

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1949

An Interpretation of the Epistle of St. Jude

William Hassold

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hassold, William, "An Interpretation of the Epistle of St. Jude" (1949). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 219.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/219>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

AN INTERPRETATION OF
THE EPISTLE OF ST. JUDE

A Thesis Presented to
the Faculty of Concordia Seminary
Department of New Testament

I. Introduction 1
II. Interpretation 2
Bibliography 121

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Sacred Theology

By
William J. Hassold

May, 1949

41,278

Approved by: W. Arndt.

Martin H. Franzmann

CONCORDIA SEMINARY
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

52406

BV
4070
C69
M3
1949
no. 2
C. 2

52406

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| I. Introduction | 1 |
| II. Interpretation | 22 |
| Bibliography | 101 |

CONCORDIA SEMINARY LIBRARY
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

AN INTERPRETATION OF THE EPISTLE OF ST. JUDE

I. Introduction

With regard to the Epistle of Jude, Luther, in the year 1545, wrote as follows: "Although I praise the book, it is an epistle that need not be counted among the chief books, which are to lay the foundation of the faith."¹ And with this opinion I am ready to concur. And yet, though this letter does not have the doctrinal significance of Romans or 1 Peter, or the practical significance of 1 Corinthians or James, it is worthy of study as a part of the canon of Scripture. To many people it is known only very superficially as the letter which speaks of "contending for the faith once delivered to the saints," or as the letter which tells of the struggle of the archangel Michael with the devil for the body of Moses, or which tells of the prophecy of Enoch. Beyond these few scattered references, the letter of Jude is almost entirely an unknown quantity.

Luther's attitude towards the letter of Jude, as he himself says, was influenced by three factors: 1) its close resemblance to part of 2 Peter; 2) its use of material found nowhere else in Scripture; 3) its rejection by many of the Church fathers.² We shall have to consider

1. Works of Martin Luther, Vol. 6, p. 479.

2. Ibid.

each of these matters in formulating our opinion of the letter of Jude.

External Evidence

"The Epistle of Jude, indeed, is acknowledged in the Catholic Church," says the anonymous author of the Muratorian Canon.³ This is the first specific reference by name to the Epistle of Jude. Some scholars, however, find allusions to it in the writings of the sub-apostolic age (cf. Ep. Barn. 2:16; 4:9, with Jude 3 f.; Ep. Polyc. iii. 2, iv. 2, with Jude 3, 20; Mart. Polyc. xx. with Jude 24 f.). But a closer examination of these supposed allusions to Jude will show, as Chase observes, that "little or no stress can be laid on supposed coincidences with this Ep. in sub-apostolic writings."⁴ However, there is a very marked resemblance between the letter of Jude (vv. 22 f.) and Didache iv. 2 (ca. 110), if the text which is adopted in the commentary is the correct one. This similarity, however, does not necessarily imply literary interdependence, but it may merely imply, that both writings may have arisen in the same circles. It is therefore dangerous to press this resemblance too vigorously.

As already mentioned, the Muratorian Canon (ca. 175) contains a specific reference to the letter of Jude. Clement of Alexandria (ca. 200) is the first Church father to quote from it (Faedag. III. 8, Strom. III. 2); he also commented on it in his Hypotyposes.⁵ Origen (ca. 240) speaks of Jude as having written an "epistle of but few lines, yet full

3. B. F. Westcott, A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament, p. 526, where the Latin original of the Muratorian Canon is printed out.

4. F. H. Chase, "The Epistle of Jude," A Dictionary of the Bible, ed. James Hastings, Vol. 2, p. 799.

5. Cf. Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiae, XIV. 1.

of mighty words of heavenly wisdom" (in Matt. XII. 55, 56), and quotes it elsewhere. In one passage, however, he expresses doubt as to its reception (in Matt. XXII. 23). Tertullian (ca. 200) who lived in North Africa, employed Jude in attempting to validate the canonicity of the Book of Enoch, (de Hab. Mul. I. 3), and he could scarcely have done this, had it not been for the fact that Jude was accepted as canonical among the churches of Northern Africa. Eusebius (H. E., III. 25) places Jude among the antilegomena, as being controverted, but well-known and recognized, being publicly read in the Churches. Didymus of Alexandria (ca. 395) comments on it and defends it against those who deny its authority because of the use of apocryphal literature in it. Jerome (de viris illis. IV) states that this letter is rejected by many because of its use of apocryphal literature.

If we then analyze the areas from which the testimonies to the existence and acceptance of Jude come, we discover that these testimonies are mainly Western. One very important area has not been mentioned in any way: we are indeed at first surprised to see that the letter is not included in the Peshitta, the Syriac translation of the New Testament, though we must remember that the Peshitta omitted all four minor Catholic epistles. But we should not be surprised, for a letter so brief and directed against so specific a manifestation in the life of the Church would naturally not have the appeal of a letter like Romans or 1 Peter. The remarkable thing really is that it was known as commonly as it was. While the external evidence is not so good as it is for other books of the New Testament canon, it is sufficient to show that this letter was known in various areas of the Church at an early date.

Authorship

The epistle before us purports to come from "Jude, a slave of Jesus Christ, and brother of James" (1:1). We know that the name Jude (or Judas) was very common among the Jews of the first century after Christ. It was borne by the progenitor of one of the tribes of Israel, as well as by one of the Maccabean heroes: and this is sufficient to account for its popularity among the Jewish people of that age. Two of the disciples of the Lord bore this name: Judas, who came from the Judean town of Kerieth and who later betrayed his Lord into the hands of His enemies; and Judas "not Iscariot" (Jn. 14:22), who is also known as "Judas the son of James" (Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰακώβου, Lk. 6:16; Acts 1:13), or Thaddaeus or Lebbaeus (Mt. 9:3, Mk. 3:18, the MSS. reading is somewhat uncertain). Among the brothers of the Lord⁶ there was also a Jude (Mt. 13:55, Mk. 6:3). In the remainder of the New Testament we meet Judas of Galilee (Acts 5:37), Judas of Damascus (Acts 9:11), and Judas surnamed Barsabbas (Acts 15:22).

Among the various Judes mentioned in the New Testament, only two merit consideration as the author of this letter: Judas the son of James, the apostle of the Lord; and Jude the brother of the Lord.

6. The controversy which has been waged over the meaning of the words ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ κυρίου need not concern us here. It has been held that they were (a) sons of Joseph by a former marriage, and so older than Jesus (the Epiphonian hypothesis); (b) sons of Joseph and Mary, younger than Jesus (the Helvidian hypothesis); (c) not really brothers at all, but cousins (the Hieronymian hypothesis). For an able defense of the first of these views, see J. B. Lightfoot, The Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians, pp. 252-291; for a defense of the second, see J. B. Mayor, The Epistle of St. James, pp. i-xxxvi; and for a defense of the third, see F. Bechtel, "The Brethren of the Lord", The Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. 2, pp. 767 f.

The cause of the apostle Jude, the son of James, has been championed in modern times by all Roman Catholic scholars⁷ and, in Protestant circles, by Keil.⁸ However, a number of cogent arguments can be raised against this view, and it is rejected by an overwhelming majority of New Testament scholars. Jude does not call himself an apostle of the Lord, neither in the wider nor in the narrower sense of that term. Keil accounts for this by the supposition that Jude did not feel the necessity to urge his apostolic dignity in writing to this congregation, for the members of this congregation already recognized and acknowledged his apostolic authority.⁹ However, two facts may be urged against this: 1) in a controversial letter against false teachers, it is most certainly strange that Jude did not urge his apostolic authority in rejecting the onslaughts of the libertines. We need only think of St. Paul's emphasis on his apostleship in times of controversy to see how unusual such reticence would be on the part of Jude if he possessed apostolic dignity; 2) more important, v. 17 seems to imply that Jude does not include himself in the number of the apostles of the Lord, but is separate from them. Another consideration which may be urged against the authorship of this letter by Jude the apostle is that it is not included in the Peshitta, the Syriac translation of the New Testament. Tradition has it that the Apostle Jude labored in Syria and died at Edessa, and if the tradition is cor-

7. See e.g., J. Steinmueller, A Companion to Scripture Studies, Vol. 3, pp. 183 f.

8. Carl Friedrich Keil, Commentar Über die Briefe des Petrus und Judas, pp. 287-291.

9. Ibid., p. 287.

rect in these particulars, it is strange indeed that the Epistle of Jude should be excluded from the Peshitta. One other point may be urged against the view that the author of the Epistle of Jude was an apostle: he calls himself a brother of James (ὁ δὲ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Ἰακώβου). It is almost certain that the James referred to by Jude as his brother is the leader of the Jerusalem Church (Gal. 1:19), and accordingly is a brother of the Lord. If this is the case, only on the Hieronymian hypothesis can Jude be an apostle in the restricted sense of the word. However, it is the consensus of most modern scholars that the Hieronymian view is untenable in the light of the facts.

Accordingly, if we are to identify the author of the Epistle of Jude with one of the Judes mentioned in the New Testament, only one other person merits our consideration, Jude the brother of the Lord.

Of this Jude we know very little from Scripture. Depending upon the view which is adopted concerning the vexed question of the Brethren of the Lord, he may be either a uterine brother, or a step-brother, but scarcely a cousin of Jesus. We do know that he was among those, who, during the Lord's ministry upon earth, did not believe on Him, but who, after the resurrection, joined himself to the early Christian community while awaiting the promise of the Spirit. From 1 Cor. 9:5 we know that the brethren of the Lord were married and were engaged in itinerant missionary work. But beyond these few notices we know nothing from Scripture concerning the brethren of the Lord.

Tradition is not of much greater help in giving us information about the later activities of Jude. On the basis of the story told by Hegesippus concerning the grandsons of Jude, as related in Eusebius'

Historia Ecclesiae,¹⁰ we may infer that Jude was dead when the incident related took place, for after these grandsons of Jude were released by Domitian, they became leaders in the Church, which they would scarcely have done had Jude still been alive and active. *This was before 81 when Domitian came to the throne*

Several considerations have been urged against identifying the author of this epistle with any person known to us from the New Testament. It has been said that the epistle bears traces of developments which occurred long after the apostolic age was ended,¹¹ and that therefore the author cannot be anyone known to us from the New Testa-

10. This story as related by Eusebius is as follows: "The same Domitian gave orders for the execution of those of the family of David, and as an ancient story goes that some heretics accused the grandsons of Judas (who is said to have been the brother, according to the flesh, of the Saviour) saying that they were of the family of David and related to the Christ himself. Hegesippus relates this exactly as follows: 'Now there still survived of the family of the Lord grandsons of Judas, who was said to have been his brother according to the flesh, and they were delated as being of the family of David. These the officer brought to Domitian Caesar, for, like Herod, he was afraid of the coming of the Christ. He asked them if they were of the house of David and they admitted it. Then he asked them how much property they had, or how much money they controlled, and they said that all they possessed was nine thousand denarii between them, the half belonging to each, and they stated that they did not possess this in money but that it was the valuation of only thirty-nine plethra of ground on which they paid taxes and lived on it by their own work. They then showed him their hands, adducing as testimony of their labour the hardness of their bodies, and the tough skin which had been embossed on their hands from their incessant work. They were asked concerning the Christ and his kingdom, its nature, origin, and time of appearance, and explained that it was neither of the world nor earthly, but heavenly and angelic, and it would be at the end of the world, when he would come in glory to judge the living and the dead and to reward every man according to his deeds. At this Domitian did not condemn them at all, but despised them as simple folk, released them, and decreed an end to the persecution against the church. But when they were released they were the leaders of the churches, both for their testimony and for their relation to the Lord, and remained alive in the peace which ensued until Trajan.'" The translation is taken from Kirsopp Lake, Eusebius, The Ecclesiastical History, Vol. 1, pp. 237, 239.

11. See, eg. Rudolph Knopf, Die Briefe Petri und Judas, p. 206.

ment. This matter will be discussed in more detail under the dating of the epistle. Suffice it to say that the arguments used against dating this letter in the apostolic age are singularly inconclusive. It has also been suggested that the identification of Jude as a brother of James is a device by which the author wished to gain a hearing for his letter.¹² But, we may ask, why does he adopt the name of such an obscure character for this purpose when the names of many other more prominent individuals lay ready to hand? To obviate this difficulty it has been suggested that the phrase "brother of James" is a later interpolation. However, we may ask why the annotator did not say "Jude, a slave of Jesus Christ, and an apostle of the Lord," thus indubitably identifying his author with the apostolic band? Such a salutation would most certainly be more likely to gain reception in the churches than the name of an obscure individual like Jude the brother of the Lord. Scott suggests that the word ἀδελφός may be an interpolation, thus making the author either the apostle Jude—a view which is extremely unlikely—or an unknown Jude who is in some way related to an otherwise unknown James.¹³ But the objections which have been raised to the previous theories also apply in this case.

Dating

We have already seen reason for conjecturing that Jude died before the year 81, and this—if our previous identification is correct—forms the terminus ad quem for the epistle. There are two considera-

12. E. J. Goodspeed, An Introduction to the New Testament, p. 347.

13. E. F. Scott, Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, pp. 225 f.

tions which will help us to determine the terminus a quo for the epistle:

1) We feel that Jude would scarcely have undertaken to write this letter while his brother James was still alive and active, unless, of course, it was to a congregation which he himself had founded. But as will be shown, I believe this letter was written to a congregation in which the apostle Peter had been active. This consideration, therefore, is inconclusive for dating the letter. 2) More important is the fact that Jude employed the second letter of Peter in drafting his epistle. (This question is much debated and will be considered at greater length in another section of this introduction.) Had Peter still been alive and active, Jude would scarcely have written this letter, since--if the view which I am espousing is correct--his letter is to serve as a reminder to the congregation of the apostolic teaching on the subject of errorists. Accordingly we must date the letter after 64 and sometime before 80. Beyond this we have no certain data.

However, as already mentioned, a number of very definite objections have been raised against dating this letter in the first century. It is urged that "Jude clearly looks back upon the age of the apostles, for they had foretold the conditions he now sees existing."¹⁴ This, I feel, is forcing an unwarranted meaning into Jude's words. As Chase observes:¹⁵

The language of v. 17 implies that the recipients of the Ep. had been wont to receive oral instruction (ἐλεγον) from the general body of the apostles (τῶν ἀποστόλων), and that this

¹⁴. Goodspeed, Introduction, p. 347.

¹⁵. Chase, op. cit., p. 803. -- Chase perhaps overstates his case; ἐλεγον may be colorless, and the apostolic instruction may also

period of intercourse was now over. It may well be that some of the apostles had been removed by death, but the requirements of language are satisfied if we suppose that the apostles were now scattered.

A second objection which has been expressed to dating this epistle in the apostolic age is the use of the term πίστις for a body of doctrine. It is held that this is a much later development. However, some scholars hold that Paul's use of the term πίστις in such passages as Gal. 1:23, 3:23, 6:10, Rom. 10:8, Eph. 4:5, Phil. 1:27 approximates the use of πίστις in Jude, and shows that this is not necessarily a late development.

The third objection which is often raised is that Jude uses late apocryphal literature. Goodspeed, for example, says: "He quotes with the greatest confidence passages from the Book of Enoch and the Assumption of Moses (towards A.D. 50)—late Jewish writings which he evidently regards as Scripture."¹⁶ However, this objection only appears to be serious when put as vaguely as Goodspeed puts it. The Book of Enoch is assigned by most scholars to the era before the birth of Christ, while Goodspeed dates the Assumption of Moses exceptionally late.¹⁷ Most modern scholars place it in the first decades of the first century, and therefore the date of composition of these works has very

have come by letter. In any case the readers of Jude's letter remembered it.

16. Goodspeed, Introduction, loc. cit.

17. Cf. M. R. James, The Second Epistle of Peter and the Epistle of Jude, pp. xlv f. — This volume (pp. xi - xlviii) gives an excellent summary of the modern state of knowledge with regard to both the Assumption of Moses and the Book of Enoch. For a more detailed statement of modern opinion, see R. H. Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, Vol. 2, pp. 163-187, 407-413.

little bearing on the dating of this letter.¹⁸

Many scholars confidently assert that Jude was writing to combat some form of Gnostic teaching, and since this form of error did not become current until the second century after Christ, they maintain that the letter of Jude, which purports to come from a brother of the Lord, cannot have been written by him, but is the work of an unknown second-century author who adopted the name of Jude to gain authority for his writing. This reconstruction appears very convincing, until further investigation shows that there is no reason for such confident assertions. The position of these scholars is untenable in two distinct areas. 1) Gnosticism as a full-blown and elaborately developed system is most certainly a product of the second century, but the germs of it may well have been found in the congregations of the first century as well. In the letter of Paul to the congregation at Colossae, we have corroboration for this view. 2) The other area in which the reconstruction falls down is this: the assumption that the letter clearly shows that it was directed against Gnosticism. The Gnostic character of these errorists is deduced from three passages in the letter:

a) In v. 4b the words τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ Κύριον καὶ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ὀρνούμενοι are often looked upon as referring to denials, on the part of Gnostics, of God as the creator and ruler of the universe, coupled with a denial of Christ. However, the single article before both nouns would seem to indicate that it is a denial of only one person, the Lord and Master Jesus Christ. If this is the case, it is a reference to

18. For a discussion of the use of apocryphal material in Scripture interpretation, see the interpretation of v. 6 of this epistle.

the denial of the sovereignty of Christ in the lives of the errorists.

b) The verb ἐϋπνίαζεσθαί (v. 8) is thought to point to visions as the source of Gnostic speculations. However, it is just as easily understood of their tendency to do and say monstrous things, as men might do while they are asleep and dreaming. These men are sunk in the torpor of sin, and in this state they do vile and evil things. c) The contrast which some scholars feel is implied in v. 19 between the ψυχικοί and the πνευματικοί is thought by some to be a reference to the various classes into which the Gnostics divided all mankind; but this is not necessarily the case. The context seems to imply that the distinctions which these men made (ἁποδιόριζοντες) were on a social level rather than on a spiritual or intellectual level. Accordingly, the arguments for a later dating of this epistle on the basis of the identification of the libertines with antinomian Gnostics will not stand. There is, then, no reason why this letter may not come from the first century. It is, as Dods notes, "impossible to suppose that an epistle which contains so little explicit allusion to the false doctrines of Gnosticism should have been written after the close of the apostolic age and at a time when these doctrines were well known and prevalent."¹⁹

Place of Writing, Addressees

There is no direct evidence in the epistle as to where it was written, and any attempt to designate some definite locality is sheer speculation. Various places for the composition of the letter have been suggested: Egypt, especially Alexandria, Syria, or Palestine,

19. Marcus Dods, An Introduction to the New Testament, p. 228.

in particular Jerusalem; but in the absence of definite evidence, it is best to leave the question of place of writing unanswered.

As there is no evidence as to the locality from which this letter was sent, so also there is no specific information as to the persons addressed by Jude. However, we may draw a number of inferences from the material found in the letter itself. The address is quite general, suggesting that this may be an encyclical letter. Goodspeed says: "The mere fact that it is an encyclical in form--addressed to all Christians everywhere--suggests that that literary form was already familiar through Ephesians, possibly James, and to some extent 1 Peter, though this last is addressed only to the Christians of five provinces of Asia Minor."²⁰ However, though the address is quite general, it does not exclude the possibility that this letter was addressed to one specific congregation; as Wand notes: "the situation it [the epistle] envisages is too concrete to let us suppose that it was just an open letter addressed to Christians in general."²¹ We need only think of the specific vices which Jude castigates, the turning of the love-feasts into rowdy banquets, and the perversion of the doctrine of grace by an ungodly life, and the causing of divisions in the congregation for the sake of gain. These charges are too specific to be found in an encyclical letter.

Is it then possible to identify these people to whom Jude is writing more closely? On the basis of the phrase "changing the grace

20. Goodspeed, Introduction, loc. cit.

21. J. W. C. Wand, The General Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, p. 194.

of our God into licentiousness" it has been conjectured that the addressees are members of a congregation founded by the Apostle Paul because of that apostle's tremendous emphasis upon sola gratia. However, the thought of God's grace is never far from the apostolic preaching, and therefore this phrase does not offer us any firm basis for identifying the addressees of this letter. More tenable is the suggestion that Jude is addressing the same people as Peter did in his second epistle. We can only conjecture that they are from Asia Minor, since the address and contents of that epistle do not afford definite evidence as to who the recipients are. The fact that Jude repeats so much of what Peter has written speaks in favor of this view. Only on this basis can we understand the brevity of our letter and the use which it makes of 2 Peter.

Relation to 2 Peter

Undeniably there is a literary relationship between Jude and 2 Peter. The extent to which it goes is shown graphically in the following table:

| <u>2 Peter</u> | <u>Jude</u> |
|--|---|
| <p>But false prophets also arose among the people, just as there will be false teachers among you, who will secretly bring in destructive heresies, even denying the Master who bought them, bringing upon themselves swift destruction. (2:1)</p> | <p>For admission has been secretly gained by some who long ago were designated for this condemnation, ungodly persons who pervert the grace of our God into licentiousness and deny our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ. (4)</p> |
| <p>For if God did not spare the angels when they sinned, but cast them into hell and committed them to pits of nether gloom to be kept until the judgment; (2:4)</p> | <p>And the angels that did not keep their own position but left their proper dwelling have been kept by him in eternal chains in the nether gloom until the judgment of the great day. (6)</p> |

if by turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah to ashes he condemned them to extinction and made them an example to those who were to be ungodly; (2:6)

And especially those who indulge in the lust of defiling passions and despise authority. (2:10)

whereas angels, though greater in might and power, do not pronounce a reviling judgment upon them before the Lord. (2:11)

But these, like irrational animals, creatures of instinct, born to be caught and killed, reviling in matters of which they are ignorant, will be destroyed in the same destruction with them, (2:12)

suffering wrong for their wrongdoing. They count it pleasure to revel in the daytime. They are blots and blemishes, reveling in their dissipation, carousing with you. (2:13)

Forsaking the right way they have gone astray; they have followed the way of Balaam, the son of Beor, who loved gain from wrongdoing, (2:15)

These are waterless springs and mists driven by a storm; for them the nether gloom of darkness has been reserved. (2:17)

just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the surrounding cities, which likewise acted immorally and indulged in unnatural lust, serve as an example by undergoing a punishment of eternal fire.(7)

Yet in like manner these men in their dreamings defile the flesh, reject authority, and revile the glorious ones. (8)

But when the archangel Michael, contending with the devil, disputed about the body of Moses, he did not presume to pronounce a reviling judgment upon him, but said, "The Lord rebuke you." (9)

But these men revile whatever they do not understand, and by those things that they know by instinct as irrational animals do, they are destroyed. (10)

These are blemishes on your love feasts, as they boldly carouse with you, looking after themselves; waterless clouds, carried along by winds; fruitless trees in late autumn, twice dead, uprooted; (12)

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. (11)

These are blemishes on your love feasts, as they boldly carouse with you, looking after themselves; waterless clouds, carried along by winds; fruitless trees in late autumn, twice

For, uttering loud boasts of folly, they entice with licentious passions of the flesh men who have barely escaped from those who live in error. (2:18)

that you should remember the predictions of the holy prophets and the commandment of the Lord and Savior through your apostles. (3:2)

First of all you must understand this, that scoffers will come in the last days with scoffing, following their own passions. (3:3)

dead, uprooted, wild waves of the sea, casting up the foam of their own shame; wandering stars for whom the nether gloom of darkness has been reserved forever. (12, 13)

These are grumblers, malcontents, following their own passions, loud-mouthed boasters, flattering people to gain advantage (16)

But you must remember, beloved, the predictions of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ; (17)

They said to you, "In the last time there will be scoffers, following their own ungodly passions. (18)

How are these similarities to be accounted for? It has been suggested that both Jude and 2 Peter are quoting from a common document. However, this hypothesis is insufficient to explain the references to the apostles of the Lord (2 Pet. 3:2, Jude 17), and therefore it has not found a wide reception.

The question then resolves itself into this: Which of these two letters has the priority over the other? Scholars have studied the literary affinities of these two works with great care, and yet, in spite of this fact, there is no unanimity of opinion among them, though it must be admitted that the balance of authority lies behind the priority of Jude. The arguments with which they support this contention are the following:

1.) The letter of Jude is written with a freshness of approach which would not have been possible had the author been modifying a previous

writing. However, it may be noted that other scholars have come to exactly the opposite conclusion; in the words of Dods:

It is more reasonable to suppose that Jude rewrote and improved what he found in Peter, than that Peter, having clear and powerful expressions before him in the Epistle of Jude, should retain just so much of his language as would show that he was borrowing and yet have left uncopied the most significant words.²²

2) It is more likely that a short letter should be incorporated into a longer letter than that the opposite should be the case. However, it may be urged that because of the urgency of the situation Jude employed only that which met his needs; the remaining material in 2 Peter, while known to him, did not apply to the situation with which he had to cope.

3) The writer of 2 Peter, it is urged, would omit that which seemed difficult to him, or which was likely to give offense to his readers, and in doing this, he confused the sense of the letter. However, it is just as possible that Jude recognized the obscurities of 2 Peter and by recasting undertook to remove them.

4) It is urged that there are elements in 2 Peter which would have been employed by Jude had he been acquainted with Peter's letter. We may mention, e. g., the destruction of the world of the ungodly by the flood, the explanation of the "great swelling words," as "promising them liberty," which would have exactly suited his purpose in condemning those who turn the "grace of God into licentiousness." But, this line of argument may also be used to prove just the opposite: there are elements in the letter of Jude which the author of 2 Peter may be

22. Dods, op. cit., p. 233.

presumed to have used had he known of them, e.g., the pun upon the verb ἡρᾶν in v. 6, the wandering stars, who as false teachers, lead others astray, etc.

5) The triplets in Jude are signs of originality, say many scholars, but it may just as readily be urged that they are refinements which Jude introduced into material which he took from the letter of Peter. However, since Jude wrote under the pressure of necessity, some scholars argue he would not have been so interested in purely stylistic matters. But the constant use of triplets may have been one of the unconscious characteristics of Jude's written style.

6) The question is asked, If Jude borrowed from Peter, why does he not acknowledge the source of his materia? The answer is: he does, indirectly, in v. 17, for the word ἔλεγον does not necessarily imply only oral instruction. A difficulty is also raised by the use of the plural τῶν ἀποστόλων, but it may be solved by saying that Jude refers specifically to a quotation from the letter of Peter, and indirectly also to prophecies of similar purport but couched in different terms which came from other apostles.

A number of arguments have been raised in defense of the priority of 2 Peter which merit our consideration:

1) The likelihood that an apostle of the fame and stature of Peter should have borrowed from a little known personage such as Jude is not very great. However, this must not be pressed too vigorously, since we cannot ascertain what standing Jude may have possessed in certain areas of the Christian Church. In connection with this, we may well ask why Peter did not acknowledge his debt to Jude; this is explicable

if Jude is first, since Peter does refer to the letters of Paul by name.

2) The writer of 2 Peter employs future tenses as well as present tenses in his letter. He says that "mockers shall come in" but he also employs present tenses where we might have expected future tense forms. However, upon examination, we shall discover that these present tenses are used to describe the character of the men who are going to stealthily enter the church. If the author of 2 Peter were a forger, it seems most likely that he would have used future tenses all the way through the letter, in order to strengthen the impression that it came from Peter.

3) One final argument which may be brought to bolster the priority of 2 Peter is the fact that Jude wrote under pressure and may therefore have used whatever material he found available. By employing the letter of Peter in a somewhat altered form, Jude was bringing to remembrance the warnings of the apostle and was showing that they were being fulfilled in the midst of the congregation to which he was writing.

While the arguments for the priority of Jude are weighty and have proved convincing to many scholars, equally valid reasons may be adduced for holding that Jude was written after 2 Peter. It would appear that Jude was written to congregations ministered to by Peter, pointing out to them the dangers which had now arisen in their midst and reminding them of the prophecies, both spoken and written, which came to them from the apostles of the Lord.

Canonicity

One question remains before we can undertake to interpret the letter of Jude. As we have already noted, Luther hesitated to accept this

letter into the canon. He offered three reasons why he entertained doubts about its canonicity. He said that it was a copy of the letter of Peter; with that statement we can agree, but that fact does not militate against its acceptance into the canon, since God has deigned to give us a prophecy and a fulfillment of the entrance of false teachers into the Church.

The second reason which Luther advanced against the acceptance of Jude was this, that it employed material found nowhere else in Scripture. As we know, in the light of modern research, much of this is derived from the apocryphal and pseudepigraphal literature with which Jude was acquainted. However, this is not a valid argument against accepting Jude into the canon, since under the Holy Spirit's guidance Jude was led to choose only such things as had an historical basis.

The third objection which Luther offered was the hesitance of the early Church to accept the letter. But the letter of Jude is much better attested than the second letter of Peter which Luther did accept. The external evidence for so short a letter as the letter of Jude is quite strong.

There is, however, one other objection which may be raised to the canonicity of Jude: the early Church laid great stress upon apostolic authorship of the various writings of the New Testament; but, as we have seen, this letter does not come from one of the twelve apostles or from someone who was closely associated with them. However, this does not say that Jude was not an apostle, for the term ἀποστόλος was used in both a narrower and a broader sense. Jude himself may have been accustomed to using the term in the narrow sense; and therefore he did not call

himself an apostle of the Lord. He was, we may assume, an apostle in the wider usage of that word, and accordingly the letter before us meets the requirement of apostolic authorship.

II. Interpretation

V. 1, 2.

Ἰούδας Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δούλος ἀδελφός δὲ Ἰακώβου
τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἠγαπημένοις καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις
κλήτουσι·
ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη.

Jude, a slave of Jesus Christ and brother of James,
 To those called ones who in God the Father are beloved and in
 Jesus Christ, preserved,
 May mercy, peace, and love be multiplied to you.

On the identification of Jude see the discussion on p. 4 of this paper. Jude, like his older brother James (Jas. 1:1) terms himself a "slave of Jesus Christ." As Bigg correctly observes, this does not mean that Jude was laying claim to apostolic dignity;¹ indeed, v. 17 seems to show that he did not include himself in the number of the apostles of our Lord, apparently understanding that term in its narrower sense.² The charge to "remember the predictions of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ" does not necessarily imply that the writer is not one of the apostles; and yet it would be more fitting coming from one who did not possess apostolic dignity. In calling themselves "slaves of Jesus Christ" both James and Jude wished to show that they counted their spiritual relationship to the risen Christ of far greater worth than their earthly kinship with Him.

1. Charles Bigg, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, p. 323.

2. See the excellent discussion of the term ἀπόστολος in Ernest De Witt Burton, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, pp. 363-384.

In calling himself a "slave of Jesus Christ" Jude places himself in a line with the prophets and leaders of the Old Testament. In commenting on the phrase δοῦλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in Rom. 1:1 Sanday and Headlam note that:

δοῦλος Θεοῦ or κυρίου is an Old Testament phrase, applied to the prophets in a body from Amos onwards (Am. 3:7; Jer. 7:25 and repeatedly; Dan. 9:6; Ezra 9:11); also with slight variations to Moses (Δεράμων Josh. 1:2), Joshua (Josh. 24:29; Jud. 2:8), David (title of Ps. 36 [35]; Pss. 78 [77]:70; 89 [88]:4, 21; also παῖς Κυρίου, title of Ps. 18 [17]), Isaiah (παῖς Is. 20:3); but applied also to worshippers generally (Pss. 34 [33]:23; 113 [112]:1 παῖδες; 136 [135]:22 of Israel, etc.).

This is the first instance of a similar use in the New Testament; it is found also in the greetings of Phil., Tit., Jas., Jude, 2 Pet., showing that as the Apostolic age progressed the assumption of the title became established on a broad basis. But it is noticeable how quietly St. Paul steps into the place of the prophets and leaders of the Old Covenant, and how quietly he substitutes the name of His [sic!] own Master in a connexion hitherto reserved for that of Jehovah.³

Jude continues the description of himself by the phrase "brother of James." On the implications of this self-designation for ascertaining the authorship of the letter, see p. 6. Jude by this phrase wished to identify himself to his readers who were acquainted with his brother James, the bishop of Jerusalem.⁴ But is this all that this appellation implies? Did not Jude perhaps also intend this description to serve as a captatio benevolentiae by which he might gain the attention and good will of his readers? The answer to ~~this~~ question depends chiefly on the position in the life of the early Church which was occupied by the

3. William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, p. 3

4. That Jude was not reminding his readers of his brother's letter is made probable by the fact that this letter was known most commonly in the East, while the external evidence for the letter of Jude is chiefly Western. See Alfred Plummer, The General Epistles of St. James and St. Jude, p. 21.

Brethren of the Lord. Bigg argues that this description "cannot have been needed as an introduction or recommendation, for the brethren of the Lord were all held in high esteem (Acts 1:14)"⁵ Schlatter presents the opposite point of view when he says:

Jakobus war unter den Brüdern Jesu der wichtigste Mann, dessen Ansehen das der anderen Brüder überwog. Darum hat Judas dadurch, dass er an seine Gemeinschaft mit Jakobus erinnerte, das Gewicht seines Worts verstärkt, weil alle in Christenheit von Jakobus wussten, dass er für die Bewahrung des Worts Jesu und für den Aufbau seiner Gemeinde mit Kraft und Erfolg wirksam war.⁶

Paul (Gal. 2:9) states that James was counted as one of the "pillars" of the Church at Jerusalem; while the position of Jude in the early Christian community is somewhat obscure. But if it be legitimate to argue from silence in this instance, it may be inferred that he did not take such a leading part in directing the affairs of the Jerusalem congregation as did his elder brother.⁷ There would be scarcely any point in Jude's adding the description "brother of James" were it not to recommend himself to his readers; and it therefore appears best to hold the view espoused by most modern commentators, that this further self-designation is intended to gain the good will of the readers of the letter.

There are a number of difficult problems connected with the next phrase, and it would be foolhardy to claim absolute finality for any

5. Bigg, *op. cit.*, p. 324.

6. Adolph Schlatter, Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament, Vol. 3, p. 58.

7. Reference to Acts 1:14 in this connection is entirely superfluous, since that passage merely states that "all these [the disciples] with one accord devoted themselves to prayer, together with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and his brothers." There is no reference to the position held by the Lord's brethren in this verse.

interpretation of it. However, the interpretation here offered has a number of points to commend it.

Jude speaks of his readers as τοῖς . . . κλητοῖς, modified by two participles which are enclosed between the article and the substantive. The readers are not merely "called," but they are also "beloved" and "preserved." The emphasis, as the Greek clearly shows, by κλητοῖς being placed at the end of the phrase, is upon the calling. κλητός is here used substantively (as in Rom. 1:6, 1 Cor. 1:24), and it bears the same meaning which it has in the other epistles of the New Testament. As Wohlenberg says: "Der göttliche Ruf zur Busse und zum Glauben an Jesum Christum ist an die Leser ergangen, und sie haben ihm Folge geleistet."⁸

The readers, who have been called, are also "beloved."⁹ No agent is mentioned for this passive participle; who then is the one who is loving these called readers? Is it the author of the letter? or is it God? Wohlenberg notes:

An den drei Stellen, wo das Wort ἠγαπημένοις sonst noch im NT von den Christen gebraucht wird, wird zum zweimal Gott bzw. der Herr als Urheber der Liebe hingestellt (1 Th 1, 14; ἀδελφοὶ ἠγαπημένοι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ. 2 Th 2, 13: ἀδελφοὶ ἠγαπημένοι ὑπὸ κυρίου), und an der dritten Stelle ist eine analoge Bestimmung¹⁰ zu ergänzen (Kol 3, 12: ὡς ἐλεκτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἠγαπημένοι).¹⁰

For this reason it is probably best to conceive of the love as pro-

8. G. Wohlenberg, Der erste und zweite Petrusbrief und der Judasbrief, p. 280.

9. The late uncial MSS. KLP give ἠγαπημένοις for ἠγαπημένοις, which is read by BA. The former is the much easier reading, which may well have resulted from a comparison with 1 Cor. 1:2, and it is on that account suspect. When the internal and the external evidence are considered, it is obvious that ἠγαπημένοις is the correct reading.

10. Wohlenberg, loc. cit.

ceeding from God to the recipients of the letter, rather than from the author.

But how are the two phrases ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ and Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ to be construed? A large number of solutions have been proposed for this passage,¹¹ but the one here offered has a good deal to commend it.

11. The following are the most important solutions which have been proposed for the phrases in question: (a) Some commentators would connect ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ with τοῖς and translate "to those who are in God the Father, beloved," etc.; (b) others, like James Moffatt (The New Testament, A New Translation, in loc.) regard ἐν as the preposition of agency, and translate "to those who have been called, who are beloved by God the Father and kept by Jesus Christ;" (c) Moffatt's translation suggests another line of interpretation which has been adopted by some translators: the ἐν before Θεῷ is supplied once more (at least tacitly) before Ἰησοῦ and is connected with την ἡρμημένον; (d) others, like Hort (B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek, Vol. 2, p. 187), who is followed by Goodspeed (E. J. Goodspeed, The New Testament, An American Translation, in loc.), would drop the ἐν before Θεῷ and insert it before Ἰησοῦ, feeling that a primitive error has crept into all MSS. of the New Testament; (e) another suggestion which is extremely attractive has been offered by Chase: that after ἐν a place name was meant to be inserted (as in Eph. 1:1), the letter being a circular letter, and the name varied according to the place where it was being read. The sentence would run: "to those at . . . who are beloved of God the Father," etc.; (f) many commentators would separate Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ from ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ and would translate, "to those who are called, beloved, in (by) God the Father, and preserved for Jesus Christ."

The first suggestion (a) does violence to the flow of the sentence, although it must be admitted, such an objection is purely subjective and cannot be substantiated by any appeal to authority. Although it is quite possible to construe in this way, it seems more likely that τοῖς and κλιτοῖς are to be connected. Moffatt's rendering (b) encounters difficulties in another area, that of grammar. While it is true that ἐν is often used to express agency, no example can be adduced where it is unmistakable that it has this use in connection with persons. The third line of interpretation (c) is quite possible, and no argument besides a subjective one can be raised against it. (d) Hort's conjecture is admittedly due to the difficulty of the text as it stands, but it is always dangerous to appeal to conjecture so long as satisfactory sense can be made of the text found in the MSS. Such a course would open the doors to the caprice and whims of the commentator and would give him unbridled license in handling the text. (e) This suggestion is extremely attractive, and might be adopted if it could be shown that Jude is an encyclical letter. The content of the letter, however,

The two modifiers ἐν Θεῷ Πατρὶ and Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ are connected with the participle ἠγαπημένοις, the second of these modifiers being somewhat in the nature of an afterthought. A paraphrase of Jude's thought will make the matter clear: "I am writing to you called ones, who in God the Father have been beloved, yes, beloved also in Jesus Christ."

The called readers are now further described. They have been loved by God in the past, and now by virtue of this love which still continues to the present time (note the perfect participle!), they are in union with the Father and the Son.¹² A remarkably close parallel to this thought is found in Jesus's words as recorded in John 14:23: "If any man loves me, he will keep my word and we will come to him and make our home with him." Those who have been called and who have accepted the call do keep the word of the Son of God; and those who are beloved are so because God has loved them; and those who are "in God the Father and in Jesus Christ," will have the dwelling of God established in them. It is true that in the passage under consideration Christians are "in

indicates the the Epistle of Jude was sent to one local congregation. (f) The final suggestion has much to commend it; however, one hindrance to accepting it is the fact that the thought of "preservation for Jesus Christ" is not found elsewhere in the New Testament: it is always preservation for "the day of Jesus Christ" or some similar expression.

12. While ἐν is never used in this sense with Θεός or Πατήρ outside of this passage, the parallel expressions ἐν Χριστῷ and ἐν Κυρίῳ afford abundant precedent for interpreting ἐν in this way, especially if the phrase Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ be connected in the manner suggested above.

13. God is here termed the Father. Is this used with respect to His relationship to all believers? or with respect to Jesus Christ. Both forms of expression are found in Scripture, but here it is probably best to understand it of God's fatherly relationship to His creatures, the characteristic of which is love in Jesus Christ. But one should hesitate to be dogmatic on this matter.

God the Father and Jesus Christ," while in the Johannine passage God the Father and God the Son are in the believer, dwelling in him by faith. This fact, however, does not lessen the similarity; in each case the point of comparison is the closeness of the connection between God and the believers. This interpretation is supported by v. 21 of this letter: "Keep yourselves in the love of God," where the reference is to God's love toward men.

But not only are the called ones beloved; they are also preserved, especially as a result of guarding by God. God again is the agent by whom this work is performed. There are two aspects to the work of preservation as viewed by Jude: preservation from something, and preservation for something. The general context of this epistle makes it clear that Jude looks upon his readers as being preserved from pernicious errors of life and conduct which were rampant in their midst, and which, if allowed free course, would destroy their union with God (cf. 1 Thess. 5:23). As long as the readers remain in the world, they are in danger of succumbing to the onslaughts of their enemies. But when the Parusia shall arrive, this danger will be past, and the work of preservation, which has been accomplished up to the time of writing (again note the perfect participle!), will be forever finished and complete. They then will no longer be in danger of "denying their only Lord and Master Jesus Christ."

There was much comfort in this description for the readers of the letter. They might easily infer that their calling was based upon the love of the unchangeable God, which He had for each one of them from

all eternity, and which He had manifested in their call and preservation until the time when they heard this letter read to them in their ἐκκλησία, and they might be certain that He who had begun a good work in them would continue it until the day of Jesus Christ.

Jude now comes to the salutation proper of his letter: he expresses the wish that mercy, peace, and love may be multiplied to his readers. The salutation corresponds, in general, to the salutation of 1 Peter (1:2) and 2 Pet. (1:2), where the verb πληθυνθείη is also used. This verb is used one other time in Biblical Greek, in the salutation of a letter, in Dan. 6:25, in the letter of Darius.¹⁴

In this passage we have a triplet of graces which Jude wishes may be ever increasing for his readers. Some commentators believe that there is a chiasmic arrangement of these words to correspond to the three words found in the description of the addressees of the letter.¹⁵ They hold that ἔλεος corresponds to κλητοῖς, for the calling of God shows His mercy; εἰρήνη to τετηρημένοις, for peace is the condition of those who are preserved; and ἀγάπη to ἐχθαυμένοις. Such an arrangement seems artificial and far-fetched; and, besides, it is not at all patent to the average reader.

There is, however, an inner connection between the three substantives found in this greeting. ἔλεος is the divine kindness and good will which God has for men who are miserable and afflicted with sin, coupled with a desire to relieve them of this bane. This ἔλεος is

14. Edward Gordon Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Essays, p. 121.

15. James, op. cit., p. 37

the ground for the χάρις of God which reveals itself in the gift of His Son to be the Savior of the world. Men could never know anything of the mercy of God, were it not for the fact that He displayed His grace in Christ.¹⁶

The mercy of God is the ground of peace, which Jude wishes for his readers. The readers are now at one with God and can be absolutely sure of the completeness of their salvation; therefore they need no longer fear, they are in possession and can enjoy to the full the peace which comes from the knowledge that they are redeemed sons of God (cf. Rom. 5:1, reading ἔχωμεν).

The last grace which Jude wishes for his readers is the grace of love. Is this the love of God towards them? or is it their love which expresses itself towards God and their fellowmen? Perhaps the writer did not distinguish between these two thoughts. In commenting on 1 John 3:1 Westcott says:

The Divine love is infused into them, so that it is their own, and becomes in them the source of a divine life (Rom. 13:10). In virtue of this gift they are inspired with a love which is like the love of God, and by this they truly claim the title of children of God as partakers in His nature, 1 John 4:7, 19.¹⁷

Jude wishes that each of these graces may be multiplied in the life of the readers of his letter: that they may experience more and more fully the mercy of God which, manifesting itself in Jesus Christ, has forgiven their sins, that they may experience more and more fully the

16. Richard Chenevix Tranch, Synonyms of the New Testament, pp. 166 ff.

17. B. F. Westcott, The Epistles of St. John, p. 93.

peace which comes as a fruit of justification before God; and experience the love which proceeds from God and which motivates them to a life of love towards God and their fellowmen. It is Jude's prayer that each of these graces may be multiplied to his readers, in order that they may be the more able to withstand the libertine errorists who have come into their midst.

VI. 3, 4.

Ἀγαπητοί, πάναν ἐπουδὴν ποιούμενος, γράφειν ὑμῖν περὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας ἀνάγκη ἔχειν γράμμι ὑμῖν παρακαλῶν ἐπαγωγίσεσθαι τῆ ἐπιστῆ παραδοθείη τοῖς ἄλλοις πιστεῖ. παρελάβουσαν γὰρ τινες ἄνθρωποι, οἱ πάλαι προλεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα, θεοβεῖς, τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀθέλησιν, καὶ τὸν μόνον δεσπότη καὶ Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι.

Beloved, in giving all diligence to write to you of our common salvation, I found it necessary to write to you, urging you to contend more and more for the faith once committed to the saints; for certain men have crept in, written down of old for this verdict, impious, changing the grace of our God into licentiousness, and denying our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ.

Immediately after the salutation of his letter, Jude states his purpose. It was quite common in the letters of the first century after Christ to follow the greeting with a word of thanksgiving for the welfare of the persons addressed, coupled with a prayer for its continuance. Paul often uses this form,¹⁸ filling it with a profound Christian content. When he omitted the use of it, as he did in the letter to the congregations of Galatia, the matter on which he was writing was of such importance that it compelled him to go at once in medias res. And so it is here. Jude goes immediately, without any delay whatsoever, to the purpose of his letter.

18. Cf. Rom. 1:8 ff., 1 Cor. 1:4 ff., Phil. 1:3 ff., Col. 1:3 ff., 1 Thess. 1:2 ff., 2 Thess. 1:3 ff., 2 Tim. 1:3 ff., Phlm. 4.

He begins by calling his readers "beloved," ἀγαπητοί. This form of address, while found in the writings of all the authors of New Testament letters, is found at the beginning of a letter only here and in 2 John 3 (where, however, the form is singular). Wohlenberg correctly says:

Es klingt wie ein Widerhall von jenem ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ ἀγαπημένου v. 1 und dem ἀγαπῆ πλῆθυνθει v. 2, wenn Judas seinerseits (v. 3) seine Leser als Geliebte (v. 17, 20) anredet, und sie darüber unterrichtet, dass und warum er an sie zu schreiben veranlasst sei. Von vorherein sollen sie darüber im klaren sein, dass seine Liebe zu ihnen ein Ausfluss derselben Gottesliebe ist, die sie empfangen haben und deren Mehrung er ihnen angewünscht hat, und dass die Abfassung des Briefes sich auf jene Liebe zurückführt. Er ist aufs eifrigste für sie besorgt; darum will er, dass sie nicht bloss im Heilstande verharren, sondern auch für ihren Glauben kämpfend eintreten.¹⁹

Jude begins by telling his readers that while he was giving all diligence to writing to them about their common salvation, the necessity arose for him to write a letter of exhortation to them, in which he would urge them to contend ever more for the faith once delivered to the saints. Jude does not say that he has undertaken the composition of the letter on the "common salvation," but only that he was planning to write such a letter.²⁰ The phrase πάναν ἐπιουσίαν ποιούμενος

19. Wohlenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 284.

20. Plummer, *op. cit.*, p. 377, correctly says: "The words 'our common salvation' (περὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας) may go either with what precedes or with what follows. . . . The true connexion is, now 'While I was giving all diligence to write unto you, I was constrained to write unto you of our common salvation,' but, 'While I was giving all diligence to write unto you of our common salvation, I was constrained to write unto you to contend earnestly for the faith.' This epistle can scarcely be called a letter 'about our common salvation.' The meaning is that St. Jude intended to write such a letter, but the crises created by the entrance of these ungodly men into the Church constrained him to write a letter of a different kind, viz. the one which lies before us."

says nothing about the stage which Jude had reached in the composition of this letter, or whether he had even begun to write as yet. But the fact that it has not been preserved for the Church, and the fact that there are no references to it in the writings of the Church fathers, would suggest that it was never completed and sent. It may be noted that there is no exact parallel for the phrase πάσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος in Biblical Greek, the closest parallel being found in 2 Pet. 1:5; much closer verbal parallels may be found in Plato, Isocrates, Herodotus, and Polybius.²¹

The letter which Jude had been contemplating to write was to deal with "our common salvation." Salvation, σωτηρία, is used in its fullest and most comprehensive sense;²² Jude is speaking of the deliverance of the entire world, all men, from the power and domination of sin, death, and the powers of evil. By the work of Christ all men have been set free from this fearful bondage. And this fact is exactly what Jude has in mind when he calls salvation "common"--it is intended for all men. The word "our", ἡμῶν²³ in this connection helps to explain what Jude means when he speaks of "our common salvation." In Tit. 1:4 it is faith which is called κοινή. In both these passages "stress is laid on the 'faith' or 'salvation' as being that in which all

21. Cf. Walter Bauer, Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur, sub σπουδή; and Hand Windisch, "Die Katholischen Briefe", Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Hans Lietzmann, Vol. 4, 2, p. 37.

22. Keil, op. cit., p. 300.

23. ἡμῶν is not found in the Koine (or Byzantine) textual tradition and accordingly was not in the text upon which the A. V. was based; but it is well attested by the oldest and best Greek MSS. and by the ancient versions.

Christians are sharers."²⁴

While Jude was making ready to write of our "common salvation" he found it necessary (ἔρχομαι, an ingressive aorist) to write a different kind of letter from that which he had been contemplating.²⁵ An emergency which called for immediate and decisive action on his part had arisen; and Jude was ready to meet it. What this emergency was is indicated in v. 4. This was not a pleasant task which faced him, but, as he recognized only too well, it was a necessary one. It was made so necessary because the people to whom he was writing, had they not been warned, might have been led astray by these libertines who had crept into the Church. As a Christian, and especially as a leader of the Church, Jude could not remain silent while this situation lasted; he had to warn these people of their danger. Necessity was laid upon him to write a letter of admonition.

The English translation "to write" for both γράφειν and γράψαι

24. E. H. Plumptre, The General Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, p. 202.

25. Windisch, op. cit., p. 37, denies that two letters are here intended. He says, "Der Hinweis auf eine zweite Schrift περὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας (vgl. Josephus ant X. 1, 3 ὑπὲρ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας, dieselbe Wendung bei Isocrates de pace 39, panegy. 85, weitere Belege bei Wetstein), deren Bearbeitung der Vf. unterbrochen habe, um zuvor eine Warnung vor den die πίστις der Leser bedrohenden Irrlehre zu erlassen, kann in den Worten nicht gefunden werden (ähnlich Barn 4, 9), auch an eine Verschiebung der ursprünglich geplanten Anlage ist nicht zu denken, denn die σωτηρία war durch die Irrlehrer genau so gefährdet wie die πίστις, auch sind σωτηρία und πίστις gar nicht getrennt zu behandeln 1 Cor 1, 21, Rom 1, 16, Joh 3, 16 f., Act 16, 31." Windisch, however, overlooks two important considerations which support the view of this matter as taken in the text: 1) He does not account for the change in infinitives from γράφειν to γράψαι; and 2) the passages to which Windisch refers use πίστις in the active sense of the Christian's hold upon Christ, the fides qua creditur, while in the passage before us it is used in the sense of that which is believed, the fides quae creditur.

in this verse does not reveal a fine difference in meaning between these two infinitive forms. In the words of Mayor, "The new epistle had to be written at once and could not be prepared for at leisure like the one he had previously contemplated."²⁶ A similar change of tense, and consequently of Aktionsart, is found in 3 John 13.

Jude now lays it upon the hearts of his readers to "contend" or "struggle" for the faith once committed to the saints. The word ἐποχωνίζεσθαι is not found elsewhere in Biblical Greek; it is, however, found in secular literature of the post-classical period,²⁷ and, to quote Knopf, "ist gleichbedeutend mit ἀγωνίζεσθαι und ist also einfach mit: weiter kämpfen zu übersetzen, vgl. ἐπιμαυεσθαι und ἀμαυεσθαι oder ἐπιαντιπύεσθαι und ἀντιπύεσθαι."²⁸

Knopf sets this contest in the proper light when he says:

Dass die Haltung des Christen ein stetes Kämpfen ist oder sein muss, ist eine öfters wiederkehrende Form der Paränese, vgl. Eph. 6, 10 ff.; 1 Tim. 6, 12; 1 Pt. 5, 8 f.; 2 Clem. 7; 1 Clem. 7, 1 u. a. m. Die Gläubigen stehen in einer ihnen sehr feindlichen Welt, und auf verschiedenen Wegen kommen Plagen und Versuchungen, vom Satan und finsternen Engelmächten geschickt, über sie. Denn gegen übermenschliche Mächte ist der Kampf der Christen gerichtet, vgl. Eph. 6, 12, und die Menschen, mit denen sie es feindlich zu tun haben, sind die Werkzeuge dämonischer Bosheit. Das ist auch hier die selbstverständliche und darum gar nicht erst ausdrücklich in Worte gebrachte Anschauung des Verf.²⁹

The great thing which Christians are to defend in a contest over against all enemies is "the faith once committed to the saints."

There are two interpretations which have been offered for the word

26. J. B. Mayor, "St. Jude" in the Expositor's Greek Testament, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll, p. 254.

27. Bauer, op. cit., sub ἐποχωνίζεσθαι.

28. Knopf, op. cit., p. 214.

29. Ibid.

πίστις in this connection. Some hold that πίστις here, as so commonly in the New Testament, refers to the living and active faith which lays hold on God and will not let Him go. If this be the interpretation of πίστις here, Jude is urging his readers to contest for their brother's faith, that he may remain a Christian, a member of the Body of Christ, in spite of the onslaughts which the enemy might launch against him. The modifier "once committed to the saints," however, seems fatal to any such interpretation, for faith as trust and confidence in God is not once and for all times delivered, so that there is no possibility of a lapse from the state of grace.

The other interpretation takes πίστις in the objective sense, that which is believed, the fides quae creditur of the dogmaticians.³⁰ Plumptre says, "This faith, as yet, was not embodied in a formal creed or committed to writing, but was imparted orally to every convert."³¹ It is not yet the doctrines of faith as formulated in the creeds of the Church, but the basic content of the faith, the kerygma, which found expression in later times in such confessions of belief as the Apostolic Creed.³²

30. A number of scholars believe that this and v. 20 are not the only places where πίστις occurs in the sense of fides quae creditur. They cite Gal. 1:23, 3:23, 6:10, Rom. 10:8, Eph. 4:5, Phil. 1:27 as examples of this use. For an excellent discussion of the use of πίστις in the New Testament, see "The Meaning of Faith in the New Testament and in Some Jewish Writings" in Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., pp. 31-34, or the word study in Burton, op. cit., p. 475-485.

31. Plumptre, op. cit., p. 202.

32. The apostolic preaching (or kerygma) followed a very definite pattern, as has been shown by A. M. Hunter, The Message of the New Testament. This outline may well have formed the basis for the development of the earliest creedal statements of the Church. Examples of these may be found in Rom. 1:2-4, 1 Cor. 15:3-5. The development may have been made necessary by the need for a concise summary of Christian

The faith was committed to the saints; who is it that delivered this "noble deposit" to them? Two possible answers come to mind: God, or the apostles. The ultimate source of all Christian doctrine is God, who has revealed a mystery which could never be known in a purely human and rational way, but which requires divine revelation. But here, on the basis of such texts as 1 Cor. 11:2, 23; 15:3, it is probably best to understand that the apostles committed that which they had received from God to the saints, a body of doctrine which brooked no change or addition in content, for it was committed ἅπας, once and for all time. On this use of ἅπας see v. 5 and Heb. 6:4. No additions in content can be made to this doctrine, and accordingly we need expect no new revelations (cf. Gal. 1:8 f.).

Jude says that this faith has been committed to the "saints," a designation which has its roots in the Old Testament. Lightfoot, in commenting on Phil. 1:1 gives a classic summary of the development of this idea:

All who have entered into the Christian covenant by baptism are 'saints' in the language of the Apostles. Even the irregularities and profligacies of the Corinthian Church do not forfeit it this title. Thus the main idea is consecration. But though it does not assert moral qualifications as a fact in the persons so designated, it implies them as a duty.³³

V. 4 indicates the reason why (ἕνεκα) Jude found it necessary to change his plans, and instead of writing a letter on the subject of "our common salvation" to pen a missive of exhortation, urging his readers to contend for the Christian faith. The danger which confronted Jude's

faith. It is from these baptismal creeds that the Roman Symbol, and, ultimately, the Apostolic Creed developed.

33. J. B. Lightfoot, St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, p. 79.

readers was not from without--a persecution instigated by the Jews against what they regarded as a sect, or instigated by the Roman Empire against a religio illicita--nor was it a virulent attack upon the principles of Christianity by some critic from without the Church, but, as Moffatt notes, it was "an insidious distortion of Christianity from within, due to the influence of some who claimed to be members of the Church."³⁴

Jude mentions no names: he simply refers to the trouble makers as ἀνδρῶν τινες. On the position of τις see Acts 3:2; 14:8; 15:1; 17:6; 1 Tim. 5:24, and for the scornful tinge which it here bears, see 2 Cor. 10:2; Gal. 1:7, and see Lightfoot's comments on the latter passage.³⁵

These men have come into the Church by stealth, as the verb παρειε-
δουσαν indicates.³⁶ While the verb παρειδουσαν is used nowhere else in Biblical Greek, its meaning is clear. The other compound verbs formed with the prefix παρεικ- show that an element of stealth is involved.³⁷ These libertines against whom Jude is writing have come into the Church from without, and not without a measure of deceit have been presenting

34. James Moffatt, The General Epistles, James, Peter, and Judas, p. 229.

35. J. B. Lightfoot, The Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians, p. 76.

36. The reading παρειεδουσαν is found only in B, while all other MSS. which contain these epistles read παρειεδουσαν, as given above. It is only the veneration which Westcott-Hort and B. Weiss had for this uncial that prompted them to adopt this very poorly attested reading as the correct one. If, however, the reading of B is the correct one, it is a 2 a.o. pass. of the verb παρειδουσαν, bearing an intransitive sense. The other reading which is here adopted may be either the 1 a.o. act. of the same verb, or a root a.o. for which the 1st sing. is παρειεδουσαν. In any case the meaning is clear. Cf. Bauer, op. cit., sub παρειδουσαν

37. Cf. Gal. 2:10; 2 Pet. 2:1; Rom. 5:20; and the substantive παρειδουσαν in Barn. 2:10; 4:10. Cf. Knopf, op. cit., p. 215.

themselves as Christians in good standing. Because of their deception the danger to Jude's readers is so acute.

To help his readers in identifying these men who are intruders among them Jude describes these libertines in detail. They were "written down of old for this verdict, impious, changing the grace of our God into licentiousness, and denying our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ."

The first of these descriptive epithets is a gentle rebuke to the readers of this letter; they should have been on guard against these men, for they were "written down of old for this verdict." Burton says: "προρρίξειν occurs in Greek writers in three senses: (1) 'to write beforehand,' the προ being temporal (Rom. 15:4; Eph. 3:3); (2) 'to write publicly,' 'to register' . . . (3) 'to write at the head of the list.' The third meaning does not occur in biblical writers and may be dismissed as wholly inappropriate to the context."³⁸ Accordingly we must make our choice between the first two meanings. While Burton understands the passage under consideration as being an example of the second use, the πάλαι would seem to indicate that the first use is the correct one.³⁹ Von Soden, in his terse way, indicates the two lines of interpretation along which this statement has been explained, when he says: "voreingeschrieben sind (entweder in einem prophetischen Buch, oder, analog den himmlischen Büchern, im Bürgerbuch der Hölle, vgl. Heb. 12, 23)."⁴⁰

38, Burton, op. cit., p. 144.

39. Ibid.

40. H. von Soden, "Judasbrief," Handcommentar zum Neuen Testament, Vol. 3, 2, p. 205.

Lenski mentions both views and indicates that his choice is for a version of the former,⁴¹ but does not directly state why he rejects the latter. There are good reasons which may be urged against adopting the second interpretation. The first is grammatical: nowhere is ἠδὲ used of events that took place outside of time, such as the recording of a person's name in the Book of Life or of Death, which is equivalent to eternal election either to salvation or damnation. The second reason is theological: such an interpretation runs contrary to the analogy of faith, for a man is lost alone through his own fault, not because of an arbitrary fiat of God. We readily admit that the Old Testament Apocrypha contain references to the Book of the Dead, but these writings were not given by God and contain many things which are known to be erroneous. And so it is here. The Book of the Dead is a concoction of man's own mind when he attempts to plumb the depths of the mysteries of God. There are other interpretations which seem more in line with the statement that these men were "written down of old for this verdict."

The other view is that Jude is here making reference to a prophecy recorded in a prophetic book of one kind or another. Which book, or books, is Jude referring to in this passage? Four answers have been given to this question: 1) Some commentators refer it to prophecies contained in the canonical books of the Old Testament. 2) Others refer it to prophecies contained in the Old Testament Apocrypha. 3) Others combine both of these views. 4) And yet others refer it to the pro-

41. R. C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of the Epistles of Peter, John, and Jude, p. 613.

phesies contained in the second chapter of 2 Peter.

The great difficulty which the first three views encounter is that nowhere, neither in the Old Testament Scripture nor in the Old Testament Apocrypha, are there prophecies against libertine errorists such as those who are condemned in this letter. Of course there are warnings against errorists, and these may be the warnings to which Jude is referring. The last interpretation seems to encounter difficulties with the word πάλαι, which ordinarily means "of old." However, in Mark 15:44 it seems to bear the meaning "some time ago."⁴² When πάλαι is used, there is always an emphasis on the comparatively remote past. To give an example: Someone asks me to eat supper with him; the time is 6:30. I reply, "I ate long ago (πάλαι)," even though it was only at 5:30. If this be the meaning, the reference is to the prophecies contained in 2 Peter concerning the coming errorists.

The difficulties connected with this phrase have not all been resolved as yet. Wand succinctly states them and offers his own suggestion in commenting on the phrase "for this verdict."

Does the 'this' look backward or forward? If the former, it may apply either to the contention against them advised in v. 3, or to their stealthy creeping in, the sin being its own punishment. If the latter, it may apply to a renewal of the destruction mentioned in v. 5. Zahn suggests that the creeping in of false teachers brings judgement [sic!] upon the Church (cf. Jn. 9:37). . . . Bennett takes the word as applying in a general sense to the condemnation set forth in this letter. Is it not possible to take the 'this' as an emphatic definite article implying 'the great Judgement,' that is, at the last day?⁴³

42. Wohlenberg, op. cit., p. 289.

43. Wand, op. cit., p. 199.

While Wand's suggestion is attractive, is it not still best to agree with Bengel who says, "judicium de quo mox"? By this he refers to the condemnation to be pronounced in the succeeding verses.⁴⁴

The next epithet which Jude applies to the libertines is ἀσεβείας, impious. Knopf says:

ἀσεβείας ist eine sehr allgemeine Charakteristik, die die Gegner als unfrohm und gottlos bezeichnet. Ueber das gottlose Treiben der eingedrungenen Neuerer ist der Brief sehr erstaunt und entrüstet. Etwas genauer wird die Schilderung der Irrlehrer in den beiden folgenden Gliedern, den beiden Partizipialsätzen von 4 b, die auch die ersten Andeutungen über den Inhalt der bekämpften Irrlehre bringen.⁴⁵

This may be correct, but it seems somewhat better to link this epithet with the next. Their impiety (ἀσεβείας) is the affront which they offer God in misusing and perverting His grace to them and to all mankind (cf. Rom. 1:18 ff.)

In the next descriptive phrase Jude charges the libertines with "changing the grace of our God into licentiousness." The correct reading here is χάριτα (supported by BA) rather than χάρι (a scholarly correction found in the other MSS.). As to the content of this phrase Schlatter well says:

Dass die Gnade uns frei macht, ganz frei, das haben alle Boten Jesu in seinem Namen bezeugt, und das ganze Leben der Gemeinde war darauf gegründet, dass sie aus Freien besteht, die keinen Herrn haben als Christus und kein Gesetz über sich haben als Gottes Gnade. Deshalb haben auch Jesu Jünger nichts Unreines und Verwerfliches zugelassen, weil das Böse nicht zu Gottes Willen, nicht zu Gottes Gnade, nicht zur Wirkung des Geistes gerechnet wird und darum von der Gemeinschaft mit Gott gänzlich abgeschieden bleibt. Die Erlösung vom Bösen macht uns frei, nicht zum Bösen, sondern zum Gehorsam gegen Gottes

44. J. A. Bengel, Gnomon Novi Testamenti, in loc.

45. Knopf, op. cit., p. 217.

guten Willen, zur Reinheit, nicht zur Unreinheit. Wenn aber der sündliche Wille unbereut und ungebrochen den Menschen treibt, dann ist die Schritt aus der Freiheit vom Bösen in die Freiheit zum Bösen klein und aus der Gnade, die uns an Gott bindet, wird dan leicht eine Gnade, die uns die Erfüllung unseres Eigenwillens und seiner Begehungen erlaubt.⁴⁶

For an instructive commentary on this, the reader is referred to Rom. 6: 1 ff. These men, however, misused this grace which brought them freedom and turned it into an opportunity for licentious living. Their lives were utterly immoral and unrestrained. They made use of their liberty, which they claimed as Christians, as a cloak for license to indulge their flesh. To warn his readers against this perversion of Christian freedom, Jude paints the terrible picture which he does: these men, these impious libertines, have converted the grace of our God--He is no longer theirs, for by their immoral conduct they have disowned Him--into licentiousness and have turned the liberty of the Christian man into license.

And now Jude caps this description of these errorists. They deny "our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ." At the outset we are confronted with a difficult exegetical problem. As Windisch says:

In den Worten τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. hat man die schwierige exegetische Frage, ob ein oder zwei Personen gemeint sind. Das Fehlen des Artikels vor dem zweiten Glied ist nicht entscheidend vgl. Eph 5, 5 1 Tim 5, 21 u. 8. Allerdings bedeutet μόνος bei δεσπότης & θεός u. dgl. in Jüdischen wie christlichen Schriften die Feststellung des Monotheismus im Gegensatz zum Polytheismus oder zum Cäsarentum Rom 16, 27 1 Tim 1, 17 Joh 5, 44 17, 3 Jud 25 Josephus bell. Jud. VII 8, 6 Ant XVIII 1, 6 Philo de mut. nom. 22 p. 582. . . . Beziehen wir indes

46. Schlatter, op. cit., p. 61.

auch hier den κύριος δεσπότης auf Gott, so kommt heraus, dass der Glaube der Heiligen eigentlich "zwei einzige" Herren hat. Daher werden wir die beiden synonymen Ausdrücke den einen Herrn J. Chr. bezeichnen.⁴⁷

Inasmuch as these two expressions are used of one person, the question arises: Why did Jude employ both in such close connection? Von Hofman very carefully distinguishes between these two words when he says: "Jesus Christus ist unser δεσπότης, als dessen zu seinem Dienste verpflichtetes Eigenthum wir sind, und er ist unser κύριος, als dessen Wille für uns massgebend ist."⁴⁸

How did these men deny their only Master and Lord? It was not by a dogmatic denial of any of the tenets of the Christian religion, of the faith once delivered to the saints,⁴⁹ but it was by their conduct. As Bennett says: "They did not formally repudiate Christianity; the serious danger of their example lay in the fact that they professed to be faithful Christians."⁵⁰ Jude gives fuller details of this denial in the rest of the letter.

VV. 5 - 7.

ὑπομνήσει δε ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰδοτάς ἅπασι πάντα, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς, ἀποστῆναι ἐκ γῆς Αἰγυπτίου γένους, τὸ δεύτερον τοῦς μὲ πιστεύσαντας ἀπέπεσον ἀγγέλου, ἅτε τὰς κη' ἡμερῶν τῶν ἐαυτῶν ἀρχῆν, ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντες τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον, εἰς κρήνην μεγάλης γῆρας δεσμῶς αἰδέοις διὰ ζόφου τετήρηκεν. ὡς Σοδομα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις, τὸν ὁμοίου τρόπον τοῦτοις ἐκπορεύσασθε καὶ ἀπελθούσαν ὀπίω σαρκὰ ἑτέρας, προκείμεναι δείγμα πυρός διανίου, διατὴν ὑπέχουσαι.

47. Windisch, op. cit., pp. 37 f.

48. J. C. von Hofman, Die Heilige Schrift, Neuen Testaments, Vol. 7, 2, pp. 157 f.

49. Many commentators hold that this phrase has a dogmatic basis, that these errorists had false notions concerning the divinity of Christ. But nowhere else in the letter is any mention made of such a charge, and we feel certain that, had this been the error, Jude would have been much more explicit in rejecting it. In contrast to this denial we may refer to Tit. 2:12 where Christians are spoken of as ἀνομιώβητοι ἡσέβητοι.

50. W. Bennett, The General Epistles, pp. 331 f.

I desire to remind you, having come to know all things once for all, that Jesus, having saved the people out of the land of Egypt, the second time destroyed such as did not believe; and the angels, too, who did not preserve their own rule, but left their proper habitation, He has kept for the judgment of the great day with everlasting bonds under gloom; just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the surrounding cities in similar manner to these having committed fornication and having gone after other flesh serve as an example of everlasting fire—suffering punishment.

After having stated the reason which had prompted him to write this letter, Jude continues by citing examples of how God on previous occasions had punished evil-doers similar to the libertines against whom he is writing. Like any good teacher Jude makes his point clear by illustrations. Examples of God's judgment are to be seen in the fate of the faithless Israelites, the disobedient angels, and the depraved inhabitants of the cities of the valley. This much is clear; but closer examination reveals that this section also contains numerous difficulties.

Before we can undertake to comment upon the sense of v. 5, we must determine a number of readings. In the participial phrase Β35 and the Koine textual tradition insert a ἰμᾶς; it is not found in A 33 and very many other MSS. This insertion appears to be an explanatory gloss inserted from the margin where it had been placed to clarify the antecedent of the participle. We can with confidence reject this ἰμᾶς as an insertion.⁵¹

The position of ἄπας has been debated at length. Some few MSS. (among them 32) would place ἄπας after the subject of the ὅτι clause, while the position after εἰδοτάς is supported by BACL and the Vulgate. The ἄπας, if read after the subject of the ὅτι clause, answers to το

51. Bigg, op. cit., p. 328.

δεντερου. This is most certainly attractive, but, in the words of Plummer, "it is precisely this superficial attractiveness which has caused the corruption of the text. . . . The external evidence against the proposed transposition is enormous; and there is no strong internal evidence against the best attested text . . . to turn the scale."⁵²

There is another important variant in this participial phrase. For την KLP and some minuscules read ταυτα, which is either a slip on the part of a scribe or a deliberate attempt to emend the difficult reading.⁵³

One other important variant occurs in the text of this verse and must be discussed. It is perhaps the most difficult of all. What is the subject of the ου clause? Is the correct reading ουριος (supported by BC*)? or ο θεος (supported by C²)? or την (supported by BA and a few other MSS.)? or must we suppose with Westcott and Hort that a primitive error has crept into the text at this point, and adopt the conjecture that the original reading was ου ο?⁵⁴ Admittedly the problem is difficult. την is by far the best attested reading and would be adopted without hesitation by the editors were it not for the fact that nowhere else in the New Testament are acts which occurred before the Incarnation attributed to Jesus. This very fact which is urged against its adoption is, I believe, the best evidence in its fa-

52. Plummer, op. cit., p. 403 f.

53. Bigg, loc. cit.

54. Cf. Westcott and Hort, op. cit., p. 106, where the authors point out that OTIO might easily be corrupted into OTIIC or OTIKC. In passing, it might be mentioned that this is the only instance where the translators of the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament adopted a conjectural emendation as the basis for their translation. (An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament, P. 41.)

vor; for scribes, realizing the uniqueness of the reading, would be inclined to alter it to a less difficult or unusual one. Such alterations would explain the other variants just as easily as the conjecture proposed by Westcott and Hort, while the other variants could never account for the introduction of Ἰησοῦς at this point. While it is true that Jesus is nowhere else in the New Testament said to be the author of anything which took place before His Incarnation we may justly refer to Paul's statement concerning the Rock which accompanied the children of Israel on their wanderings in the desert: "That Rock was Christ" (1 Cor. 10:4). Or we may recall the statement of Peter that the "Spirit of Christ" made things clear to the Old Testament prophets (1 Pet. 1:11). Another reason which may have prompted the scribes to alter the reading from Ἰησοῦς to one of the variants was the fear which they may have entertained that the readers would understand this statement of Joshua, whose name in the LXX appears as

Ἰησοῦς.⁵⁵

Jude introduces his examples with the formula ὅτι μὲν βούλομαι εἰδόντας ὅτις πάντα, the ὅτι being a particle of transition to a new thought. The participial phrase, which is often understood in the possible adversative sense (harking back to the καὶ ἔπειτα εἰδόντας of 2 Pet. 1:12), is just as well taken in the equally possible

55. Cf. Wohlenberg, op. cit., p. 291. -- Jerome regarded the reading Ἰησοῦς as a reference to Joshua; but "this interpretation is made impossible by the fact that Joshua did not destroy them that believed not," (Wand, op. cit., p. 201), and by the fact that the subject of this example is also the subject of the verb in the next verse which treats of the fallen angels.

causal sense, explaining why it is merely necessary to remind the readers of what will follow. This is perhaps a side glance at the letter of Peter, which if our reconstruction is correct these people received some time before. Since this letter has told them all things, only a reminder is necessary.

Knopf notes that "Die Einführungsformel . . . ist nicht bloss auf das erste Beispiel, sondern auch auf die beiden anderen zu beziehen, nicht aber auf alle folgenden Ausführungen."⁵⁶

Jude now offers three examples or illustrations which are included in the ἰστορία of the introductory formula. He refers to the fact that "Jesus, having saved the people out of the land of Egypt, the second time destroyed those who did not believe." The noun λαός is here used anarthously, because in the course of time it came to be regarded as a proper noun denoting the people of God, Israel.

Jesus is an extremely appropriate subject for the first part of this verse: He saved the people out of the land of Egypt; but with an altogether unexpected turn, this same Jesus, this Savior, destroyed such as did not believe.

To which incidents in the history of Israel is Jude referring in this connection? Zahn maintains that "a fact from the Old Testament is here meant is doubtful."⁵⁷ He urges that it is impossible to find

56. Knopf, op. cit., p. 219.

57. Theodore Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, Vol. 2, p. 254. -- Zahn was not the first to propose that "the original readers readily understood that Jude was contrasting the judgment of the generation of Israel that came out of Egypt, who, with a few happy exceptions, perished in the wilderness for their unbelief without having seen the land of promise . . . with another generation, which, likewise, after having been redeemed as God's people was condemned and

within the Old Testament the familiar second instance in which God destroyed those who were redeemed from Egypt but remained unbelieving, in comparison to a first instance, equally well known in which He did the same thing; for that the cases were parallel is the natural presupposition, since otherwise it would be necessary to indicate the content of the divine action in the two cases.⁵⁸

As this quotation clearly indicates, the crux of this passage lies in the interpretation which we give the τὸ δευτέρον. Literally it means "the second time." James rather hopelessly says: "With the text before us, I can see no other reasonable rendering but to take τὸ δευτέρον as simply equivalent to ὕστερον, 'afterwards': but no authority has been cited for such a use."⁵⁹ The explanation which seems least difficult is to understand τὸ δευτέρον in the original sense of "the second time," but understanding it of the second time that God intervened in the history of His people in an especial way.⁶⁰

The first intervention occurred when God delivered the Israelites from the power of Pharaoh in Egypt and formed them into a nation; the

destroyed in punishment for its unbelief," though he is the leading modern exegete to adopt this view. Zahn continues: "In neither case, after the redemption out of Egypt and after the redemption by Christ were the redeemed people destroyed, but the majority of those to whom redemption was offered--those who were first called to the acceptance of the redemption and the possession of the blessings which it assured, i.e. the countrymen and contemporaries of Jesus, who refused to have faith in Him--were condemned for their unbelief. Jude could say that Jesus had visited this judgment upon the unbelieving mass of the Jewish people because they had been judged by the testimony of Jesus which they rejected . . . and because the threatening prophecy of Jesus about the evil and adulterous generation had been fulfilled by the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple." (Ibid.) Plummer (op. cit., p. 407) holds that this interpretation is "very forced and improbable. Let us hold by Hooker's most infallible rule in expositions of sacred Scripture that 'where a literal construction will stand, the farthest from the letter is commonly the worst'."

58. Zahn, loc. cit.

59. James, op. cit., p. 38.

60. Windisch, op. cit., p. 38.

second, during the wanderings in the wilderness, when the children of Israel murmured against the leadership of Moses, and in consequence of this fact were murmuring against God. This constant grumbling was a sign of their lack of faith (cf. Num. 14:11). Plummer is probably correct when he holds that the destruction mentioned is not a particular catastrophe in the wilderness, such as followed the insurrection of Korah (Num. 16:49) or of Baal-peor (Num. 25), for the aorist may well be constative; but it is a reference to "the gradual destruction, during the forty years of wandering, of the rebellious and unbelieving, 'whose carcasses fell in the wilderness. And to whom sware He that they should not enter into His rest, but to them that were disobedient? And we see that they were not able to enter in because of unbelief' (Heb. 3:17-19)." ⁶¹

The contrast between εὐσεβείας and ἀπώλεσεν is noteworthy; as Knopf says:

εὐσεβείας und ἀπώλεσεν sind Ausdrücke von stark religiöser Färbung, die in der Gemeindefsprache zur Zeit des Verf. oft verwendet wurden. Absichtlich werden diese Worte gebraucht, damit die Verbindung zwischen jenem in Verderben gegangenen Geschlecht der alten Zeit und den Irrlehrern der Gegenwart leicht hergestellt werden kann. ⁶²

The purpose for which Jude employed this illustration is to show how the libertines, like the people of Israel in the wilderness, have rejected the grace which they once possessed when they belonged to the saved of God, and how these libertines will be destroyed, even as the Israelites, in spite of previous deliverance, were destroyed. Jude

61. Plummer, op. cit., p. 408.

62. Knopf, op. cit., p. 221.

directed this illustration not so much to the libertines themselves as to the true members of the church to which he addressed this letter.

The second illustration is a very difficult one. The majority of modern commentators refer the fall of the angels to the incident recorded in the Book of Enoch (6-12), where the "Watchers" lusted after the "daughters of men," and thus deprived themselves of their lofty position in the hierarchy of heaven, and were bound with chains to keep them in darkness until the judgment of the great day.⁶³ However, since the narrative is built upon a false exegesis of Gen. 6:1 ff., it is indubitably incorrect. The rabbis were uncertain as to the correct explanation to be given to the passage in question.⁶⁴ Conservative modern exegetes have demonstrated that the Genesis pericope refers to the fact that the believing children of God ("sons of God") desired the unbelieving women of their age ("daughters of men") as wives.⁶⁵ The incorrect exegesis of this passage in Genesis to which we have

63. For an accurate English translation of the Book of Enoch, the reader is referred to R. H. Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, Vol. 2, pp. 163-281.

64. Billerbeck notes (H. L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, Vol. 3, p. 780): "Die Worte [v. 6] haben den Engelfall im Auge, auf den die älteste Zeit allgemein Gn 6, 2 ff. bezogen hat. Ungewiss bleibt nur die Auffassung der LXX; dagegen hat Philo aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach u. Josephus mit Bestimmtheit unter den Söhnen Gottes Gn 6, 2 Engel verstanden; ebenso der äthiopische und der slavische Henoch u. das Buch der Jubiläen. Erst im Kreis der rabbinischen Gelehrten tritt ein Schwanken hervor, während die einen Gn 6, 2 auf Engel deuteten, hielten andere die "Söhne Gottes" für die Söhne der Grossen u. Vornehmen der Erde."

65. Cf. Carl Friedrich Keil, Biblische Kommentar über die Bücher Mose's, Vol. 1, pp. 90 ff.; John Peter Lange, Genesis, tr. Taylor Lewis, pp. 280-284; H. C. Leupold, Exposition of Genesis, pp. 250-254.

already referred forms the basis for the elaboration of this incident in the Book of Enoch.

But is it not quite possible that Jude may have been thinking of the story of the fall of the angels as it is given in the Book of Enoch, with which we can be reasonably certain that he was acquainted? I feel that he may have; for this verse contains reminiscences of the language found in the Book of Enoch. But I also believe that the Spirit of God guided him in such a way that he did not give expression to these false notions in clear and unmistakable language. The Holy Spirit led him to choose words and expressions which were capable of quite another interpretation, presenting the fall of the angels in a way that was consonant with the analogy of faith. No one will deny that the writers of the Old and New Testaments entertained false notions about natural phenomena; but we marvel that, though they themselves held these false notions, the Holy Spirit prevented them from placing them on record in the Bible. I believe that this parallel is apposite here and in the other places (vv. 9, 14) where Jude employs apocryphal material. As Lenski says: "We always see that the inspired writer is protected, none of them adopts an single fiction."⁶⁶

The similarity in phraseology between Enoch and Jude seems to me to be conclusive proof that Jude was well acquainted with the Book of Enoch. But one must beware of making the illogical mistake of assuming that similarity (or even identify) of terminology implies an acceptance of the ideas of the original coiners of the phrases employed. Just as

66. Lenski, op. cit., p. 630.

people who quote Shakespeare and Milton approvingly do not necessarily use the expressions in their original meaning, so Jude here is adopting expressions from the pseudepigraphal Book of Enoch and using them in his own way. Paul is to be charged with a similar thing in Rom. 10:6, where he employs expressions from Deut. 30:12 in a sense quite foreign to its original context.

The restraint with which Jude speaks of these matters is noteworthy. In no way does he adopt a phrase that must be referred to the mistaken interpretation of Gen. 6:1 ff., as given in the Book of Enoch. All that Jude says can just as well be understood of the original rebellion of the angels against God and of their punishment which occurred before the fall of man into sin.

The second illustration is closely connected with the first, the ἔτι being conjunctive, and the subject of the verb being the same as in the previous verse. Jude speaks of angels, ἄγγελοι, who kept not their own dominion but left their proper habitation. The absence of the article before ἄγγελους stresses quality: these were angelic beings of which he is speaking. Jude describes these angels in both a negative and a positive way. In the first place, they did not keep their ἄρχι. This ἄρχι was the rule or dominion assigned them by God. In Eph. 1:21 and Col. 2:10, angels themselves are spoken of as ἄρχι, probably because they possessed rule or dominion. Nowhere does the Bible state where in this dominion consists.⁶⁷ These angels did not only not pre-

67. It is sheer speculation to suppose that the rule of the angels was over the various nations of the world (basing this assumption on the LXX translation of Deut. 32:8, which is a mistranslation of the

serve this dominion, but in the second place, they also left their proper habitation, this latter phrase being a reminiscence of Enoch 12:4. Their proper habitation was with God, in the Light, as the contrast in the latter part of the verse clearly shows. By their own will and choice these angelic beings cast themselves out and separated themselves from God.

As punishment Jesus--for He is still the subject of this verse--has preserved these angels with everlasting bonds under nether gloom for the final judgment. Each of the phrases in the latter portion of this verse requires the closest scrutiny.

Jesus has preserved these angels for the "judgment of the great day." In referring to the final judgment, this expression stands alone in the New Testament, though we do have the expression "the great and terrible day of the Lord" in Joel 3:1. Numerous parallels for this phrase may be found in the Book of Enoch. Plummer says:

What St. Jude calls "the Judgment of the Great Day" (κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας) . . . is called in the Book of Enoch "the Great Day of Judgment" (10:9); "the Day of the Great Judgment" (93:8; 98:15); "the Great Day" (16:2); "the Great Judgment" (22:5); "the General Judgment" (22:9).⁶⁸

The turn of phrase which Jude here employs would seem to indicate that he was well acquainted with the Book of Enoch. However, to infer from this, as Plummer does,⁶⁹ that he was influenced in his theological development by this work, is unwarranted. The thought of the final

Hebrew text) (cf. Bigg, op. cit., p. 329); or that their dominion was over the various planets (basing this upon Enoch 72-82) (cf. Knopf, op. cit., p. 222).

68. Plummer, op. cit., p. 412.

69. Ibid.

judgment is a thought often expressed by Jesus (cf. Matt. 25) and in the preaching of the early Church (cf. Acts 2:20).

Jesus has kept (or preserved) these angels with δεσμῶν αἰδίων. The angels are said to be chained with everlasting bonds because they will be forever prevented from recovering the joy and happiness which they once possessed. The word αἰδίων has caused the commentators much difficulty. It is possible (but certainly improbable) that Jude by a false, but popular etymology derived the word from αἰδῶ.⁷⁰ This expedient was resorted to because of the difficulties found in the phrase "everlasting bonds." Mayor says: "The bonds are called 'everlasting,' but they are only used for a temporary purpose, to keep them for the final judgment."⁷¹ However, this explanation is less satisfactory than that offered by Knopf, who writes: "Die Fesseln sind αἰδίων, ewig, sie werden den Engeln auch nicht am Tage des Gerichts abgenommen, sondern mit ihnen gebunden werden die Verworfenen in den Feuer gestürzt."⁷² This picture has its counterpart in Enoch 54:3 ff.

The angels will be kept "under nether gloom," ὑπὸ ζέφου. The use of the accusative after ὑπὸ to express "rest under" is also found in John 1:49.⁷³ No such materialistic concept need have been in the mind of Jude as was in the minds of the rabbis who conceived of the fallen angels as being confined in caverns beneath the surface of the earth until the final judgment when they will be cast into a lake of fire.⁷⁴

70. Cf. Windisch, op. cit., p. 39.

71. Mayor, Jude, p. 260.

72. Knopf, op. cit., p. 223.

73. Albert Debrunner, Friedrich Blass' Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch, # 232, 1.

74. Strack and Billerbeck, op. cit., pp. 783 f.

Wohlenberg, I believe, offers the correct explanation:

Vorher im Lichte wohnend, selbst voller Licht, wie Gott, unterliegen sie nunmehr, weil aus der Gemeinschaft mit Gott ausgeschlossen, dem geraden Gegenteil, der Macht der Finsternis, des Todes, der Unseligkeit.⁷⁵

This phrase, too, is a reminiscence of Enoch (10:4; 62:10).

The third illustration deals with the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah and the surrounding cities. It differs from the preceding two in that it tells only of the punishment which came upon these notorious sinners and not of the preceding fall from grace. Grammatically too this example is distinct from the two preceding illustrations: it is introduced by ὡς rather than by ὅτι. The ὡς is to be translated "just as," the clause being subordinate to what has preceded.⁷⁶ Jude may have been prompted to choose this illustration because of the similarity of the sins of the people of Sodom and Gomorrah and the surrounding cities with the sins of the libertines against whom he is writing.⁷⁷

The account of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah is found in Gen. 19:4-25. The cities round about, according to Deut. 29:23, Hos. 11:8, were Admah, Zeboim, and Zoar, the last of which, however, was spared by the Lord at Lot's request (Gen. 19:20 ff.).

The participial phrase τὸν ὁμοίον τρόπον τοῦτοις ἐκπορεύσασαι modifies αὐτὰ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις. It indirectly indicates the reason why these cities were destroyed with fire from heaven. The inhabitants

75. Wohlenberg, op. cit., p. 298.

76. A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research, p. 1032, thinks that the ὡς is simply "how," being somewhat in the form of an indirect question.

77. Knopf, op. cit., p. 223.

of these cities about Sodom and Gomorrah committed sexual sins similar to those of their neighbors. The τούτοις refers κατὰ συνέσειν to the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah.⁷⁸ The inhabitants of these cities were guilty of fornication. The phrase ἐκπορνύειν ὀπίσω is not found elsewhere in the New Testament but is frequent in the LXX, translating לְאַחַר גַּבָּיִם. The ἐκ may be intensive (cf. ἐκφροσύνω, ἐκμείνω).⁷⁹ They were also guilty of "going after other flesh." The attempts of commentators to refer this to the attempted assault on the angels by the Sodomites (Gen. 19:4) are superfluous, for the sins which destroyed these cities were not isolated, but were commonplace, everyday occurrences in these cities. Nor is the contention valid that homosexual sins are not referred to here, for the ἕτερος may well be understood to mean "other than that appointed by God." If this is the correct interpretation, the people of these cities of the plain were guilty of the sins condemned in Rom. 1:26 f.⁸⁰

These cities serve as an example of eternal fire, suffering punishment.⁸¹ The verb προκείμεναι is a present. Of course, when Jude wrote the cities were no longer to be seen, but according to Jewish tradition

78. It may also possibly refer proleptically to the ὁδοί of v. 8. That it cannot refer to the sin of the angels in v. 6, as many commentators wish to understand it, is proved by the fact that the sin of the angels was of a different nature from that of the inhabitants of the cities of the plain. Sexual aberrations are impossible for the angels, for they are asexual spirits.

79. Windisch, op. cit., p. 39; Knopf, op. cit., p. 224.

80. Cf. Mayor, Jude, p. 260.

81. There is another way of construing this sentence: πρὸς αἰῶν-
ίου may be connected with δεξιμά, but Wohlenberg (op. cit., p. 298) correctly rejects this construction, for it is not in accord with the analogy of Scripture.

which has been verified by modern archaeological research, the site of these cities was beneath the surface of the Dead Sea. The fame of the Dead Sea had spread throughout the ancient world, and accordingly we are not compelled to think that the congregation to which Jude is writing was located in Palestine. These cities serve as an example of eternal fire, for a destruction so utter and so permanent as theirs has been is the nearest approach that can be found in this world to the destruction awaiting the damned, for fire and brimstone made the Dead Sea what it is. It is quite possible that Jude was acquainted with the belief that was common among the Jews that subterranean fires were still burning at the place where the cities of the plain had stood, but the words do not necessarily imply that he is here stamping this belief with approval.⁸²

The last phrase comes as a climax by virtue of its restraint: "suffering punishment." The phrase δίκην ὑπέχουσιν is found in Jos. Ant. XI, 1.⁸³ The inhabitants of the cities of the plain are suffering the just punishments for their sins; the libertines will soon be doing the same; and with this, Jude makes the transition to the next verse.

WV. 8 - 11.

ὁμοίως μέντοι καὶ οὗτοι ἐνυπνιάζομενοι ἕρκα μὲν μισίνουσιν,
κυριότητα δὲ ἀδεύουσιν, βίας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν. ὁ δὲ Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχ-
αγγελος, ὅτε τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος βεβήητο περὶ τοῦ Μωυσέως
σώματος, οὐκ ἐτόλμασεν κρίσιν ἐπιτελεῖν βλασφημίας, ἀλλ' εἶπεν,
Ἐπιτιμῆσαι σοὶ Κύριος. οὗτοι δὲ ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἶδουσιν βλασφημοῦσιν,
ὅσα δὲ σπουδαίως, ὡς τῶν ἀλοχῶν ἄνδρες, ἐπιβάντων, ἐν τούτοις φείσονται.
οὐδὲ αὐτοῦ ὅτι τῷ θεῷ τὰ κείν' ἐπρωτεύοντο, καὶ τῷ πάλιν τοῦ

82. Mayor, Jude, p. 261.

83. Windisch, op. cit., p. 39.

Βαλαάμ Μισδοῦ ἔξεχύθησαν, καὶ τῇ ἀντιλοχίᾳ τοῦ Κορέ ἐπέδοντο.

Yet in like manner these, too, dreaming, for one thing defile the flesh; for another set at naught lordship; and for still another blaspheme glories. But Michael the archangel, when contesting with the devil disputed concerning the body of Moses, did not dare to bring a railing accusation, but said, "The Lord rebuke you!" But these men revile whatever they do not understand, and by those things that they know by instinct as irrational animals do, they are destroyed. Woe to them! for they have walked in the way of Cain and abandon themselves for the sake of gain to Balaam's error and perish in Korah's rebellion.

And yet, in spite of these examples which Jude has just brought to remembrance—which the members of the congregation and the libertines themselves should have known without any prompting on Jude's part—these men, too, these libertines, are guilty of gross sins against God and are likewise liable to divine punishment. The ὁμοίως refers not merely to the example of the Sodomites and the people like them, as many commentators believe, but refers to the three examples which Jude has just brought. Jude is not here specifically speaking of sexual sins, but he is dealing with the fall from divine grace and the ensuing punishment.

In his characteristic way Jude takes up his previous subject again by οὗτοι (cf. vv. 12, 16, 19). The καὶ before οὗτοι is relative. "These too, dreaming, for one thing, defile the flesh; for another set at naught lordship; and for still another blaspheme glories."

The ἐνυπνιάζομενοι does not refer merely to the εἴρα μιδίουειν, as is clear from its position, but it modifies all three phrases which follow. ἐνυπνιάζεσθαι, which is related to ἐνύπνιον, dream, is used in the LXX of prophetic dreams (cf. Deut. 13:1, 3, 5; Jer. 37:7; Joel 3:1).⁸⁴

84. Bigg, op. cit., p. 330.

This may be the case here, that the libertines claimed special revelations from God which permitted them to live the lax moral life which they did. However, since there are no other indications in the letter of such a state of affairs, it may be better to take it in a more general way: "they are like men who do and say monstrous things in their sleep. They are deadened to all sense of decency and duty."⁸⁵ Schlatter is no doubt correct when he says:

Obwohl der Ernst Gottes in der Schrift und in der Geschichte seine deutliche Bezeugung hat, gehen sie denselben Weg. Das heisst Judas in Träumen leben. Das sehende Auge ist weg; willkürlich geformte Gedanken füllen sie, verdecken ihnen die Wirklichkeit und bringen sie so unter ihre Herrschaft, dass sie völlig in ihnen leben. Sie geben dem freilich andre Namen und versichern, das sei Erkenntnis, das sei die Wahrheit. Judas heisst aber jeden einen Träumer, der nicht merkt, dass ihn sein zuchtloses, unreines Begehren von Gott trennt.⁸⁶

Jude now levels three specific charges at the heads of the libertines: in the first place, they defile flesh; in the second, they set at nought lordship; and finally, they blaspheme glories.

The first of these charges is that the libertines defile flesh. Jude does not say that these men defile their own flesh; his charge is broader and more general than that; they defile flesh, wherever it may be. This charge is an expansion of the ἁγιάσεια of v. 4. Moffatt has reconstructed the situation correctly:

The close connexion of sex and religion produced moral aberrations which Jude calls a pollution of the flesh; the primitive love feasts (v. 12) where men and women met in exalted fervor, gave opportunities for indulging in such passions. So called 'spiritual' men might urge and did urge that the ordinary restraints of the sexes should be abolished by the new freedom of the Spirit, and that the impulse to

85. Plummer, op. cit., p. 416.

86. Schlatter, op. cit., p. 63.

87. Moffatt, op. cit., p. 234.

promiscuous sexual intercourse was a genuine expression of the love-spirit in the community. Religious communism for some enthusiasts meant free love as well as no property.⁸⁷

The next charge is variously interpreted by the commentators, and one should again be hesitant to claim finality for any interpretation of it. The original sense of κυριότης is "lordship" and may imply the position of the Lord himself, cf. v. 4; Did. 4:1 ("whencesoever the lordship is spoken, there is the Lord"). Others, like Calvin, would interpret it of civil magistrates.⁸⁸ Plummer feels that "if earthly rulers are meant . . . it is more probable that St. Jude is thinking of ecclesiastical officers; in which case the meaning would be that these libertines set Church discipline at defiance, and reviled the presbyters and bishops who rebuked them for their evil conduct."⁸⁹ However, Plummer himself does not accept this interpretation. Others, referring to Col. 1:16; Eph. 1:21, Enoch 61:10, understand κυριότης of a class of angels. But even Knopf who advocates this interpretation says: "aber sicher ist die Deutung nicht; sie wäre es, wenn statt κυριότητι der Plur. κυριότητων stünde."⁹⁰ Perhaps the most satisfactory interpretation of this phrase is the first: these men set the Lord (κύριος) Himself at nought. The verb ὀδεύω is used of an attitude toward God or Christ in Luke 10:16; John 12:44; 1 Thess. 4:8, etc. If this is the correct interpretation we are reminded of the τὰ μάλιστα δεσποτῆν καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν ἑλθεῖν χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι, of v. 4. How do

87. Moffatt, op. cit., p. 234.

88. Plummer, op. cit., p. 417.

89. Ibid.

90. Knopf, op. cit., p. 227.

they do this? For all practical purposes, these men by their conduct refuse to recognize Jesus Christ as their κύριος, attempting themselves to take His place.

The next phrase too is beset with difficulties. The libertines are charged with blaspheming glories. The great difficulty lies in determining who or what Jude means by "glories", δόξαι. Bigg is almost alone in referring δόξαι to the rulers of the congregations.⁹¹ Such a use is completely unparalleled. Lenski interprets δόξαι of the attributes of Christ in His state of exaltation.⁹² Such an interpretation seems out of harmony with the context where there is apparently a progression of thought from κυριότης to δόξαι. A number of commentators refer it to the evil angels, citing v. 9 as proof of this contention; others refer it to the good angels; while yet others do not feel that a distinction should be made between good and evil angels. That δόξαι

91. Bigg, *op. cit.*, p. 279.

92. Lenski, *op. cit.*, p. 318. — It may be well to state Lenski's argumentation in more detail. "Δόξαι [*sic!*] 'glories,' are the glorious attributes of Christ that are identical with the 'glories' mentioned in 1 Pet. 1:11. In 1 Pet. 1:11 Peter says that the Spirit of Christ testified in advance to the Old Testament prophets the sufferings regarding Christ and the glories after these sufferings. But the sufferings and the glories pertain to his human nature: the sufferings to his state of humiliation, the glories after the sufferings to his state of exaltation. As the sufferings are manifold (plural), so are also the glories (plural). The singular is more commonly used: "God Father of the glory" (Acts 7:2; Eph. 1:17); "Jesus Christ of the glory" (James 2:1); "the revelation of his glory" (1 Pet. 4:1); "the Lord of the glory" (1 Cor. 2:8); also "the Spirit of the glory and of God" (1 Pet. 4:14). The singular always denotes the sum of the divine attributes shining forth; the plural, "the glories," which occurs in both epistles of Peter (and in Jude 8) spreads out this sum, each divine attribute of Christ (communicated to his human nature) being one of these great glories."

refers to evil angels seems highly improbable, since "glories" is certainly a strange name for devils.⁹³ This objection also applies to the suggestion that Jude did not distinguish between good and evil angels. Moreover he specifically calls the leader of the evil angels ὁ διάβολος.

Good reasons can be offered why δόξαί should refer to the good angels. In the LXX in Ex. 15:11 δόξαί is used of the angels. The Shekinah is also known as the Glory, each separate ray of it being an angel. In the Test. Jud. 25:2, we read that the "powers of the glory blessed Simeon."⁹⁴ The use of the plural δόξαί may be compared with Philo's use of λόγοι for angels, in contrast with the divine λόγος.⁹⁵

Plummer feels that

it is quite possible that in this particular also St. Jude is under the influence of the Book of Enoch. In it we read "Ye fulfill not the commandments of the Lord; but ye transgress and calumniate greatness" (6:4); and again, "All who utter with their mouths unbecoming language against God and speak harsh things of His glory, here they shall be collected" (26:2); and again, "My eyes beheld all the sinners who denied the Lord of glory" (1:8). But, of course, it does not follow that because St. Jude partly reproduced the language of this writer, therefore he uses it with precisely the same meaning.⁹⁶

And now Jude brings home his point once again by means of an illustration. He refers to the incident of Michael's contest with the devil over the body of Moses. When the archangel Michael contended with the devil, who was one of the fallen angels, he did not dare to bring a railing accusation against him. What a contrast these libertines show to the humility of the archangel, who did not even dare to revile the

93. Plummer, op. cit., p. 419.

94. Wand, op. cit., p. 205.

95. Mayor, Jude, p. 262.

96. Plummer, op. cit., p. 418 f.

devil! They revile the lordship and glories, God and His angels.

Michael is the leader of the good angels in their conflict with the power of Satan. In the Old Testament we see Michael as the guardian and protector of the Jewish people in their conflict with the powers of heathenism. In the New Testament, in the only other passage besides this where Michael is mentioned (Rev. 12:7-9), he is represented as fighting against Satan and his angels.⁹⁷ In Dan. 10:13 Michael is called אַחַד אֲנֹכְחֵי הַמַּלְאַכִּים, "one of the first (angelic) princes;" in Dan. 12:1 he is called הַגָּדוֹל הַרְבֵּי, "the great prince." In the rabbinic writings he is known as מַיְכָאֵל הַגָּדוֹל, which is approximately equivalent to ἀρχάγγελος.⁹⁸

The struggle between Michael and the devil was not one where sheer might and force were employed, but was conducted with words, as the participle διακρινόμενος shows. διακρίνεσθαι is here used, as Bigg notes, in its proper sense of "contending with an adversary in a court of law."⁹⁹ The dative τῷ διαβόλῳ is governed by the finite verb διελέχθη. The archangel contested with the devil about the body of Moses, which according to Deut. 34:5 f. was buried by God. Elsewhere in Scripture there is no account of this struggle.

Michael did not dare to bring a railing accusation against the devil, for that is a prerogative reserved for God Himself. This passage is a reminiscence of 2 Pet. 2:11, where we find the phrase βλασφημοῦν κρίειν for the κρίειν βλασφημίας of this verse. In the pas-

97. Wand, loc. cit.

98. Strack and Billerbeck, op. cit., p. 783.

99. Bigg, op. cit., p. 331.

sage before us, the genitive is therefore best taken as adjectival rather than as objective. It was not a charge of blasphemy that Michael did not dare to bring, but a "railing (blasphemous) accusation."

Michael's course was quite different from that of the libertines. They are audacious in speech, setting at nought lordships and blaspheming glories. Michael, in contrast to them, appeals his case to the Lord, saying, "The Lord rebuke thee!" for it is the Lord's prerogative to judge (cf. 1 Pet. 2:23). The verb, of course, is an optative of wish. The same words are also found in Zech. 3:2, where the angel and the devil contended over Joshua the highpriest.

Plummer says:

The meaning of this illustration is obvious. The profane libertines allow themselves to speak of "dignities" in a way which even an archangel did not venture to adopt in rebuking Satan. It is a very strong argument a fortiori. Consequently, the fact that it was an evil angel against whom Michael did not dare to rail by no means proves that it was evil angels against which the libertines did dare to rail. Rather the contrary must be inferred. They use language of good angels which Michael would not use of a bad one.¹⁰⁰

The elucidation of the thought of this verse is not difficult, but the crucial problem is: Where did Jude obtain this story? He introduces it in a way which implies that it is familiar to his readers. We know that it is nowhere found in the Old Testament. The account of the death of Moses as given in Deut. 34:5 f. is sober and simple. We know that a good many legends grew up around this account in succeeding years, which are preserved for us in the rabbinic writings.¹⁰¹

100. Plummer, op. cit., p. 419.

101. For these legends see Strack and Billerbeck, op. cit., p. 486f.

However, none of these accounts exactly corresponds to the narrative as given in the letter of Jude, and we may therefore be fairly certain that these legends are not the source from which Jude drew his illustration.

Origen (de Princip. III. ii. sub init.) tells us that the account is taken from an apocryphal book called the Assumption of Moses: "In Genesis the serpent is described as having seduced Eve, regarding whom, in the Assumption of Moses (a little treatise of which the Apostle Jude makes mention in his Epistle) the archangel Michael, when disputing with the devil regarding the body of Moses, says that the serpent, being inspired of the devil, was the cause of the transgression of Adam and Eve."¹⁰²

Plummer says:

The book was fairly well known in the early Church. Clement of Alexandria quotes it (Strom. VI. xv. sub fin.); and in the Latin translation of the Hypotyposesis his note on Jude 9 is "Hic confirmat Assumptionem Moysis." Didymus of Alexandria says the same as Origen about St. Jude's use of it, and censures those who made this an objection to the Epistle of Jude (In Epist. Judae enarratio in Gallandi Biblioth. Patr. VI. 307). Evodius, Bishop of Uzala, one of Augustine's early friends (Confess. IX. viii. 17; xii. 31), in writing to him, speaks of it as the Mysteries (Secreta) of Moses, and calls it a writing devoid of authority (Aug. Ep. clviii. 6). It was known in the second half of the fifth century to Gelasius of Cyzicus, and in the second half of the eighth to Nicephorus of Constantinople, who in his Stichometri Sacrorum Librorum tells us that it was about as long as the Apocalypse of St. John. But from that time we hear no more of it until 1861, when Ceriani published about a third of it from a palimpsest in the Ambrosian library at Milan (Monumenta Sacra et Prof. I. i. p. 55). This fragment contains the passage quoted by Gelasius, but most tantalizingly comes to an end before the death of Moses, so that we are still without the passage about the contest between Michael and the devil respecting his body.¹⁰³

102. Translation taken from Plummer, op. cit., p. 422.

103. Plummer, loc. cit.

In view of this almost overwhelming evidence from antiquity we are forced to the conclusion that this work is the source from which Jude drew his illustration.¹⁰⁴

Other suggestions have been made as to the source from which Jude may have obtained information about this conflict between the archangel and the devil, but they are scarcely worthy of consideration. It is certainly difficult to believe that a tradition of this nature could have been handed down for so many centuries without leaving some trace in the literature of the Old Testament. But we must not be too dogmatic about this; it may be. There is even less ground for the supposition that Jesus revealed the fate of the body of Moses to His disciples after they came down from the Mount of the Transfiguration, after Moses and Elijah appeared and conversed with Him (Matt. 17:1-9, especially v. 9). The text itself is against the supposition that Jude received a special revelation on this matter, for the illustration is introduced as if it were familiar to Jude's readers. We may therefore rest satisfied that the Assumption of Moses is the prime source for Jude's illustration.¹⁰⁵ We are strengthened in this conviction by the fact that

104. Lenski offers counter-arguments for this position as follows (op. cit., p. 630): "Whence did Jude . . . obtain this information regarding Michael's contention with Satan about the body of Moses? . . . Quite a number answers: Jude obtained it from the Assumption of Moses; and some say that Jude 'quotes' it. The fragment of the Assumptio that is extant breaks off in the middle of the sentence before Moses' death is reached. The ancients, who had the document intact, do not say that Jude quotes it; Clement: hic confirmat assumptionem Moysi; Origen: cuius libelli meminit in epistola sua apostolus Judas; Didymus says far less, namely that objection is raised to Jude's epistle and to the Assumptio propter eum locum, ubi significatur verbum archangeli de corpore Moyseos ad diabolum factum."

105. However Lenski comments: "These three church fathers are usually offered as proof that Jude quotes the Assumption. But one of

Turning back again to the description of the profligates, Jude says (v. 10): "But these men revile whatever they do not understand, and by those things that they know by instinct as irrational animals do, they are destroyed."

What are these things which the libertines do not know? We find the answer in v. 8: they are κυριότης and δόξα, and "generally the world of spirit to which these conceptions belong."¹⁰⁷ These men are crass materialists who have no place in their thinking for spiritual matters and ideas. In order to atone for their ignorance these men use vile and abusive language of these spiritual matters.¹⁰⁸

And now, we might expect Jude to have said, "and in those things that they know by instinct as irrational animals do, they find their delight." With a cutting irony Jude rather says, "by these things they are destroyed."

κυριότης here means "by instinct." The things that these men understand are those things which man has in common with beasts, the desire for food and for procreation, and in them is their delight. But not only is their delight in them; in them also is their ruin. "If they had been spiritual they would have had a better understanding of the spiritual sphere. For this, cf. 1 Cor. 2:7-16. The two passages together supply a good defence of the Christian point of view against the almost unrestrained licence which is apparently the idea

σῶμα ὡς τῆς ὕλης δεσπόζοντι ἤτοι διὰ τὸ παύσαι τὸν Ἀγύπτιον, ἀποστρέφονται κατὰ τὸ ἄγιον καὶ φονεῖα ἀναχορεύσαντος καὶ ἐνεγκώντων κατὰ τὸν ἄγιον βλασφημίαν ὁ ἄγγελος. Ἐπιτιμῆσαι σε ὁ Θεός, πρὸς τὸν διάβολον ἔσθ.

107. Bigg, op. cit., p. 331.

108. Wand, op. cit., p. 206.

of many modern writers."¹⁰⁹ The ruin which awaits these men is not their physical and mental ruin; it is far worse than that: these things are the cause of their eternal destruction.¹¹⁰

Charged with emotion, Jude cries out in v. 11, "Woe to them! for they have walked in the way of Cain and abandoned themselves for the sake of gain to Balaam's error and perish in Korah's rebellion."

Outside of the Gospels the phrase οὐοί c. dat. is found only in 1 Cor. 9:16 and in Revelation. "It is rare in later writers," says Bigg, but "occurs in a fragment of Clement of Alexandria."¹¹¹ It is also found in the Didache.¹¹² It is also quite common in Enoch, especially in chapters 94-100.¹¹³

Keil says:

'Wehe ihnen!' ist nicht Ausruf des Schmerzes und Abscheu's, sondern warnender Misbilligung und Strafandrohung, und wird durch den Vergleich ihres Wandels mit dem alttestamentlicher Gottloser begründet.¹¹⁴

The first of these warning examples is Cain. The dative τῷ δδω is the locative dative. The tertium for this example is much disputed. James says: "Cain is perhaps chosen as an instance of one who defied the simplest and most obvious laws of God by murder, or else as having consulted only his natural instincts as he chose an offering for God."¹¹⁵ Plumptre says: "The reference to Cain in 1 John 3:13 indicates that his name was used to point a moral as to the issue of 'evil

109. Ibid.

110. Windisch, op. cit., p. 41.

111. Bigg, op. cit., pp. 331 f.

112. Knopf, op. cit., p. 230.

113. Bigg, loc. cit.

114. Keil, op. cit., p. 315.

115. James, op. cit., p. 39.

works' in the spirit of hatred and murder."¹¹⁶ Bigg says: "The name Cain, standing as it does without qualification, must mean Cain the murderer. . . . Hence Grotius, Oecumenius, and others rightly account for his introduction here by supposing Jude to mean that the false teachers murder men's souls."¹¹⁷ Wand suggests that "since Balaam is an example of avarice and lust, and Korah of rebellion, Cain may here be cited as an example of unbelief."¹¹⁸ I believe this to be correct, for, in the first place, in the Jerusalem Targum on Gen. 4:7 Cain is considered to be the first sceptic, and is there represented as saying: "Non est iudicium nec iudex, nec est aliud saeculum, nec dabitur merces bona justis, nec ultio sumetur de improbis, neque per miserationem creatus est mundus, neque per miserationem gubernatur."¹¹⁹ It is true that this Targum comes from a later age, but the same idea is also found in Philo (De Agric. I M 300 f.); the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews also looks upon Cain as an example of unbelief (Heb. 11:4).¹²⁰ Accordingly we may assume that such an interpretation would not be foreign to the readers of Jude's letter.

The next reason which Jude gives for crying "woe to them!" is that they have been swept on (as Souter renders ἐκχέω)¹²¹ by the error of Balaam for gain. The verb ἐξευδίσαν is used of "indulging in pleasure unrestrainedly," like the Latin effundi in (cf. Ecclus. 37:29; also

116. Plumptre, op. cit., p. 208.

117. Bigg, op. cit., p. 332.

118. Wand, loc. cit.

119. Bigg, loc. cit.

120. Mayor, Jude, p. 265.

121. Alexander Souter, A Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament, sub ἐκχέω.

Sir. 37:25;¹²² and Ign. Phil. 5:1; Clem. Alex. II, 20:118; Plut. Vit. Ant. 21:38.¹²³ These men fling themselves into sensual indulgence, and they do it μικροῦ, which is the genitive of price, "for gain." By means of their libertinistic message they wish to gain others, from whom they may enrich themselves. Bigg says: "Jude does not press the charge of greed and extortion so strongly as 2 Peter; he barely alludes to it here and in v. 16; in his eyes the covetousness of the false teachers is as nothing in comparison with their uncleanness."¹²⁴

The use of the dative πλῆνυ in this phrase is likewise difficult. Various explanations have been offered for it, the most plausible of which are: 1) that the dative is equivalent to εἰς πλῆνυ;¹²⁵ or 2) that it is instrumental.¹²⁶ The latter seems to be the preferable construction. The meaning of πλῆνυ is also indispute; it may bear either an active or a passive sense. If it is to be understood in its passive sense, it means "being deceived;" if in its active sense, "deceiving." For the Greek it may well be that no distinction was made, just as in the case of the English word "error." Balaam is the prophet who was brought by Balak to curse Israel (cf. Num. 22-24; 25:1-3; 31:16; Neh. 23:2), and who caused the Israelites to eat things sacrificed to idols and to commit fornication (Rev. 2:14). In Rabbinic literature Balaam is depicted as the father of all errorists and of all covetous and impious men. On the basis of Num. 22:22 f. he is also charged with dis-

122. James, op. cit., p. 39.

123. Knopf, op. cit. p. 230 f.

124. Bigg, loc. cit.

125. Debrunner, op. cit., # 187.

126. Ibid., # 195.

respect of angels.¹²⁷ All of these charges may well be leveled against the libertines against whom Jude is warning in this letter.

The last reason which Jude gives in this threesome is that "by the gainsaying of Korah they have perished." Of course this had not yet occurred when Jude wrote these words, but he uses the aorist because their fate is as certain as if it had been a historical fact.¹²⁸ Korah and his followers "gainsaid" Moses (Num. 26) because Moses by divine command had settled the priesthood upon the family of Aaron. It was not that Korah despised all of God's ordinances, but this particular ordinance which God had established for the sake of maintaining order in the Old Testament cultus was particularly odious to him. How can this be said of the libertines? They disregarded God's ordinances for maintaining propriety and order in the worship services of the Church (cf. v. 12). They used them for an occasion for indulging in their licentious conduct, especially at the love-feasts which at this time were a part of the worship of the Church.

It is noteworthy how the verbs increase in intensity until a climax is reached: ἐπορεύθησαν . . . ἔξεχύθησαν . . . ἀπώλοντο.

V. 12 - 15.

οὗτοι εἶναι οἱ ἐν ταῖς ἀγαταῖς ὑμῶν ἐπιλάβες συνευωχούμενοι, ἠκούσως ἑαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες· γεφύλακι ἀνύδριος, ὑπὸ ἰκνέμων παρακρεσόμενοι· δεῖδρα φθινοπωρινὰ ἄκαρτα, δις ἀποθανόντα, ἐκρίθωθέντα κύματα ἄγρια θαλάσσης, ἐπαφρίζοντα τὰς ἑαυτῶν αἰγύνας· ὕστερες πλεονήται, οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ φόβου εἰς διῶνα πτηρῆται· προσεφθέτευσεν δὲ καὶ τοῦτοις ἑβδόμος ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ ἔνωλ λέγων, Ἰδοὺ, ἔληθεν κύριος ἐν ἀγιάσις μυριάειν αὐτοῦ, ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντα, καὶ ἐλέγξει πάντας τοὺς ἡγεβείας περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ἡγεβείας αὐτῶν ὧν ἡεβήσαν, καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν φιλζῶν ὧν ἔλλζεν καὶ αὐτοῦ ἡμετωλοῖ ἡεβείας.

127. Knopf, op. cit., p. 231.

128. Wand, op. cit., p. 207.

These are those who are filthy as they feast together in your love feasts, fearlessly faring luxuriously; clouds without water, driven past by the wind; autumn trees without fruit, twice dead, uprooted; wild waves of the sea, casting up the foam of their shameful deeds, wandering stars, for whom the nether gloom of darkness has been kept forever. Also concerning these Enoch, the seventh from Adam, did prophecy, saying: "Behold, the Lord will come with his holy myriads, to execute judgment against all and to expose all the impious on the basis of all the impious works which they have committed in such an impious way, and on the basis of all the harsh things which impious sinners have spoken against Him."

Jude now leaves off the description of these libertines based upon comparison with characters well known to his readers from their knowledge of the Old Testament Scriptures and begins an independent description of them, unrivaled in the whole of Scripture for the vehemence of its denunciation. This description, as Plummer notes,

falls into three parts of which this VV. 12-15 is the first. Each of these three parts begins in the same way: "These are" (οὗτοι εἰσίν). And each is balanced by something on the other side which is introduced by a "But" (ὅτι). In the case before us the "But" introduces a warning given prophetically to these libertines [?] by Enoch (VV. 14, 15). In the second case St. Jude quotes a warning given prophetically to his readers by the Apostles (VV. 17, 18). In the third case he exhorts the readers himself.¹²⁹

The formula οὗτοι εἰσίν, as Mayor notes, is found in Zech. 1:10; Rev. 7:14; Enoch 46:3; and elsewhere in the apocalyptic writings, and again, in this particular, Jude shows his acquaintance with such works.¹³⁰

Serious difficulties confront the commentator in the next few words. The first question he must answer is: To which noun does the definite article οἱ belong? It is impossible that it is to be joined immediately with πικράδες since that noun is feminine, unless, of course, it is a constructio ad sensum, the feminine being treated as masculine, because

129. Plummer, op. cit., p. 426.

130. Mayor, Jude, p. 266.

it is used metaphorically of men. However, I feel that this is altogether too unlikely to receive serious consideration. It is possible that a participle like ὄντες or κλητοί is to be supplied after ἐχάπιδις, so that the phrase would be translated: "These are they who are in your love feasts as ἐπιλάδες," or "who in your love feasts are called ἐπιλάδες." This is altogether possible and may be adopted. However, there are other ways in which this sentence may be construed. The οἱ may also be connected with συνεωχούμενα, understanding ἐπιλάδες as either an appositional modifier or as a descriptive adjective. Chase suggests that the οἱ should be dropped, thus obviating the difficulty;¹³¹ but this is cutting the Gordian knot rather than untying it. There is nothing in the text to demand any of these constructions to the exclusion of the others, and only the interpreter's good sense can guide him. I personally prefer to connect οἱ with συνεωχούμενοι and to understand ἐπιλάδες as an adjective modifying συνεωχούμενα because of its position between the article and the noun.

The second question which the commentator must grapple with in this connection is the meaning of ἐπιλάς. As a noun the meaning which many commentators and lexicographers assign to it is "spots," a meaning which the word bears only in an Orphic poem, *Lithica*, 614, of the fourth century.¹³² However, the evidence for this meaning is not confined to one solitary reference. Hesychius interprets ἐπιλάδες by μεμιδόμενοι. Those who advocate this meaning give a reference to 2 Pet. 2:13, where the word ἐπιλοι undoubtedly bears this sense. However, we must not be

131. Chase, *op. cit.*, p. 799.

132. Plummer, *op. cit.*, p. 427; Preuschen, *op. cit.*, sub ἐπιλάς.

unduly influenced by this seeming parallel in assigning a meaning to ἐπιλάς in this passage. It may well be that Jude, while reading the letter of Peter, was reminded of the word ἐπιλάς which ordinarily means "rock," and regarded this as a much more telling picture than "spot" and therefore adopted it. The common meaning of ἐπιλάς, as we have already mentioned, is that of "rock" or "reef." It bears this meaning from Homer onwards, and there is no good reason why it should not bear it also in the passage before us. However, if it be an adjective, it bears the meaning of "filthy," as is shown by the papyri.¹³³ There is no way of determining the exact meaning of this word in this connection, and therefore it must remain an exegetical problem, at least until more information is available.

Jude speaks of these men as feasting together at the Christians' love feasts, which symbolized the brotherhood of all Christians. "It was a simple meal, says Plummer, "in which all met as equals, and the rich supplied the necessities of the poor. Anything like excess was peculiarly out of place, and it was the duty of the rich to see that the poorer members of the congregation were satisfied."¹³⁴

While this was the ideal for which the Christians were to strive, the ideal was not being realized in the congregations to which Jude was writing. It would seem as if these profligates (1) brought with them luxurious food, thus destroying the Christian simplicity of the meal;

133. J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, sub ἐπιλάς. — Souter, op. cit., sub ἐπιλάς, suggests that ἀνεμοί is to be supplied after ἐπιλάδες, so that the sense would be: "These are the filthy winds at your love feasts." But this is highly improbable, inasmuch as the picture is not further developed in this connection.

134. Plummer, op. cit., p. 429.

and (2) brought this, not for the benefit of all, but for their own private enjoyment, thus destroying the idea of Christian brotherhood.¹³⁵

It is for this reason that the epithet πιλάδες, whatever its precise meaning, is used of these men. If it means either "filthy" or "spots," Jude means to say that by their very presence at these feasts where Christians express their fellowship with one another, these libertines mar and deface them. If, however, πιλάδες means "rocks," Jude is warning his readers against the grave danger in which they are placed. They may easily make shipwreck of their faith and lose their souls by contact with these errorists. It is their duty to avoid them.

Jude continues his description by saying that these men "shepherd themselves without fear." It is best to take ἑαυτοῖς with ποιμαίνοντες because ἑαυτοῦχούμενοι is modified by πιλάδες, no matter what view is taken of the meaning of that word. Lumby feels that

it is likely that in the word without fear (ἑαυτοῖς) there is contained a degree of rebuke to the Christian congregations for having allowed the evil practice to creep so far and get such a bold front. It is as though the writer had said, "Such impunity ought not to have been permitted, the mischief should have been checked at its earlier stages."¹³⁶

The libertines are said to be "shepherding themselves," a phrase which verbally recalls Ezek. 34:8. This passage, however, does not seem to say that these men are untrue shepherds who nourish themselves on spiritual food while the flock is starving. Rather ποιμαίνειν seems to have the sense of "to fatten, indulge," as in Prov. 28:7; 29:3, and

135. Ibid.

136. J. R. Lumby, "The General Epistle of Jude," The Holy Bible According to the Authorized Version (A.D. 1611), with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary and a Revision of the Translation, by Bishops and Other Clergy of the Anglican Church, New Testament, Vol. 4, p. 398.

therefore these men are faring luxuriously while other Christians at the love feasts go without food.¹³⁷

Jude once again changes the picture and depicts a new aspect of these libertinistic errorists. He says that these men are "waterless clouds driven past by the wind." In the Orient the coming of a cloud is eagerly awaited by the farmers whose lands are scorched by the hot, dry winds coming from the deserts. The rising of a cloud over the horizon is a promise to them that rain is on the way; and, accordingly, the passing of a cloud without pouring down its water is one of the severest disappointments with which an Oriental farmer can meet. It may well be that these men were looked upon as an important addition to the Christian community when they entered the congregation; but they are "waterless;" they did not produce that which was expected of them by the other Christians, as they were driven about by every wind of impulse that struck them, so that they are utterly unreliable and unstable, doing nothing that was expected of them.

With another picture Jude enlarges his description of these libertines. He says that they are "fruitless trees in late autumn." The meaning of φθινοπώριον, has been investigated by Mayor¹³⁸ and he proves conclusively that it means "in late autumn," at harvest time, when men expect to find fruit on the trees. But these men are barren, without fruit, when they may properly be expected to bear it. In this they remind us of the barren fig tree in the Gospels. As the clouds do not pour down rain when it was expected, so these men, as trees planted in God's

137. Mayor, Jude, p. 267.

138. J. B. Mayor, "φθινοπώριον" The Expositor, Series VI, Vol. IX, pp. 98-104.

garden, do not produce the expected fruit, although they have received God's loving care throughout the entire growing season.

The next epithet continues the description of the libertines as trees. These men are "twice dead, uprooted." What is the precise meaning of the expression "twice dead"? The most reasonable and correct explanation seems to be that these men, before baptism, were dead in sin (Col. 2:13), and by baptism were made alive to God. But now they have apostatized from the faith and are once more dead to God, without the life of God in them (Rev. 21:8; 2 Pet. 2:20 ff.). And as a consequence of this, these men have sinned so grievously that their time of grace is passed. They have committed the sin against the Holy Ghost and are now, by God's decree, "uprooted" from the soil of grace. There is no longer any possibility of their being renewed again to repentance (Heb. 6:4 ff.). God no longer will work upon them to bring them back to life. They are utterly and irrevocably dead.

The picture changes once again. Jude now draws his illustration from the sea. He describes the errorists as "wild waves of the sea, casting up their own shames." As the sea rages wildly, the waves bear refuse upon their crests and drop it upon the shore. This is a picture of the life of these libertines. They expose their shames, that is, their licentious lives, to view. The plural *αἰσχύματα* of the abstract noun *αἰσχύνη*, means concrete instances of shame.¹³⁹ Jude may here be thinking of the picture painted in Is. 57:20, though the wording of the LXX is different from that which we have here.

139. Debrunner, op. cit., # 142.

The next phrase bristles with difficulties. Jude says that these libertines are "wandering stars, for whom the nether gloom of darkness has been kept forever." It seems obvious that Jude is not referring to planets in the modern sense of that term, for they do not appear to wander from their appointed courses. Nor is it likely that he refers to comets, for they too appear to have set and fixed courses. It is probably best to understand by the phrase ἀστέρων πλανήται shooting or falling stars, which "appear to leave their place in the heavens where they are beautiful and useful and to wander away into the darkness to the confusion and dismay of those who observe them."¹⁴⁰

At this point, as Lumby points out, "the thought of the writer seems to have escaped the simile and to be fixed on the men" rather than on the stars.¹⁴¹ He pictures the stars as going away into nether gloom, but it is for these men that this darkness has been kept forever. Darkness in Scripture denotes the state of being without God; and when this is spoken of in connection with the idea of eternity, it refers to the everlasting state of being without God, hell itself. These men are going into the same darkness which was mentioned in v. 6. They will join the devil and his angels in everlasting condemnation, and will be forever, irretrievably without God.¹⁴²

Jude now introduces a warning from the Book of Enoch. The readers of the letter should have recognized the libertines for what they were,

¹⁴⁰. Plummer, op. cit., p. 433.

¹⁴¹. Lumby, loc. cit.

¹⁴². Some commentators find in this verse another allusion to the language of the Book of Enoch (cf. 80, 86, 88), but here, as in other places, it seems to be no more than a verbal reminiscence.

for "Enoch, the seventh from Adam, also prophesied in respect to these" libertines. The τοῦτοις may be construed in either of two ways: 1) it may be understood as an indirect object; Enoch also directed his prophecy to these men; or 2) it may be taken as a dative of respect, in which case the meaning would be, "In respect to these also, Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied." (cf. Lk. 18:31). This latter seems to be the better construction, since the warnings in each of these three sections are directed, not to the libertines, but to the unwary Christians to whom Jude is writing. The position of the αὐτῶν also favors this interpretation.

It was also in respect to these that Enoch prophesied. His prophecies pertained to the wicked men of his own day, but not only to them. His words are couched in such a form as to apply also to the errorists against whom Jude is writing. He foretells their fate and gives the reasons for it.

Enoch¹⁴³ is called the "seventh from Adam." According to the Jewish inclusive method of counting, Jude arrived at this figure; Adam was the first, ^{Enoch} Jude, the seventh. This designation is also found in Enoch 60:8; 93:3. Is there any significance to this designation? There does not seem to be any mystical connotation to this phrase. The idea which

143. From Gen. 5 we learn that Enoch was the seventh from Adam in the line of Seth. He was the son of Jared, and at the age of sixty-five he became the father of Methusaleh. He "walked with God, and he was not, for God took him." In Ecclus. 44:16; 49:14, we are told that he was the most remarkable of men, that he was an example of repentance, and that having pleased God, he was translated from the earth. Luke (3:37) places him among the ancestors of the Lord. In Heb. 11:5 he is listed as one of the heroes of faith, who so pleased God that he was translated into heaven without tasting death. Cf. G. Kittel, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, sub Ἐνὸς.

it is to convey is this, that although he was so far removed from Jude's time as to be only six generations from Adam, yet it is to Jude's contemporaries that these words may also be applied.¹⁴⁴

There is scarcely any doubt that Jude is taking his quotation from the Book of Enoch, as a comparison of the Greek and Ethiopic texts of that work will show. While the quotation does not agree in all particulars with either the Greek or Ethiopic text, it shows such a striking similarity to them, agreeing at one time with one, and at another time with the other (in cases where they differ), that it is impossible to believe that it is not a quotation. Many scholars hold that the Book of Enoch was originally written in Hebrew, and we may assume that Jude is translating directly from the Hebrew original. If this is the case, it will serve to explain the variations which we find in the quotation in the letter before us.¹⁴⁵

This prophecy, which in the Book of Enoch (1:9) is spoken by an angel who interprets a vision which the patriarch had received as foretelling the final judgment, is introduced with the interjection ἰδοὺ. Wohlenberg says: "Das ἰδοὺ fordert zur Andacht und zu scharfer Betrachtung der Erscheinung des Herrn auf, und setzt voraus, dass sie unerwartet und Überraschend erfolge."¹⁴⁶

"Behold," says the angel, "the Lord will come with His holy myriads." The verb is an aorist (ἰδεῖν), which is to be understood in the sense of a prophetic future (cf. 1 Kings 22:17; and v. 11 of this letter).

144. Knopf, op. cit., p. 205.

145. See Knopf, loc. cit., for the Greek text and for a German translation of the Ethiopic text.

146. Wohlenberg, op. cit., p. 318.

When the Book of Enoch was written Κυρίου, for the author, indubitably meant Yahweh, the God of Israel; but for Jude and his readers, in this same passage, it meant Christ who had promised to come again in glory to do judgment to the quick and the dead (Matt. 25:31).¹⁴⁷ When Jesus would come to do this, He would be accompanied by His holy myriads. In line with the description of the final judgment which Jesus gives us in Matthew 25, we know that these are the myriads of His holy angels who will accompany Him at the last day when He will come in all His divine power and glory.

What is the purpose of the Lord's coming? He will come to carry out, to execute, judgment. It is not that Christ will come to judge the world, for it is judged already (Jn. 3:18); He comes only to execute the judgment which has already been pronounced. (For the phrase κρίειν πῶς, cf. Gen. 18:25; Jn. 5:27.) He is to execute judgment κατὰ πάντων. Enoch does not restrict this judgment to the ungodly, but regards the judgment as universal in scope. All men will be judged, but condemnation will be executed only against the ungodly, who have not come to be united with Christ Jesus by faith.

Enoch does not speak of the gracious judgment of those who trust in God, but he turns to the wicked and specified what their fate will be. He will come to convict all the ungodly. The word ἀεβέη and its cognates are repeated three times in this verse. It shows clearly the agitation of the writer and the underlying thought of the entire epistle.¹⁴⁸ The next two phrases are introduced by καὶ and indicate the grounds on

147. Ibid.

148. Cf. Wand, op. cit., p. 214.

which this condemnation was carried out. Both deeds and words are equally culpable, are the grounds of condemnation. These impious and wicked men are condemned "on the basis of all the impious works which¹⁴⁹ they have committed in such an ungodly way, and on the basis of all the harsh things which ungodly sinners have spoken against Him." The wicked deeds of the libertines are described throughout the epistle, while their evil words are particularly dwelt on in vv. 8, 16. It may be noted that ἁμαρτηρῶς ἄσεβεις, the subject of the verbs ἤσέβησαν and ἐλάλησαν "were placed where they are," as Lumby points out, "in order to lay that marked emphasis upon the irreverence which the writer is evidently desirous to express."¹⁵⁰

VV. 16 - 18.

οὗτοι εἰσὶν χοχλυῖται μεμψίμοιροι, κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορνεύοντες, καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέροχα, θαυμάζοντες πρόσωπα ὠφελείας γάρου. Ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀγαπητοί, μνησθε τῶν ρημάτων τῶν προειρηκένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἔλεγον ὑμῖν. Ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τοῦ χρόνου ἐσονται ἐμπαῖκται κατὰ τὰς ἐαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορνεύοντες τῶν ἄσεβειῶν.

These are murmurers, querelous, walking according to their own lusts, and their mouth speaks arrogant things, flattering people for the sake of gain. But you, beloved, remember the predictions of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ, that they said to you: "In the last time there will be mockers walking according to their own lusts of impiety.

Jude introduces his second independent description of the libertines in the same way as he did the first (v. 12). He says οὗτοι εἰσὶν. He first calls the libertines χοχλυῖται, and then defines that term more closely by calling them μεμψίμοιροι. As Plummer notes, "the second group

149. Ἐν is attracted to the genitive from the accusative by attraction of the relative to the case of the antecedent.

150. Lumby, op. cit., p. 399.

of characteristics hangs on closely to what precedes. It seems to have been suggested by the last words of the prophecy quoted from Enoch, 'the hard things which ungodly sinners have spoken against Him'.¹⁵¹ While the word ροχχυσίης is used nowhere else in the New Testament, words closely allied to it are often found (cf. ροχχύζειν, ροχχυσμός). On the basis of the usage of these words, it would seem to indicate a rebellious murmuring against any authority, whether human or divine. The context here indicates that the murmuring of the libertines was against God.

The next word μεμυήνοισι, which etymologically means, "complaining of one's fate," indicates the cause of the libertines' murmuring. They were discontented with the condition of life which God had imposed upon them, and therefore they are not only blaming Him for this, but also for the moral restrictions which He has placed upon them and upon all mankind.

The next phrase, "walking in accord with their own lusts," stands in a very close connection with the preceding. It appears best to understand this participial phrase as concessive. These men grumble and complain, even though they shape their course of life in accord with their own base desires. They do as they please. The difficulty lies in this: the means for gratifying these lusts is not always present; and worse than that, the lusts themselves are insatiable: "even when gratification is possible," to quote Plummer, "it is only temporary; the unruly desires are certain to revive and clamour once more for satisfaction."¹⁵²

151. Plummer, op. cit., p. 442 f.

152. Ibid., p. 443.

In his excitement, Jude now falls out of the construction with which he had begun. He continues with an independent clause, introduced by a καί: "and their mouth speaks arrogant things." The best possible commentary on this phrase is found in vv. 8, 15, where the words of the libertines are described. They are harsh words directed against God and His holy angels. The unanimity with which they speak is indicated by the use of the singular, εἶπεν. In this phrase Jude returns once more to the thought expressed by the ἰσχυρὰ μὲν ἠγόρευον, as though he wished to underscore that thought once again.

And now Jude turns to another aspect of these false teachers, which, on first reading does not seem to have any connection with what has preceded, but which upon work and reflection will yield up its proper connection. Jude says that the libertines are "marvelling at faces for the sake of gain." While this exact phrase θαυμάζειν πρόσωποι is unparalleled in the New Testament, it may be found in the LXX (cf. Gen. 19:21; Lev. 19:25). Its meaning is that these profligates were prone to become flatterers for the sake of gaining any benefit which might come to them. Mayor points out the connection when he says: "As the fear of God drives out the fear of men, so defiance of God tends to put man in His place as the chief source of good to his fellows."¹⁵³ These libertines complained so bitterly against the lot which God had assigned to them, and yet, when they thought that they might benefit in a material way from fawning before the rich, they were not hesitant to do so.

And now Jude once more admonishes his readers. In the previous instance he quoted a prophecy of the patriarch Enoch; now he reminds his

153. Mayor, Jude, p. 272.

readers of the warnings against this very danger which was confronting them, as they had been issued by the apostles of the Lord.

Jude appears to take for granted that the apostolic warning to which he refers is known to his readers. Simply he urges them to recall (μνη-
σθητε, an effective aorist) the predictions of the apostles of the Lord. We translate the phrase τῶν προειρημένων as "predictions," for the word προλέγειν implies prophetic speaking. The use of the perfect participle in this phrase is worthy of note: the words which were spoken beforehand are still applicable to the situation in which Jude's readers found themselves and are still accessible in written form.

Jude speaks of these predictions as having been spoken by the apostles of the Lord. Had he said "by us apostles," there could be no doubt that he claimed apostolic authority for himself. But he did not choose to express himself in this way, either because he did not feel any necessity for doing so, or because he was not an apostle of the Lord in the sense in which he understood that term. If he knew both usages (the wider and the narrower sense) he was not an apostle in any sense of the term; but if he knew and recognized only the more restricted meaning of that word, he might still have been an apostle in the broader sense which the word ἀπόστολος sometimes bears.¹⁵⁴

Jude says that the apostles ἔλεγον to their readers. This verb does not necessarily say that it was by means of an oral communication that they spoke to them, although it may be very well understood in that way. Written warning may also be included (cf. Rom. 4:3; 9:17; 10:11;

154. See the comments on v. 1 of this letter.

11:2; Gal. 4:30). If this is the case, the prophecy of 2 Peter 3:2 appears to be the one to which Jude is specifically referring, though not excluding similar predictions, both written and oral, of similar import, made by others of the apostles.

The text of the first phrase of the prediction shows a large number of variations. ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου is read by B⁵AC (though ἐσ is inserted before χρόνου by δ, several minuscules and several of the fathers); the reading ἐπ' ἐσχάτω χρόνω is found in KLP and the Koine textual tradition. Other minor variants of this phrase also occur.¹⁵⁵ Since the oldest and best MSS. read ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου, and since there is no internal evidence against it, it may safely be adopted. It is a translation of the Hebrew phrase בְּיָמֵי הַיָּמִים הָאֵלֶּיךָ, Jer. 25:18. It does not refer to an age remote from the time of the apostles: the last days had already begun when they spoke and wrote (cf. 2 Tim. 3:1; 1 Jn. 2:18; Heb. 1:2; 1 Pet. 1:20).

The apostles said that there would be mockers, ἐμπαῖκτοι. This is a very unusual word, not appearing in profane literature or in the papyri, and appearing only once in the LXX in the sense of "childish persons."¹⁵⁶ It also appears in 2 Peter 3:3, from which place Jude seems to have taken it. Outside 2 Peter, there are no other predictions of mockers, though there are several other examples in the New Testament predicting false teachers and wickedness entering the Church (e.g. Acts 20:29; 1 Tim. 4; 2 Tim. 3, etc.).¹⁵⁷

155. Knopf, op. cit., p. 238.

156. Plummer, op. cit., p. 447.

157. Cf. James, op. cit., p. 411.

Jude once more returns to the self-willed profligacy of these men: he says that they are walking κατὰ τὰς αὐτῶν ἐπιθυμίας. Hauck says: "Auch das zeigt, dass bei ihnen der niedere, Lust begehrende Mensch die Oberhand gewonnen und Gott den Abschied gegeben hat, um ungestört den eigenen Wünschen nachleben zu können."¹⁵⁸

In this phrase there is ~~one~~ advance over the very similar phrase in v. 16. Jude adds the words τῶν ἁσεβειῶν. With these words he stresses once again the wickedness and impiety of these false teachers. But how exactly are these words to be understood, especially since they fall in such an unusual position, at the end of the phrase? A welter of interpretations has been offered for this: Plummer feels that "most probably the genitive here is descriptive, as in James 1:24 and 2:4," or it is also possible that "'lusts of ungodliness' means that they lusted after impieties."¹⁵⁹ Mayor suggests that the genitive here is subjective: "lusts belonging to, or arising from, impieties."¹⁶⁰ Wohlenberg suggests that the genitive may be exclamatory,¹⁶¹ since the parallel passage in 2 Peter does not contain any similar genitive. This is permissible as Greek, though no example of it has been cited from the New Testament outside of this passage; I therefore should hesitate to advocate this construction, since almost any of the others seems more natural. It is, I fear, impossible to make a definite decision as to how these words are to be understood.

158. F. Hauck, Die Briefe St. Petri und Juda, p. 108.

159. Plummer, loc. cit.

160. Mayor, Jude, p. 273.

161. Wohlenberg, op. cit., p. 324.

VV. 19 - 23.

οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιρίζοντες, ψυχιστοί, πνεύμα μὴ ἔχοντες.
ὕμῃν δέ, ἀγαπῆτοί, ἐποικασθμοῦντες ἐπιποῶν ἐν ἀριστῆθ ὑμῶν πίετες,
ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ προσευχόμενα, ἐαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρεῖσθε,
προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.
καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλέετε διακρινόμενους, οὓς δὲ σώσετε ἐκ πυρός ἀρπάζοντες,
οὓς δὲ ἐλέετε ἐν φόβῳ, μισούντες καὶ τὸν ὅπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐπιλωμέρου
γίτῳν.

These are they who are making divisions, worldly people, not having the Spirit. But you, beloved, building yourselves up with your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Spirit, keep yourselves in the love of God, awaiting the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ to everlasting life. And on some who dispute have pity; and others save by snatching them from the fire; and others pity in fear, hating even the garment spotted by the flesh.

Once again Jude begins a description of the errorists: "These are they who set up divisions." The rare word ἀποδιρίζειν is used of logical distinctions in Aristotle, Politics, iv. 4, and, if Mayor is to be trusted,¹⁶² in every other known occurrence. It can scarcely mean, as James suggests,¹⁶³ that the libertines created divisions by saying: "stand aside; touch me not: I am holier than thou," for that would be incompatible with the stealthiness with which they crept into the congregation. It is not that they have actually made a schism from the Church; rather, they are creating a faction within it. As Plummer says:

Even in the public services of the Church they keep aloof from the poorer members of the congregation. At the love-feasts they feed themselves on the good things which they bring with them, instead of handing them over to the ministers to be distributed among all. And in society they care only for persons of rank and wealth, out of whom they hope to gain something. Worst of all, they claim to be specially enlightened members of the Church, having a more comprehensive knowledge of Christian liberty, while turning upside down the fundamental principles of Christian living. Hence, although they are not actual schismatics, who have gone out of the Church and set

162. Mayor, Jude, p. 273.

163. James, loc. cit.

up a communion of their own, their tendencies are in that direction. They are, in short, much the same kind of people as those against whom St. Paul warns his readers in the Epistle to the Romans: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which ye learned: and turn away from them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by their smooth and fair speech they beguile the hearts of the innocent" (16: 17, 18).¹⁶⁴ And again in the Epistle to the Philipians: "For many walk of whom I told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ: whose end is perdition, whose god is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things" (3:18, 19).¹⁶⁵

The next epithet which Jude applies to these men is ψυχικοί. It is almost impossible to find an adequate translation for this term. The RSV did not translate the word, but came close to its meaning by paraphrase: "worldly people." The ψυχικοί are those people who live in the world of sense and are ruled by human feelings and human reason. They are, as Plummer says, "not very much above the carnal, and with them are opposed to the spiritual."¹⁶⁶ As ψυχικοί they have no use for the things of the Spirit (1 Cor. 2:14); they are utterly opposed to them, and it is for this reason that Jude says that they are πνεῦμα ἢ ἔχοντες.

When Jude wrote πνεῦμα ἢ ἔχοντες what did he mean? Did he intend to say that these men are utterly devoid of the Holy Spirit? or did he mean to say that they have no spiritual nature? Either translation is

164. The exegesis of this passage has been debated at length in recent years, whether the phrase πρὸς τὴν διδαχὴν τὴν ἐμάθητε is an adjectival or an adverbial modifier. It is an adjectival modifier, the divisions are doctrinal in nature, but if it is adverbial, the causing of the divisions is that which is contrary to apostolic teaching. I fear that this question can never be completely settled. If the phrase is adjectival in nature, it is not an apposite parallel, but if, as I hold, it is an adverbial modifier, the use of this passage is in place.

165. Plummer, op. cit., p. 450 ff.

166. Ibid., p. 452.

permissible on grammatical grounds. If the correct rendering is "not having spirit," Jude implies that these men "have overthrown the seat of the Spirit."¹⁶⁷ Their power of spiritual insight, of laying hold of the invisible world and of entering into the life of God was gone. However, if as seems preferable, the author meant "not having the Spirit," that is, the Holy Spirit, he is stigmatizing them as non-Christians.¹⁶⁸ The Holy Spirit is one of the glorious possessions of the Christian. The presence of the Holy Spirit promotes true unity, as a consideration of Acts 4:31 f. will show. It is because these men do not possess the Holy Spirit they are raising up factions within the Church.

Plummer notes:

It will be observed that the three independent descriptions of the libertines, beginning with the words "These are," become shorter as they go on. The first is two long verses (12, 13); the second is one long verse (16); the third is one very short verse. It is as if the writer were disgusted with the unpalatable subject which necessity had compelled him to take in hand (ver. 3), and were hurrying through it to the more pleasant duty of exhorting those faithful Christians for whose sake he had undertaken this painful task.¹⁶⁹

Once again Jude begins a hortatory section with the words, "But you, beloved." The main clause of this exhortation is, "keep yourselves in the love of God," modified by a triad of participial phrases. This triad must not be lost sight of by the fact that the finite verb comes in between the participles. Even here Jude shows his fondness for the threefold construction.

167. Ibid.

168. The absence of the article is no hindrance to this translation, as a comparison of Phil. 2:1; Eph. 2:22; 6:18; Col. 1:8 will show. The mention of the Holy Spirit in v. 20 would favor the same meaning being found in this verse.

169. Plummer, op. cit., p. 455.

Jude begins by exhorting the Christians to whom he is writing to build themselves up by their most holy faith. In the New Testament the expression "to build up" (οἰκοδομεῖν) is never used in its literal sense, but only in the metaphorical sense of believers being united so as to form a temple. The notion of building up comes from the prepositional prefix (ἐνί) with which this verb is formed. What is the role which faith plays in this upbuilding? Some commentators hold that it is the foundation on which the building is to rest, and this is the view espoused by the translators of the RSV. Others, correctly I believe, feel that faith is the cement with which the temple is to be built.¹⁷⁰ The faith of which Jude here speaks is not the hold upon God, but rather the doctrines of faith, as in v. 3, the fides quae creditur. The Christians are to build themselves up by means of this faith, that is, by means of the doctrines of the Gospel which are the content of this faith.

Schlatter, though interpreting faith to mean the hold on God, very beautifully says:

Vowärts muss sich die Gemeinde bewegen; sie kann nicht bleiben, was sie ist. Bauarbeit hat sie zu tun und der Bau ist noch nicht fertig und wird nicht fertig in dieser Zeit. Das Mittel, aber, wodurch sie nach innen und nach aussen wächst, ist der Glaube. Ohne ihn ist sie nichts; durch ihn hat sie empfangen, was sie ist, und wird sie weiter empfangen, was sie wachsen macht. Denn im Glauben besteht ihr Anschluss an Gott. Er ist der Allerheiligste, was die Gemeinde hat; denn er ist Gottes Werk, entsteht aus dem, was er uns mit der Sendung Jesu gab und was sein Ruf und Wort in uns schafft. Was heilig ist, muss bewahrt sein. Darum tut der keine Bauarbeit, sondern ihr Gegenteil, der in sich und den anderen den Glauben zerstört.¹⁷¹

170. Plummer, op. cit., p. 456.

171. Schlatter, op. cit., p. 68 f.

The next participial phrase is "praying in the Holy Ghost."¹⁷² This precise combination is not found any place else in the New Testament, but the thought which it expresses corresponds with Paul's language in Rom. 8:26; Gal. 4:6. The meaning of the phrase is that Christians pray in the power and wisdom of the Holy Spirit. "In order that we may pray, and pray aright, He must move our hearts and direct our petitions," is the apt comment of Plummer.¹⁷³

As has already been indicated the main exhortation to the Christians is: keep yourselves in the love of God. Jude is not here exhorting his readers to love God—though that most certainly is demanded of them—but he is exhorting them to remain in and under God's love to them which has manifested itself in God's sending of His only Son to remove the barrier between Himself and mankind. The Christians are in the sphere of God's love, and Jude's exhortation to them is: stay in that sphere. Be conscious of this fact, and by building themselves up with the most holy faith, by praying in the Holy Spirit, and by looking for the mercy of the Lord Jesus Christ which issues in eternal life, you can achieve this.

The third participial phrase follows the main verb; in it Jude is urging his readers to wait for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Wand says that

waiting for the mercy is a technical phrase for the Messianic expectation. So Simeon waited for the consolation of Israel and others looked for the redemption of Jerusalem (Lk. 2:25, 38). Many times the Lord Himself had emphasized the importance of watching. Such an attitude of mind will keep the faithful from evil by adjusting their sense of value, fixing their at-

172. Some commentators (e.g. Lenski, op. cit., p. 656) connect "in the Holy Ghost" with the preceding phrase. However, the rhythm and parallelism of the sentence favor the construction here adopted.

173. Plummer, op. cit., p. 457.

tention upon the right things, and filling them with joyful hope.¹⁷⁴

An exegetical problem of some importance in connection with this verse is the construction of the phrase εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Is it to be connected with the main verb τηρήσατε or with the noun ἔλεος? Is it that the Christians are to keep their faith that they remain in the area of God's love until He grants them the life of heaven, of unending union and communion with Him? This is a perfectly proper thought, but I feel that the prepositional phrase is to be joined closely with ἔλεος. Two considerations prompt this: 1) the word ἔλεος often has an eschatological connotation (cf. Matt. 5:7; Jas. 2:13; 2 Tim. 1:18); 2) the rhythm of the sentence seems to indicate that the prepositional phrase is to be joined closely with ἔλεος. This mercy is God's attitude towards man in His need, which mercy will finally culminate in giving man life eternal.

Jude now (v. 22) abruptly returns to the thought of the false teachers suggested perhaps by the words ἑαυτοὺς τηρήσατε. "And what about your relation to those who are endangered by the libertines? What is your duty towards them?"

However, before we can attempt an interpretation of these verses we must undertake to establish the correct text. Textually these two verses are perhaps the most difficult verses in the entire letter. In the textus receptus the text is as follows:

καὶ οὓς μὲν ἔλεεῖτε διακρινόμενοι
οὓς δὲ ἐν φάρω εὐσεβεῖ ἐκ τοῦ πυρός ἀρπάζοντες, μισοῦντες καὶ
τοὶ ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐπιλωμένοι χιτῶνι.

The text of A is as follows:

174. Wand, op. cit., p. 219.

καὶ οὓς μὲν ἔλεγετε διακρινομένους
οὓς δὲ σῶσατε ἐκ πυρός ἑρπάζοντες
οὓς δὲ ἔλεγετε ἐν φόβῳ, μισούντες κ. ε. λ.

The text of B, which is adopted by Westcott and Hort, is as follows:

καὶ οὓς μὲν ἔλεγετε διακρινομένους σῶσατε ἐκ πυρός ἑρπάζοντες
οὓς δὲ ἔλεγετε ἐν φόβῳ, μισούντες κ. τ. λ.

The text of א is as follows:

οὓς μὲν ἔλεγετε διακρινομένους
οὓς δὲ σῶσατε ἐκ πυρός ἑρπάζοντες
οὓς δὲ ἔλεγετε ἐν φόβῳ, μισούντες κ. τ. λ.

The text of C has only two clauses, as follows:

οὓς μὲν ἔλεγετε διακρινομένους
οὓς δὲ σῶσατε ἐκ πυρός ἑρπάζοντες ἐν φόβῳ, μισούντες κ. ε. λ.

In these various texts the main difference is that some (A⁵) give three clauses, others (textus receptus, B C) only two. The Latin, Egyptian and Ethiopic versions have three clauses, while Clement of Alexandria and the Syriac versions have only two.

The text of B is very clumsy: we must translate it as follows:

"And those on whom you have compassion as waverers, save, snatching them from the fire: but on others have compassion in fear," etc. We must take the first οὓς as a relative and the second as a demonstrative; and the first ἔλεγετε as indicative and the second as imperative. Hort suggests that the first ἔλεγετε is to be omitted.¹⁷⁵ However, it is as easy for the scribe to have dropped a οὓς after διακρινομένους which ends with the same letters. Coupling this with Jude's fondness for the triple construction, the form of the text with three clauses is to be preferred.

However, having arrived at this point, we still have not determined the correct text. We can do so only on the basis of internal evidence. The participle διακρινομένους, which occurs in all forms of the text,

175. Westcott and Hort, loc. cit.

is capable of bearing two interpretations: it may mean either "doubting," as in Jas. 1:6, or "contending," as in v. 9 of this letter. If it means "doubting" the text which make most harmonious sense is ἐλεᾶτε, "show mercy," for even as our Lord did not quench the smoking flax or break the bruised reed, so Christians are not heartlessly to condemn honest doubters who have been unsettled by the libertines, but are to show mercy to them. If, however, it means "contending," the correct text is probably ἐλέγχετε, for "it is those who are disposed to be contentious that need to be refuted and convinced of their error."¹⁷⁶ Since there seems to be an ascending scale in the description of those with whom the Christians are to deal, the preferable reading is ἐλεᾶτε and the preferable rendering for διὰκρινόμενους is "doubting."

The second group is in a more perilous state. Then the Christians are to save by snatching them out of the fire. This fire, of which Jude is here speaking, cannot refer to the penal fire of judgment, for once a man has been condemned to that fire, he is beyond rescue. Jude, rather, is speaking of the state of perdition in which these people are now living. Their situation is very perilous, as though they are about to be destroyed by their sins which Jude likens to fire. There may be a reference to Zech. 3:1 or Amos 4:11. The Christians are also to be warned in this description: saving these men is a dangerous task and the would-be rescuer must protect himself that he too does not fall into the fire.

The third command presents the most difficult textual problem of all. The MSS. which present three clauses agree in reading ἐλεᾶτε. The

176. Plummer, op. cit., p. 459.

verb ἐλεᾶν means "show mercy" and not merely "feel pity," for which thought the verb οἰκτεῖρειν would be used (cf. Mt. 9:27; 15:22; 17:15; 18:33; 20:30; Mk. 10:47; Lk. 16:24; 17:13; 18:38; Phil. 2:27). If this is the case, the Christian is to manifest his pity for these men in their sin, even though he hates their sins and fear contamination from them, as is pictured in the phrase "hating even the shirt spotted by the flesh." The χιτῶν is the inner garment which can so easily be contaminated by contact with a sore. There may again be a reference to Zech. 3:1-3. The very contact with these men is extremely dangerous. Since there seems to be such an ascent in intensity, the reading ἐλέχτε seems somewhat difficult. Windisch feels this difficulty and conjectures that the original reading was ἐκβάλλετε,¹⁷⁷ while Wohlenberg, more plausibly suggests ἐλάσατε (from ἐλαύνειν).¹⁷⁸ The Christians are to show pity to those among them who doubt because of the claims and example of the libertines. Others are in grave danger, and them the Christians are admonished to save by snatching them forcibly from the fire; and those who are so far gone that nothing can any longer be done for them are to be driven out, to be excommunicated, in the hope and with the intention of regaining their souls.

VV. 24, 25.

τῷ δὲ δυναμῆν σφάραξ ὑμᾶς ὀπιταίους,
καὶ ὁπότε κατανώπιον τῆς βίβλου αὐτοῦ ἀμώμου ἐν ἀχαλλιάσει,
ἀφ᾽ ἧς ὁπότε εὐπῆρι γινώσκῃ διὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν
δοξα, μεγαλοσύνη, κράτος καὶ ἐπιτομία,
πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας ἀμήν.

177. Windisch, op. cit., p. 45.

178. Wohlenberg, op. cit., p. 331.

To Him who is able to guard you without stumbling,
 And to present you before the presence of His glory without
 blemish with rejoicing,
 To the only God, our Savior through Jesus Christ our Lord,
 Glory, majesty, might, and authority,
 Before all ages, and now, and to all ages. Amen.

Jude concludes his epistle with one of the most elaborate doxologies in the New Testament. This beautiful ending, says James, "grows naturally out of the preceding words. The thought of the fate that attends those who have gone astray leads to a prayer that the faithful may be preserved in their faith."¹⁷⁹

In the doxology great works are ascribed to God: He alone is able to guard men and keep them from stumbling. He is able to protect them from all the perils which surround them and to keep them from so much as stumbling. Many a person may stumble without falling, but God is able to prevent even this. The word ἀναίστητος is used of a horse which does not stumble and of a man not given to making moral stumbles.¹⁸⁰ It is most fitting for Jude to commend his readers to such a God after urging them to enter upon a course in which there was such grave danger. Unless they were safely protected they too might stumble and perhaps even fall into the sin of the libertines; but God alone is able to keep them from falling, yes, even from so much as stumbling. Such is the power of God!

But God is able to do even more for us: after keeping us from stumbling, He is able to present us without blemish before the presence of His glory with rejoicing. This is a result of God's gracious protection. No man can come before the glorious presence of God while harboring

179. James, op. cit., p. 45.

180. Bigg, op. cit., p. 343.

the slightest imperfection in himself and still live (cf. Eph. 1:4; 5:27; Phil. 2:15). Only when men are blameless dare they come into God's presence and hope to live. For us Christians there is nothing to fear, since for Christ's sake we are blameless in God's sight, as a lamb without blemish and without spot. We shall come before the presence of God at the Parusia, when Christ will come with all His glory to judge the world. And when He comes then there will be a time of great rejoicing, for we shall come immediately into the presence of God.

The next ascription is to "the only God, our Saviour through Jesus Christ." While ordinarily we call Jesus the Saviour, the designation of the Father as our Savior is also found. Plummer says:

St. Paul, like St. Jude, speaks of God the Father as our Saviour. He is "an Apostle of Jesus Christ according to the commandment of God our Saviour" (1 Tim. 1:1), and he says that intercession and thanksgiving for others is "good and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior" (2:3). Still more fully he says that "God our Saviour . . . saved us . . . through Jesus Christ our Saviour" (Tit. 3:4-6; comp. 1:3; 2:10). The work of the Son is the work of the Father; and so in the Old Testament we have Jehovah spoken of as the Saviour and Redeemer of His people (Ps. 106:21; Is. 41:15; 49:26; 60:16). . . . God is our Saviour "through Jesus Christ our Lord."¹⁸¹

It appears best to construe εἰς ἔξοδόν Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν with ἐπιτηρησάμεν, for it is only through the work of Christ that God has deigned to save mankind. It is not incorrect, however, to connect this phrase with δόξα, μεγαλοσύνη, κράτος, καὶ ἔξουσία, since only through Jesus Christ, in His name, do we make our approach to God.

181. Plummer, op. cit., p. 466.

Jude now ascribes four attributes to God, δόξα, μεγαλοσύνη, κράτος, and ἐξουσία. Lenski says:

Jude has four terms: "glory," the sum of all the divine attributes in their radiant shining forth; "majesty," (Heb. 1:3; 8:1; ascribed to Christ in 2 Pet. 1:16) as King, ἄε-πότης, absolute Ruler; "might" as in action; "authority," the right and power to rule.¹⁸²

While the meaning of δόξα appears to be somewhat artificial (it would be better to say that the glory which is here ascribed to God is praise from all mankind), the remainder of the quotation from Lenski is acceptable as an explanation of Jude's words.

No verb is here expressed, and if we must supply one in our minds, it must be a present indicative, not an imperative, since δόξα, μεγαλοσύνη, κράτος, and ἐξουσία are constant possessions of God (πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, and καὶ νῦν, and καὶ εἰς πάντα τοὺς αἰῶνας). Plummer well says:

"Before all time, and now, and for evermore." Thus in a very comprehensive phrase, eternity is described. Throughout all time, and throughout the ages which precede and follow it, these attributes belong to God. Evil men in their dreamings may "set at naught dominion and rail at glories," and their mouth may speak "great swelling words" about their own superior knowledge and liberty, and may mock and scoff at those who will not follow them in "walking after their own ungodly lusts." Nevertheless, ages before they were born, and ages after they shall have vanished from the world which they are troubling by their presence, glory, majesty, dominion, and power belong to Him who saves us, and would save even them, through Jesus Christ our Lord.¹⁸³

Jude concludes his letter with an "Amen" since he is absolutely certain that God is able to do that which he ascribes to Him. The "Amen" at the end of this letter, as at the end of Romans and 2 Peter, seems to be genuine. In all other epistles, excepting perhas Galatians, it is spurious.

182. Lenski, op. cit., p. 650.

183. Plummer, op. cit., p. 467.

Bibliography

- Bauer, Walter, Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur, Erwin Preuschen, ed., Giessen, Verlag von Alfred Töpelmann, 1928.
- Bechtel, F., "The Brethren of the Lord," The Catholic Encyclopedia, Charles G. Herbermann, et al., eds., New York, Robert Appleton Company, n. d., II, 767-768.
- Bengel, J. A., Gnomon Novi Testamenti, in quo ex nativa verborum vi simplicitas, profunditas, concinitas, salubritas sensuum coelestium indicatur, 2 vols., third edition, Tübingen, Ludov. Frid. Fues., 1850.
- Bennett, W. H., The General Epistles: James, Peter, John, and Jude, in The New-Century Bible, W. F. Adeney, ed., New York, Henry Frowde, n. d.
- Bigg, Charles, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, in The International Critical Commentary, C. A. Briggs, et al., eds., New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909.
- Burton, Ernest De Witt, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, in The International Critical Commentary, C. A. Briggs, et al., Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1948.
- , Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek, third edition, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1923.
- Charles, R. H., The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English, 2 vols., Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Chase, F. H., "The Epistle of Jude," A Dictionary of the Bible, James Hastings, ed., New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901, II, 799-806.
- Debrunner, Albert, Friedrich Blass' Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch, seventh edition, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1943.
- Dods, Marcus, An Introduction to the New Testament, ninth edition, New York, Thomas Whittaker, 1902.
- Farrar, F. W., The Early Days of Christianity, New York, E. P. Dutton & Co., 1882.
- Goodspeed, E. J., An Introduction to the New Testament, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, n. d.

- , The New Testament: An American Translation, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, c. 1923.
- Hauck, Fr., Die Katholischen Briefe, in Das Neue Testament Deutsch, Paul Althaus and Johannes Behm, eds., Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1933.
- Hunter, Archibald M., The Message of the New Testament, Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1944.
- James, Montague Rhodes, The Second Epistle General of Peter and the General Epistle of Jude, R. St. John Parry, ed., in The Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges, Cambridge, The University Press, 1912.
- Keil, C. F., Biblischer Kommentar über die Bücher Mose's, second edition, in Biblischer Kommentar über das Alte Testament, C. F. Keil and Franz Delitzsch, eds., Leipzig, Dörffling und Franke, 1886.
- , Commentar über die Briefe des Petrus und Judas, Leipzig, Dörffling und Franke, 1883.
- Kittel, G., et al., Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, Stuttgart, Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1932 --.
- Knopf, Rud., Die Briefe Petri und Judä, in Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1912.
- Lake, Kirsopp, Eusebius: The Ecclesiastical History, 2 vols., in The Loeb Classical Library, E. Capps, et al., eds., London, William Heinemann, 1926.
- Lange, J. P., Genesis, or the First Book of Moses, fifth edition, Taylor Lewis and A. Gosman, tr., in A Commentary on the Holy Scripture, Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical, John Peter Lange, ed. reed. by Philip Schaff, New York, Charles Scribner and Co., 1871.
- Lenski, R. C. H., The Interpretation of the Epistles of St. Peter, St. John, and St. Jude, Columbus, Ohio, The Wartburg Press, 1945.
- Leupold, H. C., Exposition of Genesis, Columbus, Ohio, The Wartburg Press, 1942.
- Lightfoot, J. B., The Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians, London, Macmillan and Co., 1892.
- , St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, London, Macmillan and Co., 1927.

- Lumby, J. R., "The General Epistle of Jude," in The Holy Bible According to the Authorized Version (A.D. 1611), with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary and a Revision of the Translation, by Bishops and Other Clergy of the Anglican Church, F. C. Cook, ed., 7 vols., London, John Murray, 1881.
- Luther, Martin, "Preface to the Epistles of Saint James and Saint Jude," in The Works of Martin Luther, 6 vols., C. M. Jacobs, tr., Philadelphia, Muhlenberg Press, 1932.
- Mayor, J. B., The Epistle of St. James, second edition, London, Macmillan and Co., 1897.
- , "The General Epistle of Jude," in The Expositor's Greek Testament, W. Robertson Nicoll, ed., 5 vols., Grand Rapids, Michigan, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., n. d.
- , "ΦΘΙΝΟΤΩΡΠΙΝΟΣ," The Expositor, Series VI, IX (February, 1904), 98-104.
- Moffatt, James, The General Epistles: Peter, James, and Judas, in The Moffatt New Testament Commentary, James Moffatt, ed., New York, Harper and Brothers, n. d.
- , An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, in The International Theological Library, C. A. Briggs and S. D. F. Salmond, eds., New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911.
- , The New Testament: A New Translation, New York, George H. Doran, n. d.
- Moulton, James Hope, A Grammar of New Testament Greek, second edition, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1906.
- Moulton, James Hope, and George Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and other non-literary Sources, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1914.
- Nestle, Eberhard, Novum Testamentum Graece, seventeenth edition, Erwin Nestle, ed., Stuttgart, Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, c. 1941.
- New Covenant, The, Commonly Called the New Testament of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, Revised Standard Version, New York, Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1946.
- Plummer, Alfred, The General Epistles of St. James and St. Jude, in The Expositor's Bible, W. Robertson Nicoll, ed., New York, A. C. Armstrong and Son, n. d.
- Plumptre, E. H., The General Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, in The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, J. J. S. Perowne, ed., Cambridge, The University Press, 1889.

- Robertson, A. T., A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research, fourth edition, Nashville, Tennessee, Broadman Press, c. 1934.
- , Word Pictures in the New Testament, 5 vols., New York, Richard R. Smith, 1930.
- Salmon, G., An Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament, tenth edition, London, John Murray, 1913.
- Sanday, William, and Arthur C. Headlam, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, eighth edition, in The International Critical Commentary, C. A. Briggs, et al., eds., New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903.
- Schlatter, Adolph, Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament, 3 vols., second edition, Stuttgart, Calver Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1921.
- Scott, E. F., Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, in Records of Civilization, Austin P. Evans, ed., New York, Columbia University Press, n. d.
- Selwyn, Edward G., The First Epistle of Peter, second edition, London, Macmillan and Col, 1947.
- Souter, Alexander, Novum Testamentum Graece, second edition, Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1947.
- , A Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament, Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1946.
- Steinmueller, J. E., A Companion to Scripture Studies, 3 vols., New York, Joseph F. Wagner, 1943.
- Strack, H. L., and Paul Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, 3 vols., München, C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Oskar Beck, 1922.
- Swete, H., The Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint, 3 vols., Cambridge, The University Press, 1901.
- Thayer, J. H., A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, Being Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi Testamenti. Translated, Revised and Enlarged, New York, American Book Company, c. 1889.
- Trench, Richard Chenevix, The Synonyms of the New Testament, ninth edition, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1948.
- von Hofman, J. Chr. K., Die Heilige Schrift, Neuen Testaments, zusammenhängend untersucht, 8 vols., Nördlingen, C. H. Beck'sche Buchhandlung, 1875.

- von Soden, H. F., "Judasbrief," Handcommentar zum Neuen Testament, third edition, H. J. Holtzmann, ed., Freiburg i. B., Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1899.
- Wand, J. W. C., The General Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, in The Westminster Commentaries, Walter Lock and D. C. Simpson, eds., London, Methuen and Company, 1934.
- Weigle, L. A., et al., An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament, New York, Thomas Nelson & Sons, n. d.
- Weiss, Bernhard, A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament, 2 vols., A. J. K. Davidson, tr., London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1888.
- Westcott, B. F., The Epistles of St. John, London, Macmillan and Co., 1883.
- , A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament, fifth edition, Cambridge and London, Macmillan and Co., 1881.
- Westcott, B. F., and F. J. A. Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek, 2 vols., New York, Harper and Brothers, 1882.
- Windisch, "Die Katholischen Briefe," Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, Tübingen, Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1911.
- Wohlenberg, G., Der erste und zweite Petrusbrief und der Judasbrief, in Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, Theodor Zahn, ed., Leipzig, A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Werner Scholl, 1915.
- Zahn, Theodore, Introduction to the New Testament, 3 vols., Melancthon William Jacobus, tr., Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1909.