A.V. *a railing accusation:* a sentence  
savouring of, belonging to, *evil speaking*),  
**but said, The Lord rebuke thee** (the  
source of the tradition to which St. Jude  
here refers as familiar to his readers, is  
not known with any certainty. Origen  
says, “In the Ascension of Moses, of which  
book the Apostle Jude makes mention in  
his Epistle, Michael the archangel, disputing   
with the devil concerning the body  
of Moses, says...” No such tradition is  
found in any apocryphal or rabbinical book  
now extant. In the targum of Jonathan on  
Deut. xxxiv. 6, it is stated that the grave  
of Moses was given into the special custody  
of Michael. Some have given an allegorical   
interpretation, understanding by **the  
body of Moses** the law, or Jewish polity,  
or even people: and, thus interpreting,  
fix the occasion very variously: at the  
giving of the law: at the siege under  
Hezekiah, or the rebuilding under Zerubbabel.   
All such explanations are of  
course out of the question: and the literal,  
matter of fact alone to be held fast. It is,  
however, remarkable, that the same words,  
**The Lord rebuke thee**, are spoken by  
the angel to the devil in Zech. iii. 1–3.  
This has led some, e.g. Bede, to imagine,  
that this was the occasion referred to, when  
Joshua and Satan stood as adversaries concerning   
the deliverance of Israel from captivity.   
The only straightforward conclusion   
is, that St. Jude took the incident  
from primitive tradition, which tradition,  
slightly modified, is also given by the prophet   
Zechariah. That the incident is related   
as matter of fact, and not as an  
“argumentum ad hominem,” is evident  
by the very form of it. That, being thus  
related as matter of fact, it *is* matter  
of fact, is a conclusion which will or will  
not be made, according as we are or are  
not, persuaded of the authenticity of our  
Epistle as a part of canonical Scripture:  
and according as we esteem that canonical  
Scripture itself).

**10.**] *Contrast of the behaviour of these  
persons to that just related.* 2 Pet. ii. 12.  
**These on the other hand, whatever things  
they know not, speak evil of** (the reference   
in *whatever things they know not* is  
to the spiritual world. Those who understand   
*dominion* and *glories* above of human  
authorities, are at a loss for an explanation   
here: so Arnaud, “il est assez difficile  
do préciser, quelles étaient ces choses  
qu’ignoraient cesi mpies”): **but whatever  
things naturally, as the irrational animals,   
they understand** (viz. the objects  
of sense: of which *the flesh*, ver. 8, has  
already been mentioned as one. **naturally**,   
i.e. instinctively:. In 2 Pet. ii. 12,  
the comparison to irrational creatures is  
not confined to the sort of knowledge  
which they have, but is extended to the  
persons themselves and their conduct), **in  
these** (in the element and region of these)  
**they corrupt themselves** (or, are depraved).

**11.**] The description is interrupted by  
*a denunciation on them for having followed   
in the steps of former ungodly men.*  
**Woe unto them** (so also St. Paul, 1 Cor.  
ix. 16, “*woe is unto me:*” from which  
it appears that Bengel is not exact, when  
he says “that this apostle only, and in  
this place only, uses the imprecation”):  
**for they went by the way** (the past  
tenses are probably anticipatory, as looking   
back on their course: as those in  
John xvii,—“*I glorified Thee on the  
earth, &c.*” In an English *version* we are  
sometimes [though not here] compelled  
to render these by our perfect, “*they  
have gone,” &c.*) **of Cain** (how? I have  
treated some of the explanations in my  
Greek Test. The most probable answer  
is that given by Stier and Huther, that the  
point of comparison is that selfish regard  
and envy which was at the root of Cain’s  
sin), **and rushed after** (so literally) **the**