

# STYLE AND STYLISTICS, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO LUKE<sup>1</sup>

ADELBERT DENAUX

Taking Saussure's distinction between language (*langue*) and speech (*parole*) as a starting point, the present article describes a concept of 'style' with special reference to the use of a given language system by the author of Luke-Acts. After discussing several style definitions, the question is raised whether statistics are helpful for the study of style. Important in the case of Luke is determining whether his use of Semitisms is a matter of style or of language, and to what extent he was influenced by ancient rhetoric. Luke's stylistics should focus on his preferences (repetitions, omissions, innovations) from the range of possibilities of his language system ("Hellenistic Greek"), on different levels (words, clauses, sentences, rhetorical-narrative level and socio-rhetorical level), within the limits of the given grammar, language development and literary genre.

## 1. Language and Style

Philological studies of Luke-Acts often speak about the "language and style" of Luke-Acts. Often there is no attempt to distinguish the two concepts. Both words are understood as a hendiadys<sup>2</sup>. Since the studies of the French linguist Ferdinand de Saussure, however, it makes sense to distinguish the two concepts. De Saussure himself made a distinction between language in its entirety (*langage*)<sup>3</sup>, language as a structured

<sup>1</sup> Paper held in the Seminar "The Greek of the New Testament" of the 58th General Meeting of the SNTS, Bonn 29/07-02/08/2003.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. T. Vogel, *Zur Charakteristik des Lukas nach Sprache und Stil. Eine philologische Laienstudie* (Leipzig 1897; <sup>2</sup>1899); A. Plummer, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (ICC; Edinburgh, 1896; <sup>5</sup>1922 [= 1964]) xli-lxvii: § 6. "Characteristics, style, and language"; J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke I-IX. Introduction, Translation and Notes* (AB, 28; Garden City, NY 1981) 107-27: "IV Lukan Language and Style".

<sup>3</sup> F. de Saussure, *Cours de linguistique générale* (ed. C. Bally & A. Sechehaye, 1916; Paris 1972 [Critical edition prepared by Tullio De Mauro]); ET: *Course in General Linguistics*, translated and annotated by Roy Harris (London 1983) 10: "Language in its entirety has many different and disparate aspects. It lies astride the boundaries separating various domains. It is at the same time physical, physiological and psychological. It belongs both to the individual and society. No classification of human phenomena provides any single place for it, because language as such has no discernible unity".

system (*langue*) and speech (*parole*): “Linguistic structure (*langue*) ... is not, in our opinion, simply the same as language (*langage*). Linguistic structure (*langue*) is only part of language (*langage*), even though it is an essential part. The structure of a language (*langue*) is a social product of our language faculty. At the same time, it is also a body of necessary conventions adopted by society to enable members of society to use their language faculty” (pp. 9-10); “By distinguishing between the language itself (*langue*) and speech (*parole*), we distinguish at the same time: (1) what is social from what is individual, and (2) what is essential from what is ancillary and more or less accidental. The language itself (*langue*) is not a function of the speaker. It is the product passively registered by the individual ... Speech (*parole*), on the contrary, is an individual act of the will and the intelligence, in which one must distinguish: (1) the combinations through which the speaker uses the code provided by the language (*langue*) in order to express his own thought, and (2) the psycho-physical mechanism which enables him to externalise these combinations” (pp. 13-14)<sup>4</sup>. Hence G. Kazimier comments: “language as a means of communication, a system of ‘signs’, is meant to transfer ideas; and hence of psychic and social origin. His (i.e. de Saussure’s) distinction between ‘la langue’, the language system of a community, and ‘la parole’, the individual realisation of that system, has been of great importance for the study of style”<sup>5</sup>. Or, in the words of Moisés Silva: “These two terms have become standard in linguistic literature and are intended to contrast the (abstract) linguistic system of a particular speech community with the actual utterances of individual speakers”<sup>6</sup>. The former (*langue*) points to a given language system (on the one hand ‘words’ in their semantic, grammatical and morphological aspects; on the other hand more complex data like word groups, phrases, sentences, parataxis and hypotaxis, described in the syntax). Any language user (writer or speaker) has to ‘obey’ to this system if he wants to be understood by his reader or hearer. Within a given language system the individual language user has the freedom to develop his own style (*parole* or *idiolect*), through which his personal linguistic expression is recognizable (e.g. this particular text displays the personal style of a well known writer). Language systems are

<sup>4</sup> F. de Saussure, *Cours*, 9-10 and 12-13; see also 19: “The study of language thus comprises two parts. The essential part takes for its object the language itself (*langue*), which is social in its essence and independent of the individual. This a purely psychological study. The subsidiary part takes as its object the individual part of language, which means speech (*parole*), including phonation. This is a psycho-physical study”.

<sup>5</sup> G. Kazemier, “Stilering”, in *Moderne encyclopedie der wereldliteratuur* 8 (1974) 234.

<sup>6</sup> M. Silva, *Biblical Words and their Meaning. An Introduction to Lexical Semantics* (Grand Rapids, rev. and exp. ed., 1994) 114-15.

described in linguistics, and partly in grammars (be it in a normative way), while the lexical-semantic aspect of words (the ‘unmarked meaning’) is described in lexicons. Hence, one should distinguish between acceptable and unacceptable variation of language patterns. “He goes/will go to school tomorrow” is an acceptable variation. “He went to school tomorrow” is unacceptable. The first variation has to do with style, the second with language.

*Text theory and the Concept of Style*<sup>7</sup>

Stylistic approach is determined by the underlying text theory. When a text is primarily understood as a composition of different signs, which are integrated in a larger semantic system, then the style definition will be less interested in the effect of the text on the reader, with the consequence that rhetorical stylistic features like stylistic figures and the narrative/argumentative structure of a text will not be taken into consideration. Linguists have developed several text theories that have implications for their approach to style<sup>8</sup>. One clear trend nowadays is to put a greater focus on the communicative function of texts<sup>9</sup>. A text initiates a communication event between author, text and reader<sup>10</sup>. Such an approach will also have to examine rhetorical aspects of stylistic

<sup>7</sup> See B. Kowalski, “Stil in der neutestamentlichen Exegese. Definition, Methodik und Konkretisierung am Beispiel des Lukasevangeliums”, *Protokolle zur Bibel* 12 (2003) 105-28, 121-23. The author wrote this article as a scientific collaborator to our Research project “The Language and Style of Luke-Acts” (1999-2003).

<sup>8</sup> N.E. Enkvist, “On the Place of Style in Some Linguistic Theories”, in S. Chatman (ed.), *Literary Style: A Symposium* (Oxford 1971) 47-61.

<sup>9</sup> S.J. Schmidt, *Texttheorie. Probleme einer Linguistik der sprachlichen Kommunikation* (UTB 202; München 1976). According to J. Vorster (“Toward an Interactional Model for the Analysis of Letters”, *Neotestamentica* 24 [1991] 107-130, 110), the communication process includes at least eight components: physical context and subject; intention of the speaker; social context; behavioral or cultural codes appropriate to the situation; linguistic codes; rhetorical code; selected code; selected genre; and the text itself.

<sup>10</sup> A good description in U. Utzschneider, “Text - Leser - Autor. Bestandsaufnahme und Prolegomena zu einer Theorie der Exegese”, *BZ* 43 (1999) 224-38. See also I.J. du Plessies, “Applying the Results of Socio-Historical Research to Narrative Exegesis. Luke as Case Study”, *Neotestamentica* 30 (1996) 335-58, 338, who relates the different exegetical methods to one of the three poles of communication: “Whereas the historical method (including the social-historical) is based on the *author* and his milieu, a literary approach focuses on the text. A narratological approach, focusing on the *text*, also has its consequences for the *reader* which has lately received much attention in reader-response criticism”. In the same direction, see the pragmalinguistic method, developed by an international group of exegetes (C. Mora Paz, M. Grilli and R. Dillmann, *Lectura pragmalinguística de la Biblia. Teoría y aplicación* [Evangelio y cultura 1; Estella 1999]; German translation, R. Dillmann, *Vom Text zum Leser* [SBS, 193; Stuttgart 2001]; cp. the practical application in R. Dillmann and C. Mora Paz, *Das Lukas-Evangelium. Ein Kommentar für die Praxis* [Stuttgart 2000]).

figures as well as the narrative structure of a text. Exegetes are not used to link a theory of the text as communication event with the question of the style of its author. They usually apply stylistic study to the issue of authorship determination or tradition/redaction criticism. And not all students involved in stylistic studies ask for the pragmatic effects of style on the reader. For NT texts there is, of course, the difficulty that only the text is directly accessible to the student. The original author and reader are unknown or only accessible through the way the author manifests himself in his work (implied author) and the image of the readers that can be detected from his text (the implied reader). Moreover, in view of the fact that the text of the Bible has been transmitted within a living tradition, one has to take into account the diachronic situation of the readers, dependent on their temporal, cultural and confessional context<sup>11</sup>. H. Utzschneider has pointed to three aspects implied in a responsible way of interpreting biblical texts: 1. The relative autonomy of the text; 2. The orientation towards the reader, and 3. No reduction of the text to its auctorial original situation<sup>12</sup>. These three aspects offer a basis for diachronic study as well as a synchronic interpretation of biblical texts. Interpretation of texts implies the three intentions, called by U. Ecco 1. *intentio auctoris* (author), 2. *intentio operis* (text), and 3. *intentio lectoris* (reader or hearer)<sup>13</sup>. The interpretation of the text (*intentio operis*) can be described on three levels: “1. seine sprachlich-literarische Gestalt oder Oberfläche, 2. seine thematischen Gehalte oder Tiefenstruktur und 3. seine Anredeelemente, anders gesagt: seine pragmatisch-kommunikativen Gehalte”<sup>14</sup>. The last aspect shows that the autonomy of the text is indeed relative. Its meaning or *intentio* cannot be isolated from the *intentio* of the author and of the reader. It would be naïve to think that a text is autosemantic. In reality each (historical or present) reader has some perception or knowledge of the intention and milieu of the real author (and his implied author and implied reader)<sup>15</sup>.

<sup>11</sup> Reader-response criticism is aware of the ambiguity of the term ‘reader’: is it the implied reader, the informed reader, the flesh-and-blood reader, the model reader, the competent reader, the encoded reader, the intended reader, the subjective reader, or even the willful misreader (cf. S.D. Moore, “Stories and Reading: Doing Gospel Criticism as/with a ‘reader’”, *SBL 1988 Seminar Papers* 27 [1988] 141-59, 141).

<sup>12</sup> U. Utzschneider, “Text - Leser - Autor”, 227. For this model, see also J.D. Hester, “Speaker, Audience and Situations. A modified Interactional Model”, *Neotestamentica* 32 (1998) 75-94; I.J. du Plessies, *Results*, 338-43.

<sup>13</sup> U. Eco, *Die Grenzen der Interpretation* (München 1992) 35ff. (ital. original, 1990).

<sup>14</sup> H. Utzschneider, “Text - Leser - Autor”, 230.

<sup>15</sup> I.J. du Plessies, “Results”, 339.

## 2. A Definition of Style

The stylistics of NT writings is still in its infancy, J.E. Botha stated at the beginning of the nineties<sup>16</sup>. At the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, the situation does not seem to be much better. A scientific description of “style” is not easy, because most descriptions of style and even the concept of style are notoriously vague<sup>17</sup>. D. Crystal and D. Davy distinguish four uses of the notion of style in the literature on stylistics: 1. in reference ‘to some or all of the language habits of one person’, 2. in reference ‘to some or all of the language habits of a group of people at one time’, 3. with an ‘evaluative sense’ (e.g. ‘She has a very refined *style* in her writing’) and 4. applied only to literary language”<sup>18</sup>. J.P. Louw can describe style simply as “the manner in which something is said”<sup>19</sup>. By this he limits style to the domain of spoken language (“is said”), and situates it within the dichotomy of form (“the manner”) and content (“something”). Putting style on the ‘form’ side is very common in literary criticism and has an age long history, although an ‘organic’ view of style will insist upon the inseparable unity of content (or meaning) and surface form. The dichotomy form/content finally derives from the distinction between *res et verba* in classical rhetoric and even persists in modern linguistics which treats texts in terms of *signifié* and *signifiant*<sup>20</sup>. Style, however, has not only to do with spoken language, but also with written texts. It even transcends the domain of (spoken or written) language and comprises all vital expressions of human beings, activities or art (architecture, sculpture, film, television, graphic arts, fashion, literature). Moreover, style is not a property of individuals, but also of groups (youngster

<sup>16</sup> Cf. J.E. Botha, “Style, stylistics and the study of the New Testament”, *Neotestamentica* 24 (1990) 173-84; “Style in the New Testament. The Need for Serious Reconsideration”, *JStNT* 43 (1991) 71-87.

<sup>17</sup> S. Chatman (ed.), *Literary Style: A Symposium* (Oxford 1971) xi: “As everyone knows, ‘style’ is an ambiguous term. Among other things, it has been used to refer to the idiosyncratic manner of an individual or group; or to a small-scale formal property of texts (in the language alone, or additionally in other attendant systems like meter); or to a kind of extra or heightened expressiveness, present in non-literary language as well; or to a decorum based on social or cultural contexts; or to any one a number of other concepts”.

<sup>18</sup> D. Crystal & D. Davy, *Investigating English Style* (London 1969) 9-10.

<sup>19</sup> J.P. Louw, “On Johannine Style”, *Neotestamentica* 20 (1986) 5-12, at 5.

<sup>20</sup> R. Barthes, *Style and Its Image*, in S. Chatman (ed.), *Literary Style: A Symposium* (Oxford 1971) 3: “Res (or the demonstrative materials of the discourse) depends on Inventio, or research into what one can say about a subject (Quaestio); on Verba depends Elocutio (or the transformation of these materials into a verbal form). This Elocutio is, roughly, our ‘style’”.

culture, punk fashion, etc.), or of periods (e.g. in architecture one speaks of roman, gothic, renaissance, baroque, classicist period, etc.). Language usage also displays a great variety whereby the border between language and style is not always easy to draw. One may speak of deviations from standard language that are linked to region (regional, dialect), groups (technical language and jargon), and style (informal style: spoken language; children's language; formal style: written, archaic or literary language)<sup>21</sup>. Buffon's famous aphorism, *Le style, c'est l'homme*, rightly refers to style as the idiosyncratic manner of an individual<sup>22</sup>. One should not deny, therefore, that style can also be the idiosyncratic manner of a group. Is the sometimes semitizing Greek of Luke a personal idiolect or is it just one example of what Walser and Blomqvist would call the "Pentateuchal", "synagogal" or "Jewish-Christian" variety of Koinè Greek<sup>23</sup>? In short, (literary) style is not only bound to persons, but also to groups and times.

Speaking of style as a "deviation from standard language" points to another current opposition 'Norm/Deviation' which, to a large extent, also seems a tributary of the Saussurian paradigm *langue/parole* (or code/message). In this approach style is seen as an aberrant message which "surprises" the code<sup>24</sup>. It seems undeniable that features of style are drawn from a code, or at least from some kind of systematic space, and that style connotes distance, difference. However, the whole question is in reference to what<sup>25</sup>? Is it the spoken language, the standard language, the normal, grammatical, well-formed language, or something else? In any

<sup>21</sup> *Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst*, ed. by G. Geerts, W. Haeseryn, J. de Rooij en M.C. van den Toorn (Groningen-Leuven 1984) 12-13.

<sup>22</sup> On the meaning of Buffon's aphorism, see L.T. Milic, "Rhetorical Choice and Stylistic Option. The Conscious and Unconscious Poles", in S. Chatman (ed.), *Literary Style: A Symposium* (Oxford 1971) 77-80.

<sup>23</sup> G. Walser, *The Greek of the Ancient Synagoge. An Investigation on the Greek of the Septuagint, Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament* (Stockholm 2001); J. Blomqvist, *The Languages of the Synagogue: An Evaluation*, in B. Olsson and M. Zetterholm (eds.), *The Ancient Synagogue From Its Origins until 200 C.E. Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University October 14-17, 2001* (CB, NTS, 39; Stockholm 2003) 303-11.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. R. Barthes, "Style and Its Image", in S. Chatman (ed.), *Literary Style: A Symposium* (Oxford 1971) 4: "Style is seen here as an exception (though coded) to a rule; it is the aberration (individual, yet institutional) from a current usage, a usage which is either colloquial (if one defines the norm in terms of the spoken language) or prosaic (if one opposes poetry as 'the other thing')". He adds that this vision has a moral undertone and is rather sociological in nature: "the code is what is statistically determined by the greatest number of users".

<sup>25</sup> R. Barthes, "Style and Its Image", 6.

case, there always is a point of reference. One cannot speak, for example, of an 'archaism' without referring to the synchronic language system. One cannot speak of a 'metaphor' without referring to the normal, i.e. the literal, meaning. And one cannot speak of the low and unusual frequency of the order 'personal pronoun (e.g. σου) + noun' in a text without referring to the 'normal order' (i.e. the high frequency) 'noun + personal pronoun' (e.g. σου) in the language system. In view of the fact, however, that the notion 'deviation from a norm' has a too normative connotation, it seems better to speak of repetitive 'variations' a text displays within a given code or language structure, the reference being a comparable variation within the language code or in another text. The ancient division into low, middle, and elevated styles is better understood as variations, because "none of these three styles is seen as 'deviant' in respect to any other, although each is, obviously, different from others"<sup>26</sup>. When Luke shows a number of distinctive language features in comparison to Matthew and/or Mark or any other writer, one could speak of his characteristic style. His style is the result of conscious (or unconscious) choices among an innumerable potential of possible language features. Style is a distinctive and systematic kind of 'language variation' used by a speaker/author, text, or group of persons/texts, within the limits of a specific language structure, in comparison to another speaker/author, text, or group of persons/texts. The reference to describe the characteristic style of a person/text/group is a comparable person/text/group chosen by the one who aims to study the style of a person/text/group. One could object that a stylistic study of a text should not necessarily be comparative. It seems to us, however, that comparison is always essential to the study of style<sup>27</sup>. Comparison is the basic methodological principle, for example, of Henry J. Cadbury's standard study on the style and literary method of Luke<sup>28</sup>. And even when one studies the stylistic features of a text in itself, the student always has in mind a set of rules, according to which he qualifies some language features as characteristic or not for the style of an author or a text. They can be of qualitative nature (e.g. deviance from common grammar rules) or of quantitative nature (e.g. relative frequency or absence of certain

<sup>26</sup> T. Todorov, "The place of Style in the Structure of the Text", in S. Chatman (ed.), *Literary Style: A Symposium* (Oxford 1971) 32.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. N.E. Enkvist, "On the Place of Style in Some Linguistic Theories", in S. Chatman (ed.), *Literary Style: A Symposium* (Oxford 1971) 54: "Comparison is always the essence of all study of style: the very concept and feel and texture of style arise through comparison of the structure of the text we are studying with the structures of other texts".

<sup>28</sup> H.J. Cadbury, *The Style and Literary Method of Luke*, 2 Vols. (Harvard Theological Studies, 6; Cambridge, MA 1919/1920 [= New York 1969]).

features). Hence, from a linguistic point of view, style is but one type of systematic linguistic variation<sup>29</sup>.

Style is also modified by the literary genre that is used (e.g. the style of a ‘miracle story’ differs from that of a ‘hymn’), by the audience that is addressed (e.g. writing to enemies or to beloved), and of by the circumstances in which one writes (e.g. peace or persecutions).

Style has also to do with beauty and a sense of proportion. Hence, it is also an aesthetic and ethic reality, especially in works of imaginative literature<sup>30</sup>. Most NT writings, however, do not belong to this category.

In the light of what is said, we can point to some definitions of style that give due attention to all aspects involved. G. Kazemier defines style as follows: “Literary style is the proper, not accidental but repetitive way in which a person, or a group of persons, influenced by time, social conditions, life view, belief, age, etc., expresses himself through language”<sup>31</sup>. J.E. Botha gives a more elaborate definition of style:

“Style has to do with the choices available to users of language, and since these choices are determined by specific needs and circumstances, style is a *contextually determined* phenomenon. Because of this, style in effect deals with the *successful communication* of texts in context. Every aspect of language which facilitates this process of communication, therefore, has to do with the style of the text. This, however, does not mean that a general description of all the innumerable linguistic and literary features in a text, will amount to a description of the style of a text. Far from it. Only those features which facilitate the specific communication in these specific circumstances can be considered of stylistic value in this paradigm. The features in a text which facilitates this process should not be limited, and can vary according to the specific needs of a specific text or context”<sup>32</sup>.

<sup>29</sup> H.J. Cadbury, *Style*, 47: “A full theory of language should carry the onus of accounting for different types of linguistic variation – regional dialects, social dialects, styles, registers, idiolects – and distinguish systematic, structurally significant variation from non-significant or random variation within each of these types”.

<sup>30</sup> R. Wellek, “Stylistics, Poetics, and Criticism”, in S. Chatman (ed.), *Literary Style: A Symposium* (Oxford 1971) 65: “Stylistics can, for our purposes, be divided into two fairly distinct disciplines: the study of style in all language pronouncements, and the study of style in works of imaginative literature”; 66, “The problem is very different as soon as we narrow out attention to a study of literary style, in the sense of style in imaginative literature, with an aesthetic function, particularly in poetry”.

<sup>31</sup> G. Kazemier, *Stilering*, 230.

<sup>32</sup> J.E. Botha, “Style in the New Testament. The Need for Serious Reconsideration”, *JStNT* 43 (1991) 71-87, at 78-79.



Botha lays an almost exclusive stress on the communicative/rhetorical function of style. It is obvious that style is often aiming at and leading to effective persuasion, but it would be exaggerated to reduce the function of style to its rhetorical effectiveness. Some stylistic features of Paul's letters might have been persuasive in his time, but not necessarily in ours. That means that style should at least be distinguished from rhetorical effectiveness.

In 1995, I.H. Henderson has published an interesting study on "Style-Switching" in the Didache which makes use of rhetorical and socio-linguistic theories<sup>33</sup>, and which can be fruitful for the stylistics of Luke's Gospel. He defines style as follows:

"Style is not something of which a text or author or corpus has one. Rather, style is a dynamic function of extra- and infra-textual variables, including educational institutions and traditions (e.g., the progymnastic curriculum), language contact, social conflict among and within groups, an author's *ethos* and *pathos* in relation to projected readerships, and the wide (but not infinite) variety of language itself. From this perspective, style is not radically distinct from other aspects of rhetoric, notably argumentation, but makes part of a whole which is intentionally expressive as well as persuasive. Moreover, style is not static - it exists in relation to the communicative process of textual production and reading. Style is therefore stylistic variation, a judicious mixture of repetition, omission, and innovation"<sup>34</sup>.

This definition excels in integrating all aspects of communication between text, author and recipient and is very dynamic. Henderson remarks that, different from his approach, traditional definitions of style either elaborate the personal style of the author, the style of a text, or the language habits of a group<sup>35</sup>. However, all three aspects are part of a communication process. Henderson makes another distinction:

"The difference between a classical, rhetorical, and sociolinguistic stylistics, on the one hand, and either a redaction-critical or a neorhetorical (argu-

<sup>33</sup> See B. Kowalski, "Stil in der neutestamentlichen Exegese", 109-11.

<sup>34</sup> I.H. Henderson, "Style-Switching in the Didache. Fingerprint or Argument?", in C.N. Jefford (ed.), *The Didache in Context. Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission* (NT. S 77; Leiden 1995) 177-209.

<sup>35</sup> I.H. Henderson, *Style-Switching*, 195: "At the same time, rhetorical and sociolinguistic theories of style resist both the romantic individualism and the theological communism of redaction criticism, which focuses upon the *Personalstil* (individual style) of a particular author, upon *the* style of a single text, or upon the habits of the presumed speech-community which lies behind a text".

mentation) approach to style, on the other, is broadly a difference between interactive and determinist theories respectively. [...] ... to define style as a series of socially or topically irrelevant redactional changes”<sup>36</sup>.

Hence, according to Henderson, one can distinguish between three methodological approaches to style definition: on the one hand a classical, rhetorical and sociolinguistic approach, on the other hand a redaction-critical and neo-rhetorical approach (that looks for the argumentation of the text). Methodologically, Henderson’s view on style implies an adapted vocabulary. Concerning the *Didache*, he starts from a multilingual context and introduces the concepts of Code-switching, i.e. “alternations of linguistic varieties within the same conversation”<sup>37</sup> and “style-switching”, i.e. “which goes beyond the style-switching of monolinguals and allow[s] individuals a flexibility of expression that could not be obtained in a single system”<sup>38</sup>. As is well known, Luke’s Greek is characterised by a remarkable adaptability or versatility: his preface (Lk 1,1-4) is modelled on classical patterns; the infancy story (Lk 1,5-2,52) is written in de highly semitized Greek; the subsequent chapter (Lk 3) he seems to use a good literary Koine Greek<sup>39</sup>. Jonathan W. Watt has used the model of code-switching, developed in modern socio-linguistic studies, to explain this phenomenon in Luke-Acts. He states that: “Semitic style, or register, does not appear consistently throughout Lk and Ac, and it has been impossible to ascertain with certainty which Semitic features Luke produced, created, borrowed from other speakers, or retained from his sources. Yet their presence in Lk and Ac gives the overall effect of vividly creating a Jewish orientation for many of the accounts. The Semitisms in this ancient document function quite like the code-switching observed in modern bilingual situations”<sup>40</sup>. He thinks that the increased frequency of Semitisms in many sections of Luke-Acts may well correlate with

<sup>36</sup> I.H. Henderson, *Style-Switching*, 196.

<sup>37</sup> I.H. Henderson, *Style-Switching*, 199.

<sup>38</sup> I.H. Henderson, *Style-Switching*, 199. More particularly, he points to two categories of “style-switching” in *Did: Greek/Aramaic (Hebrew) CS*, and quotation and “non-quotation”. Moreover, he refers to the variation between “passages-tu” and “passages-vous”, that J.-P. Audet, *La Didachè* (Paris 1958) has distinguished and interpreted from a redaction-critical point of view.

<sup>39</sup> This has already been remarked by A. Plummer, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (ICC; Edinburgh 1896; 1922 [= 1964]) xlix: “The author of the Third Gospel and of the Acts is the most *versatile* of all N.T. writers. He can be as Hebraistic as the LXX, and as free from Hebraisms as Plutarch. And, in the main, whether intentionally or not, he is Hebraistic in describing Hebrew society, and Greek in describing Greek society”.

<sup>40</sup> J.M. Watt, *Code-Switching in Luke and Acts* (Berkeley Insights in Linguistics and Semiotics, 31; New York etc. 1997) 92.

subject matter, that is, with Jewish settings and circumstances described or implied within each and that they may well be the result of conscious style- or code-switching of the final redactor of Lk-Acts<sup>41</sup>.

This interesting hypothesis does not contradict the general fact that the personal style or expression of an author can nestle itself in all possible aspects of a language system: phonology, vocabulary, morphology, syntax, sentence and larger discourse, structure, semantics, etc. An overall study of style, that is “stylistics”, needs to examine all levels of language use of an author to obtain an adequate impression of his/her style. Hence, the study of the style of a particular NT writing cannot be limited to the study of Semitisms and related grammatical peculiarities, or to the presence or absence of rhetorical figures of speech<sup>42</sup>.

### 3. Stylistics and Statistics

Sophie Antoniadis is to our knowledge the only person who wrote a complete grammar of the Greek of Luke’s gospel, including a study of its morphology, vocabulary and syntax. In the final chapter of her valuable study full of interesting observations, she offers a quite substantial study of Luke’s style<sup>43</sup>. However, she clearly doubts whether the stylistics of Luke can arrive at the same scientific results as the grammar, because style is something elusive, which cannot be grasped in objective categories. It is rather a subjective enterprise, based on indications rather than on patterns<sup>44</sup>. Here then arises the question how such a qualitative and personal reality like “style” can be described in an objective and scientific way<sup>45</sup>. In any case, the style or the characteristic idiom of an author can only be described when it is distinguished from other comparable texts. Therefore Luke’s characteristic usage of language (vocabulary, syntax, stilistic figures, etc.) needs to be compared carefully with more or less related writings (e.g. the other Gospels and writings of the New

<sup>41</sup> J.M. Watt, *Code-Switching*, 93.

<sup>42</sup> J.P. Louw, “On Johannine Style”, 5.

<sup>43</sup> S. Antoniadis, *L’Evangile de Luc. Esquisse de grammaire et de style* (Coll. de l’Institut néo-hellénistique de l’université de Paris, 7; Paris 1930) 362-443.

<sup>44</sup> S. Antoniadis, *L’Evangile de Luc*, 362: “Si la grammaire, qui est une science, conduit ceux que en appliquent les principes à des résultats sensiblement pareils, il n’en est pas ainsi de la stylistique qui est faite d’un ensemble d’indications plutôt que des règles. Ces indications éclairent ceux qui aiment pénétrer les nuances de cet élément presque insaisissable qui s’appelle ‘le style’. Or plus la mentalité de l’écrivain est complexe, plus la stylistique varie ses moyens de recherche. Quant aux conclusions, elles changent avec l’observateur”.

<sup>45</sup> J.E. Botha, “Style, Stylistics”.

Testament, the Septuagint, and further the non-Biblical Greek literature). Hence, stylistics has a comparative dimension. Moreover, stylistics may also make use of statistics. Stylistics is not just a question of linguistics fingerprints but of numbers<sup>46</sup>. In light of recent developments in computer technology and biblical search software and the increased access to a much larger amount of empirical data resulting from it, the question is raised whether and in what measure quantitative models of analysis are useful, or even necessary to describe Luke's usage of language. In the past, quite a few scholars were aware of the dangers of quantitative criteria, they nevertheless made use of this method, and rightly so<sup>47</sup>. There is, indeed, a danger of falling into the habit of what Matthew Brook O'Donnell calls "statisticulating", that is, engaging in the unprincipled and statistically unjustified use of numbers to support a particular point"<sup>48</sup>. It is possible, however, to develop a linguistically and statistically sound method for stylistic study as is shown, for example, in Anthony Kenny's *A Stylometric Study of the New Testament*<sup>49</sup>. Moreover, "collection and analysis of statistics can only aid in the *description* of style, but it cannot provide an *explanation* for its occurrence"<sup>50</sup>. In our opinion then, statistical methods remain useful in stylistics of literary texts, at the condition they are used in combination with other, more holistic approaches.

<sup>46</sup> We allude to the title of M. Brook O'Donnell, "Linguistic Fingerprints or Style by Numbers? The Use of Statistics in the Discussion of Authorship of New Testament Documents", in S.E. Porter - A. Carson (eds.), *Linguistics and the New Testament. Critical Junctures* (JSNT.SS 168 = Studies in New Testament Greek 5; Sheffield 1999) 206-62.

<sup>47</sup> J.C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae. Contribution to the Study of the Synoptic Problem* (Oxford 1899; Oxford/ New York <sup>2</sup>1909 [= 1968]); R. Morgenthaler, *Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes* (Zürich-Frankfurt am Main 1958 [= Zürich, <sup>4</sup>1992]); L. Gaston, *Horae Synopticae Electronicae. Word Statistics of the Synoptic Gospels* (SBS, 3; Missoula, MT 1973); J.H. Friedrich, "Wortstatistik als Methode am Beispiel der Frage einer Sonderquelle im Matthäusevangelium", *ZNW* 76 (1985) 29-42; K. Aland (ed.), *Vollständige Konkordanz zum griechischen Neuen Testament. Band II. Spezialübersichten* (Berlin-New York 1978); M.-É. Boismard & A. Lamouille, *Le Texte Occidental des Actes des Apôtres. Reconstruction et réhabilitation. Tome I. Introduction et textes; Tome II. Apparat critique des caractéristiques stylistiques, index des citations patristiques* (Paris 1984 [= 1985]); F. Neiryck, "Le texte des Actes des Apôtres et les caractéristiques stylistiques lucaniennes", *ETL* 61 (1985) 304-34 (= Id., *Evangelica* II [BETL, 99] 1991, 243-278); W. Hendriks, *Karakteristiek woordgebruik in de synoptische evangelies* (Thesis, K.U. Nijmegen 1986).

<sup>48</sup> M. Brook O'Donnell, M., "Linguistic Fingerprints", 207.

<sup>49</sup> A. Kenny, *A Stylometric Study of the New Testament* (Oxford 1986) 222, "In his discussion of the 'Lukan Problem', he looks at around 50 different grammatical items and examines the correlation between the counts for Luke and Acts. He concludes, "Any two texts in Greek will correlate positively with each other at a significantly high level, but it is unusual for correlations to be as high as this" (quoted from M. Brook O'Donnell, "Linguistic Fingerprints").

<sup>50</sup> M. Brook O'Donnell, "Linguistic Fingerprints", 228-29.

In Lukan studies research on style is normally linked to one form or another of literary criticism. So-called “Lukan characteristics” play i.a. an important role in the textual criticism of Luke-Acts. The question arises whether, besides the Alexandrian text (represented a.o. by codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus), the quite divergent “Western” text (represented a.o. by Codex Bezae) is also from Luke<sup>51</sup>. Lukan characteristics also play a crucial role in the question of distinguishing tradition and redaction and of the mutual interdependence of the gospels. The problem is that scholars have a different approach: either their study is totally independent from source-critical theories (e.g. T. Vogel), or they start from the hypothesis of Markan priority (e.g. J.C. Hawkins, H. Cadbury, F. Neiryck), or the Griesbach-hypothesis (i.e. Mark as compiler of Matthew and Luke) (e.g. F.J.G. Collison), or a Proto-Luke-theory (e.g. F. Rehkopf; H. Schürmann). Here the danger arises of circular reasoning: one starts from what one would like to prove. In other words: is it possible to analyse the style of the Gospels independently from literary hypotheses concerning the interdependence of the Gospels or, if that is impossible, is it possible to develop an “objective” model that can function within every literary hypothesis or whereby one can distinguish between an “objective” description of linguistic data on the one hand, and an interpretation within certain models of literary dependence on the other hand? The question is even more complex in the Book of Acts. Within the New Testament this writing is unique in its kind: a reconstruction of its sources or the traditions that lie behind it is still more hypothetical than in the case of the Gospels (which are comparable among each other).

#### 4. Style and Semitisms

Although Luke has rightly been called the most hellenistic author of the four Evangelists, his language is characterised by a remarkable number of so-called “semitisms” (resp. Hebraisms, Aramaisms, Septuagintisms)<sup>52</sup>. At least three questions may be raised in this respect. First, the question of definition: what do we mean exactly by “semitism”; is it “an aberration

<sup>51</sup> See the status quaestionis of J. Delobel, “The Text of Luke-Acts: A Confrontation of Recent Theories”, in J. Verheyden (ed.), *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (BETL 142; Leuven 1999) 83-107.

<sup>52</sup> K. Beyer, *Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament*. I/1 (SUNT 1; Göttingen 1962) 298, gives the following statistical comparison of syntactic semitisms: Mt: 329 (4,84 per page); Mk: 113 (2,69 per page); Lk: 422 (5,86 per page); John: 173 (3,2 per page); Acts: 74 (1,06 per page).

of language and style which suggests influence, direct or indirect, of Aramaic or Hebrew upon the Greek”<sup>53</sup>, or should we rather think in terms of frequency (frequently occurring idioms that are not un-Greek as such)<sup>54</sup>? Secondly, the question of origin: what are the possible causes of those “semitic” idioms in the Greek of Lk-Acts: use of semitic sources<sup>55</sup>, conscious or unconscious imitation of the (translation) Greek of the Septuagint<sup>56</sup>, bilingualism of the author<sup>57</sup>, etc.? Finally, the question of its frequency and relevance: how important is this phenomenon (inventory of all items) and what is its relevance; is it only a question of style<sup>58</sup>, or is it also a question of language? D.B. Wallace sees style almost exclusively in connection with semitic influence: “It is our conviction *that the language of the NT needs to be seen in light of three poles*, not one: style, grammar, vocabulary. To a large degree, the style is Semitic<sup>59</sup>, the syntax is conversational/literary Koine (the descendant of Attic), and the vocabulary is vernacular Koine”<sup>60</sup>. As we stated before, semitisms can be explained as a phenomenon of Lukan style. Luke’s style, however, cannot be reduced to the question of semitisms<sup>61</sup>.

## 5. Style and Rhetoric

Another question is whether Luke was acquainted, in one way or another, with classical rhetorics. Study of style, that is the way one has to speak and to write, was an integral part of rhetorical education. The task

<sup>53</sup> M. Wilcox, “Semiticisms”, *ABD* 4 (1992) 1081-86.

<sup>54</sup> J.H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Vol. 1. *Prolegomena* (Edinburgh 1906; <sup>3</sup>1908 [repr. 1955]) 10-11.

<sup>55</sup> E. Schweizer, “Eine hebraisierende Sonderquelle des Lukas?”, *TZ* 6 (1950) 161-85.

<sup>56</sup> J.W. Voelz, “The Language of the New Testament”, in W. Haase (ed.), *Religion (Vorkonstantinisches Christentum: Leben und Umwelt Jesu; Neues Testament, Forts. [kanonische Schriften und Apokryphen])* (ANRW, II, 25/2; Berlin-New York 1984) 893-977.

<sup>57</sup> M. Silva, “Bilingualism and the Character of New Testament Greek”, *Biblica* 61 (1980) 198-219.

<sup>58</sup> Silva, “Bilingualism”.

<sup>59</sup> D.B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basis. An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament. With Scripture, Subject, and Greek Word Indexes* (Grand Rapids, MI 1996) 27: “Its style, on the other hand, is largely Semitic – that is, since almost all of the writers of the NT books are Jews, their style of writing is shaped both by their religious heritage and by their linguistic background”.

<sup>60</sup> D.B. Wallace, *Grammar*, 27-28.

<sup>61</sup> This is the deficiency of N. Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (by J.H. Moulton), Vol. IV. *Style* (Edinburgh 1976), who reduces “The Style of Luke-Acts” almost exclusively to the issue of the Semitic character of his language.

of the rhetor did not only comprise the *inventio* (finding the convincing content), and the *dispositio* (choice of the strategic order of the material), but also the *elocutio* or style, which was considered the most difficult task of the orator. In the course of time a canon of four qualities of style were developed: purity of language (ἑλληνισμός c.q. *Latinitas*), clarity (σαφήνεια c.q. *perspicuitas*), ornament (κατασκευή c.q. *ornatus*, to which belong the tropes, the *figurae* or style figures, and the *compositio* or the writing of good sentence patterns) and the appropriateness (πρέπον c.q. *decorum, aptum*)<sup>62</sup> (See Appendix: *Quintillian on Style*). The two remaining tasks of the orator were the *memoria* or the technique of memorising a speech, and the proper *actio* (*pronuntiatio*), i.e. the delivery of the speech. It is the third task of the orator which interests us more specifically. In 1993 R. Morgenthaler has devoted a study to the question whether the *Institutio oratoria* of Quintilianus, a classic introduction to rhetorics, can throw a light on the rhetoric techniques and the style of Luke-Acts<sup>63</sup>. He is of the opinion that this is indeed the case.

Even if the question of Luke's familiarity with ancient rhetorics can never be settled satisfactorily, there is still room for applying modern rhetorics to his work. This has certainly the result of taking into account the essentially communicative nature of his writings and to develop a more holistic approach to his style. In another context, R.H. Snyman has offered a theoretical scheme that tries to integrate the different levels on which style is playing a role. According to him, a stylistic analysis should distinguish<sup>64</sup>:

1. The macrolevel of rhetorical structure:
  - 1.1. Progression (four discourse types) (diversity);
    - 1.1.1. A set of related events, essentially organised in terms of temporal progression;
    - 1.1.2. The description of certain objects and events in terms of space or in terms of categories;
    - 1.1.3. A set of discourse elements mainly by virtue of certain logical connections between the parts: dependent, qualificational and dyadic;

<sup>62</sup> See a synthetic description in A.D. Leeman & A.C. Braet, *Klassieke retorica. Haar inhoud, functie en betekenis* (Groningen 1987) 98-117.

<sup>63</sup> R. Morgenthaler, *Lukas und Quintilian. Rhetorik als Erzählkunst* (Zürich 1993).

<sup>64</sup> A.H. Snyman, "Remarks on the Stylistic parallels in 1 Corinthians 13", in J.H. Petzer & P.J. Hartin, *A South African Perspective in the New Testament*. FS B.M. Metzger (Leiden 1986) 202-13.

- 1.1.4. Dialogue in the sense that an author anticipates the objections of his readers and provides them with solutions in advance.
- 1.2 Cohesion (unity) is attained by the following means:
  - 1.2.1. The thematic unity within a pericope or chapter;
  - 1.2.2. The unfolding nature of a sequence;
  - 1.2.3. Situational markers on the microlevel as *here, now, there*, as well as referential markers including personal pronouns, relative pronouns and so on.
2. The microlevel of rhetorical structure:
  - 2.1. Repetition: may involve almost any unit of discourse from sounds to series of propositions; they are classified in terms of sounds, grammatical constructions, lexical units and propositions.
  - 2.2. Omission: two types: omissions that can readily be supplied from the context, and those which cannot.
  - 2.3. Shifts in expectancies account for some of the more effective rhetorical features. The shift may be on the level of word order, of sentence structure or of lexical meaning.
  - 2.4. Compactness involves packing the maximum amount of meaning into the fewest possible words. It is typical of discourse formulae and credal formulations.
3. The (semiotic) meanings of rhetorical structures
  - 3.1. The interrelationship of parts of the text (cohesion);
  - 3.2. The relationship of a text to the participants in communication (traditionally called the functions of a communication: informative, emotive, performative and the rest)
  - 3.3. The relationship of the text to the setting in terms of time and place;
  - 3.4. The relationship of the text to the real world;
  - 3.5. The relationship of the text to other, similar texts.

Level 2 (microlevel of rhetorical structure) is further elaborated in Snyman and Cronjé<sup>65</sup>. Cronjé puts 2.3 in a larger framework of what he calls “defamiliarization” (or “estrangement”, “alienation”, “foregrounding”), i.e. “the reader’s attention is captivated by the unfamiliar way a familiar subject is presented” and summarises it as follows<sup>66</sup>:

<sup>65</sup> A.H. Snyman & J.v.W. Cronjé, “Toward a New Classification of the Figure (ΣΧΗΜΑΤΑ) in the Greek New Testament”, *NTS* 32 (1986) 113-21.

<sup>66</sup> J.v.W. Cronjé, “Defamiliarization in the Letter to the Galatians”, in J.H. Petzer & P.J. Hartin, *A South African Perspective in the New Testament*. FS B.M. Metzger (Leiden 1986) 214-27.



## 6. Shifts in Expectancies

- A. Shifts in expectancies of word-order
  1. Unusual position in a clause: Hyperbaton.
  2. Unusual position outside the clause: Prolepsis.
  3. Insertion: Parenthesis and dihorthisis.
- B. *Shifts in expectancies of the syntax*
  1. Anacolouthon
  2. Synecdoche.
- C. *Shifts in propositions*
  1. Apparent contradictions: Oxumoron and Paradoxon.
  2. Contradictions in content and intent: Eironia, Litotes, Hyperbole and Paraleipsis (to proceed contrary to the statement)
- D. *Shifts with regards to the communication function*
  1. Rhetorical Questions: Erotema.
  2. Question and answer: Dialektikon.
  3. Literal and figurative meaning: Metaphors, Metonomia and Prosopopoiia.
- E. *Shifts between meaning and referent*  
Periphrasis and Antonomasia.

Although the list of possible rhetorical figures is not complete, the value of Cronjé's proposal is that he does not simply give an alphabetical list<sup>67</sup>, but that he attempts to integrate them within the overall pattern of shifts in expectancies.

## 7. The Style of Luke-Acts

The above observations can be applied to "Luke", the author of Luke-Acts<sup>68</sup>. His style can be defined as the choices or variations (repetition, omission, innovation) he makes within the many possibilities of his language system (namely "Hellenistic Greek"), on different levels (words, sentences, structure and discourse<sup>69</sup>), within the limits of the given

<sup>67</sup> E.W. Bullinger, *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible, Explained and Illustrated* (London 1898 [repr., Grand Rapids, MI 1993]); W. Bühlmann and K. Scherer, *Stilfiguren der Bibel* (Fribourg 1973).

<sup>68</sup> See B. Kowalski, "Stil in der neutestamentlichen Exegese", 124.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. S.E. Porter - J.T. Reed (eds.), *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament. Approaches and Results* (JSNT 170 = Studies in New Testament Greek 4; Sheffield 1999).

grammar, language development<sup>70</sup> and literary genre<sup>71</sup>. His style manifests itself on different levels:

- Word level: characteristic words, word forms and word groups that are not only defined by content or literary genre; the richness of vocabulary compared to text-length; distribution of words and word groups<sup>72</sup>.
- Sentence level: characteristic syntactical structures.
- Rhetorical-narrative level: figures, rhetorical-structural features constructing the text.
- Socio-rhetorical level<sup>73</sup>: communication between author, text and recipient in their socio-historical context.

The value of the above observations can only be proved when they are put into practice in the stylistic analysis of a particular text unit in Luke.

We conclude this survey with a remark of Aristotle, who did not have a high esteem of style, and found it a matter of less importance:

...the matter of style itself only lately came into notice; and rightly considered it is thought vulgar. But since the whole business of Rhetoric is to influence opinion, we must pay attention to it, not as being right, but necessary ... in every system of instruction there is some slight necessity to pay attention to style; for it does make a difference, for the purpose of making a thing clear, to speak in this of that manner; still, the difference is not so very great, but all these things are mere outward show for pleasing the hearer; wherefore no one teaches geometry in this way (Aristotle, *Rhet.* III,1,5-6).

Maybe Aristotle reduced style too much to the issue of rethorics and this resulted in his “depreciation” of the complex reality of style. I hope that the above observations have shown that there is more at stake than just “outward show”!

<sup>70</sup> Style can be consciously archaic and take up ancient language traditions as well as take a modern shape and challenge in a provocative way the rules of grammar.

<sup>71</sup> See J.L. Bailey and L.D. Vander Broek, *Literary Forms in The New Testament* (London 1992).

<sup>72</sup> See A. Denaux and R. Corstjens, in collab. with H. Mardaga, *The Vocabulary of Luke, Alphabetical List of Words, Word Groups, Characteristics of Luke in comparison to Mt and Mk, and Literature*. With biblical references to Luke and Acts (and a comparison to the number of occurrences in Matthew and Mark), Leuven (forthcoming).

<sup>73</sup> A good example of a socio-rhetorical analysis of Luke 21 is L.G. Bloomquist, “Rhetorical Argumentation and the Culture of Apocalyptic. A Socio-Rhetorical Analysis of Luke 21”, in S.E. Porter - D.L. Stamps (eds.), *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture. Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference* (JSNT.SS 180; Sheffield 1999) 173-209.

## Appendix

### *Quintilian on Style*

In his well known handbook *Institutio Oratoria*, Marcus Fabius Quintilianus (+ before 100 A.D.) summarises the Greco-Roman tradition of how to educate an orator. According to him, the art of oratory consists of five parts: invention, arrangement, expression, memory, and delivery or action (III, 3,1). In fact, the third part, called *elocutio*, deals with the question of “style”, because style has to do with how one expresses his subject<sup>74</sup>. Books VIII, IX, X, and XI, 1 are devoted to this subject. In I, 5,1 however, he already affirms: “Style has three kinds of excellence, correctness, lucidity and elegance (for many include the all-important quality of appropriateness under the heading of elegance)”<sup>75</sup>. In Book VIII, 1,1, he again enumerates the “virtues” of style in the following way: “What the Greek call *φρασίς*, we in Latin call *elocutio* or style. Style is revealed both in individual words and in groups of words. As regards the former, we must see that they are Latin, clear, elegant and well-adapted to produce the desired effect. As regards the latter, they must be correct, aptly placed and adorned with suitable figures”<sup>76</sup>. By correctness, he understands the correct use of (the Latin) language. Lucidity is the opposite of the obscure, almost not understandable use of language. Elegance points to the beauty of the language, and appropriateness indicates the quality of choosing the language that is appropriate to the subject, circumstances of time and place, and to the audience.

- The first virtue or quality of style is “correctness of speech” (*emendate loqui*) (VIII, 1,1). In fact, this first quality of style is part of the study of grammar (I, 5,1-71). “The teacher of literature therefore must study the rules for correctness of speech, these constituting the first part of his art. The observance of these rules is concerned with either

<sup>74</sup> Already Aristotle, *Art of Rhetoric* III,1,2, speaking about style (*λέξις*) said: “For it is not sufficient to know *what* one ought to say, but one must also know *how* to say it, and this largely contributes to making a speech appear of a certain character” (cf. *Aristotle’s “Art of Rhetoric*, with an English Translation by John Henry Freese (LCL 193; Cambridge, MA - London 1926 [repr. 1994] 345)

<sup>75</sup> Cf. H.E. Butler (ed.), *The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian*. Vol. 1 (LCL 124; Cambridge, MA - London 1920 [repr. 1989]) 78-9: *Iam cum omnis oratio tres habeat virtutes, ut emendata, ut dilucida, ut ornata sit (quae dicere apte, quod est praecipuum, plerique ornatui subiiciunt)* (I,5,1).

<sup>76</sup> Cf. H.E. Butler (ed.), *The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian*. Vol. 3 (LCL 126; Cambridge, MA - London 1921 [repr. 1986]) 194-95: *Igitur, quam Graeci φρασίς, Latine dicimus elocutionem. Ea spectatur verbis aut singulis aut coniunctis. In singulis intuendum est ut sint Latina, perspicua, ornata, ad id quod efficere volumus accomodate, in coniunctis, ut emendata, ut collocata, ut figurata* (VIII,1,1)

one or more words” (I, 5,1)<sup>77</sup>. Individual words will either be native or imported, simple or compound, literal or metaphorical, in current use or newly-coined (I, 5,3). Each of these possibilities is discussed.

- The second virtue or quality of style is the “clearness of speech” (*perspicuitas*) (VII, 2,1-22). “For my own part, I regard clearness as the first essential of a good style: there must be propriety in our words, their order must be straightforward, the conclusion of the period must not be long postponed, there must be nothing lacking and nothing superfluous. Thus our language will be approved by the learned and clear to the uneducated. I am speaking solely of clearness of style, as I have already dealt with clearness in the presentation of facts in the rules that I laid down for the *statement of the case*. But the general method is the same in both. For if what we say is not less not more than is required, and is clear and systematically arranged, the whole matter will be plain and obvious even to the not too attentive audience” (VIII, 2, 22)<sup>78</sup>.

- The third virtue or quality of style is the “ornament of speech” (*orationis ornatus*) (VIII, 3,1-88). The employment of skilful ornament not only serves the interests of the case that is defended, but at the same time, it commends the orator and appeals the approval of the world at large (VIII, 3,2). Rhetorical ornament resides in individual words or in groups of words. As to the use of individual words, it is to be noted that, whereas clearness mainly requires propriety of language, ornament requires the skilful use of metaphor. We should realise, however, that without propriety ornament is impossible (VIII, 3,15). The choice of striking and sublime words will be determined by the matter that is dealt with (VIII, 3,18). Words are proper, newly-coined or metaphorical (VIII, 3,24). Hence, it is a question of good taste whether and when one uses archaisms, neologisms, or metaphors (VIII, 3,24-39). When one considers connected discourse (groups of words): “Its adornment may be effected, primarily, in two ways; that is to say, we must consider first our ideal of style, and secondly how we shall express this ideal in actual words. The first essential is to realise clearly what we wish to enhance or attenuate, to express with vigour or calm, in luxuriant or austere language, at length or

<sup>77</sup> Cf. Butler, *The Institutio Oratoria* 1, 78-79, ... *emendate loquendi regulam, quae grammatices prior pars est, examinet. Haec exigitur verbis aut singulis aut pluribus.*

<sup>78</sup> Cf. Butler, *The Institutio Oratoria* 3, 208-09, *Nobis primus virtus sit perspicuitas, propria verba, rectus ordo, non in longum dilata conclusio, nihil neque desit neque superfluat; ita sermo et doctus probabilis et planus imperitis erit. Haec eloquendi observatio. Nam rerum perspicuitas quo modo praestanda sit, diximus in praeceptis narrationis. Similis autem ratio est omnibus. Nam si neque pauciora quam oportet neque plura neque inordinata aut indistincta dixerimus, erunt dilucida et negligenter quoque audientibus aperta* (VIII, 2, 22).

with conciseness, with gentleness or asperity, magnificence or subtlety, gravity or wit. The next essential is to decide by what kind of metaphor, figures, reflexions, methods and arrangement we may best produce the effect we desire” (VIII, 3,40-41)<sup>79</sup>.

- The fourth virtue or quality of style is the “appropriateness of speech” (XI,1) (*apte dicere*). “This topic is discussed by Cicero in the third book of the *de Oratore*, and, although he touches on it but lightly, he really covers the whole subject when he says, *One single style of oratory is not suited to every case, nor to every audience, nor every speaker, nor every occasion*” (XI,1,4)<sup>80</sup>. When one reads Acts 17,16-34, one wonders whether the author of Luke-Acts had not heard somewhere the recommendation which Quintilian formulates thus: “It, likewise, makes no small difference whether we are speaking in public or in private, before a crowded audience or in comparative seclusion, in another city or our own, in the camp or in the forum: each of these places will require its own style and peculiar form of oratory” (XI,1,47)<sup>81</sup>.

Adelbert DENAUX  
Catholic University Leuven  
Tiensestraat 112  
B-3000 Leuven (BELGIUM)

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Butler, *The Institutio Oratoria* 3, 232-3, *Iam hinc igitur ad rationem coniuncti transeamus. Cuius ornatus in haec duo prima dividitur, quam concipiamus elocutionem, quo modo efferamus. Nam primum est, ut liqueat, augere quid velimus an minuere, concitate docere an moderate, laete an severe, abundanter an presse, aspere an leniter, magnifice an subtiliter, graviter an urbane. Tum, quo translationum genere, quibus figuris, qualibus sentiis, quo modo, que postremo collocatione id, quod intendimus, efficere possimus.*

<sup>80</sup> Cf. H.E. Butler (ed.), *The Institutio Oratoria*. Vol. 4 (LCL, 127; Cambridge, MA - London 1922 [repr. 1993]) 157, *Non omni causae neque auditori neque personae neque tempori congruere orationis unum genus; see also: Nec tantum, quis et pro quo sed etiam apud quem dicas, interest*” (XI,1,43), “*Tempus quoque ac locus egent observatione propria*” (XI,1,46).

<sup>81</sup> Cf. Butler, *The Institutio Oratoria* 4, 180-81, *Et loco publico privatone, celebri an secreto, aliena civitate an tua, in castris an foro dicas, interest plurimum, ac suam quidque formam et proprium quandam modum eloquentiae poscit.*