

FROM THE IMPERSONAL PASSIVE ‘IT WAS TOLD THAT~’
(ETC.) TO THE PERSONAL PASSIVE ‘HE WAS
TOLD THAT~’ (ETC.):
A COMPARATIVE OBSERVATION BASED ON THE
VARIOUS VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE* (I)

KIKUO YAMAKAWA

1. *Introduction: Historical Background*

1.1. The main purpose of the present paper is first to consider the remarkable prevalence in the AV¹ of impersonal passive constructions with verbs of saying, of the type ‘it was told him that~’, etc., to examine what precedent factors, both internal and external, caused them to be inherited there, and then to observe how in the late Modern English Versions of the Bible there has grown a general tendency for the impersonal passive to be replaced by the corresponding personal passive, such as of the type ‘he was told that~’, etc.

1.2. Before embarking on the main theme of making an analytic description of the relevant examples taken from the AV, I think it proper to survey the general process of the kind of impersonal passive under consideration, as inherited from the OE period down to the period of early Modern English, that is, the English of the AV.

Two typical OE verbs of saying used in the construction concerned are *secgan* (> say) and *queðan* (cf. *quoth*). They are used in the impersonal passive with a dative (or dative equivalent) of person, followed by a complementary² clause which is introduced by the subordinating conjunction *þæt* (> that) or the dependent interrogative or indefinite relative *hwæt* (> what), *hu* (> how), etc. In this type of construction it was usual that the formal subject *hit* (> it) was left unexpressed.³ One example is:

* I express my thanks to Professor P. E. Davenport, Hitotsubashi University, for reading the draft of this paper and making a number of valuable suggestions. My acknowledgement is also due to Professor Kenji Toki, Hitotsubashi University, who instructed me on some points in the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin languages and checked my transliteration of the Hebrew and the Greek quotations taken from the respective Versions of the Bible.

¹ The abbreviation of *The Authorized Version of the English Bible* (1611). Cf. APPENDIX, A.

² Admittedly, the clause concerned may logically be interpreted as the subject of the passive predicate. Mitchell (*OES*, §842) further states: “In so far as the direct object of the active verb—the noun clause or infinitive—is (or is in apposition with) the subject of the passive verb, we have the so-called personal passive.” Though on subtler grounds, I should like to differ from him and interpret as impersonal the example he cited in the same place: *ÆHom* 20.376–7 *Ðam folce wæs behaten . . . þæt hi sceoldon habban soðlice renscuras* (= It was promised to the people that they should truly have showers), as well as those given as delicate instances in §1089, where “we have a formal *hit* with which the infinitive or clause is in apposition.”

³ Sometimes, though less commonly, *hit* was used as the formal subject of the impersonal passive predicate with the complementary *þæt*-clause. The following pair of examples should be compared: *Nis nanum men*

(1) Nu is eow gesæd, þurh ðone soðan Crist, þæt ge sind gebroðra, gif ge ðone bend healdað soðre broðerrædene untobrocenne.—*ÆCHom*⁴ II.318.4–6 (=Now it is told you, by the true Christ, that you are brothers if you keep the bond of true brotherhood unbroken.)

In the translation above “it is told you . . . that . . .” is syntactically more faithful to the original “is eow gesæd . . . þæt . . .”; but “you are told . . . that . . .” sounds better as idiomatic modern English.

The following example is noteworthy in having the impersonal passive of *cweðan* running parallel to that of *secgan*, both complemented by *hwæt*-clauses:

(2) næs him no ða giet to gecweden hwæt he mid ryhte ðonon forð don scolde, ac him wæs gesæd hwæt he ær to unryhte dyde.—*CP(H)* 443.19–20. (=He was not yet told what he should do rightly in the future, but he was told what he had done wrongly in the past.)

In the first clause the preposition *to*, which is structurally required by *cweðan*, is used preverbally and related to the foregoing dative *him*, while in the second the simple dative *him* precedes *wæs gesæd*.

Another common verb used in the same kind of impersonal passive is *cyðan*, which means ‘make known, announce’ and is usually construed with an accusative of thing and a dative of person. Below we shall show an example of the construction with *cyðan* complemented by a *þæt*-clause and another of the same kind of construction complemented by a *hu*-clause.

(3) Ða wearþ ge-cydd þam fæder þæt martinus come þa into þære byrig.—*ÆLS* 31.490–1. (=Then it was told the father that Martin had come into the town,)

(4) and him wearð þa gecydd hu iudas ofer-feaht his fynd mid wæpnum, and hu he geclænsod hæfde þæt halige godes templ from eallum þam fylðum þe he fyrnlice þær arærde.—*ÆLS* 25.535–8. (=and then it was told him how Judas overcame his enemies with weapons and how he had cleansed the holy temple of God from all the abominations that he had formerly set up there;)

Next, as an example of the impersonal passive of this sort introducing direct speech, the following may be specially worth noting:

(5) Ac to ðæm anstræcum is gecueden ðurh sanctus Paulus: Ne sculon ge no ðyncan eow selfum to wise. Ond eft he cuæð to ðæm unbealdum: Ne læte ge eow ælcra lare wind awecggan. To ðæm anstræcum is gecueden ðurh Solomon: Hie etað ðone wæsðm hiera ægnes weges.—*CP(H)* 306.6–10. (=But it is said to the resolute by St. Paul: “You must not think yourselves too wise.” And again he said to the

alyfed þæt he oðerne wyrige,—*ÆCHom* II.34.25. (=It is not permitted to any man that he should curse another,) / *Ac hit nis nanum men alyfed þæt he mæge witan eall þæt God getiohhod hæfð*, . . . —*Bo* 135.6–8. (=But it is not permitted for any man to know all that God has decreed, . . .).

² For the abbreviated titles of the OE and ME works quoted in this and the following section, see APPENDIX, B.

irresolute: "Don't let the wind of every doctrine move you." It is said to the resolute by Solomon: "They eat the fruit of their own way.")

Here, in the first and the third sentences we find the passive constructions, while in the second there occurs the active construction. Between the direct speech in the first and the third—impersonal passive—sentences and that in the second—active—sentence, we should notice an affinity in syntactic function, that is, the function as extraposition for the main statement.

As a verb of saying in OE, *tellan* (> *tell*), which originally meant 'to count' and came to mean 'to account' and then 'to recount,' had not yet attained those relevant syntactic features with which *cweðan* or *secgan* was generally used.⁵

1.3. In ME, impersonal passive constructions in indirect narration come more and more to occur with *(h)it* as formal subject and *tellen* (<OE *tellan*) as the verb of saying. The first example below, which is virtually assumed as belonging to OE, illustrates the earlier stage of the development with particular distinctness.

(1) He befran þa hwan þa gebytle gemynte wæron, swa mærllice getimbrode. *Him was gesæd þæt* heo wæron gemynt anen suture on Romane byrig, and hine eac næmde.—*Vsp. D. Hom.* 119.2-4 [a 1150].⁶ (=Then he asked for whom the building, so magnificently built, had been constructed. It was told him that it had been intended for a shoemaker in the city of Rome and it was also named after him.)

(2) But *me was toold*, certeyn, nat longe agoon is, *That . . .* taughte he me That I ne sholde wedded be but ones.—Chaucer, *CT. WB. D.* 9-13 [c1395]. (=But, certainly, it was told me, not long ago, that he [i.e. Christ] taught me that I should be married only once.)

It should be added that (2) is the only example in Chaucer of the impersonal passive construction with *tellen*. In Chaucer we cannot find any example of the corresponding construction with *hit* expressed as formal subject.

Generally, in works of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, we find the type '(h)it was told him that~' occurring, as in:

(3) *Hit is tolde me* bi tulkes *þat* þou trwe were Profete of þat prouynce þat prayed my fader,—*Cleanness* 1623-4 [c1380]. (=It is told me by people that you were truly a prophet of that province that my father plundered,)

(4) But *it was told vs* of hem of the contree, *þat* withjnne þe desertes weren the trees of the sonne and of the mone,—*Mandev.* 198.24-6 [c1400].

(5) Also I purposyd me to have sent to Stapylton, as ye sent word by James Gre-sham, and *it is told me that* he is to* London.—*Paston L.*, No. 184 (Gairdman, II. p. 250) [1451]. (* *is to* is gone to)

⁵ Cf. M. Ogura, *The Syntactic and Semantic Rivalry of Quoth, Say and Tell in Medieval English*, pp. 75, 106 et passim.

⁶ In quoting examples from works that were composed from the ME down to the early ModE period, I show in brackets the date at the end of each.

(6) Sir, *hit was tolde me that* at thys tyme of youre maryaige ye wolde gyff ny man the gyffte that he wolde aske you excepte hit were unresonable.—Malory, *Wks.* 99.25–7 [a 1470].

(7) Than was *hit tolde the kyng* that sir Mordred had pyght* a new fylde* uppon Bareon Downe.—*ibid.*, 1232.21–2. (* *pyght* pitched; *fylde* combat)

(8) Syr, hyt whos tellyd Robard Heryks at Calles that howr mother schowlde be maryd or in the whay of maryge, into so myche that . . . —*Let. Cely* 175.5–7 [1482]. (=Sir, it was told Robert Herrick at Calais that our mother should be married or in the way of marriage, into so much that . . .)

Occasionally, especially in a terse and lively context, the subordinating conjunction *that* is unexpressed, leaving the clause asyndetic, as in:

(9) Cosyn, *it is told me* ther is a goodly man in youre Inne,—*Paston L.*, No. 94 (Gairdner, II. p. 110) [a1449].

(10) For I have bene at kyng Royns, for *hit was tolde me* there were passyng good knyghtes;—Malory, *Wks.* 62.4–5.

(11) and *yt ys teld me* our ger ys in Temys.—*Let. Cely* 8.24–5 [1476]. (=and it has been told me that our things are in Thames.)

Sometimes the dative element of this construction is expressed in the form of a *to*-phrase so as to acquire the more distinct force as the dative adjunct for the impersonal passive predicate. This usage of the dative equivalent *to*-phrase is generally observed in the English of Wyclif and his followers, as will be further illustrated in the relevant citations from the Wycliffite Versions of the English Bible in Chapter II. The following is an instance of the same construction cited from another Wycliffite work.

(12) *It is tolde to vs þat*oure moost reuerent broþer Basile þe bischop is occupied in seculer causis, and kepþ unprofetably moote hallis,*—Wycl., *Clergy HP* (Matthew, p. 395) [a 1400]. (* *moote hallis* legal assemblies)

In the *Paston Letters* we find a number of examples of the type '*as it is told me,*' together with those of the type '*it is told me that~,*' as illustrated in (5) above.⁷ In the former type, the subordinating conjunction *as* refers to the content of the main clause, and *it* performs anaphoric reference denoting the foregoing content while functioning as the formal subject of the *as*-clause. Here we should note a functional affinity between the *it* in the type '*it is told me that ~*' and the *it* in the type '*as it is told me,*' since we must admit that there is a fairly delicate correlation between the anaphoric and the cataphoric reference as it is performed by *it* in this kind of construction. One of the examples is:

(13) for defawt of payment, Toppis hath enterid ayen* therinne, and shall selle itt in haste, *as it is told me.*—*Paston L.* No. 197 (Gairdner, II. p. 247) [1451]. (**ayen* back again)

⁷ In Vol. II of Gairdner's edition of the *Paston Letters*, which contains 259 Letters dated 1424 down to 1454, we find 21 examples of the type '*it is told me that~*' and 6 of the type '*as it is told me.*'

Here "Toppis . . . shall selle itt in hast, *as it is told me*" should be compared with '*it is told me that* Toppis . . . shall selle itt in hast.'

Next we shall see two fifteenth-century examples of the construction where the relevant impersonal passive predicate is complemented by a dependent interrogative clause, instead of a *that*-clause.

(14) when *hit was tolde him how* and in *what* maner the queen was taken away frome the fyre,—Malory, *Wks.* 1183.1–3.

(15) And in the meanetyme *hit was tolde unto kynge Marke how* sir Trystrames and La Beale Isode were in that same maner,—*ibid.*, 433.1–3.

In (15) it should be noted that the dative element whose head is a proper noun is indicated with particular explicitness by the prepositional phrase "*unto kynge Marke.*"

For an ME example of the relevant impersonal passive construction in direct narration, we shall show the following from the Wycliffite Bible, which will be reconsidered under (12) in §2.4 with a comparison of the corresponding verses of the AV and other earlier Versions:

(16) And *it was teld*, and *said to the kyng of Jericho*, Lo! men of the sones of Israel entriden hider bi nyzt, to asprie the lond.—Wyc. 2, *Josh.* 2.2 [c1395].

Here (*was*) *said* is added to *was teld* (=told) to form a compound predicate verb in the passive, *said* functioning as an introductory word for the direct speech; and the dative equivalent *to the kyng of Jericho* is related to both *teld* and *said*.

On the other hand, it is worth noting that as early as the beginning of the fifteenth century the personal passive construction of the type '*as he was told*,' corresponding to the impersonal passive type '*as it was told him*,' began to occur, as in:

(17) And þou ssal þy wylle abyde, *as ycham ytold her*.—*Glo. Chron.* (Hrl) 5357 [c1400]. (=And you shall have your will, as I have been told before.)⁸

(18) Sych an othere, *as I am told*, In all thys warld is none.—*Towneley Pl.* 9.35–6 [a 1460].

This appendent or parenthetic use of the *as*-clause displays its syntactic affinity with the type '*I am told*+*that*-clause,' since *as* in the former, which refers to the content of the main clause, may be interpreted as functionally parallel to *that* in the latter, which introduces the subordinate clause.

Now, from a historical point of view, two significant points might be commented on. The first is that the early occurrences of the personal passive construction with a personal pronoun as subject, as in (17) and (18) above, suggests that, at least with regard to the construction with *tell*, it is difficult to assume the transition from the impersonal passive to the personal passive through the factor of the inflectional distinction being lost between the nominative/accusative and the dative. In other words, we find it difficult to follow

⁸ This should be compared with the corresponding line in the earlier version of the same work, where the *as*-clause appears in the active construction: And þou ssalt þi wille abide, *as ich þe abbe ytold her* (=as I have told you before).—*Glo. Chron.* (Clg) 5357 [c1300].

the traditional assumption that OE 'him [þam cýninge] wæs sægd þæt . . .' led first to ME 'the king was told that . . .' and then to ME 'he was told that . ..'. Rather we would better assume two different lines of development. One is: OE him [þam cýninge] wæs sægd þæt . . . → ME 'it was told him [the king] that . ..'. Here the dative object remains syntactically unchanged, though it is involved in the change of element order. The other line of development might be assumed on the basis of the lexical character of the verb *tell*. *Told* in the type 'he [the king] was told that . . .' would be better interpreted as the passive participle of the *tellen* which, as the OED (s.v. TELL 8a) records, means 'to inform <a person> of something' and so is construed with an accusative of person. 'He [The king] was told that . . .,' accordingly, has as subject a form derived from the accusative (not the dative) in the corresponding active sentence.

At the same time, we should assume that there was a syntactic confluence between the old construction 'it was told him [the king] that . . .' and the new construction 'he [the king] was told that . . .'. This confluence in turn was to bring about the tendency for the latter to be substituted for the former, which was to be witnessed in the ModE period.

The second point is that the appearance of the type of construction 'he was told + that-clause' was to motivate the generalization of the type of construction 'he was told a story,' that is, what is commonly called the indirect passive construction with the retained direct object.⁹ This involves a process of syntactic reinterpretation with regard to the development of the constructions concerned. As was stated in §1.2, the primary function of the that-clause in 'it was told him that ~' / 'he was told that ~' is complementary. Taking a further step, we might even define it as adverbial. In this respect, it is suggestive that the OED (s.v. TELL 8b) treats 'he was told of it,' 'he was told so,' and 'he was told that ~' upon the same level of lexical and syntactic development.

But this primary nature, that is, the complementary or adverbial nature of the that-clause in 'it was told him that ~' / 'he was told that ~,' comes to be reinterpreted as *postposed subject* / *retained direct object*, in just the same way that "a story" in 'he was told a story' is usually interpreted as retained direct object. This is indeed in the natural course of development.

1.4. In early ModE, that is, the English of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the impersonal passive type 'it was told him that ~,' as against the personal passive type 'he was told that ~,' was still of commoner use. And all the examples of the constructions concerned that can be found in the AV, as will be treated in the main chapters, are of this older type.

The first example below, where the complementary element is a *how*-clause, instead of a *that*-clause, is especially noteworthy in showing the older feature of the construction leaving the formal subject *it* unexpressed.

(1) Abyde, abyde, And to you shall be tolde Howe hyr ale is solde To mawte and to melde.*—Skelton, *Elymour Rummage* 155–9 [1517]. (**mawte* malt, be converted into malt; *molde* be moulded [i.e. from the careless and hasty treatment of the grain])

⁹ Cf. B. Brose, *Die englischen Passivkonstruktionen vom Typus 'I am told a story' und 'I am sent for,'* pp. 99–100. It also seems significant that in the consequent context (*ibid.*, p. 100) the author refers to the process of the analogous nature by which the appearance of the type 'I am given to understand . . .' motivated the later generalization of the type 'he was given a book.'

Here, adapted to the metric structure of the poem, the periphrastic dative equivalent *to you* occupies the front position, instead of *it* in the type 'it was told you how ~.'

Next we shall show some early ModE examples of the impersonal passive type 'it was told him that ~.' Example (2) is specially to be noted in that two relevant constructions appear parallel in the same consequent context, the first containing *sayd* (=said) accompanied by the prepositional dative equivalent *unto hym* (=him) and the second the simple dative *him* appended to *tolde* (=told).

(2) But here *was it* also *sayd unto hym* yet again, *that* though saint James do saye that faith without good workes is dead, he should not therby runne to his old glose* *It was tolde him that* this glose would not serue him.—Thomas More, *A Dialoge concerning Heresies* (265H–266A) [1528]. (**glose* flattering speech)

(3) *It is told me* thou art a shrew, *iwis*.—Mr. S. Mr. of Art, *Gammer Gurton's Needle* 5.2.85 [1575].

(4) 'Twas *told me* you were rough, and coy, and sullen, And now I finde report a very liar:—Shakespeare, *Tam. Shr.* 1046–7 (2.1.243–4) [1593–4].¹⁰

(5) *It was told you* before, *That* Prudence bid the Boys, that they should ask her some Questions,—Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress* II (231.36–8) [1684].

(6) *It will be told me, that* I have mistaken the Italian poet, who means only, that . . . —Dryden, *Cleomenes*, Ded. (VIII.p.172) [1692].

In (3) and (4), the asyndetic clause is used as the complementary element so as to conform to the lively and speedy style of the context.

To these we may add an example of the type 'as it was told him':

(7) By my faith, *as it was told me* More than once or twice, All the substance of their play Shall proceed this wise,—Medwell, *Fulgens and Lucreca* 1.65–9 [c 1516].

In this sentence, the *as*-clause is parenthetical, with *it* cataphorically referring to the content of the main clause. It would be instructive to compare the original "as it was told me . . . , all the substance . . . shall proceed this wise" with 'it was told me that all the substance . . . should proceed this wise.'

As an example of the impersonal passive complemented by a clause of dependent question, we may quote:

(8) . . . , so shalt thou see the Gate; at which when thou knockest, *it shall be told thee what* thou shalt do.—Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress* I (10.21–2) [1678].

The same work contains the following examples of the relevant construction in direct narration:

¹⁰ In Shakespeare we find two other examples of the same type of construction, all containing asyndetic clauses: *Tis told me* he hath very oft of late Giuen private time to you,—*Haml.* 504–5 (1.3.91–2) / *it was told me* I should be rich by the Fairies,—*Wint. T.* 1369 (3.3.121–2).

(9) *It was also said to the same persons* Gather my Wheat into my Garner.—*ibid.*, I (36.31–3).

(10) and [I heard] that *it was said unto them*, Enter ye into the joy of your Lord.—*ibid.*, I (162.5–6).

In these examples the passive predicate verb is *was said*, and it is construed with the prepositional dative equivalent introduced by *to / unto*.

On the other hand, we find the personal passive construction of the type '*he was told that . . .*' gradually increasing in use in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It is exemplified as follows:

(11) Those were the two sonnes of Acrates old, Who . . . , of him *were told*, That he was Guyon bold.—Spenser, *Faerie Queene* 2.8.10.6–9 [1590].

(12) for *I was told*, you were in a consumption.—Shakespeare, *Much Ado* 2614 (5.4.96) [1598–9].

(13) *I was told*, that he scattered almost all the rest of the way with nothing but doleful and bitter complaints.—Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress* I (127.9–11).

(14) *I have been told* she had that admirable quality of forgetting to a man's face in the morning, that she had layn with him all night,—Congreve, *Love for Love* 4.1. 333–6 [1695].

As in the case of (7) above, the parenthetic use of the type '*as he was told*' is syntactically associated with the self-contained use of the type '*he was told that ~.*' Some examples are:

(15) Madam, *as in secrecy I was tolde*, My brother Guise hath gathered a power of men, Which are he saith, to kill the Puritans,—Marlowe, *The Massacre at Paris* 646–8 [c1600].

(16) This tree is not, *as we are told*, a tree Of danger tasted,—Milton, *Paradise Lost* 9.863–4 [1667].

(17) but *as I was told*, the good man was much afflicted for his loss.—Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress* I (126.18–9).

(18) Chaucer (*as you have formerly been told* by our learned Rymer) first adorned and amplified our barren tongue from Provençal, which was then the most polished of all the modern languages,—Dryden, *Pref. to the Fables* (XI. pp. 208–9) [1700].

To these we shall add the following, with the demonstrative pronoun *that* as retained direct object:

(19) I know him to be valiant.—*I was told that*, by one that knowes him better then you.—Shakespeare, *Hen. V.* 1673–5 (3.7.112–4) [1598–9].

The demonstrative *that* here refers to the content expressed by "him to be valient"

in the foregoing interlocutor's speech, and "I was told *that*" may be contextually expanded into 'I was told *that* he was valiant.' Here we see the potential correlation between the demonstrative *that* and the conjunction *that* rooted in the primary transition from the former to the latter as it is used in the construction concerned.

The above illustration shows that in the age of the AV the new personal passive construction represented by the type '*he was told that . . .*' was progressing along with the remainder of the old impersonal passive construction represented by the type '*it was told him that ~.*' For various reasons, however, the latter only occurs in the AV: no example of the former can be found there. The archaistic character observable in the relevant AV usage provides us with sufficient motivation for a series of comparative inquiries to be attempted in the following main chapters.

II. *The AV Usage Compared with Its Predecessors*

2.1. As was mentioned in the previous section, the AV (1611) contains a considerable number of examples of the impersonal passive construction in question but none of the corresponding personal passive construction. This shows that the English of the AV is excessively archaistic, as compared with that of contemporary English works. Needless to say, this archaizing tendency, both stylistic and linguistic, has to be ascribed to various—not only tangible but more subtle and profound—factors. Upon grounds that we hope will become clear later on, however, we would concentrate on seeking for the external influence, that is, the influence of the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin of the respective Versions of the Bible, rather than the internal influence, that is, the influence of the earlier English Versions.

Below (in §§2.3–2.7) we are going first to take up the AV examples of the relevant impersonal passive constructions and then to observe them in comparison with their respective predecessors. For the AV examples taken from the Old Testament, which are greater in number than those taken from the New Testament, we shall compare (i) externally the corresponding passages of (1) the Masoretic Text (i.e. the standard text of the Hebrew Bible) (MT), (2) the Septuagint (in Greek) (LXX), (3) the Vulgate (in Latin) (V), and (ii) internally those of (4) the Old English Heptateuch (OE Hept.),¹¹ (5) the Early and the Later Versions of the Wycliffite Bible (dated a 1382 and c 1395, respectively) (Wyc. 1; Wyc. 2), and (6) the Doway Bible (1610) (Doway). For the AV examples taken from the New Testament, we shall compare (i) externally the corresponding passages of (1) the Greek New Testament (NT-Gk), (2) the Vulgate, and (ii) internally those of (3) the West Saxon Gospels (WS Gosp.),¹² (4) the Early and Later Versions of the Wycliffite Bible, (5) the Tyndale's New Testament (1525) (Tyn.), and (6) the Rheme Bible (1582) (Rheme).

2.2. In the AV we find 48 examples of the relevant impersonal passive constructions.¹³

¹¹ References to the OE Hept. are limited to the cases where the examples concerned belong to the Heptateuch.

¹² References to the WS Gosp. are limited to the cases where the examples concerned belong to the four Gospels.

¹³ For the statistical examination of the AV examples I have depended on *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*. In Group III I have especially included two examples of the active construction of the

These may be classified into the following five groups. Among them, I and II may be called *major groups*, and III, IV and V *minor groups*; or III may rather be called a *miscellaneous group*.

- I. Type 'it was told him that ~' (10 examples)
- II. Type 'it was told him (saving) + direct speech' (16 examples)
- III. Type 'it was told him what [how (that)] ~,' etc. (8 examples)
- IV. Type 'as it was told him' (8 examples)
- V. Type 'it was said ((un)to him) + direct speech' (6 examples)

These 48 examples are distributed among several Books of the AV, as shown in the following table:

	I	II	III	IV	V	Total	
O.T.	{ <i>Gen.</i>	31.22	22.20, 38.13, 38.24	48.1, 48.2		6	
	<i>Exod.</i>	14.5			5.19	2	
	<i>Josh.</i>		2.2, 10.17	9.24		3	
	<i>Deut.</i>				17.4	1	
	<i>Judges</i>	9.47	16.2		9.25	3	
	<i>1 Sam.</i>	23.7, 23.13, 23.22, 27.4	15.12, 19.19, 24.1		19.21	8	
	<i>2 Sam.</i>		6.12, 19.1	21.11	10.17	4	
	<i>1 Kings</i>	2.29, 2.41	1.51	18.13		5	
	<i>2 Kings</i>		6.13, 8.7			2	
	<i>1 Chron.</i>					19.17	1
	<i>Job</i>	37.20					1
	<i>Isa.</i>		7.2		40.21		2
	<i>Ezek.</i>					13.12	1
	<i>Hos.</i>					1.10, 1.10*	2
<i>Zeph.</i>					3.16	1	
N.T.	{ <i>Luke</i>		8.20			2	
	<i>Acts</i>			9.6, 22.10, 27.25	22.30	4	
Total	10	16	8	8	6	48	

* This is the case where two examples of the relevant construction occur successively in the same verse.

This distribution presents a very conspicuous feature: the greater part of the examples are from the Old Testament. Furthermore, we should note that with a few exceptions (i.e., *Deut.* 17.4, *Job* 37.20, *Isa.* 40.21, *Hos.* 1.10, and *Zeph.* 3.16) those quotations from the Old Testament are generally in the context of prosaic and narrative style.

This phenomenon reminds us that the stylistic and syntactic features observable in the examples are to a great extent due to the influence of biblical Hebrew. It suggests to us the necessity of comparing them with their earliest predecessors, tracing their syntactic

type 'one told him (and said) + direct speech,' whose semantic association with the impersonal passive construction is clearly perceivable.

peculiarities back to their origin in the MT, and the LXX, which was under the direct influence of the MT.

2.3. I. Type 'it was told him that ~'

This type of construction, which has a *that*-clause as complementary element, occurs in the AV less frequently than the type 'it was told him, saying, +direct speech.' But we shall treat it first since it may be regarded as the most representative, in view of the main theme of transition from the impersonal passive to the personal passive.

In the AV we find ten examples of the type 'it was told him that ~,' all from the Old Testament. We shall arrange them according to the difference of patterns by which the AV examples are derived, through the intermediate stages of the V (Latin) and the LXX (Greek), from the MT (Hebrew).¹⁴

i. First we shall present four sets of examples, i.e. (1) *Gen.* 31.22, (2) *Exod.* 14.5, (3) *1 Sam.* [*1 Kings*]¹⁵ 23.7, and (4) *1 Sam.* [*1 Kings*] 27.4. Here we see the pattern of transition: MT *wayyuggad* + *lā*-dative + *kī*-clause → LXX *anēngélē* [*apēngélē*] + dative + *hóti*-clause → V *nuntiatum est* + dative + *quod*-clause.

In the MT (Hebrew), *wayyuggad* is the *hophal* (i.e. passive of the *hiphil*, whose primary function is causative or permissive) imperfect masculine, meaning 'and it was told.' Here it must be noted that the Hebrew gender is composed of masculine and feminine, and the masculine in this instance functionally corresponds to the neuter in Greek or in Latin. And so the masculine *hophal wayyuggad* should be translated into 'and it was told,' not 'and he was told.' We see the characteristic use of the Hebrew impersonal passive instanced here. *Lā*-dative stands for a prepositional composite prefixed by the preposition *lā* (=to), forming a periphrastic dative equivalent. *Kī* is a subordinating conjunction, meaning 'because, that.'

In the LXX (Greek), *anēngélē* or *apēngélē* is the second aorist passive third person singular, meaning 'it was reported or told.' It may be interpreted as forming an impersonal passive. *Hóti* is a subordinating conjunction, meaning 'since, that.'

In the V (Latin), *nuntiatum* is the neuter third person singular past participle, meaning 'announced, told'; and *nuntiatum est*, forming a third person singular passive perfect, may also be interpreted as constituting an impersonal passive. *Quod* is a subordinating conjunction, meaning 'because, that.'

It is worth noting that there is a significant semanto-functional feature common to the Hebrew *kī*, the Greek *hóti* and the Latin *quod*. The primary or intrinsic function of each of them is to introduce a complementary or explanatory clause, which might be defined as adverbial rather than substantival.¹⁶ And the same semanto-functional nature has also permeated the English *that* in the type 'it was told me that ~.'

The four sets of examples are as follows:

¹⁴ In this paper, I show quotations from the Hebrew and Greek texts by transliterating them into Roman letters.

¹⁵ Generally speaking, *1 Sam.*, *2 Sam.*, *1 Kings* and *2 Kings* in the MT and the AV correspond to *1 Kings*, *2 Kings*, *3 Kings* and *4 Kings* in the LXX, the V, the Wyc. 1 and 2, and the Doway, respectively. So when we refer inclusively to quotations from these four books belonging to these various Versions of the Bible, we employ the following system of notation: *1 Sam.* [*1 Kings*] . . . , *2 Sam.* [*2 Kings*] . . . , *1 Kings* [*3 Kings*] . . . , and *2 Kings* [*4 Kings*]

¹⁶ Cf. Gildersleeve, *Latin Grammar*, §524.

(1) *Gen. 31.22*—AV: and it was tolde Laban on the third day, that Jacob was fled. Cf. MT: wayyuggaḏ ləlāḇān bayyōm haššəlišî kî ḇāraḥ Ya‘āqōḇ. (*lit.*:¹⁷ and-it-was-told to-Laban on-the-day the-third that fled Jacob.) / LXX: Anēngēlē dē Laban tōi Sýrōi* tēi trítēi hēmérāi hótī apédra Iakōb. (*lit.*: It-was-told but Laban the Syrian on-the-third day that fled Jacob.) (*Laban undeclined dat., with which tōi Sýrōi [m. dat.sg.; =the Syrian] is in apposition) / V: Nuntiatum est Laban* die tertio quod fugeret Iacob. (*Laban undeclined dat.) / OE Hept.: Þa cydde man Labane on þam ðriddan dæge þæt Jacob wæs asceacen. / Wyc. 1: it was tolde to Laban, the thridde day, that Jacob fleeiȝ. / Wyc. 2: it was teld to Laban, in the thridde dai, that Jacob fledde. / Doway: it was told Laban the third day that Jacob fled.

(2) *Exod. 14.5*—AV: And it was told the King of Egypt, that the people fled: Cf. MT: wayyuggaḏ ləmelek Mišrayim kî ḇāraḥ hā‘ām, (*lit.*: and-it-was-told to-king-of Egypt that fled the- people,) / LXX: Kai anēngēlē tōi basilei tōn Aigyptiōn hótī pépheugen ho laós: (*lit.*: And it-was-told to-the king of-the Egyptians that has-fled the people:) / V: Et nuntiatum est regi Aegyptiorum* quod fugisset populus: (*regi m.dat.sg., =to the king; Aegyptiorum m.gen.pl., =of Egyptians) / OE Hept.: x¹⁸ / Wyc. 1: And it is told to the kyng of Egipcians, that the puple hadde flowun; / Wyc. 2.: And it was teld to the kyng of Egipcians, that the puple hadde fled; / Doway: And it was told the king of Ægyptians that the people was fled:

(3) *1 Sam. [1 Kings] 23.7*—AV: And it was told Saul that David was come to Keilah. Cf. MT: wayyuggaḏ ləšā‘ûl kî ḇā’ Dāwīd Qə‘ilāh. (*lit.*: and-it-was-told to-Saul that went David Keilah.) / LXX: Kai apēngēlē tōi Saûl hótī hékei Dayid eis Keila: (*lit.*: And it-was-told to-the Saul that has-come David to Keila:) (*Saul undeclined dat., defined by the m.dat.sg. definite article tōi) / V: Nuntiatum est autem Saul* quod venisset David in Ceila: (*Saul=Sauli (Bagster ed.) dat. of Saul) / Wyc. 1: Forsothe it is toold to Saul, that Dauid was comen into Saylam; / Wyc. 2: Forsothe it was teld to Saul, that Dauid hadde come in to Seila; / Doway: And it was told Saul that David was come into Ceila:

(4) *1 Sam. [1 Kings] 27.4*—AV: And it was told Saul, that Dauid was fled to Gath, Cf. MT: wayyuggaḏ ləšā‘ûl kî ḇāraḥ Dāwīd Gaṯ, (*lit.*: and-it-was-told to-Saul that fled David Gath,) / LXX: Kai anēngēlē tōi Saûl hótī pépheugen Dayid eis Geth, (*lit.*: And it-was-told to-the Saul that has-fled David to Gath,) / V: Et nuntiatum est Saul quod fugisset David in Geth, / Wyc. 1: And it is toold to Saul, that Dauid was flownen into Geth; / Wyc. 2: And it was teld to Saul, that Dauid fledde in to Geth; / Doway: And it was told Saul that David was fled into Geth,

¹⁷ For Hebrew and Greek quotations I give literal word-for-word translations, after the mark “*lit.*”, connecting multiple English words used to translate one Hebrew/Greek word with hyphens. In doing this, I follow the format adopted by *The NIV Interlinear Hebrew-English Old Testament* (ed. J.R. Kohlenberger III), with a few modifications of my own, such as e.g. “and-it-was-told” for “and-he-was-told” as the translation of Hebrew wayyuggaḏ. For translations of quotations from the LXX—apart from the format mentioned above—I have referred to *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English* (ed. L.C.L. Brenton). And for Latin quotations I usually give partial notes but sometimes, when I think it better, give freer translations after the mark “=”.

¹⁸ The sign x indicates that there appears no expression of the relevant construction or that there appears some expression divergent in content.

Some comments will be added on the expressions in the earlier English Versions. In (1) (*Gen.* 31.22) the OE Hept. has the active construction “þa cydde man Labane . . . þæt . . .” with the indefinite *man* as subject. Stylistically, it is a simpler equivalent of the impersonal passive construction concerned.

As in the other examples of the relevant constructions, Wyc. 1 and 2 have *to*-phrases for dative elements in all these four examples, thus denoting the dative relation more explicitly. Another point to be commented on is that except in the case of (1), *Wyc.* 1 has *is told*, whereas *Wyc.* 2 has *was told*. This discloses the strict formal dependence of the Early Version upon the usage of the Latin passive perfect in the Vulgate, as against the freer and more idiomatic English style of the Later Version.

The Doway, though in the earlier stage, reveals the syntactic features of the AV in an even plainer manner.

ii. Next we shall observe two sets of examples: (5) *1 Kings* [3 *Kings*] 2.29 and (6) *1 Kings* [3 *Kings*] 2.41. Here we see the pattern of transition: MT *wayyuggaḏ + lə*-dative + *kī*-clause → LXX *apēngēlē + dative + légontes + hōti + direct speech* → V *nuntiatum est + dative + quod*-clause → AV *it was told + dative + that*-clause. The distinctive features are found in the LXX type. It contains the introductory word *légontes*, the nominative plural present participle meaning ‘saying.’ The medial presence of this Greek *légontes* should be compared with the use of *saying* in the AV type ‘*it was told him, saying + direct speech*,’ which will be treated in §2.4. Placed after the impersonal passive verb with the dative, it functions absolutely. This absolute use of the present participle, however, reveals a characteristic aspect of the impersonal passive construction concerned. This feature is followed by another remarkable one. Between *légontes* and the direct speech there stands the pleonastic conjunction *hōti*, as if to introduce a subordinate clause in indirect narration.¹⁹

The two sets of examples are as follows:

(5) *1 Kings* [3 *Kings*] 2.29—AV: And *it was told king Solomon that* Ioab fled vnto the Tabernacle of the lord, Cf. MT: *wayyuggaḏ lammeleḵ Šəlōmōh kī nās Yō’āb ’el ’ōhel YHWH*, (*lit.*: and-it-was-told to-the-king Solomon that fled Joab to tent-of Yahweh,) / LXX: *Kai apēngēlē tōi Salōmōn légontes hōti Éphygen Iōab eis tēn skēnēn tū kyrfū* (*lit.*: and it-was-told to-the Solomon they-saying that Fled Joab to the tabernacle of-the lord) / V: *Nuntiatumque est regi Salomoni* quod fugisset Ioab in tabernaculum Domini*, (**regi Salomoni* dat. of *rex Salomon* (m.) =king Solomon) / *Wyc.* 1: And *it is toold to kyng Salomon, that* Joab hadde flowen into the tabernacle of the Lord, / *Wyc.* 2: And *it was told to kyng Salomon, that* Jacob hadde fledde in to the tabernacle of the Lord, / Doway: And *it was told king Salomon, that* Ioab was fled into the tabernacle of our Lord,)

(6) *1 Kings* [3 *Kings*] 2.41—AV: And *it was told Solomon, that* Shimei had gone from Jerusalem to Gath, and was come againe. Cf. MT: *wayyuggaḏ liŠəlōmōh* kī hālaḵ Simé’i mīrūšālam Gaṭ wayyāšōḅ*, (*lit.*: and-it-was-told to-Solomon that went

¹⁹ This use of what is termed “*hōti* recitativum” is especially common in the Greek New Testament, and is characteristic of the familiar style of Greek works in general (cf. Blass & Debrunner (tr. R.W. Funk), *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, §470.1; H.W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §2590).

Shimei from-Jerusalem Gath and-he-returned,) (**li*Šālōmōh < *lā* Šālōmōh = to Solomon) / LXX: Kai apēngélē tōi Salōmōn légontes hóti Eporeúthē Semei ex Ierusalēm eis Geth kai anéstrepseñ tūs dūlūs autū. (*lit.*: And it-was-told to-the Solomon they-saying that Is-gone Shimei out-of Jerusalem to Gath and has-brought-back the servants his.) / V: *Nuntiatum est autem Salomoni quod* isset Semei in Geth de Hierusalem et redisset. / Wyc. 1: *It is toold* forsothe to kyng Salomon, that Semai was goon to Geth fro Jerusalem, and was turned azen. / Wyc. 2: Forsothe *it was teld* to kyng Salomon, that Semei hadde go to Geth fro Jerusalem, and hadde come azen. / Doway 2.41: And *it was told Salomon that* Semei went into Geth out of Ierusalem, and was returned.

iii. Each of the other four AV examples of the type '*it was told him that ~*' should be treated individually. For (7) *Judges* 9.47, the respective versions follow the line of transition: MT *wayyuggad* + *lā*-dative + *kī*-clause → LXX *apēngélē* + dative + *hóti*-clause → V *audiens* + accusative + accusative past participle → AV *it was told* + dative + *that*-clause. Here the Vulgate has recourse to a divergent way of expression, that is, a participial construction with *audiens* (=hearing) governing an accusative noun and past participle phrase.

(7) *Judges* 9.47—AV: And *it was told Abimelech, that* all the men of the towre of Shechem were gathered together. Cf. MT: *wayyuggad la'Ābimelech kī* hitqabbəšū kol ba'ālē migdal Šəkem. (*lit.*: and-it-was-told to-Abimelech that they-assembled all-of citizens-of tower-of Shechem.) / LXX A[B]: Kai apēngélē [anēngélē] tōi Abimelech hóti synéchthēsan pántes hoi ándres tū pýrgū Sikimōn [ándres pýrgōn Sychem]. (*lit.*: And it-was-told to-the Abimelech that were-gathered-together all the men of-the tower of-Sichimon [men of-the-towers of-Sychem].) / V: Abimelech quoque audiens viros turris Sycimorum pariter conglobatos, . . . (=Abimelech, also hearing the men of the tower of Shechem gathered together, . . .) / OE Hept.: x / Wyc. 1: And Abymelech herynge the men of the tour of Sichemys togidre gedred in o company, . . . / Wyc. 2: And Abymelech herde the men of the tour of Sichegaderid togidere, / Doway: Abimelech also hearing that the men of the towre of Sichegaderid were gathered together,

It should be noted that the Vulgate way of expression is generally followed by Wyc. 1 and 2 and the Doway, though Wyc. 2 has the clausal construction with the finite *herde* as predicate verb, and the Doway has the participial construction containing a *that*-clause as the object of *hearing*. Thus the impersonal passive construction has disappeared in these versions.

For (8) *1 Sam.* [*1 Kings*] 23.13, the Hebrew version has the type '*huggad* + *lā*-dative + *kī*-clause,' from which goes the line of transition: LXX *apēngélē* + dative + *hóti*-clause → V *nuntiatum est* + dative + *quod*-clause → AV *it was told* + dative + *that*-clause. In the MT version of this instance, the perfect *huggad* (instead of the imperfect *wayyuggad*) is used as predicate verb. Here, regulated by the characteristic Hebrew grammar of conjunctive narrative sequence,²⁰ the perfect verb in the first clause is followed by the *wa*²¹-prefixed imperfect verb in the second clause.

²⁰ Cf. T.G. Lambdin, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*, §§92, 132.

²¹ The *wa*- (<*wə*- = and) is the form required with the doubling of the initial consonant of the imperfect verb.

(8) *1 Sam [1 Kings] 23.13*—AV: And it was told Saul that David was escaped from Keilah, and hee forbore to goe foorth. Cf. MT: *ûlšā'ûl* huggad kî nimlaṭ Dā-wîd miqqə'îlāh, wayyehdal* lāšēṭ*. (*lit.*: and-to-Saul it-was-told that escaped David from-Keilah, and-he-forbore to-go.) (**ûlšā'ûl* < *wə- + lə + šā'ûl* = and to Saul; *wayyehdal* < *wə- + wehḏal qual* imperfect, =ceased) / LXX: *kal tōi Saūl apēngélē hōti di-asésō(s)tai Dayid ek Keīla, kal anēken tū exeltheîn*. (*lit.*: and to-the Saul it-was-told that had-escaped David from Keila, and he-forbore the to-go-out.) / V: *nuntiatumque est Saul quod fugisset David de Ceila quam ob rem dissimulavit exire.** (**quam ob rem . . . exire* = wherefore he feigned to go out) / Wyc. 1: And it is toold to Saul, that David hadde flowen fro Seila, and was sauid; for what skyl he laft to goon out. / Wyc. 2: And it was telde to Saul, that David hadde fledde fro Seila, and was saued; wherfor Saul dissymylide to go out. / Doway: and it was told Saul that David was fled from Ceila and was saued: for which cause he dissembled to goe forth.

In (9) *Job 37.20*, the AV contains a problematic point. There the subordinating *that* may be interpreted as indefinite relative, meaning 'what,' not as conjunction, since the corresponding Latin expression is the relative-interrogative *quae*. We should also note the use of *what thingis* in Wyc. 2 and *the things that* in the Doway. However, the syntactic nature of the *that* is rather subtle; and the close interrelation between the conjunction *that* and the relative *that* seems to suggest some primary characteristics inherent in the impersonal passive construction in question. In this respect, we should compare the use of the Hebrew conjunction *kî* in the MT version.

(9) *Job 37.20*—AV: *Shall it bee told him that I speake?* Cf. MT: *hayəsuppar lō* kî 'āḏabbēr*: (*lit.*: should-it-be-told to-him that I-would-speak?) (**hayəsuppar* < *ha-*interrogative marker + *yəsuppar* imperfect *pual*,²² m.3 sg. (cf. perfect *piel sippēr* = tell, narrate); *lō* < *lā-* (=to) + pronominal suffix meaning 'him') / LXX: *x* / V: *Quis narrabit ei quae loquor?* (=Who shall tell him what I speak?) / Wyc. 1: Who shal telle to hym, that I speke? / Wyc. 2: Who schal telle to hym, what thingis Y speke? / Doway: Who shal tel him the things I speake?

(10) *1 Sam. [1 Kings] 23.22* presents a strikingly particular case. Only the MT, the LXX and the AV agree in content, whereas the Vulgate has its content differently expressed, and this way of expression is followed by Wyc. 1 and 2 and the Doway. Even limiting our attention to the MT-LXX-AV line, we find the peculiarity that the AV alone has the impersonal passive construction "*it is told mee that ~,*" while the MT has the active construction with the third person singular verb *'āmar* implying an indefinite agent as its subject. It should also be noted that the object clause there is asyndetically combined with the leading predicate without the conjunction *kî*. In the LXX version the relevant content is expressed in the compressed form of an adverbial clause.

(10) *1 Sam [1 Kings] 23.22*—AV: *for it is told mee that he dealeth very subtilly.* Cf. MT: *kî 'āmar 'ēlay, 'ārōm* ya'rim hū'*. (*lit.*: for someone-said to-me, to-be-crafty is-crafty he.) (**'ēlay* < *'el* = to, towards + pronominal suffix meaning 'me'; *'ārōm* (in-

²² The *pual* is the passive counterpart of the *piel*, whose primary function is factitive or causative.

finitive absolute) preceding the cognate finite verb *va'rim* (imperfect *hiphil*, m. 3 sg.), meaning '(he) is very crafty') / LXX: *mēpote panūrgeúsētai*: (*lit.*: lest-ever he-should-deal-craftily:)

For the present purpose, we think it enough to take these three versions into account.

2.4. II. Type 'it was told him (saying) + direct speech'

In the Old Testament of the AV we find 14 examples of the type 'it was told him, saying, + direct speech' and a single example (2 *Sam.* 19.1) of the type 'it was told him + direct speech.' Another instance of the same kind of direct narration can be quoted from the New Testament (*Luke* 8.20), and it appears in the more explicitly grammatical construction "it was told him by certaine which saide, . . ."

The type 'it was told him, saying, + direct speech,' occurring 14 times exclusively within the Old Testament, forms the most prevalent group of all the constructions concerned. As in the case of the LXX versions of (5) and (6) in §2.3, this AV type contains the syntactic peculiarity that the impersonal passive 'it was told him' is followed by the present participle *saying*, which is used absolutely with the implied agent as its sense-subject. It is, as it were, strainedly—or we might rather say, naively—used to link the direct speech to the impersonal passive predicate, as though the latter were the personal active predicate. It appears so peculiar to the AV usage that we find it difficult to cite any parallel instances from earlier English texts.²³ This suggests the necessity of seeking for the external influence of the Hebrew, Greek and Latin usage as it occurs in the respective versions of the MT, the LXX and the Vulgate. Actually, as will be illustrated below, this peculiar use of *saying* in the AV can be traced back to the corresponding Greek use of *légontes* in the LXX, which in turn is to be attributed to the Hebrew use of the infinitive construct *lē'mōr* in the MT.

i. First we shall take up six sets of examples (1)~(6), in each of which we see the line of transition: MT *wayyuggad* + *lā*-dative + *lē'mōr* + direct speech → LXX *apēngélē* [*anēngélē*] + dative + *légontes* + direct speech → V *nuntiatum est* + dative + *quod* [*eo quod*]-clause / *a dicentibus* + direct speech → AV *it was told* + dative + *saying* + direct speech.

Here we would make a brief comment on the Hebrew infinitive construct *lē'mōr*. Morphologically, *lē'mōr* is a prepositional form composed of *lā*- (=to) and *'ēmōr*, the infinitive construct for the perfect *qal 'āmar* (=say). The prepositional infinitive construct, like the present participle *saying*, is used adverbially to introduce direct speech.²⁶

We shall begin by showing four examples as follows:

(1) *Gen.* 22.20—AV: And it came to passe after these things, that *it was told Abraham, saying*, Behold Milcah, shee hath also borne children vnto thy brother Nahor, . . . Cf. MT: Wayəhî* 'aḥrê haddəbārîm hā'ēlleh wayyuggad* lə'Abrahām lē'mōr, hinnēh, yāləqāh Milkāh gam-hiw' bānîm ləNāḥōr 'ahîkā, . . . (*lit.*: and-it-was after the-things the-those that-it-was-told to-Abraham to-say, see! she-bore Milcah also-

²³ Though we can exemplify the appositive use of OE *cwæðende* or ME *seying*, e.g.: Se Wealdenda Drihten sæde ðis bigspell his gingrum, ðus *cwæðende*, "Sum welig man wæs mid purpuran and godewebbe geglenged, . . . —*ÆCHom* I.328.12–14. (=The Sovereign Lord said this parable to his disciples, thus saying, "There was a certain rich man adorned with purple and fine linen, . . .) / To whom sche spake, *seying* as ze schal here: "My owne Iason, . . . —Lydg., *TB* I. 2982–8 [a1420]. Also cf. the Wyc. 1 versions of (7), (11), (14) below, and (1) in §2.7.

²⁶ This use of the infinitive construct is stereotyped (cf. *Genenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §114.4).

she sons to-Nahor mother-of-you, . . .) (*The *wə-* in *wayəhi* and the *wə-* in *wayyuggaḏ* are correlated so as to constitute the sense 'and it . . . that') / LXX: Egéneto dè metà tà rhēmata taūta kaì *anēngélē tōi Abraam légontes* Idù tétoken Melcha kaì autē hyiūs Nachōr tōi adelphōi sū, . . . (*lit.*: It-happened and after the things these that it-was-told to-the Abraham they-saying See has-borne Melcha too herself sons to-Nahor to-the brother thy,) / V: His itaque gestis, *nuntiatum est Abraham* quod* Melcha quoque genuisset filios Nahor fratri suo, . . . (=It so happened after these that it was told Abraham that Melcha had also borne sons to his brother Nahor, . . .) (**Abraham*=*Abrahæ* (Bagster ed.) dat. of *Abraham*) / OE Hept. (MS.C):²⁷ *Him wiarð wiððan gesæd, þat xii sunu wæron acennodon his breðer Nachor: . . .* / Wyc. 1: And so thes thingis don, *it was told to Abraham, that* Melcha forsothe had getun sones to Nachor, his brother; . . . / Wyc. 2: And so whanne these thingis weren don, *it was told to Abraham that* also Melcha hadde bore sones to Nachor his brother; . . . / Doway: These things so being done, *it was told Abraham that* Melca also had borne children to Nachor his brother, . . .

(2) *Gen. 38.13*—AV: And *it was told Tamar, saying*, Behold, thy father in law goeth vp to Timmath to sheare him sheepe. Cf. MT: *wayyuggaḏ, ləTāmār, lə'mōr, hinnēh ḥāmīk 'oleh Timnāṭāh lāgōz š'ō'nō*: (*lit.*: and-it-was-told to-Tamar, to-say, See! father-in-law-of-you going-up to-Timnah to-shear sheep-of-him:) / LXX: Kaì *apēngélē Thamar tēi nýmohēi autū légontes* Idù ho pentherós sū anabaínei eis Thamna kéirai tà próbata autū. (*lit.*: And it-was-told Thamar the daughter-in-law his they-saying See the father-in-law thy goes-up to Thamna to-shear the sheep his.) / V: *Nuntiatumque est Thamar* quod* socer illius ascenderet* in Thamnas ad tondendas oves.* (**Thamar* undeclined dat.: *ascenderet* subj. imperfect 3 sg.,=was going up; *ad tondendas oves*=for shearing the sheep, to shear the sheep) / OE Hept.: ða cydde man ðamare þæt hyre swear for to ðamnatha hys scēp to scyrene. (=then someone told Thamar that her father-in-law went to Thamnatha to shear his sheep.) / Wyc. 1: And *it was told to Thamar, that* hir housbonde fader steiede vp into Tampnas, to the sheep that shulden be clippid. / Wyc. 2: And *it was told to Thamar, that* the fadir of hir hosebonde stiede to Thampnas, to schere scēep. / Doway: And *it was told Thamar that* her father in law came vp into Thamnas to sheare his sheepe.

(3) *Josh. 10.17*—AV: And *it was told Ioshua, saying*, The fiue kings are found hid in a caue at Makkedah. Cf. MT: *wayyuggaḏ lihōsua* lə'mōr, nimšə'u ḥāmēšet hamməlākīm neḥbə'im bammə'ārāh bəMaqqēdāh*, (*lit.*: and-it-was-told to-Joshua to-say, were-found fiue-of the-kings ones-hiding in-the-cave at-the-Makkedah.) (**lihōsua*'<*lə-Yəhōsua*'=to Joshua) / LXX: Kaì *apēngélē tōi Iēsū* légontes* Heurēntai hoi pénte basileis kekrymménoi en tōi spēlaíoi tōi en Makēda. (*lit.*: And it-was-told to-the Joshua they-saying Have-been-found the five kings hidden in the cave the in Makeda.) (**Iēsū* dat. of *Iēsus* (m.)=Joshua) / V: *Nuntiatumque est Iosue, quod* inventi essent quinque reges latentes in spelunca urbio Maceda. (=And it was told Joshua that the five kings were found hiding in a cave of the city of Makeda.) / OE Hept.: ða

²⁷ This quotation is the first half of the "addition" in Crawford's edition of *The Heptateuch* whose content roughly covers *Gen. 22.20–24*.

wearð Iosue gecyðð ðæt ða cyningas ðær lagon behyðde on ðam scræfe. (=Then it was told Joshua that the kings lay hidden there in the cave.) / Wyc. 1: And *it is told to Josue, that* there were foundun fyue kyngis lurkinge in the spelunk of the cite of Maceda. / Wyc. 2: And *it was told to Josue, that* the fyue kyngis weren foundun hid in the denne of the citee of Maceda. / Doway: And *it was told Josue that* the fue|kinges were found lying hid in a caue of the cite of Maceda.

(4) *2 Sam. [2 Kings] 6.12—AV: And it was told Dauid, saying,* The Lord hath blessed the house of Obed Edom, . . . Cf. MT: *wayyuggaḏ lammelek Dāwīḏ lē'mōr, bēraḳ YHWH 'eṭ-bēt 'Obēḏ 'Ēḏōm, . . .* (*lit.*: and-it-was-told to-the-king David to-say, blessed Yahweh [acc.s.]²⁸-household-of Obed Edom, . . .) / LXX: *Kaī apēngēlē tōi basileī Dayid lēgontes Eulōgēsēn kýrios tōn oīkon Abeddara . . .* (*lit.*: And it-was-told to-the king David they-saying Has-blessed the-lord the house of-Abeddara . . .) / V: *Nuntiatumque est regi David benedixit [quod benedixisset]* Dominus Obededon, . . .* (**benedixit* ¹ind. perf. 3 sg., =has blessed [*quod benedixisset* (subj. pluperf. 3 sg.) (Bagster ed.)=that . . . had blessed]) / Wyc. 1: And *it is toold to the kyng Dauid, that* the Lord hadde blessid Obethedon, . . . / Wyc. 2: And *it was told to the kyng Dauid, that* the Lord hadde blessid Obethedom, . . . / Doway: And *it was told king Dauid, that* our Lord had blessed Obededom, . . .

In these four examples, while the AV follows the MT and LXX way of direct narration, the earlier English Versions follow the Vulgate way of indirect narration. The OE Hept. versions of (1), (2) and (3) show some remarkable features in respect of the relevant constructions. While we see the impersonal passive constructions with the passive predicate verbs *wiarð gesæd* and *wearð gecyðð* in (1) and (3) respectively, there appears in (2) the active construction with the indefinite pronoun *man* as subject “*cyðde* (pret. sg. of *cyðan*) *man* þamare þæt . . .”. Especially, “*wearð Iosue gecyðð ðæt . . .*,” with the dative noun placed before the past participle, appears to imply the greater potentiality of leading to the personal passive construction ‘*Joshua was told that . . .*’.

To these should be added exalmples (5) (*1 Sam. [1 Kings] 15.12*), where the Vulgate has a complementary clause introduced by *eo quod*, in place of the simple *quod*. This Latin *eo*²⁷ *quod*, whose original sense is ‘for that that, on that account that,’ just corresponds to the English *for that*. It seems significant that the primary function of *quod* itself, as was mentioned in the previous section, is to introduce an explanatory or complementary, or rather, in a sense, an adverbial clause; and so the function of *eo quod* is to denote this adverbial significance more explicitly. It should be noted that this *eo quod* in the Vulgate is represented by *for* in Wyc. 1, though it is displaced by *that* in Wyc. 2 (and also in the Doway).

(5) *1 Sam. [1 Kings] 15.12—AV: And when Samuel rose early to meet Saul in the morning, it was tolde Samuel, saying,* Saul came to Carmel, . . . Cf. MT: *way-yaškēm Šəmū'el liqera'ṭ Šā'ul babbōqer, wayyuggaḏ liŠəmū'el lē'mōr, bā' Šā'ul hakkarmelāh, . . .* (*lit.*: and-got-up Samuel to-meet Saul in-the-morning, and-it-was-told

²⁸ The Hebrew *'eṭ*, which is the *accusative sign* or *object marker*, is marked “[acc.s.]” It is chiefly used to indicate that the noun following is in the accusative relation, especially when it is a proper name or is defined by a definite article or by a determinate genitive (cf. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §117. a-b).

²⁷ Originally *eo* is the ablative of the neuter demonstrative *id* (=that).

to-Samuel to-say, went Saul to-the-Carmel, . . .) / LXX: Καὶ ὄρθρῃσεν Σαμουὴλ καὶ ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἀπᾶντῆσιν Ἰσραὴλ πρόϊ. Καὶ ἀπᾶνγῆλῃ τοῖς Σαμουὴλ λέγοντες Ἡέκει Σαὺλ εἰς Καρμῆλον . . . (*lit.*: And rose-early Samuel and went to meet Israel early-in-the-morning. And it-was-told to-the Samuel they-saying Has-come Saul to Carmel . . .) / V: Cumque de nocte surrexisset Samuhel, ut iret* ad Saul mane, nuntiatum est Samuheli,* eo quod venisset Saul in Carmelum, . . . (**ut iret*=so that he might go; *Samuheli* dat. of *Samuhel*) / Wyc. 1: And whanne fro nyzt Samuel was rysen that he go to Saul eerli, *it is toold to Samuel, for Saul was comen into Carmeel, . . .* / Wyc. 2: And whanne Samuel hadde rise bi nyzt to go eerly to Saul, *it was teld to Samuel, that Saul hadde come in to Carmel, . . .* / Doway: And when Samuel had risen in the nyght, to goe to Saul in the morning, *it was told Samuel, that Saul was come into Carmelus, . . .*

For (6) *1 Sam [1 Kings] 19.19* the vulgate version has another variation. There the impersonal passive ‘*nuntiatum est*+dative’ is followed by *a dicentibus*, which introduces the direct speech. In contrast to *lē’mōr* in the MT, *lēgontes* in the LXX, and *saying* in the AV, *a dicentibus* in the Vulgate is used with syntactic coherence. The phrase is composed of the preposition *ā* (=ab, meaning ‘by’) and the ablative plural present participle *dicentibus* and makes the meaning ‘by those saying.’ It thus functions very logically as adverbial of agency for the passive predicate. It may be worth noting that this Latin locution is copied by Wyc. 1 with “*of seieres* (=sayers),” by Wyc. 2 with “*of men, seiyng*,” and by the Doway with “*by some saying*.”

(6) *1 Sam. [1 Kings] 19.19*—AC: And *it was told Saul, saying*, Behold, David is at Naioth in Ramah. Cf. MT: *wayyuggad ləšā’ul lē’mōr*, hinnēh Dāwīd bəNwyṭ bāRāmāh. (*lit.*: and-it-was-told to-Saul to-say, see! David in-Naioth at-the-Ramah.) / LXX: Καὶ ἀπᾶνγῆλῃ τοῖς Σαὺλ λέγοντες Ἰδὺ Δαυὶδ ἐν Ναυαθ ἐν Ραμα. (*lit.*: And it-was-told to-the Saul they-saying See David in Navath in Rama.) / V: *Nuntiatum est autem Sauli a dicentibus*: Ecce David in Nahioth in Rama. / Wyc. 1: Forsothe *it is toold to Saul of seieres*, Loo! Dauyd in Naioth in Ramatha. / Wyc. 2: Forsothe *it was teld to Saul of men, seiyng*, Lo! Dauid is in Naioth in Ramatha. / Doway: And *it was told Saul by some saying*: Behold David is in Naioth in Ramatha.

ii. As for the three examples—(7) *Gen. 38.24*, (8) *1 Kings [3 Kings] 1.51*, and (9) *Isa. 7.2*—the Vulgate version of each again shows an excessively logical construction with the active predicate verb: *nuntiaverunt*+dative+*dicentes*+direct speech,’ where *nuntiaverunt* is a third person plural perfect, meaning ‘(they) told.’ So the nominative plural present participle *dicentes* (=saying) is coherently related to the active finite verb *nuntiaverunt*.

This coherent construction with the active predicate in the Vulgate is in sharp contrast with the impersonal passive construction loosely accompanied by the nominative present participle Gk *lēgontes* and E *saying* in the LXX and the AV, which may radically be traced back to the Hebrew construction with the *lə*-infinitive construct *lē’mōr* in the MT. And the Vulgate style of the active construction is followed by Wyc. 1 and 2 and the Doway, with some minor characteristic features in the respective versions, such as “*telden . . . , and seiden*” in Wyc. 2, as against “*tolden . . . , seiyng [seiende]*” in Wyc. 1.

(7) *Gen. 38.24*—AV: And it came to passe about three months after, that *it was*

tolde Iudah, saying, Tamar thy daughter in law hath played the harlot, . . . Cf. MT: wayəhî kəmišlōš ḥoḏāšim wayyuggaḏ līhūdāh lē'mōr, zānəṭāh Tāmār kallāteḳā, . . . (*lit.*: and-it-was about-three-of months that-it-was-told to-Judah to-say, played-harlot Tamar daughter-in-law-of-you, . . .) / LXX: Egéneto dè metà trímēnon anēngélē tōi Iūda* légontes Ekpepórneuken Thamar hē nýmphē sū . . . (*lit.*: It-happened and after three-months it-was-told to-the Judah they-saying Has-played-grievously Thamar the daughter-in-law thy . . .) (*Iūda=Iūdāi³⁰ dat., cf. nom. Iūdas) / V: Ecce autem post tres menses nuntiaverunt Iudae,* dicentes: Fornicata est Thamar nurus tua, . . . (*Iudae dat. of Iudas=Judah) / OE Hept.: Ða æfter þrim monþum hi cwædon to Iudan: Thamar þin snoru is forlegen . . . (=Then after three months they said to Judah: Thamar your daughter-in-law has fornicated . . .) / Wyc. 1: Loo! forsothe after thre monethis men tolden to Jude, seiynge, Thamar, thi sones wijf, hath doon fornycacioun, . . . / Wyc. 2: Lo! sotheli aftir thre monethis thei telden to Judas, and seiden, [Thamar, wiif of thi sone, hath do fornycacioun, . . . / Doway: And behold after three moneths they told Iudas, saying: Thamar thy daughter in law hath played the harlot, . . .

(8) *1 Kings [3 Kings] 1.51—AV: And it was tolde Solomon, saying, Behold, Adonijah feareth Solomon: . . .* Cf. MT: wayyuggaḏ liSəlōmōh lē'mōr, hinnēh 'Āḏoniyyāhū yārē' 'eṭ hammeleḳ Šəlōmōh, . . . (*lit.*: and-it-was-told to-Solomon to-say, see! Adonijah fears [acc.s.] the-king Solomon, (. . .) / LXX: Kai anēngélē tōi Salōmōn légontes Idū Adōnias ephobēthē tòn basiléa Salōmōn . . . (*lit.*: And it-was-told to-the Solomon they-saying See Adonias fears the king Solomon . . .) / V: Et nuntiaverunt Salomoni,* dicentes: Ecce Adonias, timens regem Salomonem, . . .) (*Salomoni dat. of Salomon) / Wyc. 1: And thei toolden to Salomon seiynge, Loo! Adonyas dredynge kyng Salomon, . . . / Wyc. 2: And thei telden to Salomon, and seiden, Lo! Adonye dredith the kyng Salomon, . . . / Doway: And they told Salomon saying: Behold Adonias fearing king Salomon, . . .

Particularly, the LXX version of (9) *Isa. 7.2* contains a marked point. There the recipient of the information is analytically expressed by the prepositional phrase “eis tòn oïkon Dayid (=to the house of David),” where the preposition *eis* governs the accusative (*Dayid* being an undeclined genitive). This Greek usage should be compared with the Latin construction in the Vulgate, where the active *nuntiaverunt* is directly followed by the dative *domui* (dat. of *domus* (f.)=house).

(9) *Isa. 7.2—AV: And it was told the house of David, saying, Syria is confederate with Ephraim: Cf. MT: wayyuggaḏ ləḥēṭ Dāwīḏ lē'mōr, nāḥāh 'Ārām 'al 'Eprāim. (lit.*: and-it-was-told to-house-of David to-say, allied-herself Aram with Ephraim.) / LXX: Kai anēngélē eis tòn oïkon Dayid légontes Synephōnēsen Aram pròs ton Ephraim: (*lit.*: And it-was-told to the house of-David they-saying Conspired Aram with the Ephraim:) / V: Et nuntiaverunt domui David, dicentes: Requievit Syria super Ephraim. / Wyc. 1: And thei toolden to the hous of David, seiende, Siria restede vp on Effraym, / Wyc. 2: And thei telden to the hous of David, and seiden, Sirie hath rested on Effraym, / Doway: And they told the house of David, saying: Syrie hath rested vpon Ephraim,

³⁰ Cf. J.W. Wevers (ed.): *Septuaginta*, Vol. I: *Genesis*, p. 367.

iii. Next we shall take up two sets of examples, i.e. (10) *2 Kings* [*4 Kings*] 6.11 and (11) *2 Kings* [*4 Kings*] 8.7. There the most marked feature is that the LXX has the active construction of the type 'apéngeilan [anéngelian] + dative + légontes + direct speech.' Apéngeilan [anéngelian] is active first aorist, third person plural, meaning 'they told.' This Greek construction thus agrees with the Latin type of construction as it occurs in the Vulgate versions of (7), (8) and (9), though the Vulgate version of (10) has as the active verb *adnuntiaverunt*, in place of *nunciaverunt*. (The two verbs are synonymous, both perfect third person plural, meaning 'they told.') This LXX and V style with the active construction is followed by Wyc. 1 and 2 and the Doway. It is thus that in the case of (10) and (11) we have anomalous patterns of transition, that is, the MT-AV impersonal passive pattern, on one hand, and the LXX-V-Wyc. 1 & 2-Doway active pattern, on the other.

(10) *2 Kings* [*4 Kings*] 6.13—AV: And it was tolde him, saying, Behold, he is in Dothan. Cf. MT: wayyuggaḏ lô* lē'mōr, hinnēh ḥəDōṭān. (lit.: and-it-was-told to-him to-say, see! in-Dothan.) (*lô < lā = to + m. 3 sg. pronominal suffix) / LXX: kal apéngeilan autōi* légontes Idū en Dothaim. (lit.: and they-told him saying See in Dothan.) (*autōi as 3rd personal pron., m.dat.sg.) / V: Adnuntiaveruntque ei,* dicentes: Ecce in Dothan. (*eī dem. pron., m.dat.sg., = (to) him) / Wyc. 1: and thei tolden to him, sayinge, Loo! in Dotaym dwellith. / Wyc. 2: And thei telden to him, and seiden, Lo! he dwellith in Dothaym. / Doway: And they told him, saying: Behold in Dothan.

(11) *2 Kings* [*4 Kings*] 8.7—AV: And it was tolde him, saying, The man of God is come hither. Cf. MT: wayyuggaḏ lô lē'mōr, bā' 'iš hā'ēlōhīm 'aḏ hēnnāh. (lit.: and-it-was-told to-him to-say, came man-of the-God to here.) / LXX: kal anéngelian autōi légontes Hēkei ho ánthrōpos tū theū hēōs hōde. (lit.: and they-told him saying Has-come the man of-the God to here.) / V: nuntiaveruntque ei, dicentes: Venit vir Dei huc. / Wyc. 1: and thei tolden to hym, sayinge, The man of God is comen hydre. / Wyc. 2: and thei telden to hym, and seiden, The man of God came hidur. / Doway: and they told him, saying: The man of God cometh hither.

iv. The Old Testament of the AV contains three other examples of the type 'it was told him, saying + direct speech,' i.e. (12) *Josh.* 2.2, (13) *Judges* 16.2, and (14) *1 Sam.* 24.1. Along the line of transition for each of these examples, we find some distinctive or peculiar points, as compared with the case of those examples hitherto examined in this section.

The line of transition with regard to (12) *Josh.* 2.2 is strictly normal in having proceeded with the impersonal passive construction in direct narration. Only the MT version has as the main verb *yē'āmar* (=it was said), that is, the imperfect *niphal*, whose original function is medio-passive, instead of the imperfect *hophal yuggaḏ*, as it occurs in most of the examples hitherto examined in this and the previous sections. The Vulgate version has the compound passive verb "nuntiatum est . . . et dictum," and this style is followed by the earlier English Versions, except the OE Hept.

(12) *Josh.* 2.2—AV: And it was told the king of Jericho, saying, Behold, there came men in hither to night, of the children of Israel, to search out the country. Cf. MT: wayyē'āmar lamelek Yārîhō, lē'mōr, hinnēh 'ānāšîm bā'ū hēnnāh hallaylāh miḇbānē Yîsrā'ēl laḥpōr 'eṭ hā'āreš. (lit.: and-it-was-told to-king-of Jericho, to-say, see! men came here the-night from-sons-of Israel to-spy-out [acc.s.] the-land.) / LXX: Kai

apēngēlē tōi basilef Ierichō légontes Eispepóreuntai hôide ándres tōn hyiōn Israēl katas-
kopeúsai tēn gên. (*lit.*: And it-was-told to-the king of-Jericho they-saying Have-come-
in hither men of-the sons of-Israel to-spy the land.) / V: *Nuntiatumque est regi Hiericho, et dictum*: Ecce viri ingressi sunt huc per noctem de filiis Israel, ut* explorarent
terram. (**ut . . . terram*=so that they might explore the land) / OE Hept.³¹: Ða wearð
ðam cyninge gecyðd ðæt ðær comon sceaweras of Israhela bearnum, ðæt hi ða burh scea-
wodon, (=Then it was told the king that there came spies of the children of Israel so
that they might search out the city,) / Wyc. 1: And *it is told to the kyng of Jerycho, and
seid*, Loo! men ben goon yn hythir bi nyzt, of the sones of Yrael, for to aspye the loond.
/ Wyc. 2: And *it was teld, and seid to the kyng of Jerico*, Lo! men of the sones of Israel
entriden hidir bi nyzt, to asprie the lond. / Doway: And *it was told the king of Iericho,
and seid*: Behold there are men come in hither by night of the children of Israel, to spie
the land.

Thus the OE Hept. alone has recourse to indirect narration. There, as in the case
of the OE Hept. version of (3) *Josh. 10.17* above, "*wearð ðam cyninge gecyðd ðæt . . .*" ap-
pears to imply the particular potentiality of leading to the personal passive '*the king was
told that . . .*'

Of (13) *Judges 16.2*, the MT version has the particular style of elliptical construction,
where the main predicate verb, such as *wayyuggad*, has been suppressed. What seems
more peculiar is that the Vulgate version is composed with a different kind of construction,
which reveals an aspect characteristic of Latin syntax. There we find the impersonal in-
transitive verb in the subjunctive³² preterite perfect, third person singular, *percrebuisset*
(=it had got well known) as predicate verb, followed by the perfect infinitive with nom-
inative, *intrasse Samson* (=for Samson to have entered). This manner of expression in
the Vulgate is strictly followed by Wyc. 1 with "*was pupplished* (=published) . . . , *Samson
to haue comen*." Wyc. 2 copies it by replacing the infinitive phrase with a *that*-clause. In
a similar way the Doway has recourse to the leading structure "*it was bruted . . . that . . .*".
It is also noteworthy that while Wyc. 2 and the Doway have the type of construction '*it
. . . that ~,*' Wyc. 1 has recourse to that older type of impersonal construction which is not
supplied with the formal subject *it*.

(13) *Judges 16.2*—AV: And *it was told the Gazites, saying*, Samson is come hither.
Cf. MT: *la'azzātim, lē'mōr, bā' Šimšōn hennah*. (*lit.*: to-the Gazites, to-say, came
Samson hither.) / LXX: A[B] Καὶ ἀπὲνγέλε [ἀνὲνγέλε] τοῖς Γαζαίοις λέγοντες Ἡέκει Σαμψόν
εὐταῦθα [hôide]. (*lit.*: And it-was-told to-the Gazites they-saying Has-come Samson
hither.) / V: Quod cum audissent Philisthim, et percrebuisset apud eos, intrasse urbem
Samson, . . . (=Which when the Philistines had heard, and it had been well known
among them that Samson had entered the city, . . .) / OE Hept.: x / Wyc. 1: The which
thing whanne Philistiens hadden seen, and was pupplishid anentis hem, Sampson to
haue comen into the citee, . . . / Wyc. 2: And whanne Filisteis hadden seyn this, and
it was pupplischid at hem, that Sampson entride in to the citee, . . . / Doway: Which

³¹ The corresponding Latin version appended in Crawford's edition of *The Heptateuch* runs: Nuntiatum-
que est regi Iericho: Ecce . . .

³² In the Vulgate version, the relevant content is expressed within a subordinate clause of time, introduced
by *cum* (=when), which grammatically requires the predicate verb to take the subjunctive form.

when the Philisthiims had heard, and it was bruted among them, that Samson was entered into the citie, . . .

The predecessors of (14) *1 Sam.* 24.1 involve a number of peculiarities. First, in respect of textual location, *1 Sam.* 24.1 of the AV corresponds to *1 Sam.* 24.2 of the MT, and accordingly to *1 Kings* 24.2 of the LXX, the V, Wyc. 1 and 2, and the Doway. For the present inclusive observation, we specially adopt the heading "*1 Sam.* 24.1[2] / *1 Kings* 24.2."

Secondly, the MT version reveals a marked feature in having the leading verb in the active, that is, the third person plural imperfect *hiphil yaggidû* (=they told), followed by 'la-dative+lē'mōr+direct speech,' where the use of the infinitive construct is syntactically coherent. This style of expression is here followed by the Vulgate, where we find the type of construction: 'nuntiaverunt+dative+dicentes+direct speech,' just as in (7), (8) and (9) above. The Vulgate style is in turn followed by Wyc. 1 and 2 and the Doway, as in the case of the examples hitherto examined. On the other hand, the LXX version appears in the impersonal passive construction of the type 'apēngélē+dative+legóntōn+hóti+direct speech.' As contrasted with the nominative plural present participle *legontes* introducing *hóti*+direct speech, as in (5) and (6) in §2.3, or directly introducing direct speech, as in all the other examples (except the last one (16)) in this section, *legóntōn* is genitive plural and here it is used with syntactic coherence. After the impersonal passive predicate the genitive present participle denotes a sort of cause, that is, agency, meaning 'by them saying.' In this instance, it is the LXX version, not the MT version, that the AV usage should be traced back to.

(14) *1 Sam.* 24.1[2] / *1 Kings* 24.2—AV: And it came to passe when Saul was returned from folowing the Philistines, that *it was told him, saying*, Behold, Daudid is in the wilderness of En-gedi. Cf. MT: wayōhî ka'āšer šāḥ* Šā'ûl mē'ahārē Pəlišṭîm, wayyaggidû* lô, lē'mōr, hinnēh Dāwîd bəmiḏbar 'Ēn Gedî. (*lit.*: and-it-was just-as returned Saul from-after Philistines, then-they-told to-him, to-say, see! David in-desert-of En Gedi.) (*The perfect *qal šāḥ* in the first clause and the *wa*-prefixed imperfect *hiphil wayyaggidû* in the second clause constitute a conjunctive narrative sequence.) / LXX: Kai egenēthē hōs anēstrepsen Saûl apò ópisthen tōn allophýlōn, kai apēngélē autōi legóntōn hóti Dayid en têi erēmōi Engaddi. (*lit.*: And it-happened when returned Saul from after the Philistines, that it-was-told him by-them-saying that David in the wilderness of-Engedi.) / V: Cumque reversus esset Saul, postquam persecutus est Philistheos, nuntiaverunt ei* dicentes: Ecce, David in deserto est Engaddi. (**eī* dem. pron., m. dat. sg.) / Wyc. 1: And whanne Saul was turned azen, after that he hadde pursued the Philisteis, *thei toolden to hym, seiyng*, Loo! Daudid is in the deseert of Engaddi. / Wyc. 2: And whanne Saul turnede azen, aftir that he pursuede Filisteis, *thei telden to hym, and seiden*, Lo! Daudid is in the desert of Engaddi. / Doway: And when Saul was returned, after he pursued the Philistians, *they told him, saying*: Behold, Daudid is in the desert Engaddi.

v. The AV contains a single example of the type 'it was told+dative+direct speech' without the introductory *saying*, as against so many examples of the corresponding type with *saying*. The example is (15) *2 Sam.* 19.1. (This verse is assigned to *2 Sam.* 19.2 in the MT and *2 Kings* 19.2 in the LXX. For the inclusive heading, therefore, we adopt "*2 Sam.*

[2 *Kings*] 19.1[2].”) We find that it corresponds exactly to the type of construction occurring in the MT version: ‘wayyuggaḏ + lə-dative + direct speech’ without the introductory *lē’mōr*. This special, or exceptional, phenomenon can thus be accounted for. The LXX, on the other hand, has recourse to the more usual pattern ‘anēngélē + dative + légontes + direct speech.’ The Vulgate has the type of indirect narration, ‘nuntiatum est + dative + quod-clause,’ and this way of expression is followed by Wyc. 1 and 2 and the Doway.

It might be added in this context that, as will be examined in Chapter III, the later English versions have usually adopted the simpler type (i.e. without *saying*) of direct narration with the impersonal passive predicate where the older construction is preserved.

(15) 2 *Sam.* [2 *Kings*] 19.1[2]—AV: And it was told Iob, Behold, the king weepeth and mourneth for Absalom. Cf. MT: wayyuggaḏ ləYô’āb, hinnēh, hammelek bōkēh wayyit’abbēl ‘al ‘Abšālōm. (lit.: and-it-was-told to-Joab, see! the-king weeping and-mourns for Absalom.) / LXX: Kai anēngélē tōi Iōab légontes Idū ho basleūs klaiei kai pentheī epī Abessalōm. (lit.: And it-was-told to-the Joab they-saying See the king weeps and mourns for Absalom.) / V: Nuntiatum est autem Iob quod rex fleret et lugeret filium suum: / Wyc. 1: Forsothe it is toold to Joab, that the kyng wept, and weilide his sone; / Wyc. 2: Forsothe it was teld to Joab, that the kyng wepte, and biweilide his sone; / Doway: And it was told Iob, that the king wept, and mourned for his sonne:

vi. The New Testament of the AV contains a single example (*Luke* 8.20) of the impersonal passive construction under consideration. Below we shall show it along with its predecessors, that is, the corresponding versions of the NTGk, the V, the WS Gosp., Wyc. 1 and 2, Tyn. and the Rhemes.

(16) *Luke* 8.20—AV: And it was told him by certaine which saide, Thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to see thee. Cf. NTGk: Apēnéglē dē autōi;* hē mētēr sū kai hoi adelphoi sū hestēkasin éxō ideîn thélontés se. (lit.: It-was-told and to-him: the mother thy and the brothers thy are-standing outside to-see wishing thee.) (*autōi as 3rd personal pron., m.dat.sg.) / V: Et nuntiatum est illi:* Mater tua, et fratres tui stant foris, volentes te videre. (*illi dem. pron., m.dat.sg.) / WS Gosp.: Þa wæs him gecyðed, þin modor and þine gebroðru standað her ute, wyllað þe geseon. (=Then it was told him, “Your mother and your brothers are standing outside here and want to see you.”) / Wyc. 1: And it is told to him, Thi modir and thi britheren stonden with oute forth, willinge to se thee. / Wyc. 2: And it was teeld to hym, Thi modir and thi britheren stonden with outforth, willynge to se thee. / Tyn.: And they tolde hym sayinge: Thy mother and thy brethren stande wyth out, and wolde se the. / Rhemes: And it was told him, Thy mother and thy bretheren stand without, desirous to see thee.

Thus all the earlier Versions, except Tyndale, have the impersonal passive construction in the direct narration without the introductory word. The AV alone has the introductory element expressed in the form “by certaine which saide,” which, though it appears rather clumsy, functionally corresponds to the Greek *legóntōn* in (14) or the Latin *a dicentibus* in (6). We can see that the diction is intended to denote the logical relation so much the more explicitly. Tyndale, on the other hand, has recourse to the active construction “they tolde hym sayinge:”

2.5. III. Type 'it was told him what [how (that)] ~,' etc.

In this section we are going to take up the AV examples of these miscellaneous types: five examples of (i) the impersonal passive construction of the type 'it was told him what [how (that)] ~,' one of (ii) the impersonal passive construction of the type 'it was told him+of-phrase,' and two of (iii) the impersonal passive equivalent of the type 'one told him+direct speech.' Of these five are taken from the Old Testament and three from the New Testament, all from *Acts*.

i. Before illustrating the five AV examples—(1) *1 Kings* 18.13, (2) *2 Sam.* 21.11, (3) *Josh.* 9.24, (4) *Acts* 9.6, and (5) *Acts* 23.30—of what we call the type 'it was told him what [how (that)] ~,' we think it proper to comment on the syntactic nature of *what* and *how* (*that*) and the clauses introduced by them. First, *what* in (1) *1 Kings* 18.13 and (4) *Acts* 9.6 can be interpreted as indirect interrogative and so introducing the complementary clause of indirect question, which performs in the construction concerned much the same syntactic function as the *that*-clause does in the type 'it was told him that ~,' treated in §2.3. Concerning *how* in the *how*-clause that appears parallel with the *what*-clause in (1) *1 Kings* 18.13, some comment will be made from a comparative point of view in the appropriate place.

How that as it occurs in (3) *Josh.* 9.24 and (5) *Acts* 23.30 is a more archaic form than the simple *how*, whose use is now considered literary; but functionally it has much the same value as the subordinating conjunction *that*, though we must admit that the *how that*²³ clause has a stylistic value of its own, as distinct from the *that*-clause as it appears in the corresponding construction.

What seems rather problematic concerns (2) *2 Sam.* 21.11, where *what* might be better interpreted as indefinite relative, not indirect interrogative, especially when we compare the corresponding passage in the Vulgate or those in the earlier English Versions. If we regard the *what*-clause in question as relative, we shall have to interpret the sentence as direct passive with the formal subject *it* anticipating the *what*-clause as logical subject. However, as was touched on in §1.3, we are dealing with a delicate matter in this respect. Under (2) below we shall see that such delicacy was already realized in the Hebrew prototype. Our conclusion is that the *what*-clause in the AV version of (2) *2 Sam.* 21.11 can be qualified for the complementary element of the impersonal passive construction, just as the *what*-clauses in the AV versions of (1) *1 Kings* 18.13 and (4) *Acts* 9.6 can.

Below, for the benefit of comparative observation, we shall first treat the examples from the Old Testament—(1) *1 Kings* [*3 Kings*] 18.13, (2) *2 Sam.* [*2 Kings*] 21.11, (3) *Josh.* 9.24—and then those from the New Testament—(4) *Acts* 9.6 and (5) *Acts* 23.30.

(1) *1 Kings* [*3 Kings*] 18.13—AV: *Was it not told my lord, what I did when Iezebel slew the Prophets of the Lord? how I hid an hundred men of the Lords Prophets . . . ?* Cf. MT: *hālō' huggaḏ* la'dōnī 'eṭ 'āšer 'āšīṭi bahārōg 'Izebel 'eṭ nəḥī'ē YHWH wā'aḥbi' minnəḥī'ē YHWH mē'āh 'iš . . .* (*lit.*: not? it-was-told to-lord-of-me [acc.n.] what I-did while-to-kill Iezebel [acc.n.] prophets-of Yahweh and-I-hid from-prophets-of Yahweh hundred man . . .) (**huggaḏ* perfect *hophal*, m.3 sg. [cf. (8) in §2.31]) / LXX: *Ê ūk apēngēlē soi tōi kyrīōi mū hoīa pepoīēka en tōi apokteinein Iezabel tūs prophētas kyrīū kaī ékrypsa apō tōn prophētōn kyrīū hekatōn ándras . . .* (*lit.*: What? not has-it-been-told to-thee to-the lord my

²³ Cf. OED, s.v. *HOW adv.* 10; MED, s.v. *HOU conj., adv.* 4 b, c.

what I-did in the slaying of-Jezabel the prophets of-the-Lord that I-hid of the prophets of-the-Lord a-hundred men . . .) / V: Numquid non *indicatum** *est tibi domino meo, quid fecerim cum interficeret Hiezabel prophetas Domini, quod absconderim de prophetis Domini centum viros . . . ?* (=Was it not told you, my lord, what I did while Jezabel was killing the prophets of the Lord, that I hid a hundred men of the Lord's prophets . . . ?) (**indicatum* past part.; n. nom. sg. <*indico*=announce) / Wyc. 1: Whethir *is it* not *shewid to thee, my lord, what* I haue doon, whanne Jesabel shulde slee the prophetis of the Lord, *that* I hidde of the prophetis of the Lord an hundrid men . . . ? / Wyc. 2: Whether *it is* not *schewid to thee, my lord, what* Y dide, whanne Jesabel killide the prophetis of the Lord, *that* Y hidde of the prophetis of the Lord an hundrid men . . . ? / Doway: *Hath it* not *beene told thee my lord, what* I did when Iezabel killed the prophetes of our Lord, *that* I hid of the prophets of our Lord an hundred men . . . ?

There are two important points to be noted. The first point is that the MT version has the accusative note 'ēṭ before the clause introduced by 'āšer (=what).³⁴ This discloses the accusative nature latent in the 'āšer-clause as it is used in this kind of construction.³⁵ This usage should indeed be ascribed to the characteristic nature of Hebrew syntax. It suggests that the clause concerned has retained the same accusative function that it has in the corresponding active construction. In other words, it has not obtained the nominative function or the function as the subject of the passive predicate. Anyway, the usage proves the complementary nature of the 'āšer-clause as it occurs in the impersonal passive construction.

The second point concerns not only the MT version but the others. While in the AV "what I did . . ." and "how I did . . ." are expressed paratactically, the MT and the LXX have recourse to coordination. In the MT the second clause appears as 'wə-+imperfect,' that is, the second part of the perfect+imperfect sequence. In the LXX we find the first clause, which is introduced by *hoīa*,³⁶ linked to the second clause by the coordinating conjunction *kai*. This Greek *kai*, which is the copied counterpart of the Hebrew *wə-*, should be translated into 'that,' rather than 'and.' The Vulgate, on the other hand, has "*quid*³⁷ ~ *quod* ~" (=what ~ that ~); and accordingly Wyc. 1 and 2 and the Doway have "*what* ~ *that* ~."

It is true that *how*, which introduces the second clause in the AV version, is interrogative, just like *what*, which introduces the first clause. It is thus imbued with more expressive force. But at the same time we should remember that the *how* is the very word that is liable to be used as a subordinating conjunction, virtually meaning 'that.' In this respect *how that* in (3) and (5) should be compared.

(2) 2 Sam. [2 Kings] 21.11—AV: And it was tolde David what Rizpah the daughter

³⁴ The Hebrew 'āšer is an indeclinable relative, and here just like the English *what*, it functions as indefinite relative introducing the clause of dependent question.

³⁵ It is worth noting that the Hebrew accusative note is used even before a nominal group that would have appeared as the subject of a direct passive sentence. Actually, however, it retains the nature of an accusative object in the impersonal passive construction, as in: wayyuggaḏ ləRiḥqāh 'eṭ dibrê 'Ēsāw—MT, Gen. 27.42. (lit.: and-it-was-told to-Rebekah [acc.n.] words-of Esau) (Cf. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, §121 a.)

³⁶ The Greek *hoīa*, n.acc.pl. of *hoīos*, which is primarily a relative pronoun meaning 'such' as, of such sort as', here functions as indirect interrogative, meaning 'what kind of things.'

³⁷ The Latin *quid* (n.acc.sg.) is interrogative, as distinct from the relative *quod*.

of Aiah the concubine of Saul had done. Cf. MT: wayyuggad ləDāwîd 'ēt 'āšer 'āsəṭāh Rišpāh bāt 'Ayyāh pilegeš Šā'ūl, (*lit.*: and-it-was-told to-David [acc.n.] what did Rizpah daughter-of Aiah concubine-of Saul,) / LXX: Kai apēngélē tōi Dayid hōsa epoiēsen Rhespha thygātēr Aia pallakē Saūl, (*lit.*: And it-was-told to-the David what had-done Respha daughter of-Aia concubine of-Saul,) / V: Et nuntiata* sunt David quae facerat Respha, filia Ahia, concubina Saul. (*nuntiata past part., n.nom.pl.) / Wyc. 1: And *these things ben toold to Dauid, the whiche* did Respha, the douzter of Ahia, the secound-arye wif of Saul. / Wyc. 2: And *tho thingis whiche* Respha, secoundarie wiif of Saul, douztir of Ahia, hadde do, *weren teld to Dauid.* / Doway: And *the thinges were told Dauid, which* the Respha had done, the daughter of Aia, the concubine of Saul.

Here, as in the case of (1) *1 Kings* 18.13, the accusative note 'ēt is used in the MT version to denote straightforwardly that the subsequent 'āšer-clause is in the relation of accusative object.

We can see that the use of the 'āšer-clause in the MT has led to that of the hōsa³⁸-clause in the LXX, and the *what*-clause in the AV, which should accordingly be interpreted as indefinite relative, not indirect interrogative. The Vulgate has *quae*,³⁹ which should also be interpreted as relative. Moreover, the plural *quae* agrees with the preceding predicate verb *nuntiata sunt* in number. Here appears the direct passive sentence with strictly grammatical concord. In the earlier English Versions we see the relative construction in a more notable form: "*these thingis . . . the whiche*" in Wyc. 1, "*tho thingis whiche*" in the Wyc. 2, and "*the thinges . . . which*" in the Doway. Thus the MT, the LXX and the AV have retained the character of the impersonal passive construction, whereas the Vulgate, Wyc. 1 and 2, and the Doway have recourse to a structure coloured with greater syntactic coherence, that is, the direct passive construction.

(3) *Josh.* 9.24—AV: Because *it was* certainly *told thy seruants, how that* the Lord thy God commanded his seruant Moses to giue you all the land, and to destroy all the inhabitants of the land from before you, Cf. MT: wayyōmarū kī huggēd* huggad la'ābādēkā 'ēt 'āšer šiwwāh YHWH 'ēlōhēkā 'et Mōšeh 'abdō lāṭēt lākem 'et kol hā'āreš, ūlōhašmīd 'et kol yōšəḇē hā'āreš mippənēkem, (*lit.*: and-they-said clearly to-be-told it-was-told to-servants-of-you [acc.n.] how commanded Yahweh God-of-you [acc.n.] Moses servant-of-him to-give to-you [acc.n.] whole-of the-land, and-to-wipe-out [acc.n.] all-of ones-inhabiting-of the-land from-before-you,) (*The infinitive absolute *huggēd* is used before the finite *huggad*, perfect *hophal*, to emphasize the verbal idea that the latter expresses.) / LXX: Anēngélē hēmīn hōsa synétaxen kýrios ho theós sū Mōysēi tōi paidī autū, dūnai hymīn tēn gēn taútēn kai exolethreūsai hēmās kai pántas tūs katoikúntas ep' autēs apò prosōpū hymōn, (*lit.*: It-was-told to-us how commanded the-Lord the God thy Moses the servant his, to-give to-you the land this and to-destroy us and all the ones-dwelling on it from before you,) / V: *Nuntiatum est nobis servis tuis, quae [quod] promississet Dominus Deus tuus Mosi servo suo, ut traderet vobis omnem terram, et disperderet cunctos habitatores eius.* (=It was told us . . . that the Lord . . . had promised Moses . . . that he should hand down all the land to you and destroy

³⁸ The Greek *hōsa* is a relative, n.acc.pl. of *hósos*, and primarily means 'as many as, all that.'

³⁹ The Latin *quae* is n.acc.pl. of the relative *quī*.

all the inhabitants of it.) / OE Hept.: x / Wyc. 1: *It is told to vs thi seruauntis, that the Lord thi God hadde bihoot*⁴⁰ to Moyses, his seruaunt, that he shulde taak to zow al the loond, and scatre the dwellers of it; / Wyc. 2: *It was told to vs thi seruauntis, that thi Lord God bihižte*⁴⁰ to Moises, his seruaunt, that he schulde bitake to zou al the lond, and schulde leese alle the dwelleris therof; / Doway: *It was told vs thy seruantes, that the Lord thy God had promised Moyses his seruantes, that he would deliuer you al the Land, and would destroy al the inhabitantes therof.*

As in (1) and (2) above, the MT has the accusative note 'ēŧ before the 'āšer-clause, where 'āšer functions adverbially, meaning 'how.' In the LXX *hósa*, which is here adverbial accusative and means 'as much as, how,' may be interpreted as the copied counterpart of the Hebrew 'āšer. The Vulgate has *quae* in the corresponding use, but in the Bagster edition we find there *quod*, which may be held responsible for the *that*-clause in Wyc. 1 and 2 and the Doway. Comparing the use of the connective in these earlier Versions, we may safely conclude that the *how that* in the AV is to be formally attributed to the Hebrew 'āšer, the Greek *hósa* and the Latin *quae*, thus having inherited the nature of the indefinite relative, and that functionally it has the quality of the subordinating conjunction *that*, which may be traced back to the Latin *quod*.

The following example (4) is assigned to *Acts* 9.6 in the NTGk and the AV, but to *Acts* 9.7 in the V, Wyc. 1 and 2, and the Rhemes (apart from the case of Tyn., where the location of verses is undefinable); and so we adopt the inclusive heading "*Acts* 9.6[7]."

(4) *Acts* 9.6[7]—AV: Arise, and goe into the citee, and *it shall be told thee what thou must doe*. Cf. NTGk: *allà anástēthi kai eisēlthe eis tēn pólin kai lalēthēsetai* soi hó tí* se deí poiēin*. (*lit.*: but rise-thou-up and enter into the city and it-will-be-told thee what thee it-behovēs to-do.) (**lalēthēsetai* pass. 1 fut. 3 sg. < *lalēō*=speak; *hó tí* indefinite rel. [n.acc.sg.] in the compound form) / V: Sed surge, et ingredere civitatem, et ibi *dicetur* tibi quid* te oporteat facere. (**ibi*=then; *dicetur* pass.fut.3 sg. < *dico*=say, tell) / Wyc. 1: Ryse thou, and entre in to the citee, and *it schal be seide to thee, what it bihoueth thee for to do*. / Wyc. 2: Rise vp, and entre in to the citee, and *it schal be seide to thee, what it behoueth thee to do*. / Tyn.: Aryse and goo into the citee, and *ytt shal be tolde the what thou shalt do*. / Rhemes: Arise, and goe into the citee, and *it shal be told thee what thou must doe*.

Here we have the future impersonal passive as the leading predicate verb, and see the following pattern of transition: NTGk *lalēthēsetai*+dative+*hó tí*~→V *dicetur*+dative+*quid*~→AV *it shall be told*+dative+*what*~. The essential matter is that the subordinate clause performs a complementary function in the impersonal passive construction; but it is immaterial whether the introductory word may be interpreted as indefinite relative or as dependent interrogative.

(5) *Acts* 23.30—AV: And when *it was tolde me, how that* the Iewes laid waite for the man, I sent straightway to thee, . . . Cf. NTGk: *Mēnytheisēs dé moi epibulēs*

⁴⁰ *Bihizte* and *bihoot* are respectively the preterite and the past participle of ME *bihoten*. The verb ordinarily means 'promise,' but in the context concerned it may be interpreted as meaning 'charge' or 'urge' (cf. MED, s.v. BIHOTEN 5 (a)).

eis tôn ándra ésesthai* exautês épempsa pròs sè . . . (*lit.*: Being-revealed and to-me a-plot against the man to-be at-once I-sent to thee . . .) (**mēnytheisēs* [1 aor.pass.participle,f.gen.sg.] . . . *epibūlē*s [f.gen.sg.] . . . *ésesthai* [future infinitive] genitive absolute, =and when it was revealed to me that there would be a plot) / V: Et cum *mihi perlatum esset** de insidiis, quas paraverunt ei, misi ad te, . . . (=And when it was told me of the ambush plot which they had prepared against him, I sent him to you, . . .) [**perlatum* p.p., n.nom.sg. <*perfero*=deliver, report; *perlatum esset* pass.subj.pluperfect) / Wyc. 1: And whanne *it was teeld to me* of the aspies that thei maden redy, I sente him to thee, . . . / Wyc. 2: And whanne *it was teeld me* of the aspies, that thei arayden for hym, Y sente hym to thee, . . . / Tyn.: Afterwarde when *it was shewed me howe that* the iewes layde wayte for the man, I sent him strayghtwaye to the, . . . / Rhemes: And when *it was told me* of embushments that they had prepared against him, I sent him to thee, . . .

As for the leading impersonal passive predicate, it should be specially noted that the NTGk has the absolute participial construction with the feminine genitive *mēnytheisēs* agreeing with the subsequent noun *epibūlē*s, which together with the infinitive *ésesthai* constitutes the complementary phrase. The whole genitive absolute with infinitive construction may be interpreted as ascribable to the independent sentence with the nominative with infinitive, i.e.: *emēnythē* (pass. 1 aor. 3 sg.) *moi epibūlē* (f.nom.sg.) . . . *ésesthai* (=it was revealed to me that there would be a plot . . .).⁴¹

In the Vulgate *mihi perlatum esset* is complemented by the *de*-phrase+relative clause. And this style of construction is followed by Wyc. 1 and 2 and the Rhemes. Tyn. and the AV, on the other hand, have the *how that* clause complementing the impersonal passive predicate.

ii. The AV contains one example, i.e. *Acts* 22.10, of the type 'it was told him+of-phrase.' There the complementary element is expressed in the form of an adverbial phrase introduced by the preposition *of*.

(6) *Acts* 22.10—AV: Arise, and goe into Damascus, and there *it shall be told thee of all things* which are appointed for thee to doe. Cf. NTGk: *anastās poreū eis Damaskōn kakeī soi lalēthēsetai perī pántōn hōn tētaktaī soi poiēsai*. (*lit.*: rising-up go into Damascus and-there to-thee it-will-be-told of all-things which have-been-arranged for-thee to-do.) / V: *surgens vade Damascus: et ibi tibi dicitur de omnibus, quae te oporteat facere*.* (**quae . . . facere*=which it may be necessary for you to do) / Wyc. 1: Thou risynge, go to Damask; and there *it schal be seid to thee, of alle thingis* whiche it bihoueth thee for to do. / Wyc. 2: Rise thou, go to Damask; and there *it schal be seid to thee, of alle thingis* which it bihoueth thee to do. / Tyn: Aryse and goe into Damascon and there *it shal be tolde the of all things* which are apoynted for the to do. / Rhemes: Arise and goe to Damascus: and there *it shal be told thee of all things* that thou must doe.

Concerning the prepositional phrase+relative clause, we see here the transition: Gk

⁴¹ Cf. Blass & Derbrunner (tr. Funk), *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament*, §424.

peri + genitive + *hôn*⁴² ~ → L *de* + ablative + *quae* ~ → E *of*-phrase + *which* (or *that*) ~. In order to realize the syntactic nature of this construction, it would be suggestive to compare "it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do" with "it shall be told thee what [that things] are appointed for thee to do."

iii. The successive verses of the AV, i.e. *Gen.* 48.1–2, contain a couple of examples of the type 'one told him + direct speech.' That is an active construction with the indefinite pronoun *one*, which corresponds to OE *man*, as subject. Semantically it is equivalent to the impersonal passive type 'it was told him + direct speech.' Actually, as we shall see under (7) and (8) in §3.4, it usually comes to be replaced by the corresponding (impersonal or personal) passive construction in the later English Versions. Below we shall inquire what predecessors the AV construction can be traced to.

(7) *Gen.* 48.1—AV: And it came to passe after these things, that *one told Ioseph*, Behold, thy father is sicke: Cf. MT: wayōhī 'aḥārē haddəḥārīm hā'ēlleh wayyōmer* ləYōsēp, hinnēh 'āḥīkā ḥōleh. (*lit.*: and-it-was after the-things the-these that-some-one-said to-Joseph, see! father-of-you being-ill.) (*wayyōmer < wə- = and + yō'mar imperfect *qal*, m. 3 sg., = someone said) / LXX: Egéneto dè metà tà rhēmata taūta kai apēngélē tōi Iōsēph hōti* Ho patēr sū enochleītai, (*lit.*: It-happened and after the things these that it-was-told to-the Joseph that The father thy is-afflicted.) (*hōti recitative hōti⁴³) / V: His ita transactis nuntiatum est Ioseph quod aegrotaret pater eius: (=These being so done, it was told Joseph that his father was ill:) / OE Hept.: Ða þis wæs ðus gedon, ða cydde man Ioseph þæt his fæder wære gesycled, (=When this was so done, someone told Joseph that his father was taken ill,) / Wyc. 1: And so thes thinges passid ouer, it was toold to Joseph, that the fader of hym wex sik. / Wyc. 2: And so whanne these thingis weren don, it was teld to Joseph, that his fadir was sijk. / Doway: These things being so done, it was told Ioseph that his father was sicke:

(8) *Gen.* 48.2—AV: And *one told Iacob, and said*, Behold, thy sonne Ioseph cometh vnto thee: Cf. MT: wayyaggēd* ləYa'āqōḥ wayyōmer,* hinnēh binəkā Yōsēp bā' 'elēkā. (*lit.*: and-one-told to-Jacob and-one-said, see! son-of-you Joseph came to-you.) (*wayyaggēd < wə- + yaggīd imperfect *hiphil*, m. 3 sg.; wayyōmer < wə- + yō'mar imperfect *qal*, m. 3 sg.) / LXX: Apēngélē de tōi Iakōb légontes Idū ho hyiós sū Iōsēph érchetai pròs sé. (*lit.*: It-was-told and to-the Jacob they-saying See the son thy Joseph comes to thee.) / V: Dictumque est seni: Ecce filius tuus Ioseph venit ad te. (=And it was said to the old man: See! your son Joseph comes to you.) / OE Hept.: Ða cydde man Ysrahele þæt Iosep his suna wære cumen; / Wyc. 1: And it was seide to the olde man, Loo! thi sone Joseph is comen to thee; / Wyc. 2: And it was seid to the elde man, Lo! thi son Joseph cometh to thee; / Doway: And it was told the old man: Behold thy sonne Ioseph cometh to thee.

In both instances (7) and (8) we can see two distinct lines of transition. One is the line of the active construction with the indefinite pronoun (implied or expressed) as sub-

⁴² The grammatical form of the Greek relative *hôn* (n.gen.pl.) has been attracted to that of its antecedent *pántōn* (n.gen.pl.).

⁴³ Cf. the LXX versions of (5) and (6) in §2.3 and (14) in §2.4 and the NTGk version of (4) above.

ject, and the other is that of the impersonal passive construction (with the subordinate clause or with the direct speech). The former is the line: MT→OE Hept.→AV; and the latter is the line: LXX→V→Wyc. 1 & 2→Doway.⁴⁴

2.6. IV. Type 'as it was told him'

In the AV we find six examples of the type 'it was told him' and two of the type 'as it was told him.' Differing from *it* in the types 'it was told him that [what, how (that)]~' and 'it was told him (saying)+direct speech,' whose reference is cataphoric, *it* in those types refers, in most cases, anaphorically, to the content expressed in the foregoing statement or in the main clause of the same sentence. This referential difference, however, does not affect the fact that it functions as the formal subject of the impersonal passive construction.

i. First we shall deal with six examples of the independent clause type 'it was told him,' which all occur in the Old Testament. Of these the following three will be taken up first:

(1) *Judges 9.25*—AV: and it was told Abimelech. Cf. MT: wayyuggad la'Ābimeleḳ. (lit.: and-it-was-told to-Abimelech.) / LXX A[B]: kai apēngélē tōi Abimelech [basilei Abimelech]. (lit.: and it-was-told to-the Abimelech [king Abimelech].) / V: nuntiatumque est Abimelech. / OE Hept.: x / Wyc. 1: and it is told to Abymalech. / Wyc. 2: and it was teld to Abymelech. / Doway: and it was told Abimelech.

(2) *2 Sam. [2 Kings] 10.17*—AV: And when it was told David, he gathered all Israel together, Cf. MT: wayyuggad laDāwīd, wayye'ēsōp 'et kol Yisrā'el, (lit.: when-it-was-told to-David, then-he-gathered [acc.n.] all-of Israel,) / LXX: Kai apēngélē tōi Dayid, kai synégagen tòn pánta Israēl (lit.: And it-was-told to-the David, and he-gathered the all Israel) / V: Quod cum* nuntiatum esset David, contraxit omnem Israhelem, (*quod rel.pron., n.nom.sg.,=which; cum=when) / Wyc. 1: And whanne it was toold to David, he drewz togidre al Irael, / Wyc. 2: And whanne this was teld to David, he drow togidere al Israel, / Doway: Which when it was told David he gathered together al Israel,

(3) *1 Chron. 19.17*—AV: And it was tolde David, and hee gathered all Israel, Cf. MT: wayyuggad laDāwīd, wayye'ēsōp 'et kol Yisrā'el, (lit.: when-it-was-told to-David, then-he-gathered [acc.n.] all-of Israel,) / LXX: Kai apēngélē tōi Dayid, kai synégagen tòn pánta Israēl (lit.: and it-was-told to-the David, and he-gathered the all Israel) / V: Quod cum nuntiatum esset David, congregavit universum Israhel, / Wyc. 1: The whiche thing whan was tolde to David, he gaderde al Yrael, / Wyc. 2: And whanne this was teld to David, he gaderide al Israel, / Doway: Which when it was told David, he gathered together al Israel,

First it should be noted that the Hebrew *yuggad*, the Greek *apēngélē*, and the Latin

⁴⁴ In this connection, it seems significant to compare the corresponding passages of the Luther Version (1545), the present-day German Bible (Herder) and the present-day French Bible (ed. L. Segond). Luther: Daknach ward Joseph gesagt Sihe dein Vater ist kranck. . . . Da wards Jacob angesagt Sihe dein son Joseph kompt zu dir. / PG: Nach diesen Begebenheiten sagte man zu Joseph: Siehe, dein Vater ist krank. . . . Als Jakob meldete: Siehe, dein Sohn Joseph kommt zu dir! / PF: Après ces choses, l'on vint dire à Joseph: Voici, ton père est malade. . . . On avertit Jacob, et on lui dit: Voici ton fils Joseph qui vient vers toi.

nuntiatum est [esset⁴⁵], which are all in the third person singular, are used irrespectively of whether the implied subject has definite reference or whether it has indefinite reference—that is, it is what is commonly termed ‘impersonal.’

The second point to be noted is that the Vulgate versions of (2) and (3) have the non-restrictive relative clause concatenated to the adverbial clause of time, where the nominative relative *quod* functions as the subject of the passive predicate verb *nuntiatum esset*. This Latinate construction is followed by the Doway in (2), and by Wyc. 1 and the Doway in (3). Particularly, Wyc. 1 “The whiche thing whan was tolde to Daud” appears very clumsy. In the Doway “Which when *it* was told Daud” the redundancy of *it* is exposed. On the contrary, the use of the demonstrative *this* in Wyc. 2 “And whanne *this* was told to Daud” has enhanced the expressiveness of the context, though it may be considered to weaken the impersonal character of the construction.

Example (4) (*Isa.* 40.21) is an instance of rhetorical question, and the AV version has the present perfect *hath beene tolde* as the predicate verb, which is found to be the counterpart of the Hebrew perfect *huggad* (instead of the imperfect *yuggad*).

(4) *Isa.* 40.21—AV: *hath it not beene tolde you* from the beginning? Cf. MT: *hālô’ huggad mērō’s lākem.* (*lit.*: not? has-it-been-told from-beginning to-you.) / LXX: *ūk anēngélē ex archēs hymîn;* (*lit.*: not? has-it-been-told from beginning you;) / V: *numquid* non adnuntiatum est ab initio vobis?* (**numquid* interrogative particle introducing a direct question to which a negative answer is expected) / Wyc. 1: whether not *told to zou it is* fro the bigynnyng? / Wyc. 2: whether *it was not told to zou* fro the begynnyng? / Doway: why, *hath it not bene told you* fro the beginning?

As to example (5) (*1 Sam.* [*1 Kings*] 19.21), it is particularly noteworthy that the MT version has as the leading verb the third person, plural imperfect in the active, that is, the *hiphil yaggidū*, which, along with the corresponding impersonal passive *apēngélē* in the LXX and *nuntiatum esset* in the Vulgate, should be regarded as having led to *it was tolde* in the AV.

(5) *1 Sam.* [*1 Kings*] 19.21—AV: And when *it was tolde Saul*, he sent other messengers, Cf. MT: *wayyaggidū ləšā’ūl*, *wayyišlah mal’ākīm ’āḥērīm*, (*lit.*: and-they-told to-Saul, and-he-sent men more-ones,) / LXX: *Kai apēngélē tōi Saūl*, *kai apésteilen angélūs hetérūs*, (*lit.*: And it-was-told to-the Saul, and he-sent messengers others,) / V: *Quod cum nuntiatum esset Sauli*, *misit et alios nuntios*; / Wyc. 1: The whiche whanne *was toold to Saul*, he sente and other messagers; / Wyc. 2: And whanne *this was told to Saul*, he sente also othere messangeris; / Doway: Which when *it was told Saul*, he sent other messengers:

As in (2) and (3) above, the concatenated relative clause “*quod cum nuntiatum esset Sali*” in the Vulgate is copied by “*the whiche whanne was toold to Saul*” in Wyc. 1, and by “*which when it was told Saul*” in the Doway; but it is displaced by “*and whanne this was told to Saul*” in Wyc. 2. The AV “*it was tolde Saul*,” on the other hand, can be considered most of all ascribable to the LXX “*apēngélē tōi Saūl*,” in which *Saūl* is undeclined dative.

⁴⁵ *Esset* is subjunctive imperfect, 3 sg., for *esse* (=to be). In the Vulgate versions of (2) and (3) we see the archaic use of the subjunctive in the subordinate clause of time.

Example (6) will be cited in an extended context so that the subjunctive occurring in the predicate in question may be accounted for.

(6) *Deut. 17.2-4*—AV: If there be found . . . man or woman that hath wrought wickedness in the sight of the Lord thy God, . . . And hath gone and serued other gods, and worshipped them . . . And *it be told thee*, and thou hast heard of it, . . . Cf. MT: *kî yimmāšē* . . . 'iš 'ô 'iššāh 'āšer ya'āšeh 'eṭ hāra' bə'ênê YHWH 'elōhêkā . . . wayyēlek wāyya'āḇōd 'elōhîm 'āḥērîm wayyištaḥû lâhem . . . *wəhuggad* ləqā wəšāmā- 'ətā* . . . (*lit.*: if is-found . . . man or woman who does [acc.n.] the-evil in-eyes-of Yah-weh God-of-you . . . and-goes and-worships gods others and-bows to-them . . . and-it-is-told to-you and-you-heard . . .) (**wəhuggad* < *wə- + huggad* perfect *hophal*, m.3 sg.) / LXX: *Eàn dè heurethêi* . . . *anēr è gyné, hóstis poiései tò ponēròn enantíon kyríu tû theû sū*, . . . *kaì elthóntes latreúsōsin theoîs hetérois kaì proskynésōsin autoîs*, . . . *kaì anangelêi* soi*, . . . (*lit.*: If and should-be-found . . . a-man or a-woman, who will-do the evil before Lord the God thy, . . . and going will-serve gods others and will-worship them, . . . and it-should-be-told thee, . . .) (**anangelêi* 2 aorist passive, subj.3 sg.) / V: *Cum repperti fuerint* . . . *vir aut mulier qui faciant malum in conspectu Domini Dei tui*, . . . *Ut* vadant et serviant diis alienis, et adorent eos*, . . . *Et hoc* tibi fuerit nuntiatum, audiensque** . . . (**ut* . . . *eos*=so that they may go and serve other gods, and worship them; *hoc* demonstrative, n.nom.sg.: *et hoc* . . . *nuntiatum*=and (if) it were told you; *audiensque*=and hearing it, and (if) you heard it) / OE Hept.: x / Wyc. 1: And whanne were founden . . . man or womman, that doth yuel in sizt of the Lord thi God, . . . that thei goon, and seruen to alien goddis, and honoure hem . . . ; and *this were told to thee*, and herynge . . . / Wyc. 2: And whanne a man ether a womman, that doon yuel in the sizte of thi Lord God, ben foundun . . . , that thei go and serue alien goddis, and worschipe hem . . . ; and *this is teld to thee*, and thou herist, . . . / Doway: When there shal be found . . . man or woman that do euil in the sight of our Lord thy God, . . . that they goe and serue strange goddes, and adore them . . . ; and *this is told thee*, and hearing it . . .

Here again the use of the demonstrative *hoc* in the Vulgate and *this* in Wyc. 1 and 2 and in the Doway appears to have weakened the nature of the impersonal passive construction concerned.

ii. In the New Testament of the AV we find two examples of the type '*as it was told him*,' as follows:

(7) *Luke 2.20*—AV: And the shepherds returned, glorifying and praising God for all the things that they had heard and seene, *as it was told vnto them*. Cf. NTGk: *Kaì hypéstrepsan hoi poiménes doxázontes kaì ainúntes tôn theòn epì pāsîn hoîs êkūsan kaì eîdon kathòs elalêthê* pròs autūs*. (*lit.*: And returned the shepherds glorifying and praising the God at all-things which they-heard and saw as was-told to them.) (**elalêthê* 1 aorist passive, 3 sg. < *laléō*=speak, tell) / V: *Et reversi sunt pastores glorificantes, et laudantes Deum in omnibus, quae audierant et viderant, sicut dictum est ad illos*. / WS Gosp.: *Pa gewendon ham þa hyrdas, God wuldriende and heriende on eallum þam ðe hi hegyrdon and gesawon, swa to him gecweden wæs*. / Wyc. 1: And the schepherdis turneden aȝen, glorifynge and heriynge God in alle thingis that thei had-

den herd und seyn, *as it is seyd to hem.* / Wyc. 2: And the scheepherdis turneden azen, glorifyinge and heriynge God in alle thingis that thei hadden herd and seyn, *as it was seid to hem.* / Tyn.: And the shepherdes retourned, praysynge and laudyng God ffor all that they had herde and senè, *evyn as itt was told vnto them.* / Rhemes: And the shepherds returned, glorifying and praising God in al things that they had heard, and seen, *as it was said to them.*

(8) *Acts 27.25*—AV: for I beleue God, that it shall be *even as it was tolde me.* Cf. NTGk: pisteuō gar tōi theōi hōti hūtōs éstai kath' hon trópon lelálētai* moi. (*lit.*: I-believe for the God that thus it-will-be in whichever way it-has-been-told me.) (**lelálētai* passive perfect, 3 sg. < *lalēō* =speak, tell) / V: credo enim Deo, quia sic erit,* *quemadmodum* dictum est mihi.* (**quia sic erit* =because it will be so; *quemadmodum* < *quem* [rel., m.acc.sg.] *ad* [=in] *modum* [m.acc.sg., =way], =as) / Wyc. 1: forsoth I bileue to my God, for so it chal be, *as it is seid to me.* / Wyc. 2: for Y bileue to my God, that so it schal be, *as it is seid to me.* / Tyn.: for I beleue God that so it shal be *even as it was tolde me.* / Rhemes: for I beleue God, that it shal so be, *as it hath been seid to me.*

It should be particularly noted that in (7) *Luke 2.20* the Tyn. and the AV have the prepositional dative equivalent, as in “(evyn) as itt [it] was told *vnto them,*” whereas in (8) *Acts 27.25* they have the simple dative, as in “even [even] as it was tolde *me.*” This difference in usage is due to contextually semantic factors, which can be perceived through the comparative observation of the respective earlier versions.

2.7. V. Type ‘*it was said ((un)to him)*+ direct speech’

In the Old Testament of the AV we find six examples of this minor group. Of these, five contain dative equivalent (*un*)*to*-phrases, and one, which will be shown last below, lacks the element that denotes the dative relation.

(1) *1 Kings* [3 *Kings*] 13.17—AV: For *it was said to mee* by the word of the Lord, Thou shalt eate no bread, nor drinke water there, nor turne againe to go by the way that thou camest. Cf. MT: kī *dābār** 'ēlay biḏəḅar YHWH, lō' tō'kal lehem wəlō' tišteḥ šām māyim; lō'tašūḅ lāleket badderek 'āšer hālaḳtā bāh. (*lit.*: for he-told to-me by-word-of Yahweh, not you-must-eat bread and-not you-must-drink there waters; not you-must-return to-go by-the-way that you-came by-it.) (**dābār* perfect *qal*, m.3 sg.; 'ēlay < preposition 'el [=to, towards]+ pronominal suffix meaning 'me') / LXX: Hōti hūtōs *entétaltai** moi en lógōi kýrios, légōn, Mē phágēis árton ekeí kai mē píeis hýdōr ekeí kai mē epistrépsēis en tēi hodōi, hēi eporeúthēs en autēi. (*lit.*: For he commanded me by word the-Lord, saying Not eat bread there and not drink water there and not return by the way, which thou-camest by it.) (**entétaltai* middle perfect, 3 sg. < *entéllō* =command) / V: Quia *locutus est** Dominus *ad me* in sermone Domini, *dicens*: Non comedes panem, et non bibes ibi aquam, nec reverteris per viam, qua ieris.* (**locutus est* perfect 3 sg., = (he) said, < deponent verb *loquor* =speak, say; *per viam, qua ieris* [subj. perfect 2 sg. < *eo* =go] =by the way where you have come) / Wyc. 1: for the Lord *spak to me* in the word of the Lord, *seyynge*, Thow shalt not ete breed, and thou shalt not drynke watir there, ne thou shalt turne azen bi the weye that thou wentist. / Wyc. 2: for the Lord *spak to me* in the word of the Lord, *and seide*, Thou schalt

not ete breed, and thou schalt not drynke water there, néther thou schalt turne azen bi the weie bi which thou zedist. / Doway: because our Lord *spake to me* in the word of our Lord, *saying*: Thou shalt not eate bread, and thou shalt not drinke water there, nor returne by the way thou wentest.

(2) *Ezek.* 13.12.—AV: Leo, when the wall is fallen, *shall it not bee sayde vnto you*; where is the dawbing wherwith ye haue dawbed it? Cf. MT: wəhinnēh nāpāl haqqîr, hālô' yē'āmēr 'ālêkem,* 'ayyēh haṭṭīah 'āšer ṭaḥtem. (*lit.*: when-see! collapses the-wall, not? it-will-be-said to-you, where? the-whitewash that you-covered.) (*yē-āmēr imperfect *niphal* [cf. (12) in §2.4]; 'ālêkem < 'el [prep., =to, towards] + pronominal suffix for 2nd person m.pl.) / LXX: Kai idū péptōken ho toîchos, kai ūk erûsin* pròs hymàs Pû estin hē aloiphē hymôn, hēn ēleípsate; (*lit.*: And see! has-fallen the wall, and not will-they-say to you Where is the plaster your, wherewith ye-plastered-it?) (*erûsin future, 3 pl.; pròs hymàs [acc.pl., =you] dative equivalent) / V: Siquidem, ecce cecidit paries, numquid non *dicetur vobis*: Ubi est litura, quam levistis? (=For indeed, see! the wall has fallen. Will it never be said to you: Where is the daubing that you daubed?) / Wyc. 1: Forsothe loo! the wal felle down. Whether *it shal not be seid to zou*, Wher is the dawbynge, that ze dawbiden? / Wyc. 2: For lo! the wal felle down. Whether *it schal not be seid to zou*, Where is the pargetyng,* which ze pargetiden*? (*pargetyng=plastered surface; pargetiden=plastered, daubed [<OF]) / Doway: for in dede behold the wal is fallen: *shal it not be sayd to you*: Where is the dawbing, that you dawbed?

(3) (4) *Hos.* 1.10[2.1]⁴⁶—AV: and it shall come to passe, that in the place where *it was said vnto them*, Yee are not my people, there *it shall be said vnto them*, Ye are the sonnes of the liuing God. Cf. MT: wəhāyāh bimeqôm 'āšer yē'āmēr lāhem,* lō' 'ammî 'attem, yē'āmēr lāhem, bənē 'Ēl ḥāy. (*lit.*: and-it-will-be in-place-of where it-was-told to-them, not people-of-me you, it-will-be-said to-them, sons-of God living-one.) (*yē'āmēr imperfect *niphal* [cf. (2) above]; lāhem < lā = to + hēm = they [m.pl.]) / LXX: kai éstai en tōi tōpōi, hū *erréthē** autoîs Ū laós mū hymeîs, ekeî klēthēsontai* hyioi theû zōntos. (*lit.*: and it-will-happen in the place, where it-was-said to-them Not people my ye, there they-will-be-called sons of-God living.) (*erréthē passive 1 aor., 3 sg. < eîpon = say; klēthēsontai passive future, 3 pl. < kaléō = call) / V: Et erit in loco ubi *dicetur eis*: Non populus meus vos: *dicetur eis*: Filii Dei viventis. (=And it will happen that in the place where it will be said to them: You are not my people, it will be said to them: You are the sons of the living God.) / Wyc. 1: and it schal be in place, where *it schal be seid to hem*, Not my peple ze; *it schal be seid to hem*, Sones of God lyuyng. / Wyc. 2: and it schal be in the place, where *it schal be seid to hem*, Ze ben not my puple; *it schal be seid to hem*, ze ben the sones of God lyuyng. / Doway: And it shal be in place where *it shal be sayd to them*: Not my people you: *it shal be sayd to them*: Children of the liuing God.

(5) *Zeph.* 3.16—AV: In that day *it shall be said to Ierusalem*, Feare thou not: . . .

⁴⁶ The relevant passage of *Hos.* 1.10 in the V, Wyc. 1 and 2, the Doway, and the AV is assigned to *Hos.* 2.1 in the MT and the LXX.

Cf. MT: bayyôm hahû' yē'āmēr lîrûšālam,* 'al tîrā'î, . . . (*lit.*: on-the-day the-that it-will-be-said to-Jerusalem, not you-fear, . . .) (*yē'āmēr imperfect *niphal* [cf. (2) (3) (4) above]; lîrûšālam <lā- =to + Yērûšālam =Jerusalem) / LXX: En tōi kairōi ekeinōi ereî* kýrios tēi Ierūsālēm* Thársei, . . . (*lit.*: At the time that will-say the-Lord to-the Jerusalem Be-of-good-courage, ' . . .) (*ereî future 3 sg., = (he) will say; tēi Ierūsālēm f.dat.sg., =to Jerusalem) / V: In die illa dicitur Hierusalem: Noli timere: . . . (=In that day it will be said to Jerusalem: Do not fear: . . .) / Wyc. 1: In that day *it shal be said*, Jerusalem, nyl thou dreede; . . . / Wyc. 2: In that dai *it schal be seid*, Jerusalem, nyle thou drede; . . . / Doway: In that day *it shal be sayd to Ierusalem*: Feare not: . . .

(6) *Exod. 5.19*—AV: And the officers of the children of Israel did see that they were in euill case, after *it was said*, Yee shal not minish ought from your brickettes of your dayly taske. Cf. MT: wayyirê'û šōṭarê bənê Yisrā'el 'ōṭām bərā' lē'mōr* lō' ṭigrê'û millîḥnêkem dāḅar yôm bəyômô.* (*lit.*: and-realized foremen-of sons-of Israel them in-trouble to-say not you-can-reduce from-bricks-of-you required-of day in-day-of-it.) (*lē'mōr infinitive construct, =saying; yôm bəyômô =each of the days) / LXX: Herōrōn dē hoi grammateis tōn hyiōn Israēl heautūs en kakois légontes* Ūk apoleípsete tēs plintheias tō kathêkon* tēi hēmérāi. (*lit.*: Saw and the accountants of-the children of-Israel themselves in evil-situations saying Not ye-will-fail from-the brick-making the-one belonging to-the day.) (*légontes m.nom.pl. present participle, agreeing with the preceding finite verb *heōrōn* [imperfect 3 pl., =they saw]; tō kathêkon [n.acc.sg.] object of *apoleípsete*, meaning '(to do) that which belongs') / V: Videbantque se prae-positi filiorum Israhel in malo, eo quod diceretur eis*: Non minuetur quicquam de lateribus per singulos dies. (=And the commanders of the sons of Israel saw themselves in disaster, because it was told them: Nothing will be diminished of bricks for each day.) (*diceretur subjunctive passive imperfect, 3 sg., <dico =say; eis m.dat.pl., =to them) / OE Hept.: And Israhela folces prafastas gesawon þæt hy⁴⁷ wæron geswencte, for þam ðe him wæs gesæd þæt hym nære nan þing þæs tigolgeweorces forgyfen, buton on þam ilcan gemete þe hi ær gewuna wæron. (=And the officers of the people of Israel saw that they were afflicted, because it was told them that nothing of the brick-making would be remitted for them, except in the way that they had been accustomed to.) / Wyc. 1: And the maystris of the sones of Yrael seen hem seluen into yuel, for that *it was seide to hem*, There shal not be maad lasse eny thing of the tiles bi eche daies. / Wyc. 2: And the souereyns of the children of Israel sien hem silf in yuel, for *it was seid to hem*, No thing schal be decreessid of tijl stoonus bi alle daies. / Doway: And the ouerseers of the children of Israel saw them selues in hard case, because *it was said vnto them*: There shal not a whitte be diminithed of the brickettes for euerie day.

It is remarkable that while in (3)–(4) (*Hos. 1.10*[2.1]) the impersonal passive construction is found throughout all the respective Versions—with the exception of the LXX use of the divergent construction in part of (4)—in (1) (*1 Kings* [3 *Kings*] 13.17) the AV alone has the impersonal passive but all the other Versions have the active construction. In (2) (*Ezek. 13.12*) and (5) (*Zeph. 3.16*) the LXX alone has the active but all the others, including

⁴⁷ Here Crawford's edition of *The Heptateuch* has *by*, which has been emended into *hy*.

the AV, have the impersonal passive. In (6) (*Exod.* 5.19) the MT and the LXX have the active, instead of the impersonal passive.

Concerning how the dative or dative equivalent is expressed in these sets of examples, we may note that the simple dative is used with the Greek active verb, as in "entétaltai moi" ((1) *3 Kings* 13.17) and "erei tēi Hierūsālēm" ((5) *Zeph.* 3.16), with the Greek impersonal passive verb, as in "erréthē autois" ((3) *Hos.* 2.1), with the Latin impersonal passive verb, as in "dicetur vobis" ((2) *Ezek.* 13.12), "dicetur eis" ((3) and (4) *Hos.* 1.10), "dicetur Jerusalem" ((5) *Zeph.* 3.16), and "diceretur eis" ((6) *Exod.* 5.19), and with the OE impersonal passive verb, as in "him wæs gesæd" ((6) *Exod.* 5.19).

The prepositional dative equivalent is used with the Hebrew active verb, as in "dābār 'ēlay" ((1) *1 Kings* 13.17), with the Hebrew impersonal passive verb, as in "yē'amēr lāhem" ((3) and (4) *Hos.* 2.1), "yē'amēr līrūsālam" ((5) *Zeph.* 3.16), and "yē'amēr 'ālēkem" ((2) *Ezek.* 13.12), with the Greek active verb, as in "erūsīn prōs hymās (acc.)" ((2) *Ezek.* 13.12), with the Latin active verb, as in "locutus est ad me (acc.)" ((1) *3 Kings* 13.17), with the ME active verb, as in "spak to me" ((1) *3 Kings* 13.17), with the ME impersonal passive verb, as in "it shal [schal] not be seid to zou" ((2) *Ezek.* 13.12), "it schal be seid to hem" ((3) and (4) *Hos.* 1.10), and "it was seide [seid] to hem" ((6) *Exod.* 5.19), with the early ModE active verb, as in "spake to me" ((1) Doway, *3 Kings* 13.17), and with the early ModE impersonal passive verb, as in "shal it not be sayd to you" ((2) Doway, *Ezek.* 13.12), "it shal be sayd to them" ((3) and (4) Doway, *Hos.* 1.10), "it shal be sayd to Ierusalem" ((5) Doway, *Zeph.* 3.16), "it was said vnto them" ((6) Doway, *Exod.* 5.19), "it was said to mee" ((1) AV, *1 Kings* 13.17), "it shall be said to Ierusalem" ((5) AV, *Zeph.* 3.16), "shall it not bee sayde vnto you" ((2) AV, *Ezek.* 13.12), "it was said vnto them" ((3) AV, *Hos.* 1.10), and "it shall be said vnto them" ((4) AV, *Hos.* 1.10). And it seems rather remarkable that we find instances where the impersonal passive verb is not accompanied by any dative equivalent: "it shal [schal] be said [seid]" ((5) Wyc. 1 & 2, *Zeph.* 3.16) and "it was said" ((6) AV, *Exod.* 5.19).

FUKUOKA UNIVERSITY

APPENDIX

I should like to give some information about (A) the abbreviated titles of the earlier biblical texts down to the AV from which the examples have been quoted, and (B) the short titles of the OE and ME works quoted in the present instalment (Part I).

A. (1) MT: The Masoretic Text. The edition adopted is *The NIV Interlinear Hebrew-English Old Testament* (ed. John R. Kohlenberger III; Michigan: Regency, 1979). (2) LXX: The Septuagint. The edition adopted is chiefly *Septuaginta* (2 vols.; ed. Alfred Rahlfs; Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935) and subsidiarily *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English* (ed. L. C. L. Brenton; Michigan: Regency, n.d.). (3) NTGk: The New Testament in Greek. The edition adopted is *Novum Testamentum Graece* (ed. Eberhard Nestle and Erwin Nestle; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung; 26. Aufl. 1898, 1979). (4) V: The Vulgate. The edition adopted is chiefly *Biblia Sacra: Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem* (2 vols.; ed. Robertus Weber; Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1969), and subsidiarily *Biblia Sacra Latina: Vulgatæ Editiones* (London: Bagster, n.d.). (5) WS

Gosp.: *The West Saxon Gospels* (Corpus Christi) (ed. W. W. Skeat; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970). (6) OE Hept.: *The Old English Version of the Heptateuch* (ed. S. J. Crawford, EETS 160, 1922). (7) Wyc. 1 and 2: *The Earlier and Later Versions of the Wycliffite Bible* (4 vols.; ed. J. Forshall and F. Madden; Oxford Univ. Press, 1850). (8) Tyn.: *William Tyndale's New Testament, 1526* (London: Partridge, 1976). (9) Rhemes: *The New Testament: Rhemes, 1582* (facs. Kyoto: Rinsen, 1990). (10) Doway: *The Holy Bible: Doway, I. 1609, II. 1610* (facs. Kyoto: Rinsen, 1990). (11) AV: *The Authorised Version of the English Bible, 1611* (5 vols.; ed. W. A. Wright; Cambridge Univ. Press, 1909).

B. OE (excepting "WS Gosp." and "OE Hept.")—*ÆCHom: Ælfric's Catholic Homilies* (ed. B. Thorpe, 1844, '46) / *ÆHom: Homilies of Ælfric* (ed. J. C. Pope; EETS 259-260, 1967-8) / *LS: Ælfric's Lives of Saint* (ed. W. W. Skeat, EETS 76, 82, 94 and 114, 1881-1900) / *Bo: Boethius' De Consolatione Philosophiae* (Alfredian) (ed. W. J. Sedgefield; 1899, 1968) / *CP(H): Gregory's Pastoral Care* (Alfredian) (ed. H. Sweet, EETS 48, 54, 1871-2).

ME (excepting "Wyc. 1 and 2")—Chaucer, *CT. WB.: The Wife of Bath* (*The Riverside Chaucer*, pp. 105-122) / *Cleanness—Purity* (ed. R. J. Menner, 1920) / *Glo. Chron. (Caligula): The Metrical Chronicle of Robert of Gloucester* (ed. W. A. Wright; Rolls Series, 86 (1887)) / *Glo. Chron. (Harleian): Robert of Gloucester's Chronicle* (ed. Thomas Hearne, 1724, rpt. 1810) / *Let. Cely: The Cely Letters 1472-1488* (ed. A. Hanham, EETS 273, 1975) / *Mandev.: Mandeville's Travels* (ed. P. Hamelius, EETS 153, 1919) / Lydg., *TB: Lidgate's Troy Book* (ed. H. Bergen, EETS. ES 97, 103, 106, 1906-10) / Malory, *Wks: The Works of Sir Thomas Malory* (ed. E. Vinaver; rev. P.J.C. Field, 1990) / *Paston L.: The Paston Letters: A.D. 1422-1509* (ed. J. H. Gairdner, 1904) / *Towneley Pl: The Towneley Plays* (ed. A. Pollard, EETS. ES 71; 1897, rpt. 1925) / *Vsp. D. Hom: Early English Homilies from the Twelfth Century MS Vesp. D. xiv* (ed. R. D.-N. Warner, EETS 152, 1917) / *Wycl. Clergy HP: English Works of Wyclif; Clergy May Not Hold Property* (ed. F. D. Matthew, EETS 74, 1880).