

from inward trust more than from anything else that a man's life for Christ gains the outward triumph of maintaining itself worn but unstooping to the end.

JAMES MOFFATT.

ON A RECENT EMENDATION IN THE TEXT OF
ST. PETER.

IN the EXPOSITOR for last year I ventured the suggestion that the obscurity in one of the most perplexing statements in the New Testament, that passage which affirms of Christ a mission (either evangelic or the opposite) to the fallen angels, was due to a very simple cause, viz., the omission of the name of Enoch after a group of similar letters. And it was suggested that the first step towards clearing the Petrine argument was the restoration of the name and the subsequent study of the passage in the light of certain descriptions which are found in the book of Enoch. Since writing the article in question, it has come to my knowledge that I had just anticipated, in the emendation referred to, a much better scholar than myself, and also that both of us had been anticipated, some years since, by a celebrated Dutch theologian. This is in the highest degree interesting. For though, at the first sight, the successful emendation of an obscure passage is like the famous pool of Bethesda, where the first man that troubles the pool monopolizes the virtues, and all who follow him obtain nothing for their patience and their pains, it must be remembered that the medicinal act is not always so clear, in the critical world, as to convince mankind of the miracle. And we must not be surprised if the angel that is set over Conjectural Emendations (to imitate a phrase from Hermas) should find it to his credit to trouble the water two or three times for the same disease.

One wonders what would have happened at the famous pool if two persons had jumped in at precisely the same psychological instant! Would they both have been healed? Or if a difficult passage should be doctored simultaneously and independently by a couple of experts with the very same result, ought we to believe them?

It may, perhaps, be accepted as a canon that when there is more than one hand occupied in producing an adroit emendation of a passage, the value of the emendation is greatly increased. And for this reason we were glad to find from Dr. M. R. James that the very same reading had occurred to himself which we had published last year.

But then the emendation really hails from Holland. It was made by Cramer in 1891, and will be found in his *Nieuwe bijdragen op het gebied van godgeleerdheid en wijsbegeerte*. That makes three justices' hands to it, as Autolycus would say. The emending hands may at least be held to correct one another for personal equation. We were not, all of us, suffering from Enoch on the brain.

Cramer's emendation, for such we may now call it, was attacked by Baljon in a series of papers on Conjectural Emendation in the New Testament, which he wrote in *Theol. Studiën* for 1890. And certainly in the form in which Cramer presented the matter it was far from convincing. Cramer was anxious to get rid of the passage altogether as an interpolation which had arisen in the following manner: An early scribe, commenting upon 1 Peter iii. 24, where the angels and authorities and powers are said to have become subject to the ascended Christ, writes upon his margin the remark, which was due to a comparative study of 2 Peter and Enoch, that "Enoch went and preached to the spirits in prison," and this comment

'Ενώχ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πορευθεῖς ἐκήρυξεν
becomes corrupted into

ἐν ᾧ καὶ κτέ

and absorbed into the text, where it was misunderstood of a visit of Christ to the angels and of a preaching of doom.

It will be seen that this is not nearly simple enough as a history of textual corruption, and it ignores the Petrinism of $\epsilon\nu\ \phi$ for the opening of a sentence. Moreover, Cramer did not know, as we now do, that Enoch had been actively used in the first chapter, or he would not have been so hasty to eject the passage, nor so subtle as to imagine a commentator upon 1 Peter who had been misled by a study of 2 Peter and Jude into a remote reference to the book of Enoch. No doubt this method is incorrect, but the emendation itself may be correct where the reconstruction is faulty.

Baljon appears to me to hold a brief against emendations of the text of the New Testament, but it must be allowed that in this case Cramer had not presented the matter attractively, so that there was some excuse for a negative verdict on the part of Baljon.

I came across the reference to Cramer (to whose work I have not yet had direct access) in Dr. Carl Clemen's essay entitled *Niedergefahren zu den Toten*, which was published at Giessen in 1900. And a few days after I had noticed the passage, Dr. Clemen himself asked my attention to it, as well as my opinion of the adverse verdict which he had passed upon Cramer.

If I may venture to comment adversely upon an extremely interesting and valuable contribution to the subject of the Descent into Hades, I should say that Dr. Clemen was too anxious to make modern theology to be perfectly unprejudiced in his treatment of ancient theology. He wishes to ground the modern doctrine of the Larger Hope, as it is commonly called, upon the larger interpretation of the Descent of Christ into Hell. Now the "Larger Hope" can safely be left to take care of itself; it depends not upon the creed but upon the Larger Mercy of God; and we must

not take the reference in 1 Peter out of its historical setting and certain connexion with the book of Enoch, in order to elaborate a doctrine of hope beyond the grave. The fallen angels are a bad historical precedent for either hopes or fears. To begin with, in the Enochian sense they never existed; and further, they existed to the mind of the eschatologist who discoursed on them, in Tartarus and not in Hades (as I was recently reminded by Mr. St. Clair). Thus the article in the creed is not in evidence.

So we will ask Dr. Clemen to leave the passage in 1 Peter which speaks of the "spirits in prison" outside of his future treatment of a very important matter of Christian speculation. And with this suggestion (I hope he will forgive its freedom) we may for the present leave the matter.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.