

with the author of this opinion, whose aim seems to be to throw discredit upon the superhuman origin of Christianity, and to trace it to merely human development. According to him, "the work of the Semitic Milton was the inexhaustible source from which Evangelists and Apostles, or the men who wrote in their names, borrowed their conceptions of the resurrection, judgment, immortality, perdition, and of the universal reign of righteousness under the eternal dominion of the Son of Man." Yet the same ideas run through all the Pseudepigraphic writings, a fact of which our flippant author seems to be wholly unaware. The writer, as he deems, puts orthodox believers in a dilemma: either Enoch was an inspired prophet and the New Testament writers were justified in using his words as Divine utterances, or he was a visionary and fraudulent enthusiast, whose illusions were erroneously accepted by Apostles and Evangelists, who thus lose their claim to inspiration. Happily, there is a third alternative: the New Testament writers have not borrowed from Enoch, save in the single quotation by St. Jude.

But enough of this. Let us see what is the Christology of our Book, and its Messianic utterances.¹ First, as to the names applied to the Messiah. He is called The Anointed One, the Christ (chap. xlviii. 10; lii. 4); The Righteous (xxxviii. 2); The Elect (xl. 5; xlv. 3, 4); The Son of Man (xlvi. 2); Son of the Woman (lxii. 5). This last title occurs only once, and seems intended to accentuate the fact that He is very man. Of the Christian verity, that Jesus was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin, there is no trace. But to this Christ is attributed pre-existence with other Divine attributes. Thus in the second similitude we read (chap. xlvi. 1-3), "There I saw one who had a Head of days (age-marked), and his head was white as wool (Dan. vii. 9); and with him was another, whose countenance resembled that of

¹ Drummond looks with suspicion on most of these allusions to Messiah as interpolations by a Christian or semi-Christian editor. There is really nothing to show the reasonableness of this notion; and were it true, it would be difficult to account for the vagueness of the statements, the reticence concerning the facts of Christ's life, and the apparent inconsistency in some of the expressions used and actions attributed to Him.