

I presume, will not be asserted: and against the latter I will produce the words of that Father himself. *Judas, frater Jacobi, parvam, quæ de septem catholicis est, epistolam reliquit. Et quia de libro Enoch, qui apocryphus est in ea assumitur testimonium, a plerisque rejicitur.* § Here observe, he asserts expressly that this book of Enoch is *Apocryphal*, that is, not undoubtful and uncertain, but (as the context shews) destitute of any divine authority whatever: for, so long as they believed, the Epistle of St. Jude had, bona fide, a reference to this book, many we find, would not receive even that Epistle as Canonical. And elsewhere he not only repeats it, that the Book is Apocryphal; but seems surpris'd; that any one should be inclined to receive it into the Scriptural Canon, though some parts of it (that is of the whole Book) might appear worthy of approbation. *Qui autem putant totum librum debere sequi eum qui libri parte usus sit, videntur mihi et apocryphum Enochi, de quo Apostolus Judas in Epistola sua testimonium posuit inter ecclesiæ scripturas recipere.* † Wherefore, though Jerome was of opinion that St. Jude had a reference to this book, it is plain that he is no Advocate for its authenticity.

But after all what ground is here for believing that St. Jude did really refer to this Book? None at all. For he says nothing of a prophetic book; but is speaking only of the *prophecy* of Enoch: of which he may have been informed by Tradition or Revelation or speaking after the Jewish manner, he might intend only that such in all probability, was the substance of Enoch's prophecy. This latter is the opinion of Grotius, whose comment (as every one may not have it at hand) I shall take the liberty to produce. *Solebant Rabini et Angelis et magnis hominibus tribuere ea verba, quæ verisimiliter dicere potuerunt. Tale illud quod de Enocho habebimus, et illud quod Heb. XII. 21, et Actos. VII. 26. Similia habes in Midrasch ad deuteronomium. in Arboth Rabini Mathan et alliis.* So he writes on Jude 9; which is exactly parallel to what we read in ver. 14. And we have the same reason to believe, the apostle quoted some ancient authentic book in what he says about Michael's dispute with the Devil, that we have to believe he quoted such a book in what he says about Enoch's prophecy. And no less remarkable are the other scriptures referred to in the above Comment. St. Paul's words are, *so terrible was the sight* (of Mount Sinai, when the law was given) *that Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake,* Heb. 12, 21: yet, on comparing this with Exodus 19, 16, we find no such words: but only, that *all the people that were in the Camp trembled.* And when Moses saw the two Israelites quarrelling and fighting together, we read not, that he said, as St. Stephen relates, *Sirs ye are Brethren; why do ye wrong one to another?* Acts. 7. 26; but only that *he said to him, that did the wrong, wherefore smitest thou thy fellow?* Exod. 2. 13. In these instances, if the Apostle and Protomartyr were not guided by Revelation or Tradition; they seem to have expressed what appeared to them to have been said on those occasions.

As to the antiquity of this celebrated book of Enoch, it is enough, that the Ancient Jews were ignorant of it that it was never known to make a part of their canon, nor to be read in their synagogues. Had it really been a pro-

duction.