A FURTHER NOTE ON THE USE OF ENOCH IN 1 PETER.

In a recent number of the Expositor[1] I gave reasons for believing that there were traces of the use of the first chapter of Enoch in the first chapter of Peter, and that the allusion in the latter writing to prophets who had it revealed to them that their utterances were not for themselves but for those who should live long after them, was very nearly an extract from Enoch: in fact it only needed a slight change in a single word (διενοοῦντο for διηκόνουν) to make (*a*) the coincidence with Enoch indisputable, (*b*) the sequence of the argument in Peter perfect (τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν in 1 Peter i. 13 being connected with the emended word).

If this is correct, and I think it will be allowed that a very strong case has been made out for it, we may perhaps go a step further in our criticism of the extent to which Enoch was present in the mind and in the text of Peter. Recall for a moment the parallel case of the universally recognized use of Enoch in Jude: it is well known that Jude's actual quotation is not the only one in the Epistle, but that, before he betrays his favourite author by name, he has used him three or four times in allusions to the imprisoned angels and condemned stars. The use which Jude makes of his textbook suggests the inquiry (*a*) whether Peter does not employ Enoch elsewhere than in his first chapter, (*b*) whether he may not conceivably have actually mentioned him as Jude indisputably does and with great damage to his canonical reputation.

The first question is at once answered in the affirmative, for whatever may be the ultimate exegesis of the celebrated passage concerning the spirits in prison, it is commonly recognized that these imprisoned spirits are the angels

[1] Expositor for Sept. 1891.

who sinned with mortal women, for whose offence and its punishment the book of Enoch is our prime authority. The very language used in Enoch for their place of punishment—"This place is the prison of the angels" (Enoch xxi. 10)—is in close correspondence with the Petrine expression. Accordingly Mr. Charles, who is our latest and best exponent of Enoch, in tabulating the passages in the New Testament that show traces of its influence, gives the equation—

1 Peter iii. 19, 20 = Enoch x. 4, 5, 12, 13,

and a comparison of the passages will abundantly verify the use of the Apocalypse in question in the Epistle.

Mr. Charles also thinks that there is a trace of the use of Enoch in the Petrine language, "The time is come for judgment to begin at the house of God" (1 Pet. iv. 17), with which he compares Enoch i. 7, "There will be a judgment upon everything and upon all the righteous"; but this parallel is far less forcible than the allusions to imprisoned spirits and perhaps ought not to be pressed; and the objection also suggests itself that the writer is thinking of Ezekiel ix. 6 ("Begin at my sanctuary").

The second question mooted above relates to the possibility that in 1 Peter, as in Jude, the name of Enoch may have actually stood. Here again we may take our stand in the passage where, of all others, the influence of Enoch is most apparent, viz. the verse 1 Peter iii. 19 to which we have already been referring. The difficulties in the exegesis of the sentence

ἐν ᾧ καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν κτέ

have often been regarded as insurmountable, nor are they, at first sight, lightened by the recognition that the language is based on that of Enoch. For how did Christ preach by the spirit to the fallen angels? and why are these singled out as visited in Hades, rather than the patriarchs and

prophets who appear in the conventional "harrowing of hell"? It is no wonder that with regard to the passage in question Luther declined to express any opinion and that, with regard to the doctrine supposed to be deduced from it, he affirmed that if one were ten times wiser than Solomon, he would fail to understand it and should therefore content himself with the simple words of the apostolic symbol of the faith.

But the suggestion presents itself to our mind that perhaps after all the difficulty really arises from the fact that the subject of the word *ἐκήρυξεν* has dropped out of the text, and that the real person who made proclamation to the spirits in prison is not Christ, but Enoch himself. Write the opening words of the sentence in the form

ΕΝΩΚΑΙ[ΕΝΩΧ]ΤΟΙϹΕΝΦΥΛΑΚΗ . . .

and observe how easily the name of Enoch would drop out in copying. It is the simplest kind of error to drop repeated letters in this way, and hardly needs to be illustrated at all, but just for the sake of illustration it may be worth while to refer to a somewhat similar case where a name appears to have been *inserted* in the New Testament. If we turn to Mr. Lake's account of the uncial MS. Ψ in the *Journal of Theological Studies* (vol. i. p. 290), we shall find in Mark xiv. 47 the curious reading *ἀρχιερέως* [*καίαφα*] *καὶ ἀφεῖλεν*, where a name has either been coined by dittography, or else has been lost from all copies of Mark except the uncial in question. We suggest then that the name *Ἐνώχ* has dropped out of 1 Peter iii. 19.

It may be perhaps asked why we do not accept the somewhat simpler correction of altering *ἐν ᾧ καὶ* into *καὶ Ἐνώχ*. The answer is that the connecting formula *ἐν ᾧ* is characteristically Petrine and must not be interfered with: cf. 1 Pet. i. 6, ii. 12, iv. 4. We therefore retain it and simply insert the name of Enoch in the right place. When this correction is made, many of the exegetical

difficulties of the passage will disappear at once; we have no need, for instance, to treat ἐν ᾧ as a relative to a previous πνεύματι. It is simply an awkward introduction of a new sentence, as in 1 Peter iv. 4 (ἐν ᾧ ξενίζονται) and in other places, and we are not to look for an antecedent to the relative.

It remains to be seen whether Enoch did go and make any proclamation of doom to the fallen angels. The solution is in Enoch xii. as follows:

"And before all these things fell out Enoch was hidden, and no one of the children of men knew where he was hidden, and where he abode, and what had become of him. And all his activities had to do with the holy ones and with the watchers in his days. And I Enoch was blessing the great Lord and the King of the world, when lo! the watchers called me—Enoch the scribe—and spoke to me. 'Enoch, thou scribe of righteousness, *go, announce*[1] to the watchers of the heaven who have abandoned the high heavens and have defiled themselves with women,' etc. And Enoch went and said[2]—'Azazel, thou shalt find no peace,' etc."

Surely we have here a sufficient basis for the statement of Peter, τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν. Moreover the superficial difficulty which suggests itself that Enoch could hardly have preached in the days of Noah disappears when we observe that the legation of Enoch is expressly said to be subsequent to his translation.

There are still some serious difficulties to be faced, and the explanation of the whole passage requires to be taken up again and argued in detail. For the present we limit ourselves to the two following theses:

(*a*) The name of Enoch has dropped out of the text in 1 Peter iii. 19.

(*b*) Many of the exegetical difficulties of the passage disappear when it is restored.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

[1] Gr. πορεύου, εἶπε. [2] Gr. Ὁ δὲ Ἐνὼχ τῷ Ἀζαὴλ πορευθεὶς εἶπεν.