

“How ‘Memories’ about the OT in Jewish and Christian Tradition Factor into Assumptions about whom and upon whom Peter and Jude Spoke and Depend”

by Herbert W. Bateman IV¹

Paper for the General Epistle Study Group (R. Bruce Compton and Timothy E. Miller, Moderators)
presented at the 75th Annual Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society,
Tuesday, November 14, 2023, at San Antonio, TX.

ABSTRACT

Introductory issues for 2 Peter and Jude often involve discussions about “false prophets” and “false teachers” as well as the order in which the letters were written based upon literary dependence. Yet, did both Peter and Jude confront “false prophets” and “false teachers”? Was 2 Peter written first upon which Jude was dependent? Or was Jude written first upon which 2 Peter depended? This paper argues that Peter and Jude tackled two totally different adversaries, wrote independent of one another, and yet were reliant upon their “memories” of events in common with their Jewish and Christian traditions.

Assumptions! Assumptions are like a building’s cornerstone. They are a vital part of a structure’s foundation upon which a building is built. A commentator’s assumptions about a NT text’s background information often, but not always,² serve as a cornerstone upon which interpretations are built. Yet, if fractures in foundational claims or lines of reasoning appear, perhaps it’s time for some reevaluation as it was the case during the mid 1900s about how to interpret Hebrews. Spicq and others, at one time, insisted that the recipients of the book of Hebrews were Hellenistic Jewish Christians from a Philonic background.³ In fact, it was assumed the best hermeneutical approach

¹ Herbert W. Bateman IV is a retired NT Studies Professor who has authored several commentaries on General Epistles: *James: An Exegetical Guide for Preaching and Teaching* in The Big Greek Idea Series, co-author with William Varner (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2022); *Hebrews: A Commentary for Biblical Preaching and Teaching* in Kerux Commentaries, co-author with Steven W. Smith (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2021); *John’s Letters: An Exegetical Guide for Preaching and Teaching* in The Big Greek Idea Series, co-author with Aaron C. Peer (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2018). *Jude* in The Evangelical Exegetical Commentary, edited by Hall Harris (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, digital 2015; print 2017). He most recently submitted a manuscript for Guides for Reading Biblical Greek is *Jude*, a new series with Lexham Press (forthcoming 2024).

² In the opening remarks of her book on Jude’s letter, Reese rightly criticizes commentators for their judicious discussions of authorship, place of writing, original readers, date of writing, occasion for writing, theological themes, and other topics about which are prudently decided; and yet, they “often become background issues that fail to play a significant role when it comes to the actual interpretation of specific passages.” Ruth Anne Reese, *2 Peter & Jude* in The Two Horizons New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 7 (emphasis mine).

³ C. Spicq, *L’Épître aux Hébreux*, 2 vols. (Paris: Gabalda, 1952–53), 1:39–91. Other advocates of the Hellenistic Jewish Christians influenced by Philo are H. Grotius, *Annotationes in Acta Apostolorum et in epistolas catholicas* (Paris: n.p., 1646); J. B. Carpzov, *Sacrae exercitationes in S. Pauli epistolam ad Heraeos ex Philone alexandrino* (Amsterdam: n.p., 1750); E. Ménégos, *La Théologie de l’épître aux Hébreux* (Paris: Fischbacher, 1894); S. G. Sowers, *The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews* (Zurich: n.p., 1965). Werner Georg Kümmel also believes that Hebrews has a conceptual nearness to Philonic thought, but that the recipients are Hellenistic Christians. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, trans. Howard Clark Kee (Nashville:

to the book of Hebrews, prior to the discoveries at Qumran, was based upon a particular understanding of Philo. Yet, after numerous manuscript finds in the region of the Dead Sea, Spicq and others reconsidered their assumptions and replaced their Philonic cornerstone upon which they interpreted Hebrews with another, one that involved Jewish exegetical practices observable in numerous scrolls.⁴ Perhaps it's time to rethink a few assumptions about 2 Peter and Jude.

Admittedly, entry-level matters like authorship, recipients, date, occasion, and others for 2 Peter and Jude are without question challenging. Yet, two assumptions most frequently accepted and upon which many interpretations are built are that both letters confront “false teachers” and a “literary dependence” upon one another. The question is why? Why does the “false prophets” (ψευδοπροφήται) and “false teachers” (ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι) view remain the assumed and prevailing cornerstone for interpreting both of these letters? And why do the majority of commentaries acquiesce to their “literary dependence”? Admittedly, there are undeniable similarities between 2 Peter and Jude. Yet unfortunately, the status quo about “false prophets” and “literary dependency” are far too often regurgitated from one commentary to another. So, while conceding that relationships of some sort exist between 2 Peter and Jude, do they warrant the same assumption that both confront “false prophets” and thereby display “literary dependence”? Perhaps Jude is not confronting “false prophets” and “false teachers” as in 2 Peter, and maybe there is no literary reliance upon one another.

About Whom did Peter and Jude Speak

Naturally, the first assumption to address is about whom did Peter and Jude speak? Are the rivals in both letters the same sort of people, upholding the same sort of errors, disseminating the same sort of challenges to church communities and thereby “false teachers”? Desjardins insists that “It is difficult not to conclude that they are addressing, if not the same problem in the same community, *then at least* remarkably similar tendencies in different communities.”⁵ Needless to say, there are those who openly recognize fractures in this cornerstone upon which interpretations are built.

Harrington, while maintaining that both speak about “teachers,” differentiates between the rivals in 2 Peter and Jude. He says, “Both letters addressed real crises in church life, but the opponents — the ‘intruders’ in Jude and the ‘false teachers’ in 2 Peter — were probably *not exactly* the same.”⁶ Donelson also recognizes differences when he says “the portrait of these opponents in 2 Peter is different from that of the ‘impious’ in Jude. In particular, 2 Peter addresses doctrinal errors in a way that Jude does not.”⁷ So while the adversaries may have similar tendencies, they

Abingdon Press, 1975), 395. See also Feine, Behm, and Kümmel, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1963), 285–86.

⁴ While building upon and reinforcing Richard Longenecker’s *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), the importance in understanding the Jewish exegesis in Hebrews was demonstrated in Herbert W. Bateman IV, *Early Jewish Hermeneutics and Hebrews 1:5–13: The Impact of Early Jewish Exegesis on the Interpretation of a Significant New Testament Passage* in *American University Studies* (New York, NY: Peter Lang, 1997), 149–50; nn 1–7, 315–16. See also my article “Second Temple Exegetical Practices: Extra-biblical Examples of Exegesis Compared with Those in the Book of Hebrews” in the *Dead Sea Scrolls* issue of *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 53.1 (Fall 2010): 26–54.

⁵ Michel Desjardins, “The portrayal of the Dissidents in 2 Peter and Jude: Does It tell Us More about the ‘Godly’ Than the ‘Ungodly’?” *JSNT* 30 (1987): 89–102; specifically, 89–90 (*emphasis mine*).

⁶ Daniel J. Harrington, *Jude and 2 Peter*, *Sacra Pagina*, edited by Daniel J. Harrington (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2003), 161 (*emphasis mine*).

⁷ Lewis R. Donelson, *I & II Peter and Jude A Commentary* in *The New Testament Library* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2010), 209;

are not exactly the same nor are their unbecoming activities alike. So, how do Peter and Jude describe their rivals? How do their respective descriptions indicate that their opponents differ? It seems rather relevant to underscore and draw attention to the manner in which Peter and Jude describe their respective adversaries and subsequent actions.

Peter's Descriptions of *His* Rivals

There can be no denying about whom Peter speaks. They are “false prophets” (ψευδοπροφῆται) and “false teachers” (ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι) who are opposing Christians residing, however temporarily, in Northern Galatia: Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, the province of Asia, and Bithynia (1 Pet 1:1; 2 Pet 3:1).⁸ It's immediately after Peter's testimonial⁹ whereby he provides a call for moral excellence and thereby provides the reason believers need to be reminded of the necessity for moral excellence. From Peter's perspective, it's because the end is near (1:12–14). Peter then directs attention to himself as one of several eye witnesses who heard and who currently serves as God's true prophetic voice in 1:18–19. (1:18–19).

^{1:18} *We ourselves heard this voice* (= God's) *uttered from heaven, when we were with him* (= Jesus) *on the holy mountain.* ^{1:19} *And we have the prophetic word made more sure to which you will do well if you pay attention to this as to a lamp shining in a gloomy place until the day dawns and the morning star rises in your hearts.*¹⁰

While there may be much to unpack in these two verses, Peter's point is simply this: eyewitnesses, like himself, heard God confirm Jesus as Messiah and that as eyewitnesses, they have a clearer

⁸ The phrase “to those . . . a faith of equal valued with ours” in 2 Peter 1:1 (Gk: “of equal of value” (ισότητος); or “of the same kind” (NASB) see BDAG, s.v. “ισότης,” p. 481) may indicate that Peter's audience was the same Gentile Christian audience who received Peter's first letter. Second Peter 3:1 reads: “This is now, . . . , the second letter that I have written to you” (Ταύτην ἤδη, . . . , δευτέραν ὑμῖν γράφω ἐπιστολήν; Lit: “I am already writing this a second letter”). Discussions and interactions with views to the contrary may be found in Charles Bigg, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*, ICC (New York, NY: Scribner's, 1909), 289; J.A.T. Robertson, *Redating the New Testament* (London, SCM, 1976), 179; Peter H. Davids, *II Peter and Jude: A Handbook on the Greek Text* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2011), 257–59; Michael Green, *2 Peter and Jude*, rev. ed., TNTC (Grand Rapids: Inter-Varsity Press, 1987), 123–24; Gene L. Green, *Jude & Second Peter* in Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 140–44, 150; Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1990), 814, 820–42; James Moffatt, Douglas Moo, *2 Peter and Jude*, NIV Application Commentary (Grand Rapids, 1996), 21–26, 162–63; Bo Reicke, *The Epistles of James, Peter, and Jude*, AB (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1964), xxxvi; Thomas R. Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, NAC (Nashville, TN: Bradman & Holman, 2003), 260–61.

⁹ Richard Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, WBC (Waco, TX: Word, 1983), 131–35; Werner Georg Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, translated by Howard Clark Kee (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1975), 433; Walter Grundmann, *Der Brief des Judas und der zweite Brief des Petrus*, Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1974), 151–53; Harrington, *Jude and 2 Peter*, 252–53; Schriener, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, 255. Yet, Davids considers 2 Peter to be more of a farewell speech (*The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*, 147–49). Kraftchick, echoes Davids. Steven J. Kraftchick, *Jude 2 Peter*, ANTC (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 2002), 102, 124.

¹⁰ My translation. The Greek “ourselves heard” (ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν) is emphatic (ESV NET CNT NLT). For the rendering of ἐνεχθεῖσαν as “uttered,” see BDAG, s.v. “φῆρω,” 7. The rendering “when we were” (ὄντες) is temporal participle (Tyndale KJV ASV NET CNT NLT). The participle προσέχοντες is translated “if you pay close attention” (BDAG, s.v. “προσέχω,” 2b) is a conditional participle (NET); but it could be a complementary adverbial participle with ποιεῖτε. For other options, see Davids, *II Peter and Jude*, 61.

understanding of God’s prophetic word — John makes a similar appeal in 1 John 1:1–4.¹¹ In 2 Peter 2:1, however, Peter contrasts (δέ) God’s true eyewitness prophets, like himself, with those who are “false prophets.”

2:1 But (δέ) false prophets also arose among the people, just as there will be false teachers among you who will introduce destructive opinions — even to the point of denying the Master (= Jesus) who bought them — *with the result of bringing upon themselves swift destruction.*¹²

Peter’s description of *his* rivals is explicit and unmistakable. They are “false prophets” (ψευδοπροφήται) and “false teachers” (ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι), they are ubiquitous in that they have always existed among God’s people, and they will also exist among the followers of Jesus. Needless to say, the nomenclature “false prophets” and “false teachers” is frequently used to *brand people* who falsely claim to be God’s prophet, who make false prophecies, and who teach error, a point mentioned often in literature of the first and second temple periods.¹³

While identifying his contemporary rivals as “false prophets” (ψευδοπροφήται) and “false teachers” (ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι), Peter more specifically describes their beliefs, actions, and forthcoming punishments. Apparently, they were circulating “destructive *opinions*” (αἰρέσεις ἀπωλείας; 2:1c), which would result in their ultimate “destruction” (ἀπώλειαν; 2:1d) about which Peter defines later as an everlasting state of torment (3:7, 16). Unfortunately, many to whom Peter wrote were compelled to follow an unbecoming moral lifestyle of the “false prophets” (2:2a). Furthermore, these “false teachers” often misrepresented the truth (2:2b) motivated by “greed” (πλεονεξία) whereby they exploited God’s people for monetary gain (2:3a).

So, who were these “false prophets” (ψευδοπροφήται) and “false teachers” (ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι)? Peter’s reference to their “destructive opinions” could be viewed as distinguishing a *particular*

¹¹ John identifies himself as an authoritative representative of Jesus, who witnessed Jesus’s life and ministry firsthand and now proclaims Jesus’ earthly ministry in order that fellowship might be shared among all who hear the message about Jesus and in order that true fellowship might become a reality for many people. John’s opponents, however, are not identified as “false prophets” but rather as those who *deny* the humanity of Jesus and his Messiahship and left John’s Christian community. See Herbert W. Bateman IV and Aaron C. Peer’s *John’s Letters An Exegetical Guide for Preaching and Teaching*, The Big Greek Idea series (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2018), 62–74, 60–61.

¹² My translation. The rendering of as “introduce” (παρεισάξουσιν) is also translated as “infiltrate” (NET) or “secretly” (ESV) but are *not* a warranted rendering (BDAG, s.v. “παρεισάγω”). An earlier render is “privily” (Tyndale KJV ASV). Likewise, the Greek translation, “opinions” (αἰρέσεις) is preferred and that “secrets” (Tyndale) or “heresies” (KJV ASV ESV NIV NET CNT NLT) are *not* a warranted (; BDAG, s.v. “αἵρεσις,” 2). Finally, the participle “bringing on” (ἐπάγοντες), is a present active nominative masculine adverbial participle of result from ἐπάγω, which means, “I bring on.” Syntactically, it probably should be read as concluding the previous sentence, thus indicating the resultant destruction of the of the false prophet/teachers. Alternatively, however, the participle might be concessive, which begins the sentence that follows. Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 639.

¹³ Naturally, the second temple period began in 515 B.C. and extends to A.D. 70 whereby some of the OT and all of the NT writings are written along with many non-canonical Jewish works. The prefixed ψευδο to the noun προφήτης appears in the OT (Zech 13:2; Jer 6:13), in non-biblical Jewish works (Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 4,51; Josephus, *J.W.* 6.5.2 §285; *Ant.* 8.9.1 §236; 8.13.1 §318), the NT (Matt 7:15; 24:11, 24; Mark 13:22; Luke 6:26; Acts 13:6; 1 John 4:1; Rev 16:13; 19:20; 20:10), and non-biblical Christian works (*ApcPt* 1:1; HM 11:1, 4, 7). J. Reiling, “The Use of ψευδοπροφήτης in the Septuagint, Philo, and Josephus,” *NovT* 13.2 (April 1971), 147–56.

group's thinking.¹⁴ Perhaps his portrayal of them as “scoffers” (ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαῖκται, 3:3), contributes more specifically to identifying who these people are.¹⁵ Neyrey suggests “the opponents were either Epicureans, who rejected traditional theodicy, or ‘scoffers’ (*Apikorons*), who espoused a similar deviant theology.”¹⁶ Epicureans rejected any possibility of an afterlife. The soul, like the body, is material and thereby returns to its original elements.¹⁷ They advocated living for pleasure whereby they favored the absence of pain and thereby sought out pleasure for both the body and the mind. Pleasures of the mind, the greater of the two, involved feelings of joy, the lack of fear, and pleasant memories.

Finally, while not denying the existence of the gods, the gods were merely physical and immortal beings who resided elsewhere. Yet, some Epicureans believed them to be completely separate from the rest of reality, and they did not interfere with the universe.¹⁸ So it would seem, in Epicurean thought, that there was no place for *divine judgment* in the future. Therefore, the eschatological skepticism would appear to fit Peter's warning and prophecy about God's future condemnation (2 Pet 2:1, 3; 3:9) of “false prophets” as well as their subsequent immoral behavior.

Yet, some commentators hesitate to specify who these “false prophets” and “false teachers” are because of the “limited information” about them in 2 Peter. Schreiner readily admits some “commonality between the opponents and Epicurean thought” but denies the view that “the opponents were *full-fledged* Epicureans.”¹⁹ Gene Green refers to the “false teachers” as “seed–

¹⁴ Philo describes “philosophers who came *from the cynic school* (ὁ ἀπὸ τῆς κυνικῆς αἰρέσεως ὁρμηθεὶς φιλόσοφος). Aristippus and Diogenes; and other too who chose to practice the same mode of life, an incalculable number of men.” Philo, “Noah's Work as a Planter,” volume 3, translated by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1938), 151; cf. BDAG, s.v. “αἵρεσις,” 1b, 2). Fitzgerald points out that Josephus likens the Sadducees as a group of Jewish Epicureans who denied fate; immortality of the soul; and future rewards and punishments (*J.W.* 2.8.14 §§164–65; *Ant.* 13.5.9 §173; 18.1.4 §16). John T. Fitzgerald's, “Epicureans” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Volume 1, edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2000), 254–55. For a similar observation and a more complete history of the rise of Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, and Qumran community against the background of the Second Temple Judaism, see Albert I. Baumgarten, *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation* (New York, NY: Brill, 1997), 39, 114.

¹⁵ The Greek actually reads ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαῖκται (lit. “scoffers in their scoffing”). The rare appearance of ἐμπαιγμονῇ (cf. 2 Pet 3:3; Jude 18; Isa 3:4) has been translated in 2 Peter 3:3 as “mocking” in Tyndale NASB NLT; BDAG, s.v. “ἐμπαιγμονῇ”; or “with scoffing” (ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ) as in NRSV ESV NIV CNT. Regardless of the rendering, the false teachers engage in scoffing or they are “blatant mockers.”

¹⁶ Jerome H. Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, The Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 122–28; cf. “The Form and Background of the Polemic in 2 Peter.” *JBL* 99 (1980): 407–31. See also Richard Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1990), 154–57; Karen H. Jobes, *Letters to the Church: A Survey of Hebrews and the General Epistles* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011), 236; Steven J. Kraftchick, *Jude, 2 Peter*, Abington New Testament Commentaries (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2002), 78.

¹⁷ Catherine Wilson, *Epicureanism: A Very Short Introduction* (United Kingdom: Oxford, 2015), 52. See also Carlo Diano and Brian Duignan, “Epicureanism,” *Encyclopedia Britannica*, July 18, 2023, <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Epicureanism>. Accessed 12 September 2023; cf. Fitzgerald, “Epicureans” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1:254.

¹⁸ Tim O'Keefe, *Epicureanism*, Ancient Philosophies, vol. 7 (University of California Press, 2010), 107–27, 155–56; cf. Fitzgerald's, “Epicureans” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1:254.

¹⁹ Thomas R. Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude* in NAC (Nashville, TN: Bradman & Holman, 2003), 280 (*emphasis mine*). His reasoning, however, is an admitted inability to grasp “how the false teachers could be Christian in any sense of the word if they embraced Epicurean thought.” Yet, perhaps they aren't Christians but merely people who had attended their church or people who were confronting Christians ... or perhaps like Judaizes in Galatians or they were opponents like those in 1 John.

pickers” mentioned in Acts 17:18 who “snatch up philosophical scraps” and thereby a more “Eclectic movement” that mirrors Epicurean beliefs and practices.²⁰ Nevertheless, what is certain is this: Peter, “by way of reminder” (ἐν ὑπομνήσει), wants his readers “to remember” (μνησθῆναι) predictions by OT prophets²¹ as well as the apostles who were witnesses for Jesus.²² Peter specifically wants his predominately Gentile ~~and Jewish~~ readers to remember that there would be rival prophets who would be skeptical of the Parousia of Christ and the Day of Judgment (3:3–5). Despite his “false prophet” cynics, however, Peter forewarns his readers in Northern Galatia that *divine judgment* will occur when God’s forbearance ends; it will come without warning (3:6–13); it will be catastrophic (3:10b–11a). So, regardless of who these false teachers are they appear to have Epicurean *leanings* and who are clearly identified as Peter’s rivals ~~about whom he writes~~.

Jude’s Descriptions of *His* Rivals

There is no denying about whom Jude speaks. He describes them as “ungodly *people*” (ἄσεβεις; vv 4, 15) but more frequently and throughout his letter they are referred to as “these *people*” (οὗτοι; vv 8, 10) or “these are” (οὗτοί εἰσιν; vv. 12, 16, 19). Unfortunately, Jude’s *branding* is more ambiguous. Despite the conventional conjecture that Jude’s opponents are “false teachers,” quite a few people have noticed a number of fractures in the foundational cornerstone whereby the “ungodly *people*” (ἄσεβεις) in Jude are assumed to be “false teachers.”

“There does not seem to me,” according to Salmon, “to be sufficient evidence that those about whom Jude condemns were teachers of false doctrine, or even teachers at all.”²³ Likewise, Eybers considers the letter to be “practical more than doctrinal” (e.g., v 4).²⁴ Naturally those who hold to a rhetorical letter for the church at large would concur. “The author is not trying to combat heresies within the Church,” according to Wisse, “the author’s purpose is to inform Christians everywhere that the enemies of the last days have arrived.”²⁵ Toit, speaking comparatively, observed that unlike other NT authors who address false teachers, Jude fails to use any *pseudo*-prefixed nouns typically employed in designating opposition groups such as “false apostles” (2 Cor 11:13), “false brothers” (Gal 2:4), “false teachers” (2 Pet 2:1), and “false prophets” (1 John 4:1). Nor are they called “liars”

²⁰ Gene Green, *Jude & Second Peter*, 155–59. It’s been suggested that the Sadducees had Epicurean leanings but they weren’t Epicureans. Fitzgerald, “Epicureans” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1:254–55.

²¹ False prophets not only lacked a divine commission, they often rejected the predictions of true prophets. This is evident in the OT when false prophets scoff or mock God’s delayed judgment the prophecies espoused by God’s prophets: Isaiah 5:18–20; Jeremiah 5:12–24; Ezekiel 12:22; Amos 9:10; Zephaniah 1:12; Malachi 2:17. This is also apparent in Wisdom 11:1 (referring to Moses), Luke 1:70 (OT prophets); Acts 3:21 (Peter’s speech of restoration promised through the OT prophets). See Davids, *II Peter and Jude*, 260–61; Anton Vögtle, *Das neue Testament und die Zukunft des Kosmos* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1970), 125–26; D. Edmond Hiebert, “Selected Studies from 2 Peter,” *BSac* 141 (1984): 255–65.

²² Luke clearly traces the apostolic witness in Acts: apostles directed to be witnesses (1:8), Peter and John at the Temple (3:1–26), Peter and apostles before Jerusalem council (5:17–42), Philip’s witness in Samaria and Gaza (8:4–40), Peter’s witness along the coastal plains (9:32–43), Barnabas and Paul set apart to be witnesses to Jews and Gentiles throughout the Roman world even though Jewish people and leaders tended to reject them as well as the message (13:1–18:23; 19:1–21:9; 27:1–16). Similarly, John is an eyewitness (1 John 1:1–3) and recalls and teaches Jesus’ commands (John 13:33–35 & 1 John 2:7–11; 3:11–12; cf. Hebrews 2:4).

²³ George Salmon, *An Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament*, 2nd edition. (London: John Murray, 1886), 507.

²⁴ I. H. Eybers, “Aspects of the Background of the Letter of Jude,” *Neot* 9 (1975): 113–23, especially 114.

²⁵ Frederik Wisse, “The Epistle of Jude in the History of Heresiology,” *Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts in Honour of Alexander Böhlig*, ed. Martin Krause, Nag Hammadi Studies, vol. 3:133–43 (Leiden: Brill, 1972), 142.

(Rev 2:2).²⁶ Thuren goes so far as to say, “Almost no word refers to teaching or doctrinal issues.”²⁷ He underscores the references in Jude to slander (vv 8, 10), wicked remarks (v 15), discontented murmurings (v 16) and scoffing (v 18), “describe – in a pejorative way – verbal criticisms of other people.”²⁸

Furthermore, the often cited licentious and antinomian categories that are frequently ascribed to false teachers tell us very little about the godless people Jude vehemently insults (vv 8–13). Although Donelson does not explicitly identify what he believes, he rightly observes “there is nothing in Jude that explicitly suggests antinomianism” and that “a summarizing adjective, such as Gnostic or antinomian, should be avoided.”²⁹ Yet, despite the little information in Jude, namely, his lack of any “systematic presentation” of any false doctrine, and the fact that he describes the opponents as “dishonorable”; Davids maintains “we must still attempt to describe those whom he (= Jude) considers false teachers.”³⁰ While agreeing that the “godless” in Jude must be described, why as though they are “false teachers”? Is it because the assumed cornerstone of so many commentaries on Jude remains the same, namely that, Jude’s rivals, whether Gnostic or Christian, are “false teachers”?³¹ Unfortunately, these fractures about “false teachers” in Jude and upon which interpretations are often based has given rise in the recent past to reexamine who these “ungodly people” (ἄσεβεις) are in Jude.³²

Nevertheless, it seems reasonable to ask, if the “ungodly people” (ἄσεβεις) were not “false teachers,” whether Gnostic or Christian, who then were they? How does Jude describe his rivals? First, the term “godless” (ἄσεβεις) appears in Josephus to depict OT tyrannical leadership over Israel and Judah and links similar despotic behavior to Zealot leaders who were wreaking havoc throughout Judaea during the early 60s.³³ Even more significant is Jude’s description of the godless as people who were “denying” (ἄρνούμενοι) Jesus as “the only Master and Lord” (τὸν μόνον

²⁶ Andrie du Toit, “Vilification as a pragmatic Device in Early Christian Epistolography,” *Biblica* 75 (1994): 403–12, esp. 408, 410. He seems to limit Jude’s vilification to moral depravity and prone to judgment.

²⁷ Lauri Thuren, “Hey Jude! Asking for the Original Situation and Message of a Catholic Epistle,” *NTS* 43 (1997): 451–65; especially, 463.

²⁸ Ibid. Thuren’s emphasis is noticeably upon Jude’s condemnation of the rhetorical devices of the opponents being used against Christian leadership within the church community.

²⁹ Donelson, *I & II Peter and Jude*, 164.

³⁰ Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*, 19.

³¹ The various objections (nn 23–29) are recontextualized from Bateman, *Jude*, 44–51; Herbert W. Bateman IV, “The Minority Report: A Different Assessment for Interpreting Jude, Part 1,” *BSac* 177 (January–March 2020): 91–105.

³² Bateman, *Jude*, 51–80; idem, “The Minority Report: A Different Assessment for Interpreting Jude, Part 2,” *BSac* 177 (April–June 2020): 193–204.

³³ Josephus uses the term “godless” or “without God” (ἄσεβεις) some sixty times in *Jewish War* and *Antiquities* of the Jews mostly to depict tyrannical leadership over Israel and Judah. A few examples from *Antiquities* 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). The Judean Zealots are also described as ἄσεβεις (*J.W.* 4.3.8 §157; 5.8.15 §§401–42). These depictions are in keeping with the overall purpose of his work, particularly *Jewish War*. The essential thesis of the *Jewish War* (1.4 §9–12) is that the Judean 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.” See Steve Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992), 60; Martin Hengel, *The Zealots: Investigations into the Jewish Freedom Movement in the Period from Herod until 70 A.D.* (Edinburgh, Scotland: T&T Clark, 1997), 181–85. This is recontextualized from Bateman, *Jude*, 146–47 n 67, and yet much more has been discussed on identifying people as godless.

δεσπότην καὶ κύριον) in verse 4. The description echoes a similar one in Josephus about the Zealots. Yahweh is their “only Master and Lord God” (τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον τὸν θεόν).³⁴ “They think little of submitting to death in unusual forms,” writes Josephus, “and permitting vengeance to fall on kinsmen and friends if only they may avoid calling any man master.”³⁵ Jude’s statement about the godless parallels a Zealot belief and perhaps echoes one of their religious-political catchphrases. Historically, Zealots were renegades at odds with Jesus followers and Rome who campaigned and fought for the reestablishment of a purely physical kingdom of Judaea.³⁶

Second, Jude’s literary structure, content, and exemplars center around rebellion evident in a chiastic structure for Jude. While Jude 5–16 provides a scathing description of the godless and their divine condemnation, verses 17–23 is an admonishment for followers of Jesus that describes *how to* defend their faith, an expectation expressed earlier in verses 3–4.

- Salutation (vv 1–2)
 - The Stated Purpose: Contend for the Faith (vv 3–4)
 - *Descriptions of Rebellion and Its Consequences* (vv 5–16)
 - The Stated Strategy: Practice Love and Mercy (vv 17–23)
- Doxology (vv 24–25)

Josephus, as an eyewitness to and participant in the Judaeen upheaval against Rome, wrote about the Judaeen revolt after the fact (*J.W.* A.D. 75; *Ant.* A.D. 95).³⁷ Jude, however, wrote

³⁴ Josephus, *Ant.* 18.1.5 §23. It’s not unusual for δεσπότης to refer to both men and God in the OT and non-biblical material. Men, and at times parents, are referred to as “master” (Josh 5:14; Prov 6:7; 17:2; 22:7; 30:10; Wisdom 18:11; Sirach 3:7; Judith 5:20, 24; 7:9, 11;). God is frequently referred to as “Master” (Gen 15:2, 8; Prov 29:25; Jonah 4:3; Isa 1:24; 10:33; Jer 1:6; 4:10; 15:11; Dan 3:37; 9:8, 15–17, 19; Tob 8:17; Wis 6:7; 8:3; 11:26; 13:3, 9; Sir 23:1; 34:29; 36:1; EpJer 6; 2 Macc 5:17, 20; 6:14; 9:13; 15:22; 3 Macc 2:2; 5:12; 6:5, 10; 1 Esd 4:60; Jdt 9:12). Occasionally, reason is described as a “master” (4 Macc 2:24; 6:31; 18:2).

³⁵ Josephus, *Ant.* 18.1.6 §§23–25; cf. *J.W.* 2.8.1 §117–118. This cry of the Zealots was first introduced around AD 6, when Judas the Galilean founded the movement. Jesus was probably around twelve years old at the time. Similar sentiments are expressed elsewhere in Josephus: “God is the father and Lord of all things” (*Ant.* Preface 4 §20); Seth esteems God as Master and Lord (*Ant.* 1.3.1 §72), and even after the Romans conquered Judaea, “they could not get anyone of them to comply so far as to confess or seem to confess, that Caesar was their master; but they preserved their own opinion” (*J.W.* 7.10.1 §418). See Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, vol. 1, ed. Geza Vermes et al. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1973), 456; Hengel, *The Zealots*, 229–30. For a more detailed discussion, see Bateman, *Jude*, 152–56.

³⁶ Judaea’s frenzy with Rome manifested itself in pockets of civil disobedience led by Zealots (= godless; v. 4; cf. vv. 8, 10, 11–13, 16, 19). The nation had already rejected Jesus and the kingdom message he proclaimed (Matt 13:53–58; 26:57–68; 27:1–43; cf. Mark 6:4–6; 14:53–65; 15:1–37), explained away the resurrection and denied the current reign of Jesus (Matt 27:62–66; 28:11–15), and rejected the message and messengers who preached that Jesus had fulfilled God’s covenantal promises (Acts 4:1–4; 5:29–33; 7:1–60; 13:45–46, 50–51; 14:19; 17:5, 13; 18:5–6; etc.). Thus, godless Zealots had already rebelled against God and his Messiah. Now they wished to rebel against Rome and reestablish the kingdom of Israel according to their standards, in their own strength, and with Jewish leaders vying for self-imposed leadership rights. Consequently, for Jude, belief in the messiahship of Jesus was the Judean believer’s most holy faith. They need not feel compelled to get involved in Judaea’s rebellion against Rome (Herbert W. Bateman IV, “Rebellion and God’s Judgment in Jude,” *BSac* 170 (October–December 2013), 454–78; Bateman, *Jude*, 51, 78–79). Compare Reicke’s discussion about the Jewish rise of nationalism when James was still alive, *The Epistles of James, Peter, and Jude*, xix–xxii.

³⁷ Bateman, et al, *Jesus the Messiah*, 219–21; cf. Louis H. Feldman, “Josephus Flavius” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Volume 1, edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2000), 427–31.

(between A.D. 63–65) while the Jewish rebellion was unfolding (during A.D. 60s).³⁸ Jude’s letter, by nature a vituperative letter,³⁹ was written to Jewish Christians living in Judaea during the mid-60s when the relationship between Rome and Judaea was rapidly deteriorating and the Zealots were actively inciting a national rebellion and thereby provides a scathing description of them (vv 5–13, 16) while also admonishing his Judaeans readers to defend their faith in Jesus (vv 17–23).⁴⁰ Jude’s thrust – his literary theme – is that rebellion has consequences. He makes this clear when he recalls the exodus, angelic, and Gentile rebellions (vv 5–7) whereby God’s punishment was impartial and thereby Jude’s Jewish rivals about whom he writes will also experience future divine consequences for their rebellious activities (vv 14–15).

Conclusion

Despite the prevailing assumption that links the “false prophets” and “false teachers” in 2 Peter 2:1 with the “godless” in Jude 4, it appears safe to say that Jude was not speaking of “false teachers.” To begin with, the letters were written to different audiences and their literary themes and concerns differ. Jude is a vituperative letter. Second Peter is a testimonial. While Jude warned his predominately Jewish readers in Judaea to avoid “godless *people*” whose current acts resemble past and present rebellions of his day, Peter refutes and corrects the anti-eschatological teachings of Gentile Epicurean *like* beliefs and lifestyles that were swaying his readers in Northern Galatia. Finally, Peter’s predominate Gentile rivals were denying Jesus as “Master” by way of their destructive teachings “contrary” to Jesus, while Jude’s Jewish rivals were “denying” Jesus as their “Master” by way of rebelling against both Jesus and Rome in order to reestablish Judaea’s independence as in the days following the Maccabean revolt.

Upon Whom did Peter and Jude Depend

The second assumption to tackle is upon whom did Peter and Jude depend? It was once argued that Jude (a lessor figure) borrowed from 2 Peter (a prominent figure), a position the early church assumed and several modern scholars still consider as viable.⁴¹ Yet, due to Jude’s canonical acceptance before 2 Peter, many contemporary studies doubt 2 Peter’s authenticity and is often

³⁸ For a fuller discussion for the dating of Jude, see Bateman, *Jude*, 34–44

³⁹ The term “vituperative” describes letters that were harsh letters. In Jude’s case, verse 8–16 contains the scathing portion of his letter against Zealot rebels. See Herbert W. Bateman IV, “Genre of the General Letters” in *Interpreting the General Letters* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2013), 19–56; compare G. Green, *Jude & 2 Peter*, 37–41, 54–56.

⁴⁰ The summary statement for Jude was derived from several writings on Jude: Bateman, “Rebellion and God’s Judgment in Jude,” 454–78; idem, *Jude*, 11–80; “The Minority Report: A Different Assessment for Interpreting Jude, Part 1,” 91–105; idem, “The Minority Report: A Different Assessment for Interpreting Jude, Part 2,” 193–204.

⁴¹ Charles Bigg, *Epistles of St. Jude and St. Peter* in International Critical Commentary (New York, NY: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1909), 216–23; D. Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, 924–25; Douglas Moo, *2 Peter; Jude* in The NIV Application Commentary (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 18; Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter; Jude*, 409; E. M. Sidebottom, *James, Jude, 2 Peter* in New Century Bible Commentary (Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1967 assigned to Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1971), 69; F. Spitta, *Der zweite Brief des Petrus und der Brief des Judas* (Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung Waisenhauses, 1885), 381–470; J. W. C. Wand, *The General Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*, WC (London: Methuen, 1934), 132; Theodor Zahn, *Introduction to the New Testament*, translation supervised by Melancthon Williams Jacobus (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1953; reprint) 2.238–55, specifically 250–51, 265–67.

cited as evidence for 2 Peter's dependence on Jude.⁴² In fact, 2 Peter is one of the few NT books that has had "a very rough passage down the centuries."⁴³ Thus, the lesser figure versus the prominent figure has shifted the discussion whereby the pseudonymous author of 2 Peter (the lesser figure) is now considered the one who borrowed from Jude (the prominent figure).

Furthermore, the case for Peter's dependence on Jude has also been made by way of a *basic rule* typically employed in text criticism and Gospel studies, namely that, Jude's shorter letter is more likely to be the original because the propensity was for authors like Peter to add and expand a text like Jude (cf. Mark and the synoptic problem) rather than reduce its size. Kistemaker, in arguing for Jude's priority, argues that "we apply the basic rule that the shorter text is more likely to be the original. That is, writers are more apt to add to a text than to reduce its size."⁴⁴ Less likely, is the insinuation that both letters were written by the same author.⁴⁵ The noticeable difference in style and theology strongly argue against this latter dubious view. Nevertheless, claims about Jude's priority — as well as the "false teacher" view — seem to be the popular assumption that far too often underscores Peter's literary dependence upon Jude as his source.⁴⁶

Nevertheless, Gene Green rightly contends "the conclusion that both epistles address the same problem because of the clear literary dependency between them is no more warranted than the view that the Synoptic Gospels were addressed to the same audience and responded to the same

⁴² Raymond E. Brown, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (New York, NY: Doubleday, 1997), 764–65; Bauckman, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 13, 158–62; Donelson, *I & II Peter and Jude*, 208–09; Jörg Frey, *The Letter of Jude and the Second Letter of Peter: A Theological Commentary*, translated by Kathleen Ess (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018), 163–78; Harrington, *Jude and 2 Peter*, 162, 235–36; Georg Hollmann "Der Brief des Judas und der zweite Brief des Petrus," *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, ed. by J. Weiss, 2:61–84 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1907), 63; J. N. D. Kelly, *The Epistles of Peter and Jude* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1969; repr. 1976), 226–27, 235; Kummel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 430–34; Kraftchick, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 22, 75–76; Joseph B. Mayor, *The Epistle of Jude and II Peter: Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Comments* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979), i–xxv, especially, xxi–xxiii; Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, 30; Duane Watson and Terrance Callan, *First and Second Peter* in *Paideia Commentary on the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012), 132, 142.

⁴³ M. Green notes that "At the Reformation it was deemed second-class Scripture by Luther, rejected by Erasmus, and regarded with hesitancy by Calvin." Michael Green, *The Second Epistle of Peter and the Epistle of Jude* in *Tyndale New Testament Commentaries* (London: Tyndale, 1968; 2nd ed., Leicester: England: InterVarsity Press, 1986), 13. See also Frey, *The Letter of Jude and the Second Letter of Peter*, 163–78; cf. the canonical overview of the NT in William E. Nix and Norman L. Geisler, *Introduction to the Bible* (Chicago, IL, Moody, 1968), 295; Herbert W. Bateman IV, *Charts on the Book of Hebrews*, Kregel Charts of the Bible (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2012), 59 (two subsequent charts about the inclusion of Hebrews in Early Church Canons also reveals 2 Peter's inclusion (chart # 28) as well as its omission (chart #29) from some canons.

⁴⁴ Simon J. Kistemaker, *Peter and Jude*, New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987), 221.

⁴⁵ M. Green, *The Second Epistle of Peter and the Epistle of Jude*, 53–54; J. A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (London, SCM, 1976), 192–95; R. Riesner, "Der Zweite Petrus-Brief und die Eschatologie," *Zukunftserwartung in Biblischer Sicht: Beiträge zur Eschatologie*, ed. Gerhard Maier (Giessen: Brunnen, 1984) 130–31.

⁴⁶ Jean Cantinat, *Les Épîtres de Saint Jacques et de Saint Jude*, Sources bibliques (Paris: Gabalda, 1973), 287–88; J. Chaine, *Les Épîtres catholiques* (Paris: Gabalda, 1939), 18–24; Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*, 23, 141–43; G. Green, *Jude & Second Peter*, 23, 144–50; Robert Harvey & Philip H. Towner, *2 Peter & Jude* in *The IVP New Testament Commentary Series*. Edited by Grant R. Osborne (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2009), 9, 157; Adolf von Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius II :Die Chronologie der literature von Irenaeus bis Eusebius*, vol. 2 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1958, 2nd ed.), 465; Kistemaker, *Peter and Jude*, 221–23; Schreiner, *I, 2 Peter, Jude*, 260–70 418–19; K. Schelkle, *Die Petrusbriefe, Der Judasbrief* (Freiburg: Herder, 1961), 138–39;

issues because they drew from common sources.”⁴⁷ Reicke more pointedly argues that “Scholars have . . . endeavored to find some influence of 2 Peter that runs parallel with Jude but important differences make it unlikely that either epistle was the source of the other,” and that “it is better to suppose that they depended on a common tradition of preaching.”⁴⁸ Like the first assumption about whom Peter and Jude wrote, upon whom Peter and Jude depend also has notable fractures. So, if literary dependence is to be questioned, how might their commonality be explained? How might “the memory” and writings of other Jewish and Christian traditions factor into the equation of a common source? Admittedly, there are a substantial number of similarities *and* differences evident in their respective letters. How might they be understood?

Jude	Descriptions	2 Peter	Descriptions
—		1:17	Jesus is declared “beloved” of God at baptism / mount of transfiguration (Gospel tradition)
3	“beloved” (ἀγαπητοῦ: direct address)	—	
4	“godless” (ἀσεβεῖς)	—	
—		2:1	“false prophets” (ψευδοπροφήται) “false teachers” (ψευδοδιδασκαλοι) “destructive heresies” (αἰρέσεις ἀπωλείας) “denying the Master” (δυσπότην ἀρνούμενοι)
—	“who deny our Master and Lord” (δυσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν . . . ἀρνούμενοι)	2:2	indecent conduct
—		2:3	“greed” (πλεονεξία) result: exploited with lies
5	“remember” past Jewish history Exodus generation “destroyed” (ἀπώλεσεν)	—	
6	angels “abandoned their dwelling” (ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον)	2:4	“angels who sinned” (ἀγγέλων ἁμαρτησάντων)
—	‘he has kept’ in eternal chains (τετήρηκεν) “under darkness” (ὑπὸ ζόφον) “for the judgment of the great Day” (εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας)		held captive in Tartarus (ταρταρώσας) in chains (σιραῖς) “of darkness” (ζόφου) “kept until judgment” (εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους)
—		2:5	punishment of the ancient world Noah, a herald of righteousness, rescued God’s punishment by way of flood
7	Sodom and Gomorrah judgment as an example	2:6	Sodom and Gomorrah reduced to ashes
—		2:7	righteous Lot rescued
—		2:8	righteous Lot’s soul tormented
—		2:9	protection of the godly judgment of the ungodly
8	ungodly people are dreamers (of earthly glories) defile the flesh reject authority insult angelic beings	—	
9	the archangel Michael argues with the devil <i>Testament of Moses</i> quoted argument over body of Moses Michael refuses to issue judgment	2:10	false teachers indulge in fleshly desires insult angelic beings
10	comparison with animals	—	
—		2:11	issue judgments
—		2:12	compared with animals born for capture and “eternal” destruction
—		2:13	suffer harm deceitful inclinations “blemish” (σπίλος) feasts

⁴⁷ G. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, 23.

⁴⁸ Reicke, *The Epistles of James, Peter and Jude*, xxxvi; 189–90. Compare C. Spicq, *Les Epîtres de Saint Pierre* (Paris: Gabalda, 1966, 1966), 197; M. Green, *The Second Epistle General of Peter and the General Epistle of Jude*, 50–55.

—		2:14	“greed” (πλεονεξίας) in a vice list (cf. 2:2, 3)
11	Cain’s brutality Balaam’s “error of wages” (τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαάμ μισθοῦ)	—	
—	Korah’s rebellion	2:15	Balaam’s “love for wages of unrighteousness” (ὃς μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν)
12	hidden reefs (σπιλάδες) rivals are waterless springs / clouds autumn tress without fruit / dead	2:16	Balaam’s rebuke by a mute pack animal
13	wild waves of the sea wandering stars “for whom the gloom of darkness has been reserved forever” (οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰῶνα τετήρηται)	—	
14	description of Enoch Enoch, descent from Adam <i>1 Enoch</i> 1:9 quote	2:17	rivals are waterless springs and mists
15	divine judgment of all people convict every person of ungodly deeds convict the ungodly of their harsh words	—	
16	ungodly (rebellious) people are grumblers fault-finders follow their own desires offer bombastic speeches flattery condemned	—	“for whom the gloom of darkness has been reserved” (οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους τετήρηται)
—		—	
—		2:18	speaking empty words entice with debouchery
—		2:19	slaves to corruption (cf. 2:2, 3, 14)
—		2:22	Proverbs 26:11 quote Proverb from an unknown source
17	“beloved” (ἀγαπητοί: direct address) “remember the prophetic words” (μνησθῆτε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων)	3:1	“beloved” (ἀγαπητοί: direct address) “to remember the prophetic words” (μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημένων ῥημάτων) “from the holy prophets” and the commandments of the Lord “through your apostles” (τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν) second letter to stir up a pure mind
—	“from the apostles of our Lord” (ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν)	3:3	the coming of scoffers (ἐμπαίκεται)
18	the coming of scoffers (ἐμπαίκεται)	3:8	“beloved” (ἀγαπητοί: direct address) God’s view of time differs
—	driven by ungodly desires (context: rebellion)	3:9	God has not forgotten his promise
—		3:10	God’s catastrophic judgment is coming
20	“beloved” (ἀγαπητοί: direct address)	3:14	“beloved” (ἀγαπητοί: direct address) wait patiently live a moral life
—		—	
—	build one another up in faith be merciful to those wavering save others maintain godly love	—	
—		3:15	Paul is declared as “beloved”
—		3:17	“beloved” (ἀγαπητοί: direct address)

Similarities Between Jude and 2 Peter

Needless to say, there are undeniable similarities. Mayor rightly states the obvious when he says, “The connexion between the two Epistles is most conspicuous in the second Chapter of P.”⁴⁹ There

⁴⁹ Mayor, *The Epistle of Jude and II Peter*, v.

are parallel references to celestial beings, Gentile cites, and Balaam. Then there are similar references to “beloved” (ἀγαπητοί), Jesus as “Master” (δеспότης), “apostles” (ἀπόστολος), and “scoffers” (ἐμπαῖκται). Finally, there are parallel references to specific metaphors to further brand their respective rivals. Yet, do these similarities *require* a “literary dependence”? Do they really signal borrowing from one another? Or are they merely collective “memories” and ways of speaking (or writing) that are also echoed in both Jewish and Christian traditions?

Unfortunately, Davids dismisses any dependence on a common Jewish source, oral or written because “it is a hypothesis that cannot be disproved in that by definition we do not have the common source,”⁵⁰ He goes on to say, “If it is an oral tradition, it is impossible to recover, and if it is a written source, we have yet to find it.” Nevertheless, there are several Jewish writings that allude to and recontextualize well-known events about fallen angels, Sodom and Gomorrah, and Balaam in their literary works whereby they tackle issues pertinent to their specific audiences. For instance, many of the more complete Dead Sea Scrolls have a focus for its *Essene audience*.⁵¹ The Cairo Damascus Document (CD) is just one example. It 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 that are also referred to as “a sure house in Israel” in 3:19, “the House of Judah” in 4:11, and “those who entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus” in 6:19, cp. 6:5, 7:19).⁵²

Apocryphal and Pseudepigraph books, like Sirach and *I Enoch* were also composed to tackle topics for a specific audience. On the one hand, Ben Sira, a scribe who lived and taught in Jerusalem before the Maccabean revolt (167–164 B.C.) was, according to deSilva, “no reactionary, but he was definitely a conservative voice of the first and second century B.C.E., calling *his pupils* to seek their fortune, their honor, and their good name through the diligent observance of the demands of the God

⁵⁰ In fairness to Davids, he also says, “If 2 Peter has used Jude, he has clearly adapted it rather than simply incorporated the letter,” which he explains throughout his commentary (*emphasis mine*). Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*, 142. Yet, Kraftchick echoes similar thoughts (*Jude, 2 Peter*, 79–80).

⁵¹ For an argument supporting an Essene view see, Geza Vermes and Martin D. Goodman, eds., *The Essenes According to the Classical Sources* (Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1989); 1–99; Todd S. Beal, “Essenes” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Volume 1, edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2000), 262–69, especially, 265–67; James VanderKam, “The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Essenes or Sadducees” in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by Hershel Shanks (New York, NY: 1992), 50–52. However, some believe Qumran should be linked to the Sadducees. Compare Emanuelle Main, “Sadducees” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Volume 2, edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2000), 262–69, especially, 812–16, especially, 815–16.

⁵² The Damascus Document actually consists of two medieval manuscripts (abbrev. MS): MS A and MS B. They were not found among the Dead Sea scrolls but rather in Cairo, Egypt. Furthermore, they were first published in 1910 long before the first scrolls were discovered in 1947. Yet today, CD is treated as one of “the foundational works of the Qumran community” due to the discoveries of Cave 4 in 1952, namely, 4Q266 (4QDa) but there are other 4QDamascus Document fragments. They are labeled alphabetically and assigned numbers as well. 4QDa = 4Q266, 4QDb = 4Q267, 4QDc = 4Q268, 4QDd = 4Q269, 4QDe = 4Q270, 4QDf = 4Q271, 4QDg = 4Q272, 4QDh = 4Q273. Solomon Schechter was the first to publish the Cairo Damascus Document, but he entitled it *Fragments of a Zadokite Work* (Cambridge: University Press, 1910). See also Joseph M. Baumgarten and Daniel R. Schwartz, “Damascus Document” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 2 Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents, James H. Charlesworth, ed. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 4–9. For translation of the Damascus Document (CD), see Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, volume one 1Q1–4Q273, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 551–627; Michael Wise, Martin Abegg Jr, and Edward Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (New York, NY: Harper Collins, 1996), 49–74. This material is adapted from Bateman, et al, *Jesus the Messiah*, 250.

of Israel first and foremost.”⁵³ And while Sirach is considered a book of wisdom teachings about proper speech, riches and poverty, honesty, diligence, choice of friends, sin and death; it is not totally proverbial. Sirach concludes with a hymn of praise about famous Jewish ancestors (41:1–49:16).

On the other hand, the various authors of *1 and 2 Enoch* express thoughts and theology that springboard off the limited information about Enoch in Genesis 5:23–24, namely that, he lived for 365 years, he walked with God, and then, he was not for God took him. Enoch, because he was considered perfectly righteous, did not die, and was with God; he tends to transcend time and place — his place is either unknown or hidden (cf. *1 En.* 12:1–2). He then becomes the perfect candidate for ascending through the heavens and viewing the world below, namely, its history and its future.⁵⁴ “Texts like *1 Enoch* 90:6–7 and 93:9–10,” according to Nickelsburg, “suggest that the Enochic authors were *leaders* in one segment of a *broad reform movement* that appealed for a return to righteous behavior based on revealed wisdom.”⁵⁵ Nickelsburg also considers the similarity with the Damascus Document (CD) and the Rule of the Community (1Q28 viii.1–16), “indicate that at least *some members* of the Qumran Community stood in *historical continuity* with the authors of the Enochic corpus.”⁵⁶

Finally, the Jewish historian, **Josephus**, wrote four works: an apologetic, a rationale for the Jewish war, and two literary productions to dispel misinformation.⁵⁷ In his masterpiece entitled *Antiquities*, Josephus challenges *Roman misconceptions* about the Jewish people by recalling and reframing

⁵³ David A. deSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002), 153 (*emphasis mine*). The discussion about *Sirach* (also known as *Ecclesiasticus* or *Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sira*; see *Sir* 50:27) material is adapted from Bateman, et al, *Jesus the Messiah*, 221–23.

⁵⁴ E. Isaac, “1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch” and F. I. Anderson, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Volume 1, *Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*, edited by James H. Charlesworth (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983). Compare James C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*, CBQ Monograph Series 16 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1984), 88–106.

⁵⁵ George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Books of,” *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Volume 1, edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2000), 249–53, especially, 251 (*emphasis mine*). For a fuller discussion of Enoch’s parallel references to Enoch’s prophecy in verse 14, see Bateman, *Jude*, 300–15.

⁵⁶ Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Books of,” 251. 1Q28 (or 1QS) defines the rules for the Essene community during the pre-messianic age by describing the ritual ceremony for entering the covenant community (1:16–2:18), outlining the annual renewal ceremony, denunciations, and atonement practices (2:19–3:12), providing an exposition of the community’s dualistic beliefs (3:13–4:26), supplying rules for life in the community and precepts for punishment (5:1–7:25), issuing a charter for the new congregation (8:1–10:8), and closing with a hymn of praise (10:9–11:22). Of the ten fragments from Cave 4, only three appear to have enough text to be deemed of value. They are 4QS^b = 4Q256 and 4QS^d = 4Q258 from circa 25 B.C., and 4QS^e = 4Q259 from circa 100 B.C. See Elisha Qimron and James H. Charlesworth, “Cave IV Fragments” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 1 *Rule of the Community and Related Documents*, James H. Charlesworth, ed. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 52–103; Martínez, et al, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1:69–99. The description of 1Q28 was recontextualized from Bateman, et al, *Jesus the Messiah*, 252.

⁵⁷ Whereas *Antiquities* combatted the ridicule and misinformation that was characteristic of Roman portrayals of the Jews (1.1–2 §§1–6), *Life* combatted allegations against Josephus himself and his involvement in the war effort against Rome (65 §§336–67). On the other hand, *Jewish Wars* was a rationale for the Jewish revolt of A.D. 66–70 (1.1–4 §§1–9), and *Against Apion* was a religious apologetic against a well-known Egyptian scholar, Apion (1.1 §2; cp. 1.11 §§57–58). Apion had moved to Rome to teach rhetoric during the thirties of the first century and was an outspoken adversary of Jewish people. For more information about Josephus and his writings see Steve Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2nd edition, 1992); idem, *Josephus, Judea, and Christian Origins: Methods and Categories* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009).

Jewish events from the OT and Jewish traditions for *Roman leaders*. These and other Jewish literary sources appeal to fallen angels, Sodom and Gomorrah, and Balaam. So, in what way then do all of these writings reflect literary dependency or do they merely mirror, build upon, and expand Jewish traditional memories of the past?

Fallen Angels, Sodom & Gomorrah, Balaam in Jewish & Christian Literature			
Type of Literature	Fallen Angels	Sodom & Gomorrah	Balaam
OT Event Recorded	Genesis 6:1-6	Genesis 19:23-25	Numbers 22:5-41; 23:1-30; 24:1-3, 10-17, 25; 31:8, 16,
Subsequent OT References	Job 1:6-12; 2:1-6	Deuteronomy 29:23 Amos 4:11 Isaiah 1:9; 3:9; 13:19 Jeremiah 23:14; 49:18; 50:40 Ezekiel 16:48-50	Deuteronomy 23:4-5 Joshua 13:22; 24:9 1 Chronicles 1:42; 7:37 Nehemiah 13:2 Micah 6:5
Non-Canonical References	Sirach 16:5-7 3 Maccabees 2:4 CD-A 2:17-20 1QapGen ar 2:1 <i>1 Enoch</i> 6:1-19:3; 21; 86:1-88:3 <i>Jubilees</i> 5:1-11 (cf. 4:15, 22) <i>TReub</i> 4:6 <i>TNaph</i> 3:5 Josephus, <i>Ant.</i> 1.3.1 §§72-73	Sirach 16:8 3 Maccabees 2:5 4Q180 (4QAgasCreat A) ff. 2-4 column 2:1-8 <i>Jubilees</i> 16:3-6 <i>TNaph</i> 3:4 <i>TAsher</i> 7.1 <i>TBen</i> 9:1 Josephus, <i>Ant.</i> 1.11.1, 3-4 §§194, 199-203	A negative rogue: 4Q175 (4QTest) 1.5-13 4Q339 (4QList) 2 <i>Pseudo-Philo</i> , 18.1-14 Philo, <i>Cherubim</i> 2.10 §§32-33; <i>Worse Attack</i> 2.22 §71; <i>Unchangeableness</i> 3.37 §181; <i>Confusion of Tongues</i> 4.31 §159; <i>Flight</i> 5.26 §145; and <i>Change of Names</i> 5.37 §§202-03 Josephus, <i>Ant.</i> 4.7.2-6 §§104-130, 157 Echoes of Balaam's oracle: CD-A 7.18-19 <i>T.Jud.</i> 2.4
NT References	2 Peter 2:4 Jude 5 Revelation 12:7-9; 20:1-3; 7-10	Matthew 10:15; 11:23-24 Luke 10:12, 17:29 Romans 9:29 2 Peter 2:6-10a Jude 7	A negative rogue: 2 Peter 2:15-16; Jude 11; Revelation 2:14 Echoes of Balaam's oracle: Matthew 2:1-10; 2 Peter 1:19; Revelation 22:16

Naturally, this chart is not intended to be exhaustive but rather selected literary evidence to establish that similar allusions to angelic beings, Sodom and Gomorrah, and Balaam appear in other Jewish and Christian literature. Grundmann rightly points out that Jude's presentation of three examples in verses 5-7, namely, the Exodus generation, angels, and Sodom and Gomorrah were events that his readers remembered (ὑπομνήσαι, "to remind"). He goes on to say that Jude is not alone.⁵⁸ In fact, Maier, in his discussion of Jude 6-7, argues that the sins of both the angels and Sodom and Gomorrah were well known in Jewish theology and thereby an assumed interpretation of Genesis 6:2 itself or a referencing of *Enoch* alone cannot be justified, but rather "you have to take into consideration the 'Jewish tradition' to help" in understanding Jude 6-7.⁵⁹

⁵⁸ Grundmann cites several examples: Luke 24:6; John 2:17, 12:16; 1 Corinthians 11:2, 24; 2 Timothy 2:8, 14; Titus 3:1, 2 Peter 1:12; 3:1). Grundmann, *Der Brief des Judas und der zweite Brief des Petrus*, 32.

⁵⁹ Maier specifically says, "man muß die 'jüdische Überlieferung' zu Hilfe nehmen"; "into consideration" is my insertion for clarity. Friedrich Wilhelm Maier, *Der Judasbrief* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1906), 34. Neyrey also contends "What is cogent here is that when arguments are made or precedents cited, that come from Jewish traditions." (p. 36) Jude apparent viewed these traditions as his best authorities (2 Peter, Jude, 35-36). For a fuller discussion of Enoch's parallel references to angels in Jude 5, see Bateman, *Jude*, 174-83.

There should be no denying that Jude's appeal to various "divine punishments" from the past were in common with Jewish traditional memories. And based upon a common Jewish tradition, the same should be considered as true about Peter (or a pseudonymous Peter). Like other authors, their choices or appeals to Jewish tradition were not arbitrary but rather calculated in order to tackle their particular and ever-present concerns. For Jude, it was the godless rebels circulating among Judaeen churches to secure support for a national rebellion. For Peter, it was addressing doctrinal errors of "false prophets" and "false teachers" maneuvering through churches of Northern Galatia. They, like Jewish authors before and during their lifetime, appeal to the OT whereby past events are remembered and recontextualized in their respective second temple Jewish letters. The past provides, according to Fuchs and Reymond, "a key to understanding the present" and that, "typological interpretation assumes the past is literally contained in *these forms* of exemplary types of models."⁶⁰ Thus, these unpleasant memories from the past serve as examples *not* to be followed. Consequently, Peter and Jude present their respective arguments from "memories" and / or from various oral and written Jewish traditions in circulation.

Moreover, similar references to "beloved" (ἀγαπητός), "apostles" (ἀπόστολος), and Jesus as "Master" (διδάσκαλος) are also part of several early Christian traditions. The use of "beloved" (ἀγαπητοί) in 2 Peter and Jude is not unique to their letters. Moving beyond the fact that "beloved" is a common description of God's people in the LXX and Dead Sea Scrolls,⁶¹ it too appears throughout numerous NT writings, particularly in — but not limited to — the general epistles. Many NT authors commonly applied "beloved" to specific people or groups of people.⁶² It also served as a literary transition to introduce a command.⁶³ Peter and Jude made use of the vocative "beloved" (ἀγαπητοί) as a means to recall the prophetic words of the apostles. Thus, the

⁶⁰ Fuchs and Reymond specifically say, "Le passé est présent non seulement comme fournissant un sens moral, avertissant des dangers qui pourraient menacer, mais aussi comme proposant une clé de compréhension du présent; en effet l'interprétation typologique suppose que le passé contient littéralement le présent, sous forme de types exemplaires, de modèles." The selective quoting and the insertion "these forms" is for clarity. Eric Fuchs and Pierre Reymond, *La deuxième épître de saint Pierre: L'épître de saint Jude*, Commentaire du Nouveau Testament (Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1980), 163. See Richard N. Longenecker's discussion and examples in *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Vancouver, Canada: Regent College, 2nd ed., 1999); Herbert W. Bateman IV, "Second Temple Exegetical Practices: Extra-biblical Examples of Exegesis Compared with Those in the Book of Hebrews" in the Dead Sea Scrolls issue of *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 53.1 (Fall 2010): 26–54, especially 14–18; and Herbert W. Bateman IV, "The Use of Psalm 110:1 in the New Testament," *BSac* 149 (October–December 1992): 438–53; W. Edward Glenny, "Typology: A Summary of the Present Evangelical Discussion," *JETS* 40.4 (December 1997), 627–38; cf. Brent E. Parker, "The Church as the Renewed Israel in Christ: A Study of 1 Peter 2:4–10," *SBJT* 22.3 (Fall 2017): 41–52.

⁶¹ In the Septuagint (LXX), "beloved" (ἀγαπητοί) is descriptive of God's chosen people, Israel (Jer 6:26, 31[38]:20, Pss 60:7[5], 108:7[6], 127:2) as seems to be the case among the sectarian group that may have inhabited nearby Qumran. They too addressed community members as "beloved" (1QS 6:10, 22; CD 7:1, 2; 20:8). For a fuller discussion see Bateman, *Jude*, 119–20.

⁶² God refers to Jesus as his "beloved" (Luke 3:22; 20:13; 2 Pet 2:17), leaders of the Jerusalem church refer to Barnabas and Paul as "beloved" (Acts 15:25); Paul refers to individuals as his "beloved" (1 Cor 4:17; Eph 6:21; Col 1:7; 4:7, 9, 14; 1 Tim 6:2; 2 Tim 1:2; Philemon 1, 16); John refers to Gaius as "beloved" (3 John 1, 5, 11), Paul refers to the church(es) in Rome, Corinth, Ephesus, Philippi, and Thessalonica as "beloved" (Rom 1:7; 1 Cor 4:14; 12:19; Eph 5:1; Phil 2:12; 4:1; 2 Thess 2:8), Barnabas refers to the church(es) in Rome (Heb 6:9), James refers to the churches in the diaspora (1:16); Peter refers to Paul as "beloved" (2 Pet 3:15), and John to the churches in Ephesus as "beloved" (1 John 3:2, 21).

⁶³ "Beloved" introduces or is used to transition to a command (Rom 12:19; 16; 1 Cor 7:1; 10:14; Eph 5:1; Phil 2:12; 4:1; James 1:19; 1 Pet 1:3; 2:11; 4:12; 2 Pet 3:1, 8, 14, 17; 1 John 2:7; 4:1, 7, 11; Jude 3, 17, 20) and in exhortations to greet friends (Rom 16:5, 8, 9, 12).

exhortations to remember apostolic teachings in 2 Peter 3:1 and Jude 17 should not strike us as unusual or as a basis for literary dependence. Jesus tells his disciples to teach things about the Kingdom evident in the five Matthean discourses, namely, the ethics, mission, growth, life, and future of the Kingdom.⁶⁴ Paul praises the Corinthians for maintaining Christian traditions: “I praise you because you . . . maintain the traditions just as I passed them on to you” (Ἐπαινῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς ὅτι . . . καθὼς παρέδωκα ὑμῖν τὰς παραδόσεις κατέχετε; 1 Cor 11:2). John speaks of an “advocate” (ὁ παράκλητος) who will come and bring to remembrance of Jesus’ teaching (14:25–26; cf. 7:37–39; Acts 2:4; 1 John 2:27). So, it should come as no surprise that Peter and Jude refer to their readers as “beloved” followed by a similar expectation to remember apostolic warnings.

Furthermore, when Peter and Jude refer to Jesus as “Master” (2 Pet 2:2; Jude 4), their reference to Jesus as “Master,” just as Reicke has contended, “depend on a common tradition of preaching.” Luke, who was from the province of Asia (Acts 16:11, 16), frequently recalls situations where Peter (5:5), John (9:49), the disciples (8:24; 9:33), a group of lepers (17:13), and believers who prayed for boldness (Acts 4:24) addressed Jesus as “Master.” References to Jesus as “Master” was part of early Christian tradition that was recorded repeatedly in Luke’s writings and thereby not surprisingly evident in 2 Peter and Jude. Yet, both mention Jesus as Master for two very different historical situations. For Peter, it was to confront “teachings” contrary to Jesus. For Jude, it was to challenge acts of a Jewish national “rebellion” against Rome.

One last word to consider is the similar appeal to “scoffers” (ἐμπαῖκται). While the term seldom appears in the NT, it is used in the LXX where Isaiah speaks of a leadership vacuum after God’s judgment: “And I will make boys their princes, *shameless scoffers* shall rule over them” (καὶ ἐπιστήσω νεανίους ἄρχοντας αὐτῶν καὶ ἐμπαῖκται κυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν; Isa 3:4).⁶⁵ Perhaps the appeal to scoffers may echo this citation from the LXX.⁶⁶

Unfortunately, these four-word choices — “beloved” (ἀγαπητός), “apostles” (ἀπόστολος), Jesus as “Master” (δεσπότης), and “scoffers” (ἐμπαῖκται) — are often skewed to support literary dependence. It seems, at times, commentators provide an oblique direction to shape a preconceived

⁶⁴ In Mathew’s five discourses, Jesus teaches about the Ethics of the Kingdom (5:1–7:29), Mission of the Kingdom (10:5–42), Growth of the Kingdom (13:1–52), Life in the Kingdom (18:1–35), and Future of the Kingdom (23:1–25:46).

⁶⁵ My translation is based upon several facts. First, the Hebrew word תַּעֲלִילִים — translated in the LXX as ἐμπαῖκται — is a nominative masculine plural with an abstract meaning “wantonness” or “caprice” (BDB, s.v. “תַּעֲלִילִים,” 760) with various renderings, most of which underscore the chief characteristic of these leaders whereby they are depicted as childish in most English translations because the translators appear to tighten the parallelism of “boy” or “youths” (נַעֲרִים) from the previous clause by emending the form תַּעֲלִילִים to עוֹלָלִים. Thus, תַּעֲלִילִים is translated as “toddlers” NLT; “babes,” KJV ASV NRSV; “infants,” ESV; “children” NIV). Yet, other translations emphasize the type of children they are: “capricious children” (NASB) or “malicious young men” (NET) whereby the cruelty of the “leaders” who rise up after God’s judgment. Second, God’s ultimate judgment against Judah sweep away young nobles like Daniel and his friends in 605 B.C. (Dan 1:1–2; Jer 25:1, 3, 8–12; 46:2) and later Judah’s rulers, namely Jehoiachin and Ezekiel in 597 B.C. (2 Kings 24:8–14; 2 Chron 36:9–10; Josephus, *Ant.* 10. 6. 3 §98) and even later Zedekiah and his leadership counsel in 586 B.C. (2 Kings 25:1–7; Jer 52:4–11; Ezek 24:1–14) whereby only inexperienced, impulsive, and shameless youths were left to fill Judah’s leadership vacuum. See also Lisveth S. Fried, “The Land Lay Desolate: Conquest and Restoration in the Ancient Near East” and B. Oded, “Where is the ‘Myth of the Empty Land’ to be Found” History versus Myth” in Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period, edited by Oded Lipschits and Joseph Blenkinsopp (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 21–74.

⁶⁶ While Chaine suggests that Jude takes his citations from LXX (*Les Epîtres Catholiques*, 277), Richard J. Bauckham suggests that Jude had a knowledge of Hebrew in *The Letter of Jude: An Account of Research*, ANRW, 25.5 (Berlin, Germany: DeGruyter; hardback, 1988; eBook, 2016), 3793–94.

and often regurgitated assumption of literary dependence that has as its root a “false teacher” presupposition. Kelly, while admitting there are verbal similarities between 2 Peter and Jude, rightly contends verbal agreement is rare.⁶⁷ In fact, the only *identical* clause is found in 2 Peter 2:17 and Jude 13.⁶⁸ So, when it’s presumed that Peter and Jude speak against “false prophets,” another assumption arises whereby Peter and Jude’s use of similar words appear overly and unnecessarily stressed to support literary dependency.⁶⁹

Finally, an over emphasizing of literary dependency also occurs with regard to metaphors. A perfect example is the translation of the *hapax legomena* σπιλάδες in Jude 12 as “spot” (KJV KJVS) or “blemish” (NRSV NIV), a metaphor interpreted to suggest immorality and thereby *wrongly* emphasizes the misconduct in Jude as sexual (vv 4, 7, 8 13, 16) whereby its rendering becomes an assumed indication of Peter’s use of Jude. Second Peter 2:13, however, uses a different noun, σπίλος rather than σπιλάδες. And though σπιλάδες in Jude might describe the immorality of someone who “spots” or “stains” an event like a Judean Christian love-feast, the more common understanding of σπιλάδες is a rocky hazard hidden by ocean waves.⁷⁰ So, just as hidden reefs were harmful for anyone sailing the Mediterranean Sea, Jude presents his “godless *people*” as hidden and harmful people who mingled and encouraged rebellion among Judaeans.⁷¹ Perhaps it is time to concede that not only did Peter and Jude write independently, but that there are very few examples of *identical wording* in 2 Peter and Jude that actually validates literary dependency but rather their letters are more reflective of “memories” that are part of and often recontextualized in numerous other Jewish and Christian writings.

Differences Between 2 Peter and Jude

There are several undeniable differences between 2 Peter and Jude. While not ignoring the *divine punishments remembered* by first century Jews like Peter and Jude — there are also irrefutable *divine rescues remembered* by Peter that are not in Jude. Needless to say, celebrating divine rescues to be remembered is a distinctively Jewish feature in Jewish and Christian traditions.

⁶⁷ Kelly, *The Epistles of Peter and Jude*, 226; M. Green, *2 Peter and Jude*, 50. Similar observation appears in Kraftchick’s *Jude, 2 Peter*, 79–80.

⁶⁸ Whereas 2 Peter 2:17 says, οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους τετήρηται (“for whom the gloom of darkness has been reserved”), Jude 13 says, οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰῶνα τετήρηται (“for whom the gloom of darkness has been reserved *forever*”). The only distinction is εἰς αἰῶνα (“forever”) in Jude.

⁶⁹ Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*, 136–41; Frey, *The Letter of Jude and the Second Letter of Peter*, 182–83; G. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, 159; Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, 35–36; Harrington, *Jude and 2 Peter*, 162; Kraftchick’s *Jude, 2 Peter*, 79; Kummel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 430–31; Mayor, *The Epistle of Jude and II Peter*, i–xxv; Moo, *2 Peter, Jude*, 16–21; Schreiner, *I, 2 Peter, Jude*, 416–17. Reicke, *The epistles of James, Peter and Jude*, 189–90; C. Spicq, *Les Epîtres de Saint Pierre* (Paris: Gabalda, 1966, 1966), 197; Michael Green, *The Second Epistle General of Peter and the General Epistle of Jude*, 50–55.

⁷⁰ Whereas 2 Peter 2:13 speaks of false teaches being “blemishes” at feasts (NRSV NASB95 NIV ESVS NET; cf. Josephus, *J.W.* 1.3.6 §82, *Ant.* 13.11.3 §314), Josephus also speaks of hazardous rocks that jut from the sea at Joppa: “Now Joppa is not naturally a haven, for it ends in a rough shore, where all the rest of it is straight, but the two ends bend towards each other, where there are deep precipices and great stones (σπιλάδες) that jut out into the sea” (Josephus, *J.W.* 3.9.3 §§419–420 (Thackeray); cf. BDAG 938b 1; Spic, *TLNT*, s.v “σπίλος,” 3:270–72; Walter, *EDNT*, s.v “σπίλος”; 3:265 for other examples). For a fuller and more complete comparison, see Bateman, *Jude*, 275–76.

⁷¹ Other metaphors in 2 Peter and Jude are also part of the Jewish and Christian tradition — “waterless clouds” (Prov 25:14; *I En.* 80:2–8), “autumn trees without fruit” (Ps 1:3; Jer 17:8; Wis 4:3–5; Sir 6:3; *I En* 80:2–3; Matt 3:10; Luke 3:9; James 3:12), “wild waves” (Isa 57:20; 3 Macc 7:5; 1QH 10.8–13; Josephus, *J.W.* 2. §377) and “wandering stars” (Isa 45:12; Ps 148:1–3; *I En.* 18:13–16; 21:3–6). Bateman, *Jude*, 282–91.

There are several historical events that were to be remembered and celebrated nationally and throughout the Roman world on an annual basis wherever Jewish people lived. The OT speaks of the celebration of three feasts (Exod 34:23): the Feast of Unleavened Bread or Passover, the Feast of Weeks or Pentecost, and the Feast of Booths or Tabernacles.⁷² During the second temple period three other *divine rescues* were to be remembered as well: the Feast of Purim, the Feast of Lights or Hannukah, and the Lord's Supper.⁷³ So, Peter's recalling of divine rescues is not unique to his second letter. Most significant for Peter's audience, however, are his allusions to creation (3:5), Noah and the flood (2:5; 3:6), and Lot (2:7). Peter's exemplars — that do not appear in Jude — emphasize God's "sparing" (ἐφείσατο) of the righteous in common with other sources.

Peter's References to Creation, Noah, Flood, Lot, the Apocalypse in Jewish & Christian Literature					
Type of Literature	Creation (in general)	Noah (Righteous)	Flood (Destruction)	Lot (Righteous)	Earth (Destruction)
OT Event Recorded	Genesis 1	Genesis 5:29; 6:9; 8:15–22	Genesis 6:13; 7:6–24	Genesis 19:1, 12, 14–15, 29	
Subsequent OT References	Psalms 104:1–35	Ezekiel 14:14, 20	Isaiah 54:9		
Non-Canonical References	4Q2 (4QGen ^b) 1:1–28; 4Q7 (4QGen ^a) 1:1–11, 13–22; etc. ⁷⁴ 2 Enoch 24:1–5 Jubilees 2:1–16 Testament of Adam 1:5; 2:10 Philo, <i>Creation</i> 1.6 §§23–26ff Josephus, <i>Ant.</i> 1.1.1–3 §§27–39	Sirach 44:17 Wisdom 10:4 1QapGen ar 6.6, 13–16, 23; 10:1–17 1 Enoch 106:13–107:3 Jubilees 5:12–19 Pseudo-Philo 3:1–5 Philo, <i>Migr Abr</i> 4.22 §125 Josephus, <i>Ant.</i> 1.3.2, 8 §§75, 99	1QapGen ar 11.1; 12.1, 8–9 4Q252 1.1–10 6Q1 (6QpaleoGen) 6:13–21 1 Enoch 89:2–8 Jubilees 5:20–32 Pseudo-Philo 3:6–7, 11–12 Josephus, <i>Ant.</i> 1.3.2 §§75–78, 99	Sirach 16:8 Wisdom 10:6 4Q180 (4QAggCreat A) frags. 2–4; 2.1–8 Jubilees 16:7–9 Philo, <i>Dreams</i> 5.15 §85 Josephus, <i>Ant.</i> 1.11.3 §§199–200	4Q182 (4QCatena B) 1:1–2:1 1QH 3.29–35 1 Enoch 10:2 Jubilees 5:10 Philo, <i>Rewards & Punishments</i> 8.26 §152
NT References	Mark 13:6 Acts 17:22–31 Romans 1:15, 20 Hebrews 11:3 2 Peter 3:6–7	Matthew 24:37–38 Luke 3:36; 17:26–27 Hebrews 11:7 1 Peter 3:20 2 Peter 2:8	Luke 17:26–27 2 Peter 2:5	Luke 17:28–29 2 Peter 2:7–8	2 Peter 3:7, 16 Revelation 3:10, 13; 6:12–17, 20; 18:1–21; 20:1–6; 21:1–4

Once again, this chart is not intended to be exhaustive but rather a representation of OT historical events and personalities that have been remembered and recontextualized in other Jewish and

⁷² Feast of Unleavened Bread or Passover/Pesach (Exod 12:1–15; *Jub.* 49:1–23; Matt 26:17–20; Luke 22:7–8; John 11:55; 18:28), the Feast of Weeks or Pentecost/Shavout (Exod 34:22; *Jub.* 6:17–31; Acts 2:1, 5–11), Feast of Tabernacles or Booths/Sukkoth (Exod 23:16; 34:22–23; Josephus, *Ant.* 8.4.1 §100; John 7:2). In one second temple text, the Feast of Pentecost/Shavout has been traced to the appearance of the first rainbow on the 15th of Sivan when God made his covenant with Noah (*Jub.* 6:15–22; 44:1–5; cf. *Pseudo-Philo* 13:11–12).

⁷³ Feast of Lights or Hannukah (1 Macc 4:36–59; John 10:22–23; cf. Dan 8:9–14; 8:21–25), the Feast of Purim (Esther 9:26–32; perhaps John 5:1), the Lord's Supper (Mark 14:22–26; Matt 26:26–30; Luke 22:14–20; 1 Cor 11:2, 24; cf. 10:14–21). As Qumran, the Essenes added to New Wheat (Shavuot) two other celebrations: New Wine and New Oil.

⁷⁴ For a more thorough listing of Dead Sea Scrolls about creation, see Martin Abegg Jr., Petter Flint, and Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time into English* (New York, NY: HarperCollins, 1999), 5–7.

Christian writings. For instance, the surviving portions of 4Q252 (4QcommGen^a) ponder four personalities in Genesis: Noah (1:1–2:8), Abraham (2:8–10), Amalek (4:1–3), and Jacob (4:3–6). 4Q252 was written by and for members of the community at Qumran. Concerning Noah, 4Q252 deals with the chronology of the flood story (1:3–2:5). It also attempts to resolve problems like the object of Noah’s curse (2:5–8), the identification of the 120 years of Genesis 6:3, and the 120 years within Noah’s life (1:1–3). Consequently, the first part of the document appears to address Israel’s past, while the latter part of the document looks forward to Israel’s future, particularly as that future entails the coming of a royal Messiah.⁷⁵

Another second temple text, *Jubilees*, retells the stories in Genesis and the first parts of Exodus (Gen 1—Exod 19) set within the literary context of a divine revelation to Moses while he was on Mount Sinai. In Chapter 1, God himself converses with Moses about Israel’s future apostasy and restoration. In the remaining chapters (2–50), an Angel of the Presence reveals the contents of heavenly tablets to Moses whereby Creation and Adam, Noah, Abraham, Jacob, and Moses are retold. While there are no indications that *Jubilees* ever became more widely authoritative in Jewish circles, it was valued by later Jewish writers and considered an authoritative work at Qumran.⁷⁶

Finally, Philo, an Alexandrian Jew, interprets the OT in conformity with the categories and methods of Platonic philosophy and thereby exposit the OT with a view whereby tensions of life involving eternal prototypes exist with their present shadowy transcripts. He tended to treat biblical history allegorically rather than literally. According to Longenecker, Philo wrote to vindicate Jewish theology before the court of Greek philosophy by using the OT as a body of symbols given by God for a person’s spiritual and moral benefit.⁷⁷

Like other Jewish writers, Peter draws attention to *righteous Noah’s divine rescue and divine judgment*. Noah was in fact “rescued” or “protected” (ἐφύλαξεν) from a universal flood that destroyed all the ungodly of Noah’s day except for Noah’s immediate family.⁷⁸

⁷⁵ Composed sometime during the reign of Herod the Great (30–4 B.C.), the six fragments of 4Q252 (4QcommGen^a) comments on selected passages from Genesis 6 to 49. George Brooke did the initial evaluation of 4Q252 in *Qumran Cave 4.XVII* (DJD 22; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 185–207; cf. Gerbern S. Oegema, “Tradition-Historical Studies on 4Q252” in *Qumran–Messianism*, edited by James H. Charlesworth, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Gerbern S. Oegema (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 154–74; Martínez, et al, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1:500–03; Wise, et al, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 274–78; Bateman, *Jesus the Messiah*, 268–69.

⁷⁶ Written about the patriarchs, *Jubilees* presents them as faithfully obedient to divine laws that were revealed only in post-patriarchal times. See O. S. Wintermute, “Jubilees” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, volume 2, edited by James H. Charlesworth (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1985), 35–142; James C. VanderKam, “Jubilees, Book of” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Volume 1, edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2000), 434–38.

⁷⁷ Longenecker *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 30–33, 154–55; Gregory E. Sterling, “Philo Judaeus” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Volume 2, edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2000), 663–69.

⁷⁸ “Protected” (ἐφύλαξεν) conveys the idea of protecting something or someone by taking careful measures to “guard,” “protect,” or act” (BDAG, s.v. “ρύομαι,” 2b, p 1068). While some translations render the constative aorist in 2 Peter 2:7 and 9 as “protect” (NIV NLT; cf. NET), others suggest “saved” (KJV NRSV) or “preserved” (ASV NASB ESV CNT). It’s a term that appears frequently in the NT (some 31 times), usually in terms of guarding something or someone as is often the case in Luke’s writings (e.g., Luke 2:8; 8:29; 11:21; Act 12:4; etc.). It’s also used again in 2 Peter 3:17 exhorting followers of Jesus to be “on guard” or similarly with John’s expectation to keep oneself from idols (1 John 5:21; cf. Luke 12:15). In Jude 24, it’s used in a doxology about Jewish Christian followers who are divinely “protected” or “kept” from turning or falling away from Jesus.

^{2:5} if God did not spare the ancient world — yet, God *protected* Noah, a herald of righteousness, with seven others⁷⁹ — when God brought a flood on an ungodly world; ^{2:8} (for while Noah lived as a resident among them, day after day, his righteous soul was tormented by their lawless deeds that he saw and heard)

Similarly, Peter calls to remembrance *righteous* Lot's *divine rescue* and the subsequent *divine judgment* of Sodom and Gomorrah. Lot is “rescued” (ἐρρύσατο) from the danger of immoral temptations.⁸⁰

^{2:7} if God *rescued* Lot, a *righteous* man distressed by the socially unacceptable conduct of unprincipled *men and women*,⁸¹ ^{2:6} . . . by reducing to ashes⁸² the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, when he condemned them to destruction⁸³ because God had appointed them to be an example to those who were to be ungodly in the future.

The last phrase in 2:6, “to those who were to be ungodly in the future” (μελλόντων ἀσεβέσιν), underscores a typological-prophetic warning applicable to Peter's set of circumstances whereby future events of divine destruction were being challenged. So, how do these examples apply to Peter's contemporary readers? He says, the earth will be destroyed by fire *like* the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah.

^{2:9} if God did all these things, then the Lord knows how to *rescue* (ρύεσθαι)⁸⁴ the godly from trials and to keep the ungodly under judgment for the day of judgment . . . ^{3:10} But the day of the Lord

⁷⁹ The Greek: literally reads “the eighth” (ὀγδοον) . . . “he protected Noah, the eight person (cf. KJV) . . .” but is too cryptic and therefore rendered “with seven others” like other translations (ASV NASB ESV NIV NIV CNT etc.). Tyndale ignored and did not translate “the eighth” (ὀγδοον).

⁸⁰ “Rescue” (ἐρρύσατο) conveys the idea of rescuing someone from danger and may be rendered “save,” “rescue,” “deliver,” or preserve someone” (BDAG, s.v. “φυλάσσω”). While most translations render ἐρρύσατο as “rescue” (NASB NRSV ESV NIV NET NLT CNT), older translations translate ἐρρύσατο as “deliver” (Tyndale KJV ASV). In 2 Peter, Lot is rescued from danger of temptation (2:7) and thereby serves as a positive exemplar for Peter's audience (2:9). But it's also use to describe being rescued from death (2 Tim 3:11), the power of darkness (Col 1:13), eternal punishment (1 Clement 6:7), etc.).

⁸¹ This is my rearranged translation for interpretive clarity. Whereas the English rendering “socially unacceptable” (ἀσελγεία; cf. BDAG, s.v. “ἀσελγείω,” p 141) is also translated “the debauched” (NET) or “the sensual” (ESV); “unprincipled (τῶν ἀθέσμων; cf. BDAG, s.v. “ἀθέσιμος”) is also be translated “lawless” (NET), “sensual” (ESV). Yet, the translations “debauched,” “sensual,” “lawless,” and “sensual” emphasize sin in a very broad sense.

⁸² Once again, this is my purposeful rearranged translation for interpretive clarity. The participle “has reduced to ashes” (τεφρώσας), is an aorist active nominative masculine singular participle from τεφρώω, which means, “by reducing to ashes.” This is a New Testament hapax legomenon, and occurs only elsewhere in extrabiblical literature. James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963), 632.

⁸³ The phrase “the condemned to destruction” ([καταστροφῇ] κατέκρινεν) is difficult because it reflects a difficult text critical decision. The decision rests on whether καταστροφῇ was added by scribes (x A C² K ψ 049, etc.), or whether it was original and accidentally dropped from the text (P⁷² B C*, etc.). Metzger reasons that the shorter reading, usually preferable, might have arisen due to “transcriptional oversight.” Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary of the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (New York, NY: United Bible Society, 1994), 632.

⁸⁴ The term ρύεσθαι conveys the idea of rescuing someone from danger and may be rendered “save,” “rescue,” deliver,” or preserve someone” (BDAG, s.v. “ρύομαι” p 907. While most translations render ρύεσθαι as “rescue” (NASB NRSV ESV NIV NET NLT CNT), older translations render ρύεσθαι as “deliver” (Tyndale

will come like a thief, at which time, the heavens will pass with a roar, and then the basic elements of the natural world will be destroyed by burning up⁸⁵ and the earth and the works done on it will be discovered.^{3:11} Since all these things are to be destroyed, what sort of people ought we⁸⁶ be in holy conduct and godliness,^{3:12} while waiting for and hastening the coming of the day of God whereby the heavens will be destroyed by fire and the basic elements will dissolve by burning.^{3:13} So, let us wait for a new heaven and a new earth according to his promise wherein righteousness dwells.

Peter's theological theme of "destruction" (ἀπώλεια), a theme that resonates throughout his letter, mirrors similar discussions in Christian preaching and teaching, whereby "destruction" has been escalated from meaning a physical death to one that also involves a state of torment and death for "false prophets," "the Antichrist," "the beast," and "all the ungodly," whose names are not listed in the book of Life.⁸⁷ Moreover, Peter's theme of the "indecent conduct" (ταῖς ἀσελγείαις; 2:2)⁸⁸ of his rivals appear several times throughout his letter. "Greed" (πλεονεξία) leads to exploiting others by way of lying and later with various other types of indecent conduct (2 Pet 2:2, 3, 14). Similar linking of "greed" (πλεονεξία) in Christian vice lists occurs in the traditional teaching by Jesus (Matt 7:22) and Paul (cf. Eph 4:19, 5:3; Col 3:5; 1 Thess 2:5). Peter's phrase "Slaves to corruption" (δοῦλοι ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς; 2:19) also helps in defining Peter's sense of "indecent conduct" that parallels Paul's concept of being "slaves to sin" (Rom 6:6). Apparently, Peter (or a *pseudo*-Peter) knew of Paul, his teachings, and his writings (2 Pet 3:15–16; cf. Gal 2:11–14).

Jude, on the other hand, does not evoke the traditional vice list but rather reminds his readers of divine condemnations (past, vv 5–7; present, vv 8–13; and future vv 14–16) of those who had and were rebelling against God and societal standards.⁸⁹ God is, after all, no respecter of persons in that he condemns rebellion, regardless of whether Jew, celestial beings, or Gentiles, which is another echo of Jewish and Christian tradition (Sir 16:5–14; Luke 20:9–19). In fact, a striking difference between 2 Peter and Jude is Jude's arrangement of material in triplets rather than an

KJV ASV). A person may be rescued from immoral temptation as in case Peter's audience (2 Pet 2:9), from death (2 Tim 3:11), the power of darkness (Col 1:13), from eternal punishment (1 Clement 6:7), etc.

⁸⁵ The rendering "the basic elements of the natural world" (στοιχεῖα; BDAG, s.v. "στοιχεῖον," 1a) may be translated "the elements" (Tyndale KJV ASV NASB NASV NLT CNT). Yet, "heavenly bodies" / celestial bodies" (BDAG, s.v. "στοιχεῖον," 1b; ESV NET) is also possible. The Greek participle καυσούμενα ("by burning") is rendered as a participle of means expressing how the elements will be destroyed. It is a *hapax legomena*.

⁸⁶ This is a textual issue concerning a pronoun with the infinitive. While some manuscripts read ὑμᾶς ("you"; A C* P ψ 33 81 1739, etc.), others read ἡμᾶς ("we" – 8 630 241 209 104 8). Other manuscripts omit the pronoun all together (P⁷² B 1175 etc.). Despite the slim evidence for the omission the first-person pronoun seems to be a clarifying variant. It would be difficult to explain the pronoun's absence in some witnesses if the pronoun were original. Nevertheless, NA 27 has ὑμᾶς in brackets, indicating doubt as to its authenticity.

⁸⁷ "Destruction" (ἀπώλεια) is applicable to those who attempt to thwart God's program (Judas, John 17:12; Antichrist, 1 Thess. 2:3) and those who distort God's message (2 Pet. 2:3, 3:16). The destruction is an everlasting state of torment for ungodly people (2 Pet. 3:7, cf. Matt. 7:13) and the beast and people whose names are not written in the book of Life (Rev. 17:8, 11). For other occurrences see Oepke's discussion in *TDNT*. 1964 ed., s.v. "ἀπόλλυμι, ἀπώλεια, ἀπολλύων."

⁸⁸ The translation of ταῖς ἀσελγείαις as "indecent conduct" may also be translated or "pernicious ways" (KJV) "licentious" (ASV), "debauched lifestyles" (NET), and "shameful immorality" (NIV NLT) — cf. BDAG, s.v. "ἀσέλγεια." Regardless of how ταῖς ἀσελγείαις is translated, Peter defines "indecent conduct" by way of traditional vice lists in Christian tradition.

⁸⁹ Bateman, *Jude*, 159–331.

appeal to vice lists. There are at least ten sets of triplets in Jude.⁹⁰ Although Jude speaks of a coming judgment of all people (vv 14–15), he says nothing of an eternal destruction of the “godless.” Granted, Jude recalls the “physical destruction” (ἀπώλεσεν) of the Exodus generation and “punishment of eternal fire” (πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκην ὑπέχουσai) of several Gentile cities. Yet, his emphasis is to defend the faith (v 4) by way of extending mercy to people who are wavering, to save others, and to maintain godly love (1:21–23). Furthermore, Jude alludes to several exemplars that are not in 2 Peter: Cain (v 11), Enoch (v 14), the Exodus Generation (v 5), Moses (v 9), and Korah (v 11). These exemplars also appear in other Jewish and Christian literature.

Jude’s References to Cain, Enoch, Exodus Generation, Moses, and Korah in Jewish & Christian Literature					
Type of Literature	Cain (Rebellion)	Enoch	Exodus Generation (Rebellion)	Moses	Korah (Rebellion)
OT Event Recorded	Genesis 4:1–9; 13–17; 24–25	Genesis 5:3	Numbers 13:1–14:45 (cf. Deut 9:7–8)	Deuteronomy 34:1–8	Numbers 16:1–35
Subsequent OT References			Psalms 78:11–57 Psalm 95:8–10 Ezekiel 20:10–36		Numbers 16:1–35
Non-Canonical References	Wisdom 10:3 4 Maccabees 18:11 4QGen ^b 4:2–11 <i>Pseudo-Philo</i> 2:1 <i>TAbr</i> A 13:2 <i>TBenj</i> 7:5 Apoc, Ab Philo, <i>Migr Abr</i> 4.20 §§113–15; <i>Flight</i> 5.12 §64; Josephus, <i>Ant.</i> 1.2.1 §§52–59	Sirach 44:16; 49:14 Wisdom 4:10–11 1QapGen ar 3:19–24 Qumran texts ⁹¹ <i>1 Enoch</i> 60:1–25 <i>Jubilees</i> 7:39 Philo, <i>Posterity</i> 2.12 §40–48 and <i>Abraham</i> 6.3 §17 Josephus, <i>Ant.</i> 1.3.2, 8 §§75, 99	Sirach 16:6 3 Macc 2:6–8 CD-A 3.5–12 <i>Pseudo-Philo</i> 10:1–7	<i>Testament of Moses</i> <i>Jubilees</i> 1:1–29 <i>Pseudo-Philo</i> 19:16	Sirach 45:18 4Q491 fl. 3, 1–2 (4QWar Scroll) ff 1–3 4Q423 (4Q Instruction) f 5.1–3 <i>Pseudo-Philo</i> 16:1–7 Philo, <i>Flight</i> 26 §145 Josephus, <i>Ant.</i> 4.2.2 §§14–16

⁹⁰ The ten sets of triplets in Jude are three divine acts: called, loved, and kept (v 1); three blessings: mercy, peace, and love (v 2); three historical rebellions: God’s people, angels, and Gentiles (v 5–7); three godless activities: pollute their bodies, reject authority, and slander (v 8); three historical insurgents: Cain, Balaam, and Korah (v 11); three godless mannerisms: grumblers, faultfinders, and braggers (v 16); three godless traits: cause divisions, follow natural instincts, and do not have God’s spirit (v 19); three godless traits: cause divisions, follow natural instincts, and do not have God’s spirit (v 19) ; Three strategies to persevere: build yourselves up your faith, pray, and remain in God’s love (v 20–21); three expectations of mercy: help doubters, save others, and be merciful to the ungodly with caution (v 22); three divine acts: keep believers faultless, cause believers to stand blameless, cause believers joy (v 24).

⁹¹ We might also add *1QGenesis Apocryphon* (circa 30 B.C. – A.D. 68), *4QEnoch* (Aramaic: 4Q204); *4QEnoch Giants* (= 4Q530; circa 125–100 B.C.), *4QAstronomical Enoch* (= 4Q208; circa 250–150 B.C.), *4QJubilees* (= 4Q216; circa 75–50 B.C.), and *4QPseudo-Jubilees* (= 4Q225; circa A.D. 30). Many works reiterate the obvious genealogical connections presented in Genesis 5 (*1 Enoch* 60:8; 98:3; *Jub* 7:39; 1Q20 3.3; 4Q212 fl. iii:23; 4Q369 fl. i:10; cf. Philo *Post* 40–48). Yet, The examples are not intended to be an exhaustive listing of Qumran texts but rather a sampling. For instance, there are other manuscripts for the Aramaic version of Enoch (4Q201–02; 204–07; 212), for Enoch’s book of the giants (e.g., 4Q203, 1Q23, 2Q26, 4Q530–532, 6Q8), and Jubilees (e.g., 1Q17, 18; 2Q19, 20; 3Q5; 4Q176, 216, 219, 220, 221, 227; 11Q12). For a more complete listing of Qumran texts, see Emanuel Tov, “The Unpublished Qumran Texts from Caves 4 and 11,” *BA* 55 (June 1992): 94–104; Emanuel Tov, ed., *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and An Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series*, DJD 39 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 371–75. This material was recontextualized from Bateman, *Jude*, 303.

NT References	Hebrews 11:4 1 John 3:12 Jude 11	Luke 3:37; Hebrews 11:5 Jude 14	Acts 7:38-44 1 Corinthians 10:1-13 Hebrews 3:7-4:11 Jude 6	Acts 7:20-45 Hebrews 8:5; 9:19-22; 11:23-29 Jude 9	Jude 11
---------------	--	---------------------------------------	---	--	---------

Once again, this chart is not intended to be exhaustive but a mere representation of Jewish historical events and exemplars that appear frequently in other Jewish and Christian writings. Furthermore, these OT events and personalities appear to be chosen to fit Jude's theological theme of rebellion. On the one hand, Enoch and Moses are revered historical heroes in Jewish history and subsequent Jewish and Christian writings. Bauckham rightly observes that Jude's "use of Jewish apocrypha works is at least as extensive as his use of the OT" and that "Jude was familiar with Jewish paraenetic and haggadic traditions which cannot be pinned down to any particular written source (vv 5-7, 11)."⁹² Jude's frequent allusions to Jewish works like *1 Enoch* and *Testament of Moses* sets Jude apart as being, according to Bauckham, "in kind" to a Jewish apocalyptic mindset even though such allusions are "reinterpreted and focused on Jesus."⁹³

On the other hand, the citing Cain and Korah fit Jude's narrative of rebellion and that resulted in killing one's brother(s). In the case of the well-known Jewish accounts of Cain, he brutally murdered his brother Abel.⁹⁴ In the case of Korah, a cousin to Moses and Aaron, lured other Levitical priestly families (Abiram and Dathan) into a major rebellion against Moses, challenged Moses, and exalted themselves over an entire Exodus generation. Jewish memories of Korah, as evident in Jewish second temple literature, typically portray Korah as a warning sign for those who craved power and conspired against authority. Their rebellion ended with a supernaturally designed physical death.⁹⁵ While the memory of Cain appears frequently in Jewish and Christian tradition (but not in 2 Peter), Korah is not only absent from 2 Peter, he is nowhere to be found in the NT. Why? Perhaps it was because Jude, unlike 2 Peter, was not concerned about "false teachers." He was confronting the escalation of a national rebellion that was turning brother against brother, that involved priestly power struggles, and that resulted in revolts wreaking havoc throughout Judaea whereby Jewish kinsman were killing fellow kinsman.

Needless to say, it's not surprising and only natural for Jude to speak of "ungodly people" as "grumblers" (γογγυσταί) and "fault-finders" (μεμψίμοιροι) in verse 16 — neither description appears in 2 Peter. Jude's description of his rivals as "grumblers" (γογγυσταί) would resonate with his Judean readers and thereby take them back to his previous mention of the rebellion in verses 5 and 11, especially Korah. Just as the Jewish people grumbled against God's appointed leader, Moses, the Zealots were grumbling against God's appointed Roman rule (cf. Rom 13:1-7; 1 Tim 2:1-4; 1 Pet 2:17).⁹⁶ And though Harrington maintains a Christian false teacher view, his

⁹² Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 7. See Richard J. Bauckham, "James, 1 and 2 Peter, Jude," *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture; Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*, edited by D. A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 303-17.

⁹³ Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 10; cf. Kraftchick, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 17. For a more extensive look at Enoch in non-biblical second temple literature and Jude, see Bateman, *Jude*, 303-15.

⁹⁴ For a fuller discussion of Cain in second temple literature and the role his mention plays in Jude, see Bateman, *Jude*, 239-49.

⁹⁵ For a fuller discussion of Korah in second temple literature and the role his mention plays in Jude, see Bateman, *Jude*, 263-72.

⁹⁶ "Grumbling" appears frequently in the Hebrew Scriptures (e.g., LXX: Ps 105:25; English: 106:25), Second Temple texts (1QS 1.6; 4.11; 5.1-7; CD 1.12; 2.14; 3.3; 1QpHab 2.5; *1 Enoch* 5:4; *Pss Sol.* 8:29; Sir 3.26; 16:5-15; 3 Macc 2:3-7), and the New Testament (e.g., 1 Cor 10:10). Although Jude's choice of the noun

comment about grumbling fits well a Zealot view: “they are conducting a *campaign* of complaint and slander.”⁹⁷ But the Zealots were not merely campaigning against the Romans and those Judeans willing to submit to Rome. They made it a practice to expose excessively the faults of other people, even other Zealots and rebels for personal power and control.

Furthermore, Jude’s use of the *hapax legomena*, “faultfinder” (μεμψίμοιροι), fits well the public form of Zealot complaining or faultfinding with both Roman and Jewish leaders that was both a visible and an escalating discontentment that permeated all of Judaea during the early A.D. 60s. While “faultfinder” (μεμψίμοιροι) appears in other Jewish literature, its appearance in Josephus is telling.⁹⁸ He reveals how Jewish people in the past *found fault* with God’s chosen leader, Moses, as well. They emerge among the Judaeans, prior to the revolt against Rome, whereby they generated a fear in their manner of *faultfinding*.⁹⁹ No matter what Rome did, the Zealots were *like* sick people, hard to please, and perpetual faultfinders. Perhaps Sidebottom’s rendering of the term “malcontents” captures better the term’s force of Jude’s rival.¹⁰⁰

Conclusion

The cornerstone whereby interpretations assume literary dependence of Jude on Peter or Peter on Jude has notable fractures. First, there is no “real” verbal agreement between 2 Peter and Jude that supports literary dependence. Second, literary dependence often downplays the call in both letters to remember exemplars that were both well-known and found in numerous other Jewish

“grumbler” (γογγυσταί) occurs only here in the New Testament, the noun occurs in the LXX to translate the Hebrew noun גִּזְלוֹן on a number of occasions (Exod 16:7–9; Num 17:25; cf. 1QH^a 13:32; 4Q429 f3:2), and the Hebrew noun לִין in Numbers 17:5–10 that described the Exodus community’s response to Korah’s punishment after he rebelled against Moses (cf. 4Q365 f6a:ii+6c:10). At Qumran, murmurs against the secret teaching of the Yahad was not to occur and was punishable by banishment (1QS 7:17; 4Q261 f6a_e:4). Grumbling against another person was permitted in a legal proceeding (4Q269 f11:ii+15:5), but if a murmur about another person could not be proven, the one who grumbled was to be punished (4Q261 f6a_e:5; 4Q270 f7i:7). These scroll citations are identified according to Accordance referencing of fragments and may differ in Martinez, et al, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1:87, 541, 605, 609. The verb form, however, occurs more frequently in the both the LXX and New Testament.⁹⁶ Of particular significance is the use of the verb to describe the grumbling that occurred at Kadesh Barnea (LXX: Num 14:27, 29). Adapted and recontextualized from Bateman, *Jude*, 320–22.

⁹⁷ Harrington, *1 Peter, Jude, and 2 Peter*, 215.

⁹⁸ Both a cognate noun (μέμψις) and verb (μέμψωμαι) appear in the LXX. The noun appears in Job when Elihu takes issue with Job’s defense who claims that even though he has done nothing wrong (33:9) God “finds fault” (Greek: μέμψιν; Hebrew: מָצָא ... חַטֹּאתַי) with him (33:10). Sirach uses the verb form to speak of children who “will *find fault* (μέμψεις) with an ungodly (ἀσεβείς) father, for they suffer disgrace because of him (41:7; cf. Job 33:23; 39:7; Wis 13:6; Sir 41:7; 2 Macc 2:7).

⁹⁹ Josephus uses the noun to label rivals as “faultfinders.” Moses remained firm against the faultfinding Pharaoh and the Hebrews. Josephus says, “but Moses did not let his courage sink for the king’s threatening; nor did he abate of his zeal on account of the Hebrews’ complaints (= faultfinding μέμψεις); but he supported himself and set his soul resolutely against them both, and used his own utmost diligence to procure liberty to his countrymen” (*Ant.* 2.13.4 §290). Of particular significance is that the high priest Jonathon, about whom Jude’s audience would have known, feared Jewish faultfinders (μέμψιν) and frequently warned Felix (the Roman governor) of his need to be more cautious (*Ant.* 20.8.5 §162). Furthermore, Josephus testifies about how he himself encouraged Galileans not to get carried away and encouraged *a hundred older men to go to Jerusalem in order to issue a complaint* (μέμψιν) against those who were splitting the country (*Life* 52 §266). Finally, when Agrippa II said “if servitude to Rome is intolerable, raise *complaints* (μέμψις) *against your governors*” (*J.W.* 2.16.4 §349). Adapted and recontextualized from Bateman, *Jude*, 322–24.

¹⁰⁰ Sidebottom, *James, Jude, 2 Peter* (1967), 91.

and Christian writings. Like other authors, Peter and Jude made word choices and picked particular exemplars in order to confront their respective and very different rivals who were disrupting the church for very different reasons. Both Peter and Jude arranged their literary themes to confront two very different disputes. Finally, the idea that an author and the congregant have “memories” upon which an author might have constructed their respective arguments are unfortunately either downplayed or discounted.

Conclusion

The cornerstone upon which most commentators interpret 2 Peter and Jude is that both confronted “false prophets” and “false teachers” in their respective letters and thereby are dependent upon one another. Surprisingly, some of these same commentators concede and point out the fractures upon which their interpretations are based. Yet, 2 Peter and Jude were not only written to different audiences, their literary themes differ, and literary dependence upon each other questionable.

While Jude warns his readers against joining in rebellious activities, Peter refutes the Epicurean *like* teachings that appear to have been swaying his readers. Consequently, they drew independently from Jewish tradition to warn their respective readers about the rivals of their day. Peter’s exemplars and vice lists underscore Peter’s theological thrust of God’s sparing the righteous and destroying the unrighteous due to sinful behavior in its broadest sense. He purposefully accentuates *divine punishments* and irrefutable *divine rescues*. Jude’s exemplars underscore the theological thrust of God’s even-handed manner in dealing with rebellion whereby God responds to rebellion in a manner that shows no favoritism.

Is there a common Jewish source upon which 2 Peter and Jude depend? Yes and no. On the one hand, it’s difficult to prove a dependence on any specific written Jewish source. It seems more than reasonable to think they drew from their own “memory” of Israel’s historical past *like* Stephen did before a crowd in Jerusalem (Acts 7:1–53). On the other hand, it’s reasonable to suggest that Jewish “memories” of history past permeate Jewish writings whether they be in the rewriting of OT biblical texts (4Q1, 4Q7, 6Q1, *Pseudo-Philo*) or in literary works for a specific audience with a pointed intention (Sirach, Wisdom, CD, 4Q252, 1QapGen ar, 1Q28, *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, Philo, Josephus). Peter and Jude not only employ Jewish exegetical practices of their day, they apparently viewed Jewish and Christian traditions — whether written or oral — as their best authorities. They reiterate “memories” of well-known exemplars in Jewish history and recontextualizes them to fit their written proclamations of Jesus for two entirely different situations and thereby refute two entirely different rivals.

Consequently, it seems more than reasonable to conclude that Peter and Jude tackled two totally different adversaries, wrote independent of one another, and yet were reliant upon their “memories” of events in common with their Jewish and Christian traditions.