

LEXICAL NOTES ON LUKE-ACTS

IV. ON DIRECT QUOTATION, WITH SOME USES OF

ὄτι AND εἰ.

HENRY J. CADBURY
BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

THE comparative rareness of sustained indirect speech whether statement, command or question is a well known difference of the Greek of the classical and Hellenistic periods from our own language. The abundance of prolonged *oratio indirecta* in Latin is familiar to even the beginner, and in this respect Latin even more than modern languages contrasts with the Greek. In Hebrew, on the other hand, the indirect method of quotation is more infrequent than in Greek. Even thinking is expressed by the Semites as direct speech, — to one's self or in one's heart. The New Testament, therefore, not only because of its own Greek idiom, but also by the reinforcement of such Semitic influences as lie behind it, may be expected to display an abundant supply of examples of direct speech.

The object of this paper is not to discuss these phenomena as a whole. It is limited, like all the notes in this series, to the writings of Luke, and its aim is to point out certain evidences of direct statement or question in his writings that have not been always so recognized. Several reasons make it probable that such unrecognized instances exist. It cannot be said that scholars have in the past ignored the Greek penchant for direct speech. But there is an inevitable tendency to understand an ambiguous

foreign text in accordance with our own idiom. Further the modern study of Hellenistic grammar enables us now to postulate certain popular idioms as probably familiar to the New Testament writers of which earlier grammarians were not aware. The use of participles¹ and of infinitives² in place of direct imperatives, and the recognition of *ὄτι* as a direct interrogative (see below) are cases in point.

That the line between direct and indirect statement was less clear in antiquity than now, is due in part to the outward circumstances of expression. Ancient writing was intended for the ear. Writing now, much oftener than was true then, is intended for the eye. Our punctuation also provides a means of discrimination that was not presented even to the eyes of the ancients. The direct expression is trebly marked in a modern sentence, by the introductory comma or colon, by the initial capital, and by the enveloping inverted commas.

One aspect of Greek idiom which makes the distinction slight between direct and indirect is the lack in Greek of change of tenses after verbs of saying and the like. English requires after a past tense a change of tense, so that "I know and will obey" when quoted becomes "he said that he *knew* and *would* obey." The Greek as a rule retains the tense of the original and, except for the optative after past tenses (an obsolescent idiom in the Koine but in the New Testament used by Luke sometimes in indirect

¹ That the participle is used like a principal verb in the imperative was claimed for the N. T. and the papyri by J. H. Moulton in *Expositor*, Dec. 1904, p. 450 and *Grammar of N. T. Greek*, i. 180f. This is denied for the Ptolemaic papyri by E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri*, II. i. 340f. As none of the instances claimed are in Luke-Acts we may leave the matter open.

² See L. Radermacher, *Neutestamentliche Grammatik*², 1925, pp. 179ff. The independent infinitive had already become stereotyped in the epistolary *χαίρειν* as in Acts 15 23; 23 26. Perhaps other instances are to be found in the close neighborhood of each of those passages, viz. 15 28, *ἔδοξε . . . μηδὲν πλέον ἐπιτίθεσθαι ὑμῖν βάρος πλὴν τῶν ἐπιτάγης τούτων*. 29 *ἀπέχεσθαι εἰδωλοθύτων κτλ.* 23 23, *εἶπεν, ἐτοιμάσατε στρατιώτας διακοσίους . . . 24 κτήνη τε παραστήσαι, ἴνα κτλ.*

questions, always correctly in secondary sequence) retains after $\delta\tau\iota$ the same mood as well as the same tense.

A thoroughly ambiguous feature of the Greek idiom, at least in its Hellenistic stage, is the use of $\delta\tau\iota$. This particle not only introduces an indirect statement after verbs of speaking but has also an extensive recitative use equivalent to our quotation marks in direct statement. In cases where no forms of the first or second person occur in the quotation one is usually without clue as to which of the two it is, and modern editors follow their own judgment.³ But an ancient writer, reader, or hearer would have no necessity of deciding there which construction of $\delta\tau\iota$ is used.

The writings of Luke do not represent in the matter of direct quotation the extreme of popular idiom. They are said to show less of the *oratio directa* than those of the other evangelists. A comparison of parallel passages between Luke and Mark discloses some instances where Mark's direct expressions are put by Luke in indirect form or are otherwise eliminated.⁴

Of $\delta\tau\iota$ recitative also there is some reduction of use on Luke's part.⁵ It is said to be a construction especially characteristic of Mark.⁶ Yet a considerable number of instances are found in Luke's writings. Hawkins gives the "very striking cases in which *oratio directa* immediately and certainly follows $\delta\tau\iota$ " as numbering in Luke 13, Acts 14. But he also lists as doubtful cases 15 in Luke and 8 in Acts.

Especial interest attaches to those passages where Luke appears to begin with *oratio obliqua* and to end with *oratio recta*. In a footnote to an out of the way article, J. B. Lightfoot commenting on Acts 14 22 declared, "This abrupt transition from the

³ Westcott and Hort indicate their choice by capitalizing or not capitalizing the word that follows $\delta\tau\iota$.

⁴ Cadbury, *Style and Literary Method of Luke*, 1920, pp. 80f.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 139ff.

⁶ Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, 1899, pp. 28, 41. But in the second edition (1909) this is withdrawn from the "list of words and phrases characteristic of Mark's Gospel."

oblique to the direct narrative is especially characteristic of St. Luke's style, and one subsidiary proof of the unity of authorship between different parts of the Acts and between the Acts and the third Gospel. Winer, *Gramm.* § 64, III. 2 gives only a few instances out of many".⁷ Harnack shows how in Acts this phenomenon is widely distributed among the possible sources.⁸

Three conspicuous examples are the following:

Luke 5 14, καὶ αὐτὸς παρήγγειλεν αὐτῷ μηδὲν εἰπεῖν· ἀλλὰ ἀπελθὼν δεῖξον σεαυτὸν τῷ ἱερεῖ, καὶ προσένεγκε περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου καθὼς προσέταξεν Μωσῆς εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς.

Acts 1 4, καὶ συναλιζόμενος παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων μὴ χωρίζεσθαι ἀλλὰ περιμένειν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς ἣν ἠκούσατέ μου.

Acts 23 22, ὁ μὲν οὖν χιλιάρχος ἀπέλυσε τὸν νεανίσκον παραγγείλας μηδὲν ἐκλαλῆσαι ὅτι ταῦτα ἐνεφάνισας πρὸς ἐμέ.

In each of these passages the verb is παραγγέλλω. It begins with an infinitive construction but in each case some forms in the second person and, in the last two, forms in the first person show that the direct speech has come in subsequently. The distribution of this idiom binds together, as Lightfoot said, the two books Luke and Acts and even two parts of Acts. The latter point is particularly interesting since Torrey in support of his theory of an Aramaic source for Acts 1—15 36 remarks of Acts 1 4: "The transition to direct discourse, in just this manner, is the usual thing in Aramaic."⁹ But such transitions are natural in the Greek also¹⁰

⁷ *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology*, III (March 1856), p. 95. The reference to Winer should be § 63, II. 2 where Acts 23 22; 23 23, 24; Luke 5 14 are noted as examples.

⁸ *The Acts of the Apostles*, Eng. Trans., p. 228.

⁹ *The Composition and Date of Acts*, 1916, p. 24.

¹⁰ Of many discussions that might be cited I mention only E. Kieckers, „Zur oratio recta in den indogermanischen Sprachen," *Indogermanische Forschungen* xxxvi (1915), pp. 51—53. Illustrations from the papyri have not, so far as I know, been collected. I quote one picked up at random: *P. Amh.* II. 30, lines 28—36 (ii/ B. C.) ὁμοίως καὶ [sc. προσκληθέντος] Κουδύλου ἐνὸς τῶν ἀλείων προσεμαρτύρει ἔχειν τὰς τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ Τεσενούφιου συγγραφὰς τῆς δηλουμένης οἰκίας καὶ ἐν τῇ πόλει ἡραγάσθη (sic) ὑπὸ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἀποστατῶν ἐνέγκαι τὰς συγγραφὰς καὶ ταύτας κατακαῦσαι.

and he has overlooked the example at 23 22 in a section of the book that he regards as unmarked by Semitic idiom.¹¹

In two other instances the transition from indirect speech is more gently made with the help of an inserted expression:

Acts 7 6, ἐλάλησεν δὲ οὕτως ὁ θεὸς ὅτι ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ πάροικον ἐν γῆ ἀλλοτρία καὶ δουλώσουσιν αὐτὸ καὶ κακώσουσιν ἔτη τετρακόσια, 7 καὶ τὸ ἔθνος ᾧ ἂν δουλεύουσιν κρινῶ ἐγώ, ὁ θεὸς εἶπεν, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξελεύσονται κτλ.

Acts 25 4, ὁ μὲν οὖν Φῆστος ἀπεκρίθη τηρεῖσθαι τὸν Παῦλον εἰς Καισαρίαν, ἑαυτὸν δὲ μέλλειν ἐν τάχει ἐκπορεύεσθαι. 5 οἱ οὖν ἐν ὑμῖν, φησίν, δυνατοὶ συνκαταβάντες εἰ τί ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἀνδρὶ ἄτοπον κατηγορεῖτωσαν αὐτοῦ.

In both instances the explanatory words ὁ θεὸς εἶπεν or φησίν occur immediately after the words which by their person betray the emerging of *oratio recta*. In 25 5 the φησίν actually separates the article and its substantive. In Acts 7 6 the author fell into difficulty. Quoting from the LXX, at first he recast the *oratio recta* into *obliqua*, substituting for σου the third person αὐτοῦ. But as his quotation continued he found it expedient to retain the persons of the original and so at the point of transition interjected by way of repetition ὁ θεὸς εἶπεν. That it is an insertion appears clearly from the very typography of modern Greek texts of Acts in which words from the Old Testament are printed in a special face of type. The LXX text of Gen. 15 13 f. is as follows: καὶ ἐρρέθη πρὸς Ἀβραάμ· γινώσκων γνώση ὅτι πάροικον ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου ἐν γῆ οὐκ ἰδία καὶ δουλώσουσιν αὐτοὺς καὶ κακώσουσιν αὐτοὺς καὶ ταπεινώσουσιν αὐτοὺς τετρακόσια ἔτη. τὸ δὲ ἔθνος ᾧ εἰς δουλεύωσι κρινῶ ἐγώ· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἐξελεύσονται κτλ.

¹¹ Acts 23 23f., the next verses, are often regarded as a change in the reverse direction from *oratio recta* (imperative ετοιμάσατε) to *obliqua* (infinitive παραστήσαι), but see above note 2. Cf. Luke 9 3, μηδὲν αἰρετε εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν, μήτε βάλβον, μήτε ἄρτον, μήτε ἀργύριον, μήτε δύο χιτῶνας ἔχειν. Contrast Mark 6 8, the parallel passage, which has three constructions perhaps all different, καὶ παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδὲν αἴρωσιν εἰς ὁδὸν εἰ μὴ βάλβον μόνον, μὴ ἄρτον, μὴ πήραν, μὴ εἰς τὴν ζώνην χαλκόν· ἀλλ' ὑποδεδεμένους σανδάλια· καὶ μὴ ἐνδύσασθε δύο χιτῶνας. In general the transition from direct to indirect statement is much less frequent than the reverse.

The use of the interjected *φησίν* is particularly idiomatic, both the word and its position in the sentence. Josephus, who (or whose collaborators) surpassed in extended indirect discourse, repeatedly relapses into direct, interpolating *φησί*, *ἔφη* or *εἶπεν*, just at the tell-tale words that reveal the direct style.¹²

Another form of transition from indirect to direct discourse is accomplished by the insertion of *ὅτι*. This is most clearly shown in Acts 14²¹, *ὑπέστρεψαν . . . ἐπιστηρίζοντες τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν μαθητῶν*, ²² *παρακαλοῦντες ἐμμένειν τῇ πίστει καὶ ὅτι διὰ πολλῶν θλίψεων δεῖ ἡμᾶς εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ*. Three explanations of the *ἡμᾶς* in this passage are possible and have been long the subject of debate. (1) It is another 'we passage' like those later in the book by which the author shows that he with others was present at the occasion referred to. (2) It is a reference to the author and the readers under an inclusive pronoun. It means in this case "all we as Christians." Such a usage would find possible parallels in the two uses of *ἡμῖν* in Luke 1 1, 2. (3) The words of Paul and Barnabas are being now directly quoted. They are saying of themselves and their hearers in the cities of Asia Minor, "We Christians must enter the kingdom of God through many tribulations." The third is doubtless the correct explanation. *παρακαλέω* then is followed first by an infinitive representing a command, and then by *ὅτι* recitative and a direct quotation.

¹² Krenkel, *Josephus und Lucas*, 1894, pp. 329ff., gives as examples of this *φησί Antt.* vi. 13, 4; vi. 13, 7; ix. 4, 4; x. 7, 6; xi. 6, 8; xiii. 13, 2, also five cases with an interjected *εἶπεν* and thirty-two instances of transition from indirect to direct without any new *verbum dicendi*. Of changes in reverse direction he notes two, and of changes in both directions in the same passage, five. Probably the lists are not exhaustive but they are sufficient. We may submit as further possible cases of change to direct discourse Luke 19 13 *εἶπε πρὸς αὐτοὺς πραγματεύσασθαι ἕως ἔρχομαι*, Acts 20 01 *εἶπεν μὴ θορυβείσθαι* (BCD) *ἢ γὰρ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐστίν*, 21 33 *ἐπυνθάνετο τίς εἶη καὶ τί ἐστιν πεποιηκός*.

That ὅτι recitative occurs elsewhere in combination with other clauses seems altogether probable, though the combination is somewhat awkward. Here are a few of the cases where either direct or indirect statement is possible, and where I think the direct is preferable.

Luke 7 16, ἐδόξαζον τὸν θεὸν λέγοντες ὅτι προφήτης μέγας ἠγέρθη ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ ὅτι ἐπεσκέψατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ.

Luke 9 7, καὶ διηπόρει διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι ὑπὸ τινων ὅτι Ἰωάννης ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἢ ὑπὸ τινων δὲ ὅτι Ἡλείας ἐφάνη, ἄλλων δὲ ὅτι προφήτης τις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη.

Luke 9 18, τίνα με οἱ ὄχλοι λέγουσιν εἶναι; οἱ δὲ ἀποκριθέντες εἶπαν Ἰωάννην τὸν Βαπτιστὴν, ἄλλοι δὲ Ἡλείαν, ἄλλοι δὲ ὅτι προφήτης τις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη.

Luke 24 33, εὐρον ἠθροισμένους τοὺς ἕνδεκα καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς, λέγοντας ὅτι ὄντως ἠγέρθη ὁ κύριος καὶ ὤφθη Σίμωνι.

In all these passages occurs either ἠγέρθη or ἀνέστη.¹³

At 7 16 the direct nature of the first clause is evident. Probably all the other instances are *oratio recta*. With the ὄντως of Luke 24 34 compare the same word in *oratio recta* at 23 47 (contrast Mark 11 32). At 7 16 the clause in question is followed by another in ὅτι. Probably this also is recitative. Such exclamations tend to use ὅτι recitative as is evident in Luke 5 26, ἐδόξαζον τὸν θεὸν καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν φόβου λέγοντες ὅτι εἶδαμεν παράδοξα σήμερον. And there is no objection to two ὅτι recitative clauses in succession from the same speaker. Also contrasting speakers use direct discourse in Acts 2 12 1; 17 18, 32, though only at 2 13 is the ὅτι *recitantis* to be found as we have suggested of the alternative speakers at Luke 9 7. On the other hand the passage Luke 9 18, so near to it in thought as well as in position, appears to be *oratio variata*. The first replies are in the accusative (with an infinitive to be supplied¹⁴), the last has ὅτι with either direct or indirect statement. It is not impossible for Greek writers to

¹³ The verb should be translated as an English perfect but the Greek form is past.

¹⁴ Or shall we regard the accusatives as objects of λέγουσιν in the sense καλοῦσιν or ὀνομάζουσιν?

change from the infinitive of direct statement to the *ὅτι* clause of indirect statement,¹⁵ but the analogies that we have considered incline us to the view that the *ὅτι* clause is direct quotation.

¹⁵ Note that at Acts 27 10 the *ὅτι* and infinitive constructions occur in the same clause — possibly a mere oversight, as the many intervening words have led the author to forget how he began: *ἄνδρες, θεωρῶ ὅτι μετὰ ὑβρεως καὶ πολλῆς ζημίας οὐ μόνον τοῦ φορτίου καὶ τοῦ πλοίου ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν μέλλειν ἔσσεσθαι τὸν πλοῦν*. Such phenomena occur also in other Hellenistic authors. Examples may be found in Keelhoff, *Revue de l'Instruction publique en Belgique*, xxxviii (1895), pp. 166ff., or by running down the earlier commentators listed in Winer's *Grammar*, § 44 Note 2; § 63 I. 2c. The latter says (English Trans. by W. F. Moulton, 1870 and later, pp. 426f.). "It occurs so frequently in the best writers . . . that the construction had almost ceased to be felt by the Greek as an anacoluthon. We can only ascribe to the *ὅτι* a *vis monstrandi* as when it stands before the *oratio directa*." Another instance which textual critics have corrected and grammarians overlooked is Acts 16 19, *ὡς δὲ εἶδαν οἱ κύριοι τῆς παιδίσκης ὅτι ἀπεστερήσθαι τῆς ἐργασίας αὐτῶν*.

After J. H. Moulton we may cite from the papyri *P. Oxy 237* (ii A. D.) *δηλῶν ὅτι εἰ τὰ ἀληθῆ φανεῖη μηδὲ κρίσεως δεῖσθαι τὸ πρᾶγμα*. Other examples are in Aristeas 125, Philo Byz. 77, 6, Diodorus Siculus v. 56, 3. The construction is of course in no sense direct discourse and therefore this long note is out of place here. It is justified only because the *ὅτι* strengthening the infinitive of *oratio obliqua* is perhaps akin to the *ὅτι* recitative strengthening the *oratio recta*.

The construction at Acts 27 10 *θεωρῶ ὅτι μέλλειν*, raises other questions. (1) There are in Greek literature instances of *ὡς* with the infinitive like these with *ὅτι* and the infinitive. Is *ὡς* used in like manner in cases where normally oblique constructions are in the participle? At Acts 17 22 we read *κατὰ πάντα ὡς δεισδαιμονεστέρους ὑμᾶς θεωρῶ*. I think the *ὡς* does not directly modify the adjective. Has the verb *θεωρῶ* here again a helping particle in *ὡς* in place of *θεωρῶ ὑμᾶς εἶναι* or *θεωρῶ ὑμᾶς ὄντας*? Cf. *P. Tebt 58, 24* (iii B. C.), *θεωρήσας με ὡς προσεδρεύοντα καθ' ἡμέραν*. (2) The same infinitive *μέλλειν* occurs in the involved sentence in 19 27, *οὐ μόνον δὲ τοῦτο κινδυνεύει ἡμῖν τὸ μέρος εἰς ἀπελεγμὸν ἐλθεῖν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ τῆς μεγάλης θεᾶς Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν εἰς οὐθὲν λογισθῆναι μέλλειν τε καὶ καθαιρεῖσθαι τῆς μεγαλειότητος αὐτῆς*. The *μέλλειν καθαιρεῖσθαι* could of course depend on *κινδυνεύει* but because it seemed awkward Buttman and Meyer preferred to suppose that the *oratio recta* (Demetrius the silversmith is speaking) has turned into indirect. See note 11. (3) *μέλλειν* of *oratio obliqua* figures once more in a mixed construction at 25 4, being preceded by an another infinitive clause,

In this connection we may inquire whether a different type of *zeugma* involving *ὅτι* recitative occurs in the following:

Acts 9 27, διηγήσατο αὐτοῖς πῶς ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ εἶδεν τὸν κύριον καὶ ὅτι ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ καὶ πῶς ἐν Δαμασκῷ ἐπαρρησιάσατο ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ.

Acts 14 27, ἀνήγγελλον ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς μετ' αὐτῶν καὶ ὅτι ἤνοιξεν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν θύραν πίστεως.

In the latter case the parallel in Acts 11 28, ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεὸν λέγοντες· ἄρα καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὁ θεὸς τὴν μετάνοιαν εἰς ζῶν ἐδῶκεν, suggests that the *ὅτι* may be recitative. In the former instance there is not only the alternative of indirect statement but of *ὅτι* as a relative 'whatever' or indirect interrogative 'what'. At Luke 8 47 and 24 35 we have a similar use of *ὡς* in combination with a different construction. And this suggests that at least Acts 9 27 is not recitative. Observe that in all these mixed examples the verb is a verb of 'reporting'.

A sentence with two clauses in *ὅτι* is in Acts 17 3, διανοίγω καὶ παρατιθέμενος ὅτι τὸν χριστὸν εἶδει παθεῖν καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστός, ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὃν ἐγὼ καταγγέλλω ὑμῖν. The grammatical person of the last words shows that in the end we have *oratio recta*. There are three possibilities. (1) If it begins in the middle of the last clause, we have a case of transition like those mentioned on p. 415. (2) If it begins with the second *ὅτι* clause, it is a case of double construction something like Acts 14 22. (3) But both clauses may be regarded as *oratio recta* as at Luke 7 16. Perhaps some reason for treating the first clause as *oratio recta* is found in the frequency with which Luke's favorite *δεῖ* sentences are thus given in recitative. Compare among others Luke 4 43; 9 22; 24 7, 44, cf. 46; Acts 1 16 and 14 22 (above), and contrast Acts 24 24.

The three examples just cited from Luke 24, perhaps require some comment:

Luke 24 6, μνησθητε ὡς ἐλάλησεν ὑμῖν ἔτι ὢν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ,

and followed by *oratio recta*. See above, p. 416. Evidently *μέλλειν* in Luke-Acts needs to be watched. Cf. note 19.

7 λέγων τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὅτι δεῖ παραδοθῆναι εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων ἀμαρτωλῶν. Here the position of ὅτι suggests that τὸν υἱὸν is the proleptic object of λέγων as in the familiar "I know thee, who thou art."¹⁶ If so, can ὅτι be recitative? Or is υἱὸν the subject of παραδοθῆναι?

Luke 24 44, εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι μου οὓς ἐλάλησα πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔτι ὡν σὺν ὑμῖν, ὅτι δεῖ πληρωθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα . . . περὶ ἐμοῦ. In this case of self-quotation the ὅτι, even with the following ἐμοῦ, may be indirect, but it may also be direct, an explanation of the preceding noun λόγοι. In like manner the risen Jesus refers to his earlier words in Acts 1 41. (see above) . . . περιμένειν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς ἣν ἠκούσατέ μου· ὅτι Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐβάπτισεν ὕδατι κτλ. Here too the clause is probably self-quotation, giving the contents of the ἐπαγγελίαν heard from Jesus' lips. It is not easy to translate so, but the easier translation 'because' is hardly right.¹⁷

Luke 24 45, τότε διήνοιξεν αὐτῶν τὸν νοῦν τοῦ συνιέναι τὰς γραφάς, 46 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι οὕτως γέγραπται παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν . . . 48 ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων. καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς κτλ. I have treated this as a case of ὅτι recitative. Is it a case of *oratio obliqua* with ὅτι, ultimately changing to *recta*?¹⁸

Turning to the interrogative constructions we may first consider a passage which in thought belongs closely to those just examined on the fulfilment of scripture:

Acts 26 22, οὐδὲν ἐκτὸς λέγων ὧν τε οἱ προφῆται ἐλάλησαν μελ-

¹⁶ Cf. Mark 11 32, ἅπαντες εἶχον τὸν Ἰωάννην ὅτι προφήτης ἦν, Acts 9 20, ἐκήρυσσεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.

¹⁷ A. T. Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek N. T.*, p. 1033, says, "It is sometimes doubtful whether ὅτι is declarative or causal." His example is a double ὅτι passage, Acts 22 29, καὶ ὁ χιλιάρχος δὲ ἐφοβήθη ἐπιγνοὺς ὅτι Ῥωμαῖός ἐστιν, καὶ ὅτι ἦν αὐτὸν δεδεκώς.

¹⁸ If the passage so similar in thought at Acts 26 23 is direct interrogative (see p. 422) there is something to be said for regarding ὅτι οὕτως γέγραπται κτλ. as direct interrogative here, with ὅτι 'why' (see pp. 423 ff.). Yet ὅτι δεῖ is hardly, 'Why is it necessary?' in Luke 24 7, 44; Acts 17 3.

λόντων γίνεσθαι καὶ Μωυσῆς, 23 εἰ παθητὸς ὁ χριστὸς, εἰ πρῶτος ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν φῶς μέλλει¹⁹ καταγγέλλειν τῷ τε λαῷ καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

The *εἰ* here can of course be translated 'if', though it has no apodosis. It is sometimes regarded as equivalent to *ὅτι*. But Rendel Harris in his studies on *testimonia* suggests an interrogative interpretation. He says:

"No one, as far as I know, has succeeded in translating this sentence. The RV margin comes nearest to it, with the suggested 'whether' for *εἰ*. It is clearly interrogative: 'Does the Messiah suffer, and does he first rise from the dead, etc.?' The words are headlines of Testimonies, awkwardly incorporated in the text, and are betrayed as such by the previous references to the prophets and Moses, who are to answer the questions."²⁰

What concerns us here is not the theory of *testimonia* but the question of grammar. That *εἰ* may be interrogative, even in a direct question, is familiar to us now. Among the New Testament writers Luke uses it so most frequently.²¹ With direct questions *εἰ* occurs also in the LXX. So far as I know the construction has not yet been freed from the suspicion of Semitism. The awkwardness of construction in Acts 26 23 is bad enough in any case. At no point does the grammar of Acts so much need 'light from the dead.' That the two *εἰ* clauses are interrogative is as good an explanation as the alternatives. It is not impossible that they are even direct questions.

Acts 10 18, *φωνήσαντες ἐπύθοντο* (or *ἐπυνθάνοντο*) *εἰ Σίμων ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος Πέτρος ἐνθάδε ξενίζεται*. This is a more certain

¹⁹ So ABL 13, but in view of what is said above in note 15 *sub fine* perhaps we should read here another anomalous *μέλλειν* with **N*** 81 HP 31 61.

²⁰ *Testimonies*, Part I, 1916, pp. 19f. A similar suggestion for Luke 24 45f. I have added in note 18.

²¹ Luke 13 23; 22 49; Acts 1 6; 7 1; 21 37; 22 25. The best examples elsewhere in the N. T. are perhaps Matt. 12 10; 19 3 (= Mark 10 2), in all of which the question (indirect?) is *εἰ ἔξεστι*. Even if with Moffat we move 26 8 to precede 26 23 the *εἰ* clauses (now three in succession, dependent on *ἀπιστον κρίνεται*) are hardly conditional but interrogative or declarative.

case of unrecognized direct question in Luke-Acts. The translators generally render it as indirect: "They called and asked whether Simon which was surnamed Peter were lodging there." I would render it as direct: "They called and asked, 'Is Simon which is surnamed Peter lodging here?'" The Greek, unlike the English, would make no difference in the tense of the dependent verbs or in the choice of the adverb. At least twice in Acts (4 7; 23 19) *πυνθάνομαι* precedes a direct question.

The decisive reason for preferring to regard this sentence as quoted is, however, the use of the phrase 'Simon which is called Peter.' This author quite strictly distinguishes certain terms for speeches and dialogue and others for narrative.²² Elsewhere in this scene Peter in narrative is called simply Peter, but in dialogue the same passage uses three times the unique and cumbrous expression *Σίμων ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος (ὃς ἐπικαλεῖται) Πέτρος* (10 5, 32; 11 13). I believe the question with *εἰ* in 10 18 is to be regarded as a direct quotation because it also includes *Σίμων ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος Πέτρος*.²³

Another unclassical particle of direct question is *ὅτι*, 'why?' The grammarians have been forced to admit its presence in Mark.²⁴ So far as I know it has not been claimed for Luke, though

²² Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts*, 1927, pp. 225ff.

²³ Radermacher, *Neutestamentliche Grammatik*², p. 195 note 4, seems to recognize an *εἰ recitativum* in Luke 22 67, ἀπήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ συνέδριον αὐτῶν λέγοντες εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός; εἰπὸν ἡμῖν. But we have in John 10 24, καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ Ἔως πότε τὴν ψυχὴν ἡμῶν αἴρεις· εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός, εἰπὸν ἡμῖν παρησιᾶ. Cf. John 20 15. In these cases we have as alternatives conditional, direct interrogative, and indirect interrogative uses of *εἰ*.

²⁴ Blass-Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, § 300,2. Field, *Notes on the Translation of the N. T.*, 1899, p. 33, approved *ὅτι* of direct interrogation in Mark 9 11 and 28, though he could quote other Biblical or classical evidence only for its use in indirect interrogation. Abbott, *Corrections of Mark*, 1901, § 357a gives some LXX examples. Hawkins, in the same edition in which he dropped *ὅτι* recitative as characteristic of Mark (see above p. 414, note 6), added *ὅτι* interrogative, as found in Mark 2 16 (?); 9 11 and 9 28 but not elsewhere in the N. T. Another possible N. T. example is the famous *cruz interpretum* John 7 25, τὴν ἀρχὴν ὅτι καὶ λαλῶ

Luke knew and understood it in Mark. Three cases in Mark (not without variants) are 2¹⁶, ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει, where Matt. 9¹¹ and Luke 5³⁰ both have διὰ τί for ὅτι; Mark 9¹¹, ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες ὅτι λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς ὅτι Ἡλείαν δεῖ ἐλθεῖν πρῶτον, where Matt. 17¹⁰ has for the first ὅτι the words τί οὖν; Mark 9²⁸, οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ κατ' ἰδίαν ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό, where Matt. 17¹⁹ has διὰ τί.

The most likely case of ὅτι interrogative in Luke-Acts seems to me to be Acts 11³ where (not without variants) we read διεκρίνοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς λέγοντες ὅτι εἰσῆλθες πρὸς ἄνδρας ἀκροβυστίαν ἔχοντας καὶ συνέφαγες αὐτοῖς. A statement, whether in the second or third person (for some authorities read εἰσῆλθεν . . . συνέφαγεν), seems somewhat jejune compared with a forceful interrogative complaint, "Why did you go in etc.?" followed by an answer of Peter. This was certainly the understanding of Chrysostom. In his Homilies on Acts, 25. (Montfaucon ix. 193) he explains ὅτι . . . εἰσῆλθες καὶ συνέφαγες αὐτοῖς thus οὐ λέγουσι διατὶ κατήγγειλας; ἀλλά, διατὶ συνέφαγες; Failure to observe this idiom led to the reading in the third person in Codex Vaticanus and a few others (cf. Ropes, *Text of Acts, ad loc.*) and to the conjecture of τί by Boyss. In the gospels, Mark 2¹⁶ and parallels show an interrogative in a like complaint against Jesus and these parallels all suggest a like construction in two²⁵ similar passages in the third Gospel: Luke 15², καὶ ἡμῖν. C. H. Turner in a full study in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, xxvii (1925), pp. 58ff., accepts ὅτι as a direct interrogative in Mark 2⁷ (B⁰); 2¹⁶ (BL 33); 8¹² (C Origen); 9¹¹; 9²⁸, in Hermas, Sim ii. 10; v. 6, 4; viii. 1, 4 (*P Mich*), viii. 6, 2 (*P Mich*) and, following Tischendorf, at Barnabas vii. 9; viii. 5; x. 1. In some of the patristic instances it is probably an indirect interrogative.

²⁵ Note διεγόγγυζον in both, like ἐγόγγυζον of Luke 5³⁰. The verb διεκρίνοντο of Acts 11² finds a parallel in the Western text of Luke 11³⁸ (another case of violation of Pharisaic food restrictions): ἤρξατο διακρινόμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ λέγειν διὰ τί (the Neutral text is simply ἰδὼν ἐθαύμασεν ὅτι) οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη πρὸ τοῦ ἀρίστου. In a similar complaint at Mark 2⁶, we have διαλογιζόμενοι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν ὅτι οὗτος λαλεῖ; βλασφημεῖ according to B⁰; the other MSS. read τί for ὅτι and many add οὕτως.

διεγόγγυζον οἱ τε Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς λέγοντες ὅτι οὗτος ἁμαρτωλὸς προσδέχεται καὶ συνεσθίει αὐτοῖς, and Luke 19 7, καὶ ἰδόντες πάντες διεγόγγυζον λέγοντες ὅτι παρὰ ἁμαρτωλῶ ἀνδρὶ εἰσῆλθεν καταλύσαι.

As the idiom is confirmed for Mark by the paraphrase of Matthew and Luke ("the earliest commentators"²⁶), so it is in a sense confirmed for Luke-Acts by the old Latin version which is the first commentator on that work.²⁷ At Acts 11 3 *quare* is read by most MSS. and at Luke 15 2 by Codex Vercellensis. Of course *quare* like ὅτι may be indirect as well as direct interrogative. It must suffice here to open the question concerning these and possibly other instances²⁸ of ὅτι = 'why' in direct question in the writings of Luke.

²⁶ A. T. Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek N. T.*, 1919, p. 1421.

²⁷ Turner, *loc. cit.* shows how frequently the Latin translations find interrogatives in the Greek ὅτι, but he appeals to none of the Lucan instances.

²⁸ Other possible cases in Luke-Acts would include Luke 1 25 (ὅτι οὕτως as in Mark 2 7, see old Latin); 11 38 (see note 25; variant of D and Latin); Acts 18 13.