THE TRANSLATION OF āpār ‘DUST’ IN THE LATVIAN BIBLE

Introduction

This paper investigates the translation of āpār ‘dust’ in the Latvian Bible, from Johann Ernst Glück’s first translation in 1689 to the present. After surveying the history of translation in Latvian, we address the lexical semantics of āpār ‘dust’, noting the senses and translation equivalents. We then examine Glück’s approach to translation and the subsequent revisions. Glück rendered āpār as pīšļi ‘dust’ in 97 of the 110 occurrences of the word, yet he also translated the term with seven other translation equivalents, including zeme ‘earth’ and putekļi ‘fine dust’. Subsequent revisions have followed Glück in employing pīšļi ‘dust’ as the principal translation equivalent. However, changes in the semantics of pīšļi ‘dust’ and putekļi ‘fine dust’ coupled with a reevaluation of Glück’s translation strategy, have prompted a steady move from pīšļi as the primary translation equivalent. The paper concludes with proposals for future revisions of the Latvian Bible.

Latvian language and translations

Latvian is a Baltic language spoken primarily in Latvia, with approximately 1.3 million native speakers. Together with Lithuanian, it forms the Baltic sub-family within the Indo-European family of languages. The Latvian language was not written and used in
education until the Protestant Reformation. The first published book in Latvian that has survived to the present is a Catholic catechism published in Vilnius in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in 1585. A Lutheran catechism was published the following year in Vilnius. The first secular book to be published was Georgius Mancelius’ Vademecum in 1631. Mancelius also produced the first dictionary, Lettus, in 1638 and laid the foundations for the language’s orthography.

The translation of the Bible into Latvian is widely recognized as the greatest landmark in the literary development of the Latvian language. With the petition and royal sanction of Charles XI, the king of the Swedish Empire, the German Lutheran pastor Johann Ernst Glück (1652–1705) undertook the task. He published the New Testament in 1685 and subsequently the Old Testament in 1689. However, the completed work, entitled Ta Śwehta Grahmata, was not released until 1694. This translation remained the standard in Latvian religious life until well into the 20th century, going through six subsequent editions, the latest in 1898.

In 1920, the British and Foreign Bible Society began to work with the Lutheran Church in the newly independent Latvia with the goal of revising the Latvian Bible. The revision of the New Testament was completed and published in Latvia in 1936. However, the Second World War and subsequent Soviet occupation delayed the work on the Old Testament. In 1965, the British and Foreign Bible Society and the Latvian community in exile published a revision of the entire Bible, containing the 1936 New Testament and subsequent revisions of the Old Testament. In 1997, the Latvian Bible Society published a revision of the 1965 edition of the Bible.

---

1 The beginnings of the Protestant Reformation in Livonia can be traced to the work of a pastor by the name of Andreas Knopke, who arrived in Riga in 1517 and began preaching Lutheran doctrine in 1522. See Agnis Balodis, Latvijas un latviešu tautas vēsture (Rīga: Kabata, 1990), 64–65.

2 For the history and development of Latvian literature, see G. Berelis, Latviešu literatūras vēsture: No pirmajiem rakstiem līdz 1999. gadam (Rīga: Zvaigzne ABC, 1999).

3 Ernst Glück worked with C. B. Witten under the guidance of Johann Fischer according to Paul Ellingworth, “Latvian”, in A Guide to Bible Translation: People, Languages, and Topics, edited by Philip A. Noss and Charles S. Houser (Maitland, FL: Xulon Press, 2019), 185.

4 See Edgars Dunsdorfs, Pirmās latviešu bībeles vesture (Latviešu ev. lut. baznīca Amerikā: Minneapolis, 1979) and Gustavs Šaurums, Latviešu bībeles vēsture (Rīga: Ev. lut. baznīcas virsvalde, 1935). Ta Swehta Grahmata Jeb Deewa Swehtais Wahrd… (Rīga: Gedruckt bey Johann Georg Wilcken, königl. Buchdrucker, 1689).

5 “Bībeles tulkojumi Latviešu valodā”, Latvian Bible Society, accessed July 26, 2019, http://www.bibelesbiedriba.lv/ Bībeles_tulkojumi_Latviesu_valodas. These occurred in 1739, 1794, 1825, 1854, 1877, and 1898.

6 Ibid.

7 Ibid. See Bībele (London: The British and Foreign Bible Society, 1965).
In January 1995, the Latvian Bible Society started translating a new Latvian Bible. After publishing portions from the New Testament, the entire New Testament appeared in 2005. In 2012, the Latvian Bible Society published the complete Latvian Bible, including, for the first time, a translation of the deuterocanonical books, both Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox. The new translation shares characteristics in common with Glück’s translation from 1689, but also retains some of the modern language introduced in the 1965 revision.

After investigating the semantics of ʿāpār ‘dust’, we will examine in depth Glück’s approach to the translation of this term. After Glück’s Bible (hereafter, LB1689), we will also note the minor revisions in the final 1898 edition (hereafter, LB1898) and then the more extensive revisions in the 1965 London edition (hereafter, LB1965). Finally, we address the translation of ʿāpār in the 2012 Latvian Bible Society’s work (hereafter, LB2012).

Semantics of ʿāpār ‘dust’

The Hebrew noun ʿāpār ‘dust’ has nine distinct senses, clustering in four semantic domains. The first domain includes three senses related to natural materials associated with the ground, glossed as ‘dust’, ‘loose earth’, and ‘soil’. The second consists of a single term referring to a building material made from the natural materials in the first group: ‘mud plaster’. The third domain has four senses denoting various remains of items intentionally destroyed: ‘powder’, ‘debris’, ‘rubble’, and ‘ashes’. The final domain refers to the location from which the materials in the first domain originate, glossed as ‘ground’. In the following section, we examine these senses in greater detail, also noting the related figurative usages. We also provide the standard translation equivalents in English and Latvian, based on a survey of the major translations in each language. A table summarizing the analysis concludes the section.

The first sense of ʿāpār is ‘dust’, referring to fine particles of earth, located on the ground, yet fine enough to be airborne. In Josh. 7:6 and Job 2:12, mourners tore their clothes and put ʿāpār on their heads. In Deut. 28:24, ʿāpār is mentioned as coming down from the sky during a time of drought as part of God’s curse on Israel.

ʿāpār ‘dust’ occurs in three figurative expressions. First, the concept of abundance is conveyed by the simile ‘abundant as dust’ as in Gen. 28:14. Furthermore, the expressions ‘beat like dust’ and ‘destroy like dust’ are used to convey complete destruction by reduction to a fine material as in Ps. 18:42 and Isa. 41:2, respectively. Finally,

---

8 See Bībele jaunā tulkojumā (Rīga, Latvia: Latvijas Bībeles biedriба, 2012).
9 See Bihbele: Wezās un Jaunās Deribas Swehtee Raksti, 8th ed. (Rīga: n. p., 1898).
humiliation is communicated by two expressions that refer to consuming ‘dust’: ‘eat dust’ as in Gen. 3:14 and ‘lick dust’ as in Mic. 7:17.

In the major English translations from the Reformation era until today, the translation equivalent for this sense is dust. The Latvian equivalent is primarily pišļi ‘dust’, but the term putekļi ‘fine dust’ is also used.

The second sense of āpār is ‘loose earth’, denoting material composing part of the surface of the earth, dislodged from the earth by natural or human causes and hence ‘loose’. This sense is seen in Gen. 26:15 where the Philistines are reported to have filled up wells with āpār ‘loose earth’. In Hab. 1:10, military forces piled up āpār ‘loose earth’ in order to build an earthen siege ramp. Similarly, in Lev. 17:13, blood is poured out on the ground and then covered with āpār ‘loose earth’.

āpār ‘loose earth’ occurs in three figurative expressions. First, the concept of abundance is conveyed by the expressions ‘pile up like loose earth’ in Job 27:16 and ‘heap up like loose earth’ in Zech. 9:3. Second, the concept of being despised is expressed with ‘pour out like loose earth’ in Zeph. 1:17. Third, human frailty and mortality is communicated with a metaphorical association of humanity with ‘loose earth’ in Ps. 103:14.

The translation equivalents for this sense in English are dust and earth, with the former used most often in figurative usages of the term. The term earth has been used in Gen. 26:15 with reference to the material that was used to fill wells. The translation equivalent for this sense is predominantly pišļi ‘dust’ in the Latvian translations. However, in Lev. 17:13 the term zeme ‘earth’ has been used from LB1689 until today. Smiltis ‘sand’ was Glück’s choice in Gen. 26:15; more recent versions also employ zeme ‘earth’ for this verse.

The third sense of āpār is ‘soil’, denoting the material composing part of the surface of the earth, yet still in the earth in contrast to the prior senses of ‘loose earth’ and ‘dust.’ In Job 14:19, the torrents wash away the āpār, referring to soil. In Isa. 34:9, Edom’s streams, land, and āpār ‘soil’ will become burning pitch and sulfur, referring to the arable soil that will no longer yield crops. The first two senses, ‘loose earth’ and ‘dust’, refer to material no longer part of the earth; they differ primarily in the degree of fineness of the material, but not in their location. The third sense, ‘soil’, differs in terms of location; it is an instance of a secondary sense based on metonymy, a semantic relationship of association.

The primary English translation equivalents for this sense are dust and soil. Of these two terms, dust has been used more frequently; however, modern English translations also use soil in Isa. 34:7, 9. Pišši ‘dust’ is the primary translation equivalent in Latvian. However, in Job 28:6, the terms graudi ‘granules’ and smiltis ‘sand’ have been used.

The fourth sense of āpār is ‘mud plaster’. It refers to a mixture of loose earth, water, and other ingredients such as straw, applied to the interior wall of a house to

10 D. Clines, “āpār,” Dictionary of Classical Hebrew (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press: 2007), 6:515.
produce a smooth surface.\textsuperscript{11} In Lev. 14:42, instructions are given for removing the stones in the wall of a house and then replacing the stones and applying ʿāpār ‘mud plaster’ to refurbish the wall. This sense is also a case of metonymy; with loose earth being the primary ingredient of plaster, the term ʿāpār is used metonymically to refer to the whole in terms of one of its parts.

The three primary translation equivalents for this sense include dust, mortar, and plaster. In the first English translation from Hebrew, William Tyndale translated ʿāpār in Lev. 14:41 with reference to the plaster that was scrapped off as dust; however, in Lev. 14:42, 45, he translated the term as mortar to convey the concept of a building material. Subsequent English translations followed Tyndale until the American Standard Version of 1899 translated these three instances of ʿāpār with one term, mortar ‘mortar’. The Revised Standard Version continued the practice of using only one term, but replaced mortar with plaster, which has become a significant translation equivalent for ‘mud plaster’ in modern English translations. Māli ‘clays’ is the primary translation equivalent in Latvian from LB1689 to LB1965, but the modern versions have introduced apmetums ‘plaster’ and java ‘mortar’.

The fifth sense of ʿāpār is ‘powder’.\textsuperscript{12} It denotes the remains of objects intentionally destroyed by grinding to a fine consistency. In Deut. 9:21, after grinding the golden calf to ʿāpār, Moses threw its ʿāpār ‘powder’ into a brook. Similarly, in 2 Kings 23:6, idols were burned and beaten to ʿāpār ‘powder’, and then their ʿāpār was thrown away. This sense and the following three senses refer to a material resulting from the intentional destruction of an object; the terms differ primarily in the degree to which the object was destroyed, whether to a fine degree as in the case of ‘powder’ or coarsely and minimally in the case of ‘debris’ and ‘rubble’. These senses are related to the first semantic domain metaphorically, sharing the feature of being material, which is broken, crushed, or even reduced to a fine consistency, usually found on the ground.

The English translation equivalents for this term include dust and powder. The term powder was used in 2 Kings 23:6a, 15 in the Reformation-era translations; the New International Version is a modern translation with powder in these verses. However, the majority of modern English translations prefer dust. In Latvian the translation equivalent is primarily pišļi ‘dust’, but the term putekļi ‘fine dust’ has been used in the LB1965 in 2 Kings 23:6a–b, 15 and in the LB2012 in Deut. 9:21a–b.

\textsuperscript{11} See Philip Zhakevich, “The Tools of an Israelite Scribe: A Semantic Study of the Terms Signifying the Tools and Materials of Writing in Biblical Hebrew” (PhD dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 2015), 75–77, 90–91.

\textsuperscript{12} Clines, “ʾpāʾp,” Dictionary of Classical Hebrew, 6:515. Clines prefers “dust” but adds the qualification “of pulverised ashes.”
The sixth sense of ‘āpār is ‘debris’, denoting course remains of objects intentionally destroyed and left on the ground.\(^\text{13}\) In contrast to ‘powder’, the objects were not ground up as part of being destroyed. In 2 Kings 23:12, various altars were removed and broken into pieces, and the resulting ‘āpār ‘debris’ was thrown into the Kidron valley. Similarly, in Ezek. 26:4, the walls and towers in Tyre were destroyed; then the resulting ‘āpār ‘debris’ was removed.

The translation equivalents for this term include dust, rubble, soil, and debris. Most English translations have employed the term dust. However, in Ezek. 26:4, the remains of Tyre are translated as soil in the Revised Standard Version and English Standard Version, rubble in the New International Version, and debris in the New American Standard Bible. In the Latvian translations, the translation equivalent is primarily pišļi ‘dust’, but the modern translations also use drazas ‘debris’ and atliekas ‘remains’ in 2 Kings 23:12, and gruveši ‘rubble’ and gruži ‘rubbish’ in Ezek. 26:12.

The seventh sense of ‘āpār is ‘rubble’. It refers to broken fragments of material resulting from the destruction of a building, wall, etc. In contrast to the previous senses, ‘powder’ and ‘debris’, ‘rubble’ is larger and potentially still useful in construction. In Neh. 4:2, the workers in Jerusalem mention that there are heaps of ‘āpār ‘rubble’ that contain stones that might be salvaged for rebuilding the wall. Later, in Neh. 4:10, the workers complain that there is so much ‘āpār ‘rubble’ that they are not able to work.

The translation equivalents for this term include dust, rubbish, and rubble. Dust is the most common term; however, in Neh. 4:2, 10, the remains of Jerusalem’s walls are translated as rubbish in the Authorized Version and Revised Standard Version, but as rubble in modern translations such as the NIV. The principal translation equivalent in Latvian is pišļi ‘dust’. However, in Neh. 4:2, pelni ‘ashes’ was used in LB1889 and LB1965; in LB2012, the heaps of ‘āpār are rendered with drupas ‘ruins’. Similarly, in Neh. 4:10, the terms drupas ‘ruins’ and gruveši ‘rubble’ are used instead of pišļi ‘dust’.

The eighth sense of ‘āpār refers to the remains of something burnt, glossed as ‘ashes’. In Num. 19:17, priests are instructed to take ‘āpār from the burnt remains of an offering. Similarly, the burnt remains of idols destroyed in the fields of the Kidron are referred to as ‘āpār in 2 Kings 23:4. The translation equivalent for this term is ashes; it is consistently translated as pelni ‘ashes’ in Latvian.

The ninth and final sense of ‘āpār is ‘ground’.\(^\text{14}\) In Isa 2:19, people live in holes in the ‘āpār ‘ground’. In Job 38:2, iron ore is taken out of the ‘āpār, referring to the ground. Finally, in Job 41:33, the Leviathan has no creature like it on the ‘āpār, referring to the

\(^\text{13}\) Clines, “ AHL”, Dictionary of Classical Hebrew, 6:515. Clines does not distinguish debris and rubble; nonetheless, the translations require more specificity than the lexicons.

\(^\text{14}\) Ibid., 6:515. Clines distinguishes between the senses related to the ground and places these under the first sense, “dust, (dry) earth, soil”; he has a separate sense for place as a grave under
dry land in contrast to its aquatic habitat. The previous senses refer to physical materials, but this sense refers to a location, the source of the material in the first semantic domain, constituting another instance of metonymy.

³āpār ‘ground’ occurs in several figurative expressions. First, the concept of humiliation is conveyed by the expression ‘go to the dust’, as in Lam 3:29. Snakes are described as animals that ‘crawl in the dust’ in Deut. 32:24. Second, exaltation and honor are expressed by the phrases ‘rise from the dust’ and ‘stand on the dust’ in Ps. 113:7 and Job 19:25, respectively. Finally, concepts of death, burial, and the grave are also conveyed. The phrase ‘in the dust’ designates the grave in Job 7:21; ‘return to dust’ refers to being buried and decomposing in Job 10:9. Finally, by metonymic extension, ³āpār refers to a cadaver in a grave in Ps. 30:9.

The translation equivalents for this sense in English include dust, earth, and ground, with dust the predominant term, especially in figurative usages. In Job 41:33, the term earth is used with reference to dry land in contrast to the aquatic habitat of the Leviathan. Furthermore, in Isa. 2:19, ³āpār refers to a specific, local area of the earth and, consequently, it is translated as ground. In Latvian, the translation equivalent is predominantly pišļi ‘dust’, especially in the figurative expressions. The terms zeme ‘earth’ and putekļi ‘fine dust’ are used in some non-figurative expressions. For instance, in Job 41:33, Glück and all subsequent translations have employed zeme ‘earth’.

### Table 1

The senses of ³āpār with glosses, definitions, and English and Latvian translation equivalents.

| Sense | Gloss     | Definition                                           | English equivalents | Latvian equivalents |
|-------|-----------|------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 1     | dust      | fine particles of earth, fine enough to be airborne, typically on the ground | dust                 | pišļi, putekļi     |
| 2     | loose earth | material composing part of the surface of the earth, displaced from the earth | dust, earth          | pišļi, zeme, putekļi, smiltis |
| 3     | soil      | material composing part of the surface of the earth | dust, soil           | pišļi               |

the first sense. However, he has a separate sense for “land, field.” We prefer to group all references to a location in a single sense.
Translation of āpār as ‘dust’ in Glück’s Bible

In this section, we investigate the translation of āpār ‘dust’ in the Latvian Bible. First, Glück’s translation strategy is addressed, with particular attention to the historical influences of other Reformation-era translations. Second, we note the minor revisions in the subsequent editions. The major changes in translation strategy in the 1965 revision (LB1965) are examined in depth. Finally, the manner in which the 2012 translation (LB2012) diverges from the LB1965 and, in other instances, agrees with its attempt to modernize the language, is discussed.

Johann Glück translated āpār with primarily one translation equivalent, pišļi ‘dust’, utilizing this term in 97 of the 110 occurrences of the word. Glück employed seven other translation equivalents as was seen in Table 1. The evidence suggests that Glück did not follow the translation approach of Luther’s German Bible nor the Vulgate, two translations that would have been very familiar to him. Interestingly, his approach resembles the French translation of Pierre-Robert Olivétan in his preference for a single term.15 In the following section, we will examine Glück’s translation according to the different senses of āpār, considering in more depth possible influences on his translation decisions.

Whenever āpār had the sense of ‘dust’, Glück utilized pišļi ‘dust’ in 24 of the 26 instances. In Deut. 28:24, however, he translated āpār as pelni ‘ashes’, following the Vulgate, Luther’s German Bible, and the French Bible. Furthermore, in 2 Kings 13:7,

---

15 Pierre-Robert Olivétan, La Bible Qui est toute la Saincte escripture (Neuchâtel: 1535).
he used *puteķļi* ‘fine dust’ to describe the fine particles of dust associated with the threshing floor, possibly influenced by Luther’s use of *Drescherstaub* ‘threshing dust’. However, Glück did not follow the Vulgate and other Reformation translations in Gen 3:14 by employing a term referring to loose earth or soil. Instead, Glück employed *pišļi* ‘dust’, as found also in the French Bible *pouldre* ‘dust’. Glück and the French Bible also agree in their translation in Job 2:12, 7:15; Ps. 72:9, Isa. 40:12, 65:25, while differing with Luther, who preferred *Erde* ‘earth’.

With the sense ‘loose earth’, Glück utilized *pišļi* ‘dust’ in 11 of the 14 instances. In Gen. 26:15, Glück translated ‘āpār as *smītis* ‘sand’ in reference to the ‘loose earth’ being used to fill a well, following the Vulgate, Luther’s German Bible, and the French Bible. In Lev. 17:13, loose earth is translated as *zeme* ‘earth’, in agreement with Luther but not the French translation. In Gen. 18:27, *puteķļi* is also employed in Abraham’s reference to himself as ‘āpār wā-ʔēper (‘dust and ashes’). Furthermore, in Hab. 1:10, Glück did not follow any of the major translations in using a term that communicates the concept of earth piled up for a ramp, rather, he utilized *pišļi* ‘dust’. Thus, Glück’s preference for *pišļi* ‘dust’ resembles the French translation, with 10 of the 14 verses translated in the same way. However, Glück also agreed with the German translation and not the French rendering in Lev. 17:13.

When ‘āpār had the sense of ‘soil’, Glück utilized *pišļi* ‘dust’ in 5 of the 6 instances. In Job 28:6, though, Glück used a diminutive form of *pišļi* (*Pi∫hli∫chi*) ‘dust’ to convey the concept of small pieces of earth. In Job 38:38, Glück and the major translations agreed in using a term referring to fine particles. However, in Job 28:6, Glück used *pišļi* ‘dust’, while Luther used *Erdenklöße* ‘clods of earth’. Glück and the French translation employed terms for ‘dust’ in Prov. 8:26, Job 17:19, Isa. 34:7, 9; Luther, however, used the terms *Erde* ‘earth’ and *Erdbodens* ‘ground’.

With regard to ‘mud plaster’ in Lev. 14:41–42, 45, Glück used two translation equivalents, *nokasījums* ‘scrapings’ and *māli* ‘clays’. His use of *māli* ‘clays’ indicates the influence of Luther’s translation; Luther translated ‘āpār as *Leimen* ‘clay plaster’ (also plural) in Lev. 14:41–42, 45. Glück employed *māli* ‘clays’ for the fresh building material in 14:42 and the debris in Lev. 14:45. However, he parts with Luther in Lev. 14:41, where he uses *nokasījums* ‘scrapings’. Interestingly, Glück does not use *pišļi* in Lev. 14:41, but prefers a term that is the only instance of a translation equivalent referring to man-made as opposed to naturally occurring material, as is implicit in *nokasījums* ‘scrapings’. The use of this term followed by a second, distinct term in the following verses resembles the translation in the French Bible, with *poudre* ‘dust’ in Lev. 14:41 and then *mortier* ‘mortar’ in Lev. 14:42, 45.

With the senses of ‘powder’, ‘debris’, and ‘rubble’, Glück consistently employed *pišļi* ‘dust’. The German and French translations agreed in using *Staub* ‘dust’ and *poudre* ‘dust’ for these senses. However, the French translation used *terre* ‘earth’ in Neh. 4:10,
yet Glück preferred pīšļi ‘dust’, as did Luther in his translation. Finally, with the sense ‘ashes’ in Num. 19:17, Glück translated ˁāpār as pelni ‘ashes’. It is noteworthy that the French translation has poudre ‘dust’ in this passage. If Glück’s translation strategy were to follow the French consistently, we would expect him to translate ˁāpār as pīšļi in Num. 19:17, but he did not, suggesting that he was working more independently in his translation.

Finally, the sense of ‘ground’ was translated with pīšļi ‘dust’ in 44 of the 47 instances of the sense. In Job 28:2, iron is described as coming out of the ˁāpār ‘ground’; similarly, in Isa. 2:19, people hide in holes in the ˁāpār ‘ground’. In both verses, Glück employed zeme ‘earth’. Furthermore, Glück employed zeme ‘earth’ in Job 41:33, which describes the Leviathan as having no rival on the ˁāpār, referring to the dry land in contrast to its aquatic habitat. Glück agrees with the French in 41 verses with ‘dust’, and in three with ‘earth’. However, in three remaining verses, he agrees with Luther’s Staub ‘dust’ (such as in Job 8:19).

In summary, Johann Glück translated ˁāpār with a preference for the translation equivalent pīšļi ‘dust’. He also employed translation equivalents referring to naturally occurring materials in agreement with other translations, e.g., pelni ‘ashes’ and māli ‘clays’. Glück did not follow closely the translation approach of the Vulgate and German Bible, but rather his approach resembles the French translation in its preference for a single term. However, the influence of Luther’s Bible is seen in the use of māli ‘clays’ in Lev. 14:42, 45. On the other hand, the distinct influence of the French translation may be seen in the use of two translation equivalents in Lev 14:41–42, 45. These observations suggest that as Glück translated from the Hebrew, he consulted other translations, even adapting some of their translation decisions, but he did not appear to follow one translation so systematically as to suggest a dependence on one Reformation-era translation over another. These preliminary observations regarding Glück’s translation of a single Hebrew term concur with Kazakēnaitė’s finding that Glück’s New Testament translation was a ‘heterogeneous’ translation, showing influence from a variety of sources.16

Translation of ˁāpār as ‘dust’ in LB1898

The 1898 edition of Glück’s Bible underwent minor revisions, with only 11 changes in the translation of ˁāpār ‘dust’. One notable revision was the change of pīšļi to putekļi in Ps. 78:27, where the term is used to describe the abundance of meat descending from heaven. The revision suggests that the translators recognized that

---

16 Ernesta Kazakēnaitė, “Connections between fragments of the 16th–17th century Lutheran Bible in Latvian and Glück’s translation of the Bible into Latvian (1685–1694) [A summary of a thesis]” (PhD Dissertation, Vilnius University, 2019), 41–42.
putekļi denoted airborne particles. Conversely, the term putekļi was revised to pišļi in 2 Kings 13:7 and Gen. 18:27 because the particles of earth in these contexts are not airborne.

Furthermore, ˁāpar has the sense of ‘loose earth’ in 1 Kings 18:38 and, consequent-ly, was revised from pišļi to zeme ‘earth’. ˁāpar has the sense of ‘soil’ in Job 28:6 and, consequently, it was revised as graudi ‘granules’. Although Glück translated ˁāpar with the sense of ‘rubble’ as pišļi ‘dust’, the 1898 revision has pelni ‘ashes’ in Neh. 4:2 and gruveši ‘rubble’ in Neh. 4:10.

In Job 30:6, ˁāpar has the sense of ‘ground’ and, consequently, was revised from pišļi to zeme ‘earth’. Similarly, pišļi was revised as smiltis ‘sand’ in Job 39:14. Finally, in Isa. 47:1, pišļi was revised as zemes pišļi ‘earth’s dust’, a new translation equivalent.

Translation of ˁāpar as ‘dust’ in LB1965

The 1965 work undertaken by the British and Foreign Bible Society resulted in a major revision, differing from 1898 edition in 37 verses. One significant change was the use of putekļi ‘fine dust’ in ten more verses than in prior versions; zeme ‘earth’ was also used more frequently. Furthermore, 10 new translation equivalents were introduced, such as apmetums ‘plaster’ and drupas ‘ruins’.

In the verses in which ˁāpar refers to ‘dust’, pišļi ‘dust’ remains the primary translation equivalent. However, in five instances, pišļi was revised as putekļi to convey the concept of a finer dust than associated with pišļi, as in Num. 5:17, where the referent is fine dust from the floor. Furthermore, putekļi was preferred over pišļi in Num. 23:10 to express the concept of abundance. Pišļi was also replaced by putekļi in the expression ‘to beat as fine as dust’ in 2 Sam. 22:43 and Ps. 18:42. These revisions reflect the semantic broadening of the term putekļi, from ‘airborne dust’ to ‘dust’.

When referring to ‘loose earth’, pišļi is revised as putekļi in Zech. 9:3, but as samazgas ‘silt’ in Zeph. 1:17, pišļu kaudze ‘pile of earth’ in Job 27:16, and smilšu valnis ‘wall of sand’ in Hab. 1:10. With the sense of ‘soil’, pišļi was translated as zeme ‘earth’ in Prov. 8:26, Isa. 34:7, 9 and zemes virsus ‘top of the earth’ in Job 38:38.

Finally, in the verses referring to ‘mud plaster’, the term nokasījums ‘scrapings’ was revised with atkritumi ‘remains’, a more general term for the broken pieces of plaster scraped off the wall. In Lev. 14:42, the term māli ‘clays’ was retained, but in v. 45, māli ‘clays’ was replaced by a term referring to a kind of construction material, namely, apmetums ‘plaster’.

In the verses with ˁāpar referring to ‘powder’, pišļi is revised as putekļi in 2 Kings 23:6a, 6b, and 15, suggesting, as seen earlier, that the translators considered putekļi a better term for fine material than pišļi. When ˁāpar has the sense of ‘rubble’, gruveši was revised as drupas in Neh. 4:10.
Finally, with the sense ‘ground’, pišļi was revised as zeme in Job 14:8, Isa. 2:10, and Isa. 29:4a. The translators also employed other terms, including zemes pišļi ‘earth’s dust’ in Job 5:6, putekļi in Ps. 44:25, kapa smiltis ‘grave sand’ in Job 21:26, and zemes klēpis ‘lap of the earth’ in Ps. 22:29.

**Translation of ˁāpār as ‘dust’ in LB2012**

The 2012 Latvian Bible was a new translation, differing in many respects from the previous three versions, but it also reflects an appreciation for Glück’s translation over LB1965. LB2012 agrees with the LB1965 version in employing putekļi more frequently, with 17 usages as opposed of 11 in LB1898 and only one in LB1689. However, LB2012 prefers the term pišļi to terms like zeme and pelni. Furthermore, LB2012 directly continued the use of only one of the 10 new translation equivalents in the 1965 revision, namely, apmetums ‘plaster’.

In the verses in which ˁāpār refers to ‘dust’, the term putekļi ‘fine dust’ is used instead of the traditional pišļi in 9 verses: Gen. 13:16a–b, 28:14; Exod. 8:16, 17a–b; 2 Chr. 1:9, 2 Kings 13:7, and Isa. 49:23. In four verses with putekļi in the LB1965, LB2012 preferred pišļi: Num. 5:17, Ps. 78:27, 2 Sam. 22:43, Mic. 7:17. In addition, the traditional rendering as pelni ‘ashes’ in Deut. 28:24 was replaced with pišļi. Similarly, pišļi was used in Job 7:5, in agreement with LB1689 (ne∫chkih∫teem Pih∫chleem ‘unclean dust’) in contrast to puveši ‘rot’ in LB1965.

A similar preference for pišļi is seen in the verses wherein ˁāpār has the meaning of ‘loose earth.’ Pišļi is used instead of pelni ‘ashes’ in 1 Kings 18:38, pišļi kaudze ‘pile of dirt’ in Job 27:16, samazgas ‘silt’ in Zeph. 1:17, and putekļi ‘fine dust’ in Zech. 9:3. Furthermore, when ˁāpār refers to ‘soil’, LB2012 prefers pišļi to zeme in Job 38:38, Prov. 8:26, and Isa. 34:7, 9.

In the verses in which ˁāpār refers to ‘mud plaster’, LB2012 exhibits two translation equivalents, apmetums ‘plaster’ for the dry material in Lev. 14:41 and java ‘mortar’ for the malleable building material and its remains in Lev. 14:42, 45. This approach resembles the use of two terms in LB1689 as opposed to the three terms in LB1965. However, LB2012 does not employ māli ‘clays’, but introduced a new translation equivalent, java ‘mortar’, and retains one of the terms introduced in LB1965, apmetums ‘plaster’.

With the sense of ‘powder’, pišļi is revised as putekļi in Deut. 9:21a–b. However, the translators preferred pišļi to putekļi in 2 Kings 23:6a–b, and verse 15. Furthermore, with reference to ‘debris’, LB2012 introduced a new term, atliekas ‘remains’ in 2 Kings 23:12. But in 1 Kings 20:10, pišļi is putekļi, not a term for ‘debris’. In the verses referring to ‘rubble’, gruveši is used in Neh. 4:10 instead of drupas ‘rubble’. In Neh. 4:2, though, drupas is used instead of LB1965 pelni ‘ashes’. The translators continued to use pišļi in Ps. 102:14 and Ezek. 26:4.
Finally, with the sense ‘ground’, LB2012 preferred *pīšļi* ‘dust’ over other translation equivalents. Furthermore, they agreed with the traditional renderings in 1898 and did not accept the new translation equivalents from 1965, including *kapa smiltis* ‘grave sand’ in Job 21:26 and *zemes klēpis* ‘lap of the earth’ in Ps. 22:29. However, the LB2012 differed with LB1898 by revising *pīšļi* as *puteķļi* ‘fine dust’ in two verses, Ps. 119:25 and Isa. 2:10.

**Proposed revisions of the translation of *‘āpār* as ‘dust’**  
In this final section, we propose revisions to the translation of *‘āpār* in 33 verses of the LB2012. Of the 33 revisions, three involve returning to a translation decision originating with Glück’s 1689 translation while three others agree with revisions of 1898. Furthermore, nine proposed revisions agree with LB1965 against LB2012. However, 18 of the revisions are new, especially those employing a new translation equivalent, *augsne* ‘soil’.

**Revisions of the translation of *‘āpār* with the sense ‘dust’**  
*‘āpār* has the sense of ‘dust’ in 26 of its 110 occurrences, referring in these verses to fine particles of earth. From Johann Glück’s translations until the LB2012, the principal translation equivalent has remained *pīšļi* ‘dust’. However, the meaning of this term appears to be narrowing semantically, from fine particles of earth to particles of earth originating from the remains of a cadaver.

Note, for example, the following usage of *pīšļi* in *Mērnieku laiki* (1879), the first modern Latvian novel:  

… kad tautas kronis, gods un greznība guļ *pīšļos* pie viņas nicinātāju un tēvijas smējēju kājām…

“… when the crown of the nation, its honour and splendour, lie in the dust at the feet of her fatherland’s jeerers and mockers …”

*Mērnieku laiki*, chapter 2

The context and usage of *pīšļi* in this example clearly evidences overtones of humiliation (if not outright death). It is not difficult to posit a semantic development from the

---

17 Latvian literature in the modern period began with the literary work produced by the New Latvians during the first national awakening in the mid 19th century.  
18 Reinis Kaudzīte and Matīss Kaudzīte, *Mērnieku laiki* (Rīga: Liesma, 1980), 359.
predominant location of пішлі (namely, the ground) to the location being the place of humiliation and death.

Jēkabs Janševskis’ 1928 novel Bandavā has 5 occurrences of пішлі, all semantically associated with death and decay to varying degrees. The following is a striking example:

“Pēc dažām dienām viss jau pārvēršas пішлос, top par zemes піті,” viņš domāja. “Nu es redzu pats savu kapu. Tā tas reiz patiesi izskatīsies, un es tur gulēšu apakšā un sapūšu, un iznīkšu…”

‘After a few days, everything already turns into dust, becoming earth,’ he thought. ‘Now I see my own grave. One day it will truly look like that, and I will lie there underneath and rot away and decompose…’ ”

Chapter 42 (Pēc bērēm)

Finally, for a recent example, note Ojārs Vācietis’ poem Si minors:

Ja tu no savas patiesības bīsies, klūs пішлос viss, kas bija dzīvs un zaļš, un kamolīnā varaviksnes tīsies, un tēvi nesīs zārkus atpakal.

“If you’ll be afraid of your own truth, then everything which once was living and green will turn to dust, and rainbows will roll up into a ball of yarn, and will fathers carry back coffins.”

_Si minors_ (1982)

As can be seen from the above examples, the term пішлі has connotations of mourning, death, and judgment. By contrast, _puteķļi_ ‘fine dust’ appears to have broadened semantically, from airborne particles to any fine particles, regardless of location. For example, Edvarts Virza’s famous work Straumēni (1933) clearly indicates the use of _puteķļi_ to refer to fine dust that has accumulated and settled, and is no longer airborne: …ar slotu aizslaukot projām zirneklju tīklus un _puteķļus_, kas še bija sakrājušies no pērnā gada kulšanas (“...sweeping away with a broom cobwebs and dust that had accumulated

19 Other examples are also illustrative. Chapter 14 (Liela uzdevuma priekšā) mentions autumn leaves that have been stomped into the dust (rudenī nobīrušas, пішлос samītas lapas). In chapter 15 (Kā pasakā), life is described in the following way: projām no pelēkās ikdienišķības, no zemes nicības un пішлju dzīves (“away from gray daily existence, from the transitoriness of the earth, and a life of dust”).

20 Jēkabs Janševskis, Bandavā (Rīga: Daugava, 2001), 559.

21 Ojārs Vācietis, “Si minors” in Ojāra Vācieša Kopotie raksti, 4 (Rīga: Liesma, 1991), 77.
here from the previous year’s threshing.”). Given these ongoing semantic changes in the language, we suggest the following revisions.

We propose that *puteķļi* ‘fine dust’ is the preferred term when *ˁāpār* refers to fine particles of earth. For example, in Num. 5:17, *ˁāpār* refers to fine particles of earth from the floor of the tabernacle, fine enough to be mixed in water. In Ps. 78:27, *ˁāpār* is used figuratively to convey the concept of food descending in abundance form the sky; thus, *puteķļi* more accurately conveys these concepts with its association of being fine enough to be airborne. Furthermore, in 2 Sam. 22:42 and Isa. 41:2, *ˁāpār* is used in a simile to express the concept of being reduced to a fine consistency; thus, we propose that *puteķļi* be employed over *pišļi*.

Finally, the concept of licking *ˁāpār* as an expression of humiliation occurs in Ps. 72:9, Isa. 49:23, and Mic. 7:17. LB1965 translated *ˁāpār* as *puteķļi* in Mic 7:17 but as *pišļi* in the other two verses; however, LB2012 translated *ˁāpār* as *puteķļi* in Isa. 49:23, but as *pišļi* in the other two verses. We propose that *puteķļi* be employed in all three verses for consistency and because this term more accurately conveys that the material on the feet would be fine, even sufficiently fine to be airborne.

### Table 3

| Citation   | LB1689 | LB1898 | LB1965 | LB2012 | Revision |
|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------|
| Num. 5:17  | *pišļi* | *pišļi* | *puteķļi* | *pišļi* | *puteķļi* |
| Ps. 78:27  | *pišļi* | *puteķļi* | *puteķļi* | *pišļi* | *puteķļi* |
| 2 Sam. 22:43 | *pišļi* | *pišļi* | *puteķļi* | *pišļi* | *puteķļi* |
| Isa. 41:2  | *pišļi* | *pišļi* | *pišļi* | *pišļi* | *puteķļi* |
| Ps. 72:9   | *pišļi* | *pišļi* | *pišļi* | *pišļi* | *puteķļi* |
| Mic. 7:17  | *pišļi* | *pišļi* | *puteķļi* | *pišļi* | *puteķļi* |

### Revisions of the translation of *ˁāpār* with the sense ‘loose earth’

*ˁāpār* has the sense ‘loose earth’ in 14 verses, referring to material dislodged from the earth. Following Glück, the Latvian translations have preferred *pišļi* ‘dust’ or another term such as *smiltis* ‘sand’, *pelni* ‘ashes’ or *samazgas* ‘silt’ instead of *zeme* ‘earth’. However, given the semantic narrowing evidenced by *pišļi*, we propose the following revisions.

---

22 Edvarts Virza, “Vasara”, in *Straumēni* (Rīga: Liesma, 1989), 112.
In 2 Sam. 16:13, ‘āpār refers to loose earth on the side of a path, possibly loosened when Shimei picked up adjacent stones to throw at King David. In this context, we suggest *smiltis* ‘sand’ as preferable to *pišļi* ‘dust’. In 1 Kings 18:38, Elijah built an altar and had a trench dug around it; when fire descended on the altar, it burned the altar itself as well as the ‘āpār. In this context, we suggest that the ‘āpār refers to the earth dislodged by digging the trench, not simply dust that might have been on the ground. Similarly, in Ezek. 24:7, a reference is made to pouring blood on the ground and then covering it with ‘āpār; we suggest that *zeme* ‘earth’ better communicates that loose earth was taken to cover the blood.

In Job 27:16 and Zech. 9:3, the expression ‘to heap up silver like [‘āpār]’ conveys the concept of abundance; furthermore, in these verses, ‘āpār is used in parallel with ‘mud’ and ‘clay’, suggesting that ‘āpār refers to dislodged earth. We propose that *zeme* ‘earth’ better conveys the image of heaping up earth in abundance.

Finally, in Gen. 3:19a, Adam is referred to as ‘āpār ‘dust’. In this verse, ‘āpār has been traditionally translated as *pišļi* ‘dust’; however, in LB2012, it was translated with a singular form of the noun, *pišlis*, meaning ‘a piece of dust’. However, *pišļi* was retained in Gen. 2:7 and other verses referring to human creation. Thus, we propose retaining the traditional rendering in Gen. 3:19a.

### Table 4

Translation of ‘āpār ‘loose earth’ with proposed revisions.

| Citation   | LB1689 | LB1898 | LB1965 | LB2012 | Revision   |
|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|------------|
| 2 Sam. 16:13 | *pišļi* | *pišļi* | *pišļi* | *pišļi* | *smiltis*  |
| Ezek. 24:7   | *pišļi* | *pišļi* | *pišļi* | *putekļi* | *zeme*     |
| 1 Kings 18:38 | *pišļi* | *zeme* | *pelni* | *pišļi* | *zeme*     |
| Job. 27:16   | *pišļi* | *pišļi* | *pišļu kaudze* | *pišļi* | *zeme*     |
| Zech. 9:3    | *pišļi* | *pišļi* | *putekļi* | *pišļi* | *zeme*     |
| Gen. 3:19a   | *pišļi* | *pišļi* | *pišļi* | *pišlis* | *pišļi*    |

**Revisions of the translation of ‘āpār with the sense ‘soil’**

‘āpār has the sense ‘soil’ in 6 verses, referring to material in the earth. Following Glück, the Latvian translations have preferred *pišļi* ‘dust’. However, we propose reconsidering the use of modern terms for ‘soil’ or kinds of earth in place of *pišļi* ‘dust’, especially in view of the changes in meaning associated with the term.

In Job 14:19, a flood washes away the ‘āpār and leaves man without hope, a reference to soil; thus, the term *smiltis* ‘sand’ conveys the notion of a kind of soil that...
would be prone to damage by flooding. In Job 38:38, ˒āpār refers to the soil, which hardens due to lack of rain. In Prov. 8:26, ˒āpār is used in parallel with ˒ēreṣ ‘land’ and conveys the idea of the material covering the earth. In these two verses, we propose *źeme* ‘earth’ in lieu of *pišļi* ‘dust’.

Finally, in Isa. 34:7, ˒āpār is used in parallel with ˒ēreṣ ‘land’ to refer to the ground, which swells with the blood and fat of sacrifices. Similarly, in Isa. 34:9, ˒āpār and ˒ēreṣ ‘land’ occur in parallel in reference to the materials, which are destroyed in judgment. In these verses, we propose a new translation equivalent, *augsne* ‘soil’.

**Table 5**  
**Translation of ˒āpār ‘soil’ with proposed revisions.**

| Citation   | LB1689 | LB1898 | LB1965 | LB2012 | Revision  |
|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------|
| Job 14:19  | *pišļi* | *pišļi* | *pišļi* | *pišļi* | *smiltis* |
| Job 38:38  | *pišļi* | *pišļi* | *źemes virsus* | *pišļi* | *źeme*   |
| Prov. 8:26 | *pišļi* | *pišļi* | *źeme* | *pišļi* | *źeme*   |
| Isa. 34:7  | *pišļi* | *pišļi* | *źeme* | *pišļi* | *augsne* |
| Isa. 34:9  | *pišļi* | *źeme* | *pišļi* | *augsne* |

**Revisions of the translation of ˒āpār with the sense ‘mud plaster’**

In Lev. 14:41, ˒āpār refers to the dry, broken remains of mud plaster, which has been scraped off the walls. The traditional terms *nokasījums* ‘scrapings’ and *atkritumi* ‘remains’ convey the idea of remains, but LB2012 used *apmetums* ‘plaster’ and allowed the context to communicate that it was broken into pieces. In Lev. 14:42, fresh mud plaster is applied to the wall. LB2012 employs *java* ‘mortar’ to express that this is fresh material, but we propose *apmetuma java* ‘plaster’ to distinguish fresh plaster from mortar. Finally, Lev. 14:45 contains a reference to the broken remains of the house, doubtless including the mud plaster. We propose the term *gruveši* ‘debris’, in view of the fact that the debris in question would include more than broken plaster.

**Table 6**  
**Translation of ˒āpār ‘mud plaster’ with proposed revisions.**

| Citation   | LB1689     | LB1898     | LB1965     | LB2012     | Revision     |
|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| Lev. 14:41 | *nokasījums* | *nokasījums* | *atkritumi* | *apmetums* | *apmetums*   |
| Lev. 14:42 | *māli*     | *māli*     | *māli*     | *java*     | *apmetuma java* |
| Lev. 14:45 | *māli*     | *māli*     | *apmetums* | *java*     | *gruveši*    |
Revisions of the translation of ˁāpār with the sense ‘powder’

The term ˁāpār ‘powder’ is used in 2 Kings 23:6, 15 with reference to the remains of Asherah poles and altars that were destroyed and reduced to ˁāpār ‘powder’, before being scattered on graves as well as thrown into the Kidron. We propose that ˁāpār ‘powder’ be translated with putekļi ‘fine dust’, since this term refers to fine particles of material. The LB2012 translators used the term putekļi for the powdery remains in Deut. 9:21a–b; thus, this revision would produce a consistent rendering of the sense ‘powder’ with putekļi.

Table 7  Translation of ˁāpār ‘powder’ with proposed revisions.

| Citation   | LB1689 | LB1898 | LB1965 | LB2012 | Revision |
|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------|
| 2 Kings 23:6a | pišļi | pišļi | putekļi | pišļi | putekļi |
| 2 Kings 23:6b | pišļi | pišļi | putekļi | pišļi | putekļi |
| 2 Kings 23:15 | pišļi | pišļi | putekļi | pišļi | putekļi |

Revisions of the translation of ˁāpār with the sense ‘rubble’

In Neh. 4:2, 10, the term ˁāpār refers to the rubble of the destroyed wall. We propose that drupas ‘rubble’ be used in both verses. In Ps. 102:14, ˁāpār occurs in parallel with ‘stones’, and in 104:16, a reference to building the city is made, suggesting a context of destruction with the hope of rebuilding. We propose that ˁāpār has the sense of ‘rubble’ as opposed to ‘dust’ in this passage. In Ezek. 26:4–5, the destruction of the city of Tyre is prophesied; the walls and towers of the city will be destroyed, and then the ˁāpār of the city will be scraped into the sea, revealing the bedrock on which the city was built. We propose that after the destruction of the city, it is more probable that ‘rubble’ would need to be removed than pišļi ‘dust’ or zeme ‘earth’.

Table 8  Translation of ˁāpār ‘rubble’ with proposed revisions.

| Citation   | LB1689 | LB1898 | LB1965 | LB2012 | Revision |
|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------|
| Neh. 4:2   | pišļi | pelni  | pelni  | drupas | drupas   |
| Neh. 4:10  | pišļi | gruveši| drupas | gruveši| drupas   |
| Ps. 102:14 | pišļi | pišļi  | pišļi  | pišļi  | drupas   |
| Ezek. 26:4 | pišļi | pišļi  | zeme   | pišļi  | drupas   |
Revisions of the translation of ˁāpār with the sense ‘ground’

ˁāpār has the sense ‘ground’ in 19 verses, referring to a location instead of material associated with the location. Following Glück, the Latvian translations have preferred pišļi ‘dust’ but also employed other terms such as zeme ‘earth’ and zemes pišļi ‘earth’s dust’. We propose that the phrase zemes pišļi ‘earth’s dust’ in Job 4:19 and 41:33 be revised as zeme ‘earth’. In fact, ˁāpār was translated as zeme in Job 41:33 from Glück’s translation until 1965. The phrase zemes pišļi does not convey the sense of ‘ground’ more clearly than the simple term zeme ‘earth’, and so we propose the traditional rendering. Similarly, ˁāpār was translated as zeme ‘earth’ in Job 28:2 in Glück’s translation; we propose that the 2012 revision to pišļi be reversed to restore the traditional zeme ‘earth’ in this verse.

In Job 39:14, the ostrich is described as leaving her eggs on the ground to warm on the ˁāpār; we propose that smiltis ‘sand’ better describes the location than pišļi ‘dust’. In Isa. 2:10, ˁāpār is used in parallel with šûr ‘rock’ to refer to a place that someone could enter to hide; thus, we propose zeme ‘earth’ to convey the idea of a subterranean refuge. Furthermore, in Amos 2:7, the expression ‘dust of the earth’ is used; we propose that it be consistently translated with putekļi when referring to fine material on the surface of the ground. Finally, when ˁāpār ‘ground’ is used in a context referring to plants, we propose employing augsne ‘soil’, as in Job 8:19 and 14:8.

Table 9  Translation of ˁāpār ‘ground’ with proposed revisions.

| Citation   | LB1689 | LB1898 | LB1965 | LB2012  | Revision |
|------------|--------|--------|--------|---------|----------|
| Job 4:19   | pišļi  | pišļi  | pišļi  | zemes pišļi | zeme     |
| Job 8:19   | pišļi  | pišļi  | pišļi  | pišļi   | augsne   |
| Job 14:8   | pišļi  | pišļi  | zeme   | pišļi   | augsne   |
| Job 28:2   | zeme   | zeme   | zeme   | pišļi   | zeme     |
| Job 39:14  | pišļi  | smiltis| smiltis| pišļi   | smiltis  |
| Job 41:33  | zeme   | zeme   | zeme   | zemes pišļi | zeme    |
| Isa. 2:10  | pišļi  | pišļi  | pišļi  | pišļi   | putekļi  |
| Amos 2:7   | pišļi  | pišļi  | pišļi  | pišļi   | putekļi  |
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Conclusion

We have investigated the translation of הָעַד ‘dust’ in the Latvian Bible, from Johann Ernst Glück’s translation in 1689 to the most recent translation of the Bible in 2012. We have noted that Glück did not follow closely Luther’s translation in German, as other Lutheran translations in the Reformation era did. On the contrary, Glück translated with one principal translation equivalent, πῆλος ‘dust’, and employed seven other terms, preferring terms that refer to naturally occurring materials. Glück’s approach has significantly influenced subsequent versions, especially the 2012 Latvian Bible Society translation. Following our study of the translation of הָעַד ‘dust’, we propose 33 revisions to the 2012 Latvian Bible. Of the 33 revisions, three involve returning to a translation decision associated with Glück’s 1689 translation while three others agree with revisions of the 1898 edition. Furthermore, nine proposed revisions agree with the London revision of 1965 against the 2012 translation. However, 18 of the revisions are new, especially those employing a new translation equivalent, augšne ‘soil’. We hope that our research sheds further light on the history of the Latvian Bible while contributing to future Latvian translation.

KOPSAVILKUMS

Vārda ḥāʿād ‘pišļi’ tulkošana latviešu Bībelē

Rakstā pētīta senebreju vārda ḥāʿād ‘pišļi’ tulkošana latviešu Bībelē – no Johana Ernsta Glika 1689. gada tulkojuma līdz mūsdienām. Rakstu sākam ar pārskatu par latviešu Bībeles tulkošanas vēsturi. Pēc tam tiek diskutēta vārda ḥāʿād ‘pišļi’ leksiskā semantika. Mēs vārdu iedalām pēc leksiskās nozīmes niansēm un katrai piedāvājam definīcijas. Tiek izklāstīti galvenie angļu un latviešu valodas tulkojumos izmantotie vārdi. Tālāk pētām Gliks tulkojumu pišļi lietojis 97 reizes (vārds ḥāʿād Bībelē kopumā sastopams 110 reižu), taču viņš arī izmantoja vēl septiņus vārdus, to skaitā zeme un putekļi.

Turklāt arī pieminam pārmaiņas nākamajās revīzijās. Plašāk pētām tulkošanas pieeju 1965. gada izdevumā, kura teksts ievērojami mainījies. Visbeidzot, analizējam jauno tulkojumu (2012) salīdzinājumā ar iepriekšējām revīzijām (tulkojums vietām līdzinās, vietām atšķiras no 1965. gada izdevuma modernizētās valodas).

Nobeigumā sniedzam ieteikumus 2012. gada tulkojuma revīzijai: piedāvājam izmaiņas 33 pantos, kur tiek izmantots senebreju vārds ḥāʿād. No šiem ieteikumiem trīs atspoguļo Glika originālo tulkojumu un vēl trīs sakrīt ar 1898. gada izdevumu. Deviņas ieteiktās izmaiņas sakrīt ar Londonas 1965. gada revīziju. Savukārt 18 pantos piedāvājam jaunus ieteikumus, vietām arī jaunu vārdu augšne. Ceram, ka mūsu pētījuma atklājumi un ieteikumi snieg ieguldījumu nākotnes tulkojumiem latviešu valodā.