A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

'𝕭reach for 𝕭reach,' and 'the 𝕭reach of his 𝕻eople.'

By the Rev. G. Buchanan Gray, D.Litt., D.D., Professor of Hebrew and
Old Testament Exegesis in Mansfield College, Oxford.

It may be questioned whether either of the two phrases which I have placed at the head of this article conveys to most readers of our English Versions any clear and sharply defined idea; or whether, if such an idea is conveyed to a reader, it corresponds to the meaning of the Hebrew text. Nor, English usage being what it is, could anything else be expected. We may speak of a person as suffering from a broken leg, or even as suffering from fracture; we do not speak of any one as suffering from a breach, or even as suffering from a breach in the leg. Yet if 'breach' does not suggest bodily injury, there are certain passages in the English Versions of the Old Testament in which the use of the word must necessarily obscure, if it does not positively misrepresent, the meaning of the original. And, unfortunately, this obscure term receives no explanation in some even of our most recent commentaries. For example, no explanation is offered of 'breach for breach' in Lv 24[20], either in the Century Bible or in the Cambridge Bible; or of 'broken with a great breach,' in the Century Bible on Jer 14[17]. Under these circumstances there is room for a discussion of some of the passages in which 'breach' occurs in the English Versions, together with some of those in which the Hebrew term so rendered occurs in the original text.

The word 'breach,' or its plural 'breaches,' occurs thirty-five times in the A.V., and thirty-four times in the R.V. In the A.V. it renders—or, in a few cases, forms part of the rendering of—not fewer than seven different Hebrew words; in the R.V. of not fewer than five. It occurs most frequently, and especially where, as e.g. in Am 4[3], a breach in a wall is referred to, most appropriately, as a rendering of *pereṣ*, or as a part of the rendering of the verb from the same root.[1] The word which is rendered by 'breach' with the next frequency is *bedek* (2 K 12[5bis. 6. 7bis 8. 12] 22[5]), and again the rendering is open to little objection,

except on the ground perhaps that some other English term than that used for *pereṣ* would have been more convenient. The occasional use of 'breach' to render certain other words[2] need not detain us. What we are concerned with is passages in which 'breach' renders *sheber*. These number six in the A.V. (Lv 24[20], Ps 60[2], Pr 15[4], Is 30[26], Jer 14[17], La 2[13]) and four in the R.V., which has a different rendering in Pr 15[4] and Is 30[26].

Etymologically, nothing is clearer than the Hebrew word *sheber*: it is a noun from the familiar root *shbr, to break*. It is this, doubtless, that led the translators of the A.V. to render it by *breach*, and the Revisers to retain this rendering in four passages. Unfortunately, as we have seen, the range of meanings in *sheber* and *breach* is by no means the same; and the English translators, and especially the Revisers, betray their doubts as to the legitimacy of the rendering *breach* by abandoning it in a number of passages very similar to those in which it is retained. Thus A.V. and R.V. alike render *sheber*, not by 'breach,' but by 'hurt' in Jer 8[11. 21] 10[19]; and also in Jer 6[14], where, however, the A.V. gives on the margin as alternatives 'bruise' or 'breach,' and the R.V. margin gives the alternative 'breach.' R.V. substitutes 'hurt' as a rendering of *sheber* for 'breach' (A.V.) in Is 30[26], and for 'bruise' (A.V.) in Jer 30[12], Nah 3[19]; and for 'affliction' (A.V.) in Jer 30[15]. On the other hand, R.V. retains the rendering 'affliction' in Am 6[6], and follows A.V. in giving 'destruction' as yet another rendering of *sheber* in La 2[11] 3[48] 4[10], in the first of these passages only giving 'hurt' as an alternative in the margin.

This great variety of renderings, even in a group of similar passages, is partly due to a real uncertainty as to the precise force of the word *sheber* in a given passage. Something almost as general as 'destruction' seems to be required by the context in La 4[10], as it certainly is sometimes else-

---

[1] Gn 38[29], Jg 21[15], 2 S 5[20] 6[8], 1 K 11[27], 1 Ch 13[11] 15[13], Neh 4[7] 6[1], Job 16[14], Ps 106[23], Is 30[13] 58[12], Am 4[3] 9[11]— fifteen times in all in A.V. R.V. also so renders in Job 30[14], 1 Ch 14[11], but renders otherwise in 2 S 6[8] (=1 Ch 13[11]).

[2] These are: (1) בקעים, Is 22[9]; הכבין, Is 7[6], Ezk 26[10]; and in R.V. only נבעי, 2 K 25[4], Jer 52[7]; הבנה, Jer 39[2]; (2) רתוסים, Am 6[11]; (3) מברוי, Jg 5[17] (A.V. only); and (4) תאנותי, Nu 14[34] (A.V. only).

where (*e.g.* Jer 4⁶); but it is doubtful whether the meaning is not more precise even in the very similar sentence in La 3⁴⁸;[1] and I believe it to be tolerably certain that in the remainder of the passages cited in the last paragraph *sheber* means some form of bodily injury. The figure before the mind as these several passages were written was of an injured human body; the same figure ought to be brought before the mind of the English reader; but general renderings like 'affliction' and 'destruction' call up no single clear picture; and 'breach,' if it clearly suggests a picture at all, probably suggests the wrong one. I proceed to a closer examination of some of the passages in question, in the course of which we may consider whether in any or all cases any particular form of bodily injury is more especially suggested by the word *sheber*. But even if bodily injury in general be denoted, and not any particular form of such injury, the rendering *breach* is inappropriate, and even the rendering *hurt* is too general, for a man may be hurt in other ways than on his body.

I turn first to Lv 24²⁰—the *lex talionis*. This runs in E.VV. as follows: 'And if a man cause a blemish in his neighbour; as he hath done, so shall it be done to him; breach for breach, eye for eye, tooth for tooth.' In spite of their terseness, the last two clauses are clear: if a man has caused another the loss of an eye or a tooth, he must himself be deprived of eye or tooth. Of course these are merely illustrative instances of a general principle; but what is the first illustrative instance? The first clause certainly does not mean that if a man has made a breach in his neighbour's wall, a breach must be made in his wall, as the familiar usage of the term *breach* might suggest to an English reader; it refers to some form of bodily injury, but not to bodily injury in general, for like the two clauses that follow, this first clause must be specific. The clause means: if a man breaks some part of his neighbour's body, that part of his own body must be broken. Like ourselves, the Hebrews were accustomed to speak of broken hearts and broken bones. We also speak of broken skin; whether the Hebrews did the same is less clear. Unless they did so, the *lex talionis* is specifying in particular broken bones,

for broken hearts can scarcely have entered into the consideration of the framers of the law. The slight freedom of translation—if so it be regarded—may therefore be pardoned in the Polychrome Bible,[2] which brings out the real meaning clearly by rendering the three clauses, 'limb for limb, eye for eye, tooth for tooth.' The first clause in Leviticus thus takes the place of two clauses specifying the limbs in Ex 21²⁴, which runs: 'eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot.' If a man break another's hand, foot, leg, or arm, or by implication any other bone, his own must be broken. The illustrative instances specified in the Code of Hammurabi (§§ 196, 197, 200) are thus the same as in Lv 24²⁰, the verb in the clause of the code which refers to the bone being from the same root as the Hebrew term which is rendered 'breach' in E.V., 'limb' in the Polychrome Bible, and which actually means *what is broken*, this being limited in certain contexts to what is broken in the human body, and particularly the bones. It may be convenient to cite[3] the three clauses from the Babylonian Codex, and I will add the original of the 'bone' clauses:

'§ 196. If a man have destroyed (*úḫ-tap-pi-id*) the eye of a gentleman, they shall destroy his eye.

'§ 197. If he have broken a gentleman's bone, they shall break his bone (*šum-mae ṣmet a-wi-lim iš-te-bi-ir eṣemta-šu i-šě-ib-bi-ru* (=וישברו).

'§ 200. If a man have knocked out (*it-ta-di*) the tooth of a man of his own rank, they shall knock out his tooth.'

It may also serve further to illuminate the term *sheber* as used in Lv 24²⁰, and to prepare the way for the understanding of other passages in which the word is used and is rendered by 'breach' in the E.VV., if we have before us at this point certain passages in which the verb which is used in § 197 of the Code of Hammurabi, and with which the Hebrew noun *sheber* is cognate, occurs.

I cite first Lv 21¹⁹. This occurs in an enumeration of various bodily defects that render a priest unfit for sacrificial duties: the verse is rendered very idiomatically in R.V.—'a man that is broken footed or broken handed'; but had the Revisers kept to the rendering of *sheber* which they ad-

---

[1] If *sheber* is rightly rendered destruction in La 3⁴⁸, we should have an interesting instance of the same phrase (שבר בת עמי) used with different meanings in Jer. and La.

[2] *The Book of Leviticus*, by S. R. Driver and H. A. White.

[3] From R. W. Rogers (*Cuneiform Parallels*, p. 445).

mitted in some other passages, they would have rendered—'a man in whom is a breach of the foot, or a breach of the hand.'[1] The term *sheber* is here commonly and rightly understood to refer to broken bones—the bones of the hand and the foot in particular, though perchance it may also have included malformations producing a similar appearance or effect to that which would arise from actual fracture. Among the defects which render an animal unfit for sacrifice is its being 'broken or maimed' (Lv 22^{22}); the second of these terms (*ḥārûṣ*) appears to mean really 'having had its flesh cut into'; the first (*shābûr*) means *broken (in limb)*.

Ought we, however, to infer from Ex 22$^{10\,(9)}$. $^{14\,(13)}$ that *sheber, shābûr, nishbār*, though etymologically meaning *what is broken*, became in usage extended to mean any hurt received by a human or animal body? This appears to be the view underlying the use of the term *hurt* in several passages in the R.V., some of which have already been referred to; and it may receive at first sight some support from the law regarding responsibility for animals entrusted or lent to another by their owner (Ex 22$^{10\,(9)}$), the first part of which in the R.V. reads: 'If a man deliver unto his neighbour an ass, or an ox, or a sheep, or any beast, to keep; and it die, or be hurt (i.e. *nishbār*), or driven away, no man seeing it,' etc.; for here the law contemplates two cases of complete loss to the owner of the animal—loss by death and loss by raiders—and one of partial loss, namely, loss through injury. But the crucial question is: does the law regulate by an exhaustive statement of possibilities, or, as in the *lex talionis*, by typical instances? In the first alternative, *be hurt* would be the more satisfactory rendering; in the second, it would be better to keep nearer to the fundamental meaning of *nishbār*, and to render *get (a limb) broken*. In favour of the second alternative it may be noted that the law does not exhaust possibilities; for it does not refer to strayed cattle. Moreover, in v.$^{14\,(13)}$ the instances are abbreviated still further to one only of complete loss, and one of partial loss.

With the inconsistency that marks the E.VV. in their renderings of *sheber, nishbār*, etc., the rendering 'hurt' is abandoned in a prophetic catalogue of hazards to cattle in favour of 'broken'; and this latter rendering, if we understand it to mean *broken (in limb)*, no doubt gives us the right turn

---

of meaning in Ezk 34^4 (cf. also v.^{16}): 'The diseased [sheep] have ye not strengthened, neither have ye healed that which was sick, neither have ye bound up that which was broken, neither have ye brought again that which was driven away, neither have ye sought that which was lost.' Similarly E.V. has 'broken,' not 'hurt,' in Zec 11^{16}.

As a further example of the verb *shebar* in connexion with broken limbs, and of binding up as the most conspicuous element in the treatment of fractures, Ezk 30^{21} may be cited; not, however, from the E.V. with its curious reference to a 'roller,' but from Professor Toy's translation: 'I break the arm of Pharaoh, king of Egypt, and it shall not be bound up, so that healing applications may be made, and bandages put on, to make it strong to grasp the sword.' Naturally enough the more general term *to heal* (רפא) could also be used for the treatment of bones that had been broken (Zec 11^{16}).

I come now to the passages in which the Hebrew text speaks of the *sheber (bath) 'ammi'* (or *ṣiyyôn*), and the E.VV. of the 'breach' or 'hurt of (the daughter of) my people (or Sion).' It is, I hope, obvious by now that *breach* is a wholly unsatisfactory rendering; is 'hurt' the best? Do these passages speak of some undefined bodily injury, or specifically of broken limbs or bones? I believe that in most of them at least the more specific reference is intended.

La 2^{13} is not without difficulties. The E.V. reads: 'What shall I equal to thee, that I may comfort thee, O virgin daughter of Sion? For thy breach is great like the sea; who can heal thee?' It is possible that R.V. refrained from substituting *hurt* here on the ground that *sheber* refers to breaches in the walls of the city; and it may be for a similar reason that Dr. Smith[2] renders:

> Vast as the sea is thy ruin:
> Who will restore thee?

But if the *personal* figure of the Virgin of Sion which was before the mind of the writer in the previous lines was dissolving into a vision of the actual ruins of the *city*, the pronoun at the end would almost certainly have been third person, referring to the breach, or ruin (cf. Ps 60^2); *thee* implies that the personal figure is still, or again (but that would be most improbable), before the mind of the writer. It is strange certainly to com-

---

[1] The Hebrew is אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה בוֹ שֶׁבֶר רֶגֶל אוֹ שֶׁבֶר יָד.

[2] G. H. Smith, *Jerusalem*, ii. 277.

pare for size the fracture of bones and the sea; but it is not altogether certain that this comparison stood in the original text; if it did, we are faced with a choice of strange phrasing, treat the passage how we may.

With less justification R.V. retains *breach* in Jer 14[17], and thereby sadly obscures the figure. There is certainly no reference here to breaches in the walls of the city. Jeremiah's eyes run down with tears, not for a city in ruins, but because the body politic is desperately ill; he sees before him a human figure—the figure of a virgin which stands to him for his nation—'broken greatly (in body and limb), (wounded) with very grievous wounds.' He cannot unconcerned look on like those grandees of Samaria who quaffed their wine out of great bowls and used the choicest ointments for their own bodies utterly regardless of the 'broken (limbs)[1] of Joseph' (Am 6[6]). Nay, rather, on account of 'the broken (limbs) of the daughter of his people,' Jeremiah also 'is broken,' *i.e.* feels himself broken in limb; for so, perhaps, if the text is correct, we should explain Jer 8[21], though the alternative suggested by Dr. Peake, that the prophet is 'broken' (-hearted), is also possible.

Though we speak, for example, of the 'Sick Man' of Europe, we do not so readily in speech or writing develop details of the figure in such personifications of a nation as the Hebrews did; and a translation is almost compelled at times to eliminate the personification by the substitution of vaguer terms or by substituting plural pronouns for singulars.[2] But we certainly ought not even in a translation to be deprived of more of the vividness of the original than is absolutely necessary; and if even the R.V. in Hos 7[9] happily retains the striking figure of the personified people of Ephraim on whose head grey hairs are here and there appearing, there is no reason why the figure of Judah broken in limb should be concealed or blurred by substituting for terms describing bodily injury vague terms such as affliction, breach, or destruction.

A further passage to be considered is Jer 10[19]: here the personified people is represented as the owner of a tent which has been spoiled and flung down, his children carried off, and he himself left behind beaten and with limbs broken, and therefore incapable of setting up the tent again, or finding any to do so for him. The picture is here expressed in words put into the mouth of the personified people: 'Woe is me for my broken (limbs)! my wounds are grievous: but I said, Truly this is my [3] sickness, and I must bear it. My tent has been spoiled, and all my cords are broken: my children have gone out from me, and are no more: there is none to stretch forth my tent any more, or to set up my tent-hangings.' Similarly in Jer 30[12. 15], Is 30[26], we must substitute for the 'hurt' of R.V. some such term as 'broken (limbs),' if the passage in translation is to retain the vividness of the original.

The last passage I can discuss here, and perhaps the most striking of all, is Jer 6[14], repeated at 8[11]. Again the condition of his people is seen by Jeremiah under the figure of a man with broken limbs; neighbours easily assume the *rôle* of a surgeon; they bind up the broken limbs, it is true; yet they do it carelessly and light-heartedly, with no thought of the shock that the injuries have caused, but ready at once to cry, It is all well again. Both the injured man and the careless healers represent the Jews of Jeremiah's time: the injured man is the whole nation; the healers are the individuals that compose the nation. A similar double representation occurs in Hos 2[2(4)]. In this passage the E.VV. by translating *sheber* by 'hurt,' and *shalôm* by 'peace' completely obliterate the picture which Jeremiah saw and with a few masterly strokes portrayed. *Shalôm* may, of course, in a suitable context mean *peace*; but what has peace to do here, where bodily injury and the healing of it are in question? Quite clearly, the word is used in its familiar sense of *well (in health)*; as it is, to mention but two passages, in Gn 29[6] 43[27]. And then how poor a rendering is 'hurt' in such a passage as this. Even if we cannot be quite certain that *sheber* refers to broken *bones* in particular, it certainly does imply some severe bodily injury; it would not, for example, have been applied to a trifling hurt, such as a child receives when it stumbles. And yet if

<hr>

[1] The word *sheber* here is very inadequately represented by the generalized *affliction* of R.V.

[2] As *e.g.* in the R.V. of Jos 9[7], 1 S 5[10]. See more fully the note in my *Commentary on Numbers* ('International Critical Commentary'), pp. 265 f.

[3] Reading חֳלִי for חָלְיִי. There can be little doubt that חֳלִי could be used of a person suffering from broken limbs; it is actually used of the condition of Ahaziah when he fell out of the window of his upper chamber (2 K 1[2]).

Jewish children were like, and treated like, English children, Jeremiah may actually have been using *sheber* in implicit contrast to such trifling hurts. A little child hurts itself, cries, is kissed, and told that all is well again, and is happy; and in this case all is well. But these people treat the desperate injuries from which Judah is suffering in the same way! 'They have healed the broken (limbs) of my people lightly, saying, Well (again). Well I (no, indeed!) nothing at all is well.'

Literature.

MODERN RELIGIOUS MOVEMENTS IN INDIA.

THE President of the Hartford Theological Seminary, U.S.A., never made a better choice than when he invited the Rev. J. N. Farquhar, M.A., to deliver the Lamson lectures. The subject of the Lamson lectures is the Religions of the World. Mr. Farquhar could not have lectured well on all the Religions of the World. Only a rare scholar, like Professor Moore of Harvard, would dare to lecture or to write on them all. But Mr. Farquhar could lecture on *Modern Religious Movements in India* better than any man living. And he was invited to make that the subject of his lectures and his book (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net).

He realized the difficulty of his task. But he has spent sixteen years in India studying these movements. He has a singularly keen and orderly mind. He spares neither himself nor his friends in his search for truth. And beyond all else he has the requisite sympathy. The article which he contributed to the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS on the Brahma Samaj introduced him, probably to the President of Hartford, certainly to most of its readers, as an ideal writer on a subject which has not had many writers of any kind.

Whether it is the subject—so near in thought, so far in expression—that attracts us, or whether it is the necessarily abundant element of human life and experience which the book contains, there is no resisting its strong attraction. Perhaps something is due to the clearness of the style and the arrangement of the material. Mr. Farquhar describes first of all those movements which favour serious reform, of which the Brahma Samaj is the chief; next those movements which introduced into the reform some defence of the old faiths, such as the Arya Samaj; then those movements which aimed at out and out defence of the old religions, of which Theosophy is the most notorious. Here he includes the Sectarian movements in Hinduism and the Caste organizations. Religious Nationalism is the topic of the fifth chapter; Social Reform and Service the subject of the sixth; while the last chapter explains the significance of the movements.

In explaining the significance of the movements, Mr. Farquhar draws our attention to the fact that throughout all the period of reform, say from 1828 till now, there has been a steady advance of the ancient faiths. But he adds—and with his words we shall close this notice—'The triumphant revival of the old religions, with their growing body-guard of defence organizations, has been accompanied by *continuous and steadily increasing inner decay*. This most significant of all facts in the history of these movements seems to be scarcely perceived by the leaders. They believe that the danger is past. This blindness arises largely from the fact that they draw their apologetic and their inspiration almost entirely from Rāmakrishṇa, Vivekānanda, Sister Niveditā, Dayānanda, and Mrs. Besant; and it is clear that neither capable thinking nor clear-eyed perception can be bred on such teaching as theirs.'

CHRIST IN ART.

It is better, when we have the opportunity, to occupy ourselves with great things than with small, whether it be a text of Scripture or a work of art. A great subject will sometimes rescue a mediocre book from obscurity, of which we have a notable example in Mrs. Jameson's *History of our Lord in Art*. But when the book really rises to the magnitude of its subject, as is the case with *The Christ of the Men of Art*, by the Rev. J. R. Aitken (T. & T. Clark; 15s. net), there is no money that we would not be entitled to spend on the purchase.