

## **The Angels under Reserve in 2 Peter and Jude**

J. DARYL CHARLES  
UNION UNIVERSITY, JACKSON, TENNESSEE

*In both 2 Peter and Jude, the reader encounters the rebellious angels, a paradigm of hard-heartedness that appears frequently in Jewish tradition. In both epistles, OT characters and events (and exegetical traditions extending from them) are paraenetic rather than didactic in nature. That is, they are illustrative and serve as moral types to warn the reader. In their function the rebellious angels constitute all important weapon in the rhetorical arsenal of both writers. Despite similarities in their appearance, they function in slightly different ways in the two epistles, suggesting a literary-rhetorical strategy that is unique to each writer.*

*Key Words: angelology, 2 Peter, Jude, moral paradigm, typology, Old Testament, extrabiblical tradition*

In the epistles of 2 Peter and Jude, the rebellious angels appear in a series of moral paradigms that receive no commentary, explanation, or interpretation. These paradigms, while enigmatic to the modern reader, are proverbial in character and part of moral-typological tradition well established in the history of Jewish interpretation. In both 2 Peter and Jude, where such allusions are particularly dense, OT characters and events (and exegetical traditions extending from them) are paraenetic rather than didactic in nature; that is, they are illustrative and serve as moral types to warn the reader.<sup>1</sup>

Author's note: Presented at the 2002 Midwest Regional Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, University of Saint Mary of the Lake, Mundelein, IL, 22-24 February 2002.

1. 2 Peter and Jude demonstrate the extent to which the paraenetic use of typology is integral to the Christian moral tradition. Not infrequently, the modern reader learns, the use of these paradigms in the General Epistles has more in common with contemporary exegetical practice than any OT passages to which they might be traced. On the function of paraenesis as a genre, see K. Berger, "Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament," in *ANRW* 11.25.2: 1075-77; and A. J. Malherbe, *Moral Exhortation: A Greco-Roman Sourcebook* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980) 124-25, 135-38. On the paraenetic

In Jewish tradition the example of the disenfranchised angels (Jude 6 and Pet 2:4) appears frequently alongside hard-hearted Israel (Jude 5), Sodom and Gomorrah (Jude 7 and 2 Pet 2:6), and Noah and the flood in extrabiblical tradition.<sup>2</sup> Stereotypically, these are employed as types of apostasy upon which divine judgment fell. The angels function in what appear to be similar contexts, since the theme of moral accountability is present in both 2 Peter and Jude. And while reference to the angels in both letters is abrupt, parenthetical, syntactically alike, and without qualification, faint exegetical nuances can be detected in the two allusions. Noting these nuances sharpens the reader's appreciation for a unique literary-rhetorical strategy that is at work in each letter, despite the parallel material in the two

### LIFTING APOCALYPTIC VEIL

"There were angels in Jewish belief before there were demons," wrote C. Guignebert concerning the world of the unseen.<sup>3</sup> In the OT, angels are depicted foremost as the servants of the Most High. In Orthodox Judaism, they remain preeminently God's ministers. Aside from "the angel of the Lord," angels generally receive less prominence in the OT before the Exile. From the exilic experience onward, however, they acquire increasing importance and a more clearly defined role in the divine economy.<sup>4</sup>

Several features differentiate the angelology of the intertestamental period from that of the OT. In the former, their depiction becomes far more elaborate and systematic, with a number of figures having their names and functions expressly stated. Jewish apocalyptic literature knows between four and nine echelons of angelic authorities.<sup>5</sup> The chief angels in heaven's multitiered hierarchy develop strat-

---

use of typology in the General Epistles, and 1-2 Peter and Jude in particular, see T. W. Martin, *Metaphor and Composition in 1 Peter* (SBLDS 131; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) 85-121; J.D. Charles, *Literary Strategy in the Epistle of Jude* (Toronto: Associated University Presses / Scranton: University of Scranton Press, 1993) 72-74; and idem, *Virtue amidst Vice: The Catalog of Virtues in 2 Peter I* (JSNTSup 150; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997) 37-43.

2. E.g., *3 Macc.* 2:4-7; *T Naph.* 3:4-5; *Sir* 16:7-10; *CD* 2:17-3:12; and *m. Sank* 10:3.

3. C. Guignebert, *The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1951) 96.

4. E.g., *Ezek* 9:2ff.; 40:3ff.; 42:6ff.; *Dan* 3:28; 4:13; 6:22; 7:16; 8:13; 10:5ff.; 12:1ff.; *Zech* 1:8ff.; 2:1ff.; 3:11ff.; 4:1ff.; 5:1ff.; 6:1ff.

5. Four levels of hierarchy are found in *1 En.* 40:2; *T Levi* 3:2-7; *Jub.* 1:27, 29; 2:1, 3; seven levels are stated in *1 En.* 81:5; 90:21; *T Levi* 8:2; *Tob* 12:15; and nine are listed in the *Testament of Adam* 4.

egies, superintend nations, reveal secrets, intercede for the saints, and filter prayers of the righteous.

In the book of Daniel, Michael is presented as “one of the chief rulers” (*'ahad haśśārîm hāri'šōnîm*, 10:13 and 12:1; LXX: *heis tōn archon-tōn tōn prōtōn*) and “the great angel” (*haśś haggādōl*; LXX: *ho aggelos ho megas*).<sup>7</sup> In late Judaism, he achieves an incomparable stature, from which he mediates the prayers of the saints, offers the souls of the righteous, and accompanies the righteous into paradise.<sup>8</sup>

Neither the OT nor the NT makes any explicit statements as to the fall of the rebellious angels. The NT implies at most the notion that Satan, a fallen angel chief among many, was cast down (cf. Luke 10:18; John 12:31; Rev 12:4, 7, 9, 10), yet it gives no clear time of the fall. Some, as did Origen, hold Jesus' words in Luke 10:18 as referring to an original fall.<sup>10</sup> Others believe the statement to be a dramatic way of expressing Satan's certain ruin.<sup>11</sup> Still others view the fall as coinciding with Jesus' ministry on earth.<sup>12</sup>

Corresponding typology to the fallen angels might well be drawn from several prophetic oracles in the OT—oracles that serve as graphic illustrations of fall or ruin: (1) Isa 14:5–23, a taunt (*māšāl*, v. 4) against the king of Babylon, (2) Isa 24:21–22, a symbolic representation of Yahweh's judgment, and (3) Ezek 28:1–19, a prophetic funeral dirge (*qinah*, v. 12) against the king of Tyre. Both Isaiah 14 and Ezekiel 28 appear to be shaped similar to ancient Canaanite creation

6. *1 Enoch* 6–9. *1 En.* 20:5; *Jub.* 15:31–32; cf. LXX Deut 32:8; Dan 10:13–21; and 12:1. *1 Enoch* 41–43; 46:2; 71:3. *T. Dan* 6:2. *1 En.* 14:4.

7. On the development of Michael's stature in postexilic Jewish thinking, see J. P. Rohland, *Der Erzengel, Arzt und Feldherr: Zwei Aspekte des vor- und fruehbabylonischen Michaelkultes* (Leiden: Brill, 1977).

8. See L. Leuken, “Michael,” *RGG* 4.369–70. As it relates to Jude 6 and 2 Pet 2:4, the intertestamental period exhibits a proliferation in speculative explanations as to “the sons of God,” the *bēnē hā'ēlōhîm*, of Gen 6:1–4. By the time of the Christian advent, most of Judaism (mainstream and sectarian) had embraced the notion that the *bēnē hā'ēlōhîm* in Genesis 6 were angels who had introduced sexual promiscuity among “the daughters of men.” In fact, it is not uncommon to find this line of thinking in early Christian commentary on Jude 6 and 2 Pet 2:4, as we find in Clement of Alexandria (*Paed.* 3.2) and Hilary of Arles (fifth century). Hilary writes: “The angels sinned in three ways, by their pride, by their envy and by their lust” (PL Supp. 3.110). The English translation of Hilary is found in *James, 1...2 Peter, 1...3 John, Jude* (ACCS 1; ed. G. Bray; Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2000) 146.

9. In *Jub.* 10:8 Satan is “Prince of the spirits” (cf. Eph 2:2: *archonta tēs exousias tou aeros*). In *T. Dan* 5:6 and *T. Sim.* 2:7, he is *ho archon* and *ho archon tes planes*.

10. *Paed.* 3.2.

11. E.g., G. Aulen, *Christus Victor* (New York: Macmillan, 1956) 111; and J. W. Boyd, *Satan and Mara* (SHR 27; Leiden: Brill, 1975) 39.

12. E.g., G. B. Caird, *Principalities and Powers* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1956) 31.

myths,<sup>13</sup> and both enunciate the same principal reason for the king's demise: pride, self-exaltation, and corruption. The object of condemnation in the Isaiah oracle is characterized by wickedness and oppression (vv. 2, 6). In light of the great rejoicing (vv. 7–8), this must have been an arch enemy. Evidence of his pompous nature are the multiple “I will” assertions (vv. 13–14), whereby he presumes upon the glory of the Most High, resulting in being “brought down to Sheol” (vv. 9, 15), where the spirits of the departed (the *rēpā'im*) greet him.

The funeral dirge in Ezekiel 28 is directed against an arrogant ruler (*nagîd*, v. 2). This figure is corrupted through his own perception of exaltedness.<sup>14</sup> Allusion to “Eden, the garden of God” (v. 13), “the anointed cherub” (vv. 14, 16) and fire (v. 16) are reminiscent of the Genesis narrative and suggestive of traditions familiar to the readers.

The oracles of Isaiah 14 and Ezekiel 28, like Jude 6 and 2 Pet 2:4, reflect a catastrophic disenfranchisement, an utter fall from glory. Several elements are common to both the OT and NT texts. In each we encounter an abrupt transition from an earthly to a heavenly plain. This occurs without any explanation or bridge, suggesting that the readers are familiar with backgrounds that are likely assumed by the writer. Second, there is a correlation between the earthly and heavenly in all four cases; that is, the heavenly serves as a paradigm for the earthly. Third, in all four texts the objects of condemnation experience a fall from glory and are consigned to prisoner status.

While the idea of imprisoned spirits in the OT is undefined, in Jewish apocalyptic literature it is pronounced,<sup>15</sup> along with the notion of a pit or “abyss.”<sup>16</sup> Apart from Jude 6 and 2 Pet 2:4, traces of this appear in the NT: for example, in Jesus' deliverance of the demon-possessed man as recorded in Luke 8:31 (whereupon the demons cast out implore the Son of God not to be cast into the abyss); Rev 9:1–3, which describes the opening of the abyss, out of which ascend locusts that are granted the power of scorpions on the earth; Rev 20:1–3, which describes the imprisonment of Satan for a thou-

13. Note, for example, the reference in Isa 14:13 to Mount Zaphon, the seat of the Canaanite deity. The use in 14:14 of *'el 'elyôn* seems to confirm its Canaanite background. See T. H. Robinson, “Hebrew Myths,” in *Myth and Ritual* (ed. S. H. Hooke; London: Oxford University Press, 1933) 183; B. S. Childs, *Myth and Reality in the Old Testament* (Naperville: Allenson, 1960) 68–69; and R. J. Clifford, *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972) 160.

14. The man of lawlessness in 2 Thess 2:4 makes a similar claim: *apodeiknynta heay-ton hoti estin theos*.

15. E.g., 1 En. 10:4, 12–14; 13:1; 18:14, 16; 21:3, 6, 10; 67:4; 69:8; 88:1, 3; 90:23; 2 Apoc. Bar. 56:13; Jub. 5:10; Rev 18:2; and 20:3.

16. 1 En. 10:4; 18:11; 21:7; 22:1–2; 54:5; 56:3; 88:1, 3; 90:24, 26; and Rev 20:3.

sand years in the abyss; and finally, the fascinatingly cryptic and difficult text of 1 Pet 3:18–20.<sup>17</sup>

Although both 2 Pet 2:4 and Jude 6 allude to the punishment of rebellious angels, neither states when or why these angels were disobedient, only that they were judged for having “sinned” (2 Peter) and having “left their own abode” (Jude). Without explanation or commentary, and without necessarily endorsing conceptions of cosmic warfare that have their roots in pagan mythology, Jude and 2 Peter assimilate imagery current to their day and exploit it for their own theological purposes. The motif of “rebellion in heaven,” a notion vaguely hinted at in the OT, illustrates graphically the effects of choosing to fall away. Within apocalyptic mythology, a frequent pattern tends to merge: (1) war erupts in heaven, not infrequently depicted in astral terms,<sup>18</sup> followed by (2) a spilling over of this rebellion to the earth, then culminating in (3) ultimate vindication and punishment by the king of heaven.<sup>19</sup> We see this pattern on display in the NT Apocalypse: (1) the tail of the dragon draws “a third of the stars” and casts them down to the earth (Rev 12:4); war breaks out in the heaven, with the dragon and his angels fighting Michael and his angels (12:7); and the “king of heaven” vanquishes the dragon, who is cast out (12:8–9).

Contextual considerations must guide our interpretation of the rebellious angels. In both epistles reference to the angels occurs in a *sequence* of moral paradigms. The link that binds the angels with Noah and his contemporaries, Sodom and Gomorrah, and Lot in 2 Pet 2:4–10a invites investigation, just as the specific link between the

17. While an examination of this text remains outside the scope of the present paper, I have attempted elsewhere to deal with the spate of dizzying questions raised by the text. See Charles, *Literary Strategy*, 134–42 n. 1. A bibliography of varying exegetical approaches to these verses is found on pp. 214–15 nn. 37 and 38. The judicious words of W. J. Dalton, from whose thorough investigation of this text any student of the NT would benefit, are worth repeating: “the difficulty of the text lies not in the thought of the author, which is neither odd nor fantastic, but in our ignorance of his background and field of reference. . . . [S]tudies in later Jewish apocryphal writings and in early Jewish-Christian literature reveal a whole world of ideas which was powerfully at work, all the more so because simply taken for granted, in the writers of the New Testament. The exegete . . . must try to immerse himself as deeply as possible in the mental atmosphere of the biblical writer, his pre-suppositions, his categories of thought, his literary conventions” (*Christ’s Proclamation to the Spirits: A Study of 1 Peter 3:18–4:6 [Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965] 7–9*).

18. This depiction we find in Jude, where the apostate are portrayed as “wandering stars” (*asteres planētai*, v. 13), but not in 2 Peter, where we encounter a more Hellenistic version, reminiscent of the Titan mythology.

19. P. D. Hanson, “Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel, and Euhemeristic Heroes in 1 Enoch 6–11,” *JBL* 96 (1977) 208.

angels, unbelieving Israel, and Sodom and Gomorrah in Jude must be identified. It is thus to the task of contrast and contextualization that we now turn.

### THE DEPICTION OF THE ANGELS IN 2 PETER

The angels in 2 Peter 2 find themselves part of a sequence of four paradigms; they join Noah and his contemporaries, Sodom and Gomorrah, and righteous Lot to help form a monstrously complex sentence that stretches from 2:4 to 2:10a. The text of 2:4 reads: *Ei gar ho theos aggelōn hamartēsantōn ouk epheisato alla serais zophou tartarōsas paredōken eis krisin tēroumenous . . .* (“For if God did not spare the angels who sinned, but rather cast them into Tartarus and delivered them over to chains of darkness to be reserved for judgment . . .”).<sup>20</sup>

The grammar and syntax of 2:4–10a (“For if God . . . kept . . . kept . . . condemned . . . delivered . . . , then the Lord knows how to deliver . . .”) indicates that two motifs—judgment and deliverance—are operative in 2 Peter, in contrast to Jude 5–7, where categorical judgment alone occurs. Hence, in 2 Peter the paradigms function in a slightly different way. They are meant simultaneously to encourage and to condemn, to exhort, and to warn. Whereas in Jude unbelieving Israel, the angels, and the cities of the plain suffer loss and are roundly condemned, in 2 Peter the four paradigms serve a dual purpose. The angels are judged because they “sinned” (2:4), just as Sodom and Gomorrah are “turned into ashes” and “condemned to destruction, making them an example to those who afterward would live ungodly” (2:5). At the same time, “Noah, one of eight people, a herald of righteousness,” joins “righteous Lot” (2:7–8) as a recipient of divine deliverance in the face of enormous social pressures. The lesson is expressly stated, with a twofold trajectory: “the Lord knows how to deliver the godly . . . and to reserve the ungodly” for judgment (2:9).<sup>21</sup>

What is noteworthy as well in 2 Peter is the fact that reference to the fallen angels appears side by side with reference to the flood, an association that is absent in Jude. Why the allusion to Noah in 2 Peter but not in Jude? The answer may lie in the Petrine affinity for flood typology (cf. 1 Pet 3:18–22) as well as the use of comparison. Righteous Noah, after all, stands in utter contrast to his contemporaries, who were destroyed in the flood. The angels, similarly, whose condemnation has already been pronounced, await eschatological destruction, of which the flood was typological. Noah, then, is set in contradistinction to his contemporaries and the angels. Viewed pastorally, this

20. Free translation.

21. Emphasis added.

strengthened form of comparison has the effect of encouraging the faithful, who are probably struggling amidst a pervasively pagan cultural environment.<sup>22</sup>

Unlike Jude, the angels in 2 Peter are “consigned to Tartarus” (*tartaroo*)—terminology unique to the NT that is reminiscent of Greek Titan mythology, on which *1 Enoch*, with its apocalyptic mythology and fall of the “Watchers,” is largely assumed to be dependent. This language is conspicuous and suggests a Gentile audience; by contrast, reference to Hades or Gehenna would indicate a more Jewish audience. The use of this sort of imagery that calls to mind Greek Titan mythology doubtless would be familiar to both Greeks and Jews<sup>23</sup> and reflects a more pluralistic, Gentile social location in which the audience is located.

Several other details distinguish the reference to the angels in 2 Peter. What is curiously absent from 2 Peter is apocalyptic astral imagery that casts the adversaries as “wandering stars” (Jude 13), a description that would trigger immediate association with *1 Enoch*<sup>24</sup> among Jewish readers. Finally, whereas Jude’s stress is the angels’ fall from authority, domain, and position, in 2 Peter allusion is more generic (they “sin”), with emphasis placed on their being committed to judgment. The rebellious angels, according to 2 Peter, constitute a precedent of “not having been spared” (*ouk epheisato*, 2:4).

### THE DEPICTION OF THE ANGELS IN JUDE

The rebellious angels in Jude join two other exhibits—unbelieving Israel and Sodom and Gomorrah—to form a triplet of paradigms that serve to warn the readers. All three appear in Jewish tradition as stereotypes of hard-heartedness.<sup>25</sup> In Jude, these three are united by a common fate; all share a remarkable disenfranchisement. Whereas two of these are earthly models, the third is heavenly, reinforcing the lessons gleaned from the other two. Perhaps sensing great interest among his readers in the angelic realm,<sup>26</sup> Jude chooses a heavenly counterpart to Israel and the cities of the plain. Both in the choice of

22. The reason for the juxtaposition of the rebellious angels and Noah is less the connection between the two that is found in *1 Enoch* (wherein the flood is a consequence of the Watchers’ depravity) than it is a contrast between excessive wickedness and righteous living. R. J. Bauckham seems to capture this relationship when he writes that Noah serves a “counterpart to two examples of judgment” (*Jude, 2 Peter* [WBC 50; Waco: Word, 1983] 250).

23. Jdt 16:6 refers to the fallen angels as *titanes*. Josephus also alludes to the Titan myth in his commentary on Genesis 6 (*Ant.* 1.73).

24. E.g., 1 En. 18:14–16; 21:6; 86:1–3; and 90:24.

25. *See n. 1.*

26. This sense is confirmed by the use of apocalyptic traditions in Jude 9 and 14–15.

paradigms as well as in the fondness for threes, the letter of Jude shows itself to be the product of a Palestinian Jewish-Christian milieu.

One cannot help but be struck by the use of triplets in Jude.<sup>27</sup> Not one or two illustrations suffice, but three. The writer, whether in his use of prophetic types or in his explanation of these types, exploits the method of threefold “witness” to condemn his opponents (vv. 4, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 19) while exhorting the faithful. The validity of testimony in the OT was affirmed by the mouth of two or three witnesses (Num 35:30; Deut 17:6; and 19:15). This principle is carried over into the NT, where it finds validation (Matt 18:16; John 5:31–33; 8:17–18; 2 Cor 13:1; 1 Tim 5:19; Heb 10:28). Multiple witnesses confirm, and a threefold concurrence yields completeness. In a very Jewish and calculating way, Jude corroborates evidence in order to condemn those who threaten the community. His testimony is valid and sure, buttressed by the cords of multiple witnesses.

The center-point of Jude’s illustration involving the angels is their departure, heightened by a play on the catchword “keep” (*terein*).<sup>28</sup> Whereas 2 Peter only says that the angels “sinned” (*hamartanō*), Jude explains that they “did not keep their rule; rather, they deserted their own habitation” (*me teresantas ten heauton archon alla apolipontas to idion oiketerion*). As a result, they have been dispossessed, “having been kept in eternal chains of darkness until the judgment of the great day” (*eis krisin megales hemeras desmois aidiois hypo zophon tetereken*). The reader is hereby struck by the utterly incomprehensible nature of departing from the truth. The angels’ fate is commensurate with their privilege. Having been exposed to light and glory, they are eternally consigned to darkness and judgment.

The apocalyptic imagery surrounding the angels in Jude 6 is strengthened by the allusion to Jude’s opponents as “wandering stars” (v. 13) and would trigger immediate association with *1 Enoch*,<sup>29</sup> particularly if Jude’s readership was Palestinian Jewish-Christian. This association is virtually guaranteed, given the near-verbatim citation in Jude 14–15 of a theophany statement found in *1 En.* 1:9<sup>30</sup> as well as

27. The unsurpassed use of triplets in Jude defies comparison, given the mere 25 verses that compose the epistle. All told, 20 sets of triplets occur. These are found in (1) the listing of paradigms (vv. 5–7, 11), (2) explanation or interpretation of the paradigms as they related to the *houtoi* (vv. 8–10, 12–13, 16, 19), (3) epistolary features of Jude’s address and doxological conclusion (vv. 1–2, 24–25), and (4) the grammatical-lexical particularities of Jude’s writing style (vv. 1, 8, 9, 11, 20–23). See my “Literary Artifice in the Epistle of Jude,” *ZNW* 82 (1991) 122–23.

28. Significantly, in Jude’s doxology (vv. 24–25), the believer is “kept” (*phyllasso*, a strengthened form of the verb “to keep”) from falling.

29. E.g., *1 En.* 18:14–16; 21:6; 86:1–3; 90:24.

30. Elsewhere I have examined at length Jude’s use of Enochic tradition material. See *Literary Strategy*, 153–62.

what appears to be an allusion to the *Assumption of Moses* in Jude 9. What all three texts share in common is *theophany that leads to judgment*.

Several observations need to be made at this point. On the one hand, Jude draws freely from Enochic language and imagery. The verbal parallels alone in v. 6 are conspicuous: “binding and darkness” (cf. *1 En.* 10:4); “the great day” (cf. *1 En.* 10:6); “abandoning the high heaven” (cf. *1 En.* 12:4); reservation in “chains” (cf. 54:5).<sup>31</sup> On the other hand, the reader should take care to note what Jude emphasizes and what he omits. The presentation of the angels in v. 6 is abrupt. This can mean one of several things. It may reflect the assumption that the audience is familiar with the traditions, needing no introduction or explanation. It may also indicate that Jude is borrowing from Jewish apocalyptic imagery without necessarily endorsing its theological content, employing the imagery for his own purpose.<sup>32</sup> The latter possibility is strengthened by the fact that the “Watchers” of Dan 4:13, 17, and 23 are holy and servants of God, whereas in *1 Enoch* they are fallen and take on mythological proportions.<sup>33</sup>

The sin of the angels,<sup>34</sup> though veiled to humans, was very real. The point of Jude’s witness, however, is not speculation as to the precise reasons for or nature of the fall. The angels are moral agents; like Israel and the cities of the plain, they were dispossessed—and utterly so.

Using a play on the catchword “keep” (*terein*), Jude unites typologically in v. 6 the event of the angels’ fall with unbelieving Israel (v. 5) and the cities of the plain (v. 7) under the theme of categorical judgment. Without necessarily endorsing conceptions of cosmic warfare that have their roots in pagan mythology, and without necessarily embracing Jewish apocalyptic theology wholesale, Jude assimilates apocalyptic imagery current in his day and exploits it for his own purposes. The motif of “rebellion in heaven,” a notion vaguely hinted at in

31. One of the most extensive comparisons of Jude 6 and *1 Enoch* has been done by R. Rubinkiewicz, *Die Eschatologie von Henoch 9...11 und das Neue Testament* (ÖBS 6; Klosterneuburg: OKB, 1984) 128–33.

32. For example, Jude would not assert that 200 angels bound themselves to a curse, descended upon Mount Hermon, and took wives for themselves (*1 En.* 6:4–7:1). Nor would Jude suggest that these angels did in fact teach magic and incantations or that the women, having been impregnated, brought forth giants 300 cubits (roughly 500 feet) in height (*1 En.* 7:1–2).

33. Likewise, in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and in Jubilees they are fallen.

34. Much commentary, ancient and modern, has linked the sins of the angels in Jude and 2 Peter with Gen 6:1–4 and the “sons of God.” The focus of the present paper is a comparison of the angels’ depiction in the two texts and *not* speculation as to the link between the angels and Sodom and Gomorrah. On the viability of this connection, see *Literary Strategy*, 108–16 and 145–49.

the OT and greatly expanded in Jewish apocalyptic, illustrates graphically the fate that awaits those who choose to depart from the way.<sup>35</sup>

### CONCLUSION

In both 2 Peter and Jude we encounter the rebellious angels, a paradigm of hard-heartedness that appears frequently in Jewish tradition. In both epistles, where such allusions are particularly dense, OT characters and events (and exegetical traditions extending from them) are paraenetic rather than didactic in nature; that is, they are illustrative and serve as moral types to warn the reader. Contextually, in 2 Peter the angels function with three other paradigms to illustrate the contrast of incontrovertible judgment over against merciful deliverance. For a readership that finds itself in a pervasively Gentile social climate, the juxtaposition in 2 Peter of deliverance of the righteous and judgment of the wicked is encouraging and reassuring. The actual depiction of the angels themselves in 2 Peter is molded by language that is more Gentile than Jewish. By contrast, in Jude the angels are part of an initial triad of examples from Jewish tradition that represent categorical judgment. They constitute an important weapon in Jude's rhetorical arsenal that draws heavily on standard apocalyptic conventions and imagery, the sum total of which mirrors a readership that is likely Palestinian Jewish-Christian.

Despite the nuances that distinguish angelic depiction in 2 Peter and Jude, in both letters the angels are united by one thing: they are being kept under reserve for the judgment of the great day. An awareness of this stunning reality should not be lost on the reader: it is designed to produce both comfort and reverence.

35. Hence, the language in Jude that is applied to the second triad of apostates: "Woe to them! For they walk in the way of Cain, and abandon themselves for the sake of gain to Balaam's error, and perish in Korah's rebellion" (v. 11).