

CYCLOPÆDIA
OF
BIBLICAL LITERATURE

EDITED BY

JOHN KITTO, D.D., F.S.A.,

**EDITOR OF 'THE PICTORIAL BIBLE,' AUTHOR OF 'THE HISTORY AND PHYSICAL
GEOGRAPHY OF PALESTINE,' &c. &c.**

ILLUSTRATED BY NUMEROUS ENGRAVINGS

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

NEW YORK:
MARK H. NEWMAN, 199 BROADWAY.
CINCINNATI:
WILLIAM H. MOORE & CO., 110 MAIN STREET.
1846.

Mark ix. 43-48; Jude 13; comp. Rev. xiv. 10, 11; xix. 20; xx. 14; xxi. 8). The figure by which hell is represented as burning with fire and brimstone is probably derived from the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah, as well as that which describes the smoke as ascending from it (comp. Rev. xiv. 10, 11, with Gen. xix. 24, 28). To this coincidence of description Peter also most probably alludes in 2 Pet. ii. 6.

The names which in many of the other instances are given to the punishments of hell, are doubtless in part figurative, and many of the terms which were commonly applied to the subject by the Jews are retained in the New Testament. The images, it will be seen, are generally taken from death, capital punishments, tortures, prisons, &c. And it is the obvious design of the sacred writers, in using such figures, to awaken the idea of something terrible and fearful. They mean to teach that the punishments beyond the grave will excite the same feelings of distress as are produced on earth by the objects employed to represent them. We are so little acquainted with the state in which we shall be hereafter, and with the nature of our future body, that no strictly literal representation of such punishments could be made intelligible to us. Many of the Jews, indeed, and many of the Christian fathers, took the terms employed in Scripture in an entirely literal sense, and supposed there would be actual fire, &c. in hell. But from the words of Christ and his apostles nothing more can with certainty be inferred than that they meant to denote great and unending miseries.

The punishments of sin may be distinguished into two classes—1. *Natural* punishments, or such as necessarily follow a life of servitude to sin; 2. *Positive* punishments, or such as God shall see fit, by his sovereign will, to inflict.

1. Among the natural punishments we may rank the privation of eternal happiness (Matt. vii. 21, 23; xxii. 13; xxv. 41; comp. 2 Thes. i. 9); the painful sensations which are the natural consequence of committing sin, and of an impenitent heart; the propensities to sin, the evil passions and desires which in this world fill the human heart, and which are doubtless carried into the world to come. The company of fellow-sinners and of evil spirits, as inevitably resulting from the other conditions, may be accounted among the natural punishments, and must prove not the least grievous of them.

2. The positive punishments have been already indicated. It is to these chiefly that the Scripture directs our attention. 'There are but few men in such a state that the merely natural punishments of sin will appear to them terrible enough to deter them from the commission of it. Experience also shows that to threaten positive punishment has far more effect, as well upon the cultivated as the uncultivated, in deterring them from crime, than to announce, and lead men to expect, the merely natural consequences of sin, be they ever so terrible. Hence we may see why it is that the New Testament says so little of natural punishments (although these beyond question await the wicked), and makes mention of them in particular far less frequently than of positive punishments; and why, in those passages which treat of the punishments of hell, such ideas and images are constantly employed as suggest

and confirm the idea of positive punishments' (Knapp's *Christian Theology*, § 156).

As the sins which shut out from heaven vary so greatly in quality and degree, we should expect from the justice of God a corresponding variety both in the natural and the positive punishments. This is accordingly the uniform doctrine of Christ and his apostles. The more knowledge of the divine law a man possesses, the more his opportunities and inducements to avoid sin, the stronger the incentives to faith and holiness set before him, the greater will be his punishment if he fails to make a faithful use of these advantages. 'The servant who knows his lord's will and does it not, deserves to be beaten with many stripes.' 'To whom much is given, of him much will be required' (Matt. x. 15; xi. 22, 24; xxiii. 15; Luke xii. 48). Hence St. Paul says that the heathen who acted against the law of nature would indeed be punished; but that the Jews would be punished more than they, because they had more knowledge (Rom. ii. 9-29). In this conviction, that God will, even in hell, justly proportion punishment to sin, we must rest satisfied. We cannot now know more; the precise degrees as well as the precise nature of such punishments are things belonging to another state of being, which in the present we are unable to understand (Knapp's *Christian Theology*, translated by Leonard Woods, Jun., DD., §§ 156-158; Storr and Flatt's *Biblical Theology*, with Schmucker's Additions, § iii. 58).

HELLENIST (Ἑλληνιστής). This word is derived from the Greek verb ἑλληνίζω, which in Aristotle means 'to talk (good) Greek' (*Rhetoric*, iii. 5. 1; 12. 1); but, according to the analogy of other verbs in -ίζω, it might mean 'to favour the Greeks,' or 'to imitate Greek manners.' In the New Testament it seems to be appropriated as the name of those persons who, being of Jewish extraction, nevertheless talked Greek as their mother-tongue; which was the case generally with the Jews in Egypt, Syria, Asia Minor, and Greece; and in fact, through the influence of the Greek cities in northern Palestine (Decapolis), it would appear that the Galileans from their childhood learned nearly as much Greek as Hebrew. The appellation *Hellenist* is opposed to that of *Hebrew* in Acts vi. 1: in Acts ix. 29 the reading is not so certain, yet probably it should there also be 'Hellenists,' meaning unconverted Jews. Modern critics have accordingly agreed to denominate the Jewish dialect of Greek 'Hellenistic'; and, whatever name be used, the thing itself ought to be distinctly conceived of.

The Greeks who conquered the Persian empire spoke many different dialects; and the leading nation, the Macedonians, were too deficient in literary pretensions to give an exclusive currency to their own idiom. A necessary result of this was, that even in the written style the current Greek became more or less a compound of several dialects; and much more must this have happened to the speech which foreigners learned to talk as Greek. They could not discriminate Ionic and Macedonian words and phrases from those of Attica; and while they fused the language into a new mould, they would also fail to learn the niceties of Greek grammar, and the peculiarities of its genius. Add to this, that each separate people was of course liable to introduce its

own idioms into the Greek—a source of corruption less influential perhaps in the case of those languages (such as Phrygian and Persian) which belonged to the Indo-European stock, but which in the case of the Jews must have been peculiarly powerful, both because of the eminent contrast between the genius of their tongue and that of the Greek, and because their national literature had taken so deep a hold. In consequence, so similar in style are most parts of the New Testament and of the Apocrypha to the Old Testament, that even the best scholar would fail of finding out from the English translation, close as it is, in which of the two languages the original was written.

The last remark, however, has its exceptions; for in the Hellenistic Greek the Jewish element is not always equally predominant. As might naturally be expected, it is generally found to be most abundant in the translations from Hebrew, such as the Alexandrine Version of the Old Testament and the first book of Maccabees. The Apocalypse, of all original compositions in Greek, though full of natural eloquence, is the most thoroughly Hebraic, and most violates the laws of Greek grammar. Next to it, the three first Gospels and the first half of the Acts may be fitly reckoned, and perhaps after these the Gospel and Epistles of John. Still more vigorous and natural Greek is found in the Catholic Epistles and in those of Paul; better still is the latter half of the Acts, and the preface to the third Gospel, which is nearly or quite on a par with the Epistle to the Hebrews. The book called The Wisdom of Solomon, and the second book of Maccabees, are likewise written in a Greek decidedly superior to the common Hellenistic style. But from all other Jewish writers Josephus and Philo are separated by a long interval. Their studies led them to a close perusal of classical authors, whose idiom they have anxiously imitated, and with much success.

Every such arrangement as has been just given must be liable to objections. We cannot, for instance, draw so sharp a line between the first and second half of the Acts of the Apostles as may seem to be implied. No writer of the New Testament has so great inequality of style as Luke; of which a more striking illustration is not needed than the sudden change from the preface of his Gospel to the actual narrative. It seems impossible to assign this to any other cause than his having worked up into his own account the very words and sentences of those from whom he gained his information, though he has done this in such a way that here and there a better Greek phraseology seems to come out. In the latter part of the Acts, where he is describing what he himself saw, the style is almost free from Jewish idiom, and, though not perfectly the language of European Greece, is yet deeply imbued with its spirit. Again, it is not easy to decide in what place we should rank the Gospel and Epistles of John. In them we complain of meagreness of vocabulary and general monotony. In Matthew, Mark, and Luke the genius of the Hebrew language obtrudes itself, on the whole, more than in John, and yet the style of John is rather to be called less Hebraic than more Greek. This may be plausibly ascribed to his long absence from Palestine and from Hebrew influences, and to the absorption of his mind in contemplations peculiarly his own. Once more,

the Epistles of Peter, James, and Jude contain a profusion of Ionic or poetical words, beyond what can have entered into the spoken tongue, and scarcely to be paralleled in the contemporaneous prose Greek. It might almost seem that the writers (as often happens to foreigners learning our language, or indeed to half-educated persons) had never learned to feel the difference between the poetical and the common diction. In this respect these Epistles may be judged hardly as good Greek as those of Paul: still they have, in common with his, a certain freedom, fluency, and vigour; and their differences may be ascribed to peculiarities rather of mind than, strictly speaking, of dialect.

It belongs to a grammar to detail all that distinguishes the Greek of the New Testament (see Winer's excellent *Grammatik des new-testamentlichen Sprach-idioms*). But in fact, by knowing Hebrew and Greek, it might almost have been predicted what sort of errors and defects would exist in the degenerate tongue. Whatever especially characterizes the Greek would be ill-learned or lost, such as the use of numerous particles, the sequence of moods and tenses, the multifarious use of the participles, the delicate proprieties of prepositions and their cases. It was to be expected that a part of the vocabulary would never be learned at all, and another large part be slightly misapplied; that Hebrew secondary and metaphorical senses would be obtruded on Greek words; that various new vocables or compounds would arise, not always generated according to a sound analogy; that in the structure of sentences the tame uniform concatenated Hebraic idiom would, to a great extent, supersede the periodic and varying form of the Greek sentence, flexible for rhetorical energy or logical perspicuity; and (as an indication of the fact) that the conjunction *and* would predominate over all others. This is exactly what has occurred. A still further step is a neglect of the common laws of concord, which, however, is generally restricted within narrow limits. Only in the Apocalypse do we meet with very gross instances of it; such as, *ὁ θεὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ μόνος ὁ πιστός* (i. 5); *τὴν γυναῖκα ἢ λέγουσα* (ii. 20); *τῶ ἀγαπήσαντι ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς, τὼν ποιήσαντι* (i. 5, 6). The repetition also of the pronoun, as in the last instance, so natural to the Hebrew, is slavish in the Greek. Once only (and that not without dispute) is an instance found of the singular idiom which technical grammar has denominated in Hebrew *Vau conversive*; viz. *καὶ ἐτελέσθη* for *τελεσθήσεται* (x. 7). In the Greek of the New Testament generally the optative mood is observed to be very rare; which appears as the first stage of the process by which it has vanished in modern Greek. So too, instead of the participle, the infinitive is substituted in Hebrew fashion; which often gives an ungraceful stiffness to passages otherwise well written. As a single instance, in James iii. 3, *ἰδοὺ, τῶν ἴππων τοὺς χαλινούς εἰς τὰ στόματα βάλλομεν πρὸς τὸ πείθεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἡμῶν . . .* down to *βάλλομεν* the Greek is good, and suited to the elevated tone of the writer, but the words which follow spoil it to a classical ear.

The Epistle to the Hebrews differs from all the other compositions of the New Testament, in being the writing of one who has evidently spent much pains on the cultivation of his style. With a few

exceptions, it is scarcely more thoroughly idiomatic than the 27th chapter of the Acts; but it is full of indications that the writer had not only moved in circles where good Greek was talked, but had studied well-written models, and aimed to imitate them. In point of mere style it may be fairly compared with the Wisdom of Solomon (although the *subject* of the latter book often throws the sentences into a more Hebrew form); and in fact both appear to exhibit sufficient marks of the Alexandrian culture.

It has been thought unnecessary here to enter into detail concerning the old controversies between the Purists, who tried to prove that all the Greek of the New Testament was classical, and the Hebraists, who overdid the opposite argument (Winer's *Gram.* § 1, edit. of 1836); for on this subject there are no longer two opinions amongst the learned.

The fact that so large a portion of the Jewish nation was Hellenistic, was destined to work great results on the Christian cause. Indeed, in some sense, Christianity itself may be said to have had its human birth among Hellenists, since Jesus himself and the majority of his disciples were reared in Galilee, and were probably nearly as familiar with the Greek as with the Hebrew tongue. Nevertheless, during the early times which followed the day of Pentecost, no striking result appears from this, except that it must have facilitated communication with the Jews of the dispersion. The important part which the Hellenists were to sustain, was first indicated by the preaching of Stephen; who discerned the lower place which must be assigned to the national law of Moses in the kingdom of Messiah. Stephen, indeed, was abruptly cut off by the odium which his principles caused; but the same were soon after adopted, and yet more efficiently inculcated, by his persecutor Saul, to whom the high office was allotted of establishing the peculiar system of doctrine which thenceforward distinguished the Gentile from the Jewish church. The Epistle of James (whether written, as Neander thinks, before the development of the Pauline views or not) exhibits to us undoubtedly the state of Christian doctrine in the mother-church of Jerusalem. We see in it the higher spirit of Christ struggling to put down the law into its right place, but having by no means as yet brought out into their full clearness the distinguishing doctrines of the gospel. All of these were preached and established by Paul in his own churches, founded among Gentile proselytes to Hellenistic Judaism, and from them in no long time were imbibed by all Gentile Christendom. But, simultaneously, the struggle began within the church itself between the Hebraic and the Hellenistic spirit. The (so-called) first council at Jerusalem (Acts xv.) decided, for the time at least, that the Mosaic law was not to be enforced upon the Gentiles, but it did not lessen the importance of it to Jewish Christians; and it would appear that the Hebrew spirit became afterwards even stronger still within the Jerusalem church, if we may interpret literally the words of James (Acts xxi. 20):—'Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe, and they are all zealous of the law.' At any rate it appears certain that the resistance to the Pauline doctrine continued intense in the

great body of the Hebrew Christians; for they show themselves in ecclesiastical history only under the names of Nazarenes and Ebionites, and are always regarded as (more or less) heretical by the Gentile churches, since they held only the bare rudimental creed on which the original Pentecostal church was founded; and pertinaciously rejected the distinguishing tenets of Paul, which were confirmed by Peter, and perhaps extended by John. This first and greatest of controversies ended in the extinction of the Hebrew churches, which had refused to grow with the growth of the Christian spirit in its highest and most favoured leaders. But long before that event the Hellenistic Jews had been swallowed up in the mass of Gentile believers; and to follow the further development of the Grecian mind within the bosom of Christianity, belongs, not to this article, but to a history of Gentile Christendom.

F. W. N.

HELMET. [ARMS; ARMOUR.]

HELPS (*ἀντιλήψεις*; Vulg. *opitulationes*; 1 Cor. xii. 28). The Greek word, signifying aids or assistances, has also this meaning, among others, in the classical writers (*e. g.* Diod. Sic. i. 87). In the Sept. it answers to *עֲזָרָה* (Pa. xxii. 19), to *עֲזָרָה* (Pa. cviii. 12), and to *עֲזָרָה* (Pa. lxxiii. 8). It is found in the same sense, *Eccles.* xi. 12; 2 Macc. xi. 26; and in Josephus (*De Bell. Jud.* iv. 5. 1). In the New Testament it occurs once, viz. in the enumeration of the several orders or classes of persons possessing miraculous gifts among the primitive Christians (*ut supra*), where it seems to be used by metonymy, the abstract for the concrete, and to mean *helpers*; like the words *δυνάμεις*, 'miracles,' i. e. *workers* of miracles; *κυβερνήσεις*, 'governments,' that is, *governors*, &c., in the same enumeration. The Americans, it is well known, by a similar idiom, call their servants 'helps.' Great difficulty attends the attempt to ascertain the nature of the office so designated among the first Christians. Theophylact explains *ἀντιλήψεις* by *ἀντιχρῆστας τῶν ἀσθενῶν*, *helping or supporting the infirm*. And so Gennadius, in Eucumenius. But this seems like an inference from the etymology (see Gr. of Acts xx. 35). It has been assumed by some eminent modern writers that the several 'orders' mentioned in ver. 28, correspond respectively to the several 'gifts' of the Spirit enumerated in ver. 8, 9. In order, however, to make the two enumerations tally, it is necessary to make 'divers kinds of tongues' and 'interpretation of tongues,' in the one, answer to 'diversities of tongues' in the other, which, in the present state of the received text, does not seem to be a complete correspondence. The result of the collation is that *ἀντιλήψεις* answers to 'prophecy,' whence it has been inferred that these persons were such as were qualified with the gift of 'lower prophecy,' to help the Christians in the public devotions (Barrington's *Miscellanea Sacra*, i. 166; Macknight on 1 Cor. xii. 10-28). Another result is, that 'governments' answers 'to discerning of spirits.' To both these Dr. Hales very reasonably objects, as unlikely, and pronounces this tabular view to be 'perplexed and embarrassing' (*New Analysis*, &c., Lond. 1830, iii. 289). Bishop Horsley has adopted this classification of the gifts and office-bearers, and points out as 'helps,' i. e. persons gifted with 'prophecies or predictions,' such per-