

PhD, The Master's Seminary, Sun Valley, California, USA

AARON SHRYOCK

PhD, Tyndale House, Cambridge, United Kingdom

KASPARS OZOLIŅŠ

THE TRANSLATION OF עָפָר ^ʿĀPĀR 'DUST' IN THE LATVIAN BIBLE

Introduction

This paper investigates the translation of עָפָר ^ʿāpār '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 ^ʿāpār 'dust', noting the senses and translation equivalents. We then examine Glück's approach to translation and the subsequent revisions. Glück rendered ^ʿāpār 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.¹ 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.²

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.³ He published the New Testament in 1685 and subsequently the Old Testament in 1689. However, the completed work, entitled *Ta Šwehta Grammata*, was not released until 1694.⁴ This translation remained the standard in Latvian religious life until well into the 20th century, going through six subsequent editions, the latest in 1898.⁵

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 1936.⁶ 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.⁷ 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 Grammata Jeb Deewa Swehtais Wahrds...* (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/Bibeles_tulkojumi_Latviesu_valoda. 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.⁸ 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).⁹ Finally, we address the translation of *ʿāpār* in the 2012 Latvian Bible Society's work (hereafter, LB2012).

Semantics of עָפָר *ʿāpār* 'dust'

The Hebrew noun עָפָר *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 biedrība, 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 *pīšļi* ‘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 *pīšļi* ‘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. *Pīšļi* ‘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’.¹⁰ 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, “**אָפָר**,” *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press: 2007), 6:515.

produce a smooth surface.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 ^š*āpār* ‘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 ^š*āpār* 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 ^š*āpār* 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 ^š*āpār* with one term, *mortar* ‘mortar’. The Revised Standard Version continued the practice of using only one term, but replaced *morter* 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 ^š*āpār* is ‘powder’.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 ^š*āpār*, Moses threw its ^š*āpār* ‘powder’ into a brook. Similarly, in 2 Kings 23:6, idols were burned and beaten to ^š*āpār* ‘powder’, and then their ^š*āpār* 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 *pīšļi* ‘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.

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.

12 Clines, “עָפָר,” *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, 6:515. Clines prefers “dust” but adds the qualification “of pulverised ashes.”

The sixth sense of ʿāpār is ‘debris’, denoting course remains of objects intentionally destroyed and left on the ground.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 ʿāpār ‘debris’ was thrown into the Kidron valley. Similarly, in Ezek. 26:4, the walls and towers in Tyre were destroyed; then the resulting ʿāpār ‘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 *pīšļi* ‘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 ʿāpār 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 ʿāpār ‘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 ʿāpār ‘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 *pīšļi* ‘dust’. However, in Neh. 4:2, *pelni* ‘ashes’ was used in LB1889 and LB1965; in LB2012, the heaps of ʿāpār are rendered with *drupas* ‘ruins’. Similarly, in Neh. 4:10, the terms *drupas* ‘ruins’ and *gruveši* ‘rubble’ are used instead of *pīšļi* ‘dust’.

The eighth sense of ʿāpār refers to the remains of something burnt, glossed as ‘ashes’. In Num. 19:17, priests are instructed to take ʿāpār from the burnt remains of an offering. Similarly, the burnt remains of idols destroyed in the fields of the Kidron are referred to as ʿāpār 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 ʿāpār is ‘ground’.¹⁴ In Isa 2:19, people live in holes in the ʿāpār ‘ground’. In Job 38:2, iron ore is taken out of the ʿāpār , referring to the ground. Finally, in Job 41:33, the Leviathan has no creature like it on the ʿāpār , referring to the

13 Clines, “עָפָר,” *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, 6:515. Clines does not distinguish debris and rubble; nonetheless, the translations require more specificity than the lexicons.

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.

ʿāpār ‘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, ʿāpār 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, ʿāpār refers to a specific, local area of the earth and, consequently, it is translated as *ground*. In Latvian, the translation equivalent is predominantly *pīšļi* ‘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 ʿāpār 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	<i>dust</i>	<i>pīšļi, putekļi</i>
2	loose earth	material composing part of the surface of the earth, displaced from the earth	<i>dust, earth</i>	<i>pīšļi, zeme, putekļi, smiltis</i>
3	soil	material composing part of the surface of the earth	<i>dust, soil</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>

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.

4	mud plaster	mixture of earth, water, and other ingredients used to form a smooth layer on the surface of a wall	dust, mortar, plaster	māli, apmetums, java
5	powder	remains of object intentionally destroyed by grinding	dust, powder	pīšļi, putekļi
6	debris	coarse remains of objects intentionally destroyed and left on the ground	dust, rubble, soil, debris	pīšļi, putekļi, drazas, atliekas
7	rubble	broken fragments of material resulting from the destruction of a wall, building, etc.	dust, rubbish, rubble	pīšļi, pelni, drupas, gruveši
8	ashes	remains of something burnt	ashes	pelni
9	ground	surface of the earth comprised of material such as soil, typically a limited extent of the surface	dust, earth, ground	pīšļi, zeme

Translation of *ṣāpār* as ‘dust’ in Glück’s Bible

In this section, we investigate the translation of *ṣāpār* ‘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 *ṣāpār* with primarily one translation equivalent, *pīšļi* ‘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 *ṣāpār*, considering in more depth possible influences on his translation decisions.

Whenever *ṣāpār* had the sense of ‘dust’, Glück utilized *pīšļi* ‘dust’ in 24 of the 26 instances. In Deut. 28:24, however, he translated *ṣāpār* 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 Sainte escripture* (Neuchâtel: 1535).

he used *putekļi* ‘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 *pīšļi* ‘dust’, as found also in the French Bible *poudre* ‘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 *pīšļi* ‘dust’ in 11 of the 14 instances. In Gen. 26:15, Glück translated ^š*āpār* as *smiltis* ‘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, *putekļi* is also employed in Abraham’s reference to himself as ^š*āpār wā-²ēper* (‘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 *pīšļi* ‘dust’. Thus, Glück’s preference for *pīšļi* ‘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 ^š*āpār* had the sense of ‘soil’, Glück utilized *pīšļi* ‘dust’ in 5 of the 6 instances. In Job 28:6, though, Glück used a diminutive form of *pīšļi* (*Piščlišchi*) ‘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 *pīšļi* ‘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 *Erbodens* ‘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 ^š*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 *pīšļi* 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 *pīšļi* ‘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 ‘*āpār*’ 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 ‘*āpār*’ 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 ‘*āpār*’ ‘ground’; similarly, in Isa. 2:19, people hide in holes in the ‘*āpār*’ ‘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 ‘*āpār*’, 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 ‘*āpār*’ 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 Kazakēnaitē’s finding that Glück’s New Testament translation was a ‘heterogeneous’ translation, showing influence from a variety of sources.¹⁶

Translation of ‘*āpār*’ as ‘dust’ in LB1898

The 1898 edition of Glück’s Bible underwent minor revisions, with only 11 changes in the translation of ‘*āpār*’ ‘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 Kazakēnaitē, “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 *pīšļi* in 2 Kings 13:7 and Gen. 18:27 because the particles of earth in these contexts are not airborne.

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

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

Translation of ‘*āpār* 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 ‘*āpār* refers to ‘dust’, *pīšļi* ‘dust’ remains the primary translation equivalent. However, in five instances, *pīšļi* was revised as *putekļi* to convey the concept of a finer dust than associated with *pīšļi*, as in Num. 5:17, where the referent is fine dust from the floor. Furthermore, *putekļi* was preferred over *pīšļi* in Num. 23:10 to express the concept of abundance. *Pīšļi* 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’, *pīšļi* is revised as *putekļi* in Zech. 9:3, but as *samazgas* ‘silt’ in Zeph. 1:17, *pīšļu kaudze* ‘pile of earth’ in Job 27:16, and *smilšu valnis* ‘wall of sand’ in Hab. 1:10. With the sense of ‘soil’, *pīšļi* 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 ‘*āpār* referring to ‘powder’, *pīšļi* 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 *pīšļi*. When ‘*āpār* has the sense of ‘rubble’, *gruveši* was revised as *drupas* in Neh. 4:10.

Finally, with the sense ‘ground’, *pīšļi* was revised as *zeme* in Job 14:8, Isa. 2:10, and Isa. 29:4a. The translators also employed other terms, including *zemes pīšļi* ‘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 ‘āpār 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 *pīšļi* 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 ‘āpār refers to ‘dust’, the term *putekļi* ‘fine dust’ is used instead of the traditional *pīšļi* 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 *pīšļi*: 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 *pīšļi*. Similarly, *pīšļi* was used in Job 7:5, in agreement with LB1689 (*nefchkih/steem Pih/chleem* ‘unclean dust’) in contrast to *puveši* ‘rot’ in LB1965.

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

In the verses in which ‘āpār 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’, *pīšļi* is revised as *putekļi* in Deut. 9:21a–b. However, the translators preferred *pīšļi* 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, *pīšļi* 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 *pīšļi* 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 *putekļi* ‘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, *augšne* ‘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 *Mērnīeku laiki* (1879), the first modern Latvian novel:¹⁷

...*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 ...”

Mērnīeku laiki, chapter 2¹⁸

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, *Mērnīeku laiki* (Rīga: Liesma, 1980), 359.

predominant location of *pīšļi* (namely, the ground) to the location being the place of humiliation and death.

Jēkabs Janševskis' 1928 novel *Bandavā* has 5 occurrences of *pīšļi*, all semantically associated with death and decay to varying degrees.¹⁹ The following is a striking example:

“Pēc dažām dienām viss jau pārvēršas pīšļos, top par zemes pīti,” 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*)²⁰

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

Ja tu no savas patiesības bīsies, kļūs pīšļos viss, kas bija dzīvs un zaļš, un kamoliņā varavīksnes tīsies, un tēvi nesīs zārkus atpakaļ.

“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)²¹

As can be seen from the above examples, the term *pīšļi* has connotations of mourning, death, and judgment. By contrast, *putekļi* ‘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 *putekļi* to refer to fine dust that has accumulated and settled, and is no longer airborne: ...*ar slotu aizslaukot projām zirnekļu tīklus un putekļus, 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 nobirušas, pīšļos samītas lapas*). In chapter 15 (*Kā pasakā*), life is described in the following way: *projām no pelēkās ikdienišķības, no zemes nīcības un pīšļu 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.”)²² Given these ongoing semantic changes in the language, we suggest the following revisions.

We propose that *putekļi* ‘fine dust’ is the preferred term when ‘*āpār*’ refers to fine particles of earth. For example, in Num. 5:17, ‘*āpār*’ refers to fine particles of earth from the floor of the tabernacle, fine enough to be mixed in water. In Ps. 78:27, ‘*āpār*’ is used figuratively to convey the concept of food descending in abundance from the sky; thus, *putekļi* 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, ‘*āpār*’ is used in a simile to express the concept of being reduced to a fine consistency; thus, we propose that *putekļi* be employed over *pīšļi*.

Finally, the concept of licking ‘*āpār*’ as an expression of humiliation occurs in Ps. 72:9, Isa. 49:23, and Mic. 7:17. LB1965 translated ‘*āpār*’ as *putekļi* in Mic 7:17 but as *pīšļi* in the other two verses; however, LB2012 translated ‘*āpār*’ as *putekļi* in Isa. 49:23, but as *pīšļi* in the other two verses. We propose that *putekļi* 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 Translation of ‘*āpār*’ ‘dust’ with proposed revisions.

Citation	LB1689	LB1898	LB1965	LB2012	Revision
Num. 5:17	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>putekļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>putekļi</i>
Ps. 78:27	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>putekļi</i>	<i>putekļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>putekļi</i>
2 Sam. 22:43	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>putekļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>putekļi</i>
Isa. 41:2	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>putekļi</i>
Ps. 72:9	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>putekļi</i>
Mic. 7:17	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>putekļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>putekļi</i>

Revisions of the translation of ‘*āpār*’ with the sense ‘loose earth’

‘*āpār*’ has the sense ‘loose earth’ in 14 verses, referring to material dislodged from the earth. Following Glück, the Latvian translations have preferred *pīšļi* ‘dust’ or another term such as *smiltis* ‘sand’, *pelni* ‘ashes’ or *samazgas* ‘silt’ instead of *zeme* ‘earth’. However, given the semantic narrowing evidenced by *pīšļi*, 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 *pīšļi* ‘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 *pīšļi* ‘dust’; however, in LB2012, it was translated with a singular form of the noun, *pīslis*, meaning ‘a piece of dust’. However, *pīšļi* 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	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>smiltis</i>
Ezek. 24:7	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>putekļi</i>	<i>zeme</i>
1 Kings 18:38	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>zeme</i>	<i>pelni</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>zeme</i>
Job. 27:16	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļu kaudze</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>zeme</i>
Zech. 9:3	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>putekļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>zeme</i>
Gen. 3:19a	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīslis</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>

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 *pīšļi* ‘dust’. However, we propose reconsidering the use of modern terms for ‘soil’ or kinds of earth in place of *pīšļi* ‘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 ‘*éreš*’ ‘land’ and conveys the idea of the material covering the earth. In these two verses, we propose *zeme* ‘earth’ in lieu of *pīšļi* ‘dust’.

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

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

Citation	LB1689	LB1898	LB1965	LB2012	Revision
Job 14:19	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>smiltis</i>
Job 38:38	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>zemes virsus</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>zeme</i>
Prov. 8:26	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>zeme</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>zeme</i>
Isa. 34:7	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>zeme</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>augšne</i>
Isa. 34:9	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>zeme</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>augšne</i>

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	<i>nokasījums</i>	<i>nokasījums</i>	<i>atkritumi</i>	<i>apmetums</i>	<i>apmetums</i>
Lev. 14:42	<i>māli</i>	<i>māli</i>	<i>māli</i>	<i>java</i>	<i>apmetuma java</i>
Lev. 14:45	<i>māli</i>	<i>māli</i>	<i>apmetums</i>	<i>java</i>	<i>gruveši</i>

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

The term ‘*āpār* ‘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 ‘*āpār* ‘powder’, before being scattered on graves as well as thrown into the Kidron.

We propose that ‘*āpār* ‘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 ‘*āpār* ‘powder’ with proposed revisions.

Citation	LB1689	LB1898	LB1965	LB2012	Revision
2 Kings 23:6a	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>putekļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>putekļi</i>
2 Kings 23:6b	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>putekļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>putekļi</i>
2 Kings 23:15	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>putekļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>putekļi</i>

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

In Neh. 4:2, 10, the term ‘*āpār* refers to the rubble of the destroyed wall. We propose that *drupas* ‘rubble’ be used in both verses. In Ps. 102:14, ‘*āpār* 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 ‘*āpār* 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 ‘*āpār* 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 *pīšļi* ‘dust’ or *zeme* ‘earth’.

Table 8 Translation of ‘*āpār* ‘rubble’ with proposed revisions.

Citation	LB1689	LB1898	LB1965	LB2012	Revision
Neh. 4:2	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pelni</i>	<i>pelni</i>	<i>drupas</i>	<i>drupas</i>
Neh. 4:10	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>gruveši</i>	<i>drupas</i>	<i>gruveši</i>	<i>drupas</i>
Ps. 102:14	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>drupas</i>
Ezek. 26:4	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>zeme</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>drupas</i>

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

‘āpār 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 *pīšļi* ‘dust’ but also employed other terms such as *zeme* ‘earth’ and *zemes pīšļi* ‘earth’s dust’. We propose that the phrase *zemes pīšļi* ‘earth’s dust’ in Job 4:19 and 41:33 be revised as *zeme* ‘earth’. In fact, ‘āpār was translated as *zeme* in Job 41:33 from Glück’s translation until 1965. The phrase *zemes pīšļi* does not convey the sense of ‘ground’ more clearly than the simple term *zeme* ‘earth’, and so we propose the traditional rendering. Similarly, ‘āpār was translated as *zeme* ‘earth’ in Job 28:2 in Glück’s translation; we propose that the 2012 revision to *pīšļi* 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 ‘āpār; we propose that *smiltis* ‘sand’ better describes the location than *pīšļi* ‘dust’. In Isa. 2:10, ‘āpār is used in parallel with *šūr* ‘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 ‘āpār ‘ground’ is used in a context referring to plants, we propose employing *augšne* ‘soil’, as in Job 8:19 and 14:8.

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

Citation	LB1689	LB1898	LB1965	LB2012	Revision
Job 4:19	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>zemes pīšļi</i>	<i>zeme</i>
Job 8:19	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>augšne</i>
Job 14:8	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>zeme</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>augšne</i>
Job 28:2	<i>zeme</i>	<i>zeme</i>	<i>zeme</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>zeme</i>
Job 39:14	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>smiltis</i>	<i>smiltis</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>smiltis</i>
Job 41:33	<i>zeme</i>	<i>zeme</i>	<i>zeme</i>	<i>zemes pīšļi</i>	<i>zeme</i>
Isa. 2:10	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>zeme</i>	<i>putekļi</i>	<i>zeme</i>
Amos 2:7	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>pīšļi</i>	<i>putekļi</i>

Conclusion

We have investigated the translation of עָפָר ‘*āpār* ‘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, *pīšļi* ‘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 ‘*āpār* ‘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 עָפָר ‘*āpār* ‘pīšļi’ tulkošana latviešu Bībelē

Rakstā pētīta senebreju vārda עָפָר *āpār* ‘pīšļi’ tulkošana latviešu Bībelē – no Johana Ernsta Glikā 1689. gada tulkojuma līdz mūsdienām. Rakstu sākam ar pārskatu par latviešu Bībeles tulkošanas vēsturi. Pēc tam tiek diskutēta vārda ‘*āpār* ‘pīšļi’ 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 Glikā Bībeles tulkošanas principus, kā arī tulkošanas pieeju turpmākajās revīzijās. Glikā tulkojumu *pīšļi* lietojis 97 reizes (vārds ‘*āpār* Bībelē kopumā sastopams 110 reizi), 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 ‘*āpār*. No šiem ieteikumiem trīs atspoguļo Glikā oriģinālo 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 sniegs ieguldījumu nākotnes tulkojumiem latviešu valodā.