IN Prof. Thayer's Lexicon of the New Testament is a quite full discussion of the particle ἐν, with references to the Septuagint, the Apocrypha, and to classic and later Greek authors, as well as to the New Testament.

The work of so excellent a scholar as Prof. Thayer is above criticism, especially when built upon the basis of such scholarship as that of Grimm and Wilke. But study of the particle under discussion has shown a wide deviation in the N.T. Greek from the usage of classic authors, which deviation does not come to the surface in Thayer's Lexicon article. A cursory reading of the article would lead one to suppose that the employment of ἐν in the N.T. is comparatively pure, while as a matter of fact, perhaps in no other word is there so wide a departure from classic usage. The subjoined discussion is offered as a contribution toward a more complete understanding of this particle, and gives the result of study of the word in the New Testament (Westcott and Hort's text), the Apocrypha (Fritzsche's ed., Leipz. 1871), and the Septuagint (Van Ess, Leipz. 1831, founded on the Roman ed., other texts not being immediately available). It may be said, in passing, that the particular text of the Septuagint makes little difference in this discussion, the induction having been sufficiently wide to cover differences of reading.

Prof. Thayer's scheme of the usage of ἐν is as follows:
1. **As a CONJUNCTION.**
   1. **Temporal terminus ad quem, till, until.**
      a. with an indicative preterite.
      b. with ἄν and the aor. subj., or with aor. subj. and ἄν omitted.
      c. with indic. present, instead of aor. subj.
      d. with indic. future (but reading rejected).
   2. **While, followed by the indicative, — in N.T. only indic. present**
II. As an ADVERB, usque ad.

1. Temporal terminus ad quem, until, unto.
   a. like a preposition, with a genitive of time.
      before names of illustrious men.
      before names of events.
   b. with the genitive of neuter rel. pronoun, ὥς or ὅς, it gets
      the force of a conjunction.
      a. ὥς ὅς, followed by the indic. or by the subj.
      b. ὥς ὅς ὅς
         aa. until, till, followed by the indic.
         bb. followed by the subj. (no ἂν).
         c. before adverbs of time (ὡς ἄψις, ἄριστα, etc).

2. Local terminus ad quem, unto, as far as to.
   a. like a preposition, with a gen. of place.
   b. with an adverb of place.
   c. with a preposition.

3. Limit of quantity.
4. Limit of measurement.
5. Limit of acting and suffering.

Liddell and Scott’s arrangement is as follows:

A. RELATIVE PARTICLE, expresses point of time up to which.

I. Until

1. Temporal conjunction.
   a. with indicative, in past time.
   b. with subjunctive, with ἂν or κέ, uncertain event in future
      time.
   c. with optative, uncertain event in past, with ἂν if con-
      ditional [not in New Testament].
   d. with infinitive, in late authors.

2. With single words, mostly adverbs of time, of place,
   with the genitive, and with a preposition.

II. While, so long as.
   a. with indicative (mostly in Homer).
   b. with ἂν and subjunctive, when action is future.
   c. with optative, of repeated action.

B. In Homer sometimes DEMONSTRATIVE.

It will be seen that the arrangement of Liddell and Scott turns on
the meaning of the word, and then on its use with different moods of
the verb; while that of Thayer hinges on the change in use as con-
junction and adverb.

The arrangement suggested by my own study is the following; re-
marking only that the class V. is placed under A, rather than under
B, because although ἀν is really a preposition governing the genitive,
the force of the combination is conjunctive.

A. ἀν used with VERBS.
   I. With ἄν and subjunctive.
   II. With indicative.
      a. present.
      b. past.
      c. future (only in Apocrypha).
   III. With subjunctive, ἄν omitted.
   IV. With infinitive,
      a. with τοῦ and subject accusative.
      b. with τοῦ and no subject accusative.
      c. with infinitive alone.
   V. With οὗ and ὄτου followed by
      a. the indicative, as above (II).
      b. the subjunctive, as above (III).

B. Used with NOUNS, ADVERBS, and PREPOSITIONS.
   I. As a preposition, governing the genitive,
      a. of time.
      b. of place.
      c. of quantity and number.
      d. of motion to persons.
   II. With
      a. indeclinable nouns.
      b. indeclinable adjectives
         (if declinable would be in the genitive).
   III. With adverbs,
      a. of time, πάντες, ἄρτι, etc.
      b. of place, ἄνθε, κάτω, etc.
      c. of manner, ὡς.
   IV. Followed by preposition governing a noun.

We will now examine the usage of ἀν according to the proposed
arrangement, and notice the deviation from classic models.
It will be noticed that no mention is made of the optative, the reason being that I have not found in the range of literature under discussion any instances of ἢσος used with that mood.

A. I. is in strict accord with classic usage, except that we find instances where earlier writers would probably have used the narratio obliqua. I find nineteen cases of this in the N.T., only six in the Apocrypha. The Septuagint I have not fully examined, but have found many instances. See Luke ix. 27, 1 Makk. ii. 7, and Isa. xxxii. 15 for examples.

II. a. With indicative present. This is used of events, not contingent, considered as present. An example of this, in full accord with classic usage, is John ix. 4, ἢσος ἠμέον ἔστιν. In John xxi. 22, 23 we have a construction not justifiable by the canons of classical Greek: ἦν αὕτω θεός μετέχει ἢσος ἠρχομαι. Xenophon would have employed the subjunctive in the latter verb, for the time of the coming is an uncertainty, is indefinite. The same is true of 1 Tim. iv. 13, ἢσος ἠρχομαι πρόσεχε τῇ ἀναγνώσει. I find no instance of this corrupt usage in either Apocrypha or Septuagint, though, as I may say once for all, my examination of the latter has not yet been exhaustive.—b. With indicative past. This refers to definite events in past time, and the usage in the three works under discussion accords with that of early Greek writers. Examples are: Matt. xxiv. 39; Tobit vi. 5; Dan. vii. 11 [Theod.].—c. Two instances of ἢσος followed by the indicative future occur in the Apocrypha: Susanna 59 [Chis.], ἢσος δ ὁ λαός ἐξολοθρεύεται ἔμας; Judith x.15, ἢσος παραδώγοντι σε. I am quite sure no clear cases of this exist in the N.T., and I have found none in the LXX. This usage is without warrant in the classics.

III. Followed by the subjunctive ἄρα omitted. While it might be difficult to cite classic authority for this construction, there can be no doubt that it is in accord with the genius of the Greek. Sedgwick (Greek Prose Composition, pp. 46, 47) remarks, "ἢσος, etc., are by nature so indefinite when applied to future time that the Greek mind does not require ἄρα so imperatively to mark the indefiniteness." Examples of this may be seen in Luke xiii. 35; Ecclus. xxxii. 17 [21]; Ps. lxxii. 17. In the Apocrypha and N.T. this construction is found eight times in each.

IV. a. This construction is not found in the N.T.—b. A solitary instance of this is found in the N.T., viz. Acts viii. 40, and this Thayer calls the genitive of time of event. He evidently intends the
infinitive to be considered as a noun governed by ἓος used "like a preposition," which is correct, which would bring it properly under B. I. in my arrangement. It has, however, been placed here in order to group and make complete the arrangement of the constructions of ἓος with VERBS. In the Apocrypha and LXX this construction and the former (IV. a.) is a common one, occurring sixteen times, and it is frequently met in the LXX. Of c. no instances occur in the N. T.; I have found none in the LXX,¹ and only one in the Apocrypha; viz. Tob. i. 14. [Cod. Sin.] Liddell and Scott quote authority for ὦ, but a and c are entirely late or Hellenistic.

V. Here we reach what is the most marked departure from classic usage. The one use of ἓος in early Greek is as a conjunctive or conjunctive adverb; here we find it degraded to the use of a preposition.² This construction does not occur very frequently with the indicative in the New Testament (seven times), but it is found with the subjunctive eleven times. In the Apocrypha and LXX it occurs quite often, and about an equal number of times with each mood. Examination of the instances of its occurrence (see, e.g. Matt. i. 25; xiii. 33; Tob. i. 21; ii. 4; Gen. xxvi. 13) shows that ὦ and ὒνου are superfluous, and do not affect the construction of mood or tense.

This usage is referred to both by Liddell and Scott and by Thayer, and citations are made of its existence in a classic author. Liddell and Scott cite Herodotus ii. 103, and Thayer, Herodotus ii. 143. It is to be remarked that in both passages Teubner's edition (edited by Dietsch) reads ἑ and ὦ, and that Schweighäuser, a very careful student of Herodotus, remarked: "ubi formulam ἓος ὦ ex interpretatione alius grammatici inventam esse suspicabatur Koen ad Greg. Dial. Ion. § 63, quoniam pro illa alias ὦ frequen tant Herodotus." If, then, no other ground is discoverable, this must be considered a late usage, perhaps developed by analogy from phrases like ἓος ὒνει, ἓος ὒπει, etc., or perhaps from the Hebrew וְשָׁנָן וְשָׁנָן.

B. I. The use of ἓος as a preposition is the next calling for remark, showing in the most marked way what Winer calls "debased Greek."

¹ Strictly speaking, this class should be relegated to the next head (B. I.), since ἓος governs ὦ and ὒνου (or, more strictly, the suppressed antecedent). But since the compound expression serves as a conjunctive adverb, the use seemed to call for separate classification.
² Strictly speaking, this class should be relegated to the next head (B. I.), since ἓος governs ὦ and ὒνου (or, more strictly, the suppressed antecedent). But since the compound expression serves as a conjunctive adverb, the use seemed to call for separate classification.
³ Sophocles (Lex. s. v.) cites an example from Polybius: 4, 19, 12. — Eds.
Thayer has separated the treatment of this use, other matters having been interspersed, so that in his Lexicon the connection is somewhat obscured. I have spent considerable time looking for classic authority for this use of ἄπατος, with no result.

In the proposed classification given above (B. I.) are grouped the cases of employment of the particle governing nouns in the genitive to express the limit of time, of place, of quantity and number, and of motion to persons. Thayer has, additional to this (II. 5 in his arrangement), the "limit in acting or suffering." This is intended to be included under my arrangement B. I. c. Of course, as previously remarked, in this division may be included the case of Acts vii. 40, considered above. It also includes such expressions as ἐκ νῦν, which are, according to Greek usage, real nouns. I have made a separate division for ἄπατος followed by indeclinable nouns and adjectives in order to avoid misleading any who might overlook the prepositional character of the particle. Had those words been declinable they would have been in the genitive.

This use of ἄπατος preponderates greatly in Hellenistic Greek, there being nearly fifty cases of its occurrence with a noun or adjective in the genitive, exclusive of the cases where ὁ οὐ or ὁ οὐκ are found, or about one third of the whole number of passages where ἄπατος is used. In the Apocrypha and LXX this use of ἄπατος far outnumbers all others, there being in the former no less than one hundred and fourteen cases. And from the time of the LXX on, this usage is frequent down through the Byzantine authors.

Here, then, is the great contrast between the early and the late usage of this particle. In classic Greek it is found as a conjunctive adverb, construed with verbs and directing their mood, or else with single adverbs, like ὅτε, ἀπρό, etc. Citations of passages showing this construction are not necessary, since a very few minutes' reading in either New Testament, Apocrypha, or LXX will reveal instances of its employment. In most cases where this construction is found, early authors would have employed μέχρι, or possibly προς or ἐκ with the accusative.

Two cases under d. call for special mention: Luke iv. 42 and Acts ix. 38. These are cases where classic authors might have used ἄπατος with the accusative. The occurrence of this use, confined in the New Testament to these two books, is a confirmatory indication of the same authorship of both. One instance of this occurs in the Apocrypha.
If a change could profitably be made anywhere in the treatment of ἐν in Prof. Thayer's lexicon, it seems that this is the place.

Of B. II. sufficient has been said in the discussion of B. I.

B. III. The use of the particle ἐν with adverbs has abundant authority in authors such as Xenophon, and is plain enough to need no annotation. It is a matter of convenience to divide its usage with adverbs of a. time, b. place, and c. manner. In the LXX is one noteworthy passage: 1 Kings xviii. 45, καὶ ἐγενέτο ἐν ὀψει καὶ ὀψε, translating יָרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִרָה יִр
this word, besides being a noun is also a preposition and conjunction, and is used with both nouns and verbs. What more natural than that this Hebrew, having learned to translate the נָּשׁ in לְנָּשׁ רֵעַ by לְנָּשׁ, should also express the same word in לְנָּשׁ רֵעַ by לְנָּשׁ.

And the contempt the Jew felt, and too often manifested, for the Gentile would be a powerful factor in leading him to spend as little time as possible in the refinements of a language so difficult as the Greek. So, for similar reasons (probably), we find לְנָּשׁ doing duty in rendering, לְנָּשׁ, לְנָּשׁ רֵעַ, לְנָּשׁ, and לְנָּשׁ רֵעַ. Even Josephus, who boasted of the ease and purity with which he expressed himself in Greek, often found himself entangled in the niceties of the Greek particle.

Undoubtedly a great gain can still be made in the appreciation of the meaning of the New Testament when more attention has been paid to the deviations from the usage of the classic authors, and especially to those changes as influenced by Hebrew modes of thought.

4 [(?) Cf. e.g. his Antt. 26, 11, 2; c. Apion. 1, 9. On the uses of לְנָּשׁ see Professor Gildersleeve's historical classification and examples in American Journal of Philology, iv. 4, pp. 416-418 note. — Eos.]