§v.] THE APOCRYPIIAL WRITINGS. [ixtrovucrion.   
   
 the message of the hook is emphatically one of faith and truth: and   
 while tho Writer combines and repeats the thoughts of Seripture, he   
 adds no new element to the teaching of the prophets. His   
 from an undisciplined attempt to explain their words, and from rs spring   
 exultation in present suecess. For the great characteristic by which the   
 book is distinguished from the later apocalypse of Esdras is the tone   
 of trinmphant expectation by which it is pervaded.”   
 7. Tho date of the book has been matter of great uncertainty. Abp.   
 Lawrence, and Hofmann, suppose it to have been compiled in the reign   
 of Herod the Great: and with this view Gfrérer, Wieseler, and Giescler   
 agree. Liicke gocs very fully into the question, and determines that   
 it consists of an earlier and a later portion: the former written   
 early in the Maccabean period, the latter in the time of Herod the   
 Great. It is from the former of these that the quotation in our Epistle   
 is taken.   
 8. But the whole question of the date has been recently discussed by   
 Prof. Volkmar, of Zurich. He undertakes to prove the book a produc-   
 tion of the time of the sedition of Barchochebas (a.v, about 132), and   
 to have been written by one of the followers of Rabbi Akiba, the great   
 upholder of that impostor. And certainly, as far as I ean see, his proof   
 seems not easy to overthrow. In that ease, as he remarks, the book of   
 Enoch was not only of Jewish, but of distinctly antichristian origin.   
 But this one point in the progress of his argument seems to me debate-   
 able. He assumes that the words cited in our Epistle as a prophecy of   
 Enoch are of necessity taken from the apocryphal book, and regards it as   
 an inevitable sequence, that if the book of Enoch is proved to be of the   
 first half of the second century, the Epistle of Jude must be even later.   
 In order however for this to be accepted, we need one link supplied,   
 which, it seems to me, Prof. Volkmar has not given us. We want it   
 shewn, that the passage cited is so interwoven into the apoeryphal book   
 as necessarily to form a part of it, and that it may not itself have been   
 taken from primitive tradition, or even from the report of that tradition   
 contained in our Epistle.   
 9. The account of the matter hence deduced would be, that the book,   
 in its original groundwork, is of purely Jewish origin, but that it has   
 reeeived numerous Christian interpolations and additions. “Tt may be   
 regarded,” remarks Mr, Westcott, “as deseribing an important phase of   
 Jewish opinion shortly before the coming of Christ.” If we accept the   
 later date, this must of course be modified accordingly.   
 There never has been in the church the slightest doubt of the apocry-   
 phal character of the book of Enoch. The sole maintainer of its autho-   
 rity seems to have been Tertullian: it is plainly described as apoeryphal   
 by Origen, Augustine, and Jerome, and is enumerated among the apocry-   
 phal books in the Apostolical Constitutions.   
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