

LIBRARY OF NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES

581

Formerly Journal of the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series

Editor

Chris Keith

Editorial Board

Dale C. Allison, John M.G. Barclay, Lynn H. Cohick, R. Alan Culpepper,
Craig A. Evans, Robert Fowler, Simon J. Gathercole,
John S. Kloppenborg, Michael Labahn, Love L. Sechrest, Robert Wall,
Steve Walton, Catrin H. Williams



JUDE ON THE ATTACK

A Comparative Analysis of the Epistle of Jude, Jewish Judgement Oracles, and Greco-Roman Invective

Alexandra Robinson

Bloomsbury T&T Clark
An imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

B L O O M S B U R Y
LONDON • OXFORD • NEW YORK • NEW DELHI • SYDNEY

Bloomsbury T&T Clark

An imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

Imprint previously known as T&T Clark

50 Bedford Square
London
WC1B 3DP
UK

1385 Broadway
New York
NY 10018
USA

www.bloomsbury.com

BLOOMSBURY, T&T CLARK and the Diana logo are trademarks of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

First published 2018

© Alexandra Robinson, 2018

Alexandra Robinson has asserted her right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988,
to be identified as Author of this work.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by
any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage
or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publishers.

No responsibility for loss caused to any individual or organization acting on or refraining from
action as a result of the material in this publication can be accepted by Bloomsbury or the author.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN: HB: 978-0-5676-7878-2
ePDF: 978-0-5676-7879-9

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

Series: Library of Hebrew/Old Testament Studies, volume 581

Typeset by Forthcoming Publications (www.forthpub.com)
Printed and bound in Great Britain

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	vii
A Note on Translation	ix
Abbreviations	xiii
 Chapter 1	
INTRODUCTION	1
 Chapter 2	
PRELIMINARY MATTERS	6
2.1. Authorship	6
2.2. Jude and 2 Peter	10
2.3. Textual Variants	11
2.3.1. Jude 5	12
2.3.2. Jude 22–23	12
2.4. Summary	16
 Chapter 3	
EXAMINING THE LITERATURE, THE METHOD, AND THE GENRES	17
3.1. Literature Review	17
3.1.1. Partly Jewish and Partly Greek	18
3.1.2. A Polemical Attack	23
3.1.3. Summary	26
3.2. Defence of the Genres	27
3.2.1. Following in Their Footsteps	27
3.2.2. Jude’s Rhetorical Climate	28
3.2.3. Hints from Within the Text	32
3.2.4. Method for the Comparative Analysis	38
 Chapter 4	
THE STRUCTURE OF JEWISH JUDGEMENT ORACLES, GRECO-ROMAN INVECTIVES, AND THE EPISTLE OF JUDE	40
4.1. The Structure of Jewish Judgement Oracles	40
4.1.1. Jeremiah 23.9–22 (Case Study, Part 1)	42
4.1.1.1. Context Surrounding the Selected Passage	46
4.1.1.2. The Structure of Jeremiah 23.9–22	46

4.2. The Structure of Greco-Roman Invectives	49
4.2.1. Exploring a Variety of Greco-Roman Texts	49
4.2.2. Demosthenes and Ovid: The Case Studies	52
4.2.2.1. Demosthenes, Against Meidias (Case Study, Part 1)	53
4.2.2.2. Ovid, Ibis (Case Study, Part 1)	56
4.3. The Structure of the Epistle of Jude	58
4.3.1. Exploring the Units of Jude	62
4.3.1.1. Jude 1–2 (Greeting)	62
4.3.1.2. Jude 3–4 (Purpose)	63
4.3.1.3. Jude 5–10 (Comparisons and Past Examples)	71
4.3.1.4. Jude 11–13 (Reproof)	73
4.3.1.5. Jude 14–16 (Enoch's Prophecy)	74
4.3.1.6. Jude 17–19 (Prophetic Reminder)	76
4.3.1.7. Jude 20–23 (Instructions to the Beloved)	76
4.3.1.8. Jude 24–25 (Doxology)	77
4.4. Comparative Analysis	77
Chapter 5	
THE AIM OF JEWISH JUDGEMENT ORACLES, GRECO-ROMAN INVECTIVES, AND THE EPISTLE OF JUDE	82
5.1. The Aim of Jewish Judgement Oracles	82
5.1.1. Jeremiah 23.9–22 (Case Study, Part 2)	87
5.2. The Aim of Greco-Roman Invectives	88
5.2.1. Demosthenes, Against Meidias (Case Study, Part 2)	92
5.2.2. Ovid, Ibis (Case Study, Part 2)	93
5.3. The Aim of the Epistle of Jude	94
5.3.1. Primary Aim	95
5.3.1.1. σωτηρία and πίστις	97
5.3.1.2. Treaty Language in Jude	101
5.3.1.3. Contend for the Faith	104
5.3.1.4. Summary of the Primary Aim	106
5.3.2. Secondary Aim	107
5.4. Comparative Analysis	110
Chapter 6	
THEMES IN JEWISH JUDGEMENT ORACLES, GRECO-ROMAN INVECTIVES, AND THE EPISTLE OF JUDE	114
6.1. Themes in Jewish Judgement Oracles	114
6.1.1. Jeremiah 23.9–22 (Case Study, Part 3)	118
6.2. Themes in Greco-Roman Invectives	120
6.2.1. Demosthenes, Against Meidias (Case Study, Part 3)	128
6.2.2. Ovid's Ibis (Case Study, Part 3)	129
6.3. Themes in the Epistle of Jude	131
6.4. Comparative Analysis	147

Chapter 7	
THE STYLE OF JEWISH JUDGEMENT ORACLES, GRECO-ROMAN INVECTIVES, AND THE EPISTLE OF JUDE	150
7.1. The Style of Jewish Judgement Oracles	150
7.1.1. Jeremiah 23.9–22 (Case Study, Part 4)	154
7.1.1.1. Jeremiah 23.9–22 (Stylistic Devices)	155
7.1.1.2. A Word on Hermogenes' Model	159
7.1.1.3. Overall Style of Jeremiah 23.9–22	161
7.2. The Style of Greco-Roman Invectives	162
7.2.1. Demosthenes (Case Study, Part 4)	167
7.2.2. Ovid, Ibis (Case Study, Part 4)	169
7.3. The Style of the Epistle of Jude	173
7.3.1. Metaphor	174
7.3.2. Simile	179
7.3.3. Intertextuality	180
7.3.4. Marked Emphasis	188
7.3.5. Overall Style	190
7.4. Comparative Analysis	194
7.4.1. Stylistic Devices	195
7.4.2. Overall Style	198
Chapter 8	
CONCLUSION	201
Bibliography	205
Index of References	229
Index of Authors	246

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank those Chris Keith, Nathan L. Shedd and Dominic Mattos of Bloomsbury T&T Clark, as well as my copy-editor, Duncan Burns, for kindly assisting me in the process of getting this book to print. I would also like to acknowledge the efforts of Larry Welborn and Stephen Llewelyn who had a significant role in guiding me through my doctoral dissertation. Many thanks to you both for your endless support and insight over the years. Thank you to those who offered feedback or supported my research, including Andrie B. du Toit, Alan Cadwallader, Raffaella Cribiore, Markus Bockmuehl, Richard Kalmin, Steven Runge, John Painter, David Neville, Jonny Robinson, Will Robinson, Nat Smith, Blake Wassell, Jenny Knight, Don Barker, Alanna Nobbs and my New Testament and Early Christianity cohort at Macquarie University.

This book contains material presented at Macquarie University and the Fellowship for Biblical Studies Conference (September 2012). I want to thank the participants at these events for their helpful comments. Some of the material from this book appears elsewhere in another form, and I would like to take this opportunity to thank the publishers for their permission to reuse the material here. Material for Chapters 4 and 5 appears in 'The Enoch Inclusio in Jude: A New Structural Possibility', *JGRChJ* 9, no. 7 (2013): 196–212.

This book could not have come to fruition without the assistance and financial support of the Australian Postgraduate Award, the ADM Anna Pallister Scholarship, the ADM Travel Scholarship and the Macquarie Postgraduate Research Fund. Thank you to each of these committees for providing me with an opportunity to spend time at Columbia University, Fordham University and Oxford University compiling my research. To the Australian Academy for Humanities, thank you for supporting work like this, and for your efforts to see early career researchers excel.

To Beck Beeton, Maryann Webb, Hayley Tate, Alison op de Veigh, Nicola Hay, Jane Robinson, and Katrina Mileto, thank you for giving up so many hours to sit and play with my girls while I wrote this book. Many thanks to Jane and Stuart Robinson for the countless sleepovers with Elsie

and Ida, and Katrina Mileto for taking Elsie on weekly shopping outings. Rocco and Katrina Mileto and Stuart and Jane Robinson, thank you for greatly supporting my love for the Bible. To my darling daughters Elsie Rose and Ida Lily, thank you for letting me spend my days reading to you from Cicero and Isocrates and learning to entertain yourselves while I worked. Thank you to my husband Jonny, for his tolerance, encouragement and feedback. If it were not for you, I would have never finished this project! Finally, my greatest thanks Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ φυλάξαι ὑμᾶς ἀπταίστους καὶ στήσαι κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἀμώμους ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει μόνῳ θεῷ σωτῇρι ἡμῶν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν (Jude 24–25).

A NOTE ON TRANSLATION

It should be noted that unless otherwise stated: the author has used NA²⁸ for references to the Greek New Testament, biblical citations in English have been self-translated, and classical translations are derived from the Loeb Classical Library.

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>1–2 Clem.</i>	<i>1–2 Clement</i>
<i>1 Apol.</i>	<i>1 Apology</i>
<i>1 En.</i>	<i>1 (Ethiopic) Enoch</i>
<i>2 En.</i>	<i>2 (Slavonic) Enoch</i>
<i>2 Bar.</i>	<i>2 (Syriac) Baruch [Apocalypse of Baruch]</i>
<i>3 Macc.</i>	<i>3 Maccabees</i>
<i>4 Macc.</i>	<i>4 Maccabees</i>
<i>4 Ezra</i>	<i>4 Ezra [2 Esd. 3–14]</i>
Ⲛ	Codex Sinaiticus
A	Codex Alexandrinus
AB	Anchor Bible
<i>'Abot.</i>	<i>'Aboth</i>
Aesch., <i>Ag.</i>	Aeschylus, <i>Agamemnon</i>
Aeschin.	Aeschines
<i>AJP</i>	<i>The American Journal of Philology</i>
Alc., <i>Heracl.</i>	Alcaeus, <i>Heracles</i>
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
APA	American Philological Association
Arist., <i>Kn.</i>	Aristophanes, <i>Knights</i>
Arist.	Aristotle
<i>De an.</i>	<i>De anima</i>
<i>Poet.</i>	<i>Poetics</i>
<i>Rhet.</i>	<i>The Art of Rhetoric</i>
Artem., <i>One</i>	Artemidorus Daldianus, <i>Oneirocritica</i>
<i>Ass. Mos.</i>	<i>Assumption of Moses</i>
August.	Augustine
<i>De civ. D.</i>	<i>De Civitate Dei Contra Paganos</i>
<i>Doctr. Chr.</i>	<i>De Doctrina Christiana</i>
<i>b.</i>	Babylonian Talmud
<i>BA</i>	<i>The Biblical Archaeologist</i>
BAGD	W. Bauer, W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, F. Danker, <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> (3rd edn. Reprint, Chicago, 2000)
<i>Barn.</i>	<i>Barnabas</i>
BBB	Bonner biblische Beiträge
<i>BBR</i>	<i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>
BCAW	Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World

BCBC	Believers Church Bible Commentary
BCE	before the Common Era
BDF	Friedrich Blass, A. Debrunner and Robert W. Funk, <i>A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961)
<i>Bekh.</i>	<i>Bekhorot</i>
<i>Ber.</i>	<i>Berakot</i>
BHGNT	Baylor Handbook of the Greek New Testament
<i>Bib.</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
BJS	Biblical Judaic Studies
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentary
BZNW	Beiheft zur <i>ZNW</i>
Callim.	Callimachus
Cat.	Catullus, <i>Poems</i>
CBC	The Cambridge Bible Commentary
CBNTS	Coniectanea Biblica New Testament Series
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CCTC	Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries
CD	Damascus Document
CE	Common Era
CGTSC	Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges
Cic.	Cicero
<i>Att.</i>	<i>Epistulae ad Atticum</i>
<i>Cael.</i>	<i>Pro Caelio</i>
<i>Cat.</i>	<i>In Catilinam</i>
<i>Clu.</i>	<i>Pro Cluentio</i>
<i>De or.</i>	<i>De oratore</i>
<i>Dom.</i>	<i>De domo sua</i>
<i>Inv.</i>	<i>De inventione rhetorica</i>
<i>Off.</i>	<i>De officiis</i>
<i>Phil.</i>	<i>Orationes Philippicae</i>
<i>Pis.</i>	<i>In Pisonem</i>
<i>QRosc.</i>	<i>Pro Roscio comoedo</i>
<i>Rep.</i>	<i>De republica</i>
<i>Sen.</i>	<i>De senectute</i>
<i>Vat.</i>	<i>In Vatinius</i>
<i>Verr.</i>	<i>In Verrem</i>
Clem.	Clement of Alexandria
<i>Paed.</i>	<i>Paedagogus</i>
<i>Protrep.</i>	<i>Protrepticus</i>
Comm.	Commodus
<i>CTJ</i>	<i>Calvin Theological Journal</i>
Crates <i>Ep.</i>	Crates, <i>Epistle</i>
Dem.	Demosthenes
<i>Andr.</i>	<i>Against Androtion</i>
<i>Cor.</i>	<i>On the Crown</i>
<i>Emb.</i>	<i>On the False Embassy</i>

<i>Meid.</i>	<i>Against Meidias</i>
<i>Phil.</i>	<i>Philippics</i>
Demetr., <i>Eloc</i>	Demetrius, <i>De Elocutione</i> (Περὶ ἐρμηνείας)
Democr.	Democritus
<i>Did.</i>	<i>Didache</i>
Din., <i>Dem.</i>	Dinarchus, <i>Against Demosthenes</i>
Dio Cass., <i>Rom Hist.</i>	Dio Cassius, <i>Roman History</i>
Dio Chr., <i>Or.</i>	Dio Chrysostom, <i>Orations</i>
Diog.	Diogenes
<i>Dion. Hal.</i>	<i>Dionysius Halicarnassensis</i>
EGGNT	Exegetical Guide to the Greek New Testament
Epicurus	Epicurus
<i>Ep.</i>	<i>Epistulae</i>
<i>RS</i>	<i>Ratae Sententiae</i>
<i>Epiph.</i>	<i>Epiphanius</i>
<i>Erub.</i>	<i>Erubin</i> (Babylonian Talmud)
<i>Esd.</i>	<i>Esdras</i>
ESV	English Standard Version
ETSMS	Evangelical Theological Society Monograph Studies
Eur., <i>Ion</i>	Euripides, <i>Ion</i>
Euseb.	Eusebius
<i>Hist. eccl.</i>	<i>Historia ecclesiastica</i>
<i>EvT</i>	<i>Evangelische Theologie</i>
fr.	fragment
<i>Gos. Pet</i>	Gospel of Peter
Hdt. <i>Hist.</i>	Herodotus, <i>Histories</i>
Heliogab.	Heliogabalus
Hermas, <i>Vis.</i>	Hermas, <i>Vision</i>
Hermas, <i>Sim.</i>	Hermas, <i>Similitude</i>
Hermog.	Hermogenes
<i>Id.</i>	Περὶ ἰδεῶν
Hil. <i>Comm. Ps.</i>	Hilary of Poitiers, <i>Commentarius in Psalmum</i>
Hippoc.	Hippocrates
Hom.	Homer
<i>Il.</i>	<i>Iliad</i>
<i>Od.</i>	<i>Odyssey</i>
Hor., <i>Carm.</i>	Horace, <i>Carmina</i> or <i>Odes</i>
<i>HSCP</i>	<i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i>
<i>HTR</i>	<i>The Harvard Theological Review</i>
HUT	Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie
<i>I.</i>	Inscription
ICC	The International Critical Commentary
ICOT	The International Commentary on the Old Testament
IG	Inscriptiones Graecae
Ir., <i>Ad. Haer.</i>	Irenaeus, <i>Ad Haereses</i>
I.Samos	Inscription Samos
Isoc.	Isocrates

<i>Antid.</i>	<i>Antidosis</i>
<i>Call.</i>	<i>Against Callimachus</i>
<i>Dem.</i>	<i>To Demoniacus</i>
<i>de Pace</i>	<i>On the Peace</i>
<i>Euth.</i>	<i>Against Euthynous</i>
<i>Nic.</i>	<i>Nicocles</i>
<i>Panath.</i>	<i>Panathenaicus</i>
<i>Paneg.</i>	<i>Panegyricus</i>
<i>Soph.</i>	<i>Against the Sophist</i>
<i>Speech.</i>	<i>Speeches</i>
JAAR	<i>Journal of the American Academy of Religion</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
Jer.	Jerome
<i>Comm. Ep. Ad Tit.</i>	<i>Commentarius in Epistolam ad Titum</i>
<i>De vir. Ill.</i>	<i>De viris illustribus</i>
JETS	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
JGRChJ	<i>Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism</i>
JNES	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
Joseph.	Josephus
<i>Ant.</i>	<i>Antiquities of the Jews</i>
<i>Apion</i>	<i>Against Apion</i>
<i>Life</i>	<i>Life of Josephus</i>
<i>War</i>	<i>The Jewish War</i>
JSNT	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament, Supplement Series</i>
JSOTSup	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>Jub.</i>	<i>Jubilees</i>
<i>Jus., I Apo.</i>	<i>Justin Martyr, I Apologia</i>
<i>Juv., Satire</i>	<i>Juvenal, Satires</i>
<i>Ketub.</i>	<i>Ketubbot</i>
KKNT	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament
L.A.B.	Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum
<i>Lib. Max</i>	<i>Libanius, The Exercise in Maxim</i>
LNTS	The Library of New Testament Studies Series
Loeb	Loeb Classical Library
LSJ	H.G. Liddell, Robert Scott and H. Stuart Jones, <i>Greek-English Lexicon</i> (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 9 th edn, 1968)
Lucian	
<i>Encom. Demosth.</i>	<i>Encomium of Demosthenes</i>
<i>Nigr</i>	<i>Nigrinus</i>
LXX	Septuagint
<i>m.</i>	indicates a tractate of the Mishnah
<i>Martial, Ep.</i>	<i>Martial, Epigram</i>
<i>Meg.</i>	<i>Megillah</i>
Mish	Mishnah
MT	Masoretic Text

NA ²⁷	Nestle-Aland: <i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> . Eds. K. Aland et al., 27 th rev. edn. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993)
NA ²⁸	Nestle-Aland: <i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> . Eds. B and K. Aland et al., 28 th rev. edn. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012)
NAC	The New American Commentary
NASB	The New American Standard Bible
NCB	The New Century Bible Commentary
<i>Neot.</i>	<i>Neotestamentica</i>
NETS	New English Translation of the Septuagint
NHMS	Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies
NICOT	The New International Commentary on the Old Testament
<i>NIDB</i>	<i>New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</i> . Edited by Katharine Doob Sakenfeld. 5 vols. Nashville: Abingdon, 2006–2009
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NIV	New International Version
NKJV	New King James Version
NLT	New Living Translation
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
<i>NPNF</i>	<i>Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers</i>
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NTM	New Testament Message
NTL	The New Testament Library
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OTL	The Old Testament Library
OTP	<i>Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> . Edited by James H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983, 1985
OTS	The Old Testament Series
Ov.	Ovid
<i>Ib.</i>	<i>Ibis</i>
<i>Tr.</i>	<i>Tristia</i>
ⲡ	<i>Papyrus/papyri</i>
PGNT	Phoenix Guide to the New Testament
Philo	Philo Judaeus
<i>Agr.</i>	<i>De agricultura</i>
<i>Leg. Gai.</i>	<i>Legatio ad Gaium</i>
<i>Op. Mund.</i>	<i>De opificio mundi</i>
<i>Plant.</i>	<i>De Plantatione</i>
<i>Rer. Div. Her.</i>	<i>Quis rerum divinarum heres sit</i>
<i>Vit. Mos.</i>	<i>De vita Mosis</i>
Pind., <i>Pyth.</i>	Pindar, <i>Python</i>
Pl.	Plato
<i>Resp.</i>	<i>Respublica</i>
<i>Tht.</i>	<i>Theaetetus</i>
Plin., <i>Pan.</i>	Pliny (the Younger), <i>Panegyricus</i>
Plut.	Plutarch
<i>Comm. not.</i>	<i>On Common Conceptions about Stoics</i>

<i>Dem.</i>	<i>Demosthenes</i>
<i>Fab.</i>	<i>Fabius Maximus</i>
<i>Gab.</i>	<i>Gabla</i>
<i>Num.</i>	<i>Numa</i>
<i>Pomp.</i>	<i>Pompey</i>
P. Mich	Michigan Papyrus Collection
PNTC	The Pillar New Testament Commentary
Polyb., <i>Hist.</i>	Polybius, <i>Histories</i>
P.Oxy.	Oxyrhynchus Papyri
ps.-	pseudo
ps.-Cic.	Pseudo Cicero
ps.-Demetr.	Pseudo Demetrius
ps.-Sall.	Pseudo Sallust
Q	Qumran
1QH	<i>Hymns</i>
1QpHab	<i>Habakkuk Pesher</i>
1QJub ^b	<i>Jubilees</i>
1QNoah	<i>Noah</i>
1QS	<i>Community Rule</i>
2QapProph	prophecy
4QpHos	<i>Hosea Pesher</i>
4QapLam ^a	<i>Lamentations on Jerusalem</i>
4Q185	<i>Eulogy of Wisdom</i>
4QJer ^b	Fragments of Jeremiah from Cave 4
4QD	<i>Damascus Document</i>
4QShir ^b	<i>Songs of the Sage</i>
Quint., <i>Inst.</i>	Quintilian, <i>Institutio Oratoria</i>
<i>Rhet. Alex.</i>	<i>Rhetorica ad Alexandrum</i>
<i>Rhet. Her.</i>	<i>Rhetorica ad Herennium</i>
<i>Ros. Has.</i>	<i>Rosh Hashanah</i> (Babylonian Talmud)
Sall.	Sallust
Sanh.	Sanhedrin
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBTS	Sources for Biblical and Theological Study
Sen., <i>Ep.</i>	Seneca (the Younger), <i>Epistles</i>
SHA	Scriptores Historiae Augustae
<i>Shab.</i>	<i>Shabbat</i>
<i>Sib. Or.</i>	<i>Sibylline Oracles</i>
Sir.	Sirach
<i>Sot.</i>	<i>Sotah</i> (Babylonian Talmud)
SOTSMS	Society for Old Testament Study Monograph Series
SSN	Studia Semitica Neerlandica
Strab., <i>Geogr.</i>	Strabo, <i>The Geography of Strabo</i>
Suet.	Suetonius
<i>Aug.</i>	<i>Divus Augustus</i>
<i>Dom.</i>	<i>Domitianus</i>
Syll	<i>Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum</i>

SymS	Symposium Series
<i>t.</i>	<i>indicates a tractate of the Tosefta</i>
<i>T. Job</i>	<i>Testament of Job</i>
<i>T. Levi</i>	<i>Testament of Levi</i>
<i>T. Naph.</i>	<i>Testament of Naphtali</i>
<i>T. Reu.</i>	<i>Testament of Reuben</i>
Tac., <i>Hist.</i>	Tacitus, <i>Histories</i>
TANZ	Texte und Arbeiten zum Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter
TDNT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76
Tert.	Tertullian
THL	Theory and History of Literature
Thuc., <i>Hist.</i>	Thucydides, <i>Histories</i>
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum
UBS ⁴	<i>The Greek New Testament</i> . Eds. K. Aland et al. 4 th rev. edn. (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1994)
<i>VF</i>	<i>Verkündigung und Forschung</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
Wis.	Wisdom of Solomon
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
Xen.	Xenophon
<i>An.</i>	<i>Anabasis</i>
<i>Hell.</i>	<i>Hellenica</i>
y.	Jerusalem Talmud
ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The epistle of Jude has generated robust arguments owing to its eclectic use of Jewish apocalyptic material, its mysterious authorship, fascinating relationship with 2 Peter, and unusual scribal discrepancies.

Since the late fourth century, when the authority of *1 Enoch* was disputed by Augustine (*De civ. D.* 15.23; 18.38), Hilary of Poitiers (*Comm. Ps.* 132.3–6) and Jerome (*De viris Ill.* 4; *Comm. Ep. Ad Tit.* 1.12), the authenticity of the epistle of Jude was also questioned.¹ Jerome records: ‘Jude, the brother of James, left a short epistle, which is reckoned among the seven Catholic Epistles, and because *in it* he quotes from the apocryphal book of Enoch it is rejected by many’ (*De viris Ill.* 4).² Jude’s use of *1 Enoch* has troubled Christians for centuries.³ While some openly deny Jude’s use of the Enochic corpus,⁴ concluding that there are no quotations or allusions drawn from it, the majority of scholars are more realistic, and seek to explore the reasons why a first-century follower of Jesus would quote this particular text in an authoritative manner.⁵ Despite this initial

1. Gerald L. Bray, ed., *James, 1–2 Peter, 1–3 John, Jude*, Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture 11 (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000), 255. See also Paul L. Maier, *Eusebius: The Church History*, trans. Paul L. Maier (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2007), 101; *OTP*, 1:8.

2. Jerome, ‘Lives of Illustrious Men’, in *NPNF: Theodoret, Jerome, Gennadius, and Rufinus*, ed. Philip Schaff, Christian Classics Ethereal Library (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1892), 833 (emphasis added).

3. Scot McKnight, ‘Jude’, in *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible*, ed. James D. G. Dunn and John W. Rogerson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 1532; Ernest M. Sidebottom, *James, Jude and 2 Peter*, NCB (London: Thomas Nelson, 1967), 75.

4. Randall Price, *Searching for the Original Bible* (Oregon: Harvest House, 2007), 136. See also George L. Lawlor, *Translation and Exposition of the Epistle of Jude* (Nutley: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1972), 102; John Phillips, *Exploring the Epistle of Jude: An Expository Commentary*, The John Phillips Commentary Series (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2004), 73.

5. Most scholars recognize that the Enochic influences found in Jude are intertwined among Old Testament references, stories and thinking. See J. Daryl Charles

negativity, the epistle gained authority ‘by age and use’ (*De viris Ill.* 4),⁶ and among modern scholars (even those who doubt the authority of *1 Enoch*) there is minimal hesitation in accepting Jude into the canon.⁷ As Green concludes, ‘Within the contemporary church, the canonical status of Jude has not been shaken by its use of apocryphal works’.⁸

Of Jude’s 25 verses, 19 resurface within 2 Peter (see §2.2). Apart from the synoptic gospels, few New Testament texts have this level of correlation. A relationship of this scale has prompted vigorous debates among scholars and raised many questions:⁹ Which author borrowed from the other? Was there a third text to which both writers had access? Are these texts pseudonymous?¹⁰ Are these texts from the early second century CE? Are they, in fact, written by their implied first-century authors?¹¹ These

and Erland Waltner, *1–2 Peter, Jude*, BCBC (Scottsdale & Waterloo: Herald, 1999), 276; Gene L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 26; Richard J. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, WBC 50 (Waco: Word, 1983), 10. See §2.1 for a discussion on date and authorship.

6. Jerome, ‘Lives of Illustrious Men’, 833.

7. For example, Phillips, *Exploring the Epistle of Jude*, 73; Lawlor, *Translation and Exposition of the Epistle of Jude*, 102; Price, *Searching for the Original Bible*, 136; Douglas J. Moo, *2 Peter, Jude*, ed. Terry Muck, The NIV Application Commentary (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 271–78. Painter helpfully reminds us that Jude would not have been operating under any particular ‘canon’. The quest for a canon had hardly begun, let alone been settled, by the end of the first century. See John Painter and David A. deSilva, *James and Jude*, Paideia (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012).

8. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, 29. In the end ‘the canonization of Jude shows that it is authoritative’, despite its use of Enochic literature. See Duane F. Watson, ‘The Letter of Jude’, in *The New Interpreter’s Bible*, ed. L. E. Keck et al. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1998), 493.

9. Callan takes the position that that the author of 2 Peter has not only incorporated Jude’s epistle into his own, but reworked it to serve his own purposes. See Terrance Callan, ‘Use of the Letter of Jude by the Second Letter of Peter’, *Bib* 85 (2004): 42. These issues are picked up again in §2.2.

10. One argument advocating this theory is the obvious inconsistency between 1 Peter and 2 Peter; see Scot McKnight, ‘2 Peter’, in Dunn and Rogerson, eds., *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible*, 1504. However, this could simply be the result of different scribes as opposed to a different author. See also Terry L. Wilder, J. Daryl Charles, and Kendell Easley, *Faithful to the End: An Introduction to Hebrews Through Revelation* (Nashville: B&H Academic 2007), 125–33.

11. On this, see Michael J. Kruger, ‘The Authenticity of 2 Peter’, *JETS* 42, no. 4 (1999): 670; John N. D. Kelly, *The Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, BNTC (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1969), 2; Richard J. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1990), 224–25.

questions and more will be examined in Chapter 2. Further speculation concerns the textual transmission of the epistle of Jude. For example, does Jude 5 refer to ‘the lord’ or to ‘Jesus’? In Jude 14–15, is the author paraphrasing *1 En.* 1.9, or is he using an Aramaic text to which we no longer have access? Was Jude 22–23 originally a two-clause passage (as found in $\mathfrak{B}^{72}$) or a three-clause passage (as found in NA²⁸)? Though the speculative nature of these issues prevents any definitive conclusion being drawn, these matters have also been the focus of many prominent studies on Jude.¹³ This topic of textual transmission will also be examined in the following chapter (§2.3), as it does impact upon the way in which the epistle is read and understood.

In addition to these textual debates, the rich vocabulary and style of this short but energetic text has generated a variety of approaches to the study of the epistle. In the existing scholarship, we find rhetorical studies,¹⁴ grammatical studies,¹⁵ socio-historical studies,¹⁶ and even a semiotic study.¹⁷ In the latter, the epistle is read alongside the classic science fiction/horror film, *Invasion of the Body Snatchers*, in an attempt to explore the dynamics of paranoia.¹⁸ Such a variety of approaches to the study of the epistle of Jude amplifies the complexity and intrigue that has surrounded this text for centuries.

In this growing field of Jude studies, the epistle is repeatedly referred to as an invective, a polemic, and an attack speech. Commentators also note Jude’s dependence on both Jewish and Greco-Roman sources. Due to the pre-established relationship between the New Testament writings and the Hebrew Bible (and more specifically Jude’s own references to Jewish sources), it makes sense to look at Jewish literature by way of comparison to the epistle of Jude. However, there are elements of the text, for example

12. See §2.3 for an in-depth discussion on this variant and others.

13. See Tommy Wasserman, *The Epistle of Jude: Its Text and Transmission*, CBNTS 43 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2006), 148–50, 174–84, 196–99, 262–66, 295–306, 320–30.

14. Duane F. Watson, *Invention, Arrangement and Style: Rhetorical Criticism of Jude and 2 Peter*, SBL Dissertation Series 104 (Atlanta: SBL, 1988).

15. Peter H. Davids, *2 Peter and Jude: A Handbook on the Greek Text*, BHGNT (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2011).

16. Ruth Ann Reese, *Writing Jude: The Reader, the Text and the Author in Constructs of Power and Desire* (Leiden: Brill, 2000).

17. George Aichele, *The Letters of Jude and Second Peter: Paranoia and the Slaves of Christ*, PGNT (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2012).

18. Andrew Mbuvi, ‘Review of George Aichele, *The Letters of Jude and Second Peter: Paranoia and the Slaves of Christ*’, *RBL* 6 (2015).

rare vocabulary and the letter-writing style, which cannot be explained using this Jewish literature alone. Much of the rare vocabulary found in the epistle appears in Aristotle (e.g. ἐνυπνιάζω and φθινοπωρινός), Homer (σπιλάς), and Isocrates (μεμψίμοιρος) suggesting we turn to Greco-Roman sources for further investigation.¹⁹ The letter-writing style also reflects the well-established epistolary form and model taught in the Greek schools of antiquity.²⁰ Accepting all this, the challenge, as Frey recognizes, ‘is to render more specifically what the Jewish and Hellenistic elements of Jude’s position are’,²¹ and in this case, how they relate to the harsh nature of the discourse. This is precisely the task of the present study. By examining the structure, aims, themes, and style of various Greco-Roman and Jewish polemical texts, I will show to what degree Jude has been influenced by Greco-Roman invective and Jewish judgment oracles in the composition of this brief but detailed letter.

To do this, I will first discuss some prevailing controversies surrounding Jude in order to establish my position going forward (Chapter 2). Following this, I will survey the existing commentary on Jude where the Jewish, Greek, and polemical elements of the epistle have been noted (Chapter 3). A thorough investigation of these elements begins in Chapter 4, where I analyze the *structure* of Jewish judgment oracles and Greco-Roman invective, comparing these to the structure of Jude. This same pattern continues through Chapters 5, 6, and 7 where the *aims*,

19. Some scholars have even noticed a parallel between the language of Jude and *Theogony* 715–33. Cozunsen notices that the language in Jude 6 (δεσμοῖς, ὑπὸ ζόφον) echoes Hesiod’s story of Zeus’ defeat of the Titans, and Jude 13 (wild waves foaming up shame) echoes *Theogony* 188–200. See Bert Cozunsen, ‘A Critical Contribution to the Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti: Jude and Hesiod’, in *The Use of Sacred Books in the Ancient World*, ed. L. V. Rutgers et al. (Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 96–109. See also Thomas F. Glasson, *Greek Influence in Jewish Eschatology: With Special Reference to the Apocalypses and Pseudepigraphs* (London: SPCK, 1961), 62–63; Henning Paulsen, *Der zweite Petrusbrief und der Judasbrief*, KKNT 12 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 72.

20. Abraham J. Malherbe, *Ancient Epistolary Theorists*, SBL Sources for Biblical Study 19 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 6. In the Hellenistic Period, letter writing was ‘common place’ at certain social levels. See Catherine Hezser, *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*, TSAJ 81 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 254. However, we do not have evidence of a strong Hebrew letter writing tradition. Apart from the Hebrew Bible, we only have 47 extracts of Hebrew letters from ca. 7 BCE to c. 2 CE. Thus, this too leads us to the Hellenistic world for answers. See *ibid.*, 258.

21. Jörg Frey, ‘The Epistle of Jude Between Judaism and Hellenism’, in *The Catholic Epistles and Apostolic Tradition*, ed. Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr and Robert W. Wall (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2009), 315.

themes, and *style* of these two genres are analyzed in similar manner and, once again, compared to Jude. To conclude, I summarize the findings concerning these four elements and their manifestation in Jude. In the end, I will argue that Jude has constructed a ‘Jewish invective’. His epistle is a polemical text which takes the *form* (structure, aims and style) of a typical Greco-Roman invective but is filled with Jewish *content* (themes and allusions), drawing on Israel’s heritage for the benefit of his primarily Jewish-Christian audience.

Chapter 2

PRELIMINARY MATTERS

Before arriving at our main argument, three preliminary matters must be addressed: the authorship of the epistle;¹ Jude's relationship with 2 Peter; and the textual transmission of Jude. Of the many issues surrounding Jude, I will focus only on these three, as they are the most contentious and have direct bearing on my argument.

2.1. *Authorship*

Scholars are divided on the issue of authorship concerning the book of Jude. It has been suggested, for example, that Jude was the historical brother of Jesus, a scribe from a later generation, a relative, or a disciple writing under Jude's name.² At this stage, I am less concerned with adding another survey of evidence, and more concerned with the way Jude portrays himself throughout the discourse.³ From the opening verse, Jude provides explicit information, establishing himself initially as δοῦλος ('a slave') and as ἀδελφός ('a brother') of someone named Ἰακώβου ('James').⁴ The author makes use of identification markers to create a persona (a carefully constructed depiction of oneself, interpreted in a particular manner by the

1. It is necessary to note at this stage that some scholars would classify this piece of writing as an epistle and not a letter. See Adolf Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, trans. Lionel R. M. Strachen, 2nd ed. (1923; repr., New York: George H. Doran Co., 1927), 228–29. Others, however, are divided on the matter and see too many overlaps to draw such clear categorical distinctions. See John L. White, 'The Ancient Epistolography Group in Retrospect', *Semeia* 22 (1981): 6. Due to this ambiguity, I will be using the two words interchangeably.

2. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 14–16; Richard Kugelman, *James and Jude*, NTM 19 (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1980), 79–82. For a discussion on a later first-century dating, see Peter Müller, 'Der Judasbrief', *ThR* 63 (1998): 267–89.

3. Throughout this book I will refer to the author of Jude as 'he' as it is clearly the gender the writer wants to project.

4. Reese, *Writing Jude*, 20.

recipients of the letter).⁵ Introductions play a significant role in communication. Here, the writer puts forth his ‘credentials’ as he sees fit for the situation at hand.⁶ Although ‘brother’ and ‘slave’ are familiar terms, they are nonetheless deliberately selected by the writer as he seeks to establish a connection with his recipients. In a greeting a writer will choose the identification which best fits the objectives of his purpose.

The metaphor δοῦλος, meaning ‘one in a position of being controlled and possessed by another’, infers obedience and submission.⁷ In the ancient world, according to BAGD, slaves were generally ‘duty-bound only to their owners or masters, or those to whom total allegiance is pledged’.⁸ It is this idea of allegiance that Jude draws upon when using the metaphor of δοῦλος. He is magnifying a loyalty and commitment to Jesus Christ, ‘the only Lord and Master’ (Jude 4). Interestingly, what is of concern to Jude is that persons within the community are no longer submitting to the lordship of Jesus Christ, but denying him as the only Lord and Master (v. 4).⁹ In contrast, Jude identifies himself as a servant or slave of Jesus Christ.

Slavery is a complicated concept. Although the term δοῦλος could signify dishonour, it was also used as ‘an honorific title’ for those in service to God.¹⁰ Being a slave of God reflected a special claim to authority. Jude’s audience would have understood the phrase Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

5. I use this term *persona* with caution given that it can bear negative connotations and can carry an aura of falsehood. This is not the meaning here. For clarification, see Robert C. Elliott, *The Literary Persona* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 19. On the use of identification markers, see Steven E. Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2010), 317.

6. Steven E. Runge, *Philippians: A Visual Textual Guide*, High Definition Commentary (Bellingham: Lexham, 2011). 1.

7. Reese, *Writing Jude*, 20.

8. BAGD, s.v. δοῦλος, 260. See also Haim H. Cohn, ‘Slavery’, in *Encyclopedia Judaica*, ed. Cecil Roth and Geoffrey Wigoder (Jerusalem: Keter, 1972), 1655; James Albert Harrill, *The Manumission of Slaves in Early Christianity*, HUT 32 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 25; Painter and deSilva, *James and Jude*, 190; Carolyn A. Osiek and David L Balch, *The Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches*, Family, Religion, and Culture Series (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 74.

9. For example, in Galatians, Paul identifies himself as ‘an apostle not from men nor by men but through Jesus Christ’ (Gal. 1.1) because ‘what is at stake is his apostleship’ (Runge, *Philippian*, 1).

10. Painter and deSilva, *James and Jude*, 191. See also, Dale B. Martin, *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990).

δοῦλος in the context of the Hebrew Bible, where Israel is often referred to as ‘slaves of the Lord’ (Ps. 134.1; Isa. 49.3; Jonah 1.9; Judg. 2.8) and Yahweh is referred to as the κύριος of his people (Mal. 1.6). For Philo, a servant of God is filled with delight for his master, ‘when he is free from all sins, and is aware in his conscience that he loves his master, feeling more joy at the fact of being a servant of God, than he would if he were sovereign over the whole race of mankind’ (Philo, *Rer. Div. Her.* 2.7). Here, there is a clear sense of pride in being known as a slave of the Lord. Therefore, in this context, δοῦλος is not an offensive term, but rather a symbol of loyalty to God. He takes great pride in this honoured title and it sets the scene for the underlying issue at the heart of Jude’s epistle.

Jude also identifies himself as the brother of James. While Jude and James were common names at this time (Lk. 6.16 and Jn 14.22), there is one Judas-Jacob pair in the early church that would have been well known; they were the brothers of Jesus (Mt. 13.55//Mk 6.3; Mt. 27.56//Mk 15.40). Whether the writer is in fact the biological brother of James (and, in turn, the half-brother of Jesus) is difficult to confirm. However, it is not a stretch of the imagination to suggest that the audience would have made this connection, especially given the fact that James was such a prominent figure in the early church.¹¹ The writer could have used any title to identify himself, but he chooses ‘brother of James’ presumably to create a connection with his audience and as an attempt on the author’s part ‘to establish credibility’ among his hearers.¹² As Aristotle writes, such a technique gives the impression of ‘good sense, good moral character, and goodwill’ (Arist., *Rhet.* 2.1.25) and when held against the opposing party it not only undermines their credibility, but arouses suspicion and prejudice (Arist., *Rhet.* 3.14.6–7; 3.19.1; *Rhet. Alex.* 1436a.33–37).¹³

From as early as the Council of Jerusalem, James was a prominent leader and a spokesman for the Jerusalem eldership (Acts 15.12–29).¹⁴ But his legacy did not end there. Eusebius records that James, the brother of the Lord, was ‘surnamed “the Just” for his outstanding virtue’, he was ‘elected to the bishop’s throne of the church of Jerusalem’ (Euseb., *Hist. eccl.* 2.1.2); the only bishop who was referred to by Eusebius as having ‘a throne’.¹⁵ Eusebius’ reference from Hegesippus suggests that James was

11. Note that ἀδελφός, like δοῦλος, can also be used in a metaphorical sense. However, in this verse I take it to be a literal usage.

12. Painter and deSilva, *James and Jude*, 190.

13. Ibid.

14. Dan G. McCartney, *James* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academy, 2009), 9–10.

15. John Painter, *Just James: The Brother of Jesus in History and Tradition* (Edinburgh: First Fortress, 1999), 113.

the first bishop (Euseb., *Hist. eccl.* 4.22.4), again providing him prominent status, and that during the reign of Domitian, Jesus' grandnephews, the grandchildren of James and Jude, continued as leaders of the Jerusalem church (*Hist. eccl.* 3.19.1–3.20.8). Hengel makes mention of the inscription Ἰάκο/βος ὁ παπᾶ (with editors concluding that the final word should read πρωτοπαπᾶς) found on a marble fragment in Ephesus from the church of St. John, reflecting that the Eastern Church also regarded James as the first pope of Jerusalem.¹⁶ James was held in high esteem even by non-Christian Jews 'on account of his Torah observance and personal piety' (*Hist. eccl.* 2.23.4–7).¹⁷ Bauckham also references the second-century *Gospel of the Hebrews* (fr. 7), in which James is referred to as 'the first person to whom Jesus appeared after his resurrection'. From this document, we clearly see that there is a strong tendency in the early church 'to glorify the figure of James'.¹⁸ By closely associating himself to James, not only was Jude capitalizing on his personal connection with one of the 'pillars' (Gal. 1.19; 2.9, 12) of the early church,¹⁹ but more specifically a 'pillar' of the 'Jerusalem community of Jews, who followed Jesus'.²⁰ Therefore, Jude would have us believe that he is the brother of James, the leader of the Jerusalem Church, who was held in high regard by most.²¹

Whether the author, self-titled as 'Jude', is in fact the first-century brother of James and servant of the Lord is partially irrelevant. It is the linguistic choices which are important here. By using these credentials – 'servant of Jesus Christ' and 'brother of James' – to identify himself, the author creates a respectable status, demanding authority from the recipients and causing them to pay careful attention to the message which is to follow.²²

16. Martin Hengel, 'Jakobus der Herrenbruder – der erste Papst?', in *Glaube und Eschatologie. Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum*, ed. Erich Gräßer and Otto Merk (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1985), 71–104.

17. See also Painter and deSilva, *James and Jude*, 190–96.

18. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church*, 55.

19. Ian J. Elmer, *Paul, Jerusalem and the Judaizers: The Galatian Crisis in Its Broadest Historical Context*, WUNT 258 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 90.

20. Jacob Neusner and William Scott Green, eds., *Dictionary of Judaism in the Biblical Period* (New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan, 1996), 327. For a discussion on the significance of the Jerusalem church, see John Riches, *The World of Jesus: First Century Judaism in Crisis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 22; Nicholas H. Taylor, *Paul, Antioch and Jerusalem: A Study in Relationships and Authority in Earliest Christianity* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1992), 75.

21. Kugelman, *James and Jude*, 79.

22. Aichele, *The Letters of Jude and Second Peter*, 4.

2.2. Jude and 2 Peter

It is clear, even superficially, that an exceptional relationship exists between the epistle of Jude and the second epistle of Peter.²³ The overlap between these two texts has been observed by most Jude and 2 Peter scholars and is the focus of many studies.²⁴

There are three main positions when discussing the relationship between Jude and 2 Peter and their potential dependency upon each other: (i) the author of Jude quotes (and thus simplifies) the text of Second Peter;²⁵ (ii) the author of Second Peter quotes and expands on the themes found in Jude;²⁶ (iii) neither has borrowed from the other – rather, they are working from a common source (perhaps somewhat like the alleged Q).²⁷ There are influential scholars on every side of this debate. Callan, for instance, is of the view that Jude, being the briefer and more concise

23. Compare 2 Pet. 1.5 with Jude 3; 2 Pet. 1.12 with Jude 5; 2 Pet. 2.1 with Jude 4; 2 Pet. 2.4 with Jude 6; 2 Pet. 2.6 with Jude 7; 2 Pet. 2.10–11 with Jude 8–9; 2 Pet. 2.12 with Jude 10; 2 Pet. 2.13–17 with Jude 11–13; 2 Pet. 3.2–3 with Jude 17–18; 2 Pet. 3.14 with Jude 24; and 2 Pet. 3.18 with Jude 25.

24. See Jeremy F. Hultin, ‘The Literary Relationships Among 1 Peter, 2 Peter, and Jude’, in *Reading 1–2 Peter and Jude: A Resource for Students*, ed. Eric F. Mason and Troy W. Martin (Atlanta: SBL, 2014), 27–30; Callan, ‘Use of the Letter of Jude by the Second Letter of Peter’.

25. See Mark D. Mathews, ‘The Literary Relationship of 2 Peter and Jude: Does the Synoptic Tradition Solve this Synoptic Problem?’, *Neotestamentica* 44, no. 1 (2010): 47–66. See also D. Edmond Hiebert, *Second Peter and Jude: An Expository Commentary* (Greenville: Unusual Publications, 1989); J. B. Mayor, *The Epistle of St. Peter and St. Jude*, ICC, 2nd ed. (1907; repr., Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2004); Anders Gerdmar, *Rethinking the Judaism–Hellenism Dichotomy: A Historiographical Study of Second Peter and Jude*, CBNTS (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2001), 116–23. Gerdmar also goes on to suggest that both Jude and 2 Peter could have simply arisen out of a common milieu (*ibid.*, 331–38).

26. See Jörg Frey, *Der Brief des Judas und der zweite Brief des Petrus* (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2015), 158–61; Edouard Cothenet, ‘La tradition selon Jude et 2 Pierre’, *NTS* 35 (1989): 408; Jerome H. Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 37C (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 122; Alfred R. C. Leaney, *The Letters of Peter and Jude*, CBC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 77–78.

27. A position raised but not necessarily held by Simon J. Kistemaker, *Exposition of James, Epistles of John, Peter, and Jude*, NTC (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996). It has also been suggested that both epistles were written by the same author, which might explain the overlap. See John A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976), 193. This view, however, has not gained much traction.

text, is original.²⁸ Frey, Baulkham, Kelly, and Thurén agree with this observation.²⁹ However, scholars such as Mathews, Bigg, and Wallace consider 2 Peter to be the original text.³⁰ Wallace observes that the author of Peter's second epistle speaks in future terms (i.e. the false teachers are yet to come), while Jude speaks of the false teachers as already among the community (present tense).³¹ He also suggests that in Jude 17 ('remember the words of the apostles') the author is referencing the words found in 2 Peter. He writes: 'It is perfectly clear why an author, after the age of the apostles had ended, spoke of them in more absolute terms'.³²

While Wallace makes an interesting case, I side with the scholars who view Jude as the earlier text.³³ I believe that Jude's shorter epistle has been expanded upon by Peter and used for his own distinct purposes (as was customary with the practice of quotation and allusion in the ancient world). This is contrary to the theory that Jude reduced Peter's epistle to suit his own needs. As Bauckham suggests, 'The habit of classing 2 Peter and Jude together has, for too long, been a serious hindrance to research'.³⁴ Consequently, I will not turn to 2 Peter to discuss issues of intertextuality in Jude but hold that Jude is fully independent from 2 Peter.

2.3. Textual Variants

Before commencing my analysis of the epistle of Jude, the text from which I am working must first be established. Although the primary concern of this study is not textual criticism, the issue of an original reading of Jude must be briefly discussed. Of the several textual variants in the epistle of Jude, two are especially important with regards to my interpretation: Jude 5 and Jude 22–23.

28. Callan, 'Use of the Letter of Jude by the Second Letter of Peter'.

29. Frey, *Der Brief des Judas und der zweite Brief des Petrus*, 158–61; Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church*, 147; Kelly, *The Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, 2; Lauri Thurén, 'Hey Jude! Asking for the Original Situation and Message of a Catholic Epistle', *NTS* 43 (1997): 454.

30. Mathews, 'The Literary Relationship of 2 Peter and Jude', 52–62; Charles Bigg, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902), 217–25.

31. Daniel B. Wallace, 'Second Peter: Introduction, Argument, and Outline', *New Testament: Introductions and Outlines* 22 (2015): www.bible.org.

32. Daniel B. Wallace, 'Jude: Introduction, Argument, and Outline', *New Testament: Introductions and Outlines* 26 (2015): www.bible.org.

33. See Hultin, 'The Literary Relationships among 1 Peter, 2 Peter, and Jude', 40.

34. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church*, 147.

2.3.1. Jude 5

The textual variant in this verse relates to the subject, ὁ κύριος (the Lord). Some manuscripts read Ἰησοῦς (Jesus), while others use θεός (God). The committee of the Greek New Testament clearly struggled to come to a consensus on the matter given their verdict to class this variant as category D (unresolved).³⁵ According to Wallace, the reason scribes inserted κύριος, instead of Ἰησοῦς, into v. 5 was because they were uncomfortable with the concept of Jesus being physically active and present before his recorded birth. The Ἰησοῦς reading, however, has strong support from early witnesses (e.g. manuscripts A B 33 81 1241 1739 1881 2344 pc vg co Or1739mg), and is used by the new Nestle-Aland (NA²⁸). This more difficult reading was previously argued for by Bartholomä, who studied this variant in detail and concluded that Ἰησοῦς was preferred.³⁶ However, Wasserman, who has compiled the most exhaustive investigation of the epistle, favours the reading found in NA²⁷. He argues that at no other point in the New Testament is Jesus mentioned in any acts prior to his birth under the name Ἰησοῦς. Frey also views κύριος as the original subject, but whether it was originally preceded by the article (ὁ) is more difficult to determine.³⁷ Furthermore, ὁ κύριος has a significant place in the overall cohesiveness of the epistle (as demonstrated in §4.3.1.2 and §6.3.a). While it is possible that either of these readings could be original, I follow Wasserman and remain with NA²⁷ on this variant.

2.3.2. Jude 22–23

By far the most problematic text in Jude is vv. 22–23. First, there is the issue of textual discrepancies, and then the notorious difficulty of translation. The available manuscripts can be arranged into two groupings: two-clause readings (C, K, P, L, and ℞⁷²) and three-clause readings (A and ⋈).³⁸ While there is an overwhelming amount of support for the two-clause

35. J. Harold Greenlee, *An Exegetical Summary of Jude*, 2nd ed. (1999; repr., Dallas: SIL International, 2012), 26.

36. Philipp F. Bartholomä, 'Did Jesus Save the People Out of Egypt? A Re-Examination of a Textual Problem in Jude 5', *NovT* 50, no. 2 (2008): 143–58.

37. Frey, *Der Brief des Judas und der zweite Brief des Petrus*, 70.

38. There are several compelling resources which offer plausible theories on this topic. For example, Wasserman, *The Epistle of Jude*, 320–31; Joel S. Allen, 'A New Possibility for the Three-Clause Format of Jude 22–3', *NTS* 44 (1998): 22–23; Frey, *Der Brief des Judas und der zweite Brief des Petrus*, 119–31; Sara C. Winter, 'Notes and Observations on Jude 22–23: A Note on the Text and Translation', *HTR* 82, no. 2 (1994): 215–22; Thomas R. Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter; Jude*, NAC 37 (Nashville: B&H, 2003), 484–9; Sakae Kubo, 'Jude 22–23: Two-division Form or Three?', in *New*

reading,³⁹ it could be argued that the credibility of Codex Sinaiticus (Ⲱ) and Codex Alexandrinus (A) makes the three-clause reading more plausible,⁴⁰ hence its acceptance in NA²⁷ and NA²⁸.⁴¹ The two-clause reading is a smoother rendition, and is most likely a scribal attempt to simplify the original command.⁴² On the other hand, the three-clause reading, being more grammatically complicated, perhaps best explains the rise of all other readings.⁴³

(a) *Deconstructing the Three-clause Reading.* As mentioned, the three-clause reading of NA²⁸ is difficult to interpret. First, it is not clear to what οὓς refers; second, the μέν, δέ, δέ construction is problematic; and third, the term διακρινομένους is difficult to translate. In regards to the structure of the verse, there are two main interpretations: (i) the relative pronoun (οὓς) introduces three individual subordinate clauses, each with their own object, modified by a new imperative command (i.e. have mercy on some, save others, have mercy on other ones);⁴⁴ (ii) there are three subordinate

Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis, ed. Eldon Gay Epp and Gordon D. Fee (Oxford: Clarendon, 1981), 239–53.

39. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 109–10; J. Neville Birdsall, ‘The Text of Jude in p72’, *JTS* 14, no. 2 (1963): 394–99; Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, 85–86; Winter, ‘Notes and Observations on Jude 22–23’, 215–22; Carroll D. Osburn, ‘The Text of Jude 22–23’, *ZNW* 63 (1972): 139–44; Charles Landon, *A Text-Critical Study of the Epistle of Jude* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996), 131–34. It must be noted that Osburn has now changed his position on this issue and is in favour of the three-clause reading. See Carroll D. Osburn, ‘Discourse Analysis and Jewish Apocalyptic in the Epistle of Jude’, in *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse Analysis*, ed. David Alan Black (Nashville: Broadman, 1992), 292. Many of these scholars base their views on ⱱ⁷² (which has the two-clause reading). While ⱱ⁷² is an important manuscript, when it comes to Jude, ‘it is more idiosyncratic and wild’, only agreeing with Codex B 38% of the time. See Philip W. Comfort, *The Quest for the Original Text of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992), 95–96.

40. Ben Witherington, *Letters and Homilies for Jewish Christians* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2007), 626.

41. There is one variant between Ⲱ and A: Ⲱ contains ἐλέγχετε in the initial clause, whilst A contains ἐλεᾷτε. As Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, 486, points out, ἐλεᾷτε is supported by the wider textual tradition, while ἐλέγχετε is more likely a scribal addition, used to create a progression of severity.

42. Darian Lockett, ‘Objects of Mercy in Jude: The Prophetic Background of Jude 22–23’, *CBQ* 77 (2015): 325.

43. Wasserman, *The Epistle of Jude*, 325; Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, 486.

44. Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, 484–89; Witherington, *Letters and Homilies for Jewish Christians*, 626; Charles and Waltner, *1–2 Peter, Jude*, 274–340; Greenlee, *An Exegetical Summary of Jude*, 72–74; Daniel A. Keating, *First and Second Peter, Jude*,

clauses, but one central object (διακρινομένους) to which each relative (οὓς) refers (i.e. have mercy on those, save those, have mercy with fear upon those).⁴⁵ A position on this will soon be established.

(b) *Analyzing the Three-clause Reading.* Jude 20–23 is broken up into two parts. The clause ‘build yourselves up in the most holy faith’ functions as the main clause of the four verses.⁴⁶ Verse 22 begins, ‘And indeed have mercy’ (καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε).⁴⁷ This subordinate clause marks a shift in focus from the believers’ own faith to others within the community.⁴⁸ Initially, Jude instructs the community on how to keep themselves in their own faith, whilst waiting for the mercy of the Lord (vv. 20–21), whereas Jude 22–23 expresses how the beloved are to show mercy to those who oppose the faith.⁴⁹

The difficulty arises in interpreting the μέν, δέ, δέ construction (vv. 22–23). Such a construction could be used to contrast opposing ideas or simply to separate one thought from another (BAGD, s.v. μέν, δέ, 520; BDF §250). It can also appear in series (accompanied by pronouns or reoccurring articles),⁵⁰ or in isolation. Only context can determine which is in use. Within the epistle itself, the μέν, δέ, δέ construction appears previously in Jude 8. Here, the dreamers defile the flesh *and* reject authority *and* blaspheme angelic beings. Jude does not contrast three opposing ideas, but instead makes use of the μέν, δέ, δέ construction to build upon an argument and create increasing emphasis, known as the ‘anaphoric δέ’.⁵¹ An example is also found in Jude 10, where this

Catholic Commentary on Sacred Scripture (Grand Rapids: Baker Academy, 2011); Ruth Anne Reese, *2 Peter and Jude* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 70; Simon J. Kistemaker, *Peter and Jude*, NTC (Grand Rapids: Evangelical Press, 1987), 406–9.

45. A view also held by Allen, ‘A New Possibility for the Three-Clause Format of Jude 22–3’, 134; Davids, *2 Peter and Jude*, 35; Lewis R. Donelson, *1 & 2 Peter and Jude: A Commentary*, NTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2010), 199–200; Daniel J. Harrington, *1 Peter, Jude and 2 Peter*, Sacra Pagina (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2003), 221.

46. Davids, *2 Peter and Jude*, 35; John Benton, *Slandering Angels* (Darlington: Evangelical Press, 1999), 148.

47. A similar usage is found in 1 Cor. 12:28, καὶ οὓς μὲν, translated ‘and certainly indeed’. For a discussion on καί as a linking device, see John D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 291.

48. Richard B. Vinson, Richard F. Wilson, and Watson E. Mills, *1 and 2 Peter, Jude*, Smyth and Helwys Bible Commentary (Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 2010), 395.

49. This is a position argued in more detail below.

50. Allen, ‘A New Possibility for the Three-Clause Format of Jude 22–3’, 136.

51. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 383.

construction appears in a slightly different order *δέ, μέν, δέ*, but, again, it is used in a climactic manner. It is therefore not inconceivable that Jude would be using this same climactic sense in Jude 22–23.

Is it then possible that these three clauses are directed to a single group?⁵² If this were the case then these verses would be a subdivision of *actions* as opposed to groups,⁵³ implying that Jude is using *μέν, δέ, δέ* as a tool to distinguish actions and add increasing emphasis.⁵⁴ The structure of Jude 22–23 leans towards this theory. Jude is constructing a progressive argument (as seen in Jude 8 and 10),⁵⁵ and referring to the one larger group.⁵⁶ The first clause is a simple construction. The second clause adds a prepositional phrase. The third clause adds a prepositional phrase and an explicit warning.

(c) *The Object in the Three-clause Reading.* Although this section moves outside the scope of textual criticism, it may prove effective to establish to whom Jude refers when making use of the relative pronoun in vv. 22–23. Relative pronouns often act as hinge words, referring back to something previously mentioned while also commencing a new clause.⁵⁷ Thus, Jude is either referring to the beloved ones (vv. 1, 20–21, 24) or the ungodly (vv. 3, 5, 14–15, 16, 19),⁵⁸ as these are the only two groups mentioned previously.⁵⁹ The participle *διακρινόμενους* (and the object of the relative pronoun), then, either refers to those who are wavering/doubting within the community (i.e. the beloved) or those who are contesting with the beloved (i.e. the ungodly).⁶⁰ Even though it seems unlikely that Jude would instruct the beloved to show mercy to the ungodly, a case could

52. Lockett, 'Objects of Mercy in Jude', 328.

53. See also Peter H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*, ed. D. A. Carson, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 35; Donelson, *1 & 2 Peter and Jude*, 199; Harrington, *1 Peter, Jude and 2 Peter*, 223.

54. Allen, 'A New Possibility for the Three-Clause Format of Jude 22–3', 136.

55. Wasserman, *The Epistle of Jude*, 328.

56. Donelson, *1 & 2 Peter and Jude*, 200. Similar examples can be found in 2 Macc. 3.26; 11.18; 12.24; 15.12; 3 Macc. 6.29; 4 Macc. 4.12; 7.1.

57. Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 44.

58. See Peter Spitaler, 'Doubt or Dispute (Jude 9 and 22–23): Rereading a Special New Testament Meaning Through the Lense of Internal Evidence', *Biblical Studies on the Web* 87 (2006): 201–22. A problem also noticed by Greenlee, *An Exegetical Summary of Jude*, 73; Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, 90–92.

59. Landon, *A Text-Critical Study of the Epistle of Jude*, 133.

60. Donelson, *1 & 2 Peter and Jude*, 200.

be made for this very assertion:⁶¹ (i) Jude previously uses the term διακρινόμενος in v. 9 when referring to the archangel Michael and the devil ‘contesting’ over the body of Moses; (ii) there is a significant amount of ambiguity surrounding the language used in vv. 22–23 (mirroring the ambiguity used in v. 4, ‘certain persons’); (iii) just as the beloved have received mercy from God (vv. 2, 20–21), they are to show mercy (Mt. 18.33); (iv) ‘showing mercy’ to the very ones with whom they contend highlights that judgment is reserved for the Lord (which is stated several times throughout the letter, vv. 5, 9, 14–15). Therefore, I not only favour the three-clause reading of Jude 22–23 as it appears in NA²⁸; rather, I believe that Jude is referring to one group (those who are contesting with the beloved), providing a three-part instruction for the beloved to perform toward this group.

2.4. *Summary*

In summary, Jude uses identifying markers – Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος and ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου – to present himself as a faithful servant of the Lord and to establish credibility before his audience. I argue that the epistle of Jude was written independently of 2 Peter and, because of this, my analysis will proceed without reliance upon this text. Finally, concerning the choice of manuscript, I remain with ὁ κύριος in v. 5 (as found in NA²⁷) and the three-clause reading of Jude 22–23, as found in NA²⁸. For vv. 22–23, I present a case for a three-clause, single-object interpretation whereby the beloved are instructed to show mercy to those with whom they contest. These preliminary matters clarify my position on some existing controversies surrounding the epistle, which will at times impact my interpretation of the text.

61. This case is explored in detail in a forthcoming *NTS* article: Alexandra Robinson, Stephen Llewelyn, and Blake Wassell, ‘Showing Mercy to the Ungodly and the Inversion of Invective in Jude’.

Chapter 3

EXAMINING THE LITERATURE, THE METHOD, AND THE GENRES

With a wealth of available genres, the first task is to make clear why I have chosen only two for comparison with Jude. In regards to the polemical nature of the epistle, I will argue that Jude is primarily influenced by Greco-Roman invective and Jewish judgement oracles. First, I will survey the existing literature on Jude where an overwhelming number of scholars have noticed Greek, Jewish, and polemical elements throughout the epistle. Second, I will attempt to extract more specifically the Jewish and Greek elements present in Jude and suggest that Greco-Roman invective and Jewish judgement oracles are the most suitable candidates both historically and stylistically. Finally, I will briefly outline my methodology before moving into the main body of the argument beginning in Chapter 4.

3.1. Literature Review

The last three decades have seen a significant increase in the number of books, monographs, and articles published on the epistle of Jude. Studded with allusion, quotation, and various influences, the epistle has generated an amount of scholarship and intrigue seemingly out of proportion to its mere 25 verses. Where there was once a well-noted gap in scholarship,¹ there is now a healthy body of work with which to engage.²

1. Charles and Waltner, *1–2 Peter, Jude*, 274; Lauri Thurén, ‘The General New Testament Writings’, in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 300 B.C.–A.D. 400*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 451; Douglas J. Rowston, ‘The Most Neglected Book in the New Testament’, *NTS* 21 (1975): 554; Moo, *2 Peter, Jude*, 15.

2. The pool is comparatively shallow compared to Pauline studies, but is alive and well within itself.

Reading through the existing scholarship, one is struck by the repetition of phrases used to explain and describe the epistle of Jude. There are two categories of repeated phrases on which I will focus here. First, there are the wider and various references to Jude's dependence upon both Jewish and Greco-Roman traditions, and second, there are the many references to the harsh and polemical nature of Jude's discourse. Most of these references are brief, but a few, as will be seen, go further. With the purpose of highlighting a gap in research, I will provide an overview of these two notions in the current literature, and show where my own research fits into this.

3.1.1. *Partly Jewish and Partly Greek*

Much attention has been placed upon the Greco-Roman and Jewish influences woven throughout the epistle. Importantly, scholars have recognized that these coincide within the one text, and few commentators argue for a wholly Jewish or wholly Greek influence.³ However, for the sake of clarity, I will examine first some existing references to Greek tendencies followed by a discussion of the Jewish influence.

Given that both Greek language and culture steadily infiltrated the entire Mediterranean (see §3.2.2) including Jewish Palestine,⁴ it is no surprise that the epistle has Greek persuasive strategies. In Jude's brief communication, there are 34 participle forms,⁵ 22 uncommon Greek words⁶ (some with distinct Hellenistic meaning),⁷ several carefully organized Greek grammatical patterns,⁸ a number of Greek pragmatic structures,⁹ and the usage of Greco-Roman rhetorical devices.¹⁰ Comments have been made

3. A point expressed also by Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*, 26–27; Harrington, *1 Peter, Jude and 2 Peter*, 179; Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 5–6. Frey writes: 'the short text strongly refers to biblical and early Jewish traditions, but is written in a profound, almost artistic rhetorical style'. See Frey, 'The Epistle of Jude Between Judaism and Hellenism', 310.

4. Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period*. Vol. 1, *Texts* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2003), 60. See also Christopher Forbes, 'Comparison, Self-Praise and Irony: Paul's Boasting and the Conventions of Hellenistic Rhetoric', *NTS* 32 (1986): 23.

5. J. Daryl Charles, 'Literary Artifice in the Epistle of Jude', *ZNW* 82, no. 1–2 (1991): 110–11. See also, Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, 27.

6. As established by Eric Fuchs and Pierre Reymond, *La Deuxième épître de Saint Pierre; L'épître de Saint Jude* (Geneve: Labor et Fides, 1988), 138.

7. Spitaler, 'Doubt or Dispute', 205.

8. Wasserman, *The Epistle of Jude*, 327.

9. See also Wilder, Charles, and Easley, *Faithful to the End*, 227.

10. Watson, *Invention, Arrangement and Style*, 194.

regarding Jude's 'natural command of the Greek language',¹¹ 'competence in Greek',¹² 'close familiarity with Greek rhetorical style',¹³ rhetorical structure (and use of the honour/shame dichotomy),¹⁴ 'extensive Greek vocabulary',¹⁵ easy use of 'Greek idioms',¹⁶ and the letter itself follows 'conventions of Hellenistic letter writing'.¹⁷

A few scholars have taken these observations further. Primarily looking into Jude's structural resemblance to Greco-Roman rhetoric, Duane F. Watson compares Jude to the rhetorical styles of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian.¹⁸ He suggests that Jude follows a pattern similar to speeches found in the Greek handbooks of antiquity, complete with a *quasi-exordium* (vv. 1–2), *exordium* (v. 3), *narratio* (v. 4), *probatio* (vv. 5–16), *peroratio* (vv. 17–23), and *quasi-peroratio* (vv. 24–25).¹⁹ Jude's rhetoric, he argues, conforms to the 'best principles', including elements in the proper sequence and used with correct function.²⁰ In Watson study, Jude's rhetorical genre is categorized as *deliberative* rhetoric given that Jude intends to advise and dissuade, often stressing likely *future* outcomes and highlighting what is advantageous and what is harmful via comparison. Watson also sees elements of *epideictic* rhetoric given the present time references.²¹ Watson paved the way for many seeking to understand Jude as a product of its time and not as a 'New Testament' letter paradoxically isolated from its place in history and geography.²² However, as

11. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 11.

12. Wasserman, *The Epistle of Jude*, 297.

13. Jennifer Wright Knust, *Abandoned to Lust* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006), 119.

14. Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, 23–27.

15. Harrington, *1 Peter, Jude and 2 Peter*, 179.

16. J. Daryl Charles, 'Polemic and Persuasion: Typological and Rhetorical Perspectives on the Letter of Jude', in *Reading Jude with New Eyes: Methodological Reassessments of the Letter of Jude*, ed. Robert L. Webb and Peter H. Davids (London: T&T Clark International, 2008), 103.

17. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*, 23.

18. Watson, *Invention, Arrangement and Style*, 77.

19. *Ibid.*, 77–78.

20. *Ibid.*, 78.

21. *Ibid.*, 32–33.

22. In reference to this work Pearson writes, 'Watson's book is in many ways a ground-breaking work. It has certainly demonstrated to me the usefulness of employing rhetorical criticism in the study of the NT epistles. I need hardly add that scholarship on Jude and 2 Peter will never be the same as a result of this book.' See Birger A. Pearson, 'Review of *Invention, Arrangement, and Style: Rhetorical Criticism of Jude and 2 Peter*, by Duane Frederick Watson', *JBL* 109, no. 1 (1990): 166.

demonstrated by Watson's own confession, these categories are 'too neat'.²³ As a result, the study is perhaps too strict in suggesting such a precise structure whereby every verse of Jude fits into an established rhetorical grid.²⁴ While Watson's study puts rhetoric onto the map (in relation to Jude), at the same time it does not go into detail regarding the aim of Jude, its rich metaphors, or its similarities with other existing polemics.²⁵ These are elements, which, along with structure, provide evidence of Jude's interaction with Greco-Roman rhetoric and polemic (and will be discussed in this book).

Stephan Joubert argues that Jude's 'global strategy' is, in fact, predominantly epideictic, employing praise (*laudatio*) and blame (*vituperatio*) to estrange the opponents and build trust with the readers.²⁶ Green also recognizes the use of *vituperatio* in Jude,²⁷ while Neyrey (endorsing Watson's general structure) believes that the emphasis on crime and punishment and the consistent contrasts (e.g. virtue/vice, praise/blame, honour/shame, and *conquestio/indignatio*) reflect *forensic* rhetoric.²⁸ The fact that each of these commentators attributes a different rhetorical species to the epistle highlights both the difficulty in assessing Jude, and the fluid nature of discourse in relation to these rhetorical categories (as opposed to the rigid forms offered by the handbooks).²⁹

As with the above scholarship on Greek influences, several authors have looked deeper into Jude's Hebraic inclinations (particularly its relationship to Jewish literature) and produced more extensive studies on this. Within the commentaries, there are mentions of the 'Jewish

23. As mentioned, Watson himself recognizes that the classification of deliberative rhetoric is 'too neat'. See Watson, *Invention, Arrangement and Style*, 33.

24. Davids explains that while Jude displays familiarity with this kind of education, form is 'secondary and often modified'. See Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*, 24. Harrington writes that whether Jude deliberately followed a pattern or instinctively did so is impossible to determine. See Harrington, *1 Peter, Jude and 2 Peter*, 179.

25. Watson does mention style, but only briefly. See Watson, *Invention, Arrangement and Style*, 22–28, 79.

26. Stephan J. Joubert, 'Persuasion in the Letter of Jude', *JSNT* 58 (1995): 79–80. See also Anna A. Novokhatko, *The Invective of Sallust and Cicero* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 13.

27. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, 20–22.

28. Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, 27.

29. Much of the comprehensive work done on Jude's Greek influence has concentrated on the structural similarities and not on stylistic or thematic features, as this study aims to do.

nature’,³⁰ the ‘Jewish character’,³¹ and an assumed familiarity with Jewish traditions (‘steeped in Jewish traditions’).³² We read that the discourse is ‘replete with examples of prophetic typology’,³³ is ‘rich in its use of story drawn from the Jewish scriptural tradition’,³⁴ contains Semitisms (vv. 5, 7, 11, 16, 17, 18, 21),³⁵ and Hebraic literary techniques (e.g. triplets, vv. 5–7, 11,³⁶ and parallelism, v. 6). Scholars adduce that Jude has a ‘predilection for Jewish apocalyptic tradition’,³⁷ displays skilled Jewish exegesis,³⁸ and is ‘embedded’³⁹ within Jewish-Christian apocalypticism.⁴⁰ Bauckham summarizes that ‘despite his competence in Greek, the author’s real intellectual background is in the literature of Palestinian Judaism’.⁴¹

In 1978, E. Earle Ellis laid much of the groundwork regarding Jude and its relation to Jewish and Hebraic rhetorical style. His insight into what he calls ‘phenomena in earlier Christian literature’, recognized Jude’s use of midrash and midrashim.⁴² Midrash is a hermeneutical act designed to recreate significant religious and redemptive experiences

30. Craig L. Blomberg, *From Pentecost to Patmos: An Introduction to Acts Through Revelation* (Nashville: B&H, 2006), 461.

31. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 11.

32. Thomas R. Wolhuis, ‘Jude and Jewish Traditions’, *CTJ* 22 (1987): 21. See also David A. deSilva, *The Jewish Teachers of Jesus, James and Jude: What Earliest Christianity Learned from the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 56; Sáiz Busto and José Ramon, ‘La Carta de Judas a la Luz de Algunos Escritos Judíos’, *Estudios Bíblicos* 39 (1981): 83–105.

33. J. Daryl Charles, ‘The Use of Tradition-Material in the Epistle of Jude’, *BBR* 4 (1994): 2.

34. Robert L. Webb, ‘The Use of “Story” in the Letter of Jude: Rhetorical Strategies of Jude’s Narrative Episodes’, *JSNT* 31, no. 53 (2008): 55.

35. Landon, *A Text-Critical Study of the Epistle of Jude*, 96. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 6, argues that these Semitisms are not prominent.

36. Charles and Waltner, *1–2 Peter, Jude*, 292.

37. Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, 410.

38. Michael Green, *2 Peter and Jude: An Introduction and Commentary*, TNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 176.

39. Reese, *2 Peter and Jude*, 25.

40. Gerdmar, *Rethinking the Judaism–Hellenism Dichotomy*, 2. See also Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 8–10.

41. *Jude, 2 Peter*, 7.

42. E. Earle Ellis, *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity: New Testament Essays*, WUNT 18 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1978), 221.

found in the Torah,⁴³ and in Jude's case is a 'preformed' piece on the theme of judgement.⁴⁴

Like Ellis, Bauckham also observes the use of Jewish midrash.⁴⁵ Cementing Jude's familiarity with Jewish tradition, Bauckham closely ties the letter to Palestinian Jewish Apocalyptic literature, focusing his attention on comparable literary styles found in the writings at Qumran (e.g. *Sir.*, *CD*, *3 Macc.*, *m. Sanh.*), which refer to the stories found in Jude 5–7).⁴⁶ Bauckham's most meticulous textual studies concern two Jewish works alluded to in Jude 9 (*Ass. Mos.*) and vv. 6, 14–15 (*1 En.*). Bauckham provides a significant excursus detailing the background to the account mentioned in v. 9 where Michael and the devil contest over the body of Moses.⁴⁷ Bauckham provides us with a tour through the *Ass. Mos.* and reconstructs a text of which we are no longer in possession.⁴⁸ He also offers one of the earliest analyses of Jude 14–15 containing Jude's quotation of *1 En.* 1.9 and makes a case for Jude's use of the Aramaic text,⁴⁹ as well as wider reliance on *1 Enoch*.⁵⁰ Overall, Bauckham argues for dependence on the Hebrew Bible.⁵¹ 'The work', he writes, 'has all the marks of a fairly early work of Palestinian Jewish Christian provenance'.⁵²

J. D. Charles identifies the letter as a 'word of exhortation', a type of homily used in Jewish synagogues.⁵³ In 'Literary Artifice in the Epistle of Jude', he recognizes that *grammatically* 'semiticism is far less prolific'

43. Daniel Boyarin, *Intertextuality and the Reading of Midrash*, Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature, 2nd ed. (1990; repr., Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994), 5, 14, 28, 110.

44. E. Earle Ellis, *The Making of the New Testament Documents* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 120.

45. For a clear analysis of this text and Bauckham's contribution to Jude scholarship, see Frey, 'The Epistle of Jude Between Judaism and Hellenism', 311. See also Kelly Carter, 'Jude, 2 Peter, Richard J. Bauckham', *Leaven* 2, no. 2 (1992): 45.

46. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 5, 46. See also Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, 1.

47. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 65–76.

48. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church*, 141–44, 235–80.

49. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 93–101.

50. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church*, 139–41.

51. *Ibid.*, 136–37.

52. *Ibid.*, 177. While it is true that Jude certainly has a deeply Jewish foundation, I disagree that the author could not have relied upon the LXX. An explanation of this viewpoint is given in the following chapter.

53. J. Daryl Charles, *Literary Strategy in the Epistle of Jude* (Scranton: University of Scranton Press, 1993), 25–30.

than the Greek.⁵⁴ However, it is, in his opinion, undeniable that the text has persuasions indicative of the writer's profoundly Jewish world-view.⁵⁵ He explores the way Jewish stories and traditions have been embedded into Jude's argument affecting the entire tone of the discourse.⁵⁶ In a similar manner, Wolthius outlines the way Jewish traditions have thoroughly coloured the text both thematically and theologically.⁵⁷ Wolthius' study seeks to enhance our understanding of how Old Testament material was developed in the context of Jewish exegesis and thought and, in particular, how this was done throughout Jude.

3.1.2. A Polemical Attack

Secondly, Jude has been understood a number of different ways, being called a 'short but lively polemic',⁵⁸ 'a vehement polemic',⁵⁹ a 'sharp, succinct, creative and multi-faceted' polemic,⁶⁰ a 'forceful polemic',⁶¹ an 'impassioned *invective*',⁶² a '*bitter invective*',⁶³ a strong invective,⁶⁴ a

54. Charles, 'Literary Artifice in the Epistle of Jude', 110–11.

55. Charles, 'The Use of Tradition-Material in the Epistle of Jude', 2. See also Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 11.

56. In Frey's reflection upon this work he notices the way Charles parallels the author of the epistle of Jude with the apostle Paul. Both 'combine Jewish tradition and methods of exegesis with elements of Hellenistic rhetoric and style' (Frey, 'The Epistle of Jude Between Judaism and Hellenism', 314). See also Roman Heiligenthal, *Zwischen Henoch und Paulus. Studien zum Theologiegeschichtlichen Ort des Judasbriefes*, TANZ 6 (Tübingen: Francke, 1992).

57. Wolthuis, 'Jude and Jewish traditions', 21–45.

58. Charles, 'Literary Artifice in the Epistle of Jude', 114.

59. Frederik Wisse, 'The Epistle of Jude in the History of Heresiology', in *Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts in Honour of Alexander Böhlig*, ed. M. Krause, Nag Hammadi Studies (Leiden: Brill, 1972), 134.

60. J. Daryl Charles, 'Jude's Use of Pseudepigraphical Source-Material as Part of a Literary Strategy', *NTS* 37, no. 1 (1991): 133.

61. Charles, 'The Use of Tradition-Material in the Epistle of Jude', 13.

62. Henry Alford, *The Greek Testament*. Vol. 4, *The Epistle to the Hebrews, the Catholic Epistles of St. James and St. Peter, the Epistles of St. John and St. Jude and the Revelation* (London: Deighton, Bell & Co., 1871), 147. See also Alicia J. Batten, 'The Letter of Jude and Graeco-Roman Invective', *HTS Theologese Studies/Theological Studies* 70, no. 1 (2014): 1–7.

63. Andrew Chester and Ralph P. Martin, *The Theology of the Letters of James, Peter, and Jude* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 81.

64. Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter; Jude*, 423. Schreiner comments that 'the invective is strong' even though Bauckham warns we should be careful *not* to label vv. 5–19 as a denunciation of the opponents. See Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church*, 157.

‘polemical attack’,⁶⁵ and repeatedly, and more simply, an ‘invective’.⁶⁶ It is described as being, ‘clearly polemical’,⁶⁷ ‘highly polemical’,⁶⁸ ‘a rather vicious (and clever) attack’,⁶⁹ ‘stern and unbending’,⁷⁰ as having ‘a very distinct polemic character’,⁷¹ a ‘very polemic nature’,⁷² and ‘harsh tones’.⁷³ It is said to be a ‘virulent attack’,⁷⁴ with ‘polemical motivation’,⁷⁵ and ‘frequently polemical tenor’.⁷⁶ McCrudden sees Jude keeping in line with ‘ancient models of rhetorical invective’,⁷⁷ while Brosend identifies ‘invective, sarcasm, and denunciation’.⁷⁸ We find references to the way in which Jude ‘piles on’ the invective,⁷⁹ has a ‘main stream’ of invective,⁸⁰

65. Harrington, *1 Peter, Jude and 2 Peter*, 180; John MacArthur, *1, 2, 3 John and Jude* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2007), 106; Keating, *First and Second Peter, Jude*, 202; Landon, *A Text-Critical Study of the Epistle of Jude*, 110.

66. Ralph P. Martin and Andrew Chester, *The Theology of the Letters of James, Peter and Jude*, New Testament Theology (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 73; Wilder, Charles, and Easley, *Faithful to the End*, 224; Kelly, *The Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, 225; Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, 110.

67. Simon J. Joseph, “‘Seventh from Adam’ (Jude 1.14–15): Re-examining Enochic Traditions and the Christology of Jude’, *JTS* 64, no. 2 (2013): 465.

68. Paul Ellingworth, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 17.

69. Lewis R. Donelson, ‘Gathering Apostolic Voices: Who Wrote 1 and 2 Peter and Jude?’, in Mason and Martin, eds., *Reading 1–2 Peter and Jude*, 21.

70. Bigg, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*, 311.

71. Ian H. Eybers, ‘Aspects of the Background of the Letter of Jude’, *Neot* 9 (1975): 113–14.

72. Wasserman, *The Epistle of Jude*, 327.

73. Chester and Martin, *The Theology of the Letters of James, Peter, and Jude*, 81.

74. Michel Desjardins, ‘The Portrayal of the Dissidents in 2 Peter and Jude: Does It Tell Us More About the “Godly” than the “Ungodly”?’ *JSNT* 30 (1987): 89–90.

75. Ernst R. Wendland, ‘A Comparative Study of “Rhetorical Criticism”, Ancient and Modern: With Special Reference to the Larger Structure and Function of the Epistle of Jude’, *Neot* 28, no. 1 (1994): 217.

76. Charles, ‘Literary Artifice in the Epistle of Jude’, 112.

77. Kevin B. McCrudden, ‘2 Peter and Jude’, in *The Blackwell Companion to the New Testament*, ed. David E. Aune (West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 604.

78. William F. Brosend, *James and Jude* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 192.

79. John J. Gunther, ‘The Alexandrian Epistle of Jude’, *NTS* 30, no. 4 (1984): 556; Green, *2 Peter and Jude: An Introduction and Commentary*, 190.

80. Montague R. James, *The Second Epistle General of Peter and the Epistle of Jude*, vol. 19, CGTSC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912), xlix.

a ‘polemical vein’,⁸¹ and how the opponents are ‘denounced with invective’.⁸²

While these descriptions are used rather frequently in an adjectival sense, some commentators have gone into detail, attempting to tie Jude’s tone to an existing genre or rhetorical category. Again, Watson’s influential 1988 study argues that Jude structures his letter per the conventions of Greco-Roman rhetoric. He considers there to be both deliberative (‘persuasion and dissuasion’) and epideictic (‘praise and blame’) elements throughout the epistle.⁸³ Together these genres help in discrediting Jude’s opponents by lowering their *ethos*, diminishing their reputation in the community, and, in turn, convincing the godly to avoid such evil snares.⁸⁴

As stated earlier, Joubert makes a similar case to Watson, focussing his attention specifically on epideictic rhetoric.⁸⁵ Jude makes use of the conventions of *laudatio* (praise) and *vituperatio* (blame) to magnify the divide between the two parties as well as to persuade the believers to reject the teachings of the intruders, who are acting as an obstacle in the way of true faith.⁸⁶

Jennifer Wright Knust’s major study, *Abandoned to Lust*, places Jude among a range of Greco-Roman invectives by remarking upon the offensive language used by Jude, specifically sexual imagery and slander, and its similarity to the Greco-Roman invectives in this. Importantly, invective in this context is not merely a convenient adjective but an established style following convention.⁸⁷ Like Joubert, Wright Knust argues that invective is ‘designed to control insiders [and] shame outsiders’.⁸⁸ The association between these polemics and Jude is made primarily due to the latter’s use of sexual language (Jude 5–19).⁸⁹ While Wright Knust’s work is a comprehensive analysis of invective, Jude is only one example among many, and thus significant avenues of the study of Jude as an invective are not explored due to obvious time and space constraints.⁹⁰

81. Jonathan Knight, *2 Peter and Jude*, New Testament Guides (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995), 46.

82. Witherington, *Letters and Homilies for Jewish Christians*, 597.

83. Watson, *Invention, Arrangement and Style*, 10.

84. *Ibid.*, 79.

85. Joubert, ‘Persuasion in the Letter of Jude’, 79.

86. *Ibid.*, 79, 87.

87. Wright Knust, *Abandoned to Lust*, 13.

88. *Ibid.*

89. *Ibid.*, 122–26.

90. *Ibid.*

More recently, Alicia J. Batten has endeavoured to show the explicit relationship between the epistle of Jude and Greco-Roman invective. She argues that this well-known style – given its prevalence throughout the Mediterranean world in antiquity – was used to display different types of morality. Invective, she writes, was an effective way to create divisions between members of society: it could elevate the morally upright, lower the corrupt, and manipulate the way each party viewed the other.⁹¹ After a discussion of invective in the Greco-Roman world and some common themes,⁹² Batten focusses on sexual misconduct,⁹³ indulgence, and deceitful speech in Jude.⁹⁴ Like Wright Knust, the scope of Batten's article lacks key elements. There is a very brief mention of the aim of the letter,⁹⁵ and no account of style, aside from a comment on comparison and metaphor.⁹⁶ The argument is structured using Watson's categories without further defence or justification of them.

3.1.3. *Summary*

In conclusion, and taken together, we repeatedly read in the existing literature that Jude is *a polemical attack* with both *Greek* and *Hebrew influences*. A small number of commentators have been more explicit, actively tying Jude to an existing rhetorical species (e.g. epideictic) or style (e.g. invective). However, many have used these terms in passing without clear explanation or expansion. I will build upon the many passing references, as well as the work of Wright Knust and Batten, and examine the precise nature of Jude's polemical 'attack', offering criteria for Greco-Roman invective and providing several case studies whereby these criteria can be applied and evaluated. However, as illustrated above, Jude owes an obvious debt to both Greek *and* Jewish influences and, as yet, there is no thorough investigation of Jewish polemics and Jude's possible usage of or dependence upon them. There exists, then, a further gap in the current research. I aim at providing criteria for Jewish judgement oracles and presenting a detailed case study whereby these criteria can be applied and evaluated. With these data, I will compare the epistle of Jude with both Greco-Roman invective and Jewish judgement

91. Batten, 'The Letter of Jude and Graeco-Roman Invective', 1.

92. Ibid., 3–4.

93. Ibid., 4.

94. Ibid., 5.

95. Ibid., 6.

96. Ibid., 7.

oracle with the aim of detailing the precise nature of Jude's attack and its stylistic influences. In short, the aim of my research will be to examine both Greco-Roman invective and Jewish judgement oracles to see how the epistle of Jude is influenced by both.⁹⁷

3.2. *Defence of the Genres*

Of the many hundreds of literary genres available, I have chosen to focus only on two: Greco-Roman invective and Jewish judgement speech. It might be asked why these two, above all others, have been selected. Why not, for example, investigate Babylonian poetry or Ancient Egyptian literature to see if Jude owes any debts to these as well?⁹⁸ I offer three reasons for the narrow focus chosen. First, as this study is an expansion of previous commentary, I am following the authors already mentioned and thus looking for genres which fit the description of an 'attack'. Second, the discussion of Greek and Hebrew influences makes sense given the cultural climate in which Jude was written. And, third, there are hints within the text of Jude that make Jewish judgement oracle and Greco-Roman invective particularly plausible.

3.2.1. *Following in Their Footsteps*

As discussed in my literature review (§3.1), most scholars agree that the epistle of Jude is polemical in nature and has both Jewish and Hellenistic persuasive strategies. However, noting that Jude's rhetoric is somewhat Jewish, somewhat Greek, and has distinct harsh tones, is relatively

97. Neyrey undertakes a similar project with 2 Peter, examining Greco-Roman and Jewish polemics which might have had some influence on the form of Peter's discourse. See Jerome H. Neyrey, 'The Form and Background of the Polemic in 2 Peter', *JBL* 99, no. 3 (1980): 407–31.

98. Some may also question why the study does not draw on Hebrew and Aramaic letters as collated in James M Lindenberger, *Ancient Aramaic and Hebrew Letters*, 2nd ed. (1994; repr., Atlanta: SBL, 2003). These letters have been consulted, and besides a small few letters (i.e. accusation and warning of AP 38 [no. 31], accusation of AP 27 [no. 33], petition regarding the destruction of Jewish temple of AP30/31 [no. 34], letter of complaint no. 47, and Mezaḏ Hashavyahu Ostrakon [no. 50]), which do have a negative tone, the overall structure, aim, themes, and style of these letters are not overly comparable to Jude. These letters are largely official or reporting in nature. See Lutz Doering, *Ancient Jewish Letters and the Beginnings of Christian Epistolography* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 95. Overall they lack literary pretension and thus have not proved to be helpful for this analysis.

obvious. As highlighted in the introduction, the challenge ‘is to render more specifically what the Jewish and Hellenistic elements of Jude’s position are’, and in this case, how they relate to the harsh nature of the discourse.⁹⁹ By analyzing specific forms of harsh rhetoric within these two cultural milieus, we might clarify the observations made in previous scholarship and, in turn, show that the epistle is a true reflection of its time, place, and circumstances.

3.2.2. *Jude’s Rhetorical Climate*

After the death of Alexander the Great, Greek language and culture thoroughly infiltrated the Roman Empire. By looking at the language of Koine Greek alone, we can perceive that its sphere of influence was far-reaching, dominating economic, political, and public life at that time. In this language, the laws were written, the merchants dealt, the treaties were signed, and the letters were inscribed.¹⁰⁰

The infiltration of Greek language and culture impacted all peoples (Jews included).¹⁰¹ Evidence for this can be seen rather broadly in infrastructure,¹⁰² cultural practices,¹⁰³ inscriptions, and literature.¹⁰⁴ Given its pervasive nature it was inevitable that the Jewish peoples would also absorb certain elements of Greek culture.¹⁰⁵ Cadwallader observes that

99. Frey, ‘The Epistle of Jude Between Judaism and Hellenism’, 315.

100. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 58.

101. George A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984). 11

102. Under the rule of Herod and Augustus, Hellenization became especially apparent. Typically, Greek institutions and buildings were erected, including the theatres in Caesarea, Petra, and Jerusalem. See John Strange, ‘Herod and Jerusalem: The Hellenization of an Oriental City’, in *Jerusalem in Ancient History and Tradition*, ed. Thomas L. Thompson (London: T&T Clark International, 2003), 100. In addition to this, the High Priest, Jason, obtained permission to build a *gymnasium* in 175 BCE (2 Macc. 4.9) and according to Josephus, the Hasmonean palace was built in the Upper City (*War* 1.7; 2.17.3) and the temple also underwent a degree of Hellenization.

103. For an extensive discussion on the relationship between Judaism and its surrounding Greek culture, see Richard J. Bauckham, *The Jewish World Around the New Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 252–53.

104. For a discussion on Jewish men and women with Latin names, see *ibid.*, 384.

105. For a helpful discussion on what is meant by Judaism in this period, see Gabriele Boccaccini, *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought 300BCE to 200CE* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991). When referring to first-century Judaism in this book, it is assumed that this includes both Christ followers and non-Christ followers.

many Jews even adopted secondary Greek names in order to ‘advance prospects and facilitate connections in the dominant culture’.¹⁰⁶

To demonstrate this connection more clearly, we must step back and begin our discussion with what is now known as the Classical age (particularly the sixth, fifth and fourth centuries). In this period subjects such as grammar, rhetoric, logical reasoning, ethics, politics, medicine, physics, and metaphysics, ‘began to emerge into the Greek consciousness as distinct entities’.¹⁰⁷ Building upon this progress, in the Hellenistic age Roman education became formalized. Up until the fourth century BCE, a child’s primary educator was his or her parent or guardian, but this rapidly changed during the Hellenistic period when schools were introduced.¹⁰⁸ Through these schools came the systemization of rhetoric.¹⁰⁹

During the Greco-Roman period, orators such as Demetrius, Cicero, Quintilian (largely influenced by Aristotle), and Hermogenes wrote rhetorical handbooks setting forth complete systems of rhetoric and teaching students how to construct persuasive arguments. Texts such as Cicero’s *De Inventione* were widely read for the next fifteen hundred years.¹¹⁰ Quintilian’s *Institutio Oratoria* and *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (compiled by an unknown author) had similar impact. In the second century CE, Hermogenes, who, according to Kennedy, was ‘the single most important rhetorician of Roman imperial times’, wrote, *inter alia*,

106. Alan Cadwallader, ‘Greeks in Colossae: Shifting Allegiances in the Letter to the Colossians and its Context’, in *Attitudes to Gentiles in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. David C. Sim and James S. McLaren, LNTS 499 (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013), 238.

107. George A. Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1980), 15–16.

108. Michael Chiappetta, ‘Historiography and Roman Education’, *History of Education* 4, no. 4 (1953): 149–56.

109. This has been called ‘the great creative activity of the Hellenistic Age’. See Laurent Pernot, *Rhetoric in Antiquity*, trans. W. E. Higgins (Washington: The Catholic University of America, 2005), 58. While rhetoric was always a part of Greek speech and literature, ‘such a degree of conceptualization’ had never before been achieved. See Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric*, 7; Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik: die Grundlegung d. Literaturwiss* (Munich: Hueber, 1960); Henri I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1982); Stanley F. Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977); Raffaella Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001).

110. Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric*, 90.

his *Progymnasmata*¹¹¹ and *Peri Ideon*.¹¹² Students across the empire were encouraged to compose speeches using the models set forth by well-known figures such as Cicero and Sallust, imitating their oratory techniques and styles to help train them for their future careers.¹¹³ As early as 60 BCE, Cicero described his own orations of 63 BCE as ‘offering a model of study for contemporary youths’.¹¹⁴ Writing on style, Quintilian refers to the writings of Cicero, asserting that these passages would have been familiar to any student; there was even an expectation that Cicero’s spelling of certain words would have been well-known to the reader (Quint., *Inst.* 1.4.11).

Students from all areas, including the regions of Palestine and Syria, would have been influenced by this rhetoric.¹¹⁵ As noted by Forbes, ‘If Josephus the historian, Theodorus the rhetorician, Meleager the poet, and Philodemus the philosopher were hailed from Galilee, perhaps it is indeed time to dispel the myth of “Galilean illiteracy”’.¹¹⁶ While many Jews maintained the centrality of religious instruction,¹¹⁷ they were not excluded from Greek education (e.g. Christian bishops Basil of Caesarea and Gregory of Nazianzus who studied rhetoric alongside Julian the future emperor,¹¹⁸ Josephus who was both Jewish and Roman and a prominent

111. Ibid., 103. Hermogenes’ was born in Tarsus, the same city from which the apostle Paul was born. Even though Hermogenes’ work dates to the second century CE, it is still a helpful indicator of the writing that was coming out of Tarsus at the beginning of the Common Era.

112. The work of Hermogenes will resurface in later parts of this book, specifically when analyzing the style of various texts. Thank you to Professor Larry Welborn for bringing, *Peri Ideon*, to my attention.

113. Novokhatko, *The Invective of Sallust and Cicero*, 3.

114. Anthony Corbeill, ‘Ciceronian Invective’, in *Brill’s Companion to Cicero*, ed. James M. May (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 211. Cicero writes: ‘As for my poor speeches, I will send you both those you ask for and some more also, since what I write to satisfy the studious youth finds favour, it seems, with you also’ (Cicero, *Att.* 2.1.3).

115. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*, 9. See also Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1, 60.

116. Forbes, ‘Comparison, Self-Praise and Irony’, 23.

117. Parents (particularly fathers) had a great responsibility to teach their children in the ways of the Lord (Gen. 18.19; Prov. 22.6; Deut. 6.7). It was expected that young men would be thoroughly familiar with the Torah as well as the cultural practices, dietary laws, and practical occupations that accompanied the life of a Jew (Joseph., *Apion* 2.204). See also Philo, *Leg Gai.* 210; Joseph., *Apion* 17.

118. Richard Flower, *Emperors and Bishops in Late Roman Invective* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 33.

historian and even Jesus who ‘shows considerable dialectical skill’ when disputing, with the Pharisees in Mt. 22).¹¹⁹ There is indication in Josephus’ and Paul’s writings to suggest that a Jewish citizen could have received a typically Jewish education in the Torah,¹²⁰ and an education in the surrounding schools. There were hundreds of places to study the scriptures in and around Jerusalem,¹²¹ from as early as five years of age (*m. ’Abot*. 5.12). Both Josephus (Joseph., *Life* 7–9; *Ant.* 20.263)¹²² and the apostle Paul¹²³ are said to have been learned in the Hebrew Scriptures, but also clearly at home in the Greek idiom of his time and the conventions of the Greek epistle.¹²⁴

Whether learned or simply instinctive, rhetoric was ‘a commodity of which the vast majority of the population were either producers or much more likely consumers’.¹²⁵ Rhetoric would have been on display daily in the courtrooms, marketplaces, and assemblies of the empire. Christians and Jews intermingled with their neighbours and would have been ‘exposed to the same coins, inscriptions, legal pronouncements,

119. Hans D. Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount: Including the Sermon on the Plain* (Matthew 5:3–7:27 and Luke 6:20–49), Hermeneia: A Critical & Historical Commentary on the Bible (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995); Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*, 9.

120. Shmuel Safrai, ‘Education and the Study of the Torah’, in *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*, vol. 2, ed. Shmuel Safrai and Menahem Stern (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1976), 945–70 (945).

121. David M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 243. According to *t. Meg.* 3 and *t. Ketub.* 13.35c there were four hundred and eighty synagogues in and around Jerusalem which had houses for the study of the scriptures and the study of the law.

122. Safrai, ‘Education and the Study of the Torah’, 953; Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, 243.

123. See Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts, ‘Paul’s Bible, His Education and His Access to the Scriptures of Israel’, *JGRChJ* 5 (2008): 9–41.

124. On Paul’s education, see Ronald F. Hock, ‘Paul and Greco-Roman Education’, in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World*, ed. J. Paul Sampley (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2003), 198–227; Porter and Pitts, ‘Paul’s Bible, His Education and His Access to the Scriptures of Israel’, 11–12; Christopher P. Craig, ‘Self-Restraint, Invective, and Credibility in Cicero’s First Catilinarian Oration’, *AJP* 128, no. 3 (2007): 335–39; Hock, ‘Paul and Greco-Roman Education’, 198–227; Strabo, *Geogr.* 14.5.13; Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism*, 10.

125. Duane Litfin, *St. Paul’s Theology of Proclamation, 1 Corinthians 1–4 and Greco-Roman Rhetoric* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 132. See also Flower, *Emperors and Bishops in Late Roman Invective*, 33.

building projects, and statuary as their neighbours'.¹²⁶ They did not live in isolation.¹²⁷ As Josephus records, even Herod swayed from Jewish purity by incorporating foreign practices. 'He appointed solemn games to be celebrated every fifth year, in honour of Caesar, and built a theatre at Jerusalem', and there were inscriptions of Caesar's great acts ('all made of the purest gold and silver') around the theatre (Joseph., *Ant.* 15.7.1).

It is widely believed that the writers of the New Testament would have been familiar with their Jewish heritage as well as Greek rhetoric 'either from formal education or interaction with oral and written Hellenistic culture'.¹²⁸ These authors wrote in the context of a Greek world with Greek-speaking listeners and thus assuming an understanding of classical rhetoric would seem fitting. In terms of education, it is reasonable to suggest that Jewish men (in particular) would have been well versed in both the Hebrew Scriptures with an appreciation for Greek language. Considering this, I believe that my initial focus on Jewish and Greco-Roman texts is justified both historically and geographically. The specific genres of Jewish judgement speech and Greco-Roman invective, however, will require some further defence.

3.2.3. *Hints from Within the Text*

At a superficial level, there are two main textual features within the epistle of Jude hinting at specific Jewish and Greco-Roman polemical genres. The first is the 'woe-cry' (v. 11), a literary device that suggests the presence of Jewish judgement oracle. The second is the obvious tonal shift throughout the discourse from praise (vv. 1–3) to blame (vv. 4–19) and back to praise (vv. 20–25), hinting at the trademarks of epideictic rhetoric. I will now briefly describe these two literary genres.

(a) *Jewish Judgement Oracles*. Even though the Jews of the Second Temple period did not appear to conceptualize rhetoric in any formalized manner, after consideration it can be seen that there are, in fact, rhetorical categories within their writings.¹²⁹ A central literary form is that of

126. Ibid.

127. Wright Knust, *Abandoned to Lust*, 17.

128. Duane F. Watson and Alan J. Hauser, *Rhetorical Criticism of the Bible: A Comprehensive Bibliography with Notes on History and Methods* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 110.

129. These were most likely learned by imitation. See John Van Seters, 'Creative Imitation in the Hebrew Bible', in *CSBS Presidential Address* (Alberta: Canadian Society of Biblical Studies, 2000), 10. Some of these literary forms include law, prophecy, wisdom, apocalyptic, and narrative. See Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric*, 123.

prophecy.¹³⁰ Within the prophetic genre, there are two primary variations: those that focus on salvation, and those that focus on judgement.¹³¹ The adverse aspect of prophecy, known as oracles of judgement or judgement-speech, will be the focus of this section.¹³² The judgment oracle is a structured speech-form, which was often used by the appointed prophets to bring public indictment against a guilty person or persons.¹³³ According to Petersen, this speech-form can be traced back to the ‘law court’ where it was used to summarize legal proceedings.¹³⁴ In polemical writings, it is used when a prophet has an accusation to bring against a guilty person(s): the accusation is made, a sentence is passed, and Yahweh’s decree is used to seal the fate of the guilty party.¹³⁵

A prominent feature within judgement oracles is the woe-cry, הוי (οὐαί or ܐܝܝ in the LXX). It appears more than 50 times in the Hebrew Bible and, on 36 of these occasions, it is delivered with an explicit tone of accusation (e.g. Hab. 2.6; Zeph. 2.5). It is generally believed that this term הוי either originated in the context of funeral laments (as seen in 1 Kgs 13.30, Jer. 22.18 and 34.5, which is why this term could also be used as a summons or a lament over death¹³⁶) or out of the covenant curse.¹³⁷ The

130. For a discussion on prophecy, see Christopher Forbes, ‘Christian Inspired Speech and Hellenistic Popular Religion’, *NovT* 28, no. 3 (1986): 257–70.

131. See Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric*, 124–25.

132. These oracles were delivered ‘during periods of social crisis and political oppression’. See David E. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 73–74.

133. Erhard Gerstenberger, ‘The Woe-Oracle of the Prophets’, *JBL* 81, no. 3 (1962): 250.

134. David L. Petersen, *The Prophetic Literature: An Introduction* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 66.

135. Ibid. For examples, see Isa. 28.14–22; 29.13–14; 30.12–14. Tucker clarifies that prophetic announcements are ‘not speculations about coming events, but the very word of God about the future’; see Gene M. Tucker, *Form Criticism of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), 62.

136. Claus Westermann, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech* (Cambridge: John Knox, 1991), 191. See Robert B. Chisholm, ‘Structure, Style and the Prophetic Message: An Analysis of Isaiah 5.8–30’, in *Vital Biblical Issues: Examining Problem Passages of the Bible*, ed. Roy B. Zuck (Grand Rapids: Dallas Theological Seminary, 1994), 92. Others, such as Gerstenberger, believe that the woe-form originated in clan wisdom where it was intended to teach morality to the younger members of the community, and thus, ‘the woe-form in its original shape and content came out of the popular ethos’. See Gerstenberger, ‘The Woe-Oracle of the Prophets’, 258.

137. Westermann, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech*, 191–98; Waldemar Janzen, *Mourning Cry and Woe Oracle* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972), 27.

sound of the word is conducive to pain and anguish. It has been described as a cry,¹³⁸ or a reflex used to express ‘grief, pain or other emotional release’.¹³⁹ It was known to be an effective way to draw the attention of the listeners,¹⁴⁰ marking the presence of a *woe oracle* (a common subset within judgement speech). The primary difference between a woe oracle and a judgement-speech is this use of the woe-cry at the opening. In the context of woe oracles, הוי is often followed by an accusation outlining the misdeeds of those, against whom the oracle is directed, and an announcement of judgement often centred upon the day of the Lord.¹⁴¹ In such speeches, ‘the mood is frequently one of scorn and bitterness even to the point where the *hōy*-cry takes on all the characteristics of a curse (Zech. 11.17)’.¹⁴² As ‘God’s hired professional mourner’¹⁴³ (Jer. 9.17–18; Amos 5.16), the prophet is ‘the first to announce both the woe cry and the death wail’.¹⁴⁴ The *hōy*-cry is the instinctive reaction of the prophet upon hearing the announcement of God’s sure and certain judgement. This cry appears to be found in Jude 11 and signals the impending presence of a woe oracle (vv. 11–15).

(b) *Greco-Roman Invective*. According to ancient rhetoricians, there are three main species of rhetoric: deliberative, forensic (judicial), and epideictic (Arist., *Rhet.* 1.3.1358b.3; *Rhet. Alex.* 1.1421b.7; Cic., *Inv.* 1.5.7; Cic., *De Or.* 1.31.141, 2.81.333–85.349; Quint., *Inst.* 2.21.23; 3.3.14–15; 3.4.12–15).¹⁴⁵ Each genre has a different objective. The aim

138. Barbara R. Rossing, ‘Alas for Earth! Lament and Resistance in Revelation 12’, in *The Earth Story in the New Testament*, ed. Norman C. Habel and Vicky Balabanski, *The Earth Bible* 5 (London: Sheffield Academic, 2002), 182.

139. Janzen, *Mourning Cry and Woe Oracle*, 3.

140. Jesus uses this to great effect in his speech against the Pharisees in Mt. 23.

141. Common constructions can be found in Isa. 5.8, 11, 18, 20; 10.1; 29.15; 31.1; 33.1; 45.9, 10; Jer. 22.13; Ezek. 13.18; Amos 5.18; Mic. 2.1; Hab. 2.6, 9; Zeph. 3.1

142. Janzen, *Mourning Cry and Woe Oracle*, 3. Janzen unpacks the relationship between the woe-cry used in mourning rites and the woe of prophetic invective and admits that at times it is difficult to distinguish between the two (1 Kgs 13.30; Isa. 1.24; 17.12; 18.1; Jer. 22.18; Ezek. 34.2).

143. Steven Horine, ‘A Study of the Literary Genre of the Woe Oracle’, *CBTJ* 5 (1989): 86.

144. Ibid.

145. Although the different handbooks agree that there are three species, each author provides different terminology. For a contemporary discussion on this topic see George A. Kennedy, *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World: 300 B.C.–A.D. 300* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), 7–23; Duane F. Watson, ‘The Three Species of Rhetoric and the Study of the Pauline Epistle’, in *Paul and Rhetoric*,

of the deliberative orator (and author) is to urge or deter (Arist., *Rhet.* 1.3.1358b.3–5; *Rhet. Alex.* 1.1421b.17–23; Cic., *Inv.* 1.5.7; Quint., *Inst.* 3.4.6–16; 3.8.1–6; Cic., *De Or.* 1.31.141; 2.82.333–36). The aim of the forensic orator is to prosecute or defend in matters of the present but also crimes of the past (Arist., *Rhet.* 1.3.1358b.5; Cic., *Inv.* 2.4.12; 2.51.155–56; Quint., *Inst.* 3.4.15). For epideictic rhetoric, the objective is to praise and blame, and is generally concerned with issues of the present (Arist., *Rhet.* 1.3.1358b.3–5; *Rhet. Alex.* 3.1425b.36–39; Cic., *Inv.* 1.5.7; 2.4.12; Quint., *Inst.* 3.4.6–16).

Although, in theory, these three genres are agreed upon, still Aristotle, in *Art of Rhetoric*, recognizes that there is much overlap between forensic, deliberative, and epideictic oratory with all ‘both praising and denouncing, both urging and deterring, both in prosecution and in defence’ (Arist., *Rhet.* 1.3.1359a). Not only is there overlap but, as Quintilian warns, while the divisions made within the handbooks are easy and neat, they are not necessarily exclusive, ‘for all three kinds rely on the mutual assistance of the other. For we deal with justice and expediency in *panegyric* and with honour in *deliberations*, while you will rarely find a *forensic* case, in part of which at any rate something of those questions just mentioned is not to be found’ (Quint., *Inst.* 3.14.16).

One sub-genre, which often appears in each of these species, is *invective*.¹⁴⁶ Invective can be used as both a technique within a text (Cic., *Cael.* 31–34), or as framework and style for a text in its entirety (Cic., *Pis.*).¹⁴⁷ The word ‘invective’ actually means ‘to ride into the attack’.¹⁴⁸ It was a term originally found in the context of military dialogue, but has taken

ed. J. Paul Sampley and Peter Lampe (New York: T&T Clark International, 2010), 25–47. Carey makes a helpful observation regarding these rhetorical categories, pointing out that the genres did not emerge randomly but were established based on ‘existing trends in oratorical practice’. See Christopher Carey, ‘Epideictic Oratory’, in *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, ed. Ian Worthington (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), 236.

146. Valentina Arena, ‘Roman Oratorical Invective’, in *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric*, ed. William Dominik and Jon Hall (Malden: Blackwell, 2007), 150, writes, ‘In the strict sense only speeches delivered, or supposedly delivered, as a direct attack against an individual should be considered invective... However, if we are prepared to broaden our definition, speeches whose first aim was not to attack the opponent directly, but to discredit him or her in order to achieve a specific persuasive goal, might also be considered invective’. This study will be working with that ‘broader definition’.

147. I will use examples of both throughout.

148. J. G. F. Powell, ‘Invective and the Orator: Ciceronian Theory and Practice’, in *Cicero on the Attack*, ed. Joan Booth (Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2007), 2.

on a more metaphorical meaning ‘to launch an attack’.¹⁴⁹ In reference to a literary genre, the term itself did not make an appearance until the fourth century CE, though it is widely understood that the technique was being used long before this by orators such as Cicero, Isocrates, and Demosthenes, particularly in their writings titled ‘*Against...*’. In the Latin rhetorical tradition, *vituperatio* (invective), together with its opposite *laus* (praise), were the principal topics making up the *genus demonstrativum* or, as the Greeks had named it, epideictic oratory.¹⁵⁰

Technically speaking, ‘invectives were to be formal epideictic orations, with negative subject matter organized into the same categories and structure employed for panegyrics’.¹⁵¹ A brief discussion of invective (named ‘blame’ by Cicero) can also be found in his work *De Inventione* (Cicero, *Inv.* 2.177–78), while a more extensive discussion can be found in *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (*Rhet. Her.* 3.6.10–3.7.15), here titled ‘censure’. *Rhetorica ad Herennium* states that the author of an invective should expose the opponent’s shortcomings so that ‘they [the audience] may avoid his [the target’s] wickedness [...and] vigorously disapprove his way of life’ (*Rhet. Her.* 3.6.12).¹⁵² Corbeill writes that *vituperatio* or invective is ‘the public shaming of a known individual through the open recounting of faults’, and is often used to instil fear in the public with a view to avoiding similar behaviour.¹⁵³ Invective appears in various

149. Ibid.

150. Arena, ‘Roman Oratorical Invective’, 149. Although invective is normally considered to be the counterpart to ‘praise’ within epideictic oratory (Cic., *Inv.* 2.177; *Rhet. Her.* 1.1.2; 3.6.10), it often arises within forensic and deliberative rhetoric alike. (See *Rhet. Her.* 3.7.15 for a helpful discussion on this intertwining of genres.) For example, Cicero’s speech *Pro Cluentio* is categorized within the forensic corpus but certainly has elements of invective as Cicero launches an attack against Sassia. In fact, many of Cicero’s speeches are both forensic and invective in nature. This can be so because language in practice is far more fluid than the handbooks claim. As Arena points out, invective is often an ingredient *within* rhetoric and is not restricted to the praise and blame genre. See *ibid.*

151. Flower, *Emperors and Bishops in Late Roman Invective*, 49.

152. Demetrius observes five features of negative epideictic speech: blaming, reproaching, censure, admonishing, and invective (Demetr., *Eloc.* 211.18–22; 288.4–19; 292.21–24; see also ps.-Demetr., *Epist.* 3–9; Sen., *Ep.* 75.6–7; Clem., *Paed.* 1.9.76.1–81.2). See also Malherbe, *Ancient Epistolary Theorists*, 33–39; Stanley K. Stowers, *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986), 86.

153. Corbeill, ‘Ciceronian Invective’, 200. Invective is often used to attack prominent or influential figures, as will be seen in the following examples. See Renato Barilli, *Rhetoric* (trans. Giuliana Menozzi), THL 63 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989), 3.

contexts and in various forms, such as letters (categorized in the praise and blame genre), public orations (often judicial in nature) and poetic discourses. Even though criticism and rebuke are dominant features of invective, it is important to note that invective is not merely slander or ridicule but rather bringing an accusation against someone (Cic., *Cael.* 6).¹⁵⁴

In the epistle of Jude, we find charges of wrongdoing (vv. 4, 8, 10, 11–13, 16, 19), proofs and comparative examples of wrongdoing (vv. 5–7, 9, 14–15, 18), shaming (vv. 11–13), and the running theme of praise (vv. 1–2, 3, 20–25) and blame (vv. 4–19). These similarities with invective warrant further investigation. Taking the above into account, the styles of Greco-Roman invective and Jewish judgement oracle best fit the criteria of an *attack speech* in a part of the world dominated by Greek and Hebrew education, authority, and religious tradition.

As I am comparing letter, court case, poem and prophecy, there is the potential issue of genre to answer for. Importantly, all these texts envisage a degree of oral delivery and, though they present differently, the convention of a confronting address takes precedence. The divide we now have between the written and spoken genres is a false dichotomy. There would not have been such a strict distinction in the mind of the writer, especially one working with the understanding that his letter would have been *heard* by most of the audience. It is estimated that the rate of literacy in the Roman Empire was less than 10%,¹⁵⁵ creating a necessity for letters to be read aloud. ‘Both political persuasion and the diffusion of literature remained oral to an important degree throughout

154. Anthony Corbeill, *Controlling Laughter: Political Humor in the Late Roman Republic* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 18.

155. See Willem Smelik, ‘Code-switching: The Public Reading of the Bible in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek’, in *Was ist ein Text? Alttestamentliche, ägyptologische und altorientalistische Perspektiven*, ed. Ludwig Morenz and Stefan Schorch (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 125; Seth Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society 200 BCE to 640 CE* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 10–11; Hezser, *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*, 496–504. Some, such as Poirier and Safrai, give a slightly higher statistic; see John C. Poirier, ‘The Linguistic situation in Jewish Palestine in Late Antiquity’, *JGRChJ* 4 (2007): 127; Safrai, ‘Education and the Study of the Torah’. Factors such as class, gender, and urbanization make it difficult to know the real figure for a community, but nonetheless, the principle of the ‘oral-literacy continuum’ means that even in areas where literacy were high, orality tradition would have been prominent. See Ruth Finnegan, *Literacy and Orality: Studies in the Technology of Communication* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1988), 4–6.

antiquity.’¹⁵⁶ In other words, the distinction between text types is somewhat falsely drawn as the practices of the written medium were penetrated by those of the oral. It is, therefore, ‘misleading to view orality and literacy as simple opposites in an either/or distinction’.¹⁵⁷ When a letter was sent to a community it was expected that the letter-bearer would present the message before the audience, performed not distributed. Therefore, while I do recognize that the epistle of Jude is a letter, I justify my claim that it can be compared to oral discourse on the basis that Jude was working with the understanding that his recipients would have heard the letter through oral delivery.

3.2.4. *Method for the Comparative Analysis*

The lens through which I will study Jude may be described as tri-focal insofar as it is not solely dependent on one approach or methodology. My methodological focus draws upon rhetorical, historical, and socio-linguistic elements.

The main body of this study will consist of a four-part analysis examining the structure (Chapter 4), aims (Chapter 5), themes (Chapter 6), and style (Chapter 7) of Jewish judgement oracles, Greco-Roman invectives, and the epistle of Jude. Each chapter will be broken up into four parts: the first concerning Jewish judgement oracles (§4.1, §5.1, §6.1, and §7.1), the second Greco-Roman invectives (§4.2, §5.2, §6.2, and §7.2), the third the epistle of Jude (§4.3, §5.3, §6.3, and §7.3), and the fourth, a comparative analysis of all three (§4.4, §5.4, §6.4, and §7.4). In each chapter, I will begin with an overview of a variety of texts across both styles (Jewish judgement oracles and Greco-Roman invective) in an attempt to understand how each genre broadly functions in relation to structure, aims, themes, and style. Specific case studies – Jeremiah 23, Demosthenes’ *Against Meidias*, and Ovid’s *Ibis* – will also be provided in each chapter for a more detailed and consistent examination.¹⁵⁸ This will be followed by an analysis of Jude, first looking at the structure of

156. William V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989), 326.

157. Istvan Haag, Stephen Llewelyn, and Jack Tsonis, ‘Ezekiel 16 and Its Use of Allegory and the Disclosure-of-Abomination Formula’, *VT* 62, no. 2 (2012): 200.

158. Given that Jude’s relationship with Jewish literature is widely accepted among scholars only one Jewish case study has been provided (Jer. 23.9–22). However, as the influence of Greco-Roman rhetoric on Jude is (comparatively) less established, two case studies from Greek and Latin texts will be explored.

the epistle, then the aim, themes, and finally the style. Once the data are assembled, I will use the comparisons to identify whether Jude (or part of Jude) might be understood as invective or judgement-speech, and to what extent the author has been influenced by each genre (if at all).¹⁵⁹

159. My aim is *not* to take a set rhetorical genre (as outlined in the handbooks) and to apply it strictly to Jude. Rather, I will look for patterns arising within polemical discourse across both cultures (either contemporary to the epistle or at least influential at this time) to see if any of these patterns also arise in Jude.