

The Pilgrim Way Commentary on Jude



by Dr. John Cereghin
Pastor
Grace Baptist Church of
Smyrna, Delaware

August, 2020

The Pilgrim Way Commentary on Jude
2013

by Dr. John Cereghin
PO Box 66
Smyrna DE 19977
pastor@pilgrimway.org
website- www.pilgrimway.org

APOLOGY

This commentary on Jude follows in a long line of other works by divines of the past as they have sought to study and expound this small, but vital epistle. This commentary grew out of over 35 years of both preaching in three pastorates in Maryland, Delaware and North Carolina as well as teaching as an instructor at Maryland Baptist Bible College in Elkton, Maryland. I needed my own notes and outlines as I taught and preached from Jude, so this commentary flows from those notes and outlines. Thus, the layout of this commentary is a practical one, written by a preacher to be preached from in the pulpit or to be taught in a Sunday School. It was not written from an isolated study of a theologian who had little contact with people or practical ministerial experience. There are many such commentaries on the market and they tend to be someone dull and not very practical in their application. This is written as something of a theological reference manual to me, filled with quotes and outlines from various books in my library. The layout and format are designed to help me in my preaching, teaching and personal study of this book. I figured there may be others out there who may benefit from this work which is why I make it available, but the work is basically laid out in a selfish manner, for my benefit and assistance. That is why I call this as “reference commentary”. You, as the reader, hopefully can find some profit in this!

This commentary cannot be easily classified into any single theological system. I believe that no single theological system is an accurate presentation of Scriptural truth in and of itself. When Charles Spurgeon once wrote “There is no such thing as preaching Christ and Him crucified, unless we preach what nowadays is called Calvinism. It is a nickname to call it Calvinism; Calvinism is the gospel, and nothing else”, he displayed a most unfortunate theological hubris. Calvinism is a flawed, limited and uninspired theological system. There is some truth there, as there is in any theological system, but it ranks no better than other competing systems, such as Arminianism (which is nothing more than a modified version of Calvin’s teachings), dispensationalism, covenant theology, Lutheranism, Romanism, Orthodox theology, pre-wrath rapture, take your pick. All these systems are flawed as they are all the products of human attempts to understand and systematize Biblical presentations. They can all make contributions to our overall understandings of the truth but none may claim to be the only correct such presentation, at the expense of all others. Knowing the human impossibility for absolute neutrality and the human love for theological systems, I readily admit that I cannot be as dispassionate and uninfluenced by human teachings in these pages as I would like. No man can be. But I have made every attempt not to allow my own personal systems influence my understanding of what the clear teachings of Scripture is. But it will be clear that my presupposition is dispensational and premillennial, but I am hardly one to be shackled to, say, the notes in the *Scofield Reference Bible*. Too many commentators go no farther than the “great men” in their library, and thus, limit any additional or newer insights that the Holy Spirit may have for them. I try not to just “parrot” other commentaries but give you my own thoughts.

I have freely consulted a wide variety of commentaries and sermons for insights and other views of various texts that I might have missed. As the old preacher once remarked “I milked a lot of cows but I churned my own butter.” Direct quotes are attributed to their proper source to prevent that unpardonable sin of literary theft. But simply because I quoted a writer should not be viewed as an endorsement of all that he wrote or of his theological system. I selected the quote because I found it interesting and useful, not because I am in any degree of agreement regarding the rest of his teachings.

This commentary is based on the text of our English Received Version, commonly referred to as the King James Version or the Authorized Version. I believe that this is the most preserved

English translation available to us and that it is the superior translation in English. I can see no good reason to use or accept any of the modern versions, especially the current “flavor of the month” of the New Evangelicals and apostate fundamentalists, the corrupt and mis-named English Standard Version. When it comes to these modern, critical text versions, I reject them for a variety of reasons. One major reason is that they have not been proven on the field of battle. I have liver spots older than that are older than the English Standard Version, but I am expected to toss my English Received Text, over 400 years old, and take up this new translation, whose ink is still barely dry? How many battles has the ESV won? How many missionaries have done great exploits with an NIV? What revivals have been birth and nurtured with an NASB? We will stick with the translations and texts that our fathers have used and that God has blessed. It is too late in Church history to change English translations. We are also favorably inclined to the Geneva Bible, Tyndale Bible, Matthews Bible, and other “cousins” of our English text. I have also referenced the readings on the English Standard Version, as being the most “up to date” example of apostate Bible translation and scholarship. The ESV is the current darling of the “mainline church” and is the culmination of over 150 of corrupt textual criticism. The ESV is nothing more than an “evangelical revision” of the old corrupt Revised Standard Version, so there is really “nothing new under the sun” when considering the ESV. It is nothing more than warmed over apostasy, served on fine china. But rotten eggs still taste horrible, no matter how you serve them up.

Each verse is commented upon, with the English text, with Strong’s numbers for interesting words and grammatical coding of Greek verb tenses. The English grammatical notes are limited to the tenses of the corresponding Greek verbs as I believe the study of the verb tenses is the most important element of the usage of the Greek text, even moreso than word studies. Not every Greek word is commented upon, only unusual or important ones. I am guilty of “picking and choosing” my word studies instead of presenting complete word studies for every word. That system would simply be too unwieldy for my purposes. I have made occasional references to readings in the Geneva Bible of 1599, to compare this version to the King James.

I have also decided to do some textual studies, mainly comparing the King James readings with the English Standard Version. I also refer to the readings in the English translations that preceded the King James Bible for sake of comparison and to examine how the English Received Text readings developed from the Tyndale Bible, through the Coverdale Bible, the Geneva Bible and the Bishops Bible.

The presupposition of this commentary is that what the Bible says is so and that we will not change the text to suit our theological fancy. It says what it says and that is what we must accept, else we will be found unfaithful stewards of the Word of God, a judgment we fear. We will not amend our text but will take it as it is the best we can.

This commentary certainly is not perfect, nor is it the final presentation of my understanding and application of the book of Jude. A commentary over 35 years in the making can never truly said to be finished. As new insights are granted by the Holy Spirit and as my understanding of the epistle deepens, additional material will be added and sections will have to be re-written. One is never truly “finished” with any theological book. As one deepens and grows in his relation with the Lord, so does his theological understandings and that should be reflected in one’s writings.

This book was also written as a theological legacy to my four children. They will need to be mighty for God in their generation for their days will certainly be darker than the generation their father grew up in. This book is an expression not only of the heart of a preacher in the early 21st

century but also of a Christian father for his children, so they may more fully understand what their father believed and preached during his ministry.

It is my sincere prayer that this unpretentious contribution to the body of Christian commentary literature will be a blessing to the remnant of God's saints in the earth as we approach the coming of our Lord.

INTRODUCTION

Jude has 25 verses and 613 words

Authorship

According to the testimony of the book itself; it was written by "Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James" (1) I take this to be the Apostle Jude based on Acts 1:13, also known as Lebbaeus and Thaddaeus. The same language appears in Acts 1:13 as does in Jude 1 : " Judas the brother of James" Yes, there is the italics in Acts 1:13 but the meaning is the same and their addition is necessary for the reading I thus hold to apostolic authorship James then must have been the Apostle James, the son of Alphaeus (Matthew 10:3). Based on the similarity of the language between Acts 1:13 and Jude 1, I hold to apostolic authorship. I don't think the "Jude" who was one of Jesus' half-brothers (Mark 6:3) is the author as this Jude was not an apostle.

Authenticity

Hermas, Polycarp, Athenagoras, Theophilus of Antioch, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Eusebius give early attestation to the book.

Jude is more strongly attested than 2 Peter This is somewhat astonishing when one considers its question of apostolic authorship, its shortness, its polemic character, and its alleged reference to apocryphal literature.

Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Augustine, Jerome, and other church Fathers maintained that since Jude made reference to the Apocrypha and non-canonical books, many early Fathers rejected it. Verse 9 was thought to have been a quotation from the Assumption of Moses. Verses 14-15 were supposed to be taken from the book of Enoch. Even if Jude did quote a passage from non-canonical books and other uninspired literature, it was not an endorsement of the material, but because he used was accurate and useful to make his point. The Holy Spirit obviously had no problem with it. Paul did something similar in Acts 16:28 and in Titus 1:12. So why get all upset when Jude does it?

Background

The general character of the epistle does not permit a certain determination of the locality of its composition or its destination

Date

The date is undeterminable. It could have been written any time from A.D. 66 to 80. Liberals, as usual, push the date back as far as they can. One reason they give to justify this is since Jude tells his readers to "remember the words of the apostles" (17), then Jude is not a contemporary of the apostles, hence the need for a late date. But what the liberals do not realize is that by this writing, all of the apostles except John are probably dead, so their words must be remembered since they are now gone Such an admonition argues for an earlier date as opposed to a later one

Occasion

Warnings and descriptions of the apostasy are the motivation for the epistle. Jude desired to write about the "common salvation" of all Christians but was so moved by the urgency of warning of the apostasy of the day that he wrote about it instead.

Remarks and Observations

Jude gives capsule summaries of the following doctrines:

1. The trinity 1,20
2. The historicity of the Old Testament 5-1 1
3. Existence of angels 6
4. Satan's existence and power 9
5. Judgment and retribution 6,7,13,15
6. Second coming of Christ 14,15
7. Deity of Christ 25
8. Security of the believer 24

While Jude reads in a similar manner and style as 2 Peter, Jude is actually more severe and uncompromising against the apostates than is Peter. "One of the differences between Jude and 2 Peter seems to be that while Peter warned that "there shall be false teachers" (2:1), Jude states that "there are certain men crept in unawares" (Jude 4). One anticipates the problem, while the other realizes it as present (H. T. Spence, *The Canon of Scripture*, page 208)."

Names and titles of Christ in Jude

- | | |
|------------------------|-----------------|
| 1. Jesus Christ 1 | 4. Wise God 25a |
| 2. Lord Jesus Christ 4 | 5. Savior 25b |
| 3. Lord 14 | |

Names and titles of God the Father in Jude

1. Father 1
2. Lord God 4
3. The Lord 5

Names and titles for the Holy Spirit in Jude

1. The Spirit 9
2. Holy Ghost 20b

Old Testament references in Jude

1. Satan rebuked, 9 with Zechariah 3:2
2. Israel's exodus from Egypt, 5 with Exodus 12:41
3. Israel's unbelief in the wilderness, 5b with Numbers 14:22-29; 26:64,65
4. Destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, 7 with Genesis 19:24; Deuteronomy 29:23
5. Moses' body after his death, 9 with Deuteronomy 34:5,6
6. Cain's sacrifice, 1 1a with Genesis 4:5
7. Balaam's error, 11b with Numbers 22:7-21
8. Korah's rebellion, 11c with Numbers 16:1-3
9. Enoch. 14 with Genesis 5: 18

Outlines of Jude

1. Introduction 1,2
2. Earnestly contend for the Faith 3

3. Creeps 4
4. An example of apostate Israel 5
5. An example of apostate angels 6
6. An example of Sodom and Gomorrah 7
7. Filthy dreamers 8
8. How to handle the Devil 9
9. A description of apostates 10-13,16
10. The prophecy of Enoch 14,15
11. Remember the warning 17-19
12. Closing admonitions 20-23
13. Our assurance of security 24
14. Closing admonition 25

From Ethelbert Bullinger, *The Companion Bible*, page 1880:

- A. Salutation 1,2
 - B. Exhortation 3
 - C. Ungodly, denying 4
 - D. Remembrance 5a
 - E. Retribution 5b-16
 - D. Remembrance 17
 - C. Ungodly, separating 18,19
 - B. Exhortation 20-23
- A. Doxology 24,25

John MacArthur, *The MacArthur Study Bible*, page 1984:

1. Desires of Jude 1,2
2. Declaration of War Against Apostates 3,4
3. Damnable Outcome of Apostates 5-7
4. Denunciation of Apostates 8-16
5. Defenses Against Apostates 17-23
6. Doxology of Jude 24,25

From J. Sidlow Baxter, *Explore the Book*, 6:315

1. Greeting 1,2
2. Why to Contend- Apostate Teachers 3-16
 - A. Their subtle perversions: two basic denials 3,4
 - B. Their certain doom: three historic examples 5-7
 - C. Their impious ways: three historic examples 8-11
 - D. Their utter falsity: six awful metaphors 12,13
 - E. Enoch's prophecy: coming destruction 14,16
3. How to Contend- Our True Resources 17-23

From W. Graham Scroggie, *The Unfolding Drama of Redemption*, 3:328

1-4	5-16	17-23	24,25
Introduction	An Exposition of the Danger	An Exhortation to the Duty	Conclusion
The address 1,2	Apostates Doomed 5-7	The Biblical Duty 17-19	The God Addressed 24,25a
The keynotes 3,4 A. Duty 3 B. Danger 4	Apostates Denounced 8-11	The Personal Duty 20,21	The Praise Ascribed 25b
	Apostates Described 12-16	The Relative Duty 22,23	

The Profile of an apostate as revealed by Jude:

- | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 Ungodly- 4 | 11 Fault finders- 16 |
| 2 Morally perverted- 4 | 12 Self-seeking- 16 |
| 3 Deny Christ- 4 | 13 Arrogant speakers- 16 |
| 4 Defile the flesh- 8 | 14 Flatterers- 16 |
| 5 Rebellious- 8 | 15 Mockers- 18 |
| 6 Revile holy angels- 8 | 16 Cause division- 19 |
| 7 Dreamers- 8 | 17 Worldly-minded- 19 |
| 8 Ignorant- 10 | 18 Without the Spirit- 19 |
| 9 Corrupt- 10 | |
| 10 Grumblers- 16 | |

THE DISPENSATIONAL CHARACTER OF JUDE

Jude, along with Hebrews, James, the epistles of Peter and John are known as “General” or “Catholic” Epistles. While they all contain much church age doctrine, these epistles are unique in that their primary doctrinal and dispensational thrust is tribulational. The church age only accounts for 28.5% of human history, as it makes up about 2000 years of the 7000 years of history. It is not logical then to assume that the entire Bible is written in a church age context. The Old Testament deals with the nation of Israel, not the Church. Acts 2-7 is a theological minefield, as it is a transitional period between the Old Testament and Church Age. I teach that it was very possible that Christ could have returned at any time between Acts 2-7, where Israel had a “second chance” to accept the kingdom. That open door was closed at the death of Stephen when Israel rejected his witness. After that, the gospel goes to the Samaritans in Acts 8. In Acts 9, the Apostle to the Gentiles is saved. In Acts 10 and 11, we have the Gentile Pentecost. Then the missionary call to the Gentiles is given in Acts 13 and we move solidly into the Church Age. That lasts until the Rapture.

We find church doctrine primarily in Paul’s epistles, although they are also sprinkled through the gospels, Acts and the other epistles. But since Paul is the Apostle to the Gentiles, we would expect him to deal with doctrines that deal with the Church. But Peter was the Apostle to the Circumcision in Galatians 2:7-9. If he was involved in a Jewish ministry, his preaching would be more Jewish in context and this would be reflected in his two epistles.

There are several verses in Hebrews 3 and 6 that simply make no sense in a church age context as they seem to teach that a believer can lose his salvation. Many commentators simply gave up trying to expound these verses. The root of the trouble was that they were trying to fit a round peg (church doctrine) into a square hole (tribulation doctrine). But if the verses were applied to a tribulational context, they make more sense.

James has caused a lot of consternation over the years. Martin Luther hated it because he couldn't reconcile it to Romans. But Luther's problem was that he was trying to compare apples and oranges, church doctrine with tribulation doctrine.

John and Jude are also primarily aimed at tribulation saints, although there are many church age applications to be made in all four epistles. The burden of the commentator is to discern the proper zip code or a certain verse. Is this verse written to me as a Christian or is it written for a saint in the tribulation? Or maybe it has a millennial application?

The root for the majority of heresies today is a dispensational misapplication of verses. When someone claims that a Christian can lose his salvation, he is taking a tribulation doctrine and is trying to apply it to a Christian. If a man claims that a Christian has to "endure to the end to be saved", citing Matthew 24:13, he is taking a tribulation doctrine and is trying to apply it to the church age. Seventh Day Adventists, with their fixation on Sabbath observance today, have the right doctrine but the wrong dispensation. Ditto with their insistence that Christians have to keep the moral law and the ceremonial law to be saved. That's good tribulational preaching, but it is heresy for the Christian. But if we can "rightly divide" these verses and place them in the correct dispensations, we will avoid such errors. But this can still be tricky because such verses may be mixed in with church age doctrines and some verses may have a double application that can apply to multiple dispensations. It can be very confusing! This is why the ministry of the Biblical commentator is not for the faint of heart or weak of spirit.

The Bible has to be able to minister and guide to yet future generations, including those who will be saved in the tribulation period. Since the tribulation is a totally different dispensation that the church age is, we would expect a different set of doctrine to be presented for those who go into that dispensation, just as much as we would if we were considering the dispensation of the Millennium. Why do we assume that all of the Bible, especially the New Testament, has to apply only to Christians in this dispensation? The Bible is for all dispensations, so we have to expect there are going to be sections of it that apply to other dispensations than our own. This is not to say that the Christian should totally ignore anything that Paul didn't write, for there are doctrines and applications all over the Bible that still apply to the Christian. But we must know which ones do and don't.

With all this in mind, we will delve into Jude, recognizing it as primarily a tribulational epistle with church age applications. After all, look at its neighbor- the book of Revelation, which primarily deals with the tribulation period!

THE PILGRIM EPISTLES

One of the prominent truths found in Hebrews concerns the Mosaic Tabernacle. Although fifty chapters in the Bible are dedicated to this unique shadow and type of Christ, only the Epistle to the Hebrews gives its spiritual interpretation. Hebrews is also the only New Testament book to address the tabernacle. What is a tabernacle? A tabernacle is a tent for sojourning; it is also a place of worship for one who is on the move. In contrast, a temple is a fixed, permanent place for worship. The Mosaic Tabernacle was portable; its parts and pieces could be wrapped and moved, and then re-erected at the next camp. Christ is my tabernacle, the revelation of how Christ is to be with me in my earthly journey. Thus, one of the key burdens of the Epistle to the Hebrews is the presence of my Christ as my tabernacle for my earthly pilgrimage.

The pilgrim Epistle of James was written "to those scattered" by the Diaspora. James presents a practical religion; thus, no matter where one is scattered, this is the way he is to live. James exhorts believers to wisely face their trials along the way-trials from both

God and the world. James also calls for these scattered pilgrims to have an anointed tongue when speaking to others. No special favor is to be shown a wealthy person over a poor one—both must be treated with equal respect. James even instructs those who are sick or born with infirmity that there are always purposes in God's ways; one must seek the Lord to resolve them. The Book of James is dedicated to practical, day by day, pilgrim living.

Following the Epistle of James are the Epistles of Peter. First Peter is the epistle that presents the sufferings and persecutions of the pilgrim. It is most important to live wisely with your sufferings while on one's pilgrimage. It is also imperative to resolve in the heart how one responds to those who persecute the believer. At the same time, Peter exhorts the pilgrim to ever have upon his mind the hope of the imminent second coming of Christ.

In his epistles John the Apostle steps forward to say that on the pilgrimage there are going to be those who proclaim they are Christians. How often the pilgrim hears, "I'm born again; I go to church; I talk about Jesus." Therefore, in his first epistle John presents six characteristics to test whether a person is truly a Christian.

John's second epistle reveals insight concerning those who may come in Christ's name but are not true Christians. The pilgrim must be warned about such men. John also speaks of the need for Christian hospitality toward other pilgrims as well as strangers in the biblical sense. Although there are those who present themselves as Christians simply to get a handout, there will be those who are strangers to us but not to God. For those who merely seek to take advantage of a Christian's hospitality, is it appropriate to even say to them, "Godspeed"? No. John also clarifies whom we can address as "brother." The word brother (Gr., adelphos) means "born of the same womb." Is this the womb of truth? Is this the womb of the true Christ, of the Word of God? Or is this of the mega-church womb, of the Neo-Christian womb? We must be careful concerning our spiritual words to others. Expressions such as "May the Lord richly bless you" should only be addressed to the right people. Some Christians may not have much to give to others, but they can grant them a spiritual benediction. However, even then we must be careful. When we tell a person with sincerity, "I trust and pray that God will bless you:" we are giving a powerful benediction from the heart and from the Word of God. Even in the aftermath we are still praying for God to bless that person. Second John gives these precious words to the pilgrim.

In the Third Epistle of John, we are warned that in this pilgrimage we will meet some church leaders who are very proud and arrogant, who love to have the preeminence.

The Epistle of Jude is an epistle that contrasts the beloved and the behated. This little epistle makes it clear that there are individuals that God does not love. In the light of the End Time and its global apostasy within the institutional church, Peter traces the origin of the apostasy to false teachers (2 Pet. 2:1-3, 15-19), while in the Epistle of Jude all phases of the apostasy are addressed. Amidst the needed emphasis upon the behated

and the apostasy, these epistles do not produce hopelessness; God and His promises are still accessible to the Christian pilgrim.

As we view these General Epistles, it becomes evident that there are a multitude of truths that a pilgrim and a stranger in this world (though of heaven's citizenship) must be careful about. We must consider how we live, how we act, how we talk, where we go, and what things we do. Our blessed Lord through these General Epistles gives us this exhortation "This is the way of the pilgrim." (H. T. Spence, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, pages 3-4)."

BOOKLIST ON JUDE

The following reviews are taken from the following sources:

\$ *Commenting and Commentaries*, by Charles Spurgeon

% *The Minister's Library*, by Cyril Barber

* *An Introduction to the New Testament*, by D Edmond Hiebert

^ *Tools for Preaching and Teaching the Bible*, by Stewart Custer

@ *The Treasure House of Good Books*, by James Alexander Stewart

& An Annotated Bibliography of Reference Works and Commentaries on the Greek New Testament. Jon Weatherly, Cincinnati Bible College & Seminary, for Fall Semester, 2003.

? Website of Ligonier Ministries "Top 5 Commentaries on Jude", at

<http://www.ligonier.org/blog/2009/05/top-5-commentaries-on-the-books-of-2-peter-and-jude.html>

! *Biblical Viewpoint*, Bob Jones University.

Listings without any notation are by the author, Dr. John Cereghin

Comments are that of the reviewer and not necessarily those of the author nor are such reviews automatically endorsed. Not all commentaries are that useful despite these reviews. As always, discernment in choosing commentaries is required. Recommended commentaries are in **bold**.

! Alford, Henry, *2 Peter and Jude* in volume 4 of *The Greek Testament*, 1871, 26 pages. Concise comments on the Greek text. He defends the authenticity of II Peter and Jude (148-58; 188-92); warns against private interpretations of the Word (400); stresses universal redemption (402); identifies the "elements" as the heavenly bodies (416); explains the "other scriptures" as other New Testament writings (420); urges the "keeping inviolate the faith once for all delivered to God's people" (530); thinks that probably the "angels" refer to Genesis 6 (532).

Barclay, William, *The Letters of John and Jude* in *The Daily Study Bible*. Short studies, usually noted for Barclay's word studies. Useful, if used with discernment, as Barclay has a liberal bent.

& Bauckham, Richard J. *Jude, 2 Peter*. Word Biblical Commentary volume 50., 1983. Thorough and stimulating, argues against Petrine authorship of 2 Peter.

* Barrett, Albert E. and Elmer Homrighausen, "The Epistle of Jude" in *The Interpreter's Bible*, volume 12, 26 pages 1957. Rejecting the traditional authorship, Barrett places the epistle about 125. Introduction and exegesis by Barnett, exposition by Homrighausen.

! Think the author embellished Jude (199); deny that Jude wrote the epistle bearing his name.

! Bauckham, Richard J., *Jude, 2 Peter*, volume 50 of Word Biblical Commentary, 1983, 376 pages. A detailed critical commentary with lengthy introductory sections and exhaustive bibliography. The "Comment" sections feature meticulous treatment of Greek vocabulary and grammar.

^ Bigg, Charles, "The Epistles of St Peter and St Jude" in *International Critical Commentary*, 1901, 48 pages. The most thorough commentary on the Greek text identifies Jude as the brother of James of Acts 15 (317); holds that he quoted from the book of Enoch (336); gives a careful comparison of the subjects of 2 Peter and Jude (221).

! Thinks Jude was confused in his teaching (329); concludes by giving the doxology and saying "Words could hardly express more clearly Jude's belief in the pre-existence and eternity of Christ" (344).

! Blum, Edwin A., *2 Peter and Jude* in volume 12 of The Expositor's Bible Commentary, 1981, 33 pages. Based on the NIV and including excellent summaries of the arguments about apostolic authorship (257-261, 381f), these brief commentaries expound the text carefully, clearly and briefly. The comments are especially rich in cross references. Blum identifies "the angels" of Jude 6 with the sons of God in Genesis 6 (390).

! Caffin, B.C., and S.D.F. Salmond, *II Peter and Jude* in The Pulpit Commentary, n.d., 107 pages. Homiletical expositions. They favor the view that Christ is called God (2); stress universal redemption (43); argue that the phrase "other scriptures" shows Paul's Epistles were ranked with the Old Testament (71).

* Coder, S. Maxwell, *Jude: The Acts of the Apostates*, 1958. A rich and stimulating exposition.

? Davids, Peter H., *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*, Pillar New Testament Commentary, 2006. Until the publication of Gene Green's commentary, this volume by Peter Davids was the best commentary on these two neglected books. Like all of the other volumes in the Pillar series, it is accessible and insightful.

! Erdman, Charles R., *The General Epistles*, 1918, 15 pages. Brief conservative comments. Holds that "the divine choice and call do not make human effort unnecessary" (117); teaches the premillennial coming of the Lord (127); thinks that the "elements melting" does not mean literal fire but judgment (132).

! Fausset, A.R., *1 Corinthians-Revelation* in volume 6 of A Commentary Critical, Experimental and Practical, 1871, 15 pages. A conservative exposition. He argues for the deity of Christ (619); holds that assurance in Scripture is doubly sure (622); identifies the elements as "the world's component materials" (627); holds that Paul's Epistles were already known as "Scripture" (628); defends Jude, the brother of the Lord, as author (lixff, 649); does not think the term "angels" refers to Genesis 6 (650).

! Frommuller, G. F. C., *The Epistles General of Peter and the Epistle General of Jude*, Lange's Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, 1867, 34 pages. Conservative Lutheran exposition. Defends Jude, the brother of Jesus, as author (3-6); does not think that the word "angels" refers to Genesis 6 (27).

! Fuhrman, Eldon R., and Delbert Rose, *II Peter and Jude* in volume 10 of The Beacon Bible Commentary, 1967, 31 pages. An Arminian commentary. Rose defends Jude, the brother of James, as author (421); warns that God's keeping process does not go on automatically (429);

holds there is no room for innovations in the faith (432); argues that the angels in Jude do not refer to Genesis 6 (436).

\$ Gardiner, F , *The Last of the Epistles: Commentary on Jude*, 1856. An interesting, straightforward, instructive commentary.

? Green, Gene L., *Jude and 2 Peter*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, 2008. Until very recently, there were not a lot of choices for good commentaries on 2 Peter and Jude. The situation has changed dramatically in recent years with the publication of several very good works. If you are able to have only one commentary on 2 Peter and Jude, this recent commentary by Gene Green should be at the top of your wish list. At 450 pages, it is thorough without becoming inaccessible. It should be of use to both students and pastors. Highly recommended.

& Green, Michael. *2 Peter and Jude*. TNTC. 2nd ed., 1987. Most recent commentary defending Petrine authorship, responds to the best of Bauckham.

% Written by a leading conservative theologian in England, this work is a valuable companion volume to Stibbs' fine treatment of First Peter. Green handles the matters of textual criticism and the problems of authorship with rare ability. His exposition of the text is based upon a detailed exegesis and he ably applies the teaching of these epistles to the needs of the present. Anglican.

! Hiebert, D. Edmond, *Second Peter and Jude: An Expositional Commentary*, 1989, 324 pages. Blends thorough, conservative exegesis with a devotional spirit. He lists legitimate interpretations then reasons for one; defends inspiration in Jude's use of the Assumption of Moses (250) (and Enoch, 266); and takes "difference" to mean "doubting" in Jude 22 (288).

I have always found Hiebert's commentaries to be rather bland and not challenging.

! Hillyer, Norman, *1 and 2 Peter, Jude*, New International Biblical Commentary, 1992, 43 pages. Comments on the NIV for lay persons. Non-technical guide to the text with Greek words transliterated. An introductory chapter covers background details. The exposition is verse by verse one section at a time followed by "Additional Notes" that include a much greater use of Greek.

* Jaeger, Harry, *Hidden Rocks*, 1949. An informative exposition with a timely analysis of modern religious conditions in Christendom.

\$ Jenkyn, William, *Exposition of Jude*, 1652, 367 pages. Very full and profoundly learned. A treasure-house of good things.

& Kelly, J. N. D. *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*. BNTC, 1969. The best of the older commentaries, accepts traditional authorship.

! A critical commentary. He holds that both Jude and II Peter "are somewhat lacking in quality" (225); attacks the authenticity of both Jude and II Peter (234-237); identifies the faith once for all delivered as the "body of saving beliefs accepted as orthodox in the church" (247); thinks that "angels" refer to Genesis 6 (257).

* Kelly, William, *Lectures on the Epistle of Jude*. A series of expository lectures by a Plymouth Brethren scholar.

% Lawlor, George Lawrence, *Translation and Exposition of the Epistle of Jude*, 1972. Includes a basic study of the original text.

! Leaney, Alfred Robert Clare, *The Letters of Peter and Jude*, 1967, 67 pages. Brief liberal comments. He compares Jude and II Peter (77-80); denied that Jude wrote Jude, claiming instead that it was written about A.D. 100, among the last New Testament books written (81,100,101), thinks Jude meant I Enoch by "Scripture" (86); identifies "angels" with Genesis 6 (88-89,118); holds that "other Scriptures" include non-canonical books (138); pours contempt on the "blessed hope": "We can no longer believe in a literal return of Jesus as Lord, whether on the clouds of heaven or in any other way" (140).

! Lenski, Richard Charles Henry, *The Interpretation of the Epistles of St. Peter, St. John and St. Jude*, 55 pages. A thorough Lutheran commentary. Argues that Jude was written after II Peter (599-600); denies that "angels" refer to Genesis 6 (620).

! Lucas, Dick and Christopher Green, *The Message of 2 Peter & Jude: The Promise of His Coming*, 1995, 270 pages. A practical commentary based on the NIV. The aim is to be a "non-technical exposition" (10) and thus this work is especially helpful for preaching. Includes an appendix, discussing the issue of authorship (235-251) and a "Study Guide" (252-270).

! MacDonald, William, *II Peter & Jude: The Christian & Apostasy*, 1972, 94 pages. A brief but helpful exposition. He attacks the false doctrine of the Mormons, Seventh Day Adventists, Jehovah Witnesses, etc. (33); identifies the sinning angels with the sons of God in Genesis 6 (37,80); condemns homosexuality (38); commends the premillennial truth (52,58); includes brief bibliographies (62f, 94).

\$ McGilvray, Walter, *Lectures on Jude*, 1855. Vigorous, popular addresses by a Free Church divine.

\$ Manton, Thomas, Commentary on Jude, 1658, 376 pages. Manton at first gave up all idea of printing this book when he found that Jenkyn had taken up the subject; but he afterwards changed his mind He tells us "I consulted with my reverent brother's book and when I found any point at large discussed by him, I either omitted it or mentioned it very briefly; so that his labors will be unnecessary to supply the weakness of mine " Manton's work is most commendable.

^ An exhaustive, wordy Puritan commentary stresses God's election and effectual calling (18) and preservation (43); attacks ignorance (136) and "popish idolatry" (253).

! In an exhaustive, wordy Puritan exposition, Manton warns that God's people have always been troubled by persecutors outside and sectaries inside (6); stresses God's election and effectual calling (18) and preservation (43); urges growth in grace (88) and preservation of the truth (110); attacks ignorance (136) and "popish idolatry" (253).

* Mayor, J. B., "The General Epistle of Jude" in *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, volume 5, 69 pages. Greek text Important for advanced critical study. Valuable introductory material of 40 pages.

! Mayor, Joseph B., *The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter: Greek Text with Introduction Notes and Comments*, 1907, 1965, 441 pages. Long introduction (over 200 pages), covering many issues on the two books, such as authenticity and use of apocryphal books. He gives technical notes on the Greek text, including many long Greek quotations of Scripture and ancient writers; has a few appendixes on important Greek words.

! Moffat, James, *The General Epistles*, 1928, 32 pages. A liberal interpretation. He states that besides the reference to the love of God, Jude has "little permanent interest or value" (222); dates Jude about A.D. 90-100 (226).

? Moo, Douglas J., *2 Peter, Jude*, NIV Application Commentary, 1997. Although the commentaries in the NIVAC series vary in quality, any time you see a commentary by Douglas Moo, it will be well worth reading.

\$ Muir, William, *Discourses on Jude*, 1822. Sermons which do not rise above mediocrity.

& Neyrey, Jerome. *2 Peter, Jude*. Anchor Bible volume 37C, 1993, 287 pages. Thorough recent comments, updating Bauckham, not conservative.

! Written by a Jesuit priest who taught at Notre Dame. Includes extensive bibliographies of English, German and French works. The notes focus on words or phrases. He provides his translation of each section, followed by critical discussions of form, structure and argument.

\$ Otes, Samuel, *Exposition of Jude in Forty-one Sermons*, 1633. Of the conforming Puritan style, full of quaintness and singularities of learning. A book by no means to be despised.

\$ Perkins, William, *Exposition of Jude*, 1606. Perkins was regarded by his cotemporaries as a paragon of learning, but his writings fail to interest the generality of readers.

Phillips, John, *Exploring the Epistle of Jude*. Phillips is usually useful and reliable, if not deep. He writes devotionally and his outlines are usually worth the price of the books. He occasionally quotes other English versions without any words of warning.

* Plummer, Alfred, "The General Epistle of Jude", in *Ellicott's Commentary on the Whole Bible*, volume 8, 16 pages. A concise and informative commentary. Gives list of parallels between Enoch, 2 Peter and Jude.

! 15 pages. A critical but reverent commentary. He attacks Calvinistic interpretations (509); gives parallels between the Book of Enoch, II Peter and Jude (518-519); argues for Jude, the brother of James, as the author (505); dates Jude before A.D. 70 (506).

! Reicke, Bo, *The Epistles of James, Peter and Jude*, volume 37 of the Anchor Bible, 1964, 31 pages. A liberal interpretation. Holds that Jude was written by a disciple of Jude (191).

Ruckman, Peter, *The Books of the General Epistles, volume 2: 1 John-Jude*, 2004, 91 pages for Jude. Strong commentary, based on the Authorized Version. Generally good material, with his usual attacks on commentaries that alter the King James text. Dispensational and premillennial, Ruckman mainly applies these epistles to the tribulation doctrinally.

* Salmond, S D F., "The General Epistle of Jude" in *The Pulpit Commentary*. A valuable interpretation of the epistle with an abundance of homiletical suggestions appended.

? Schreiner, Thomas, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, New American Commentary, 2003. Schreiner's work is always worth consulting. His strengths in the field of biblical theology shine through in this helpful commentary.

@ Stewart, James, *The Apostasy in the Last Days*, 1965. An exposition and plea for separation from those who deny the faith.

! Strachan, R. H., and J. B. Mayor, *The Second Epistle General of Peter and The General Epistle of Jude* in volume 5 of *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, 1907, 1961, 68 pages. Technical commentary on the Greek text. He gives background of the Greek words and phrases; holds that the Parousia is both a judgment on the wicked and a triumph for the kingdom (146); admits that Paul's Epistles are classed with the Old Testament as Scripture (147), holds that II Peter borrowed from Jude (225).

\$ Willet, Andrew, *A Catholicon, Gathered Out of the Catholike Epistle of Jude*, 1614. This book is in the Museum, but we cannot procure a copy.

* Williams, Nathaniel Marshman, "Commentary on the Epistle of Jude" in *An American Commentary*, 1888. A suggestive and rewarding exposition by a conservative.

* Wolff, Richard, *A Commentary on the Epistle of Jude*, 1960. The introductory section deals with critical problems from a conservative viewpoint. The verse-by-verse commentary is a scholarly but readable interpretation showing wide acquaintance with the literature on the epistle.

COMMENTARY ON JUDE

1 . Introduction 1,2

**1 Jude,^a the servant of Jesus Christ,^b and brother of James, to them that are sanctified^{c-d}
e-perfect passive participle by God the Father; and preserved^{f-perfect passive participle} in Jesus Christ,^g
and called.^{h-i}**

1a Matthew Poole makes Jude an apostle, also known as Lebbaeus and Thaddaeus (Matthew 10:3) and brother of James, the son of Alphaeus (page 3:944). John Gill (page 9:668), Thomas Manton (page 9) and the editors of the Matthew Henry commentary on Jude (which Henry did not complete since he died before he could get to Jude) also make the author the apostle (page 6:1107) and not the Lord's half-brother Charles Spurgeon also held to this view (*Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit* 54:19). Poole also identifies the Apostle James Bar-Alphaeus as the James of the Acts 15 and Galatians 2, one of the pillars of the Jerusalem church, which is also a very strong possibility. It would seem that the position that this is the Lord's half-brother is a rather late one, as the Puritan and early commentators identify Jude as an apostle.

The Matthews Bible has "Judas" and "The Epistle of Saint Judas", which, while correct, just doesn't look right!

"Jude...the brother of James" also distinguishes him from Judas, a mistake no one should make but according to John Trappe, some ancient writers actually did (he fingers Nicholas the deacon, who was the author of the sect of the Nicolaitians). It's amazing to think how anyone could assume that a man like Judas could write anything that the Holy Spirit would inspire and preserve.

1b Jude does not call himself an apostle (if this is the Apostle Jude). But this is not an automatic disqualification for apostolic authorship. Paul didn't always identify himself as an apostle in the introductions to his letters (see Philippians and Philemon). John never did in his letters and neither did James, nor the author of Hebrews. Jude may have simply not felt worthy to compare himself to the "greats" or he did not feel it necessary to stress any apostolic credentials he might have had to his audience. He simply refers to himself by a higher title-servant.

1c The perfect tense indicates that God's positional sanctification, once bestowed on us, continues to remain on us. Sanctification is the setting apart of something or someone for a special or dedicated purpose In terms of religion, God sets us apart unto holiness, service and discipleship, Every Christian is positionally sanctified at salvation The practical sanctification is something that takes the entire lifetime to work out and develop

We notice that Jude mentions that we are sanctified "by God", referring to our standing before God rather than the process of sanctification that every believer undertakes in his own life in a practical sense.

1d The ESV omits "sanctified".

1e There are a number of "trinities" in Jude. The first one is here, referring to the saints as:

1. **Sanctified.** We have been set aside for the Lord's use and pleasure at salvation. We are sanctified positionally at salvation, and this is worked out in our lives practically through the rest of our lives.

There is a threefold sanctification of the believer, mentioned in the New Testament:

1. Sanctified by God the Father- Jude 1

- 2. Sanctified in Christ Jesus- 1 Corinthians 1:2
- 3. Through sanctification of the Spirit- 1 Peter 1:2

2. **Preserved.** This speaks to the security of the truly born again believer. If you have been born again, you cannot lose your salvation, but you certainly can ruin it through apostasy and unfaithfulness. The perfect tense expresses the continued secure state of God's safekeeping of the believer. Eternal security is addressed here, as Jude does in verse 24. The basis for eternal security is that we are "preserved in Jesus Christ" and not in ourselves. This is the key Just as our salvation is not dependent upon our own power, neither is our safe-keeping. Both are dependent upon Christ and He is responsibility for both as well. The reason why we cannot fall from salvation is because it is God Who does the holding, not us. We do not hold or keep ourselves. What God starts in us in terms of salvation, He sees through to the end and completes.

3. **Called.** Called to salvation, then to service and sanctification.

1f The Geneva Bible does not have "preserved" but instead uses "returned to Jesus Christ". One would think that a Calvinistic translation like the Geneva would be "big" on the doctrine of the preservation of the saints!

1g The ESV has the idea that we are kept "for" Jesus Christ, for His sake and benefit, instead of by Jesus Christ, in His keeping us from falling by His own power (verse 25). The ESV allows the door to be opened to works-based "keepings" of salvation and even the possibility of losing one's salvation by this rendering.

1h We are "called" to salvation, then sanctification. Not the same as election, as that is a determination, not a calling It is to this calling we either respond or not, for salvation or condemnation.

1i The Geneva Bible scrambles some of the wording, reading "...to them which are called and sanctified..."

2 Mercy unto you, and peace, and love,^{a-b} be multiplied.^{c-d-e-aorist passive optative}

2a The only place in the New Testament where mercy, peace and love appear so close together is here. "Grace, mercy and peace" appear in 1 Timothy 1.2; 2 Timothy 1:2 and 2 John 3.

2b "**Mercy and peace**" were elements of Jewish greetings "Love" was added to make it Christian.

2c "**multiplied**" Not just added to but multiplied.

2d The second of Jude's "trinities". Jude wishes his audience:

- 1. **Mercy.** We will need mercy at the judgment seat of Christ as we will be judged for our Christian lives and stewardship after the rapture (Revelation 4).
- 2. **Peace.** We get peace from the Father (Philippians 4:7).
- 3. **Love.** This is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit (Romans 5:5).

2e "This form of greeting using the word "multiplied" is confined to the two Epistles of Peter and the Epistle of Jude. It is not without significance. When believers suffer, as seen in the First Epistle of Peter, they can count on God to multiply grace and peace. But Second Peter and the

Epistle of Jude look forward to the last days, the end of the age, with its predicted apostasy, and for those days God promises to multiply to His own grace, peace and mercy. (A. C. Gaebelein, *The Annotated Bible*.)”

2. Earnestly contend for the Faith 3

3 Beloved, when I gave ^{present middle participle} **all diligence** ^{a-b} **to write** ^{present middle/passive participle} **unto you of the common salvation,** ^c **it was needful for me** ^{aorist} **to write** ^{aorist infinitive} **unto you, and exhort** ^{d-present active participle} **you that ye should earnestly** ^e **contend** ^{f-present middle/passive infinitive} **for the faith** ^g **which was once delivered** ^{h-aorist passive participle} **unto the saints.** ⁱ

3a Jude felt an urgency and a need for haste in writing to exhort his hearers to earnestly contend for the faith due to the seriousness of the situation with these false teachers, the damage they were doing and the threat they possessed. There is no “lost epistle” here as Jude was originally going to write concerning the common salvation we all share, but the “common distress” changed his mind to write of the apostasy instead.

3b The ESV butchers this to “I was very eager to write to you...” Being eager to do something and giving diligence to do something are two entirely different things. I can be diligent to do something that I don’t want to do for no other reason than to get it done and out of the way, like mowing my grass.

3c “**common salvation**” is not as something despised or inferior, which is one definition of “common”. “**Common**” is used here to describe the universality of this salvation among the saints, that which is common, or is shared, by all believers, its extent, not its quality. There is a common malady that affects all men (sin) so there must be a common remedy for that condition that also applies to all men without exception, the salvation that is in Christ Jesus.

3d The work of “exhorting” as in warning and urging a congregation to some form of action is of the duties of the preacher. See Hebrews 10:25.

3e There is no “**earnestly**” in the ESV...just “contend”.

3f Jude is being forced by circumstances to write on the need to defend and contend for the faith instead. There is an apostasy out there, it is growing worse and claiming victims and Jude must write concerning it so that Christians will know what is involved, will be able to both defend themselves against it and to launch offensives against it. Militancy against error and for the truth is commanded unto the church. It is not an optional thing. If we are soldiers, that presupposes a warfare. Fight for truth and against all forces that would seek to overthrow that truth.

This is to be done “**earnestly**”, implying great effort and activity, as a boxer in a ring, a soldier on a battlefield or a runner in a race. One cannot contend in a lazy manner as the word implies vigorous activity.

Since Jude is also “earnestly contending” in this epistle, it can rightly be classified as polemic literature, since Jude is dealing with controversial doctrines and is attacking false doctrine and apostates.

Jude would have written about our “**common salvation**” but the “present distress” would not let him. Preachers would rather spend their ministry preaching on good things, on Jesus Christ, His person and His work. No one likes a fight and having to waste time preaching on

apostasy and error. But it must be done if we are to remain faithful to the truth when it is under attack. We are compelled to respond in the same manner as Jude did.

The Tyndale and Matthews Bibles have “continually labor in the faith”.

“**earnestly contend**” Strong’s #1864 epagônizomai; from epi (Strong’s #1909) upon, on, at, or as an intensifier; and agônizomai (Strong’s #75) to strive, fight; to contend in an intensive manner. Used only here in the New Testament.

3g The Geneva Bible adds “...contend for the *maintenance* of ye faith...”

3h "**once delivered**“ No other faith, or body of spiritual truth, will be given to this generation and dispensation. God has said all that He is going to say to our dispensation in the Word of God. If you are an English speaker, then God has delivered you this “faith” finally, its contents preserved within a King James Bible.

This faith is delivered to the saints by God, from heaven, and is received by the saints on earth. It is delivered and received, not invented by the saints. We did not “dream” this up for man would never concoct the plan of salvation that God has given. Man would develop a works-based faith, dependent upon religious ritual, not one that is solely founded on the grace of God.

The faith and the truth there of have their origins with God and are given in stewardship in trust to the saints The Church does not create it but rather is in stewardship of it to promote it and to make it known This faith was once delivered to the saints in the giving of the Scriptures. This body of truth was given once, never to be given again. We have all the truth that God intended us to have. We need no new "truth" or "revelation" from Charismatics or cultists. Nor do we need any “updates” or “additions” to the Bible to add to this depositum of the faith, such as the Book of Mormon or *Science and Health With Key to the Scriptures* or any Roman Catholic traditions.

3i "**saints**" This is who receives the faith, not the institutional church or some theological system. Christians have it. God always works through individuals rather than groups. No group, church, fellowship or theological system may claim to have exclusive possession of the truth for all saints share in it. God desired the entire body of Christ to receive this faith, not just one group. Nor is it to be found within a certain theological system for the truth of God transcends all human theological systems. No theological system nor denominational system in and of itself is large enough to contain this body truth.

3. Creeps 4

**4 For there are certain men crept in unawares^{a-b-c-aorist} who were before of old ordained^{d-}
perfect passive participle to this condemnation,^e ungodly men,^{f-g-h} turning^{present active participle} the
grace of our God into lasciviousness,ⁱ and denying^{present middle/passive participle} the only Lord^j
God, and our Lord^k Jesus Christ.^l**

4a Even the apostles couldn't keep false teachers out of the church. How much harder do we have to work in our day, with the apostasy that much more advanced? These false teachers creep into the church in much the same way as a snake would slither into a building. They come in with stealth, and unawares and catch their prey by surprise. They are spiritual snakes! They came in under false pretence, flying false colors of a false profession of godliness and orthodoxy. False teachers do not operate openly as a true man of God would. We have nothing to hide but they hide everything. Think of Seventh Day Adventists. They never tell you who they are. They never identify themselves in their literature or on their radio and television

broadcasts. They don't want you to know who they are until it is too late and you have been ensnared in their trap. False teachers hide their true intent and position and misrepresent themselves in order to gain the confidence of their victim. And they came in unawares. No one saw them come in, just as no one saw the snake slither under the door, until it was too late. The threat they pose calls for diligence and spiritual discernment to watch all of the openings, to make sure that the creep does not creep in. If he manages to get in, he must be expelled at once before he can work his mischief. Some people may need to be thrown out of a local church if they qualify as a false teacher, operating as a creep.

Nor did they come in boldly, pounding their chests and declaring their error for all to hear. Apostates are seldom so bold since they know such an approach would give time for their intended victims to raise their defenses. No, they always work "undercover", in secret, with ulterior motives. They are not the bravest souls around, at least not publicly.

I have seen this personally. When I started attending Maranatha Baptist Church in Elkton, Maryland in July, 1985, there were a few men who were trying to sow the seeds of Calvinism into the church. They could not be convinced of their errors from the Scripture and they would not back off, so they were expelled from the church. One man then took the church directory and started sending a home-made "magazine" to every member of the church (except the pastor, of course!), in a continuing effort to split the church and sow discord. That is a theological "creep" that Jude is warning about.

4b **"crept in unawares"** Strong's #3921 *pareisdunô*; from *para* (Strong's #3844) along side of; and a compound of *eis* (Strong's #1519) into; and *dunô* (Strong's #1416) to go into, enter; to enter secretly, slip in stealthily, to steal in. "It is used of the spacious and seductive words of a clever pleader seeping gradually into the minds of a judge and jury; it is used of an outlaw slipping secretly back into the country from which he was expelled...it always indicates a stealthy insinuation of something evil into a society or situation (William Barclay, *The Letters of John and Jude*, page 179)." Used only here in the New Testament.

The Tyndale, Bishop's and Matthews Bibles have "craftily crept in", showing their strategy and design by using such an entrance.

4c The False Teachers:

Their entrance into the church- they crept in,

Their condemnation- written beforehand by God,

Their character- they are ungodly men

Their doctrine- they turn the grace of God into lasciviousness

4d Strong's #4270 *prographô*; from *pro* (Strong's #4253) before; and *graphô* (Strong's #1125) to write to write before (of time), of old set forth or designated before hand (in the scriptures of the Old Testament), to write before the eyes of all who can read

4e Being ordained unto something is not the same as being elected unto something. The words are quite different. God simply wrote their condemnation beforetime. He did not ordain certain men to this apostasy, nor did He elect or reprobate them to it. He simply wrote out their condemnation ahead of time. He told these false prophets what the penalty would be for their apostasy before they ever committed it. In His foreknowledge, He saw their apostasy and already prophesied about it. We cannot read any Calvinistic idea of reprobation or unconditional election into this phrase because no one is being elected or reprobated to anything here. Only the penalty and punishment for these "creeps" is laid out ahead of time. Salvation is not the issue here, but rather the punishment for apostates and false teachers.

An example of this "fore-ordaining" of wicked men would be Judas Iscariot, whose treason against Christ was recorded in Psalm 41:9.

4f These ungodly men are guilty of two sins:

1. **They turn the grace of our God into lasciviousness.** The Geneva has this as "wantonness". They abuse grace by turning liberty into license, saying that now that you are saved by grace, it doesn't matter how you live because God has already forgiven you. They make grace a license to sin and an excuse to do away with the law of God, the commandments of God and Biblical principles and standards. They are antinomians, saying that grace gives them a license to sin. False prophets and apostates cannot stand rules or discipline. They rail against "legalism", "rules" and "standards" as though it was a sin to encourage people to live holy lives. "Holiness" is a word not found in their lexicons. The law of God and the commandments of Jesus Christ are highly offensive to them because they are rebels at heart and rebels hate law. Such rebels have no intention of obeying anyone's laws, even those of God's. They are their own god and their word is law. They believe themselves to be autonomous, answerable to no one's law but their own. Beware of any preacher who says that since you are saved by grace that you may now live in any manner you desire and God won't care. They ignore Romans 6:1, another verse they can't handle. They refuse to understand and recognize the discipline of grace, that the grace of God in reality constrains us to live a holy life and places us under a higher obligation of personal holiness.

Now why do they think they have the liberty to turn the grace of God into sin? Because they have a low view of God. If we had a high and holy view of God (the correct one) then our resulting conduct would reflect that view. But if our hearts are bad and our view of God is low then our life in reference to our God will also be low in response. We will not rise above our view and understanding of God in holiness. The Greeks and Romans were so immoral because their gods were immoral. Their gods were not holy but acted as bad as men did. Their gods were nothing but exalted humans, complete with an exalted fallen nature. Their gods were carnal, so their followers were too. If my god is immoral then why should I be holy? But if worship a thrice holy God of infinite holiness, then my life and conduct will demonstrate that. False prophets and apostates then have very low views of the holiness of God, which, in their mind, give them the justification to live low and loose.

2. **They deny the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.** This is done in any number of ways, either through doctrine or practice. Denying the Lord in doctrine would involve denying any tenet of orthodox Christology, such as His incarnation, eternal sonship, virgin birth, deity and fully unfallen humanity, hypostatic union, atoning death, resurrection, ascension, current priestly ministry and second coming. They deny that Jesus is the Christ, the Messiah, or God. They deny that the Messiah is Jesus, but is rather another man. To deny Him in practice is described above in their turning the grace of God into lasciviousness.

4g "**ungodly men**" Strong's #765 asebes, from a (Strong's #1) not; and sebomai (Strong's #4576) to worship, venerate; irreverent, impious, wicked, ungodly; irreverent The word does not mean irreligious, but one who actively practices the opposite of what the fear of God demands. It is immoral and impious behavior.

4h So how are we to handle these "creeps"?

1 Mark them - Romans 16:17,18

2 Charge them - 1 Timothy 1:3

3 Try them - 1 John 4:1-3

4 Separate from them - 2 Corinthians 6:14-17; Ephesians 5:11

4i "lasciviousness" Strong's #766 aselgeia; unbridled lust, excess, licentiousness, lasciviousness, wantonness, outrageousness, shamelessness, insolence. William Barclay calls this "a grim and terrible word" (*The Letters of John and Jude*, page 180)."

The Tyndale, Geneva, Matthews and Bishop's Bibles use "wantonness". "The word wanton is from the Middle English wantowen, literally meaning untrained, as it is from wan, 'lacking' and towen, 'to train'. Thus wanton originally meant undisciplined, untrained, uneducated, or unruly. It later came to mean malicious, reckless, merciless or unprovoked, extravagant or excessive, also lewd or lascivious (Laurence Vance, *Archaic Words and the Authorized Version*, page 370)."

'Lasciviousness'...is from the Latin lascivus, 'sportive'. To be lascivious is to be lustful, licentious, wanton or lewd (Vance, *ibid.*, page 208)."

The English Standard Version translates this as "sensuality", which only covers a portion of the definitions given above.

4j "Lord"..."Lord" Two different words for "Lord" to describe the Lordship of the Father and the Lordship of Christ:

1. The Lordship of the Father is Strong's #1203 despotês, amaster, Lord, with the idea of a despot, a ruler with absolute power, as a husband or father over a family, the inherent position of authority more than the use of the power.

2 The Lordship of Christ is Strong's #2962 kurios, he to whom a person or thing belongs, about which he has power of deciding; master, lord, the owner; one who has control of the person, the master, in the state: the sovereign, prince, chief, the Roman emperor, a title of honor expressive of respect and reverence, with which servants greet their master

4k Here is another of Jude's "trinitities" in describing the sins of these "creeps"

1. They are ungodly
2. They turn the grace of God into lasciviousness
3. They deny the Lord

4l The ESV completely mangles the last part of verse 4 into "deny our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ." The Authorized Version rendering of "denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ." This clever twist by the ESV removes a reference to the deity of Christ. He is indeed "Master" and "Lord", but is He also God?

4. An Example of Apostate Israel 5

5 I will present middle subjunctive **therefore put you in remembrance,** a-aorist infinitive **though ye once knew** perfect active participle **this, how that the Lord, having saved** aorist active participle **the people^b out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed** c-aorist **them that believed** aorist active participle **not.** d-e

5a Because we are so prone to forget, especially in spiritual matters

5b The ESV has "saved a people" while the King James and the other translations all use the definite article. What people? Jude assumes his readers knew he was talking about Israel, but the use of the indefinite article by the ESV makes this a generic people instead of a specific people that Jude is considering.

5c "**destroyed**" not annihilated, but rather, to render them unfit, or ruin them, for the use that God had intended for them. If God will judge His own people severely for apostasy, as He has on numerous occasions, then how can the unsaved and ungodly hope to escape judgment for similar sins? Despite their miraculous deliverance from Egypt, God still destroyed them for their idolatry Past blessing are no defense against future judgments.

5d There is another “trinity” in verses 5-7, where Jude gives three Old Testament examples of divine judgments against false teachers and apostates:

1. The children of Israel, who left Egypt in the Exodus but then believed not at Kadesh Barnea- verse 5
2. The angels who kept not their first estate but fell with Lucifer- verse 6
3. The destruction of Sodom, Gomorrah and the cities of the plain- verse 7

5e This seems to be aimed straight at the Jew, for he would be very familiar with this account. Now why the warning here? We have another tribulation context. If God “destroyed” an unbelieving Jew in Exodus, the same fate awaits an unfaithful Jew in the tribulation. If they do not believe the preaching of the 144,000 or of the Two Witnesses, they will be destroyed, just as their fathers were in the wilderness for their unbelief.

5. An Example of Apostate Angels 6

6 And the angels which kept^{a-aorist active participle} not their first estate,^b but left^{aorist active participle} their own habitation,^c he hath reserved^{a-perfect} in everlasting chains under darkness^{d-e} unto the judgment of the great day.^{f-g-h-i-j}

6a "**kept**" and "**reserved**" in this verse are the same Greek word, which is Strong's #5083 *têreô*, to attend to carefully, to take care of, to guard or keep.

6b This reads in a similar way to 2 Peter 2:4. What is this "**estate**"? It is the place where God placed the angels, the sphere of their own existence and responsibility. God created the angels for a special purpose and gave them unique ministries and responsibilities. He also set boundaries around them, forbidding them certain acts. The class of angels who followed Lucifer in his rebellion transgressed those boundaries that God laid down and left the stations and positions that God had created them for. Some of these angels even went so far as to make the ultimate transgression of angelic being and cohabited with human women (Genesis 6). They may have taken human form to commit this sin. It is interesting that Jesus also took on human form and a human nature but He did so to redeem mankind, not to corrupt it. And He certainly did not cohabit with any women during His time on earth. The number and magnitude of these sins could not be tolerated by God so severe judgment resulted. This was how the account of the “sons of God” in Genesis 6:1-4 was universally understood (so far as our evidence goes) until the mid- second century A. D. 1 Enoch 6-19 also deals with this material.

6c This is when they rebelled with Satan and followed him. Angels were ultimately created to serve God. That was their initial “**habitation**”. But when they rebelled and cast in their lot with Satan, they left that for which they were created. Satan is said not to have abode in the truth in John 8:44. The truth was the original and intended habitation for both Lucifer and the angels who followed (and will yet follow) him. To abandon that is to leave your habitation.

The ESV renders this as “did not stay within their own position of authority”. Just what “authority” do angels have? They are messengers of the Lord who are ministering spirits to the heirs of salvation (Hebrews 1:14). God placed them in a certain place with certain responsibilities and tasks, but nowhere do we read them having any kind of authority over anything. God has all the authority. The angels simply execute that authority.

6d The **darkness** here is literal, as well as spiritual in the idea of separation from the presence God and His truth. But this physical darkness, that is worse and more intense than anything

seen on earth, is a part of their punishment, to be eternally blinded as a part of their judgment, never to experience any light ever again. Those who once saw the light of heaven and of the glory of the Lamb are condemned never to see any light ever again for eternity. They are to exist for eternity as a type of mole, blindly groping in the pit. Since they followed the Prince of Darkness, their punishment will fit the crime. Since they seemed to enjoy darkness so much, God will give it to them for eternity.

6e There are 3 everlasting/eternal things mentioned in Jude:

1. Chains 6
2. Fire 7
3. Life 21

6f When did this happen? It can refer to two events:

1. The initial apostasy of the angels before the creation, who followed Lucifer in his apostasy and rebellion,
2. The events of Genesis 6, where angels cohabitated with women in an attempt to corrupt the human race and defeat the prophecy of a Redeemer in Genesis 3:15. This is the better interpretation of the two. Since angels are always presented in the masculine gender (never sexless), it is possible for angels to engage in sexual activities with human women. Everything this entails is not laid out in its entirety in Scripture, however. The fact that angels do not marry nor are given in marriage (Matthew 22:30) has no bearing to the discussion, because you do not need to be married to have sex or to produce children!

If the first interpretation was correct, then those angels who fell along with Lucifer would already be in the bottomless pit, based on the past tense of the judgment. Those angels would have already been judged. Yet it is obvious that many fallen angels are very active in the world even to this day. Since not all these angels have been judged, the first interpretation cannot be correct. But the angels who were responsible for the events of Genesis 6 were judged quickly at the time of the flood. These angels are now in the bottomless pit. Their sin was so severe that God punished it on the spot.

6g "**the great day**" since this is in judgment of the wicked, it would refer to the Great White Throne judgment of Revelation 20. We do not believe that all the fallen angels are currently in the bottomless pit awaiting the day of judgment, though some are. Many are on the loose today in the forms of devils. But there is a class of angels who are so imprisoned. Peter says that God "delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment" in 2 Peter 2:4. This is the fate of these apostate angels who were cast down into the bottomless pit. They are chained with eternal chains, reserved for their final judgment, which may take place at the Great White Throne of Revelation 20. They are reserved so that they cannot escape their prison or judgment. They were judged in the past as they were chained and cast down into hell, but their final and "official" judgment is still future. And I do believe the chains spoken of here are literal and real, chains forged by God that endure for eternity and cannot be broken, designed to bind the worst of the fallen angels. These angels must be fearsome indeed for God to deal with them in such a manner.

6h God judged the apostate angels who kept not their first estate and will judge the rest of them in the future. Revelation 12:4 tells us of yet another defection among the angels that will take place in the tribulation. If God will judge angels, then how do false teachers and apostates hope to escape their judgment?

6i “How terrible must be the torment of these fallen beings! Once they dwelled in a light beyond the brightness of the noonday sun. Once they sang the praises of God in a land of bliss. Once they knew ‘joy unspeakable and full of glory’. Once they gazed upon the throne of God and shouted for joy at the works of his creation. Once, in a fallen state, they still retained a measure of freedom and occupied seats of power. But now all they know is the everlasting burnings of an unholy lust and the terrible anticipation of ‘the judgment of the great day’. The horror of that judgment is already upon them. If the terror of their coming doom haunts the demons (Matthew 8:28,29), how much more must it haunt these former sons of light, chained already in darkness and doomed to endure ‘the blackness of darkness forever’ (John Phillips, *Exploring the Epistle of Jude*, page 38).”

6j “If sin could drag an angel from the skies, it may well pluck a minister from the pulpit, a deacon from the communion table, a church-member out of the midst of his brethren. It is only perseverance in holiness which is the token of eternal salvation; if we forsake the Lord, and turn back to our former evil ways, it will be the evidence that we never really believed in Christ, and that there was no true work of grace in our hearts (Charles Spurgeon).”

6. An Example of Sodom and Gomorrah 7

7 Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner,^{a-b} giving themselves over to fornication,^{c-aorist active participle} and going^{aorist active participle} after strange flesh,^d are set forth for^{present middle/passive} an example, suffering^{present active participle} the vengeance of eternal fire.^e

7a The suburbs and neighboring areas surrounding these cities were also destroyed, not just the cities. The other cities are Adamah and Zeboim (Deuteronomy 29:23 and Hosea 11:8). Zoar was spared because that is where Lot fled to. The sin of Sodom and Gomorrah had infected the countryside and their inhabitants. Archaeologists believe this area is today under the southern extension of the Dead Sea. Underwater archaeological exploration may reveal the remains of these once proud and great cities. This very desolate area is a vivid example of the total judgment of God and what awaits this world in the tribulation period.

We also see that Jude considered their overthrow a historical event and treats it as such. Jude does not doubt the historical account of the destruction of the cities of the plain in Genesis 19.

Jude points us to it as an example when men fall away and apostatize God judges angels who are guilty of this sin and men cannot escape a similar judgment for similar sins.

7b In like manner to the angels of verse 6 The sin of Sodom and Gomorrah was fornication and going after strange flesh. "In like manner" is a reference to the angels who sinned. This helps us to confirm that the angelic sin spoken of in Jude 6 and 2 Peter 2:4 is sexual, in attempting to invade the human race in an attempt to corrupt it through fornication with human women, so that the promised seed of Genesis 3:15 could not be born. The sin of Sodom and the fallen angels is one and the same. We do not accuse the angels of homosexuality, which was the sin of Sodom (Genesis 19:5) but both went after "strange flesh" or flesh that was not lawful for them to pursue- the Sodomites in homosexuality and the angels in human female flesh. Something very perverted was going on, both in the cities of the plains and among the fallen angels in the days before the Flood.

7c Strong's #1608 ekporneuô; from ek (Strong's #1537) out of; and porneuô (Strong's #4203) commit fornication; to go a whoring, "give one's self over to fornication". Used only here in the New Testament.

The Geneva Bible has "committed fornication" but the Authorized Version is stronger here, in that they simply did not "commit" fornication but they gave themselves over to it, wholly. Most modern versions will remove "fornication" and replace it with something like "sexual immorality". Technically, that may be correct, but we wonder what the modern versions have against "fornication"? Why change that reading, when just about everyone today knows what it means, seeing it is so common?

7d The ESV weakens this to merely "sexual immorality and unnatural desire". The King James and other translations are much stronger with the "strange flesh" and this informs you that their sins were of a perverted sexual nature. Something was not right and was very unnatural in their sexual sins.

7e The Bishop's Bible has "pain of eternal fire", denoting the suffering, while the King James and the other traditional text translations stress more the judgment behind this suffering by using "vengeance".

7. Filthy Dreamers 8

8 Likewise also these *filthy*^a dreamers^{b-c-present middle/passive participle} defile^{d-present} the flesh, despise^{e-present} dominion,^f and speak evil^{g-present} of dignities.^{h-i}

8a Missing in every version, except the King James. The Geneva Bible has "sleepers" where the Tyndale and Coverdale Bibles have "dreamers". The Bishop's Bible has them "deceived by dreams". All modern versions also do not have "filthy". "Filthy" is not in any Greek text, which is why the word is in italics in the King James text. The Authorized Version translators added "filthy" as a commentary regarding the moral character of these apostates, and the description fits. They are not simply dreamers but morally and spiritually filthy dreamers.

The Greek word (see below) includes the idea "to be beguiled with sensual images and carried away to an impious course of conduct", or morally defiled. We may expect them to be guilty of some rather gross sexual sins to go along with their apostasy. This is also seen in their relation, by context, to the sins of Sodom and Gomorrah.

"Our translators, by rendering ενυπνιαζομενοι *filthy dreamers*, seem to have understood St. Jude to mean...self-pollution, with all its train of curses and cursed effects on body, soul, and spirit. The *idea* of our translators seems to be confirmed by the words σαρκαμενμιαινουσι, *they indeed pollute the flesh*. See what is said at the conclusion of the thirty-eighth chapter of Genesis (Adam Clarke)."

So why did the Authorized Version add "filthy" when no other version, not even the related versions of the Tyndale, Coverdale, Bishops and Geneva Bibles, did? We will never know for certain, as the translators did not leave us many of the translation notes. It may be that with the extra scholarship of the Authorized Version translators (who translated after these other Bibles) gave the Authorized Version translators extra insight into the fuller meaning of ενυπνιαζομενοι that the earlier translators did not have. It was their commentary on just what ενυπνιαζομενοι meant.

We (unfortunately) do not have the translators notes as to why they inserted "**filthy**" into the text, but, as always, they were honest enough to let you know when they were adding words to the text by printing them in an italic font. They may have inserted "**filthy**" as a commentary on the moral quality of these "**dreamers**" since the context (from verse 7) were the filthy

Sodomites! These dreamers were as morally filthy as the residents of Sodom, Gomorrah and the cities of the plains. They may have even been the same group of people that Jude was talking about.

But before anyone complains about the Authorized Version translators adding words to the text, we would point out that it is almost a necessity to add words to the English text in order to smooth out the readings. Every English translation does it, including the modern versions, which are forever adding and removing words from the text. But when the Authorized Version translators did it, they were honest to tell you where they did it by putting the additional words into italic. You do not see that in the ESV, NIV, NASV or any modern version. That is because the translators of the Authorized Version were honest while the modern translators are not. Just look at what the ESV does in Jude 12 by adding “shepherds” to the text. It might be included in the Greek definition (just as “filthy might fit into the Greek definition in Jude 8), but “shepherd” is not in the text. But the ESV made no notation that they added the word, like the Authorized Version translators did in verse 8.

8b **"filthy dreamers"** This is another title for apostates because their imaginations are filthy and defiled. Since they are fallen, their minds have not been renewed nor regenerated by the Holy Spirit through the new birth. Matters that are pure and holy are foreign to them. Their thoughts do not center about the truth or about pleasing and honoring God. Instead, their imaginations and thoughts are consumed with making a dollar, with feeding their own belly, with searing their conscience, with snaring more victims into their web of deceit. Such thoughts are indeed filthy because they are selfish, carnal and devilish instead of godly. Thoughts that are not godly must be classified as filthy because there is no neutrality anywhere in God's universe. Our thoughts are either for God or against Him, either godly or filthy. Their doctrines, motivations and practices are filthy because they are anti-God.

God does speak in dreams (Genesis 20:3,6; 31:10,11,24; Daniel 2,4; Matthew 1:20; 2:12, *et al*) so we would expect false prophets to claim this as a vehicle for their error.

False prophets and Charismatics are forever claiming to receive "dreams" and "visions" from God. and try to lure God's people away from the truth on the basis of these dreams, as in Numbers 12 and Deuteronomy 13. The penalty for such “filthy dreaming” was death (Deuteronomy 13:5).

The Bishop's Bible does not use **"filthy"** but has “deceived by dreams”. The ESV just has “people also, relying on their dreams”, with no mention about them being **"filthy."** The other translations also omit the “filthy” and the Authorized Version is the only translation that attaches this adjective to these dreamers, although it is in italics, showing the word is not there but was added by the translators to smooth out or round out the reading. The Geneva Bible has “sleepers”.

Strong's #1797 *enupniazomai*; to dream, to be beguiled with sensual images and carried away to an impious course of conduct.

8c These filthy dreamers sue guilty of three sins, as we have another of Jude's “trinities”:

1. **They defile the flesh.** They are very fleshly minded and carnal. They not only defile their spirits and souls but they go all the way and drag their flesh down as well.

2. **They despise dominion.** A false prophet respects and honors no one but himself. He wouldn't be caught dead citing other writers in his literature, believing that he is the fount of all Christian knowledge and that God speaks only through him. This lack of respect extends all the way to heaven, as he will not honor or glorify God.

3. **They speak evil of dignities.** This is related to the despising dominion. Their lack of respect for others and for God results in speaking against them as well.

8d Immorality is a part of their message. False prophets are seldom clean morally. They oftentimes will use their doctrines as an excuse for immorality. They live like the devil since they are not saved and do not have the Holy Spirit indwelling them, so they must find some scripture or some teaching that will justify their sin.

"The Nicolaitines taught community of wives and that it was an indifferent thing to commit adultery. The Gnostics gave themselves up to all manner of prodigious and incestuous pollutions; whence, from their obscenity and beastly life, they were called 'Borborites' (Thomas Manton, *Commentary on Jude*, page 230)".

"defile" Strong's #3392 miainô; to dye with another color, to stain, to defile, pollute, sully, contaminate, soil, to defile with sins.

8e They have enthroned themselves as god, enshrined their own philosophy and doctrine above the truth of God, and hence they deeply resent any and all authority which would try to reign in their extremes of orthodoxy and orthopraxy. They will accept no authorities over them (not even God!), nor any restraints over their activities. These people usually can name no great theologian or divine from church history who is good enough to suit them as guide or a check on their beliefs and practices for they respect no one. Everyone is wrong and they alone are right. They recommend no one except themselves and no writings except their own. Beware of such men! They are not only rebels against the authority of man but also against God,

Their rebellion also affects society in general for they also despise political authority, which is ordained by God (Romans 13:1) and the magistrate, who is the minister of God (Romans 13:4). The Arians of the 4th century were great disrupters of society, even threatening civil war by their heresies. Their children, the Jehovah Witness cult, are similar trouble-makers today.

"despise" Strong's #114 atheteô; from a (Strong's #1) a negative particle; and tithêmi (Strong's #5087) to set in place; to do away with, to set aside, disregard, to thwart the efficacy of anything, nullify, make void, frustrate, to reject, to refuse, to slight

8f **"dominion"** Strong's #2963 kuriotês; dominion, power, lordship, government. The Geneva Bible has this as "government".

8g **"speak evil"** or blaspheme, which is the word here. Blasphemy is a specialty of theirs. If they are so bold as to rebel against God Himself in word in practice, then they would have absolutely no hesitancy to speak against the authority they are in rebellion against.

Strong's #987 blasphêmeô; to speak reproachfully, rail at, revile, blaspheme, to be evil spoken of, reviled, railed at

8h The Greek for **"dignities"** is the same word as for "glory", doxa. The officers of the church are called doxa, the "glory of Christ" in 2 Corinthians 8:23. It could also have a reference to angelic authorities. These spiritual leaders are the glory of Christ as displayed and manifested on earth in context of the local churches. False teachers will never hesitate to attack a pastor or elders in a church in order to damage their authority and ministry so that they may take advantage of it, and even "steal" that church away for their own use and benefit.

The Geneva and Bishops Bible renders this as "them that are in authority". The ESV has "glorious ones".

8i "So the Papists do familiarly those princes they count heretics, as Henry IV of France, whom they called Huguenot Dog, &c. Our Edward VI, bastard. Of Queen Elizabeth they reported in print some years after her death, that she died without sense or feeling of God's mercies. (John Trappe)

8. How to Handle the Devil 9

9 Yet Michael the archangel,^{a-b} when contending^{present middle/passive participle} with the devil he disputed^{imperfect} about the body of Moses,^c durst^{aorist-d} not bring against him^{aorist infinitive} a railing^e accusation,^f but said,^{aorist infinitive} The Lord rebuke^{optative} thee.^{g-h-i}

9a Michael is the chief angel, the highest-ranking angel in the angelic hosts. The Book of Enoch lists seven archangels but the Bible only identifies one. We are not considering cherubim or seraphim here, as they are totally different types of heavenly beings. We have no reason to refer to cherubim and seraphim as angels. Nor is there any reason to try to identify Michael with Christ, as Jehovah Witnesses try to do. They are distinct and separate. If they were the same, then why is Michael telling Satan that the Lord will rebuke him if Michael is Christ? If Michael were Jesus and thus was God, then why couldn't Michael rebuke Satan, seeing that he was God? This is because Michael is not divine but angelic and thus will not rebuke Satan.

9b Biblical material on Michael the Archangel:

1. He is called one of the chief princes, suggesting there are other archangels- Daniel 10:13.
2. Michael is called the prince of Israel, probably the angel delegated a special responsibility regarding the wellbeing and protection of the nation of Israel. There would seem to be a fallen angel with similar, national responsibilities. This suggests that each nation may have a "guardian angel" assigned to it, as well as a fallen angel- Daniel 10:21.
3. He is called a great prince who stands for the people of Israel- Daniel 12:1.
4. He also appears in Revelation 12:7, fighting against Satan and his angels in heaven and winning.

He is NOT the pre-incarnate Christ! Jehovah Witness teach this heresy and even the commentator Matthew Poole toyed with the idea by giving that position some serious thought in his commentary. Jesus is not Michael and there is absolutely no Scriptural reason for anyone to try to equate the two, as they quite separate and distinct persons.

9c Not the soul, but the body of Moses. Satan had no jurisdiction over the redeemed soul of Moses, for that was safe with God after his death. Satan did make a play for the body. Since Satan had the power of death before the death of Christ, Satan could have had a claim on the body of Moses. But God, who has more power and authority than Satan, overruled. We are not told when this took place but we suspect sometime not too long after Deuteronomy 34, when Moses died and God buried him in that secret place. There was no "assumption of Moses" for his body was buried God did it Himself. No man knows where Moses was buried (Deuteronomy 34:6) but Satan probably knew and he wanted the body We are not told why Satan wanted it (or contended over it) but we may speculate that Satan might have wanted to use the body to corrupt Israel. If Satan could produce the body of Moses, he could use it as an object of idolatry. The serpent on the pole was a perfect example of how something ordained by God and used by God could be twisted into a form of idolatry (2 Kings 18:4). If Satan could have brought out the body of the most loved figure in Jewish history (after Abraham), what a field day he would have had with it! The man who lashed out against idolatry to be turned into an idol himself! Satan could have even claimed to have resurrected Moses, thus claiming to be more powerful than God. Who knows for certain? But God allowed none of it and sent Michael to guard the body from Satan, and to deny it to him. God desired an honorable burial for His servant and was not about to allow Satan to defile the event. And I take this to be a historical event, not to be interpreted symbolically,

One possibility for this confrontation was that since Moses was going to return as one of the Two Witnesses in the tribulation, Satan may have tried his feeble best to stop that by stealing Moses' body. This would have involved a resurrection of Moses' body (Elijah's body was in heaven, so that was never an issue or a point of contention). If Satan could have prevented that, he may have thrown a monkey wrench into God's plans to have Moses return, bodily, in the tribulation.

9d Dare not.

9e **"railing"** Strong's #988 blasphemia; slander, detraction, speech injurious, to another's good name, impious and reproachful speech injurious to divine majesty. It is blasphemy but with an irrational twist. Think of some rabid, irrational atheist screaming in your face that there is no God, or some tree-hugging, man-hating feminist doing the same thing and you'll see the mind-set of a "railer".

9f The Geneva Bible has this as "durst not blame him with cursed speaking". The Authorized Version reading is much better here. The ESV has "blasphemous judgment". What? Blaspheme the devil? What's wrong with that? It wasn't that Micheal was forbidden to "blaspheme" Satan, he would not "rebuke" him. But with that totally incorrect reading, is the ESV trying to generate a little "sympathy for the devil?"

9g Even Michael the Archangel would not rebuke the devil. Satan is more powerful than any angel, including Michael. Instead, Michael simply says "The Lord rebuke thee". If no angel, nor Michael, feels it within his authority to rebuke Satan, then what makes us think that we, fallen, puny man, may? Railing accusations do not belong in the mouths of Christians. Even Jesus, the Son of God, while on earth as the Son of Man, did not rebuke Satan during His three temptations, but He did as Michael did- they both turned Satan over to the Father for a good and proper "rebuking". "The God of peace will not be served with a wrathful spirit, and Christ's warfare needeth no carnal weapons (Thomas Manton, *Commentary on Jude*, page 259)".

Is this not a frequent Charismatic practice, rebuking the devil? They do it frequently. On what authority do they imagine themselves to possess to rebuke Satan? We are told to resist the devil in James 4:7 but nowhere are we commanded to rebuke him. Instead, we simply turn Satan over to the Lord and say "The Lord rebuke thee, Satan". Charismatics are guilty of gross presumption when they claim to "rebuke the devil" for they can do no such thing. We need to respect the power of the devil but we must also rest assured in the fact that Christ is more powerful than Satan and that we can overcome Satan only by the blood of the Lamb (Revelation 12:11), not by our puny "rebukes", which Satan probably just laughs at.

Also see Zechariah 3:2 where "the angel of Lord" would only rebuke Satan by the name of "the Lord" and not by His own name or any other name, only by the name of the Lord Himself.

9h "Do you see why neither Michael nor God's SON could deal with the devil in a 'face off'? The key was in the book of Job (10:2-5, where Job speaks for Satan.)

The preincarnate Word did not 'take Satan on' man-to-man, person to person, till He **'was manifest in the flesh'**. Once He had **eyes of flesh** (Job 10:2-5) that **see as a man seeth** (Job 10:2-5), not as a member of the Godhead, He was tempted in all points **'like as WE are'** (Hebrews 4:11,13- MEN), not as a sinless member of the Trinity.

It was as a MAN- *which He was not before Matthew 1-* that Jesus Christ whipped the Devil (Colossians 2) *on his own grounds* (Luke 4), for the Devil was **'the god of this world'** (2 Corinthians 4:4). Jesus whipped him, challenged him (Isaiah 50:7,9), and called him into close quarters for hand-to-hand combat (Isaiah 50:5,6). He took the devil's 'best shot' (Calvary;

Colossians 2:14,15) and won the bout by a 'K.O.' (John 14:30) as a *Man*, not as the God of Zechariah 3:1,2.

This is what is behind Michael's refusal to rebuke the Devil. He couldn't have. Only God, as a HUMAN MAN could do it, but there was only *one HUMAN MAN* who ever showed up who *could* do it. He did it, but not in the Old Testament (Peter Ruckman, *The Book of the General Epistles*, volume 2, page 267,268)."

9i We are not going to bother ourselves trying to figure out if Jude quoted from any hypothetical *Assumption of Moses* or not. Jude, writing under divine inspiration, could have very well have gotten the information regarding the confrontation over the body of Moses directly from the Holy Spirit. Or it may have been "common knowledge" in Jude's day. Or he may have gotten it from something styling itself as the *Assumption of Moses*. It makes no real difference as to the source of this account, as it is just as accurate, not matter where Jude got it.

9. A Description of Apostates 10-13,16

10 But these speak evil^{a-present} of those things which they know^{b-present} not:^c but what they know^{b-present middle} naturally, as brute beasts,^{d-e} in those things they corrupt^f themselves.^{present middle}

10a "**speak evil**" Compare 2 Peter 2:10,11. They will blaspheme any and everyone, including God, since there is no fear of God in their eyes and because they are rebels against the word and law of God.

10b "**know**"..."**know**" Same English word in this verse but two different Greek words:

1 First "**know**"- Strong's #1492 *eidô*; to see, to perceive with the eyes, notice, discern, discover, to pay attention, observe, to inspect, examine, to know, get knowledge of, understand, perceive, to know how, to be skilled in.

2 Second "**know**"- Strong's #1987 *epistamai*; to put one's attention on, fix one's thoughts on, to turn one's self or one's mind to, put one's thought upon a thing

10c Ignorance breeds a blasphemous and railing tongue in false teachers. They can't understand certain doctrines so they lash out at them. If they can't understand it, they assume it to be wrong. Many men, even of the more orthodox sort, react like this to truth. Take a "controversial" doctrine, like the "sons of God" in Genesis 6 or why the Authorized Version is the preserved Word of God in English. Many men cannot wrap their brains around the facts and arguments supporting these teachings, so they will generally attack both the doctrine and those who support them by calling them "cultists" or something similar.

They also have the idea that if they see something in the Scripture (in an Authorized Version) that they cannot understand, then it must automatically be a mistranslation. After all, they have a Th.D. or a Ph.D. in theology! They are smart, refined, cultured and educated! They must be able to understand everything they read! If they cannot, they will not confess or admit their own ignorance but rather blame the Authorized Version translators of "mistranslating" or making a poor word selection. It's their fault! They should have done a better job! But the issue is with them. Since they will not submit themselves to the absolute authority of the Scripture, God will give them no light beyond what their own intellect and human scholarship will allow them to figure out. The men who have had very unusual insights to Scriptures are the men who never relied upon their own education or understanding to interpret what God said, but they asked the Holy Spirit for illumination and relied totally upon Him. False teachers and apostates would never stoop so low.

Generally it is so that those who revile Scripture are usually persons who have not read the Bible; they “speak evil of those things, which they know not.

10d They are as stupid and as stubborn as a beast. You might as well try to argue with a brick wall than as to talk to them or to try to convince them of their errors. They are totally unreasonable and will not listen to any reason or argument designed to turn them from their error to the truth. They think they are right and every other Christian on earth is wrong. Proverbs 26:16 certainly applies to them as they imagine themselves wiser than seven men that can render a reason. And since they will not listen to man, they certainly will not listen to God as He pleads with them. This is the same condemnation Peter announces upon them in 2 Peter 2:12. Peter says that these false prophets are stupid, stubborn, and brutish in their conduct and reasoning, void of reason and understanding. They act little better than animals instead of redeemed men. Sin, rebellion and apostasy does this to the thinking process of a man. Reject the truth of God and God will mess up your mind so that you will not be able to think straight. In this condition, you will say and do the stupidest and most outlandish things that a man who is right with God would never allow himself to be guilty of. You will end up thinking and behaving like a stupid animal. Men are not to act as beasts but sinners do. They are a little lower than angels, created in the image and likeness of God. But apostates are beasts. See how sin degrades? Sin robs man of his glory and god-likeness and transforms him to the spiritual level of an animal. They act like animals, sin like animals and have about as much spiritual discernment as an animal. And since these false teachers are not saved, they cannot understand spiritual truth, no matter how high their IQ may be or how many degrees they may have.

The ESV has “unreasoning animals” but the Authorized Version is much stronger and forceful.

10e The other translations all give the idea that they are “unreasoning” beasts, or stupid beasts.

10f "corrupt". Not only do they corrupt others with their errors but they corrupt themselves more. Peter says in 2 Peter 2:12 and 19 that they will perish in their own corruption, a judgment of their own making. A man cannot corrupt others unless he is first corrupt himself. A pure man could not corrupt others just as a corrupt man could not purify others. Every time they speak their errors they corrupt their hearers because error always corrupts. As pornography corrupts the mind through the eye gate and worldly music via the ear gate, false doctrine corrupts through the gate of reason and understanding. Not only the doctrine but also their false orthopraxy corrupts all those who witness it. If a false teacher is outwardly and unapologetically immoral, how will that affect his followers?

11 Woe unto them!^{a-b} for they have gone ^{aorist passive} in the way of Cain,^{c-d} and ran greedily after^{e-aorist passive} the error of Balaam^f for reward, and perished^{aorist middle} in the gainsaying⁴⁸⁵⁻⁹ of Core.^{h-i}

11a A woe is pronounced unto them and for good reason! They are apostate, corrupted, corrupting, rebellious, proud, arrogant and under condemnation. Nothing good can be said concerning them. All that can be said on their behalf is "woe!"

11b “Now Peter is particularly occupied with wicked teachers — men that privily brought in, what he calls, "heresies," or sects. The word "heresy" in scripture means "a sect." It never means heterodoxy, as we use the word in its modern sense. That is not the scriptural sense at all. No doubt in the sect there might be heterodoxy, and there might be a sect without

heterodoxies, or there might be one with a great deal of heterodoxy. So that "sect" admits of all kinds, or shades, of evil and error; but Peter is looking particularly at false teachers, and these false teachers covetous men; greed of gain is one marked feature which he specifies. Well now, where could you get an Old Testament example of greed so marked as Balaam? Consequently, we find Balaam in Peter, just where it should be. It falls in entirely with his purport, and with that Second Epistle and second chapter.

But here, Jude, in this very much shorter Epistle — and far more compact, far more compressed, and far more vehement — writes as in a tempest of hatred of all these bad men. Indeed, I do not know stronger language. Some do not like strong language. But that should entirely depend upon how it is used. Strong language against what is good is infamous, but against what is bad is thoroughly right; and I do not know stronger language anywhere than in this very Epistle of Jude in which he speaks out against railing. But strong language and railing are not the same thing. Railing is abuse of what is good; but here we have the pithiest, the most vehement, and most cutting exposure of what is evil; and instead of this being a thing to regret, it is a thing that we ought to feel and go along with heartily. But I know it does not suit the present age. The present age is an age for trying to think that there is nothing so good but what there is bad in it, and nothing so bad but what there is good in it. The consequence is that all moral power is at a deadlock, and people have no real, burning love for what is good — only a calm, quiet, lukewarm state. They are neither strong for good nor strong against evil; and that is a state which, I believe, the Lord hates — at any rate, it does not agree with either Peter or Jude. (William Kelly, *Lectures on Jude*)."

11c Cain (the murderer and apostate), Balaam (the greedy man) and Korah (the rebel) quite a triple presentation of Old Testament evil. This is another one of Jude's "trinities".

11d "**way of Cain**" Cain was a murderer who was of that wicked one (1 John 3:12). Cain is the example of a wicked man, a child of Satan, who hated his brother and did not do righteousness. Cain was a follower of Satan who not only murdered his brother but probably was the human father of evil and apostasy. He was the arch-typical sinner and instructor in sin. His love toward God was weak and imperfect and it led him to fall away from the truth and commands of God and follow unrighteousness. He slew his brother over anger and jealousy because Abel's works were righteous and his own were wicked. He slew Abel and the word used in 1 John 3:12 signified a violent death, as in slitting the throat of an animal sacrifice. Cain killed Abel by slicing his throat. Was this in response to Abel's method of killing the lamb that he used in his sacrifice? Abel killed his sacrifice by cutting its throat so Cain did the same thing to Abel in his hatred and jealousy. And wherefore slew he him? Because his own works were evil, and his brother's were righteous. Jealousy is certainly a factor, since Abel was righteous and was accepted by God while Cain's offering was rejected. This rejection by God of Cain's offering was bad enough to hurt Cain's ego, but to see God accept his younger brother over him and instead of him was just too much for Cain to take, so he murdered his brother out of both jealousy and hatred. Cain had his ego hurt and an innocent man died as a result.

False teachers are no better for they are soul-murderers. They hate the righteous because they are a constant rebuke to them since they know that the works of the righteous are righteous and are accepted by God while their works are wicked and rejected of God. This anger and frustrations are fueled by jealousy. They would kill the righteous if they could get away with it. Barring that, they are content simply to spiritually murder the unfortunate souls who choose to follow them and their teachings. Cain then is not only presented as the first murderer but is typical of all such sinners.

11e "**ran greedily after**" Compare 2 Peter 2:15. Imagine a herd of pigs making a mad dash toward the feeding trough and you will get an example of how these apostates run greedily

toward any promise of financial reward they can make from their errors. Excess and throwing themselves upon their lusts were their watchwords.

Strong's #1632 ekcheô or ekchunô; from ek (Strong's #1537) out of, and cheô; to pour out, shed forth, to bestow or distribute largely. The eagerness with which they run for the reward of their errors is like pouring water down a steep hill.

11f What is the **error of Balaam**? Balaam was a prophet for hire, who would have cursed God's people if God had let him. Balaam rented himself out to the highest bidder as a prophet for hire. As he loved the wages of unrighteousness, so do they. Imagine, being willing to curse God's people for a dollar! But since he could not curse God's people, he did the next best thing, as he told Barak how to get them to curse themselves, by engaging in sexual practices with the women of Midian (Numbers 31:8. why was he among the Midianites? Was he a Midianite- Numbers 22:4,7?). It's the money that causes false prophets to go out of the way. If apostasy and teaching error wasn't so profitable, not as many people would be doing it. This is why fewer people teach truth- it simply doesn't pay as well. But God does pay wages of righteousness. Why not enter God's employ? God does not pay right away, in this life. You have to wait for full and final payment for God, which you will receive at the judgment seat. But Satan gives the good wine first, in this world. He will allow you to spend your wages now in fulfilling the lusts of the flesh. God has you wait until heaven for your payday. Many are simply too impatient to wait for God's payday. They want it now and want it all, like the Prodigal Son of Luke 15. So they sell out on the altar of the immediate.

Peter uses the phrase "**way of Balaam**" in 2 Peter 2:15. The "way" and "error" lead to the same dead end- the love of money. The "way" of Balaam is a road that leads you to compromise and treachery, all for love of a dollar. This is the sin of the Charismatic television evangelists, like Benny Hinn, Joel Osteen, Joyce Meyer, Kenneth Copeland, Oral Roberts and the lot. I once heard O. Talmadge Spence, who knew Oral Roberts personally back in the 1940s and 1950s tell the story of the night when his father finally broke fellowship with Roberts once and for all. When Roberts began claiming to hear audible voices from God and blather on about the power to heal in his right hand, Spence's father (H. T. Spence) threw Roberts out of his house. As Roberts left, he replied "Hubert, you are never going to be anything but a little preacher. And I'm not working for pennies anymore". And Roberts didn't. He built a great empire and a great "Christian University" because he followed the way of Balaam, which was "follow the money" by preaching error.

Of course, Charismatics are not the only ones guilty of this. We do not know the motivations of the hearts of anyone, but we wonder the motivation and the methods used by the "big" fundamentalist schools, like Bob Jones University, Pensacola Christian College, Liberty University and Hyles Anderson College, in building their facilities and their empires. Could it have been accomplished solely by preaching and following the truth, without any compromise whatsoever? Is that possible?

So the differences between the **way** of Balaam and the **error** of Balaam are:

WAY- following after the money

ERROR- is where Balaam told Balak how to get the children of Israel to corrupt themselves in Numbers 25- mingle with the Midianites and turn the women loose on Israel!

The Geneva Bible reads "and are cast away by the deceit of Balaam's wages", which just isn't very clear.

11g The Tyndale and Matthews Bibles have "treason" instead of "gainsaying".

"gainsaying" is a literal translation, being compounded of the Anglo-Saxon 'gegn', which reappears in the German 'gegen', meaning against, and say. To "gainsay" is to speak against, contradict, oppose, hinder. Strong's # 485 antilogia; gainsaying, contradiction, opposition, rebellion, to speak against or contrary to.

11h "Core" This is the Korah of Numbers 16. "Core" is the Greek version of his name. His sin was pride and rebellion, like Diotrephes of 3 John 9, who wanted the pre-eminence.. He invaded the office of the priesthood without a call or a warrant from God. Korah reasoned "Who did Moses think he was to take all the honor to himself' unless Moses wanted to make himself king (Numbers 16:13)?" Korah then anointed himself against the anointed of the Lord and volunteered to become a prince in Israel. But it was all pride and not concern for the welfare of Moses or the nation as a whole. It was rebellion against the ordained order of God (Romans 13:1,2). As Korah rebelled and perished in going down alive into the pit (Numbers 16:33) so shall these false prophets also perish in the pit. Korah's judgment shall be theirs and their names shall stink as does his.

11i Another one of Jude's "trinitities", in three historical examples of sins that brought judgment:

1. The way of Cain
2. The error of Balaam
3. The gainsaying of Korah

12^a These are ^{present} spots^{b-c} in your feasts of charity,^d when they feast ^{present middle/passive} with you, feeding^{present active participle} themselves without fear:^e clouds they are without water,^f carried about ^{present passive participle} of winds;^g trees whose fruit withereth,^h without fruit, twice dead,^{i-aorist active participle} plucked up by the roots;^{j-aorist passive participle}

12a More descriptions of false teachers in 12,13:

1. They are spots.
2. They are dry clouds
3. They are trees without fruit
4. They are raging waves of the sea
5. They are wandering stars

12b The "**spot**" here is a slightly different word than the "spot" in 2 Peter 2:13, which here is Strong's #4696 spilos, a stain or blemish, defect, disgrace, spot (also used in Jude 23). Peter speaks of a passive spot while Jude looks at it in a more active sense.

The Bible has a lot to say about "spots":

1. Leprosy is associated with spots, and leprosy is a type of sin- Leviticus 13. How interesting that the most comprehensive chapter dealing with leprosy is in Leviticus chapter 13. That is no accident!
2. Leprosy can appear as a "bright spot" or white. Sin can appear to be "bright", desirable, fun, even profitable, but it is still a fatal disease. Leviticus 13:2,4,19,24
3. The spot of leprosy appears on the skin- Leviticus 13:2,4
4. The spot of leprosy can also appear reddish. This red color is more typical of sin, when one considers the old phrase about "scarlet sins". In these cases, sin appears in its more natural state, sin appearing as sin. Leviticus 13:19,24
5. When the spots appeared, the infected person had to present himself to the priest for examination. When we have the spots of sin appearing in us, we should also present ourselves to our Great High Priest for an examination! Leviticus 13.
6. A burning is associated with the spots of leprosy. This reminds us that sin will lead the sinner to the burnings of hell if left untreated. Leviticus 13:24.
7. Freckled spots are also mentioned in the examination of leprosy. Leviticus 13:39.

8. The animal used for the red heifer offering had to be without spot. Numbers 19:2
9. The animals used for the burnt offering had to be without spot. Numbers 28:3,9,11,17,26
10. Spots are associated with corruption, and a perverse and crooked generation. Deuteronomy 32:5.
11. Solomon said that the Shulamite had no spot in her. Song 4:7. This is how Christ sees the Christian, as spotless.
12. A leopard cannot change his spots, showing that a man cannot change his sinful nature himself. Jeremiah 12:23.
13. The Church will be presented to Christ, not having any spots. Ephesians 5:27.
14. We should keep the commandments without spot. Spots would be associated with disobedience and rebellion here. 1 Timothy 6:14.
15. Christ offered Himself to the Father without spot. Hebrews 9:14.
16. Christ was as a lamb, without spot. This speaks of His sinlessness. 1 Peter 1:19.
17. False teachers and apostates are spots. 2 Peter 2:13; Jude 12.
18. We should strive that we be found in Him without spot. 2 Peter 3:14.
19. Our garments can be spotted by the flesh (old nature) and we should hate this if it should happen- Jude 23.

12c The Geneva Bible has “rocks” instead of “spots”, as do most modern versions. The other pre-Authorized Version translations use “spots”. The ESV uses “hidden reefs”.

12d These **feasts of charity** were early fellowship meals in local churches. The custom which prevailed in the early church was meetings at fixed times (probably the first day of the week) for a common meal, of which all partook. The bishop or an elder probably presided. Church members supplied the food (the "covered dish" meals in modern churches would be a good example). News concerning other churches would often be announced during these gatherings. It was a prominent feature in the fellowship and social life of the local church until about the 4th century, when church authorities prohibited them. The Lord's Supper may have been observed in conjunction or in addition to these times of feasting, as Paul alludes to in 1 Corinthians 11:20-22. It was during these feasts that rich and poor, master and slave, would eat together in brotherly Christian fellowship, which would have been a powerful witness to the unsaved around them. An offering for the poor would usually be taken up at the end of the feast. Abuses of the feasts of charity caused their prohibition by the end of the 4th century the Council of Nicea (391) and repeated by the Council of Trullo in 692. These false teachers would corrupt even these feasts by their presence and activities while present. They just ruin everything they touch or attend. The feasts also probably were corrupted over the years into the Roman Catholic “mass”.

The Tyndale and Matthews Bibles have “kindness feast” while most other versions have “love feasts”.

12e "**feeding themselves without fear**" They are gluttons, who stuff their face at these feasts of charity without any fear. There was nothing wrong with the feasting in itself; but the sin was in their attitudes while feasting. See examples of this attitude in Numbers 11:33 and Psalm 78:31. They feed their own bellies and fill their own purses but they empty the purses of their hearers and do not feed them good spiritual food. These false teachers “pastor” themselves but no one else. Here is another way you can discern a true teacher from a false one is whether or not he can feed the sheep and fill their spiritual stomachs or if he rather excels in emptying their purses.

The ESV adds that these are “shepherds” who feed themselves in this manner.

“feeding” Strong’s # 4165 *poimainô*; to feed, to tend a flock, keep sheep, to rule, govern, to furnish pasture for food, to cherish one’s body, to serve the body, to supply the requisites for the soul’s need.

12f Compare 2 Peter 2:17. They are dry spiritually as well as disappointing. When you are thirsty and go to a well, you expect the water to be there. But the dry well delivers only disappointment. To an area parched with drought, the clouds promise rain, but these clouds never deliver. They carry the same spiritual disappointment as does the empty well. False prophets also promise great things spiritually but are never able to deliver. This is because they have nothing to deliver in the first place. All their promises are empty. They promise exclusive spiritual knowledge if you follow them or a “sure ticket” to salvation but their followers end up in hell. False teachers promise spiritual riches and prosperity if you send in a generous “seed faith offering” to their “vital last days ministry” but the promised raise or promotion at work never comes and their credit cards never get miraculously paid off. False teachers and apostates will also disappoint their followers because they will never be able to follow through on their promises.

12g They are clouds that are carried with winds. These clouds are the same as the dry well. There should be (spiritual) water here but all that was found was hot air and vanity. There was no substance to them, so they were easily blown about with every wind of doctrine.

Also compare this with 2 Peter 2:17. These clouds are carried about with winds because they have no grounding, either morally or theologically. When the storm of controversy or opposition arises, as it always will, the false prophets will be carried about and swept away with the storm, while the Christian, who is rooted and grounded in the truth, will stand and prevail.

12h They are dead trees that produce no fruit because they have nothing to produce. They are not saved, else they would produce some fruit (John 15). They are not in the vine, they are not among the grafted branches (Romans 11). They look like trees in December- dead, dried with no fruit or leaves.

The Geneva Bible has this as “corrupt trees”.

12i They are twice dead because they are dead externally and internally. There is no spiritual seed in them, nor can they produce any spiritual fruit. Their fruit and foliage are all gone, just like a tree in late November.

The “twice dead” also assumes two deaths- a physical death when the body dies and the second death, forever, in the lake of fire, which is where these apostates are doomed to. The apostate is also spiritually dead since he was born that way, in sin, and he will stay spiritually dead since he has absolutely no interest in ever getting saved. You could say then that he is really dealing with three deaths- spiritual, physical and eternal.

12j They are uprooted because they are cumbering the ground with their apostasy (Luke 13:7) and are worthless.

13 Raging waves of the sea,^a foaming out present active participle their own shame; wandering stars,^b to whom is reserved perfect passive the blackness of darkness for ever.^c

13a Not only are they as unstable as water but they are as turbulent as water and an easy to be disturbed. They are carried about with a tempest, or a storm. As the sea waves are agitated by the winds of the storm, so are the false teachers. This is because they have no grounding, either morally or theologically. Thus when the storm of controversy or opposition arises, as it

always will, the false prophets will be carried about and swept away with the storm, while the Christian, who is rooted and grounded in the truth, will stand and prevail.

Jude may also be speaking of the tempest that is raging in their own hearts due to their conscience. They are wrong and they know it, deep down in their own conscience. Yet they continually fight the witness of their conscience against their sin. They have no inward peace because they are wicked (Isaiah 48:22; 57:20) and they cannot rest because the way of sin and rebellion they have chosen will not allow them rest. The way of the transgressor is hard. Satan continually whips and rides his slaves and never gives them a moment's rest.

13b "wandering star" We get our word "planet" from this, a wandering star that is useless for navigation. We navigate by Polaris, the North Star, because it does not change its position in the night sky. It is a constant fixed point of reference, always where it is supposed to be. But not so with false teachers, who change their position, doctrine and practice on a regular basis. These false teachers have forsaken the right way that God has appointed for them and have wandered off on their own, thus becoming useless and having absolutely no spiritual value for the Christian mariner seeking a trusty star by which to navigate by in his Christian life and ministry.

It is interesting that they are called "stars". The use of "stars" in Scripture is an interesting study:

1. In Joseph's dream, his brothers were referred to as "stars" and Jacob as the sun in Genesis 37:9.
2. Christ is referred to as a "Star out of Jacob" in Numbers 24:17.
3. Stars are not to be worshipped in Deuteronomy 4:19.
4. The "stars" fought against Sisera in Judges 5:20.
5. Angels are referred to as "morning stars" in Job 38:7.
6. Stars, or angels, were cast down in Daniel 8:10, see Revelation 6:13 and 12:4.
7. The Jews, in their idolatry, worshipped the "star" of their god Moloch in Amos 5:26. Stephen refers to this as "Remphan" in Acts 7:43.
8. The star that appeared at the birth of Christ is called "his star" in Matthew 2:2.
9. Heavenly powers are called "stars" and will be shaken in the tribulation- Mark 13:25
10. Christ is the day star that shall arise in our hearts in 2 Peter 1:19.
11. False prophets are called "wandering stars" in Jude 13.
12. Churches are called "stars" in Revelation 1:16,20; 2:1; 3:1.
11. Christ will give overcomers the "morning star" in Revelation 2:28.
12. A "star" fell from heaven and was given the key to the bottomless pit in Revelation 9:1.
13. The woman of Revelation 12:1 had a crown of 12 stars.
14. Christ is the bright and morning star in Revelation 22:16.

Stars are then usually referring to angelic beings, even Satan and his angels, especially before their fall. Isn't it interesting that today, we have a lot of human "stars"? Famous people are called "stars", such as Hollywood stars, Nashville stars, sports stars and political stars. These "stars" also tend to lead people as people will navigate by them, just as the mariner will navigate by the north star. Spiritually speaking, all men are navigating by either heavenly stars or demonic stars. On earth, these human "stars" are also influencing people, usually toward evil. Most Hollywood stars are wicked sinners, influencing people for the worse, especially young people. Music stars are the same way. Few sports stars as good role models. And how many people look toward political stars to guide them and provide them all their need?

13c "blackness of darkness" Compare with 2 Peter 2:4. This is the fate of these apostate angels as well as false teachers. The fallen angels are chained with eternal chains, reserved for their final judgment, which will probably take place at the Great White Throne judgment of

Revelation 20. They are reserved so that they cannot escape their prison or judgment, nor do any more damage to those on earth. They were judged in the past as they were chained and cast down into hell, but their final and "official" judgment is still future. While some of these fallen angels are chained now, their current fate will be the same one to be shared by the false prophets who served their common master, Satan. This darkness is one of the more terrifying aspects of hell, the inability to see anything for eternity, blind forever as one suffers in the fires the damned. If you could see the terror, then you might be able to understand it better and prepare yourself for it. But when you are shrouded in eternal darkness, then you cannot see your situation and that fear only serves to add to the torment. This is why when you hear strange noises in your house at night, the first thing you do is turn on the lights so you can see the danger.

10. The Prophecy of Enoch 14,15

**14 And Enoch^a also, the seventh from Adam,^{b-c} prophesied^{d-aorist} of these, saying,^{present}
active participle **Behold,**^{aorist imperative} **the Lord cometh^{aorist} with ten thousands of his saints,**^{e-f}**

14a "**Enoch**" This is not the son of Cain but of Seth, the man who walked with God and was raptured before the flood in Genesis 5.

14b "**The seventh from Adam**" shows us several things about Enoch:

1. His prophecy was an ancient one. Whether The Book of Enoch that we have today (that is floating around the internet and that you can buy in some stores) accurately preserved his prophecies is open to debate, although that book is not accepted as inspired Scripture.
2. He was the seventh from Adam, in the seventh generation. Seven is that number of deity and perfection. The seventh generation would receive a special word from God.
3. This designation distinguishes this Enoch from the other Enoch, the son of Cain. (Genesis 4:17).
- 4 Enoch was a prophet, the first one the world knew. Enoch was the prophet, Noah the preacher of righteousness.

14c How very interesting that the note in the *ESV Study Bible* calls Jude a liar, when the note reads "**Enoch, the seventh from Adam** does not necessarily imply that Enoch was literally the seventh generation descended from Adam; it may mean simply that he is the seventh one listed in the line of Adam in the Genesis narrative (Genesis 5:18–24; compare with 1 Chronicles 1:3)." But both Jude and Moses (who wrote Genesis) says Enoch was the seventh from Adam, as well as the writer of 1 Chronicles (Jeremiah? Ezra?). Now who are you going to believe- inspired writers of Scripture or uninspired Bible correctors and promoters of corrupt English versions?

14d This prophesy is not recorded in the Bible, but it seems he prophesied of the Lord's coming about 5,000 years ago. Where did he get this prophecy? There is a book called the *1 Enoch* that is not a canonical book. If Jude quoted from it (and I am not certain he did) then at least the part of it that he quoted from is true and accurate and there must have been some useful in it that the Holy Spirit approved of, for Jude to use. We do not believe *1 Enoch* to be divinely inspired, but any truth contained in the book can be used by the Holy Spirit. Jude says that Enoch prophesied this but does not say he wrote it. Enoch was probably one of the non-literary prophets.

It is not unusual for inspired writers to cite non-inspired works. Paul does this in Acts 17:28 and Titus 1:12,13. He also cites an unrecorded saying by the Lord in Acts 20:35 "It is

more blessed to give than to receive" Where did Paul get this quote? Whatever its source, it was accurate. This "prophecy of Enoch" may have been "common knowledge" in his day and Jude could have cited it without referring to any "Book of Enoch". After all, Jude makes no mention of him quoting any written prophecy of Enoch or any book. Jude simply said that Enoch prophesied, but Jude does not say that Enoch wrote this prophecy down for it to be inserted in any Book of Enoch.

The Book of Enoch It was widely known in the early church and some use was made of it. Tertullian went as far as to suggest canonicity for it. Origen and Augustine marked it as apocryphal. The Greek translation, which was known to the fathers, has been lost It was divided into 20 sections, which were further divided into 108 chapters. The book claims to record a series of revelations given to Enoch and Noah. Part 1 contains prophecies regarding the second coming and the judgments. Enoch also gets a tour of heaven as well as hell, much like Dante. Part 2 has three parables regarding the higher secrets of heaven. The third part deals with the motions of the moon and stars and of the seasons. Part 4 is of a dream of Enoch regarding the future history of the kingdoms of the world. The last section records Enoch's last addresses to his children. Jude's quote is from chapter 2, which matches up well with Jude 14,15.

"The book of Enoch makes God come to execute judgment *on His saints*. There is no such doctrine as this in Jude. And the book of Enoch distinguishes particularly executing judgment on them, *the saints*, and destroying the wicked. No such idea as this exists in Jude...It is the positive doctrine of the book of Enoch, "while judgment," it is said, just before, "shall come upon all, *even all the righteous*."

Thus His executing judgment upon them [the preserved] is the specific doctrine of the passage. It certainly is not that of Jude; for he says Enoch prophesied of the reprobate. And, while speaking of executing judgment on all, there is no such a thought as executing judgment on the saints and destroying the wicked. Jude goes on to speak of His convicting the ungodly for their deeds and their words against Him. So that the substantial meaning of the passages is quite different, as one contains what the other does not; and the language is quite diverse too... Jude. The phraseology too in Jude is quite different and very peculiar. I should say, from the language and omissions, that it certainly was not a quotation. (John Nelson Darby, "The Prophecy of Enoch" in his *Collected Works*, volume 6)."

14e Neither premillennialism nor postmillennialism are in view here, neither is the rapture. The simple fact of the second coming of the Lord is mentioned, which shall be fulfilled in Revelation 19. These saints are part of that army of heaven which ride on the white horses that accompany the Lord in Revelation 19:14. But only "ten thousands?" In Biblical days, they did not really have concepts of "millions" and "billions" and "trillions" as we do today, To express huge numbers, they would express it in multiples of thousands. We do not have simply a few ten thousand saints, nor do we have a mere 144,000 Jehovah Witnesses returning with the Lord (as that cult mistakenly insists on), but an uncountable myriad of saints from all ages returning with the Lord at Armageddon.

14f The Tyndale and Geneva Bibles only have "thousands" of his saints. The Authorized Version makes it a greater number. The ESV uses "holy ones" instead of "saints". There is no good reason for that change, for "saint" is not an archaic word. The editors of then ESV seem to think these "holy ones" are angels and not necessarily saints, according to their note in the *ESV Study Bible*. But Jude is clearly referring to saints who went up to heaven seven years earlier in the rapture returning with the Lord and the Second Advent.

15 To execute^{aorist infinitive} judgment upon all,^a and to convince^{b-aorist infinitive} all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed,^{aorist} and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken^{aorist} against him.

15a This shows the purpose of the second coming, what the Lord will accomplish at His advent:

1. To execute judgment upon all of these ungodly men.
2. To convince them of their ungodly deeds and speeches. There are lots of “ungodly’s” in this verse! No doubt they will try to justify themselves right up to the very end, but the second coming and the glory of the Lord will be more than enough to convince them of their great errors and sins. Only the Lord can do that, as the arguments of their fellow men usually have no impact upon them. Have you ever tried to convince a Jehovah Witness to leave his Kingdom Hall? But once they see the Lord coming in power and great glory, with the armies of heaven behind Him (Revelation 19), all doubts and debates will cease!

15b The Bishops Bible has “rebuke”. The ESV has “convict” but that is not as good as “convince”. You can convict a criminal in a court of law yet he can still maintain his innocence and may still refuse to admit he did anything wrong. But when you “convict” a criminal, he will stop trying to justify himself. Of course, all sinners are “convicted” but few are really “convinced” of their sin and they will not be until they see the Lord at the second coming.

9. A Description of Apostates 10-13,16, Part 2

16^a These are^{present} murmurers,^{b-c} complainers,^d walking^{present middle/passive participle} after their own lusts;^e and their mouth speaketh^{present} great swelling words,^f having men’s persons in admiration^{present active participle} because of advantage.^g

16a Verse 16 resumes the analysis and condemnation of apostates, from verse 13.

16b "**murmurers**" What whiners and complainers they are, never thankful for the good things that God has done for them! They always accuse God, must as their father, the devil does (John 8:44). They accuse God of unrighteousness and folly, just as their father, the devil, does. They are ignorant of the gracious hand of God on them and refuse to acknowledge or even realize His blessings upon them which they do not deserve. Murmurers refers to their complaints against God while complainers deals with their own lot and situation in life. This reminds us of the constant murmuring of the Jews during their wilderness wanderings, and we see how tired God got with that attitude! The ESV uses “grumblers”.

"Man is a foolish creature; what doth he get by complaining of' God? Who shall right us? Before what tribunal will you put him in suit? It is like spitting against the wind, the drivel is returned upon our own heads (Thomas Manton, *Commentary on Jude*, page 304)."

Thomas Manton (pages 302-303 in that same commentary) then lists the causes of murmuring:

1. **Pride and self-love.** When men are conceited of themselves, they storm that others are preferred before them. A proud man must needs be discontented, because he sets a high price upon himself.
2. **Impatience.** We cannot endure the least inconvenience. An unsubmission of will to God will inevitably put us upon repining.
3. **Presumption of merit.** Men ascribe to themselves when they prescribe to God what he shall do for them, or how bless them.

4. **Carnal affection.** We are too ravenous and greedy upon outward things, and therefore the disappointment breedeth the more vexation. God giveth sufficiently to satisfy our necessities, and we seek to supply our lusts. Lust is more given to murmuring than necessity.

5. **Unbelief and distrust** (Psalm 106:24,25). Men quarrel with God's providence because they do not believe his promises.

Yet there are some things worth murmuring about that do not lead to sin. We can murmur about the increasing sin of our day, the strength of this world system, the coldness and carnality in our churches, apostates and their hellish ministries and the great damage they do in the churches, slob culture, lack of true Biblical scholarship, unbiblical hyper-evangelism, the Charismatic clowns of our day, and so on. All these diseases are with us today and we may indeed murmur about them to the Lord as long as we do not charge God foolishly regarding them. We do well to be angry at the world, the flesh and the devil, but without sin.

16c Strong's #1113 goggustês, a murmurer, one who discontentedly complains (against God). Used only here in the New Testament.

16d "**complainers**" This is the same basic idea as above but only stronger. The murmurer usually complains privately, under his breath. The complainer is much more vocal. The ESV has "malcontents"

They will complain about everything, including God, claiming that He is not fair or that He has not given you what you deserve in life. They will complain about the "hand you were dealt" or anything else, except bless God and submit to His will. This attitude will foster resentment toward God and orthodox Christianity, thus making it easier for false prophets to exploit that discontent and win new converts. It goes something like "Why are you poor and sick all the time?" "Why would a God of love allow that into your life?" "Why isn't God answering your prayers?" Why indeed? The seed of doubt is implanted into the soul, stoking discontent and making one easier pray for an apostate theological system, fed by a discontented attitude. You know the sort of people alluded to here, nothing ever satisfies them. They are discontented even with the gospel. The bread of heaven must be cut into three pieces, and served on dainty dishes, or else they cannot eat it; and very soon their soul loatheth even this light bread. There is no way by which a Christian man can serve God so as to please them. They will pick holes in every preacher's coat; and if the great High Priest himself were here, they would find fault with the color of the stones of his breastplate.

Strong's #3202 mempsimoiros; complaining of one's lot, querulous, discontented. Used only here in the New Testament.

16e "**lusts**" Compare with 2 Peter 2:10. They suffer from terminal selfishness. What they want is what is important and their desires is what counts. If they have to kill you to get what they want or cast your soul into hell to fulfill their lusts, then so be it. They are even willing to sacrifice their own souls to the pit to fulfill their lusts. Do not sodomites and the immoral do this? The drunkard, the drug addict, the thief? Instant gratification now while sacrificing their soul for eternity. They sacrifice the eternal on the altar of the immediate. They seek to preserve and maintain that in their hearts that Jesus came to destroy on the cross, thus frustrating His redemptive and sanctifying work on their behalf. They walk in the way of Old Adam instead of being filled with the Spirit, as they are commanded. This is because they are carnal and their thinking is fleshly.

16f "**great swelling words**" Compare this with 2 Peter 2:18. They are big talkers! They excel in "fifty cent words" and "tradesman terminology" to impress you and to make you think they are intelligent, or at least that they know what they are talking about. It dresses up their apostasy in

nicer clothing. It is also very intimidating, especially with young converts and Christians who may not have much education. The apostate will try to “buffalo” them with a lot of verbiage, and brow-beat them into accepting their errors. But big swelling words are usually nothing more than cover for tiny, little ideas, or, in this case, apostasy. If a man has to dress his ideas into this kind of verbiage, it only shows that his ideas are too weak to stand on their own. Use plain speech and direct talk when preaching the truth. Don't try to impress us or to intimidate us with words that even you don't know what they mean. “Simplicity is truth’s most becoming garb.” The true teacher is plain spoken, easy to understand, is not forever quoting Greek, Hebrew and Latin to an English-speaking congregation. He speaks to be easily understood, no matter how deep he is preaching. Here is how you discern the false teacher from the true teacher- which one can you understand?

The same is true with regards to Bible versions. The simpler and easier to read is usually the better one. This is why the Authorized Version has the lowest grade-level index of any version out there. D. A. Waite Jr. did an exhaustive study of the readability of the various English versions in *The Comparative Readability of the Authorized Version* in 1996. His exhaustive research found that the King James was the easiest to read. The average word in the King James was 1.31 syllables and had 3.968 letters per word. The New American Standard Version was generally the worst in readability. Of course, the ESV came out after Waite’s study but its own advertising claims that it reads at an 8th grade level.

Strong’s #5246 *huperogkos*; from *huper* (Strong’s #5228) in behalf of; and *ogkos* (Strong’s #3591) weight; overswollen, immoderate, extravagant, literally “heavy words”.

16g They do not love people, they use them and milk as much out of them before they cast them away like an old shoe. People are things to be used in their selfishness and as a tool to fulfill their lusts. They flatter not because they mean it but because they sense something you have that they want, something you own that they can use to heap upon their selfishness and lust. These men are like a Billy Graham, who loves to smooze with presidents, yet will never rebuke them for their sin, lest he lose his White House pass. He will skinny dip with Lyndon Johnson and "forgive" the adulteries of Bill Clinton and compromise with the compromiser Jimmy Carter. He, and others like him, will do it because they love the admiration of the world. How many Christians are also like this, who will flatter the world as long as the world flatters them? This prevents the preacher from fulfilling his commission to rebuke sin wherever he sees it. Can you imagine Elijah playing it up with Ahab and Jezebel, or John going fishing with Herod? How about John Knox “hitting it off” with Queen Mary? Yet false prophets will, since they rebuke none but the righteous and the faithful anyway.

11. Remember the Warning 17-19

17 But, beloved, remember^{aorist passive imperative} ye^a the words which were spoken before^{b-} perfect passive participle of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ;^{c-d}

17a "ye " is emphatic.

17b The ESV has “predictions of the apostles” which is totally wrong. The apostles spoke “words” in this verse. They did not “make predictions”. Even if they did, giving of God-revealed prophecies is not the same things as “giving predictions”,. The Apostles were not choosing next week’s winners in football games. They were giving divine revelations regarding what God SAID (not “predicted”) about the future.

17c Compare this with 2 Peter 3:1-4. Remember the words of the apostles and their doctrines! It is the job of the preacher and teacher to continually bring to remembrance to their congregations the words recorded beforehand by the Lord and His prophets. If we forget them, we lose the divine and infallible revelations that alone can safely guide us through the dangers of life and steer us toward eternity. To lose the words of God is a spiritual tragedy beyond compare.

17d Some might see Jude's exhortation to remember the words of the apostles as an indication that it was not the Apostle Jude who wrote this letter. If he did, why isn't Jude including himself in this exhortation? It seems like he does not consider himself to be an apostle. Again, we cannot be absolutely dogmatic about the authorship of this letter, but this verse does not disqualify the Apostle Jude from authorship. Jude could just be giving this as an exhortation to remember the apostolic instructions in a general sense, since he does not mention the names of any of the apostles. He could have very well have included himself among "the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ" without magnifying himself among the "greater lights" like Peter or Paul. Humility may have not allowed himself to promote himself, as he may have thought of himself as the "least of all the apostles" like Paul did.

18 How that they told^{a-imperfect} you there should be^{future middle} mockers^b in the last time,^c who should walk^{present middle/passive participle} after their own ungodly lusts.

18a "Told" and continued to tell, as seen by the imperfect tense. This was not a one-time or an isolated telling or warning. The apostles told us this over and over again and still do by their writings, preserved in Scripture.

18b "mockers" This Greek word is also used in 2 Peter 3:3. Mockers and scoffers are often the worst class of sinners, compare Psalm 1:1. In our day we have many who scoff and mock at the doctrine of the Second Coming and premillennialism, as well as at other doctrines, such as the superiority of the Authorized Version. As we progress further into the age, they will increase in number and magnitude, as well as in boldness.

The Tyndale, Matthews and Bishops Bibles use "begilers", "mockers".

18c This places this verse into a context of the last days of the Church Age and the tribulation period. Things are bad now, with the ever-increasing number of mockers and scoffers. But after the Church has been removed in the rapture, along with the restraining influence of the Holy Spirit, how much worse will their activities be? This is something the 144,000, their converts, the tribulation saints and believing Jews in the tribulation will have to deal with, just as Christians have had to deal with for over 1900 years.

19 These be^{present} they who separate^{present active participle} themselves,^{a-b} sensual,^c having not^{present active participle} the Spirit.^{d-e}

19a These apostates separate themselves from the truth, the things of God and all things that are good and holy. This is a voluntary separation from the good unto the profane, the opposite of Biblical separation. This also involves the divisions they create in the church and among brethren due to their practices and false doctrines.

The Tyndale, Bishops and Matthews Bibles have "maker of sects" which is a good translation, as these false teachers are forever splitting churches and destroying fellowships by virtue of the theological trouble they cause. The ESV's "cause divisions" is not as good.

19b "'These be they who separate themselves'- that is from the Church of Christ; from the great universal body of the elect. We did not separate ourselves- we were turned out. Dissenters did not separate themselves from the Church of England, from the Episcopal Church; but when the Act of Uniformity was passed, they were turned out of their pulpits. Our forefathers were as sound Churchmen as any in the world, but they could not take in all the errors of the Prayer Book, and they were therefore hounded to their graves by the intolerance of the conforming professors. So they did not separate themselves. Moreover, we do not separate ourselves. There is not a Christian beneath the scope of God's heaven from whom I am separated. At the Lord's Table I always invite all Churches to come and sit down and commune with us. If any man were to tell me that I am separate from the Episcopalian, the Presbyterian or the Methodist, I would tell him he did not know me, for I love them with a pure heart fervently, and I am not separate from them. I may hold different views from them, and in that point truly I may be said to be separate; but I am not separate in heart. I will work with them. I will work with them heartily; nay, though my Church of England brother sends me in, as he has gone, a summons to pay a church-rate that I cannot in conscience pay. I will love him still; and if he takes chairs and tables it matters not- I will love him for all that; and if there be a ragged-school or anything else for which I can work with him to promote the glory of God, therein will I unite with him with all my heart. I think this bears rather hard on our friends the Strict Communion Baptists. I should not like to say anything hard against them, for they are about the best people in the world, but they really do separate themselves from the great body of Christ's people. They separate themselves from the great Universal Church. They say they will not communion with it; and if any one comes to their table who has not been baptized, they turn him away. Oh! I should think myself grossly in fault if at the foot of these stairs I should meet a truly converted child of God, who called himself a Primitive Methodist, or a Wesleyan, or a Churchman, or an Independent, and I should say 'No, sir, you do not agree with me on certain points; I believe you are a child of God, but I will have nothing to do with you'. I should then think that this text would be very hard on me. But would we do so, beloved? No, we would give them both our hands and say, God speed to you in your journey to heaven; so long as you have got the Spirit we are one family, and we will not be separate from one another. God grant the day may come when every wall of separation shall be beaten down! See how to this day we are separate. There! you will find a Baptist who could not say a good word to a Paedo-baptist if you were to give him a world. You find to this day Episcopalians who hate that ugly word, 'Dissent'; and it is enough for them that a Dissenter has done a thing; they will not do it then, be it never so good. (Charles Spurgeon, "The Holy Spirit and the One Church" in *New Park Street Pulpit*, 4:23,24, sermon 167)".

Now we will separate from apostasy and compromise and from those with bad hearts but we will willingly fellowship with anyone of a genuine Christian heart, a heart that beats for purity, love of God and genuine Biblical evangelism. We may disagree over Calvinism or baptism, but we judge by the heart and not necessarily by the doctrinal system of our brother. A man may be wrong doctrinally yet still be a man of God and have the right kind of heart. We seek an honorable irenic, to bring the quarreling factions of Christians together so that we may fight our common enemies with a united front instead of fighting the brethren. This is a lesson that fundamental Baptists desperately need to learn, for they will seldom cooperate with anyone who is not a similar kind of fundamental Baptist. What narrowness and short-sightedness (not to mention arrogance), to think that only fundamental Baptists were in the right! We wonder if they have the Spirit.

19c "sensual' They do not respond to the spiritual because they are natural brute beasts (verse 10, 2 Peter 2:12). They think only in carnal terms and the things of the spirit and God have no appeal to them, because their god is their belly and that they must serve (Philippians 3:19). They are "soulish" rather than "spiritual".

Strong's # 5591 psuchikos; of or belonging to breath, having the nature and characteristics of the breath, the principal of animal life, which men have in common with the brutes, the sensuous nature with its subjection to appetite and passion

19d "having not the Spirit" They have not the Holy Spirit for the simple reason that they are not saved. If they were, they would have the Spirit (Romans 8:9). The sensual ones do not enjoy the indwelling presence of the Spirit of God.

The ESV has "devoid of the Spirit". How is that a better reading from the Authorized Version? How is "devoid" a better or more accurate rendering than "having not...?"

The Tyndale Bible leaves out the article, "not having Spirit". The article really needs to be there to identify which spirit Jude is talking about.

19e They have "a" spirit, but not the Holy Spirit. They have the spirit of Antichrist.

12. Closing Admonitions 20-23

20^{a-b} But ye,^c beloved, building up^{d-present active participle} yourselves on your most holy faith,^e praying^{present middle/passive participle} in the Holy Ghost,^f

Verses 20 and 21 are listed by O. Talmadge Spence in his *Quest For Christian Purity* that he lists as a "guiding verse" for that quest. This is a verse that deals with some aspect of the Christian's growth and pursuit of God.

20a After some very rough material, Jude ends his epistle on a much more positive tone!

20b We have a 4 commands in verses 20 and 21:

1. Build yourself up on you most holy faith
2. Pray in the Holy Ghost
3. Keep yourself in the love of God
4. Look for the mercy of the Lord

These 4 commands can be viewed as deterrents to sliding into the apostasy that Jude has been exposing and condemning.

20c "ye" is emphatic.

20d The pre-Authorized Version translations all use "edify".

20e Our continual work as Christians is to work on ourselves and to improve ourselves, to develop our own personal Biblical culture and to build ourselves up in the most holy faith as we seek to become more and more Christ-like (Romans 8:29,30). This is how we defend ourselves and build up our armor in the face of the enemy, by building up our faith through prayer, Bible reading, meditation and developing our Christian walk and relation with God.

20f Is there any other way to truly pray than in the help and power of the Holy Spirit? He teaches us to pray and assists us in our prayer life, aiding us in our helplessness in prayer (Romans 8:26,27). "When a believer prays, he is not alone- there are three with him: the Father seeing in secret, His ear open; the Son blotting out sin, and offering up the prayer; the Holy Ghost quickening and giving desires. There can be no true prayer without these three (Robert Murray McCheyne, *Memoirs and Remains*, page 509)."

21 Keep aoorist middle subjunctive **yourselves in the love of God,**^a **looking for** present middle/passive participle **the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ**^b **unto eternal life.**

21a We must keep ourselves in the love of God. To a degree, we are responsible for our own spiritual well-being and relationship to God. We then are to make all diligence to make sure our love and relationship to God is in a strong and acceptable state. There are some things we are responsible for in our salvation, and there are other things which only the Lord can do for us, such as keep us from falling (Jude 24).

There is also a tribulation application to this, since Jude has made reference to the “last time” and the time around the tribulation already. As we have already noted, the tribulation saint must keep himself in the love of God through that seven-year dispensation. There is no eternal security in the tribulation period, as the conditions of salvation are different. This is no longer the church age, so church age requirements of salvation no longer apply. We are in an Old Testament/Acts 2-7 time period now. The tribulation saint must accept all the divine revelation given to him and refuse to follow the Antichrist or to take his mark. The only way he will do this is to keep himself in the love of God, which means obeying Him by keeping His commandments. If he fails to “endure to the end” (Matthew 24:13), he will fall out to the Antichrist and lose his salvation. Thus anyone today who teaches that salvation can be lost or that you have to keep the commandments to be saved are right but are applying this truth to the wrong dispensation. They are teaching tribulation salvation truth in the church age. Today it is false doctrine. Soon, it will be truth.

We make the tribulation application of keeping ourselves in the love of God because this doesn't match up with what Paul said in Romans 8:37-39. Paul said nothing could separate us from the love of God. But Jude says we need to keep ourselves in the love of God. If nothing (not even ourselves) can separate us from His love in this age, what is the danger? In the tribulation, one can separate himself from the love of God by apostasy. In that case, he loses his salvation because he did not keep himself in the love of God since he fell away from God and is no longer keeping the commandments as an evidence and demonstration of his love. That is not church age doctrine but it is tribulation doctrine. Rightly dividing the Word of God helps keeps these things straight and in the proper compartments.

21b "looking for the mercy " This would be associated with the second coming. We look for and anticipate both the mercy of our Lord toward us as well as the promise of eternal life in Christ for those who have put their belief into Him.

22 And of some have compassion, present imperative **making a difference,** present middle participle-a-b

22a This deals with the saints because verse 23 clearly is an evangelistic text. We are to have compassion, active mercy, on any and all we can, especially to those who are within the household of faith. We take an interest in others, do what we can to help those who need our help. We weep with those who weep and rejoice with those who rejoice. In this way, we can make a real difference in the lives of people but putting a personal investment into them. Compassion, the power of the Holy Spirit and the love of God are the only things that can make a real difference in the lives of men. Religion, philosophy or science (the "Three Stooges" of human intellect) are all impotent to do so.

22b The ESV makes utter hash of verse 22. First it renders the first part of the verse “And have mercy on those who doubt”. Then it drops the last have of the verse- no “compassion” on these poor souls in the ESV!

The Tyndale Bible reads "separating them" instead of "making a difference". The Coverdale and Bishops Bibles also do not have "making a difference" although the Geneva Bible does.

23 And others save present imperative **with fear, pulling** present active participle **them out of the fire,** ^{a-b-c}
hating present active participle **even the garment spotted** perfect passive participle **by the flesh.** ^{d-e}

23a "pulling them out of the fire " Compare this with Zechariah 3:2 about a "brand plucked from the burning". This is evangelism, pulling sinners out of the fires of hell. Of course, only the Holy Spirit can save the soul, but we can have compassion on the sinner and make a difference by witnessing to him, praying for him, and setting forth the proper example of the Christian life in front of him so that he may see it and consider. The Holy Spirit will take these witnesses and apply them to the heart of the sinner as only He can. It is the Holy Spirit Who uses us to pull these sinners out of the fire.

We see also that hell is literal fire, not just a mere "separation from God". Jude plainly says someone is heading for literal fire, not just to "separation" like Billy Graham teaches and many apostates also insist upon.

23b This is not a "proverbial saying" but an urgent command in witnessing. Of course, you can't pull anyone out of any fire if you don't believe there is any fire to pull anyone out of in the first place. All Christians should be spiritual firemen.

23c "On the 27th January, 1903, fire broke out in a London lunatic asylum. Of the 300 inmates, 50 perished and 250 had to be literally pulled out of the fire. While the work of rescue was going on, these poor insane creatures behaved in such a way as to remind us very forcibly of how insane sinners behave when their salvation is earnestly sought after by others. It was reported that-

"Some laughed at the mention of fire." Only fools could laugh at a calamity like this. Fools make a mock at sin. Only those who are morally insane would dare to trifle with the fire of sin.

"Some said they would not leave their bed in the night and go out." They would not consent to leave their present enjoyment, even to save their lives. There are many like this, who prefer the pleasures of a condemned state to the joys of salvation. Their madness is self-evident by the choice they make.

"Some were found hiding under the bed from the fire." In their refuge of lies, they said, "Peace, peace, when there was no peace." No one but a fool can suppose that a bed of ease or of indifference is any protection against a consuming fire. Be sure your sin, like a fire, will find you out.

"Some seemed to fancy that the rescuers had made the fire." They were blamed for trying to "burn them up." You would think, to hear some people speak, that preachers were the makers of Hell, and the disturbers of the peace, by seeking to convince men of sin and to pull them out of their perishing condition. Of course, in making a charge like this they only prove that they are beside themselves.

"Many of them fought against their rescuers, biting and tearing their hair out." What a melancholy picture; what a sad proof of insanity-warring against those who were sacrificing themselves for their deliverance. It is no uncommon experience for those who seek to pull men out of the fire of sin to have their Christ-like efforts gnashed upon with their teeth, and to have their merciful motives torn to pieces. Only spiritual lunatics could behave in this fashion.

"Some were heard knocking at a closed door to get out, when it was too late." It must have been a terrible awakening to come to their senses and find themselves imprisoned in a

devouring fire. Those who refuse to be pulled out of the fire of sin will perish in it. "How shall ye escape, if ye neglect so great salvation?"

"Every sane man and woman went to the rescue." The time was short; the doom of the unsaved was certain; the work was great and urgent; every other interest was set aside; the one thing needful was the salvation of souls. All sane Christians make it their chief business to get souls pulled out of the fire of sin. Are you out or in? (Robert Lee, James Smith, *Handfuls on Purpose*, volume 7)."

23d We hate any and all things that the flesh, our old, fallen sin nature, spots and defiles. Sin is a spot and defilement and we detest the corruptions that it brings to our lives, the lives of others and the creation of God. We are to hate it, fight against it and separate ourselves from it so that it will not contaminate us.

Also see Leviticus 15:4,17 where he that touched a defiled garment was himself defiled.

"There is a story of Valentinian in Theodoret, who, accompanying Julian the Apostate to the temple of fortune, and those that had charge of the house sprinkled their holy water upon the emperor; a drop falling upon his garment, he beat the officer, saying that he was polluted, not purged, and tore off the piece of his garment upon which the drop lighted, 'hating', saith the historian, 'the garment spotted by the flesh' (Thomas Manton, *Commentary on Jude*, page 359)".

Also see a fuller treatment of the "spots" in our notes under verse 12.

23e The ESV gets rid of the "spots" and just has "stained by the flesh". Seeing the vast amount of light regarding "spots" in the Authorized Version, why is the ESV so eager to replace "spots" with a mere "stain?" The Matthews Bible also does not mention the spots, rendering it "filthy vesture".

13. Our Assurance of Divine Safekeeping 24

24^a Now unto him that is able present middle/passive participle **to keep** aoist infinitive **you from falling,** ^{b-c}
and to present aoist infinitive **you faultless^d before the presence of his glory with exceeding**
joy, ^{e-f}

24a Just as Paul was very fond of closing his letters with a doxology, so is Jude. Turning from his harsh analysis and denunciation of the apostates, Jude seeks to end his epistle on a high note by glorifying the grace of Jesus Christ.

24b This is a good verse for the security of the believer. Only Christ, who saved us, is able to keep us from falling and losing our salvation. We cannot save ourselves and we certainly cannot keep ourselves from falling, as we simply are not strong enough and because the world, the flesh and the devil are all stronger than we are. Our safety, safekeeping and security in salvation are not dependent upon us (thankfully!), just as the power to save us from sin was not dependent upon us. If it was up to us to keep ourselves saved then none of us would make it to heaven because none of us have it within ourselves to keep ourselves in salvation, since we still possess the fallen, Adamic sin nature, even after salvation. If we are to be kept from losing our salvation, then it must be God who does the safekeeping.

But we can look at falling as being more than loss of salvation. It can be a fall from grace (Galatians 5:4), severe, prolonged backsliding, apostasy or compromise. These are falls too, although not loss of salvation in this dispensation. There is a difference between falling out of an airplane at 35,000 feet and falling down within an airplane, from your seat to the floor. You are in Christ but you still fell. But that second fall will not kill you as the first one will. God can also

prevent us from making shipwreck of our salvation by keeping us from falling into sin, error, immorality and apostasy. Again, we cannot keep ourselves from such a fall but God can and does keep us.

God is the only one who can keep us from falling away from the faith and forsaking the faith. Many professing Christians (who were probably never truly saved) will come back years later and totally renounce the faith that they once confessed. They may have been deceived regarding their salvation, either by themselves or by someone else. They go through the motions, living a (hopeful) lie but then come to the realization that they were never truly saved. In their frustration and/or discouragement, they will renounce the faith they may once confessed. The grace and power of God can keep us from falling into this spiritual trap that claims so many victims.

Ultimately, if you make it from your new birth to your death bed and are still professing Christ and have gone all the way with Him, it will not be because of your spirituality but only by the grace and power of God. So many "better" and "stronger" Christians before you didn't make it to the end. Their faith and profession lapsed. They backslid or denied the faith. They did not die well. May we rely on Christ and Christ alone to help us make to the end well and strong. It will not be your doctrinal statement or your theological system or the fact that you graduated from some Christian School that will preserve you, but Christ alone. Christ and Christ alone is more than a match for the world, the flesh and the devil as they seek to destroy our testimony and our soul.

24c Since Jude is a General Epistle with tribulational overtones, we must also make the tribulation application. Just as God is able to keep the Christian from fallen through the keeping power of Christ, He can keep the tribulation saint from falling away from his salvation. This is done through apostasy and not "enduring to the end" (Matthew 24:13). The tribulation saint will have an extremely difficult time maintaining his faith and profession, and thus, maintaining his salvation. He will have to endure the 21 tribulation judgments, the full brunt of the Antichrist and his spirit, the lack of any New Testament-type church on earth, no indwelling of the Holy Spirit (that is a Church Age doctrine), and few, if any, faithful preachers he can look to for encouragement. The whole world will be in the power of the Antichrist and the Man of Sin. He will face martyrdom on a continual basis if he refuses to take the mark of the beast. His "lot" is quite different, and a whole lot more difficult than the "lot" of a Christian, even during the worst of times. But even in this most challenging of environments, God is able and sufficient to preserve that saint in the tribulation period, and He will, if the saint rests fully upon His strength and grace to get him through without falling.

Jude says God is "able" to keep the tribulation saint from falling but Jude does not say God *will* keep him from falling. God can and is certainly able, but the choice is that of the tribulation believer. It depends more on his desires, his heart and his faithful in this dispensational context than it does the Lord, which is different than it is in the church age. Compare this with 1 Thessalonians 5:23,24, where Paul presents the safekeeping of the Christian by the Lord as an absolute certainty, something Jude is not as dogmatic about. God WILL keep the church age saint and He is ABLE to keep the tribulation saint. For all saints, He is certainly ready, willing and able to keep us from falling.

This would also apply to the present-day saint. God allows us free-will. If we WANT to be preserved, He will make it possible. But if you get wearied of God and the Christian life, and yearn for something else, God will not force it upon us.

24d The ESV has "stumbling" rather than **falling**. They are not the same. You may "stumble" and not lose your salvation, but when you "fall", you do lose your salvation. The Bishops Bible has "free from sin". That is not a good rendering. Jude is talking about losing salvation, not sinless perfection, in this verse.

24e "**present you faultless**" This is the goal, the aim of the work of the Holy Spirit, to make us presentable before the throne of God, not with shame or embarrassment but with exceeding joy. Compare this with Romans 8:29. The saint after he is saved has a long way to go before he is presentable before the throne. In Genesis 41:14, Joseph, before he was to stand before Pharaoh, had to be shaved and changed out of his prison garb. He was not fit to stand before the throne of the king of Egypt dirty and disheveled as he was, nor dressed in his prison garb. Neither are we fit to stand before the holiest throne of all until the Holy Spirit has done His renewing work in our hearts and conform us to the image of Jesus Christ. The Holy Spirit is doing this good work in our lives even right now. Everything the Lord allows in our lives is so designed to hasten that conforming process and to make us fit to stand before the throne of God with exceeding joy.

24f There is certainly "**joy**" in being kept from falling! The benefits and rewards of being kept unto salvation and being kept from falling are so great that the joy that results is indeed "**exceeding**", since the end result of that preservation is heaven and eternal life.

14. Closing Admonition 25

25 To the only wise^b God our Saviour,^{a-b} be glory and majesty,^c dominion and power, both now and ever.^d Amen.

25a God is our Savior Jesus is our Savior. Therefore, Jesus is God our Savior, showing the deity of Jesus.

25b Again, the ESV mangles this phrase into "to the only God, our Savior, through Jesus Christ our Lord." The phrase "Jesus Christ" does not appear in this verse. And "**wise**" is dropped from the ESV, robbing Christ of that divine attribute.

25c "**majesty**" This speaks to us of the kingship of God as well as of Jesus, who is King of Kings. We should be doing everything that is within our power to be promoting that kingship through the world today. We should also be doing everything that we can do to submit ourselves to the kingship of King Jesus in our own personal lives and ministries.

25d The ESV has a very bulky and wordy "before all time and now and forever." How is that an improvement upon "now and forever?"

Bibliography

Barclay, William, *The Letters of John and Jude*, The Daily Study Bible
Baxter, J. Sidlow, *Explore the Book*
Clarke, Adam, *Commentary on the Whole Bible*
Darby, John Nelson, *Collected Works*
Gaebelein, Arno C., *The Annotated Bible*
Kelly, William, *Lectures on Jude*
Lee, Robert and James Smith, *Handfuls on Purpose*
Manton, Thomas, *Commentary on Jude*
McCheyne, Robert, *Memoirs and Remains*, ed by Andrew Bonar
Phillips, John, *Exploring the Epistle of Jude*
Poole, Matthew, *Commentary on the Entire Bible*
Ruckman, Peter, *The Book of the General Epistles*, volume 2
Scroggie, W. Graham, *The Unfolding Drama of Redemption*
Spence, H. T., *The Canon of Scripture; The Epistle to the Hebrews*
Spurgeon, Charles, *The Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit*
Spurgeon, Charles, *The New Park Street Pulpit*
Trappe, John, *Commentary on the Whole Bible*
Vance, Laurence, *Archaic Words and the Authorized Version*
Willmington, Harold *The Outline Bible*