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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 ὅτι 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. 180ff. This is denied for the Ptolemaic papyri by E. Mayser, Grammatik der griechischen Papyri, II. i. 340ff. As none of the instances claimed are in Luke-Acts we may leave the matter open.

² See L. Radermacher, Neutestamentliche Grammatik², 1925, pp. 179ff. The independent infinitive had already become stereotyped in the epistolarv 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, ἐσοφίζε... μηδὲν πλέον ἐπιτίθεσθαι ὑμῖν βάρος πλήν τῶν ἑσάνγχεων τούτων. 29 ἀπέλευεν εἴδολοθύτων κτλ. 23 23, ἐπεν, ἐτοιμάσατε στρατιώτας ἰακωβίους... 24 κτήμνε τε παραστήσαι, ἰνα κτλ.
questions, always correctly in secondary sequence) retains after ἰτι 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 ἰτι. 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. But an ancient writer, reader, or hearer would have no necessity of deciding there which construction of ἰτι 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.

Of ἰτι recitative also there is some reduction of use on Luke's part. It is said to be a construction especially characteristic of Mark. 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 ἰτι" 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 ἰτι.
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 παρῆγγελεν αὐτῷ μηδεν εἶπεν. ἀλλὰ ἀπελθὼν δείξον σεαυτὸν τῷ ἰερεῖ, καὶ προσένευκε περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου καθὼς προσέταξεν Μωσῆς εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς.

Acts 1 4, καὶ συναλίζομεν παρῆγγελεν αὐτῷ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσόλυμων μὴ χορηγεῖσθαι ἀλλὰ περιμένειν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς ἦν ἱκουστέ μου.

Acts 23 22, ὅ μὲν οὖν χιλιάρχος ἀπέλυσε τὸν νεανίσκον παραγγελίας μηδεν εἰκαλήσαι 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.


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.) ὅμως καὶ [sc. προσκλήθηντος] Κονδύλου ἐνὸς τῶν ἀλείων προσεμαρτύρει ἔχειν τὰς τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ Τενενώφους συνγραφὰς τῆς δηλομένης οἰκίας καὶ ἐν τῇ πόλει ἱεραγόςθην (sic) ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀγνώτητων ἀποστατῶν ἐνέκαι τὰς συνγραφὰς καὶ ταῦτα κατακαύσατ.
and he has overlooked the example at 23 22 in a section of the book that he regards as unmarked by Semitic idiom.\textsuperscript{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 οὖτως ὃ θεὸς ὑπεντὶ ἔσται τὸ στέρμα αὐτοῦ πάροικον εἰς γῆ ἄλλην καὶ δουλώσωσιν αὐτὸ καὶ κακώσωσιν ἐπὶ τετρακώσία, ὃ καὶ τὸ ἔθνος ὃ ἄν δουλεύσωσιν κρινῷ ἐγὼ, ὃ θεὸς ἐπεν, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξελεύσόνται κτλ.

Acts 25 4, ὃ μὲν οὖν Φήστος ἀπεκρίθη τηρεῖσθαι τὸν Παῦλον εἰς Καισαρίαν, ἕαυτὸν δὲ μελλεῖν εἰς τάχι τὸν προσφεύσαται. ὃ οἱ οὖν εἰς ζων, φησίν, δυνατοὶ συνκαταβάντες εἰς τί ἕστων εἰς τῷ ἀνδρὶ ἀτοποποιοικίῳ κατηγορείσθωσαν αὐτοῦ.

In both instances the explanatory words ὃ θεὸς ἐπεν 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 σοῦ 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 ὃ θεὸς ἐπεν. 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 1 is as follows: καὶ ἔρρεθη πρὸς Ἀβραὰμ· γνώσκοι γνώση ὃτι πάροικον ἔσται τὸ στέρμα σου εἰς γῆ ὧν ἱδα καὶ δουλώσωσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ κακώσωσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ταπεινώσωσιν αὐτοῦ τετρακώσία ἐπὶ, τὸ δὲ ἔθνος ὃ ἐὰν δουλεύσωσι κρινῷ ἐγὼ· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἐξελεύσόνται κτλ.

\textsuperscript{11} Acts 23 23 1., the next verses, are often regarded as a change in the reverse direction from oratio recta (imperative ὁρμάσατε) to obliqua (ininitive παραστήσατε), but see above note 2. Cf. Luke 9 3, μηδὲν ἄφησεν εἰς τὴν ὄδον, μήτε βάζον, μήτε ἄρτον, μήτε ἄργυρον, μήτε δύο χιτῶνας ἔχειν. Contrast Mark 6 8, the parallel passage, which has three constructions perhaps all different, καὶ παράγγειλεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι μηδὲν ἄφησον εἰς ὄδον εἰ μή βάζον μόνον, μή ἄρτον, μή πάρα, μή εἰς τὴν ζώνην χαλκόν· ἀλλ᾽ ὑποδεδειγμένοι σαυδάλια· καὶ μὴ ἐνδυσώσθε 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, ἐφη or εἰπεν, 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 14 21, ὑπεστρεψαν . . . ἐπιστηριζότες 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 φησίν 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 εἰπεν 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 18 εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς πραγματεύσασθαι ἐως ἐρχομαι, Acts 20 01 εἶπεν μὴ βορειεσθαί (BCD) ἢ γὰρ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐστίν, 21 33 εἰποθάνετο τίς εἰ. καὶ τί ἔστων 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 9:18, τίνα μὲ αὐτὸν ἰχθύον ἵππον ἐδόθη; οἱ δὲ ἀποκριθέντες εἶπαν Ἰωάννης τὸν Βαπτιστήν, ἄλλοι δὲ Ἡλέαν, ἄλλοι δὲ ὅτι προφήτης τις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη.

Luke 24:33, εἰδὼν ἡδροσμένους τοὺς ἐνδέκα καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς, λέγοντας ὅτι ὄντως ἤγερθη ὁ κύριος καὶ ὑφήθη Σιμων. In all these passages occurs either ἤγερθη 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 ὅντως of Luke 24:34 compare the same word in oratio recta at 23:47 (contrast Mark 11:32). At 7:18 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 5:28, ἐδοξάζουν τὸν θεὸν καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν φόβου λέγοντες ὅτι εἴδαμεν 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; 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 ὄνομαῖσον?
change from the infinitive of direct statement to the ὅτι clause of indirect statement, 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: ἀνδρεῖς, θεωρῶ ὅτι μετὰ ὁδεγοῦ καὶ πολλῆς ἡμέρας οὐ μόνον τοῦ φορτίου καὶ τοῦ πλοίου ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ψυχῶν ἦμοι μέλλειν ἐσσεθαι τῶν πλοίων. 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. 426ff.). "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 ἔδωκαν οἱ κύριοι τῆς παιδικῆς ὅτι ἀπεστερήσατο τῆς ἐργασίας αὐτῶν.

After J. H. Moulton we may cite from the papyri P. Oxy 237 (ii A. D.) ἐγέλων ὅτι εἰ τὰ ἄλληθρα φανεῖ ἠμαίνετο καὶ ἐστάθη τὸ πράγμα. 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 ἔκδοσαμονετέρους 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 οὐ θεωρῶ ὑμᾶς ὡς; Cf. P. Tebt 58, 24 (iii B. C.), θεωρήσας με ὡς προσέδρεοντα καθ’ ἡμέραν. (2) The same infinitive μέλλειν occurs in the involved sentence in 19 27, οὐ μόνον δὲ τούτο κινδυνεῖε ὑμῖν τὸ μέρος εἰς ἀπελευθεροῦν ἐλθεῖν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ τῆς μεγάλης θέας Ἀρτέμιδος ἵνα ἐν αὐτῇ λογισθῇ μέλλειν τε καὶ καθαιρεῖσθαι τῆς μεγαλευτρίας αὐτῆς. The μέλλειν καθαιρεῖσθαι could of course depend on κινδυνεῖε but because it seemed awkward Buttmann 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 τῶς ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ εἶδεν τὸν κύριον καὶ ὅτι ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ καὶ τῶς ἐν Δαμασκῷ ἐπαρρησίασατο ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι Ἰησοῦ.

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

In the latter case the parallel in Acts 11 28, ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεὸν λέγοντες ἀρα καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὁ θεὸς τὴν μετάνοιαν εἰς ζωὴν ἐδώκεν, 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 ὅσος 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 ἔδει παθεῖν καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ ὅτι οὐτὸς ἐστὶν ὁ χριστός, ὁ Ἰησοῦς δὲν 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 ὅσοι 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, μνήσθητε ὡς ἐλάλησεν ὑμῖν ἔτι ὅν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ,

7 λέγων τὸν νῦν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁτι δεῖ παραδοθῆναι εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων ἀμαρτηλῶν. Here the position of ὁτι suggests that τὸν νῦν is the proleptic object of λέγων as in the familiar “I know thee, who thou art.”

If so, can ὁτι be recitative? Or is νῦν the subject of παραδοθῆναι?

Luke 24:44, εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι μου οὗς ἐλάλησα πρὸς υμᾶς ἔτι ὅν σὺν υμῖν, ὁτι δεῖ πληρωθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα...περὶ ἐμοῦ. In this case of self-quotiation the ὁτι, 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 1:1 (see above) ... περιμένειν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς ἡν ἡκουσατε μου· ὁτι Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐβάπτισεν ὑδατι κτλ. Here too the clause is probably self-quotiation, 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.

Luke 24:45, τότε δύνασαν αὐτῶν τὸν νοῦν τοῦ συνέναι τὰς γραφάς, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁτι οὕτως γέγραπται παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν ... ὁμίσεις μάρτυρες τούτων, καὶ ἵδι έγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς μου ἐφ’ υμᾶς κτλ. I have treated this as a case of ὁτι recitative. Is it a case of oratio obliqua with ὁτι, ultimately changing to recta?

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 διὸ τε οἱ προφῆται ἐιλάλησαν μελ-


17 A. T. Robertson, Grammar of the Greek N. T., p. 1033, says, “It is sometimes doubtful whether ὁτι is declarative or causal.” His example is a double ὁτι passage, Acts 22:22, καὶ ὁ χιλιάρχος δὲ ἐφοβήθη ἐπιγνοῦν ὁτι Ῥωμαίοι ἐστιν καὶ ὁτι ἦν αὐτὸν δεδεκόν.

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 ὁτι οὕτως γέγραπται κτλ. as direct interrogative here, with ὁτι ‘why’ (see pp. 423 ff.). Yet ὁτι δεῖ is hardly, ‘Why is it necessary?’ in Luke 24:7, 44; Acts 17:3.
The ει 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 ει. 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.”

What concerns us here is not the theory of testimonia but the question of grammar. That ει may be interrogative, even in a direct question, is familiar to us now. Among the New Testament writers Luke uses it so most frequently. With direct questions ει 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 ει 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 ἐπύθωντο (οτ επνωθάνοντο) ει Σίμων ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος Πέτρος ἐνθάδε ξενὶζεται. This is a more certain

19 So ΑΒΛ 13, but in view of what is said above in note 15 sub fine perhaps we should read here another anomalous μελέλειν with Ν* 81 ΗΡ 31 61.


31 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 8 (= Mark 10 2), in all of which the question (indirect?) is ει ἔξωτη. Even if with Moffat we move 26 8 to precede 26 23 the ει clauses (now three in succession, dependent on ἀπεστον 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) πωθάνομαι 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 (ὁ ἐπικαλεῖται) Πέτρος (10:5, 32; 11:13). I believe the question with εἴ 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 δότι, '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

23 Radermacher, Neuestamentliche Grammatik, p. 195 note 4, seems to recognize an εἴ recitativum in Luke 22:87, ἀπήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ συνέδριον αὐτῶν λέγωντες εἰ δὲ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς; εἶπον ἠμῖν. But we have in John 10:24, καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ Ἐως πότε τὴν ψυχὴν ἠμῶν αἴρεις; εἰ τῷ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς, εἰπόν ἡμῖν παρρησία. Cf. John 20:15. In these cases we have as alternatives conditional, direct interrogative, and indirect interrogative uses of εἴ.
24 Blass-Debrunner, Grammatik des neuestamentlichen Griechisch, § 300,2. Field, Notes on the Translation of the N. T., 1899, p. 33, approved δότι of direct interrogation in Mark 9:11 and 23, though he could quote other Biblical or classical evidence only for its use in indirect interrogation. Abbott, Corrections of Mark, 1901, § 357α gives some LXX examples. Hawkins, in the same edition in which he dropped δότι recitative as characteristic of Mark (see above p. 414, note 6), added δότι 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 crux interpretum John 7:25, τὴν ἀρχὴν δότι καὶ λαλῶ.
 Luke knew and understood it in Mark. Three cases in Mark (not without variants) are 2 16, ἐλεγον τοις μαθηταις ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελονῶν καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν εἰσῆλθεν, where Matt. 9 11 and Luke 5 29 both have διὰ τί for ὅτι; Mark 9 11, ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες ὅτι λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς ὅτι Ἡλειὰν δεῖ ἐλθεῖν πρῶτον, where Matt. 17 10 has for the first ὅτι the words τί οὖν; Mark 9 28, οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτὸν κατ' ἵδιαν ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν ὅτι ἤμεις οὐκ ἠδυνήθησεν ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό, where Matt. 17 19 has διὰ τί.

The most likely case of διὰ τί interrogative in Luke-Acts seems to me to be Acts 11 3 where (not without variants) we read διεκρίνοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς λέγοντες ὅτι εἰσῆλθες πρὸς ἄνδρας ἄκροβυστίαν 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 διατ' ᾐσθήματα; ἀλλὰ, διατ' συνέφαγεν; 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 2 16 and parallels show an interrogative in a like complaint against Jesus and these parallels all suggest a like construction in two similar passages in the third Gospel: Luke 15 2, καὶ ἱμὼν. C. H. Turner in a full study in the Journal of Theological Studies, xxvii (1925), pp. 58ff., accepts διὰ as a direct interrogative in Mark 2 16 (BL 33); 2 18 (BL 33); 8 12 (C Origen); 9 11; 9 28, 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.

Note διεγόγγυζον in both, like ἐγόγγυζον of Luke 5 30. The verb διεκρίνοντο of Acts 11 2 finds a parallel in the Western text of Luke 11 32 (another case of violation of Pharisaic food restrictions): ἦρξατο διακρίνοντο καὶ ἐχαρισμόνειν εἰς ἑαυτῷ λέγειν διὰ τί (the Neutral text is simply οὖν ἐδαύμασεν ὅτι οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη πρὸ τοῦ ἀρίστου. In a similar complaint at Mark 2 6, we have διαλογίζομενοι εἰς ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν ὅτι οὕτως λαλεῖ; βλασφημεῖ according to BO; the other MSS. read τί for ὅτι and many add οὕτως.
διεγόγγυζον ὦτε Φαρισαίοι καὶ ὦτε γραμματεῖς λέγοντες ὦτε όντος ἁμαρτωλοῦς πρὸς ἑξῆς ὑμεῖς ἀντίων, and Luke 19, καὶ ἱδόντες πάντες διεγόγγυζον λέγοντες ὦτε παρὰ ἁμαρτωλῷ ἀνδρὶ εἰσῆλθεν καταλῦσαι.

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 11:2 quare is read by most MSS. and at Luke 15:2 by Codex Vercellensis. Of course quare like ὦτε may be indirect as well as direct interrogative. It must suffice here to open the question concerning these and possibly other instances28 of ὦτε = 'why' in direct question in the writings of Luke.

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