right means for grasping as a homogeneous whole all the passages in Jeremiah which contain references to sacrifice, throws at the same time a welcome light upon other utterances in the Old Testament which concern the rank assigned to the sacrificial regulations. But these must be discussed on another occasion.

Ed. König.

_DID OUR LORD, OR ENOCH, “PREACH TO THE SPIRITS IN PRISON”?_

Dr. Rendel Harris has recently contributed to this magazine some very interesting notes on the connexion of 1 Peter with the Book of Enoch. (6th Series iv. 194–346, v. 317.) He suggests that the name Ἔνωχ in 1 Peter iii. 19 has dropped out of the text, by similarity (of sound) or the ἐν ὄνομα καὶ with which that verse commences.

In his last paper, he states that the proposed emendation had occurred to Dr. M. R. James recently, and to the Dutch theologian Cramer in 1891. They, however, seem to consider the ἐν ὄνομα καὶ as a substitute for Ἔνωχ. His view is certainly the preferable one (if one of the two emendations must be adopted) for reasons which he gives.

But I venture to call his attention and that of your readers to the note in Stier and Thiele's Polyglot New Testament of A.D. 1855. It is


Bowyer published in 1763 in London a Greek New Testament in two volumes, with Wetstein’s approved readings, and a collection of critical conjectures, which were not necessarily his own. These conjectures were afterwards published separately. They also are contained in Knapp's
New Testament of 1797, from which Rudolf Stier appears to have derived them.

The proposed substitution of 'Evωχ for the received text (or the addition of the word) is therefore a proposal of at least 139 years' antiquity, and it may be far older. It would be interesting to trace Bowyer's note to its original author. S. T. Bloomfield (A.D. 1828) refers to it contemptuously (Recensio Synoptica, viii. 671), but he seems to imply that several authors had made or continued the proposal. "Some resort to critical conjecture, which merits no attention." Who are the "others" referred to by Stier? Nihil sub sole novum! George Farmer.

THE HISTORY OF A CONJECTURAL.
EMENDATION.

Mr. Farmer has, in the preceding note, made the important observation that the conjectural restoration which was proposed in this magazine for the difficult passage 1 Pet. iii. 19 is more ancient than I had supposed, and that it was already extant in Bowyer's Conjectures to the New Testament, from whom it passed into the Sylloge Conjecturarum at the end of Knapp's New Testament, and thence into the footnotes of the Polyglot edition of Stier and Thiele. His discovery adds new force to some remarks of my own, when trying to do justice to those who had independently lighted upon the emendation, either in the form which I gave or one closely related to it. I think that I pointed out that if three independent workers (say Dr. Cramer, Dr. James, and myself) had suggested the correction, the subjectivity which is the bane of conjectural restoration is reduced nearly to zero, and that we might use Shakesperian language, and say that there were "three justices' hands to it." Mr. Farmer tells us that the number three must be raised to four, and that one