

WHO LED THE ISRAELITES OUT OF EGYPT? AN EXAMINATION OF JUDE 5

Introduction

Few books in the Bible attract less interest than Jude. Even in the world of New Testament studies, discussions regarding textual variants in this brief epistle are unlikely to succeed in drawing readers into a theological journal, let alone make front page news. Indeed, as John Elliott remarks, “Jude is a book that has often been treated with ‘benign neglect.’”¹ Perhaps the import and relevance of Jude 5 will grab our interest, rebuke our inattention, and ensure that we give this letter the study that it rightfully deserves as part of God’s ever-profitable and ever-relevant Word.

Notwithstanding the widespread disinterest in this epistle, the textual variant in Jude 5 has been given slightly greater prominence in the past decade or so as the increasingly popular English Standard Version adopted what—until 2001—had been a largely unknown minority report. Prior to the ESV’s publication, the majority of English Bibles translated Jude 5 in a manner similar to the New American Standard Bible: “Now I desire to remind you, though you know all things once for all, that the Lord, after saving a people out of the land of Egypt, subsequently destroyed those who did not believe” (emphasis added). A handful of translations included a footnote to highlight that some manuscripts read Ἰησοῦς—“Jesus”—instead of [ό] κύριος—“the Lord”—but none included the former reading in the main body of their translation.² None, until the ESV. And so, whilst the underlying text-critical work remains unchanged from the circa. nineteen centuries since Jude wrote his brief letter, interest in this intriguing variant has increased—by necessity, if nothing else.

Methodology

In order to structure our review of this textual variant, we will begin by placing Jude 5 within its immediate context before analyzing the external, manuscript evidence and determining how the testimony of the ancient uncials, minuscules, and patristic writings should inform our understanding

¹ John H. Elliott, *I-II Peter, Jude* (ACNT; Minneapolis, Minnesota; Augsburg Publishing House, 1982), 161. Though as Peter Davids rightly reminds us, “the neglect is more the result of our problems than of Jude’s problems”—Peter Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude* (Pillar; Grand Rapids, Michigan; Eerdmans, 2006), 8.

² The Revised Standard Version—which became the linguistic foundation for the ESV—might at first glance appear to be hedging its bets by including a personal pronoun in the body of the text (“that he who saved a people out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed those who did not believe”) and a footnote that explained the manuscript alternatives. However, as Paul Wikgren explains, this may instead be a reflection of F. J. A. Hort’s suggestion regarding the original reading of the text in Jude—see Paul Wikgren, “Some Problems in Jude 5,” *Studies in history and text of the New Testament in honor of Kenneth Willis Clark* (eds. Boyd L. Daniels and M. Jack Suggs; Salt Lake, Utah; University of Utah Press, 1967), 148-149. We will comment on this further below.

Interestingly, as Carroll Osburn records, the UBS text of Jude 5 was significantly amended in the second edition, demonstrating the uncertainty regarding the original reading. The first edition of the UBS Greek text read, ἄπαξ πάντα, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς, but the second edition read πάντα, ὅτι κύριος ἄπαξ—see Carroll Osburn, “The Text of Jude 5,” *Biblica* 62/1 (1981), 107.

of what Jude originally wrote. We will then consider various aspects of internal evidence that, as we will seek to demonstrate, affirm the accuracy of the ESV’s translation. In considering this evidence, we will assess the various arguments commonly made against the Ἰησοῦς reading, which we will contend do not present insurmountable objections to it. The relevance and significance of this translation will then be considered under two distinct implications: firstly, the high Christology that it attests; and secondly, the unique redemptive-historical perspective Jude 5 affords us on the pre-incarnate salvific ministry of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ.

We will contend that Jude not only intended to refer to Jesus as the Person within the Triune Godhead who led His people out of Egypt, but that this insight should enlarge, embolden, and excite our comprehension of our Savior’s trans-testamental work of redemption.

Placing Jude 5 In Context

Given the lack of familiarity with this epistle, a brief summary of the immediate context to Jude 5 is in order. Without entering into the various critical debates, we shall presume the long-standing evangelical conviction that Jude was written by Judah, the human brother of both our Lord Jesus Christ and the apostle James (Jude 1).³ The purpose for his writing is clearly set out in Jude 3, commonly—and rightly—considered the “theme verse” for the entire epistle: “contend for the faith that was once for all delivered to the saints.” But as David Helm explains, this “contending for the faith” is not presented in a vacuum: “Verse 4 supports the theme by contributing the occasion for the letter with the little word ‘for.’ Thus, the call to contend is rooted in Jude’s conviction that the faith is being challenged by opponents he only will call ‘certain people’ (vv 4, 8, 10, 12, 16, 19).”⁴

Although we cannot be sure about the precise nature of the opposition presented by these τινες ἄνθρωποι (“certain people”),⁵ we can be sure about the severity of the judgment that would befall them and everyone who forgot the “once for all delivered” faith and followed them in their

³ For a detailed articulation of this position, see Richard J. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter* (WBC 50; Waco, Texas; Word Books, 1983), 14-15; Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*, 8-11.

Davids succinctly dismisses the suggestion that Jude is a pseudepigraphical work: “If it is pseudepigraphical, then one has to ask why it was attributed to Jude ‘the brother of James’ and not to James (who after all had led the Jesus movement in Jerusalem) or some other better-known person”—Peter Davids, *II Peter and Jude: A Handbook on the Greek Text* (BHGNT; Waco, Texas; Baylor University Press, 2011), xviii-xix. Bauckham (and many others) make the same argument—Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 14.

⁴ David R. Helm, *1 & 2 Peter and Jude: Sharing Christ’s Sufferings* (PTW; Wheaton, Illinois; Crossway Books, 2008), 279.

⁵ Although it involves a degree of conjecture, William Barclay’s salutary interpretation deserves our consideration: “The evil men who were corrupting the church did not regard themselves as enemies of the church and of Christianity; they regarded themselves as the advanced thinkers, a cut above the ordinary Christian, the spiritual elite”—William Barclay, *The Letters of John and Jude* (DSBS; rev. ed.; Philadelphia; The Westminster Press, 1976), 181.

perversion and heresy—because Jude makes God’s certain judgment abundantly clear in verses 5-19.⁶ In broad terms, Jude uses illustrations from both the Old Testament and well-known contemporary literature to prove that apostasy and rebellion are always punished. We see this in three historical events—“the apostasy of the wilderness rebels, the autonomy of some angelic creatures, and the immorality of some ancient cities”⁷—and three Old Testament examples of individuals who departed from and challenged the faith, thereby bringing judgment upon themselves i.e., Cain, Balaam, and Korah. Thus, the main body of Jude is simultaneously a message of encouraging perspective and terrifying warning: encouragement in the fact that, as Helm helpfully reminds us, “challenges to the faith have always been present and that God has always met them with divine judgment”;⁸ and an alarming warning when we remember the inescapable danger we would face if we departed from the faith.

Jude 5 therefore marks the beginning of a battle cry to Jude’s readers—then and now—to remember.⁹ This clarion call is infrequent and unfamiliar in our day and generation. As John Benton observes, “We are the children of an era which sees ‘progress’ as good and the past as obsolete. Such an atmosphere stifles inner reflection and breeds social and historical amnesia.”¹⁰ In stark contrast, God’s Word consistently calls us to remember.¹¹ And here in Jude (as elsewhere in Holy Writ), the concern is not merely one of mental recall: as Benton explains, “Jude is concerned

⁶ These verses, far from “a mere stream of undisciplined denunciation...[form] a detailed exegetical argument”—Bauckham, “James, 1 and 2 Peter, Jude,” *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture—Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars* (eds. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson; Cambridge, England; Cambridge University Press, 1988), 303.

⁷ Helm, *1 & 2 Peter and Jude*, 280. Commentators invariably highlight the similarity between Jude 5-7 and 2 Pet 2:4-8, but the differences—i.e. the differences in order; Jude’s inclusion of the exodus from Egypt (Jude 5); and Peter’s inclusion of Noah’s salvation from the deluge of the Flood (2 Pet 2:5)—are often left unexplained. Curtis Giese provides us with a superb solution to these differences: “The apostle Peter presents in chronological order the fall of the angels, the flood of Noah, and the judgment of Sodom and Gomorrah, whereas Jude 5-7 does not cite OT texts in their chronological order. Instead, Jude proceeds from an inner circle of closeness to an outer circle of distance from God”—Curtis P. Giese, *2 Peter and Jude* (CC; St. Louis, Missouri; Concordia Publishing, 2012), 263.

⁸ Helm, *1 & 2 Peter and Jude*, 280. This commonality in danger, response, and judgment between the covenant communities of the Old and New Testaments is more encouraging than we instinctively think. As Davids reminds us in reflecting upon the fact that all three examples Jude cites come from the Old Testament: “Since they all deal with people within the community who morally or otherwise defected from the community and received God’s judgment, they show that the pre-Jesus Jewish community also saw the need to deal with such defectors from their community”—Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*, 47.

⁹ Or be reminded of, ‘Υπομνήσαι. Although the English is cumbersome, the King James Version helpfully captures the aorist active infinitive when it translates the opening phrase, ‘Υπομνῆσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, “I will therefore put you in remembrance.”

¹⁰ John Benton, *Slandering the Angels: The Message of Jude* (WCS; Darlington, England; Evangelical Press, 1999), 64.

¹¹ “The reason, of course, lies not in our stupidity, but in the importance of memory in biblical terms”—Dick Lucas and Christopher Green, *The Message of 2 Peter & Jude: The Promise of His Coming* (BST; ed. John R. W. Stott; Downers Grove, Illinois; Inter-Varsity Press, 1995), 182.

that they have forgotten the true significance of these stories. It is not simply the facts they need to grasp, but the meaning.”¹² In other words, Jude 5 is a wake up call to not only remember, but to change our lives in accordance with that vivid memory.

Within this broader context, Jude 5 fleshes out the first of three Old Testament examples of the κρίμα (“judgment”) that Jude warns of in verse 4: *viz.*, that although the Jews were rescued out of Egypt, those within the physically-redeemed community who did not personally believe were destroyed.¹³ But this raises the central question for our purposes: who saved the people from Egypt—the Lord, Jesus, or God?¹⁴ To begin to answer this question, we must examine the testimony of the manuscript evidence.¹⁵

Examining The External Evidence

Reviewing The Manuscript Evidence

Whilst the subject matter of the textual variant in Jude 5 should invoke significant interest in its own right, the complexity of the testimony of the extant manuscripts makes its study even more

¹² Benton, *Slandering the Angels*, 64-65.

¹³ We concur with those who understand this reference to destruction as an allusion to God’s judgment in wiping out the generation in the wilderness (Num 14:26-35; 26:63-65; cf. Heb 3:17-19) who refused to believe “his pledge to enable them to conquer the Canaanite inhabitants and take possession of the promised land”—Curtis Giese, *2 Peter and Jude*, 265; Richard B. Vinson, Richard F. Wilson, and Watson E. Mills, *1 & 2 Peter, Jude* (SHBC; Macon, Georgia; Smyth & Helwys Publishing, 2010), n4, 402; Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*, 47.

¹⁴ A number of commentators who conclude that the original text of Jude 5 included the [ό] κύριος reading spend time considering whether this reading should be interpreted to refer to our Lord Jesus Christ, effectively bringing the Second Person of the Trinity back into the text as the subject of Jude 5 through the back door. By way of example, Bauckham concludes that “it may be that, in view of Jude’s general usage, he has used κύριος here of Jesus, not so much because he is concerned to explain the preexistent activity of Christ, but rather because in his typological application of these OT events to the present it is the Lord Jesus who has saved his people the church and will be the Judge of apostates”—Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 49. David Horrel concedes that, “Jude sees Jesus as the agent through whom God acted in the Exodus and subsequent events”—David Horrel, *The Epistles of Peter and Jude* (Peterborough, England; Epworth Press, 1998), 120. See also J. N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude* (New York, New York; Harper & Row, 1969), 255; Vinson, Wilson, and Mills, *1 & 2 Peter, Jude*, n4, 402.

Intriguing though this interpretative approach may be, we will focus our attention on deciding between the alternative readings themselves, rather than how they could subsequently be interpreted.

¹⁵ Considerable ink has been spilled in seeking to demonstrate what ἄπαξ modifies. As Scott Hafemann explains, there are essentially two options: either (a) “because they know all things ἄπαξ, [Jude] wishes to remind them that, having saved the people from Egypt...the Lord destroyed ‘the second time’ those who were not believing”; or (b) “because they know all things, [Jude] wishes to remind them that, having saved the people from Egypt ἄπαξ, the Lord ‘destroyed the second time’ those who were not believing”—Scott J. Hafemann, “Salvation in Jude 5 and the Argument of 2 Peter 1:3-11,” *The Catholic Epistles and Apostolic Tradition* (eds. Karl-Wilhem Niebuhr and Robert W. Wall; Waco, Texas; Baylor University Press, 2009), 331-332.

Whilst Davids is correct in observing that the manuscript evidence regarding [ό] κύριος, Ἰησοῦς, and θεός Χριστός is “similar to that for ‘once’ in that those manuscripts reading ‘once’ where the KJV has it also usually read ‘Jesus’ or ‘God Christ’ and those that the NRSV follows read ‘Lord,’” this similarity is not a definitive or conclusive linguistic argument—Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*, 48.

Although an interesting syntactical discussion in its own right, this question does not impinge upon the focus of our paper and will not be investigated further.

fascinating. Carroll Osburn's summation is exactly right: "Considerable disparity exists within the manuscript tradition concerning the text of Jude 5."¹⁶ Given the importance of this data, we have annexed tables that document the manuscript evidence for each of the three predominant readings: [ó] κύριος, [ó] Ἰησοῦς, and [ó] θεός (see Appendices A, B, and C respectively).¹⁷

From the perspective of the external evidence, the [ó] θεός reading is clearly the most inferior option. As Appendix C demonstrates, beyond the second corrector of C and one Alexandrian manuscript (1243), only a few Byzantine minuscules, one Latin Father, and a few early translations or versions of the Bible testify to this reading.¹⁸ We can, therefore, be confident in excluding [ó] θεός from the list of potentially authentic writings.

Insofar as the [ó] κύριος reading is concerned, it certainly finds its greatest support in the Byzantine text—although not exclusively so: two early (i.e., fourth/fifth century) Alexandrian uncials (N and C*) confirm this reading (see Appendix A).¹⁹ Philipp Bartholomä suggests that "it may well be that the late secondary Alexandrian witnesses in favor of [ó] κύριος are marked by a Byzantine influence."²⁰ Although entirely plausible, it is impossible to prove this definitively.

Limiting ourselves at this stage to an assessment of the manuscript evidence, we would contend that the external evidence leans—though perhaps not irrefutably so—in favor of the [ó] Ἰησοῦς reading. As Appendix B shows, this reading has the strongest support from the most

¹⁶ Osburn, "The Text of Jude 5," 107.

¹⁷ Two further readings occur in the manuscripts: κύριος Ἰησοῦς, and θεός Χριστός. Both of these readings are poorly attested (κύριος Ἰησοῦς is found in 1735 [X]; 1591 [XI]; Did^{tri}^{1,19}; θεός Χριστός in Ψ⁷² [III/IV]) and, as Bruce Metzger reminds us, their lack of support from other witnesses points towards the probability that they are not authentic—see Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (2d ed.; Edmonds, Washington; UBS, 2007), 657.

Additionally, as Michael Kruger observes, the Ψ⁷² manuscript "seems to be an oddity in that it also includes a number of noncanonical works, such as the Nativity of Mary, 3 Corinthians, and others...[and] such a mix of canonical and noncanonical books in the same manuscript is quite rare": suggesting that Ψ⁷² "was made for private use and not to be taken as typical of early Christian manuscripts"—Michael Kruger, *Canon Revisited: Establishing the Origins and Authority of the New Testament Books* (Wheaton, Illinois; Crossway, 2012), 246. This further highlights the likelihood that the θεός Χριστός reading is not authentic.

As we shall see in considering the three main options, these two, poorly attested variants can be explained through probable scribal errors, and we will therefore not examine them further.

¹⁸ Somewhat curiously, Osburn contends that Clement of Alexandria's support of the [ó] θεός reading is a reflection of the fact that he "garbled the opening section in typical patristic fashion" and that, "Under these circumstances it is difficult to assume that this part of Clement's citation actually reflects a biblical exemplar"—Osburn, "The Text of Jude 5," 109. He goes on to suggest that Clement did not actually know the original text of Jude 5.

¹⁹ Metzger provides a helpful summary of the external evidence regarding the inclusion of the definite article in square brackets: "The great majority of witnesses read ó before κύριος, but on the strength of its absence from N Ψ and the tendency of scribes to add the article, it was thought best to enclose ó within square brackets"—Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 657.

²⁰ Philipp F. Bartholomä, "Did Jesus save the people out of Egypt? A Re-examination of a Textual Problem in Jude 5," *Novum Testamentum* 50/2 (2008), 149.

reliable manuscripts within the primary Alexandrian texts. In addition to being found in the two early (i.e. fourth/fifth century) and important Alexandrian uncials (A and B), together with a large number of significant minuscules, its Patristic heritage extends all the way back to the second and third centuries with Justin Martyr and Origen—over a century before the first extant Patristic witness for [ό] κύριος.²¹ It is also attested by the largest number of early versions, including the Vulgate, Coptic, Ethiopic, and some manuscripts of the Armenian.

Additionally, as Bartholomä helpfully highlights, “In addition to being earlier, [ό] Ἰησοῦς is also more geographically widespread”—spanning from Egypt/North Africa to western areas of the Roman Empire.²² Though not ultimately definitive in itself, Bartholomä contends that this geographical diversity “is yet another strong argument for the primacy of the Ἰησοῦς reading.”²³

Whilst our analysis of the external evidence does not definitively address the issue, Bruce Metzger’s assessment succinctly captures the testimony of the manuscript data: “Critical principles

²¹ The apparent sparsity of Patristic citations of Jude 5 in particular should not surprise us—for the entire epistle is not as frequently attested as other New Testament books. Part of the reason for this, as Kruger explains, is the brevity of letter: “Jude is particularly small—containing only 602 words—which makes the lack of extant evidence for the book less surprising”—Kruger, *Canon Revisited*, 270; cf. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*, n3, 8.

However, it is also likely that Jude’s more difficult journey into the New Testament canon played a part in its fewer citations too. Although Jude is included in the Muratorian Canon (~170 A.D.), it endured a period of skepticism during the third and fourth centuries. Origen used the epistle but, as Barclay explains, “was well aware that there were many who questioned its right to be in scripture”—Barclay, *The Letters of John and Jude*, 167. Similarly, Eusebius classifies the letter as “disputed, nevertheless familiar to the majority” (Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History and The Martyrs of Palestine* (trans. Hugh J. Lawlor and John Oulton; London, England; S. P. C. K., 1954), III.25.3); and Jerome had concerns too (see Barclay, *The Letters of John and Jude*, 167).

Scholarship lacks certainty when it comes to the reasons for doubting Jude’s canonical status in the first four-six centuries. (It was only accepted by the Syriac-speaking churches at the beginning of the sixth century when the Philoxenian recension was published—see Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, 224; for further background on the minimalist approach of the church in Syria, see Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance* (Oxford, England; Clarendon Press, 1997), 284.) On one hand, Davids speaks honestly when he states that, “We are never told why it was disputed, so any answer to that question is speculative and may reflect the contemporary scholar’s view more than that of the ancient followers of Jesus”—Davids, *II Peter and Jude*, xix. However, Davids himself is willing to engage in such speculation: “It has frequently been suggested that the doubts were occasioned by Jude’s citation of *I Enoch*, which, if true, means that by the time of Eusebius the church was getting uneasy about endorsing certain ‘Old Testament’ works”—Davids, “The Catholic Epistles as a Canonical Janus: A New Testament Glimpse into Old and New Testament Canon Formation,” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 19/3 (2009), 414. Interestingly, Wolfgang Grünständl and Tobias Nicklas rely upon Tertullian’s citations from Jude in refuting the authority of *I Enoch* as a proof of Tertullian’s conviction in the divine authority of the epistle: “Tertullian bases a part of his argument for the disputed authority of *I Enoch* on the authority of Jude. This argument, however, was only possible if Tertullian expected that the authority of the latter was undisputed by his presumed readers”—Wolfgang Grünständl and Tobias Nicklas, “Searching for Evidence: The History of Reception of the Epistles of Jude and 2 Peter,” *Reading 1-2 Peter and Jude: A Resource for Students* (eds. Eric F. Mason and Troy W. Martin; Atlanta, Georgia; Society of Biblical Literature, 2014), 217.

It would be considerably beyond the scope of our paper to engage with this debate in detail. For our purposes, it is sufficient to discern the understandable reasons for the apparently infrequent citation of Jude’s epistle in Patristic writings—because of both its size and the canonical questions that were raised in connection with the book during the first few centuries of the New Testament church.

²² Bartholomä, “Did Jesus save the people out of Egypt?,” 149.

²³ *Ibid.*, 149.

seem to require the adoption of Ἰησοῦς, which admittedly is the best attested reading among Greek and versional witnesses.”²⁴

Considering The Testimony Of Two Church Fathers

Before turning to consider the internal evidence, it is interesting to pause briefly and reflect upon the evidence of two important Patristics: Justin Martyr and Bede. Although the testimony of these church fathers is not final, their opinion certainly merits our careful consideration.

In his *Dialogue with Trypho*, Justin Martyr states that Jesus is “the one who led your fathers out of Egypt.”²⁵ Even more intriguing is the observation of the venerable Bede, who follows the Ἰησοῦς reading, and then provides a rationale to which we will return in due course:

[Jude] is referring not to Jesus the son of Nun but to our Lord, showing first that he did not have his beginning at his birth from the holy virgin, as the heretics have wished [to assert], but existed as the eternal God for the salvation of all believers...For in Egypt he first so saved the humble who cried out to him from their affliction that he might afterward bring low the proud who murmured against him in the desert.²⁶

Reflecting upon all of this data, Osburn certainly has an evidential base from which to conclude “that one is hardly alien to primitive Christianity who detects Jesus in the events of the history of Israel.”²⁷

In light of the external evidence, we can now turn to consider how the internal evidence should inform our understanding of what Jude originally wrote.

Investigating The Internal Evidence

To structure our examination of how the internal evidence should inform our analysis of Jude 5, we will address two broad but discrete issues: transcriptional probability and intrinsic probability. The first issue seeks to understand how the variant can be accounted for within the scribal copying process. The second question focuses upon whether there is an intrinsic or innate reason that would favor either reading.

²⁴ Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 657.

²⁵ Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho*, 120.3, cited in Charles Landon, *A Text-Critical Study of the Epistle of Jude* (JSNTSS; Sheffield, England; Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 71.

²⁶ Quoted in Gene L. Green, *Jude & 2 Peter* (BECNT; Grand Rapids, Michigan; Baker Academic, 2008), 65. Although Bede uses the title ‘Lord,’ the context clearly confirms that he considered Jude to be referring to the Lord Jesus, as the second member of the Trinity (who alone was born of the Virgin Mary).

²⁷ Osburn, “Discourse Analysis and Jewish Apocalyptic in the Epistle of Jude,” *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse Analysis* (ed. David Black; Nashville, Tennessee; Broadman Press, 1992), 295.

Transcriptional Probability—Unintentional Change

As Bartholomä helpfully explains, “Because all three variants were written as *nomina sacra*, the tendency has been to account for the different readings by *unintentional change*” (emphasis his).²⁸ This approach certainly reflects the majority decision of the UBS Committee. In giving the κύριος reading a D decision—“indicating that the Committee had great difficulty in arriving at a decision”²⁹—as Metzger recounts, a majority of the Committee explained the origin of the Ἰησοῦς reading “in terms of transcriptional oversight (KC being taken for IC).”³⁰

Insofar as both *nomina sacra* have a vertical stroke in common, the accidental error is theoretically possible. However, considerably more likely is the probability of an intentional scribal change—rather than a mere oversight. As Bartholomä explains, two important reasons support this conclusion. Firstly, “It seems unlikely that K (in KC = κύριος) and θ (in θC = θεός) would be easily mixed up. [And secondly,] the change made by the second corrector of C was obviously deliberate, thus we have to reckon with the fact that there were reasons for a scribe to be uncomfortable with the κύριος reading and intentionally alter it.”³¹

Transcriptional Probability—Intentional Change

The possibility of intentional scribal change directs our attention to some of the foundational principles of textual criticism. In seeking to determine which of a number of textual variants represents the original reading, two overarching maxims must be borne in mind: firstly (and

²⁸ Bartholomä, “Did Jesus save the people out of Egypt?,” 149.

²⁹ J. Harold Greenlee, *An Exegetical Summary of Jude* (Dallas, Texas; Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1999), 22.

³⁰ Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 657. This reflects Hort’s summation, which though predicated upon the fact that the original text included merely the personal pronoun—ó—considers a scribal error in the copying of the *nomina sacra* to be the best explanation for the textual variant: “Some primitive error probable, apparently OTIKC (ὅτι κύριος) and OTIIC (ὅτι Ἰησοῦς) for OTIO [ὅτι ó]”—F. J. A. Hort, “List of Suspected Readings,” in *The New Testament in the Original Greek* (Text Revised by Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort; London, England; Macmillan and Co., 1909), 586; cf. B. F. Westcott and Hort: “The best attested reading Ἰησοῦς can only be a blunder. It seems probable that the original text had only ó, and that OTIO was read as OTIIC and perhaps as OTIKC”—B. F. Westcott and Hort, *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek: With Notes on Selected Readings* (Peabody, Massachusetts; Hendrickson, 1988), 106.

Notwithstanding the *prime facie* cogency of Hort’s argument, we would contend that the force of his conclusion weakens somewhat when we consider his linguistic premise. Transcriptional error in misreading and miscopying *nomina sacra* is a legitimate argument, but in the specific case of Jude 5—if we are to adopt Hort’s reasoning—the *autograph* would merely have stated ὅτι ó. Although the context clearly establishes the divine referent for this personal pronoun, Hort’s contention that the original text was ὅτι ó makes the probability of an accidental scribal error (based upon the text being a *nomina sacra*) less convincing. Considerably more likely is an intentional change made in an effort to clarify the original text (which, in itself, does not preclude Hort’s argument for ὅτι ó being original—but it certainly decreases the probability of the change being made unintentionally).

³¹ Bartholomä, “Did Jesus save the people out of Egypt?,” 150.

generally speaking), the more difficult reading is to be preferred,³² and secondly, the reading which best explains the origin of the other readings has the best claim to originality.

No one disputes the fact that the Ἰησοῦς reading is the most difficult. The problem for translation committees and scholars alike is whether the reading is—in Metzger’s words—“difficult to the point of impossibility.”³³

The question of which reading—Ἰησοῦς or [ό] κύριος—best explains the origin of the other readings is highly contested.³⁴ Bauckham, for instance, considers the [ό] κύριος reading to be the most satisfactory in this regard,³⁵ and explains the emendation by pointing to the Joshua-Jesus typology that became popular during the second century.³⁶ Although Scott Hafemann concurs,³⁷ F. F. Bruce argues the complete reverse: “indeed the variety of other readings can best be explained as substitutes for ‘Jesus’.”³⁸ Gene Green³⁹ and A. R. C. Leaney⁴⁰ follow Bruce’s lead.

³² Particularly, as Metzger points out, “when the sense appears on the surface to be erroneous but on more mature consideration proves to be correct”—Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 12-13.

³³ Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 657. Davids considers it “not just the more difficult reading but a highly unlikely one”—Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*, 48.

Part of the reason for the alleged “impossibility” of the Ἰησοῦς reading is the fact that the subject in verse 5 remains the subject in verse 6, in which Jude describes the same person—either Ἰησοῦς or [ό] κύριος—imprisoning the disobedient angels. Scholars who affirm the [ό] κύριος reading frequently cite Jude 6 as another obstacle to the Ἰησοῦς reading, because Scripture nowhere else describes Jesus as the Person within the Trinity who imprisoned the fallen angels (see, for instance, Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 43, 49; Green, *2 Peter and Jude*, 177; Landon, *A Text-Critical Study of the Epistle of Jude*, 72; Vinson, Wilson, and Mills, *1 & 2 Peter, Jude*, n4, 402). Although understandable, this line of reasoning is somewhat circular, insofar as proponents argue that the lack of additional support for Jesus being responsible for the activity in verse 6 proves that Jesus could not be the Person referred to in achieving the activity of verse 5 (which they similarly deny on the basis of a lack of corresponding/confirming Scripture). We would contend that if the external and internal evidence warrants our conclusion regarding the Ἰησοῦς reading in Jude 5, we must allow our theology to be informed by our exegesis in both verses 5 and 6.

³⁴ Given its limited external testimony, and the fact that it is the least likely to explain the origin of the other predominant readings, we will not consider the [ό] θεός reading separately here.

³⁵ “Probably κύριος should be preferred since it could have given rise to the other readings as attempts to resolve the ambiguity in κύριος”—Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 43. Similarly, Michael Green—“Probably the Lord was what Jude wrote, and the other readings are scribal glosses to add precision”—Michael Green, *2 Peter and Jude* (TNTC; rev. ed.; Grand Rapids, Michigan; Eerdmans, 1993), 177.

³⁶ See Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 43; cf. Landon, *A Text-Critical Study of the Epistle of Jude*, 73.

³⁷ “This attention is surprising in view of the fact that the external evidence for the reading [ό] κύριος is strong, and the only compelling internal trajectory is to suppose that the apparent ambiguity surrounding κύριος spawned the variants ὁ θεός, Ἰησοῦς, and θεός Χριστός, as well as the combinations of readings found in the tradition, rather than any other possibility”—Hafemann, “Salvation in Jude 5 and the Argument of 2 Peter 1:3-11,” n2, 475.

³⁸ F. F. Bruce, *New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes* (Grand Rapids, Michigan; Eerdmans, 1987), 35-36.

³⁹ “This difficult reading best accounts for the rise of the other variants, which either reflect the more traditional language of the exodus summaries or seek to clarify the sense”—Green, *Jude & 2 Peter*, 65.

⁴⁰ “The reading ‘Jesus’ is hard to explain if it is not original, but a scribe might well alter it to ‘the Lord’ so as to mean God, recognizing that the author was referring to the Old Testament story”—A. R. C. Leaney, *The Letters of Peter and Jude* (CBC; Cambridge, England; Cambridge University Press, 1967), 88.

Instinctively, even this brief survey of the spectrum of scholarly disagreement on this issue gives one pause to offer yet another personal opinion. However, insofar as we can determine, we would submit that the Ἰησοῦς reading does indeed best explain the origin of the other readings. The story of יהוָה’s deliverance of the Jews from Egypt is the single greatest event of redemptive-history in the Old Testament. No first-century Jew or subsequent scribe would have either forgotten the divine architect behind their liberation from bondage, or considered that יהוָה’s involvement required any clarification by way of correction to the text of Jude 5. If Jude 5 had originally contained the [ό] κύριος reading, one can only imagine, therefore, that a scribe would only change that reference from the Greek translation of יהוָה to Ἰησοῦς by mistake—and we have already ruled out the probability of an accidental transcriptional error.

Considerably more likely is the reality that Jude originally ascribed the leadership of the Jewish exodus from Egypt to Jesus Christ Himself using the proper noun Ἰησοῦς, and that scribes subsequently hesitated in attributing this miraculous delivery to anyone other than יהוָה Himself—even to the exclusion of the Second Person of the Trinity. This analysis accords with Metzger’s minority report to the UBS Committee: “Struck by the strange and unparalleled mention of Jesus in a statement about the redemption out of Egypt (yet compare Paul’s reference to Χριστός in 1 Cor 10:14), copyists would have substituted (ό) κύριος or ο θεός.”⁴¹ In such case, whilst we could empathize with the concern that lay behind their emendations, the scribes of old should not have allowed their surprise at the pre-incarnate ministry of Christ’s redemption to give way to amending the text of God’s Holy Word.

Intrinsic Probability—Arguments Within Jude

Having considered the issues pertaining to transcriptional probability, we can direct our attention towards the question of intrinsic probability: are there any intrinsic or innate reasons that would favor either reading?

Certainly the most problematic intrinsic evidence against the Ἰησοῦς reading is the fact that Jude does not refer to our Lord Jesus Christ by the name Ἰησοῦς anywhere else in his epistle, and opponents to the Ἰησοῦς reading consistently highlight this fact.⁴² Although our Savior is explicitly referenced six times in this brief letter (excluding verse 5), Jude uses other titles for Jesus: Ἰησοῦ

⁴¹ Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 657.

⁴² See, by way of example, Landon, *A Text-Critical Study of the Epistle of Jude*, 73-74; Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 657; Daniel J. Harrington, *Jude and 2 Peter* (SPS 15; Collegeville, Minnesota; The Liturgical Press, 2003), 195.

Χριστοῦ/Χριστῷ (twice in v1); τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν (v4); τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (vv17, 21); and Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν (v25). Beyond the obvious reasons for affirming Jesus' divinity, Landon (building on Bauckham) goes a step further and suggests that Jude consistently attaches the title of Χριστός to Ἰησοῦς—a practice he sought to instill in his readers—in order to distinguish Jesus from the plethora of men called Ἰησοῦς in his day:

Jesus was a common name during Jude's lifetime, and Jude obliges Christians 'who would have needed a way of distinguishing Jesus from others who bore this very common name' [quoting Bauckham] by supplying the double name Ἰησοῦς Χριστός whenever referring to Jesus in his epistle. The variant Ἰησοῦς is therefore uncharacteristic of the author since it appears without Χριστός.⁴³

This evidence cannot be denied. But is it sufficient to categorically refute the possibility that Jude would refer to our Lord Jesus Christ with the simple noun, Ἰησοῦς, in verse 5? We would argue that this analysis is incomplete until two further issues have been taken in consideration: firstly, the brevity of the epistle; and secondly, the unique literary qualities that Jude employs in his albeit short letter.

Firstly, given the small sample size of Jude's extant writings—his epistle consists of just over six hundred words in Greek—we need to exercise caution against the temptation to consider that this letter exhaustively represents the totality of Jude's vocabulary preferences. Indeed, Bauckham concedes this very principle whilst defending the [ό] κύριος reading: "Does Jude use κύριος consistently of Jesus? The evidence may not be sufficient to decide this."⁴⁴ Certainly Jude's references to Jesus throughout his epistle are noteworthy; but given the limited sample from which to draw linguistic conclusions, arguments for the [ό] κύριος reading based primarily upon the absence of a second, stand-alone reference to Ἰησοῦς are inconclusive at best.

Secondly, one of the fascinating insights that has emerged in recent scholarship is the recognition that, despite its brevity, Jude's epistle represents a high watermark in Greek rhetoric and composition.⁴⁵ As Bauckham observes, "The short letter of Jude contains perhaps the most elaborate and carefully composed piece of formal exegesis in the style of the Qumran pesharim to be found in the NT, though it has only recently recognised [sic.] as such."⁴⁶ Davids agrees: "Jude

⁴³ Landon, *A Text-Critical Study of the Epistle of Jude*, 74.

⁴⁴ Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 49.

⁴⁵ For many commentators, this very linguistic ability gives them pause to at least consider whether it is feasible that Jude, the human brother of Jesus, could have written this epistle. By way of example, see *ibid.*, 15.

⁴⁶ Bauckham, "James, 1 and 2 Peter, Jude," 303.

was not written by an uneducated man or one unskilled in rhetoric...The author...is writing in a Hellenistic Greek influenced by the Greek translations of the Hebrew Scriptures that he knew" (i.e., LXX).⁴⁷ One of the specific qualities that merits these accolades is the high number of New Testament *hapax legomena* contained in Jude's letter. As Bauckham observes, there are fourteen words in this brief epistle that are not found elsewhere in the New Testament.⁴⁸ These linguistic contributions to the canon need to be seen in perspective, as not every one of these unique words is as significant as others.⁴⁹ However, as Bauckham rightly concludes, "More important than the statistic is Jude's evident ability to vary his vocabulary and choose effective and appropriate words and expressions from good literary, even poetic, Greek."⁵⁰

And in addition to his *hapax legomena*, Jude's literary composition is also highly regarded: "Close exegesis soon reveals great economy of expression. Single words, phrases, and images are chosen for the associations they carry, and scriptural allusions and catchword connections increase the depth of meaning."⁵¹

In light of Jude's exemplary literary qualities, the *prima facie* objection to a unique reference to Ἰησοῦς in verse 5 appears less problematic. Not only does this reference immediately follow the Lordship citation of verse 4 (τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν)—which certainly provides Jude with a referent point from which to utilize a more succinct proper noun in verse 5—but seen in the broader context of Jude's ability and willingness to employ his linguistic abilities in novel expressions and configurations throughout his epistle, it is entirely possible that he would have been comfortable writing Ἰησοῦς in Jude 5.

Intrinsic Probability—Arguments Beyond Jude

One final component of intrinsic probability needs to be considered: do any of the other New Testament writers similarly ascribe any Old Testament events to Jesus that the MT attributes to God/יהוָה? The Ἰησοῦς reading in verse 5 would certainly be unique in Scripture in attesting that Jesus (as the Second Person of the Trinity) led the Israelites out of Egypt, but do any other writers

⁴⁷ Davids, *II Peter and Jude*, xix.

⁴⁸ See his list in Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 6.

⁴⁹ Bauckham's cautionary approach is exemplary: "Of course, some discrimination is needed in assessing the significance of this list: some words are relatively common words which other NT writers happen not to use; some are rather specialized words which Jude's subject matter requires; some are cognate with words which are found elsewhere in the NT and are characteristic of biblical Greek; some are rare"—*ibid.*, 6.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 6.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 6-7.

suggest that the pre-incarnate Christ was actively and personally involved throughout the Old Testament era?

The most obvious candidates in the New Testament canon are found in 1 Cor 10:4 and 10:9, where Paul states that Christ was personally present with Israel in the wilderness—symbolically/typologically as the Rock (10:4), and personally as the one whom the Israelites put to the test before they were destroyed by serpents (10:9). Furthermore, as Thomas Schreiner explains,

New Testament writers identify Jesus Christ with texts that refer to Yahweh in the Old Testament. John said that Isaiah saw the glory of Jesus Christ (John 12:41), referring to the throne room vision of Isaiah 6. Isaiah said every knee will bow to Yahweh and confess allegiance to him (Isa 45:23), but Paul related this to Jesus Christ (Phil 2:10-11).⁵²

Some would contend that this whole concept is a product of over-zealous believers at the genesis of the New Testament era. Kelly, for instance, argues that the Ἰησοῦς reading in Jude 5 can be explained by “the eagerness of Christian writers even in the apostolic age to recognize the pre-existent Christ as active in OT events (John 12:41; 1 Cor 10:4 etc.).”⁵³ Bauckham adopts a similar methodology but applies it chronologically later, suggesting that the scribal errors that produced the Ἰησοῦς reading are best explained by the Joshua-Jesus typology which became popular in the second century.⁵⁴

However, a less critical approach established upon an evangelical commitment to the inspiration of Scripture need not attempt to explain away these references. Although relatively few in number,⁵⁵ their presence throughout the New Testament canon cannot be denied, and the most natural and faithful approach to understanding them is by recognizing the pre-incarnate ministry of our Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore, although no other New Testament passage explicitly ascribes the exodus to the salvific ministry of Jesus Christ, as this sampling of Scriptures shows, “it is not surprising that Jude could attribute the destruction of Israel, the angels, and Sodom and Gomorrah to Jesus Christ.”⁵⁶

⁵² Thomas R. Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter; Jude* (NAC 37; Nashville, Tennessee; Broadman & Holman, 2003), 444.

⁵³ Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, 255.

⁵⁴ Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 43.

⁵⁵ Bauckham is entirely correct to ask, “Are references to the activity of the preexistent Christ in OT history rare in the NT (John 12:41; 1 Cor 10:4, 9 are the most commonly admitted) or very common?”—*ibid.*, 49. However, his argument progresses on the logic that infrequent references render all of the rare instances unreliable. Without disputing with Bauckham that the instances are rare, we would contend that faithful exegesis that honors the inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture necessitates that we accept the albeit infrequent references as the Holy Spirit has presented them to us in his infallible Word, and allow these passages to shape and transform our theology (rather than *vice versa*).

⁵⁶ Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter; Jude*, 444.

Reflecting Upon The Evidence

As we have seen—and, indeed, would expect in circumstances relating to a disputed textual variant—there are aspects to the external and internal evidence that, taken on their own, could support either a Ἰησοῦς or [ό] κύριος reading. However, as we work through the data carefully and systematically, we believe that the cumulative argument presented in the manuscript, transcriptional, and intrinsic evidence supports the Ἰησοῦς reading. This has two incredibly important implications for us.

Jude's Early Testimony To A High Christology

On the basis of the foregoing presentation, Jude 5 presents an unsurpassably high Christology. We have already touched upon the unparalleled importance of the exodus event—both in the redemptive-history of Israel, and in the typological significance of that rescue in light of and preparation for the future salvation that Jesus Christ would accomplish for His people who otherwise remained in bondage to sin (cf. John 8:31-36; Rom 6:12-23; Gal 5:1; Heb 2:15). As we have seen, the pages of the Old Testament consistently testify that the exodus was accomplished by the mighty hand of יְהוָה (see Num 14:26-35; 26:63-65).

Familiar though we are with the doctrine of the lordship of Christ and the typological component to the exodus, we would do well to reflect afresh upon the reality that Jude—a Jewish Christian who had been raised not only to understand the history of his people, but to fear the God of the first commandment (Ex 20:3), which is itself prefaced with a reminder of יְהוָה's great deliverance (אָנֹכִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהִיךְ אֲשֶׁר הָזִאתִיךְ מִאָרֶץ מִצְרַיִם מִבֵּית עֲבָדִים:)—here ascribes the glory and worship-inducing rescue to Jesus Christ. As Giese explains: “While the OT ascribes that act of judgment to Yahweh, Jude identifies the actor by name as ‘Jesus.’ He thereby asserts a high Christology and confesses the divinity of Jesus.”⁵⁷ The implications of this Christology are significant.

The scholarly debate concerning when Jude was written is extensive and shows no sign of reaching a universal consensus in the near future. One of the key components to that debate relates to the significant overlap between 2 Peter and Jude,⁵⁸ and whether one copied from the other or both relied upon a common source. The theory that both epistles were based upon a common, third

⁵⁷ Giese, *2 Peter and Jude*, 265.

⁵⁸ Of the 25 verses in Jude, 19 have a strong parallel in 2 Peter.

source can be easily dismissed,⁵⁹ but the determination of priority between the two epistles is a more involved discussion. Most commentators presume that Jude was written first,⁶⁰ and therefore assign an early date to the Jude's epistle. Whilst we would suggest that there are reasonable grounds for advocating that Peter was written first and Jude incorporated much of Peter's material in his epistle, the grounds for that conclusion would require significant argumentation.⁶¹

However, whether we consider Jude to have been written first or second, the dating implications are relatively minor: either Jude was written in the 50s A.D. or—if Petrine priority is accepted—Jude's epistle was written in the 80s. In either case, the glorious Christology Jude affirms with the pre-incarnate salvific ministry of Jesus in the exodus is established decades before the end of the first century, dispelling all critical and liberal suggestions that a high Christology was engineered and enforced by the established church centuries later.

Jude's Insight Into Jesus' Pre-Incarnate Salvific Ministry

The second astonishing implication concerns the unique insight Jude gives us into the trans-testament ministry of redemption that our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, has undertaken on behalf of His people. In recent years, the resurgence of a redemptive-historical understanding of salvation has instilled in many evangelicals an appreciation for the typological component to the exodus of the Jews from Egypt. Indeed, given the dominating theme of God's rescue of His people from Egypt throughout the Old Testament, “It is not surprising...that Christians took over this model as a way of teaching about the cross and the salvation Jesus Christ accomplished there. Jesus himself taught us to do that, calling his death an ‘exodus’ (Luke 9:31).”⁶²

But Jude 5, understood in light of our foregoing analysis, takes us one glorious step further. The exodus was not merely a typological foretaste of Christ's future redemption. Rather, it was a physical deliverance personally accomplished by the pre-incarnate Christ, whose ministry in pioneering redemption (cf. Heb 12:2) and rescuing sinners from their bondage spans the testaments.

⁵⁹ Davids' succinct explanation is most instructive: “the vast majority of scholars argue for the dependence of 2 Peter on Jude because (1) introducing a third work that has disappeared without a trace is a council of despair, (2) Jude shows no traces of 2 Pet 1 or of the last half of 2 Pet 3, which is unlikely if it was abstracted from that work, and (3) Jude and 2 Pet 2-3 take up the same topics in the same order (with only one reversal of order), often using some of the same language, which rules out total independence”—Davids, “The Catholic Epistles as a Canonical Janus,” n32, 414.

⁶⁰ See, by way of example, Davids, *II Peter and Jude*, xviii.

⁶¹ In brief summary, the most significant factor that argues for Petrine priority within the text of the two epistles is the comparison between 2 Pet 3:3 and Jude 18. Peter warns of the scoffers who would come in the last days, whereas Jude's account states that, “They said to you, “In the last time there will be scoffers” (emphasis added) where the subject identified by the third person plural ending to ἔλεγον clearly refers back to apostles in Jude 17. As such, Jude appears to be citing the words of the apostle Peter, implying that 2 Peter was written first.

⁶² Lucas and Green, *The Message of 2 Peter & Jude*, 183-184.

Conclusion

Although textual criticism may not be considered a natural seedbed in which to enlarge, embolden, and excite our comprehension of our Savior’s trans-testamental work of redemption, Jude 5 is a glorious example of a passage that does precisely that. Working systematically through the external and internal evidence, we contend that the cumulative weight of the data supports the Ἰησοῦς reading of Jude 5, and therefore substantiates the ESV’s translation: “Now I want to remind you, although you once fully knew it, that Jesus, who saved a people out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed those who did not believe.”

Within the immediate context of Jude’s epistle, the salutary warning must not go unnoticed—or, indeed, unheeded. As Giese rightly warns us, “The demise of the unfaithful generation became an ongoing warning for all who distrust God and reject his gifts (Ps 95:10-11; 1 Cor 10:1-13; Heb 3:16-4:2). Those who pervert God’s grace in Christ and reject his lordship will certainly share the same fate.”⁶³ Lest we be caught up in the contemporary imbalance that focuses solely upon Jesus’ role in salvation, Jude 5 affirms not only that Jesus is and has always been the Savior of His people—but also that He is and has always been the Judge, who will bring judgment upon those who reject the “once for all delivered” faith.

But Jude 5 also requires us to recalibrate our systematic and redemptive-historical framework to take account of the reality that our pre-incarnate Savior personally led the Israelites out of Egypt. Seen in light of this redemptive-historical perspective that spans the testaments of Scripture, Jude’s oft-quoted benediction assumes a yet deeper level of meaning, profundity, and glory—for it has always been our Lord Jesus Christ who has personally led his people out of slavery and who will personally present us blameless in the throne room of God.

“Now to him who is able to keep you from stumbling and to present you blameless before the presence of his glory with great joy, to the only God, our Savior, through Jesus Christ our Lord, be glory, majesty, dominion, and authority, before all time and now and forever. Amen.”

⁶³ Giese, *2 Peter and Jude*, 265.

Appendix A—[ό] κύριος

	Alexandrian	Western	Byzantine	Other
	Primary	Secondary		
Uncials	ς [IV]	C* [V]		K [IX]
		Y [IX/X]		L [VIII]
Minuscules		1175 [XI]		<i>Byz</i> [IX-XVI]
		1292 [XIII]		104 [1087]
		1409 [XIV]		175 [X]
		1852 [1306]		216 [1358]
				307 [X]
				255 [XII]
				326 [XII]
				337 [XII]
				429 [XIV]
				383 [XIII]
				436 [XI/XII]
				460 [XIII]
				630 [XIV]
				489 [1316]
				945 [XI]
				632 [XII-XIV]
				1067 [XIV]
				917 [XII]
				1505 [XII]
				927 [1133]
				1611 [X]
				1245 [XII]
				1844 [XV]
				1311 [1090]
				2138 [1072]
				1518 [XV]
				2147 [XI]
				1717 [XIII]
				1738 [XI]
				1765 [XIV]
				1829 [XI]
				1836 [X]
				1857 [XIII]
				1874 [X]
				1890 [XIV]
				1898 [X]
Lectionaries				<i>Lect l</i> 593 [XV]
Versions			syr ^b [616]	
Fathers				Ephraem [† 373]
				John Damascus [before 754]

	Alexandrian	Western	Byzantine	Other
	Primary	Secondary		
Fathers (cont.)				Ps-Athanasius [VIII]
				Oecumenius [VI]
				Theophylus [† 412]

Appendix B—[ό] Ἰησοῦς

	Alexandrian	Western	Byzantine	Other
	Primary	Secondary		
Uncials	B [IV]	A [V]		
Minuscules	81 1044]	33 [IX]	424 [XI]	6 [XIII]
	1241 [XII]	322 [XV]		88 [XII]
		323 [XII]		915 [XIII]
		1739 [X]		2298 [XII]
		1881 [XIV]		
		2344 [XI]		
Lectionaries				
Versions	(cop ^{sa}) [III-IV]		it ^{ar} [IX]	
		vg [IV/V] ^[1]		(cop ^{bo}) [IX-XII]
				eth [VI]
				arm ^{ed} mg
Fathers		Origen ^{1739mg} [253/254]	Jerome [† 420] ^[2]	Justin Martyr [† 165]
		Didymus [† c. 395] ^[3]		Cyril [† 444]
				Bede [735]

[1] Given the debate regarding whether vg is an Alexandrian or Western texttype, it is has been included across all three columns.

[2] As Joseph Mayor observes, “The reading Ἰησοῦς is recognized by Jerome (Jovin. 1. 12) but explained by him of Joshua.”⁶⁴

⁶⁴ Joseph B. Mayor, *The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter: Greek Text with Introduction Notes and Comments* (Grand Rapids, Michigan; Baker Book House, 1965), 28-29.

[3] As Bartholomä explains, Didymus witnesses to two different readings: Ἰησοῦς (Did^{lat³⁰⁷}) and κύριος Ἰησοῦς (Did^{tr^{1,19}}). However, “since both readings include a clear reference to Jesus as the subject,” Didymus is listed here.⁶⁵

Appendix C—[ό] θεός

	Alexandrian	Western	Byzantine	Other
	Primary	Secondary		
Uncials				C ² [VI]
Minuscules	1243 [XI]		5 [XIV] 442 [XIII] 1845 [X]	623 [1037] 1846 [XI]
Lectionaries				l 44 [XII] l 596 [1146]
Versions				vg ^{mss} [?] arm [V] geo [V] syr ^{ph} [507/508] (slav) [IX]
Fathers	Clement ^{vid} [before 215]		Lucifer [† 371]	

NB The tables shown in Appendices A-C categorize all of the manuscripts mentioned in NA²⁷ and UBS⁴.⁶⁶

⁶⁵ Bartholomä, “Did Jesus save the people out of Egypt?,” 146.

⁶⁶ We are particularly grateful to the labors of Bauckham and Bartholomä in consolidating this data, on the basis of which the spreadsheets in Appendices A-C have been prepared.

As Bartholomä observes, there are a number of other manuscripts not referred to in either GNT that are cited in Tischendorf, von Soden, Merk or Bover. For a list of these additional manuscripts, see *ibid.*, 147.

Bibliography

Barclay, William. *The Letters of John and Jude*. The Daily Study Bible Series. Rev. ed. Philadelphia; The Westminster Press, 1976.

Bartholomä, Philipp F. "Did Jesus save the people out of Egypt? A Re-examination of a Textual Problem in Jude 5." *Novum Testamentum*. 50/2 (2008), 143-158.

Bauckham, Richard J. *Jude, 2 Peter*. Word Biblical Commentary 50. Waco, Texas; Word Books, 1983.

_____. "James, 1 and 2 Peter, Jude." *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture—Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*. Edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson. Cambridge, England; Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Benton, John. *Slandering the Angels: The Message of Jude*. Welwyn Commentary Series. Darlington, England; Evangelical Press, 1999.

Bruce, F. F. *New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes*. Grand Rapids, Michigan; Eerdmans, 1987.

Davids, Peter H. *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*. The Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, Michigan; Eerdmans, 2006.

_____. "The Catholic Epistles as a Canonical Janus: A New Testament Glimpse into Old and New Testament Canon Formation." *Bulletin for Biblical Research*. 19/3 (2009), p 403-416.

_____. *II Peter and Jude: A Handbook on the Greek Text*. Baylor Handbook on the Greek New Testament. Waco, Texas; Baylor University Press, 2011.

Elliott, John H. *I-II Peter, Jude*. Augsburg Commentary on the New Testament. Minneapolis, Minnesota; Augsburg Publishing House, 1982.

Eusebius. *The Ecclesiastical History and The Martyrs of Palestine*. Trans. Hugh J. Lawlor and John Oulton. London, England; S. P. C. K., 1954.

Giese, Curtis P. *2 Peter and Jude*. Concordia Commentary. St. Louis, Missouri; Concordia Publishing, 2012.

Green, Gene L. *Jude & 2 Peter*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Michigan; Baker Academic, 2008.

Green, Michael. *2 Peter and Jude*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids, Michigan; Eerdmans, 1993.

Greenlee, J. Harold. *An Exegetical Summary of Jude*. Dallas, Texas; Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1999.

Grünständl, Wolfgang and Tobis Nicklas. "Searching for Evidence: The History of Reception of the Epistles of Jude and 2 Peter." *Reading 1-2 Peter and Jude: A Resource for Students*. Edited by Eric F. Mason and Troy W. Martin. Atlanta, Georgia; Society of Biblical Literature, 2014.

Hafemann, Scott J. "Salvation in Jude 5 and the Argument of 2 Peter 1:3-11." *The Catholic Epistles and Apostolic Tradition*. Edited by Karl-Wilhem Niebuhr and Robert W. Wall. Waco, Texas; Baylor University Press, 2009.

Harrington, Daniel J. *Jude and 2 Peter*. Sacra Pagina Series 15. Collegeville, Minnesota; The Liturgical Press, 2003.

Helm, David R. *1 & 2 Peter and Jude: Sharing Christ's Sufferings*. Preaching the Word. Wheaton, Illinois; Crossway Books, 2008.

Horrel, David. *The Epistles of Peter and Jude*. Peterborough, England; Epworth Press, 1998.

Hort, F. J. A. "List of Suspected Readings." *The New Testament in the Original Greek*. Text Revised by Brooke F. Westcott and Fenton J. A. Hort; London, England; Macmillan and Co., 1909.

Kelly, J. N. D. *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*. New York, New York; Harper & Row, 1969.

Kruger, Michael J. *Canon Revisited: Establishing the Origins and Authority of the New Testament Books*. Wheaton, Illinois; Crossway, 2012.

Landon, Charles. *A Text-Critical Study of the Epistle of Jude*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series. Sheffield, England; Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Leaney, A. R. C. *The Letters of Peter and Jude*. The Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge, England; Cambridge University Press, 1967.

Lucas, Dick and Christopher Green. *The Message of 2 Peter & Jude: The Promise of His Coming*. The Bible Speaks Today. Edited by John R. W. Stott. Downers Grove, Illinois; Inter-Varsity Press, 1995.

Mayor, Joseph B. *The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter: Greek Text with Introduction Notes and Comments*. Grand Rapids, Michigan; Baker Book House, 1965.

Metzger, Bruce. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 4th ed. Edmonds, Washington; UBS, 2007.

_____. *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance*. Oxford, England; Clarendon Press, 1997.

Osburn, Carroll D. "The Text of Jude 5." *Biblica*. 62/1 (1981), 107-115.

_____. “Discourse Analysis and Jewish Apocalyptic in the Epistle of Jude.” *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse Analysis*. Edited by David Black. Nashville, Tennessee; Broadman Press, 1992.

Schreiner, Thomas R. *1, 2 Peter, Jude*. The New American Commentary 37. Nashville, Tennessee; Broadman & Holman, 2003.

Vinson, Richard B., Richard F. Wilson, and Watson E. Mills. *1 & 2 Peter, Jude*. Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary. Macon, Georgia; Smyth & Helwys Publishing, 2010.

Westcott, B. F. and F. J. A. Hort. *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek: With Notes on Selected Readings*. Peabody, Massachusetts; Hendrickson, 1988.

Wikgren, Allen Paul. “Some Problems in Jude 5.” *Studies in history and text of the New Testament in honor of Kenneth Willis Clark*. Edited by Boyd L. Daniels and M. Jack Suggs. Salt Lake, Utah; University of Utah Press, 1967.