

REBELLION AND GOD'S JUDGMENT IN THE BOOK OF JUDE

Herbert W. Bateman IV

JUDE'S SHORT LETTER, tucked away at the end of the New Testament, offers a straightforward theological point frequently overlooked, yet pertinent to both his and the present time.¹ Writing with a sense of urgency (v. 3),² Jude tackled directly the issue of rebellion and the subsequent outcome for anyone who rebels against God. Jude's theological concern about rebellion and its

Herbert W. Bateman is an author and teacher who resides in Leesburg, Indiana.

¹ Several reasons suggest why Jude's epistle tends to be overlooked. First, Jude's insulting tone (vv. 8–16) and his evident displeasure over the godless when he declared, "Damnation to them" (οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς, v. 11) can be unsettling. Second, words interwoven in the letter like "I keep" (τήρω, vv. 1, 6, 13, 21) and "immorality" (ἀσελγεία, v. 4; ἐκπορνείω, v. 7) are finely nuanced and important for understanding Jude's argument. His ambiguous use of "ungodly" (ἀσεβείς) and "these people" (οἱτοί, vv. 8, 10, 12, 16, 19) is difficult to apply to twenty-first-century believers. Third, Jude's references to Old Testament situations (e.g., Exodus generation, angels, and Gentile urbanites, vv. 5–7) as well as Old Testament people (e.g., Cain, Korah, Balaam, v. 11) and his application of them to his generation may seem foreign. Fourth, including nonbiblical material like *1 Enoch* (vv. 14–15) and *The Assumption (Testament) of Moses* (v. 10) generates theological uneasiness. In short, the letter is difficult to interpret at some points and to apply. Nevertheless in his expressed annoyance, Jude wanted his Judean readers to consider any and all forms of rebellion as unacceptable (vv. 5–7, 10), to stand firm in their faith in Christ (vv. 3–4), and to extend mercy to those who do not believe (vv. 22–23).

² Jude 3, "I just now had necessity to write to you" (ἀνάγκην ἔσχον γράψαι ὑμῖν), seems somewhat intense, reflecting a sudden change of mind, and perhaps even an unexpected interruption, which is also evident in several translations: "I found it necessary to write" (ESV, NKJV), "I felt the necessity to write" (NIV), "I now feel compelled instead to write" (NET), and "I must write" (CEV, NLT). The Greek word ἀνάγκην occurs seventeen times in the New Testament. In Jude 3 it has a certain amount of force whereby Jude was compelled "to appeal" (ESV, NRSV), "to urge" (NIV, NLT, CEB), "to exhort" (KJV, ASV), or "to encourage" (NET) Judean believers to *struggle intensely* for their faith. Josephus used the same term when discussing the Jewish war with Rome (AD 66–73). "The great encouragements which the Jews had in view to act vigorously were their fear for themselves and for the temple, and the presence of their tyrant, who *exhorted* (παρακαλῶν) some, and beat and threatened others to act courageously" (Josephus, *The Jewish Wars* 6.2.6 § 143).

outcome compelled him throughout his letter. He makes it perfectly clear: Rebellion, of any kind, is not a good idea. Why? Rebellion raises divine ire.

TYPES OF REBELLION IN JUDE

Three kinds of rebellion are seen in Jude: rebellion against God's leading, rebellion against God's universal design, and rebellion against God's societal norms. As Jude tackled each type of rebellion, past rebellions mirrored his contemporary situation. Jude's remembrance of the rebellions of the wilderness generation, angels, and Gentile urbanites (vv. 5–7) reflects the current rebellion (vv. 4, 8–16) that seemed to be wreaking havoc throughout all of Judea. And though Jude identified his contemporary rebels only as “godless” (ἀσεβείς, v. 4),³ “dreamers” (ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι, v. 8),⁴ “certain

³ Josephus used ἀσεβείς some sixty times in *The Jewish Wars* and *The Antiquities of the Jews*, mostly to depict tyrannical leadership over Israel and Judah. The essential thesis of *The Jewish Wars* (1.4 § 9–12) is that the Jewish revolt against Rome “was caused by only a few troublemakers among the Jews—power-hungry tyrants and marauders who drove the people to rebel against their will” (Steve Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament* [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992], 60). From *The Antiquities of the Jews* a few examples of ungodly tyrants over Israel are Jeroboam (8.9.1 §§ 243–45), Baasha (8.12.3 § 299), Ahab (9.1.1 § 1), and Pekah (9.11.1 § 234). A few examples of tyrants over Judah are Rehoboam (8.10.2 §§ 251, 256), Ahaz (9.12.1 § 243), and Manassah (10.3.1 § 37).

⁴ Some suggest this reference to “dreamers” (ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι) indicates these godless dream dreams. Yet when dreams and visions occur in Hebrew Scriptures, the content and interpretation follow, and they are somewhat lengthy narratives (e.g., Jacob, Gen. 28:12; Joseph, Gen. 37:5, 9; 41:5; and Nebuchadnezzar, Dan. 2:1, 3). Jude's contextual brevity (e.g., no content or interpretation of the dreams is included) and subsequent threefold depictions of the godless as contaminated, rebellious, and slanderous (v. 8), as well as the lack of any direct reference to the godless as “false teachers,” seem to support Horst Balz when he says, “We cannot agree with much modern exegesis in seeing a reference to special ecstatic or visionary experiences.” This is not to suggest that people did not have dreams and visions during the second temple period. Like most visions and dreams in Hebrew Scriptures, however, the content of second temple visions or dreams is also given for the reader. For instance, 4Q543 f1a c:1 reads, “A copy of the book ‘The Words of the Vision of Amram [son of Kohath, son of Levi].’” This seems to be similar to dreams and visions in Daniel (Greek: ἐνύπνιον and ὄραματι). In another second temple text, Isaac has a “dream” (ὄνειρον) and he is to relate that “vision” (ὄραμα) to others (*Testament of Abraham* A 4:8; cf. Acts 11:1–18; 1 Enoch; 4Q543). In both cases, the content of the vision is provided in the text. Thus Earl J. Richard correctly concludes, “Since nothing in the letter supports the visionary option, it seems logical to opt for the meaning that depicts more succinctly the opponents' moral and intellectual bankruptcy (see vv. 10, 12–13, 16, 19)” (*Reading 1 Peter, Jude, and 2 Peter: A Literary and Theological Commentary* [Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2000], 268; see also Horst Balz, in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1974], s.v. ἐνυπνιαζομαι).

people” (τινες ἄνθρωποι), or most frequently “these *people*” (οὗτοι),⁵ it seems that they were Judean followers of Jesus and that Jude was concerned that they not become involved in Judea’s rebellion against Rome.⁶

REBELLION AGAINST GOD’S LEADING

In the past the wilderness generation had rebelled against God’s leading (v. 5). When Jude called his readers to remember that the Lord had saved “His people out of the land of Egypt” (v. 5), Jewish readers would think of God’s having delivered Israel from Egypt through Moses (Exod. 7:1–12:42; cf. Ps. 135:8), who avoided recapture (Exod. 13:17–15:21; cf. Pss. 66:5; 78:13), provided for the needs of the people (Exod. 15:22–17:7; cf. Ps. 78:14–16), and mediated a covenant with God (Exod. 19:1–20:21; 24:1–18). Jude’s more explicit concern, however, was the wilderness generation’s *second rebellion* (“those who did not believe were destroyed”). Although there is no shortage of segmented rebellion during the Exodus from Egypt,⁷

⁵ Whereas “certain *persons*” (τινες ἄνθρωποι) occurs in verse 4, the most frequent reference to the rebels is “these *people*” (οὗτοι, vv. 8, 10, 12, and perhaps 19). Jerome H. Neyrey views the repetition of “these . . .” as an anaphora figure of speech in which the repetition of “these people” is linked throughout the letter to catalog their evils (2 *Peter, Jude*, Anchor Bible [New York: Doubleday, 1993], 72). Although Peter also uses οὗτοι (2 Pet. 2:12), he directs explicit attention against “false teachers” (ψευδοδιδασκαλοι), who were more than likely men due to the historical and cultural setting (see NET note for Jude 4). Jude’s indistinct references throughout the letter make it difficult to pinpoint exactly who these people were. However, during the Jewish revolt, both men and women took part in the war, as evidenced via battles throughout the country. This revolt was not only cross-generational among men, it was also cross-gender, as evident in the suicides at both Gamla and again at Masada (Josephus, *The Jewish Wars* 4.1.9 § 63–83; 7.9.1 § 389–406). Thus, it appears more than likely “certain people” and “these people” fit Jude’s historical context of the Jewish revolt.

⁶ This article assumes that Jude wrote his letter while living in Judea to Judean followers of Jesus after the death of James (AD 62) and before the Jewish revolt (AD 66–73) when King Agrippa II (great-grandson of Herod the Great) shared political leadership with Festus, Rome’s procurator over Judea and Samaria (cf. Acts 25:13–26:32). The Jewish revolt against Rome resulted in various active factions among the Jewish leadership. On the one hand, there was a radical faction led by two people. One was a priest named Eleazar, son of Ananias, and the other was Menahem from the Sicarii and a descendant of “Judas the Galilean.” There is no need to doubt whether Menahem claimed to be the Messiah. He was a warrior who entered Jerusalem dressed as a king, quarreled with the high priest (who may have entertained some doubts about Menahem’s claim), and worshipped God in the temple (Josephus, *The Jewish Wars* 2.442–48). On the other hand, there was a moderate faction led by the wealthy aristocracy: the Herodian family, the Sadducees, the Boethusians, and those of the priestly tradition who merely wished to work towards accommodation and not confrontation.

⁷ Some examples of segmented rebellion in the wilderness from the book of Numbers are Miriam and Aaron, who rebelled against Moses and his choice of an Ethio-

two extensive rebellions occurred that involved the entire community. The first occurred at the Red Sea when Pharaoh was in rapid pursuit of his recently released slaves (Exod. 14:5–7). God obviously overlooked the revolt, for He parted the sea, the people crossed the sea on dry ground (14:22), the sea destroyed Egypt's army (14:23–28), and the Israelites were “delivered” from the Egyptians (14:29–31).⁸ The second major rebellion occurred at Kadesh-barnea (Deut. 12:9–10; Josh. 21:44). After twelve men spied out the land for forty days, they returned to report their findings, but only two expressed confidence about subduing the land of Canaan (Num. 13:1–30). The others expressed great reservations, which resulted in murmuring against Moses, Aaron, and God, and in making plans to elect new leaders and return to Egypt (Num. 13:31–14:4). The mutiny was rooted in disbelief in both God and His appointed leader, Moses.⁹ Ten disbelieving spies turned an entire community to doubt God's ability to deliver.¹⁰ Thus Jude recalled the ancient testimony about the wilderness community, who were persuaded by a few to rebel against God's leading.

In Jude's present situation rejection of Jesus as Messiah served as his example of rebellion against God's leading. Jude's portrait of rebellion against Jesus as God's appointed Messiah occurs twice in Jude. In verse 4 the godless are first portrayed as denying both the sovereignty and lordship of Jesus (“the only Mas-

pian wife (12:1–15); Korah, along with Dathan and Abiram rebelled against Moses' leadership (16:1–35); and people rebelled against Moses by their perpetual complaints about their circumstances (11:1–15). Each was divinely judged. The first was judged by leprosy (12:10, 13–16), and the latter two by death (16:20–35; 11:3, 31–34).

⁸ Cf. Josephus, *The Antiquities of the Jews* 3.12.6 § 297.

⁹ Alluding to the Kadesh-barnea event is not unique to Jude. Hebrews 3:7–4:14 also references Kadesh-barnea. By way of Psalm 95, Hebrews emphasizes hardening of the heart. In the LXX, the Hebrew verb פָּשַׁע is rendered as $\sigma\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\acute{\upsilon}\nu\omega$ (“harden”) in Psalm 94[95]:8. The term conveys an attitude of stubbornness. It is used to describe Pharaoh and Zedekiah (Exod. 13:15; 2 Chron. 36:13), the Exodus/wilderness community (Exod. 32:9; 33:5; 34:9; Deut. 9:6, 13; 31:27), the pre-dynastic community (Judg. 2:19), the dynastic communities of Judah and Israel (2 Kings 17:14; 2 Chron. 30:8; Isa. 48:4; Jer. 7:26; 17:23; 19:15; Ezek. 2:4; 3:7), the Jewish community's ancestors (2 Chron. 30:8; Neh. 9:16–17, 9:26; 4Q504 frag 4:7), and it was a characteristic *not observed* in the Qumran community (1QS 5:5, 26; cp. Prov. 28:14; 29:1). Psalm 94[95] specifically cites the wilderness community's stubbornness at “Meribah as in the day of Massah in the wilderness” (cf. Exod. 17:1–7; Num. 20:1–13). Thus, the wilderness rebellion in Psalm 95:7–11 provides a model *not* to be followed. Yet unlike Hebrews 3:7–4:14, where the followers of Jesus are warned *not to become like those followers of God at Kadesh-barnea*, Jude warned his readers that there were people who were like those ten spies at Kadesh-barnea in the midst of their congregations.

¹⁰ Cf. Josephus, *The Antiquities of the Jews* 3.14.1–15.1 §§ 300–14.

ter and Lord”).¹¹ The rejection of Jesus as Messiah manifests itself in exchanging God’s grace, which came through Jesus, for conduct that violated many forms of socially acceptable behavior (“immoral,” ἀσέλγεια, v. 4)¹² whereby they rejected authority (vv. 8, 11), slandered others (vv. 8, 10, 16), grumbled (v. 16), found fault with others (vv. 16, 19), and were greedy self-seekers (vv. 11, 16). More will be said about their immoral behavior later under the rejection of God’s societal norms.

The second example of the godless rebelling against God’s leading occurs in Jude 8, where the godless “rebel against the Lord” (κυριότητα . . . ἀθετούσιν). Whereas previously in verse 4, attention was given to the simple fact that the godless denied Jesus as God’s regal Sovereign to whom God had granted regal ruling power or lordship, in verse 8 the godless are portrayed as insubordinate.

The general assumption about verse 8 is that the noun ἡ κυριότης speaks only to the rejection of the lordship of Jesus.¹³ Yet

¹¹ The construction “the only Master and Lord” (τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον) is significant in Greek. The designations “Master” and “Lord” follow a typical pattern in Greek, article–noun–καί–noun. Since both nouns are singular and personal, and not proper names, the phrase fits the Granville Sharp rule, which means here that “Master” and “Lord” refer to one person. The same construction occurs in Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:11. See Daniel B. Wallace, *Granville Sharp’s Canon and Its Kin: Semantics and Significance* (New York: Peter Lang, 2009), 31–44; and idem, *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 276–77.

¹² Josephus employed ἀσέλγεια broadly to include “inappropriate” language (*The Antiquities of the Jews* 4.6.12 § 151), of following a way of “wickedness” as a reproof to governing officials (ibid., 8.10.2 § 252), of women who fall into “impurity” (ibid., 8.13.1 § 318), of Herod’s feelings of “lust” (sexual?) for Cleopatra (ibid., 15.4.2 § 98), the inconsistency of Mariamne, which was not sexual (ibid., 16.7.1 § 185), of “wasteful behavior” (ibid., 17.5.5 § 110), of “impudent obscenity” of a soldier (ibid., 20.5 § 112), of Cleopatra’s sexual lust for Anthony (*The Jewish Wars* 1.22.3 § 439), of “lascivious behavior” of women (ibid., 2.8.2 § 121), and of “unlawful pleasures” (ibid., 4.9.10 § 562). So for Josephus, ἀσέλγεια takes into consideration many wicked activities. Some commentators, however, limit it to be sexual. For instance, even while admitting that in Hosea it is a metaphor for idolatry, Harrington still contends “it is best taken in its root sexual sense” (Donald Senior and Daniel Harrington, *1 Peter, Jude and 2 Peter*, Sacra Pagina [Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2003], 190). Yet Steven J. Kraftchick rightly concludes about ἀσέλγεια, “We cannot say that the opponents were actually engaged in sexual misconduct” (*Jude, 2 Peter*, Abingdon New Testament Commentaries [Nashville: Abingdon, 2002], 33–34).

¹³ Although the noun κυριότητα is rendered as “dominion” in referencing angelic beings (Col. 1:16; Eph. 1:21; cf. *1 Enoch* 61:10; *2 Enoch* 20:1), in Jude κυριότητα refers back to verse 4. Years later, the author of *The Didache* wrote, “My child, you shall be mindful day and night of the one who speaks to you the word of God. You shall honor him as the Lord [ἡ κυριότης], for at the source of proclamation of the lordship [of the Lord], the Lord is there” (4:1; cf. *Hermas Sim.* 5.6.1; *The Didache*, trans. Kurt Niederwimmer [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998], 103, 105). Advocates for

elsewhere in the New Testament to reject Jesus as Messiah is to reject God as well (1 Thess. 4:8; 1 John 1:3; 2:23, 24; 4:15; 5:1, 20). Thus Jude's current rebels are without God (i.e., godless) and in-subordinate to Jesus, who is Lord. Judean followers of Jesus were well aware of the nation's repudiation of Jesus as Messiah during His ministry (e.g., Matt. 10:33; Luke 12:9; cf. Acts 3:11–15) as well as the dismissal of His authority (e.g. Mark 1:14–15, 12:35–37; 14:61b–64; cf. Acts 3:16–4:3). The denunciation of Jesus as Messiah in Jude 4 and 8 is reminiscent of the rebellion against God's leading at Kadesh-barnea through Moses. Once again disbelieving religious leaders turned an entire nation against the one whom God had sent, while they looked for a different kind of Messiah. Not only was Jesus God's Messiah, however, He was the Messiah who came to announce the coming of God's kingdom (cf. Mark 1:15).¹⁴ Some thirty plus years later the desire for a Messiah other than Jesus remained and threatened Jude's followers of Jesus. Consequently the comparison between the past and the present is simply this: Whereas the wilderness community rebelled against God's leading by rejecting Moses, who wanted to lead God's people into the land of Canaan (v. 5b), Jude's rebels rebelled against God's leading by rejecting Jesus as Messiah (vv. 4, 8b), who came to inaugurate God's kingdom rule.

REBELLION AGAINST GOD'S UNIVERSAL DESIGN

In the past, celestial beings rebelled against God's universal design (v. 6). When Jude called his readers to remember the angelic rebellion, his readers would have been well aware of various Jewish traditions about a previous period of time when men and women were reproducing according to God's expressed expectations (cf. Gen. 6:1; cp. 1:28) and "sons of God" decided that they too wanted to join in the reproduction process (Gen. 6:1–4).¹⁵ At least three

this view are Richard J. Bauckham, *2 Peter, Jude*, Word Biblical Commentary [Waco, TX: Word, 1983], 56–57; Gene L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008], 74–75; Norman Hillyer, *1 and 2 Peter, Jude*, New International Biblical Commentary [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992], 248; Thomas R. Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, New American Commentary [Nashville: B&H, 2003], 455–56). J. N. D. Kelly suggests a Gnostic orientation (*A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude*, Thornapple Commentaries [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981], 260–61).

¹⁴ See further discussion in Herbert W. Bateman IV, "Expectations of Israel's King," in *Jesus the Messiah: Tracing the Promises, Expectations, and Coming of Israel's King*, by Herbert W. Bateman IV, Darrell L. Bock, and Gordon H. Johnston (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2012).

¹⁵ Although it is assumed here that the "sons of God" in Genesis 6:1–4 were angelic beings, some scholars believe they were human beings. Some contemporary com-

Jewish sources—*Jubilees*, 1Q Genesis Apocryphon, and *1 Enoch*—draw attention to angels who desired women, left heaven, took women for wives, procreated with women, and suffered divine punishment (e.g., *1 Enoch* 6:1–4a; 7:1–6). In fact, as *1 Enoch* 6–7 unfolds, it interprets and expands the celestial rebellion in Genesis 6 by first identifying the crisis (6:1–8 from Gen. 6:1–2a), then isolating the deed (7:1 from Gen. 6:2, 4b), and finally indicating the results (7:2–5 from Gen. 6:4, 7). Once again, only a few angelic beings led many astray. Yet Jude does not recount the event in the same manner as any of these sources. What Jude underscores is evident in two parallel statements.¹⁶

Τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν
 “those who did not keep their own domain”

ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον
 but those who abandoned their own place of residence

Although “the language is rather vague,”¹⁷ the similar wording

mentaries argue they were offspring of Sethite women. Yet Job speaks of “sons of god” as angelic beings (1:6; 2:1; 38:7). Furthermore, the Hebrew “sons of God” (בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים) is rendered “angels of God” (ἄγγελοι θεοῦ) in the Septuagint (3rd BC). Josephus also offers clarification when he writes, “for many angels of God [πολλοὶ γὰρ ἄγγελοι θεοῦ] when they had sex with women [lit. “with women joining together”; γυναιξὶ συνιόντες] they gave birth to sons [ἐγέννησαν παῖδας] that proved unjust, and despisers of all that was good, on account of the confidence they had in their own strength” (*The Antiquities of the Jews* 1.3.1 § 73). Josephus adds, “Now this posterity of Seth continued to esteem God as the Lord of the universe, and to have an entire regard to virtue, for seven generations; but in process of time they were perverted, and forsook the practices of their forefathers, and did neither pay those honors to God which were appointed them, nor had they any concern to do justice towards men. But for what degree of zeal they had formerly shown for virtue, they now showed by their actions a double degree of wickedness; whereby they made God to be their enemy, for many angels of God [πολλοὶ γὰρ ἄγγελοι θεοῦ] accompanied with women, and begat sons that proved unjust, and despisers of all that was good, on account of the confidence they had in their own strength; for the tradition is, That these men did what resembled the acts of those whom the Grecians call giants [γίγαντων]” (*ibid.*, 1.3.1 § 72–73).

¹⁶ Bauckham also views these two clauses as in synonymous parallelism. He contends, however, that the sin is one of apostasy because he views the opponents to be “a group of itinerant charismatics who have arrived in the church(es) to which he writes.” Thus, they claim to be followers of Jesus but are perverting the gospel message (*Jude, 2 Peter*, 11, 52). However, Jude describes this second rebellion as a refusal to accept God’s desired place in the heavens and thereby a rejection of God’s universal design.

¹⁷ Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, 448. Schreiner, however, tends to read Jewish tradition about sex with women into the text rather than concentrate on what Jude explicitly says about the event in order to address his current situation in Judea.

“their own domain” (τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχή) and “their own residence” (ἴδιον οἰκητήριον) gives emphasis to the angelic act of leaving heaven. Granted, the noun “domain” (ἀρχή) could indicate that they were authority figures or cosmic rulers,¹⁸ but Jude’s parallelism seems to stress that these celestial beings did not stay within their sphere of official activity, they did not maintain their rightful place of influence, or quite simply they did not remain in their proper domain. In short they left heaven (cf. *1 Enoch* 12:4; 15:3).¹⁹ Thus Jude recalled that celestial beings rebelled against God’s universal design by leaving their place in heaven.

In Jude’s present situation the audacious defamation of angels serves as Jude’s example of rebellion against God’s universal design. In verse 8 Jude portrayed the godless as slandering angels (“they blaspheme the glorious *ones*, δόξας . . . βλασφημοῦσιν). The concept of blasphemy has the general sense of defaming another person, an angelic being, or God with abusive language.²⁰ Thus the godless malign angelic beings. Although δόξας could refer to hu-

¹⁸ For instance one Qumran text states, “Peace and blessing for the lot of God, to exalt the authority of Michael among the gods and the dominion of Israel among all flesh” (1QM 17:7–8; cf. *1 Enoch* 82:10–20; 1QM 10:12). Naturally Michael is the archangel who appears in Jude 9. The point is that an angel is given authority or a “position of authority.” Thus the term *might* mean angels did not keep their office or position of rulership. Several commentators seem to support the idea that the angels did not keep their position as heavenly powers that they at one time occupied over the world (Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 52; Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter, Jude*, 50; Hillyer, *1 and 2 Peter, Jude*, 242; and Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude*, 257).

¹⁹ Both possibilities (“ruler” and “domain”) are listed in Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd ed., rev. and ed. Frederick W. Danker (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 138d 7, s.v. ἀρχή). Several commentators appear to support the idea that Jude is merely saying they left heaven (e.g., Gene L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008], 68; Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, 448; and NET). The synonymous parallelism would seem to support this option; the two clauses say the same thing with different terms.

²⁰ In Josephus the verb “I blaspheme” (βλασφημέω) is used of “contumelious language” against Moses (*The Antiquities of the Jews* 3.14.3 § 307), of Nabal’s “critical language” against David (ibid., 6.13.7 § 300), of verbal insults against King Agrippa (*The Jewish Wars* 2.406, 637) and Tiberius (ibid., 2.493), of Apion who “criticizes” (βλασφημίας δοῦναι) the laws of his own country (*Against Apion* 2.14.143), of letters from one of the leaders of the Jewish revolt that were “full of reproaches and lies” (πλήρεσι βλασφημιῶν καὶ ψευσμάτων) (*Life* 47.245; cf. 50.260). Similarly Philo used the term to speak of Alexandrians who were “calumny and evil-speaking” (διαβολαίς καὶ βλασφημίας) about their king and thereby reviled him in his own person (*Flaccus* 33). Philo also used it of the builders of Babel (Gen. 11:6) who insulted God’s angels (*Conf.* 154). Likewise in Scripture, βλασφημέω conveys the idea of speaking ill of another person (1 Pet. 4:4; Titus 2:3), God’s name (Isa. 52:5; Rom. 2:24), God’s Spirit (Mark 3:29; Luke 12:10), God’s leaders, celestial beings (2 Pet. 2:10, 12), or a combination of the above (Mark 3:28).

man dignitaries,²¹ during the latter part of the second temple period (ca. 164 BC–AD 70) the Hebrew equivalent נַכְבְּדִים was associated with angelic beings.²² Although the lexical evidence is scanty, it seems Jude’s context favors “glorious ones” (δόξας) to be angelic beings. Humans daring to criticize angels evidence rejection of God’s established cosmic boundaries. The content of the slander remains open for interpretation because Jude is unclear on this point.²³ What is clear, however, is that the godless malign angels when even an angel like Michael the archangel restrained himself from doing so against a fellow angel, Satan (v. 9; cf. 2 Pet. 2:10).²⁴ Consequently the comparison between the past and the present is this: Whereas angels left heaven to engage in earthly affairs (v. 6a), the godless interjected from earth criticism about heavenly affairs (v. 8c). Jude views both as unacceptable forms of rebellion against God’s universal design.

²¹ See ASV, KJV, and Harrington, *Jude and 2 Peter*, 206. Although the Hebrew equivalent נַכְבְּדִים often describes nobility (Isa. 23:8; Nah. 3:10; 1QpHab. 4:2), the elderly (Isa. 3:5), illustrious men (1QpHab 14:11), and people who reside at Qumran (1QSb 4:20; 1QM 10:10; 14:12 [4Q491 f8 10i:9]; 4Q521 f2ii+4:7). Bauckham rightly observes that the Septuagint does not translate נַכְבְּדִים as δόξας. For instance the LXX renders נַכְבְּדִים in Isaiah 3:5 as “the elder” (τὸν πρεσβύτερον) and נַכְבְּדִים in Isaiah 23:8 as “rulers” (ἄρχοντες) and in Nahum 3:10 as “the nobility” (οἱ μεγιστάνες).

²² For instance one Dead Sea scroll describes angels as “glorious ones”: “Behold, You are Chief of the gods and King of the glorious ones (נַכְבְּדִים), Lord of every spirit and Ruler over every creature” (1QH 18:10). In *2 Enoch* the author writes, “The glorious ones bowed down to the Lord, and said: Let Enoch go according to Thy word” (22:7; cf. 22:10). In Philo, Moses speaks of seeing the “glory” (δόξας) or perhaps the “glorious ones” that surround God rather than viewing God Himself (*The Special Laws*, 1:45). Advocates of this view are Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 57–59; Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, 64–65, 69; Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, 76–77; Harrington, *Jude and 2 Peter*, 263; Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude*, 263; and Schriener, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, 455–57.

²³ Perhaps the slander “relates,” as suggested by Hillyer, “to the angels’ function as mediators of the law of Moses (Acts 7:38, 53; Gal. 3:19; Heb. 2:2; *Jubilees* 1:27–29; Josephus, *The Antiquities of the Jews* 15.136) and guardians of creation (1 Cor. 11:10; Shepherd of Hermas, *Similitudes* 8.3.3), a responsibility which some angels had abdicated (Jude 6)” (Hillyer, *1 and 2 Peter, Jude*, 248).

²⁴ In verse 9 Jude contrasted (δὲ) the verbally abusive acts of the godless directed at celestial beings in verse 8c with the self-control of the archangel. Michael’s dispute with Satan concerns the corpse of Moses: “he debated *aggressively* about Moses’ body” (διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωϋσέως σώματος). Jude then credited Michael with the ability to exercise self-control when “he did not act rashly to bring a verbally abusive judgment *against Satan*” (οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφημίας). So while arguing (διακρινόμενος) with the devil, Michael disputed (διελέγετο) *aggressively* over the corpse of Moses, and yet he managed to control his tongue. In essence Michael exhibited verbal restraint when it came to ushering a condemning judgment of other angels. For further discussion about the archangel Michael see Herbert W. Bateman IV, commentary on *Jude and Second Peter*, Evangelical Exegetical Commentary, ed. Hall Harris (Bellingham, WA: Logos, forthcoming).

REBELLION AGAINST GOD'S SOCIETAL NORMS

In the past Sodom and Gomorrah rebelled against God's societal norms (v. 7). When Jude called his readers to remember the rebellion of Sodom and Gomorrah, his readers would have been aware of various Jewish traditions circulating about the rebellion and the fact that Jewish retellings of the event expanded Sodom's sin to include far more than sexual misconduct.²⁵ The portion of Sodom and Gomorrah's rebellion that Jude underscores is seen in two parallel statements:

Τὸν ὁμοιον τρόπον τούτοις ἐκπορνεύσασαι
 who practiced immorality in the same way as these

καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐτέρας,
 and who went after different flesh

Unfortunately these two clauses are a bit baffling. Of all the New Testament authors Jude alone uses ἐκπορνεύω for "immorality." The forty-four Septuagint occurrences of the verb point to various sorts of sexual sins: premarital sex, whoredom or perhaps adultery, sexual orgies, cultic prostitution, and marriage to a non-Jew; as well as figuratively describing Judah's national whoredom in their worship of idols, or just a general form of lusting after things.²⁶ Thus "immorality" (ἐκπορνεύω) takes into consideration

²⁵ Jewish literature often points out that Sodom and Gomorrah's demise was due to depraved sexual activities (Gen. 19:1–13, 23–25; cf. *Jubilees* 16:5–6; 20:5–6; Josephus, *The Antiquities of the Jews* 1.11.3–4 § 200–204; cf. Philo, *Abel* 122; *Dreams* 1:85). And yet their sins are expanded to include pride (Ezek. 16:49a), arrogance (*Sir.* 16:8; 3 *Macc.* 2:5), disregard for the poor (Ezek. 16:49b), hatred of foreigners (Josephus, *The Antiquities of the Jews* 1.11.1 § 194), and moral debauchery in general (Ezek. 16:46–48; 3 *Macc.* 2:5). In fact Josephus captured all these sins when he described them as people who "grew proud, on account of their riches and great wealth: they became unjust towards men, and impious towards God, insomuch that they did not call to mind the advantages they received from him: they hated strangers, and abused themselves with Sodomitical practices" (Josephus, *The Antiquities of the Jews* 1.11.1 § 194; cf. Gen. 19:2–11).

²⁶ Literal sexual deviations include premarital sex (Deut. 22:20–21); sex with foreigners (Num. 25:1; Philo, *Dreams* 1:89); Tamar and Gomer playing a whore or perhaps better an adulterer in Gomer's case (Gen. 38:24; Hos. 1:2, 5); Northern Israel's sexual orgies (Hos. 4:18); cultic prostitution (Exod. 34:15–16; Lev. 17:7; 19:9; 20:5; 21:9; Deut. 31:16); Dan committing revolting acts of the Gentiles in chasing after wives of lawless men (*Testament of Dan* 5:5).

Figurative deviations include worshiping idols (Judg. 8:27; 2 Chron. 21:11; Hos. 4:12–13; 5:3; Sirach 46:11); Judah's national whoredom (Jer. 3:1; Ezek. 6:9; 16:16, 20, 26, 28, 30, 33; 20:30; 23:3, 5, 30, 43); and general lusting (Num. 15:39; Judg. 2:17). This obviously is different from Bauer, Arndt, and Gingrich, *A Greek-English*

many possible forms of sexual misconduct. Another challenge is the phrase “in the same way as these” (ὁμοίον τρόπον τούτοις). The phrase probably refers back to Sodom and Gomorrah.²⁷ An interpretive paraphrase would be “the cities practiced immoral *sexual relations* like Sodom and Gomorrah.” Accordingly the negative behavior of two cities influenced other nearby urban centers to ignore God’s societal norms by promoting a “free-sex” society. Jude defined this type of free-sex society when he wrote that these Gentile urbanites “went after different flesh” (ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρᾱς). The word “different” (ἑτέρας) generally means another of a different kind, “flesh” (σαρκὸς) tends to speak of “a person” or “a living being.”²⁸ Consequently rather than sleeping with their wives (spouses), flesh of their flesh (Gen. 2:23; cf. Eph. 5:28–31), they went after “different flesh” and thereby practiced forms of sexual whoredom that span activities such as marriage to foreign women, premarital sex, adultery, prostitution, orgies, cultic prostitution, and homosexuality. Jude’s portrayal of sexual promiscuity (“immorality,” ἐκπορνεύω) involved sex with anyone other than one’s spouse (“different flesh,” σαρκὸς ἑτέρας). As Green put it, sexual misconduct is “the vehicle by which they had violated the order established by God.”²⁹ These Gentile urban centers had violated God’s societal norm pertaining to the marital relationship between

Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, in that its definition of ἐκπορνεύω is limited to “indulge in illicit sexual relations/debauchery (309a, s.v. ἐκπορνεύω). Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider say “be very immoral” (s.v. ἐκπορνεύω, in *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990]; cf. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* [1968], s.v. πόρνη . . . ἐκπορνεύω and the discussions of extramarital intercourse).

²⁷ Many consider the word “these” (τούτοις) to refer back to the “angels” (ἀγγέλους) of verse 6 (cf. NET). If this is so, to what is Jude drawing the reader’s attention? An interpretive paraphrase would be “the cities practiced immoral *sexual relations* like the angels.” Jude’s depiction of seditious celestial beings, however, does not involve sexual deviations but rather a refusal to accept God’s designated placement or station. Perhaps the demonstrative pronoun “these” (τούτοις) should be declined as a neuter plural dative and modify both “Sodom and Gomorrah” because it is not unusual for neuters to have antecedents of mixed gender or sometimes even purely masculine gender (cf. Rom. 2:14; 1 Cor. 6:10–11; cf. KJV, and ESV).

²⁸ Bauer, Arndt, and Gingrich define “different” (ἑτέρας) as “to be dissimilar in kind or class from all other entities” and cite speaking with another language (Acts 2:4; Isa. 28:11; 1QH 4.16) as an example (*A Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 399d 2, s.v. ἑτέρας). Using the noun “flesh” (σάρξ) for a “whole person” or “living being” is a figure of speech known as a synecdoche, where the part is used for the whole. Thus flesh is put for the whole person and is a frequent figure of speech in Scripture (Gen. 6:12; Ps. 56:4[5]; Isa. 40:5; Rom. 3:20; 1 Cor. 1:29). See E. W. Bullinger, *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible: Explained and Illustrated* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1968; tenth 1984), 642.

²⁹ Green, *Jude & 2 Peter*, 71–72.

a husband and a wife.

In Jude's present situation the rejection of religious piety (v. 8a), as well as unrestrained and self-indulgent behavior of the godless (vv. 4, 10, 11), serves as Jude's example of rebellion against God's societal norm. First, Jude portrayed his contemporary rebels as people who "defile the flesh" (σάρκα μὲν μαιίνουσιν, v. 8), a phrase that alludes to the Jewish concept of purity. Unfortunately the twenty-first-century interpreter tends to limit the concept of "purity" to "sexual purity."³⁰ Jude's allusion to purity, however, has to do with the Jewish concept of religious purity. This is not to suggest that sexual immorality was not a concern in Judea (e.g., Antipapas and Herodias, Mark 6:14–18). Rather, for the Judeans of Jude's era and speaking very broadly, religious contamination may be segregated into one of three categories: (1) contact with unclean things such as a dead body or entering into the home of a Gentile,³¹ (2) improper worship such as idolatry or disbelief in God's leading,³² and (3) moral misconduct such as bitterness, language, murder, sexual misconduct.³³ Jude's explicit description of the godless

³⁰ Those who tend to advocate limiting "defiled flesh" to sexual impurity are Harrington, *Jude and 2 Peter*, 206; Hillyer, *1 and 2 Peter, Jude*, 247; Kraftchick, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 41–42; Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, 456; and of Gnostic orientation: Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude*, 260–61.

³¹ Within Judaism, religious purity may be jeopardized when "a person" ("flesh," σάρξ) defiles himself through contact with a dead body (Tobit; Josephus, *The Antiquities of the Jews* 4.4.6 § 81) or by entering a Gentile's home (John 18:28). Other examples may include contact with unclean animals (Lev. 5:3; 11:24, 43, 44; 22:8; Josephus, *The Antiquities of the Jews* 3.12.1 § 275), contracting disease (Lev. 13:3, 11, 14, 15, 20, 27, 25, 27, 30, 44, 59; Philo, *Quod Deus sit immutabilis* 123–124), contact with the dead (Lev. 21:1, 11; Num. 19:13; Deut. 21:23; Philo, *The Special Laws* 3.152; Ezek. 44:25).

³² Within Judaism, religious impurity occurred through improper worship as a result of practicing idolatry (Exod. 20:25; Lev. 20:3; 2 Kings 23:13; Hos. 5:3; 6:10; Jer. 2:23; 3:1–2; Ezek. 5:11; 20:7, 18, 31; 28:7; 37:23; 1 Macc. 4:45). Unbelief was also viewed as a form of corruption or religious defilement (Titus 1:15). Jude described the godless as people who do not believe in Jesus as the Messiah (v. 4; cf. v. 8b) and may suggest that the godless suffered from a form of religious contamination because of unbelief in Jesus as Messiah.

³³ Within Judaism, religious impurity occurred because of immoral acts of murder (Num. 5:1–2, 10), by an abundance of war as in the case of David, who was considered defiled because of his making many wars and slaughtering his enemies (Josephus, *The Antiquities of the Jews* 7.4.4 § 92; cp. 7.14.8 § 371), by language (ibid., 16.4.1 § 93), by bitterness (Heb. 12:15), and by sexual misconduct including adultery (Num. 5:3, 14, 20, 27, 29; Ezek. 22:11; 44:25); a brothel house (Josephus, *The Jewish Wars* 4.9.10 § 562), rape (Gen. 34:5, 13, 27), incest (Gen. 49:4), homosexual activities (Philo, *The Special Laws*, 2.50; Josephus, *The Antiquities of the Jews* 3.12.1 § 375). Philo also spoke of a person defiled through his mind by "giving himself up to folly and being bred up with shamelessness and audacity, infamous man that he was, attempted to pollute and to defile the judicial faculties of the mind" (*Migration* 224;

throughout his letter (vv. 4, 8, 10, 11, 16, 18, 19) suggests that this religious contamination occurred by way of disbelief in Jesus as Messiah (vv. 4, 8b) and moral misconduct by way of language (vv. 8, 10, 16, 19), bitterness (vv. 11, 16, 19), murder, and sexual misconduct (v. 8). Yet Jude's center of attention, which closely relates to this broader religious contamination, is covered in his next example about the godless.

The second example of the godless rebelling against God's societal norms is given in verses 4, 10, and 11. In verse 4 the portrait Jude paints begins with a broad depiction of the godless, who violated many forms of social behavior ("immoral," ἀσέλγεια) in that they rejected authority (vv. 8, 11), they slandered others (vv. 8, 10, 16), grumbled (v. 16), found fault with others (vv. 16, 19), and ultimately were greedy self-seekers (vv. 11, 16). In verse 10, however, the details of Jude's portrait are more focused in that Jude explicitly depicted them as stupid as well as irrational. Whereas Jude first exposed the godless as bold slanderers of angels (v. 8c), he now painted them as slanderers of everything ("they slander whatever they do not understand," ὅσα . . . οὐκ οἶδασι βλασφημοῦσιν, v. 10).³⁴ Both statements, the one in verse 8 and here in verse 10, are in stark contrast to Michael (v. 9). Whereas Jude admired Michael for not acting rashly in pronouncing judgments on Satan ("he did not act rashly to bring a verbally abusive judgment *against Satan*," οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφημίας), Jude ridiculed the godless for spinning unlimited destructive criticism as a sign of their stupidity ("no understanding," οὐκ οἶδασι, v. 10).³⁵

cf. Titus 1:15). Other examples may include *1 Enoch* 7:1; 9:8; 10:11; 12:4; 15:3, 4; *Epistle of Aristeas* 166; *Papiri greco-egizii, Papiri Fiorentini*, Supplementi Filologico-Storici ai Monumenti Antichi (Milan: Hoepli, 1905–1915), 338, 18; Josephus, *The Jewish Wars* 4.5.2 § 323).

³⁴ Verses 8–10 expose the unbecoming scruples of contemporary rebels. Jude portrayed the godless as self-indulgent rebels who lacked restraint and engaged in slander. Although verses 8–10 consist of seven independent clauses and three dependent clauses, a significant lexical feature throughout these verses is the use of βλασφημέω in verses 8 and 10 as well as βλασφημίας in verse 9. The concept of blasphemy links these verses to form a single unit of thought. For further discussion about the linking of these verses with "blasphemy" see Bateman, *Jude and Second Peter* (forthcoming).

³⁵ To speak with "no understanding" (οὐκ οἶδασι) occurs in *Joseph and Aseneth*. In Aseneth's confession of sin and prayer for acceptance she expresses regret for speaking without understanding when she admits, "And I did not know, miserable that I am, that he is your son, O Lord; for the people told me that Joseph was a son of a shepherd from the land of Canaan, and I believed them. But I was wrong, and I despised Joseph, your chosen one, and I spoke evil words of him, not knowing [οὐκ ᾔδειν] that he is your son" (13:10). On the other hand to slander with no understanding may generate ridicule. For instance Josephus insulted Apion for speaking

Jude escalated his accusation when he further painted the godless as people who followed animal instincts (ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα)³⁶ and who thereby were in the process of “corrupting themselves” (φθειρόνται).³⁷ “The accusation that someone acts out of one’s irrational nature as an animal,” according to Green, “was part of *vituperation* (Philo, *Embassy* 19–20 §§ 131–32), which Jude’s pen pours

without understanding when he wrote, “And say you so, sir! as I may reply; then does Apion load the ass, that is himself, and lays on him a burden of fooleries and lies; for he writes of places that have no being; and not knowing [οὐκ εἰδὼς] the cities he speaks of, he changes their situation” (*Against Apion* 2.10 § 115). In a similar way God refers to those who do not know Him (they have no understanding) as stupid: “For my people are foolish, they do not know [οὐκ ἤδεισαν] me; they are stupid children, they have no understanding” (Jer. 4:22, NRSV). Jude’s use of “no understanding” is in keeping with the latter of these usages.

³⁶ Naturally the drive to care for children is as instinctive for people as it is for “unreasoning animals” (τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα; cf. 4 Macc. 4:14, 18). Yet caring for children and even nature’s drive to survive are not what concerned Jude. Jude’s comment insulted the godless because he insinuated that they ignore *all* reason. Ptolemy Philadephia (285–247 BC) allegedly inquired of a group of Jewish delegates, “What is the highest form of sovereignty (= government)?” One of those Jewish representatives, Eleazar, who was sent to Ptolemy’s court responded, “Control of oneself, and not being carried away by one’s *impulses*” (φυσικόν; *Letter of Aristeeas*, 222). While admittedly people are driven by natural instincts, control of those instincts was expected. Isaiah compares a dog’s lack of contentment with that of shepherds: “The dogs have a mighty appetite; they never have enough. The shepherds also have no understanding [οὐκ εἰδότες]; they have all turned to their own way, to their own gain, one and all” (Isa. 56:11, NRSV). And though Jude did not address false prophets, the apparent lack of self-control as well as ignoring all reason drove Jewish leaders to revolt against Rome. In essence Jude portrayed the godless as people who lacked control as a result of ignoring reason. See Josephus’s attempt to dissuade the Jews from entering the war in *Life*.

³⁷ On the one hand, most translations render φθειρόνται as “they are destroyed” (ASV, CNT, ESV, NASB, NET, NIV, NLT, and NRSV). Conceptually Josephus used the verb “I destroy” (φθεῖρω) most frequently to speak of physical death in general, but he also used the term more specifically to speak of destruction (of the world destroyed by fire, Josephus, *The Antiquities of the Jews* 1.2.3 § 70; of a city, *ibid.*, 5.1.2.12; of a Philistine city, *ibid.*, 5.8.7 § 296; 20.2.2 § 29; and circumstances in general, *ibid.*, 9.14.3 § 289). The latter perspective is often understood to speak of suffering eternal punishment as in 1 Peter 2:12. On the other hand a few translations render φθειρόνται as “they are corrupt” (KJV, KJVS, BISHOP, DRBY, YNG). The term may specify sexual corruption and other times it may refer more broadly to general corruption. For instance, Josephus employs the term to speak of sexual corruption of “Abimelech, the king of that country, who did also himself fall in love with Sarah, and was disposed to corrupt her” (Josephus, *The Antiquities of the Jews* 1.12.1 § 207) as well as the general corruption of people (*ibid.*, 18.4.4 § 100); by gifts (*ibid.*, 20.6.2.127); by a political power (*The Jewish Wars* 4.9.4 § 510); by money (*Life* 13.73), or simply a charge of corruption (*The Jewish Wars* 1.31.5 § 618). More frequently, however, the New Testament uses the term to speak of corrupt morals (1 Cor. 15:33; Eph. 4:22; Rev. 19:2; cf. 2 Cor. 7:2; 11:3). Certainly in Jude’s immediate context the issue was a moral one, slander (the reoccurrence of the verb βλασφημέω recalls the same verb in verse 8 as well as the noun βλασφημία in v. 9).

out as a concrete accusation.”³⁸ Thus in verse 10, Jude first ridicules the godless for their speech and then insults them for acting impulsively or rashly (= irrationally; cf. 9b) like animals. Both are contrary to God’s societal norm.

Finally in verse 11, the details of Jude’s portrait are once again very focused. Jude depicted his contemporary rebels as discontented people. Shrouded in a typological association with people of the past, namely, Cain, Balaam, and Korah, Jude essentially depicted the godless as greedy. They followed the way of Cain, whose greed manifested itself in self-gratification at the expense of others. “Clearly,” as Green rightly concludes, “the Cain story became an interpretive space that longed to be filled.”³⁹ Consequently and quite unlike the biblical and extrabiblical sources, Jude provided no specifics about Cain’s waywardness. In comparing the godless with Cain, Jude merely said, “They have gone [ἐπορεύθησαν] the way of Cain” (τῆ ὁδῷ τοῦ Κάιν ἐπορεύθησαν). Nevertheless Jude tended to move from one subject matter to another in groups of three (e.g., three past rebellions in vv. 5–7 and three types of blasphemy in vv. 8–11). It seems reasonable to suggest that Jude may have shifted to Cain’s general propensity and reputation as a greedy person as portrayed extensively in second temple literature⁴⁰ and thereby likened to the next two notorious Old Testament

³⁸ Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, 85.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 90.

⁴⁰ Portrayals of Cain in second temple literature vary in what they emphasize about him. In a work from around the time of the Maccabean revolt (ca. 164 BC), Cain is portrayed typologically as a warning to any who may pattern their life in moral corruption: “Until eternity those who are like Cain in their moral corruption and hatred of brother shall be punished with a similar judgment” (*Testament of Benjamin* 7:5). In another work written around AD 70, Cain is presented in heaven with “the crafty adversary,” acts under the influence of “the lawless one,” and in essence has joined hands with the devil: “And I saw, as it were, Adam, and Eve who was with him, and with them the crafty adversary and Cain, who had been led by the adversary to break the law, and (I saw) the murdered Abel (and) the perdition brought on him and given through the lawless one” (*Apocalypse of Abraham* 24:5). Finally, Josephus in his retelling of the Cain and Abel event makes several editorial comments that depict Cain’s greedy disposition: “Now, the two brethren were pleased with different courses of life, for Abel, the younger, was a lover of righteousness, and, believing that God was present at all his actions, he excelled in virtue; and his employment was that of a shepherd. But Cain was not only very wicked in other respects, but was wholly intent upon getting; and he first contrived to plough the ground” (Josephus, *The Antiquities of the Jews* 1.2.1 § 53). The portrayal of Cain’s greedy disposition expands when Josephus muses, “And when Cain had travelled over many countries, he, with his wife, built a city, named Nod, which is a place so called, and there he settled his abode; where also he had children. However, he did not accept of his punishment, in order to amendment, but to increase his wickedness; for he only aimed to procure everything that was for his own bodily

figures—Balaam and Korah. Thus the godless are greedy in that they follow the error of Balaam, whose greed manifested itself in his desire for money at the expense of God's chosen people (Num. 22:3–24:25; cf. 2 Pet. 15–16).⁴¹ And the godless are greedy in that they follow the rebellion of Korah, whose greed manifested itself in a challenge to Moses' authority (Num. 16:1–35; cf. Josephus, *The Antiquities of the Jews* 4.3.4 § 57–58).⁴²

pleasure, though it obliged him to be injurious to his neighbors. He augmented his household substance with much wealth, by rapine and violence; he excited his acquaintance to procure pleasures and spoils by robbery, and became a great leader of men into wicked courses. He also introduced a change in that way of simplicity wherein men lived before; and was the author of measures and weights. And whereas they lived innocently and generously while they knew nothing of such arts, he changed the world into cunning craftiness" (ibid., 1.2.2 § 60–61). Josephus ends his editorial comments about Cain's greedy posterity with "even while Adam was alive, it came to pass that the posterity of Cain became exceeding wicked, every one successively dying one after another more wicked than the former. They were intolerable in war, and vehement in robberies; and if anyone were slow to murder people, yet was he bold in his profligate behavior, in acting unjustly and doing injuries for gain" (ibid., 1.2.2 § 66; cf. Philo, *Worse* 10 § 32). Thus, second temple literature paints Cain as one who hated his brother and was morally corrupt (*Testament of Benjamin* 7:5), but his moral corruption resonated more specifically with a greedy disposition that enhances personal pleasures at the expense of others through robbery and murder if necessary (Josephus, *The Antiquities of the Jews* 1.2.1–2 § 52–61) and was in keeping with the devil, whom he associated with himself (*Apocalypse of Abraham* 24:5).

⁴¹ Although God appeared to Balaam, inquired about Balak's delegation that arrived in Pethor, and directed Balaam not to curse Israel (Num. 22:9–14), he still saddled his donkey and set out for Moab (22:15–21). However, through a chain of supernatural events (22:22–35), a certain irony emerged as the historical account unfolded. Balaam blessed Israel (Num. 23:7–10, 18–24; 24:3–9, 15–19) and cursed Moab with other surrounding enemies (24:20, 21–22, 23–24). True to the God who spoke through him (22:9, 12, 13, 20, 35, 38; 23:3, 5, 12, 16, 26; 24:2, 13), three of Balaam's oracles contain short, cryptic prophecies about the coming king of Israel (23:21; 24:7, 17–19), which is most notably positive in many texts outside the book of Numbers. See Gordon Johnston's discussion in *Jesus the Messiah: Tracing the Promises, Expectations, and Coming of Israel's King*, by Herbert W. Bateman IV, Darrell L. Bock, and Gordon H. Johnston (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2012), 52–57. But what lingers in Jewish second temple retellings about Balaam is his willingness to be hired to utter a curse on the Israelites. Furthermore, Balaam encouraged sexual immorality with the daughters of Moab and idolatry at Baal-Peor (cf. 25:1–3 with 31:16).

⁴² Korah is remembered for instigating a major rebellion against God's chosen leader, Moses (Num. 16:1–35). Korah, a Levite, incited 250 leaders ("princes") to rebel against Moses and Aaron ("stood before Moses") for allegedly exalting himself over the entire community (vv. 1–3). Moses' response to Korah and the 250 leaders was to let the Lord decide. When Moses summoned Dathan and Abriam, they too joined the rebellion. The next day, each brought his own censer with fire and incense on it, and they assembled at the tent of meeting. Korah and the others were standing against Moses and Aaron at the entrance of the tent of meeting when the glory of the Lord appeared to everyone (vv. 4–19). The Lord directed Moses and Aaron to separate the community from Korah, Dathan, and Abram. Then Moses declared that if these men died a natural death, it would prove that the Lord did not

Consequently the comparison between the past and the present is this: Though Gentile urban centers rebelled against God's societal norms by rejecting God's marital standards between husband and wife (v. 7), the godless of Jude's day were even worse. They were religiously contaminated in that they denied Jesus as Messiah and thereby God Himself (vv. 4, 8), they suffered from voicing stupid statements and exhibiting a lack of self-control brought about by ignoring human reason (v. 10), and they were greedy self-absorbed people (v. 11). Jude viewed all these behaviors as unacceptable forms of rebellion against God's societal norm.

REBELLION RAISES DIVINE IRE

Anyone who rebelled against God experienced His divine ire. Jude wanted his readers to remember that God was impartial when He judged rebellion, no matter who rebelled against Him, whether Jew, celestial being, or Gentile urbanite. The wilderness generation's *rebellion against God's leading* at Kadesh-barnea ended in physical death. Thus when Jude wrote that "God destroyed" (ἀπώλεσεν, v. 5)⁴³ the Israelites because of their disbelief, he meant that God pronounced a penalty of physical death.

Concerning the angelic *rebellion against God's universal design*, God confined the celestial dissenters "in eternal chains" (δεσμῶις αἰδίωις, v. 6). Although it is not unusual to read about people bound in chains and imprisoned either as criminals or prisoners of war,⁴⁴ the concept of angels being shackled is not common,

send Moses. But if the Lord did something phenomenal, then they would know that they had despised the Lord (vv. 20–30). When Moses was finished speaking, the ground split open where Korah, Dathan, and Abriam and their entire families stood and "swallowed them." Two hundred fifty men who offered incense were devoured by fire (vv. 31–35).

⁴³ For instance the Egyptian pursuit of the Israelites leaving Egypt came to an abrupt end: "what he [God] did to the Egyptian army, to their horses and chariots, how he made the water of the Red Sea flow over them as they pursued you, so that the LORD has destroyed [ἀπώλεσεν] them to this day" (Deut. 11:4, NRSV; cf. 4Q 122.1–5). Noncanonical retellings of the Exodus event also consider "destroy" to mean physical death. For instance, in speaking of God's judgment of Korah, Josephus wrote, "Moses, after these men were destroyed [ἀπολλώτας], was desirous that the memory of this judgment might be delivered down to posterity, and that future ages might be acquainted with it" (Josephus, *The Antiquities of the Jews* 4.3.4 § 57; of Dathan, *ibid.*, 4.3.3 § 52; cf. Philo, *Moses* 2.281).

⁴⁴ Of the forty-eight occurrences in the Septuagint many references use the noun "bind" (δεσμῶις; Heb. רָכַס) for literal imprisonment (of Israelites in Egypt, Lev. 26:13; of Manasseh in Assyria, 2 Chron. 33:11; Prayer of Manasseh 10; of Zedekiah in Babylon, 1 Esdras 1:40; of Jewish people in Egypt, 3 Macc. 3:25). Yet there are references to figurative bindings (of sin, Isa. 52:2; Jer. 2:20; of women, Eccles. 7:26). In

nor is it mentioned in Genesis 6, but it is prominent in *1 Enoch*.⁴⁵ Similarly Genesis says nothing of shackled angels being confined “in darkness” (ὑπὸ ζόφον)⁴⁶ “for the judgment of the great day” (εἰς

the New Testament the idea of being bound for literal imprisonment describes the situations of both Peter and Paul in Jerusalem (Acts 12:7; 16:22–27). Likewise of the forty-five occurrences in Josephus, nearly all speak of someone bound for imprisonment (of Joseph in Egypt, *The Antiquities of the Jews* 10.7.5 § 122; of Jeremiah in Jerusalem, *ibid.*, 10.7.5 § 122; of Aristobulus in Rome, *ibid.*, 14.7.4 § 123; of Herod Agrippa in Rome, Josephus, *The Jewish Wars* 1.9.6 § 181). At Masada they would rather commit suicide than be placed in chains and taken to Rome (*ibid.*, 7.9.1 § 389–406). In fact, Josephus recalls how the rebel leader John of Gischala, one of several who led a Jewish insurrection against Rome *circa* 67–68 was captured and describes his imprisonment as the equivalent to “eternal chains” (δεσμοῖς αἰωνίους; *ibid.*, 6.9.4 § 434).

⁴⁵ For instance, “And to Michael God said, ‘Make known to Semyaz and the others who are with him, who fornicated with the women, that they will die together with them in all their defilement . . . bind them for seventy generations underneath the rocks of the ground until the day of their judgment and of their consummation, until the eternal judgment is concluded’” (*1 Enoch* 10:12; cf. 4Q202 f1iv:5–10). *1 Enoch* 10:12 was translated by E. Isaac in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985), 1:17. See also Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 53.

⁴⁶ The idea that angels are confined “in darkness” (ὑπὸ ζόφον) is common in the Enoch tradition. *2 Enoch* reads, “And those men picked me up and brought me up to the second heaven. And they showed me, and I saw a darkness greater than earthly darkness. And there I perceived prisoners under guard, hanging up, waiting for her measureless judgment. And those angels have the appearance of darkness itself, more than earthly darkness” (71–2; cf. 18:1–5). Jude’s description “in darkness” (ὑπὸ ζόφον) may refer to a second heaven, beneath the earth, the ancient Greek’s “underworld” (CEB) or the “nether world” (RSV: “nether darkness”). Green supports the netherworld perspective with selected statements from Greek classical literature: “As for me, I depart for the darkness beneath the earth” (Aeschylus, *Persians*, 839); and “Forever in the nether gloom” (Euripides, *Hippolytus*, 1416). The concept of “darkness” occurs in Homer’s *Iliad* where Homer tells how the heaven and earth were divided into three parts: Neptune dwells in the sea, Hades took the darkness of the realms under the earth, and Zeus took to the air, sky, and clouds (15.184–199). More specifically, the *Iliad* says the god Hades rules the world below, “the darkness (ζόφον) of the realms under the earth” (15:191). Closely related to the Greek concept of Hades is a reference to the underworld as an abyss. Enoch describes, “I then saw one . . . seizing that first star binding his hands and feet, and throwing him into an abyss—this abyss was narrow and deep, empty and dark” (88:1; cp. 54:3–5). Perhaps it is merely a sort of pit or cistern. In *1 Enoch*, the “darkness” in which Semyaz (sometimes referred to as Azazel) is buried (10:4–5; 11–12) seems to be nothing more than a cistern similar to the one Jeremiah was placed (Jer. 38:6–13; Josephus, *The Antiquities of the Jews* 10.7.5 § 122). In Isaiah heavenly forces and earthly kings are imprisoned in a pit (e.g., “cistern,” see NET note) until a period of judgment (Isa. 24:21–22). Perhaps it is merely a hole in the ground or a grave. In *1 Enoch* 10, an archangel bound the divine being called Semyaz, made a hole in the desert, cast him in the hole, threw on top of him rugged and sharp rocks, and covered his face in order that Semyaz would never see daylight (10:4–5), and again it is said he was placed “underneath the rocks of the ground” (10:11–12; cp. 14:5).

κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας).⁴⁷ But as if they were criminals or prisoners of war, Jude vividly depicted the miserable conditions of rebellious angels: they have been chained, cast into a dark prison, were incapable of moving about freely, and were kept by God for judgment. Angels who rejected their prescribed heavenly residence are “banished from heaven and condemned to imprisonment in darkness within the earth with chains (*1 Enoch* 10:4–6; 14:5; 54:3–5) until the ominous ‘great day of judgment’ (*1 Enoch* 10:12; 22:11).”⁴⁸ As a national Judean insurgence against Rome was gaining momentum to reestablish the kingdom of Israel, was Jude intending for his readers to ponder their placement in Roman society? “To keep one’s proper station in society,” avers Green, “was a high value during the era when Jude wrote. In a stratified society where status and position were marked by both clothing and positions in banquets and the theater, the accusation that these beings had moved outside their proper sphere or realm would have been understood as a transgression without any further mention of their sin.”⁴⁹

Participants in the Gentile urbanite *rebellion against God’s societal norms* suffered (“by suffering,” ὑπέχουσαι, v. 7) a “divine

⁴⁷ Jude’s reference to angels and the “judgment of the great day” (εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας) is not in Genesis 6:1–4. Perhaps this is his embellishment derived from Joel’s “the day of the LORD comes—that great and terrible day” (Joel 2:31; 3:4, NET) or from another Hebrew prophet because this concept resonates among many prophets (Isa. 13:6, 9; Joel 2:11; Amos 5:18, 20; Zeph. 1:14; Mal. 4:5). Although possible, Jude’s portrayal seems similar to *1 Enoch*. The “judgment of the great day” (κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας) is God’s righteous judgment, when fallen angels are led into “the bottom of the fire—and in torment—the prison (where) they will be locked up forever” (10:13–14). Of significance are the perceived location of the sinful before judgment day, the judgment day itself, and the events after judgment day: “sinners are set apart when they die and are buried in the earth and judgment has not been executed upon them in their lifetime . . . until the great day of Judgment—and to the accursed (there will be) plague and pain forever, and the retribution of their spirits. They will bind them there forever” (*1 Enoch* 22:10–11; cp. Luke 16). Regardless, celestial beings remain incarcerated until God’s appointed judgment day.

⁴⁸ Richard, *Reading 1 Peter, Jude, and 2 Peter*, 256.

⁴⁹ Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, 69. “Legal position and status lay at the root of Roman social organization,” writes Craige B. Champion, “which at all levels was formally hierarchical.” “Rome exercised a quasi-paternal authority in its foreign policy and expected other states to behave as dutiful clients. In all such cases, Roman authority was paramount and subordinates were hierarchically graded” (*The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece and Rome*, ed. Michael Gagarin [New York: Oxford University Press, 2010], s.v. “Social Organization, Roman”). See also Everett Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 48–69. At the time, Jude’s Judea was not behaving in a manner in keeping with Rome’s authority and was thereby rejecting its station in the Roman Empire.

punishment” (δίκην).⁵⁰ A similar combination of the terms “suffer” (ὑπέχω) and “punishment” (δίκην) occurs in Josephus to describe God's people suffering divine judgment of the flood (*The Antiquities of the Jews* 1.3.8 § 99) and a plague for rebellion (4.4.1 § 61; cf. 17.5.6 § 129). Consequently Sodom and Gomorrah symbolized (“they are set as an example,” πρόκεινται δέγματα)⁵¹ the sort of judgment to expect for any sinful city (Jer. 49:18; 50:40), Jew (Amos 4:11; *Testament of Levi* 14:6), or Gentile (Zeph. 2:9).⁵²

Furthermore they were consumed by an “eternal fire” (πυρὸς

⁵⁰ The noun “punishment” (δίκην) is frequently used to describe judgment: against Egypt (Wis. 18:11); against anyone who ignored God and practiced sexual immorality or idolatry (Wis. 14:22–31; cf. 1:8); against the Jewish nation for Jason's changing the nation's way of life (4 Macc. 4:21); against a tyrant for an unjustified murder and other heinous crimes (4 Macc. 11:2; 18:22); and in 12:12 divine judgment involves “intense and eternal fire and tortures (πικνοτέρῳ καὶ αἰωνίῳ πυρὶ καὶ βασάνοις) (18:22). Elsewhere the term appears in a request for substitution whereby divine judgment of the Jewish nation would be passed on to Eleazer (6:28) and in mention of people excused from divine judgment when fearing a king (8:22).

⁵¹ Although πρόκεινται δέγματα seldom denotes being placed on display as an example, Josephus references Jehoiachin as a public example for John of Gischala (a leading rebel in the Jewish revolt) concerning how to behave when he was faced with the threat of Jerusalem's destruction by Rome. The event about Jehoiachin (alternative: Jechoniah) occurred when Nebuchadnezzar invaded Judea (Hatti-land) sometime in December 598 BC, laid siege on Jerusalem, and captured it on Saturday, March 16, 597. While Jerusalem was under siege, Jehoiakim died in December 598. His son, Jehoiachin, ascended to the throne December 9, 598, but he reigned only three months and ten days, and was then deported to Babylon in 597 (2 Kings 24:8–14; 2 Chron. 36:9–10). Nebuchadnezzar then appointed Zedekiah, Jehoiachin's uncle, to be king over Judah and Jerusalem (2 Kings 24:17). The event also appears among the Babylonian cuneiform tablets: “In the month Kisliwu [Nov–Dec], the king of Addad called up his army, marched against Syria [lit., Hatti-land], encamped against the city of Judah and seized the town on the second day of the month Adar. He captured the king [i.e., Jehoiachin]. He appointed there a king of his own choice [i.e., Zedekiah]. He took much booty from it and sent (it) to Babylon” (James B. Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 3rd ed. [Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969], 203, fig. 58). Josephus avers, “But still, John, it is never dishonorable to repent, and amend what has been done amiss, even at the last. You have a ‘good example set’ (καλὸν ὑπόδειγμα . . . πρόκειται) before you in Jechoniah, the king of the Jews. He, when of old his conduct had brought the Babylonian's arm upon him, of his own free will left the city before it was taken, and with his family endured voluntary captivity” (*The Jewish Wars* 6.2.1 § 103–04; cf. Philo, *Moses* 1:48).

⁵² The sins of adultery, living lies, and encouragement of evildoers prior to the destruction of the first temple were, in God's eyes, typical of the people of Sodom and Gomorrah (Jer. 23:14). Others declared that “just as the Sodomites were destroyed from the earth, so all who serve idols will be destroyed” (4Q221 f2i:3; cf. 4Q223 224 f2i:53). Jesus described Galilean rejection of Him and His ministry in the cities of Capernaum as sin whose judgment will be more terrible than that of Sodom and Gomorrah (Matt. 10:15; 11:23–24; cf. Luke 10:12; 17:29; Rom. 9:29).

αἰωνίου). The concept of “eternal fire” could serve as a warning,⁵³ an expression for hell,⁵⁴ or both, that is, a temporal warning for the present in order to avoid the eschatological perils of eternal flames associated with hell. As Schreiner observes, “This fire functions as an example because it is a type or anticipation of what is to come for all those who reject God. The destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah is not merely a historical curiosity; it functions typologically as a prophecy of what is in store for the rebellious.”⁵⁵ Regardless of how the figure is explained, the point is that as it happened to the Gentiles, so it might happen to any Judean who rejected God’s societal norms. The Gentile urbanites’ rebellion against God’s nuptial expectations ended in their entire cities being destroyed by fire.

In Jude’s present situation the godless are considered damned (v. 11). Jude’s prophetic pronouncement, typically rendered “woe to

⁵³ “Eternal fire” (πυρὸς αἰωνίου) could be classified as a figure of example as a precedent to be followed or avoided and thereby similar to one found in Luke 17:32. “Remember Lot’s wife” (i.e., do not look back) is the example. Here in Jude it is the fiery destruction of Gentile urbanites. Their sin should not be repeated. Since the geographical area where the urban infernos occurred remained desolate, “eternal fire” (πυρὸς αἰωνίου) could be conceived as a warning. The fiery destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah was so dreadful it was an eternal warning for all subsequent generations to beware lest it happen to them: “You consumed with ‘fire and sulfur’ [πυρὶ καὶ θεῖῳ] the people of Sodom who acted arrogantly, who were notorious for their vices; and you made them an example [παράδειγμα] to those who should come afterward” (3 Macc. 2:5; cf. Philo, *Moses* 2.56; Josephus, *The Jewish Wars* 4 § 483). See Bullinger, *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible*, 467.

⁵⁴ A periphrasis or circumlocution figure of speech uses seemingly unnecessary words to express the author’s point. For instance, “in the city of David” is a periphrasis for Bethlehem (Luke 2:11), and “this fruit of the vine” is a periphrasis for wine (Matt. 26:29). Here in Jude “eternal fire” is a periphrasis for hell. The idea of fire being an eternal form of punishment occurs elsewhere for tyrants: “justice has laid up for you intense and eternal fire and tortures, and *these throughout all time will never let you go*” (4 Macc. 12:12; cf. 1QS 2.8; Matt. 18:8; Rev. 20:11–15). Commentators vary. “Jude means,” according to Bauckham, “the still burning site of the cities is a warning picture of the eternal fires of hell” (*Jude, 2 Peter*, 55). Harrington sees “eternal fire” as a periphrasis for “hellfire” (*Jude and 2 Peter*, 197). What appears to drive this periphrasis sense is the presupposition that Jude spoke of the sexual misconduct of angels, who in turn will suffer the eternal fires of hell, where angelic beings are eventually cast for their sexual misconduct (1 *Enoch* 10:13–14; 20:1–7; cf. Rev. 20:10). Though there may be conceptual parallels with the angelic situation, it is not because of their sexual misconduct but rather their final punishment on the “great day of judgment.” Others who favor this both-and position are Davids, *The Letter of 2 Peter and Jude*, 53–54; Hillyer, *1 and 2 Peter, Jude*, 244–46; Steven J. Kraftchick, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 39–40; and Moo, *2 Peter and Jude*, 241–42. See Bullinger’s *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible*, 419–22.

⁵⁵ Schreiner writes, “The brimstone, salt, and wasted nature of the land function as a warning for Israel and the church elsewhere in the Scriptures (Deut. 29:23; Jer. 49:17–18; cf. Isa. 34:9–10; Ezek. 38:22; Rev. 14:10–11; 19:3; 20:10)” (1, 2 *Peter, Jude*, 453). See also E. K. Lee, “Words Denoting ‘Pattern’ in the New Testament,” *New Testament Studies* 8 (1961–62): 167.

them" (οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς), seems a rather mild reproach in today's culture.⁵⁶ Perhaps a more appropriate contemporary English rendering would be "Damnation will come to them" or "They are damned" or just simply, "Damn them." Jude's expression is a prophetic pronouncement of judgment on a group of people who have forsaken God similar to pronouncements uttered by Old Testament prophets (cf. Isa. 5:1–30; Jer. 22:13–17; 23:1–4; Amos 6:1–3; Hab. 2:6–20), the author of *1 Enoch* (94:6–8; 95:4–7; 96:4–8; 97:7–8; 98:9–16; 99:11–15; 100:7–9), and Jesus (e.g., Matt. 11:21; 18:7; 23:13–16, 23, 25, 27, 29; cf. Peter's statement in Acts 8:20).⁵⁷ Thus Jude condemned rather harshly the godless who were recruiting Jews to rebel against Rome.⁵⁸ Furthermore, Jude's appeal to *1 Enoch* 1:9

⁵⁶ The English expression "woe" is reminiscent of the King James era and yet, as indicated above, is maintained by many translations. Only the NLT breaks away from an antiquated English idiomatic expression with "What sorrow awaits them!" Woe-oracles are condemning prophetic announcements to the people of Israel for rejecting God and living sinful lives that warrant divine judgment. For instance Hosea, Isaiah, and Jeremiah all utter woe oracles to the Jewish people: "Woe to them [οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς], for they have strayed from me! Destruction to them, for they have rebelled against me!" (Hos. 7:13, NET). "The look on their faces bears witness against them; they proclaim their sin *like* Sodom, they do not hide it. Woe to them [woe to their souls, οὐαὶ τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτῶν]! For they have brought evil on themselves" (Isa. 3:9, NET). "I have seen your abominations, your adulteries and neighings, your shameless prostitutions on the hills of the countryside. Woe to you [οὐαὶ σοι], O Jerusalem! How long will it be before you are made clean?" (Jer. 13:27, NET). "Woe to you [οὐαὶ ὑμῖν] who write down lying and godless words; for they write down their lies that men may hear them and act godlessly towards (their) neighbor" (*1 Enoch* 98:15). "Woe to you [οὐαὶ ὑμῖν] who work godlessness, and glory in lying and extol them: You shall perish, and no happy life shall be yours" (*1 Enoch* 99:1).

Woe oracles are also used in prophetic announcements on Gentile nations as well. "Woe to the nations [οὐαὶ ἔθνεσιν] that rise up against my people! The Lord Almighty will take vengeance on them in the day of judgment; he will send fire and worms into their flesh; they shall weep in pain forever" (Judith 16:17, NRSV). "Woe to you, Moab [οὐαὶ σοι, Μωάβ], Chemosh is destroyed: their sons who had sought to escape have been given up, and their daughters have become captive to Sihon, king of the Amorites" (Philo, *Allegorical Interpretation* 3:225; cf. 3:231; Num. 21:29).

⁵⁷ In fact, one contemporary translation of Matthew 11:21 reads, "Damn you Chorazin! Damn you Bethsaida! If the miracles done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have (sat) in sackcloth and ashes and changed their ways long ago." In fact, Jesus tells Capernaum "you'll go to hell." See Robert J. Miller, ed., *The Gospels* (New York: Harper San Francisco, 1994). D. A. Carson says, "May your money perish with you" in Acts 8:20 could be rendered idiomatically as "to hell with you and your money" (*The Inclusive Language Debate: A Plea for Realism* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1988], 64). See a discussion of Greek and English idiomatic language in Herbert W. Bateman IV, *Interpreting the General Letters*, Kregel's Handbook of Exegesis, ed. John Harvey (Grand Rapids: Kregel, forthcoming).

⁵⁸ Jude states in verse 4 that some people *παρεισέδυσαν* ("have secretly slipped in," NET, CEB; cf. NIV; "have secretly stolen in," NRSV; "have crept in," KJV, ASV, ESV; and even "have wormed their way into your churches," NLT). Although the verb is unique to Jude, two significant usages are in extrabiblical material. The first

certainly directs attention to the fact that rebellion raises divine ire. Although *1 Enoch* contains five separate works and each one is unique,⁵⁹ they all contribute to a major theme, which Nickelsburg states “is the coming judgment in which God will adjudicate the injustices that characterize life as the authors and their readers experience it.”⁶⁰ Needless to say, it is the predominant theological theme in Jude’s vituperative letter against the godless.

CONCLUSION

Jude’s grouping of the disbelieving Exodus generation, the seditious celestial beings, and the Gentile cities of Sodom and Gomorrah is not unique to Jude. This theme of rebellion followed by judgment occurs in numerous Jewish writings.⁶¹ What is unique to Jude is his intention. Jude desired that Judeans remember that whether a person is an Israelite, an angel, or a Gentile urbanite, God punishes rebellion. Jude makes it perfectly clear that rebellion

usage occurs in a third-century papyri: “you cannot creep in [παρεισέδυσιν], for the woman has been in possession for a long time.” Here there seems to be a focus on secrecy (see *Griechische Papyrus su Strassburg* I, II, ed. F. Preisigke [Leipzig, 1912–1920], I.22:30). A second usage occurs in Josephus where he used the term to speak of people with less than honorable motives. During the time of Herod the Great (40–4 BC), some acted as friends and endeared themselves to honorable people only to spy on them (Josephus, *The Jewish Wars* 1.24.1 § 468). Despite its infrequent use, *παρεισέδυσαν* (“have slipped in secretly”) appears to communicate that “certain people” (τινες ἄνθρωποι) had managed to intermingle among Judean followers of Jesus in a manner that was at first unnoticed and were now perhaps gaining sway within the community as recruiters for the Jewish revolt.

⁵⁹ *1 Enoch* is a collection of five books: *The Book of Watchers* (1–36), *The Book of Parables* (37–71), *The Book of Luminaries* (72–82), *The Book of Dream Visions* (83–90), and *The Epistle of Enoch* (92–105).

⁶⁰ George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 7.

⁶¹ For instance the *Damascus Document* (CD) is typically divided into two major sections: “The Admonition” and “The Law and Communal Rules.” “The Admonition” reviews Israelite history by focusing on Israel’s past and future punishment as well as God’s gracious salvation of Israel’s “remnant” (1:1–10; also referred to as “a sure house in Israel,” 3:19; “the House of Judah,” 4:11; and “those who entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus,” 6:19; cf. 6:5, 7:19). The appeal to three historical tragedies in “the Admonition,” where the text speaks of God’s future punishment of wicked backsliders, warns readers to stay firm in the Jewish tradition and not to stray from it. In 3 Maccabees historical disasters attributed to God’s judgment are intentionally placed in the midst of an intercessory prayer for divine intervention against Gentiles who profane the temple. In Jude they are used intentionally to pause and remember that God judges the rebellious impartially and decisively. Richard correctly observes, “Examination of these shows no signs of literary borrowing by Jude” (*1 Peter, Jude, 2 Peter*, 266), though there are cultural, conceptual, and literary parallels.

of any kind raises divine ire and that God judges rebellion impartially and in various ways. Jude demonstrates God's impartiality via the divine judgment of Jew, angel, and Gentile alike.

<i>Groups</i>	<i>Types of Rebellion</i>	<i>Types of Punishment</i>
Jewish People	Disbelief in God's Leading	Physical Death and No Entrance into the Land of Promise
Angelic Beings	Rejection of God's Designated Placement or Station	Imprisonment and No Longer Able to Interact in Heaven or on Earth
Gentile People	Rejection of God's Design of Societal Sexual Behavior	Total Destruction of Cities and Their Inhabitants

Jude's pronounced concern about the present rebellion, in particular the current rebellion against Rome, is simply that God would punish the rebellion that was wreaking havoc throughout the land. Having identified three types of rebellion—disbelief in God's leading, rejecting God's prescribed residence, and rejecting God's societal norms—and noting the divine ire it raises (e.g., physical death, imprisonment, and total destruction of cities) served as a warning to Judean followers of Jesus to stay clear of those who were advocating a rebellion against Rome.