

Naked Bible Podcast Transcript

Episode 434

The Epistle of Jude, Part 3

July 17, 2022

Teacher: Dr. Michael S. Heiser (MH)

Host: Trey Stricklin (TS)

Episode Summary

In Jude 6 the author introduces his readers to a group of angels that sinned against God. They failed to “stay within their own position of authority, but left their proper dwelling.” As a result, these angels are “kept in eternal chains under gloomy darkness until the judgment of the great day.” The verse is both clear and yet raises many questions. In this episode, we take a look at the angelic sin of Jude 6 and its textual relationship to both 2 Peter 2:4 and the book of 1 Enoch. Doing so produces clarity for understanding to what Old Testament event Jude alludes and why he injects it into his condemnation of false teachers.

Transcript

TS: Welcome to the Naked Bible Podcast, Episode 434: The Epistle of Jude, Part 3. I’m the layman, Trey Stricklin, and he’s the scholar, Dr. Michael Heiser. Hey, Mike! What’s going on?

MH: Oh, not a whole lot. We are through *Stranger Things* though.

TS: Yeah.

MH: I figured you would be asking that.

5:00 **TS:** Mm-hmm. And your thoughts?

MH: Uh, I would say I thought it was good, but not quite at the level of the first three seasons.

TS: Okay.

MH: I kind of judge these things by how many memorable scenes there are and different things like that. But without giving away any spoilers, the scene with Murray in the last installment in the Russian prison was the best one. But, I mean, it was good. It was good. It’s just a hard act to follow. The first three seasons were so good.

TS: Yeah, I'm going to say Eddie shredding the guitar was my favorite scene. I enjoyed him. He was a good addition to the season, so that was fun.

MH: Yeah, yeah, well, again, without... We don't want to do any spoilers here.

TS: Yeah.

MH: But my kids thought he was a good addition, too.

TS: Yeah, yeah, the whole Hellfire Club was funny. That D&D... See what's funny is I remember that. In the 80s, I was a kid. I was their age as a kid at that time and I didn't play Dungeons and Dragons because I, too, heard it was satanic and I was scared of it and I didn't know anything about the game and we didn't have the internet back then. We had three channels on TV and things like that, so for the longest time I really thought it was some kind of satanic Ouija board game or something.

MH: Yeah.

TS: So that's funny.

MH: Right and not just for geeks, yeah.

TS: Yeah, so that whole... In the show, when the jock thought they were devil demon worshippers or whatever and they're playing the game. So I was like, that's spot on. That's exactly what the mentality was at the time, and I remember thinking that way as well as a kid. They nailed that part of it.

MH: I remember hearing... Yeah, I remember hearing that, but I mean I never played it either. But it didn't get too much hype where I was at school, but I know there were kids that played it. But you'd hear every now and then something like that, yeah.

TS: Yeah, yeah, taking it a little too serious. Well, you know, Jude is going to be way better than D&D game. I mean with how much is packed into this little letter.

MH: Yeah, yeah, and today, I mean, Jude 6 is almost like its own Hellfire Club, too [laughter]. Well, today we are going to hit Jude 6. I'm actually going to spend some time in verse 8 as well, but the next time we'll hit verses 7 and 8. It's just kind of hard to know what to split up and what to sort of focus on in this book because it's so compact. I don't know, it kind of presents some difficulties because the writer kind of assumes things of his audience that I'm just wondering, can we assume today that we all know about this or that? Especially like the book of Enoch. We're going to spend time talking about Enoch today again, too. But, yeah, Jude 6 for the most part today. We might as well just start it off by reading. I'm going to read verses 4-8, but we'll focus on verse 6 with the angels that sin. So beginning in verse 4. It says:

⁴ For certain people have crept in unnoticed who long ago were designated for this condemnation, ungodly people, who pervert the grace of our God into sensuality and deny our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ.

⁵ Now I want to remind you, although you once fully knew it, that Jesus, who saved a people out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed those who did not believe. ⁶ And the angels who did not stay within their own position of authority, but left their proper dwelling, he has kept in eternal chains under gloomy darkness until the judgment of the great day— ⁷ just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the surrounding cities, which likewise indulged in sexual immorality and pursued unnatural desire, serve as an example by undergoing a punishment of eternal fire.

⁸ Yet in like manner these people also, relying on their dreams, defile the flesh, reject authority, and blaspheme the glorious ones.

That's Jude 4-8 and, again, it's not an easy task to know kind of how to split these things out because verses 6 and 8 sort of play off each other and we don't have enough time in this episode to hit 6, 7 and 8. So we're going to reserve the Sodom and Gomorrah verse (verse 7) and pick up again with verse 8 next time. But we're going to try to focus on Jude 6. And I've already telegraphed it. We're going to get into verse 8 because verse 8 is something of a commentary on verse 6 in some ways.

10:00

So if we go to Jude 6, we focus here on the angels who did not stay within their own position of authority, but left their proper dwelling. Jude is comparing the false teachers of verse 4 (where we began our reading) and their fate to Old Testament typologies. We discussed that in chapter 2—that Jude is going to be pulling out different events, different personages, different figures from the Old Testament as analogous to the false teachers, again, to make his point that their doom is certain. They're not going to get away with anything that they've been trying to get away with, and he's going to use a variety of Old Testament events and characters to try to illustrate this. So he is comparing the false teachers of verse 4 to the angels that sinned, and then he's going to compare them to Sodom and Gomorrah. A little later it will be Balaam and Cain and Korah. So Jude is going to do a lot of this (to paint the false teachers in a certain way) and, by analogy... What they're guilty of by analogy [audio breaks up].

We will also be dipping into 2 Peter 2 a little bit today to discuss this, which is unavoidable. Listeners are likely aware that 2 Peter 2:4 has the same sort of content in view as in Jude 6—the angels that sinned. They are also probably aware that the epistles of 2 Peter and Jude have a close content relationship. But in case not, I don't know if this article is publicly accessible or not, but I think it

actually is because it's a BBR title (*Bulletin for Biblical Research*). This is J. Daryl Charles, "The Angels Under Reserve in 2 Peter and Jude," and this is from a 2005 issue (way back), Volume 15. And what he points out in regard to this relationship between Jude and 2 Peter... He writes:

In Jewish tradition the example of the disenfranchised angels (Jude 6 and 2 Peter 2:4) appears frequently alongside hard-hearted Israel (Jude 5), Sodom and Gomorrah (Jude 7 and 2 Peter 2:6), and Noah and the flood in extrabiblical tradition.

So basically, what he's saying is, just broadly in Jewish tradition (not just the New Testament, but broadly), you see these things lumped together—the angels that sinned, Sodom and Gomorrah, hard-hearted Israel, the flood. It's common for ancient Jewish books of the period to get into this content and mix all this stuff because of sort of the crime and punishment that was involved and also the whole story of the Watchers. The Watchers were guilty of false teaching. That was one of the main things that they were guilty of. Again, I'm assuming that this audience is going to know who the Watchers are and they're going to know the basics of the Enoch story, so I'm not going to just rehearse all that. I'm assuming people have read *Unseen Realm* and have dipped into this content before. But again, Charles is just saying that this is really common to lump all these things together in Jewish literature in that period. He says:

Stereotypically, these are employed as types of apostasy upon which divine judgment fell. The angels function in what appear to be similar contexts, since the theme of moral accountability is present in both 2 Peter and Jude.

So again, these two epistles in the New Testament are closely related, and so 2 Peter 2:4 and Jude 6 are both going to be dealing with angels that sinned. They're not identical in everything they say, but you put them together and you get the full picture. And you can get even a fuller picture if you start factoring in the ancient Jewish literature that both Jude and Peter know and they reference in their epistles, in what they're writing.

Bauckham, in his commentary on Jude, gets into the details of Jude 6. So I want to include some quotations from scholars in this regard because I don't want anybody to think this is just Mike's take on Jude 6 or the angels that sinned going back to Genesis 6:1-4. No, this is standard academic research going into 2 Peter 2 and Jude 6. I mean, anybody who spends any amount of time in the material is going to know that both these New Testament writers, Peter and Jude, are very, very closely acquainted with Enoch and Enoch's story of the episode of the sons of God in Genesis 6:1-4. Of course, the sons of God in Enoch's version are referred to as Watchers. That's the Second Temple Jewish name for these villains—these characters. So Bauckham gets into the details, and let me just quote from what he says in his *Word Biblical Commentary*. He says:

15:00

ἀλλέλους are the angels (known as the Watchers) who, according to Jewish tradition, descended from heaven to marry human wives and corrupt the human race in the period before the Flood. This was how the account of the “sons of God” in Gen 6:1–4 was universally understood (so far as our evidence goes) until the mid-second century A.D. (*1 Enoch* 6–19; 21; 86–88; 106:13–15, 17; *Jub.* 4:15, 22; 5:1; CD 2:17–19; 1QapGen 2:1; *Tg. Ps.-J. Gen.* 6:1–4; *T. Reub.* 5:6–7; *T. Napht.* 3:5; *2 Apoc. Bar.* 56:10–14)...

There’s a wide variety of Second Temple Jewish literature where you find this story. And again, there’s no ambiguity here. Up until the second century A.D., everybody understood that the sons of God of Genesis 6 were supernatural beings, angelic beings. There was no Sethite view, none of that nonsense that you run into so frequently in the church today—nobody in antiquity up until well into the 200s A.D., a couple hundred years after the birth of the Early Church. They all knew what this was. They all knew what it was talking about and did not run away from it. So Bauckham writes... picking up with him again:

Jude’s reference is directly dependent on *1 Enoch* 6–19, which is the earliest extant account of the fall of the Watchers (from the early second century B.C. at the latest: Milik, *Enoch*, 22–25, 28, 31), and he shows himself closely familiar with those chapters. They tell how, in the days of Jared (Gen 5:18), two hundred angels under the leadership of Šemiḥazah and ‘Aśa’el, filled with lust for the beautiful daughters of men, descended on Mount Hermon and took human wives. Their children, the giants, ravaged the earth, and the fallen angels taught men forbidden knowledge and all kinds of sin. They were therefore responsible for the total corruption of the world on account of which God sent the Flood. The Watchers were punished by being bound under the earth until the Day of Judgment, when they will be cast into Gehenna. Their children, the giants, were condemned to destroy each other in battle (10:9), but their spirits became the evil spirits responsible for all evil in the world between the Flood and the Day of Judgment (15:8–16:1). It is clear that for the author of these chapters the judgment of the Watchers and men at the time of the Flood prefigured the final elimination of all evil at the Last Judgment. The parallel will also have been in Jude’s mind when he used the Watchers as a type of the false teachers of the last days.

It’s very clear that Jude, when he refers to the angels (very clear—*angels* that sinned), Jude clearly accepts the sons of God of Genesis 6:1–4 as supernatural beings. And there’s simply no escape from this other than to simply ignore the text at this point or to make up some other angelic sin and then add it to the Old Testament. You get to create your own scripture. And I don’t want to sound too flippant there, but I don’t mind sounding at least a little bit flippant because that’s essentially what people do. They come up with this third of the angels revolting and all that sort of stuff. There is no account of this—of a third of the angels

rebelling in the Old Testament—zero. It shows up nowhere. The only time you get that language is Revelation 12 and it's about a war in heaven in response to the birth of the Christ child. It has nothing to do with the events before the Flood. Again, these are the facts of the text. If you just don't like it, well that's too bad because that's just the way it is. These are the facts of the text, and everybody in the ancient world knew this. They didn't try to run from it or hide from it. So Jude clearly accepts that the sons of God of Genesis 6:1-4 were supernatural beings. He calls them angels.

There's an explicit parallel in 2 Peter 2:4-6, and that includes both angels that sinned before the Flood came and Sodom and Gomorrah also, as Old Testament analogies to false teachers, just like Jude. All scholars (and I'm serious about this) are aware of the tight overlap between Jude and 2 Peter and these things. There is no ambiguity here. Nobody's wondering how to take these things. This is one of the few things in scripture where there is consensus agreement because, frankly, the content is so obvious.

In the 2 Peter 2 reference, the sin of the angels doesn't get much of a description. In fact, let's just go there real quickly. We'll go to 2 Peter 2:4. I'll read it just in case it's not in the minds of listeners. 2 Peter 2:4:

20:00

⁴ For if God did not spare angels when they sinned, but cast them into hell...

And the verb there is *tartarus*, *tartaroo* (cast them into *tartarus* is the verb). And *tartarus* was the place where the Titans of Greek religion wound up in response to their rebellion.

⁴ For if God did not spare angels when they sinned, but cast them into *tartarus* [MH: the ESV has "cast them into hell"] and committed them to chains of gloomy darkness to be kept until the judgment; ⁵ if he did not spare the ancient world, but preserved Noah, a herald of righteousness, with seven others, when he brought a flood upon the world of the ungodly; ⁶ if by turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah to ashes he condemned them to extinction, making them an example of what is going to happen to the ungodly;

So on and so forth. So that's 2 Peter 2:4-7. It reads just like Jude 6-8. You get the same thematic elements there—the angels that sinned, Sodom and Gomorrah... Of course, you have the timing with the Flood there, and so on and so forth. So again, scholars are very aware that 2 Peter 2 and Jude 6; specifically 2 Peter 2:4 and Jude 6 are very close in terms of their content. But in 2 Peter 2, we don't really get a specific description of the sin. We do get a description, however, of the sensuality of the false teachers that both precedes and follows. The description of the false teachers in 2 Peter 2 are described that way in 2

Peter 2:1-2 and 2 Peter 2:9-10. There's something about their character that has something to do with sexual immorality and that theme is more pronounced in the Jude passage. Again, going back to Jude 6, our verse for the day:

⁶And the angels who did not stay within their own position of authority, but left their proper dwelling, he has kept in eternal chains under gloomy darkness until the judgment of the great day—

You get down to verse 8 and it talks about defiling the flesh. Verse 7 talks about Sodom and Gomorrah “likewise,” like the angels who sinned, indulged in sexual immorality, so on and so forth—unnatural desire. So there's something about that element in both Jude and 2 Peter that sort of works its way into the description. In some cases, it is more overt than others. In 2 Peter 2:4, you get specifically a reference to sensuality. Let's just go back there.

⁴For if God did not spare angels when they sinned, but cast them into hell [Tartarus] and committed them to chains of gloomy darkness to be kept until the judgment;

Again, so on and so forth with Sodom and Gomorrah. You get this situation where in verse 7:

⁷and if he rescued righteous Lot, greatly distressed by the sensual conduct of the wicked...

You get these references to sensuality and then the whole Sodom and Gomorrah episode as well. Then you get the angels that sinned, again, casting them into Tartarus. And then in Jude 6:

**⁶And the angels who did not stay within their own position of authority,
⁷just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the surrounding cities, which likewise indulged in sexual immorality...**

Again, it's just a recurring theme throughout, and that makes sense in light of Genesis 6:1-4. Okay, Genesis 6:1-4—the sons of God and the daughters of men—again, a forbidden transgressive relationship there that results in the Nephilim and the giants and so on and so forth. And all of these details of the story get amplified—get blown up—in the book of Enoch in lots of detail. But this is part of the important context which is just inescapable, as far as this element of it. And again, it makes sense because it's referencing Genesis 6:1-4. There is no other angelic sin that would've involved any sort of sexual immorality or any language like that back in the Old Testament except for Genesis 6:1-4. There just isn't any. I want to spend a little bit more time on this specifically in 2 Peter 2:7.

Not to belabor the point too much, but I want... The reason I'm doing this is to reinforce the reality that there is no angelic sin that has something to do with sexual immorality other than Genesis 6:1-4. This is the *only* thing that Peter could have in his head when he was writing this.

25:00

So if you go to 2 Peter 2:7, again, this is going to be consistent with what we're reading in Jude. When you get to the Sodom and Gomorrah story in verse 7 in 2 Peter 2:

⁷ and if he rescued righteous Lot, greatly distressed by the sensual conduct of the wicked...

Sensual conduct there is a Greek term, *aselgeia*, and the term is very clear. BDAG (which is the standard lexicon for New Testament study) defines that the term is just generally:

lack of self-constraint which involves one in conduct that violates all bounds of what is socially acceptable, *self-abandonment; live licentiously*

And of 2 Peter 2, BDAG has that specifically referenced here as “many will follow in their licentious tracks,” and he has some notes from other passages as well. The term is used in the New Testament in Romans 13:13 with *koitē*. We get our word “coitus” from it (a reference to the sexual act), and it's also used elsewhere with *porneia* or some of these “porn” root terms in the New Testament. So it's very clear that what we have here has something to do with... Again, there's sexual flavor to it, a sexual content to it.

Another source, the *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology and Exegesis* notes of this term (of *aselgeia*) that it means licentiousness, lewdness, indecency. And specifically, the contributor there writes this:

In the LXX ἀσέλγεια occurs only twice, both times in the Apoc. (3 Macc 2:26 [of Ptolemy's dissolute behavior]; Wis 14:26 [with μοιχεία [*moicheia*] G3657, “adultery,” and other terms dealing with sexual immorality]). The term is used by Jos. 10x, in some instances of intemperate behavior generally (e.g., A.J. [Antiquities of the Jews] 8.252), but other times with ref. to sexual conduct (e.g., B.J. [Wars of the Jews] 2.121). Philo uses it 3x...

I'm not going to go through all these references, but Second Temple Jewish literature uses this term in the Greek material there to refer to licentious behavior of a sexual nature. So the word, going down the entry here in NIDNTTE the contributor notes this:

The word occurs 10x in the NT, all but one instance (Mark 7:22) being found in the Epistles.... The general meaning “lack of moral restraint” is poss. in Mark 7:22

(in a list next to “deceit” and “envy”) and Eph 4:19 (unless the presence of ἀκαθαρσία G174 in the context indicates otherwise), but in every other passage the term is found either next to words that explicitly refer to sexual immorality (Rom 13:13; 2 Cor 12:21; Gal 5:19; 1 Pet 4:3 [here perhaps “profligacy”]; 2 Pet 2:18) or in contexts that indicate the same (2 Pet 2:7, 18 [cf. vv. 13–14]; Jude 4 [cf. vv. 7–8]).

But again, I’m belaboring this point because you have people that still, especially within evangelicalism, try to approach Jude 6 (the angels who sinned) and 2 Peter 2:4 (again, angels who sinned) and try to come up with it referring to something other than Genesis 6:1-4. I’m sorry, but it can’t be done. It’s the only sin of a group of angels just generally in the entire Old Testament, and it’s the only sin of a group of angels more specifically that has some kind of sexual content to it. There’s only one candidate. It’s Genesis 6:1-4.

So let’s get back into Jude. Again, I don’t want to belabor it too much, but people just deny it. They don’t want Peter, they don’t want Jude (again, for our purposes today) to be affirming Genesis 6:1-4 as supernatural beings, but he does. Sorry. He just does. So the Peter parallel is important, I think, ultimately because of verse 8, which in Jude 8 we read this:

⁸ Yet in like manner these people [MH: these false teachers] also, relying on their dreams, defile the flesh, reject authority, and blaspheme the glorious ones.

30:00

So what Jude does is he betrays the false teachers in three ways: they defile the flesh, they reject authority, and they blaspheme the glorious ones. But he has this phrase that they do this in like manner. “Likewise...” to what? Well, to (this is Jude 8) what has preceded, that is, the angels that sinned and then, of course, the Sodom and Gomorrah story. So the “defile the flesh” line in verse 8 in Jude 8 and earlier... Again, the relationship between Jude 6 and 2 Peter 2:4 and the sexual context there... I think if we view all these things together (Jude 6, Jude 8, 2 Peter 2:4, 2 Peter 2:7), we get a fuller picture of not only how the writers are portraying the false teachers (and again, their false teaching has something to do with sexual immorality and just corrupting people that way), but it also provides a real strong foothold back to Genesis 6:1-4.

So I’m going to camp a little bit on verse 8, even though our focus is the angels that sinned in Jude 6, because I think verse 8 allows us to interpret verse 6 a little bit better. So let’s just do that. Jude 8 essentially describes the sin of the angels and of Sodom and Gomorrah three ways. I’ll mention it again: defilement of the flesh, rejection of authority, blaspheming the glorious ones. So what I’m going to suggest is that these elements... We’ve already talked about the defilement of the flesh, and we’re not going to rabbit-trail back into that. But other than the sexual nature of the sin, there are two other things going on here that we can

take back to Genesis 6:1-4 or we can take back to Jude 6 (and even into 2 Peter 2) and talk about what this original crime was. It wasn't *just* the sexual transgression; there was more going on here.

So by rejecting authority it has something to do with a hunger for autonomy—the angels resisting the authority of God over them. And, of course, in Sodom and Gomorrah's case, the cities have already rejected God's will for general behavior approved by God. We know that from the story, and we'll cover the Sodom and Gomorrah story next time. But Genesis 18 makes that clear. There's nobody righteous in the city so they've clearly rejected God's morality in every way. And then, not only have they rejected the authority of God over them, but they also blaspheme the glorious ones. And I think it helps us to see a little bit more of what is going on and how the transgression of Genesis 6:1-4 was understood and how we can be reading the angelic sin of Jude 6 a little bit differently too. There's something blasphemous going on here, where the angels that sinned blaspheme God and they diminish the loyalty of the rest of the heavenly host. They essentially snub their noses at God and those who are on God's side. And of course, in Sodom and Gomorrah's case (as we'll find out next time), the connection point there may very well be that the men of the city of Sodom desired to sexually take the two men who are actually angels in the story. And that may be the way that the glorious ones are blasphemed, but we'll hit that next time.

Let's take this all back to Jude 6.

⁶ And the angels who did not stay within their own position of authority, but left their proper dwelling,

I mean, you look at that description: "They didn't stay within their position of authority." Well, that sounds like they're rejecting authority in verse 8. Again, in verse 6 and verse 8 there is some relationship there, "and they left their proper dwelling." Again, that's a rejection of authority. Then what I am also going to suggest to you is that it does have something to do with blasphemy as well. The rest of verse 6 (factoring verse 8 into the description of the sin), what did the angels do? Well, they don't stay within their own position of authority. The Greek term there is *archē*. They don't stay within their own *arche*, which generally means "rule," but they left their proper dwelling. The Greek word there is *oikētērion*. They leave home, essentially, which amounts to rejecting the authority put over them in verse 8. They reject the lordship that is put over them (the Greek word there is *kyriotēs*) and they wind up "blaspheming the glorious ones" there at the end of verse 8.

So I want to take each one of these element by element and you'll just see some of the details that emerged from this. Again, what we're doing is we're comparing

35:00

Jude 6... We're allowing Jude 8 to be a bit of a commentary on it, and also we're looping in 2 Peter 2 and, of course, Genesis 6:1-4. So let's take the first one.

1. "Did not stay within their own position of authority" (here in Jude 8).

They didn't stay within their own *archē*, their own rule. Herb Bateman in his commentary has a nice summary paragraph of this I'm going to read to you. He says:

The noun "domain" (ἀρχήν, *archēn*) [MH: the ESV has "authority"] could mean they were authority figures or cosmic rulers [MH: again, the word is *archē*]. For instance, one Dead Sea Scroll states, "peace and blessing for the lot of God, to exalt the authority of Michael among the gods and the dominion of Israel among all flesh" (1QM 17.7–8 [MH: the War Scroll]; cf. *1 En.* 82:10–20; 1QM 10.12). Naturally, Michael is the archangel who appears later, in Jude 9. The point here is simply this: an angel is given authority or "position of authority" (CEB). In fact, the NT speaks of angelic principalities and powers (Rom 8:38; Col 2:15). This is not to say that there was a civil war in heaven and angels were cast out,

Again, that's good because the Old Testament doesn't record that anywhere. So he's saying it's not to say that.

...but rather that they left on their own accord as a form of rebellion against God. Thus the term might mean angels did not keep their office or position of rulership. Yet Jude's parallelism seems to suggest that these celestial beings did not stay within their sphere of official activity, did not maintain their rightful place of influence, or quite simply did not remain in their proper domain. In essence, they left heaven (cf. *1 En.* 12:4).

And they do it voluntarily. Again, this doesn't have anything to do with a war in heaven. There is no such passage in the Old Testament. You go back to Genesis 6:1-4 and there's no sense that they're being kicked out of heaven "and now we're going to go down to earth and have our way with human women." That isn't the sense that you get at all. They do what they do voluntarily. They choose to leave their own jobs, their own position of authority, their own proper place. They violate God's sovereignty over them.

Bauckham in his commentary concurs with that. He says:

ἀρχήν here means a position of heavenly power or sphere of dominion, which the angels exercised over the world in the service of God (cf. *Jub.* 2:2; 5:6; *1 Enoch* 82:10–20; 1QM 10:12; 1QH 1:11; Justin, *2 Apol.* 5.2).

The angels exercise certain dominion over the world in the service of God and as cosmic powers. He's relating this in part to some of the terminology that's used in

the New Testament of angels as authorities and dominions and rulers of the power of the air, and you get some of these references that we're familiar with. So angels have some kind of status, some kind of ruling authority, and these in Jude 6 just decide to leave it. They abandon it. They forsake it. They're apostates. This is what apostates do. They leave something. They abandon it. And that's what they do.

2. The second line from Jude 8: they "left their proper dwelling."

Again, the Greek term here is *oiketerion*. This is right out of 1 Enoch and, again, most of your commentaries note this when dealing with the Greek text, but it actually is right out of 1 Enoch. So the idea of leaving (just hold that verb in your head—leaving) and leaving their proper dwelling... So specifically Bauckham writes this:

[The Greek term] *apolipontas to idion oikētērion* "abandoned their proper home": cf. *1 Enoch* 12:4; 15:3: "you left..."

Again, the angels left. That's the same verb as *apolipontas* here. It's ἀπελίπετε). But they leave their first estate. They leave something. They leave where they're supposed to be in the high, holy, and eternal heaven. Then in 1 Enoch 15:7, the thing that they leave is called "their dwelling—the κατοίκησις. Again, it's very similar to *oiketerion*. Again, they're in the same family of words that mean "house" or "household dwelling" and that kind of thing. So it's very evident that Jude is tracking with Enoch in Greek very closely. Bauckham says:

40:00

The two participial phrases, in synonymous parallelism, stress the apostasy of the angels, which Jude intends to compare with that of the false teachers. The fact that sexual immorality was also involved in the angels' sin will become apparent in v 7.

(Again, Jude 7 which we've already noted.)

3. Next, they rejected authority.

They rejected the lordship over them, and the word here is *kyriotes*. It's related to the word for Lord, *kyrios*. Gene Green in his commentary writes this. He says:

The second accusation Jude levies against the heretics [MH: again, both the heretics, of course, by default by analogy against the angels that sinned, as well] is that... they revolt against lordship. Although *kyriotēs* may refer to angelic beings, as is the case in Col. 1:16 and Eph. 1:21 (cf. 2 En. 20.1; 1 En. 61.10; T. Sol. 8.6 [MS D]), here as in 2 Pet. 2:10 it denotes the ruling power of the Lord (κύριος, *kyrios*) himself...

So they reject Christ's lordship—God's lordship—itsself when they're doing this. So the angels that sinned... I mean, back in Genesis 6:1-4, it's not just that they're driven by irrational lust or something like this. I mean, that's a big part of it, but they have to make a deliberate decision to be apostate and to forsake the authority that they did have and to leave the proper estate—the proper dwelling that God had assigned to them. They just chuck it all. To use the King James language, it's a high-handed sin. It's deliberate, it's intentional, it's purposeful, and it's intentional apostasy. To make the point a little bit more, Green rabbit-trails a little bit on the word "reject." He writes this.

[Jude] picks up a verb (*atheteō*) found sixty times in the LXX, which, though it is used to translate seventeen different terms in the Hebrew Scriptures, most commonly stands for "*bāgaḏ*, 'deceive, be unfaithful, betray,' and *pāša*, 'defect, revolt,' with the result that in biblical usage this verb almost always means 'be unfaithful,' to revolt, or to betray, with the sense of 'deceive' or 'scorn' " (*TLNT* 1:40). Once again the question of authority is brought to the fore as Jude accuses these heretics not only of violating established norms but also of revolting against the authority of the Lord himself. As the archetypal examples of sin (vv. 5–7), they have broken faith.

And those archetypal examples are the angels and Sodom and Gomorrah. I mean, they do what they do intentionally. It's not an accident. So again, to use the King James language, it's a high-handed sin. It's very intentional and very deliberate.

4. Further and lastly, the angels that sinned (by extension of the false teachers) are guilty of "blaspheming the glorious ones."

This has kind of an interesting twist to it. As Green points out in his commentary, identifying the glorious ones has been controversial among commentators. Commentators disagree as to who the glorious ones are. Some commentators opt for human dignitaries, which makes little sense if an analogy is being struck between human false teachers and angels that sinned. Again, if the analogy has angels in view, you would think that part of the analogy as well in verse 8 (the glorious ones), that those would be supernatural beings as well. And that's where other commentators are—people like Bauckham, Neyrey, and JND Kelly, again, some of your major commentators on Jude. Herb Bateman is going to be the same way. I believe Herb takes the same position. But some of these major commentaries, they are going to see the "glorious ones" as supernatural beings; they're angelic beings. And I'm with them certainly. I think that makes the most sense.

Here's a bit of a twist: Green makes the salient (and in my mind, decisive) observation when he writes this. He says:

Jude's idea is adopted by the book's oldest interpreter, 2 Peter. In 2 Pet. 2:10–11, the “glories” are angelic beings.

45:00

So again, if you're looking at Jude and you're wondering, “Who are the “glorious ones?” If you go over to 2 Peter 2:10-11, the “glorious ones,” the “glories,” are clearly angelic beings there in that passage. So, again, you should allow scripture to interpret scripture here. I think it's also interesting... And this is another note that Green has, is that he discovers that in the Septuagint of Exodus 15:11... And this is a familiar passage again for those who have read *Unseen Realm* or have done anything with divine council stuff. Exodus 15:11. This is the verse:

¹¹ “Who is like you, O LORD, among the gods?

It's among the *elim*. It's very clearly plural *elim*.

¹¹ “Who is like you, O LORD, among the gods?

**Who is like you, majestic in holiness,
awesome in glorious deeds, doing wonders?**

Again, the *elim* there are the “glorious ones.” It translates plural *elim*—the gods—as “glories” or the “glorious ones.” So if we take the plural *elim* there as a reference to the divine council (which you more or less have to), this amounts to an angelic transgression not only against the Most High, but also against the council itself—the heavenly host. And again, that's where you get this idea of blaspheming the “glorious ones.” So these angels that sin way back in Genesis 6:1-4 that are serving as these prototypical examples (prototypical archetypal analogy to the false teachers here), I mean they not only do what that do with boots on the ground, but they defect. They snub the authority of God himself and dismiss the rest of the loyal heavenly host of the council. They rebel against everybody. It's an all-or-nothing proposition. They're not maintaining relationships within the heavenly host here while they're doing this. They rebel. They betray really the whole system, the whole Council—the Most High and his heavenly host. Green adds some other thoughts to this observation. He writes this. He says:

The contrast that Jude sets up between the heretics' behavior and that of Michael [MH: which is coming a bit later in Jude], who did not blaspheme the devil (vv. 9–10), points in the direction of understanding these “glories” as supernatural beings. This interpretation also finds support, as Bauckham (1983: 57) notes, in the DSS, where angels are called “glories” [MH: they're specifically called “the glorious ones”] (1QH 10.8; “and perhaps 11QpsZion [= 11Q5] 22.13”),

Again, I'm not going to read through all the Dead Sea Scroll nomenclature here, but there are Dead Sea Scrolls that call the angels "glories" or "glorious ones." You get the same thing happening in 2 Enoch 22. It happened in the ascension of Isaiah 9:32. Green says:

Jude's nomenclature is understandable in light of the attribution of "glory" to angels...

Just generally; in Revelation 18:1 you get this. You get glory language attached to angels. And in other Second Temple Jewish texts: the Testament of Levi and Philo, so on and so forth.

...an idea "rooted in the OT, where the cherub is the bearer of the divine *kābôd* (Ezek. 9:3; 10:4, 18, 22; cf. also Sir. 49:8)" (J. Charles 1993: 102).

I mean, you get this idea that within the heavenly throne room of God, within the heavenly council room of God, you have the occupants of the throne room there associated with the glory of the Lord. Well, of course it's going to be a divine council context and the angels that sinned rebel against all of it. So it's a very high-handed sin, very deliberate, very intentional. It's not accidental. And it's not that they were deceived or misled. They do it willingly. They are apostates. And this is what Jude wants people to see. He wants to use the example of the angels that sinned, as bad as that was, and use that as a foil for describing the false teachers.

50:00

Now how this relates to false teachers is that their teaching is opposed to the body of truth; in other words, the faith once delivered to the holy ones, to the saints, to the Church back in Jude 3—that body of truth once handed down by God and to which the other members of the heavenly hosts were in agreement. This is essentially a snubbing of the will of God, the will of the Most High, and his council host, the rest of the supernatural family of God. It's another way of describing just a whole wholesale complete defection. So the rest of Jude 6's description, again, has secure roots in 1 Enoch's content as well. I mean, it's inescapable. What Jude is describing is the rebellion of Genesis 6:1-4. He's using that as his example of a horrible defection of an archetypal sin. He begins his description of the false teachers there, and it's an appropriate description because it's intentional, it's deliberate, and also because the sons of God, the Watchers (again, that's Enoch's term), were specifically guilty of teaching human beings false things, how to corrupt themselves.

Now if you remember, either from *Unseen Realm* or maybe *Reversing Hermon* (another one of my books), this theme becomes very pronounced. Again, we can't just rehearse all the *Unseen Realm* content here on a podcast episode, but I reference the work of Amar Annus, who was the one who goes back into the original Mesopotamian context for Genesis 6:1-4 in his article on *The Origin of Watchers*. And that is the explanation for why in Genesis 6 we go from verses 1-

4 (which is the weird stuff—the sons of God, daughters of men, the Nephilim) to verse 5, that the entirety of humankind is wicked. How do you go from the angels that sinned, the sin of the sons of God... How do you get from that to just a corporate human wickedness where every thought of the imagination of the heart was only evil continually? Well, you get that because in the original story behind the Genesis 6 episode, the original story of the Mesopotamian Apkallu, this is what they do. They transgress with human women and they teach humans more effectively how to destroy themselves. They teach them arts of warfare. They teach them astrology. They teach them idolatry. They teach them arts of seduction and immorality. All of these things specifically show up in the Mesopotamian material and in the book of Enoch and in other Dead Sea Scrolls that comment on this episode.

So there's a direct relationship between the sons of God choosing to leave heaven, to leave their task, their rule, to leave whatever their job was and whatever their station was, and come to earth. And it's not just to create Nephilim, okay? The worse part of it is the way it corrupts humanity just generally and it turns the hearts of human beings against God and against God's will, against God's morality in all sorts of areas really in every way, every fundamental way. This is why Jude thinks it's a good analogy to use the angels that sinned as an analogy to the false teachers. Because the angels that sinned taught false teaching. The story that Jude 6 is [audio breaks up]... Again, for further understanding there you're going to have to go back and read *Unseen Realm*. It's the only solution I have for you. This is why we write the books. Or you could go back and read *Reversing Hermon* as well. You would find it in there as well.

55:00

But there's an original Mesopotamian back story to all of this (to Genesis 6:1-4) that accounts for every point—the giants, the sexual element, the false teaching, everything. It accounts for every last piece of it that you get when you get into the Dead Sea Scrolls and the book of Enoch and all this stuff, because those sources remember the original context. Genesis 6:1-4 skips over it. It just assumes that the reader knows what is going on here. It assumes you know the back story, whereas, in the Dead Sea Scroll material that assumption is not made. And in Peter and Jude the assumption is not made either. Peter and Jude both have the angels that sinned kept in chains of gloomy darkness. That's not in Genesis 6. You know where you find it? You find it not only in the book of Enoch and the Dead Sea Scrolls, you find it in the original Mesopotamian Apkallu story. The Mesopotamian Apkallu, which are the bad guys (the sons of God, the divine beings that mix themselves with human women in the story) are sent to the abyss. They are imprisoned in the abyss. Again, every element of what Jude and Peter and Enoch and the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Mesopotamian back story and Genesis 6:1-4... Every last element of all of it, you find in these sources. And Peter and Jude just assume that you have the back story. They assume their readers to be Jewish readers that have some acquaintance with Jewish material like the Dead Sea Scrolls or Enoch. They just assume that they know this. On our part, it's harder because we have to recover this content. We have to recover

this knowledge by looking at all this other material, whereas Jude's readers and 2 Peter's readers... This would've been intuitive because they know the stories really well. They know it well enough they can just pick out this or that Greek word and their readers just know what they're tracking on.

So again, Jude 6's description has secure roots in Enoch's content as well. This is the part where they're kept in chains of gloomy darkness. Bauckham writes:

The chains, to which Jude refers, are very prominent in the tradition of the fall of the Watchers (cf. *1 Enoch* 13:1; 14:5; 54:3–5; 56:1–4; 88:1...

And of course it's also mentioned in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Aramaic portions of Enoch. Again, the angels' imprisonment is a very well-known feature that you don't get from Genesis 6, but you get it from this other material. The fact that Peter and Jude are including this material in their own inspired writings (in what they're writing in Jude 6 and what they're writing in 2 Peter 2:4) tells you, again, that they assume their readers are familiar with this material and that it's worth quoting. It has explanatory power. Otherwise, they wouldn't include it, they wouldn't dip into it. But they do, and they do it very explicitly.

Now I want to add one more thought here from Bateman. Bateman writes:

In Jude, however, angels are shackled in "eternal chains" (*desmois aidiois*). Whereas Jude's version of the angelic rebels includes being bound in chains, no such punishment of the "sons of god" is mentioned in Gen 6.

Which we just mentioned. You have to go back to the Mesopotamian material for that, which Bateman does not interact with, unfortunately. Bateman writes:

Bauckham suggests this concept is "very prominent in the tradition of the fall of the Watchers."

Of course, it is.

For instance, "And to Michael God said, 'Make known to Semyaz and the others who are with him, who fornicated with the women, that they will die together with them in all their defilement... bind them for seventy generations underneath the rocks of the ground until the day of their judgment and of their consummation, until the eternal judgment is concluded'" (*1 En.* 10:12; cf. 4Q202 f 1 iv, 5–10).

Again, it's very clearly in the Enochian material. Bateman asks:

[W]here does the judgment occur? Although the confinement is "in darkness" ... no such description occurs in Gen 6. Nevertheless, the concept is common in the

Enoch tradition. For instance in *2 Enoch* we read, “And those men picked me up and brought me up to the second heaven. And they showed me, and I saw a darkness greater than earthly darkness... Perhaps “in darkness” ... refers to the ancient Greeks’ “underworld” (CEB) or “nether world” (RSV: “nether darkness”)...

Closely related to the Greek concept of Hades is the idea of the underworld as an abyss. Enoch describes, “I then saw one... seizing that first star binding his hands and feet, and throwing him into an abyss—this abyss was narrow and deep, empty and dark” (*1 En.* 88:1; cf. *1 En.* 54:3–5).

So again, in the book of Enoch (we’re going to get this in Jude, too), the straying angels—the angels that sinned—are referred to as falling stars, wandering stars. And we’re actually going to get that later into the book of Jude. Jude is going to use that phrase, too. So it’s very clear that he is dipping into Enochian content here and he is, again, painting a whole portrait—a whole picture—of what he views as the villains *par excellence*, the angels that sinned. They were the ones that sort of started all this off, leaving their first estate, defecting, snubbing their nose at God, blaspheming the “glorious ones.” This is what they do—the angels that sinned initially way back in the Genesis account and, of course, the traditions that are associated with it—Mesopotamian, Enoch, and the Dead Sea Scrolls and so on and so forth in Genesis 6:5—the corruption of humankind on a total scale, totality scale. Jude thinks this is the best place to start to show how bad the false teachers really are and so this is where we wanted to focus today.

1:00:00

Jude’s point of orientation, I think, is very clear. There is no mistaking what he is referencing in the Old Testament and in this wider ancient literature. And so the next time we are going to pick up with what he views as almost as bad or in the same line of badness: the Sodom and Gomorrah story. And that’s also going to involve angels in a different way. But we’ll get to that next time in the next episode when we hit Jude 7 and 8.

TS: Real quick, I just want to bring up, Mike, what frustrates me is some criticism of you is about how people think you have to read this extra literature, the Second Temple literature, in order to understand the Bible. And that frustrates me so much because you’re not saying you *have* to go read this to understand the Bible. It just helps put it into context what the people thought back then.

MH: Yeah.

TS: Why do people muddy it up? I mean, how hard is that to understand that reading extra sources helps inform you of the Bible? It doesn’t take away the divinity or anything else.

MH: Right. Why would you not want to read the Word of God in context? Do you want to read it out of context? It doesn’t make any sense.

TS: Well, they just think it's some kind of divine context. It's a silo. There's nothing extra that can come in or out.

MH: Right. And Jude... As we talked in the very first week, this is one of the reasons why some figures in the Early Church... People wondered about the canonical status of Jude because Jude blows that up and he goes right into the book of Enoch and he is going to quote 1 Enoch 1:9 intentionally. We're not there yet. In verses 14 and 15, he quotes Enoch explicitly. But Jude not only quotes him, but he alludes to stuff in Enoch like we talked about today all over the place. So the scripture doesn't operate in a vacuum or a silo. It has a context. And the men that God chose to write it (in this case, Jude), felt very free to loop this material in for greater understanding just to give it some context. And that's all we're trying to do.

TS: Alright, Mike. Well, don't forget you can go visit our sponsor at Logos.com/nakedbible. Go help support our show at Logos. We would appreciate it. We look forward to the next installment of Jude. And with that, I want to thank everybody for listening to the Naked Bible Podcast! God bless.