of the grammar, Byron was probably already looking at Eznik's text in early January 1817 as he and Aucher began working on *G1819*.

It is also evident that *G1819* was printed from manuscripts Aucher found difficult to decipher and had therefore not written. For instance, a string of Armenian interjections denoting sorrow is followed by a nonsensical English translation—"Oh! alas! woe be to! poor! wretch that!" (p. 114)—which can only be the corrupt version of an illegible text: "Oh! alas! woe is to me! poor wretch that I am!" A few lines below Aucher also transcribed "cheer" instead of "cheer up" (for "ōn, ha").

67. Alexander Adam, *The Principles of Latin and English Grammar* (Edinburgh: A. Kincaid and W. Creech; London: T. Cadell, 1772), p. 9; emphasis original.

Probably his source manuscript was damaged, torn, or partly erased.

In *G1819* the capitalization of national adjectives is erratic, most probably because Aucher could not always recognize Byron's capitals. On pp. 2–3, "english," "french," "german" and "greek" are not capitalized, but "Armenian" is. However, Aucher's own preface consistently capitalizes "English" and "Armenian," suggesting that whenever he wrote his own texts he applied the rules as he knew them, but when he transcribed Byron's manuscripts he tried instead to reproduce what he saw on the page.

In the extract from Eznik (pp. 199, 201, 203), Aucher hesitated between two Latinized forms of the name Zruan [zər'van]. He apparently could not tell whether Byron had meant to write "Zeruanus" (according to the Armenian spelling) or "Zervanus" (according to the actual pronunciation). In fact, Byron had probably written "Zeruanus" both here and in the excerpt from Moses Chorenensis (p. 209). Byron's transcription of all the names in the latter passage was indebted to the Whiston brothers' Latin version, and the Whistons here had the ablative "Zeruano" from "Zeruanus."[68] Moreover, Byron probably expected *G1819*'s intended audience to use the humanistic pronunciation of Latin and read the first "u" as [v] anyway.

Aucher's hesitations about the name Zruan show he refrained from arbitrarily imposing his own preferences on the text. He was similarly judicious in leaving the lacunae in Byron's translation from Moses Chorenensis; *G1819* simply signaled them in both the Armenian and the English versions (pp. 208–9). While aware of Byron's translation inaccuracies,[69] Aucher nonetheless refrained from any alteration, such as correcting the placement of "as" and "and" at the end of "Paul to Corinthians," verses 7 and 20. (Byron noticed and rectified both mistakes in the revised version of "Paul to Corinthians" he sent to Murray.) A comparison between Aucher's edition of the epistles and Moore's reveals that Aucher was the more faithful editor.[70] Moore thought he improved Byron's text by capitalizing all initial words of verses, while Aucher respected Byron's decision to start verses with a capital only

68. *Mosis Chorenensis Historiæ Armeniacæ Libri III*, 23.

69. Aucher signaled them to Rinck (Rinck, *Das Sendschreiben der Korinther*, pp. 5–6).

70. Nicholson reproduced Moore's text in Byron's *Complete Miscellaneous Prose* (pp. 70–76), pointing out some but not all the differences between Moore's version and Aucher's.

when the Armenian original did so. Moore omitted Byron's characteristic dashes, three of which however survived in Aucher's version
("Corinthians to Paul," verses 1, 19; *G1819*, pp. 177 and 181, respectively). In the footnotes, Moore consistently emended Byron's usual
abbreviation "M.S.S." to "MSS.," while Aucher let it stand. Unlike
Aucher, Moore altered two names (*G1819*, pp. 177, 181)[71] and added a
"not" to Byron's translation of an Armenian sentence in the footnote
to "Paul to Corinthians" verse 41. Aucher's edition (*G1819*, p. 190)
gives us Byron's original version. Aucher's transcriptions of Byron's
missing manuscripts are more reliable than Moore's and deserve to
be included in the Byron canon at least as much as Moore's. When
Aucher prepared *G1819* for publication, he simply organized Byron's
papers into a coherent book to which he made easily identifiable additions. By subtracting these additions we can obtain a reasonably accurate version of Byron's contributions to *G1819*.[72]

We can be certain that Aucher was responsible for the title page, his
own portrait, the preface ("Advertisement," n.p.), the book's epigraph,
the contents page ("Index," p. 335), and the errata. Aucher also needed
to provide some titles and subtitles. On the pattern of his previous "A
Collection of Substantives" and "A Collection of Verbs" (*G1817*, pp.
71, 95), he now coined "A Collection of Prepositions," "A Collection
of Adverbs," "A Collection of Conjunctions," and "A Collection of
Interjections" (*G1819*, pp. 98, 102, 112, 114). Italicized titles or endnotes of the type "*D. Theodore Chrthenavor in the seventh Century*" (p.
197) are appended to all the extracts printed in the chrestomathy and
in the "Exercises in the Armenian Language." They are all Aucher's,
as occasional obsolete spellings confirm (e.g., "*In his Discourse against
the Manichians,*" p. 203). Other titles can be recognized as his by the
inaccurate word choice: "Concordance of Prepositions" (p. 133) and
"The Armenian Authors Who Recite the Foregoing Letter" (p. 195).
The latter title confuses two etymologically related words, "recite"
and "cite" (i.e., "quote"), one of Aucher's typical mistakes. Aucher

71. Moore wrote "Cleobus" instead of "Clebus" and "Stratonice" instead of "Statonice" in
"Corinthians to Paul," verses 2 and 9, respectively.

72. On the other hand, it is very likely that Aucher did not transcribe *all* the papers Byron had
left him. Unfortunately, what Aucher decided not to include (such as Byron's translations from
the Alexander romance) can only be a matter for speculation and is irrecoverable in the absence of
Byron's manuscripts.

also probably provided two section titles, "Exercises in the Armenian Language" and "Some Pieces of the Best Armenian Authors," as well as the title for Byron's impromptu stanza, *"An Armenian Verse"* (pp. 175, 199, 212, italics in original). The parenthetical italicized subtitle *"(Found in the Armenian Bible as an Apocryphal writing)"* attached to both "Corinthians to Paul" and "Paul to Corinthians" (pp. 177, 183) and absent from Moore's edition of the epistles was added by Aucher in deference to higher Catholic ecclesiastical authorities, who did not regard the epistles as canonical. The subtitles containing German-style ordinal numerals, "1. Person," "2. Person," "3. Person" (for "1ˢᵗ Person," etc.; pp. 31–32 *et passim*), were added by Aucher, who spoke perfect German.

Aucher must have written all the chapters that contain mostly Armenian text, including those with English titles. These chapters are: "Familiar Abbreviations" (*G1819*, pp. 5–6), *"Specimen of the four Conjugations of the Verbs Regular with their Moods, Tenses, Numbers and Persons"* (pp. 55–57), "Specimen of the Armenian Composition" (pp. 134–36), the table with the numerical values of Armenian letters (p. 138, mis-numbered 148), and the entire chrestomathy (pp. 213–334). Aucher also added with only slight modifications two chapters from his earlier *G1817*: "A Collection of Substantives" (pp. 139–65) and "A Collection of Verbs" (pp. 165–74). The word lists, derived from Veneroni (pp. 285–308, 311–30), were probably checked by Byron for *G1817*.

On pages 115–21 and 123–34 of *G1819*, the copious examples from the Armenian Bible with equivalents from the Authorized Version were probably collected by Aucher alone, as the unusual style of the references seems to indicate. The titles of some books of the Bible are incorrectly abbreviated and German-style ordinal numerals are used, e.g., "Psal." instead of "Ps." (p. 119), "Revel." instead of "Rev." (p. 124), "1. Corint." instead of "1 Cor." (p. 128), "1. King." instead of "1 Kings" (p. 134).

Aucher presumably provided all the Armenian examples, also translating a few into English. On pages 101–2, Aucher added to a list of prepositions several Armenian phrases whose English translations, calqued on the Armenian, must be his: "Above, higher, over than," "Before, first than," "Out than" and "After than." On page 108, the idiosyncratic spelling of several phrases indicates them as Aucher's

additions: "By my-self," "By thy-self," "By our-selves," "By your-selves." I also suspect that Aucher is responsible for the conjugation of the verb *yaṙnem*, which means "I rise" but is here translated "I raise" (pp. 87–88). While Aucher and Byron were working on this section of *G1819*, Byron was also deciphering the two epistles in which he repeatedly encountered this verb and consistently translated it correctly, using "to rise" or "to arise" (see "Paul to Corinthians," verses 35, 39, 40, 47, 49, 51 and a seeming exception in verse 34). It is more likely that Aucher confused "I raise" with "I rise," and that the conjugation of *yaṙnem* is entirely his. In the 1832 edition of *G1819* Aucher rectified the mistake, using the verb "to rise" (pp. 92–93).

Aucher only added a few sentences to the grammatical explanations of *G1819*. A confusion between two etymologically related words, "devious" and "deviant," makes two of his additions conspicuous: "or in some tense or mood [the irregular conjugation] deviates from the rule, and is called *Devious*" (p. 49, original emphasis); and "Every Conjugation although different in its moods, tenses, numbers and persons, preserves the first syllable of it's Indicative, excepting such verbs as are Devious" (p. 51). The sentences "Present is like that of the Indicative" (pp. 62, 68) and "[The "perfect tense"] Is formed by means of the Substantive verb" (p. 83) may be either Byron's quick notation or Aucher's error; I incline towards the latter interpretation. These and the above mentioned titles and examples are probably all of Aucher's modifications to the grammar section that Byron had translated. The remaining English text (some 117 pages out of the first 137 numbered pages of *G1819*) is Byron's, including the alphabet, the morphology, the syntax, and the punctuation chapters.

In 1819 Aucher printed Byron's texts with as few modifications as possible. Thirteen years later he published a second edition of *G1819*. His knowledge of English had greatly improved in the meantime, and he was confident enough to alter Byron's translations. He also added or dropped chapters; importantly, he omitted Byron's poem and the extracts from Armenian theological works (Eznik and the three fragments proving the authenticity of the epistles). Aucher added a new chapter, titled "Verse" (pp. 140–42), which contained short fragments of Armenian poetry with English prose translations. Charles Dowsett

attributed them to Byron,[73] but they were written long after Byron had stopped visiting Aucher in 1819. In fact, it seems that Aucher only thought about adding such a chapter to his grammar in 1821, when Father Arsenio (Arsēn) Bagratuni published a French-Armenian grammar with an appendix on versification in the two languages. That year Aucher published his own *Dictionary English and Armenian*, and prefixed to it a short grammar, which for the first time included a chapter on (English) poetry (pp. 22–23). In 1825 Aucher similarly added a short Armenian grammar to Brand's *Dictionary Armenian and English*. The last section was entitled "Verse" (p. 23), and it included the very snippets of Armenian poetry that were to appear in the 1832 textbook. At the time of the dictionary's publication, a year after Byron's death, the Armenian lines were not yet translated. By 1832, however, Aucher had found another English pupil who could translate them. One of the Armenian couplets in the "Verse" chapter of the 1832 grammar ("Thou dove, ever flying through the air, / the Ark of the new Noah is thy dwelling," p. 141) came from a hymn by Nierses Clajensis (Nersēs Šnorhali), also included in the book (pp. 168–71), where an almost identical translation ("Thou Dove over hov'ring in the air, the Ark of the new Noah is thy dwelling," p. 171) was explicitly attributed to "A[lexander] Goode" (p. 169). Common stylistic features suggest that the hymn and all the poetic fragments were the work of the same translator, most likely Alexander Goode. Byron was not responsible for them, just as he was not responsible for any of the other modifications *G1819* had undergone for its 1832 edition.

Any reconstruction of Byron's contributions to the Armenian-English textbook should be based upon *G1819* alone. Fortunately, in 1819 Aucher seems to have transcribed Byron's manuscripts with utmost fidelity, even when he had doubts about their correctness. He made the additions described above, which, due to linguistic and other peculiarities, are relatively easy to recognize and allow us to extract Byron's original text. The Byron canon should include the grammar section of *G1819*, as well as his short poem and the passages from Eznik, St. Gregory the Illuminator, Theodore Chrthenavor, and St. Nierses Lampronensis. Together with Byron's corrections to *G1817*,

73. Dowsett, "'The Madman Has Come Back Again!'" pp. 30–31. Dowsett apparently attributed the entire 1832 grammar to Byron.

they give us a rare glimpse of Byron as a linguist, enabling us better to understand his intellectual development and his religious quest. Moreover, because *G1819* was used all over Europe for decades, it deserves a place in the history of linguistics, as the first English-language attempt to explain the structures of classical Armenian. Byron's grammar only awaits an editor who will bring it back to light.

Göttingen, Germany