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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 AV\(^1\) 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 quedan (cf. quoth). They are used in the impersonal passive with a dative (or dative equivalent) of person, followed by a complementary\(^2\) clause which is introduced by the subordinating conjunction fuet (>that) or the dependent interrogative or indefinite relative hwe~t (>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:

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

\[^{1}\text{The abbreviation of The Authorized Version of the English Bible (1611). Cf. APPENDIX, A.}\]

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

\[^{3}\text{Sometimes, though less commonly, hit was used as the formal subject of the impersonal passive predicate with the complementary pet-clause. The following pair of examples should be compared: Nis nanum men}\]
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 cwædan running parallel to that of secgan, both complemented by hweort-clauses:

(2) *œas him no ða giet to gecwæden 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 cwædan, is used preverbally and related to the foregoing dative him, while in the second the simple dative him preceded was gesæd.

Another common verb used in the same kind of impersonal passive is cydan, 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 cydan complemented by a þæt-clause and another of the same kind of construction complemented by a hu-clause.

(3) *Da wearð ge-cydd þam fæder þæt martinus come þa into þære byrig.* —*ELS* 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 wærnnum, and hu he geclænsod hæfðe þæt hælge godes templ from eallum þam fyldum þe he fyrnlice þær æræde.* —*ELS* 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 ælecere lare wind awëcggan. To ðæm anstræcum is gecueden ðurh Solomon: Hie etæð ðone wæðom 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
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 gebyte gemynte wæron, swa mærlícet getimbrode. *Him was gesæd þat* heo wæron gemynnt anen sutere on Romane byrig, and hine eac némde.—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 pou trwe were Profete of þat prowynce 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 withjyne 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)

---


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, it was tolde me that at thys tyme of youre maryage ye wolde gyff ony 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 kynge 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 pat oure moost reuerent broPer 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 to!d me,’ together with those of the type ‘it is tolde me that~;’ as illustrated in (5) above. 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 tolde me that ~’ and the it in the type ‘as it is tolde 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 tolde 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 tolde me that~’ and 6 of the type ‘as it is tolde 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 ny5t, to aspie the lond.—Wyc. 2, Josh. 2.2 [cl395].

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 kynge 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]. (¼And you shall have your will, as I have been told before.)

(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 [æm cyninge] 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 [æm cyninge] 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." 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])

---

8 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 Dialogue 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].

(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 parenthetic, 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.),12 (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.),13 (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

---

12 References to the OE Hept. are limited to the cases where the examples concerned belong to the Hepta-
tateuch.
13 References to the WS Gosp. are limited to the cases where the examples concerned belong to the four
Gospels.
14 For the statistical examination of the AV examples I have depended on Strong's Exhaustive Concord-
ance of the Bible. In Group II 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>31.22</td>
<td>22.20</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod.</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam.</td>
<td>23.7, 23.13, 23.22, 27.4</td>
<td>15.12, 19.19, 24.1</td>
<td>19.21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam.</td>
<td>6.12, 19.1</td>
<td>21.11</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kings</td>
<td>2.29, 2.41</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>18.13</td>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kings</td>
<td>6.13, 8.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chron.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>37.20</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>40.21</td>
<td>13.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.10, 1.10*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeph.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>9.6, 22.10, 22.20</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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] 23.7, and (4) 1 Sam. [1 Kings] 27.4. Here we see the pattern of transition: MT wayyuggad + la-dative + kl'-clause – LXX anēngēlē [apēngēlē] + dative + hōti-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. La-dative stands for a prepositional composite prefixed by the preposition la (=to), forming a periphrastic dative equivalent. Kl is a subordinating conjunction, meaning 'because, that.'

In the LXX (Greek), anēngēlē or apēngēlē is the second aorist passive third person singular, meaning 'it was reported or told.' It may be interpreted as forming an impersonal passive. Hōti 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 kl, the Greek hōti 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] . . .

(1) Gen. 31.22—AV: and it was tolde Laban on the third day, that Jacob was fled. Cf. MT: wayyuggad lālāḇān bāyōm haḥāššiši kī bāraḥ Ŷa‘āqōb. (lit.: and-it-was-told to-Laban on-the-day the-third that fled Jacob.) / LXX: Anēngēlē dē Laban tōi Ṣyrōi* tēi trītēi hēmērāi hōtî apēdra Iakōb. (lit.: It-was-told but Laban the Syrian on-the-third day that fled Jacob.) (*Laban undeclined dat., with which tōi Ṣyrōi [m. dat.sg.; =the Syrian] is in apposition) / V: Nuntiatum est Laban* die tertio quod fugeret Jacob. (*Laban undeclined dat.) / OE Hept.: Þa cydde man Labane on þam orīddan dæge þat Jacob was asceacen. / Wyc. 1: it was tolde to Laban, the thriddle day, that Jacob fledde. / Doway: it was tolled 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: wayyuggad lōmelek Miṣrāyīm kī bāraḥ hāʾām, (lit.: and-it-was-told to-king-of Egypt that fled the people,) / LXX: Kai anēngēlē tēi Basilei tôn Aēgyptiōn hōtî pēpheugen ho laōs: (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.: x 18 / Wyc. 1: And it is told to the king of Egipcians, that the people hadde flowun; / Wyc. 2.: And it was teld to the kyng of Egipecians, that the puple hadde fledde; / Doway: And it was the king of Egyptians that the people was fled:

(3) 1 Sam. [1 Kings] 23.7—AV: And it was tolled Saul that David was come to Keilah: Cf. MT: wayyuggad lōSaʿāl kī ḥāʾ Daʿāwī Qaʾilāh. (lit.: and-it-was-told to-Saul that went David Keilah.) / LXX: Kai apēngēlē tēi Saʿāl hōti hēkei Daʿād 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] 27.1—AV: And it was tolled Saul, that Dauid was fled to Gath, Cf. MT: wayyuggad lōSaʿāl kī bāraḥ Daʿāwī Gath, (lit.: and-it-was-told to-Saul that fled David Gath,) / LXX: Kai anēngēlē tōi Saʿāl hōti pēpheugen Daʿād 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 flown 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 flown 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 wayyuggad. 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 “pa cyldede 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 teld. 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.

Next we shall observe two sets of examples: (5) I Kings [3 Kings] 2.29 and (6) I Kings [3 Kings] 2.41. Here we see the pattern of transition: MT wayyuggad+ls-dative+kt-clause→LXX ἐπενεγέλη+dative+lĕgontes+hōtī+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 lĕgontes, the nominative plural present participle meaning ‘saying.’ The medial presence of this Greek lĕgontes 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 lĕgontes and the direct speech there stands the pleonastic conjunction hōtī, as if to introduce a subordinate clause in indirect narration.19

The two sets of examples are as follows:

(5) I Kings [3 Kings] 2.29—AV: And it was told king Solomon that Joab fled into the Tabernacle of the lord, Cf. MT: wayyuggad lammeleḵ Ṣolōmōn kī nās Yō’āḇ ’el ’ōhel YHWH, (lit.: and-it-was-told to-the-king Solomon that fled Joab to tent-of Yahweh,) / LXX: Kai ἐπενεγέλη tōi Ṣalōmōn lĕgontes hōtī Ἐφηγεῖον Ἰοὰβ εἰς τὴν σκηνήν τοῦ κυρίου (lit.: and it-was-told to-Solomon they-saying that Fled Joab to the tabernacle of-the lord) / V: Nuntiatumque est regi Salomoni* quod fugisset loab in tabernaculum Domini, (*regi Salomoni dat. of rex Salomon (m.) =king Solomon) / Wyc. l: And it is toold to kyng Salomon, that Joab hadde flowen into the tabernacle of our Lord,) / Wyc. 2: And it was teld to kyng Salomon, that Jacob hadde fledde in to the tabernacle of our Lord, / Doway: And it was told king Salomon, that Joab was fled into the tabernacle of our Lord,)

(6) I 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: wayyuggad lûṢolōmōḥ* kī hālaḵ Simaʾī mirūšālaim Gaṭ wayyāšōḇ, (lit.: and-it-was-told to-Solomon that went

---

Shimei from Jerusalem to Gath and he returned.) (*liššolomōh<la ššolomōh=to Solomon) / LXX: Kai apēngélē tōi Salōmōn légontes hōti Eporeuthē Semēf ex Ierūsalēm eis Geth kai anēstrēpsen 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 Semēi in Geth de Ierusalem et redisset. / Wyc. 1: It is told forsothe to kyng Salomon, that Semai was gone to Geth fro Jerusalem, and was turned azen. / Wyc. 2: Forsothe it was told to kyng Salomon, that Semey 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 Jerusalem, 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 + la-dative + kū-clause → LXX apēngélē + dative + hōti-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'ābīmelek kī hitqabbeši kol ba’ālē migdal Šakēm. (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 hōti synēchtēsan phntes hoi andres tū pyrgū Sikimōn [andres pyrgōn 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 Sycomorum pariter conglobatos, . . . (=Abimelech, also hearing the men of the tower of Shechem gathered together, . . . ) / OE Hept.: x / Wyc. 1: And Abymelech herde the men of the towre of Sichemys togidre gedred in o company, . . . / Wyc. 2: And Abymelech herde the men of the tour of Sichem gaderid togidere, / Doway: Abimelech also hearing that the men of the towre of Sichem 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 + la-dative + kū-clause,' from which goes the line of transition: LXX apēngélē + dative + hōti-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 wa21-prefixed imperfect verb in the second clause.

21 The wa- (<wa-=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 he forbare to go forth. Cf. MT: .articles; wayyehdal imperfect, =ceased) / LXX: kal töi Saul apêngêlê hôti diasê ô(s) tae David ek Keella, kal anêken tê exelthein. (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 Celia quam ob rem dissimulavit exire. (*)quam ob rem . . . exire =wherefore he feigned to go out) / Wyc. 1: And it is told to Saul, that David hadde flown fro Seila, and was sauid; for what skyl he laft to goon out. / Wyc. 2: And it was telde to Saul, that Dauid hadde fledde fro Seila, and was saued; wherfor Saul dissymylide to go out. / Doway: and it was told Saul that David was fled from Celia and was saved: for which cause he dissembled to go 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 things 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 kt in the MT version.

(9) Job 37.20—AV: Shall it be told him that I speake? Cf. MT: hayasuppâr lô* kt 'âdabbêr: (lit.: should-it-be-told to-him that I-would-speak?) (*hayasuppâr < ha-interrogative marker + yasuppâr imperfect pual, m.3 sg. (cf. perfect piel sipper=tell, narrate); lô <lô- (=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 'âmar 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 kt. 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: ki 'âmar 'êlay, 'ârôm* ya'irim hû'. (lit.: for someone-said to-me, to-be-crafty is-crafty he.) (*'êlay < 'el=to, towards + pronominal suffix meaning 'me'; 'ârôm (in-
finitive absolute) preceding the cognate finite verb va‘rim (imperfect hiphil, m. 3 sg.), meaning '(he is very crafty) / LXX: mēpotē paṇūrgēusētai: (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 said, . . . "

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. 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 lēgontes 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 +lo-dative +le‘emōr +direct speech—LXX apēngēlē [anēngēlē] +dative +lēgontes +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‘emōr. Morphologically, lē‘emōr is a prepositional form composed of lo- (=to) and ‘e’mōr, 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.

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: Wayehi* 'abreh‘aben ha‘elleh wayyuggad* la‘Abrāhām lē‘emōr, hinneh, yālaḏāh Milkāh ġam-hi‘w bānim laNāḥōr āhīḵā, . . . (lit.: and-it-was after the-things the-those that-it-was-told to-Abraham to-say, see! she-bore Milcah also-borne children vnto thy brother Nahor, . . .) / To whom sche spake, seying as se schal here: “My owne Iason, . . . —Lydg., TB I. 2982–8 [a1420]. Also cf. the Wyc. I versions of (7), (11), (14) below, and (1) in §2.7.

23 Though we can exemplify the appositive use of OE cwedende or ME seying, e.g.: Se Wealdenda Drihten saede ðis bigspell his gingrum, ðus cwedende, "Sum welig man was mid purpuran and godewebbe geglegend, . . . —ÆCHom L.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 se schal here: “My owne Iason, . . . —Lydg., TB I. 2982–8 [a1420]. Also cf. the Wyc. I 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.)
FROM THE IMPERSONAL PASSIVE TO THE PERSONAL PASSIVE

she sons to-Nahor mother-of-you, . . . ) (*The wa- in wayy'êhî and the wa- in wayyuggad are correlated so as to constitute the sense 'and it . . . that . . . .') / LXX: Egêneto dé metà tã rhêmata taûta kai anêngêlê tòi Abraam légonêtes Ídû tétoken Melcha kai autê hýiûs Nachôr tòi adelphói sû, . . . (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=Abraho (Bagster ed.) dat. of Abraham) / OE Hept. (MS.C):27 Him wiard wiëdan gesed, pat xii sunu warren acennodon his bre5er Nachor; . . ./ Wyc. 1: And so thes things don, it was told to Abraham, that Melcha forsothe had getun sones to Nachor, his brother; . . ./ Wyc. 2: And so whanne these things weren don, it was teld 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 shear him sheepe. Cf. MT: wayyuggad, lsTâmâr, lè'môr, hinnêh ãmîk 'õleh TIMNAP'THâh lâgôz š'ônôn: (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: Kai apêngêlê Thamar têi nêmôhêi autôi légonêtes Ídû ho pentherôs sû anabainêi eis Thamna keîrai têi prôbata autê. (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. : ãa cydde man Ïamare ët hyre swear for to Ïamnatha hys scepp to sceyrene. (=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 hosebonde fader steiede vp into Tamnaps, to the sheep that shulden be clippid. / Wyc. 2: And it was teld to Thamar, that the faidr of hir hosebonde steiede to Thamnps, to schere sheep. / Doway: And it was told Thamar that her father in law came vp into Thamnass to sheare his sheepe.

(3) Josh. 10.17—AV: And it was told Joshua, saying, The fiue kings are found in a cave at Makkedah. Cf. MT: wayyuggad lhôsua* læ'môr, nimşa'û hâmêšêt hâmâlâkîm nè̂bâ'îm bâmmâ'ârah bâMaqqêdâh, (lit.: and-it-was-told to-Joshua to-say, were-found five-of the-kings ones-hiding in-the-cave at-the-Makkedah,)(*lh-hôsua'<ls-Yôhôsua'=to Joshua) / LXX: Kai apêngêlê tòi Iêša* légonêtes Heûrentai hoi pénte basileis kekrymménoi en tòi spêlalôi tòi en Makêda. (lit.: And it-was-told to-the Joshua they-saying Have-been-found the five kings hidden in the cave the in Makèda.) (*Iêša dat. of Iêsus (m.)=Joshua) / V: Nuntiatumque est Iosue, quod inventi essent quinque reges latentes in speluncula urbio Maceda. (=And it was told Joshua that the five kings were found hiding in a cave of the city of Makeda.) / OE Hept.: Ïa

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 Josue gecydd ðæt ðæ cyningas ðær lagon behyddæ 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 cite of Maceda. / Doway: And it was told Josue that the fieu|kinges were found lying hid in a caue of the citie 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: wayyuggad lammelek Dâwîd lê’môr, bêrakh YHWH ‘et-bêt ‘Ôbeḏê ‘Edôm, . . . (lit.: and-it-was-told to-the-king David to-say, blessed Yahweh [acc.s.] household-of Obed Edom, . . . ) / LXX: Kal apeiγέλ τοὶ basilei David lêgentes Éulôgêsen kýrios tôn oíkon 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 | ind. 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 Obethedom, . . . / Wyc. 2: And it was teld to the kyng Dauid, that the Lord hadde blessid Obethedon, . . . / Doway: And it was told king Dauid, that our Lord had blessed Obethedom, . . .

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 gecydd in (1) and (3) respectively, there appears in (2) the active construction with the indefinite pronoun man as subject “cydde (pret. sg. of cydan) man Pamâre ðet . . . ”. Especially, “wearð Josue gecydd 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 example (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* 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: wayyaggad Šômû’âl liqaraṭ Šâ’ûl babbôqer, wayyuggad li’Sômû’âl lê’môr, bâ’ Šâ’ûl hakkarmelâh, . . . (lit.: and-got-up Samuel to-meet Saul in-the-morning, and-it-was-told

---

28 The Hebrew `et, 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).
For (6) 1 Sam [I 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 le'mōr in the MT, légontes 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 a (=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, seiyenge," and by the Doway with "by some saying."

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 légontes and E saying in the LXX and the AV, which may radically be traced back to the Hebrew construction with the lo-infinitive construct le'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 . . . , seiyenge [seiende]" in Wyc. 1.
tolde Iudah, saying, Tamar thy daughter in law hath played the harlot, . . . Cf. MT:
wayyiqqel hoda'im wayyiqqal l'tahu'dah l'emor, za'nath Tamar kallateka, . . .
(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 triménôn anèngélé toî
Iudæ* légontes Ekpepòrneuen Thamar hê nýmphê 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 . . .) (*Iúda=Íudæs90 dat., cf. nom. Íudas) / V: Ecce autem post
tres menses nuntiaverunt Iudae,* dicentes: Fornicata est Thamar nurus tua, . . .
(*Iudae
dat. of Judæ=Judah) / OE Hept.: Fæ after þrim monþum hi cwaþon 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
tolden to Jude, seiynge, Thamar, thi sones wiijn, hath doon fornycacioun, . . . / Wyc.
2: Lo! sotheli aftir thre monethis thei telden to Judas, and seiden, ÍThamar, wiif of thi
sone, hath do fornycacioun, . . . / Doway: And behold after three months 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, Ado
niah feareth Solomon: . . . Cf. MT: wayyiqqal l'Salomô'h l'emor, hinnâ 'Adoniyâ'hû
yărē 'et hammelek Šalomôh, . . . (lit.: and-it-was-told to-Solomon to-say, see! Ado
niah fears [acc.s.] the-king Solomon, . . .) / LXX: Kai anèngélé toî Salomôn légontes
Iðû Adonias ephobētê tòn basilâ Sa'lômôn . . . (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 seyynge, Loo! Adonyas dredynge kyng Salo
mon, . . . / 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 re
cipient of the information is analytically expressed by the prepositional phrase “eis tòn
oikon 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 tolde the house of Dauid, saying, Syria is confederate
with Ephraim: Cf. MT: wayyiqqal lôbêêt Dáwi'd l'emôr, nâhâh 'Áram 'al 'Eprâim. (lit.: and-it-was-told to-house-of David to-say, allied-herself Aram with Ephraim.) / LXX:
Kai anèngélé eis tòn oikon Dauid légontes Synephônësen Aram prês 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: Requevit Syria super Ephraim. / Wyc. 1:
And thei toolden to the hous of Dauid, seieende, Siria restede vp on Effraym, / Wyc.
2: And thei telden to the hous of Dauid, and seiden, Sirie hath rested on Effraym, / Doway: And they told the house of Dauid, saying: Syrie hath rested vpon Ephraim.

ii. 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 ‘apêngeilan [anêngelian] + dative + légontes + direct speech.’ Apêngeilan [anêngelian] 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: wayyuggad lö* lê’môr, hinnêh bàDôthan. (lit.: and-it-was-told to-him to-say, see! in-Dothan.) (*lö<la-= to+m. 3 sg. pronominal suffix) / LXX: kai apêngeilan autôi* légontes Idô en Dothaim. (lit.: and they-told him saying See in Dothan.) (*autôi as 3rd personal pron., m.dat.sg.) / V: Adnuntiaveruntque ei,* dicentes: Ecce in Dothan. (*ei 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.


iv. The Old Testament of the AV contains three other examples of the type ‘it was tolde 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 ye’êmar (=it was said), that is, the imperfect niphal, whose original function is medio-passive, instead of the imperfect hophal yuggad, 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 tolde 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: wayye’êmâr lomelek Yorthô, lê’môr, hinnêh ‘ânâšîm bâ’û hênnâh hallaylûh nibbanê Yiśrâ’êl lahpôr ‘et hâ’âres. (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: Kal
apēngēlē tōi basilel Ierichō légontes Eispepōreuntai hōide andres tōn hyiōn Israēl kataska-
kopēusai tēn gēn. (lit.: And it-was-told to-the king of-Jericho they-saying Have-come-
hither men of-the sons of-Israel to-spy the land.) / V: Nuntiatumque est regi Hier-
cho, 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: Da weard
ðam cyninge gecydd ðæt ðær comon sceaweras of Israhela bearnum, ðæt hi ða burh sce-
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 Jericho, and
seid, Loo! men ben goon yn hythir bi nyȝt, of the sons of Yrael, for to aspye the loond.
/ Wyc. 2: And it was teld, and seid to the kyng of Jerico, Lo! men of the sons of Israel
entriden hidir bi ñyȝt, to aspie 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, “weard dam cyninge gecydd ðæt . . . ” ap-
ppears 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 construc-
tion, 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 construc-
tion, which reveals an aspect characteristic of Latin syntax. There we find the impersonal in-
transitive verb in the subjunctive32 preterite perfect, third person singular, percrebruisset
(=it had got well known) as predicate verb, followed by the perfect infinitive with nomin-
ative, intrasse Samson (=for Samson to have entered). This manner of expression in
the Vulgate is strictly followed by Wyc. 1 with “was pupplished (=published) . . . , Sampson
to have 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’azzāṭim, lē’mōr, bā’ Šimšōn hennah. (lit.: to-the Gazites, to-say, came
entauθa [hōide]. (lit.: And it-was-told to-the Gazites they-saying Has-come Samson
hither.) / V: Quod cum audissent Philisthim, et percrebruisset apud eos, intrasse urbes
Samson, . . . (=When which 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 hadde seen, and was pupplished anentis hem, Sampson to
have come into the citee, . . . / Wyc. 2: And whanne Filisteis hadde 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: Nunciatum-
que est regi Jericho: 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) I Sam. 24.1 involve a number of peculiarities. First, in respect of textual location, I Sam. 24.1 of the AV corresponds to I 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 "I 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 + lè'môr + 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 'apêngêlê + dative + legontîn + hôti + direct speech.' As contrasted with the nominative plural present participle légontes introducing hôti + 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, legontîn 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) I Sam. 24.1[2] / 1 Kings 24.2—AV: And it came to passe when Saul was returned from following the Philistines, that it was told him, saying, Behold, Davids is in the wilderness of En-gedi. Cf. MT: wayyaghî ka'âser šâb* Šâ'ûl mî'âhârê Pâlištîm, wayyaggidû* lô, lè'môr, hinnêh Dâvíd bemîqîrî 'En Geûdi. (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 qa/šâb in the first clause and the wa-prefixed imperfect hiphil wayyaggidû in the second clause constitute a conjunctive narrative sequence.) / LXX: Kai egenêthe hós anêstrepsen Saül apô ópîsthen tôn allophôn, kai apêngêlê autôi legontîn hôti Dayid en têi erêmôi 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 En-gedi.) / V: Cumque reversus esset Saul, postquam persecutus est Philisteos, nuntiaverunt et* dicentes: Ecce, David in deserto est Engaddi. (*et dem. pron., m. dat. sg.) / Wyc. 1: And whanne Saul was turned azen, after that he hadde pursued the Philisteis, thei toolden to hym, seiynge, Loo! Davids is in the desert Engaddi. / Wyc. 2: And whanne Saul turnede azen, aftir that he pursuied Filisteis, thei telden to hym, and seiden, Lo! David is in the desert of Engaddi. / Doway: And when Saul was returned, after he pursued the Philistines, they told him, saying: Behold, Daud 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.
We find that it corresponds exactly to the type of construction occurring in the MT version: ‘wayyaggad+la-dat/direct speech’ without the introductory 'lêmôr.' This special, or exceptional, phenomenon can thus be accounted for. The LXX, on the other hand, has recourse to the more usual pattern ‘anêngêlê+dat/légontes+direct speech.’ The Vulgate has the type of indirect narration, ‘nuntiatum est+dat/légontes+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 Ioab, Behold, the king weepeth and mourneth for Absalom. Cf. MT: wayyaggad lêYoô'ãh, hinnêh, hammelek bôkêh wayyi't'abbēl 'al 'Abšâlōm. (lit.: and-it-was-told to-Joab, see! the-king weeping and-mourns for Absalom.) / LXX: Kai anêngêlê tôi lôab lêgontes Idû ho basleus klaiêi kai pentheî epi Abessalôm. (lit.: And it-was-told to-the Joab they-saying See the king weeps and mourns for Absalom.) / V: Nuntiatum est autem Ioab quod rex fleret et lugeret filium suum: / Wyc. 1: Forsothe it is tooold to Joab, that the kyng wept, and weilide his sone; / Wyc. 2: Forsothe it was teld to Joab, that the kyng wepte, and bi-weilide his sone; / Doway: And it was told Ioab, 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: Ape nêgêlê deê autôî,* hê métër sû kai hoî adelphoi sû hêstêkasin éxô ideîn thêlontês se. (lit.: It-was-told and to-him: the mother thy and the brothers thy are-standing outside to-see wishing thee.) (*autôî 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.: Da was him gecyded, þin modor and þine gebrôðru standa5 her ute, wylla5 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 bretheren stonden with outhe forth, willinge to se thee. / Wyc. 2: And it was teeld to hym, Thi modir and thi bretheren stonden withouthe forthwith, wolde se te the. / 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 brethren 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 legôntôn 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 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.


(1) 1 Kings [3 Kings] 18.13—AV: Was it not told my lord, what I did when Jezebel slew the Prophets of the Lord? how I hid an hundred men of the Lords Prophets . . . ? Cf. MT: hālo‘ huggad* la’dōni ‘et ṭāser ‘ašiti bahārōg 'Izebel 'et nəḇî‘ê YHWH wa‘aḥbi’ minnəḇî‘ê YHWH me‘āh ḫiš . . . (lit.: not? it-was-told to-thee to-the lord my . . . ) (*huggad perfect hophal, m.3 sg. [cf. (8) in §2.31]) / LXX: ἕ̣ ὁ ἄγγελός σοι τοῖς κυρίοι μῦ ἡλία πεποίηκα ἐν τοῖς ἄγγελοι τῆς Ἰζαμής τοὺς προφήτας κυρίου καὶ ἐκρυψα ἀπὸ τῶν προφήτων κυρίου ἑκατὸν ἄνδρας . . . (lit.: What? not has-it-been-told to-thee to-the lord my

29 Cf. OED, s.v. how adv. 10; MED, s.v. how 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 interficceret 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. < indicio = 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 lezabel killed the prophetes of our Lord, that I hid of the prophetes 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 'et before the clause introduced by 'āšer (=what). This discloses the accusative nature latent in the 'āšer-clause as it is used in this kind of construction. 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 'ω-+ imperfect,' that is, the second part of the perfect + imperfect sequence. In the LXX we find the first clause, which is introduced by hoi̇̄a, linked to the second clause by the coordinating conjunction kai. This Greek kai, which is the copied counterpart of the Hebrew wa-, should be translated into 'that,' rather than 'and.' The Vulgate, on the other hand, has "quod? ~ 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 Dauid what Rizpah the daughter

---

84 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.
85 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: wayyaggad lāRibqāh 'et diḥrê 'Esāw—MT, Gen. 27.42. (lit.: and-it-was-told to Rebekah [acc.n.] words-of Esau) (Cf. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, §121 a.)
86 The Greek hoi̇̄a, n.acc.pl. of holȯs, which is primarily a relative pronoun meaning 'such' as, of such sort as, here functions as indirect interrogative, meaning 'what kind of things.'
87 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 laDáwid 'ét 'āšer 'āšatáh Respáh bát 'Ayáy pílegeš Šá-ul, (lit.: and-it-was-told to-David [acc.n.] what did Rizpah daughter-of Aiah concubine-of Saul,) / LXX: Kai apèngélē tóü David hósa epolíśen Rhespha thygá térr Aia pallahè Saul, (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 thingis ben toold to David, the whiche did Respha, the dou3ter of Ahia, the second-arve wijf of Saul. / Wyc. 2: And tho thingis whiche Respha, secondarie wijf of Saul, dou3tir 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 'ét 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 hósá48-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 servants, how that the Lord thy God commanded his servant Moses to give you all the land, and to destroy all the inhabitants of the land from before you, Cf. MT: wayyómarù ki huggéd* huggad laábahádéka 'ét 'āšer šíwwáh YHWH 'elóhíka 'ét Móše 'ábdó láqet lákem 'ét kol há-āres, úáhášmúd 'ét kol yöshab há-āres mîppanèkem, (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-destroy us and all the ones-dwelling on it from before you,) (*The infinitive absolute huggéd is used before the finite huggad, perfect hophal, to emphasize the verbal idea that the latter expresses.) / LXX: Aněngélē hémín hósa synétaxen kyríos ho theós sú Móysèi tóī paidí autù, dúnai hymín tèn gén tautén kal exolethreúsai hémás kal pántas tús katoikúntas ep’ autés apò prosòpù hymôn, (lit.: It-was-told to-us how commanded the-Lord the God they 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] promisisset 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

---

48 The Greek hósá is a relative, n.acc.pl. of hósos, and primarily means ‘as many as, all that.’
49 The Latin quae is n.acc.pl. of the relative qui.
all the inhabitants of it.) / OE Hept.: x / Wyc. 1: *It is told to vs thi seruauntis, that the Lord thi God hadde bihoot to Moyses, his seruaunt, that he shulde taak to sow al the loond, and scatre the dwellers of it; / Wyc. 2: *It was told to vs thi seruauntis, that thi Lord God bihi3te to Moises, his seruaunt, that he schulde bitake to sow al the lond, and schulde leese alle the dwellers therof; / Doway: *It was told vs thy 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 'ēt before the 'āšer-clause, where 'āšer functions adverbially, meaning 'how.' In the LXX hōsa, 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 hōsa 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 citie, and it shall be told thee what thou must doe. Cf. NTGk: alla anastethi kai eiselthe eis tēn pōlin kai lalēthēsetai* soi hō ti* se de poiēin. (lit.: but rise-thou-up and enter into the city and it-will-be-told thee what thee it-behoves to-do.) (*lalēthēsetai pass. I fut. 3 sg. < lalēo=speak; hō ti 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. < dicō=say, tell) / Wyc. 1: Ryse thou, and entre in to the citee, and it schal be seide to thee, what it bhoueth 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 cite, 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 + hō ti→ 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: Mēnytheïseis dē moi epibûlēs

---

40 Bihi3te 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)).
FROM THE IMPERSONAL PASSIVE TO THE PERSONAL PASSIVE

As for the leading impersonal passive predicate, it should be specially noted that the NTGk has the absolute participial construction with the feminine genitive ménýtheisēs agreeing with the subsequent noun epibulēs, which together with the infinitive ēsesthai 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.: eménýthē (pass. 1 aor. 3 sg.) moi epibulē (f.nom.sg.) ēsesthai (=it was revealed to me that there would be a plot . . . ).

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 poreúō eis Damaskōn kakeī soi laêthēsetai peri ñonton hōn tētaktaī soī poíēsai. (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 Damascum: et ibi tibi dicetur 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 tolde thee of al things that thou must doe.

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

---

peri+genitive+hôn\textsuperscript{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) ans (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: wayyaghêd* lôYa'qôb wayyômer* lôYôsêp, hinînê 'âbîkâ hôlêh. (lit.: and-it-was after the-things the-these that-someone-said to-Joseph, see! father-of-you being-ill.) (*wayyaghêd<wa-+%ygghâd imperfect hiphil, m. 3 sg.; wayyômer<wa-+%yômar imperfect qal, m. 3 sg.) / LXX: Apêngêlê de tôî Iosêph hôtî* ho patêr sê enochleítai, (lit.: It-happened and after the things these that it-was-told to-the Joseph that The father thy is-afflicted,) (*hôtî recitative hûtî\textsuperscript{43}) / V: His ita transactis nuntiatum est loseph quod aegrotaret pater eius: (=These being so done, it was told Joseph that his father was ill:) / OE Hept.: Da pis wês ôus gedon, ôa cydde man Ioseph pat his fêder wêre gesyled, (=When this was so done, someone told Joseph that his father was taken ill,) / Wyc. 1: And so thes things 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 told 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 loseph cometh vnto thee: Cf. MT: wayyaghêd* lôYa'qôb wayyômer,* hinînê binôkâ Yôsêp bâ' âlékâ. (lit.: and-one-told to-Jacob and-one-said, see! son-of-you Joseph came to-you.) (*wayyaghêd<wa-+%yagghâd imperfect hiphil, m. 3 sg.; wayyômer<wa-+%yômar imperfect qal, m. 3 sg.) / LXX: Apêngêlê de tôî Iakôb lêgontes Iôdô ho hyiôs sê Iôsêph érchetai pros sé. (lit.: It-was-told and to-the Jacob they-saying See the son thy Joseph comes to thee.) / V: Dictumque est sent: 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 fêet Iosep his suna ware 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 Joseph 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-

\textsuperscript{42} The grammatical form of the Greek relative hôn (n.gen.pl.) has been attracted to that of its antecedent pântôn (n.gen.pl.).
\textsuperscript{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: wayyaggad la'Abimelech. (lit.: and-it-was-told to-Abimelech.) / LXX A[B]: kai apêngêle toî Abimelech [basilei Abimelech]. (lit.: and-it-was-told to-the Abimelech [king Abimelech].) / V: nuntiatumque est Abimelech. / OE Hept.: x / Wyc. 1 & 2: and it is told to Abymalech. / Doway: and it was told Abimelech.

(2) 2 Sam. [2 Kings] 10.17—AV: And when it was told Dauid, he gathered all Israel together, Cf. MT: wayyaggad laDawid, wayye'esôp 'et kol Yiśrâ'el, (lit.: when-it-was-told to-David, then-he-gathered [acc.n.] all-of Israel,) / LXX: Kai apêngêle toî Dauid, kai synêgagen tôn pánta Israîel (lit.: And it-was-told to-the David, and he-gathered the all Israel) / V: Quod cum* nuntiatum esset David, contraxit omnem Israhel, (*quod rel.pron., n.nom.sg.,=which; cum=when) / Wyc. 1: And whanne it was toold to Dauid, he drewȝ togidre al Israel, / Wyc. 2: And whanne this was teld to Dauid, he drow togidere al Israel, / Doway: Which when it was told Dawid he gathered together al Israel,

(3) 1 Chron. 19.17—AV: And it was tolde Dauid, and hee gathered all Israel, Cf. MT: wayyaggad laDawid, wayye'esôp 'et kol Yiśrâ'el, (lit.: when-it-was-told to-David, then-he-gathered [acc.n.] all-of Israel,) / LXX: Kai apêngêle toî Dauid, kai synêgagen tôn pánta Israîel (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 Dauid, he gaderde al Yrael, / Wyc. 2: And whanne this was teld to Dauid, he gaderide al Israel, / Doway: Which when it was told Dawid, he gathered together al Israel,

First it should be noted that the Hebrew yuggad, the Greek apêngêle, 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: Daßnach 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: Aprèes 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. I and the Doway in (3). Particularly, Wyc. I “The whiche thing whan was tolde to Dauld” appears very clumsy. In the Doway “Which when it was told Dauid” the redundancy of it is exposed. On the contrary, the use of the demonstrative this in Wyc. 2 “And whanne this was told to Dauid” 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 yaggad).

(4) Isa. 40.21—AV: hath it not beene tolde you from the beginning? Cf. MT: hālō’ huggad mērō’s lākem. (lit.: not? has-it-been-told from-beginning to-you.) / LXX: ἕκαν ἀνέγκλητε ἐκ ἀρχῆς χορημίν; (lit.: not? has-it-been-told from beginning you.) / V: numquid* non admuntiam est ab initio vobis? (*numquid interrogative particle introducing a direct question to which a negative answer is expected) / Wyc. 1: whether not told to you it is fro the bigynnynge? / Wyc. 2: whether it was not teld to 50u fro the begynnynge? / 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 yaggidā, which, along with the corresponding impersonal passive apēngēlē 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: wayyaggidā laṣā‘āl, wayyiššāl mal’āḵīm ‘ăḥērim, (lit.: and-they-told to-Saul, and-he-sent men more-ones,) / LXX: Kai apēngēlē tōi Saūl, kai apēsteilen angēlūs hetērūs, (lit.: And it-was-told to-the Saul, and he-sent messengers others,) / V: Quod cum nuntiatum esset Saūli, misit et alios nuntios: / Wyc. 1: The whiche whanne was toold to Saul, he sente and other messagers; / Wyc. 2: And whanne this was teld 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 Saili” 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 teld 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 “apēngēlē 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 worshipped them . . . And it be told thee, and thou hast heard of it, . . . Cf. MT: kí yimmāšē . . . 'Ăš 'ō 'iššāh 'ăšer ya'ăšeḥ 'et ħāra' ba'ēnē YHWH 'ēlōhēkā . . . wayyēlek wāyya'ăḇōd 'ēlōhim 'ăhērīm wayyīštahū lāhem . . . wāhuggad* laḵā wašāmā- 'ātā . . . (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 . . .) (*wāhuggad<wa-huggad perfect hophal, m.3 sg.) / LXX: Eān dē heurethēi . . . anēr è gymnē, hōstis poiēsei τὸ ἄλλο τούτου τῷ καί ἐλθόντες λατρεύσοιν θεοῖς άλλοις καὶ προσκύνησοίν αὐτοῖς, . . . καὶ anangelēi* 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-worship them, . . . and-it-should-be-told thee, . . .) (*anangelēi 2 aorist passive, subj.3 sg.) / V: Cum reperti fuerint . . . vir aut mulier qui faciant malum in conspectu Domini Dei tui, . . . Ut* vadam et serviant diis alienis, et adorem eos, . . . Et hoc* tibi fuerit nuntiatum, audiensque*. . . (*ut . . eos=so that they may go and serve other gods, and wor- ship 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 siȝt 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 siȝte of thi Lord God, ben foundun . . ., that thei go and serue alien goddis, and worshippe hem . . .; and this is told 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 seen, as it was told unto them. Cf. NTGk: Kai hypēstrepsan hoi poimēnes doxázontes kai ainūntes tōn theōn epi pāsin hois ēkūsan kai eidon kathōs elaśēthē* prōs autōs. (lit.: And returned the shepherds glorifying and praising the God at all-things which they-heard and saw as was-told to them.) (*elaśēthē 1 aorist passive, 3 sg.<lalēō=Speak, tell) / V: Et reversi sunt pastores glorificantes, et laudantes Deum in omnibus, quae audierant et viderant, sicut dictum est ad illos. / WS Gosp.: Þa gewendon ham þa heyrds, God wuldriende and heriende on eallum þam Þe hegyrdon and gesawon, swa to him gecweden wes. / Wyc. 1: And the shepherdis turneden aȝen, glorifiynge 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 a3en, glorifynge and heriynge God in alle thingis that thei hadden herd and seyn, as it was seid to hem. / Tyn.: And the shepherdes returned, praysynge and laudynge God for all that they had herde and serne, evyn as itt was told unto them. / Rhemes: And the shepheards returned, glorifying and praysing 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 gár tōi theōi hōtōs ēstai kath' hon trópon lelētētai* moi. (lit.: I-believe for the God that thus it-will-be in whichever way it-has-been-told me.) (*le-lētētai passive perfect, 3 sg.<lalēo=peak, tell) / V: credo enim Deo, quia sic erit,* quemadmodum* dictum est mihi. (*quia sic erit=because it will be so; quemadmodum <quam [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 beleve God that so it shall 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 [euen] 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: ki dāḇār* ēlay biḏāḇār YHWH, lōʾ tōʾkāl leḥem wālōʾ tišteḥ šām māyim; lōʾtašāḇ lälekēt badderek ṭāʾer hālāktā 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.) (*dāḇār perfect qal, m.3 sg.; ēlay<preposition 'el [=to, towards] + pronominal suffix meaning 'me') / LXX: Hōtī hūtōs entētalτai* moi en lōgōi kyriōs, lēgōn, Mē pháγēs ārton ekē kai mē piēs hýdōr ekē kai mē epistrpēpsēs en tēi hodōi, hēi eπoreuēthēs 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.) (*entētalτai middle perfect, 3 sg.<entēllo=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, seiyng, Thou shalt not ete bread, and thou shalt not drynke watir there, ne thou shalt turne a3en 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 eate bread, and thou shalt not drinke water there, neither thou shalt turne azen
bi the weie bi which thou 3edist. / 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 daubinge wherwith ye haue dawbed it? Cf. MT: w3hinnnh n3pal
haqqir, h4l0' ye'am3er 'al3ekem,* 'ayy3h hatta'h 'a3er ta'them. (lit.: when-see! collapses
the-wall, not? it-will-be-said to-you, where? the-whitewash that you-covered.) (*ye-
'am3er imperfect niphal [cf. (12) in §2.4]; 'al3ekem <'el [prep.,=to, towards]+pronominal
suffix for 2nd person m.pl.) / LXX: K4 id3 p3pt0ken ho tochos, kai ük er3sin* pr3s
hymas P3 estin h3 aloiph3 hymon, h3n ãleipsate; (lit.: And see! has-fallen the wall,
and not will-they-say to you Where is the plaster your, wherewith ye-plastered-it?)
(*er3sin future, 3 pl.; pr3s hymas [acc.pl.,=you] dative equivalent) / V: Siquidem, ecce
ccidit 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 doun. Whether it shal not be seid to
5ou. Wher is the dawbynge, that 3e dawbiden? / Wyc. 2: For lo! the wal felle doun.
Whether it schal not be seid to 3ou, Where is the pargetynge,* which 3e 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: w3haylh bimaq3m 'a3er ye'am3er l4hem,* l0'
'am3i 'attem, ye'am3er l4hem, bani 'El 33y. (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.) (*ye'am3er imperfect niphal [cf. (2) above]; l4hem<l3s <to+h3m=they [m.pl.])
/ LXX: kai ãstai en to3 t3po3i, h3 err3th3* autol3 U laos m3 hymeli, ek3 kl3th3son4i*
hyioi th3 z0ntos. (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.) (*err3th3 passive 1
aor., 3 sg.<elpon=say; kl3th3son4i passive future, 3 pl.<kal33o=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 3e; it schal be seid to hem, Sones
of God lyuynge. / Wyc. 2: and it schal be in the place, where it schal be seid to hem,
3e ben not my puple; it schal be seid to hem, 3e ben the sones of God lyuynge. / Doway:
And it shall be in place where it shal be sayd to them: Not my people you: it shal be sayd
to them: Children of the liuyng God.

(5) Zeph. 3.16—AV: In that day it shall be said to Jerusalem, 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 'yê'amèr lîrûsâlaim,* 'al tîrâ'i, . . . (lit.: on-the-day the-that it-will-be-said to-Jerusalem, not you-fear, . . .) (*'yê'amèr imperfect niphal [cf. (2) (3) (4) above]; lîrûsâlaim <lî=to+ Yôrûsâlaim=Jerusalem) / LXX: En tôi kairôi ekeînôi erê† yôrîs têî Iêrûsâlêm* Thârsêi, . . . (lit.: At the time that will-say the-Lord to-the Jerusalem Be-of-good-courage, . . .) (*erêf future 3 sg.,=(he) will say; têî Iêrûsâlêm f.dat.sg.,=to Jerusalem) / V: In die illa dicetur Hierusalem: Noli timere: . . . (=In that day it will be said to Jerusalem: Do not fear: . . .) / Wyc. 1: In that day it shall be said, Jerusalem, nyl thou dreede; . . . / Wyc. 2: In that day it shall be said, Jerusalem, nyle thou drede; . . . / Doway: In that day it shall be said to Jerusalem: 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 shall not minish ought from your brickes of your dayly taske. Cf. MT: wayyire't ~tore bene Yiâ'el '6tam bora' Ie'n5r* 'îd' tig'ro'fi millibukem deb_ar yôm bay6m6.* (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.) (*lîndr infinitive construct, =saying; yôm bay6mô=each of the days) / LXX: Herôrôn dê hoi grammateis tôn hyiôn Iêsrâ'îl heautûs en kakois lêgontes* Ük apoleîpsete tês plintheias tô kathêkon* têî hêmerài. (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.) (*lêgontes m.nom.pl. present participle, agreeing with the preceding finite verb heôrôn [imperfect 3 pl., =they saw]; tô kathêkon [n.acc.sg.] object of apoleîpsete, meaning ‘(to do) that which belongs’) / V: Videbantque se prae-positi filiorum IâshâREL in malo, eo quod dicetur 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.) (*dicetur subjunctive passive imperfect, 3 sg., <dico=say; eis m.dat.pl., =to them) / OE Hept.: And Israhela folces prafastas gesawon bêt hy47 wêron geswenete, for õam õe him was gesed êt har hym nære nan õing ões tigolegewercoes forgynen, buton on õam ilcan gemete õe hi ær gewuna wêron. (=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 sons of Iysrael saw hem seluen into yuel, for that it was seide to hem, There shall not be maad lasse eny thing of the tiles bi eche daies. / Wyc. 2: And the soureyns of the children of Israel sien hem siff in yuel, for it was seid to hem, No thing schal be decreessid of tijl stoounos bi alle daies. / Doway: And the ouersers of the children of Israel saw them selues in hard case, because it was said vnto them: There shall not a white be diminithed of the brickes 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 “erē tēi Hierošalēm” (5 Zeph. 3.16), with the Greek impersonal passive verb, as in “ērrēthē autoīs” ((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 “dicetur eis” ((6) Exod. 5.19), and with the OE impersonal passive verb, as in “him was gęsęd” ((6) Exod. 5.19).

The prepositional dative equivalent is used with the Hebrew active verb, as in “dāḇār ’ēlāy” ((1) 1 Kings 13.17), with the Hebrew impersonal passive verb, as in “yēʾāmēr lāḥem” ((3) and (4) Hos. 2.1), “yēʾāmēr lirūšālaim” (5 Zeph. 3.16), and “yēʾāmēr ’ālēkem” (2 Ezek. 13.12), with the Greek active verb, as in “erūsin 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 you” (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 Jerusalem” (5) Doway, Zeph. 3.16), “it was said vnto them” (6) Doway, Exod. 5.19), “it was said to mee” (1) AV, I Kings 13.17), “it shall be said to Jerusalem” (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).

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).

