

gives *toga* a Christian reference, *candidiore toga niveum pietatis amictum | sumere* (c. *Symm.* i 547), and elsewhere employs the word in its older and more natural sense, e. g. *sanciens | mundum Quirinali toge | servire et armis cedere* (*Perist.* ii 419), a phrase reminiscent of Cicero's famous *cedant arma togae*.

C. L. FELTOE.

Since writing the above, another clear instance of this use of *toga* has come to my notice in the *missa* for SS. Simon and Jude (col. 88g): *solicita . . . convenire debet fidelium toga*.

JOSEPHUS ON JOHN THE BAPTIST.

IN *The Beginnings of Christianity* vol. i p. 102 f Dr Foakes Jackson and Dr Kirsopp Lake maintain that Josephus's version of the work of John Baptist has been generally misinterpreted by scholars, who have been misled by Whiston's translation of *Antiquities* xviii 5. 2. The passage is as follows: κτείνει γὰρ δὴ τοῦτον Ἡρώδης ἀγαθὸν ἄνδρα, καὶ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις (τοὺς Ἰουδαίους Epit.) κελεύοντα, ἀρετὴν ἐπασκοῦσι (ἐπασκοῦντας Epit.) καὶ τὰ πρὸς ἀλλήλους δικαιοσύνη καὶ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εὐσεβεία χρωμένους (χρωμένους Epit. Eus.), βαπτισμῷ συνιέναι. Whiston translates the passage thus: 'For Herod slew him, who was a good man, and commanded the Jews to exercise virtue both as to justice toward one another and piety towards God, and so to come to baptism.' The editors of *The Beginnings of Christianity* criticize this rendering on the ground that it would require the participles ἐπασκοῦσιν and χρωμένους to be in the accusative instead of the dative. '[Whiston's] explanation', they say, 'seems to have been adopted by the Epitome which has emended the datives into accusatives. This cannot be the true text, but there is perhaps a possibility that the text found in Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* i 11. 5 is right which emends χρωμένους into χρωμένους, but leaves ἐπασκοῦσι' (p. 102 n. 2). The editors themselves translate as follows: 'For Herod killed him, a good man, and one who commanded the Jews, training themselves in virtue and practising righteousness to one another and piety towards God, to come together for baptism.' This translation is literal, but ambiguous. It might still bear the same meaning as Whiston's more idiomatic version, which connects the participles with the infinitive συνιέναι, or it may mean to construe the participles with τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, thus giving a sense which would be more naturally represented in English by a relative clause—'John commanded

those Jews, who were training themselves in virtue . . . to come together for baptism.' The editors of *The Beginnings of Christianity* make it plain that they intend the latter sense. 'According to Whiston', they say, 'it means that John was addressing penitents, who were only beginning to turn to the pursuit of virtue. . . . But in view of the general content, it would rather seem that Josephus means that John preached originally to those who were already making especial practice of virtue' (p. 102). Later on they speak more confidently: 'The true text of Josephus represents him as preaching first to a body of "ascetics", and afterwards to others' (p. 105). And again: 'The real difference between Josephus and the Gospels as a whole is that Josephus represents [John] as preaching to those who had especially devoted their lives to virtue, and offering baptism as the crowning point of righteousness, whereas the Gospels, including Luke, represent the baptism of John as one of repentance for the remission of sins' (p. 106). The editors thus construct the participles *ἐπασκούσι* and *χρωμένους* with *τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις* and give them the force of an English relative clause. But this would require an article before the participles: *τοῖς ἀρετὴν ἐπασκούσι καὶ . . . χρωμένοις*. In the absence of the article, Whiston gives the only possible interpretation and Josephus agrees with the Gospels that John's mission was to the Jewish people. There is no difficulty. The Epitome puts the participles into the accusative, because it gives *κελεύω* its classical construction of the accusative of the person, and reads *τοὺς Ἰουδαίους*. The following sentence from *Antiquities* xix 1. 13 fin. shews that an infinitive does not attract into an accusative a participle which is naturally in the dative: *Ἀσπρήνας δὲ . . . παρήγει τῷ Γαίῳ . . . ὑπεξελλόντι πρὸς τε λουτρῷ καὶ ἀρίστῳ γενέσθαι, καὶ ἔπειτα δὲ εἰσελθεῖν*.

J. M. CREED.

NOTES FROM PAPYRI.

THE following notes on the language of the New Testament are based on the fourteenth volume of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*.

I. *Lexical Notes.*

Ἀκολύτως, Ac. xxviii 31. The adverb, according to Moulton and Milligan, becomes very common from the second century of our era. They give examples from contracts and similar documents dated from A. D. 164 onwards. The present volume provides an example in a contract of A. D. 68 (no. 1641), as well as several later instances. We have then clear evidence of the use of this adverb in legal documents at