

Dr. David Bauer, Inductive Bible Study, Lecture 8, Book Survey, Jude

© 2024 David Bauer and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. David Bower in his teaching on inductive Bible study. This is session 8, Book Survey, Jude.

As I mentioned before, we broke the segment into this new segment.

We want to use the letter of Jude as a sample of book survey. In a sense, this is also, will also be, kind of, it can serve as a sample of segment survey too, but it is, of course, of more manageable length for one thing. So, and of course, rather obviously, since we have only one chapter here, rather than chapter titles, we will give titles to the paragraphs that we have.

I've been working on my just-mentioned here with Revised Standard Version, which I consider to be a very worthy translation for study purposes. It is perhaps one of the, it is perhaps the closest thing to a standard translation in English. Although the RSV does not sell nearly as many copies, of course, as, for example, the NIV, it does stand in a direct line in translation from the King James Version, the authorized version of 1611, through the American revised version of 1901.

And then, of course, you have the revised standard version that came out in the New Testament in 1948 and in the Old Testament in 1952. And then after that, of course, the, you have the NRSV, the new revised standard version that came out later. The ESV, the English standard version is essentially the RSV.

As they say explicitly in the introduction to the ESV, it is essentially the RSV with only a few changes here and there that reflect the theological commitments or convictions of the editors of the ESV. But one thing that I like with regard to the RSV is that it actually takes a mediating position between two extremes, if we may put it so, of translation theory. On the one hand, translation involves really a kind of continuum. On the one end of a translation theory, we have what is sometimes referred to as formal equivalence, or I should say, some formal or verbal equivalence or the like, which really has to do with a word-for-word sort of translation, where the translators attempt to find just exactly the right Greek or Hebrew word for this English word for the corresponding Greek or Hebrew word or the like.

This is sometimes pejoratively referred to as wooden translation or maybe literal translation. The best example of this is perhaps the New American Standard Bible. The most extreme example of it is the Amplified Bible, where they're not satisfied simply to identify one word that represents a Greek or Hebrew word, but often will

have a whole parenthesis in which there are several words that are meant together to capture the precise thought of the Greek or Hebrew word that is used.

On the other end of this continuum, we have what is sometimes what is called dynamic equivalence. And the view here is that translation does not involve identifying the best English word that corresponds to the Greek or Hebrew word but actually translating whole units of thought. So, getting a sense of the meaning or the thought of a whole sentence or even a whole paragraph, and then translating the sense of that sentence or that paragraph into English.

This is represented by every translation that comes out of the American Bible Society, or the United Bible Societies for that matter. And the extreme example would be paraphrase. Paraphrase is an extreme example of dynamic equivalence.

Now, the value of the RSV, I think, is that it is that it seeks to chart a mediating position between these two. In other words, it is not committed either to verbal equivalence or to dynamic equivalence but makes translation decisions with regard to whether to move in this direction or on the basis of the translation demands of individual passages. So, it's more eclectic, and we might say more, more inductive in terms of its application of translation theory.

The NIV tends to, in some places, tend to be more, tend to move in this direction, and in other places, tend to move in this direction in some measure on the basis of who was responsible for the translation of various portions of the Bible. But I, myself, at least, do not see the kind of careful thinking with regard to where to move towards dynamic equivalence or verbal equivalence in the NIV that I find in the RSV. Now, the RSV is more difficult to get a hold of, particularly since you have the production of the NRSV.

But if you find it difficult to get a hold of the RSV, you might try the ESV. As I say, for the most part, it is essentially the RSV. The NRSV is a generally good translation, but I'm not using it because I actually have found that the NRSV has introduced at least as many problems as it attempted to solve in translation.

So, there are places where it actually improves upon the RSV, but I found many more cases where it actually introduces, and sometimes inexplicably introduces, translation problems. So, for that reason, I still prefer to use the RSV. But one of the things with regard to the RSV is that, you know, it is not gender-inclusive when it comes to human beings.

And so, it still talks about man or mankind or this kind of thing. And, of course, I'm sensitive to how women may feel excluded by that kind of language. So, you have to know translation is perfect, and I live with that because of the value, otherwise, a value that I find in the RSV.

But at any rate, the paragraphing in the RSV is indicated by indentation. So, where you have indentation, you have a new paragraph, and that's the basis then for these paragraphs, these paragraph titles. Now, being an epistle, the letter of Jude is, of course, ideological general material.

The primary concern is the presentation of ideas. You do have certain people mentioned here, of course, including Enoch, for example. But the book is not about them.

The book is really about ideas, and these persons are mentioned, places are mentioned, and events are mentioned in the service of what is really the primary concern of the content of the book, which is a presentation of ideas. Now, in terms of main units and subunits, again, we want to stand back and make these. It's important to make these units and subunits as broad as the material allows. In the book survey, you want to avoid getting bogged down in details because the more you focus on details, the less able you are to focus on the broader, overarching movement of the book.

So, you want to, you don't want to focus upon details, but to stand back and get a sense of the broad, overarching movement of the book. And that really translates into making your units and subunits as broad as the material allows. In my judgment, we begin with a salutation here in verses one and two.

Jude, a sermon of Jesus Christ and brother of James, to those who are called, beloved in God the Father, and kept for Jesus Christ, may mercy, peace, and love be multiplied to you. And then, of course, the body of the letter begins in verse three, and we seem to have the epistolary conclusion in verses 24 and 25. Now, to him who is able to keep you from falling and to present you without blemish before the presence of his glory with rejoicing, to the only God our Savior through Jesus Christ our Lord, be glory, majesty, dominion, and authority before all time and now and forever.

Amen. So, clearly, that is the conclusion then. So, we have the introduction and the conclusion, and then, verses three through 23 would be the body of the letter.

Now, I myself see, as I stand back and get a sense of the broad, overarching movement, I myself see the major break here coming between verses four and five. In verses three and four, we actually have what we might refer to as a kind of announcement of this letter. Beloved, being very eager to write to you of our common salvation, I found it necessary to write appealing to you to contend for the faith which was once and for all delivered to the saints.

For admission has been secretly gained by some who long ago were designated for this condemnation ungodly persons who pervert the grace of our God into licentiousness and deny our only Master and Lord Jesus Christ. You see, what this does is it points to the occasion and the general statement of the letter. What occasion the letter, but also the message of the letter is presented here in a general way.

So, you have here, in terms of the breakdown of verses three and four, these would be the subunits within verses three and four, the original intention, which was to write of our common salvation, and then the present concern, which is the appeal to contend for the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints, and the reason for that appeal. Verse four, notice here that you have that explicit substantiation. For admission has been secretly gained by some who long ago were designated for this condemnation ungodly persons who pervert the grace of our God into licentiousness and deny our only Master and Lord Jesus Christ.

Now, when you come to verses five through 23, I've given this a label, the address. The description, especially the description of the troublers and the appeal as to what to do in the presence of these troublers with an emphasis in that appeal upon the role of mercy. Now, you'll notice that in the general statement in verses three and four, he begins by, in verse 3b, by saying that he writes them to appeal to them to contend for the faith, appeal to them to contend for the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints.

He then goes on to explain the reason for this appeal, which was the admission of the ungodly. Now, notice that when it comes to the address, he reverses the order. He begins with the description of the ungodly, with the admission of the ungodly in verses five through 16, and then at the end of the body in verses 17 through 23, you have the specifics of the appeal for them to contend for the faith, which was once for all delivered to the saints.

We're going to come back to this, but obviously, I think you'll be able to see that you have an arrangement of chiasm here. That in the general statement, appeal to contend for the faith, and then the reason, the admission of the ungodly, and then in terms of the address where he goes ahead and develops this, particularizes it, he begins with the admission of the ungodly, B prime, and then ends with the appeal to contend for the faith, A prime. A, B, B prime, A prime.

Now, again, the subunits that we have in the address, which is found in verses five through 23, the subunits are found, of course, in verses five through 16, the description of the troublers, these ungodly, and then 17 through 23, the exhortations or the appeal to the readers in verses 17 through 23. Now, that's really as far as you would need to go in terms of identifying units and subunits. I actually, because this is

so short, I actually, and I was kind of interested in what was going on, I went a little bit farther in terms of identifying even units within the subunits here.

In verses, like within verses five through 16, we have the affirmation that God will judge the ungodly, which is established by past examples in verses five through seven. And then, in verses eight through 13, you have qualification. The godly are those who are wreaking havoc among you.

They are ungodly and, therefore, deserve divine judgment. Then he goes back to the affirmation again: God will judge the ungodly established here by prophecy, verses 14 through 16. So, this begins and ends with the affirmation that God will judge the ungodly established by past examples, verses five through seven, and established by past prophecy, verses 14 through 16.

And in between these, he really says those who have come in your midst are ungodly and deserve divine judgment, are like the ungodly in the past, and deserve a judgment similar to the judgment that was declared upon the ungodly in the past, both by past examples and by past prophecy. And then, of course, in verses 17 through 23, he says, you must remember this in verse 17, which introduces really two types of exhortations. The exhortation to remember, verses 17 through 19, which leads then to the second exhortation, the exhortation to act, to act for the sake of themselves on the one hand, verses 20 and 21, and for the sake of others, verses 22 and verse 23.

Now, again, with regard to verses five through 16, what you have emphasized within verses five through 16 is a certainty of judgment upon the ungodly. In both verses five through seven and verses 14 through 16, he appeals to pre-Christian revelation to argue for the certainty of judgment. There are two concerns then, God will judge the ungodly and the ungodly who deserve divine judgment have gained admission to the church.

That's the point he makes the second point he makes, especially in verses eight through 13. Now, what you have in verses 17 through 23, though, is a movement toward apostolic revelation, whereas the focus in verses five through 16 is on pre-Christian revelation using stories from the Old Testament, and actually, well, particularly from the Old Testament and prophecy from the Old Testament primarily, certainly pre-Christian revelation. What he does in verses 17 through 23 is to appeal to apostolic revelation there.

So, he says in verse 17, but you must remember, beloved, the predictions of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ. They said to you, in the last time, there will be scoffers following their own ungodly passions. And then he goes ahead and says, it is these who set up divisions, worldly people devoid of the Spirit, but you, beloved, build yourselves up on your most holy faith, pray in the Holy Spirit, keep yourselves

in the love of God, wait for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life, as they say, that's exhortations to act for themselves, and then to act for the sake of others, and, verses 22 and 23, and convince some who doubt, save some by snatching them out of the fire, on some have mercy with fear, hating even the garment spotted by the flesh.

So, here then are the main units and subunits drawn on a chart according to scale. So again, you get the sense here that he gives more space, more critical mass into the description of the troublers than to the exhortations to the readers here. Although, as we'll see, it may very well be in terms of structural relationships that the book comes to a climax in the exhortation to the readers here.

So, although he gives more space to the description of the ungodly and the judgment of the ungodly who have come in, all of this is actually moving toward a high point of exhortation to the readers here. This, by the way, reminds us that it's not necessarily the case that the writer considers as most important that which he spends the most time with. There may be other reasons why he gives more space, more critical attention, that is to say, attention in terms of critical mass, to one subject over another.

We cannot necessarily draw from that the conclusion in every case that that means that that is the most or the more important thing for him. There may be other reasons for it. Now, in terms of structural relationships, major structural relationships, of course, verses one and two being a salutation provide a preparation or realization.

This is the background according to which we are to understand the rest of the book of Jude. And it involves background in terms of three elements. First, background in terms of the writer.

His identity is Jude and he describes himself in terms of relationships. He says he's a servant of Jesus Christ and the brother of James. Then in terms of the recipients, they are described in three ways.

He says they are called. To those who are called, they're described as beloved, beloved in God the Father, and they are described as kept for Jesus Christ. And then, in terms of the salutation proper, may mercy, peace, and love be multiplied to you.

Again, we want to raise questions with regard to this in terms of how each main component of this passage, what he says specifically with regard to writer, recipients, and salvation, prepares for and illuminates verses three through 24, the rest of the book. Why has Jude introduced this book in precisely the way that he has? And what are the implications, the theological implications, of the answers to the definitive and rational question? Then, we know too, as we mentioned, I've already suggested here

that verses three and four may contain a general statement, that is to say, the nub of the book encapsulates really the message of the book's general statement, that he goes ahead and particularizes in the rest of the book. Now, you have really, within the general statement itself, a substantiation. He says I am writing to you to appeal to, to contend for the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints because admission has been secretly gained by some who long ago were designated for this condemnation, pardon me, ungodly persons who pervert the grace of our God into licentiousness and deny our only Master and Lord Jesus Christ.

So, you actually have within the general statement a substantiation. The reason why I say that you ought to contend for the faith that was once and for all delivered to the saints is because admission has been secretly gained by ungodly persons who were designated for this condemnation. And it's precise that general statement and the particularization of that general statement that is particularized, is developed, is unpacked in verses five through sixteen, and that chiastic ally.

So, he begins by the description of these ungodly persons. He begins by particularizing both the ungodly persons, their ungodliness, and their condemnation. By the way, in the general statement, notice he says, who were designated, who long ago were designated for this condemnation.

So, once again, that also is general. He says that they were designated long ago, and of course, this is particularized when he talks about the models or the examples that were presented long ago in the Hebrew scriptures and the prophecies that were presented previously with regard to judgment upon the ungodly. So, it's quite clear that he particularizes, unpacks, and specifies this general description of the ungodly persons and their condemnation that was designated long ago here in verses five through sixteen, and then in verses seventeen through twenty-one, he particularizes specifically what he means by contending for the faith that was once for all delivered to the saints.

If you're going to preach or teach on this passage, which is, of course, perhaps one of the most familiar verses in the book of Jude, to contend for the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints would be very important to interpret this in light of the particularization, the way in which he expands upon this business of contending for the faith once for all delivered to the saints in verses seventeen through twenty-one. That provides specific content, what's involved in contending for the faith that was once for all delivered to the saints. And then, of course, we go ahead and raise questions with regard to this.

What is the meaning of the major elements in verses three and four, and how is each of them spelled out or developed in the remainder of the book? More specifically, how does the reference to appealing to contend for the faith, etc., illumine the exhortations to the readers in verses seventeen through twenty-three? I mean, after

all, what he will go ahead and say in verses seventeen through twenty-three involves really what he said back here as contending for the faith. How does an understanding that this involves contending for the faith that was once for all delivered to the saints illumine the meaning of verses seventeen through twenty-three? And how does the reason given for this appeal in verse four, let's just say because of the introduction of these ungodly persons, illumine the remainder of the book, especially the description of the troublers in verses five through sixteen? What is the meaning of the differences between the faith once for all delivered to the saints, on the one hand, and the ungodliness of those designated for this condemnation? Exactly what are the differences? What is the meaning of these differences? What is the significance of the differences between the faith that was once for all delivered to the saints and the ungodliness here? By the way, let me just mention we don't answer these questions at this point, but one thing that, once you get to interpretation and begin to answer this question, begin to see that this whole business of the faith that was once for all delivered to the saints might not be a matter so much of orthodoxy as orthopraxy. Because what he does is to contrast the faith that was once for all delivered to the saints not with false doctrine but with false living, with an ungodly lifestyle.

Again, how are these differences developed in the remainder of the book? Here, we're picking up on the particularization. And how do they inform the message of the book as a whole? How does the chiasm support and illumine relationships between the responsibility of readers and the character of the troublers? Now, I didn't mention this with regard to chiasm, but let me say that one of the functions of chiasm is that it typically suggests that the most significant thing is A and A prime. So, when you have chiasm like A, B, as you have here, B, A, one of the purposes of the chiasm is to indicate that the A and the A prime is really the most significant thing and that B and B prime tend to be relatively secondary.

If that's the case, then this business of contending for the faith and the exhortations and really the specifics of this contending for the faith, the exhortations that we have at the end of the book, is really the primary concern. Of course, this is exactly what you'd expect. He is not writing this book to the ungodly.

He's writing them to the godly. So, he is actually exhorting the readers to contend for the faith that was once for all delivered to the saints. And that's the most important thing, which is suggested by the fact that in the chiasm he begins with this and he ends with that.

Then, the rational questions, why did the writer begin the book with this description of appeal and reason for appeal? Why did he discuss it in this way? Why did he use these terms? And why did he develop these two elements, both the appeal and the reason for the appeal, that is to say, the ungodly and their judgment, as he did throughout the rest of the book? Why did he choose to deal with the difference

between the faith delivered to the saints and the ungodliness of those designated for condemnation as he did? Why did he thus support and illumine the relationship between the responsibilities of the readers and the character of the troublers by this chiasm? And then, what are the implications, the full theological implications of the answers to all of these questions? Now, beyond that, we note here that we may have a kind of causation with contrast in the body of the book. And here I'm referring especially to verses 5 through 23.

You notice that you have the movement here from the indicative to the imperative. From what is to what therefore you ought to do. Because, in other words, of the troublers.

Because of their character, completely evil, and by the way, also the kind of evil that seeks to draw you in to it, into its orbit. It's not a matter of they're doing their own evil things out there. No, they do it in the midst of you.

And this evil is contaminating. That's part of the character of evil, of their evil, as he describes it in verses 5 through 16. Because of this character being completely and contaminatory, contaminatorily, that's a word, evil.

And because of the consequence that comes upon that kind of evil, because both of the character of their evil and the consequence of that evil, the judgmental consequence of that evil, therefore, this is how you should respond to it. With the imperative, the indicative, the imperative, oratory, causation. Consequent, exhortations to the readers to be righteous and help others to be righteous, to be entirely different from them.

Because of this, therefore, be and become entirely different from them. Hence, you have both causation and contrast. And again, we raise questions with regard to this.

How are, beginning with the definitive, the what is the meaning of sort of question, how are these troublers described? Exactly how are they described here? And what is the precise meaning of this description? What are the major elements involved in this movement, from their evil to the judgment of God, which they can expect? And what is the meaning of each of these major elements? How does a description of these troublers lead to, cause, or produce these exhortations? What are the major differences between the description of these troublers on the one hand and the kind of life the writer exhorts his readers to pursue on the other? And what is the precise and specific meaning of these differences? You notice we're picking up here on both the causation and the contrast. And then the rational question, why, according to this epistle, were these troublers so completely evil? By the way, this points to one type of rational question. There are basically two types of rational questions.

One type of rational question gets at the reason or the purpose for the writer writing something. Why did Jude want to communicate this? Why did he write this? Why did he emphasize this? But you can also have a rational question directed toward the logic of what is written. He describes these persons as evil.

And so, it raises a question, why, according to this epistle, were these troublemakers so completely evil? Why were they this way, according to the logic of the letter? Why, according to this epistle, did God choose to bring this kind of judgment upon them? He had this causation between their sin, their ungodliness, and God's judgment. Why did God choose to bring this kind of judgment upon them? Why did the writer, now here get into rational questions that have to do with the purpose of the writer, why did the writer thus describe these troublemakers, and why did he wish to present and emphasize this causal connection between sin and judgment in the way that he has? Why did the writer support his exhortations to the readers with this contrasting description of the troublemakers? And then, what are the full theological implications of the answers to these definitive and rational questions? Now, again, we don't answer these questions necessarily at this point, although Judith is sufficiently short that you could move directly into the interpretation phase, but at this stage, we're simply making observations and raising questions that then will serve as a bridge to interpretation. Now, we mentioned that we have a conclusion here, an epistolary conclusion in verse 24 that is really presented as a doxology.

Just remind us of what we have here, "...now to him who is able to keep you from falling, and to present you without blemish before the presence of his glory with rejoicing, to the only God our Savior, through Jesus Christ our Lord, be glory, majesty, dominion, and authority before all time, and now and forever. Amen." What we have noticed in verses 5 through 23 is a description of the dangers or threats to the Christian life and the exhortations to righteous living, which may then be actually substantiated by verses 24 through 25. Verses 24 and 25 may be the reason for what he says in verses 5 through 23.

In verses 24 and 25, we have the assurance of the divine power to preserve believers, "...now to him who is able to keep you from falling, and to present you without blemish before the presence of his glory with rejoicing, assurance of the divine power to preserve believers righteous throughout life, even to the judgment seat of God, and doxological praise to God because of God's glorious saving power." In other words, what you have here is the saving and preserving power of God in Christ is actually the means for the possibility of fulfilling the exhortations regarding righteous living. He has urged them to contend for the faith once for all delivered to the saints. He has urged them to remember the predictions of the apostles.

He has urged them to build themselves up in their most holy faith, to pray in the Holy Spirit, to keep themselves in the love of God, to wait for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ for eternal life, to convince some who doubt, to save some by snatching them

out of the fire, to have mercy on some with fear, to hate even the garment spotted by the flesh. Here, verses 24 and 25 indicate that they are able to do this because of the saving and preserving power of God in Christ. They are able to do it because of this, and that's a substantiation.

They are able to do it by means of this. That is to say, it's a saving and preserving power of God in Christ, which is the means for the end of their fulfilling the exhortations regarding righteous living, both in verse 3 and verses 24 and 25. Now, this is theologically quite significant because it suggests, really, that on the basis of their own human power, they are actually not at all up to the task, not at all able to respond in anything like an appropriate and helpful way to these ungodly persons who have found their way into their midst, to fulfill the exhortations that Jude gives to them.

They cannot do it. But God and his Christ are more than capable of equipping these readers to fulfill the exhortations and completely overcome the dangers that are being posed by these ungodly persons in their midst. Now, again, we want to raise questions with regard to these definitive questions.

How specifically and precisely do verses 24 through 25 provide support or reasons for both the description of dangers to the Christian life, including judgment upon the ungodly in the church, and the exhortations to righteous living? By the way, verses 24 and 25 also substantiate the judgment upon the ungodly here in this letter because he is suggesting here that the ungodly do not have to be ungodly. That is to say, their ungodliness is really an affront to grace, an affront to the rejection of, and a denial of the divine power that is available also to them to live different lives, to live lives above ungodliness. So that the divine power, the divine resources, is actually a basis for judgment upon sin.

So, again, how do verses 24 and 25, and especially the doxological affirmation of God's glorious power in salvation, bring the book to a climax and illumine the book as a whole? Why did the rational questions, why did the writer thus support or ground his descriptions and exhortations in verses 5 through 23 with this assurance of divine power to preserve believers and this doxology of praise to God because of his glorious saving and preserving power, even though that's the case, even though it's true he didn't have to say it? Why was it important for him actually to say it and to say it in this way? Why did he thus emphasize this divine power as the means of fulfilling the exhortation in the book? And, again, what are the implications to this? Now, we also have here, of course, in the book, a recurrence of contrast. And note that in most books you have anywhere from three to six or seven major structural relationships, and that's what we're finding here. But you'll notice that you have a recurrence of biographical contrast between the readers and the troublers.

The readers are described as holy, verses 3 and 20, whereas the troublers here are described as ungodly, verses 4, 15, and 18. The readers experience or await mercy, verses 2, 21, 23, whereas the troublers experience or await judgment, verses 4 through 16. The readers are described as unblemished, verse 24, whereas the troublers are described as defiled and stained, verses 8, 12, and 23.

The readers are described as or expected to pray in the spirit, verse 20. The troublers are described as being devoid of the spirit, verse 19. The readers stand before God, verse 24. The troublers will stand before God, verse 24.

The troublers stumble or fall away, verse 6. The readers are saved, that's his language, verses 3 and 25. The troublers are destroyed, also his language, verses 5, 7, 10, 11, 13, and 15. And here I would note with regard to this contrast, repeated contrast between the readers and the troublers, the role of the introduction and conclusion.

Notice that the introduction is very positive toward the readers. To those who are called, beloved in God the Father and kept for Jesus Christ, may mercy, peace, and love be multiplied to you. And the conclusion is also very positive toward the readers.

To him who is able to keep you from falling and to present you without blemish before the presence of his glory with rejoicing, et cetera. Whereas in verses 23 through 23, you have a negative description of the opponents. I would also note the role of the word kept.

The same word in Greek is used throughout Terrell. The word kept here, notice how you have a recurrence of the word kept, used one, two, three, four, five, six times, twice in one verse, verse six. But throughout the book, the role is kept.

Notice that the readers are said to be kept by God for salvation and to keep themselves. Whereas the troublers are kept by God for condemnation and have not kept themselves. So, kept is used really in such a way as to emphasize the difference.

The readers are kept for one thing or keep themselves for one thing. The ungodly are kept for another thing and do not keep themselves. So, the word keep is very, very important here.

And again, we raise questions, definitive, rational, and implicational questions regarding this. What is a specific meaning of each of these major differences and of others that may yet be identified between the readers and the troublers? Or perhaps we ought to say the ungodly because that's the word that he uses to describe them. How are these major differences related to each other? And how do they illumine one another? How does a role of the introduction and the introduction conclusion in

relation to the body and the kept theme contribute to and illumine the differences between the readers and the troublers? So, they're all definitive questions.

And the rational question is, why according to the logic of the book of Jude, did these differences between the readers and the troublers exist? Why did you describe and develop these differences as he did? And what are the full theological implications of the answers to the definitive and rational questions? And then we also, though, have a recurrence of comparison. The past description of evil, of the evil or the troublers is repeatedly compared to the present phenomena of the troublers. And this is indicated by the repeated use of these or these are.

So, notice you have the past description in verses five through seven. Now, I desire to remind you, though you were once for all fully informed, that he who saved the people out of the land of Egypt afterward destroyed those who did not believe. And the angels that did not keep their own position but left their proper dwelling have been kept by him in eternal chains in the nether gloom until the judgment of the great day.

Just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the surrounding cities, which likewise acted immorally and indulged in unnatural lust, serve as an example by undergoing a punishment of eternal fire, yet in like manner, these men, these are the current people in your midst, in like manner these men in their dreamings defile the flesh, reject authority, and revile the glorious ones. So, he moves from past description to present phenomena by way of comparison in like manner. Notice he does the same thing in verses nine and ten.

Begins with past description. But when the archangel Michael, contending with the devil, disputed about the body of Moses, he did not presume to pronounce a reviling judgment upon him but said, The Lord rebuke you. Now, present phenomena.

But these men, or these are the ones, who revile whatever they do not understand, and by those things that they know by instinct as irrational animals do, they are destroyed. Again, verse 11. Woe to them, for they walk in the way of Cain, and abandon themselves for the sake of Cain to Balaam's error, and perish in Korah's rebellion.

That's past description. Now, comparison with present phenomena. These are, these are the ones who are blemishes on your love feast, as they boldly carouse together, looking after themselves, waterless clouds carried along by winds, fruitless trees in late autumn, twice dead, uprooted.

And he does the same thing in verse 14. It was of these also that Enoch in the seventh generation from Adam prophesied, saying, Behold, the Lord came with his holy myriads to execute judgment on all, and to convict all the ungodly of all their

deeds of ungodliness, which they committed in such an ungodly way, and of all the harsh things which ungodly sinners have spoken against him. See, that's the past.

Now, we present the phenomenon by way of comparison. These are grumblers, malcontents, following their own passions, loudmouth bolsters, and flattering people to gain the advantage. And he does it finally in verses 17 and 18.

But you must remember, beloved, the predictions of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ. They said to you, in the last time, there will be scoffers following their ungodly passions. Now, verse 19, that's past description.

Now, present phenomena. It is these who set up divisions, worldly people devoid of the spirit, et cetera. So, past description of evil travelers is compared then repeatedly to the present phenomena of these ungodly in their midst.

And again, we raise questions with regard to this. What are the specific points of similarity between the past descriptions and the present phenomena? And what is the meaning of each of these points of similarity? How do these points of similarity illumine the character of these ungodly ones, that is to say, are presently in your midst? How are these individual points of similarity related to one another, and how do they illumine one another? Rational questions. Why were these ungodly so similar in these ways to the past descriptions? Why did you thus present and emphasize these similarities, and what are the implications? And then, of course, we identify key versus or strategic areas that represent major relationships that we identified.

Verses three and four, of course, represent particularization with substantiation and contrast, as we saw. And verses five, 17 through 20, and 23 represent causation and contrast with recurrence of substantiation and represent recurrence of contrast and the recurrence of comparison. Verses 24 and 25 would represent the substantiation with instrumentation and verses one and two represents preparation realization.

So out of the epistle, we notice that these are the most significant, the key verses. And then higher critical data, just on the basis of the book itself. The writer identifies himself as Jude, the brother of James.

He was thoroughly acquainted with the Old Testament and the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical writings, apparently. May therefore have been Jewish and especially acquainted with Jewish apocalypticism. The recipients were believers, makes that clear, largely pursuing the righteousness of God.

He describes him as being called, being beloved. He describes God as being our God, our master Jesus Christ. He talks of our common salvation and about God's power to keep you from falling.

But they were bothered and oppressed by the ungodly in the church. They had had prior contact with the reader, with the writer, obviously, according to verses three and five, and had become converted or nurtured under apostolic witness. Remember, beloved, the predictions of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ, how they said to you, he says.

The occasion was a personal desire to write about common salvation, but also, of course, the presence of these ungodly in the church, and we notice how he describes them here. Also, the date of writing may have been sometime after the age of the apostles. Verse 17, but you must remember, beloved, the predictions of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ, at least sometime after the ministry of the apostles, at least some of them to the readers of the church, the re-readers of the epistle.

With regard to other major impressions, the tone of the book is one of condemnation, especially in the description of the ungodly, but also a tone of hope and encouragement, especially toward the readers. We note that the writer twice alludes to extra-canonical material, presumably or apparently from the assumption of Moses and from 1 Enoch. We note that the general statement of verses three and four begins with the phrase, being very eager to write to you of our common salvation.

This phrase may be significant to the book, but its meaning is actually unclear. It may mean, although being very eager to write to you of our common salvation, I found it necessary to write to you about something else, thus indicating a contrast between what he actually has written and what he had originally intended to write. That is to say, what he has written is not about our common salvation but about something else, namely an appeal to contend for the faith.

But it may mean, because I was very eager to write to you of our common salvation, I wrote to you, I've written to you appealing to contend to the faith, which would be not so much a matter of contrast, but a matter of causation. Because I found it necessary to write to you appealing to contend, because I was eager to write to you of our common salvation, therefore I found it necessary to write to you appealing to contend for the faith, which was once for all delivered to the saints, which would suggest that what he actually writes to them is about our common salvation. Well, anyway, that essentially is a book, is a survey of the book of Jude here that we have.

I hope that that helps in terms of illustrating some of the principles that we talked about in terms of book survey.

This is Dr. David Bower in his teaching on inductive Bible study. This is session 8, Book Survey, Jude.