

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

*HORT'S POSTHUMOUS COMMENTARY ON ST.
JAMES.*¹

DR. J. O. F. MURRAY, who has had the charge of bringing out this long looked for commentary, tells us that the part which treats of the first chapter was already finished in 1871, when Hort returned from the Vicarage of St. Ippolyts, as a newly elected Fellow of Emmanuel College. The remainder (i.e. the commentary on chapters ii.-iv. ver. 7, together with the Additional Notes) formed the subject of three courses of his Hulsean lectures delivered in 1880 and 1881. When he "returned to the Epistle in the summer term of 1889, he dealt mainly with questions of Introduction." "No further progress was made with the commentary."

If we compare this account with what we are told of Hort's two other fragmentary commentaries, that on the First Epistle of St. Peter, which was brought out in 1898 by the present Bishop of Ely, with a preface by Dr. Westcott, and that on the First Three Chapters of the Apocalypse, brought out by the Rev. P. H. L. Brereton in 1908, with a preface by Professor Sanday, we learn that the foundation of the commentary on St. Peter was laid in the Hulsean lectures delivered in 1882, 3, 4, 5, 7, and in the last course of lectures delivered by Hort as Lady Margaret Professor in the Easter term of 1892; while the latter volume "represents notes of lectures delivered first in Emmanuel College in 1879 and then revised for a course of Professor's lectures in the May term of 1889."

¹ *The Epistle of St. James with Introduction, Commentary as far as ch. iv. v. 7, and additional notes, by the late F. J. A. Hort, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., 1909.*

From the above dates we should gather that Hort brought to his work upon St. Peter the fruits of a deeper study and riper scholarship than it had been possible for him to devote to St. James ; and, if I am not mistaken, this inference is, to a certain extent, confirmed by a comparison of the notes on parallel passages in the two Epistles.

The words used by Professor Sanday in his preface to the Apocalyptic fragment seem to me still to hold good, where he says that " In positive value for the student I should be inclined to place first of all (i.e. of all Hort's posthumous publications) the fragment on 1 St. Peter." I should myself be inclined to add that it stands first, not only in the list of Hort's posthumous works, but first, at any rate for the English reader, among all modern commentaries known to me. And this is very much what Professor Sanday affirms in p. ii. of the same preface :—

" It is the working student to whom Dr. Hort specially appealed, as the very *princeps* of his order. What he owes to him is not only an immense mass of really trustworthy data for his own studies, but a model—an unsurpassed model—for the method in which his own studies ought to be conducted. Dr. Hort was an ' expert,' if ever there was one. . . . He had Lightfoot's clearness and soundness of knowledge, with a subtly penetrating quality to which Lightfoot could hardly lay claim ; and if Westcott had something of the subtlety, he had not the sharp precision and critical grip. In the case of Dr. Hort, each bit of evidence, as he comes to it, seems to have a life and an atmosphere of its own ; and this life and atmosphere is compelled to yield up its secret just as much as the material evidence. In addition to this Dr. Hort had a powerful judgement ; but I am not quite sure that the judgement was equal in degree to this particular faculty of which I have been speaking ; it was perhaps biased a little in the opposite direction to that in which most of us have our judgement biased, against the obvious and commonplace. Just this last reason made it of special value as corrective and educative."

To this generous and well-weighed appreciation of the Oxford professor, I add the judgment of Hort's old friend

and fellow-worker, Bishop Westcott, as given in the Preface to the *St. Peter*, p. x. :—

“The first characteristic of Dr. Hort, as an interpreter, which will strike his readers is, I think, his remarkable power of setting aside all traditional opinion in examining the text before him. He takes nothing for granted. He regards no traditional view as valid through long acceptance. He approaches each record, each phrase, as if it came to him directly from its author. He asks, ‘What did the words mean to him who wrote them and to those who first received them?’ In this there was no disparagement of the results of Christian life and thought. . . . But he felt that, if we are to comprehend truly the message which the New Testament enshrines, we must go back and dismiss as far as possible all the associations which have gathered round familiar phrases. The result is a singular freshness and originality of treatment, which conveys to the student a vivid sense of the reality of the record. (2) Closely connected with this independent directness of interpretation is the keen historical insight with which Dr. Hort marks the characteristic lessons of minute details.’ . . . (3) Unwearied thoroughness was a necessary condition of this type of study. In enumerating the questions which required to be dealt with as preparatory to the proposed commentary on the New Testament (which was to have been divided between Hort, Lightfoot and Westcott) Dr. Hort set down ‘The principles of New Testament lexicography, especially the deduction of theological terms from Old Testament usage, usually through the medium of the LXX.,’ and ‘generally the principle that the New Testament is written in terms of the Old Testament.’ In correspondence with these theses, the notes are a treasury of historical philology. Almost every page gives examples of the gradual fashioning of some word for its use in the New Testament, and records both parallelisms with the LXX and differences from it, guarding alike the independence of the Apostolic writers and their obligations to an earlier generation. (4) ‘Independence, insight, thoroughness, were all subsidiary to the endeavour to show through Apostolic teaching the coherence of all revelation and all life. It was not enough, as Dr. Hort felt, to realize most clearly and to express most freely what the Gospel was to the first disciples. This was not a result to rest in, but the necessary preparation for determining the universal meaning of a message given under local and temporary conditions.’ (5) ‘The dominant interest of Dr. Hort in interpretation was, in a word, not philological or historical, but theological. . . . The main question always was how the truths with which each Apostolic writer dealt, entered into his own soul

and life, and so how we can represent them in terms of our own age and how they affect us.'

"When I endeavour to characterize Dr. Hort as an interpreter of the New Testament, I am not thinking only of this fragment of his work, but much more of the experiences of an uninterrupted friendship of more than forty years. . . . In the course of our work problems of every kind necessarily came before us. Principles and the application of principles were keenly discussed. It could not but happen that we finally differed in some of our conclusions; but I can say without reserve that I always found Dr. Hort's suggestions, even when at first sight they seemed to be strange and almost paradoxical, fertile in materials for serious consideration. . . . The fulness of the truth was the one aim which he pursued, in the certain conviction that the most absolute fairness in intellectual inquiry is a condition of obtaining the deepest spiritual lessons."

The characteristic features of Hort's work as a commentator, which are so well depicted in the preceding quotations, will all be found in the newly published fragment, though perhaps, as I have already hinted, not attaining quite to the level of his later productions. But there is the same careful tracing back of the Greek terms used in the New Testament to their equivalents in the LXX and in the original Hebrew of the Old Testament. Conspicuous specimens will be found in the notes on *διασπορά* p. 3, *πειρασμός* pp. 4, 21 f., *δοκίμιον* p. 5, *τέλειος* p. 5 f., *ἄνθος χόρτου* p. 15, *καύσων* p. 16 f., *ἔξεπεσεν* p. 17, *ἡ εὐπρέπεια τοῦ προσώπου* p. 17 f., *στέφανος* p. 19 f., *τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν φώτων* pp. 29 f., *τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως* p. 39, *κόσμος* pp. 44, 71, 92 f., *προσωποληψία* p. 46, *δόξα* p. 47 f., *συναγωγή* p. 48 f., *ἔλεος* p. 56 f., *ἐδικαιώθη* p. 63, *ὁμοίωσις* pp. 77 f., *καρπὸς δικαιοσύνης* p. 86, *ὑποτάγητε* p. 97. There are also many specimens of notes on words unconnected with the Hebrew, which may be described in Westcott's language as containing "a treasury of historical philology," such as those on the rare words *ἀνεμιζομένω* καὶ *ῥιπιζομένω* pp. 10 f., on *ἀπλῶς* pp. 7 f., *δίψυχος* pp. 12 f., *παρακύπτω* pp. 40 f., *σπαταλάω* pp. 107 f., *ὕλη* pp. 70 f., 104 f. There

are notes containing excellent definitions of terms, such as those on *γινώσκω* p. 5, *βούλομαι* pp. 32 f., 69 f., *ὑπάρχω* p. 58, *θρησκός* and *θρησκεία* pp. 42 and 43. Sometimes the notes deal with points of syntax, sometimes with the general argument of a passage, often leading to discussion which touches on large questions, historical, philosophical or religious. Sometimes I have the satisfaction of finding a view, which I had maintained against the majority of commentators, confirmed by Hort, as, for instance, in regard to the meaning of *δούλος* p. 2, where his note is: "It is misleading to call *δούλος* 'slave,' as many do, for it lays the whole stress on a subordinate point. It expresses in the widest way the personal relation of servant to master, not the mere absence of wages or of right to depart." So in p. 14 Hort understands the word *ἀδελφός* of i. 9 to belong equally to *ὁ ταπεινός* and to *ὁ πλούσιος*, in opposition to the view supported by B. Weiss, Beyschlag and others, that the rich are always treated by St. James as outsiders. In like manner we are both agreed that St. James wrote and spoke in Greek, and that this language was generally understood in Palestine, especially in Galilee, among his contemporaries. Hort even detects signs of a special Palestinian dialect (see his notes on *προσωπολημφίαις* and *ψυχική*).

Where we differ, I have sometimes been led to accept Hort's conclusions instead of my own, sometimes I am doubtful, sometimes I still prefer my own view; and I propose to consider, in this and the following article, the grounds which appear to me to favour one or the other conclusion. I should have done this in my new edition of St. James, were it not that the greater part of this has been already stereotyped at the desire of the publishers. The main difference, however, between our two editions is not anything which involves contradiction or retractation: it

consists in that *lux splendidior*, that inner light, of which all Hort's friends were conscious in their intercourse with him, and which I ventured to predict as the characteristic feature of his long-promised edition, when I dedicated my own edition to him in the year 1892.

All scholars will agree that, whether or not we accept Hort's views on isolated points, it is impossible to overrate the help to the understanding of this difficult Epistle, which accrues from the entrance into the discussion of a mind like Hort's, so fresh, so free, so utterly unbiassed, so full of the best knowledge of the past, and yet so scintillating with new life and thought. As regards myself, I can truly say that, though I have for more than fifty years endeavoured to read all that could throw light upon St. James, I have found something still to learn and to think over in almost every line of this, his last-published commentary. None would have been more ready than Hort to acclaim Professor Grote's fine paraphrase of the adage, *Humanum est errare* : "It is man's prerogative to mistake. . . . He may learn anything, but to balance this, he has got to learn each thing by speculation and trial, at the hazard of much mistake. If the human race were too much afraid of mistake, it would learn nothing." And the words which follow shortly afterwards seem to me to express the very mind of Hort : "My most earnest wish as to what I have done myself is that it may stimulate thought in others ; to *lead* the thought of others is a thing to which I feel very little disposition. It is a cardinal maxim of mine that every one's thought should be his own. I should wish to think rightly myself and to help, if I can, others to do so in their own way." ¹

It is possible that some students may have been deterred from making use of Hort's fragmentary commentaries from the very fact that they are fragmentary. If there are such,

¹ *Exploratio Philosophica*, Part I. p. xlvi.

perhaps the easiest way of making clear to them Hort's method of exegesis and the great value of that method will be (1) to give a selection of his notes on a continuous passage; (2) to quote a specimen of his investigation of the meaning of a word, which might well be taken as a model for all similar investigation; (3) to quote a similar note, where his investigation has thrown much light on the meaning of a word, but where his final conclusion seems to me erroneous on the grounds which I state. Of the first I will take iii. 12, 13 as an example: μήτι ἡ πηγὴ ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς ὀπῆς βρῦει τὸ γλυκὺ καὶ τὸ πικρὸν; μὴ δύναται, ἀδελφοί μου, συκὴ ἐλαίας ποιῆσαι ἢ ἄμπελος σῦκα; οὔτε ἀλυκὸν γλυκὺ ποιῆσαι ὕδ ρ.

Notes.—‘ἡ πηγὴ, the fountain]. The force of the article is not obvious: συκὴ has none, and a fountain, as such, has no particular title to be spoken of generically. The true reason probably is that St. James is thinking of what the fountain stands for, the heart. The reference to ἡ πηγὴ in itself proves that the tongue was to him merely the organ of a power within. Doubtless he remembered (Matt. xii. 34) ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ περισσεύματος (the overflow) τῆς καρδίας τὸ στόμα λαλεῖ . . . ὀπῆς, crevice] ὀπῆ is properly a chink in a wall for looking through. It then comes to be applied to holes and burrows in the ground, as those of ants and of hibernating animals, or somewhat larger clefts in the rock (Heb. xi. 38). Here too it is probably the crevice in the face of a rock through which a stream bursts forth. . . . On the springs of Palestine see Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*. . . . τὸ γλυκὺ καὶ τὸ πικρὸν, that which is sweet and that which is bitter]. . . . If we supply nothing, and understand merely ‘that which is sweet,’ etc., the articles are quite justified, and on the whole this is best, the most general abstract opposites being used here in the first instance, and then ἀλυκὸν afterwards substituted. . . . St. James would be familiar with bitter springs from those of Tiberias (see Reland, *Palestine*, 301 ff., Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* ii. 384). *Ver.* 12. Not only a new image comes in here, but a new point of view, prepared for by part of *v.* 11. In 9–11 St. James has dwelt on the inconsistency of the two kinds of speech as coming forth from the same tongue, as though bitter and sweet came alike from the same spring. But ἡ πηγὴ has carried us back from the mouth to the heart; and so now a comparison between the heart and its utterance, rather than between two utterances, comes

into view. The image is formed by examples of our Lord's words (Luke vi. 44), 'Each tree is known by its own fruit.' Wishing to treat them gently, he keeps within the limits of that single sentence of Christ, as though it were only one kind of fruit against another, all three being good and useful. But doubtless he intended them to apply the associated words, which spoke of 'corrupt trees' and of 'thorns and thistles' (Luke vi. 43 f. 11; Matt. vii. 16-20). In so doing he was indirectly implying that the curses uttered by their tongues expressed the contents of their hearts more truly than the blessings, which he assumes to be unreal words. The same comes out more clearly in the next image. *ἀλυκόν*, simply 'salt' as an adjective: doubtless *ὑδωρ*, kept to the end, goes with both *ἀλ.* and *γλ.* *Ποιῆσαι* is borrowed 'from above, being used of natural producing. As applied to *ὑδωρ* it means to 'rain,' and this is a rare use. Doubtless St. James purposely retained the same word as an image in the sense 'Out of a reservoir of salt-water springs forth no fountain of sweet water.' Thus he distinctly implies, though he still leaves the rebuke to implication, that not the verbal blessing of God but the cursing of man was a true index of what lay within. . . . Thus this sentence is no mere repetition of v. 11, but goes far beyond it."

I take now the comment on *ἐριθίαν* in iii. 14 (p. 81).

"Combined with *ζῆλος* likewise in Gal. v. 20. A curious word with an obscure history; see Fritzsche, *Rom.* xiv. 3-8, the best account, but very imperfect. "Εριθος (derivation doubtful) in Homer's time is a hired labourer,¹ apparently an agricultural labourer (*Etyim. Mag.* κυρίως δὲ ὁ τὴν γῆν ἐργαζόμενος ἐργάτης ἐπὶ μισθῷ); and a gloss of Hesychius (*ἐριθεύει εἰκῆ, ἐργάζει μάτην*) seems to show that labour or work was the main idea. The same is *always* the force of the somewhat commoner compound *συνέριθος*. The fundamental passage is *Od.* vi. 32, where Athene tells Nausicaa that she will accompany her, *καὶ τοὶ ἐγὼ συνέριθος ἄμ' ἔσομαι*, when she goes with the housemaids to wash the linen. This one passage apparently gave rise to many others, one in Arist. *Pax* 785,² and many in late poets; also in Plato (*Rep.* vii. 533 d; *Legg.* x. 889 d) of the arts co-operative, co-ancillary with philosophy, whence also Orig. *Ep. ad Greg.* 1.³ Afterwards⁴

¹ Il. xviii. 550: *ἐριθοὶ ἡμῶν ὀξέλας δρεπάνας ἐν χερσὶν ἔχοντες.*

² *μήτ' ἔλθῃς συνέριθος αὐτοῖς*, an appeal to the Muse.

³ Orig. Lomm. vol. xvii. 49 f. Philosophers speak of geometry, music, astronomy and other arts and sciences as *συνέριθοι* of philosophy; in like manner philosophy is *συνέριθος* πρὸς Χριστιανισμόν.

⁴ We find, however, the word *ἐριθος* used of a special kind of employment for women by Demosthenes in the speech *Πρὸς Εὐβουλίδην*, p. 1313, *πολλὰ καὶ τιτθαὶ καὶ ἐριθοὶ καὶ τρυγητρίαι γεγόνασιν, ὑπὸ τῶν τῆς πύλων κατ' ἐκείνους τοὺς χρόνους συμφορῶν, ἀσταὶ γυναῖκες*, and apparently of weaving, in the LXX

probably from wrong etymology it was used of women servants spinning wool. But in Aristotle, *Políticos* v. 2, 3, we find *ἐριθεία*,—*θεύομαι* in a quite different sense. Speaking of changes of political constitution, some, he says, take place from arrogance, some from fear, some from pre-eminence, some from contempt, and so on: and then some δι' *ἐριθείαν*, explained in the next chapter: 'Constitutions change without sedition, also διὰ τὰς ἐριθείας, as at Heraea, ἐξ αἰρετῶν γὰρ διὰ τοῦτο ἐποίησαν κληρωτάς, ὅτι ἤρουντο τοὺς ἐριθειομένους,' i.e. apparently they changed the mode of appointment to offices from election to lot, because they chose τοὺς ἐριθειομένους: this may mean either candidates who bribed or who courted and gained a following in other ways. Suidas says ἐριθία ἢ διὰ λόγων φιλονεκία, λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἡ μισθαρία. More definitely speaking of δεκάζεσθαι (bribery), he says ὁμοιον καὶ τὸ ἐριθεύεσθαι τῷ δεκάζεσθαι ἔστιν, καὶ ἡ ἐριθεία ἐρηται ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ μισθοῦ δόσεως (cf. *Etym. Mag.*, 254). This points to the gaining of followers and adherents by gifts. It might, however, be by arts as well as gifts; see Ezek. xxiii. 5, 12, καὶ ἠριθεύσατο (Sym.). But apparently the word came to be used not merely of the manner of winning followers, but of the seeking of followers itself. Thus Hesych. ἠριθειομένων πεφιλοτιμημένων, ἠριθεύετο ἐφιλονέκει: hence to be ambitious, indulge in ambitious rivalry. The schol. on Soph. *Ajax* 833, ὁ δὲ Σοφοκλῆς ἐριθεύσαι μὲν τι ὡς προσβυτέρῳ (sc. Aeschylus) μὴ βουληθεῖς, οὐ μὴν παραλιπεῖν αὐτὸ δοκιμάζων, ψιλῶς φησιν κ.τ.λ.; Polyb. x. 25, 9. οἱ δὲ τῆς στρατηγίας δρεγόμενοι διὰ ταύτης τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐξηριθεύονται τοὺς νέους, καὶ παρασκευάζουσιν ἐθνους συναγωνιστὰς εἰς τὸ μέλλον. It is likewise implicitly coupled with φιλοτιμία in Philo. *Leg. ad Caium* 10 (ii. 355) ἡγεμονία δ' ἀφιλονεικος καὶ ἀεριθρευτος ὀρθῆ μονή. (The passages in Eust. *Opusc. ap. Steph. suit* either 'ambition' or 'faction.' Cf. C.I.G. 2671. 46, ἀερίθρευτοι.) What sense the earlier Greek Fathers attached to it in St. Paul does not appear. Chrys. on *Rom.* ii. 8 seems to identify it with φιλονεκίας τινὸς καὶ βραθυμίας, as if he had *εἰς* in mind: in the four other places we learn nothing, nor do we from Theodore: Didymus on 2 Cor. has ἐριθίας τε καὶ ἐριθείας. Theodoret on *Rom.* is strange and obscure." Hort then treats of the Latin renderings, most of which he says: "suggest the erroneous connexion with *εἰς*." He then goes on, "Some of the New Testament places are ambiguous; but wherever the context has a defining force, it is in favour of the sense found in Polyb., etc. The difficult *Rom.* ii. 8 must be taken with Phil. i. 17, which seems to point to the Judaizing leaders, who intrigued against St. Paul. In 2 Cor. xii. 20 it is separated from *εἰς* by ζῆλος and θυμοί, and precedes καταλαλαίαι, so also in Gal., though followed by διχοστασίαι. In of Isaiah xxxviii. 12, ἐρθου ἐγγιζούσης ἐκτεμεῖν. So Tobit ii. 12 (the date of which is considered by Westcott to be about 250 B.C.) ἡ γυνή μου ἠριθεύετο ("did spin," R.V.) ἐν τοῖς γυναικεῖσι, καὶ ἀπέστειλε τοῖς κυρτοῖσι καὶ ἀπέθωκαρ αὐτῇ καὶ αὐτοὶ τὸν μισθόν.

Phil. ii. 3 it is coupled with *κενοδοξία* and contrasted with *ταπεινοφροσύνη*: so here with *ζήλος*. Thus all points to the personal ambition of rival leaderships. There is no real evidence for 'party spirit,' 'faction,' etc., i.e. for the vice of the followers of a party: *ἐριθία* really means the vice of the leader of a party created for his own pride: it is partly ambition, partly rivalry."¹

The next note which I will take for consideration is that upon iii. 4 *ἰδοὺ ἡλίκαν πῦρ ἡλίκεν ὕλην ἀνάπτει*, in which I follow the usual translation "How small a fire kindles how large a forest." Hort, however, maintains that *ὕλη* "is used either of dead wood or living, and either will make sense here. But it never means *a* wood, *a* forest. As applied to living wood it is either woodland, as opposed to mountains and cultivated plains, specially the rough bushy skirts of the hills, or brushwood." The use of *ὕλη* for timber, and then (metaphorically) for "material" of any sort, and consequently for "subject-matter" in a literary, or "matter" in the philosophical sense, is undisputed: examples will be found in the LXX see *Wisdom*, xi. 17, xv. 13, 2; *Macc.* ii. 24, 4; *Macc.* i. 28, 29. I was not, however, aware of its use for brushwood, till Hort's note impelled me to examine the LXX rendering, where our English version has "forest" or "wood," and this I found to be in almost every case *δρυμός*. Aquila, it is true, has *ὕλη* in 1 Sam. xxiii. 15, 16, 19 of the wood in the wilderness of Ziph and in the hill of Hachilah. Otherwise it is only found in Job xxxviii. 40, where the R.V. has "the young lions couch in their dens and abide in the covert to lie in wait" (*κάθηνται ἐν ὕλαις ἐνεδρεύοντες*), and Isa. x. 17, "The light of Israel shall be for a fire . . . and it shall burn and destroy his thorns and his briars in one day" (*φάγεται ὡσεὶ χόρτον τὴν ὕλην*). In both these cases Hort's "brushwood"

¹ There can be no doubt that this is the true meaning of the word. In my note I followed Lightfoot on Gal. v. 20 and Phil. i. 17, where he translates it "caballings," "partisanship," "factiousness."

seems the right translation. He also quotes passages from Plato in which ὕλη is distinguished from δένδρα; there is a more striking example in Xen. *Anab.* i. 5, 1 ἐν τούτῳ δὲ τῷ τόπῳ ἦν μὲν ἡ γῆ πεδῖον ἅπαν ὀμαλόν, ἀψιθίου δὲ πλήρες· εἰ δέ τι καὶ ἄλλο ἐνῆν ὕλης ἢ καλάμου ἅπαντα ἦσαν εὐωδη· δένδρον δ' οὐδὲν ἐνῆν (the country was a plain, and full of worm-wood: if any other kinds of shrubs or reeds grew there, they had all an aromatic smell, but there were no trees). But of course the fact that ὕλη sometimes stands for brushwood is no more inconsistent with its use for a forest than Virgil's use of *silva* in G. i. 152 (*subit aspera silva, lappaeque tridulique*) is with the commoner use of the word. Hort therefore endeavours to show against Dr. Scott (L. and S.) that no passage can be found in the whole of Greek literature in which the sense "a forest," as opposed to the descriptive "woodland," or to brushwood, is required. I will quote in chronological order a selection from his examples as given in the Additional Note on p. 104, adding a translation and a few other examples of my own.

II. ii. 455 ἡὔτε πῦρ αἰδηλον ἐπιφλέγει ἄσπετον ὕλην οὐρεος ἐν κορυφῆς ἔκαθεν δέ τε φαίνεται ἀυγή. "As the fire lays hold of a mighty forest on the mountain summits and its light is seen from afar." Here, as often, we have ὕλη and ὄρος joined, in opposition to Hort's statement above. *II.* xi. 155, ὡς δ' ὅτε πῦρ αἰδηλον ἐν ἀξύλω ἐμπέση ὕλη, πάντα τ' εἰλυφῶν ἄνεμος φέρει, οἱ δέ τε θάμνοι πρόρριζοι πίπτουσιν ἐπειγόμενοι πυρὸς ὀρμῆ, "As when the destroying flame falls on a virgin¹ forest, and the wind bears it along in volumes, and the shrubs are levelled to the ground, through the force of the hurrying flame." Here and in some other of his examples Hort allows that

¹ ἀξύλος, meaning disputed. I think Ebeling is right in following the scholiast, ἀξύλος: ἀφ' ἧς οὐδεὶς ἐξυλίσσατο. Paley translates it "timberless, where there is only scrub or brushwood."

the translation 'a wood' is equally pertinent with 'wood,' but he seems to assume that where the latter is possible, we are bound to give it the preference. On the contrary it seems to me that in the great majority of instances the more natural, as well as the more poetical, way of taking the word is that which flashes on the mind a single great impression, that of the forest with all its weird and romantic associations, rather than that of so many logs of wood or acres of plantation, where the forest is lost in the trees. *Il.* xvi. 765. As when opposing winds strive οὐρεος ἐν βήσσης βαθὴν πελεμιζόμεν ὕλην, φηγόν τε μελίην τε. *Il.* xx. 490 ὡς δ' ἀναμαιμάει βαθέ' ἄγκρα θεσπιδαῆς πῦρ οὐρεος ἀζαλέοιο, βαθεῖα δὲ καίεται ὕλη, πάντη τε κλονέων ἄνεμος φλόγα εἰλυφάζει, "As the heaven-sent fire rages athwart the deep hollows of the parched hillside and the forest burns to its depths, and the furious wind rolls the flame in volumes on every side." *Od.* v. 63 (the description of Calypso's grotto) ὕλη δὲ σπέος ἀμφὶ πεφύκεν τηλεθώσα, κλήθηρ τ' αἰγειρός τε καὶ εὐώδης κυπάρισσος, which Worsley translates, "And round the cave a leafy wood there lay, where green trees waved o'er many a shady dell, alder and poplar black, and cypress sweet of smell," which we naturally take to be a description of the sacred grove, with its tall trees, surrounding the abode of the nymph.¹ In Hes. *Op.* 506 we read of lofty oaks and stout pines as making up the ὕλη, whether we translate it "forest" or "woodland." But we come to a more decisive example in Thuc. ii. 77, where the attempt of the Lacedaemonians to set Plataea on fire is described, καὶ ἐγένετο φλόξ τσοαύτη, ὅσην οὐδεὶς πω ἔς γε ἐκείνον τὸν χρόνον χειροποίητον εἶδεν ἤδη γὰρ ἐν ὄρεσιν ὕλη τριφθειῖσα ὑπ' ἀνεμων πρὸς αὐτὴν ἀπὸ ταυτομάτου πῦρ . . . ἀνήκε, where

¹ Hort's note on this passage seems as if it were expressly intended to deny any sense of the *religio luci*: "luxuriant tree-age" (like *herbage*) about the cave.'

Arnold translates, "Such a fire produced by the power of man had never been witnessed: for, if we speak of natural conflagrations, they have been known to consume a whole mountain-forest, catching fire and bursting into a blaze of itself, from the mere attrition of its boughs owing to high winds." Hort thinks that, as mention had been made just before of fuel under this term (*φοροῦντες ὕλης φακέλλους*, and *ἐμβάλλοντες πῦρ ξὺν θείῳ καὶ πίεσση ἡψαν τὴν ὕλην*), it cannot be used here of a forest. In any case fuel or cut wood cannot catch fire from the attrition of boughs, nor can there be any reference to brushwood, for the supposed spontaneous ignition could only be regarded as possible in the case of heavy branches of withered trees, which are continually colliding and so playing the part of gigantic fire-sticks. It seems to me that the comparison becomes far more striking, if we conceive of ὕλη as a great unit, which is wiped out by the fire, rather than as so many yards of timber; and Thucydides himself seems to press this point on the reader, when he contrasts the greatest of man-made fires with a conflagration produced by the forces of nature. We have another reference to a forest fire in Thuc. iv. 29, where he describes how the wood, which covered the island of Sphacteria, prevented the Athenians from judging of the number and position of the Spartans, until it was burnt down by accident. In iii. 98 we read of the disastrous defeat of the Athenians in Aetolia owing to their ignorance of the roads and their getting lost in the forest. In Thuc. ii. 75 and iv. 69 ὕλη is used of the timber brought from Cithaeron as opposed to *δένδρα*, fruit trees, taken from the suburbs.¹ The

¹ The *Bacchae* of Euripides is full of allusions to Cithaeron and its ὕλη, e.g. 1045 foll. *λέπας Κιθαιρώνειον εἰσεβάλλομεν . . . ἦν δ' ἄγκος ἀμφίκριμμον ὕδασι διάβροχον, πεύκαισι συσκλαζόν*. It is the abode of Pan and the Nymphs (951) where the fawn rejoices *βροτῶν ἐρημίαις σκιαροκόμου τ' ἐν ἔρνεσιν ὕλης* (874), and where the hapless Pentheus is torn to pieces by the *Maenads ὕλης ἐν βαθυξύλω φόβῃ* (1137).

only passages in which it seems to me that ὕλη is used in what Hort calls a "collective sense" are those which suggest the ground-plan of an estate, where one portion is marked as forest, another as marsh, others as arable or pasture. Such seems to be the case in some of Hort's quotations from Plato and Aristotle, but I do not think this holds good in Theocr. xxii. 36 παντοίην δ' ἐν ὄρει θηεύμενοι ἄγριον ὕλην, where παντοίην is said to favour the same use. But surely the context is much opposed to this. Castor and Pollux are described as wandering away from their companions to explore the forest, where they find a fountain of pure water welling out from the rock, encircled by tall pines and white poplars and planes and cypresses. I think παντοίην is merely meant to suggest the beauty and variety of the forest which made it worth exploring. Lucian supplies several examples of the same use, cf. *Var. Hist.* 15 πᾶσα ἡ ὕλη resounds under the force of the wind; *ib.* 22 ἐπλανῶντο περὶ τὴν ὕλην, *ib.* 42 εἶδομεν ὕλην μεγίστην πιτύων καὶ κυπαρίττων; *Prom.* 12 The whole earth was originally ὕλαις ἀνημέροις λάσιος; *Sacrif.* 10 ὕλας ἀπετέμοντο καὶ ὄρη ἀνέθεσαν, "men set apart groves and consecrated mountains."

The use of ὕλη in Xenophon's *Cynegetica* is peculiar, but not, I think, to be explained from Aristotle, as Hort suggests. I should be inclined to understand it as a technical term for a tree used as a post to which the hounds are to be tied, while waiting till the scent is found. If so, it would seem to have rather an individualistic than a collective force, but I am far from certain. In any case the use is too exceptional to be of any help in determining the meaning of ὕλη in St. James. The translations are taken from Dakyns' edition. Hort's instances are vi. 12 and ix. 2, δήσαντα δ' ἐκ τῆς ὕλης τὰς κύνας; and ix. 19, where the process of catching deer by a trap (ποδοστράβη) is described, "Should the deer have been caught by the hind leg, the clog trailing

along must much impede its movement. Sometimes, too, it will come in contact with the forked branches of some tree" (*ἐνίοτε καὶ εἰς δικράσας τῆς ὕλης ἐμπίπτει*). x. 7 (of boar hunting) When the huntsman approaches the lair he places "the nooses on any forked branches of wood to hand (*ἐπὶ ἀποσχαλιδώματα τῆς ὕλης δικρᾶ*) . . . The string round the top of the net must be attached to some stout tree and not any mere shrub (*καὶ τὸν περὶδρομον ἐξάπτει ἀπὸ δένδρου ἰσχυροῦ καὶ μὴ ἐκ ῥάκου*). All about each net it will be well to stop with timber even difficult places (*ὑπὲρ ἐκάστης ἐμφράττει τῇ ὕλῃ καὶ τὰ δύσσορμα*)."

Of course I am not denying that St. James might have taken his illustration from a funeral pyre, as Philo has done (I. p. 455) *σπινθήρ γὰρ ὁ βραχύτατος ἐντυφόμενος, ὅταν καταπνευσθεὶς ζωπυρηθῇ, μεγάλην ἐξάπτει πυράν*, but St. James was a poet, and the form of his sentence shows that he desired to emphasise to the utmost the contrast between the smallness of the spark and the greatness of the conflagration. There is no comparison between the burning of weeds, or the cremation of the dead, or the combustion of so many stacks of wood, or even a prairie fire, and the terror of the forest fire described in such vivid terms by Bruncken in his *North American Forests*, pp. 99 foll. "One popular writer repeats after the other the story that forest-fires have been caused by two dry branches being rubbed against each other by the wind. No experienced woodman will believe in such a tale." (p. 98) "It is sometimes said lightning causes forest fires. This may be possible, but, as far as I know, no case of such origin has been actually observed and recorded." The cause of the forest-fire is almost always the neglect of fire kindled by the hand of man. Under ordinary circumstances this dies out of itself, but it is different "when, during a long drought, a wind fans the smouldering fire into active leaping flames." (p. 104) "Small

fires multiply everywhere, for every day new ones start, and there is no rain to put out the old ones. The smoke becomes denser and denser, . . . the heat is horrible, although no ray of sunshine penetrates the heavy pall of smoke. In the distance a rumbling, rushing sound is heard. It is the fire roaring in the treetops on the hillsides, several miles from town. Fiercer and fiercer blows the wind generated by the fire itself, louder and louder the crackling of the branches, as the flames seize one after the other, leaping from crown to crown, rising high above the treetops in whirling wreaths of fire. . . . As the heated air rises higher and higher, rushing along with a sound like that of a thousand foaming torrents, burning brands are carried along . . . bearing the fire miles away from its origin, then falling among the dry brush-heaps and starting another fire to burn as fiercely as the first." (p. 109) "There is something horrible in the steady relentless approach of a top-fire. . . . You can fight a ground fire by trying to beat it out with brush or throwing earth upon it. You cannot fight a fire that seizes treetop after treetop far above your reach, and showers down upon the pigmy mortals, who attempt to oppose it, an avalanche of burning branches, driving them away to escape the torture and death that threaten them."

Since the above was written, Mr. Dakyns has sent me a still more striking description of a forest fire by Stevenson, which he thinks might well have had for its motto, *ΗΑΙΚΟΝ ΠΤΡ ΗΑΙΚΗΝ ΤΑΗΝ ΑΝΑΠΤΕΙ*. It is taken from his book entitled *Across the Plains*, No. II., on "The Old Pacific Capital." It is too long to quote as a whole. I select one or two sentences which may serve to illustrate both Homer and St. James. "The fire passes through the underbrush at a run (compare Homer's *θάμνοι πρόρριζοι πίπτουσιν*). . . . After the squiblike conflagration of the dry moss and twigs there remains a

deep-rooted and consuming fire in the very entrails of the tree. The resin of the pitch-pine is principally condensed at the base of the bole and in its spreading roots. . . . Underground to their most extended fibres the roots are being eaten out by fire and the smoke is rising through the fissures to the surface. . . . Without a word of warning the huge pine-tree snaps off short across the ground and falls prostrate with a crash. . . . Long afterwards, if you pass by, you will find the earth pierced with radiating galleries, and preserving the design of all these subterraneous spurs, as though it were the mould of a new tree, instead of the print of an old one." He then describes how near he himself came to lynching on one occasion when in a mad fit of curiosity he struck a match and applied it to one of the tassels of dry moss hanging from a huge pine-tree, which had so far escaped the flame. "The tree went off simply like a rocket: in three seconds it was a roaring pillar of flame. Close by, I could hear the shouts of those who were at work combating the original conflagration. . . . Had any one observed the result of my experiment, my neck was literally not worth a pinch of snuff."

I see no reason why St. James may not have had such a picture in his mind, when he wrote the words we are considering. Lebanon with its cedars was the type of the glory of Israel; it was the symbol of life and beauty, as in Hos. xiv. 5, "Israel shall blossom as the lily, and cast forth his roots as Lebanon"; yet the prophet Zechariah (xi. 1-3) foretells the destruction of Lebanon by fire, "Open thy gates, O Lebanon, that the fire may devour thy cedars. Howl, O fir tree, for the cedar is fallen, for the glory is laid waste. Howl, ye oaks of Bashan, for the inaccessible forest is laid low" (Delitzsch's trans.). When we remember that Lebanon was the great storehouse for the building of houses and ships, that Anti-

gonus employed 8,000 men in felling its cedars in order to provide himself with a navy, that Herod used it in building the Temple, we need not ask where St. James borrowed his figure. Fires smaller or greater must have been of constant occurrence.¹

We have still to ask what should have led Hort to depart from what we may call the natural interpretation of ὕλη. It is never safe to assume that the considerations which have influenced oneself were unknown to Hort. He must certainly have been aware, though he has not mentioned it, of the use of the word in the LXX, and this would have inclined him to understand the saying of St. James in the same sense. He must also have noticed that in Aristotle the philosophical use, and in Xenophon, what I may call the prosaic use, quite eclipsed the poetical use, which still held its ground in ordinary writers owing to its Homeric associations.² It is curious, however, that in turning over my Greek books during the last few days, I have failed to come across such a phrase as the following, which I think would have satisfied Hort, *μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα εἰς ὕλην τινὰ παμμεγέθη ἤλθομεν τριταῖοι.*

J. B. MAYOR.

¹ Such fires are referred to in Ps. lxxxiii. 14, Isa. ix. 18, x. 17-19. The Rev. F. J. Taylor, formerly a missionary to the Telugus, mentions in his *Exposition of the Epistle of St. James* (p. 63) that, in the Deccan, forest-fires occur regularly every year. "When the season comes round the hillsides are lighted nightly by them. At a distance of sixteen miles the flames can be seen leaping from one side of a ravine to the other."

² *δρυμός* is only found in Homer in the irregular plural *δρυμά*, generally in the phrase *ἀνὰ δρυμὰ πυκνὰ καὶ θλην*. It does not occur at all in Thucydides. Polybius uses it of oak groves in ii. 15, 2, xii. 4-13, possibly in the more general sense in iii. 40, 12, *ἐν τισὶ δρυμοῖς ἐτοιμάσαντες ἐνέδρας*. Strabo regularly uses *ὁ Ἐρκύνιος δρυμός* for the Hercynian forest vii. 1, 3 and 5, but adds *ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλη θλη μεγάλη Γαβρήτα*.