

# **Dr. Dave Mathewson, New Testament Literature, Lecture 32, 2 Peter and Jude**

© 2024 Dave Mathewson and Ted Hildebrandt

This was Dr. Dave Mathewson in New Testament History and Literature, Lecture 32 on 2 Peter and Jude.

Let's go ahead and get started. I know this is such a nice day, it's hard to be inside, so I'll make it worth your while. If you show up, I'll have a piece of paper up here, you sign your name on it, and after class, you'll get extra credit for being here.

I do that once in a while just to reward the faithful remnant. Anyway. All right.

After that, I can't change my mind, I've got to go through this. All right, what I want to do today is, we are actually getting very near the end, I want to leave a couple of days, at least one day perhaps, to look at Revelation in a little bit of detail, although obviously, we're running out of some time for that, but I want to look at two documents today. This is another time when we'll go out of canonical order, that is, we will look at two books, so one that is separated from each other in their canonical order in the New Testament, but two books that bear a close resemblance that suggest that there's some kind of a relationship between them.

Just as we did with Colossians and Philemon, we suggested there was a close relationship between them, in that they were probably addressed to the same location, sent during a similar time, and if you recall, the New Testament is not arranged chronologically anyway, the books do not occur in the order in which they were necessarily written, even when you see a 1 and 2 Corinthians, or 1 and 2 Thessalonians, 1 and 2 Peter, 1 and 2 Timothy, we can't assume necessarily that that's the order in which they were written.

Paul did not write 1 and 2 Timothy on the top of his letter, or Peter did not write 1 and 2 Peter. Those are designations we've given to them according to the order in which they occur in the New Testament, which is roughly by length at times, or logically, not necessarily chronologically. But there are times when, even though the letters may not be arranged chronologically, there may be clues in the letters that help us to determine when they would have been written, and we'll look at one of those examples today with second Peter and Jude.

Jude is one of those letters that, at least I can't remember the last time I've ever heard a sermon preached on one, or a sermon preached on Jude, let alone a reference to it or anything like that. You'll see why when we look at it in just a little bit of detail.

But let's open with a prayer, and then we'll look at Second Peter and Jude.

Father, thank you for bringing us to this point in the semester, and as we anticipate the last couple of weeks, Lord, we pray for energy and endurance, and Lord, the ability to persevere and not feel too burnt out and discouraged and tired from all that we're doing, but that we'll be able to finish well. And Lord, I pray that despite the nice weather and other places that we'd rather be and things we'd rather be doing, you'll help us to focus our attention for just this brief time on just a small portion of what we confess is your very revelation to us. In Jesus' name, we pray. Amen.

All right, Second Peter. My computer just froze up.

Second Peter is, again, one of those documents that, like a number of Paul's letters that we've seen, could be categorized with, and this is important when you're thinking in terms of exams, especially the final exam. A lot of my questions sometimes ask you to relate letters or documents across the New Testament as far as what they might have in similarity with each other. Second Peter is one of those documents that share features with some of Paul's letters that we've looked at that address some kind of false teaching or some kind of a deviant teaching, such as we saw 1 and 2 Timothy, books like Colossians and Galatians, Paul was dealing with threats to the gospel that he preached.

Now, in 2 Peter, unlike 1 Peter, which was addressing a very different situation, 2 Peter is addressing a problem of teachers who basically were, a little bit differently than some of the other letters that we've looked at, teachers that were promoting a sort of antinomianism, that is, promoting a teaching that absolved one of any authority or responsibility to live life in a certain way. From some of the examples we see in 2 Peter, we're going to see also that they were promoting this by questioning and calling into question that God was actually going to return and judge. So, one of the ways they did this is by calling into question, we'll see the teaching of the apostles and the Old Testament prophets.

If you remember your Old Testament survey class, one of the dominant messages of the prophets was one of both salvation and judgment as well, that God would return and judge the earth. It seems that these teachers, whatever their precise identity in 2 Peter, were calling into question particularly the fact that God was going to return and judge the earth. Therefore, if that's the case, they could live whatever kind of lifestyle they wanted to.

And especially, they could indulge in whatever pleasures, particularly sexual immorality, with no fear that God was going to return and judge. So, that seems to be the primary issue or problem. That is these teachers that were calling into

question the fact that God was really going to return and judge humanity and judge wickedness and sin.

And if He isn't, then they are free to live their lives in whatever terms they want. They're free to indulge in any kind of sexual immorality or any pleasures they want because God is not going to return and judge them. And that seems to be the issue or the problem that the author is addressing.

Now, the problem is the notes that I'm going to follow are on the overhead. But let me for just a moment talk about the genre or literary type of 2 Peter. 2 Peter, like 2 Timothy, seems to resemble a last will and testament.

More extra credit points here. Much like we said 2 Peter was actually Paul's last will and testament to his readers, where we said a testament which was sort of a common literary type in the first century and leading up to the first century and during that time. Testament basically was the last words of a dying hero.

Someone who was ready to die was passing on their final instruction. And 2 Peter resembles that as well. And especially verses 12 through 15.

Listen to these verses. Peter says, therefore I intend to keep on reminding you of these things though you know them already and are established in the truth that has come to you. I think it is right as long as I am in the body to refresh your memory since I know that my death or my departure will come soon as indeed our Lord Jesus Christ has made clear to me. And I will make every effort so that after my departure you may be able at any time to recall these things.

That statement has all the earmarks of a testament. Those are the last words of a dying hero as the hero faces death.

He now passes on his parting instructions to remind his readers of what he has said to them and what he has taught them. And so, thank you very much. There we go.

All right. So, Peter in a sense is writing a testament much like 2 Timothy. We will return to this in a moment.

But as I said, the primary force behind the false teachers is that they are trying to teach or trying to convince the readers to deny future judgment or that there will not be a future judgment therefore they can live however they want, pursue any kind of immorality that they want. So, the purpose of 2 Peter is that Peter then writes to encourage his readers to pursue holy living in the world by maintaining their confidence in scripture primarily and in the fact that God is going to come and both judge and save. So, in one sense Peter's message is very prophetic.

By that I mean he tries to motivate his readers by reminding them and communicating a message of both salvation for those who are faithful but judgment for those who refuse. The other thing that is important about this and this will crop up again in Jude is and we have seen this a couple of other times when we think about false teaching today we usually think in intellectual or theological terms that someone who is engaged in false teaching is one who deviates theologically or one that deviates from clear scriptural teaching. However, it is interesting that the biblical authors were just as interested in ethical deviation as well.

And we are going to see in 2 Peter, 2 Peter is not only concerned that they don't believe the correct things but they act incorrectly as well. Or as some would say he is not only concerned with orthodoxy but orthopraxy. That false teaching is just as much a deviant lifestyle as it is a deviant manner of teaching.

So that would be the purpose under your notes. Now the way Peter accomplishes his purpose is this. It appears that in the rest of his letter, Peter is going to take up the objections of these teachers.

Again, remember these teachers are calling into question the fact that God is going to judge and therefore they can live lives however they want. What it seems that is going to happen is Peter is going to take up a series of objections to the fact that Christ is not going to return and God is not going to come back and judge. And Peter is going to answer these objections.

So, objection number one, and again you will notice the chapters and verses don't correspond with the entirety of 2 Peter but I am just focusing on the heart of each section. So, we will just move through 2 Peter simply looking at the objection that the false teachers were raising to Christ coming to judge and then Peter's response to that. So, the first objection was that the apostles were teaching myth in chapter 1 verses 16-19.

So, in these verses again Peter is not necessarily quoting the teachers but I think summarizing what is at the heart of their objections. So, he says, For we did not follow cleverly devised myths when we made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but we had been eyewitnesses of his majesty. Now that phrase we did not follow cleverly devised myths probably is summarizing one of the accusations of the teachers.

That is the apostles such as Peter and Paul and others were simply teaching myth. What is important about that is one of the messages of the apostles was that indeed Jesus was going to return one day and he was going to judge the world. So, by discrediting the apostolic message that Christ was going to return, which is the not-yet part of our already but not-yet tension, by the apostles teaching the not-yet that

Christ is one day going to return to judge, by calling that into question, the false teachers then would promote their antinomianism.

That is, they are not responsible for any kind of code of conduct or ethical conduct. So, the teachers are calling into question the apostolic teaching. The answer of Peter is no, the apostles were eyewitnesses of God's glory.

Now listen to this, this is interesting. Peter says, For he received, referring to Christ, for Jesus received honor and glory from God the Father when that voice was conveyed to him by the majestic glory, saying, This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased. We ourselves heard this voice come from heaven while we were with him on the holy mountain.

What is that event referring to? Does anyone remember? Now you have to go back to the gospels. Where did at least some of the apostles go up in a mountain and hear a voice, This is my beloved Son, listen to him, in him I am well pleased. The transfiguration, Matthew, Mark, and Luke all record the transfiguration, a time when Jesus went with Peter, James, and John up a mountain and was transfigured before them, was changed, and was enveloped in a cloud, it was a rather supernatural event and they heard the voice from heaven, This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased, which comes out of the book of Isaiah.

Why do you think Peter quotes that? How is this a response? How is this going to prove that when the apostles said that Jesus was going to come back and judge, they were not teaching falsity or teaching myth? How does this prove that? Why would Peter allude to this event? It is a transfiguration event in the gospels, actually it is filled with all kinds of Old Testament imagery. It was basically in a sense a glimpse, it was almost a prefiguring or a glimpse ahead of time of Jesus coming in all his glory, in his kingdom to judge and to save. So, the reason Peter quotes this is, no, we were eyewitnesses of God's glory at the transfiguration, that is, we saw a glimpse, we had a snapshot or a glimpse into what it would be like when Christ will return in all his glory to set up his kingdom and to judge and to save.

So, they kind of had a glimpse of the not yet already in the present when they saw Jesus transformed in all his glory and power as the Son of God who would return and judge and provide salvation. So, Peter says, no, we were eyewitnesses of the fact that Jesus is going to come back and judge. When the apostles thought that Christ was going to come back and judge, they were not teaching myth or falsity, but instead, it was based on an eyewitness.

They themselves saw Christ, kind of a snapshot, a prejudgment glimpse of Christ coming in all his glory when he was transfigured on that mountain in the Gospels. Objection number two, the prophets were simply wrong. Chapter 1 and verses 20 and 21.

First of all, Peter says, you must understand this, that no prophecy of Scripture is a matter of one's own interpretation because no prophecy ever came by human will or decision, but men and women moved by the Holy Spirit who spoke from God. Now, most likely then this is a response to or a summary of the false teacher's objection, and that is the prophets were simply wrong. Again, when you go back and read the Old Testament prophetic texts, one of the common features of the prophets, Ezekiel and Jeremiah, Isaiah, et cetera, is that they also envisioned a day when God would intervene and set up his kingdom and bring both salvation and judgment.

Now, by calling into question the prophets, the false teachers were calling into question their message of judgment. Again, if the prophets were wrong, and therefore there's no judgment, and if there's no judgment, therefore you can live however you want. We will not be responsible for our immoral actions.

Peter's response, as we just read, is no, the prophets were not speaking on their own. They were not wrong. They were not simply cleverly devised prophecies, but instead, they were men and women, and they were not wrong by God.

Theologians often describe prophets as the mouthpiece of God, and this is one of the texts that they get that idea from. However much their own style and communication was involved, Peter makes it clear that ultimately God's Spirit was moving the prophets to speak this message of judgment and salvation. So, when the prophets said that God was coming back to save and to judge, they're to be trusted because Peter says their message is not one that is by their own decision and human will, it's not of their own doing, but they are proclaiming a message that God's Spirit has moved them to proclaim.

Therefore, if the prophets were correct and right, then their message that there is a judgment is correct, and then therefore it does matter how the readers live. So, objection number two is answered.

Objection number three, judgment simply will not happen. In chapter two is Peter's response to that. I won't read this section, but it basically just seems to suggest the teachers were simply arguing that it's just logically and theoretically impossible and pragmatically impossible that judgment would take place. What Peter does in chapter two is Peter actually accumulates a number of Old Testament stories. If you go back and read Peter 2, you'll just see one story after another from the Old Testament, almost kind of an Old Testament survey.

But what it is, it's a story of how God has intervened and judged in the history of Israel. And you can see Peter's point for doing this. He's saying, no, it isn't unlikely that God will judge it.

It is not theoretically impossible. God has done so in the past. Look at Israel's history.

God has judged in the past. So, it's entirely conceivable and it's certain that he will judge in the future. So, once again, the false teachers are wrong by calling into question the plausibility of judgment.

Peter says one only needs to look at the Old Testament to see that God has frequently intervened to judge in the past. And so, he will in the future as well. Objection number four in chapter three, verses one through ten, is the false teachers also seem to be saying that the fact that God has delayed, the fact that God has not intervened to judge suggests that there's not going to be a judgment.

In other words, the fact that Christ has not come back for some time, despite what the apostle said, and despite what the prophet said, demonstrates that there's not going to be a judgment. Otherwise, why the delay? Again, Peter's answer is in chapter three, verses one through ten. He says I'll start with verses eight through ten.

Peter says, but do not ignore this one fact, beloved, that with the Lord one day is like a thousand years, and a thousand years are like a day. The Lord is not slow about His promise, as some of you think about slowness, but is patient with you, not wanting any to perish, but all to come to repentance. But the day of the Lord will come like a thief, which using a metaphor that Jesus Himself used, will come like a thief, and the heavens will pass away with a loud noise, and the elements will be dissolved with fire, and the earth and everything that is done on it will be revealed or disclosed.

So basically, Peter's answer is that, interestingly, although I'm not entirely sure what to make of the language of a day is like a thousand years, a thousand years like a day, slowness to God is not like slowness to us. But then he also adds, that He's also giving humanity a chance to repent. So, whatever we precisely make of this, at the least, Peter is saying that the fact that there's a delay has a reason.

It does not call into question the fact that God is indeed going to return and judge. What might seem like a delay to us, may not necessarily be a delay. And he says, and by the way, God may be delaying so that others have so that many have a chance to repent prior to the coming judgment.

So that's basically Peter in the book of 2 Peter in a nutshell. Again, it seems to me that what Peter's strategy then is to, combat these teachers who are trying to call into question the fact that there's going to be a future judgment, and therefore the readers can do whatever they want. What Peter does is he seems to take up a series of objections or possible objections by the false teachers and replies to them and responds to them.

So the conclusion then is if there is going to be a then it does matter how the readers live. So, he asks them and he motivates them to live holy lives in view of the fact that there indeed is a coming judgment and not to be duped by these false teachers that are calling that judgment into question and suggesting that they can live antinomian type lives. Any questions about 2 Peter? There's one other thing I want to say about it and that is 2 Peter is one of the books that perhaps more than any other book in the New Testament has been disputed as far as whether Peter wrote it or not.

Even though many would agree that Peter wrote 1 Peter, a number of them would disagree that he wrote 2 Peter for a number of reasons. When you compare 1 and 2 Peter, even in English translation sometimes, but especially if all of you were able to read the Greek text of 1 and 2 Peter, if I gave you a Greek New Testament and you were fairly fluent in your ability to read it, you'd have a lot easier time with 1 Peter than you would with 2 Peter, I guarantee it. So, some have suggested that the writing style, the type of Greek, and the vocabulary is just so different in 2 Peter than it is from 1 Peter that Peter could not have written it.

Another reason is that we just said that 2 Peter resembles very closely in form a testament. We said there from roughly the 2nd century or a couple of centuries before the 1st century and into the 1st century and beyond, there was a common form known as testamentary literature, a testament, that is a record of the last words of a dying hero that would include both ethical and sometimes prophetic or eschatological type of instruction which you find in 2 Peter. Interestingly, most of those testaments tend to be pseudonymous, that is, for example, we'll talk in just a moment, for example, we have a number of books titled The Testament of Abraham, the Testament of Isaac, the Testament of Jacob, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, a Testament of Moses, a Testament of Elijah, but the thing is they're obviously written not by those persons.

In other words, the Testament of Abraham was not really written by Abraham, it was written by someone after Abraham's life writing in Abraham's name. And the assumption is that the readers would have understood that, they would not have been tricked or deceived into thinking that Abraham was really writing this, but they would have known this is just a recognizable genre or literary form and they would have known that Abraham or whoever did not write this. Some have argued because 2 Peter is a form of a testament like other testaments, it too is probably pseudonymous.

That is someone after Peter's death now writes in Peter's name as someone did in Abraham's name or Moses' name or Isaac's name, some well-known figure from the past, now someone writes in Peter's name to instruct the present-day readers. Again, the assumption is the readers would not have been deceived into thinking that Peter actually wrote this, that the author was not trying to trick them, but he was just

following a standard literary convention of writing in the name of someone else. So, for that reason, some think that 2 Peter is pseudonymous.

Another reason is what some scholars call early Catholicism, that is, there's a sense that we can determine and kind of tease out of the literature in the first and second centuries, a movement within Christianity that scholars call early Catholicism. Basically, what it is, it's a label for the belief and thinking and the state of the church late in the first century and into the second century as it began to settle into life and prepare for kind of for the long run. That is, they realized that Christ was not going to come back right away, and so they kind of begin to settle in and they're prepared to live out their life in the world.

They become more institutionalized, etc., etc. But usually, it's thought that early Catholicism, and by Catholicism I'm not using that term in reference to the Catholic church, Roman Catholic church, as we think of it. Catholicism was a term that simply referred to the church universal, the church more generally and broadly.

Hence, you often find, we said that the collection of books that we're looking at now are often labeled the general epistles. Another name for them is the Catholic epistles because they're addressed to the church more broadly, the Catholic, the universal church. So that's what I mean by early Catholicism, that is, the church as it has now spread out and now begins to settle in and establish itself.

It's often been thought there are three characteristics of early Catholicism, that is, the church towards the end of the first century and into the second century A.D., number one is a fading of a belief in the soon return of Christ. I shouldn't say a fading of the soon return, it's a fading of the belief. So, the assumption is very early on, perhaps based on Jesus' teaching and the apostles' teaching, such as we read in 1 Thessalonians, the church had a vibrant expectation that Christ was coming back soon, right away.

But now as it becomes apparent, as he delays, as it becomes apparent that Christ is not coming back right away, the church, their expectation of a soon return of Christ kind of begins to fade into the background. And again, they kind of begin to settle down to live life in the world. Another feature of early Catholicism that goes along with this is the institutionalization of the church, that is, as the church begins to settle into the world and settle in kind of for the long run and realize Christ is not coming back immediately, then there's a need for the church to become more institutionalized and more structured with deacons and bishops and a hierarchy, etc.

A third one is the crystallization of the faith. There's more of a need to have a fairly set kind of body of beliefs that the church will now hold to and subscribe to. And so, it's thought that all three of these can be found in 2 Peter.

Therefore, the reasoning is, if all three of these ideas, wherever you see these ideas if they indicate a church that has been around for a while, late into the 1st century, into the 2nd century, and if these are all found in 2 Peter, then this must be a later document that Peter himself could not have or did not write. Again, I don't want to go into this, but, number one, I would really question whether the church really changed this substantially. In fact, I think that number one, I doubt that the first one is necessarily the case.

It seems to me throughout the Old Testament and the New Testament, you find both delay and imminence of God's return balanced with each other. We already saw that Paul seemed to, and back in 2 Thessalonians, think that there could be a delay, that Christ might not come back immediately. Remember, he warned the Thessalonians not to think that they are already in the day of the Lord.

So, to me, it doesn't seem like, in some of these documents that are thought to be much, much later, it doesn't seem like the soon return of Christ has necessarily faded out of view. And these two seem to me to be more a matter of extent than their presence, because, again, I think you can find both institutionalization of the church and crystallization of the faith in some of the early New Testament documents. So, I really doubt that the presence of any three of these is good enough to tell that this document must be much later.

So, in conclusion, it seems to me that there's really, although 2 Peter is a difficult book as far as to demonstrate that Peter definitely wrote it, I don't think that there's really good reason to question it. Why couldn't Peter, for example, write his own testament? There may be other reasons why 2 Peter looks so different from 1 Peter, but there's really not enough evidence to, certainly, to 100% certain that Peter wrote it, but there's really not good evidence to deny that he wrote it as well. The early church's testimony was that Peter did indeed write it.

So, I'm going to operate with the assumption that Peter, Jesus Apostle, the same person that wrote 1 Peter, wrote this book also. Yeah, you're right, that's another issue. There's even less than we have.

Basically, all we have is 1 and 2 Peter. We really don't have enough, again, to say, well, Peter couldn't have written this. Remember, we said even statistics are difficult with Paul's letters.

Even though we have a number of letters from Paul, there's still not enough to definitively conclude this is how Paul always wrote or Paul couldn't have written like this. So probably even less certain about Peter, since we only have basically 1 and 2 Peter to go on, as far as how Peter would have written or could have written. All right, as kind of a transition into the next book, which now we're going to skip ahead

to the next to the last book, the penultimate book of the New Testament, and that is Jude.

But as kind of a transition, interestingly, when you compare 2 Peter and Jude, you soon notice a number of similarities. Similarities are often to the same extent of agreement as Matthew, Mark, and Luke. There's a similarity of ideas.

There's a similarity even down to vocabulary and wording between certain sections of 2 Peter and Jude. The similarities are great enough that we need to raise a question, what might be the relationship between 2 Peter and Jude? It's doubtful that they're just coincidental. Most likely there is some kind of a relationship.

Either 2 Peter and Jude were borrowing a similar tradition or similar stories that they both had at their disposal or one of the documents borrowed and was aware of the other. Again, I don't want to go into a lot of detail, but it seems that what is commonly, I think, becoming more agreed upon now is probably Jude was written first, and 2 Peter then utilized most of Jude. In fact, much of Jude you find in 2 Peter, but then 2 Peter has a lot of material not in Jude.

Most likely, 2 Peter, or the author of 2 Peter, had access to Jude and utilized Jude, or at the very least, had access to the exact same collection of stories that Jude had, and then used those stories and then added his own material as well. I would suggest probably Jude was written first, and then 2 Peter utilized Jude, but other material. Again, it's possible it could be the other way around, that Jude could have borrowed from 2 Peter, and that would explain the similarities.

The difficulty is, on that reading, you might have a little bit more difficulty explaining why Jude would be written if it resembles 2 Peter so closely, but then leaves out a lot of Peter. Why would Jude just pick up part of Peter and not follow the rest of him? Whereas it does make a little bit more sense the other way around, to say Peter used all of Jude, but then wanted to expand and add some of his own material. But again, you can see the order in which the books occur in the New Testament is not necessarily indicative of the order in which they were written.

But again, the common view seems to be Jude was written first, and then 2 Peter, but certainly, it still could be the other way around. Now, the next obvious question is, why the book of Jude? First of all, just to kind of raise a question, it's not necessarily in your notes, but just to think a little bit, why would a book like Jude be included in the New Testament? Especially since a lot of it is already, as we said, it's already in 2 Peter. You can find virtually everything in Jude already in 2 Peter.

Why would a book like Jude, as we're going to see in a moment, Jude is one of the most strange books you've ever read, at least I've ever read in the New Testament. I used to think Revelation was strange, and it still is in some respects, but Jude has

some very weird material in it. In fact, listen, we'll talk more about this one, but this is how Jude writes.

He says, now, I desire to remind you, though you are fully informed, that the Lord, who was once for all saved a people out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed those who did not believe. And the angels who did not keep their own position, but left their proper dwelling, he has kept them in eternal and deepest darkness for judgment of the great day. Likewise, Sodom and Gomorrah and the surrounding cities, in the same manner as they indulge in sexual immorality and pursued unnatural lusts, they serve as an example.

Yet in the same way, these dreamers also defiled the flesh, rejected authority, and slandered the glorious ones. But when the archangel Michael contended with the devil and disputed about the body of Moses, he did not dare bring an accusation against him. What in the world is that about? And this whole section of Jude has a couple of rather strange stories like this.

So due to its brevity, due to the fact that most of it is already in 2nd Peter anyway, why do you think a book like this may have been accepted into the New Testament canon? And part of the issue is, who is Jude? I heard it, somebody said it. Allison would. Jesus's brother.

Jude is one of Jesus's brothers. That is probably one of the reasons why Jude would make it into the New Testament canon, being much like James, who is Jesus's brother. Jude being a relative of Jesus, being one of Jesus's brothers, it's likely then that his book would get consideration for being included in the New Testament.

Very good. Now, the purpose of Jude then, Jude then naturally, because it has much of the same material as 2nd Peter, however, you understand the relationship, naturally Jude also seems to be combating an antinomianism type of teaching, as was true with 2nd Peter, that is again teaching that one can pursue all kinds of sexual immorality and indulge in any kind of desires and pleasures that one wants with no responsibility or under no authority at all. That seems to be the heart of the false teachers behind Jude.

Yet it's, again there's the question of exactly where was Jude written, to whom was Jude written, what are the precise readers, where were they, and what was the nature of this teaching. Some have suggested Gnostic-type teaching. I have no idea.

It could have been more of a Jewish type, although it would be hard to see why they would be promoting the kind of lifestyle that you read about, apparently. In the verse that I just read, he said, yet in the same way these dreamers, that's Jude's label for the teachers, these dreamers also defile the flesh, reject authority, and slander the glorious ones. So, I'm not entirely sure exactly who the teachers were or where

they would have been located, but from best we can tell from reading Jude, again like the teachers in 2nd Peter, they were questioning, they were calling into question the need to live responsibly and instead promoting an antinomianism that is living under no authority, indulging in all the lust and pleasure that one wants, and not having to worry about judgment or anything like that as a consequence.

That seems to be what Jude is addressing, so very, very similar to 2nd Peter. Though it's not as clear in Jude that they're denying a coming judgment or anything like that. In 2nd Jude too, Jude may have been addressing, when you start reading a lot of the documents even outside of the New Testament in early Christianity, one of the problems the early church faced was kind of itinerant preachers and groups of individuals who would kind of go from town to town and promote different teachings and actually teach things such as one might find in Jude.

So, there's some suspicion that Jude, whoever he's addressing, that his readers may be subject to these itinerant preachers that are kind of moving from place to place and traveling around teaching this idea of this antinomian idea that one is not responsible to, I mean, we don't have to worry about judgment and one can live however one wants and pursue all the pleasures that you choose to. And so, like 2nd Peter then, Jude is going to respond to that to convince his readers not to give in to that. So, for example, in verse 3, the purpose of Jude seems to be summarized in verse 3, Beloved, while eagerly preparing to write to you about the salvation we share, which suggests Jude apparently was going to sit down and write a letter, but now has received this information that is troubling and now he's going to switch courses and write something else.

So, it says, Beloved, while eagerly preparing to write to you about the salvation we share, I find it necessary to write and appeal to you to contend for the faith that was once for all entrusted to the saints. That seems to summarize Jude's purpose. He wants him to contend for the faith, but he will make it clear though, as we'll see in the letter, the faith that he talks about is not only an assent to some body of belief, but it has everything to do with their ethics and the way they live as well.

So, Jude then writes to address this problem of false teaching. Perhaps these itinerant teachers who are teaching this antinomianism warn them not to give in to that, but instead to contend for the faith, both theologically, morally, and ethically, to contend for the faith that has been delivered to them. Now, the way Jude does this, and this is, I think, how you understand the letter.

Basically, the way Jude will do this, the way he will get them to resist this antinomian influence and contend for the faith, is he will, like 2 Peter in chapter 2, he is going to tell a number of stories. And what these stories all have in common, are two things. Number one, they come from the Old Testament.

So, almost the whole book of Jude is just this list of stories from the Old Testament. Number two, they all have to do with God judging evil and wicked behavior, especially immorality. So, for example, notice the first one we looked at, starting at verse 5. Verse 5, and Jude only has one chapter, so there's no chapter 1, chapter 2, it's all verses.

So, verse 5 begins, Now, I desire to remind you, though you are fully informed, that the Lord, who once for all saved a people out of Egypt, afterward destroyed those who did not believe. So, although he saved his people out of Egypt, because of their rebellion and disobedience, he destroyed them when they wandered in the desert, and he basically killed them off and raised up a new generation who would now enter the promised land. So, Jude is saying, in the same way, even if God did not spare his own people, whom he delivered out of Egypt, because of the rebellion, then he goes on and says, And the angels who did not keep their own position, but left their proper dwelling, he has kept in eternal chains and judgment.

But this one, Likewise, Sodom and Gomorrah and the surrounding cities, which in the same manner as they, indulged in sexual immorality and pursued unnatural lusts, serve as an example by undergoing a punishment of eternal fire. That one really summarizes the heart of James' examples, that he's giving examples of those who have rebelled in the Old Testament, especially in the area of immorality, and then God has judged them. The implication is, then, that the readers better be aware of giving in to these antinomian false teachers.

Because if God has judged in the past, he certainly can and he certainly will do so again, for the same kinds of behavior that people were judged for in the Old Testament. That's his whole argument. However, you'll notice in the notes, that I've given you a couple of interesting, just a couple of these examples that are kind of intriguing.

What about in verse 6, the angels who did not keep their positions of authority? We already looked at this example in 1 Peter. I suggested that, remember the 1 Peter 3 passage that we spent some time on. This idea of Christ going to the spirits in prison, who had rebelled in the days of Noah, and now we're in prison awaiting judgment. That probably comes from this tradition in Jewish literature that interpreted Genesis chapter 6, the sons of God who came down and had relations with the daughters of men, interpreted the sons of God as angelic beings, who now, according to Jewish literature, who now are in prison, in chains, awaiting the day of judgment.

And now, I think 2 Peter is repeating the same story. 2 Peter verse 6 repeats that same story in slightly different wording as we found in 1 Peter chapter 3. So, 2 Peter verse 6 then alludes to Genesis chapter 6 as interpreted in Jewish literature, which read it as angelic beings who transgressed, who abandoned their positions and

transgressed God's boundaries, and therefore were locked up in judgment, in chains, awaiting the final day of judgment. And Peter, again, alludes to that.

And obviously, it's a very good example of what he wants to prove, that their immoral actions or their actions that thwarted authority actually have dire consequences, that is judgment. But what about this one in verse 9 that we just read? But when the archangel Michael contended with the devil and disputed about the body of Moses, he did not dare bring a condemnation or slander against him. But he said the Lord rebuke you.

Now, my question is, what in the world is that referring to? First of all, where do you read about the death of Moses in the Old Testament? Does anyone remember where that is? Or just roughly? Yeah, Deuteronomy, towards the end of Deuteronomy. In fact, you actually don't read a whole lot about the actual death or don't read anything about the burial of Moses or anything like that. But I would challenge you to read Deuteronomy, read the whole Old Testament, and find this story in there anywhere.

It's not there. There's no mention anywhere, especially in Deuteronomy, there's no mention anywhere of the archangel Michael. You read about him in the Old Testament.

You read about him in Revelation and some other Jewish literature. But you will not find anywhere in Deuteronomy of the Old Testament this story of the archangel Michael disputing with Satan over the body of Moses after his death. You'll find that nowhere.

So, the question is, what in the world is Jude doing? Did he make this up? Or are we missing part of the Old Testament? Or where does he get this? Actually, there is a Jewish work that is not in the Old Testament or New Testament. We've already referred to testaments, and testamentary literature like the Testament of Abraham, and The Testament of Isaac. We said 2 Peter and 2 Timothy resembled a testament.

We do have a work called the Testament of Moses. According to some other literature written around that time, the Testament of Moses at one time had an ending that has now apparently been lost, an ending that did have the story of the archangel Michael disputing with Satan over the body of Moses. It had that exact story.

So, most likely, Jude probably is relying not just on the Old Testament, but some of the stories, and some of the ways other Jewish literature interpreted the Old Testament. Again, go to Deuteronomy. You'll never find that or the whole Old Testament.

You'll never find that story of the archangel Michael disputing with Satan over the body of Moses anywhere. But apparently, it was in a work, again, called the Testament of Moses that you can actually read an English translation of it. But you won't find this story because apparently it has been lost.

But other literature written during the time does tell us that at one time, the Testament of Moses apparently had this ending that had this story about the devil and archangel Michael disputing and arguing over what to do with the body of Moses. And unless some other evidence turns up, that's most likely where Jude got it. But again, more importantly, as I said, is to understand the purpose and the function of all these stories is simply... Even if some of them are a little bit strange to us and hard to understand, the overall function of all these stories in Jude is to demonstrate that just in the same way that God has judged evil and wickedness in the past, He will do so again.

Therefore, the readers need to do everything they can not to give in to this antinomian teaching. But instead, as Jude ends in verse 24, Jude's final call is now to Him who is able to keep you from falling. That is, falling away from the faith that they are to contend for, which includes their obedience, their ethics, and their holiness.

Now to Him who is able to keep you from falling and to make you stand without blemish in the presence of His glory with rejoicing. So that's his goal for the readers. They don't give in to these antinomian teachers, but they take to heart these Old Testament examples of God judging evil and wickedness, and instead, they pursue holiness.

And therefore, instead of standing before God in judgment, they will one day stand without blemish in His presence and in His glory. All right. Any questions about Jude? I've got a very short book.

Has anyone ever heard a sermon preached on Jude? I don't think I ever have. You can kind of see why when you read the book. Some things I'm not sure what to do with.

But overall, I think the message of it is pretty clear. Yeah, question? So then why have the two? Why have Peter and Jude? Yeah, well, I think the primary reason, again, for including Jude was mainly in the credentials of who Jude was as Jesus' brother. But again, I think one of the things it does within the broader canon is reinforce the message that the church would not tolerate antinomianism and rejection of authority and disobedience, but that they took that seriously.

And that God's people are called to pursue holiness and to live lives of holiness so that as Jude ends, we'll stand without blemish in God's presence rather than facing His wrath and judgment. So, it more or less, I think, reinforces what Peter does in a

little bit different way. But mainly, I think a lot of it was on the laurels of who Jude was as Jesus' brother that ensured that it would get into the New Testament.

Good. All right. Hey, have a great weekend.

And I'll see you on Monday. By the way, next Thursday, right now, I'll send you an email for sure. But next Thursday, I am planning to have an extra, there'll be another extra credit review session.

This was Dr. Dave Mathewson in New Testament History and Literature, Lecture number 32 on 2 Peter and Jude.