

## ΕΩΣ IN HELLENISTIC GREEK.\*

BY GEORGE W. GILMORE.

IN Prof. Thayer's Lexicon of the New Testament is a quite full discussion of the particle εως, 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 εως 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 εως is as follows:

## I. 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

\* Read in June 1890.

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, *οὗ* or *ὅρου*, it gets the force of a conjunction.
    - a. *ἕως οὗ*, followed by the indic. or by the subj.
    - β. *ἕως ὅρου*
      - aa. *until, till*, followed by the indic. followed by the subj. (no *ἄν*).
      - ββ. *as long as, whilst*, followed by indic. present.
  - c. before adverbs of time (*ἕως ἄπρι, πόρε*, 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 *ἄν* or *κε*, uncertain event in future time.
  - c. with optative, uncertain event in past, with *ἄν* if conditional [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 *ἄν* 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 conjunction and adverb.

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

A. \*Εως 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 οὔ and ὅσῳ 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, πότε, ἄρτι, etc.

b. of place, ὧδε, κάτω, etc.

c. of manner, ὧδε.

IV. Followed by preposition governing a noun.

We will now examine the usage of εως 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 *ἕως* 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, *ἕως ἡμέρα ἐστίν*. In John xxi. 22, 23 we have a construction not justifiable by the canons of classical Greek: *ἐὰν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν ἕως ἔρχομαι*. 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, *ἕως ἔρχομαι πρόσχε 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 *ἕως* followed by the indicative future occur in the Apocrypha; Susanna 59 [Chis.], *ἕως ὃ λαὸς ἐξολοθρεύσει ὑμᾶς*; Judith x. 15, *ἕως παραδώσουσί 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 *ἄν* 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, "*ἕως*, etc., are by nature so indefinite when applied to future time that the Greek mind does not require *ἄν* so imperatively to mark the indefiniteness." Examples of this may be seen in Luke xiii. 35; Eccles. 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 εως 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 εως 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,<sup>1</sup> and only one in the Apocrypha; viz. Tob. i. 14. [Cod. Sin.] Liddell and Scott quote authority for *b*, 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 εως in early Greek is as a conjunctive or conjunctive adverb; here we find it degraded to the use of a preposition.<sup>2</sup> 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. 38; Tob. i. 21; ii. 4; Gen. xxvi. 13) shows that οὐ and ὅρον 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 ἐς ὃ, and that Schweighäuser, a very careful student of Herodotus, remarked: "ubi formulam εως οὐ ex interpretatione alicujus grammatici invecam esse suspicabatur Koen ad Greg. Dial. Ion. § 63, quoniam pro illa alias ἐς ὃ frequentat Herodotus." If, then, no other ground is discoverable, this must be considered a late usage,<sup>3</sup> perhaps developed by analogy from phrases like εως ὄρα, εως ἄρτι, etc., or perhaps from the Hebrew עַד עַד.

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

<sup>1</sup> [But see Gen. x. 19 *bis*; Jud. vi. 4, xi. 33, etc.; εως ἐλθεῖν. See also Joseph. Ant. 15, 3, 3, εως καὶ παντάσῃσιν ἀποκνίξαι. — Eds.]

<sup>2</sup> Strictly speaking, this class should be relegated to the next head (B. I), since εως governs οὐ and ὅρον (or, more strictly, the suppressed antecedent). But since the compound expression serves as a conjunctive adverb, the use seemed to call for separate classification.

<sup>3</sup> [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  $\xi\omega\varsigma$ , 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 viii. 40, considered above. It also includes such expressions as  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \nu\upsilon\upsilon$ , which are, according to Greek usage, real nouns. I have made a separate division for  $\xi\omega\varsigma$  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  $\xi\omega\varsigma$  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  $\omicron\delta$  or  $\delta\rho\omicron\upsilon$  are found, or about one third of the whole number of passages where  $\xi\omega\varsigma$  is used. In the Apocrypha and LXX this use of  $\xi\omega\varsigma$  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  $\delta\tau\epsilon$ ,  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\iota$ , 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  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\chi\eta\tau\iota$ , or possibly  $\pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  or  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  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  $\xi\omega\varsigma$  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 εως 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 εως 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, και ἐγένετο εως ὧδε και ὧδε, translating וירדו ערב־כה ויערב־ה ויערב־ה. It will be seen that the Greek is a word-for-word translation of the Hebrew, and not a rendering ad sensum. It is a specimen of the poorer work done in the rendering of the later books of the Old Testament into the Greek.

IV. is undoubtedly late Greek. It is so given by Liddell and Scott; and Thayer refers to Aelian and Polybius, the one a century after Christ and the latter as much before him. In classic authors εως is probably never employed with a preposition. It is interesting again to note that only in two books in the New Testament is εως so used,—in Luke and in the Acts of the Apostles, thus contributing additional testimony to the sameness of authorship, although that is sufficiently established on other grounds.

We may summarize, then, the uses of εως under four aspects: with verbs, as a conjunction; with nouns, as a preposition; with adverbs, as a conjunction or adverb; and with another word forming a compound conjunction. Such a division would, I think, serve to render more clear the peculiarities of this word and its usage in the New Testament and the Septuagint.

Considerable light can be thrown on the probable cause of the difference between the classic and the Hellenistic use of εως by noting the particles which εως translates. The Greek is pre-eminently a precise language, and it derives this distinction from its flexibility. One who has learned, especially to speak, a new language has often discovered a tendency to translate a word which in English has two meanings by the word in the new acquisition which translates one of these meanings, even though a different word is used to express the other signification. For example, the English preposition 'for' has quite distinct meanings; e.g. the sentence "I am going for him" may mean either "I am going in his stead," or "I am going to bring him here." Suppose, now, that a Hebrew, while writing Greek, wished to employ what in his own tongue is expressed by עַר. But

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 צר in צר־שָׁבִי by ἔως, should also express the same word in צר יום by ἔως.

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 ἔως doing duty in rendering, צר, צר קי, צר אב, קי אב, and צר אָשָׁר. Even Josephus, who boasted of the ease and purity with which he expressed himself in Greek,<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> [(?). Cf. e.g. his *Antt.* 20, 11, 2; c. *Apion.* 1, 9. On the uses of ἔως see Professor Gildersleeve's historical classification and examples in *American Journal of Philology*, iv. 4, pp. 416-418 note. — Eds.]