§v.J THE APOCRYPHAL WRITINGS. [intropuction.   
   
 when the agency of the Apostles themselves had passed away from tho   
 readers, but the impress of their warning words had not faded from   
 their memories.   
 5. Another note of time has been imagined to lie in the circumstance,   
 that the destruetion of Jerusalem is not mentioned in the Epistle. It   
 has been replied, that there was no reason why any allusion should   
 have been made to that event, as the immediate subject before the   
 Writer did not lead him to it. Still I cannot help feeling that the   
 reply is not wholly satisfactory. Considering that St. Jude was writing   
 to Jews, and citing signal instances of divine vengeance, though he may   
 not have been led to mention the judgment of the Flood,—I can hardly   
 conceive that he would have omitted that which uproeted the Jewish   
 people and polity.   
 6. So that on the whole, as De Wette, himself often sceptical on the   
 question of the genuineness and antiquity of the New Test. writings,   
 confesses, there is no reason why we should place our Epistle later than   
 the limit of the apostolic age. That it was anterior to the second   
 Epistle of Peter, I have already endeavoured to prove (see above, ch, iv.   
 § iii. 3 €).   
 7. Of the place where this Epistle was written, absolutely nothing is   
 known. From its tone and references, we should conjecture that the   
 Writer lived in Palestine: but even thus much must be uncertain.   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 SECTION V.   
   
   
 ON THE APOCRYPHAL WRITINGS APPARENTLY REFERRED TO IN THIS   
 EPISTLE.   
   
 1. In ver. 14 we have a reference to a prophecy of Enoch, the seventh   
 from Adam, This has by many been supposed to indicate an acquaint-   
 ance on the part of the Writer with the existing apocryphal “ book   
 of Enoch.” It becomes desirable therefore that we should briefly put   
 the student in possession of the history and nature of that document.   
 Jn so doing I shall take my matter partly from Mr. Westeott’s article   
 in Dr. Smith’s Biblical Dictionary, partly from a notice by Professor   
 Volkmar (see below): to which sources the reader is referred for further   
 details.   
 2. The book appears to have been known to the early fathers, Justin,   
 Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen, and we have numerous   
 references to it in the “Testaments of the Twelve Patviarchs.” Tertul-   
 lian quotes it as a book not admitted into the Jewish canon, but profit-   
 able, and indeed to be received by Christians on the ground that “no-   
 thing is to be altogether rejected which has reference to ourselves,” and   
 305