

THE USE OF SCRIPTURE IN THE LETTER OF JUDE

Felix Opoku-Gyamfi

School of Theology and Missions
Valley View University, Accra, Ghana
felogy@hotmail.com; +233203413759

Abstract

The place and role of the Bible in winning or reclaiming souls in the Christian church from the earliest era to the present has been central and inevitable. Jesus himself was influenced by the Aramaic and Hebrew catena that were preserved in Judaism; these were the scriptures he knew. After Jesus, the early believers continued to search the scrolls as the pre-existent text that pointed to the continuity in their reverence to Jesus and thereby re-discovering their identity and the fulfillment of the prophecies aforementioned in them. By the second century, many other Christian writings circulated and were highly considered as of equal importance as the Jewish scriptures. Even though this process of the Christian believer searching for meaning and understanding in the Bible has not changed till date, one thing that stands to be often overlooked in the twenty first century is the cultural and ideological milieu in which the early Christians understood the constituents of scripture. It is against this background that this paper examines Jude's use of both canonical and non-canonical materials to reveal the library of scripture that existed in the early Christian communities. The method adopted in this paper is exegesis. It is mainly argued that Jude alluded to the Pseudepigrapha (1 Enoch and the Testament of Moses) as scripture in the same way he used the Old Testament. Thus, it suggests a period of writing in which the Old Testament Canon was still open. In pursuance of the above purpose, possible quotations or allusions to other material are analyzed. The discussions centre on two broad headings; The Old Testament and Pseudepigrapha, within which specific sub topics are treated.

Keywords: Jude, Pseudepigrapha, Scripture, Hermeneutics, Typology, OT in NT, Exegesis

Introduction

Many believers in the Bible today accept the arranged and bound writings as the only acceptable scripture worthy for developing doctrine and instruction. Possibly those are what they inherited. In a world in which

everything seems to be well coordinated and formalized, meanings of words such as ‘scripture’, ‘Canon’ and ‘inspiration’ may not be farfetched. But to the ancient minds, the above terms may sound unfamiliar and ambiguous even where they were known. Definitions of Scripture can be grouped into two: a) a passage or the books of the Bible and b) writings regarded as inspired or sacred. The second definition pushes further for a clarification of what is meant by inspiration or sacredness and who has the mandate to determine which belongs to these categories? James A. Sanders has defined scripture as a time-tested piece of writing that provides a group of people with a sense of ‘who they are’ (mythos) and ‘what they do’ (ethos).¹ Commenting on the above definition, Stenstrup observes that it brings to the fore, how groups making use of scripture understand themselves and their relationship with the divine being.² This assertion is true not only in reference to the ancient religious sects but also within our present religious denomination settings. One of the main divides between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism till date concerns what constitutes authoritative or inspired Scripture? And who has the prowess to make a determination of that?

A miniature of such an age long puzzle is what the letter of Jude represents in the current New Testament canon. The curious reader of the letter soon comes to the point that some of the references made in it cannot be traced in the present ‘canon of Scripture’. The author’s sources included materials from 1 Enoch and the Testament of Moses which are classified today as Pseudepigrapha. This discovery inversely poses some critical questions such as the following: Why would the author use such pieces of literature that cannot be traced in the current body of scripture (the Bible)? How does he inculcate these source-materials into his document? How much of the context and setting in the early Christian church does the inclusion of such materials portray? Of what historical importance could the letter of Jude be for New Testament studies? These are the thought-provoking questions that necessitated further inquiry into the letter of Jude as exemplified in this research.

In an attempt to answer the basic questions the letter of Jude poses, several studies have been carried out by previous scholars. A wake up call that drew scholarly attention to Jude was captured in the article of Douglas J. Rowston: “The Most Neglected Book in the New Testament.” This assertion was least to be contended during the time of its publication in the sense that previous studies regarding Jude had been dealt with in commentaries by the likes of Friedrich Spitta, G. B. Stevens and J. B.

Mayor. Reasons for the abandonment included the question marks raised about the letter's authenticity as an inspired literature that is worthy of making it into the canon. The obvious references to the Pseudepigrapha and the letter's close semblance with 2 Peter have all contributed to the authenticity problem. These issues against Jude that dominated earlier discussions in the study of the letter denigrated efforts to study it in its original *historico-cultural* milieu in which the letter of Jude functioned. However Rowston's timely stirring call has ignited progressive efforts to the study of the letter of Jude as an independent piece of writing separate from 2 Peter. Bauckham has been one of the stalwarts in this direction. Notable among his works are his commentary in the 'Word biblical' and his book, 'Jude and the Relatives of Jesus'. In these, he examines the exegetical tools of Jude, and traces the genealogy of the author to situate him as the real brother of Jesus. Also he concludes that Jude's use of the Pseudepigrapha was for literary purposes instead of them being used as scripture. His views are reiterated in most of the few articles written about Jude's use of traditional materials. For instance, Charles J. Daryl discusses the Pseudepigrapha in Jude and concludes that the author employed these carefully selected materials to suit his literary strategy.³ His later treatment of the traditional materials did not result in much different conclusion from the above.⁴ Also Robert L. Web's examination of the role of eschatology reveals that the letter served a major rhetorical function of convincing the readers to pronounce the prowlers guilty of ungodliness.⁵ It is clear that previous scholarship in Jude has centered on the author's utilization of source materials as being integral part of his literary approach. It is at this point that this study diverges importantly to explore the sources of the author from the perspective that they were employed as scripture.

A study into the use of scripture in the letter of Jude can be a multifaceted one. At a higher critical level of New Testament studies, it lends itself to address the general historical context of how the Old Testament and other Jewish writings were adopted in the New Testament. In the broader sense, the topic flows into diverse streams of biblical, theological and hermeneutical studies. But for simplicity it is limited to the singular purpose of analyzing the author of Jude's use of both Old Testament and extra-biblical materials to ascertain how they could help in understanding the extent of both the author's and the readers' library of scripture. The text-critical problems of the letter will not primarily be considered. The research will be carried out through exegesis of the

probable source-materials that served as the basis of the writer's arguments.

This article is significant in three ways. First, it will contribute to the steady development of studies in the letter of Jude. Secondly, our insight into the vast library of scripture that existed in the early Christian churches will be enhanced. Lastly by this study, the specific role of Jude providing the missing relationship between early Christianity and late Judaism becomes evident. The important questions for this study are stated here as- what were his sources? What type of inner biblical exegesis did the author of Jude employ?

The paper focuses on the content of Jude dealing with the various sources and the types of hermeneutical tools employed by the author, concentrating on vv. 4-16.

Moreover, the paper argues that, because Jude's use of source materials from the Old Testament does not differ in his use of the Pseudepigrapha, they formed part of the library of scripture of his readers as well as himself.

The use of the Old Testament

The wilderness experience: (v.5)

In verse 5 the author begins to prepare his listeners for a transition from the cordial tone of the greetings and well wishes into the more rigorous content of his epistle. In the concise prelude to the main body, he sets the agenda to remind his listeners, even though they may be in good knowledge of his impending submission. The use of the aorist infinitive active ὑπομνήσαι could serve two purposes. First it helps set his listeners into an introspective search of their memory archive. Secondly, it serves the purpose of revealing the nature of what he was about to call his readers into remembrance for; it might have been an instruction by word of mouth or an already written document having a present significance. Then comes the first incident;

‘[ὁ]κύριος ἄπαξ ἀνέκγῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν’.

‘[The] lord having saved [the] people out of the land of Egypt, secondly, destroyed the unbelieving ones.’

The above quotation suggests an obvious reference to the wilderness experiences of the people of Israel as recorded in the Old Testament. A casual reading of Jude 5b reveals that the author does not refer to any specific passage concerning the migration from Egypt to

Canaan, due to the fact that it echoes several passages in the Old Testament that present a similar incident.⁶ However, Exodus 12:51 and Numbers 14:29-30, 35 are thought to be nearest among the various Old Testament chapters to have formed the basis for the author's allusion in v.5.

At this point, analysis of the two passages would be helpful. We shall begin by comparing the texts in the LXX Exodus and the Greek text of Jude. The overt emphasis on the deliverance/salvation of the people from the Egyptian Bondage in Jude seems to resonate the happy ending of 12:51 where the writer ends on the note that God brought out the sons of Israel out of Egypt after deadly plagues in the preceding sections. The similarities between the LXX Exodus and Jude are the subjects; 'κύριος', and the phrases that describe the place of deliverance; "ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου". But the contexts as well as the areas of emphasis of the two texts differ significantly. While the Old Testament text uses the verb ἐξάγω (the LXX equivalent of the Hebrew אָצַק) which in both the Greek and Hebrew forms mean to literally 'lead out, the New Testament text employs σώζω which means to 'rescue', 'liberate', 'keep from harm', 'heal, preserve'. This verb in the New Testament usage implies a soteriological effect of salvation rather than a literal movement from one point of state into another. Moreover, the specific object; 'the Sons of Israel' "τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ" [אֲחֵרֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל] is replaced with the more general and ambiguous 'a people' 'λαός' even without the definite article. The importance of the analysis above to this research, can be summarized as follows; 1) though Jude might have known the text in Exodus 12:51, he does not quote it verbatim. 2) He has interpreted and then contextualized the original text which he may have known in the LXX to suit the purpose of his work.

We now turn to the second text which might have informed Jude; Numbers 14:29-30, 35. The possibility of this text to have served as the resource for Jude lies in the act of disbelief exhibited by the people of Israel after the report of the spies (Numbers 14:11).⁷ In this story we discover that the people incurred the judgment of God by their lack of faith and this led to the destruction of every adult from the ages of twenty and upwards. This follows the apostasy and judgment tradition regarding disobedience and its consequent destruction of the Israelites in the wilderness as an example of sin and judgment.

The Rabbis debated and concluded that 'the spies have no share in the world to come for it is written, "Even those men that did bring up the evil report of the land died by the plague before the Lord"⁸ died in this

world; and by the plague in the world to come.⁹ And Paul's reference to the same incident as 'written down for our instruction upon whom the end of the ages has come' (1 Corinthians 10.11 RSV) seeks to buttress the fact that disbelief in the wilderness formed a traditional schema.

Similar catchwords like κύριος, λαὸν, Αἰγύπτου, πιστεύσαντας in Jude 5b can also be found in the LXX version of Numbers 14. The verse that might have attracted Jude's attention would be v.17 where Moses recounts the attribute of God as One who abounds in mercy but does not leave the guilty unpunished. One difficulty in Jude's casual reference to the Old Testament here borders on how he used the material. How much attention was given to the original context? The original context within which the wilderness disobedience happened was that of the Israelites who had been saved from bondage in Egypt but for lack of faith the elderly who were first saved were later killed. Jude dwells on this salvific and divine motifs to describe the opponents whom he exhorts the readers against. In Jude's context, the savior of the people (κύριος), the saved people and their faithlessness and the consequent divine punishment are the points of emphasis. That is to say, the Old Testament story which is in the past is used here by Jude to explain the present and to serve as a guide into the future of the eschatological people of God in the new exodus (the readers and the opponents). This usage of scripture is termed 'typology'. In light of this, the λαὸς represents the opponents who at first might have been part of the 'chosen' people but for their unbelief are marked for the inevitable judgment of the Lord. With this he helps his intended audience to realize the thin line that exists between the gracious and just sides of God. But does the author's typological exploit of this Old Testament tradition, employ the rigorous *testimonia* of the New Testament writers like in 1 Corinthians 10.4, 9 where Christ is interpreted to have been pre-existent in the salvation of Israel? Does the use of κύριος refer to Jesus or to God?

These questions hold the key of insight into determining how much of the original context of the passage was re-interpreted or maintained in Jude's typology. We shall now concentrate on the subject of the passage '[the] Lord', which has generated debate in scholarship in Jude 5. Variant versions of Jude 5b, tend to produce four different subjects; a) 'Lord' κύριος b) 'Jesus' Ἰησοῦς, c) 'God' θεός d) 'God Christ' θεός χριστός. All these appear either with the definite article or without it. The most complicated and difficult among the above extant readings is that of Ἰησοῦς due to the fact that its acceptance suggests a direct pre-existent

role of Jesus in the Exodus story. On the other hand, κύριος reading is generally favored by most English translations.¹⁰ Richard Bauckham¹¹ and Charles Landon¹² are the key scholars who have been defending this reading as the original.

To determine which reading is correct is not of prime concern here in this research. Therefore, the purpose of the variant reading is to inform how far Jude might have employed typology in his first resource. Various arguments for the two most discussed readings of κύριος and Ἰησοῦς will be summarized below. Proponents in support of the Ἰησοῦς argue that it might have been the original until a scribe who found it anachronistic and problematic to refer to Jesus as the one who saved the people out of Egypt, changed it for more general terms like θεός or κύριος.¹³ Besides, the Christological controversy that erupted in the first few centuries is cited to buttress this scribal correction. Others prefer the κύριος reading on the basis that Jude intended to draw from the Lordship of God as Judge whose role is a type of what Jesus is now exercising.¹⁴

The above arguments for and against either the ‘Lord’ or the ‘Jesus’ readings notwithstanding, it is of no doubt that Jude might have towed the line of other New Testament writers in the use of Old Testament passages to prove the pre-existence of Jesus in the Hebrew scriptures. This assertion becomes especially evident, when the sole aim of v.5 as to remind the hearers of the things they already knew is considered. But it will be well said that Jude, in v. 5 was not in any way obliged to use the specific name, Ἰησοῦς in order to indicate his intent of high Christology. Again it is possible that Jude in his use of the Exodus story may have preferred the LXX rendering of the ‘Kurios’. Here, care needs to be taken in explaining the extent of typology in his use of the scripture because an over emphasis could result in an allegorical interpretation instead.

Thus Jude’s typological treatment of the Old Testament passage was for the aim of producing a type of saved people who later faced the wrath of God. Hence the reference to ‘the Lord’ as a type of Jesus is one of implied or intrinsic meaning than an explicit defense of a high Christology or a *testimonia*. His reference to the scriptures is one of allusion. Thus in spite of Jude’s lack of definite reference to the saving work of Christ, he undoubtedly implies it. The citation is indicated by the use of ὅτι. He first uses a common knowledge of the deliverance of the people of Israel from Egyptian bondage, and juxtaposes the Old Testament stories to suit his objective of keeping his audience reminded of divine judgment on unbelievers. Hermeneutical work in the two fragments of the

source materials of Jude are also comparatively put together by the use of τὸ δεύτερον. The type of inner Biblical exegesis is typology.

Sodom and Gomorrah (v.7)

In his first triplets Jude makes reference to three passages of which Sodom and Gomorrah are included as follows;

Jude 1:7 ὡς Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον τοῦ ἴτοις ἐκπορνεύσασαι καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας, πρόκειται δείγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκην ὑπέχουσαι

‘Just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them, in like manner like these, having given themselves wholly to sexual immorality even having gone after a different kind of flesh, are set forth as example of undergoing punishment of eternal fire.’

In his two previous examples, Jude compares the behavior of his opponents to that of the people of Israel during their wilderness journey which incurred the wrath of the Lord due to their unbelief. By this Jude draws the curtain on impending divine judgment on the opponents. The third description of the opponents is geared towards some *sins* they commit which have precedences in scripture (i.e. the fallen Angels and the people of Sodom and Gomorrah). These two illustrations are in fact linked together by the authors introductory¹⁵ comparative particle ὡς. In exploring Jude’s use of Sodom and Gomorrah in v.7 two main questions need to be answered. First, what are the resources from which Jude draws this third illustration? And secondly, how does he adopt the original material in his writing?

The primary story about Sodom and Gomorrah as narrated in Genesis 19:1-29 served as an archetype of divine judgment in the Bible, other Jewish and in early Christian writings.¹⁶ To summarize reference to this story in the Old Testament, some of the quotes seem to put emphasis on the desolate lands of Sodom and Gomorrah and its neighboring town as an example of how the disobedient in God would become (Cf. Deuteronomy 29:23; Jeremiah 23:14, 49:18; 50:40; and Zephaniah 2:9). Other scriptural references also mention casually the ingenuity of either Sodom alone or both (cf. Isaiah 1:9, 10; Lamentations 4:6; Hosiah 11:8; Amos 4:11; Ezekiel 16:46-59). Hence, Jude’s reference here is from the most common among all the other resources he employs in the letter. The Principle of the destruction dished up as a specimen of divine judgment is what underlies the various uses of the Genesis story in other materials. A similar trend follows in the New Testament’s usage. However the New

Testament employs the Sodom and Gomorrah episode as God's severest judgment ever meted out to the disobedient but cannot be compared to the wrath that would be poured out to sinners on the return of Jesus (Matthew 10:15; Luke 10:12; 17:29; Romans 9:29 and 2 Peter 2:6). Worthy to note is the fact that apart from the primary story in Genesis 19 and its subsequent use in Jude 7, all the other references to it neither state nor explain in particular, specific act(s) that wrought the fire from heaven unto the people. Sodom and Gomorrah also feature in the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, the apocrypha and in the works of Philo and Josephus.¹⁷

Points of emphases in these references do not significantly vary from the above observations made about the Old and the New Testaments' handling of the episode. Richard Bauckham observes that the sites of the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah that might have been located on the south of the Dead Sea (a place of sulfurous eruptions), could have accounted for their frequent citation.¹⁸ It is thus clear that Jude by this illustration was utilizing an age-long conventional scheme of sin and divine judgment.

However Jude is quite unique in his reference when compared to others in the Old Testament in the sense that he states the specific sin that led to the burning of the cities as *ἐκπορνείσασθαι καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας*. It must be noted that Jude had in mind the story in Genesis 19 and used it as a type of sin and divine judgment akin to that of his opponents. But he literarily does not depend on either the LXX or the MT. Having established this, we now turn our focus to how the author used the material he knew to fit his intended characterization of the opponents.

Commentators are divided on the import of this sin typology of Jude. Jerome Neyrey argues that the story of Sodom and Gomorrah is drawn by Jude to condemn homosexuality, the offence of which the opponents were guilty.¹⁹ Richard Bauckham contrarily, is of the view that Jewish traditions about Sodom and Gomorrah scarcely specify homosexual practice as their sin²⁰. Instead, the inhabitants of the cities were condemned for their disregard for hospitality and hatred for strangers, of which sexual immorality is on a general undertone.²¹ Davids more recently has followed the argument of Bauckham but concludes that homosexuality might have been on the mind of Jude.²² In search of a clearer understanding about what Jude meant by the story, one may ask how far other Jewish traditions can be useful in interpreting Jude 7 since there is no indication of literary dependence on them. Homosexuality in the context of Sodom and Gomorrah are often drawn from the Old Testament passage based on the assumption that those who surrounded the

house of Lot were ‘men’ (ἄνδρες/ מַנְשֵׁי) who were looking for the ‘men’ that came into the house that night (Genesis 19:4,5). Their sole intention was to ‘know’ (γινῶσκω /συγγίνομαι) them. This verb is used both in the Old and in the New Testaments to mean ‘to have sexual intercourse’. Lot’s response to the ‘men’ is very instructive of this meaning. However as has been observed above, many of the inner biblical usages of this incident alter it to suit their various purposes.

Hence, to conclude that Jude was implying the original context of the material he knew cannot be fairly warranted. The preceding example in v.7, makes use of the verb ἐκπορνεύω which means ‘to indulge in immorality.’ This word is vital in determining how Jude contextualized the Old Testament material in his piece of writing. The verb ἐκπορνεύω is a compound, made up of πορνεύω and ἐκ. Though it is used only here in the New Testament,²³ *porneuo* without the preposition *ek* is common in the New Testament.²⁴ It generally depicts an act of engaging in ‘sexual immorality’, ‘fornication’ or ‘prostitution’. Jude here uses the prepositional prefix *ek* (out, from within), to first emphasize the self willingness of the men of the cities of the plain to give themselves up for *porneuo* (sexual immorality). Thus Sodom and Gomorrah, the cities around them, just as the fallen angels in v.6 have indulged in a conscientious act of immorality. It can therefore be said that Jude in this instance views the offence and punishment of the fallen angels in the same way as he does for Sodom and Gomorrah. That is to say, in as much as the angels gave themselves up to licentiousness and changed their natural state, likewise did the people of Sodom and Gomorrah and the surrounding cities indulge in immoral behavior to the extent of seeking to ‘know’ angels. On a clearer note, the impact of the previous prototype sin of the angels and its inter-connection with the Sodom and Gomorrah type obviously shows a blatant sexual immorality. However, implied same-gender sexual relations are not certain here.²⁵ Rather, it is the unashamed self-willed behavior of the men of Sodom and Gomorrah who also were inflamed by carnal passions to go as far wanting to have sexual relation with angels (i.e. what Jude means by σαρκὸς ἑτέρας) and the subsequent judgment pronounced on them by the Lord that Jude seeks to concern himself with. This understanding is consistent with similar use of both stories in *Testament of Naphtali* 3:4,5 where the fallen angels and the men of Sodom and Gomorrah are thought to have altered the natural order of things. By this the author uses Sodom and Gomorrah and the surrounding cities’ deviant act as an archetype of sin and divine judgment in the past

which serves an *αἰώνιος* (eternal) specimen for his present audience. It is therefore clear that Jude here again applies typology in his treatment of scripture. But the style here differs in the sense that he uses the first referenced work to determine the import of a succeeding one, at the same time.

Cain, Balaam and Korah (v.11)

‘οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς, ὅτι τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Κάιν ἐ πορεύθησαν καὶ τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν καὶ τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κόρε ἀπώλοντο.’

‘Woe to them! For they have gone on the way of Cain and because of reward, they poured themselves out into the error of Balaam and have perished in the Rebellion of Korah.’

In the aforementioned set of scriptural allusions (vv. 5-7), Jude uses ‘simile’ the simplest element of comparison by the conjunction *as* or *like*. The careful reader observes that from verse 11, the tone of the letter changes into more sophisticated comparisons such as ‘metaphors’, ‘oxymoron’, ‘onomatopoeia’ and others. This sets the stage for a direct attack on the character of the opponents. In the scheme of things, Jude builds up the momentum as he now uses the more specific οὗτοι (these) from verse 8. It is in this setting that the next triplets of verse 11 function.

Jude 11 begins with a declaration of misery or woe on the opponents (οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς). This introductory woe has been described as similar to what was used in the Old Testament times as woe *oracle* or *cry*.²⁶ It links well the opponents’ disbelief (v.5) and defilement (v.7, 8) to their consequent incurrance of the wrath or curse of God that Jude wants to prevail on his readers. The author lines-up his good reasons for proclaiming the woe unto his challengers in the three biblical figures of Cain, Balaam and Korah, to whom we now concentrate.

Cain recurs sixteen times in Genesis 4 and does not appear anywhere else in the Old Testament until the New Testament (Hebrews 11:4; 1 John 3:12; Jude 11). Cain’s narrative flows along with his brother Abel in the Old Testament but the point that is of interest to us is when he and his brother brought sacrifices before the Lord. While Cain brought proceeds from the land (מִפְרֵי הָאֲדָמָה Genesis 4.3), Abel brought first born fat from his flock (מִבְּכֹרוֹת צֹאֲנוֹ וּמִחֶלְבֶּתֶן Genesis 4.4) which was accepted by God at the expense of the one from Cain. God’s rejection of Cain’s offering according to the scriptures, developed into the first murder recorded in the Bible committed by Cain. This act made him become the premiere murderer.

Upon reading the Old Testament account about Cain, one may be tempted to conclude that Jude depended on it to portray the opponents as full of envy and murderous instincts. However, this assertion will be too early and a hasty conclusion on the grounds that Jude's exploit of Cain in v. 11 (they have followed the way of Cain) is open enough to accommodate many other viable possibilities.

In extra-biblical Jewish materials, interpretations on the character of Cain in Genesis develop beyond being a murderer. He is in some writings like the Testament of Benjamin depicted as a model of envy and abhorrence towards one's brother, and a paragon of punishment by God.²⁷ For Josephus, Cain is the greatest sleaze of human beings because 'he incited to luxury and pillage on all whom he met, and became their instructor in wicked practices.'²⁸ He was equally guilty of greed, violence and lust.²⁹ In the eyes of Philo, Cain is a representation of egocentricism.³⁰ All the above characterizations of Cain might have influenced Jude to compare him to his opponents. Moreover, it is likely Jude knew the haggadic expansions of the story of Cain in the Targumim. In these Cain is seen as a prototype of a religious skeptic.³¹ To sum it up, though the Old Testament text is silent on how and why (explicitly) Cain slew (הרג) his brother Abel, Jewish traditions sought to fill in the gap with the reason of envy. It is upon this that he is portrayed as a *type* and an ungodly mentor who survives as a teacher of sin. Thus Jude by stating that the opponents have gone on the way of Cain' (τῆ ὁδῶ τοῦ Κάϊνε πορεύθησαν), sought to draw the readers' attention to the examples of Cain as expounded in Jewish traditions as above with the Cain episode in Genesis as the underlying factor. For this purpose, the author employs the deponent verb πορεύω (to live, go, proceed, conduct one's self) to denote the progressive nature of the path adopted by the opponents and the certainty of it leading to their destruction.³² It can be concluded that Jude in citing this Biblical character, first uses him as a type in an allusion that does not refer to the murderous (הרג) act recorded in the Old Testament primarily, but to the haggadic Jewish tradition of interpretations about him. This is a typological use of scripture involving no particular literary relationships neither to the Old Testament nor the other extra biblical writings.

The mention and function of Balaam is much different from that of Cain in Jude's hermeneutics. However he has strategically arranged these Biblical characters to show the essence of sin and judgment occurring in chain, from the lowest level unto the highest. He introduces Balaam at this

stage of his writing also as a type of the opponents. Following this pattern of thought, he describes them as having τῆ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαάμ μισθοῦ ἐξέχουθσαν. But does this picture of Balaam occur in the Old Testament? If it does not, what could possibly be the influencing material for Jude's exegesis?

The story of Balaam is found in Numbers 22-24. The previous chapter ends with people of Israel defeating and taking possession of the cities of the Amorites after they refused them entry through their land (Numbers 21:21-35). Chapter 22 begins with Israel having journeyed and encamped in the plains of Moab. The settling of Israel on the plains of Moab coupled with the news of their previous victories over the surrounding nations ignited much fear in Balak, Son of Zippor, the king of Moab (vv.1-3). Out of disillusion, Balak sought to devise an interesting strategy of contracting Balaam 'Son of Beor' (with the promise of wealth), to curse Israel (vv.4-8), instead of fighting them as the other nations did and were subdued. The story can be divided into two major sections; Balak's effort to woo Balaam (vv.22:5-41), and Balaam's attempt to curse Israel (23-24). Other references to Balaam in the Old Testament are generally downbeat.³³ These interpretations are no different in the New Testament.³⁴

What could have justified such presuppositions against Balaam? On the surface several issues in Numbers 22-24, seem to give backing to these conclusions. First the elder who carried the King's message to Balaam according to English translations, 'departed with the fees for divination in their hand...' (Numbers 27. 7a NASB).³⁵ However the Hebrew מִסְכָּר (MT) and Greek μαντεῖα (LXX) ³⁶ words translated as fees could equally mean 'instrument' or 'tools for divination.' Balaam's willingness to go with the Elders of Moab against the express command of God not to do so seems to support his avarice. In all these it is remarkable that Numbers 22-24 in itself does not give a bad portrait of Balaam³⁷ especially at the end of the story where the two persons (Balak and Balaam) went their separate ways.

Jewish traditional exegeses equally vilify Balaam as having accepted the invitation of Balak out of greed for the large rewards promised him. In these Balaam embodies a type of hatred, greed, recalcitrance, villainy and a lack of understanding and discernment into the will of God.³⁸ To relate all the above portraits, it can be said that Jude's reference to Balaam is dependent on the various Jewish interpretations about him rather than on the primary story in Numbers 22-

24. The author thus continues to refer to Balaam's error of loving a reward for mischief metaphorically as measuring up to the present behavior of the opponents. Jude highlights aspects of the Biblical account (especially Numbers 31:16) and the traditional Jewish schema.

The next in the tri-example is Korah. The antagonists of Jude having gone (ἐπορεύθησαν) on the way of Cain, gave up themselves to wander in the errors of Balaam for profit, in this third instance perishing in the rebellion of Korah, τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κόρε ἀπώλοντο. Among the three examples, this rebellion is the most explicit illustration of insubordination in the Old Testament. This story features primarily in Numbers 16:1-35; 29:9,10, where Korah, flanked by Dathan and Abiram led an insurrection against Moses and Aaron. From this story Korah (and the others) spearheaded the incident and their being consumed by fire and earthquake becomes a classic epitaphs of sin and its destruction. This demonstration is partly supported by the basic story and Jewish commentaries on it. The Targumim attribute the beginning of *schism in Israel* to Korah, Dathan, and Abiram.³⁹ Korah thus was seen as a natural model and mastermind of dissension.⁴⁰

This use of Korah as a type is often understood as Jude's ploy to accuse the opponents as heretics or of rebels against ecclesiastical authority. This, in one way or the other, narrows the overall effect of the typology Jude seeks to achieve with these scriptural figures. Just as the opponents cannot be loosely called 'murderers' (in the case of Cain), or 'false Prophets' (in the instance of Balaam), so the opponents cannot be necessarily called church heretics. Instead Jude employs these characters to depict classes of sin against God and man and the certainty of divine punishment.

Overall, although Jude uses Old Testament characters and themes, he neither quotes them directly nor follows the immediate contexts in which the passages functioned. Thus, the type of quotation employed by the writer is allusion. Also the author's treatment of scripture is in the sense of eschatological typology. In this, events of divine salvation and judgment in the Old Testament's Biblical history is principally interpreted to serve as prototypical examples for the final events of divine deliverance and judgment in current situations of the Christian church. Jude in essence, interprets event and behavior than texts. For this hermeneutic presupposition, the author finds in the fickle-minded wilderness generation, the cities of the plain, Cain, Balaam and Korah as traditional schema of sin and judgment. His exegesis here is akin to the broad-

spectrum of practice in early Christianity of picturing such figures as archetypes of Christian apostates and divine judgments. In his treatment of source-materials, Jude shows a great flexibility in synthesis. More so, the arrangement of source-materials in triplets, order of intensity as well as the use of catchwords are essential indistinguishable ingredients to the literary scheme of Jude.

The Use of the Pseudepigrapha

The rebellious angels (v. 6)

Jude's second example in the first triads concerns angels who abandoned their 'ἀρχήν' (domain, rule or sphere of influence) these have been eternally fettered in utter darkness for the *κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας*. With this, the author emphasizes the certainty of the Lord's judgment, in that if He did not spare rebellious angels in the past, he definitely would not spare current rebels of his day. Some commentaries opine that in employing this example, Jude copies the story in Genesis 6:2, where בני־האלהים (Sons of God) who saw the בנות־האדם (Daughters of men) whom they chose for wives, are thought to be the fallen angels in the book of Watchers (1 Enoch 6-10).⁴¹ However the parallel and contrast in Jude 6 are enlightening in the case for different primary sources for Jude. The use of the definite article in the first two phrases of the verse: τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχήν and τοῦ ἰδίου κλητήριον in addition to the two pronouns ἑαυτῶν and ἰδίον emphasizes the specific place and exalted position allotted to them as their personal possession. In verse 6b the link is drawn between the angels' disinclination to τηρήσαντας (aorist active) and their domain which necessitated their being τετήρηκεν (perfect active). Hence the angels having failed to keep their home and dominion once and for all in the past have been kept in the dark without the least chance of reverting back to the former. These make it clear that the specific purpose of Jude 6 is not to identify the sins of the angels (be it sexual relations or whatever) rather, it seeks to highlight the abnormal abandonment of their appointed domain and the certainty of their securely reserved judgment.

In that light, Jude 6 is reminiscent of 1 Enoch in terms of verbal parallels and in apocalyptic motif. Chapters 6-19 of 1 Enoch, recount how angels who were attracted to daughters of men relinquished their abode and duty in heaven, descended unto 'Ardis which is the summit of Mount Hermon' (1 Enoch 10:4) and committed adultery with them. In response to these grievous sins of the angels, the Lord ordered Raphael (the leading angel in heaven) to bind Azazel (the leader of the rebellious angels) by his

hands and his feet and throw him into darkness forever, that on the great day of judgment, he may be thrown into the fire ,καὶ τῷ Ῥαφαήλ εἶπεν· Δῆσον τὸν Ἄζαήλ ποσὶν καὶ χερσίν καὶ βάλε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ σκότος, 1 Enoch 10:4-7). The connection between Jude 6 and 1 Enoch cannot be underestimated. Jude 6a describes the sins of the fallen angels as one of forsaking their own ἀρχὴν and οἰκητήριον (meaning, their ‘rule’ or ‘position’ and their ‘house’ or ‘abode’). Jude’s language here is similar to 1 Enoch 12:4 ‘...the watchers...who have left the high heaven and the holy eternal place’. Interestingly the same verb for ‘leaving’ is used in both texts (ἀπολιπόντες in 1 Enoch 12:4 and ἀπολιπόντας Jude 6a). Further parallels can be found in Jude 6b which tells of the punishments pronounced on the angels after they deserted their abode. Jude describes them as having been kept in ‘chains into darkness eternally’, this is reminiscent of 1 Enoch 10:4-6. Finally, the fallen angels said to have been kept until ‘the great day of judgment’ also reflects the book of Watchers, (1 Enoch 10:7; 84:4; 94:9; 98:10; 99:15; 104:5).⁴² These striking similarities lead to the conclusion that Jude is dependent on the Book of Enoch in the example of v. 6. Though there is no direct quotation to any of the texts listed above, he undeniably takes up their description and contextualizes it to meet his present circumstances. He uses the Enochic story also as a type of defiance in the past serving lasting caution to the present. This indirectly relays his affection and trust in the pseudepigrapha as true and authoritative material.

Michael and the Devil, (v. 9)

After the clearer examples of the Exodus, the cities of the plain, and the fallen angels, Jude in verse 9 takes up a story that may sound unfamiliar to modern readers. This makes verse 9 eligible for full citation and discussion. The point of interest here thus, is to determine the probable source material of Jude and how the original material may have been re-used in his epistle. Jude 9 reads:

Ὁ δὲ Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος, ὅτε τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωϋσέως σώματος, οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφημίας ἀλλὰ εἶπεν· ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι κύριος.’

‘But Michael the Archangel, when he was contending with the devil concerning the body of Moses, dared not to bring slanderous accusation against him, instead he said ‘[the] Lord rebuke you’.⁴³

At this point Jude refers to a story very familiar to him as well as to his audience. Three elements in this verse suggest an allusion to one of

the popular traditions about the death and burial of Moses: Μιχαήλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος; the διελέγετο between Michael and the devil over the body of Moses; and the response of Michael: ἐπι τιμήσαι σοι κύριος. In the Old Testament the text that gives the account of Moses' death and burial is Deuteronomy 34:1-6. In this Moses dies and he is buried not by Michael but as later Rabbinic source emphasizes, but by 'none other than God himself' (*Mishna Sota*1:9). This account ends with the statement that no 'man knows his grave unto this day' (v.6). Jude could not have relied on this biblical account for two reasons; 1) Michael and his dispute over Moses' body is neither stated nor alluded to in this passage. 2) Jude's reference to Moses' body does not show any interest in the whereabouts or otherwise of Moses' burial. Besides Deuteronomy, a challenge between the devil and the chief angel of God are also attested to in Zechariah 3:1-5. The passage depicts a vision of a court room in which Zechariah sees Joshua, 'the great Priest' standing before the angel of the Lord. ἰψῶ (accuser, adversary, or Satan) is also spotted alongside ready to accuse Joshua, but הַיְהוָה declares, the Lord rebuke you Satan...' This contention and the subsequent rebuke might have formed the background to the rebuke of the devil in the case of Michael and the angel in the Moses traditions. However it differs in both content and context of Jude's usage. In Jude's letter Michael is explicitly mentioned as the archangel who resorts to the Lord to rebuke the devil. But in Zechariah's vision it is Yahweh himself that declares the rebuke. More so, the body of Moses which is paramount in Jude 9 is never in the context of Zechariah. These do not make it a possible option for Jude to have cited.

In turning our attention to other writings about Moses traditions in the apocrypha, the *Testament of Moses* is the next to be considered. There was a proliferation of Moses traditions in both mainstream and sectarian Judaism. Philo⁴⁴ and Clement⁴⁵ both recount Moses death with the former indicating that Moses could predict his ascension to heaven after his death and the latter relaying that Joshua and Caleb witnessed his spiritual ascension to heaven while his corpse was buried in the mountains. Collections of Old Testament apocrypha give two titles for stories about the death and burial of Moses: the *Assumption of Moses* and *Testament of Moses* with different emphasis. These titles are for one manuscript that is extant but not entirely complete.⁴⁶ The earliest assertion of the source of Jude 9 was made by the Alexandrian fathers: Origen, Clement and Didymus the blind. They maintained that Jude quoted from the *Assumption of Moses*. But scholars generally hold that Jude's reference

here is to the Testament of Moses instead. Irrespective of the description one gives to the Milan manuscript, our understanding of the contest between Michael and the devil over Moses' body is not enhanced by it due to its abrupt ending. In an attempt to reconstruct the lost ending of the Testament/Assumption of Moses, Richard Bauckham has pulled together variety of later writings to reflect both titles. Below is an excerpt of texts that are suggested to have been the lost ending of the Testament of Moses:

Joshua accompanied Moses up Mount Nebo, where God showed Moses the land of promise. Moses then sent Joshua back, saying, "Go down to the people and tell them that Moses is dead." when Joshua had gone down to the people, Moses died. God sent the archangel Michael to remove the body of Moses to another place and bury it there, but Samma'el, the devil opposed him, disputing Moses' right to honorable burial[. . .] Michael and the devil disputed over the body. The devil slandered Moses, charging him with murder, because he slew the Egyptian and hid him in the sand [Exodus2:11-12]. But Michael, not tolerating the slander against Moses, said, 'May the Lord rebuke you, Satan!' at that the devil took flight, and Michael removed the body to the place commanded by God. Thus no one saw the burial-place of Moses.⁴⁷

The texts put together reveal the primary concern of the devil to bring to bear the dent on the character of Moses that disqualifies him from receiving the befitting burial of a patriarch: his killing of the Egyptian. Such reconstructions from latter literature are helpful in giving in detail the full story about the main points of contention between Michael and the devil. But they fail to determine the material Jude knew, and cannot be entirely relied on for two reasons. In the first place, the overt relationship to the sources from which Bauckham quotes is difficult to verify. Again, because they are mostly commentaries on Jude, they tend to be all too speculative. Alternatively it could well be argued that these commentators either referred to unknown resources or wrote down the traditional folklore available to them.

The illustration in Jude 9 only captures the dispute between Michael and the devil which might have been the only relevant section that suits the author's purpose. Hence the author assumes the familiarity of his readers and consigns attempts to link various burial and assumption paradigms of the Moses traditions to uncertainty at least in this verse. That is to say, finding the exact source from which Jude cites in verse 9 is still

uncertain. It is possible that Jude might have alluded to an oral folklore that was known to both his readers and himself instead of relying on a particular piece of writing either in the Old Testament or in the pseudepigrapha. But for lack of evidence to support this, Bauckham's reconstruction is best maintained.

Interesting connections can be observed among Jude's characterization of the opponents in verses 8, 9, and 10. These enhance the understanding of how Jude used this Moses paradigm in verses 9. The exegesis of the author in v. 8, plays a dual role. It first serves as a commentary on verses 5-7 and secondly as statements of indictment that necessitate both the illustrations of the verse 9 and the commentary in verse 10. The writer describes in detail the acts of the godless men in three ways (in v.8): they 'defile flesh' (*μία ίνουσιν σάρκα*); 'reject Lordship' (*ἀθετοῦσιν κυριότητα*); and 'blaspheme glories' (*βλασφημοῦσιν δόξας*). Analyzing them from the reverse side, the opponents' defiling of flesh echoes the ungodly act of the men of Sodom and Gomorrah (v.7). Their rejection of authority and reviling of glorious ones are identical with the rebellion of the angels (v.6). This contextual flow is justified by the author's use in v.8, the oxymoron: *Ὀμοίως* (Likewise, same manner) and *μέντοι* (yet, however). On the other hand, the presence of *βλασφημέω* (to revile, slander, defame) in vv.8, 10 coupled with the nominal usage of the same verb, makes the second role of v.8 vivid. One thing worthy of note is Jude's use of *μέν. . .δε. . . δε* in verse 8. He craftily divides the list of evils of his opponents between: *σάρκα μὲν μία ίνουσιν* on one hand and the two on the other: *κυριότητα δε ἀθετοῦσιν ανδ δόξας δε βλασφημοῦσιν*. The former primarily revolves around the immoral attitude of the opponents while the latter two concern their rejection of authority of God and his messengers. It is the second part of the division, for which Jude employs the encounter of Michael and the devil over the body of Moses (v.9), followed by the commentary of verse 10.

With this background the effect of verse 9 becomes clearer. In this possible use of the lost ending of the *Testament of Moses*, the writer first assumes the familiarity of his readers to the traditions he is quoting. He thus glosses over in actual sense, the statements of the devil that made him deserve a defaming judgment. For his intended reasons, Jude straightaway moves on to pick and choose from the familiar Moses story, portions that illuminate his already castigating account of Jude 8b. In this, the role of Michael the archangel (*ἀρχάγγελος*), preferring not to act on his own to pronounce a blaspheming judgment on the devil, but referring it to the

Lord is contrasted with the opponents. That is to say, while Michael, in spite of his position, recognized the authority of the Lord as the only person to rebuke the devil, these opponents, ‘slander the things which they do not understand’ in one breath and ‘the things which they know by instinct like unreasoning animals’(v.10). Jude therefore found in this Pseudepigraphon, an explicatory tool with which he taps for his intended purpose. Though this usage of the material does not outwardly buttress it as an inspired work, his presumed familiarity as well as that of his readers presupposes that, the *Testament of Moses* or the tradition about Moses’ death was well available and respected in the context of the audience. Jude in comparing the godless men to the relation of Michael to the authority of the Lord also amounts to the non biblical story as a type of current personalities in his churches.

The Book of 1 Enoch (vv.14-15)

After a full description of the apostates, in verses 5-10, Jude ushers in the next stage of his polemic with a declaration of woes unto them in verse 11-12. In these verses, the certainty of divine judgment on the godless men has been expressed in the types leaving it for the reader or the interpreter to infer it as an undertone. Emerging from the indirect use of scripture and other non - biblical sources in the earlier verses, the exegesis in the epistle reaches its climax with the author’s appeal to a divine prediction (vv.14-15), in which the judgment of the opponent has been long prophesied. Jude 14, 15 forms the only precise quotation in the exegesis of Jude in the entire letter. This prophetic reference is generally accepted as a citation from 1 Enoch 1:9. But the kind of quotation (whether it is verbatim, a paraphrase or an allusion), plus what motivated the author to use this pseudepigrapha, and the intended purpose of this Enochic prophecy are still unclear. These therefore are the main focus of this section. In pursuit of this agendum, the texts of I Enoch and Jude 14, 15 will carefully be compared to find the points of similarity and differences. Conclusions about the purpose of Jude’s use of the material will be drawn from the outcome.

The book of Enoch wielded much influence and respect in both Jewish and early Christian writings with particular emphasis on Enoch who, according to Genesis 5:4-20 and Hebrews 11:5 is the first patriarch who was translated to heaven without tasting death. The Book of Enoch thus constitutes traditions about the expeditions of Enoch in heaven. This work has survived mainly in the Ethiopic and Greek versions. A discovery

of its fragments among the Qumran scrolls has also added to modern understanding of it in Aramaic also. We will here dwell on English translations of the Aramaic and the Ethiopic versions alongside the Greek text and the New Testament text for our analysis.

Jude begins: ‘And now it is for these that Enoch, the Seventh from Adam prophesied, saying “Behold the Lord appeared with myriad of his holy ones”(v.14). The writer announces the new stage of his polemic and connects to the exegetical sections of verses 5-13 with the current part by the use of δὲ καὶ. Again, in order to contextualize the words foretold by Enoch, Jude deliberately utilizes the dative pronoun τούτοις⁴⁸ ‘to or for these’. By this Jude seeks to interpret the statement of Enoch as that which was made even in its original context exclusively for ‘these’ apostates. Jude adds an appellation to Enoch as being the ‘seventh’ (ἑβδομος) from Adam. This description at first sight brings to mind the ancient antediluvian Enoch whose account is recorded in Genesis 5:221-32.

However, the use of this designation in the book of Enoch itself, reveals its symbolism, (Cf. 1 Enoch 60: 8; 93:3). The phrase ‘the seventh from Adam’ as used by Adam could possibly have arisen from the Jews’ traditional fondness for the number ‘seven’ and their inclusive reckoning.⁴⁹ The author of Jude therefore does adopt this ‘perfect’ number, perhaps to stress the special status of Enoch which gives credence to his prophecy.

Moreover, Jude provides the lens through which he reads the apocalyptic literature of 1 Enoch in the application of the verb προφητεύω to Enoch. In Jude’s mind Enoch is a prophet, a role not present in both the Biblical and non-Biblical accounts on Enoch. This gives backing to a case for 1 Enoch as inspired scripture in the circles of Jude and his audience. At this stage, Jude marks the distinction between his commentary section in verse 14a and the actual reference in verse 14b when he uses the present participle active with a semicolon: λέγων (saying;).

Jude 14b-15 has several points of similarities and differences with the other texts of the Book of Enoch. Comparison between verse 14b-15 and the various texts of 1 Enoch 1:9, as will be done below seeks to answer two basic questions: 1) does Jude follow the Greek text of 1 Enoch or is he dependent on other versions? 2) Does Jude use differently the original material for his purposes?⁵⁰

In the table in the appendix below, while the Greek text of Jude 14b begins with ἰδοὺ (Behold) the Greek text of the 1 Enoch reads ὅτι. The reconstructed Qumran text provides ‘when’. Jude here thus agrees with the

Ethiopic text against the Greek and the Qumran texts of Enoch. Jude appropriately begins with ἰδοὺ to specifically herald his all important message of the certainty of doom for the ungodly. This is similar to the Hebrew הִנֵּה which is used in the Old Testament to declare important message that follows it in a statement or in the passage. Hence Jude at this initial stage reflects the Old Testament. Again, the next significant difference between Jude and the other text of Jude is the tense of the verb ἔρχομαι (to come, go or appear). Whereas the Greek Enochic text agrees with the use of third person present indicative singular; ἔρχεται, Jude makes use of the third person aorist active in the Qumran and Ethiopic texts, Jude differs in using the third person aorist active. Though the same root verb is used, the specific reason for the variation needs to be noted. It has been argued that in using the aorist tense, the author did not necessarily intend to refer to a past theophany but to a future event instead. Further observations reveal that Jude's ἦλθεν reflects a Semitic idiom- 'proleptic aorist'⁵¹ (an aorist indicative that is used to express an event which is not past as already accomplished).⁵² Although this usage might not have been common in Aramaic, Matthew Black has conjectured that 'the Lord is coming' is the *Maranatha* version in Aramaic (a mantra which depicts the impending judgment of the Lord in the New Testament.)⁵³ The relevance of this concept is that Jude might have had access to the lost word in the Qumran Aramaic (which is supplied by Milik as *when He comes*) and translated the same idea when he used the aorist; ἦλθεν instead of the present- ἔρχεται. Thus Jude is closer to the Aramaic text of Enoch.

The supply of the 'subject' of the verb ἦλθεν in Jude also needs to be considered. All the versions of 1 Enoch above fail to plainly state the subject of the verb or the one who is coming. The individual is assumed in the third person of the verb. But Jude bluntly provides 'kurios' (Lord) for a subject. This is an obvious clever adaption of the Enochic literature to the present circumstance of Jude. It envisages his theological and Christological presuppositions as he read and interpreted the original material. Jude in this instance does not stray from the *testimonia* hermeneutics of the primitive Christian community which applied theophanic passages of the Old Testament to the *parousia* (Cf. Isaiah 40:10/Revelation 22:12; Isaiah 19:13, 15; Zechariah 14:5/ 1 Thessalonians 3:13 and Isaiah 66:15/ 2 Thessalonians 1:7). Similarly, Jude in agreement with the Aramaic and the Ethiopic Enoch utilizes, ἐν ἀγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ 'with myriads of His holy ones' against the Greek version of 1

Enoch 1:9. The associative ἐν⁵⁴ best gives the Semitic impact of Jude's portrait of the manner of the Lord's return over σὸν which is used in the Greek version of Enoch. It emphasizes the unity of purpose within the heavenly host to pronounce judgment on the ungodly. This shows that Jude tilts towards both the reconstructed Qumran text and the Ethiopic Enoch but does not follow the Greek.

In the Greek, Ethiopic and the Aramaic texts of the 1 Enoch above, the purposes of God's coming are three: i) to judge, ii) to destroy and iii) to convict. However in Jude 15 we see Jude wittingly leaving out ἀπολέσει πάντας τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς, καὶ and maintain ἐλέγξει πᾶσαν in the Greek text of Enoch. On his second alteration of the original material, Jude replaces σάρκα with ψυχήν and shortens the rest of the passage. By substituting 'every flesh' for 'every soul' the generic effect of the former is subsumed in the latter. The implication of these reworkings on the source material is that the author has customized the Enochic material to fit the ἀσεβεῖς (ungodly) already mentioned in Jude 4.

The careful modification and the subsequent resemblance of the Enochic literature with Jude 14, 15 is entirely different from Jude's treatment of the other materials already discussed. As such, it can be concluded that it is the clearest adoption of a material. Jude was independent of the Greek text of 1 Enoch 1:9 in most parts of verse 15 and closer to the Aramaic text in verse 14. Hence Jude might have possibly had access to the two texts of the same literature with which he worked.⁵⁵ Moreover, Jude quotes the Enoch source neither verbatim nor merely as allusion/paraphrase. Rather, he has adapted it for his purposes. His exegesis includes a rigorous combination of redaction, literary and grammatical criticisms, though these may sound anachronistic to the ancient mind. Again, the apocalyptic nature of the specific eschatological passage in 1 Enoch 1:9 plus the familiarity of the material to both himself and the readers must have been the points of attraction for the explicit use. That is to say 1 Enoch 1:9 on a higher note might have formed an integral unit of Jude's pre-literary material.

Conclusion

We have tried to examine Jude's use and treatment of his source materials which tend to come from scripture (in the wider sense to include both canonical and extra Biblical books). The analyses reveal that the author of the epistle employed Old Testament examples and figures such as Israel in the wilderness verse 5; Sodom and Gomorrah and its

surrounding cities verse 7 and Cain, Balaam and Korah v.11. In citing these motifs and figures in his writing, Jude does not quote verbatim. He only alludes and uses them as archetypes of sin and divine judgment. He interprets the materials and gives them the needed eschatological effect. Jude's exegesis is akin to the Jewish style of *Midrash* and the Qumran *Pesher* exegesis.

Jude also uses pseudepigraphal materials of 1 Enoch verses 6, 14-15 and the Testament of Moses or folklore regarding Moses verse 9. His treatment of the Moses paradigm does not differ from that of the Old Testament. It is of no doubt that Jude uses the Testament of Moses for an illustration but the fondness with which he cites it presupposes that it was a material held in esteem and well known to the author and his readers. 1 Enoch is used in verse 6 as an allusion to the fallen angels in the book of the watchers. This is treated typologically. The second usage includes the Lord's return to judge the ungodly, 1 Enoch 1:9. In this, Jude neither quotes verbatim nor merely alludes to it. Instead he carefully adapts the source material to suit his present purpose of pronouncing divine judgment on his opponents.

On the whole Jude deals with these extra-biblical materials as authoritative writings that may have been respected by Jude and his readers.

Notes and References

-
- ¹ James A. Sanders, "Intertextuality and Dialogue," *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 29 (1999), 25–28.
- ² Kenneth G. Strenstrup, "Scripture and Interpretive Method: Why Read Scripture as a Canon," *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 33 (2003), 158.
- ³ Charles J. Daryl, "Jude's Use of Pseudepigraphal Source-Material as Part of a Literary Strategy," *New Testament Studies* 37 (1991), 130–145.
- ⁴ Charles J. Daryl, "The Use of Tradition-Material in the Epistle of Jude," *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 4 (1994), 1–14.
- ⁵ Web L. Robert, "The Eschatology of the Epistle of Jude and Its Rhetorical and Social Functions," *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 6 (1996), 139–151.
- ⁶ Cf. *Ex* 23:20-21; *Ps* 78:12; 105:23, 38; *Ho* 2:5; *Am* 2:10; *Hag.* 2:5.
- ⁷ Disbelief is also mentioned in other Old Testament passages cf. *De.* 1:32; 9:23; *Ps* 106, 24.
- ⁸ Cf. *Nu.* 14:37. The use of similar triplet illustration regarding the Israel in the wilderness like the ones found in *Jude* vv.5-7 can be identified in *Ben Sira*, *Jub.*, *3Macc*, the *T12P*, Damascus Document. See Charles J. Daryl, "The Use of Tradition-Material in the Epistle of Jude," *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 4 (1994): 1–14. Richard Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, vol. 50 (Aylesbury: Word Incorporated, 1983).
- ⁹ *M. Sanh.* 10.3 in this same passage discussions on the people of Sodom are also concluded that they too will not have a share in the world to come. Cf. Herbert Danby, tran., "Sanhedrin 10:2," in *The Mishna*, First. (London: Oxford University, 1954), 397.
- ¹⁰ Cf. KJV, NASB, NIV, NLT
- ¹¹ Richard Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1990), 307–312. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 50:48–49.
- ¹² Charles Landon, "A Text-Critical Study of the Epistle of Jude," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament- Supplement* 137 (1996), 70–77.
- ¹³ For detailed discussion on the argument for the Vlhsou/j reading of *Jud.* 5, see Philip F. Bartholoma, "Did Jesus Save the People out of Egypt? A Re-Examination of a Textual Problem in *Jude* 5," *Novum Testamentum*, no. 50 (2008): 150–152. M. Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on Greek New Testament*, Second. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994). Jarl Fossum, "Kyrios Jesus as the Angel of the Lord in *Jude* 5-7," *New Testament Studies* 33 (1987): 226–243. He argues from on the point that *Jude* follows the early Christians' exegesis of the Angel of the Lord passages in the Old Testament. Carroll D. Osburn, "The Text of *Jude* 5," *Biblica* 62, no. 2 (1981): 107–115. His work can be described as the premier on the case for a possibility of the Jesus reading in *Jude* 5.
- ¹⁴ Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church*, 312.

- ¹⁵ The Fallen Angels in v.6 has been intentionally left out for it to be treated under non-canonical resources of Jude.
- ¹⁶ Cf. *De* 29:23; *Is* 1:9, 10; *Je* 23:14, 49:18; 50:40; *Lam* 4:6; *Ho* 11:8; *Am* 4:11; *Zep* 2:9; *Eze* 16:46-59; *M* 10:15; *Lu* 10:12; 17:29 and *Ro* 9:29.
- ¹⁷ See for example, *Jub.* 16:6,9; 20:5; 22:22; 36:10; *T. Ash.* 7:1; *T. Naph.* 3:4-5; *3 Macc* 2:5; *Ws.* 19:14-15; Philo, *Questions on Genesis*, trans. Ralph Marcus, vol. I (London: William Heinemann, 1971), 326–330. Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, trans. Thackeray H. ST. J., vol. IV (London: William Heinemann, 1967), 95–101.
- ¹⁸ Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 50:54–55.
- ¹⁹ Jerome H. Neyrey, *2 Peter and Jude*, vol. 37c, Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 60–61.
- ²⁰ Philo may be an exemption to this assertion because he explicitly makes it clear that the sin of the Sodomites was homosexuality, see *Ant* I.194.
- ²¹ Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 50:54. He refers to *Ws.* 19:14-15; Josephus, *Ant.* I:194; *Eze* 16.49, 50; *3Mac* 2:5 to support his conclusion.
- ²² Peter H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*, Pillar New Testament Commentaries (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 53.
- ²³ The LXX uses it in *Ge* 38:24
- ²⁴ Cf. *Mk* 10:19; *1Co* 6:18; 10:8; *Re* 17:2; 18:3,9
- ²⁵ Ruth dispassionately discusses the issue of homosexuality in her work. See Ruth Anne Reese, *2 Peter and Jude*, Two Horizons New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 48–49.
- ²⁶ Bauckham equates this usage to lament or declaration of Judgment by the Prophets in the OT times (LXX *Is*4:7; *Ec* 4:10; *Mt* 24:19). These were adopted by the NT writers especially in *Mt* 23, where about seven of such woes were pronounced on the Pharisees who buckled the truth. Types of these woe oracles varied but their use inversely implied a Prophetic tendency on the part of the speaker, author or writer. He however observes that Jude’s copy of this traditional formula seems to be unique. See Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 50:77–78. Cf. Also Daryl, “The Use of Tradition-Material in the Epistle of Jude,” 10.
- ²⁷ *T. Benj.* 7:5, *1Jn* 3:11 in this Benjamin exhorts his children against the malice of *Beliar* which breeds seven evils as follows ; *envy, destruction, oppression, exile, famine tumult, and desolation.* God thus brought vengeance on follows this line of thought regarding Cain.
- ²⁸ 1:61 Cf. Philo, *Post.* 38-39.
- ²⁹ Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, IV:Ant I. 52–66.
- ³⁰ *De.* 32, 78
- ³¹ With exception of the *Tg. Onq.*, all the others comment on the Genesis story about Cain. The exposition occurs in two levels. The first concerns Cain’s doubt of God being a just God and the certainty of whether there will be

another world. Below is an excerpt from the *Tg. Ps.-J.Ge* 4:17-23: ‘When the two of them had gone out Cain spoke up and said to Abel “I see that the world was created with mercy but it is not governed according to the fruit of good deeds, and there is partiality in judgment” [...] Abel answered and said to Cain “ the world was created with mercy and it is governed according to the fruits of good deeds and there is no partiality in judgment [...]” There is no judge no other world, now gift of good reward for the righteous and there is no punishment for the wicked.’

- ³² In *Lu* 22:22 *poreu,w* is an euphemism for the act of Jesus ‘going or proceeding’ to His one predetermined death. This understanding might not have been different from what Jude originally had in mind, considering the intensifying degree of the three character types of v. 11.
- ³³ With exception of *Mi* 6:3-5; where it is asserted that Balaam gave a wise counsel against Balak’s request, other allusions to him are negative. Just a little beyond the main story the Sin of Peor that claimed about 24,000 lives among the Israelite is attributed to have come through the counsel of Balaam in *Nu* 31:16. Moving a bit further, *De* 23:4-5 explains how God intentionally averted the conscious curses of Balaam for the sake of His People, (Cf. *Ne*13:2).
- ³⁴ In *IPe* 2:15-16 Balaam loved the wages of unrighteousness; he was disgraced by his donkey. *Re* 2:14 connects the incident of Baal Peor and *Nu* 31, as type for some members in the church of Pergamum who keep the teaching of Balaam. And *Jude* 11 using it as a type of the opponents whom the author writes the churches to beware of.
- ³⁵ Cf. (N)KJV, NJB, NAS, NIV, NRS.
- ³⁶ The same words in similar construction can be seen in *Is* 44:25 *Eze* 22:28. In these two instances the English translations render *Divination*. So why the sharp contrast in *Nu* 22:7?
- ³⁷ Of particular interest are the assertions of in 22:18 and 24:1, 25
- ³⁸ Cf. *M. Sanh.* 10:2 in Danby, “Sanhedrin 10:2.”; *Nu* 22:5,29 in Martin McNamara and Ernest G. Clarke, trans., *TargumNeofiti 1 and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan : Numbers*, vol. 4 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995).; *Nu* 20:10 in Slotki J. Judah, tran., *Numbers*, Third., Midrash Rabbah IV (London: Soncino, 1983).
- ³⁹ See *Nu* 16:1; 26:9 and *Nu* 26: 9 in McNamara and Clarke, *TargumNeofiti 1 and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan : Numbers*, 4.
- ⁴⁰ In the NTA similar assertion is made in II Ti 2:19.
- ⁴¹ Those who posit this normally believe that the Book of Enoch’s story about the fallen angels is a commentary on *Ge* 6:1-4. However, the present study concerns itself with the possibility of Jude’s use of I Enoch instead of I Enoch’s use of *Ge* 2. Refer to Duane F. Watson, “The Letter of Jude: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflection,” in *The New Interpreter’s Bible*,

- vol. XII (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 2003). Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 50:51. J. N. D. Kelly, *The Epistles of Peter and Jude*, Black's Commentary (London: Adam and Charles Clark, 1969), 256–257.
- ⁴² Similar Greek phrase or construction in *Jude* 6b is found in most of these texts in *1 En.*; kri, sinmega, lhjh`me, raj
- ⁴³ This is my translation.
- ⁴⁴ Philo, “De Vita Mosis,” in *Philo*, trans. Colson F. H., vol. VI (London: Harvard University, 1966), 594–595.
- ⁴⁵ *Stromata* 6.132
- ⁴⁶ This MS in Latin palimpsest was discovered by A. M. Denis c.6th or 7th Centuries and it is now kept in the Ambrosian Library in Milan in 1861. Sparks gives a description of the MS as follows: the text was published by Ceriani, contained in his first edition of the *Monumenta Sacra et Profana*. Because the document breaks off in mid-sentence, there are no means of knowing how much has been lost. The MS itself gives the work no title. The common title, ‘*The Assumption of Moses*’, was inferred by Ceriani from the fact that Gelasius of Cyzicus, in his Collection of the Acts of the Council of Nicaea, quotes i. 14 and clearly ascribes it to the Assumption, a work independently proved to have been known in the early Church from references in other patristic writers and from the ancient lists of apocryphal books. This Milan manuscript is used to depict two points of emphasis: either the body of Moses being taken up into heaven, after his death, or as a Testament not much different from the others like T. Abraham, Job, and the twelve Patriarchs which ends with in the death and an honorable burial of a patriarch. R. H. Charles is of the view that the actual title was *Assumption of Moses* consisting of two probable distinct composites: first, the *Testament of Moses* second the *Assumption of Moses*. For an extensive discussion consult Sparks H. F. D, ed., “1 Enoch,” in *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, trans. Knibb M. A. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1984), 168–319.; R. H. Charles, “The Assumption of Moses,” in *The Apocryphal and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, vol. II (Oxford: Oxford University, 1963), 407.; J. Priest, “Testament of Moses,” in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (London: Darton Longman & Todd, 1983), 919–934.
- ⁴⁷ Bauckham made the translations from the *Palaea Historica, the Slavonic Life of Moses* 16, (*pseudo*) *Oecumenius in Jude*. 9, and from Cramer’s *Catena*, Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church*, 249–280.
- ⁴⁸ Richard Bauckham perceives the use of dative here to be abnormal but when considered in context, it serves well the purpose and intent of the author.
- ⁴⁹ Charles J. Daryl, “Jude’s Use of Pseudepigraphal Source-Material as Part of a Literary Strategy,” *New Testament Studies* 37 (1991), 143.

- ⁵⁰ Figure 1.1 in the appendix shows comparison among the Qumran Aramaic translation, the Greek text, the Ethiopic translation of I Enoch 1.9 and the Greek text of Jude 14b-15.
- ⁵¹ Wallace identifies several passages in the NT where this usage is evident see Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 564. Cf. *Mk* 11:24; *J* 13:31; *Ro* 8:30; *Re* 10:7; *Mt* 18:15; and *He* 4:10.
- ⁵² Carroll D. Osborne cites G. Wohlenberg, and Shcelkle, as in support of this view. He adopts the title; *Prophetic Perfect* instead of *Proleptic Aorist* and described by Ibid., 581. See Carroll D. Osburn, “The Christological Use of I Enoch 1. 9 in Jude 14, 15,” *New Testament Studies* 23 (77 1976): 336. Cf. Also Kelly, *The Epistles of Peter and Jude*, 276.
- ⁵³ Matthew Black, “Christological Use of Old Testament in the New Testament,” *New Testament Studies* 18 (1971), 10.
- ⁵⁴ Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, 372–375.
- ⁵⁵ This conclusion slightly differs from those of Bauckham and Osburn that Jude made his own translation from the Aramaic to Greek. Consult Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 50:93–101. Osburn, “The Christological Use of I Enoch 1. 9 in Jude 14, 15.”

Appendix

<i>B: 4QEnc 1.9</i>	<i>C: Greek text</i>	<i>A: The Ethiopic text</i>	<i>Jude 14b-15</i>
[When He comes with] the myriads of His holy ones, [to execute judgment against all; and He will destroy all the wicked, and will convict all] flesh with regard to [all their] works [of wickedness which they have committed in deed and in word, and with regard to all] the proud and hard [words which wicked sinners have spoken against Him. . .] ⁵⁵	ὅτι ἔρχεται σὺν ταῖς μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων καὶ ἀπολέσει πάντας τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς καὶ ἐλέγξει πᾶσαν σάρκα περὶ πάντων ἔργων τῆς ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν ὧν ἠσέβησαν καὶ σκληρῶν ὧν ἐλάλησαν λόγῳ καὶ περὶ πάντων ὧν κατελάλησαν κατ' αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς⁵⁵	And Behold! He comes with ten thousand holy ones to execute judgment upon them and to destroy the impious and to contend with all flesh concerning everything which the sinners and the impious have done and wrought against him. ⁵⁵	Ἰδοὺ ἦλθεν κύριος ἐν ἁγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων καὶ ἐλέγξει πᾶσαν ψυχὴν περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν ὧν ἠσέβησαν καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν ὧν ἐλάλησαν κατ' αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς.

BLANK