The American novelist Conrad Richter was born in 1890 in Pine Grove, a small town in eastern Pennsylvania, and died there in 1968. The son of a Lutheran minister, he lived in various small towns in Pennsylvania during his youth, and after graduation from high school worked at various trades and occupations, finally settling for a career in journalism. He reported for a number of small-town newspapers in Pennsylvania, and was an editor of one for a short period of time. In 1913 he published his first short story, and thereafter wrote and published short stories as a part-time occupation, in addition to his journalism and other business interests. In 1928, because of his wife’s health, he moved to New Mexico and continued his writing, working as a writer for Hollywood movies in addition to short stories, published in such magazines as the Saturday Evening Post and Woman's Home Companion. In 1937, at the age of 47, he published his first novel, The sea of grass, set in the southwest, which was later made into a successful movie with Katherine Hepburn and Spencer Tracy. In the following years, he published a number of novels with southwestern backgrounds. In 1940 he turned his attention to the east and published The trees, the first of a trilogy of novels dealing with the post-Revolutionary settlement of Ohio by pioneers from Pennsylvania. The second novel of the trilogy, The fields, was published in 1945, and the third, The town, in 1950. In that year Richter moved back to Pine Grove, and in 1951 was awarded the Pulitzer Prize for fiction for The town. He continued as a successful novelist, winning the National Book Award for fiction in 1960 for a novel entitled The waters of Kronos, which was designed as the first of another trilogy, this one with a semi-autobiographical background, which went unfinished upon Richter’s death (Gaston 1989).

In the third novel of his first trilogy, The town, Richter includes a scene in which a hymn, the Doxology, the one which begins “Praise God from whom all blessings flow”, is sung in Delaware in a Delaware community in Indiana. He quotes the hymn in Delaware, but gives no source. This is,
to my knowledge, the first time Richter used Delaware in his novels. The text of the hymn is as follows:

Kain nom moo tooqk owk woz.
Kain nom moo waim uh keeng ah yaigh.
Kain nom moo wuh Koung kach tay laick.
Kain no way gweez mint wauk w’jih jogh. [Richter 1950:295]

I have been unable to find the source from which this was taken. From the spellings, it does not seem likely that this was taken from the same source or sources as were the examples in his later works.

The two other examples of use of Delaware vocabulary in Richter’s works are in his two novels about Indian captivity — The light in the forest (1953) and its sequel, A country of strangers (1966) — in which Richter made extensive use of Delaware vocabulary. Both novels deal with the period around 1764–65 and the relationship between the white settlers pushing ever westward from Pennsylvania into Ohio and the Delaware Indians. Under the terms of the peace treaty after the defeat of the Indians by the British under Colonel Henry Bouquet in 1763 (Weslager 1972:249), all white prisoners held by the Indians were to be returned to their families. These included those who had been taken as children and adopted into Indian families and raised as Indians, as well as those who had been taken as adults. As was to be expected, but was disregarded by the white families, most of the children considered themselves Indians and did not want to be returned to their former families. Such was the case with the children in Richter’s two novels.

The hero of the first novel, The light in the forest, is a 15-year-old boy who was kidnapped by the Delaware when he was four, and has been adopted by the chief of the tribe to replace a son of his that had died earlier. He is so opposed to returning to his white family that he has to be tied up and guarded on the trip to be reunited lest he run away. The attempt to integrate him into his birth family fails, and in due course of time he runs away and rejoins his Indian family. However, when called upon to aid in the ambush of a group of whites, he warns the whites of the ambush, allowing them to escape in safety. For this, he is expelled from the tribe by the Indians, and finds himself at the end of the novel with nowhere to turn, having cut himself off from both his white family and his Indian family.

Schamier (1960) examined The light in the forest from an ethnographic and historical perspective and pronounced it correct in its depiction of the
Delaware of the time and the relationships between them and the encroaching whites. He also mentioned the 179 Indian expressions or Delaware vocabulary items that he found in the novel. In actual fact, excluding personal names and names of places, the count of Delaware items is about 50, give or take a few that could be disputed, such as a personal name that has a meaning, like Niskitoon, a name for a man that means 'puts on paint', or short expressions like lenape n'hakey 'I am Indian'.

The items are basically of two types. The first type consists of words used in reported conversations, which are, of course, always in English since this is a novel written in English. These expressions are generally of an exhortatory nature, sometimes but not always immediately translated into English; the Delaware is printed in italics but the following English translation is in roman type. It is understood that the characters speak only in Delaware, since the conversations are between native speakers of that language, and that the English translation is only for the convenience of the reader. The second type consists of words, generally nouns, that name an animal or plant or some other item of the natural environment, used in narrative sections and almost always followed immediately by a translation in English, both the Delaware and the English being in roman type. The use of these nouns is designed to represent the thought processes of the characters who speak Delaware. These common nouns are elevated to the status of proper nouns — they are printed with capitalized first letters — and are used, as were the Ojibwa words in Longfellow’s Hiawatha (Longfellow 1856), as given names of the animals, much like Mickey Mouse or Jiminy Cricket in the works of Walt Disney. They are also given an anthropomorphic interpretation to a certain extent, presumably to underline the mindset of Delaware Indians, who are presented as looking upon the natural world, and especially upon animals, in a way different from that of whites. In the Delaware way of thinking, animals are like people and have personal names like people.

In a note of acknowledgement, Richter mentions his debt to Heckewelder’s Indian nations (1819) and Zeisberger’s History of the North American Indians (1910) as sources. Since neither of these is a dictionary of Delaware, it is to be assumed that Richter had another source for the vocabulary items included in the novel, possibly one or another of Zeisberger’s word lists (Zeisberger 1887a, 1887b), or his grammar of Delaware (Zeisberger 1827), or one of Heckewelder’s lists (Heckewelder
A number of the items used by Richter occur in one or another of these works. The vocabulary items of both types, excluding personal and place names and counting sentence-like expressions as single items, that I have found are given below, in the order in which they occur in the book, and including only one citation of terms that show up more than once in the text (Richter 1953):

1. “Palli aal! Go away!”
2. “Jukaall! If only I could.”
3. “Sehe! Watch out!”
4. Zelozelos, the cricket
5. “Elkesa! What does your father say?”
6. Achtok, the deer
7. Ploeu, the turkey
9. Eliwuleck, a name for God
10. Eluwitschanessik, a name for God
11. Wluwilissit, a name for God
12. “nitschu, friend”
13. “auween kacheu, who are you”
14. “kella, yes”
15. “matty, no”
16. Kaak, the northern goose
17. schka’ak lettuce [skunk cabbage]
18. the Tree of the Schwanammek [?]
19. Memedhakemo, the turtle dove
20. Namespema, the rock fish
21. Machewachtay, the red-bellied terrapin
22. Hattawaniminschi, the dogwood tree
23. Wipunquok, the white oak tree
24. Chingokhos, the big-eared owl
25. Schachachgokhos, the barred owl
26. “Aw een khacheu? Who are you?”
27. “Lenape n’ hackey. I am Indian.”
28. “Lenni Lenape ta koom? Delaware, where do you come from?”
29. “Otenik Tuscarawas noom. From the town on the Tuscarawas.”
30. “Half Arrow! Ili kleheleche! Do you still breathe!”
31. “Ehiih! Am I that bad?”
32. “Itschemi! Help me!”
33. “Pennau! Now watch me cut out his black heart!”
34. “Matta. No.”
35. "Tah. It takes too long."
36. "Lachi! Quick!"
37. "Kshamehellatan! Let us run together."
38. "Ju!" Half Arrow exclaimed with delight.
39. "Elke! That's good."
40. "Sehe! Not so loud."
41. "Lannau! Look at them."
42. "that old schwannack of your white uncle"
43. "Yuh allacque! What a pity..."
44. "Nechi!" he said
45. "Ekih! The white man is a strange creature..."
46. "Jukella! Oh, that I had been a lucky one!"
47. Sokpehellak, the waterfall
48. the bank was thick with wipochk [thicket]

The heroine of the second novel, *A country of strangers*, is another 15-year-old, taken from her white family at the age of five and raised by a Delaware family in a tribe other than the one that took the hero of the first novel. At the beginning of the story, she is married and the mother of an infant son. She too is ordered to return to her white family, and flight to another tribe is of no avail. She is temporarily placed with a French family, and after she learns of the death of her husband, and the total loss of any hope that she will be spared the return to her white family, she begins a long journey with her infant son from Ohio across the Great Lakes to eastern Pennsylvania, along with another white girl captive also being returned to her family. They are under the care of a French Jesuit priest, who successfully delivers the other girl to her family. When they arrive at the heroine’s home, however, it appears that an imposter has been accepted as the family’s missing daughter. Since it is manifestly impossible to return the heroine to Ohio, she is accepted as a servant in the household. After a short and thoroughly miserable time there, she and her infant son are captured, along with her real white sister, by another tribe of Delaware Indians. She saves her sister’s life, escapes the tribe, and returns the sister to the family, losing her son in the process. He is killed by one of the Indians, whom she immediately kills in return. She then meets the hero of the first novel. They realize that they are both outcasts, and leave together to try to forge a new life in the west. At the end of the novel, they are both about 20 years old.

In this novel, Richter used more Delaware expressions than in the
earlier one. In the introduction to the novel, Richter lists as one of his sources Brinton and Anthony’s *Lenâpé–English dictionary* (1888). Unfortunately, the words as they occur in Richter contain a number of mistakes, misprints and other deviations in respect to the Brinton and Anthony list. Richter was a novelist writing a novel, not a linguistic scholar writing an article for publication, and he appears not to have spent too much time proofreading the Delaware items in this novel. The items I have found are the following, again excluding personal and place names, arranged in the order in which they occur in the text, and listing repeated items only once. In this second novel, Richter dispenses with the use of italics for words used in reported conversation. Where Richter’s spelling or form differs from that found in Brinton and Anthony, I include their form in square brackets at the end of the entry (Richter 1966):

1. Tskinnak, the blackbird [Tskennak]
2. Munache, the Badger [Munhacke]
3. Getanitowit, He Who Is Above All [Getanittowit]
4. Lomache, the north wind [Lowanachen]
5. Waapalane, the bald eagle [Woapalanne]
6. “Nocha, Father.”
7. Echokike, the ends of the world [Ekhokiike]
8. Damaskus, the muskrat
9. Tgui, the waves
10. Guka, mamma
11. Pitquok, the poor harmless moth
12. Nisku, dirt [Niskeu]
13. Tocu, the cold
14. Tschipey, a ghost
15. Woakus, the gray fox
16. Wulalow, the One with the Beautiful tail [Wulalowe]
17. Tshimalus, the bluebird [Tschimalus]
18. Skaak, the polecat [Schkaa’k]
19. Memeu, the woodcock
20. Pachquachus, the mouse [Pochquachpus]
21. Hunja, the bull
22. Nunscheach, the she-bear
23. Ssappis, the lightening bug [Sasappis]
24. Kwaal, the blue jay
25. Memakockus, the red-headed woodpecker [Memakochkus]
26. Wipunquok, the white oak [Wipunquoak]
27. Woapink, the possum
28. Achtu, the deer
29. Machit, ugly
30. Awossagame, the Joyous Hunting Land
31. Kaak, the wild goose
32. Tsquall, the frog
33. Michalappotis, the spider
34. Maskik, greens
35. Siquonk, spring
36. Pomih’, tallow
37. Wipte, the toothache
38. Meechgalonne, the hawk
39. “Ekih! How can I meet these strangers?”
40. Angelik, death
41. Allamuin, the scalp yell
42. Gasca, the gauntlet
43. Ohum, the Indian grandmother
44. Piwitak, the aunt
45. Allogagan, servants
46. Nitschu, friend
47. Nichenos, friendship
48. Elemilowank, winter
49. “Lennau, look.”
50. Schwanachen, the south wind
51. Kamlus, the sickness that shakes
52. Andhanni, the great green bullfrog
53. Gisilija, the wild bull
54. Pitquok, the moth
55. Ktschinquehhellen, it has much sunshine
56. Wusca, it has much sunshine
57. Clampeechen, Still Water
58. Shipahap, the blue squirrel
59. Talala, the white cedar
60. Wulalowe, the black fox
61. Schawanachgook, the horned snake
62. Schachamek, the straight fish
63. “Sehe, hush!”
64. “Kitchi Kitchi, victorious.”
65. Taquach, the dogwood
66. Schwanammek, the shad tree
67. “Nimat, brother.”
68. “Auween lacke? Who are you?” [Auwen]
69. “Ta koom? Where do you come from?”
70. “Kih, I know where.”
71. Wtegowa, a follower
72. “Alla leni. It is true.”
73. Nutiket, the sentinel
74. “Ponchi! Let us alone!”
75. “Maybe you are Schupijaw, the spy?”
76. “Ochqueu, woman.”
77. “Gatati! Come.” [Gattati]
78. “Elkissa! said the Great Spirit.”
79. “I have made Macho, something bad.”
80. Ameni, a pigeon [Amemi]
82. Gokhos, the long-eared owl.
83. Nichan, or beloved child
84. Tiquensukey, the black panther cub
85. Quipias, the buffalo
86. “Elke, good.”
87. Milhilusis, old man [Mihillusis]

It is possible that Richter used other sources in addition to Brinton and Anthony (1888) for this list, which may account for some of the discrepancies.

The use of foreign vocabulary is a widespread and common stylistic device in various types of literature. It is designed to give a feel of the linguistic situation in either narrative or dialogue, a method of emphasizing that a wider spectrum of character and background is evident in the scene than would be if everything were in one language. A familiar example in dramatic literature is the comment in Latin by Julius Caesar in the play of the same name by William Shakespeare as his good friend Brutus plunges his dagger into Caesar’s heart during the assassination scene: “Et tu, Brute?” (Julius Caesar 3.i.77). It is to be noticed that Shakespeare does not provide a translation for this bit of dialogue, which means ‘And you too, Brutus?’ The rest of the dialogue in the play is in English. Presumably, the line in Latin is used by Shakespeare to enhance the drama of the moment and to provide a note of authenticity. Another Shakespearean example, with a little bit more dramatic realism, is the final scene of Henry V, in which King Henry engages in conversation with Katherine, the daughter of the king of France, whom he is wooing, and with whom he carries on a
three-cornered conversation in French and English, with Alice, the princess’s lady-in-waiting, doing translation in both directions for the basically monolingual King Henry and Katherine:

King Henry: Then I will kiss your lips, Kate.
Katherine: Les dames et demoiselles pour être baisées devant leur noces, il n’est pas la coutume de France.
King Henry: Madam my interpreter, what says she?
Alice: Dat it is not be de fashion pour les ladies of France,— I cannot tell vat is baiser en Anglish.
King Henry: To kiss.
Alice: Your majestee entendre bettre que moi. [Henry V, 5.ii.255–262]

In non-dramatic literature, there are three basic modes of use of foreign vocabulary. In the first type, the foreign expression is used with no translation, the reader being expected either to know the foreign language, or to be able to guess what the expression means, or to realize that it is not really necessary to know the meaning of the expression anyway, only to know that it is foreign. A recent example is from the novel A fine balance by Rohinton Mistry (1995), set in modern India. In a street scene, the three main characters pass a beggar sitting on the ground who addresses them in Hindi:

“O babu, ek paisa day-ray!” he sang, shaking a tin can between his bandaged palms. “O babu! Hai babu! Aray babu, ek paisa day-ray!”

“That’s one of the worst I’ve seen since coming to the city,” said Ishvar, and the others agreed. Omprakash paused to drop a coin in the tin. [Mistry 1995:7]

What is surprising about this is not that the beggar speaks Hindi, but that the other characters, who are Indians and supposedly native speakers of Hindi also, are apparently speaking among themselves in English with no native speaker of English in the scene. However unreal this is — certainly as unreal as Julius Caesar speaking Latin in an English play — the point is that the author does not translate the Hindi into English for the benefit of the reader, who is supposed to guess what the beggar said. (In case you haven’t guessed, the beggar’s words can be translated as ‘O sir, give me one paisa [the name of a coin]! Oh sir! Hi, sir! You sir, give me one paisa!’) In a later scene, a woman is trying to ingratiate herself with her husband’s senile grandfather:
Ruby sat on the sofa holding the old man’s hand. She asked if he would like her to massage his feet. Without waiting for an answer she grabbed the left one and began kneading it. The toenails were yellow, long overdue for a clipping.

Enraged, he tore his foot from her grasp. “Kya karta hai? Chalo, jao!”

Too startled at being addressed in Hindi, Ruby sat there gaping. Grandfather turned to Nusswan, “Doesn’t she understand? What language does your ayah speak? Tell her to get off my sofa, wait in the kitchen.” [Mistry 1995:30]

Again, the Hindi is not translated (it means ‘What are you doing? Get away!’), but the literary effect is obvious. It is useful to distinguish this use of foreign vocabulary where the foreign word or words could be translated, but are not, with another situation illustrated by the following passage from the same novel:

“For death, they come to me — for saros-nu-paatru, for afargan, baaj, faroksy. But for a happy occasion, for wedding ashirvaad, I am not wanted.” [Mistry 1995:41]

In such a passage, the foreign terms are the names of rituals of the Parsee religion, presumably in Old Persian, and are no more translatable into English than are terms like Ramadhan or Hanukkah.

The second type of usage of foreign vocabulary is that which is most frequently used by Richter: the foreign term is used, followed by a translation into the language of the literary work. An example from another recent work is the following from E. Annie Proulx’s Accordion crimes (1996), in a scene in a prison cell block in New Orleans, full of native speakers of Italian:

“A sarcastic voice added, “chi non ci vuole stare, se ne vada” — if you don’t like it here, go somewhere else. [Proulx 1996:48]

It is to be noted that the speaker speaks only in Italian; the English is the addition of the author for the benefit of her readers. Note that the Italian phrase is in quotation marks, but the English is not. In another example, set in a village in Iowa settled by Germans, the character speaks in both English and German:

“Jesus Christ! Somebody wants to make trouble with me, den rauch ich in der Pfeife! I smoke him in my pipe!” [Proulx 1996:78]
Proulx occasionally uses the first type of foreign vocabulary, with no English translation, as in this scene in which a French-Canadian is speaking:


Or this one in which characters of Mexican ancestry are speaking:

...that fool had fallen from the rail of the bridge and broken his pelvis on the dry stones of the riverbed. No one knew why he had been walking on the rail.

“Borracho,” said the bajo sexto.

“Loco,” added the guitar, already working out a line or two of a corrida about the idiot. [Proulx 1996:117–8]

Another example of this second type of foreign usage is seen in Rachel Carson’s book *Under the sea wind* (1955), a lyrical, narrative-like description of the flora, fauna, landscape, and weather patterns of the east coast of North America from Labrador down to the coast of Venezuela. Much like Richter, Carson uses foreign animal names in an anthropomorphic manner, personalizing the birds and fish that are seen in the narrative. Carson, however, uses Inuktitut and other languages for the names of these animals instead of Algonquian:

1. Uhuinguk, the lemming mouse
2. Oopik, the cock owl [snowy owl]
3. Tullugak, the raven
4. Canutus, the arctic knot
5. Kigavik, the gyrfalcon
6. Pandion, the fish hawk
7. Mugil, the mullet
8. Scomber, the mackerel

Carson also uses the names more extensively, devoting long chapters to one animal character, following him through various vicissitudes of birth, life, and death. The farther south she gets, the more Europeanized the names become: she describes the life and times of an eel named *Anguilla*, which is the word for ‘eel’ in Spanish, and of an anglefish named *Lophius*, which is the Greek name of the fish.

The third basic type of foreign vocabulary is that in which no foreign vocabulary is actually used, but the language of the work is phrased to
sound like it has been translated, more or less literally, from a foreign language. The best known example of this type is to be seen in Ernest Hemingway’s *For whom the bell tolls*, in which the characters, whose dialogue is in English but who are understood to be speaking in Spanish, use expressions in English like— to quote a famous parody of Hemingway— “I this and that in the milk of your mother.” A real example is the following:

He pulled out a wine-skin that he wore slung from his shoulder over his head and handed it to Sordo. “Wash thy mouth out, old one. Thou must have much thirst with thy wounds.” [Hemingway 1953:526]

It is to be noted that Hemingway also uses much Spanish, both with and without translation, throughout the novel, in both conversation and narrative passages.

Richter uses this method in names of months in both novels. The following are from *The light in the forest* (1953):

1. Month When Cold Makes the Trees Crack [December].
2. Month When the Ground Squirrels Begin to Run [January].
3. Month When the First Frog Croaks [February].
4. The Month of the Shad.
5. Month When the Deer Turn Red.
6. Month When the Corn is in the Milk.

And these are from *A country of strangers* (1966):

1. Snow Month.
2. Month When the Trees Crack with Cold.
3. Month When the Ground Squirrel Looks out on the World.
4. Month of Many Fish Bones.
5. Month of the Tree Whose Branches Are Pounded for Baskets.
6. Month That Brings the Summer.
7. Month When the Deer Turns Red.

Not all writers use such methods to enhance the foreign ambiance of their writings. Paul Theroux, in *The old Patagonian express* (1979), a book describing his travel by train from New York to the most southerly train station in Argentina, reports all his conversations, held in fluent, idiomatic Spanish, in equally fluent, idiomatic English, declaring in the introduction that he sees no reason to give a Spanish flavour by the introduction of Spanish words to conversations that were in all respects normal.
The earliest example of such use of foreign words or phrases that I have come across is from the New Testament. The New Testament is written in Greek, but in a number of places, Jesus is quoted as saying something in Aramaic, a Northwest Semitic language, similar to but not identical with Hebrew, transliterated into Greek letters, with a subsequent translation into Greek. Harris Birkeland, a Norwegian Semiticist, published a monograph, *The language of Jesus* (1954), in which he examined some of these occurrences of Aramaic. They are as follows:¹

And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani [ηλι ἡλι λαμα σαβαχθανι]? that is to say, My God, my God, why has thou forsaken me? [Matthew 27:46]

And he took the damsel by the hand, and said unto her, Talitha cumi [ταλιθα κομι]; which is, being interpreted, Damsel, I say unto thee, arise. [Mark 5:41]

And looking up to heaven, he sighed, and saith unto him, Ephphatha [ἐφφαθα], that is, Be opened. [Mark 7:34]

And at the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani [ἐλοι ἐλοι λαμα σαβαχθανι]? which is, being interpreted, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? [Mark 15:34]

And he said, Abba [αβα], Father, all things are possible unto thee; take away this cup from me: nevertheless not what I will, but what thou wilt. [Mark 14:36]

The verse from Matthew and the almost identical one from Mark represent a quotation by Jesus of an Aramaic translation of the first verse of Psalm 22, which was originally in Hebrew:

> My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? [Psalms 22:1]

In Aramaic it is as follows:²

> אלוהי אלוהי למה שבק tüni

It is to be noted that in Matthew, the first two words are in Hebrew, not Aramaic. They are spelled thus in Hebrew:

¹ The quotations are from the King James version of the Bible, with the Greek transliteration of the Aramaic in square brackets.

² The Aramaic is quoted in unpointed Hebrew script, followed by a transcription into English letters.
And, to complete the record, the entire verse in Hebrew is as follows:

אָלִיל αλλ' אָלָל (איל אל' אליל אָלָל

It is commonly believed that the language of the Jews in Palestine in the first century C.E. was Aramaic. It is claimed that Hebrew had been given up as a spoken language some time before, and was used only for liturgical purposes, as it was for the next 1900 years before its revival as a spoken language in modern Palestine and later Israel. If this was the case, then the Greek gospels must represent a translation of the original words of Jesus from their original Aramaic into Greek. Why, then, were some words left in Aramaic instead of being translated into Greek, as, presumably, were the other words spoken by Jesus? The standard explanation is that in miracle stories like these, the use of foreign words was traditional, as the Latin phrase hoc est corpus, later transformed in hocus pocus, was used in English. Birkeland (1954), however, argues that the reason these words are in a foreign language in the Greek text is that they were in a foreign language in the original text. Birkeland claims that when, for example, a novel is translated from one language into another, any foreign words in the original text remain in that foreign language in the translated text; they are not translated into the target language. As an example, I offer the following two passages from Tolstoy’s War and peace, in which French words are used in the Russian text, and are retained as French in the translation into English:

...ізволила оказать барону Функе beaucoup d’estime [Tolstoy 1958:9]
Translated as:
...she had deigned to show Baron Funke beaucoup d’estime [Tolstoy 1959:5]
And:
...известная, как la femme la plus séduisante de Pétersbourg. [Tolstoy 1958:11]
Translated as:
...known as la femme la plus séduisante de Pétersbourg. [Tolstoy 1959:7]

Birkeland argues that, if, in the words of Jesus, Aramaic words are preserved as Aramaic in a Greek translation, then the original, non-
Aramaic words of Jesus that were translated into Greek must have been in a language other than Aramaic in the first place. Otherwise there would have been no point in not translating all of the words into Greek. If this is the case, the only other language that could have been used at that time and place is Hebrew. From this it follows that the language used at least some of the time by Jesus, and by extension, the language at least understood by some Jews in Palestine at the time, was Hebrew, and that they were not monolingual speakers of Aramaic as assumed by many scholars. There must have been some Jews who did not speak Hebrew, however — the damsel he told to rise, and the deaf man whose ears he is commanding to be opened that he might hear — and to them Jesus spoke Aramaic, not Hebrew.

Birkeland’s thesis is not all that much accepted by those that deal in New Testament exegesis, but these examples do illustrate the use of foreign words in literary works, and one of the precursors to the literary device that we see in Richter’s and others’ works.

My last example of the use of foreign text in literary works comes from a novel by William Kirby entitled *The golden dog* (1897), a novel set in Quebec in the 17th century. In one scene, a woman is travelling from one location to another near Quebec City and decides to take a passenger canoe on the St. Lawrence River rather than to go by carriage. The passenger canoe is manned by Indians, and the song they sing as they paddle down the St. Lawrence is as follows:

Ah! Ah! Tenaouich tenaga!
Tenaouich tenaga, ouich ka! [Kirby 1897:373]

Kirby does not translate this, nor does he even tell us what language it is in. Some time ago I submitted these two verses to various specialists in languages like Montagnais, Algonquin, Huron, Mohawk, and Micmac; unfortunately, no one seemed to recognize the language, nor could they tell me what it means. The transcription looks like those of the Jesuits in the *Jesuit relations* (Thwaites 1896–1901), but I have examined those parts of the Relations that pertain to the native inhabitants of New France (Kenton 1927), and have found nothing like this example. I have also examined various other works, for example, those of Baron Lahontan (Lahontan 1970), again to no avail. If anyone does recognize the language and knows what it means, I would be most obliged if they could tell me.
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