

УДК 296.1

Kenneth Hanson,*Ph. D., Professor of Judaic Studies at the University of Central Florida,
Orlando, the USA***Кенет Хенсен,***викладач єврейстики та близькосхідних студій університету Центральної
Флориди, Орландо, США*

UNIQUENESS OF JUDE: WHY IS THIS EPISTLE ALONE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT IN ITS OVERT REFERENCE TO PSEUDEPIGRAPHA?

Статтю присвячено такому важливому питанню як “Послання Іуди”. Автор намагається висвітлити деякі аспекти Євангелія від Іуди, порівнюючи його з рештою новозавітних Євангелій. Розглянуто відмінності підходів та світоглядних позицій автора “Послання Іуди” та решти послань Нового Завіту. Стаття складається зі вступу, основної частини та висновків. Автор акцентує увагу на понятті “гріха” у тексті “Книги Єноха” та “Посланнях апостола Павла” у Новому Завіті. У ході дослідження професор Хенсен провів паралель між “Книгою Єноха”, “Книгою Іуди” та книгами Нового Завіту.

Ключові слова: Послання Іуди, Книга Єноха, Новий Завіт, апостол Павло, гріх, секта.

There is no more enigmatic text in the canonical New Testament than the brief epistle of Jude. Prominent among the bedeviling issues it raises is why it stands alone in the New Testament canon in directly citing Jewish pseudepigrapha. While there are oblique references to pseudepigraphical texts scattered across the Pauline and kindred epistles, it is striking that neither Paul nor the other New Testament authors explicitly quote such material or employ them as “proof texts”. The explanation for this, I will assert, may well lie in Jude being linked to circles deriving from the phenomenon of “Enochic Judaism” in ways that the Pauline epistles were not. The Dead Sea Scrolls shed significant light on ancient approaches to Jewish pseudepigrapha, given that Qumranic material dated as “early” liberally quotes these texts while “later” sectarian literature does not cite them at all. It is suggested that the Dead Sea Sect gradually abandoned the notion, dominant in pseudepigraphical works, that a troupe of evil angels rebelled against God, and instead came to emphasize dualism and radical determinism. Understanding this shift in thought may well

explain why Jude quotes pseudepigraphical writings and Paul avoids direct reference to them. Jude, I suggest, uncannily preserves a strand of Jewish exegesis, common to both the earlier Dead Sea Scrolls and the many motifs of Enochic literature.

Вступ

Немає більш загадкового тексту в канонічному Новому Завіті ніж коротке “Послання Іуди”. Воно займає окреме місце в каноні Нового Завіту. Найцікавішим є той факт, що ні Павло ні інші автори Нового Завіту не цитують цього матеріалу, відсутні навіть посилання на нього як достовірне джерело. Пояснити це можна тим, на думку професора Хансена, що Іуда був пов’язаний із сектами, що беруть свій початок з “Іудаїзму Єноха”, до якого решта апостольських послань не мала жодного відношення. Сувої мертвого моря проливають світло на давньоєврейські псевдопослання. У “Кумранських сувоях”, найдавніших пам’ятках, трапляються згадки про зазначене послання, в той час як пізніші апостольські послання позбавлені їх. Припускають, що секта мертвого моря поступово відмовилася від певних доктрин, які домінували в псевдопосланнях, зокрема від тези, що група ангелів розпочала повстання проти Бога. Замість цього було зосереджено увагу на дуалізмі та радикальному детермінізмі. Такий підхід пояснює чому Іуда цитує псевдопослання, а Павло уникає прямого посилання на них. Професор Хенсен припускає, що Іуда зберігає сюжетну лінію трактування, характерних для ранніх джерел сувоїв мертвого моря та багатьох мотивів літературних джерел Єноха. Виникає запитання, чому в “Посланні Іуди” трапляються цитування єврейських псевдопослань, зокрема книг Єноха та Мойсея? Чи це чиста випадковість чи результат серйозних відхилень послань, що стосуються авторів Нового Завіту? У своїй статті автор намагається довести, що послання Іуди, насправді, є окремим літературним твором, який бере свій початок з інших книг канонічного Нового Завіту.

Професор Хенсен стверджує, що книга Іуди відображає усталений погляд, типовий для іудейо-християнського/назаретського руху римської Палестини, якій були притаманні сектантські традиції стародавнього іудаїзму, так-званих “прихильників Єноха” та прибічників секти “Мертвого моря”. Цей підхід слід відрізняти від поглядів апостола Павла, який, як припускає професор Хенсен, встановив нові ідеологічні межі, які, хоча деякою мірою і співпадають з поглядами, типовими для “прибічників секти з Назарету” в Ізраїлі, проте відрізняються від них низкою ознак.

Секта “християн Назарету” в Ізраїлі, була пов’язана та бере свій початок з іудаїзму Єноха. Християнське вчення апостола Павла, що домінувало на Заході, було більше пов’язане з грецьким іудаїзмом. І хоча

відмінності нечіткі, проте вони поглиблюють розбіжності, що спостерігаються в тканині раннього християнського вчення.

Проблема

Слід зазначити, що минуло більше ніж чверть століття з того часу, як група знаних науковців зібралася в м. Кенетербері, університету Кент на семінар щодо розгляду питання біблійного канону зважаючи на появу “Послання Іуди”. Серед присутніх був Джеймс Чарлсверт, Ричард Баухем, які займалися вивченням книги Іуди, хоча й залишили поза увагою низку важливих питань. Серед присутніх був і Б. Дехендшатер, який опублікував коментарі щодо паралелей між книгою Іуди і першою книгою Єноха. Останній пункт і став темою обговорення. Баухем зазначив, що автори Нового Заповіту та послань другої єврейської спільноти поділяли той самий погляд на світ, їхні картини світу співпадають. Цікавим є той факт, що лише одне послання Іуди цитує останніх і тому виникає запитання: чому?

Пояснення, яке пропонує професор Хенсен, ґрунтується на припущенні, що насправді існує серйозна розбіжність між світоглядом автора книги Іуди та інших авторів Нового Завіту. Науковець припускає, що книгу Іуди як літературний твір можна найменшою мірою співвідносити з віровченням, яке називають “Іудаїзм Єноха”. На противагу, послання Павла та решти авторів Нового Завіту репрезентують несхожу літературну течію, на яку вплинуло значною мірою світобачення Кумранської секти, яка дотримувалась поглядів повного детермінізму, мінімізації ролі “свободи волевиявлення” як з боку людини, так й ангелів.

Варто зауважити, для порівняння, що локус походження гріха, відповідно до “Іудаїзму Єноха” можна прослідкувати в Книзі Буття 6:1-4 (осквернення “дочок людських” “синами Божими”), в той час як світоглядна позиція Павло підтверджена цитатою з Книги Буття (1 Мс. 3):

“Тому-то, як через одного чоловіка гріх у світ увійшов, а через гріх – смерть, так і смерть у всіх людей увійшла через того, в кому всі згрішили” (Послання до Римлян: 5-12).

Без сумніву, Павло знайомий з традиціями літературних творів “Іудаїзму Єноха”, однак щодо походження зла, то він дотримується іншого напрямку. Такий підхід можна вважати відправною точкою в оцінці творів Павла та дистанціювання його від традицій псевдопослань. Для розуміння розбіжностей слід розглянути природу світоглядних позицій Павла та авторів книг Єноха та решти псевдопослань. Іудаїстська традиція Єноха датується IV ст. до н. е., який тривав упродовж пізньоперського та ранньогрецького періодів. Її описують як неконформістську розкольникську течію, антисадукейську за поглядами. В центрі цього

вчення був не храм і не Тора, а вчення про походження зла. Жорсткий детермінізм був ключовим компонентом її ідеології, а людей трактували не як винуватців зла, а як жертв.

Незважаючи на це, вважалося, що гріх з'явився без Божого дозволу, а як результат вільного волевиявлення та непокірності ангелів. Зло трактують як змову демонів, тим самим знімаючи провину з людини. “Книга Спостерігачів” Єноха, наприклад, наголошує, що “початковий гріх” ангелів (а зовсім не порушення Адама та Єви) призвів до опоганення усього світу. “Баланс” було відновлено між “попереднім призначенням Бога” та “вільним волевиявленням”, хоча ці два поняття суперечливі, як ми бачимо, особливо в Кумранській літературі. На думку професора Хенсена, “вчення Ісуса” відокремилось від того самого вчення (“вчення Єноха”), що й решта сект Мертвого моря, які цитували авторів псевдопослать. Хоча науковець і припускає, що християнство Павла, яке жорстко критикувало деякі базові ідеї “вчення Єноха”, стало домінуючим після перших двох століть “нашої ери”, оскільки лише два тексти східного вчення/Єврейської гілки цього руху збереглися, “Послання Якова” та “Послання Іуди”.

Запропоноване вирішення проблеми

Повертаючись до зауваження Баухема про те, що автори Нового Завіту і автори єврейських псевдопослать поділяли спільні теологічні погляди, професор Хенсен, не менше, дотримується ширшого підходу, який полягає в тому, що автори низки послать Нового Завіту були однорідною групою, яка дотримувалась єдиного теологічного вчення. Автор статті вважає, що загадку “Послання Іуди” можна розгадати, якщо провести лінію та дослідити світоглядну позицію автора “Книги Іуди” та апостола Павла. Для цього слід вдатися до тлумачення іудаїзму загалом і секти Мертвого моря зокрема, не минаючи фундаментальних питань “детермінізму” та “вільного волевиявлення”.

Висновки

Узагальнюючи, можна стверджувати, що еволюція поглядів членів сект і авторів Кумранських сувоїв, що беруть свій початок з традицій “Іудаїзму Єноха” щодо наперед визначеного стану речей та дуалізму, виступає ключовим ромежуванням між вченням апостола Павла та Іуди (можливо і Якова). Беручи до уваги той факт, що на Небесах відбулося повстання, у Бога не було іншого вибору як “дозволити” гріху статися з усіма відповідними наслідками. Аби зло не було допущене Богом, то в тому б мала бути якась певна ціль, що передбачала б гріх і наслідкові страждання. Дуалістичне поняття анти Бога пом’ящило б становище

певною мірою, проте слід вважати, що навіть Сатана мав би бути частиною наперед визначеної долі.

Географічна ізоляція палестинської гілки іудейо-християнського вчення разом із поширенням “Правила Дамаску” або щонайменше його базових ідей вздовж торгових шляхів на схід, може слугувати поясненням того, як збереглися ранні ідеї Єноха в зазначених посланнях.

Introduction

Why is it that Jude, alone among all the books of New Testament canon, makes significant allusion to (quotation of) Jewish pseudepigrapha, specifically the books of Enoch and the Assumption of Moses? Is this a matter of sheer coincidence, or is it the result of seriously divergent frames of reference on the part of the New Testament authors? I will endeavor to show that the epistle of Jude does in fact represent a separate literary stream from the other books of the canonical New Testament.

I will argue that this stream reflects a worldview that, while typically associated with the Judeo-Christian/Nazarene movement of Roman Palestine, was common to several sectarian traditions within ancient Judaism, including the so-called Enochians (“Visionaries”) and the Dead Sea Sect. This worldview should be distinguished from that of the apostle Paul, who, I suggest, successfully established a new theological framework, which, while sharing some points in common with the Nazarene movement in the land of Israel and points east, nonetheless departed from it on a number of key points. The Nazarene sect in Israel was linked to and in many ways rooted in “Enochic Judaism”; Paul’s movement was much more aligned with attitudes that predominated in the west (i. e. Hellenistic Judaism). The shades of distinction may appear mild, but they produced the first major schism in the developing fabric of early Christianity.

While a solution to the issue regarding Jude’s sources appears elusive at best, I will argue that the Dead Sea Scrolls provide surprising insight on the textual traditions of both the epistle in question and the Pauline and Pauline-aligned epistles. It is hoped that the proposed solution will be a springboard to further research in the field of comparative religion and the Judaism of late antiquity.

The Problem

It is notable at the outset that more than a quarter century has passed since a group of distinguished scholars gathered in a seminar at Canterbury, at the University of Kent, to consider the question of the biblical canon with respect to the epistle of Jude [1, c. 137]. Among the attendees was James Charlesworth, Richard Bauckham, who authored a masterfully

thorough volume on the book of Jude, yet deliberately left some important issues unresolved, and B. Dehandschutter, who produced some important commentaries on the interrelationship between Jude and 1 Enoch. This latter point of inquiry came to dominate the discussion. Bauckham observed that the New Testament authors and those of the pseudepigraphical writings of the Second Jewish Commonwealth shared substantially the same worldview; yet only the epistle of Jude quotes from them. He pointedly asked: Why?

The solution I will propose hinges on the assertion that there is in fact a serious distinction between the “worldview” of the author of Jude and that of the other New Testament writers. I suggest that Jude as a piece of literature may at the very least be seen as related to the realm of what is increasingly referred to as “Enochic Judaism”. By contrast, the epistles of Paul (and kindred New Testament writings) represent a disparate literary current, like Jude, influenced to a considerable degree by the worldview of the Qumran sect, though moving in the direction of complete determinism, and minimizing the role of “free will”, either human or angelic.

It is notable, as a matter of comparison, that the locus of the origin of sin, according to Enochic Judaism, may be found at Genesis 6:1-4 (the defilement of the “daughters of men” by the “sons of God”), whereas Paul roots it in Genesis 3:

Therefore, even as through one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed on all men inasmuch as all sinned. (Rom. 5:12) [2, c. 26].

Paul is certainly aware of the traditions and literature of Enochic Judaism, but at the seminal point of the origin of evil, he moves in a different direction [3, c. 100]. This may serve at least as a starting point in evaluating Paul’s distancing himself from pseudepigraphic traditions. Nonetheless, I will argue, there is something even more fundamental in distinguishing Paul’s worldview from the books of Enoch and other pseudepigrapha.

In order to gain further insight on this conundrum, we should next review the nature of the “Enochic” tradition within Second Temple Judaism with a view to evaluating Paul’s distance from it and the book of Jude’s possible alignment with it. Enochic Judaism is generally dated to the early fourth century B. C. E., during the late Persian and early Hellenistic periods. It has been described as a non-conformist priestly current of dissent, particularly anti-Zadokite in orientation. At its center was neither the Temple nor the Torah, but the concept of the origin of evil [4, c. 9]. A strong measure of determinism colored its ideology, as human beings were cast not as perpetrators of evil but as victims.

Nonetheless, sin was viewed as having originated without divine permission, as a result of the free will of wayward angels. Evil was seen as

having originated, not from human evil, but demonic conspiracy [5, c. 65]. The Enochic "Book of Watchers", for example, stressed that this "original sin" of the angels (rather than the disobedience of Adam and Eve) had contaminated the whole of creation. A "balance" was ultimately created between "predestination" and "free will", though the two concepts remained in tension, as we shall see, especially in Qumranic literature [6, c. 227].

It is my contention that the early "Jesus Movement" was "cut from the same cloth" (the "Enochians") as the Dead Sea sectarians, who, not surprisingly, quoted liberally from pseudepigraphical traditions. However, I will also suggest that Pauline Christianity stood in opposition to some of the seminal ideas of the "Enochians", becoming so dominant after the first two centuries of the Common Era that the only texts surviving from the eastern/Judean branch of the movement were the epistles of James and Jude [7].

Proposed Solution:

Returning to Baukham's observation, that the writers of the New Testament and those of ancient Jewish pseudepigrapha shared a common theological framework, we should at this point take issue with the "broad-brushing" of New Testament authors, as though they were a cohesive group with uniform theology. I believe the "conundrum" of Jude can be resolved only if we posit a serious distinction between the worldview that inspired the book of Jude and that of the apostle Paul. We must, however, be willing to propound an evolving exegetical framework within ancient Judaism in general and the Dead Sea Sect in particular with respect to the fundamental issues of "determinism" and "free will".

It has been suggested by Charlesworth and others that the Dead Sea Sect, in the course of becoming increasingly secluded and isolated from the rest of Israelite society, gradually lost interest in Enochic textual traditions [8]. It is pointed out that the last Qumranic quotation from the book of Enoch dates from an early stage in the sect's development, being found in the Damascus Rule. Over time, Nickelsburg argues, the worldview of determinism and dualism became more dominant in the Qumran sect, and they gradually abandoned the idea (prevalent in the pseudepigrapha) that evil came about not with divine permission, but as a result of a troupe of evil angels plotting behind God's back [9, c. 47].

It has long been observed that there are distinct affinities between certain New Testament concepts and passages and Qumranic literature, but to which aspects of sectarian thought, early or late? A solution to the "problem" of Jude may be as simple as positing a link between early "Nazarene" Christianity and the earlier layers of Qumranic thought, and a similar link between Pauline and kindred New Testament traditions and the later stage in sectarian exegesis. Interestingly, it was suggested some decades ago by David Flusser

that a “second stratum” of early Christianity was directly and profoundly influenced by sectarian thought and practice, the writings of Paul being a case in point [10, c. XVIII]. It is well established that the driving “theology” behind Paul’s epistles stresses predestination and dualism, which is exactly the emphasis of the later stage in Qumranic thought [11].

Paul argues, for example, that Christians have “have obtained an inheritance, having been predestined according to the purpose of him who works all things according to the counsel of his will” (Eph. 1:11). He famously writes: “And we know that all things work together for good to those who love God, to those who are called according to His purpose” (Rom. 8:28). To bolster his argument, he adds a longer passage, which in part reads:

For the Scripture says to Pharaoh, “Even for this same purpose I have raised you up, that I might show My power in you, and that My name might be declared throughout all the earth”. Therefore He has mercy on whom He will have mercy, and whom He will, He hardens (Rom. 9:17-18).

And, while urging his flock to “... work out your salvation with fear and trembling”, he declares in the same breath that “it is God who works in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure” (Phil. 2:12-13). Theologians have observed that the Arminian would adhere to the first statement, the Calvinist to the latter [12, c. 500].

If Flusser’s “second stratum” were representative of the later, rather than earlier, stage in sectarian thought, it then stands to reason that the Pauline and Pauline-aligned epistles (including the later “pastoral epistles”) would assiduously avoid any overt reference to Enochic literature, as did later layers of Qumranic literature. By contrast, the epistle of Jude may be seen to uncannily preserve the earlier stream of Qumranic exegesis, in which Enochic Judaism was not only tolerated, but celebrated [13]. The reasons for this remain very much a mystery, but we may at least speculate that Jude, due to its unique *Sitz im Leben*, reflects more of an eastern, “Palestinian” strand of early Judeo-Christianity than the Pauline epistles.

In any case, a cursory look at Jude’s brief letter does in fact reveal a strong emphasis on personal choice and its consequences, in theological parlance “free will”. The recipients are urged “... to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints” (Jude 1:3), as if it depends on human effort alone [14, c. 38]. The Exodus from Egypt is recalled, but not in a deterministic way; for “the ones not believing” (v. 5) were destroyed. When the book of Enoch is next invoked (v. 6), it is to demonstrate, not predestined divine order, but that even in the heavenly realm, all is a matter of choice. Sodom and Gomorrah are likewise invoked as examples of choice in pursuing licentious behavior, leading to destruction. While there is no evidence in the epistle of ontological dualism per-se, the argument between Michael and the Devil over the body

of Moses (v. 9) does suggest a bifurcated conflict between powers of good and evil [15, c. 58]. However, the rebellion of the angels and disobedience of Satan is also seen as a matter of choice, absolving God of final responsibility for what went wrong. The biblical examples of Cain, Balaam and Korach (v. 11) likewise stress "free will".

In describing iniquitous behavior, it is interesting that both Jude and James invoke the same imagery of sea waves, at the very least suggesting that the two epistles are thematically linked:

[These are] wild waves of the sea foaming up their shames... (Jude 1:13)

For he who doubts is like a wave of the sea, driven by the wind and tossed. (James 1:7)

All of this may be seen as a literary "buildup" to the figure of Enoch, who prophesies coming judgment, not according to what has been preordained, but according to "... all their ungodly works which they ungodly did" (v. 15). As with the epistle of James, "faith" is determined as a measure of one's "works", for good or for evil:

But each one is tempted by his lusts, being drawn away and seduced by them. Then when lust has conceived, it brings forth sin. And sin, when it is fully formed, brings forth death. (James 1:14-15).

Jude similarly speaks of "murmurers, complainers, leading lives according to their lusts" (v. 16), admonishing that "... at the last time there will be mockers according to their lusts" (v. 18). Whereas Paul teaches that some are "destined for destruction" (Phil. 3:19), Jude, having warned of Enoch's eschaton, nonetheless urges the faithful to "save others", by "snatching them out of the fire" (v. 23).

While Paul's letters (composed in the sixth decade of the Common Era) likely predate Jude's epistle, the latter may well have been influenced by Qumranic traditions in ways that Paul's movement was not [16, c. 451]. Interestingly, the "execution of judgment" that comes by "the hand of God's elect" is found in both the Peshier on Habakkuk and Jude's epistle:

Behold, the Lord came with myriads of His saints (the elect), to do judgment against all, and to rebuke all the ungodly of them concerning all their ungodly works... (Jude 1:14-15)

We should also note the similarity in language between Jude and the Qumranic War Scroll, which declares:

For You will do battle against them from the heave[ns ...] upon them for confusion [...] For You have a multitude of holy ones in the heavens and hosts of angels in Your exalted dwelling to pr[aise] Your[name.] The chosen ones of the holy people You have established for Yourself in a [community.] (1QM 11:17-12:1)

The War Scroll describes the eschatological judgment referenced in Jude

in a much more detailed, though completely parallel fashion, employing allusions and images based on Daniel 7:13's "Son of Man" passage. The text continues:

Mercies of blessing [...] and Your covenant of peace You engraved for them with a stylus of life in order to reign o[ver them] for all time, commissioning the hos[ts of] Your [e]lect by their thousands and tens of thousands together with Your holy ones [and] Your angels, and directing them in battle [so as to condemn] the earthly adversaries by trial with Your judgments. With the elect of heaven [they] shall prev[ail.] (1QM 12:4-5)

We also read: "The company of Your holy ones is in our midst for etern[al] support" (1QM 12:7). This language recalls the "joining" of the "wilderness camps" and the heavenly host as found in both the Damascus Rule and the Community Rule [17, c. 218]. Moreover, the emphasis on the "elect" is reminiscent of the preeminence of the "Sons of Zadok" in the Damascus Rule [18]. Elsewhere, Jude's reference to the archangel Michael finds parallel, not only in Enoch (9:1; 20:5; 71:9) but in the War Scroll (col. 15), where he is depicted as a leader against the "sons of darkness" [19, c. 200]. While the influence of the Qumran corpus on the larger culture of ancient Judea is difficult to ascertain, the fact that the Damascus Rule made its way to the Cairo Geniza suggests that Qumranic material was copied in circulated in the east, and transported via eastern trade and caravan routes. The geographical distribution of the Judeo-Christian/Nazarene movement being in the east as well (to wit, scattered references that the sect relocated to Pella), we should not be surprised to find reference to otherwise suppressed aspects of ancient sectarian thought.

Conclusion

In sum we may argue that the evolution in the attitude of sectarian thought and Qumranic literature, from the Enochic traditions to strict predestination and dualism, may be seen at the core of the distinction between the Pauline approach and that of Jude (and possibly James). In moving away from the notion that angelic revolt On High, there was no way to let God "off the hook", as it were, for "allowing" sin and its outcome. Lest God be made the author of evil, there must be some predestined purpose in everything, including transgression and resultant suffering. The dualistic notion of an anti-God, "Satanic" figure would have mitigated the quandary to some extent, but lest God be seen as impotent, even Satan must be part of an overarching "destiny". It was this "second strand" of Qumranic thought that the "second stratum" of Pauline Christianity adopted. Jude (and possibly James) are the "odd men out". The geographical seclusion of the Palestinian branch of Judeo-Christianity, as well as the transmission of the Damascus

Rule or at least its ideas along the trade routes to the east, may well explain the perpetuation of the earlier Enochic ideas in these unique epistles.

While all of this is admittedly conjecture, it does, I believe, provide a logical and clear line of reasoning for resolving the "problem" posed by the epistle of Jude, as no other proposed solution has done. It is an attempt at the very least to open the door to further research and discussion of the multiple facets of the interplay between the Judaism of late antiquity and early Nazarene/Pauline Christianity.

NOTES

1. Charlesworth James. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985. – 213 p.

2. Jackson David R. *Enochic Judaism: Three Defining Paradigm Exemplars*. – New York: T&T Clark, 2004. – 400 p.

3. It is argued that Paul is appealing to the ancient concept of "solidarity" (as evidenced in 2 Esd. 3:21-22; 4:30; 7:118, etc.) , holding that all humanity fell into sin through the "fall" of Adam. See W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (London: S. P. C. K., 1962), 47ff.; C. H. Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (London: Collins Fontana Books, 1959), 100-01.

4. Gabriele Boccaccini observes that in the last two decades the emphasis of scholarship has shifted from the study of Enochic texts to the sociological and intellectual attributes of the group(s) responsible for this literary current. The dominant view is that the textual traditions of 1 Enoch represent the core of this movement, the boundaries of which overlapped, but did not coincide with the larger corpus of apocalyptic literature (possibly representing disparate parties). See Boccaccini, "The Rediscovery of Enochic Judaism and the Enoch Seminar," in *The Origins of Enochic Judaism* (ed. Gabriele Boccacini; Turin: Zamorani, 2002), 9. Additional Enochic research has been pioneered by Florentino Garcia Martinez, Michael Knibb, Klaus Koch, Helve Kvanvig, and Loren Stuckenbruck (in Europe); John J. Collins, James Charlesworth, Martha Himmelfarb, Lawrence Schiffman, David Suter, and James VanderKam (in the United States); Devorah Dimant, Hanan Eshel, Ithamar Gruenwald, and Michael Stone (in Israel).

5. That a major part of the evil in the world can be attributed to a hidden demonic world is an adjunct of dualistic thought. The two contradictory concepts of human responsibility and human victimization came to coexist between absolute determinism and absolute antideterminism. See Marius Nel, "Disputes about the Calendar in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and Its Basis," in John T. Fitzgerald, Fika van Rensburg, and Herrie van Rooy, eds. *Animosity, The Bible, and Us* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 65; George W. E. Nickelsburg, *A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 46; "Enoch, First Book of," ABD 1:490-91.

6. For a detailed discussion of the evolution of Qumranic ideology vis-à-vis

competing concepts in Second Temple Judaism, see James Charlesworth, "The Origin and Subsequent History of the Authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Four Transitional Phases among the Qumran Essenes," *RevQ* 10 (1980): 227; John J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Routledge, 1997), 35-36.

7. For a broader discussion of the apostle Paul within the context of ancient Judaism, see Alan F. Segal, *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1990); Daniel Boyarin, *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: Univ. Of California Press, 1994); James D. G. Dunn (ed.), *Paul and the Mosaic Law* (WUNT 89: Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996); John G. Gager, *Reinventing Paul* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2000).

8. Charlesworth 1980, 227; Collins 1997, 35-36; Boccaccini 1998, 129-31; Gabriele Boccaccini, *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 308.

9. Nickelsburg 2001, 47; "The Epistle of Enoch and the Qumran Literature," *JJS* 33 (1982): 333-48.

10. According to David Flusser, the initial stage of the Jesus movement derived from the character of Jesus' message, which he insists was largely rabbinic. A "second stratum" found expression in the kerygma of the hellenistic Christian communities and was largely influenced by the Essenes/ Dead Sea Sect. See D. Flusser, *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988), xviii.

11. It is significant that both Paul and the Qumran community do not simply separate humankind into two mutually distinct groups; the individual manifests the dualism internally, whether as the struggle between "the flesh" and "election" (in Paul's case), or between the "two spirits" of Qumranic literature. See James D. G. Dunn, *The Christ & the Spirit* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1998), 147; P. Wernberg-Møller, "A Reconsideration of the Two Spirits in the Rules of the Community (1QSerek iii. 13-iv. 26)," *Revue de Qumran* 3 (1961-62) 422-24, 432; J. Pryke, "'Spirit' and 'Flesh' in the Qumran Documents and Some New Testament Texts," *Revue de Qumran* 5 (1964-65) 350ff.

12. Benjamin Jowett, *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, Romans* (London: John Murray, Albemarle Street, 1855), 500.

13. It is noted that the use to which the references to Enoch are put in Jude's epistle reflects the Qumranic pesher approach to the prophet's oracles, in that they are directed to present-tense situations and circumstances. See Charles VanderKam and Peter Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: T&T Clark, 2002), 360-1; J. Fitzmeyer, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls." In P. Flint and J. VanderKam, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, Vol. 2. (Leiden: Brill, 1998-99), 2:599:621.

14. I acknowledge the argument that toward the beginning of the epistle, there is reference to those who are destined for judgment. However, the general direction, expressed toward the end, is toward keeping oneself in divine love

– emphasizing free will. See Ruth Anne Reese, 2 Peter & Jude (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 38.

15. See Peter H. Davids, The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2006), 58.

16. See Robert Eisenman, The New Testament Code: The Cup of the Lord, the Damascus Covenant, and the Blood of Christ (London: Watkins, 2006), 451.

17. Bauckham, Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church (London: T&T Clark, 1990), 218-19, points out that the War Scroll develops an implicit Exodus typology that casts the camp of the “sons of light” as that of the Israelites in the wilderness, on the verge of conquering the Promised Land.

18. Eisenman, *ibid.*

19. See D. S. Russell, Daniel (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1981), 200.