



2014

2 Peter 2:4-16: The Redaction of the Biblical and Intertestamental References Dependent on Jude 5-11 and Their Overall Significance for the Document

Jenny Devivo
Loyola University Chicago

Recommended Citation

Devivo, Jenny, "2 Peter 2:4-16: The Redaction of the Biblical and Intertestamental References Dependent on Jude 5-11 and Their Overall Significance for the Document" (2014). *Dissertations*. Paper 1079.
http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/1079

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).

Copyright © 2014 Jenny Devivo

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

2 PETER 2:4-16: THE REDACTION OF THE BIBLICAL AND
INTERTESTAMENTAL REFERENCES DEPENDENT ON JUDE 5-11 AND THEIR
OVERALL SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE DOCUMENT

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

PROGRAM IN THEOLOGY

BY

JENNY DE VIVO

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

AUGUST 2014

Copyright by Jenny DeVivo, 2014
All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my dissertation director, Dr. Wendy J. Cotter, C.S.J., for her assistance and guidance throughout my whole Ph.D. program. She has always demanded my best and has made me a much stronger scholar. I would also like to thank my readers, Dr. Thomas H. Tobin, S.J. and Dr. Robert A. DiVito whose expertise and careful analysis have strengthened and enriched my dissertation.

I would also like to thank Mrs. Catherine Wolf and Mrs. Marianne Wolfe of the Theology Department who guided me through forms, checklists, and countless other important details that eluded me.

We all need companions on the journey. I am particularly grateful to have shared the process with my dear friend and brilliant colleague, Dr. Teresa J. Calpino. Thank you for your support and, most especially, your friendship.

My interest in biblical scholarship began with Dr. Troy W. Martin at St. Xavier University in Chicago. Thank you for sparking my curiosity, guiding me through the beginnings of learning biblical scholarship, and for being my champion and friend ever since.

I would have not been able to go to graduate school at all if it were not for my dearest friend, Ms. Margaret C. Schaaf, who opened her home to me. Thank you for all of your encouragement, support, and love. None of this would have been possible without you.

Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends for all the ways they have encouraged and loved me through this process. In particular, I would like to thank my long-time friends, Dr. Jennifer M. Nelson, M.D. and Ms. Jennifer A. Meehan who carried me through much of this process with their friendship, laughter, challenge, and encouragement.

Alle Werke Gottes gehen langsam und leidvoll vor sich, dann aber stehen sie desto fester und blühen desto herrlicher. Thank you to all who have made my roots sturdier. The flower is all the lovelier because of you.

For my sister, Samantha Benevelli, of blessed memory

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	vii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Introduction	1
Jude and 2 Peter Used a Common Source	2
Jude and 2 Peter Were Written by the Same Author	11
2 Peter as a Source for Jude	14
Jude as a Source for 2 Peter	26
CHAPTER 2: 2 PETER 2:4 VS. JUDE 6	35
Introduction	35
Textual Criticism	36
The Angels	37
Function of this Narrative in 2 Peter	53
CHAPTER 3: 2 PETER 2:5	57
Introduction	57
Textual Criticism	57
The Use of the Flood Tradition in 2 Peter	58
Function of this Narrative in 2 Peter	80
CHAPTER 4: 2 PETER 2:6–8 VS. JUDE 7	83
Introduction	83
Textual Criticism	84
Sodom and Gomorrah	86
Lot	90
Textual Commentary	95
Conclusion	105
CHAPTER 5: 2 PETER 2:15–17 VS. JUDE 11	107
Introduction	107
Textual Criticism	107
Textual Commentary	111
Conclusion	133
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS	135
BIBLIOGRAPHY	157
VITA	165

ABSTRACT

For some time now, scholars have noted the close literary connection between Jude and 2 Peter, with thirteen of Jude's twenty-five verses paralleled in 2 Peter. One could say that the argument over the direction of dependency makes it the 'synoptic problem' of the Catholic Epistles. Although the literary evidence is overwhelmingly supportive of 2 Peter's dependency on Jude, the prominence of the figure of Peter in Christian history seems to have influenced certain scholars to propose the contrary.

The arguments for the dependence of 2 Peter upon Jude will be addressed immediately in this dissertation since the focus of this study is on the way the author of 2 Peter redacted certain key texts in Jude, and more importantly, why he did so. Jude draws on the Old Testament and Pseudepigrapha to present six notorious sinners/ groups of sinners placing them in two clusters of three. In the first cluster (Jude 5-7// 2 Pet 2:4-8) Jude names the Exodus generation, the sinful angels, and the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah; 2 Peter substitutes the Flood for the Exodus generation and returns to the correct chronological order of the sinful angels, the Flood, and Sodom and Gomorrah. Jude's second cluster (Jude 11) names three characters, Cain, Balaam, and Korah. 2 Peter 2:15-16 eliminates Cain and Korah, and expands upon the sinfulness of Balaam in 2:15-16.

While the majority of scholars conclude the 2 Peter is dependent on Jude, they have also made important contributions in the itemization of the ways in which the author

of 2 Peter has redacted Jude as well. What they have failed to address is the patterns that show the reasons for these alterations and how 2 Peter uses these texts for a different message to the community. This dissertation now attends to that issue, by focusing on these four narrative references which are foundational to the rest of 2 Peter; they are the key to understanding the function and genre of 2 Peter. While Jude uses these texts to threaten eternal punishment for those who follow the heresy within his community, 2 Peter uses them to assure the community that sin will not go unpunished and that God will soon destroy the entire earth with fire, consuming the unrighteous and sparing the righteous. Further research that will belong to the full study in the dissertation will help to fill out these differences, illustrate their depth, and will show their impact for the rest of the document.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

For some time now, scholars have noted the close literary connection between Jude and 2 Peter, with thirteen of Jude's twenty-five verses paralleled in 2 Peter.¹ One could say that the argument over the direction of dependency makes it the "synoptic problem" of the Catholic Epistles. Although the literary evidence is overwhelmingly supportive of 2 Peter's dependency on Jude, the prominence of the figure of Peter in Christian history seems to have influenced certain scholars to propose the contrary.²

The issue of dependency concerning Jude and 2 Peter is the fundamental issue of the dissertation, and must be addressed first, for the dissertation will examine the manner in which the use of significant scripture passages in 2 Peter are drawn from Jude, but then redacted to serve a new message. Although most scholars concur that the evidence points

¹ Jude 4–13, 16// 2 Pet 2:1–18 and Jude 17–18//2 Pet 3:2–3.

² Richard Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, Word Biblical Commentary, 50 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983), 141–2; J. Chaine, *Les épîtres catholique: la seconde épître de Saint Pierre, les épîtres de Sain Jean, l'épître de Saint Jude* (Paris: Gabalda, 1939), 18–24; Tord Fornberg, *An Early Church in a Pluralistic Society: A Study of 2 Peter*, Coniectanea biblical. New Testament Series; 9 (Lund: LiberLäromedel/ Gleerup, 1977), 31–59; Gene L. Green, *Jude & 2 Peter*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008), 327–30; Steven J. Kraftchick, *Jude, 2 Peter*, Abingdon New Testament Commentaries (Nashville: Abingdon, 2002), 79–81; J. N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude*, Black's New Testament Commentaries (London: Black, 1969), 226–7; Pheme Perkins, *First and Second Peter, James, and Jude*, Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1995), 178.

to 2 Peter as literarily dependent upon Jude, that evidence must be re-examined to reveal its degree of probability and not simply referenced and presumed.

There are four possible scholarly positions concerning the question of the literary relationship between Jude and 2 Peter. We shall examine each of them, beginning with the less probable and moving toward the more probable theories. They are (1) Jude and 2 Peter used a common source, (2) Jude and 2 Peter were written by the same author, (3) Jude is dependent upon 2 Peter, (4) 2 Peter is dependent upon Jude.

Jude and 2 Peter Used a Common Source

Bo Reicke holds that a common source, whether oral or written, was the “best assumption.”³ He poses that Jude and 2 Peter were based on a “... sermon pattern formulated to resist the seducers of the church.”⁴ The grounds for this theory are not explained or explored, but briefly stated. Moreover, he does not cite any text in either Jude or 2 Peter nor present the particular sermon pattern that leads him to the conclusion of a same source. We say “particular” pattern, because a sermon form is not singular enough in itself to prove that two documents are dependent on it.

Michael Green comes to his conclusion of a similar source by observing that although similar texts or allusions are present in both, there is a marked lack of verbal agreement between the two documents. “Out of the parallel passages comprising 2 Pet 1:2, 12; 2:1–4, 6, 10–12, 15–18; 3:2–3 and Jude 2, 4–13, 17–18, the former contain 297

³ Bo Reicke, *The Epistles of James, Peter, and Jude*, Anchor Bible (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company Inc., 1964), 190.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 190.

words and the latter 256 words, but they share only 78 in common.”⁵ In actuality, the two texts show similarity far beyond a word count, as the following seven texts will demonstrate.

Greetings

Jude 1–2 Ἰούδας Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος, ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου, τοῖς ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγαπημένοις καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς· ² ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη.

Jude 1–2 Jude, slave of Jesus Christ and brother of James, to those called, loved in God the Father and guarded for Jesus Christ. ² Mercy to you and peace and love be multiplied.

2 Peter 1:1–2 Συμεὼν Πέτρος δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῖς ισότιμον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ² χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.

2 Peter 1:1–2 Simeon Peter, slave and apostle of Jesus Christ, to those who, having obtained a faith as precious as ours, through the righteousness of our God and Savior Jesus Christ. ² Grace to you and peace be multiplied in the knowledge of God and of Jesus our Lord.

Here we see that 2 Pet 1:1–2 and their verbal parallels in Jude 1–2 contain the common opening and greeting of the standard letter of the time. For example, 2 Pet 1:2 gives greetings of grace and peace, an exceedingly common greeting found in both Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Letters.⁶ In Jude 2, the greeting is one of mercy, peace, and love. The same mention of mercy is in the Deutero-Pauline Pastorals (1 Tim 1:2 and 2 Tim 1:2). Both 2 Peter and Jude send their wishes in abundance, *πληθυνθείη*. Apart from Jude and 2 Peter, this noun is only found in the opening greeting of 1 Pet 1:2. These

⁵ Michael Green, *The Second Epistle General of Peter and the General Epistle of Jude*, 2nd, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, Morris, Leon (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987), 62.

⁶ Rom 1:7; 1 Cor 1:3; 2 Cor 1:2; Gal 1:3; Eph 1:2; Phil 1:2; Col 1:2; 1 Thess 1:1; 2 Thess 1:2; 1 Tim 1:2; 2 Tim 1:2; Titus 1:4; Phlm 1:3; 1 Pet 1:2; 2 John 1:3, and even Rev 1:4.

observations lead one to conclude that while the greetings in both 2 Pet 1:1–2 and Jude 2 are not exact, both follow the conventional pattern of greetings.

Reminders

Jude 5 Ὑπομνήσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰδότας [ὑμᾶς] πάντα ὅτι [ὁ] κύριος ἅπαξ λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπόλεσεν,

Jude 5 Moreover I wish to remind you, (although) you know all this, that the Lord having once saved a people out of the land of Egypt, second destroyed those who did not believe.

2 Peter 1:12 Διὸ μελλήσω ἀεὶ ὑμᾶς ὑπομιμνήσκω περὶ τούτων καίπερ εἰδότας καὶ ἐστηριγμένους ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ ἀληθείας.

2 Peter 1:12 Therefore, I will always remind you concerning these things, although you know them already and have been strengthened in the present truth.

It is notable that in 2 Pet 1:12// Jude 5, both share the desire to remind their readers, ὑπομιμνήσκω, of what they acknowledge they already know, οἶδα. While these two are the only words they share in common, the sentiment expressed is the same. Here we want to note another similarity in that both texts are following the same order of ideas/injunctions.

Warning about the Libertines

Jude 4 παρεῖσεδυσαν γάρ τινες ἄνθρωποι, οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα, ἀσεβεῖς, τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσελγείαν καὶ τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι.

Jude 4 For certain people crept in unnoticed, who were written about beforehand long ago for this condemnation, impious (people), who change the grace of God into licentiousness and deny our only master and lord, Jesus Christ.

2 Peter 2:1–3 Ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφηταὶ ἐν τῷ λαῷ, ὡς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, οἵτινες παρεισάξουσιν αἰρέσεις ἀπωλείας καὶ τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι. ἐπάγοντες ἑαυτοῖς ταχινὴν ἀπώλειαν,² καὶ πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις δι' οὓς ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται,³ καὶ ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ πλαστοῖς λόγοις ὑμᾶς ἐμπορεύσονται, οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει.

2 Peter 2:1–3 But false prophets also arose among the people, just as there will also be false teachers among you who will secretly bring in heresies of destruction and deny the master who bought them. They are bringing swift destruction upon themselves,² and many will follow their licentious ways (and) because of them the way of truth will be blasphemed,³ and in greed they will exploit you with fabricated words, for whom their condemnation (made) long ago is not idle and their destruction is not drowsy.

In 2 Pet 2:1–3// Jude 4 again the sentiments are the same, even if expressed differently. Both begin with a warning about libertines among the community. In 2 Peter it is the problem of false teachers (ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι), while in Jude it is the problem of certain people who have “crept in” among them, παρεισέδυσαν ... τινες ἄνθρωποι. Both texts accuse these people of licentiousness, and claim that their condemnation was pronounced long ago. Notice that the authors use either the same word or variations of the same word, licentious(ness) (2 Peter ἀσελγείαις, Jude ἀσέλγειαν), condemnation (2 Peter & Jude κρίμα), and long ago (2 Peter ἔκπαλαι, Jude πάλαι). Further, each of them are accused of denial (2 Pet 2:1, Jude 4 ἀρνέομαι) of Jesus, whom they call Master (2 Pet 2:1, Jude 4 δεσπότης).⁷

Notorious Sinners

Jude 5–6//2 Peter 2:4, 6

Jude 5–6 Ὑπομνήσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰδότας [ὑμᾶς] πάντα ὅτι [ὁ] κύριος ἅπαξ λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν,⁶ ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς αἰδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν,

Jude 5–6 Moreover I wish to remind you, (although) you know all this, that the Lord having once saved a people out of the land of Egypt, second destroyed those who did not believe.⁶ And the angels, not having kept their domain, but having left behind their own dwelling, he has kept in eternal chains under darkness, until the judgment of the great day

⁷ Calling Jesus δεσπότης is unique to 2 Peter and Jude. In the New Testament, only in Acts 4:24 and Rev 6:10 are prayers begun with the invocation, “Master,” and then, one would have to make a strong case that the prayer is addressed to Jesus, which is not clear in the text.

2 Peter 2:4 Εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἀμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο ἀλλὰ σειραῖς ζόφου ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους,

2 Peter 2:4 For if God did not spare the angels, having sinned, but cast them into Tartaros in chains of darkness, handed them over to be kept for judgment,

2 Peter 2:6 καὶ πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας τεφρώσας [καταστροφῆ] κατέκρινεν ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβέ[σ]ιν τεθεικώς,

2 Peter 2:6 and having reduced the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah to ashes, condemned them to destruction, having made them an example of what is coming to the ungodly,

Jude 5–6// 2 Pet 2:4, 6 contain striking parallels in that they refer to two of the same stories from Gen 6:1–4 and 19:1–29. Further, 2 Pet 2:15–16// Jude 11 also contain a similar reference to Balaam, taken from Num 22–24.

Jude 11// 2 Peter 2:15–16

Jude 11 οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς, ὅτι τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Κάϊν ἐπορεύθησαν καὶ τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν καὶ τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κόρε ἀπόλοντο.

Jude 11 Woe to them because they have gone in the way of Cain and have abandoned themselves to Balaam's error for wages and perished in Korah's rebellion.

2 Peter 2:15–16 καταλείποντες εὐθεῖαν ὁδὸν ἐπλανήθησαν, ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ τοῦ Βοσόρ, ὃς μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν ¹⁶ ἔλεγξιν δὲ ἔσχεν ἰδίας παρανομίας· ὑποζύγιον ἄφωνον ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ φθεγξάμενον ἐκώλυσε τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφρονίαν.

2 Peter 2:15–16 leaving the straight way, they have gone astray, following the way of Balaam (son of) Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness ¹⁶ but he had rebuke of his own lawlessness; a speechless donkey having brayed with a human voice hindered the prophet's madness.

Since this dissertation is based on these verses specifically, a detailed discussion will be provided in the following chapters.

Actions of the Libertines

Jude 8–10 Ὅμοίως μέντοι καὶ οὗτοι ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι σάρκα μὲν μιαίνουσιν κυριότητα δὲ ἀθετοῦσιν δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν. ⁹ Ὁ δὲ Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος, ὅτε τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωϋσέως σώματος, οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν κρίσιν ἐπενεγεῖν

βλασφημίας ἀλλὰ εἶπεν· ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι κύριος. ¹⁰ Οὗτοι δὲ ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἶδασιν βλασφημοῦσιν, ὅσα δὲ φυσικῶς ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα ἐπίστανται, ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται.

Jude 8–10 Yet likewise these dreamers also defile flesh, reject authority, and blaspheme the glories. ⁹ But when the archangel Michael contended with the devil and disputed about the body of Moses, he did not dare to bring a judgment of blasphemy but said, “The Lord rebuke you!” ¹⁰ But these blaspheme all that they do not know, but what they know naturally as irrational animals, in these things they are being corrupted.

2 Peter 2:10–12 μάλιστα δὲ τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμία μiasμοῦ πορευομένους καὶ κυριότητος καταφρονοῦντας. τολμηταὶ αὐθάδεις, δόξας οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες, ¹¹ ὅπου ἄγγελοι ἰσχύϊ καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες οὐ φέρουσιν κατ’ αὐτῶν παρὰ κυρίου βλάσφημον κρίσιν. ¹² Οὗτοι δὲ ὡς ἄλογα ζῶα γεγεννημένα φυσικὰ εἰς ἄλωσιν καὶ φθορὰν ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσιν βλασφημοῦντες, ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρήσονται

2 Peter 2:10–12 but above all, those who follow flesh in defiled lust and who despise authority. Presumptuous, audacious, they do not tremble to blaspheme the glories, ¹¹ whereas angels, greater in strength and power, do not bring against them a blasphemous judgment from the Lord. ¹² But these are like irrational animals, born according to nature, for capture and destruction, blaspheme things they do not know; in their destruction they will also be destroyed

In Jude 8–10// 2 Pet 2:10–12 it will be noticed that although verbal agreements are present, the texts are strikingly similar in order and content. Both begin by accusing their respective opponents that they participate in the defilement of the flesh. Jude uses the verb *μιαίνω* to describe the defilement, while 2 Peter uses the noun *μιασμός*. Both groups of opponents are anti-authoritarian (*κυριότης*)⁸ and participate in the slander (*βλασφημέω*) of the glorious ones (*δόξαι*). Next, both refer to angels, in the plural as in 2 Peter, or one, Michael, as in Jude. Both agree that angelic beings do not bring a judgment (*κρίσις*) of slander (*βλασφημέω*) against people. Finally, the description of the opponents’ behavior use three common denunciations: (a) they are like irrational animals (*ζῶα γεγεννημένα*), (b) they slander (*βλασφημέω*) what they do not understand (2 Peter

⁸ In all of the biblical corpus, this rare word only appears only in these two texts as well as in Eph 1:21 and Col 1:16.

ἀγνοέω, Jude οὐκ οἶδα), and (c) they face destruction (φθείρω). Both texts share some significant words, but beyond that, they follow the same order and contain the same message in essence. The percentage of verbal agreement hardly matters.

Further Actions of the Libertines

Jude 13 κύματα ἄγρια θαλάσσης ἐπαφρίζοντα τὰς ἑαυτῶν αἰσχύνas, ἀστέρες πλανῆται οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰῶνα τετήρηται.

Jude 13 wild waves of the sea, splashing up their shameful deeds, wandering stars for whom the gloom of darkness has been reserved forever.

Jude 16 Οὗτοί εἰσιν γογγυσταὶ μεμψίμοιροι κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας ἑαυτῶν πορευόμενοι, καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα, θαυμάζοντες πρόσωπα ὠφελείας χάριν.

Jude 16 These are grumblers, complainers, going after their own passions, and their mouth speaks arrogantly, flattering people for their advantage.

2 Peter 2:17–18 οὗτοί εἰσιν πηγαὶ ἄνυδροι καὶ ὀμίχλαι ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμεναι, οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους τετήρηται.¹⁸ ὑπέρογκα γὰρ ματαιότητος φθεγγόμενοι δελεάζουσιν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς ἀσελγείαις τοὺς ὀλίγως ἀποφεύγοντας τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφόμενους,

2 Peter 2:17–18 These are waterless springs and mists driven by a gale; for whom the gloom of darkness has been reserved.¹⁸ For, proclaiming arrogant nonsense, they lure with licentious passions of the flesh those who barely escaped from those living in error.

Jude 13, 16// 2 Pet 2:17–18 continue the description of their opponents. Here, the similarities are in the verbal parallels, sharing a few key words in common. They both agree that deepest darkness has been reserved for their opponents (ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους τετήρηται). In Jude 16// 2 Pet 2:18 both authors accuse their opponents of lust, ἐπιθυμία. What really brings the verses together is that their opponents are accused of being haughty, ὑπέρογκος, a word only appearing in these two places in the New Testament.⁹

⁹ It is found in the LXX only seven times: Ex 18:22, 26; Deut 30:11; 2 Sam 13:2; Lam 1:9; Dan 5:12, 11:36.

Predictions Concerning the Libertines

Jude 17–18 ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀγαπητοί, μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ¹⁸ ὅτι ἔλεγον ὑμῖν· [ὅτι] ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου [τοῦ] χρόνου ἔσονται ἐμπαῖκται κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι τῶν ἀσεβειῶν.

Jude 17–18 But you, beloved, remember the words spoken beforehand by the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ for they told you [that] in [the] last time there will be mockers, going after their own ¹⁸ passions of impiety.

2 Peter 3:2–3 μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημένων ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος, ³ τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες ὅτι ἐλεύσονται ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν [ἐν] ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαῖκται κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι

2 Peter 3:2–3 to have remembered the words spoken beforehand by the holy prophets and the commandment of the Lord and Savior (spoken by) your apostles, ³ “Know this first, that in the last days mockers will mock, going after their own passions

In Jude 17–18// 2 Pet 3:2–3 verbal similarities combine with content similarities.

Both ask their communities to remember (μυμνήσκω) the words (ῥῆμα) spoken previously (προλέγω), but Jude assigns these words to the apostles and 2 Peter assigns them first to the holy prophets and identifies them as the commandment of the Lord spoken through the apostles. Further, both authors speak about the end (ἔσχατος) and agree that there will be scoffers (ἐμπαίκτης) who will indulge (πορεύω) their own lusts (ἐπιθυμία).

Therefore, Green’s claim that there is no evidence to raise the question of copying is not supported. His own explanation recalls that of Reicke who appeals to a form such as the sermon, except in Green’s case he suggests, “... some standardized form of catechesis denouncing false teaching of an antinomian type” and likens it to a document such as Q, and other such tracts circulating in the early church.¹⁰ This broad scope raises

¹⁰ Green, *The Second Epistle General of Peter*, 62–63.

the question about just what form he supposes, for a catechetical document is quite distinct from the cluster of aphorisms and chreia that is Q. Here is it worthwhile to recall the observation of J. N.D. Kelly who states,

There is hardly anything in Jude which does not reappear in some form in 2 Peter, so that the supposed common source must have been to all intents and purposes identical with it. Apart from adapting this material, the writer's own contribution must have been limited to adding the prescript and the short pericope 19–23, and one wonders why he thought this worth the trouble.¹¹

Steven Kraftchick

Steven Kraftchick echoes the same sentiment as Kelly does above and goes further, arguing that there is no ancient evidence for the existence of such a common document presumed to have been the common source for 2 Peter and Jude, and that the hypothetical construction of such a document would be as good as identical to Jude.¹²

Celas Spicq

Spicq observed that while several texts are re-used in the biblical corpus, i.e., 2 Sam 22 = Ps 18; Is 2:2–4 = Mic 4:1–3, the similarities between Jude and 2 Peter are vague in their description of their opponents and the content of their teaching. Spicq concluded, therefore, that the authors used formulaic stereotypes from apologetic and polemic literature and independently drew upon an original anti-heretical document.¹³

¹¹ J. N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude*, Black's New Testament Commentaries (London: Black, 1969), 226.

¹² Steven J. Kraftchick, *Jude, 2 Peter*, Abingdon New Testament Commentaries (Nashville: Abingdon, 2002), 80.

¹³ Ceslas Spicq, *Les épîtres de Saint Pierre*, Sources Bibliques (Paris: Gabalda, 1966), 197 n.1.

In 2 Peter and Jude the description of the opponents and their teaching is certainly less specific than what one finds in Galatians. The question here, however, is one of literary dependency between the two documents. The origin of the description of the opponents and their teachings is an entirely different matter. This question can be put to rest by examining the other similarities between the two documents. If, for example, we had the Q material common to Matthew and Luke (and excluded triple-tradition material), and could see that the remaining text bore no striking similarities, we could posit a separate written source. In the case of 2 Peter and Jude, however, there are striking similarities throughout the entire document, not just in the description of the opponents. Therefore, the hypothesis that Jude and 2 Peter were drawn from a common independent source must be applied to the whole document, which brings us back in line with each scholar who has suggested the same. Hence, an independent anti-heretical document is implausible.

Conclusion

What one finds then, is that scholars who do suggest a common source for 2 Peter and Jude either seem unaware of the degree of similarity between them, or have a vague notion of the precise form that would produce them. The treatment is usually summary and quite general. When the texts are brought up close for comparison, the signs point to some closer relationship between the two than a common source.

Jude and 2 Peter Were Written by the Same Author

John Robinson is the only scholar to support the hypothesis that Jude and 2 Peter were written by the same author, “represent[ing] a single mind writing at much the same

time in a somewhat different context.”¹⁴ In fact, he was, “...astonished that [his hypothesis] has apparently suggested itself to no one here.”¹⁵ Robinson wrote:

Jude begins by saying that he was fully engaged in writing to his readers about their common salvation when he was forced to break off to send them an urgent appeal to close ranks against the danger of false teachers from within (3f). I suggest that what he was composing, in the name of the apostle, was 2 Peter. ... Jude first wrote off a hurried letter on his own authority to counter the immediate menace of the new heretics. This he incorporated (for the most part in a single block in ch. 2) in the more studied style of the formal encyclical. This would explain the fact that there is no discernible difference in the situation between the two epistles. Both are written to predominantly Jewish Christians in danger of ‘losing their safe foothold’ (2 Pet 3:17), though not from persecution but from error.¹⁶

Arguing further about the common authorship of the two documents, Robinson states, “... apart from the less spontaneous and more pretentious level of writing in 2 Peter which often overreaches itself, the vocabulary and style are indistinguishable.”¹⁷

Several pieces of the explanation for this hypothesis seem indefensible. While Jude 3 does speak of hastening to write, or being enthusiastic about writing (Ἀγαπητοί, πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος γράφειν ὑμῖν περὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας), it is not clear from the text that Jude was forced to break away from writing a planned document about salvation (2 Peter) and instead had to send an urgent appeal about the dangers of false teachers (Jude). It is a hypothetic supposition that has no defensible ground in the text. Also, if the same author wrote both documents, why was the block of material in 2 Peter 2 changed so drastically? Not only does 2 Peter change some of the Old

¹⁴ John A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976), 193.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 193.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

Testament/Pseudepigraphical references entirely, but the references they share in common are used very differently. Further, it is difficult to understand how Robinson can say that the vocabulary and style of both documents are indistinguishable, when Robinson himself says that there are far fewer verbal parallels between 2 Peter and Jude than Matthew and Luke in their common Q material. He also cites Guthrie's statistics that 70% of Jude's language has been changed in 2 Peter.¹⁸

One further glaring question is how Robinson can defend common authorship when the documents were written in the names of two different people. Robinson writes:

When writing in his own name Jude says, "Remember the predictions made by the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Jude 17); when writing with Peter's apostolic authority he says, "Remember the predictions made by God's own prophets" (2 Pet 3:2). Jude is representing Peter rather than impersonating him.¹⁹

Here, Robinson neglected to note that the second half of 2 Pet 3:2 also mentions the apostles, "καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος." Even so, reference to the apostles does not prove that this is the author of Jude representing Peter. Further, Robinson notes the strange usage of the name of the author at the beginning of 2 Peter, "Συμεὼν Πέτρος" (1:1), is evidence of Jude's authorship of 2 Peter. "For he calls him what *he* called him – Simeon. The only other person who is recorded as retaining this Hebraic use is his brother James (Acts 15:14): it was in the family."²⁰ This spelling hardly proves a family familiarity. The name יַעֲקֹב is transliterated into Greek as Σίμων or Συμεων, as well as other variations. Further, the suggestion of using a familiar

¹⁸ Ibid., 192.

¹⁹ Ibid., 194.

²⁰ Ibid.

appellation, Simeon, also carries the assumption that the historical Jude composed Jude, a work that is pseudonymous, as is 2 Peter. Robinson's conclusions seem to be a fanciful legend pasted together from very few verses of text, none of which were examined closely for other possibilities.

Richard Bauckham gives further reasons for why common authorship is implausible. 2 Peter contains 57 hapax legomena, 35 of which are not found even in the LXX.²¹ Further, Bauckham identified that the styles of the two documents differ so greatly that, "it is difficult to believe that a writer would have used his own work in the way in which the author of 2 Peter uses Jude."²² Kraftchick agrees that the great differences in their style make it impossible to consider that the same person wrote them and that their common imagery is used differently and for different purposes.²³

Robinson is alone in his theory that 2 Peter and Jude are explained by common authorship. His arguments are easily discredited because any close examination of the Greek texts reveals too many differences in vocabulary, grammar, and style to defend that the same person could have written both documents.

2 Peter as a Source for Jude

Friedrich Spitta

Friedrich Spitta's classical work, *Der zweite Brief des Petrus und der Brief des Judas eine geschichtliche Untersuchung* of 1885 is recognized as the most extensive and

²¹ Richard Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, Word Biblical Commentary, 50 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983), 135.

²² *Ibid.*, 141.

²³ Steven J. Kraftchick, *Jude, 2 Peter*, Abingdon New Testament Commentaries (Nashville: Abingdon, 2002), 79.

involved defense of the priority of 2 Peter over Jude.²⁴ He builds his case on specific differences between parallel texts in Jude and 2 Peter, arguing that 2 Peter's text is primary. The following three points made by Spitta will illustrate the types of examples he uses to argue for the primacy of 2 Peter.

Description of the Libertines

Jude 8 Ὁμοίως μέντοι καὶ οὗτοι ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι σάρκα μὲν μαινοῦσιν κυριότητα δὲ ἀθετοῦσιν δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν.

Jude 8 Yet likewise these dreamers also defile flesh, reject authority, and blaspheme the glories.

2 Peter 2:1 Ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐν τῷ λαῷ, ὡς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, οἵτινες παρεισάξουσιν αἰρέσεις ἀπωλείας καὶ τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι. ἐπάγοντες ἑαυτοῖς ταχινήν ἀπώλειαν,

2 Peter 2:1 But false prophets also arose among the people, just as there will also be false teachers among you who will secretly bring in heresies of destruction and deny the master who bought them. They are bringing swift destruction upon themselves,

Here, Spitta's concern is with the words used to describe the libertines. The true parallel to Jude 8 is 2 Peter 2:10 and the true parallel to 2 Peter 2:1(-3) is Jude 4, but we shall examine the two texts that Spitta used in this discussion. 2 Peter uses a more general ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, while Jude chooses ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι. Spitta considers Jude's choice more fitting and more erudite since various prophets of the Old Testament divine by dreams,²⁵ and Deuteronomy and Jeremiah contain stern warnings against paying heed to these prophecies. Spitta specifically observes Deuteronomy's (13:5, LXX 13:6)

²⁴ Friedrich Spitta, *Der zweite Brief des Petrus und der Brief des Judas eine geschichtliche Untersuchung* (Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1885).

²⁵ The Old Testament is inconsistent in its acceptance or rejection of prophecies that come through dreams. Whereas with Joseph in Gen 28:12; 37: 5-6, 9-10; 41:5 and in Joel 2:28 (LXX 3:1) dreams are positive, but Deut 13:1, 3, 5 (LXX 13:2, 4, 6) and Jer 23:25-32; 27:9-10 (LXX 34:9-10); 29:8-9 (LXX 36:8-9) strongly reject those who claim divine revelation through dreams.

description of those who claim prophetic status based on their dreams and who are then condemned to death for this blasphemous declaration.²⁶ To Spitta, it is unthinkable that if Jude were primary, 2 Peter would not choose to retain what Spitta considers the far better choice of ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι.²⁷

References to Michael and Moses

Jude 8–9 Ὁμοίως μέντοι καὶ οὗτοι ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι σάρκα μὲν μαιίνουσιν κυριότητα δὲ ἀθετοῦσιν δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν. ⁹Ὁ δὲ Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος, ὅτε τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωϋσέως σώματος, οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφημίας ἀλλὰ εἶπεν· ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι κύριος.

Jude 8–9 Yet likewise these dreamers also defile flesh, reject authority, and blaspheme the glories. ⁹But when the archangel Michael contended with the devil and disputed about the body of Moses, he did not dare to bring a judgment of blasphemy but said, “The Lord rebuke you!”

2 Peter 2:10–11 μάλιστα δὲ τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μiasμοῦ πορευομένους καὶ κυριότητος καταφρονοῦντας. τολμηταὶ αὐθάδεις, δόξας οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες, ¹¹ ὅπου ἄγγελοι ἰσχύϊ καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες οὐ φέρουσιν κατ’ αὐτῶν παρὰ κυρίου βλάσφημον κρίσιν.

2 Peter 2:10–11 but above all, those who follow flesh in defiled lust and who despise authority. Presumptuous, audacious, they do not tremble to blaspheme the glories, ¹¹ whereas angels, greater in strength and power, do not bring against them a blasphemous judgment from the Lord.

Here, Spitta draws attention to the notable, specific, and even odd reference to Michael contending with the devil over the body of Moses found in Jude 9. With regard to the progression of the letter’s topics, Spitta sees Jude 9 as an awkward interruption of the flow. That is, both 2 Pet 2:10–12 and Jude 8–10 refer to the libertines’ use of blasphemy (βλασφημέω) against the glorious ones and say that the angels (2 Pet 2:11) and the archangel Michael (Jude 9) do not bring a condemnation of blasphemy against

²⁶ Spitta, *Der zweite Brief des Petrus*, 433.

²⁷ Ibid.

people. Spitta observes that the specific reference to Michael should be recognized as an attempt in Jude at making a corollary illustration to the perversity of the libertines in 2 Pet 2:11. He claims that this is a misunderstanding of the 2 Peter text on which the writer of Jude shows himself to rely.²⁸ Spitta seems unable to explain how this misunderstanding connects, or flows from a reading of 2 Peter, nor does he explain how it would be incorrect to think that 2 Peter corrected awkward phrasing in Jude.

Similarly, Spitta views Jude's use of *τολμάω* in verse 9 as an unnecessary echo of 2 Peter's more fitting use of *τολμητής* in 2:10. He notes the contrast between the behavior of the libertines and the angels in 2 Peter. The libertines are bold and willful, (*τολμηταὶ αὐθάδεις*) and blaspheme the glorious ones, while the angels, who are greater in might and power (*ἰσχυῖ καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες*) do not bring blasphemous judgment. To Spitta, the contrast between the libertines and the angels fits well, particularly in reference to the boldness of the libertines. However, when the text of Jude says that Moses did not dare (*τολμάω*) to bring judgment (v 9), Spitta argues that this was another poor attempt of Jude to use a word originally used by 2 Peter.²⁹ Spitta finds Jude's use of *τολμάω* excessive and ill-fitting. To claim that one author misunderstood the text of another from which one borrowed does not clearly indicate the primacy of the supposed borrowed text.

Σπιλάς vs. Σπίλος

Jude 12 Οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες συνευωχούμενοι ἀφόβως, ἑαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες, νεφέλαι ἄνδρῳ ὑπὸ ἀνέμων παραφερόμεναι, δένδρα φθινοπωρινὰ ἄκαρπα δις ἀποθανόντα ἐκριζωθέντα,

²⁸ Spitta, *Der zweite Brief des Petrus*, 436.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 436.

Jude 12 These are stains³⁰ on your love feasts, feasting with you without fear, shepherding themselves - waterless clouds carried away by winds, autumnal, fruitless trees, twice dead, uprooted,

2 Peter 2:13 ἀδικούμενοι μισθὸν ἀδικίας, ἡδονὴν ἠγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφήν, σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν συνευωχούμενοι ὑμῖν,

2 Peter 2:13 suffering for the wages of unrighteousness. They consider it a pleasure, reveling in the day - stains and blemishes! - reveling in their deceits, feasting with you.

Similar to the example above, Spitta focuses on Jude's use of σπιλάς versus 2 Peter's use of σπίλος. Spitta argues that 2 Peter uses the image well because 2:22 contains the image of a sow who, though washed, returns to the mud (ὅς λουσαμένη εἰς κυλισμὸν βορβόρου).³¹ Further, immediately after 2 Peter calls the libertines σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι in 2:13, the following verse gives specific details about the sins that make them as dirty spots. (2:14 ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδος καὶ ἀκαταπαύστους ἀμαρτίας, δελεάζοντες ψυχὰς ἀστηρίκτους, καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίας ἔχοντες, κατάρας τέκνα·). Spitta observes that the use of σπιλάς makes far less sense in the larger context of the document since Jude immediately switches to nature images, calling the libertines waterless clouds, autumn trees without fruit, wild waves of the sea, and wandering stars. What is curious is why Spitta's examples would not lead him to conclude that the more polished text is more reasonably a redaction of Jude, rather than an author diminishing the excellent work which was his source. Spitta's arguments proceed from his assumption ahead of time that Jude is dependent on 2 Peter.

³⁰ σπιλάδες is a double-entendre. It means rock washed by the sea, a hidden reef, which cannot be seen and thus could damage or destroy the ship, but is also a spot or stain. The image of a hidden reef works perfectly with Jude 13 which speaks of waves that splash up (previously hidden) shameful deeds which cause destruction, as do those who have crept into Jude's community.

³¹ Spitta, *Der Zweite Brief Des Petrus*, 444.

Conclusion

Although Spitta has provided a set of details that must be addressed when discussing the question of dependence, his own arguments fail to set up verification controls, to allow for the opposite possibility that the greater excellence of 2 Peter on most counts, is more likely to be the later and dependent text than the reverse.

Charles Bigg

Charles Bigg seeks to illuminate the priority of authorship based on his reading of internal clues in the text. He writes:

If the arrangement of the one writer is more logical and his expression clearer than those of the other, it may be thought either that the first has improved upon the second, or that the second has spoiled the first. The criterion is of necessity highly subjective, and no very positive result will be attained unless we can show that the one has misunderstood the other, that the one uses words which are not only not used by the other, but also belong to a different school of thought, or that the one has definitely quoted the other. There are passages in our epistles which furnish us with these means of decision.³²

Before even applying the method, there is an obvious problem. When applying the method, "...either...the first has improved upon the second, or...the second has spoiled the first," it suggests that for every point of the argument, the conclusion can be applied in either direction equally. This leaves Bigg to apply either conclusion to argue for the priority of 2 Peter. Although it would seem more usual for the dependent text to be improved and even embellished, Bigg seems to struggle with signs of improvements easily seen in 2 Peter, and to find arguments to explain the less perfect text of Jude as

³² Charles Bigg, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*, International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1901), 216.

somehow the secondary and dependent text. I shall follow his arguments using the same chronology Bigg used in the following six points.

Jude 9 “Spoiled” 2 Peter 2:11

Jude 9 Ὁ δὲ Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος, ὅτε τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωϋσέως σώματος, οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφημίας ἀλλὰ εἶπεν· ἐπιτιμῆσαι σοι κύριος.

Jude 9 But when the archangel Michael contended with the devil and disputed about the body of Moses, he did not dare to bring a judgment of blasphemy but said, “The Lord rebuke you!”

2 Peter 2:11 ὅπου ἄγγελοι ἰσχύϊ καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες οὐ φέρουσιν κατ’ αὐτῶν παρὰ κυρίου βλάσφημον κρίσιν.

2 Peter 2:11 whereas angels, greater in strength and power, do not bring against them a blasphemous judgment from the Lord.

As Bigg supports the hypothesis that 2 Peter is primary, he uses the differences in these verses to demonstrate how Jude has “spoiled” 2 Peter’s point. First, he writes that Jude inserted a reference to the *Assumption of Moses* but does not explain why, or how this is relevant for Jude’s purposes.³³ Connected to this insertion, Bigg identifies that Jude naturally removed 2 Peter’s *παρὰ κυρίου* because “... the dispute between Michael and Satan did not occur in the presence of the Lord.”³⁴ He concludes that Jude, “has altered and spoiled St. Peter’s point, and quite destroyed the parallel.”³⁵ Bigg does not attempt to explain the function of the differences in the text. Rather, he concludes that Jude simply spoiled the text of 2 Peter. What is puzzling is the failure to explain how

³³ Ibid., 217.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Ibid.

Bigg recognizes that reading the sequence in that fashion does not require him to explain why the writer of Jude did not recognize himself, that he had spoiled the text.

Vocabulary Differences

Bigg begins this section with the presupposition of Pauline vocabulary as distinct from Petrine vocabulary. Secondly, associating each writer with the historical personage claimed as writer, he notes that since Jude contains words that may be called Pauline, not Petrine, then the letter must postdate 2 Peter with its Petrine vocabulary.³⁶ While it is well-established that these two documents contain distinct and diverse vocabularies, modern scholars do not claim that these differences necessarily belong to a Pauline or Petrine vocabulary nor do they lend any evidence as to which document is primary. In a second piece of his argument, however, Bigg relies on the hapax legomena of 2 Peter³⁷ to argue,

It is surely far more natural to suppose that Jude was in the habit of using Pauline language, and slipped these words in without any sense of incongruity, than that 2 Peter, while following Jude slavishly elsewhere, cut out these words on doctrinal grounds.³⁸

Much of Bigg's arguments depend on his assumption that the documents are historically reliable as compositions of the two authors named. This assumption is sufficient to explain these tortured arguments to explain 2 Peter as primary to Jude. The real problem is that in the end, Bigg must resort to special pleading rather than appeal to

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid., 224.

³⁸ Ibid., 217.

usual literary patterns in redaction to explain the diminished text of Jude as an edited version of 2 Peter.

Literary Style and Arrangement

Jude 17–18 ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀγαπητοί, μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ¹⁸ ὅτι ἔλεγον ὑμῖν· [ὅτι] ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου [τοῦ] χρόνου ἔσονται ἐμπαῖκται κατὰ τὰς ἐαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι τῶν ἀσεβειῶν.

Jude 17–18 But you, beloved, remember the words spoken beforehand by the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ, ¹⁸ for they told you [that] in [the] last time there will be mockers, going after their own passions of impiety.

2 Peter 3:2–4 μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημένων ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος, ³ τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες ὅτι ἐλεύσονται ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν [ἐν] ἐμπαίγμονῃ ἐμπαῖκται κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι ⁴ καὶ λέγοντες· ποῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ; ἀφ’ ἧς γὰρ οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν, πάντα οὕτως διαμένει ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως.

2 Peter 3:2–4 to have remembered the words spoken beforehand by the holy prophets and the commandment of the lord and savior (spoken by) your apostles, ³ “Know this first, that in the last days mockers will mock, going after their own passions ⁴ and saying, ‘Where is the promise of his coming? For since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue from the beginning of creation.’”

Bigg simply relies on his own theory as he states, “St. Peter gives the warning as his own” since the text is according to his style.³⁹ Certainly, since the two documents were written by different authors, their styles differ, and the compositions as a whole will bear a different style throughout. From this stance, Bigg then discusses which apostles may have been indicated in Jude 17, and then concludes, “There is certainly strong reason for thinking that Jude is here quoting 2 Peter.”⁴⁰

³⁹ Bigg, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 218.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 218.

Next, Bigg moves to more general reasons for supporting the priority of 2 Peter.

He writes, “The rest of the argument depends upon points of arrangement and style, which can establish nothing beyond a vague opinion.”⁴¹ Even so, we shall follow his chronology through these points of arrangement and style.

Salutation

Jude 2 ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη.

Jude 2 Mercy to you and peace and love be multiplied.

2 Peter 1:2 χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.

2 Peter 1:2 Grace to you and peace be multiplied in the knowledge of God and of Jesus our Lord.

Bigg identifies the differences in the salutations of the documents, noting that 1 & 2 Peter agree in their greeting, “χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη,” and that Jude’s greeting has a more direct parallel with other New Testament documents.⁴² In addition to Jude containing a more commonly used greeting formula, Bigg observes that immediately before the greetings of mercy, peace, and love, Jude used the “Pauline κλητοῖς.”⁴³ While this adjectival form of καλέω does appear in Rom 1:1, 6, 7; 8:28; 1 Cor 1:1, 2, 24, it also appears in Mt 22:14, Rev 17:14 and 19 times in the LXX in its adjectival form. Based on this use of κλητοῖς and the similarities of the greeting to other New Testament documents, Bigg claims that, “St. Jude’s formula is conflate and later.”⁴⁴

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² See the detailed analysis of the comparison of the greetings above in section 2.1.

⁴³ Bigg, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 218.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 218.

The preceding evidence does not prove that Jude's greeting is either conflate or later. Further, 2 Peter's imitation of the greeting in 1 Peter is not surprising, particularly when a pseudonymous document's aim is to align itself as "the second letter I am writing to you" (2 Pet 3:1). Such duplication of the same greeting is a simple way to attempt to bolster the document's validity.

Jude Wrote in Haste

Jude 3 Ἀγαπητοί, πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος γράφειν ὑμῖν περὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας ἀνάγκην ἔσχον γράψαι ὑμῖν παρακαλῶν ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει.

Jude 3 Beloved, making all haste to write to you about our common salvation I must write, imploring (you) to contend for the faith that was once for all handed over to the saints.

Here Bigg adds another theory to the meaning of this verse when he holds that Jude was clearly writing in a hurry.⁴⁵ He then offers two possible scenarios. In the first he offers the situation in which "St Peter's letter had reached him and opened his eyes to the mischief that was going on..." while in the second he opines, "that sudden information had been brought to him that Antinomian teachers were at work in his district, that time pressed, and that he copied out, with no very great alteration, as much of St. Peter's letter as he thought necessary."⁴⁶ In fact, Jude 3 has given rise to a number of similar arguments, but since there is no other clarification in the text, it is impossible to verify such claims.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 220.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

2 Peter's Phrasing is More Natural and Intelligible

Jude 5 Ὑπομνήσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰδότας [ὑμᾶς] πάντα ὅτι [ὁ] κύριος ἅπαξ λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπόλεσεν,

Jude 5 Moreover I wish to remind you, (although) you know all this, that the Lord having once saved a people out of the land of Egypt, second destroyed those who did not believe.

2 Peter 1:12 Διὸ μελλήσω ἀεὶ ὑμᾶς ὑπομνήσκειν περὶ τούτων καίπερ εἰδότας καὶ ἐστηριγμένους ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ.

2 Peter 1:12 Therefore, I will always remind you concerning these things, although you know them already and have been strengthened in the present truth.

Relying on his theory of Jude's necessary haste, he explains, "St. Peter's phrase is much more natural and intelligible than St. Jude's."⁴⁷ The argument demands that Jude be dependent on 2 Peter and in haste. It is a circular argument.⁴⁸

Conclusion

The work of Bigg has made a contribution in identifying major similarities and differences between the two letters, but the presuppositions regarding authorship which belong to his era influenced his explanations to support what would appear in his day to be sensible conclusions concerning the direction of dependency.

Since the investigations of these two great scholars, and in the light of current scholarship, the evidence as uncovered by both result in the majority of scholars concluding that 2 Peter is in fact, dependent on Jude. We now turn to those arguments and further investigations.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ In the remainder of the section, "The Relation of 2 Peter to Jude," Bigg mentions some various points of the differences between 2 Peter and Jude, but does not use the differences to argue for the priority of one over the other. For each of his previous arguments, however, he has not made a convincing case for the primacy of 2 Peter.

Jude as a Source for 2 Peter

Most contemporary scholars of the Catholic Epistles overwhelmingly concur that Jude is the source for 2 Peter and not the reverse. Their arguments can be reduced to seven main points of evidence. It must be said that counter-arguments could be made for each of the seven, but the conglomerate evidence of all seven result in a conclusion that is very difficult to contest.

Length of Document

It is usual, but admittedly not definitive, that the source document is shorter than the dependent one.⁴⁹ Jude's 25 verses result in a notably shorter document than the 61 verses of 2 Peter. While it is usual for the dependent text to expand upon the borrowed text, as seen in Matthew and Luke's redaction of some of Mark's accounts, the opposite must also be acknowledged.⁵⁰ Donald Guthrie argues that, "There would be an obvious point in an enlargement of an earlier work where the additions would enable the author to append his own special features."⁵¹ The opposite is more difficult to imagine, "... especially when the briefer epistle appears merely to extract a portion of the longer and append little more than a salutation and a doxology."⁵² Guthrie makes an excellent point.

⁴⁹ Michael J. Gilmour, *The Significance of Parallels Between 2 Peter and Other Early Christian Literature* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), 83.

⁵⁰ Some examples of when Mark's account is longer than Matthew's or Luke's in the Triple Tradition include Mk 2:1–12// Mt 9:1–8// Lk 5:17–26; Mk 5:1–20// Mt 8:28–34// Lk 8:26–39; Mk 5:21–43// Mt 9:18–26// Lk 8:40–56.

⁵¹ Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, 3rd, revised (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1970), 920.

⁵² *Ibid.*

The texts of Jude and 2 Peter under consideration are not narratives but biblical excerpts, and in this case, excising is more difficult to explain.

Context: Urgency vs. Leisure

Jude 3 Ἀγαπητοί, πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος γράφειν ὑμῖν περὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας ἀνάγκην ἔσχον γράψαι ὑμῖν παρακαλῶν ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἀγίοις πίστει.

Jude 3 Beloved, making all haste to write to you about our common salvation I must write, imploring (you) to contend for the faith that was once for all handed over to the saints.

In previous sections, we have seen how scholars have used this verse to argue for other explanations of the relationship between the two documents. Many have observed that the beginning of Jude alludes to an urgent matter that the author felt the need to address immediately. There is no indication of an immediate threat in 2 Peter. In fact, as we noted previously, some scholars explain the brevity of Jude as due to a situation requiring haste. Joseph B. Mayor, however, finds it difficult to recreate a scene of such haste and necessity with the author of Jude taking time to read through the leisurely treatment of 2 Peter, as he says, “It seems hardly possible to suppose that this note of alarm could have come to him through 2 Peter, who writes in a much more leisurely way, not feeling it necessary at once to plunge into controversy and supply his readers with weapons for the defense of the faith.”⁵³

Greater Specificity in Peter

Jude 4 παρεισέδυσαν γάρ τινες ἄνθρωποι, οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα, ἀσεβεῖς, τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν καὶ τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι.

⁵³ Joseph B. Mayor, *The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter: Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Comments* (New York: Macmillan, 1907), ii.

Jude 4 For certain people crept in unnoticed, who were written about beforehand long ago for this condemnation, impious (people), who change the grace of God into licentiousness and deny our only master and Lord, Jesus Christ.

2 Peter 2:1–3 Ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφήται ἐν τῷ λαῷ, ὡς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, οἵτινες παρεισάξουσιν αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας καὶ τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι. ἐπάγοντες ἑαυτοῖς ταχινὴν ἀπόλειαν,² καὶ πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις δι' οὓς ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται,³ καὶ ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ πλαστοῖς λόγοις ὑμᾶς ἐμπορεύονται, οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ καὶ ἡ ἀπόλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει.

2 Peter 2:1–3 But false prophets also arose among the people, just as there will also be false teachers among you who will secretly bring in heresies of destruction and deny the master who bought them. They are bringing swift destruction upon themselves,² and many will follow their licentious ways (and) because of them the way of truth will be blasphemed,³ and in greed they will exploit you with fabricated words, for whom their condemnation (made) long ago is not idle and their destruction is not drowsy.

Two scholars each see a similar issue between these verses. It is supposed that the dependent text will apply the meaning of the source in a more detailed manner. Tord Fornberg observes that, here, Jude is general, sweeping, while 2 Peter is far more specific regarding the details about the false teachers and what they will do.⁵⁴ Similarly, Guthrie points to Jude's text as more spontaneous about the false teachers, in contrast to the long introduction in the parallel passage in 2 Peter.⁵⁵

Greater Attention to Order

Jude 5–7 Ὑπομνήσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰδότας [ὑμᾶς] πάντα ὅτι [ὁ] κύριος ἅπαξ λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπόλεσεν,⁶ ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς αἰδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν,⁷ ὡς Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον τοῦτοις ἐκπορνεύσασαι καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐτέρας, πρόκεινται δεῖγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκην ὑπέχουσαι.

Jude 5–7 Moreover I wish to remind you, (although) you know all this, that the Lord having once saved a people out of the land of Egypt, second destroyed those who did not

⁵⁴ Tord Fornberg, *An Early Church in a Pluralistic Society: A Study of 2 Peter*. Coniectanea Biblical New Testament Series; 9 (Lund: LiberLäromedel/ Gleerup, 1977), 36.

⁵⁵ Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, 920.

believe.⁶ And the angels, not having kept their domain, but having left behind their own dwelling, he has kept in eternal chains under darkness, until the judgment of the great day⁷ as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them, which in like manner as they, committed fornication and went after other flesh, is exhibited as an example by undergoing a punishment of eternal fire.

2 Peter 2:4–8 Εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἀμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο ἀλλὰ σειραῖς ζόφου ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους,⁵ καὶ ἀρχαίου κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο ἀλλὰ ὄγδοον Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα ἐφύλαξεν κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἀσεβῶν ἐπάξας,⁶ καὶ πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας τεφρώσας [καταστροφῇ] κατέκρινεν ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβέ[σ]ιν τεθεικώς,⁷ καὶ δίκαιον Λῶτ καταπονούμενον ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀθέσμων ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ ἀναστροφῆς ἐρρύσατο·⁸ βλέμματι γὰρ καὶ ἀκοῇ ὁ δίκαιος ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἀνόμοις ἔργοις ἐβασάνιζεν·

2 Peter 2:4–8 For if God did not spare the angels, having sinned, but cast them into Tartaros in chains of darkness, handed them over to be kept for judgment,⁵ and did not spare the ancient world, but guarded (the) eighth (person) Noah, a herald of righteousness, when he brought a flood on the world of the ungodly,⁶ and having reduced the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah to ashes, condemned them to destruction, having made them an example of what is coming to the ungodly and⁷ rescued righteous Lot, subdued by the licentiousness of lawless conduct;⁸ for seeing and hearing, the righteous (person) living among them day after day was tormented in his righteous soul by (their) unlawful deeds;

Here, each author refers to three Old Testament narratives, but Jude presents the Exodus reference first, and then the two from Genesis: a. the Exodus generation (Ex 14; Num 14:1–35; 26:64–65), b. the sinful angels (Gen 6:1–4), and c. Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 19:1–24). In contrast, 2 Peter presents the references in canonical/chronological order: a. the sinful angels (Gen 6:-14), b. the flood (Gen 7), c. and Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 19:1–24). Gilmour observes, “It is easier to imagine Peter correcting and supplementing than the reverse scenario, namely Jude breaking up the existing

sequence.”⁵⁶ Perhaps this is what J. Chaine means when he comments that this feature shows 2 Peter to be less primitive, thus likely to be secondary.⁵⁷

Fewer Pseudepigraphical Allusions

Jude 14–15 Προεφήτευσεν δὲ καὶ τούτοις ἕβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ Ἐνώχ λέγων· ἰδοὺ ἦλθεν κύριος ἐν ἀγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ ¹⁵ 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 ἀμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς.

Jude 14–15 And also Enoch, the seventh from Adam prophesied to these saying, “Behold the Lord is coming with ten thousand of his holy ones ¹⁵ to make a judgment against all and to convict all life of all their deeds of impiety, which they committed impiously, and of all the harsh things that the impious sinners spoke against him.”

1 Enoch 1.9 Behold, he is coming with ten thousand of his holy ones in order to execute judgment upon all. He will destroy the wicked ones and censure all flesh on account of everything they have done, that which the sinners and the wicked ones committed against him.⁵⁸

1 Enoch 60.8 and (the other), a male called Behemoth, which holds his chest in an inevitable desert whose name is Dundayin, east of the garden of Eden, wherein the elect and the righteous ones dwell, wherein my grandfather was taken, the seventh from Adam, the first man whom the Lord of the Spirits created.⁵⁹

Jude 6 ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς αἰδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν,

Jude 6 And the angels, not having kept their domain, but having left behind their own dwelling, he has kept in eternal chains under darkness, until the judgment of the great day

2 Peter 2:4 Εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἀμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο ἀλλὰ σειραῖς ζόφου ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένου,

2 Peter 2:4 For if God did not spare the angels, having sinned, but cast them into Tartarus in chains of darkness, handed them over to be kept for judgment,

⁵⁶ Gilmour, *The Significance of Parallels Between*, 84.

⁵⁷ J. Chaine, *Les épîtres Catholique: La Seconde épître De Saint Pierre, Les épîtres De Saint Jean, l'épître De Saint Jude* (Paris: Gabalda, 1939), 23.

⁵⁸ James H. Charlesworth, ed., *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Vol. 1 (NY: Doubleday, 1983), 13–14.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 40–41.

Jude 9 Ὁ δὲ Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος, ὅτε τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωϋσέως σώματος, οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφημίας ἀλλὰ εἶπεν· ἐπιτιμῆσαι σοι κύριος.

Jude 9 But when the archangel Michael contended with the devil and disputed about the body of Moses, he did not dare to bring a judgment of blasphemy but said, “The Lord rebuke you!”

2 Peter 2:11 ὅπου ἄγγελοι ἰσχύϊ καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες οὐ φέρουσιν κατ’ αὐτῶν παρὰ κυρίου βλάσφημον κρίσιν.

2 Peter 2:11 whereas angels, greater in strength and power, do not bring against them a blasphemous judgment from the Lord.

Jude 14–15 have no parallel in 2 Peter, and in the above texts where there are parallels, Jude 6// 2 Pet 2:4 and Jude 9// 2 Pet 2:11, there is a question of whether 2 Peter deliberately excised allusions to extra-canonical material from the document. Extra-canonical traditions about Enoch were extremely popular and well-known by the time of the New Testament. Jude 9 refers to the *Assumption (Testament) of Moses*, which was also quoted in patristic authors, but is currently lost to us.⁶⁰ Scholars have concluded that this omission in 2 Peter would fit well with a later church’s hesitancy to rely on materials that were seen as “extra-canonical” in character.⁶¹ In order to verify this suggestion, it would be necessary to know the dates of both documents as well as have a date for an official, established Jewish canon; we have none of these dates. Even with these dates, which are highly disputed, ancient authors did not suddenly discard the Pseudepigrapha and forget its contents. Thus, in my view, this kind of argumentation lacks the evidence necessary to arrive at the conclusion that 2 Peter is dependent on Jude. In fact, 2 Peter

⁶⁰ Green, *Jude & 2 Peter*, 79–80.

⁶¹ J. N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude*, Black's New Testament Commentaries (London: Black, 1969), 227 and Gilmour, *The Significance of Parallels Between*, 85.

does make clear references to the Pseudepigrapha. In the following chapters, I shall address these issues in greater detail.

Necessary Dependence on the Allusion Found in Jude

Jude 8–9 Ὁμοίως μέντοι καὶ οὗτοι ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι σάρκα μὲν μιαίνουσιν κυριότητα δὲ ἀθετοῦσιν δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν. ⁹ Ὁ δὲ Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος, ὅτε τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωϋσέως σώματος, οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφημίας ἀλλὰ εἶπεν· ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι κύριος.

Jude 8–9 Yet, likewise, these dreamers also defile flesh, reject authority, and blaspheme the glories. ⁹ But when the archangel Michael contended with the devil and disputed about the body of Moses, he did not dare to bring a judgment of blasphemy but said, “The Lord rebuke you!”

2 Peter 2:10–11 μάλιστα δὲ τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμία μiasμοῦ πορευομένους καὶ κυριότητος καταφρονοῦντας. τολμηταὶ αὐθάδεις, δόξας οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες, ¹¹ ὅπου ἄγγελοι ἰσχύϊ καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες οὐ φέρουσιν κατ’ αὐτῶν παρὰ κυρίου βλάσφημον κρίσιν.

2 Peter 2:10–11 but above all, those who follow flesh in defiled lust and who despise authority. Presumptuous, audacious, they do not tremble to blaspheme the glories, ¹¹ whereas angels, greater in strength and power, do not bring against them a blasphemous judgment from the Lord.

Both authors have been discussing the libertines and then conclude with the contrast between the evil behavior in comparison to the holy behavior of Michael (so Jude 8–9), or, the angels (2 Pet 2:10–11). Gilmour observes that in these verses, 2 Peter only makes sense if Jude lies behind it.⁶² Observing 2 Peter alone, the reference to angels who do not bring slanderous judgment against people requires a reference, which one finds in the explication of Jude 8–9. 2 Peter appears as a summarized allusion to Jude.

Jude’s Omission of a Supportive Text in 2 Peter 3:4

2 Peter 3:4 καὶ λέγοντες· ποῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ; ἀφ’ ἧς γὰρ οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν, πάντα οὕτως διαμένει ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως.

⁶² Gilmour, *The Significance of Parallels Between*, 84.

2 Peter 3:4 and saying, ‘Where is the promise of his coming? For since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue from the beginning of creation.’”

The parallels between 2 Peter and Jude hold until 2 Pet 3:2–3// Jude 17–18. At this point, there is material only found in 2 Pet 3:4–17, and afterward the parallel continues (2 Pet 3:18// Jude 25). Since both documents exhort their readers to remain faithful and warn that God will punish those who are unfaithful, the statement in 2 Pet 3:4, which presents a challenge on the lips of the opponents who doubt that God will come with judgment, not only fits the context but the particular concern of Jude. Thus Mayor writes, “I cannot think that if Jude had known this verse, which gives so much point to the preceding prophecy, he would have refrained from inserting it.”⁶³

Conclusion

It must be said that other arguments concerning the direction of dependency between 2 Peter and Jude have been built on minutiae and have failed to address the larger issues that address the major evidence of the comparison.

In reviewing these seven observations, it is Mayor who summarizes the overall result when he states, “... we can generally see a reason why Peter should have altered Jude, but very rarely a reason why what we read in Peter should have been altered to what we find in Jude.”⁶⁴ Gilmour is more controversial in his conclusion, “... if 2 Peter already existed, it is hard to imagine why Jude was needed.”⁶⁵ In fact, as this dissertation will show, Jude appears to have had a different *Sitz im Leben* than 2 Peter. It is better to

⁶³ Mayor, *The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter*, xiv.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, xxv.

⁶⁵ Gilmour, *The Significance of Parallels Between*, 86.

rely on the literary evidence that has been presented. Jude could not have used 2 Peter in his situation. Rather, the literary evidence shows that 2 Peter relies on Jude and turns the texts, clearly expanding on them, correcting the order of texts in some cases, and creating a more polished and reflective composition. It is simply special pleading to argue that the sum of these observations support anything but that 2 Peter drew upon Jude and, “any idea that 2 Peter is earlier and was revised by Jude may be considered refuted.”⁶⁶ With the overwhelming majority of scholars, I must conclude that the best explanation of the relationship of the two documents is that 2 Peter is dependent upon Jude.

⁶⁶ Fornberg, *An Early Church in a Pluralistic Society*, 58.

CHAPTER 2

2 PETER 2:4 VS. JUDE 6

Introduction

Chapter 2 compares the treatment of the sinful angels by Jude and 2 Peter. While they both refer to the same tradition, each author presents the situation in a unique way. Remembering that 2 Peter is dependent upon Jude, this chapter examines the changes 2 Pet 2:4 made to the text of Jude 6 in particular. The changes that are present in 2 Peter demonstrate key aspects of the overall message of 2 Peter. In particular, 2 Peter's changes emphasize that God's punishment for sinners is certain. Unlike Jude, 2 Pet 2:4 does not describe the sin of the angels so that the focus is upon God's punishment. To emphasize the severity of God's punishment, 2 Peter alone says that the angels are being kept in Tartarus to await their judgment. 2 Peter uses the tradition of the sinful angels to warn his audience that if they do not remain obedient to God's commands, they too can expect God's severe punishment.

In order to understand the changes 2 Peter made to Jude's text, we begin with a textual criticism, to ensure that we are using the most secure text. Next, the differences between Jude and 2 Peter's texts will be examined in depth in order to explain the reasons behind the changes. Finally, we shall consider how 2 Peter's changes to 2:4 impact the overall function of 2 Peter.

Textual Criticism

Jude 6 ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς αἰδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν

Jude 6 And the angels, not having kept their domain, but having left behind their own dwelling, he has kept in eternal chains under darkness, until the judgment of the great day

The text of 2 Peter 2:4 is relatively secure, with the exception of two places where a variant occurs, as indicated below, underlined and in bold: **σειραῖς** and **τηρουμένους**.

2 Peter 2:4 Εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἀμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο ἀλλὰ **σειραῖς** ζόφου ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν **τηρουμένους**,

2 Peter 2:4 For if God did not spare the angels, having sinned, but cast them into Tartarus in chains of darkness, handed them over to be kept for judgment,

σειραῖς (by chains) is supported by Papyrus 72, and two late codices, P and Ψ, as well as the Koine collection of Byzantine lectionaries and the Vulgate and Syriac versions.

Codex Sinaiticus (Ⲙ) contains σιροῖς (in pits), while other prominent Codices, Vaticanus (B), Alexandrinus (A), and Ephraemi (C) contain σειροῖς, what appears to be a correction of σιροῖς. While the number and prominence of these majuscules might support the use of “pits,” their combined attestation to “pits” cannot overcome the antiquity of P 72, and as noted in *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*,¹ these manuscripts appear to be influenced by the Egyptian preference for σιρός. On the question of the connection between Jude 6 and 2 Pet 2:4, which is already admitted by scholars, one would also note that not only does the evidence of P 72 support **σειραῖς** (by chains), but also the fact that **σειραῖς** is a synonym for **δεσμοῖς** which we find in Jude 6.

¹ Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), 632.

τηρουμένους (being kept) is supported by P 72, Codex Vaticanus (B), the first correction of Codex Ephraemi (C*), Codex Porphyrianus (P), Codex Athous Laurae (Ψ), and the Koine group of Byzantine lectionaries. A variant reading, *κολαζομένους τηρεῖν* (being punished, to keep) is found in Codices Sinaiticus (Ⲡ), Alexandrinus (A), the second correction of Codex Ephraemi (C²), Codex Athous Laurae (Ψ), and a few minuscules. This reading appears to anticipate 2 Pet 2:9, connecting the punishment of the angels to the future punishment of the day of judgment:

2 Peter 2:9 οἶδεν κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ πειρασμοῦ ῥύεσθαι, ἀδίκους δὲ εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως κολαζομένους τηρεῖν,

2 Peter 2:9 (then) the Lord knows how to rescue the godly from temptation, and to keep the unrighteous under punishment until the day of judgment,

The Angels

Identity of the Angels

Jude and 2 Peter both refer to the sinful beings who appear in Gen 6:1–4, the Jewish Pseudepigrapha, especially the *Book of Watchers* (*1 En.* 1–36), the Dead Sea Scrolls, and later rabbinic literature.² The issue here is that although Gen 6:1–4 refers to these sinners as “בְּנֵי־הַאֱלֹהִים”³ in the MT and “οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ” in the LXX, both Jude and 2 Peter refer to them as “ἄγγελοι” (2 Pet 2:4; Jude 6), and it is clear that they expect their listeners to recognize the reference to Gen 6:1–4.

² It is not clear whether Genesis or *1 Enoch* is the literary source of these traditions. Some scholars such as Józef Milik argue that *1 En.* is the older text, and what appears in Gen 6:1–4 is only a textual allusion to the larger work of *1 En.* 1–36. Józef T. Milik, *The Books Of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments Of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976), 31. Such an issue stretches beyond the scope of this dissertation.

³ A term “applied to supernatural beings.” Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles Briggs, *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew And English Lexicon* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003) 120. They may also be understood as “heavenly beings in the broader sense.” H. Haag, “בְּנֵי,” *TDOT* 2:145–59, 158.

The use of בְּנֵי־הָאֱלֹהִים can be found in both positive (Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7 and *I En.* 71.1) and negative (*I En.* 69.4–5) contexts. Interestingly, one finds the LXX of Job using ἄγγελοι, and here the translator has clearly bypassed the literal translation of the Hebrew, unlike the LXX translation of Gen 6:2, which uses οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ.

Devorah Dimant notes a shift in references to these sinners of Gen 6:1–4 from “sons of God” to “angels”:

The identification of the sinners as angels is adopted by all the Qumranic documents (CD 2:18; 4Q180 1 7–10; 1QapGen 2.2, 16; generally in *I Enoch*, esp. chaps. 6–16; 86–88; 106–7; *Jub.* 4.22; 5.1; 7.21).⁴

Later, rabbinic documents wanted to avoid referring to these rebellious sinners as “בְּנֵי־הָאֱלֹהִים” “sons of God” and also show an aversion to calling them “angels.” One solution was to translate בְּנֵי־הָאֱלֹהִים as “the great ones,” or “sons of judges,” or “sons of nobility” as Gene Green explains:

At Gen 6:2, *Tg. Onq.*⁵ identifies them as ‘the sons of the great ones’ or nobility, and *Tg. Neof.*⁶ calls them ‘the sons of the judges.’ Frustration with the prevailing interpretive trend was voiced in the *Gen. Rab.* 26.5⁷ on Gen 6:2: ‘R. Simeon b. Yohai referred to them as sons of the nobility. R. Simeon b. Yohai cursed anyone who called them ‘sons of God.’⁸

⁴ Devorah Dimant, “Noah In Early Jewish Literature,” in *Biblical Figures Outside The Bible*, Stone, Michael E. and Theodore A. Bergren (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998), 126 n. 16.

⁵ Moses Aberbach and Bernard Grossfeld, *Targum Onkelos to Genesis* (New York: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1982), 50–1.

⁶ *The Aramaic Bible: The Targums*, vol. 1A, *Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis*, McNamara, Martin (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992), 71.

⁷ H. Freedman, trans., *Midrash Rabbah*, vol. 1, *Genesis* (London: Soncino Press, 1983), 213.

⁸ Gene L. Green, *Jude & 2 Peter*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008), 66–7.

Very rarely, *בְּנֵי־הָאֱלֹהִים* is used of human beings as we find in *Jub.* 22.11 and *Pirqe Abot* 3.19.

Further distinctions between these sinners and faithful angels resulted in the name “The Watchers,” so that *I En.* 1–36, which gives the fullest narration of the actions of the sinful angels, is known as the Book of Watchers.⁹ The Aramaic *עִירִין* (sing. *עִיר*) appear in *Dan* 4:10, 14, 20 (MT), meaning waking or wakeful ones.¹⁰ In the Theodotion translation of the LXX, *עִיר* is transliterated as *ιρ* (*Dan* 4:13, 17, 23 LXX), whereas the Old Greek uses *ἄγγελος*.¹¹ In the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha where a Greek text exists, *οἱ ἐγγήγοροι*, appear in *I En.* 1.5; 10.7, 9, 15; 12.2–4; 13.10; 14.1, 3; 15.9; 16.2; *T. Reu.* 5:6–7; *T Naph.* 3:5; *Jub.* 10:1. The Dead Sea Scrolls also call them Watchers in *CD* 2.18¹²; 4Q227 [4QpsJub] 4¹³; 1QapGen 2.1.^{14, 15}

What this evidence illustrates is that despite the possible synonyms, with very few exceptions, by the Hellenistic period ancient authors referred to the sinful *בְּנֵי־הָאֱלֹהִים* of *Gen* 6:1–4 using the general term “angels.”

⁹ *I En.* 1.5; 10.6, 9, 15; 12.2–4; 13.10; 14.1, 3; 15.2, 9; 16.1–2.

¹⁰ *BDB*, 1105 and John J. Collins, *Daniel*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 224–6.

¹¹ Collins, *Daniel*, 224.

¹² Florentio García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, Vol. 1: 1Q1–4Q273 (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2000), 552–3.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 482–3.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 28–29.

¹⁵ Gene L. Green, *Jude & 2 Peter*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008), 67.

It is for this reason that in both Jude and 2 Peter the references to the sinful and rebellious ones of Gen 6:1–4 are to “angels” and the authors can rely upon the popularity of their reference in that context, with no need to retell their story to identify them as evil.

Action of the Angels

Jude 6 focuses upon only one aspect of the angels’ wickedness, namely, that they did not keep to their domain but left behind their dwelling (ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον). 2 Pet 2:4 simply states that the angels sinned, but does not specify the nature of their sin (Εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἀμαρτησάντων).

While Enochic literature, and *1 Enoch* 12.4; 15.3–4; 69 in particular, lists the various sins of the angels, in fact Jude’s identification of their sin as failing to remain in their own dwelling echoes the sin articulated in *1 Enoch* where it is said they have “...violated the distinction between the heavenly and the earthly, the angelic and human spheres...”¹⁶ This accusation summarizes all of their actions and transgressions. Angels do not belong in the realm of mortals, nor do mortals belong in the dwelling of the angels. The angels taught the people of earth things they were not supposed to know, thus transgressing the boundary between heaven and earth. Moreover, the angels had sexual relations with the women of earth, the mingling of creatures which were created to be separate, and thus the women produced offspring of that illegitimate union.

Throughout *1 Enoch* and in later Jewish literature, the sin of failing to keep one’s proper place is grave. *1 En.* 12.4 says the Watchers are those who, “...forsook the highest

¹⁶ George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary On The Book Of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36, 81–108*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 271.

heaven, the sanctuary of their eternal station...” and in 15.3 they, “...left the high, holy, and eternal heaven...” In the Greek text of both *I En.* 12.4 and 15.3, the verb ἀπολείπω “suggests not only a departure but also an act that is final, an abandonment or desertion.”¹⁷

I Enoch provides several examples of how other aspects of God’s creation are properly obedient and do not stray from their proper course or place. The Book of the Heavenly Luminaries, *I En.* 72–82, details the courses of the sun, moon, stars, and seasons. After the description of the course of each, it is emphasized that they maintain this order according to the command of God.¹⁸ An oath in *I En.* 69.16–26 details the obedience of several other aspects of nature that do not transgress their proper place.

I Enoch draws a parallel between the stars and the angels. Just as there are obedient and disobedient angels, there are also obedient and disobedient stars. *I En.* 18.15 describes the place of punishment for stars who did not arrive punctually for their duties in the sky and *I En.* 21 speaks of seven stars who are bound for their sin for ten million years.¹⁹ Nickelsberg identifies a long-standing tradition in the ancient Near East and Hellenistic world in which the stars are personified, and in *I Enoch* the disobedient stars are an allusion to the disobedient angels.²⁰ The Animal Apocalypse (*I Enoch* 83–90)

¹⁷ Gene L. Green, *Jude & 2 Peter*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008), 68; Danker, F. W., W. Bauer, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), 115.

¹⁸ *I En.* 72.36–37a; 74.17a; 79.2.

¹⁹ Nickelsburg observes that the close parallels in content and wording indicate that chapter 21 is dependent upon chapters 17–19. Nickelsburg, *I Enoch*, 298.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 288.

adds another condemnation of the fallen angels in that the fallen stars have sex with cows (*I En.* 83), are punished (then the great flood follows immediately) (*I En.* 88), and are judged and thrown into a fiery abyss (*I En.* 90.21ff).

Testament of Naphtali 3.2–5 illustrates the obedience of the sun, moon, and stars in contrast to the disobedience of others, including the sinful angels.²¹

Sun, moon, and stars do alter their order; thus you should not alter the Law of God by the disorder of your actions. The gentiles, because they wandered astray and forsook the Lord, have changed the order, and have devoted themselves to stones and sticks, patterning themselves after wandering spirits. But you, my children shall not be like that: In the firmament, in the earth, and in the sea, in all this products of his workmanship discern the Lord who made all things, so that you do not become like Sodom, which departed from the order of nature. Likewise the Watchers departed from nature's order; the Lord pronounced a curse on them at the Flood. On their account he ordered that the earth be without dweller or produce. (*T. Napht.* 3.2–5)²²

Jude's focus on the failure of the angels to keep their proper place also fits well with Jude 13, where he speaks of his opponents as wandering stars (ἀστέρες πλανήται). In comparing his opponents to wandering stars, he makes an analogy between his opponents and the fallen angels who were represented as stars in *I En.* 17–21.

Jude's wording emphasizes that even if one has had a privileged place with God, disobedience, that is, not keeping one's proper place, can result in loss of the privileged position. This is clear in Jude's previous example of the Exodus generation.

Jude 5 Ὑπομνήσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰδότας [ὑμᾶς] πάντα ὅτι [ὁ] κύριος ἄπαξ λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σῶσας τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν,

Jude 5 Moreover I wish to remind you, (although) you know all this, that the Lord having once saved a people out of the land of Egypt, secondly destroyed those who did not believe.

²¹ Note that the three biblical examples of sinners match the examples given in 2 Peter 2:4–8.

²² James H. Charlesworth, ed., *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Vol. 1* (NY: Doubleday, 1983), 812.

Thus, as the document is arranged, the example of the boundary breaking, rebellious angels follows the example of the disobedient Exodus generation. While the message of subsequent loss of a privileged place is the same, the offense of the angels is so much greater. Far more than the frail humans God saved out of Egypt, the angels have an exalted, higher place of privilege. Thus their loss is enormous and in keeping with their rebellion and disobedience to God.

The threat of such punishment is Jude's warning to the members of his community. They will lose their place among God's chosen ones eternally should they dare to follow those wicked people who were destined for condemnation long ago (Jude 4).

2 Peter's use of the reference is distinct. Rather than a warning about the breaking of boundaries with its punishment of loss of privilege as we find in Jude, 2 Peter merely observes the certainty of punishment for those who transgress God's commands. 2 Peter simply recalls that the angels sinned (Εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἀμαρτησάντων), and leaves the reference there. He relies upon the ubiquitousness of the story of the fallen angels, and expects that the audience will know the identity of the angels and the nature of their sins.

In contrast to Jude, the text of 2 Pet 2:4–10a emphasizes the certainty of punishment for sinners. In each of the three examples from 2:4–8, the emphasis is not upon the details of the sin, but upon the assurance of punishment.

2 Peter 2:4–8 Εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἀμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο ἀλλὰ σειραῖς ζόφου ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους,⁵ καὶ ἀρχαίου κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο ἀλλὰ ὄγδοον Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα ἐφύλαξεν κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἀσεβῶν ἐπάξας,⁶ καὶ πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας τεφρώσας [καταστροφῆ] κατέκρινεν ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβέ[σ]ιν τεθεικώς,⁷ καὶ δίκαιον Λῶτ καταπονούμενον ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν

ἀθέσμων ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ ἀναστροφῆς ἐρρύσατο· ⁸ βλέμματι γὰρ καὶ ἀκοῇ ὁ δίκαιος ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἡμέραν ἕξ ἡμέρας ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἀνόμοις ἔργοις ἐβασάνιζεν·

2 Peter 2:4–8 For if God did not spare the angels, having sinned, but cast them into Tartarus in chains of darkness, handed them over to be kept for judgment, ⁵ and did not spare the ancient world, but guarded (the) eighth (person) Noah, a herald of righteousness, when he brought a flood on the world of the ungodly, ⁶ and having reduced the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah to ashes, condemned them to destruction, having made them an example of what is coming to the ungodly, ⁷ and rescued righteous Lot, subdued by the licentiousness of lawless conduct; ⁸ for seeing and hearing, the righteous (person) living among them day after day was tormented in his righteous soul by (their) unlawful deeds;

The apodosis of the sentence in v. 9 makes this clear through its assurance of punishment for sinners.

2 Peter 2:9 οἶδεν κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ πειρασμοῦ ῥύεσθαι, ἀδίκους δὲ εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως κολαζομένους τηρεῖν,

2 Peter 2:9 (then) the Lord knows how to rescue the godly from temptation, and to keep the unrighteous under punishment until the day of judgment,

In summary, the way each example of the notorious sinners addressed in both Jude and 2 Peter, illustrates the nature and the kind of instruction to their community. As we have shown, Jude gives the precise example of the way those who previously had God's favor lost it. 2 Peter does not give the precise example or attitude that resulted in the loss of God's favor, but only gives assurance that those who do transgress God's commands will certainly be punished.

God's Action or Reaction

Both authors state that the angels are kept until the time of judgment, using the verb τηρέω. One of the ways this verb is used in the NT is, "... 'to guard,' e.g., in a prison in Acts 12:6; guarding prisoners or felons, Mt 27:36, 54; Acts 12:5; 16:23; 24:23; 25:4,

21b.”²³ The assurance of God’s coming punishment is expressed using the same verb in *T. Reu.* 5.5.²⁴ Echoing the protasis beginning in 2 Peter 2:4, the apodosis in 2:9 reiterates that the Lord knows how to keep (τηρέω) the unrighteous under punishment until the day of judgment. Both Jude and 2 Peter state that the gloom of darkness has been reserved for their respective opponents (Jude 13// 2 Peter 2:17). 2 Peter alone adds that the present heavens and earth are being kept (τηρέω) in their present state until the final judgment when the godless will be destroyed and the heavens and earth will be destroyed by fire.

2 Peter 3:7 οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσὶν πυρὶ τηρούμενοι εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως καὶ ἀπωλείας τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων.

2 Peter 3:7 But by the same word, the present heavens and earth are being reserved for fire, being kept until the day of judgment and the destruction of ungodly people.

Jude uses τηρέω twice in verse 6, playing the sinful acts of the angels against God’s punishment. Jude uses τηρέω with a negative, meaning, “... ‘to forfeit,’ ‘to lose.’”²⁵ Since the angels forfeited (μὴ τηρήσαντας) their proper dwelling, God has kept (τετήρηκεν) them for eternal punishment, using the perfect tense of the verb, indicating that the imprisonment continues.²⁶ Moreover, the purpose of the angels’ confinement in Jude is for the sake of future punishment, while Jude is addressed to those that God guards in safety (καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς) (Jude 1). In regards to God’s dealing with the sinful angels, God seems to be reacting, as opposed to acting. That is,

²³ H. Riesenfeld “τηρέω,” *TDNT* 8:140–51, 141.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 142.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ *Ibid.*, n. 7.

God's action of keeping the angels imprisoned until the time of punishment comes after the angels forfeit their proper dwelling.

Only 2 Peter uses οὐκ φείδομαι, declaring the surety of divine punishment. The verb φείδομαι can mean to spare someone, rather than destroy them, or to spare someone by showing them mercy.²⁷ Rather than directly saying that God destroyed the angels or was merciless to them, 2 Peter says that God did not spare them so that they would act as a warning for those presumptuous of God's mercy. In the case of the sinful angels, and the ungodly world which merited the flood in the next verse, the message is that sinners were not spared. In this, 2 Peter's references emphasize that one cannot casually presume upon God's perpetual mercy and pardon.

Similarly, only 2 Peter's text uses the verb παραδίδωμι, emphasizing the direct action of God handing over sinners for punishment as in Rom 1:18–32, which specifically uses παραδίδωμι in vv. 24, 26, 28. Likewise, the reference to God handing over the Exodus generation for punishment is found in Acts 7:42.²⁸ This use of the verb in 2 Peter helps to focus on the action of God, rather than God's reaction, as in Jude. As stated above, the nature of the sin or even the sinner is not the central issue for 2 Peter. Rather, the use of παραδίδωμι helps to emphasize the sure action of punishment for those sinners, and to reiterate that punishment will certainly come to the sinners in 2 Peter's community.

In summary, what we see is that the author of 2 Peter has edited Jude's references in two significant ways. First, in Jude, the primary actors are the rebellious angels who

²⁷ s.v. “φείδομαι,” LSJ.

²⁸ Friedrich Büchsel, “δίδωμι,” *TDNT* 2:166–73, 170.

left their proper dwelling, and God's role in keeping them for later punishment is a response to their action. 2 Peter however shifts the main action to God. God did not spare them and God handed them over. Second, as we have shown, the particular sin of the angels is not the focus for 2 Peter. Rather, for 2 Peter, no matter what the transgression, the point is that the story of the rebellious angels proves that the God who took swift action against those who sinned is now keeping the angels until judgment and will do the same for the unrighteous in 2 Peter's community (2:9).

Tartarus

Greek Origins

The presence of the verb *ταρταρώσας* is the source of much debate and speculation about 2 Peter because of its origins in Greek mythological literature. Tartarus refers to a place lower than Hades and is so far beneath the earth that, according to Hesiod, if a bronze anvil fell from earth it would fall non-stop for nine days and nights and arrive in Tartarus on the tenth day.²⁹ Kronos, the Titans, and other enemies of Zeus were kept there, unable to escape, because of the bronze gates put there by Poseidon.³⁰ In the most ancient concepts of Tartarus, it was a place of punishment for defeated gods or gods who oppose Zeus, but never a place for mortals.³¹ In the 6th century BCE the concept of Tartarus shifted, and it also became a place where wicked humans were punished in the afterlife.³² The distinction between Hades and Tartarus is not always clear

²⁹ Hesiod, *Theogony*, 724-726.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 729-33; Homer, *Iliad*, VIII:13.

³¹ G. H. Baudry, "Le Tartare: De La Mythologie Greque à La Liturgie Chrétienne," *Mélanges De Science Religieuse* 52, 1 (1995), 89.

³² *Ibid.*, 89.

and was sometimes used interchangeably in popular mythology, but Tartarus was nonetheless used frequently.³³ For our purposes, however, its origins and popularity in Greek literature for centuries before its appearance in 2 Peter help illuminate why 2 Peter used this familiar term.

Use in Jewish Literature

Neyrey sees 2 Peter's use of Tartarus as an indication of the author's attempt to reach a multi-cultural audience who would be familiar with the Greek concept of Tartarus as well as the author's eagerness to employ pagan stories which reinforce the Bible.³⁴ Yet, in the same breath, Neyrey recognizes, "With the hellenization even of Israel, 'Tartarus,' entered Jewish culture and literature, finding its way into the LXX Job 40:20; 41:24; Prov 30:16, as well as *Sib. Orac.* 2.302; 4.186; *I Enoch* 20.2; and Philo, *Leg.* 103; *Praem.* 152."³⁵ Green also recognized that Tartarus was "... taken up by Jewish apocalyptic literature and appears to have found its way into the Jewish consciousness in general."³⁶

The use of the term Tartarus is inconsistent in the LXX. In Job 40:20 the LXX usage of Tartarus does not correspond to the MT. The MT says that the animals play in the field and the LXX says that the four-footed animals (τετράποσιν) play in Tartarus (ταρτάρω), which makes the Greek sound poetic, but makes no sense.

³³ Hesiod, *Theogony*, 119, 682, 721, 725, 736, 807, 822, 841, 868, *Hymn to Apollo*, 336, *Hymn to Hermes*, 256, 374; Hesiod, *Shield*, 255; *Fragments*, 27.22, 58.6, 59b; Aeschylus *Prometheus Bound*, 152–58, 1050–52; *Eumenides*, 72; Sophocles. *Oedipus at Colonus*, 1574; Pindar, *Pythian Odes*, 1.15; Nicander, *Theriaca*, 203, s.v. "Τάρταρος," *LSJ*, 1759.

³⁴ Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, 198, 202.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 202.

³⁶ Green, *Jude & 2 Peter*, 251.

Job 40:20 ἐπελθὼν δὲ ἐπ’ ὄρος ἀκρότομον ἐποίησεν χαρμονὴν τετράποσιν ἐν τῷ ταρτάρῳ

In Job 40:20 (LXX) Tartarus refers to “the deep,” but there is no sense of punishment. Similarly, in Job 41:24 (LXX), Tartarus is a translation of the Hebrew מְהוֹתָּ, referring to the subterranean water of the ancient Hebrew cosmology. In this second response to Job (40:1–41:26) where the wonders of Leviathan are recounted, the use of מְהוֹתָּ adds to the sense of God’s inscrutable power.³⁷ However, the use of Tartarus conveys a sense of punishment that is not present in the Hebrew text. In Prov 30:16 Tartarus is given as the translation of לִאֲוִי, while Prov 27:20 translates לִאֲוִי as ἄδης. In both of these texts, “...the inevitability of death was expressed as the underworld’s insatiability.”³⁸ Whether the LXX is using Tartarus or Hades, Sheol is unpleasant and undesirable, yet this is where all the dead, righteous and wicked, dwell.

For our purposes, the most important reference is from *I En.* 20.2 where the Greek Codex Panopolitanus reads “Uriel, one of the holy angels, the one over the world and Tartarus.”³⁹ In *I En.* 21, Enoch sees Tartarus and the terrible torments therein; he is so terrified that Uriel asks, “Enoch, why are you frightened and so shaken?” (*I En.* 21.9).

Excursus: Uriel

The archangel Uriel⁴⁰ appears often in connection with the judgment of sinners, with particular prominence in *I Enoch* and *Sibylline Oracles*. Uriel, with Michael, Raphael, and Gabriel, sees the bloodshed and lawlessness of the people of earth because of what the sinful angels taught

³⁷ Herbert Haag, “מְהוֹתָּ,” *TDOT* 15:574–81, 580.

³⁸ L. Wächter, “לִאֲוִי,” *TDOT* 14:239–48, 245.

³⁹ Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Vol. 1 pp. 6, 23.

⁴⁰ In some texts where multiple manuscripts exist, the name Uriel sometimes appears as Sariel.

them (*I En.* 9.1). In several instances Uriel is named as the guide who shows Enoch the places of punishment for the sinful angels and other sinners who are awaiting judgment (*I En.* 19.1; 20.1; 21.5, 9; 27.2). Uriel also shows Enoch the movement and patterns of all the heavenly bodies and also the place where the stars who did not keep their proper course (an allusion to the sinful angels) are kept for punishment (*I En.* 33.3; 72.1; 74.2; 75.3–4, 78.10; 79.6; 80.1; 82.7). In *Sibylline Oracles*, the angels Arakiel, Ramiel, Uriel, Samiel and Azael will lead people from the dark gloom to God's judgment seat (2.215). Interestingly, in *Sib. Or.* 2.227–237, Uriel acts alone in breaking the bolts of Hades and leading to judgment "...all forms that have endured much suffering, chiefly the shapes of Titans born of old, and giants, and all whom the deluge overwhelmed, and all that perished in the billowy seas, and all that furnished banquet for the beasts and creeping things and fowls, these in a mass will (Uriel) summon to the judgment-seat; and also those whom flesh-devouring fire destroyed in flame, even these will he collect and place before the judgment-seat of God."⁴¹ Also of particular interest is *I En.* 10.1–3 in which God commands Uriel to warn Noah of the impending flood and to instruct him so that he may escape.

Sibylline Oracles make frequent reference to Tartarus. In the beginning, God established the earth placing it around Tartarus (1.9–10) which is known as a gloomy place (8.362). Later, the Watchers are cast into Tartarus (1.101) and then God cast the fourth-race of blood-spilling men into Tartarus as well (1.119). A long list of sins and the terrible torments the sinners will endure are named and the sinners will pay threefold for their sins in Tartarus (1.203). Tartarus is mentioned again in connection with God's final judgment of the wicked (4.186). Here Tartarus cannot be mistaken for anything other than a place of terrible torment for sinners. Specifically, we see a continuation in the trend begun in *I Enoch* that the Watchers are kept in Tartarus.

⁴¹ As we have seen above, Tartarus and Hades were frequently used interchangeably and Tartarus was the place that Jewish texts identify as the prison of the Watchers. These same verses also mention those who died in the flood, and those who will die in the second universal judgment of fire (*Sib. Or.* 2.196–213). As we shall see in chapter 4, 2 Peter 2:6–8 uses the example of Sodom and Gomorrah because it is a precursor to the second universal judgment by fire. Therefore, in this section of *Sib. Or.*, we see Uriel's presence connecting to each element named in 2 Peter 2:4–8.

In the *Apocalypse of Ezra* (3.15; 4.5; 5.27) and the *Testament of Solomon A* (6.3) Tartarus is mentioned as a place of punishment for sinners. The same is true in Philo, *Leg.* 49, 103; *Praem.* 152; *QE* 2.40 and Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 2.240.

Since Tartarus appears in the LXX, the Pseudepigrapha, and first-century Jewish authors, it is probable that the author of 2 Peter was using a common word and making reference to a concept that had become familiar in Judaism in this time of religious syncretism. Further, the primary text that narrates the punishment of the sinful angels (*Book of Watchers 1 En. 1–36*) uses the term Tartarus. As such, it is impossible to prove a multi-cultural audience for 2 Peter from its use here, since Jews were part of Greek and Roman culture and had been since the conquests of Alexander and Augustus. Because Tartarus was such a common and familiar notion for Jews and Gentiles alike its use in 2 Peter does not prove the audience of 2 Peter had to be a Gentile audience.

Jude's δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίους ὑπὸ ζόφον vs. 2 Peter's σειραῖς ζόφου

Jude's use of δεσμός is in keeping with the tradition of the sinful angels as is shown in *1 En.* 14.5; *Sib. Or.* 1.102; 2.288; *Test Sol. A.* 6.3, all of which use δεσμός to describe their chains. As we saw above in section 2, the manuscript evidence for 2 Peter shows variants in using different forms of σειρά (cord, rope) or σιρός (pit, deep hole). As this word appears in the dative plural in Jude 6, it is easy to understand how these two words could be easily confused; σειρά becomes σειραῖς and σιρός becomes σιροῖς. As such, the choice of σειρά seems to be for the sake of word association. Like δεσμός, σειρά indicates the bondage of the angels, but its similarity to σιρός also brings to mind the depth of Tartarus and reinforces their gloomy place of punishment.

Both authors also refer to the darkness of the place of punishment, using the term ζόφος, which means more than the absence of light. Rather, ζόφος refers specifically to the underworld.⁴² At the final judgment, the archangels Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, and Uriel will lead the souls from the murky darkness (ζόφος) to judgment (*Sib. Or.* 2.214–20). In *Sib. Or.* 2.303 (302, Greek) ζόφος is used to describe the darkness of Tartarus.

Jude writes that the angels are kept in eternal chains (ἀϊδίως) and 2 Peter removes the reference to eternity. Both of these are consistent with their respective documents. In another parallel verse, Jude 13 refers to sinners for whom the gloom of darkness has been kept forever (ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰῶνα τετήρηται). Its parallel in 2 Pet 2:17 again removes the reference to eternity and states that the gloom of darkness has been kept for these sinners (ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους τετήρηται). Further, the distinction is clear in the documents' overall responses to divine punishment. As we shall see in ever increasing detail throughout the dissertation, Jude refers to eternal punishment after death, whereas 2 Peter refers to punishment that is soon expected on the unrighteous who are alive. Jude's reference to eternity appears again in vv. 7, and 13, and in each of Jude's references to eternity, its parallel verse in 2 Peter removes the reference to eternity.

Jude's κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας vs. 2 Peter's κρίσιν

Both Jude and 2 Peter agree that the angels are being kept imprisoned and will remain so until the final judgment. The future judgment of the angels occurs in *I En.* 10.12; 22.11, although *I En.* 21.10 says that the angels will be imprisoned forever. In the other examples of sinners in these documents (Jude: Exodus generation, Sodom and Gomorrah, Cain, Balaam, Korah; 2 Peter: flood, Sodom and Gomorrah, Balaam),

⁴² i.e., *Od.* 11.155; 20.356; *Il.* 15.191; 21.56.

judgment has already occurred. The angels have a unique place in that they are being held captive until the final judgment. Therefore, their judgment will be concurrent with the judgment about which 2 Peter warns his community. This is particularly clear in the protasis and apodosis in 2 Pet 2:4, 9:

2 Peter 2:4 Εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἀμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο ἀλλὰ σειραῖς ζόφου ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους,

2 Peter 2:9 οἶδεν κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ πειρασμοῦ ῥύεσθαι, ἀδίκους δὲ εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως κολαζομένους τηρεῖν,

2 Peter 2:4 For if God did not spare the angels, having sinned, but cast them into Tartarus in chains of darkness, handed them over to be kept for judgment,

2 Peter 2:9 (then) the Lord knows how to rescue the godly from temptation, and to keep the unrighteous under punishment until the day of judgment

The differences between Jude and 2 Peter here are also indicative of their larger documents. The reference to the judgment of the great day in Jude 6 (κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας) reflects similar ways of referring to God’s final judgment in Zeph. 1:14; Mal. 4:5; Acts 2:20; Rev 16:14.⁴³ 2 Peter removes μεγάλης in reference to the day of judgment. Whether Jude’s reference to the day of judgment is meant to be “great” or just “large,” 2 Peter avoids ambiguity and attempts to balance mercy with judgment throughout the document and even explains, “The Lord is not slow about his promise, as some think of slowness, but is patient with you, not wanting any to perish, but all to come to repentance” (3:9).

Function of this Narrative in 2 Peter

2 Peter’s redaction of Jude’s reference to the sinful angels is in keeping with the larger message of 2 Peter. First, 2 Peter makes it clear that one cannot continue to

⁴³ Green, *Jude & 2 Peter*, 69.

presume upon God's enduring mercy, never having any penalty for sin. God did not spare the angels who sinned. They are being kept until the day of judgment. 2 Pet 2:9 ends this recollection of notorious sinners by assuring his audience that the sinners in his community will also be judged. It may appear as though God's judgment will not come (3:3–4), but, "their condemnation, pronounced against them long ago, has not been idle, and their destruction is not asleep" (2:3). The reference to Tartarus further emphasizes God's severity in addressing sin, since the angels are kept in the lowest level of the underworld, reserved for the worst sinners. Jude merely states that the angels are kept in chains, but the place of their imprisonment is not mentioned.

Second, in 2 Peter, the detail of the angels' sin is unimportant. While Jude names each group's sin (the Exodus generation did not believe, the angels left their proper dwelling, and the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah indulged in sexual immorality and pursued unnatural lust), 2 Peter does not specify the nature of the sin. God's punishment of sinners is what matters to 2 Peter. The focus is on God, not on the details of sin. 2 Peter assures his community that those who continue to flaunt their transgression of God's commandments will be punished in the same way that these OT figures were punished.

Among the three examples in this cluster, the angels are in a unique position in that they know God more intimately than any human could. In their sin they, "...forsook the highest heaven, the sanctuary of their eternal station..." (*1 En.* 12.4) and they, "...left the high, holy, and eternal heaven..." (*1 En.* 15.3). There are those in the world who do not know any better, but the angels had better knowledge of God and God's law than any human could have. In the same way, people who do not have knowledge of Jesus cannot

be held responsible for their actions in the same way as those who do have this knowledge. As such, just as the sinful angels knew God better than humans, in 2 Peter, the members of his community know more about the ways of God than those who do not know Jesus:

2 Peter 2:20–21 εἰ γὰρ ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου [ἡμῶν] καὶ σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τούτοις δὲ πάλιν ἐμπλακέντες ἡττῶνται, γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἔσχατα χείρονα τῶν πρώτων.²¹ κρεῖττον γὰρ ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἢ ἐπιγνοῦσιν ὑποστρέψαι ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἀγίας ἐντολῆς.

2 Peter 2:20–21 For if, after they have escaped the defilements of the world through the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, they are again entangled in them and overpowered, the last state has become worse for them than the first.²¹ For it would have been better for them never to have known the way of righteousness than, after knowing it, to turn back from the holy commandment that was passed on to them.⁴⁴

Lastly, the sinful angels and the sinners in 2 Peter's community are also similar in that their judgment has not come. The angels are being kept until the day of judgment (2:4) and the sinners in 2 Peter's community will surely come to judgment as well (2:9; 3:3–9). 2 Peter urges the community to remain faithful to God and says that the only reason judgment has not come sooner is that God wants all people to repent and not perish (3:9). This is different from Jude's usage because in Jude 6 the angels are kept in eternal chains, and while Jude makes brief references to the day of judgment, there is no chance for the redemption of the wicked.

2 Peter's redaction of Jude's reference to the sinful angels illustrates the urgency of the document and makes clearer the choice available to the members of the community. Now that they have the knowledge of Jesus, to forsake their faith would be far more serious than it would have been if they did not know Jesus. Like the angels, the

⁴⁴ These verses have no parallel in Jude.

community has a privileged place in their knowledge of God. If they continue to transgress God's commandments, God will be swift, severe, and certain in punishing them, as God did with the angels.

CHAPTER 3

2 PETER 2:5

Introduction

Chapter 3 addresses the significance of the interpretation of the Genesis flood narrative in 2 Peter. 2 Pet 2:5 represents a most significant change between this text and Jude, since Jude does not refer to the flood narrative at all. The author of 2 Peter completely omits the reference to the Exodus generation in Jude 5 and substitutes the reference to the flood. As we shall show, this substitution is especially significant for the way in which 2 Peter uses the texts he does borrow from the text of Jude. To briefly anticipate our findings, it will be shown that the author of 2 Peter draws on later Jewish traditions where Noah is an example of faithfulness in the midst of wickedness.

The main body of the chapter has three sections: an examination of the text to clarify what can be argued as the most reliable reading; a close reading of the manner in which the author of 2 Peter presents the flood, and his apparent reasons for doing so; and the function of 2 Pet 2:5 for the whole document.

Textual Criticism

2 Peter 2:5 καὶ ἀρχαίου κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο ἀλλὰ ὄγδοον Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα ἐφύλαξεν κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἀσεβῶν ἐπάξας,

2 Peter 2:5 and did not spare the ancient world, but guarded (the) eighth (person) Noah, a herald of righteousness, when he brought a flood on the world of the ungodly,

The text of 2 Pet 2:5 is rather secure, with only a variant form of the second appearance of the word κόσμος.

The variant **κόσμου** appears in the original reading of Codex Sinaiticus (Ⲡ), Codices Porphyrianus and Ψ, 1611, and 1852. Another variant, κόσμου κατὰ, appears in 614, 630, 1505, and 1852. These variants are so rare that the manuscript evidence for the majority text is not listed in NA28. Further, the 4th UBS Greek New Testament does not list the variants at all. I concur with Brown's arguments regarding these minor variants:

The dative reading is probably original since there is such broad external support in every textual family and geographical region. Further, the genitive could have originated by mistake as a scribe's eye caught the genitive κόσμου used earlier in the same verse. Nevertheless, these readings do not change the meaning significantly. The genitive reading could be understood as a genitive of destination, 'when he brought a flood *into or destined for the world* of the ungodly.' The reading with κατὰ merely reinforces the punitive force of the flood, '*against* the ungodly.' Either way the meaning changes little.¹

The Use of the Flood Tradition in 2 Peter

Flood Narrative Exchanged for the Exodus Generation

As stated in the introduction, the author of 2 Peter made the greatest change to Jude's catalogue of sinners here because 2 Peter exchanged Jude's reference to the Exodus generation for a reference to the flood. This substitution works perfectly in the text of 2 Peter since the flood has strong literary connections to both the previous example of the sinful angels (2 Pet 2:4) and the subsequent example of Sodom and Gomorrah (2 Pet 2:6).²

¹ Douglas E. Brown, "The Use of the Old Testament in 2 Peter 2:4–10a," (Ph.D. diss., Trinity International University, 2003), 99 n. 14.

² Chapter 4 of this dissertation addresses the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah.

Flood as Punishment for the Events of Gen 6:1–4

The texts are not unanimous throughout Jewish and Christian literature. From the examples below, we shall see that sometimes the texts lack any blame, and other times different people or groups are blamed. In keeping with the literature of its time, 2 Peter connects the cause of the flood to Gen 6:1–4. As we shall see, over time the sinful angels, the people to whom they taught their forbidden knowledge, and the offspring of this forbidden union were blamed for the flood.

No Specific Blame for the Flood

Some references to the flood in Jewish and Christian literature do not name the sin responsible for the flood. Sir 44:16–18 [c. 180 BCE] illustrates the righteousness of Enoch and Noah:

Enoch pleased the Lord and was taken up, an example of repentance to all generations.¹⁷ Noah was found perfect and righteous; in the time of wrath he kept the race alive; therefore a remnant was left on the earth when the flood came.¹⁸ Everlasting covenants were made with him that all flesh should never again be blotted out by a flood.

In 1 Pet 3:18–20 [late 80s CE] one could assume that the connection is made through the mention of the “spirits in prison” (τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν) and the reference to the ark, and the eight persons saved; however, the writer has not targeted the spirits as responsible for the flood:

For Christ also suffered for sins once for all, the righteous for the unrighteous, in order to bring you to God. He was put to death in the flesh, but made alive in the spirit,¹⁹ in which also he went and made a proclamation to the spirits in prison,²⁰ who in former times did not obey, when God waited patiently in the days of Noah, during the building of the ark, in which a few, that is, eight persons, were saved through water.

Wicked People Caused the Flood

In Job 22 Eliphaz gives a long response to Job about the wicked things done by people. Among other things, food and drink have been withheld from the hungry (22:7) and widows and orphans are oppressed (22:9). Eliphaz suggests that those who think that God does not know these deeds and fails to judge (22:13–14) have forgotten the judgment of the flood that God brought upon wicked people in the flood (22:15–20). In 4 Ezra 3:8–11 we see people perish in the flood because of their ungodly behavior and Noah spared because of his righteousness.

4 Ezra 3:8–11 And every nation walked after its own will; they did ungodly things in your sight and rejected your commands, and you did not hinder them.⁹ But again, in its time you brought the flood upon the inhabitants of the world and destroyed them.¹⁰ And the same fate befell all of them: just as death came upon Adam, so the flood upon them.¹¹ But you left one of them, Noah with his household, and all the righteous who have descended from him.

In *3 Macc.* 2.4 God destroyed the people who committed injustice, and with them, the giants who trusted in their own strength and boldness. *1 En.* 65.6 condemns humanity because they learned the secrets of the angels. In *Jub.* 5.19–21 the corrupt ways and thoughts of people were responsible for the flood. The *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan Genesis* narrates the problems that arose because of the interactions between humanity and the “sons of the great ones” (*Tg. Ps.-Jn. Gen* 6:2), and tells of the one hundred and twenty year opportunity that God gave them to repent, but then concludes:

The earth became corrupt because of its inhabitants who strayed from the ways that are right before the Lord, and the earth was filled with (acts of) robbery. The Lord saw the earth, and behold, it was corrupt, because all flesh, without exception, had corrupted its ways upon the earth. So the Lord said to Noah, ‘The end of all flesh has come, for the earth is full of (acts of) robbery because of their evil deeds.’ (*Tg. Ps.-Jn. Gen* 6:11–13)³

³ Michael Maher MSC, trans., *The Aramaic Bible: The Targums*, vol. 1B, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992), 39.

Pirke Aboth 5.1–2 stretches the blame from the creation of time, saying that the ten generations from Adam to Noah all provoked God and therefore, brought the flood. *Life of Adam and Eve* 49:3 says that God will bring two universal judgments upon the world because of the transgressions of Adam and Eve.

T. Reu. 5.4–6 [2nd cent BCE] uses the sins of the Watchers as an example of the importance of women’s modesty. The text suggests that the women looked upon the angels with lust and coerced them, thus bringing the punishment of the flood.

For a woman is not able to coerce a man overtly, but by a harlot’s manner she accomplishes her villainy.⁵ Accordingly, my children, flee from sexual promiscuity, and order your wives and daughters not to adorn their heads and their appearances so as to deceive men’s sound minds. For every woman who schemes in these ways is destined for eternal punishment.⁶ For it was thus that they charmed the Watchers, who were before the Flood. As they continued looking at the women, they were filled with desire for them and perpetrated the act in their minds. Then they were transformed into human males and while the women were cohabiting with their husbands they appeared to them. Since the women’s minds were filled with lust for these apparitions, they gave birth to giants. For the Watchers were disclosed to them as being as high as the heavens.

Wis 10:3–4 is unique in that it claims that the flood came as a result of Cain’s murder of his brother, Abel.

Wis 10:3–4 ἀποστάς δὲ ἀπ’ αὐτῆς ἄδικος ἐν ὀργῇ αὐτοῦ ἀδελφοκτόνοις συναπόλετο θυμοῖς ⁴ δι’ ὃν κατακλυζομένην γῆν πάλιν ἔσωσεν σοφία δι’ εὐτελοῦς ξύλου τὸν δίκαιον κυβερνήσασα

Wis 10:3–4 But when an unrighteous man departed from her in his anger, he perished because in rage he killed his brother. ⁴ When the earth was flooded because of him, wisdom again saved it, steering the righteous man by a paltry piece of wood.

Winston explains that, “Cain, as the first murderer, serves as a paradigm of human wickedness, so that the cause of the Flood can be ascribed to him.”⁴

⁴ David Winston, *Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction And Commentary*, Anchor Bible, Vol. 43 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1979), 214.

Events of Gen 6:1–4 Led to the Flood

The narration of the flood in Gen 6 is immediately preceded by the transgression in 6:1–4 between the sons of God and the women with whom they engaged in illicit activities. In Gen 1–11 there are four examples of transgression and punishment.⁵ In chapter 3 Adam and Eve eat of the fruit they were forbidden to eat and are expelled from the Garden of Eden. In 4:2–16 Cain kills Abel and is cursed. In Gen 11:1–9 people try to build a great tower and a name for themselves and God confuses their language and scatters them. The punishment after the transgression in 6:1–4 is the flood. In 2 Peter 2:4–5, both the angels and the people are punished; the angels are cast into Tartarus and the earth is flooded.

Other texts connect the events of Gen 6:1–4 to the flood. In the case of *1 En.* 7–10,⁶ *Jub.* 7.21–25, and *Ant.* 1.73–76 the offspring of the angels and humans, the giants, are the cause of evil, destruction, and violence upon the earth. In *1 En.* 12.3–6⁷ the angels are blamed for the desolation upon the earth and in *1 En.* 106.13–18,⁸ *T. Napht.* 3.5, and *2 Bar.* 56.12–15 the sin of the angels is named as the direct reason for the flood. *1 En.* 65–66.3⁹ holds the angels and humans responsible for the flood. In *1 En.* 65–66.3 it is not

⁵ Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1–11: A Commentary*, A Continental Commentary (trans. John J. Scullion SJ; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), 368.

⁶ George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36, 81–108*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 205.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 235.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 546.

⁹ *1 Enoch* is a composite document written over more than a hundred and fifty years. The time span and composite nature explain why there are differences between their writings about who is responsible for the flood. *1 En.* 12.3–6 is from the early pre-Maccabean period and is part of the *Book of Watchers* (1–36). *1 En.* 106.13–18 is from the late pre-Maccabean period and is part of the *Epistle of Enoch* (91–107). *1 En.*

because of their sexual sin that God floods the earth, but because of the heavenly knowledge that the angels shared with the people, and because of the people who learned these secrets.¹⁰

In the texts above there is a correlation between the flood and the events of Gen 6:1–4. Whether it is the angels, the women with whom they had forbidden relations, their offspring, or any combination of the three, it is specifically the events of Gen 6:1–4 and its aftermath that cause God to destroy the earth with a flood. By exchanging Jude’s example of the Exodus generation for the flood, and by placing it after the sinful angels in 2:5, 2 Peter is also connecting the flood to the events of Gen 6:1–4. 2 Pet 2:4 is in keeping with *1 En.* 10.11–14 and *Jub.* 5.10 in which the punishment of the sinful angels is imprisonment until the time of judgment. In 2 Pet 2:5 those on earth are punished for their transgressions with the flood.

Sodom and Gomorrah

2 Peter’s use of the flood narrative not only proceeds logically from the preceding reference to the sinful angels, but also follows through with the subsequent reference to Sodom and Gomorrah. Punishment by fire and water and enduring trials by fire and water is common throughout the Bible, but more specifically, present in the Hellenistic and Greco-Roman writing of both Jewish and early Christian teachings concerning two universal judgments, one by water, one by fire. The flood was understood to be the first universal judgment, and, as we shall see, the account of the fiery destruction of Sodom

65–66.3 is also from the late pre-Maccabean period and is part of the *Book of Similitudes* (37–71). James H. Charlesworth, ed., *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Vol. 1* (NY: Doubleday, 1983), 7.

¹⁰ George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 37–82*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 278.

and Gomorrah portended the second sort of universal judgment, a judgment by fire. Thus the flood and Sodom and Gomorrah became linked in teachings of universal judgments of water and fire.

Judgment by Water and Fire

Fire and water appear together in the biblical text as powerful forces. People endure hardship and trial by fire and water (Ps 66:12). God has control over mighty things such as fire and water (Ps 29:7–10) and punishes by fire and water (Ezek 38:22; Wis 16:15–19).

More specifically, God's punishment in the flood narrative from Genesis and the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah were paired together in *Jub.* 20.5, *T. Napht.* 3.1–5, Luke 17:26–30, and *Mos.* 2.53–65.

Flood as Eschatological Foreshadow of Future Punishment. While the flood in Genesis was a punishment for that time, literally, it also served as an eschatological foreshadowing of future punishment in *I En.* 10–11; 83–84; 93.4; *L. A.B.* 3.9; *Ant.* 1.70 and CD 4.10–18.¹¹

Judgment by Fire.¹² On its own, fire appears as an instrument of divine punishment and destruction of the wicked.¹³ Later, a belief in a second universal judgment by fire developed.

¹¹ Brown, "The Use of the Old Testament in 2 Peter 2," 129. I omitted his examples of *I En.* 93.9–10; 1QpHab 7.10–14 and 1QH 8.4–14 because I did not feel that these texts demonstrated the point accurately. I also substituted *L. A.B.* 3.9 for 3.10 because it fit more accurately.

¹² See chapter 4 of this dissertation, which addresses Sodom and Gomorrah, for more detail.

¹³ Deut 29:19–23; 32:22; Is. 29:6; 30:27, 30, 33; 33:14; 66:15–16, 24; Joel 2:3, 30; Nah. 1:6; Zeph 1:18; 3:8; Zech; 12:6 Mal. 4:1; Mt 3:10; Acts 2:19; 1 Cor 3:13 2 Thess 1:8; 2 Pet 3:10 Rev. 9:17–18; 16:8; 20:9; *I En.* 1.6–7; 10.6, 13; 52.6; *Sib. Or.* 2.196–213; 3.83–92; 4.171–82; 5.155–61, 206–13; *Ps. Sol.* 15.4–5; *T. Jud.* 25.3; *L. A.E.* 49.3; 1 QH 11.19–36; *Ant.* 1.70. This list is a compilation of examples taken from Gene

The idea of a judgment by fire was very widespread, while the thought of a destruction of the world by fire was much more unusual. It was portended in Zeph 1:18 and 3:8, but only became widely known during the centuries around the birth of Christ. It then appears in both Gentile and Jewish texts, and may very well have reached the author of 2 Peter by way of contemporary Judaism.¹⁴

The 1st century CE document *Life of Adam and Eve* (49.1–50.2) narrates the creation of a table of stone and a table of clay to serve as a warning of the two universal judgments to come:

Indeed, six days after Adam died, Eve, aware that she would die, gathered all her sons and daughters, Seth with thirty brothers and thirty sisters, and Eve said to (them) all, ² “Listen to me, my children, and I will tell you that I and your father transgressed the command of God, ³and the archangel Michael said to us, ‘Because of your collusion, our Lord will bring over your race the wrath of his judgment, first by water and then by fire; by these two the Lord will judge the whole human race.’” **50.1** “But listen to me, my children! Now make tablets of stone and other tablets of clay and write in them all my life and your father’s which you have heard and seen from us. ² If he should judge our race by water, the tablets of earth will dissolve and the tablets of stone will remain; but if he should judge our race by fire, the tablets of stone will break up and those of clay will be thoroughly baked.”

Second Judgment Brings New Heaven and New Earth

The second universal judgment is intended to be a time when the wicked will be vanquished and a new heaven and a new earth will emerge. When the idea of the second universal judgment by fire emerged, it became a way for God to achieve the purpose of ridding the world of evil. This notion appears in Joel 2:28–32; Mal 4:1–6; *1 En.* 91.12–

L. Green, *Jude & 2 Peter*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008), 322, Tord Fornberg, *An Early Church in a Pluralistic Society: A Study of 2 Peter*, Coniectanea biblica. New Testament Series; 9 (Lund: LiberLäromedel/ Gleerup, 1977), 66 n. 3, and some of my own.

¹⁴ Fornberg, *An Early Church in a Pluralistic Society*, 66.

17; *L. A.B.* 3.10; and Acts 2:17–21. Further, we see the whole concept come together in 2

Peter:

2 Peter 2:9 οἶδεν κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ πειρασμοῦ ῥύεσθαι, ἀδίκους δὲ εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως κολαζομένους τηρεῖν,

2 Peter 3:13 καινοὺς δὲ οὐρανοὺς καὶ γῆν καινὴν κατὰ τὸ ἐπάγγελμα αὐτοῦ προσδοκῶμεν, ἐν οἷς δικαιοσύνη κατοικεῖ.

2 Peter 2:9 (then) the Lord knows how to rescue the godly from temptation, and to keep the unrighteous under punishment until the day of judgment

2 Peter 3:13 But, according to his promise, we wait for new heavens and a new earth, in which righteousness dwells.

With the belief in two universal judgments, 2 Pet 3:6–13 divides the world into three distinct ages, namely the ante-diluvian world, the post-diluvian world, and the world to come.¹⁵ 2 Peter points to the example of the flood to demonstrate that God rid the earth of wickedness once, and claims that God will do so again, this time using the agent of fire.

2 Peter 3:6–7 δι' ὧν ὁ τότε κόσμος ὕδατι κατακλυσθεὶς ἀπώλετο· ⁷ οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ τῶ αὐτῷ λόγῳ τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσὶν πυρὶ τηρούμενοι εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως καὶ ἀπωλείας τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων.

2 Peter 3:6–7 through which the world of that time was flooded with water and perished; ⁷ but by the same word, the present heavens and earth are being reserved for fire, being kept until the day of judgment and the destruction of ungodly people.

Below, we shall see how Noah becomes a paradigmatic example of a righteous person living among the wicked and becomes a bridge between the ante-diluvian and post-diluvian worlds.

¹⁵ J. Chaine, *Les épîtres Catholique: La Seconde épître De Saint Pierre, Les épîtres De Sain Jean, l'épître De Saint Jude* (Paris: Gabalda, 1939), 62–3.

Conclusion

2 Peter made a seamless substitution in exchanging Jude's example of the Exodus generation for the flood. As we saw above, later Jewish tradition came to associate the fault of the flood primarily with the sinful angels.

Further, water and fire were seen as common instruments of divine punishment. More specifically, the flood and Sodom and Gomorrah came together to exemplify the later Jewish and early Christian belief in two universal judgments by water and fire. The flood was universal, while Sodom and Gomorrah was limited to a specific region. However, Sodom and Gomorrah came to exemplify the future universal judgment by fire. By bringing the example of the flood into the text, 2 Peter uses the flood to show how God punished the whole earth once for their sin, and 2 Peter assures his community that God will do so again with fire (2 Pet 3:3–10).

The Ancient World, ἀρχαίου κόσμου

Before beginning to examine what 2 Peter meant by ἀρχαίου κόσμου it is important to note that κόσμος is not used in the description of the world in the flood narrative in Genesis. In Gen 6:5 when God identifies the wickedness of humanity on the earth, the Hebrew עָרָץ becomes γῆ in the LXX.

The κόσμος signifies more than just the physical reality of the planet Earth. The κόσμος is transitory, perishable, and is more clearly defined as κόσμος οὗτος, as opposed to the eschatological expectation of a future eternal and imperishable world.¹⁶ Further, the κόσμος can refer to the people who inhabit the world.¹⁷ “The κόσμος is the sum of the

¹⁶ Herman Sasse, “κόσμος,” *TDNT* 3:867–898, 885.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 889–90.

divine creation which has been shattered by the fall, which stands under the judgment of God,...When the κόσμος is redeemed, it ceases to be κόσμος.”¹⁸ In 2 Pet 3:5, the heavens (οὐρανοὶ) existed long ago and the earth (γῆ) was formed, but it was the κόσμος that was judged and perished in the flood in 2 Pet 3:6.

2 Peter 3:5–6 Λανθάνει γὰρ αὐτοὺς τοῦτο θέλοντας ὅτι οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν ἔκπαλαι καὶ γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι’ ὕδατος συνεστῶσα τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγῳ, ⁶ δι’ ὧν ὁ τότε κόσμος ὕδατι κατακλυσθεὶς ἀπώλετο·

2 Peter 3:5–6 For they willingly ignore this, that by the word of God, heavens existed long ago and earth is made from water and through water, ⁶ through which the world of that time was flooded with water and perished;

The use of ἀρχαῖος does not automatically refer to a specific time period. It simply refers to things that are ancient or former. The context determines the time period in question (i.e., the time of Moses in Matt 5:21, 33; the time of the ancient prophets in Luke 9:8, 18).¹⁹ In light of 2 Peter’s division of time into three worlds, it is safe to conclude that the ἀρχαίου κόσμου refers to the ante-diluvian world in this context. 2 Peter emphasizes that the ancient world did not escape the judgment of God. While they are living in the present world, according to 2 Pet 2:20, members of the Christian community have escaped the defilements of the world through Jesus.

2 Peter 2:20 εἰ γὰρ ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου [ἡμῶν] καὶ σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τούτοις δὲ πάλιν ἐμπλακέντες ἠττῶνται, γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἔσχατα χεῖρονα τῶν πρώτων.

2 Peter 2:20 For if, after they have escaped the defilements of the world through the knowledge of (our) Lord Jesus Christ, but again are entangled in them and defeated, the last state has become worse for them than the first.

¹⁸ Ibid., 893.

¹⁹ Brown, “The Use of the Old Testament in 2 Peter 2,” 97.

Like Noah who escaped the defilement of the ancient world, so 2 Peter encourages the community to remain separated from this current, fallen world.

Did Not Spare, οὐκ φείδομαι

This is the second time that 2 Peter uses οὐκ φείδομαι. In 2 Pet 2:4 God did not spare the sinful angels and here in 2 Pet 2:5, God did not spare the ancient world. As was addressed in Chapter 2, the verb φείδομαι can mean to spare someone, rather than destroy them, or to spare someone by showing them mercy.²⁰ In stating that God did not spare the ancient world the use of οὐκ φείδομαι serves as a warning to those who presume that God will spare them when the conflagration comes.

Noah, Herald of Righteousness, δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα

Well-developed extra-biblical traditions about the flood lie behind the innocent phrase δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα, namely that that flood was delayed and that Noah preached righteousness in the hopes that God would not send the flood. Echoes of these traditions appear throughout 2 Peter.

Noah as Righteous

Gen 6:9 introduces Noah, saying, “Noah was a righteous man, blameless in his generation; Noah walked with God.”²¹ This righteousness spared him in the flood.²² As with several OT figures, Noah’s righteousness expanded through time and stories about

²⁰ s.v. “φείδομαι,” LSJ.

²¹ The only other person said to have “walked with God” is Noah’s great-grandfather, Enoch (Gen 5:22, 24).

²² Noah’s righteousness is also identified in Gen 7:1; Ezek 14:14, 20; Sir 44:17; 4 Ezra 3:8–12; *I En.* 10.16; 65.11; 67.1; 84.6; 106.18; *Jub.* 5.19; *Sib. Or.* 1.125–126, 269, 280; *L. A.B.* 3.4; *Leg.* 3.77; *Abr.* 27, 47; *Mos.* 2.59; *Ant.* 1.75, 99. This list of examples is partly from Brown, “The Use of the Old Testament in 2 Peter 2,” 150 n. 44, and partly my own.

Noah's expanded righteousness appear in extra-biblical literature. These extra-biblical traditions were known and used by the author of 2 Peter.

Noah, Herald of Righteousness

2 Pet 2:5 calls Noah, δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα, a herald of righteousness. There are no biblical texts that narrate Noah proclaiming righteousness to others; however, there are extra-biblical traditions that do. *Sib. Or.* 1.128–9 narrates God's command to Noah, "Noah, embolden yourself, and proclaim repentance to all the peoples, so that all may be saved." Here the proclamation of repentance results from the direct command of God. *Sib. Or.* 1.149–70, 173–198 contain the message of repentance that Noah preached. In other texts, Noah proclaims repentance, but there is no indication that he does so at the command of God. In *Ant.* 1.74, Josephus writes,

But Noah was very uneasy at what they did; and, being displeased at their conduct, persuaded them to change their dispositions and their acts for the better; but seeing they did not yield to him, but were slaves to their wicked pleasures, he was afraid they would kill him, together with his wife and children, and those they had married; so he departed out of that land.

Josephus does not use κήρυξ or κηρύσσω here to speak of Noah's actions. Rather, this text is another example of the tradition regarding the time that God gave for repentance before the flood arrived. In *b. Sanh.* 108a, Noah urges, "Repent; for if not, the Holy One, blessed be He, will bring a deluge upon you and cause your bodies to float upon the water like gourds."²³ In *b. Sanh.* 108b, those who saw the ark Noah was building inquired about its purpose. Noah replied, "The Holy One, blessed be He, will bring a flood upon

²³ Isidore Epstein, *The Babylonian Talmud, Seder Nezikin: Sanhedrin*, Vol. 2 (London: Soncino Press, 1935), 743.

you.”²⁴ But Noah’s words were met by jeering. Finally, in *Gen. Rab.* 30.7, God says, ““One herald arose for me in the generation of the Flood, Noah,”” while those around him, “despised him and called him, ‘Contemptible old man!’”²⁵ The portion of *Sibylline Oracles* that narrates the tradition of Noah preaching repentance at God’s command was written and available before 2 Peter was composed. Sources such as *Ant.*, *b. Sanh.*, and *Gen. Rab.* were either composed after 2 Peter or were unavailable to the author; however, the fact that this tradition was so pervasive and appears in various literary works from c. 300 BCE through Talmudic works dating to c. 500 CE, attests to its popularity.

VanderKam holds that the proclamation of repentance is a late tradition.²⁶

Dimant, however, argues that Noah’s proclamation of repentance does not appear in *I Enoch* and *Jubilees* because in both of these documents it is Enoch who preaches repentance.²⁷

Flood Came after the Death of Noah’s Ancestors

The genealogy of Noah’s ancestors may seem like achingly boring material that makes those who want to read the whole Bible give up early, but when the numbers are computed, they reveal something interesting. The flood comes the same year that the last of Noah’s ancestors dies. Using the genealogy beginning in Gen 5:1, through the time of

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 743.

²⁵ H. Freedman, trans., *Midrash Rabbah*, vol. 1, *Genesis* (London: Soncino Press, 1983), 235.

²⁶ James C. VanderKam, “The Righteousness Of Noah,” in *Ideal Figures In Ancient Judaism: Profiles And Paradigms*, *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 12, Collins, John J. and George W. E. Nickelsburg (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980), 13–32, 16.

²⁷ Devorah Dimant, “Noah in Early Jewish Literature,” in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*, Stone, Michael E. and Theodore A. Bergren (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998), 123–50, 132 n. 42.

the beginning of the flood when Noah was 600 years old (Gen 7:6), the chart below calculates the years before the flood. It begins with the birth of Adam in the year 0. Since Adam was 130 years old when Seth was born (Gen 5:3), Seth's birth year is identified as 130. Since Adam lived for 930 years, the year of his death is identified as 930, etc. Using this method of calculation, we see that the flood did not occur until all of Noah's ancestors died.

Year	Event
0	Birth of Adam
130	Birth of Seth (son of Adam)
235	Birth of Enosh (son of Seth)
325	Birth of Kenan (son of Enosh)
395	Birth of Mahalelel (son of Kenan)
460	Birth of Jared (son of Mahalelel)
622	Birth of Enoch (son of Jared)
687	Birth of Methuselah (son of Enoch)
874	Birth of Lamech (son of Methuselah)
930	Death of Adam
987	Enoch taken by God
1042	Death of Seth (son of Adam)
1056	Birth of Noah (son of Lamech)
1140	Death of Enosh (son of Seth)
1235	Death of Kenan (son of Enosh)
1290	Death of Mahalelel (son of Kenan)
1422	Death of Jared (son of Mahalelel)
1651	Death of Lamech (son of Methuselah)
1656	Death of Methuselah (son of Enoch)
1656	Flood begins

Delay of the Flood

As more detailed retellings of the flood narrative arose, so did the tradition that the flood was delayed so that people might repent and God would not send the flood. This tradition is intricately connected to the tradition of Noah proclaiming repentance. As

we shall see, Noah's proclamation of repentance and the delay of the flood is the foundation of 2 Peter's explanation for the delay of the parousia.

The ancient literature gives three answers to the question of the length of the delay: either the time is unspecified, or the flood is delayed by 120 years, or by 7 days. Josephus, who has plenty to say about numbers elsewhere, gives no indication as to the length of the delay, nor does the *Sibylline Oracles*.

When a timeframe was specified, it was based on questions that arose from Genesis. The meaning of the one hundred twenty years in Genesis 6:3 has puzzled those just beginning to study the Bible as well as scholars and commentators through the centuries. When the בני־הָאֲדָמָה saw the lovely daughters of the earth they took them as wives. Immediately after this, God announces a "life-span" of one hundred twenty years.

Genesis 6:3 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה לֹא־יִדְוֹן רוּחִי בָאָדָם לְעֹלָם בְּשָׁגַם הוּא בָשָׂר וְהָיוּ יָמָיו מֵאָה וְעֶשְׂרִים שָׁנָה:

Genesis 6:3 (TNK) The LORD said, "My breath shall not abide in man forever, since he too is flesh; let the days allowed him be one hundred and twenty years."

This time period was used by some authors to coincide with the time Noah spent preaching repentance. In *Questions in Genesis*, Philo proffers that perhaps one hundred twenty, "...is not the general term of human life, but only of the life of those men who existed at that time, and who were to perish by the deluge after an interval of so many years, which their kind Benefactor prolonged, giving them space for repentance..." (1.91). Similarly, *Gen. Rab.* 30.7 says that Noah planted cedars and cut them down for one hundred and twenty years. When those around him asked why he was doing that, Noah replied that the Lord of the Universe had informed him that God would bring a flood upon the world.

The delay of seven days also comes from Genesis. Noah, his family, and the animals entered the ark, and according to Gen. 7:10, the waters of the flood began seven days later.

וַיְהִי לְשִׁבְעַת הַיָּמִים וַיְמִי הַמַּבּוּל הָיָה עַל־הָאָרֶץ: **Genesis 7:10**

Genesis 7:10 And after seven days the waters of the flood came on the earth.

Philo, who in the same document spoke of the 120 years' delay, also added that there were an extra seven days before the flood began because, "The kind Savior of the world allows a space for the repentance of sinners" (*QG* 2.13). Within *b. Sanh.* 108b, among the four explanations given for the delay, one says that during those days God gave, "a foretaste of the future world, that they might know what good they had withheld from themselves."²⁸

Through these several examples, I do not mean to suggest that the author of 2 Peter had access to all of these documents. Rather, I wish to reiterate the prevalence of these features of the Noah narrative that were expanded beyond the Genesis narrative, namely, that the flood was delayed and that people were given a chance to repent and be spared from the deluge. These texts suggest a fairly common tradition. 2 Peter uses the tradition of the delay of the flood to make his own case for why the parousia is delayed.

Eighth, ὄγδοον

וַיָּבֹא נֹחַ וּבָנָיו וְאִשְׁתּוֹ וּנְשֵׁי־בָנָיו אִתּוֹ אֶל־הַתְּבֵה מִן־הַמַּבּוּל: **Genesis 7:7**

Genesis 7:7 And Noah with his sons and his wife and his sons' wives went into the ark to escape the waters of the flood.

²⁸ Epstein, *The Babylonian Talmud*, 744.

Taking the list of Noah's sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth from Gen 6:10, and presuming one wife for each of them, there are a total of eight who escaped the flood on the ark.

Early Christian writers, using allegorical interpretation, drew a connection between the eschatological eighth day of creation (e.g., *2 En.* 33.1–2) and the eight people spared from the flood (*Barn.* 15.9; Justin *Dial.* 138.1).²⁹ For the early Christians, the day of Jesus' resurrection was that eighth day.³⁰ "For righteous Noah, along with the other mortals at the deluge, i.e., with his own wife, his three sons and their wives, being eight in number, were a symbol of the eighth day, wherein Christ appeared when he rose from the dead, forever the first in power" (*Dial.* 138.1). Bauckham conjectures that 2 Peter, in using the ordinal "eighth," draws an association between the eight who were spared in the deluge and the resurrection of Jesus as the eighth day, both serving as an instance of new creation.³¹

Given the water involved in the flood, early Christians,³² and even some contemporary commentators, have drawn a further association between the waters of the flood and baptism.

To the writer, as to the early Church in general, they seemed to foreshadow Christians both in their obedient response to God's word and in their rescue from destruction... Noah and his family were saved from

²⁹ Richard Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, Word Biblical Commentary, 50 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983), 250.

³⁰ J. N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude*, Black's New Testament Commentaries (London: Black, 1969), 159.

³¹ Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 250.

³² e.g., Justin, *Dial.* 138.1; Tertullian, *De bapt.* 8.3–4.

God's judgment, thereby anticipating the blessed privilege of baptized Christians...³³

In 1 Pet 3:19–21 the association between the flood and baptism is clear.

1 Peter 3:19–21 ἐν ᾧ καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν, ²⁰ ἀπειθήσασιν ποτε ὅτε ἀπεξεδέχετο ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ μακροθυμία ἐν ἡμέραις Νῶε κατασκευαζομένης κιβωτοῦ εἰς ἣν ὀλίγοι, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ὀκτὼ ψυχαί, διεσώθησαν δι' ὕδατος. ²¹ ὃ καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀντίτυπον νῦν σώζει βάπτισμα, οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεόν, δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,

1 Peter 3:19–21 in which he also went and preached to the spirits in prison, ²⁰ who formerly disobeyed when God was waiting patiently, in the days of Noah preparing the ark, in which a few, that is, eight lives, were saved through water. ²¹ And baptism, which this echoes, now saves you, not as a removal of filth from the flesh, but as an appeal to God for a good conscience, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ,

However, there is no association between the flood and baptism in 2 Peter, and, in fact, baptism is never mentioned in 2 Peter. Here, one must be especially careful about assumptions of authorship regarding 1 and 2 Peter. Whether one takes the stance that 1 and 2 Peter were written by the same author, or that 2 Peter is a case of *imitatio*, 2 Peter does not associate the flood with baptism.

Despite arguments that 2 Peter mentioned the eight who were spared in the flood to make an association with 1 Pet 3:20, and despite Bauckham's attempt to allegorize the mention of eight people into something more than it is, neither of these efforts provide an accurate explanation for its use in 2 Peter. There is never any variation on the tradition that eight people were saved on the ark. In light of what 2 Peter does throughout the document, apart from stating the commonly accepted notion that eight people were spared in the flood, 2 Peter shows that there were righteous people who did not die in the flood. The number eight merely enumerates the people who were spared and there is no

³³ Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude*, 158–9.

deeper symbolism behind 2 Peter's use of the number. 2 Peter balances mercy with judgment and through this example of the flood, demonstrates that just as there were righteous people who were spared in the flood, so God will spare the righteous in the future judgment by fire.

World of the Ungodly, κόσμῳ ἀσεβῶν

The description of the flood in the LXX translation of Genesis does not accuse the inhabitants of the earth of ungodliness. *I Enoch*, however, upon which 2 Peter depends for its tradition of the sinful angels, does accuse the ante-diluvian world of ungodliness. *IEn.* 13.2 says that the Watchers taught humanity the works of impiety (ἀσέβεια) and in 10.20, the impending flood will cleanse the earth of its impiety (ἀσέβεια). Philo also wrote that the flood was the result of the world's impiety (ἀσέβεια) (*Deus* 1.21; *QG* 2.13, 15, 17).

Ἀσέβεια, ἀσεβέω, and ἀσεβής refer to an improper relationship with a deity, specifically a lack of due reverence for a deity or their sacred institutions and rituals.³⁴ To make a distinction, ἀδικία, concerns an improper relationship between human beings.³⁵ The accusation 2 Peter makes against the ante-diluvian world, therefore, pertains specifically to their offenses against God.

2 Peter also uses ἀσεβής to connect the flood to Sodom and Gomorrah as well as to the final judgment. The ungodly world was punished with the flood. Further, Sodom

³⁴ s.v. “ἀσέβεια,” “ἀσεβέω,” and “ἀσεβής,” LSJ, BDAG.

³⁵ Ibid. In the LXX, God sees the ἀδικία of the earth and informs Noah that the earth will be destroyed because of it (Gen 6:11, 13).

and Gomorrah serves as an example of what is coming to the ungodly, and in the final judgment by fire, the present ungodly will be destroyed.

2 Peter 2:5–6 καὶ ἀρχαίου κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο ἀλλὰ ὄγδοον Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα ἐφύλαξεν κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἀσεβῶν ἐπάξας, ⁶ καὶ πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας τεφρώσας [καταστροφῇ] κατέκρινεν ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβέ[σ]ιν τεθεικώς,
2 Peter 3:7 οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσὶν πυρί τηρούμενοι εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως καὶ ἀπωλείας τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων.

2 Peter 2:5–6 and did not spare the ancient world, but guarded (the) eighth (person) Noah, a herald of righteousness, when he brought a flood on the world of the ungodly, ⁶ and having reduced the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah to ashes, condemned them to destruction, having made them an example of what is coming to the ungodly,
2 Peter 3:7 But by the same word, the present heavens and earth are being reserved for fire, being kept until the day of judgment and the destruction of ungodly people.

To Bring Upon, ἐπάγω

There is nothing unusual about the verb ἐπάγω. It is used frequently in the LXX, but only three times in the NT (Acts 5:28; 2 Pet 2:1, 5). It appears in Gen 6:17 and 7:4, referring to the flood that God will bring upon the earth, and is therefore fitting in 2 Pet 2:5.

Here 2 Peter makes another connection between the flood and the future judgment. In 2 Pet 2:1, the false prophets bring destruction upon themselves through their recalcitrance. God brought destruction upon the godless in the flood (2:5), and the godless will bring destruction upon themselves in the future judgment (3:7). The verb ἐπάγω does not appear in 3:7; however, I contend that the swift judgment that the false teachers will bring upon themselves in 2:1 refers to the future destruction by fire, referenced in 3:7.

2 Peter 2:1 Ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφήται ἐν τῷ λαῷ, ὡς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, οἵτινες παρεισάξουσιν αἰρέσεις ἀπωλείας καὶ τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι. ἐπάγοντες ἐαυτοῖς ταχινήν ἀπόλειαν,

2 Peter 2:5 καὶ ἀρχαίου κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο ἀλλὰ ὄγδοον Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα ἐφύλαξεν κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἀσεβῶν ἐπάξας,

2 Peter 3:7 οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσὶν πυρὶ τηρούμενοι εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως καὶ ἀπωλείας τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων.

2 Peter 2:1 But false prophets also arose among the people, just as there will also be false teachers among you who will secretly bring in heresies of destruction and deny the master who bought them. They are bringing swift destruction upon themselves,

2 Peter 2:5 and did not spare the ancient world, but guarded (the) eighth (person) Noah, a herald of righteousness, when he brought a flood on the world of the ungodly,

2 Peter 3:7 But by the same word, the present heavens and earth are being reserved for fire, being kept until the day of judgment and the destruction of ungodly people.

Function of this Narrative in 2 Peter

2 Peter's exchange of the Exodus generation for the flood is not only the biggest change to Jude, but also the most important change for the whole document. The entire message of 2 Peter hinges upon the reference to the flood.

As the character of Noah and his actions surrounding the flood developed through time, Noah became a prototype of righteousness for those living among the wicked, especially those considered to be living at the end of days before God's second and final universal judgment.

The catastrophic nature of the flood, and its function as a punishment for wickedness, made it an ideal prototype for the last generation and the cataclysmic punishment at the End of Days. In the schematic history of the Enochic *Apocalypse of Weeks* (*1 En.* 93.3–10; 91.11–17), the flood is termed the “first end,” analogous to the “last end” (*1 En.* 93.4). In this context Noah, the righteous survivor, becomes the prototype of the small group of righteous that is active amidst wickedness at the dawn of the eschatological era, a group that will survive and build the new and just world to come. This is expressed by the epithet “Plant of Righteousness,” applied to Noah and the righteous in the final age. The analogy between the flood and the End of Days, and between Noah and the group of righteous, is also reflected in the practice, common in contemporary apocalyptic writings, of juxtaposing apocalyptic forecasts with descriptions of the flood. Such an analogy appealed to the Qumran community in particular, as it corresponds to the community's self-image as a small group living on the verge of the final age. This may account for

the Qumranites' interest in Noah's fortunes. A similar interest motivated the early Christians.³⁶

As we established above, it was Noah's righteousness that spared him in the flood. Recalling the three ages comprised of the ante-diluvian and post-diluvian worlds and the world to come, we see Noah as the bridge between the first and second world. As Philo eloquently says, "... for God thought him worthy to be both the end of our race and the beginning of it, the end of those men who lived before the deluge, and the beginning of those who lived after the deluge" (*Abr.* 1.46). The same concept is expressed in *Mos.* 2.65.³⁷

Since Noah is the bridge between the first two worlds, he became the example to those living in the second, post-diluvian world. 2 Peter encourages his community to remain faithful to the commandments of God. If they do, like Noah, they will be the bridge between two worlds, this time, between the post-diluvian world and the world to come.

2 Peter 3:11–13 Τούτων οὕτως πάντων λυομένων ποταποὺς δεῖ ὑπάρχειν [ὑμᾶς] ἐν ἀγίαις ἀναστροφαῖς καὶ εὐσεβείαις, ¹² προσδοκῶντας καὶ σπεύδοντας τὴν παρουσίαν τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμέρας δι' ἣν οὐρανοὶ πυρούμενοι λυθήσονται καὶ στοιχεῖα καυσούμενα τήκεται. ¹³ καινοὺς δὲ οὐρανοὺς καὶ γῆν καινὴν κατὰ τὸ ἐπάγγελμα αὐτοῦ προσδοκῶμεν, ἐν οἷς δικαιοσύνη κατοικεῖ.

2 Peter 3:11–13 Since all of these are to be destroyed, what kind of people ought you be in holy conduct and godliness, ¹² waiting for and hastening the coming of the day of God, through which the heavens will be set on fire and destroyed, and the elements will melt, being consumed with intense heat. ¹³ But, according to his promise, we wait for new heavens and a new earth, in which righteousness dwells.

³⁶ Dimant, "Noah in Early Jewish Literature," 135–6.

³⁷ I am indebted to Douglas E. Brown for these references. Brown, "The Use of the Old Testament in 2 Peter 2," 155.

When 2 Pet 2:5 calls Noah, δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα, it is more than an allusion to a pseudepigraphical tradition. For 2 Peter's purposes, it is absolutely essential that Noah not be merely righteous, but a herald of righteousness, because it is only when Noah preaches righteousness that the flood is delayed. The delay of the flood provides an explanation for the delay of the impending conflagration (3:9).

2 Peter's community continues to see the wicked flourish, seemingly unpunished.

2 Peter responds by placing a challenge on the lips of his opponents and then responds with the example of the flood and by referring to Ps 90:4 [89:4 LXX]:

2 Peter 3:3–8 τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες ὅτι ἐλεύσονται ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν [ἐν] ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαϊκται κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι ⁴ καὶ λέγοντες· ποῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ; ἀφ' ἧς γὰρ οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν, πάντα οὕτως διαμένει ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως. ⁵ Λανθάνει γὰρ αὐτοὺς τοῦτο θέλοντας ὅτι οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν ἔκπαλαι καὶ γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος συνεστῶσα τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγῳ, ⁶ δι' ὧν ὁ τότε κόσμος ὕδατι κατακλυσθεὶς ἀπώλετο. ⁷ οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσὶν πυρὶ τηρούμενοι εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως καὶ ἀπωλείας τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων. ⁸ Ἐν δὲ τοῦτο μὴ λανθανέτω ὑμᾶς, ἀγαπητοί, ὅτι μία ἡμέρα παρὰ κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἔτη καὶ χίλια ἔτη ὡς ἡμέρα μία.

2 Peter 3:3–8 Know this first, that in the last days mockers will mock, going after their own passions ⁴ and saying, “Where is the promise of his coming? For since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue from the beginning of creation.” ⁵ For they willingly ignore this, that by the word of God, heavens existed long ago and earth is made from water and through water, ⁶ through which the world of that time was flooded with water and perished; ⁷ But by the same word, the present heavens and earth are being reserved for fire, being kept until the day of judgment and the destruction of ungodly people. ⁸ But do not ignore this one thing, beloved, that with the Lord one day is like a thousand years, and a thousand years are like one day.

2 Peter's community is beginning to think that God's fiery judgment upon sinners is not coming. With Noah as δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα, 2 Peter alludes to Noah's extended period of having to endure among the wicked. It was not that God was unaware of the ungodly behavior, or was going to let it go unpunished. In God commanding Noah to

preach repentance, we see that God does not want to see creation perish but eventually found the flood inevitable to eradicate the pervasive wickedness.

In the same way, 2 Peter argues that God has not forgotten, nor is God unaware of the ungodly behavior in the world now, but, as God did before the flood, God is waiting for all to repent in the hopes that no one will have to endure the flames of judgment:

2 Peter 3:9 οὐ βραδύνει κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ὥς τινες βραδύτητα ἡγοῦνται, ἀλλὰ μακροθυμεῖ εἰς ὑμᾶς, μὴ βουλόμενός τινας ἀπολέσθαι ἀλλὰ πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρῆσαι.

2 Peter 3:9 The Lord is not slow about the promise, as some consider slowness, but is patient with you, not wanting any to perish, but all to come to repentance.

God's desire that judgment will be spared in 2 Peter is a different approach than what is found in Jude. Jude emphasizes judgment, while 2 Peter balances judgment with mercy. Two judgments that consume the whole earth, once through drowning in a flood, and the other through burning flames, have the effect of making God seem terribly castigating. With the example of the flood, Sodom and Gomorrah, and the present delay in God's final judgment, 2 Peter demonstrates each time that punishment was not God's preference and that some people were spared. Yes, there was a flood, but only after Noah preached repentance, and eight people were spared from the deluge. Yes, a fire consumed Sodom and Gomorrah, but Lot and his family were spared. (Here we should emphasize that in Jude 7, there is no mention of anyone being spared in Sodom and Gomorrah.) So too, 2 Peter's community believes that God will eradicate wickedness from the earth permanently by fire (3:7), but the God who, "has given us everything needed for life and godliness" (1:3), and who has given us, "his precious and very great promises" (1:4), is buying extra time, "not wanting any to perish, but all to come to repentance" (3:9).

CHAPTER 4

2 PETER 2:6–8 VS. JUDE 7

Introduction

This chapter compares the treatment of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah by Jude and 2 Peter. Remembering that we hold that 2 Peter is dependent upon Jude, this chapter examines the changes 2 Peter 2:6–8 shows in contrast to the text of Jude 7 in particular. Jude 7 focuses upon the specific sins of Sodom and Gomorrah and their punishment. 2 Peter, however, does not narrate the details of their sin, but uses Sodom and Gomorrah as an example of what will happen to future sinners, and it establishes Lot as an example of a righteous person living among the wicked. 2 Peter goes on to state that if the people in his community can maintain their righteousness in the face of the current wickedness, like Lot, they will be spared from God's future punishment. 2 Peter's editing agrees with Jude in that it emphasizes that God's punishment for sinners is certain, but where it differs is in the explicit statement that righteous will be spared.

We shall begin with a textual criticism, to ensure that we are using the most secure text. Next, each of the differences between Jude and 2 Peter's texts will be examined in depth in order to explain the reasons behind the changes. Finally, we shall consider how 2 Peter's changes to 2:6–8 affect the overall function of 2 Peter.

Textual Criticism

Jude 7 ὡς Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον τούτοις ἐκπορνεύσασαι καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐτέρας, πρόκεινται δεῖγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκην ὑπέχουσαι.

Jude 7 as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them, which in like manner as they, committed fornication and went after other flesh, are exhibited as an example by undergoing a punishment of eternal fire.

2 Peter 2:6–8 καὶ πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας τεφρώσας καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβεῖν θετικῶς,⁷ καὶ δίκαιον Λὼτ καταπονούμενον ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀθέσμων ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ ἀναστροφῆς ἐρρύσατο.⁸ βλέμματι γὰρ καὶ ἀκοῇ ὁ δίκαιος ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἀνόμοις ἔργοις ἐβασάνιζεν·

2 Peter 2:6–8 and having reduced the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah to ashes, condemned them to destruction, setting them as an example of those who will be impious,⁷ and rescued righteous Lot, wearied by the licentiousness of lawless conduct;⁸ for seeing and hearing, the righteous person living among them day after day was tormented in his righteous soul by their unlawful deeds;

Jude 7

τρόπον τούτοις

The variant τούτοις τρόπον transposes the order of the majority text and appears in 307, 436, 642, 1175, the Byzantine codices, and multiple variants in the Vulgate.

Another variant, τρόπον αὐτοῖς, appears in Ψ. The final variant, τρόπον, appears in 88 and in the most important editions of the Vulgate. These variants are so rare that the evidence of the majority text is not listed in NA28. Further, the 4th USB Greek New Testament does not list any textual variants at all. The earliest and best manuscripts support the reading τρόπον τούτοις.

ὑπέχουσαι

The variant ἐπέχουσαι appears in Papyrus 78, 1611, and one manuscript from the Sahidic tradition. Another variant, ὑπέχουσιν, appears in a correction to Codex Sinaiticus

(ⲥ) from approximately the 7th century. As was the case in the variant above, the evidence of the majority text is not listed in NA28, and the 4th USB Greek New Testament does not list any textual variants at all.

2 Peter 2:6

καταστροφή κατέκρινεν

The textual variant, κατέκρινεν, appears as the original reading of Papyrus 72, Vaticanus (B), the original reading of Ephraemi (C), 442, 1175, 1243, 1739, and in the Bohairic tradition. Another variant, κατέστρεψεν, is supported in Codex Porphyrianus (P) and 1852. Finally, the variant κατεπρησεν appears in a correction of Papyrus 72.

The majority text has traditionally read [καταστροφή] κατέκρινεν. As of the NA28 there have been significant revisions in the text of the Catholic Epistles because the text reflects the second edition of the *Editio Critica Maior*. In light of these revisions, the square brackets that would have traditionally enclosed words of questionable authenticity have been removed because the majority text reflects the *Editio Critica Maior*.¹ The majority text is supported by Codices Sinaiticus (ⲥ), Alexandrinus (A), a correction to Ephraemi (C), Ψ, more than a dozen miniscules, and several late manuscripts in various languages.

ἄσεβεῖν

The preferred text has traditionally read ἄσεβέσιν, which is supported in Papyrus 72, Codices Vaticanus (B) and Porphyrianus (P), 1175, 1243, 1852, and the whole Syriac tradition. Even so, the Editorial Committee of the United Bible Societies' Greek New

¹ NA28 pp. 48*–54*

Testament gave the reading, ἀσεβέσιν, a rating of {C}, indicating that the Committee, “...had difficulty in deciding which variant to place in the text.”² In the NA28, ἀσεβεῖν now represents the preferred text and is supported in Codices Sinaiticus (Ⲱ), Alexandrinus (A), Ephraemi (C), Ψ, 33, and 1739. “From the point of view of transcriptional probability, after μελλόντων copyists would be more likely to change the noun to the infinitive than the reverse. From the point of view of intrinsic probability, the noun gives better sense (‘an example [or warning] to ungodly persons of things in store for them’) than the verb (‘an example [or warning] to those about to do wrong [act impiously]’).”³

2 Peter 2:8

ὁ δίκαιος

In Codex Vaticanus, ὁ is omitted. Since the rest of the major and minor witnesses include it, we shall do the same.

Sodom and Gomorrah

The reference to Sodom and Gomorrah is not surprising in both Jude and 2 Peter, for in any catalogue of sinners, Sodom and Gomorrah are paradigmatic. Beginning in Gen 18:16 with the announcement of the impending conflagration, Abraham’s attempts to negotiate for their preservation, and the dramatic narration of their destruction in Gen 19, these cities and their inhabitants became synonymous with sin.

² Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), 14*, 633.

³ *Ibid.*, 633.

We saw in Chapter 3, that fire was often used as an expression of divine judgment and punishment. More specifically, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah is remembered and reiterated throughout Jewish and early Christian literature.⁴

Since references to Sodom and Gomorrah are so abundant in the biblical canon, it is not necessary to compare the references in Jude and 2 Peter against each text, nor directly against Genesis 19. Jude and 2 Peter each shaped their references to Sodom and Gomorrah for the sake of their individual documents.

As 2 Peter 2:7–8 specifically address Lot and has no parallel in Jude, let us first consider the ways that Jude and 2 Peter present Sodom and Gomorrah differently.

Jude 7 ὡς Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον τούτοις ἐκπορνεύσασαι καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐτέρας, πρόκεινται δεῖγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκην ὑπέχουσαι.

Jude 7 as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them, which in like manner as they, committed fornication and went after other flesh, are exhibited as an example by undergoing a punishment of eternal fire.

2 Peter 2:6 καὶ πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας τεφρώσας καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβεῖν τεθεικώς,

2 Peter 2:6 and having reduced the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah to ashes, condemned them to destruction, setting them as an example of those who will be impious,

Jude mentions the cities around Sodom and Gomorrah in reference to cities of the Plain in Gen 19:24–25, 28–29. These additional cities are named again in Deut 29:23 and Hos 11:8 as Adamah and Zeboiim. Wis 10:6 and Jos. *J.W.* 4.484 say a total of five cities

⁴ Deut 29:23; 32:32; Is. 1:9–10; 3:9 13:19; Jer 23:14; 49:18; 50:40; Lam 4:6; Hos 11:8 Amos 4:11; Zeph 2:9; Sir 16:8; 2 Esd [4 Ezra] 2:8; 3 *Macc.* 2:5; *Jub.* 16.6, 9; 20.5; 22.22; 36.10; *T. Asher* 7.1; Matt 10:15; 11:24; Luke 10:12; 17:29–30; Rom 9:29; Philo, *Abr.* 133–46; Josephus, *JW* 5.566. Richard Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, Word Biblical Commentary, 50 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983), 53, Gene L. Green, *Jude & 2 Peter*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008), 70, and examples of my own. I removed Bauckham’s reference to Mark 6:11 because I do not believe it fits accurately.

were destroyed. In Philo's *Abr.* 145 it says that four of the five cities of the Plain were destroyed, which is harmonious with Gen 19:17–22 and the preservation of Zoar, to which Lot fled. The omission of these additional cities in 2 Peter is no more unusual than the majority of references that only mention Sodom and Gomorrah, or those that mention only Sodom and exclude Gomorrah (Isa 3:9; Lam 4:6; Ezek 16:46, 48–49, 53, 55–56; 3 *Macc.* 2:5; 4 *Ezra* 7:106; Matt 11:23–24; Luke 10:12; 17:29; Rev 11:8). Therefore, we need not wonder why Jude and 2 Peter do not include the other three cities.

In Jude, the reference to Sodom, Gomorrah, and the surrounding cities is immediately preceded by the reference to the sinful angels (Jude 6: ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς αἰδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν). Jude extends the description of the sin of the angels to attach the reference to Sodom and Gomorrah, saying that both groups are guilty of committing fornication and going after other flesh (ἐκπορνεύσασαι καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας). In the case of the sinful angels in the ante-diluvian world, the angels went after the non-angelic flesh of human women; in the case of Sodom and Gomorrah, the human inhabitants of the cities went after the non-human, angelic flesh of the angels. One could rightly argue that the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah did not know that these apparent people were actually angels due to their human disguise, but to Jude, the point is that their fornication is a fact, and in that way they merit the accusation that connects them to the sinful angels.

In contrast, the parallel verse in 2 Peter 2:6 does not follow this line of condemnation at all. It does not identify the acts that merited the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, and therefore does not connect their destruction to the punishment of the

angels on the basis of a similar sin. Rather, in 2 Peter the following verses about Lot maintain a strictly biblical and historical context describing them as licentious (2:7 ἀσελγής) and lawless (2:7 ἄθεσμος; 2:8 ἄνομος) but without creating a kind of connected cosmic evil with the angels.

While Jude 7 claims that the residents of the sinful cities are undergoing a punishment of eternal fire, in contrast, 2 Pet 2:6 describes the punishment as something that happened in the past; the cities have been reduced to ashes. Jude intends to communicate that the ceaselessness of the punishments and here Jude 7 is similar to Jude 6 in which the sinful angels are kept in eternal chains until the judgment of the great day; the punishment is ongoing. Quite differently than Jude's presentation, 2 Peter is also consistent in its own use of a time frame. It attests that the angels were not spared, but they await judgment. The ante-diluvian world was destroyed with the flood. Sodom and Gomorrah were reduced to ashes.

Jude's presentation of an ongoing, enduring punishment of the wicked is a theme also found in *4 Macc.* 10:15⁵ and 1QS 2.15; 5.13.⁶ In those texts, there is a sense of threat to the listener as though they are too involved with a kind of sin that will bring them an eternal punishment for fornication and unfaithfulness. The difference in 2 Peter is that the sins of the past have been addressed, and that they stand as a lesson in case a similar temptation should arise for the listener.

⁵ *4 Macc.* 10:15 "By the blessed death of my brethren, and the eternal punishment of the tyrant, and the glorious life of the pious, I will not repudiate the noble brotherhood."

⁶ 1QS 2.15 "May God's anger and the wrath of his verdicts consume him for everlasting destruction." 5:13 "...punishments for everlasting annihilation without there being any remnant." In Florentio García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, Vol. 1: 1Q1–4Q273 vols. (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2000), 73, 81.

Lot

In chapter three we observed that 2 Peter names Noah and the seven members of his family who were spared in the deluge, which underlines the theme of God sparing the righteous. 2 Peter agrees with Jude in the reference to the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, but differs in that it views it as an event of the past, which is complete. Significantly, the author also distinguishes his treatment in bringing attention to Lot who survived the conflagration, demonstrating again the theme of God sparing the righteous. As though the listener might miss this important message, the author declares the righteousness of Lot twice; the righteous Lot has a righteous soul.

2 Peter 2:7–8 καὶ δίκαιον Λῶτ καταπονούμενον ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀθέσμων ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ ἀναστροφῆς ἐρρύσατο· ⁸ βλέμματι γὰρ καὶ ἀκοῇ ὁ δίκαιος ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἀνόμοις ἔργοις ἐβασάνιζεν·

2 Peter 2:7–8 and rescued righteous Lot, wearied by the licentiousness of lawless conduct; ⁸ for seeing and hearing, the righteous person living among them day after day was tormented in his righteous soul by their unlawful deeds;

Wisdom also deems Lot righteous:⁷

Wisdom 10:6 αὕτη δίκαιον ἐξαπολλυμένων ἀσεβῶν ἐρρύσατο φυγόντα καταβάσιον πῦρ Πενταπόλεως

Wisdom 10:6 Wisdom rescued a righteous man when the ungodly were perishing; he escaped the fire that descended on the Five Cities.

As Brown observed, “The vocabulary and syntax of ἐρρύσατο δίκαιον so closely parallel that found in 2 Pet 2:7 that it may very well be that Peter is relying upon, or at least is influenced by, this passage.”⁸ Jude 7 refers to the additional “cities around them” which

⁷ A passing reference to Lot, “the righteous man” is also made in Wisdom 19:17.

⁸ Douglas E. Brown, “The Use of the Old Testament in 2 Peter 2:4–10a,” (Ph.D. diss., Trinity International University, 2003), 229.

were destroyed at the same time as Sodom and Gomorrah. While Wis 10:6–7 refers to the additional cities, its origin is in Gen 19:24–25, 28–29. Where Jude differs is in the reference to the continuing smoke rising from the fires of the city, which combines with the focus in Jude to emphasize that an ongoing punishment exists for the sinful. However in 2 Peter, Wisdom’s reference to the smoke continuing to rise is bypassed in favor of the clear reference to Lot, in the use of the term “righteous one.”⁹

The most extensive attempt to explain Lot’s identification as righteous in 2 Peter is in T.D. Alexander’s article, “Lot’s Hospitality: A Clue to His Righteousness.”¹⁰

Alexander focuses on Lot’s hospitality to his guests, which is referred to in Wisdom 10:6; 19:17 and in *1 Clement* 11.1:

Because of his hospitality and godliness Lot was saved from Sodom when the entire region was judged by fire and brimstone. In this way the Master clearly demonstrated that he does not forsake those who hope in him but hands over to punishment and torment those who turn aside.¹¹

Alexander also cites the very late (750–850 CE) *Pirke de Rabbi Eleazar* 25:

He [Lot] saw the two angels walking in the street of the city, and he thought that they were wayfarers in the land, and he ran to meet them. He said to them: Come and lodge ye overnight in my house, eat and drink, and ye shall go your way in peace. But the men would not accept this for themselves, and he took them by the hand against their will, and brought them inside his house as it is said, “And he urged them greatly.”¹²

⁹ The passages in Wisdom do not call Lot by name, nor any others in the list of righteous people whom Wisdom rescued. In Wisdom the focus is on the saving work of God, as it is in 2 Peter.

¹⁰ T. D. Alexander, “Lot’s Hospitality: A Clue to His Righteousness,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104, 2 (1985).

¹¹ Michael W. Holmes, trans., ed., *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, 3rd (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007), 59.

¹² Gerald Friedlander, trans., *Pirke De Rabbi Eliezer* (New York: Hermon Press, 1965), 185.

Alexander concludes,

In light of these quite separate passages it would seem reasonable to assume that there must have existed from an early period a widely circulating tradition that viewed Lot in a positive light.¹³

As we saw above, Wisdom identifies Lot as righteous along with several others, and the main intention of the text was to demonstrate God’s saving power throughout time. In *1 Clement* 11.1 and *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezar* 25 Lot shows hospitality to strangers, which is clear from Genesis. Three references over such a great length of time is not enough to convince me of a “widely circulating tradition that viewed Lot in a positive light.” Alexander successfully demonstrates that the tradition existed, not that it was widely circulating. Further, *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezar* is dated between 750–850 CE,¹⁴ giving the author centuries of literature upon which to draw.

Alexander compares Lot’s offer of hospitality to the strangers with the similar actions of Abraham urging his three visitors to stay. He concludes:

By caring for the needs of others he [Lot] resembles Abraham, and since Abraham is commended for his generosity Lot is therefore also to be viewed in a favorable light. Lot’s hospitality is a mark of his righteousness. Herein lies surely the source of the tradition noted above.¹⁵

The difficulty with Alexander’s analysis is that he misread the focus as hospitality when the references in 2 Peter 2:7–8 indicate the source of Lot’s righteousness to be steadfastness in contrast to the corruption all around him. Therefore, while Alexander has

¹³ Alexander, “Lot’s Hospitality,” 289.

¹⁴ Craig A. Evans, *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005), 243.

¹⁵ Alexander, “Lot’s Hospitality,” 290.

succeeded in identifying Lot's admirable hospitality, he has missed the function of Lot's righteousness in 2 Peter. Lot could have joined the wicked ways of his neighbors, but did not. Just so, the author of 2 Peter exhorts his community to maintain their righteousness in the midst of the wickedness around them. Given his residence in Sodom and Gomorrah, Lot serves as the perfect example of one who maintained righteousness despite the pressure and temptation to join in the behavior of the wicked.

2 Peter 2:7–8 shows the torment that Lot endured in the face of the wickedness around him.¹⁶

2 Peter 2:7–8 καὶ δίκαιον Λῶτ καταπονούμενον ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀθέσμων ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ ἀναστροφῆς ἐρρύσατο· ⁸ βλέμματι γὰρ καὶ ἀκοῇ ὁ δίκαιος ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἀνόμοις ἔργοις ἐβασάνιζεν·

2 Peter 2:7–8 and rescued righteous Lot, wearied by the licentiousness of lawless conduct;⁸ for seeing and hearing, the righteous (person) living among them day after day was tormented in his righteous soul by (their) unlawful deeds;

The emphasis on how Lot was tormented by the sins he saw made him an example to those in 2 Peter's community who are to see themselves in Lot's position.¹⁷ Green explains how Lot's righteousness fits into the larger message of 2 Peter.

The description of Lot as "righteous" resonates with Peter's thematic concern in this letter. Righteousness characterizes God's saving act in Christ (1:1), and the Christian faith is described as the "way of righteousness" (2:21). "Righteousness" was the subject of Noah's proclamation (2:5) during his own evil days, and "righteousness" will be the primary characteristic of life in the eschaton, when God will establish the new heaven and new earth (3:13). The heretics, on the other hand, are people who do unrighteous deeds (2:13), just as Balaam had followed unrighteousness (2:15). The unrighteous are those who are doomed to

¹⁶ We do not possess another text that speaks of the torment that Lot endured by seeing the wickedness around him. As Philo indicated, however, at the very least, Lot did not join in their actions even though it would have made his life in Sodom easier if he complied with the practices of the neighbors (*Mos.* 2.58).

¹⁷ Tord Fornberg, *An Early Church in a Pluralistic Society: A Study of 2 Peter*, Coniectanea biblica. New Testament Series; 9 (Lund: LiberLäromedel/ Gleerup, 1977), 48.

divine judgment (2:9). The claim that Lot was righteous sets up the promise in verse 9 that “the Lord is able to deliver the devout from trial” – those who are righteous as Lot was will be delivered from eschatological doom, just as Lot was spared the judgment of Sodom.¹⁸

In Chapter 3 we saw non-canonical traditions about the delay of the flood with the hope that God would not have to flood the earth to eradicate the pervasive wickedness. A tradition in *Gen. Rabb.* 49.6 tells of God warning the people of Sodom: “for twenty-five of these [years] the Holy One, blessed be He, made the mountains to tremble and brought terrors upon them in order that they might reform, yet they did not.”¹⁹ While we cannot claim that 2 Peter was in possession of this tradition from *Gen. Rabb.*, it nevertheless demonstrates a later Jewish tradition which is in continuity with the tradition of God’s reticence to bring punishment before the flood, which we saw in Chapter 3.

In this, the Noah and Lot traditions advance the overall message of 2 Peter. This Christian community believes Jesus will return and will punish the wicked and rescue the godly from trial (2:9), but they are becoming anxious awaiting his return. The torment of Lot’s righteous soul is supposed to mirror the righteous souls of 2 Peter’s community who are also seeing and hearing the wickedness around them. In this 2 Peter makes a perspicacious use of the Sodom and Gomorrah tradition and the addition of Lot. Further, Noah, who hated to see the wickedness of those around him, was the bridge between the ante-diluvian and post-diluvian worlds; Lot, who was tormented by what he saw and heard around him, survived the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah by fire. Those in 2 Peter’s community are exhorted to remain faithful, to remain righteous, even in the midst

¹⁸ Gene L. Green, *Jude & 2 Peter*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008), 257–8.

¹⁹ Freedman, *Midrash Rabbah*, 424.

of the torment they endure, so that they will be the bridge into the world to come, after God destroys the earth with fire.

2 Peter's addition of Noah and Lot, the examples of the righteous who were spared God's punishment, are essential in explaining the delay of the parousia. If Noah's place of exalted righteousness is difficult for 2 Peter's community to imitate, Lot provides an easier model. Through later traditions we see the development of the thought that God does not want people to perish but to repent and be spared. 2 Peter 3:9 echoes this sentiment, but one need not be nearly faultless to be spared the conflagration; Lot's rejection of the wickedness around him was enough to spare him, so 2 Peter's community can trust that their righteousness will see them through when God does bring the all-consuming fire.

Textual Commentary

τεφρώω

This verb is a *hapax legomenon* for the LXX and the NT. According to Kelly the references to ashes reflect "late Jewish folklore," which state that only ashes remain in Sodom and Gomorrah (e.g. Philo, *Migr. Abr.* 139; *Ebr.* 222 f; *Vit. Mos.* 2.56).²⁰ Examining each of these texts, however, we discover that *Migr. Abr.* 139 says nothing about ashes. In the case of *Ebr.* 222 Sodom and Gomorrah are mentioned, but this is really an avenue to address the topic of a bad soul which is burnt and reduced to ashes (τεφρώω) in 223. *Vit. Mos.* 2.56 is really the only text that directly notes that ashes remain, along with sulfur and smoke.

²⁰ J. N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude*, Black's New Testament Commentaries (London: Black, 1969), 333.

Vit. Mos. 2.56 τότε οὖν, ὡς μηνύει τὰ λόγια, κεραυνοὶ ῥυέντες ἐξ οὐρανοῦ τοὺς τε ἀσεβεῖς κατέπρησαν καὶ τὰς πόλεις αὐτῶν· καὶ μέχρι τοῦ νῦν μνημεῖα τοῦ συμβεβηκότος ἀλέκτου πάθους δείκνυται κατὰ Συρίαν, ἐρείπια καὶ τέφρα καὶ θεῖον καὶ καπνὸς καὶ ἡ ἔτι ἀναδιδομένη φλόξ ἀμαυρὰ καθάπερ διασμυχομένου πυρός.

Vit. Mos. 2.56 Therefore on this occasion, as the holy scriptures tell us, thunderbolts fell from heaven, and burnt up those wicked men and their cities; and even to this day there are seen in Syria monuments of the unprecedented destruction that fell upon them, in the ruins, and ashes, and sulphur, and smoke, and dusky flame which still is sent up from the ground as of a fire smoldering beneath;

Bauckham also lists references to ancient authors who spoke of smoking ashes that were supposed to be still in evidence in Sodom and Gomorrah (Wis 10:7; Josephus *J.W.* 4.483; Philo, *Vit. Mos.* 2.56; 4 (5) Ezra 2:9).²¹ In examining these references Wis 10:7 does mention smoke, but no ashes. 4 (5) Ezra 2:9 does describe the land lying in lumps of pitch and heaps of ashes but *J.W.* 4.483 only says that the land has been burned (καίω). It is in *J.W.* 4.484, however, where the ashes receive a special focus, “growing in their fruit” so that when one tries to pluck and eat them they disintegrate. Thus Josephus does use ashes as lasting evidence of the fire that destroyed the cities.

J.W. 4.484 φασὶ δὲ ὡς δι’ ἀσέβειαν οἰκητόρων κεραυνοῖς καταφλεγῆναι ἔστι γοῦν ἔτι λείψανα τοῦ θείου πυρός καὶ πέντε μὲν πόλεων ἰδεῖν σκιάς ἔτι δὲ κὰν τοῖς καρποῖς σποδιὰν ἀναγεννωμένην οἱ χροῖαν μὲν ἔχουσι τῶν ἐδωδύμων ὁμοίαν δρεψαμένων δὲ χερσὶν εἰς καπνὸν διαλύονται καὶ τέφραν

J.W. 4.484 It is related how, for the impiety of its inhabitants, it was burnt by lightning; in consequence of which there are still the remainders of that divine fire; and the traces [or shadows] of the five cities are still to be seen, as well as the ashes growing in their fruits, which fruits have a color as if they were fit to be eaten, but if you pluck them with your hands, they dissolve into smoke and ashes.

Kelly and Bauckham both tried to link 2 Peter’s use of τερφρώ to previous, well-attested references to Sodom and Gomorrah in Jewish literature. While ashes are mentioned several times in reference to Sodom and Gomorrah in Jewish literature, as we

²¹ Richard Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, Word Biblical Commentary, 50 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983), 251.

saw above, there are also ample references to sulfur, smoke, and continuing flames. I argue that previous attestation of *τεφρώω* does not explain 2 Peter's choice of this verb. Rather, I suspect that 2 Peter's use of only *τεφρώω* is in keeping with his assurance of divine punishment for sin. This is clear in the previous references to the punishment of the sinful angels, those who perished in the flood, and here, in those who perished in Sodom and Gomorrah. For each group their punishment was swift, decisive, and complete. In the case of Sodom and Gomorrah ashes indicate the completion of divine punishment. As such *τεφρώω* is the best way to indicate both evidence of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah and that their punishment was complete and has ended.

καταστροφή

The use of *καταστροφή* comes directly out of the Sodom and Gomorrah narrative in the LXX in Gen 19:29.

Genesis 19:29 καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἐκτρίψαι κύριον πάσας τὰς πόλεις τῆς περιοίκου ἐμνήσθη ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ ἐξάπέστειλεν τὸν Λωτ ἐκ μέσου τῆς καταστροφῆς ἐν τῷ καταστρέψαι κύριον τὰς πόλεις ἐν αἷς κατῴκει ἐν αὐταῖς Λωτ.

In addition to *καταστροφή*, Gen 19:29 also uses the verb *καταστρέφω*. The use of *καταστρέφω* in reference to Sodom and Gomorrah is abundant in the LXX, appearing in Gen 13:10; 19:21, 25, 29; Deut 29:22; Amos 4:11; Is 13:19; Jer 20:16; 49:18 (30:12 LXX); 50:40 (27:40 LXX); Lam 4:6. In this, 2 Peter uses a common term to refer to the destruction of the cities.

ὑπόδειγμα

2 Peter changes Jude's *δειγμα* (example) to *ὑπόδειγμα* (model; pattern; example). As it is, *ὑπόδειγμα* is a commonly used word, while *δειγμα* is a *hapax logomenon*. As Green observes, it was common in the ancient Mediterranean world to use examples in

moral instruction as we see as positive examples in *2 Macc.* 6:28; *4 Macc.* 17:23; Sir 44:16; John 13:15 James 5:10 and negative examples in Heb 4:11 and here in 2 Pet 2:6.²² In *2 Macc.* 6:28 Eleazar endures torture rather than eat pork. Similarly, in *4 Macc.* 17:23 Antiochus points to the Jews who bravely endured torture as an example of endurance to his soldiers. Enoch was taken to heaven as an example of repentance in Sir 44:16. Jesus washes the disciples' feet as an example of what they are to do for one another in John 13:15. The prophets are upheld as examples of patience and suffering in James 5:10. Heb. 4:11 contains a command not to imitate those who failed to enter God's rest. Each of these texts uses ὑπόδειγμα. 2 Peter uses the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah as an example to those who perish in the future conflagration of the earth.

ἀσεβέω

The adjectival ἀσεβής (impious) also appears in 2 Pet 2:5 in the discussion of the flood brought upon the world of the ungodly. We saw in Chapter 3 that in *1En.* 13.2 the Watchers taught humanity the works of impiety (ἀσέβεια) and in *1En.* 10:20, that the flood would cleanse the earth of its impiety (ἀσέβεια). Further, Philo wrote that the flood was the result of the world's impiety (ἀσέβεια) (*Deus* 1.21; *QG* 2.13, 15, 17). We also saw in Chapter 3 that in contrast to ἀδικία, ἀσέβεια, ἀσεβέω, and ἀσεβής refer to an improper relationship with a deity, specifically a lack of due reverence for a deity or their sacred institutions and rituals.²³

²² Green, *Jude & 2 Peter*, 257.

²³ s.v. "ἀσέβεια," LSJ, BDAG.

Just as the flood was brought upon the ungodly of the world (2 Pet 2:5), here in 2:6, Sodom and Gomorrah serve as an example of the kind of destruction that will befall the ungodly when God destroys the earth with fire.

2 Peter 2:7

καταπονέω

In 2 Pet 2:7 this verb appears in the passive voice and, as such, refers to being wearied, worn out, or reduced.²⁴ Green identifies that, "...this verb repeatedly appears where the author speaks of the ill-treatment or oppression that someone suffers (*3 Macc.* 2:2, 13; Josephus *J.W.* 2.313; *Ant.* 7.124; Acts 7:24)."²⁵ In *3 Macc.* 2:2, 13 the Jews suffer at the hands of Antiochus. In *J.W.* 2.313 Josephus speaks of the practice of making a vow to God after one has suffered from sickness or distress. *Ant.* 7.124 contains Joab's orders to Abishai if the troops were under distress at the hands of the Ammonites. Acts 7:24 speaks of Moses' defense of the oppressed Israelite whom Moses freed by killing the Egyptian oppressor.

ἄθεσμος

While the use of ἄθεσμος (lawless) is rare for the NT, only appearing here in 2:7 in reference to the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, and in 2 Pet 3:17 in reference to the false teachers, it is found abundantly in Jewish sources. This word appears in Josephus (*J.W.* 7.264; *Vita* 2.198), Philo (*Spec.* 2.50; *Praem.* 1.126), and throughout the

²⁴ s.v. "καταπονέω," LSJ, BDAG.

²⁵ Green, *Jude & 2 Peter*, 259. I excluded his example of *T. Levi* 6.9 because καταπονέω does not appear in that text. The text uses διώκω to refer to the persecution of Abraham, and καταπατέω to refer to the mistreatment of Abraham's flocks.

OTP (*3 Macc.* 5:12; *Sib. Or.* 1.199; 2.282; 3.524; 5.166, 177–178, 193, 271, 309, 430; 8:9, 80, 118, 317; 11.313; 13.31; *T. Sol. A* 10.2; *Ps.-Phoc.* 1.190).²⁶

The actions of the residents of Sodom and Gomorrah are considered so far beyond the realm of human decency that 2 Peter uses three different words to express their lawlessness. In 2:7 he calls them ἄθεσμος, accuses them of ἀσέλγεια, and in 2:8 calls them ἄνομος. The simplest term, ἄθεσμος, identifies their general lawlessness. As we shall see below ἀσέλγεια (licentiousness) addresses matters that are considered socially inappropriate, but not necessarily illegal. Further, it will be shown that ἄνομος (lawless) comes to represent transgression against God’s laws specifically.

ἀσέλγεια

The use of ἀσέλγεια is meant to parallel the present situation in 2 Peter’s community. The residents of Sodom and Gomorrah are guilty of the licentious conduct, which so greatly distressed Lot. We notice that in 2 Peter, the false teachers are also guilty of licentiousness, as we see in 2:2, 18.

2 Peter 2:2 καὶ πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις δι’ οὓς ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται,

2 Peter 2:2 and many will follow their licentiousness (and) because of them the way of truth will be blasphemed,

2 Peter 2:18 ὑπέρογκα γὰρ ματαιότητος φθεγγόμενοι δελεάζουσιν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς ἀσελγείαις τοὺς ὀλίγως ἀποφεύγοντας τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφόμενους,

2 Peter 2:18 For, proclaiming arrogant nonsense, they lure with licentious passions of the flesh those who barely escaped from those living in error.

²⁶ I realize that some of these references clearly post-date 2 Peter, but include them here nonetheless.

2 Peter urges the community to reject the licentiousness of those around them and remain steadfast in the face of wickedness, as Lot did in the face of the wickedness of Sodom and Gomorrah.

Since Sodom and Gomorrah are commonly portrayed as the prototypical examples of sexual immorality, it is often assumed that whenever Sodom and Gomorrah is mentioned, it must be in condemnation of their sexual behavior. I am not convinced, however that the licentious conduct (ἀσελγεία ἀναστροφῆς) to which 2 Peter refers is necessarily a reference to sexual impropriety. Let us examine the definitions of ἀσέλγεια. BDAG defines ἀσέλγεια as, “lack of self-restraint which involves one in conduct that violates all bounds of what is socially acceptable, self-abandonment.”²⁷ The LSJ defines ἀσέλγεια as, “licentiousness, wanton violence,”²⁸ which are both potentially, but not of necessity, sexual.²⁹ There are two reasons that lead me to conclude that ἀσέλγεια lacks a sexual connotation here. First, for each of the previous examples, 2 Peter removed the description of the specific sin for which the angels and the Flood generation were condemned. In Jude’s examples, the specific sins of the Exodus generation,³⁰ the sinful angels,³¹ and Sodom and Gomorrah³² are explicitly named. Second, in 2 Peter’s

²⁷ s.v. “ἀσέλγεια,” BDAG.

²⁸ s.v. “ἀσέλγεια,” LSJ.

²⁹ ἀσέλγεια is explicitly sexual in Wis 14:26; 3 Macc. 2:26; Gal 5:19; 2 Cor 12:21; 2 Pet 2:18; Vita 1.305 whereas it lacks an explicitly sexual meaning in T. Jud. 23.1; Mark 7:21–22; Rom 13:13; Eph 4:19; 1 Peter 4:3; 2 Peter 2:2, 7; Ant. 4.151; 8.252; 20.112.

³⁰ Jude 5: τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας

³¹ Jude 6: μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἐαυτῶν ἀρχὴν ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον

³² Jude 7: ἐκπορνεύσασαι καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐτέρας

description of the residents of Sodom and Gomorrah they are called lawless twice, ἄθεσμος in 2:7, and ἄνομος in reference to their lawless deeds in 2:8. Given the usual reduction of anything pertaining to Sodom and Gomorrah to sexual immorality quick conclusions are assumed but are sometimes unfounded. Notice, for example, the reference in Ezek 16:49 which condemns Sodom and Gomorrah for their lack of aid to the poor and needy despite their prosperity and ease of life.

Ezekiel 16:49 This was the guilt of your sister Sodom: she and her daughters had pride, excess of food, and prosperous ease, but did not aid the poor and needy.

Here, the people of Sodom are condemned for their complete lack of compassion. Their sin is their focus on their own pleasure and comfort with no thought for others. Thus the condemnation is not focused on sexual excess. As such, one needs to remain open to the possibility that in 2 Pet 2:7 the author's use of ἀσέλγεια the refers to all of the varied ways that their excesses are shockingly outside the boundaries of self-restraint and what is socially acceptable.

ρύομαι

This verb, which means to rescue or to deliver, most often appears in the context of divine rescue or deliverance (Rom 15:31; 2 Cor 1:10; Col 1:13; 1 Thess 1:10; 2 Thess 3:2; 2 Tim 3:11; 4:17–18).³³ Here again, the author connects Lot to those who will survive the final conflagration. Just as God rescued Lot, God will rescue the godly, as we see in 2:9.

2 Peter 2:9 οἶδεν κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ πειρασμοῦ ρύεσθαι, ἀδίκους δὲ εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως κολαζομένους τηρεῖν,

³³ Green, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 260.

2 Peter 2:9 (then) the Lord knows how to rescue the godly from temptation, and to keep the unrighteous under punishment until the day of judgment

2 Peter 2:8

ἄνομος

This commonly used word does mean lawless, but also came to be a synonym for sin or iniquity, as seen in its cognate form ἀνομία in Rom 4:7; 2 Cor 6:14; Titus 2:14; Heb 1:9; 10:17.³⁴ Further, this term was sometimes used in reference to Gentiles, who were outside of the Jewish religion and did not act according to its moral standards.³⁵ In this, the accusation in 2 Peter refers specifically to a transgression of God’s laws. Further, the word is plural here, indicating that they were guilty of several violations of God’s laws.

βασανίζω

The verb βασανίζω can mean to subject to severe distress, torment, and harass, and also means to torture, and to inflict severe pain by punitive torture.³⁶ Since this word is used in reference to physical torture,³⁷ in the instances in which it refers to torment, harassment, and distress it conveys a much stronger distress than one might ordinarily imagine. 2 Peter 2:8 conveys the great depth of Lot’s torment in the face of the wickedness surrounding him.

³⁴ Ibid., 261.

³⁵ s.v. “ἄνομος,” BDAG.

³⁶ s.v. “βασανίζω,” LSJ, BDAG.

³⁷ 2 Macc 7:13, 17; 9:6; 4 Macc. 6:5, 10, 11; 8:2, 27; 9:7, 27, 30, 32; 11:16, 20; 12:4, 13; 13:27; 15:22; 16:3, 15; Rev 9:5.

βλέμματι γὰρ καὶ ἀκοῇ

The implication of Lot's seeing and hearing is more than a statement of the function of his senses. This reference indicates Lot's spiritual insight to the wickedness around him. Perhaps even more important than Lot seeing and hearing is the fact that the residents of Sodom and Gomorrah did not see and did not hear spiritually. Green cites several examples that speak of those who are spiritually unable to see and hear (Deut 29:4; Is 6:9; 21:3; 29:18; Jer 5:21; Ezek 12:2; Mark 4:12; 8:18; Matt 13:13–17; Lk 8:10; Acts 28:26; Rom 11:8).³⁸ In each of these texts there is both a larger group who is unable to see and hear and a smaller group or an individual who is able to see and hear what the others cannot. In 2 Pet 2:6–8 Lot is the one person who has the spiritual perception to recognize the depth of the others' wickedness and is tormented by it.

In connection to 2 Peter's community, anyone who lacks the spiritual gifts given by God named in 1:5–7 is near-sighted and blind (1:9). In this, the world at large is doomed, like Sodom and Gomorrah, but Lot and the righteous among 2 Peter's community possess the spiritual insight to see righteousness and wickedness for what it is.

ἐγκατοικέω

2 Peter used the compound verb ἐγκατοικέω (to dwell among) to speak of Lot dwelling in Sodom and Gomorrah. The LXX translation of Gen 19:29 uses κατοικέω.

Genesis 19:29 καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἐκτριῖναι κύριον πάσας τὰς πόλεις τῆς περιοίκου ἐμνήσθη ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Αβρααμ καὶ ἐξάπέστειλεν τὸν Λωτ ἐκ μέσου τῆς καταστροφῆς ἐν τῷ καταστρέψαι κύριον τὰς πόλεις ἐν αἷς κατῴκει ἐν αὐταῖς Λωτ

³⁸ Green, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 261.

The use of ἐγκατοικέω is rare, appearing nowhere else in the biblical canon. It does appear however in *Ag. Ap.* 1.296 where Josephus discusses Manetho's statement that diseased quarry workers were given the city of Avaris to inhabit. This word also appears in Herodotus *Hist.* 4.204 in which King Darius of Persia gave the conquered and enslaved Barcaeans a town in Bactria in which to dwell.

Here in 2 Peter, the author shows that Lot had a daily affront to his righteousness in being unable to escape the unrighteousness of the people in the town in which he dwelled.

Conclusion

2 Peter uses the Sodom and Gomorrah tradition from a different perspective than Jude and for a clearly different purpose. For 2 Peter, the precise identification of the sins of the people is not the focus. What is important is the function of Lot as an example for the community and the destruction of the cities by fire.

Lot's righteousness receives the focus, since he remained righteous before God despite the rampant sins of his neighbors, the people of Sodom and Gomorrah. So too, 2 Peter's community is exhorted to remain righteous in the midst of a culture that holds out daily temptation to inordinate sin, in order that they might be spared. The faith was received, "through the righteousness of our God and Savior Jesus Christ" (1:1). If one were to abandon the faith it would have been better to have never known the way of righteousness at all (2:21). Finally, after the conflagration, righteousness will be at home in the new heavens and new earth (3:13).

Noah was the bridge between the ante-diluvian and post-diluvian worlds because of his righteousness. Lot's righteousness spared him in the destruction of Sodom and

Gomorrah. Righteousness then, is the common thread between Noah and Lot, for both of them are an example to 2 Peter's community that expects the destruction of the earth in flames. Like Noah, the community can be the bridge between the post-diluvian world and the world to come, but unlike Noah, they will not endure destruction by water. Here, one must turn to Lot. The burning destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah was a precursor to the future universal conflagration, which the community can survive if they can be righteous like Lot. Like Lot, the righteous will be rescued (ῥύομαι 2:7, 9) and the unrighteous will be kept under punishment until the day of judgment (2:9).

Noah and Lot both maintain righteousness despite the wickedness surrounding them. The beginning of 2 Peter states how God's power has given the community everything it needs to live a godly life. If they remain righteous and faithful they can escape the corruption in the world due to passion (ἐπιθυμία) and may instead participate in the divine nature (1:3–4). In this, 2 Peter is reminding the community that it is not truly at home in this unrighteous world. Once the righteous survive the conflagration, those who were spared will live in the new heavens and new earth “where righteousness is at home” (3:13).

CHAPTER 5

2 PETER 2:15–16 VS. JUDE 11

Introduction

This chapter will address the significance of the major change made to Jude 11 by the author of 2 Peter by eliminating the references to both Cain and Korah and fixing the focus on Balaam as a false prophet.

The chapter begins with textual criticism to ensure that we are using the most secure text. Next, each of the differences between Jude and 2 Peter's texts will be examined in order to explain the reasons behind the changes. Lastly, we shall consider how 2 Peter's redaction of Jude's material affects the overall function of 2 Peter.

Textual Criticism

Jude 11 οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς, ὅτι τῆ ὁδῷ τοῦ Κάιν ἐπορεύθησαν καὶ τῆ πλάνῃ τοῦ **Βαλαάμ** μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν καὶ τῆ ἀντιλογία τοῦ Κόρε ἀπώλοντο.

Jude 11 Woe to them because they have gone in the way of Cain and have abandoned themselves to Balaam's error for wages and perished in Korah's rebellion.

2 Pet 2:15–16 ¹⁵ **καταλιπόντες** εὐθεΐαν ὁδὸν ἐπλανήθησαν, ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῆ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαάμ τοῦ **Βοσόρ, ὃς μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν** ¹⁶ ἔλεγε δὲ ἑσχεν ἰδίας παρανομίας· ὑποζύγιον ἄφωνον **ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ** φθεγξάμενον ἐκόλυσεν τὴν τοῦ προφήτου **παραφρονίαν**.

2 Pet 2:15–16 They left the straight way and have gone astray, following the way of Balaam (son of) Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness ¹⁶ but he had rebuke of his own lawlessness; a speechless donkey having brayed with a human voice restrained the prophet's madness.

Jude 11

Jude 11 has only one minor variant: P72 writes Βαλαάκ for **Βαλαάμ**. Looking at the manuscript itself,¹ Βαλαάκ is a possible reading, but first alpha is much darker than most of the other letters, as would appear when one has made a correction by writing over a previous letter. Further, the second supposed alpha does not resemble the other alphas in the manuscript. It is fuzzy, dark, practically indiscernible, and is strongly connected to the final letter, the same way cursive letters connect to one another. As such, the supposed second alpha and the supposed kappa can also resemble a sloppily written μ. Comparing the script throughout the rest of the manuscript, however, the final letter looks like a kappa and resembles the other kappas in the manuscript. It is clear that the copyist struggled at this point in the manuscript, as the final three letters of Βαλαάκ are all particularly dark and thicker than the other letters. It may be that the copyist thought of King Balak who was trying to force Balaam to agree to curse Israel, because Balaam is not shown to have been interested in money. The LXX, however, spells the name in question Βαλάκ. So if there is actually a second alpha, it suggests a mistake in attempting to spell Balak. If the supposed second alpha is actually a letter scratched out by the copyist, the spelling Βαλάκ would be consistent with the LXX.

2 Peter 2:15–16

2 Peter 2:15 καταλιπόντες εὐθεΐαν ὁδὸν ἐπλανήθησαν, ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαάμ τοῦ Βοσόρ, ὃς μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν

¹ http://www.csntm.org/manuscript/zoomify/GA_P72?image=P72_0021b.jpg&page=1#viewer

καταλιπόντες

The variant καταλείποντες was the preferred reading in the NA 27 and 4th UBS, supported by Codex Sinaiticus (Ⲙ), the original reading of Codex Vaticanus (B*), 049, 33, 442, and a few miniscules. The NA 28 reflects the second edition of the *Editio Critica Maior* in which the preferred reading is καταλιπόντες, based on the witness of P72, the second corrector of Codex Vaticanus (B²), Codex Ephraemi (C), Codex Porphyrianus (P), Codex Athous Laurae (Ψ), 1739, the whole Syriac and Bohairic traditions, one Sahidic manuscript, and the majority of all Koine texts.

Βοσόρ

The variant, Βεωρ, appears in Codex Vaticanus (B), a few other Koine texts, the Vulgate, the Syriac revision by Philoxenus, and one Sahidic manuscript. Βεωρ, is consistent with the LXX, and is a transliteration of the Hebrew (רַעַר) and therefore would represent an improved reading.

The variant, Βεωρσορ, appears only in the original reading of Codex Sinaiticus (Ⲙ*) and as noted by Metzger, this strange reading “...is no doubt due to the conflation of Βοσόρ with a marginal correction—εωρ.”²

The preferred reading, Βοσόρ, appears in P72, the second corrector of Codex Sinaiticus (Ⲙ²), Codex Alexandrinus (A), Codex Ephraemi (C), Codex Porphyrianus (P), Codex Athous Laurae (Ψ), 048, 1739, and the majority of all Koine texts.

² Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), 635.

ὄς μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν

The variant, μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν, is identical to the majority text, save for the absence of ὄς. The witnesses for the text with the absence of ὄς are the original text of Codex Sinaiticus (κ*) and one manuscript of the Latin Vulgate.

The variant, μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησαν, is a change of number, which is witnessed only by P72 and Codex Vaticanus (B), although these witnesses are strong. The phrase in question refers to Balaam who loved the wages of wrongdoing. Since the text is clearly speaking only of Balaam, the plural, ἠγάπησαν, is undoubtedly incorrect.

The majority text seems to suggest a corrected text, an improved text, since the actual reference is to the singular person of Balaam, not the plural, as found in P72 and Codex Vaticanus (B). Thus the singular occurs correctly in the third corrector of Codex Sinaiticus (κ³), Codex Alexandrinus (A), Codex Ephraemi (C), Codex Porphyrianus (P), Codex Athous Laurae (Ψ), 049, the majority of Koine texts, the Vulgate, and the whole of the Syriac and Coptic traditions.

2 Peter 2:16 ἔλεγξιν δὲ ἔσχεν ἰδίας παρανομίας· ὑποζύγιον ἄφωνον ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ φθεγξάμενον ἐκώλυσεν τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφρονίαν.

ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ

The variant, ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ, is identical to the majority text, save for the omission of ἐν which is witnessed to only by the original reading of Codex Sinaiticus (κ*) which appears to be a simple scribal error. The variant, ἐν ἀνθρώποις φωνῇ, which appears in P72 and Codex Vaticanus (B), changes the sense, so that the donkey speaks in a voice to people.

Another variant reads ἐν ἀνθρώποις φωνῆν and is supported in 1611 and in the Harkleian Syriac. The final variant, ἐν ἀνθρώποις, is supported in Codex Athous Laurae (Ψ) and the Sahidic tradition.

The majority text, ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῆ, is so prevalent that it is not listed in the critical apparatus.

παραφρονίαν

The variant, παραφροσυνην, appears in Codex Athous Laurae (Ψ) and 5. The variant, παρανοϊαν, appears in 81. These variants have very weak attestation and the majority text is so prevalent that it is not listed in the critical apparatus.

Textual Commentary

The figure of Balaam as presented in the MT and the LXX poses various difficulties. The story of Balaam (Num 22–24), “is one of the most difficult texts of the Old Testament having numerous problems of text, grammar, structure, redaction and content.”³ For example, the LXX translations of these chapters contain a radical reinterpretation of the text with 177 differences between the MT and the LXX.⁴ The LXX Balaam texts resulted in significant changes in the exegesis of later Jewish interpreters, and even later by rabbinic commentary.⁵ Further, this section of Numbers contains at least three differing portrayals of Balaam:

1. a non-Israelite curse reciter who deals with magic as well (i.e., Num 22:5–21);

³ Józef Zsengellér, “Changes in the Balaam-Interpretation in the Hellenistic Jewish Literature (LXX, Philon, Pseudo-Philon and Josephus),” in *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*, Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook, 2008, Lichtenberger, Hermann and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert (Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), 487.

⁴ Ibid., 488.

⁵ Ibid.

2. an obedient prophet of God, who knows and follows his words, and who was called to curse but went to bless (i.e., Num 23:3–12);
3. a ridiculous prophet who far from being in contact with God does not see the angel sent by God, though seen by his ass (Num 22:22–35).⁶

By the time of the writing of 2 Peter, additional traditions about Balaam had developed so that Balaam was blamed for Israelite apostasy and was made to look the fool.

As the author of 2 Peter excoriates the “false teachers among you” (2 Pet 2:1), the most telling change in his use of Jude 11 is the removal of the references to Cain and Korah so that the full focus is on Balaam. In 2 Peter Balaam is portrayed as a false prophet, which is quite different than his portrayal in Jude 11. What will be shown in this chapter is the way in which the author of 2 Peter creates that image for Balaam and the way in which he uses Balaam to his advantage in his castigation of the false teachers in his community.

2 Peter 2:15 καταλιπόντες εὐθεΐαν ὁδὸν ἐπλανήθησαν, ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ τοῦ Βοσόρ, ὃς μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν

2 Peter 2:15 They left the straight way and have gone astray, following the way of Balaam (son of) Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness

καταλείπω

Much stronger than its root verb λείπω, which simply means to lack or fall short, καταλείπω is used in the sense forsaking or abandoning something with finality.⁷ In the LXX καταλείπω is found especially in references to forsaking God and God’s

⁶ Ibid., 487.

⁷ s.v. “καταλείπω,” BDAG.

commandments (Jer 2:17; Bar 4:1; 1 Macc 2:21).⁸ As we shall see, this is exactly the context in which the author of 2 Peter chooses to use this verb here.

πλανάω

This verb is often used for “error,” but literally refers to “wandering” in the sense of leaving the right path. Jude 11 uses πλάνη in reference to Balaam’s greed, his desire for wages. The way 2 Peter 2:15 uses the verb πλανάω emphasizes the action of wandering away, in that the verse begins with the image of abandoning a “road” or “way” (ὁδός).

Notice that in 2 Peter 2:15, ἐπλανήθησαν is an indicative aorist passive third person plural, which allows a translation of either “they have gone astray” or “they have been led astray.”⁹ Which of these is intended has important significance for the overall message of 2 Peter.

The larger context of 2 Peter 2 is a warning about giving in to sinful influences. As presented in the dissertation, the sinful angels chose to do what they knew was wrong (Ch. 2), Noah chose to remain righteous and tried to persuade the wicked to change their ways (Ch. 3), and Lot’s righteousness remained in the face of the wickedness of Sodom and Gomorrah (Ch. 4). In each of these instances there is a choice being highlighted between obedience to God’s ways or disobedience to God’s commands. The author urges the community to beware and to remain faithful.

⁸ Gene L. Green, *Jude & 2 Peter*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008), 285.

⁹ While πλανάω is in the passive in voice in 2:Pet 2:15, the sense is active here and in Mk 12:24, 27; Matt 18:12–13; Heb 3:10; 11:38; James 5:19; 1 Pet 2:25. Green, *Jude & 2 Peter*, 284.

In the more immediate context of 2 Peter 2, the parallel to the false prophets who led the people astray are the false teachers of the community. This is made plain in 2:1–2:

2 Peter 2:1–2 Ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφήται ἐν τῷ λαῷ, ὡς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, οἵτινες παρεισάξουσιν αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας καὶ τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι. ἐπάγοντες ἑαυτοῖς ταχινὴν ἀπόλειαν,² καὶ πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις δι' οὓς ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται,

2 Peter 2:1–2 But false prophets also arose among the people, just as there will also be false teachers among you who will secretly bring in heresies of destruction and deny the master who bought them. They are bringing swift destruction upon themselves,² and many will follow their licentiousness (and) because of them the way of truth will be blasphemed,

So, while 2 Peter 2:1–3 does not use *πλανᾶω* in these verses, the coherence of the references would lead us to note that the message warns that just as Balaam led the Israelites astray, the false teachers will do the same.

The false teachers are further decried in 2 Peter 2:12–14:

2 Peter 2:12–14 Οὗτοι δὲ ὡς ἄλογα ζῷα γεγεννημένα φυσικὰ εἰς ἄλωσιν καὶ φθορὰν ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσιν βλασφημοῦντες, ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρήσονται¹³ ἀδικούμενοι μισθὸν ἀδικίας, ἡδονὴν ἠγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφῆν, σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν συνευωχούμενοι ὑμῖν,¹⁴ ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδος καὶ ἀκαταπαύστους ἀμαρτίας, δελεάζοντες ψυχὰς ἀστηρίκτους, καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίας ἔχοντες, κατάρας τέκνα·

2 Peter 2:12–14 But these, like irrational animals, born according to nature, for capture and destruction, blaspheme things they do not know; in their destruction they will also be destroyed,¹³ suffering for the wages of unrighteousness. They consider it a pleasure, reveling in the day - stains and blemishes! - reveling in their deceits, feasting with you.¹⁴ Having eyes full of adultery and unceasing from sin, luring unstable souls, having a heart trained in greed - accursed children!

The evidence of the context makes it plain that the intended translation for *ἐπλανήθησαν* in 2:15 is “they have gone astray,” for the referents are the false teachers who have already chosen the wrong way and are trying to deceive others.

The use of the verb form is supported by LXX Deut 4:19; 13:1–18; 30:17 and Wis 12:24. The same sense is found in James 5:19 where *πλανάω* is used to express willful apostasy from God.¹⁰

ὁδός

Jude 11 refers to the “way of Cain” but 2 Peter 2:15 changes this, removing Cain and substituting “the way of Balaam” to keep the focus on this figure of deceit. Further, 2 Peter adds a contrast between the way of Balaam (τῆ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαάμ) and the straight way (εὐθεΐαν ὁδὸν). The conflict between two ways is a persistent theme throughout 2 Peter. The conflict is between following God’s way or being against God’s way: the way of God or the way that “wanders” from God.

It is notable that *πλανάω* and *ὁδός* appear together in 2 Pet 2:15 as they do in Deut 11:28,¹¹ Prov 21:16, and Wis 5:6, each in reference to abandoning God’s commandments.

God’s ways are called the straight way (2 Pet 2:15), and the way of truth (2 Pet 2:2). The final way presented in 2 Peter 2:21 is the way of righteousness, which refers to one’s conduct.¹²

τῆ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαάμ and ἐξακολουθέω

Jude 11 οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς, ὅτι τῆ ὁδῷ τοῦ Κάϊν ἐπορεύθησαν καὶ τῆ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαάμ μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν καὶ τῆ ἀντιλογία τοῦ Κόρε ἀπώλοντο.

Jude 11 Woe to them because they have gone in the way of Cain and have abandoned themselves to Balaam’s error for wages and perished in Korah’s rebellion.

2 Peter 2:15 καταλιπόντες εὐθεΐαν ὁδὸν ἐπλανήθησαν, ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῆ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαάμ τοῦ Βοσόρ, ὃς μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν

¹⁰ Ibid., 284.

¹¹ Particularly pertinent as a reference is the LXX’s Deut 11:(26-)28 which includes blessings for fidelity.

¹² Green, *Jude & 2 Peter*, 304.

2 Peter 2:15 they left the straight way and have gone astray, following the way of Balaam (son of) Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness

In Jude, the expression is πορεύομαι τῇ ὁδῷ which, "...appears frequently in the LXX as a reference to the direction for a person's life or someone's moral conduct, whether good or evil (Ps 32:8 [31:8 LXX]; 81:13 [80:14 LXX]; 101:6 [100:6 LXX]; Prov 1:15; 2:13; 28:18; Is 2:3; Bar 4:13; Tob 1:3)."¹³

2 Peter changes the verb from πορεύομαι to ἐξακολουθέω again emphasizing the image of the road down which one walks, using a more vivid suggestion of closer imitation and following of Balaam's way. As used in intertestamental literature, the verb means that, "those who 'follow after' something have submitted to some form of authority in their thought or actions (*T. Napht.* 3.3; *T. Iss.* 6.2)"¹⁴ and adhere to what is false.¹⁵ Thus the choice of 2 Peter's author to substitute a verb with such a powerful connotation as ἐξακολουθέω for Jude's commonplace πορεύομαι points to the larger conflict to which 2 Peter is directed.

Moreover, ἐξακολουθέω is shown to be a favorite of the author from its use earlier in 2 Peter 1:16 and 2:2:

2 Peter 1:16 Οὐ γὰρ σεσοφισμένοις μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν ἀλλ' ἐπόπται γενηθέντες τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος.

2 Peter 1:16 For we did not follow craftily devised myths when we make known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but we had been eyewitnesses of that majesty.

¹³ Ibid., p. 89.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 243.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 285.

Here in 1:16, the author asserts authority as an orthodox witness and teacher of the Christian message.

2 Peter 2:2 καὶ πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις δι' οὓς ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται,

2 Peter 2:2 and many will follow their licentiousness (and) because of them the way of truth will be blasphemed,

As we have seen, 2 Peter 2:2 warns that many people will follow (ἐξακολουθεῶ) the licentiousness of the false teachers, thus blaspheming the way of truth.

In each of these three instances, 2 Peter 1:16, 2:2, and 2:15, the contexts provide examples of those who have followed incorrect teachings, or will do so. Each of these examples is a choice against God.

εὐθεῖαν ὁδὸν

2 Peter 2:15 contrasts Balaam's way with the straight way (εὐθεῖαν ὁδὸν). This is a common term to refer to the path of obedience to God (1 Sam 12:23; Ps 107:7 [106:7 LXX]; Prov 2:13; Is 33:15; Hos 14:9 [10 LXX]; Acts 13:10.¹⁶ The accusation of 2 Peter 2:15 belongs to this context. Those in the community who have followed Balaam's way have abandoned God's way, a serious charge indeed.

In addition to the straight way (εὐθεῖαν ὁδὸν), 2 Peter names two other "ways" that correspond to God's ways. The way of truth (ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας) and the way of righteousness (ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης):

ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας

Another phrase by which 2 Peter echoes the contrast of two ways is between the way of the false prophets and the way of truth (ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας). As we have seen, as

¹⁶ Richard Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, Word Biblical Commentary, 50 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983), 267.

early as 2 Peter 2:1–2, the author warns that there will be false teachers in the community just as there have been false prophets in the past. Because of the false teachers, the way of truth will be blasphemed (βλασφημέω).

2 Peter 2:1–2 Ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐν τῷ λαῷ, ὡς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, οἵτινες παρεισάξουσιν αἰρέσεις ἀπωλείας καὶ τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι. ἐπάγοντες ἑαυτοῖς ταχινήν ἀπώλειαν,² καὶ πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις δι' οὓς ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται,

2 Peter 2:1–2 But false prophets also arose among the people, just as there will also be false teachers among you who will secretly bring in heresies of destruction and deny the master who bought them. They are bringing swift destruction upon themselves,² and many will follow their licentiousness (and) because of them the way of truth will be blasphemed,

The way of truth is used in other texts in reference to God's way. The way of truth is manifest in obedience to God's commands in Ps 119:29–30 (118:29–30 LXX), appears as a contrast between what will befall the righteous and the wicked at the final judgment in Wis 5:6–7, and mentioned in 4 Ezra 5:1, when Ezra communicates a vision of the signs that will precede the eschaton.¹⁷

Psalm 118:29–30 LXX ὁδὸν ἀδικίας ἀπόστησον ἀπ' ἐμοῦ καὶ τῷ νόμῳ σου ἐλέησόν με³⁰ ὁδὸν ἀληθείας ἠρετισάμην τὰ κρίματά σου οὐκ ἐπελαθόμην

Psalm 119:29–30 Put false ways far from me; and graciously teach me your law.³⁰ I have chosen the way of faithfulness; I set your ordinances before me.

Wisdom 5:6–7 ἄρα ἐπλανήθημεν ἀπὸ ὁδοῦ ἀληθείας καὶ τὸ τῆς δικαιοσύνης φῶς οὐκ ἐπέλαμψεν ἡμῖν καὶ ὁ ἥλιος οὐκ ἀνέτειλεν ἡμῖν⁷ ἀνομίας ἐνεπλήσθημεν τρίβοις καὶ ἀπωλείας καὶ διωδεύσαμεν ἐρήμους ἀβάτους τὴν δὲ ὁδὸν κυρίου οὐκ ἐπέγνωμεν

Wisdom 5:6–7 So it was we who strayed from the way of truth, and the light of righteousness did not shine on us, and the sun did not rise upon us.⁷ We took our fill of the paths of lawlessness and destruction, and we journeyed through trackless deserts, but the way of the Lord we have not known.

¹⁷ The way of truth (ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας) also appears in Gen 24:48 and Tob 1:3 but these examples are less pertinent for the point being made here.

4 Ezra 5:1 De signis autem: ecce dies venient, et adprehendentur qui inhabitant super terram in excessu multo, et abscondetur veritatis via, et sterilis erit a fide regio.

4 Ezra 5:1 Now concerning the signs: lo, the days are coming when those who inhabit the earth shall be seized with great terror, and the way of truth shall be hidden, and the land shall be barren of faith.

In 2 Peter 2:1–2 the use of the two ways permits a connection between Balaam and those he led astray and the false teachers in 2 Peter’s community who are leading the community astray. As we shall see below, the appellation of Balaam as prophet (προφήτης) is unique to 2 Peter, despite his prophetic actions. Just as those who followed the false prophet’s, that is Balaam’s, way brought swift destruction upon themselves, so those who follow the false teachers now go against the way of truth, God’s way. Here I do not suggest that 2 Peter 2:1–2 refers only to Balaam, since the text refers to prophets in the plural. The only false prophet named, however, is Balaam. The contrasting two ways appears in the verses specifically concerning Balaam alone (2:15–16) and functions in 2:1–2 with the same theme of either choosing to be in accord with God’s ways or against God’s ways.

ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης

2 Peter 2:21 uses the expression way of righteousness (ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης) as synonymous with living in accord with the holy commandment.

2 Peter 2:21 κρεῖττον γὰρ ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἢ ἐπιγνοῦσιν ὑποστρέψαι ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἁγίας ἐντολῆς.

2 Peter 2:21 For it would have been better for them not to have known the road of righteousness than, having known it, to turn away from the holy commandment that was handed down to them.

The same expression appears in Prov 8:20; 12:28; 16:17, 31; 17:23; 21:16, 21; Wis 5:6; Tob 1:3.¹⁸

μισθός, ἀδικία, and πλεονεξία

Depending on the situation, μισθός can refer to both reward and punishment in that good actions can bring forth positive results, and bad actions, negative results. There is a cause and an effect, with μισθός as the effect. As such, it is fitting to define μισθός as recompense or wages, which retains the sense of effect as the result of a cause.¹⁹

The concept of righteousness appears regularly in 2 Peter, but never in Jude. 2 Peter opens with a statement about the righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) of our God and Savior Jesus Christ (1:1). Using the same word, Noah was a herald of righteousness (2:5), and in the present day, it would have been better for the apostates to never have known the way of righteousness than to later turn away from God's holy commandment (2:21), for it is in the new heavens and earth that righteousness will have a home (3:13). The author of 2 Peter finds it right (δίκαιος) to refresh the community's memory of the authoritative teaching they have received (1:13). Lot is called righteous (δίκαιος) twice in 2:7–8. Righteousness is contrasted with unrighteousness. After the long protasis of three examples of God's previous judgment in 2:4–8, the apodosis in 2:9 assures the audience that God will keep the unrighteous (ἀδίκος) under punishment until the judgment of the great day.

¹⁸ Green, *Jude & 2 Peter*, 304.

¹⁹ s.v. “μισθός” BDAG.

The previous examples bring us to the unrighteousness in 2:15. Notice that the author has prepared the audience with the castigation in 2:13:

2 Peter 2:13 ἀδικούμενοι μισθὸν ἀδικίας, ἡδονὴν ἠγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφήν, σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν συνευωχούμενοι ὑμῖν,

2 Peter 2:13 suffering harm as the wages of unrighteousness. They consider it a pleasure, reveling in the day - stains and blemishes! - reveling in their deceits, feasting with you.

In 2:13, the false teachers suffer harm as the wages (μισθός) of their unrighteousness (ἀδικία), whereas Balaam loved the wages of unrighteousness. Further, the false teachers will exploit people in their greed (2:3):

2 Peter 2:3 καὶ ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ πλαστοῖς λόγοις ὑμᾶς ἐμπορεύσονται, οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει.

2 Peter 2:3 and in greed they will exploit you with fabricated words, for whom their condemnation (made) long ago is not idle and their destruction is not drowsy.

2 Peter 2:15 attaches greed to Balaam, “following the way of Balaam (son of) Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness,” but in Numbers, Balaam will not prophesy against Israel for money. In Numbers 24:11, King Balak offers Balaam a great reward if he will curse Israel.

יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ בְּרַחֲמָיו אֶל־מִקְוָמוֹ אֶמְרָתִי כִּבְדֹּ אֶכְבְּדָהּ וְהִנֵּה מְנַעַץ יְהוָה מִכַּבּוֹד

Numbers 24:11 νῦν οὖν φεῦγε εἰς τὸν τόπον σου εἶπα τιμήσω σε καὶ νῦν ἐστέρησέν σε κύριος τῆς δόξης

Numbers 24:11 Now be off with you! Go home! I said, ‘I will reward you richly,’ but the LORD has denied you any reward.”

Twice Balaam says that even if Balak were to give him his house full of silver and gold he could not transgress the word of God (Num 22:18; 24:13).

וַיַּעַן בְּלַעַם וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל־עַבְדֵי בְלַק אִם־יִתְּנוּ־לִי בְלַק מְלֵא בֵיתוֹ כֶּסֶף וְזָהָב לֹא אוּכַל לַעֲבֹר אֶת־פִּי יְהוָה
Numbers 22:18
 אֲלֹהֵי לַעֲשׂוֹת קִטְנָה אוֹ גְדוּלָה

Numbers 22:18 και ἀπεκρίθη Βαλααμ και εἶπεν τοῖς ἄρχουσιν Βαλακ ἐὰν δῶ μοι Βαλακ πλήρη τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ ἀργυρίου και χρυσίου οὐ δυνήσομαι παραβῆναι τὸ ῥῆμα κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτὸ μικρὸν ἢ μέγα ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ μου

Numbers 22:18 But Balaam replied to the servants of Balak, “Although Balak were to give me his house full of silver and gold, I could not go beyond the command of the LORD my God, to do less or more.

מַלְבִּי אֶשָּׂא יְהוָה יְהוָה אִתּוֹ אֲדַבֵּר
Numbers 24:13 אִם יִתְּנֵהוּ בַּיָּד אֲנִי בְּלֶקֶט מְלֵא בֵּיתוֹ כֶּסֶף וְזָהָב לֹא אֶוְכַל לְעֵבֶר אֶת־פִּי יְהוָה לְעֲשׂוֹת טוֹבָה אוֹ רָעָה

Numbers 24:13 ἐὰν μοι δῶ Βαλακ πλήρη τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ ἀργυρίου και χρυσίου οὐ δυνήσομαι παραβῆναι τὸ ῥῆμα κυρίου ποιῆσαι αὐτὸ πονηρὸν ἢ καλὸν παρ’ ἐμαυτοῦ ὅσα ἐὰν εἴπη ὁ θεός ταῦτα ἐρῶ

Numbers 24:13 ‘If Balak should give me his house full of silver and gold, I would not be able to go beyond the word of the LORD, to do either good or bad of my own will; what the LORD says, that is what I will say’

The text from Numbers shows that Balaam has no desire for whatever reward Balak might offer. Balaam is unable to do or say anything contrary to God’s commands.

Even so, the tradition of Balaam as the greedy false prophet belongs to a later development.²⁰ We see an example of this tradition in Philo’s description of Balaam as greedy and desiring the rewards Balak offered.

Mos. 1:267–268 και οἱ μὲν ἦκοντες ἐπανήεσαν ἄπρακτοι πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα, ἕτεροι δ’ εὐθὺς ἐπὶ τὴν αὐτὴν χρεῖαν ἐχειροτονοῦντο τῶν δοκιμωτέρων, πλείω μὲν ἐπιφερόμενοι χρήματα, περιττοτέρας δὲ δωρεὰς ὑπισχνούμενοι ²⁶⁸ δελεασθεῖς δὲ και τοῖς ἤδη προτεινομένοις και ταῖς μελλούσαις ἐλπῖσι και τὸ ἀξίωμα τῶν παρακαλούντων καταιδεσθεῖς ἐνεδίδου, πάλιν προφασίζόμενος τὸ θεῖον οὐκ ἐφ’ ὑγιεῖ· τῇ γοῦν ὑστεραία παρεσκευάζετο τὴν ἔξοδον ὀνειράτα διηγούμενος, ὑφ’ ὧν ἔλεγε πληχθεῖς ἐναργεσι φαντασίαις ἀναγκάζεσθαι μηκέτι μένειν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς πρέσβεσιν ἀκολουθεῖν.

Mos. 1:267–268 So the messengers returned back to the king, without having succeeded in their errand. And immediately other messengers of the highest rank in the whole land were sent on the same business, bringing with them more abundant presents of money, and promising still more ample rewards than the former ambassadors had promised. ²⁶⁸ And Balaam, being allured by the gifts which were already proffered to him, and also by the hopes for the future which they held out to him, and being influenced also by the

²⁰ Jerome H. Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Bible, 37 C (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 211.

rank of those who invited him, began to yield, again alleging the commands of the Deity as his excuse, but no longer with sincerity. Accordingly, on the next day he prepared for his departure, relating some dreams by which he said he had been influenced, affirming that he had been compelled by their manifest visions not to remain, but to follow the ambassadors.

The statement that Balaam loved the wages of wrongdoing connects once again to the opening statement about the false teachers in 2 Peter 2:1–3. Specifically, 2:3 speaks of the false teachers' greed (πλεονεξία).

In a different perspective on Balaam's love of the wages of wrongdoing, Num 25:1 narrates the Israelites having sex with Moabite women and sacrificing to their gods, eventually resulting in the death of 24,000 Israelites (25:9). Later, Num 31:16 says that it was Balaam's idea to have the Moabites lead Israel into sin.²¹

Numbers 31:16 הן הנה היו לבני ישראל בדבר בלעם למסר-מעל ביהוה על-דבר-פועור ותהי המגפה בעדת יהוה

Numbers 31:16 αὐται γὰρ ἦσαν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμα Βαλααμ τοῦ ἀποστῆσαι καὶ ὑπεριδεῖν τὸ ῥῆμα κυρίου ἕνεκεν Φογῶρ καὶ ἐγένετο ἡ πληγὴ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ κυρίου

Numbers 31:16 These women here, on Balaam's advice, made the Israelites act treacherously against the LORD in the affair of Peor, so that the plague came among the congregation of the LORD.

The charges of Num 31:16 resulted in later Jewish authors narrating that it was Balaam's idea to lead the Israelites to sin, and actually have him say as much (Philo, *Mos.* 1.294–304; Josephus, *Ant.* 4.126–40; *Tg. Ps.-J. Num.* 24:14; *L.A.B.* 18.13–14).²²

Even though the Balaam narrative presents him generally as innocent and obedient to

²¹ Rev 2:14 repeats the charge, saying that Balaam taught Balak to get the Israelites to eat food sacrificed to other gods and fornicate.

²² Green, *Jude & 2 Peter*, 91.

God, the connection drawn between the sins of Israel at Peor (Num 25) and Balaam's advice in Num 31:16 is the tradition that expands, thus vilifying Balaam.

The author of 2 Peter seems to have access to those traditions about Balaam leading a community dedicated to God into sinful conduct. As such, 2 Peter connects the sexual immorality of the Israelites at Peor to the false teachers who entice people to sexual sin (2:3, 14, 18) and warns that God will be especially sure to punish those who indulge their flesh in depraved lust (2:10).

2 Peter 2:3 καὶ ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ πλαστοῖς λόγοις ὑμᾶς ἐμπορεύσονται, οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει.

2 Peter 2:3 and in greed they will exploit you with fabricated words, for whom their condemnation (made) long ago is not idle and their destruction is not drowsy.

2 Peter 2:14 ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδος καὶ ἀκαταπαύστους ἀμαρτίας, δελεάζοντες ψυχὰς ἀστηρίκτους, καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίας ἔχοντες, κατάρως τέκνα.

2 Peter 2:14 Having eyes full of adultery and unceasing from sin, luring unstable souls, having a heart trained in greed - accursed children!

2 Peter 2:18 ὑπέρογκα γὰρ ματαιότητος φθεγγόμενοι δελεάζουσιν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς ἀσελγείαις τοὺς ὀλίγως ἀποφεύγοντας τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφόμενους,

2 Peter 2:18 For, proclaiming arrogant nonsense, they lure with licentious passions of the flesh those who barely escaped from those living in error.

2 Peter 2:10 μάλιστα δὲ τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μiasμοῦ πορευομένους καὶ κυριότητος καταφρονοῦντας. τολμηταὶ ἀυθάδεις, δόξας οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες,

2 Peter 2:10 but above all, those who follow flesh in defiled lust and who despise authority. Presumptuous, audacious, they do not tremble to blaspheme the glories,

Just as Balaam died by the sword (Num 31:8; Josh 13:22), the false teachers in 2 Peter's community will come to suffer destruction as the wages of their unrighteousness (2:3).

2 Peter 2:3 καὶ ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ πλαστοῖς λόγοις ὑμᾶς ἐμπορεύσονται, οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἄργεῖ καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει.

2 Peter 2:3 and in greed they will exploit you with fabricated words, for whom their condemnation (made) long ago is not idle and their destruction is not drowsy.

In summary, the change from the “way of Cain” in Jude 11 to the “way of Balaam” in 2 Pet 2:15 and the addition of the “straight way” serve the overall function of 2 Peter well. The Balaam narrative allows the author to illustrate what happens to those who follow in the ways of wickedness rather than God’s ways. We notice that the image of the road is not as vivid in Jude 11, in which ὁδός is used more in the sense of a choice of life, whereas 2 Peter seems to draw on the tradition of the “two ways” with reference to a road more as a pathway to or away from God as he refers to Balaam, using ὁδός in 2:2 and 2:21 to exhort the community to follow God’s ways and not be led to the ways of wickedness.

καταλιπόντες εὐθεῖαν ὁδὸν ἐπλανήθησαν, ἔξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ

The author is brutal in condemning the apostates. Within this short text, “καταλιπόντες εὐθεῖαν ὁδὸν ἐπλανήθησαν, ἔξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ,” there are four separate accusations. They did not just leave (λείπω), they abandoned (καταλείπω). And what these previous Christians abandoned was the straight way (εὐθεῖαν ὁδὸν), which is God’s way, the only way for a Christian to follow. As if abandoning the straight way were not clear enough, the text also says that the apostates went astray (ἐπλανήθησαν). Finally, the apostates did not just go (πορεύομαι) in the way of Balaam as Jude 11 says of going in the way of Cain, but they are imitating or following (ἔξακολουθήσαντες) the way of Balaam. These few words are a vitriolic condemnation of the apostates.

2 Peter 2:16 ἔλεγξιν δὲ ἔσχεν ἰδίας παρανομίας· ὑποζύγιον ἄφωνον ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ φθεγγόμενον ἐκώλυσε τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφροσίαν.

2 Peter 2:16 but he had rebuke of his own lawlessness; a speechless donkey having brayed with a human voice restrained the prophet's madness.

ἔλεγξις and παρανομία

The noun ἔλεγξις means an “expression of strong disapproval, reproach, rebuke, reproof.”²³ The cognate, ἔλεγχος, has a broader meaning. It can mean also refer to “accusation” or “proof.”²⁴ The verbal form, ἐλέγχω, appears in Jude 15 in reference to the ways in which the wicked will be judged and convicted (ἐλέγχω) for their ungodly ways.

Jude 15 ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων καὶ ἐλέγξαι πᾶσαν ψυχὴν περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν ὧν ἠσέβησαν καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν ὧν ἐλάλησαν κατ' αὐτοῦ ἀμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς.

Jude 15 to execute judgment on all, and to convict everyone of all the deeds of ungodliness that they have committed in such an ungodly way, and of all the harsh things that ungodly sinners have spoken against him.”²⁵

Built into the root of the word is not only rebuke for wrongdoing, but a sense that evidence of the wrongdoing is available. So the rebuke that Balaam received in 2 Pet 2:16 was not an unsubstantiated accusation, but a rebuke which came because of available evidence.

2 Peter 2:16 says that Balaam was rebuked for acting contrary to the law (παρανομία). In Num 22:32–34, however, the angel of the Lord confronts Balaam, who confesses to sinning (ἀμαρτάνω), whereas the donkey asks why she has been struck and

²³ s.v. “ἔλεγξις,” BDAG.

²⁴ s.v. “ἔλεγχος,” BDAG.

²⁵ Jude 14 It was also about these that Enoch, in the seventh generation from Adam, prophesied, saying, “See, the Lord is coming with ten thousands of his holy ones,

if she has previously failed to carry Balaam to where he directed her. In 2 Peter 2:16 there is no reference to the angel; there is only the rebuke of the donkey who restrained the prophet's madness. So again, just as alterations of Balaam as one who was eager for wages appears in 2 Peter 2:15, against Numbers, which does not make that charge, so too, alterations of Numbers are in evidence here in 2 Peter 2:16 as well, in the ridiculing of Balaam as needing admonishment from a dumb beast. Sadly, we do not have a contemporaneous Jewish recounting of the Balaam narrative to indicate the presence of this tradition in Jewish literature. However, the references to Balaam in 2 Peter are in keeping with later Jewish Targums on Numbers 22:30. While the precise dating of the Targums is not possible, they are undoubtedly later than 2 Peter. It is however, very unlikely that this alteration was introduced by Christians and subsequently influenced Jewish interpretation. Thus these Targums seem to reflect an alteration of the legend already in place before 2 Peter, but for which we have no written evidence.

Tg. Neof. Num. 22:30 And the donkey said to Balaam: "Where are you going, wicked Balaam? You lack understanding! What! If you are not able to curse me who am an unclean beast, and die in this world and who do not enter the world to come, how much less are you able to curse the sons of Abraham, of Isaac and Jacob, on whose account the world was created from the beginning, and for whose merits it is remembered before them?"²⁶

Tg. Ps.-J. Num. 22:30 Then the ass said to Balaam: "Woe to you, Balaam, (you are) lacking knowledge, for I, an unclean animal, who will die in this world and who will not enter the world to come, you are unable to curse me; how much less the children of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, by whose merits the world was created!"²⁷

²⁶ Martin McNamara and Ernest G. Clarke, *The Aramaic Bible: The Targums*, vol. 4, *Targum Neofiti 1 And Pseudo-Jonathan: Numbers* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1995), p. 128

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 254.

As Neyrey notes, the rebuke of Balaam, “recalls the divine judgment of the wicked in 2:4–9; despite their denial of judgment, Balaam’s ass is one more proof of accountability for one’s actions and for divine judgment.”²⁸

ὑποζύγιον

In the LXX, Balaam’s donkey is ἡ ὄνος, a female donkey, translated from the Hebrew, יתלף, also a female donkey. 2 Peter 2:16 uses the term ὑποζύγιον, which literally means “under the yoke,” a general term for a yoked beast, or specifically a donkey.²⁹ Both ὄνος and ὑποζύγιον are common words and can be used interchangeably.

One wonders if the author of 2 Peter might have chosen ὑποζύγιον rather than ὄνος because it highlights better the contrast between Balaam and the beast, since the animal is under Balaam’s yoke, yet it has more sense than Balaam.

ἄφωνον ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ

Balaam’s speechless animal is able to speak with a human voice:³⁰

2 Peter 2:16: ἔλεγξιν δὲ ἔσχεν ἰδίας παρανομίας· ὑποζύγιον ἄφωνον ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ φθεγγάμενον ἐκώλυσεν τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφρονίαν.

2 Peter 2:16: but he had rebuke of his own lawlessness; a speechless donkey having brayed with a human voice restrained the prophet’s madness.

As we saw in the section “ἔλεγξιν and παρανομία” above, extra-biblical texts (*Tg. Neof. Num. 22:30; Tg. Ps.-J. Num. 22:30*) heighten the ridicule of the donkey rebuking Balaam in that she points out to him that she is an unclean animal and even she has more knowledge than her master does. The scornful irony is that in 2 Peter 2:16, Balaam is

²⁸ Neyrey, *2 Peter*, 212.

²⁹ s.v. “ὑποζύγιον,” BDAG.

³⁰ In Josephus, *Ant.* 4.109–10 the donkey also spoke with a human voice. Green, *Jude & 2 Peter*, 287.

called a prophet, yet it is the donkey, ordinarily speechless, who miraculously is able to prophesy to her master. Balaam cannot speak words against Israel or even successfully curse his donkey. Thus the human has no voice, while the yoked beast speaks to the master in the human voice of a prophet, shaming her master.³¹

ἐκόλυσεν τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφρονίαν

The donkey also restrained the prophet's madness. While the verb κολύω means that the donkey restrained or hindered his madness,³² as Neyrey rightly observes, the donkey "ultimately did not prevent his pursuing his wickedness, but berated him for having no understanding."³³ However, for the author to qualify the recipient of the donkey's restraint as the "prophet" only adds to the scornful ridicule of Balaam, the false prophet, a fool for anyone idiotic enough to follow.

The noun παραφρονία is a *hapax legomenon* in all of ancient Greek literature and conveys the notion of a "state or condition of irrationality, madness, insanity,"³⁴ so that the verbal form, παραφρονέω, means "to conduct oneself in an irrational manner, be beside oneself."³⁵ Green notes the intent of 2 Peter in "setting up the deeply ironic contrast between the dumb ass, who speaks rationally, and the prophet Balaam, who is

³¹ Neyrey, *2 Peter*, 212.

³² BDAG, 580.

³³ Neyrey, *2 Peter*, 211–12.

³⁴ s.v. "παραφρονία," BDAG.

³⁵ s.v. "παραφρονέω," BDAG.

mad or irrational.”³⁶ Balaam, the prophet, is insane and cannot even curse his own animal, much less Israel.

Earlier in the section (2:12–13), the author of 2 Peter indicates the foolishness of the false teachers who are as dull-witted as irrational animals. The fact that Balaam’s donkey rebukes him suggests that Balaam the “prophet” is recognized as another irrational animal by his beast, and one in need of counsel.

2 Peter 2:12–13 Οὗτοι δὲ ὡς ἄλογα ζῶα γεγεννημένα φυσικὰ εἰς ἄλωσιν καὶ φθορὰν ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσιν βλασφημοῦντες, ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρήσονται ¹³ ἀδικούμενοι μισθὸν ἀδικίας, ἡδονὴν ἠγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφῆν, σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν συνευωχούμενοι ὑμῖν,

2 Peter 2:12–13 But these, like irrational animals, born according to nature, for capture and destruction, blaspheme things they do not know; in their destruction they will also be destroyed, ¹³ suffering harm as the wages of unrighteousness. They consider it a pleasure, reveling in the day - stains and blemishes! - reveling in their deceits, feasting with you.

προφήτης

Quite uniquely, 2 Peter 2:16 is the only text in the biblical canon, intertestamental literature, and the literature of Philo and Josephus where Balaam is referred to as a prophet.

2 Peter 2:16: ἔλεγξιν δὲ ἔσχεν ἰδίας παρανομίας· ὑποζύγιον ἄφωνον ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ φθεγγόμενον ἐκώλυσεν τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφρονίαν.

2 Peter 2:16: but he had rebuke of his own lawlessness; a speechless donkey having brayed with a human voice restrained the prophet’s madness.

In his article on “כּוּן in the Old Testament,” Rolf Rendtorff observes:

The picture of the prophecy of Israel presented in the OT is by no means uniform. It embraces such different phenomena that it seems well-nigh impossible to bring it under a single common denominator. . . . The difficulty arises at once in the sphere of terminology. Attention is focused

³⁶ Green, *Jude & 2 Peter*, 287.

almost exclusively on נְבִיא with its derived verbal forms, but this covers only one part of what is to be called prophecy in the OT...³⁷

In this sense, in his actions and words, Balaam demonstrates many characteristics of a prophet even if the word נְבִיא itself is absent.

The words of Balaam that might lead people to consider him a prophet appear in Num 22–24. God speaks to Balaam on multiple occasions (Num 22:9, 12, 20; 23:4). Balaam waits for God to speak and listens (Num 22:8, 19; 23:3). God put a word (רָבַרְבָּ, ῥῆμα LXX) into Balaam’s mouth (Num 23:5, 16).³⁸ In Num 24:2 the spirit of God came over Balaam before he uttered his oracle. In Num 23:7 the LXX also added that the spirit of God came over Balaam (καὶ ἐγενήθη πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐπ’ αὐτῷ), but those words are not present in the MT. The reception and transmission of a word of God are characteristics of a prophet.³⁹ On several occasions Balaam insists that he cannot go beyond the command of God or not say what God commands him to say (Num 22:13, 18, 38; 23:12, 26; 24:13). Multiple references are made to Balaam’s oracles (לִשְׁנֵי, παραβολή, LXX) (Num 23:7, 18; 24:3, 15, 20, 23) or (נְבִיא, φημί LXX) (Num 24:3, 4, 15). In these few chapters, it would seem that the actions described here fit the description of a prophet.

In addition to נְבִיא, the terms (אִישׁ־הַאֲלֹהִים), (רָצָה), and (הִזָּה) are all used as other terms for “prophets” in the OT.⁴⁰ It is the noun (הִזָּה) that is particularly relevant for our

³⁷ Rolf Rendtorff “נְבִיא in the Old Testament,” *TDNT* 6:796–812, 796.

³⁸ In Deut 18:18 God promises to raise up a prophet like Moses among the Israelites and will put words (רָבַרְבָּ) in the mouth of the prophet. Also at the call of Jeremiah (Jer 1:9), God touched Jeremiah’s mouth and put God’s words (רָבַרְבָּ) into Jeremiah’s mouth.

³⁹ Rendtorff, “נְבִיא in the Old Testament,” *TDNT* 6:801.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 809–10.

discussion of Balaam. The verbal form (׀׀׀) involves a different kind of seeing than the ordinary sight described by the verb (׀׀׀). The verb (׀׀׀) refers to a perception or sight that requires an inner vision, and in the case of Num 24:4, 16, Balaam sees as a seer in the ecstatic state.⁴¹

For all this evidence, no other authors have allowed the title to Balaam. The choice of the author of 2 Peter allows him a parallel to the false teachers who threaten to warp his community. Moreover, such a parallel allows him to attach ridicule and foolishness not only to their teaching, but to their persons.

2 Peter 2:1: Ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐν τῷ λαῷ, ὡς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, οἵτινες παρεισάξουσιν αἰρέσεις ἀπωλείας καὶ τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι. ἐπάγοντες ἑαυτοῖς ταχινήν ἀπώλειαν,

2 Peter 2:1: But false prophets also arose among the people, just as there will also be false teachers among you who will secretly bring in heresies of destruction and deny the master who bought them. They are bringing swift destruction upon themselves,

Earlier in the text, the author, in the identity of Peter, claimed authority in his experience of the Transfiguration (1:16–18). Thus the author claims credibility that his message has come from God alone:

2 Peter 1:19–21: καὶ ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον, ᾧ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες ὡς λύχνῳ φαίνοντι ἐν ἀρχμηρῷ τόπῳ, ἕως οὗ ἡμέρα διαυγάσῃ καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, ²⁰ τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες ὅτι πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται. ²¹ οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη προφητεία ποτέ, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι.

2 Peter 1:19–21: And we have a very sure prophetic word to which you do well to pay heed as to a lamp shining in a dark place, until the day dawns and the morning star rises in your hearts. ²⁰ First, know this, that all prophecy of scripture is not one's own explanation, ²¹ for no prophecy was ever borne of human will, but people, borne by the Holy Spirit spoke from God.

⁴¹ s.v. “׀׀׀,” BDB.

This claim will be seen again later, in 3:2, in which the author exhorts the community to remember the words of the holy prophets of the past. In doing so, it is not only important that they remember the words of the holy prophets; by extension, they must also disregard the words of the false prophets:

2 Peter 3:2: μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημένων ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος,

2 Peter 3:2: to have remembered the words spoken beforehand by the holy prophets and the commandment of the Lord and Savior (spoken by) your apostles,

Here then is the most notable feature of this section. Although Balaam was supposed to have spoken divinely inspired words, there is no other extant text which refers to him as a prophet but this text in 2 Peter. Balaam can then be shown as a false prophet whose manipulation led others to sin and destruction. Thus he is the perfect example of the false prophets who arose in the past (2:1), and as 2 Peter warns his community, there will be false teachers who threaten to destroy them as well. They must follow those whose prophetic message has been confirmed (1:19–21; 3:2), not a false prophet.

Conclusion

Balaam functions differently than our other examples of sinners, addressed in chapters 2–4. In the first cluster (2:4–8) there was an assurance of divine punishment for sin, illustrated in the examples from when God punished sinners in the past. The apodosis in 2:9 to the long protasis in 2:4–8 assures that the same will happen when God cleanses the world of sin at the final judgment.

In the first cluster (2:4–8) the specific sins were not enumerated. The emphasis was on the action of God, specifically, God’s punishment for sin, whatever the sin

happened to be. In the case of Balaam, his multiple charges serve as his overture. This is because Balaam serves as a paradigm of the false teachers who will come to the community. Each charge against Balaam has a parallel to what the false teachers will do in the community.

2 Peter 2:1–2 reminds readers of false prophets of the past and warns that false teachers will arise among them. 2 Peter 2:12–14 speaks about the false teachers who will try to lead people astray. Then 2 Peter 2:15–16 speaks of Balaam, but specifically in connection to the false teachers in 2:12–14. In their actions, the false teachers are like Balaam. The description of the specific evils of Balaam correspond to the evils of the false teachers. In a further point of connection, Balaam is called a prophet in 2:16, the only place in the biblical canon in which that occurs. It serves to connect the false prophets in 2:1, of which Balaam is only one, to the false teachers who act like Balaam, rather than follow God's ways.

The author of 2 Peter viciously attacks Balaam and those who would follow in his ways. Anyone would be mistaken in going against God's ways, but would be an imbecile to follow the way of Balaam. Who would be stupid enough to follow a fool whose own donkey shamed him? In his merciless portrait of Balaam, the author is desperately trying to get the community to stay away from the false teachers.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS

This dissertation has focused on the particular and separate interpretation that the author of 2 Peter has given in redacting the references from the Jewish scriptures and pseudepigrapha found in Jude 5–11. There we see two clusters, each targeting three sinners or groups of sinners who are not to be emulated and whose actions mirror the behavior of the undesirable people who have crept into the community. The first cluster (vv. 5–7) includes the sinners of the unbelieving Exodus generation (v. 5), the sinful angels (Watchers) who did not keep their domain and left their proper dwelling (v. 6), and the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah who went after other flesh (v. 7). The second cluster (v. 11) accuses those who have infiltrated the community of going in the way of Cain, abandoning themselves to Balaam’s error for gain, and perishing in Korah’s rebellion.

The dissertation has addressed each of Jude’s clusters and shown how the author of 2 Peter, while drawing on some of the references, has reworked them in such a way as to convey the message of a wise warning, in the first cluster, that God will surely not leave sin unpunished, and in the second cluster, that the community should beware of false teachers who will lead them astray.

The research has shown that the author of 2 Peter has dealt with the references found in the first cluster of Jude by removing Jude’s description of the particular sin

committed and has altered the function of the reference so that the emphasis is on God's sure punishment for sin, no matter what the sin may be. With the introduction of the righteous figures of Noah and Lot in 2 Peter, it was shown that, despite the evil around them, the community can be inspired to maintain their righteousness in the face of evil, as Noah and Lot have done. As such, they can expect to survive the impending conflagration in which God will destroy all wickedness conclusively. For the second cluster, 2 Peter omitted Jude's references to Cain and Korah and drew on Balaam alone, assigning him, uniquely, the title of "prophet" in order to illustrate an example of one who can be entirely false to his calling, as are those falsely called "teacher" in 2 Peter 2:1. 2 Peter's alterations are more appropriate for a community expecting God's wrath to eradicate all unrighteousness, thus encouraging the community to remain faithful to the teachings they first received in order to survive the final conflagration.

In Chapter One it was necessary to address the nature of the relationship between Jude and 2 Peter. Even the earliest Christian commentators on the Bible noted the tremendous similarities between the documents. Because this dissertation argues that 2 Peter redacted Jude, it was necessary to re-examine the evidence for this conclusion. Chapter One examined each of the four possible scholarly responses to the relationship between the documents from the least probable to the most probable theories.

The first and least probable theory is that Jude and 2 Peter used a common source. Bo Reicke holds that Jude and 2 Peter were based on a common sermon pattern. This was stated very briefly without explanation, exploration, nor evidence of any external sermon patterns. Michel Green arrives at the same conclusion, basing his claim on a lack of

verbal agreements between the two documents. The research of Chapter One, however, showed that while Jude and 2 Peter share few words in common, the content itself has an overwhelming number of similarities. Green argued that each text appealed to a standardized form of catechesis denouncing false teaching, but cited no evidence of this type of catechesis. The notion that Jude and 2 Peter are dependent upon another common source does not endure under scrutiny. Neither author was able to produce an example of the form of document they suggested. Further, examining the texts under close comparison points to a closer relationship between the documents than an external common source.

John Robinson is the only scholar to support the second hypothesis, that Jude and 2 Peter were written by the same author. Robinson claims that the author was writing at much the same time, but for a different context. He leans heavily on Jude 3 and suggests that the author was writing 2 Peter, needed to stop in order to quickly write Jude in his own name, and later return to writing 2 Peter in the name of the apostle. Robinson cited Guthrie who observed that 70% of Jude's language has been changed in 2 Peter, yet said that the vocabulary and style of both documents are indistinguishable, which is not true. Robinson did not make a convincing argument as to why Jude would write "in his own name" as well as in the name of Peter. In this, Robinson also is claiming that the historical Jude composed Jude, while most scholars hold the work to be pseudonymous. Several scholars have compared the style and vocabulary of the two documents and have found them to be so different that one cannot argue that the same person could have written both documents.

The third hypothesis posits that Jude is dependent upon 2 Peter. This was the commonly held hypothesis for several centuries for no other reason than the importance of Peter outweighs that of Jude among the disciples and therefore Peter would not need to use Jude's existing material. Even though the earliest writers believed both documents to be pseudonymous, later, others accepted the attributed authors as the actual authors without question and thus automatically concluded that 2 Peter must have written first. Acceptance of the works as pseudonymous allows scholars to examine the texts themselves and use them to determine the relationship between them. Friedrich Spitta's 1885 work, *Der zweite Brief des Petrus und der Brief des Judas eine geschichtliche Untersuchung*, is the most extensive and involved defense of the priority of 2 Peter over Jude. Over the course of dozens of pages, Spitta argues several points at which he feels that Jude used a better word than 2 Peter, suggesting that Jude improved upon 2 Peter's text. While he argues this point with several words, he does not address the majority of the words in the remainder of the document that do not match in which 2 Peter used better word choices, thus leading one to conclude that 2 Peter was an improvement upon Jude. Further, he never explained why Jude would have shortened 2 Peter so drastically if 2 Peter were primary. In 1901, Charles Bigg also argued for the priority of 2 Peter. Bigg's method showed an immediate problem. Using internal clues in the text, he said that either the first document improved upon the second, or the second spoiled the first, which would mean that for every point in the argument, the conclusion could be applied in either direction equally. Bigg concluded that Jude "spoiled" 2 Peter on several accounts. Because Bigg believed that both documents were historically reliable as compositions of the two authors named, he supported the conclusion that Jude "spoiled"

2 Peter rather than dare to consider that the apostle Peter used a text that Jude wrote. As with other scholars, Bigg used Jude 3 to say that the author wrote in haste which would explain its brevity compared to 2 Peter and the inferior phrasing which Bigg recognized in Jude. The presuppositions regarding authorship, which belonged to Spitta and Bigg's era, influenced explanations to support what would appear, in their day, to be sensible conclusions regarding the direction of dependency, but such arguments are indefensible today.

Most contemporary scholars of the Catholic Epistles overwhelmingly concur that Jude is the source for 2 Peter and not the reverse. Their arguments can be reduced to seven main points of evidence. While counter-arguments could be made for each of the seven, the cumulative evidence of all seven result in a conclusion that is very difficult to contest. These seven points of evidence are summarized briefly here. (i.) 2 Peter is longer than Jude therefore it makes more sense that the secondary document be longer than the primary. (ii.) The supposed context of urgency in Jude 3 is indefensible if Jude is dependent upon 2 Peter given that the author of Jude would have to take 2 Peter and do a lot of thoughtful editing to produce Jude. If the situation were so urgent, the author could have simply used 2 Peter. (iii.) 2 Peter is more detailed regarding the false teachers and what they will do in the community, again indicating a lengthening of a text rather than trying to explain why a longer text would be shortened. (iv.) In the first cluster, 2 Peter has the references in chronological order and Jude does not, thus it would be difficult to defend Jude breaking an existing sequence for one that is not chronological. (v.) 2 Peter contains fewer allusions to the pseudepigrapha which led some scholars to take this as

evidence of 2 Peter as a later document with a hesitancy to use “non-canonical” material.¹

(vi.) 2 Peter 2:10–11 only make sense if Jude 8–9 lies behind it. With 2 Peter alone, the reference to the angels who do not bring a slanderous judgment against people requires a reference, which one finds in Jude 8–9. Thus 2 Peter 2:10–11 appears as a summarized allusion to Jude 8–9. (vii.) There is no parallel to 2 Peter 3:4 in Jude. Since 2 Peter 3:4 is so poignant in observing that it seems as though the wicked are not punished, it would be unthinkable that Jude would choose to omit such an important verse if Jude were dependent on 2 Peter.

In each of the first three hypotheses the arguments are built on minutiae and fail to address the larger issues that address the major evidence when comparing the two documents. The literary evidence clearly shows that 2 Peter relies on Jude.

Chapters Two through Five each examine one example of a notorious sinner or group of sinners from the Old Testament and Pseudepigrapha, as presented in 2 Peter. Since 2 Peter is dependent upon Jude, we specifically examine 2 Peter’s redaction of Jude’s material. The research reveals a careful reshaping of Jude’s material to present an entirely different understanding of judgment, to explain the delay in the parousia, and to strive to get the community to maintain their righteousness despite the evil surrounding them. For each narrative allusion, their setting in 2 Peter revealed that the narratives expanded beyond their first appearance in the Old Testament and were reshaped to fit the author’s purposes.

¹ In Chapter One I argued that this particular argument is not convincing because there was no established Jewish canon that would exclude other texts as “non-canonical.” Further, this dissertation has shown that both authors used the pseudepigrapha.

The particular focus of Chapter Two was on 2 Peter's redaction of Jude's reference to the sinful angels. Both Jude and 2 Peter refer to the sinful angels from Gen 6:1–4 and the expanded narratives in the pseudepigrapha, in particular in the Book of Watchers (*1 En.* 1–36), but they each refer to the tradition differently.

In Jude 6, the focus is on the specific sins of angels and how their sin has condemned them to eternal chains. With this reminder, Jude accuses those who have crept in and disrupted the community of the same sins (v. 8) and suggests that they too will suffer eternal punishment. In 2 Peter 2:4 the material was reshaped quite differently, removing the description of the angels' sin entirely and putting the focus on God's sure punishment for sin, whatever the sin might be. 2 Peter 3:4 says that there are scoffers in the community who are saying that God will not return to punish sinners and 2:3 assures the people that the condemnation of the sinners is not idle and their destruction is not drowsy. In removing the description of the nature of the sin and focusing on God's sure punishment of the angels, 2 Peter assures the community that the sins of the false teachers will not go unpunished. The emphasis on the sure punishment of sin is in keeping with the rest of 2 Peter. In the next two examples of sin from 2 Peter's first cluster, the flood and Sodom and Gomorrah, the nature of the sin has also been omitted and the emphasis is placed on the divine punishment that was the consequence of sin.

In 2 Peter's treatment of the sinful angels, it says that God did not spare them (οὐκ φείδομαι) and handed them over (παραδίδομι), which are both lacking in Jude. Jude 5 says that the angels are kept in eternal chains under great darkness. 2 Peter's redaction says that the angels are kept in chains of darkness, but adds that they are being kept in Tartarus specifically. The reference to Tartarus has led many scholars to suggest that 2

Peter was addressed to a Gentile audience since Tartarus is a Greek concept. However, it was shown that the use of Tartarus had become a familiar concept in the Judaism of its time since Tartarus appears in the LXX, pseudepigrapha, and in Philo.

There is an important indication to the overall message of the document in 2 Peter's omission of the word eternal (αἰδιος) in Jude 6. Whereas Jude 6 speaks of the angels' eternal chains, 2 Peter removes the reference to eternity. This happens again in Jude 7 with eternal fire (αιώνιος) and its parallel in 2 Peter 2:6 which contains no reference to eternity, and again in Jude 13 with a reference to darkness being reserved forever (εις αιῶνα) and its parallel in 2 Peter 2:17 which removes the reference to eternity. This tendency in 2 Peter indicates a different way of thinking about God's judgment. In Jude, the reference is to an afterlife of eternal torment after each person's individual death, whereas 2 Peter speaks of God's final judgment on the earth² that will come to everyone at once, a punishment which will have a beginning and an end, not carry on eternally.

Chapter Three investigated 2 Peter's substitution of the flood narrative for Jude's reference to the Exodus generation. Research in Chapter Three demonstrates 2 Peter's expectation of a more immediate judgment from heaven. Jude 5 began the first cluster with the example of the Exodus generation which showed their destruction as a result of their rebellion against God, despite being God's chosen ones, recently saved from Egypt. In this, Jude assures his audience that even if they are God's beloved ones (v. 1), God would not hesitate to destroy them for infidelity. 2 Peter altered Jude's order and substituted the flood narrative for the Exodus generation, putting it in chronological

² The nature of the judgment 2 Peter's community awaits is addressed in the discussion of Chapter Three.

order, after the sinful angels. The use of the flood narrative allows 2 Peter to speak of an entirely different kind of judgment, one that comes to the living on the earth. Just as the flood was a universal judgment that destroyed everyone except those whom God chose to spare, 2 Peter warns that God will soon bring the final universal judgment to the earth in the form of fire (3:7). In this, the flood connects to the next reference in 2 Peter's cluster, Sodom and Gomorrah, a divine punishment by fire, but not universal. Further, 2 Peter also connected the flood narrative to the previous reference of the sinful angels, thus joining all three examples together.

As we saw in the summary of Chapter Two, 2 Peter's cluster was intended to assure the community that God will bring certain punishment for sin. The sinful angels must await judgment in Tartarus. The research of Chapter Three showed that many pseudepigraphical traditions deem the sinful angels the cause of the flood and that 2 Peter used the pseudepigraphical traditions to connect the flood with the sinful angels. Literarily, we saw in Chapter Two that God did not spare the sinful angels (οὐκ φείδομαι) and the same is said for the ancient world whom God did not spare (οὐκ φείδομαι), but destroyed in the flood.

In the substitution of the flood for the Exodus generation, 2 Peter also connected the flood to the last example from the cluster, Sodom and Gomorrah. It was shown in Chapter Three that the flood and Sodom and Gomorrah³ have been paired together in other instances (i.e., *Jub.* 20:5; *T. Napht.* 3:1–5; *Luke* 17:26–30; *Mos.* 2:53–65).

Additionally, water and fire are frequently mentioned together in the biblical corpus as a

³ A fuller discussion of Jude and 2 Peter's treatment of Sodom and Gomorrah is addressed below in the discussion of Chapter Four.

means of punishment. 2 Peter pairs these together in order to refer to a later Jewish and early Christian belief in two universal judgments, one by water and one by fire. Since the flood brought about universal destruction, references to the flood on its own served as an eschatological foreshadowing of future punishment. With the expectation of another total destruction by fire is the belief in three worlds: the ante-diluvian world, the present post-diluvian world, and the world to come, which 2 Peter's community awaits. Again, we see clearly that Jude and 2 Peter have very different ideas about judgment; for Jude it is after death and for 2 Peter it is expected in the conflagration of the whole earth.

Jude only discusses the punishment of the wicked at the time of their individual deaths. Since 2 Peter speaks of a judgment that will come to all the living on the earth at once, he also needed to address what would happen to the righteous people on earth when God's judgment comes. In this, we see the addition of the mention of righteous people who were spared in previous divine judgments. Into the illustration of divine punishments in the flood and Sodom and Gomorrah, 2 Peter added that Noah (and family) and Lot⁴ were spared. 2 Peter called Noah and Lot righteous, and it was their righteousness that allowed them to survive God's destructive punishments. 2 Peter draws the two narratives together even more closely in accusing those destroyed in the flood and Sodom and Gomorrah of being ἀσεβής, which is an offense against God specifically. Noah and Lot, in their righteousness, suffered by being surrounded by those who are ἀσεβής. It was shown that Noah had become a prototypical example to Jews and Christians thought to be living at the end of days. In maintaining their righteousness, Noah and Lot serve as examples to 2 Peter's community who are encouraged to maintain their righteousness in

⁴ 2 Peter's treatment of the figure of Lot is addressed more fully below in the discussion of Chapter Four.

the face of the wickedness surrounding them. Just as Noah and Lot survived God's punishment, 2 Peter says that those in his community who maintain their righteousness can also live through the coming conflagration.

2 Peter 2:5 is the only place in the biblical corpus that calls Noah a herald of righteousness (δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα). This expression is crucial for the entirety of this document because on it hinges 2 Peter's explanation of the delay of the parousia. In calling Noah a herald of righteousness, 2 Peter is drawing upon an extrabiblical tradition in *Sib. Or.* 1:128–9 in which God commands Noah to proclaim repentance to the people so that they might be saved. The notion of Noah proclaiming repentance also appeared in *Jos. Ant.* 1.74. Its preservation of the same tradition in *b. Sanh.* and *Gen. Rab.* shows Noah's ongoing role as the person who tried to persuade sinners to repent, demonstrating its popularity in certain Jewish circles. Noah as herald of righteousness is the way that 2 Peter explains the delay in the parousia. According to the pseudepigraphical tradition, God did not want to bring the flood. In sending Noah to preach repentance, God hoped that the people would repent. Their failure to turn from their wickedness necessitated the flood, to God's regret. According to 2 Peter 3:4 there are scoffers who insist that God will not come to punish the wickedness on earth because the wicked seemingly go unpunished for their deeds. 2 Peter 3:5–7 reminds the community that God punished sinners in the flood in the past and that the present world and the godless (ἄσεβής) on it will be destroyed with fire. God's response seems so slow that they might wonder if it will ever come, but 2 Peter 3:8 recalls Ps. 90:4 (LXX 89:4), that with the Lord one day is like a thousand years, and a thousand years are like one day. As such, 2 Peter 3:9 explains that

God's punishment has not yet come because God is awaiting the repentance of the wicked so that they might be spared.

2 Peter 3:9 οὐ βραδύνει κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ὡς τινες βραδύτητα ἡγοῦνται, ἀλλὰ μακροθυμεῖ εἰς ὑμᾶς, μὴ βουλόμενός τινος ἀπολέσθαι ἀλλὰ πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρῆσαι.

2 Peter 3:9 The Lord is not slow about the promise, as some consider slowness, but is patient with you, not wanting any to perish, but all to come to repentance.

The focus of Chapter Four was on 2 Peter's redaction of Jude's reference to Sodom and Gomorrah. Jude 7 specified the sins of Sodom and Gomorrah, saying they were guilty of sexual immorality and going after other flesh. Jude says that they serve as an example by undergoing a punishment of eternal fire. Jude's example of Sodom and Gomorrah connect to Jude 6 in recalling the fallen angels. Both are guilty of a boundary violation and sexual immorality: the angels did not keep their proper heavenly dwelling by having sex with humans and teaching them forbidden knowledge, and the people of Sodom and Gomorrah went after other, specifically, angelic, flesh. In both verses Jude refers to eternal punishment: the angels are kept in eternal chains, and Sodom and Gomorrah undergoes eternal fire. 2 Peter's redaction of the reference to Sodom and Gomorrah removes the description of the sin that merited divine punishment, as we saw with the previous two examples in the cluster. As we saw in 2 Peter's redaction of the reference to the angels, the reference to eternity is also omitted here. As we saw above in the discussion of Chapter Two, Jude enumerated various sins that mirrored the sins of those who crept into his community, suggesting that they will undergo eternal punishment. 2 Peter's reworking of the material was for a different purpose, using Sodom and Gomorrah as a precursor to the second universal judgment by fire. In the insertion of

the righteous Lot into the treatment of Sodom and Gomorrah, 2 Peter shows that one who maintains their righteousness in the midst of evil can survive the conflagration, just as Lot survived the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah.

2 Peter's treatment of Sodom and Gomorrah shares connections with the two previous references to the sinful angels and the flood. As was mentioned above, the references to the sinful angels and Sodom and Gomorrah in Jude (6–7) both refer to eternal punishment, whereas the references to eternity are removed in the parallel verses in 2 Peter. In the discussion of Chapter Three we also observed how 2 Peter balanced punishment with mercy in reminding readers that righteous people survived the flood and the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, thus connecting Noah and Lot by their shared righteousness.

In the discussion of Chapter Three we observed the belief in two universal judgments, one by water, one by fire. In Chapter Four we see that Sodom and Gomorrah serve as a precursor to the second universal judgment by fire. The frequent attention that Sodom and Gomorrah receive in the biblical corpus is not because of the particularity of their sin, but rather the means by which they were destroyed, namely fire.

In the addition of Lot, 2 Peter gives an example of how his community can hope to escape God's final judgment. Like Noah, Lot was righteous and was therefore spared. In Chapter Four we observed the issue of righteousness and unrighteousness are a pair never mentioned in Jude, but is a pervasive concept in 2 Peter (1:1, 13; 2:5, 7, 8, 21; 3:13 and 2:9, 13, 15 respectively). Thus the key to surviving the conflagration is to remain righteous in the face of evil, as Lot did.

2 Peter shapes the figure of Lot and his neighbors into a parallel with the righteous in 2 Peter's community and the unrighteous people who torment them. God rescued (ῥύομαι) Lot and will also rescue the godly from trial (2:9). 2 Peter 2:8 changes the verb κατοικέω which described Lot's living in Sodom and Gomorrah in Gen 19:29 LXX, to ἐγκατοικέω, showing that he was an alien living among them, not one of them. Just so, 2 Peter wants his community to escape the corruption and defilement of the present world (1:4; 3:20). They await the new heavens and earth where righteousness (and they themselves) will be at home (3:13). 2 Peter compares the situation of Lot living among the wicked with the trials of his community, suggesting that if they can remain righteous in the face of wickedness, as Lot has done, they can expect to escape the final conflagration, just as Lot escaped the fires of Sodom and Gomorrah.

2 Peter's redaction of Jude 5–7 makes several things about the message of 2 Peter become clear. Jude and 2 Peter speak about judgment and punishment very differently. Jude speaks of punishment on an individual basis which comes during the afterlife, whereas 2 Peter refers to the second universal judgment in which the earth, and those living on it, will be consumed by fire. It makes sense therefore that in Jude there is only punishment for those who sin. For 2 Peter's context, speaking of a judgment that will come upon the whole earth, the righteous will be spared punishment, hence his addition of Noah and Lot. Further, the timeframe of punishment is different for each document. In Jude, the punishment will come after the individual death of each sinner, therefore Jude's purpose in giving details of what sins merited punishment is to threaten listeners about the punishment that will follow in eternity. 2 Peter's purpose in the first cluster is to assure the community that God punished sinners in the past and will do so again in their

own time. However, since 2 Peter is waiting for the judgment to come to the earth, he must explain why the fire has not yet come and the wicked seemingly go unpunished for their evil deeds. In the reference to Noah as herald of righteousness (δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα) combined with 3:9, we see 2 Peter's explanation that God's desire is not to punish, thus the conflagration is being delayed in the hopes that everyone will repent.

Chapter Five examined 2 Peter's redaction of Jude's second cluster of Cain, Balaam, and Korah, to an extended treatment of Balaam alone. Jude 11 says that those who have crept into the community have gone in the way of Cain, abandoned themselves to Balaam's error for wages, and perished in Korah's rebellion. 2 Peter 2:15–16 omitted the reference to Cain and Korah and expanded the accusations against Balaam. 2 Peter 2:1 warns that just as there were false prophets in the past, false teachers will arise among the community. 2 Peter presents Balaam as a false prophet who led others to sin and destruction. Unlike 2 Peter's first cluster which removed the specific details of sin, here multiple accusations are brought against Balaam, each one having a parallel charge against the false teachers in 2 Peter's community. Thus, in 2 Peter, Balaam serves as a model of the sins of the false teachers in the community.

As we saw above, Jude contains no references to righteousness or unrighteousness, whereas 2 Peter uses these terms frequently. 2 Peter 2:15 says that Balaam loved the wages of unrighteousness and in 2:13, false teachers in the community suffer harm as the wages of their unrighteousness. Similarly, an association between Balaam and the false teachers is drawn in the common accusation of greed. While Balaam's original setting in Numbers does not give any indication of greed, later

traditions took the text of Num 31:16 and expanded it, saying that Balaam was paid handsomely to fabricate the idea to have the Moabites lead Israel into sin.

Numbers 31:16 הַנָּחֵשׁ לְבָרֵךְ בְּלִעָם לְמִסְרָר־מַעַל בְּיַהוָה עַל־דְּבַר־פְּעֹר וַתְּהִי הַמַּגָּפָה בְּעַדָּתָהּ

Numbers 31:16 αὐται γὰρ ἦσαν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμα Βαλααμ τοῦ ἀποστῆσαι καὶ ὑπεριδεῖν τὸ ῥῆμα κυρίου ἕνεκεν Φογῶρ καὶ ἐγένετο ἡ πλῆγη ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ κυρίου

Numbers 31:16 These women here, on Balaam’s advice, made the Israelites act treacherously against the LORD in the affair of Peor, so that the plague came among the congregation of the LORD.

Thus Balaam’s love of the wages of unrighteousness refers to a later Jewish tradition that suggests that Balaam was happy to lead the Israelites to sin to collect a reward, implying greed, but not using the actual word. However, the false teachers are also accused of greed (πλεονεξία) in 2:5, thus drawing another connection between the two.

2 Peter took Jude’s “way of Cain” (ὁδῶ τοῦ Κάϊν) and made it the “way of Balaam” (ὁδῶ τοῦ Βαλαάμ) and added a contrast between the way of Balaam and the straight way (εὐθεΐαν ὁδὸν). Throughout the rest of 2 Peter the community is presented with the contrast of the two ways, either going against God or acting in obedience to God. The straight way (εὐθεΐαν ὁδὸν) is a common term to refer to the path of obedience to God. In 2 Peter 2:2 the licentiousness of the false teachers is in opposition to the way of truth (ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας), which refers to obedience to God’s commandments. In 2:21 those who have come to follow Christ are the ones who know the way of righteousness (ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης), which is synonymous with living in accord with God’s commandments. Christians are expected to follow God’s ways and to pursue any other way is sin. In 2:15 the false teachers have abandoned God’s ways and are following the way of Balaam, a foolish choice indeed.

2 Peter 2:16 is the only place in the Bible, intertestamental literature, Philo, and Josephus that calls Balaam a prophet. Again, this proves to be an insightful literary device. A prophet has a place of respect and leadership, as does a teacher. Through 2 Peter's assault of Balaam's character, he is shown to be unworthy of the title, "prophet." Further, 2:1 warns that there were false prophets in the past and there will be false teachers in the community. Through the example of Balaam who led others to destruction and came to an untimely end (Num 31:8; Josh 13:22), 2 Peter warns the community of the destruction that will befall not only the false teachers among them, but those who follow them.

2 Peter relies on the readers' familiarity with the expanded tradition of the sins of the Israelites at Peor to warn them against sexual sin. Balaam could not curse the Israelites, despite Balak's attempts to hire him to do so. Later tradition, based on Num 31:16, says that Balaam told Balak that the way to defeat the Israelites was to send the most beautiful women of his kingdom to seduce the men of Israel and to have sex with them only after the Israelites had sacrificed to their gods. As such, following in Balaam's way is a way that entices people to sexual sin. 2 Peter warns that the false teachers will lure people to sexual sin (2:3, 14, 18) and that God will be sure to punish those who indulge their flesh in depraved lust (2:10).

In its original setting in Num 22:22–35, the angel of the Lord rebukes Balaam, who then confesses to sinning. The donkey asks Balaam why he has struck her three times. 2 Peter's reference relies upon a later tradition in which the donkey rebuked Balaam and told him that he lacked understanding and knowledge, which the donkey possessed. In 2 Peter 2:16 Balaam was rebuked and his speechless donkey spoke with a

human voice. Meanwhile, the supposed prophet lacked words, understanding, and knowledge, making the speechless donkey superior to the prophet. Earlier, in 2 Peter 2:12–13, the false teachers are likened to irrational animals. In the donkey's rebuke, she treats Balaam like an irrational beast in need of counsel.

2 Peter presents a long list of attacks on the character of Balaam. Each accusation also appears in 2 Peter's scurrilous condemnation of the false teachers. With knowledge of the Balaam narrative and what happened to those who followed his plans, we see in 2 Peter's portrayal a desperate attempt to steer the community away from the false teachers.

Throughout the dissertation, it has been shown that 2 Peter did not simply copy Jude. Rather, 2 Peter reworked Jude extensively, using the material to present a very different message for use in a different situation and addressed to a different audience.

A notably different view of judgment has been in evidence all the way through the dissertation. For Jude, judgment comes after each individual's death and those who merit punishment will suffer eternally. 2 Peter has an imminent eschatology in which the judgment of the entire earth will be destruction by fire. This will be God's final judgment on earth and the earth will be permanently cleansed of wickedness. In this universal conflagration, the wicked will be destroyed by fire and the righteous will be spared, becoming the bridge to the world to come where righteousness will be at home (3:9).

The warnings of judgment are also directed at different groups. Jude speaks of the castigation of those who have crept into the community. There is no hope for them since they were condemned long ago and darkness has been reserved for them forever (vv. 4, 13). For those who have crept into the community, their condemnation is assured. Jude spends the majority of the text condemning those who are causing division, but says

nothing about trying to win them back. Further, there is arguably no worry that others will follow their bad examples. In 17–18, the author reminds them that the apostles predicted that this kind of division would happen and in v. 21, reminds them to keep themselves in the love of God, but there is no sense that Jude is worried that others might follow their bad example. This is notably different than 2 Peter which is a pastoral warning to those in the community who might fall under the influence of the false teachers and is plea for people to stay away from the false teachers (3:17). Like Jude, 2 Peter is convinced that the condemnation of the false teachers is certain (2:3, 12–13), but there is great concern that others do not follow the false teachers. 2 Peter claims orthodox teaching and apostolic authority (1:12, 16–19; 3:1–2) to help sway the people to keep to the teaching they received, rather than follow the false teachers who are bringing in heresies of destruction (2:1).

In addition to worrying that people might follow the false teachers, 2 Peter had to address the question of there being judgment at all and the question of the return of Jesus. Scoffers see that they are seemingly unpunished for their sinful behavior and suggest that Jesus will not return since everything is the same as it always has been (3:2–3). In this accusation, we understand 2 Peter's redaction of Jude's first cluster very clearly. 2 Peter 2:3 assures the audience that the false teachers have not escaped God's notice and their condemnation was assured long ago. Then 2 Peter 2:4–8 reminds readers of three examples from the past in which God brought definite punishment to sinners, thus assuring the community that present sinners will not escape punishment. In the three examples, the focus is on God's sure punishment and the details of the sins are irrelevant; the assurance of divine punishment is all that matters. As we saw above, in the redaction

of the cluster, 2 Peter reworked the material to make reference to the belief in two universal judgments by which God would remove all wickedness from the earth. 2 Peter did this by substituting Jude's reference to the Exodus generation with the reference to the flood, the first universal judgment. 2 Peter followed this reference with Sodom and Gomorrah in order to refer to the second universal judgment by fire, which 2 Peter awaits (3:7, 10), with Sodom and Gomorrah as the precursor to the conflagration of the whole earth. Further, since 2 Peter speaks of a judgment that comes to all those living on earth, he needed to address what would happen to the righteous living on the earth. In this, we see the insertion of the righteous examples of Noah and Lot, who survived previous divine judgments on earth. 2 Peter contrasted righteousness and unrighteousness through the entire document, warning the community that righteousness is required if they expect to survive the conflagration of earth. The apodasis in 2:9 after the protasis of the first cluster (2:4–8) assures the community that the Lord knows how to rescue the godly from trial and keep the unrighteous under punishment until the day of judgment, thus assuring the community that their current behavior is determining whether they will be saved or not at the final conflagration.

2 Peter reworked Jude's second cluster for the sake of illustrating the foolishness of the false teachers. Jude's references to Cain and Korah were removed and 2 Peter greatly expanded the reference to Balaam. As we saw, 2 Peter is the only place that calls Balaam a prophet, in order to be a reminder of the false prophets of the past who are likened to the false teachers in the community (2:1). For every accusation 2 Peter makes against Balaam, there is a parallel accusation of the false teachers. 2 Peter made Balaam look foolish in order to make the false teachers, and anyone who would follow them look

foolish. In changing Jude's "way of Cain" to the "way of Balaam," 2 Peter contrasted it with following the way of God. To follow any way other than the way of God is tantamount to sin. In the reworking of the second cluster combined with the claim to apostolic authority, we see 2 Peter's desperate attempt to keep the community from following the false teachers.

Jude and 2 Peter also differ in the points in time on which they focus. Jude's concern is with eternity. Jude speaks of the condemnation of those who have crept into the community, and assures readers that they will suffer eternally after death. Jude does not convey any sense of impending eschatology. Jude 18 says that in the last time there will be mockers going after their own passions of impiety, but says nothing that would suggest that he thinks his own era to be the eschaton. Jude 21 says, "look forward to the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ that leads to eternal life." Jude 21, coupled with the assurance of eternal punishment for those who have crept into the community and the ongoing punishment of previous sinners (6, 7, 13), suggests that Jude is only concerned with reward or punishment after death.

For 2 Peter, the eschaton is imminent. For the wicked, their punishment will be destruction by the fire that will consume the whole earth, and the reward of the righteous will be to survive the conflagration and to inhabit the new heavens and the new earth where righteousness will be at home (3:13). Since God punished sinners in the past (2:4–8) and wickedness currently abounds, 2 Peter must explain why the fire has not yet come and why the wicked seemingly escape punishment. 2 Peter 3:8 uses an allusion to Ps. 90:4 [LXX 89:4] to explain that God's time is not calculated like our time. Further, 3:9 explains that God is patient, not wanting anyone to perish, but all to come to repentance.

2 Peter connected 3:9 to 2:5 in calling Noah a herald of righteousness, in reference to popular Jewish belief that God commanded Noah to preach repentance and delayed bringing the flood in the hopes that people would repent. This gives us a crucial insight into 2 Peter's view of the two universal judgments and of the great mercy of God. 2 Peter does not see these judgments as indicating a wrathful, destructive God. He presents a God who wants everyone to be saved, but in the dire case of outright, deliberate and heinous sin, exercises a judgment which requires a purification through the destruction visited on the whole earth in order to rid the world of unrighteousness.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aberbach, Moses and Bernard Grossfeld. *Targum Onkelos to Genesis*. New York: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1982.
- Alexander, Philip S. "From Son of Adam to Second God: Transformations of the Biblical Enoch." In *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*, Stone, Michael E. and Theodore A. Bergren. 87–122. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998.
- Alexander, T. D. "Lot's Hospitality: A Clue To His Righteousness." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104, 2 (1985): 289–91.
- Arndt, William, Frederick W. Danker, and Walter Bauer. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature (Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Avioz, M. "Josephus' Portrayal of Lot and his Family." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 16, 1 (2006): 3–13.
- Bauckham, Richard. "Jude, Epistle of." *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Freedman, David Noel. 3 vols. 1098–1103. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- . *Jude, 2 Peter*. Word Biblical Commentary, 50. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983.
- . "James, 1 and 2 Peter, Jude." In *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honor of Barnabas Lindars*, Carson, D. A. and H. G. M. Williamson. 303–317. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Baudry, G. H. "Le Tartare: De La Mythologie Greque à La Liturgie Chrétienne." *Mélanges De Science Religieuse* 52, 1 (1995): 87–104.
- Baxter, W. "Noachic Traditions and the Book of Noah." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 15, 3 (2006): 179–194.
- Bigg, Charles. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1901.
- Billings, Bradly S. "The Angels Who Sinned ... He Cast Into Tartarus" (2 Peter 2:4): Its Ancient Meaning and Present Relevance." *Expository Times* 119, 11 (2008): 532–537.

- Brown, Douglas E. "The Use of the Old Testament in 2 Peter 2:4–10a." Ph.D. diss., Trinity International University. 2003.
- Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles Briggs. *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew And English Lexicon*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003.
- Büchsel, Friedrich. "δίδωμι." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 2.166–73: Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans. 2006
- Callan, Terrance. "Use of the Letter of Jude by the Second Letter of Peter." *Biblica* 85 (2004): 42–64.
- Chaine, J. *Les épîtres Catholique: La Seconde épître De Saint Pierre, Les épîtres De Saint Jean, l'épître De Saint Jude*. Paris: Gabalda, 1939.
- Charles, J. D. "The Angels Under Reserve in 2 Peter and Jude." *Bulletin For Biblical Research* 15 (2005): 39–48.
- Charlesworth, James H., ed. *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Vol. 1*. NY: Doubleday, 1983.
- . *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Vol. 2*. NY: Doubleday, 1985.
- Collins, John J. *Daniel*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- Cox, S. "Lot: 2 Peter II.7, 8." *Expositor* 2 (1884): 270–80.
- Davids, Peter H. *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*. Pillar New Testament Commentary, Carson, D. A. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Desjardins, M. "The Portrayal of the Dissidents in 2 Peter and Jude: Does it Tell us More About the 'Godly' than the 'Ungodly'?" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 30 (1987): 89–102.
- Dimant, Devorah. "Noah in Early Jewish Literature." Pages 123–150 in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*. Edited by Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergren. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998.
- Elliott, John H. "Peter, Second Epistle of." *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Freedman, David Noel. 5 vols. 282–87. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Epstein, Isidore. *The Babylonian Talmud, Seder Nezikin: Sanhedrin, Vol. 2*. London: Soncino Press, 1935.
- Evans, Craig A. *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005.

- Feuillet, André. “Le Péché évoqué Aux Chapitres 3 Et 6,1–4 De La Genèse : Le Péché Des Anges De l’Épître De Jude Et De La Seconde Épître De Pierre.” *Divinitas* 35, 3 (1991): 207–229.
- Flanders, H. J. “The Relation of Jude to II Peter.” Th.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. 1950.
- Foerster, Werner. “ἄσεβής.” *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 7. 168–196: Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans. 2006.
- Fornberg, Tord. *An Early Church in a Pluralistic Society: A Study of 2 Peter*. Coniectanea biblica. New Testament Series; 9. Lund: LiberLäromedel/ Gleerup, 1977.
- Freedman, H., trans. *Midrash Rabbah*. Vol. 1. *Genesis*. London: Soncino Press, 1983.
- Friedlander, Gerald, trans. *Pirke De Rabbi Eliezer*. New York: Hermon Press, 1965.
- Fuchs, Eric and Pierre Reymond. *La Deuxième Épître De Saint Pierre, L’Épître De Saint Jude*. Commentaire du Nouveau Testament, deuxième série, XIII b. Paris: Delachaus & Niestlé, 1980.
- García Martínez, Florentio and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. Vol. 1: 1Q1–4Q273 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2000.
- Gilmour, Michael J. *The Significance of Parallels Between 2 Peter and other Early Christian Literature*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002.
- . “2 Peter In Recent Research: A Bibliography.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 42 (1999): 673–78.
- . “Reflections on the Authorship of 2 Peter.” *Evangelical Quarterly* 73 (2001): 291–309.
- Glasson, Thomas F. *Greek Influence in Jewish Eschatology*. SPCK Biblical Monographs. London: SPCK, 1961.
- Glicksman, Andrew T. *Wisdom of Solomon 10: A Jewish Hellenistic Reinterpretation of Early Israelite History through Sapiential Lenses*. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature, 9. Boston: DeGruyter, 2011.
- Green, Gene L. *Jude & 2 Peter*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008.

- Green, Michael. *The Second Epistle General of Peter and the General Epistle of Jude*. 2nd. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, Morris, Leon. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Grundman, W. *Der Brief Des Judas Und Der Zweite Brief Des Petrus*. Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1974.
- Guthrie, Donald. *New Testament Introduction*. 3rd, revised. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1970.
- Haag, Herbert. “תְּהוֹמִים.” *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. 15. 574–81: Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 1975.
- Haag, Herbert. “בְּרִי.” *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. 2. 145–159: Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 1975.
- Harner, Philip B. *What are they Saying about the Catholic Epistles?* WATSA. New York: Paulist Press, 2004.
- Hendel, Ronald S. “Of Demigods and the Deluge: Toward an Interpretation of Genesis 6:1–4.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106, 1 (March, 1987): 13–26.
- Hillyer, Norman. *1 And 2 Peter, Jude*. New Interpreter’s Bible Commentary. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992.
- Holmes, Michael W., trans., ed. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. 3rd. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Huggins, R. V. “Noah and the Giants: A Response to John C. Reeves.” *Journal Of Biblical Literature* 114, 1 (1995): 103–110.
- Kelly, J. N.D. *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude*. Black’s New Testament Commentaries. London: Black, 1969.
- Kister, M. “5Q13 And The Avodah: A Historical Survey and its Significance.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 8, 2 (2001): 136–148.
- Kolenkow, Anitra Bingham. “The Genre Testament and Forecasts of the Future in the Hellenistic Jewish Milieu.” *Journal For The Study Of Judaism (Leiden)* VI, 1 (1975): 57–71.
- Koltun-Fromm, Naomi. “Aphrahat and the Rabbis on Noah’s Righteousness in Light of the Jewish-Christian Polemic.” Pages 57–71 in *The Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation: A Collection of Essays*. *Traditio Exegetica*

- Graeca, 5. Edited by Judith Frishman and Lucas Van Rompay. Leuven: Peeters, 1997.
- Kraftchick, Steven J. *Jude, 2 Peter*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon, 2002.
- Letellier, Robert I. *Day In Mamre, Night In Sodom: Abraham and Lot in Genesis 18 and 19*. Biblical Interpretation Series 10. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Lewis, Jack P. *A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968.
- Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Loader, J. A. *A Tale of Two Cities: Sodom and Gomorrah in the Old Testament, Early Jewish, and Early Christian Traditions*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology, 1. Kampen: J. H. Kok Publishing House, 1990.
- Lunn, Nick. "Punishment in 2 Peter 2:9." *Notes On Translation* 12 (1998): 15–18.
- Lyons, William John. *Canon And Exegesis: Canonical Praxis And The Sodom Narrative*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 352. Sheffield; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Maher, Michael, M.S.C, trans. *The Aramaic Bible: The Targums*. Vol. 1B. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992.
- Makujina, John. "The 'Trouble' with Lot in 2 Peter: Locating Peter's Source for Lot's Torment." *Westminster Theological Journal* 60, (1998): 255–69.
- Mayor, Joseph B. *The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter: Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Comments*. New York: Macmillan, 1907.
- McNamara, Martin. *The Aramaic Bible: The Targums*. Vol. 1A. *Targum Neofiti: Genesis*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992.
- McNamara, Martin and Ernest G. Clarke. *The Aramaic Bible: The Targums*. Vol. 4. *Targum Neofiti 1 and Pseudo-Jonathan: Numbers*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1995.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- Milik, Józef T. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976.

- Munck, Johannes. "Discours d'Adieu Dans Le Nouveau Testament Et Dans Las Littérature Biblique." Pages 155–70 in *Aux Sources De La Tradition Chrétienne: Melanges Offerts à M. Maurice Goguel, à l'Occasion De Son Soixante-Dixième Anniversaire*. Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestle, 1950.
- Neusner, Jacob. *The Mishnah: A New Translation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. "The Form and Background of the Polemic in 2 Peter." *JBL* 99 (1980): 407–431.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. *2 Peter, Jude: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible, 37 C. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36, 81–108*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- . *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch: Chapters 37–82*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012.
- Osburn, Carroll D. "Discourse Analysis and Jewish Apocalypse in the Epistle of Jude." Pages 287–391 in *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse Analysis*. Nashville: Broadman, 1992.
- Paulsen, H. *Der Zweite Petrusbrief Und Der Judasbrief*. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992.
- Pearson, B. A. "A Reminiscence of Classical Myth at II Peter 2:4." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 10 (1960): 71–80.
- Perkins, Pheme. *First and Second Peter, James, and Jude*. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Louisville: John Knox Press, 1995.
- Peters, D. M. "The Tension Between Enoch and Noah in the Aramaic Enoch Texts at Qumran." *Henoch* 29, 1 (2007): 11–29.
- Peters, Dorothy M. *Noah Traditions in The Dead Sea Scrolls: Conversations and Controversies in Antiquity*. Early Judaism and Its Literature 28. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko. *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Reeves, John C. "Utnapishtim in the Book of Giants." *JBL* 112, 1 (1993): 110–115.

- Reicke, Bo. *The Epistles of James, Peter, and Jude*. Anchor Bible. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company Inc., 1964.
- Rendtorff, Rolf. “נְבִיאָה in the Old Testament.” *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 6. 796–812: Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans. 2006.
- Riesenfeld, Harald. “τηρέω.” *Theological Dictionary of The New Testament*. 8. 140–51: Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans. 2006
- Robinson, John A. T. *Redating the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976.
- Russell, D. S. *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Patriarchs and Prophets in Early Judaism*. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1987.
- Sasse, Herman. “κόσμος.” *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 3. 867–898: Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans. 2006
- Schelkle, K. H. *Die Petrusbriefe; Der Judasbrief*. Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Freiburg: Herder, 1980.
- Schlosser, J. “Les Jours De Noé Et De Lot: A Propos De Luc, Xvii, 26–30.” *Revue Biblique* 80 (1973): 13–36.
- Senior, Donald. “The Letters of Jude and 2 Peter.” *Bible Translator* 25 (1987): 209–14.
- Senior, Donald and Daniel J. Harrington. *1 Peter, Jude and 2 Peter*. Sacra Pagina 15, Harrington, Daniel J. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003.
- Sidebottom, E. M. *James, Jude and 2 Peter*. New Century Bible. London: Nelson, 1967.
- Spicq, Ceslas. *Les épîtres De Saint Pierre*. Sources Bibliques. Paris: Gabalda, 1966.
- Spitta, Friedrich. *Der Zweite Brief Des Petrus Und Der Brief Des Judas Eine Geschichtliche Untersuchung*. Halle: Verlag der Buchh. des Waisenhauses, 1885.
- Stone, Michael E. “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Pseudepigrapha.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 3, 3 (1996): 270–295.
- Stone, Michael E., Amihay, Aryey, and Hillel, Vered, eds. *Noah and His Book(s)*. Early Judaism and its Literature 28. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.
- Thurén, Lauri. “The Relationship Between 2 Peter And Jude - A Classical Problem Solved?” In *The Catholic Epistles and the Tradition*, Schlosser, J. 451–460. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2004.
- Townsend, John T. *Midrash Tanhuma: Genesis, Vol. 1*. Hoboken, NJ: Ktav, 1989.

- VanderKam, James C. "The Righteousness of Noah." Pages 13–32 in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 12. Edited by John J. Collins and George W. E. Nickelsburg. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980.
- . *Enoch, a Man for All Generations*. Studies on Personalities of the Old Testament. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, 1995.
- . *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*. The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 16. Washington, D.C: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984.
- von Rad, Gerhard. "מְלֵךְ In The OT." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 1. 76–80: Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans. 2006
- Wächter, L.. "אֵנוֹךְ." *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. 14. 239–48: Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans. 1975
- Wasserman, Tony. *The Epistle of Jude: Its Text and Transmission*. Stockholm, Sweden: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2006.
- Westermann, Claus. *Genesis 1–11: A Commentary*. A Continental Commentary. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994.
- Whitton, James, M., arr. *Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon, Abridged*. New York: American Book Company, 1880.
- Winston, David. *Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible, Vol. 43. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1979.
- Wise, Michael, Martin Abegg, Jr., and Edward Cook. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996.
- Zsengellér, Józef. "Changes in the Balaam-Interpretation in the Hellenistic Jewish Literature (LXX, Philon, Pseudo-Philon and Josephus)." Pages 487–506 in *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*, Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook, 2008. Edited by Hermann Lichtenberger and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2009.

VITA

Jenny DeVivo received her Ph.D. in Theology from Loyola University Chicago in August 2014. Previously, Dr. DeVivo received a Master of Arts degree in Theology with an emphasis in Biblical Studies from the Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago. She received a Bachelor of Arts in Religious Studies with a minor in Pastoral Ministry from St. Xavier University in Chicago. She currently resides in Oak Lawn, IL.

Dr. DeVivo is a member of the Society of Biblical Literature, the Chicago Society of Biblical Research, and the Catholic Biblical Association. She has taught a variety of courses in the Bible and Theology at Loyola University Chicago and Lewis University.