Bernard Lewis

From Babel to Dragoman
The Tortuous History of the Interpreter in the Middle East

Bernard Lewis is Emeritus Professor of Near Eastern Studies at Princeton University. This is an edited version of the British Academy Elie Kedourie Memorial Lecture for 1998.

And the Lord said, Behold, the people is one, and they have all one language... and now nothing will be restrained from them, which they have imagined to do. Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech (Genesis XI, 6-7).

This famous passage from the Book of Genesis expresses the recognition of a distinctive feature of the Middle Eastern region as contrasted with the two other regions of ancient civilization in the old world. China had substantially one classical language, one script, one civilization; ancient India likewise, with relatively minor variations. The Middle East had many different unrelated civilizations and many languages which, from the earliest times, created problems of communication. The problem was apparently still unresolved by the time of the New Testament, and there again we have a reference to the situation created by the Tower of Babel, which was, when necessary, solved by what in Christian parlance is called "the miracle of tongues". To quote another passage: "And how hear we every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born? Parthians, and Medes and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia-and in Judaea, and Cappadocia, in Pontus etc.. and we do hear them speak in our tongues the wonderful works of God" (Acts 2:8-11). And again "They shall cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues" (Mark 16:17). And again "If any man speak in an unknown tongue, let it by two, or at the most by three, and that by course; and let one interpret"(1 Corinthians 14:27).

By this time, clearly, the office and function of the interpreter were well understood. The interpreter - the one who translates from one language to another, who makes communication possible between different peoples speaking different languages- appears very early. In the Book of Genesis, we learn that Joseph, as a high Egyptian official, spoke to his brothers newly arrived from Canaan, and they did not know that he understood them when they spoke among themselves - "For he spake unto them by an interpreter" (Genesis 42:23). The word used in the Hebrew text is *melitz. Melitz* has a number of meanings; more often it means something like intercessor or advocate or even ambassador. But in this case, interestingly, the Authorized Version translates it as interpreter (obviously interpreting between Egyptian and Hebrew), and if we look at one of the earliest translations from the Hebrew text into Aramaic, we find that the word *melitz* is rendered as *meturgeman.* Here we have an early form of what later, in English, came to be called "dragoman". A *meturgeman* is a translator; the word is very old, and goes back to Assyrian, where *ragamu* means to speak, *rigmu* is a word and the *taf'el* form indicates one who facilitates communication.

This word *meturgeman,* also *turgeman,* passed from Aramaic to Hebrew, to Arabic, to Turkish, to Italian, to French, to English, and many other languages. It occurs in Italian in the form *turcimanno,* no longer used in modern Italian. In French, it becomes *truchement,* in English, *dragoman* and *drogman.* The Hebrew word *Targum is* from the same root.

The earliest discussions of translation are in the context of the translation of scriptures such as the *Targum,* the translation of the Hebrew Bible into Aramaic. There is an interesting difference between the attitudes of the scriptural religions to this question. Jews decided at an early stage that it is permissible to translate scripture, and translations of the Hebrew Bible were made into Aramaic, later into Greek and into other languages, especially Judaeo-Arabic, Judaeo-Persian, and of course Judaeo-German, better known as Yiddish. For Christians, translation is not only permitted, it is required, and some translations acquire the status of scriptures themselves. Such is the Latin, the Vulgate; the Syriac translation, and one might add, the Luther German Bible and the King James English Bible.

The Muslim position on the other hand is quite different; translation of the Qur'an is not only not encouraged, it is expressly forbidden. The text is divine, inimitable, uncreated and eternal, and to translate it would be an act of presumption and impiety. Of course, they do translate it. Most Muslims nowadays do not understand Arabic, and the contents have somehow to be conveyed to them, but this is presented as interpretation, not as translation. Certainly there is no translation of the Qur'an which has the status of the Vulgate or the Septuagint or the Targum.

Who did the translations? How did it happen? We have literally hard evidence, in the form of inscriptions on stone, of the concern of the rulers of multinational empires that their edicts and orders should be understood; we have bilingual and trilingual inscriptions, the most famous, of course, being the inscription at Behistoun in Iran and the Rosetta stone from Egypt, now in the British Museum. In these, the same text is given in different languages, so that it may be understood by different elements of the population.

Pliny tells us that the peoples of the Caucasus spoke many different languages, so much so that the Romans needed 130 different interpreters to deal with the Caucasian kings and princes – even exceeding the Persian Empire. Another classical author, Plutarch, tells us that among the many qualities of Cleopatra, she was an accomplished linguist: "And her tongue, like an instrument of many strings, she could readily turn to whatever language she pleased, so that in her interviews with barbarians she very seldom had need of an interpreter, but made her replies to most of them herself and unassisted, whether they were Ethiopians, Troglodytes, Hebrews, Arabians, Syrians, Medes or Parthians."

One of our earliest accounts of a diplomatic communication in the Middle Ages comes from an Arabic chronicler called Awhadi. He tells us that a European queen, Bertha the daughter of Lothar, queen of Franja (Frankland) and its dependencies, sent a gift and a letter to the Abbasid Caliph Al-Muktafl in the year 293 of the Hijra (906 CE). With them was a further message, not included in the letter, but addressed directly to the Caliph. The letter, says the Arab historian, was written on white silk "in a writing resembling the Greek writing but straighter' (presumably this was Latin writing: the queen from Italy would obviously have used the Latin script). The message, he says, was a request to the Caliph for

marriage and friendship - a rather odd listing; one cannot help but wonder whether there was some mistranslation here.

How did they read this message in Latin? Who could there have been in tenth century Baghdad that could read a letter in Latin? Awhadi tells us: they searched for someone to translate the letter, and in the clothing store they found a Frankish slave who was able "to read the writing of that people". He was brought into the Caliph's presence, where he translated the letter from Latin writing into Greek writing. They then brought the famous scientific translator Ishaq ibn Hunain, and he translated it from Greek into Arabic.

Not surprisingly, nothing seems to have resulted from this embassy, neither by way of marriage nor of friendship. But it does give us an interesting early example of a method which we here ofmuch more, and that is the two tier translation: translation throug an intermediate language. It became very common in the later Middle Ages and the early modem period, when increasingly we find a language which is, so to speak, accepted as a diplomatic and commercial lingua franca. In the later Middle Ages, Italian served this purpose in the Mediterranean; it continued until the beginning of the nineteenth century to be the most widely used European language in the region. Communications, for example, between the English and the Turks passed through Italian. An Englishman who had something to say to a Turkish official said it to someone who translated it into Italian, and then someone else translated it from Italian into Turkish. The answer came back by the same route.

On the Christian side, there was a well established need to learn languages. Christians of whatever native language.had two classical languages to learn if they wished to be considered educated: Latin and Greek, and two more if they wanted to read their scriptures in the original: Hebrew and Aramaic. In addition to that, they had a multiplicity of spoken languages: Rashid al-Din, the fourteenth-century Persian historian, notes with astonishment that "the Franks have twenty-five different languages which they use among themselves, and nobody understands the language of anybody else".

In 1492, a year well known also for some other events, a Spanish humanist called Antonio de Nebrija published a grammar of the Castilian language. This, as far as I am aware, is the first time that anyone had treated a colloquial language seriously. He tried to establish rules, and launched the process by which the Castilian dialect became the Spanish language. Very soon after that, Italian, French, English, German and all the other vernaculars of Europe became recognized written languages with rules and eventuallY grammars and even dictionaries.

The situation on the Islamic side was entirely different. The many languages of antiquity either disappeared or dwindled into insignificance, surviving as.written languages, if at all, in scriptures and rituals. After the spread of Islam, there was only,one language that mattered - Arabic. It was the langage of scripture, of the classics, of commerce,.of government, of science. And although, like Latin in the West, it developed a number of vernaculars, they did not, like French and Spanish and Italian and Portuguese, develop into autonomous languages. Colloquially, of course, they.did,but that development was never formalIy recognized or recorded. Just one language met all needs, and there was therefore no need to learn any other. Why would an Arabic speaker bother to learn the barbarous idioms of

infidels and savages beyond the imperial frontier? Arabic provided all his needs, and if anyone wanted to talk to him they would learn Arabic. One finds a similar attitude in parts of the English speaking world at the present time.

A little later. first one, then another language was added: first Persian, then Turkish. In the Islamic Middle East and North Africa, there were no more. Others were, at most, local dialects. A medieval (probably tenth-century) Arabic writer explains: "The perfect language is the language of the Arabs and the perfection of eloquence is the speech of the Arabs, all others being deficient. The Arabic language among languages is like the human form among beasts. Just as humanity emerged as the.final form among the animals, so is the Arabic language the final perfection of human language and of the art of writing, after which there is no more" - a remarkable anticipation of the later concept of evolution.

Nevertheless, there was need for communication - in commerce, in war, and in some other matters. From an early date, and especially during the Crusades and after, there are numerous references to interpreters, mostly professional interpreters who came to be known in Arabic as *tarjumãn*.

Who were these interpreters? Why does anyone set out to learn the language of another people and learn it well enough to understand and interpret what are often very complex statements? The commonest and most widespread reason for learning a language is that it is the language of your masters, and it is wise, expedient, useful, or necessary to know the language of your masters.

Another group who find it expedient and convenient to learn a language are refugees: those who flee from one world to another. There were considerable numbers of refugees who fled from Christian Europe to the lands of Islam in the Middle Ages and the early modern period; there were very few who went in the opposite direction. Among these refugees from Europe were many Jews, notably those who came after the expulsion from Spain in 1492. Some of them learned Turkish and were able to make themselves useful to the Turkish Empire in a variety of ways.

A distinctive group among the newcomers consisted of those who changed their religion, and made a new career - those whom the Christians call renegade and whom the Muslims call Muhtadi, one who has found the true path of God. Considerable numbers of Christian - shall we say adventurers? - went from various parts of Europe into the Muslim lands, bringing useful skills - military, commercial, technical and also linguistic - for which they were able to find a ready market.

All these groups - slaves, refugees, renegades- came in from the outside. There were also those who went out from the inside; there were prisoners of war, not too many, but we do know of some people from the Muslim lands who were captured by one or other Christian state and spent some years in a Christian country before they were ransomed or escaped, and went home. There were also merchants who travelled abroad and returned home; they normally seem to have been non-Muslims - Christian and Jewish subjects of the Muslim states, and they have left little record.

There were also sailors. When Prince Jem, brother of Sultan Mehmed 11, fled to Europe and spent a little while as the guest of various European rulers, the Ottoman Government was not unnaturally concerned about what he was doing

and what he might be plotting with the enemies of the empire. So they sent a spy to Italy and to France to keep an eye on the exiled prince and report on his activities. But whom could they send, whom would they have that could move around in Italy and France? They sent a sea-captain, who had been to Europe and apparently had sufficient language skill not to pass as a native, but to sail around under his own flag, so to speak, as a sailor, and communicate and report.

The Venetian Father Toderini, who visited the Turkish naval school in the late eighteenth century, found that almost all the teachers were foreigners, Europeans who had learned Turkish, but he did find one Muslim, a native Algerian seaman, who had learned Italian and was able to help him. They were not a large group, but they were not insignificant. They have left their record in the European loanwords in Ottoman Turkish. Until the beginning of the nineteenth century and the massive intrusion of new ideas and objects and words to designate them, European loanwords in Turkish were very few, and most of them were Italian and maritime.

By far the most important of those who went out and came back were Christians. From the seventeenth century the wealthy Christian families begin to send their sons (not daughters of course) to Europe, principally to Italy to study in the universities. They returned with a serious knowledge of at least one European language and usually some other useful skills as well. These came to play an increasingly important part.

In doing so, they replaced the Jews. Jews had come from Europe in the fourteenth, more especially in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. They came with a knowledge of languages and countries and for a while were very useful. But they lost their usefulness; no new ones were coming, and the second generation born in Turkey no longer possessed the skills and knowledge that their parents had brought from Europe. They were replaced by Greeks, and to a much lesser extent Armenians, who went out and came back, and took over many of the roles which Jews had formerly played in the Ottoman lands.

What were these roles? Who employed interpreters? We have rather scattered information, showing that they were employed at various levels, including the lower levels. They were needed locally. An imperial government has to have people who know the local language, for practical purposes like collecting taxes and maintaining order. For this, local people were usually used. Jews served especially in the customs administration, where their knowledge of European languages and conditions was useful. Those who came from Europe could speak Spanish and often Italian too. We find for example great numbers of customs receipts in the Venetian archives, in Hebrew letters.

There were more important interpreters, at government level, who served in negotiations between the Ottoman Government and the various European embassies. This is the period when something new was developing, that is to say, resident embassies conducting continuous diplomacy. The older custom was that one sent an ambassador when there was something to say; he said it, and then he went home. The idea of having a permanently resident ambassador conducting continuous diplomacy came in at the end of the Middle Ages and beginning of the modem period, and, one after another, the European states - the Venetians, the Genoese, the French, the English and the rest - established embassies in Istanbul to

negotiate with the Ottoman Govemment on matters of concern, primarily, of course, on commerce.

How did they talk to each other? Communication was carried on through first one and then two groups of intermediaries - those employed by the Sublime Porte, and those employed by the embassies, each side hiring and paying its own interpreters.

The earliest dragomans of the Sublime Porte about whom we have information seem to have been renegades, or from a Muslim point of view Muhtadi, and they seem to have come in the main from the periphery of the Empire, including Hungarians, Poles, Germans and Italians. These were gradually replaced by Greeks, who were Ottoman subjects. There were a few Jews, but not in major positions. In most of the jobs they had held, Jews were replaced by Western-educated members of the Greek patrician class of Istanbul. They came to be known as the Phanariots, from the district in Istanbul where many of them lived and where the office of the Greek Patriarch was situated. These, generation after generation, continued to send their sons to Italy, where they graduated from Italian universities, came back with a thorough knowledge of Italian and European conditions and were able to serve the Sublime Porte consistently, effectively and remarkablyloyally for many generations.

On whom did.the embassies rely? They drew on a rather different group of people, whom it has become customary to call Levantines. The word 'levantine' comes from Italian *levante* is the sunrise; people who come from the east are politely called "people from the sunrise", *levantini.* Those who came from the west were called *ponentini,* people from the sunset. Levantine came to be something of a term of abuse; it came to mean people who are European but not really European; who have a veneer and a smattering of European ways and education but are really local; and yet who don't possess the real local culture. The Turks called the Levantines *tatlisu frengi,* sweet-water Franks, as opposed to the genuine article, who are salt-water Franks.

The levantines flourished for several centuries. They were overwhelmingly Catholic by religion; mostly they spoke Italian. Many of them seem to have been of Italian origin, though they intermarried freely with Greeks, especially with Catholic Greeks, and they formed a more or less self-contained, autonomous society, not only in the capital but also in many provincial cities, since dragomans were needed not only at the embassies but also at consulates, viceconsulates and trading posts and the like. Both embassies and consulates relied very largely on Levantines to do these jobs.

Almost from the start we find continual complaints about the Levantines in the diplomatic documents of the European powers. Sometimes the interpreters are accused of incompetence; they pretend to know Turkish well, but they don't. That appears on the whole to be an unjustified complaint. There may have been some who were not able to do their job properly, but on the whole, they seem to have been pretty competent. A more serious complaint is disloyalty: they are accused of serving their own interests, of selling their services to the highest bidder, of forming a sort of self-contained, coherent Levantine dragoman group which owned no real loyalty to anybody. Certainly there are quite awful stories told by

many ambassadors about dragomans selling secrets to another embassy, or exchanging secrets with colleagues. They were mostly related to each other, so that a dragoman of the British embassy might be the first cousin of a dragoman of the French embassy.

Another accusation, made very frequently and certainly justified by the evidence, is that they were frightened - too frightened to do their job properly.They were, after all, not Englishmen or Frenchmen or Austrians; they were local people who lived in Turkey. The Levantine dragomans, until a very late stage, were not diplomats, and the embassies almost all agreed that they were far too scared of the Turkish authorities to deliver any unpalatable message honestly. Thus, for example, when the British or the French or the Austrian ambassador wanted to deliver a severe message, the severity disappeared entirely. The severe message as transmitted by the dragoman to the *reis efendi* or whatever other Ottoman official he dealt with became a humble supplication. A man called George Aide or Aida, who was the dragoman of the British consulate in Aleppo, working for the Levant Company and the consulate - by his name one would assume a Syrian Christian - got into trouble for reasons which are not quite clear, and was imprisoned in the citadel. He asked the British ambassador to help him. The ambassador responded and eventually managed to get Aida released. But as a precaution, the dragoman also sent a petition from the citadel, where he was imprisoned, to the Aga of the janissaries, the highest military officer in Turkey. One passage will suffice to give the flavour of such documents:

Having bowed my head in submission, and rubbed my slavish brow in utter humility and complete abjection and supplication to the beneficent dust beneath the feet of my rnighty, gracious, condescending, compassionate, merciful benefactor, my most generous and openhanded master, I pray that the peerless and almighty provider of remedies may bless your lofty person, the extremity of benefit, protect my benefactor from the vicissitudes and afflictions of time, prolong the days of his life, his might and his splendour and perpetuate the shadow of his pity and mercy upon this slave.

It goes on like this at some length. If this was how a dragoman addressed a high Ottoman functionary; one can understand a certain concem on the part of European diplomats about the form in which their words - written or spoken - were transmitted to their Ottoman addresses. Most of the European powers decided, sooner or later, that they could no longer rely on these people, and that the only real answer was to train people of their own. And so young Englishmen, young Frenchmen, young Austrians, young Russians - these being the four powers mainly concerned - were assigned to learn the language.

By the nineteenth century, the older system was dying, though it persisted quite far into the century, and for a while young Englishmen and Levantine dragomans served side by side, naturally with not very happy relations between them. On the Ottoman side, the end came with the Greek war of independence. The last of the Greek grand dragomans, Stavraki Aristarchi, was hanged in 1821 on suspicion of complicity with the rebels. I have no idea whether the suspicion was well grounded or not; am inclined to think not.

It was no longer considered safe to entrust what had become a crucial post, in the newly important field of foreign policy, to non-Muslims. In the new balance of power, the Ottomans could no longer afford the attitude of contemptuous

unconcern for the barbarous peoples of Europe and their absurd dialects. It became necessary to learn languages. After the hanging of Aristarchi, we are told by the contemporary Turkish historians that there was total confusion in the office of the grand dragoman; papers were piling up, and there was no one that could read them. So they brought in the chief professor of the naval school, a Jew converted to Islam who knew several European languages.

With the increasing importance of relations with European countries, the chief translator became more than a chief translator; he became in effect a minister of foreign affairs, conducting the policies and drafting the letters, not just translating them. Later, the Ottomans established a translation office, and that soon became the main avenue to power in Turkish bureaucratic politics in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In other words, on both sides - the Ottoman Government on the one hand and the foreign embassies on the other - they were tending more and more to use their own people.

An important question is that of mistranslation, not just mistranslation by simple error or ignorance, but systematic, intentional mistranslation, of which there are interesting examples. I had occasion some time ago to look at the correspondence between London and Istanbul in the late sixteenth century, after the establishment of the first English embassy to the Ottoman Governmnent: letters from the Ottoman sultans to the Queen of England and replies from the Queen to the sultans; also correspondence with the Grand Vizier and other functionaries. The Sultan's missives were, of course, in Turkish; a contemporary translation was provided in Italian which the English could understand; the reply was drafted in English, sent in Italian and presumably translated into Turkish.

From the Ottoman point of view, the Ottoman Sultan was the ruler of the world; outside there were enemies or vassals, and Ottoman protocol was not willing to use the full titles which these outside rulers claimed for themselves. Thus, in letters, addressed to Queen Elizabeth - polite, friendly letters - she is addressed as "Queen of the vilayet of England". The Holy Roman Emperor himself, in Vienna, is called "the king of Vienna". The words used for "king" and "queen" - *kiral* and *kiralice* - are European, not Turkish or Islamic. The Ottomans in Europe, like the British in India, used native titles for native princes.

The letters themselves reveal the same sort of approach, so that when the Sultan writes a friendly letter to the Queen of England, the purport of what he says is that he is happy to add her to the vassals of his imperial throne, and hopes, in the formal phrase, that she will "continue to be firm-footed on the path of devotion and fidelity". None of this appears in the translation, which was made for the English ambassador in Italian and communicated by him to London in English. In these, the language is one of equal negotiation between sovereigns. Thus, for example, in the *berat* (diploma) granted by Murad III to Queen Elizabeth authorizing English merchants to trade in the Ottoman lands, the Sultan speaks of the Queen as having "demonstrated her subservience and devotion and declared her servitude and attachment *(izhar-i ubudiyet ve ihlas ve ish'ar-i rikkiyet ve ihtisas).* The contemporary Italian translation renders this "sincera amicizia".

It was, it seems, the general practice for the dragomans discreetly to modify the language, making it less imperious and more polite. One may safely assume that

they were doing the same thing the other way round, and that when, for example, the Queen wrote to the Sultan expressing good will and friendship, in the Turkish version which reached the Sultan this became loyalty and humble submission.

That is one kind of mistranslation - the mistranslation of diplomatic documents, and I suspect that this continued into modem times, indeed may still be going on. A second type of mistranslation - perhaps more dangerous -occurs in treaties. A treaty is drawn up between at least two parties; it is usually elaborately negotiated, and an agreed text is produced which both parties sign. What exactly is this agreed text?

Two examples may suffice. The first is the Treaty of Kuchuk Kaynarja between Russia and Turkey, signed in 1774 after a Russian victory in a war. The Treaty was drawn up in Italian, still at that time the main diplomatic language. The last article of the Treaty (Article XXVIII) says that the Treaty will be signed and sealed in two versions - one in Italian and Russian, the other in Italian and Turkish, so that each of the two signatory nations would have a version in their own language. The Italian version, which is the same for both, was obviously the binding one. There is no doubt that the Italian version was dictated by the Russians; for one thing, they had just won the war, and they were laying down the terms. But there is even a linguistic piece of evidence: the Italian text of the Treaty refers to the Ottoman Sultan by his title *Padishah,* but writes it Padishag; only a Russian would write a g for an h. Padishag in Italian shows beyond all doubt that the Italian was translated from a Russian original. There was an agreed Italian text, which is the presumed basis of both the Russian and Turkish versions. Yet the Russians used the Russian version, and the Turks used the Turkish version, and quite considerable discrepancies appear between the two, both nominally based on the same Italian text.

For the official translator, elegance is of no significance. What matters is accuracy. But even today, startling discrepancies may sometimes arise. Thus, for example, Article (i) of Security Council Resolution 242 of November 22, 1967, requires the "withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict". The omission of the definite article before "territories" has usually been taken to mean that the required withdrawal relates to some but not necessarily all of the territories in question. This fine but crucial distinction is lost in both the French and Russian versions. The French text includes the definite article, since French grammar requires it. The Russian texts omits the definite article, since in Russian none exists. The Arabic translation, for both stylistic and political reasons, includes the article, but at that time Arabic was not an official UN language.

Carta de lector

Sir, Bernard Lewis's Elie Kedouric Memorial Lecture on the tortuous history of the interpreters in the Middle East (April 23) contains many highly illuminating observations. May 1 be permitted to offer one minor quibble and two further examples of elements discussed in his article?

Professor Lewis's reference to Castilian as first case of a colloquial language being treated seriously should, perhaps, have alluded to the Talmud, which

presents a form of colloquial elaboration of both Hebrew and Aramaic which received an eventually written and largely *ne varietur* text. Long before the 1492 Castilian instance, Hebrew grammarians had subjected. those two languages to philological analysis.

An early biblical example of polyglot attainments and of the interpreter's skills occurs 1 Kings 18:26[1] (also in Isaiah 36:11). where the officers of the King of Assyria were requested by the Jewish negotiators to speak "unto thy servants in Aramaic. for we understand it; and do not speak with us in Jewish [the term 'Hebrew' does not occur in the Old Testament] within ear-shot of the people". The Assyrian officers could thus, converse in Hebrew and Aramaic as well as obviously in their own language, Assyrian.

Lewis also refers to "the general practice for the dragomans discreetly to modify the language making it less imperious and more polite" to the ear of the interlocutor. I have witnessed that practice in contemporary form, when the principal interpreters of the late Emperor Haile Selassie adapted their Sovereign's words to the political or religious susceptibilities of interviewers innocent of the Emperor's Amharic. (Edward Ullendorff, 4 Bladon Close. Oxford.)

Source : *Times Literary Supplement*, April 23 1999.

[1] Then said Eliakim the son of Hilkia, and Shebna, and Joah, unto Rabshakeh, Speak I pray thee, to thy servants in the Syrian language; for wee understand it: and talk not with us in the Jews' language in the ears of the people that are on the wall. (The Isaiah's text is exactly the same.) Nacar-Colunga: Eliaquín, hijo de Helcías; Sobna y Joaj, dijeron al copero mayor: "Habla a tus siervos en arameo, que lo entedenmos; no nos hables en judío delante de todo el pueblo que está en las murallas"